

Transcript of the Hearing of

Date: February 24, 2015 Volume: 5

Case: SITING COUNCIL - DOCKET NO. 192B

Printed On: March 3, 2015

UNITED REPORTERS, INC. Phone:866-534-3383 Fax: 877-534-3383 Email: info@unitedreporters.com Internet: www.unitedreporters.com

Page 544

STATE OF CONNECTICUT CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

Docket No. 192B CPV Towantic, 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

Continued Council Meeting held at the Connecticut Siting Council, Ten Franklin Square, New Britain, Connecticut, on February 24, 2015, at 11:00 a.m.

Held Before: ROBERT STEIN, Chairman

UNITED REPORTERS, INC. info@unitedreporters.com Nationwide-866-534-3383-Toll-Free w

www.unitedreporters.com

	Page 545		Page 547
1	Appearances:	1	A p p e a r a n c e s (Cont'd):
2	Council Members:	2	Also present for the Pomperaug River
3	SENATOR JAMES J. MURPHY, JR.,	3	Watershed Coalition:
4	Vice Chairman	4	LEN DeJONG
5	LARRY LEVESQUE, PURA	5	
6	Designee	6	Also present for Naugatuck River
7	DANIEL P. LYNCH, JR.	7	Revival Group, Inc:
8	,	8	KEVIN R. ZAK
9	Council Staff:	9	
10	MELANIE BACHMAN, ESQ.	10	Also present for Naugatuck Valley
11	Executive Director and	11	Audubon Society:
12	Staff Attorney	12	JEFF RUHLOFF
13	\$	13	
14	MICHAEL PERRONE,	14	Also present:
15	Siting Analyst	15	WAYNE McCORMACK
16		16	-
17	FRED CUNLIFFE,	17	Also present for Westover Hills
18	Supervising Siting Analyst	18	Subdivision Homeowners:
19		19	CHESTER CORNACCHIA, ESQ.
20	For CPV Towantic, LLC:	20	
21	BROWN RUDNICK, LLP	21	
22	185 Asylum Street	22	
23	Hartford, Connecticut 06103	23	
24	BY: PHILIP M. SMALL, ESQ.	24	
25	FRANCA L. DeROSA, ESQ.	25	
	Page 546		Page 548
1		1	Page 548 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Good
1 2	Page 546 Appearances (Cont'd.): For the Town of Middlebury:	1 2	_
	A p p e a r a n c e s (Cont'd.):		THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Good
2	A p p e a r a n c e s (Cont'd.): For the Town of Middlebury:	2	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. This meeting
2 3	A p p e a r a n c e s (Cont'd.): For the Town of Middlebury: LAW FIRM OF STEPHEN L. SAVARESE	2 3	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. This meeting is called to order this Tuesday, February the
2 3 4	A p p e a r a n c e s (Cont'd.): For the Town of Middlebury: LAW FIRM OF STEPHEN L. SAVARESE 103 South Main Street	2 3 4	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. This meeting is called to order this Tuesday, February the 24th, 2015, at approximately at 11:01 a.m. My
2 3 4 5	A p p e a r a n c e s (Cont'd.): For the Town of Middlebury: LAW FIRM OF STEPHEN L. SAVARESE 103 South Main Street Middlebury, Connecticut 06470	2 3 4 5	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. This meeting is called to order this Tuesday, February the 24th, 2015, at approximately at 11:01 a.m. My name is Jerry Murphy, I'm the Vice Chairman
2 3 4 5 6	A p p e a r a n c e s (Cont'd.): For the Town of Middlebury: LAW FIRM OF STEPHEN L. SAVARESE 103 South Main Street Middlebury, Connecticut 06470	2 3 4 5 6	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. This meeting is called to order this Tuesday, February the 24th, 2015, at approximately at 11:01 a.m. My name is Jerry Murphy, I'm the Vice Chairman of the Council and opening the meeting this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A p p e a r a n c e s (Cont'd.): For the Town of Middlebury: LAW FIRM OF STEPHEN L. SAVARESE 103 South Main Street Middlebury, Connecticut 06470 By: STEPHEN SAVARESE, ESQ.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. This meeting is called to order this Tuesday, February the 24th, 2015, at approximately at 11:01 a.m. My name is Jerry Murphy, I'm the Vice Chairman of the Council and opening the meeting this morning. Our Chairman will be along very shortly, but we'll start on time. This hearing is held pursuant
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A p p e a r a n c e s (Cont'd.): For the Town of Middlebury: LAW FIRM OF STEPHEN L. SAVARESE 103 South Main Street Middlebury, Connecticut 06470 By: STEPHEN SAVARESE, ESQ. Also present for the Town of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. This meeting is called to order this Tuesday, February the 24th, 2015, at approximately at 11:01 a.m. My name is Jerry Murphy, I'm the Vice Chairman of the Council and opening the meeting this morning. Our Chairman will be along very shortly, but we'll start on time. This hearing is held pursuant to the provisions of Title 16 of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A p p e a r a n c e s (Cont'd.): For the Town of Middlebury: LAW FIRM OF STEPHEN L. SAVARESE 103 South Main Street Middlebury, Connecticut 06470 By: STEPHEN SAVARESE, ESQ. Also present for the Town of Middlebury: RAYMOND PIETRORAZIO	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. This meeting is called to order this Tuesday, February the 24th, 2015, at approximately at 11:01 a.m. My name is Jerry Murphy, I'm the Vice Chairman of the Council and opening the meeting this morning. Our Chairman will be along very shortly, but we'll start on time. This hearing is held pursuant to the provisions of Title 16 of the Connecticut General Statutes and of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A p p e a r a n c e s (Cont'd.): For the Town of Middlebury: LAW FIRM OF STEPHEN L. SAVARESE 103 South Main Street Middlebury, Connecticut 06470 By: STEPHEN SAVARESE, ESQ. Also present for the Town of Middlebury:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. This meeting is called to order this Tuesday, February the 24th, 2015, at approximately at 11:01 a.m. My name is Jerry Murphy, I'm the Vice Chairman of the Council and opening the meeting this morning. Our Chairman will be along very shortly, but we'll start on time. This hearing is held pursuant to the provisions of Title 16 of the Connecticut General Statutes and of the Uniform Administrative Procedures Act upon a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A p p e a r a n c e s (Cont'd.): For the Town of Middlebury: LAW FIRM OF STEPHEN L. SAVARESE 103 South Main Street Middlebury, Connecticut 06470 By: STEPHEN SAVARESE, ESQ. Also present for the Town of Middlebury: RAYMOND PIETRORAZIO For the Connecticut Light and Power Company:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. This meeting is called to order this Tuesday, February the 24th, 2015, at approximately at 11:01 a.m. My name is Jerry Murphy, I'm the Vice Chairman of the Council and opening the meeting this morning. Our Chairman will be along very shortly, but we'll start on time. This hearing is held pursuant to the provisions of Title 16 of the Connecticut General Statutes and of the Uniform Administrative Procedures Act upon a motion to reopen the final decision on the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A p p e a r a n c e s (Cont'd.): For the Town of Middlebury: LAW FIRM OF STEPHEN L. SAVARESE 103 South Main Street Middlebury, Connecticut 06470 By: STEPHEN SAVARESE, ESQ. Also present for the Town of Middlebury: RAYMOND PIETRORAZIO For the Connecticut Light and Power Company: EVERSOURCE ENERGY	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. This meeting is called to order this Tuesday, February the 24th, 2015, at approximately at 11:01 a.m. My name is Jerry Murphy, I'm the Vice Chairman of the Council and opening the meeting this morning. Our Chairman will be along very shortly, but we'll start on time. This hearing is held pursuant to the provisions of Title 16 of the Connecticut General Statutes and of the Uniform Administrative Procedures Act upon a motion to reopen the final decision on the Certificate of Environmental Compatibility
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A p p e a r a n c e s (Cont'd.): For the Town of Middlebury: LAW FIRM OF STEPHEN L. SAVARESE 103 South Main Street Middlebury, Connecticut 06470 By: STEPHEN SAVARESE, ESQ. Also present for the Town of Middlebury: RAYMOND PIETRORAZIO For the Connecticut Light and Power Company: EVERSOURCE ENERGY 107 Selden Street	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. This meeting is called to order this Tuesday, February the 24th, 2015, at approximately at 11:01 a.m. My name is Jerry Murphy, I'm the Vice Chairman of the Council and opening the meeting this morning. Our Chairman will be along very shortly, but we'll start on time. This hearing is held pursuant to the provisions of Title 16 of the Connecticut General Statutes and of the Uniform Administrative Procedures Act upon a motion to reopen the final decision on the Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need held by CPV Towantic, LLC for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A p p e a r a n c e s (Cont'd.): For the Town of Middlebury: LAW FIRM OF STEPHEN L. SAVARESE 103 South Main Street Middlebury, Connecticut 06470 By: STEPHEN SAVARESE, ESQ. Also present for the Town of Middlebury: RAYMOND PIETRORAZIO For the Connecticut Light and Power Company: EVERSOURCE ENERGY 107 Selden Street Berlin, Connecticut 06037	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. This meeting is called to order this Tuesday, February the 24th, 2015, at approximately at 11:01 a.m. My name is Jerry Murphy, I'm the Vice Chairman of the Council and opening the meeting this morning. Our Chairman will be along very shortly, but we'll start on time. This hearing is held pursuant to the provisions of Title 16 of the Connecticut General Statutes and of the Uniform Administrative Procedures Act upon a motion to reopen the final decision on the Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need held by CPV Towantic, LLC for the construction, maintenance and operation
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A p p e a r a n c e s (Cont'd.): For the Town of Middlebury: LAW FIRM OF STEPHEN L. SAVARESE 103 South Main Street Middlebury, Connecticut 06470 By: STEPHEN SAVARESE, ESQ. Also present for the Town of Middlebury: RAYMOND PIETRORAZIO For the Connecticut Light and Power Company: EVERSOURCE ENERGY 107 Selden Street	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. This meeting is called to order this Tuesday, February the 24th, 2015, at approximately at 11:01 a.m. My name is Jerry Murphy, I'm the Vice Chairman of the Council and opening the meeting this morning. Our Chairman will be along very shortly, but we'll start on time. This hearing is held pursuant to the provisions of Title 16 of the Connecticut General Statutes and of the Uniform Administrative Procedures Act upon a motion to reopen the final decision on the Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need held by CPV Towantic, LLC for the construction, maintenance and operation of a 785 megawatt dual-fuel combined cycle
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A p p e a r a n c e s (Cont'd.): For the Town of Middlebury: LAW FIRM OF STEPHEN L. SAVARESE 103 South Main Street Middlebury, Connecticut 06470 By: STEPHEN SAVARESE, ESQ. Also present for the Town of Middlebury: RAYMOND PIETRORAZIO For the Connecticut Light and Power Company: EVERSOURCE ENERGY 107 Selden Street Berlin, Connecticut 06037 BY: JEFFREY D. COCHRAN, ESQ.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. This meeting is called to order this Tuesday, February the 24th, 2015, at approximately at 11:01 a.m. My name is Jerry Murphy, I'm the Vice Chairman of the Council and opening the meeting this morning. Our Chairman will be along very shortly, but we'll start on time. This hearing is held pursuant to the provisions of Title 16 of the Connecticut General Statutes and of the Uniform Administrative Procedures Act upon a motion to reopen the final decision on the Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need held by CPV Towantic, LLC for the construction, maintenance and operation of a 785 megawatt dual-fuel combined cycle electric generating facility located north of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A p p e a r a n c e s (Cont'd.): For the Town of Middlebury: LAW FIRM OF STEPHEN L. SAVARESE 103 South Main Street Middlebury, Connecticut 06470 By: STEPHEN SAVARESE, ESQ. Also present for the Town of Middlebury: RAYMOND PIETRORAZIO For the Connecticut Light and Power Company: EVERSOURCE ENERGY 107 Selden Street Berlin, Connecticut 06037 BY: JEFFREY D. COCHRAN, ESQ.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. This meeting is called to order this Tuesday, February the 24th, 2015, at approximately at 11:01 a.m. My name is Jerry Murphy, I'm the Vice Chairman of the Council and opening the meeting this morning. Our Chairman will be along very shortly, but we'll start on time. This hearing is held pursuant to the provisions of Title 16 of the Connecticut General Statutes and of the Uniform Administrative Procedures Act upon a motion to reopen the final decision on the Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need held by CPV Towantic, LLC for the construction, maintenance and operation of a 785 megawatt dual-fuel combined cycle electric generating facility located north of the Prokop Road and Towantic Hill Road
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A p p e a r a n c e s (Cont'd.): For the Town of Middlebury: LAW FIRM OF STEPHEN L. SAVARESE 103 South Main Street Middlebury, Connecticut 06470 By: STEPHEN SAVARESE, ESQ. Also present for the Town of Middlebury: RAYMOND PIETRORAZIO For the Connecticut Light and Power Company: EVERSOURCE ENERGY 107 Selden Street Berlin, Connecticut 06037 BY: JEFFREY D. COCHRAN, ESQ. Also present for the Oxford Flying Club:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. This meeting is called to order this Tuesday, February the 24th, 2015, at approximately at 11:01 a.m. My name is Jerry Murphy, I'm the Vice Chairman of the Council and opening the meeting this morning. Our Chairman will be along very shortly, but we'll start on time. This hearing is held pursuant to the provisions of Title 16 of the Connecticut General Statutes and of the Uniform Administrative Procedures Act upon a motion to reopen the final decision on the Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need held by CPV Towantic, LLC for the construction, maintenance and operation of a 785 megawatt dual-fuel combined cycle electric generating facility located north of the Prokop Road and Towantic Hill Road intersection in the Town of Oxford,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A p p e a r a n c e s (Cont'd.): For the Town of Middlebury: LAW FIRM OF STEPHEN L. SAVARESE 103 South Main Street Middlebury, Connecticut 06470 By: STEPHEN SAVARESE, ESQ. Also present for the Town of Middlebury: RAYMOND PIETRORAZIO For the Connecticut Light and Power Company: EVERSOURCE ENERGY 107 Selden Street Berlin, Connecticut 06037 BY: JEFFREY D. COCHRAN, ESQ.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. This meeting is called to order this Tuesday, February the 24th, 2015, at approximately at 11:01 a.m. My name is Jerry Murphy, I'm the Vice Chairman of the Council and opening the meeting this morning. Our Chairman will be along very shortly, but we'll start on time. This hearing is held pursuant to the provisions of Title 16 of the Connecticut General Statutes and of the Uniform Administrative Procedures Act upon a motion to reopen the final decision on the Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need held by CPV Towantic, LLC for the construction, maintenance and operation of a 785 megawatt dual-fuel combined cycle electric generating facility located north of the Prokop Road and Towantic Hill Road intersection in the Town of Oxford, Connecticut.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A p p e a r a n c e s (Cont'd.): For the Town of Middlebury: LAW FIRM OF STEPHEN L. SAVARESE 103 South Main Street Middlebury, Connecticut 06470 By: STEPHEN SAVARESE, ESQ. Also present for the Town of Middlebury: RAYMOND PIETRORAZIO For the Connecticut Light and Power Company: EVERSOURCE ENERGY 107 Selden Street Berlin, Connecticut 06037 BY: JEFFREY D. COCHRAN, ESQ. Also present for the Oxford Flying Club:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. This meeting is called to order this Tuesday, February the 24th, 2015, at approximately at 11:01 a.m. My name is Jerry Murphy, I'm the Vice Chairman of the Council and opening the meeting this morning. Our Chairman will be along very shortly, but we'll start on time. This hearing is held pursuant to the provisions of Title 16 of the Connecticut General Statutes and of the Uniform Administrative Procedures Act upon a motion to reopen the final decision on the Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need held by CPV Towantic, LLC for the construction, maintenance and operation of a 785 megawatt dual-fuel combined cycle electric generating facility located north of the Prokop Road and Towantic Hill Road intersection in the Town of Oxford, Connecticut. Dn November 13, 2014, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A p p e a r a n c e s (Cont'd.): For the Town of Middlebury: LAW FIRM OF STEPHEN L. SAVARESE 103 South Main Street Middlebury, Connecticut 06470 By: STEPHEN SAVARESE, ESQ. Also present for the Town of Middlebury: RAYMOND PIETRORAZIO For the Connecticut Light and Power Company: EVERSOURCE ENERGY 107 Selden Street Berlin, Connecticut 06037 BY: JEFFREY D. COCHRAN, ESQ. Also present for the Oxford Flying Club:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. This meeting is called to order this Tuesday, February the 24th, 2015, at approximately at 11:01 a.m. My name is Jerry Murphy, I'm the Vice Chairman of the Council and opening the meeting this morning. Our Chairman will be along very shortly, but we'll start on time. This hearing is held pursuant to the provisions of Title 16 of the Connecticut General Statutes and of the Uniform Administrative Procedures Act upon a motion to reopen the final decision on the Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need held by CPV Towantic, LLC for the construction, maintenance and operation of a 785 megawatt dual-fuel combined cycle electric generating facility located north of the Prokop Road and Towantic Hill Road intersection in the Town of Oxford, Connecticut. On November 13, 2014, the Council, pursuant to a request filed by CPV
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A p p e a r a n c e s (Cont'd.): For the Town of Middlebury: LAW FIRM OF STEPHEN L. SAVARESE 103 South Main Street Middlebury, Connecticut 06470 By: STEPHEN SAVARESE, ESQ. Also present for the Town of Middlebury: RAYMOND PIETRORAZIO For the Connecticut Light and Power Company: EVERSOURCE ENERGY 107 Selden Street Berlin, Connecticut 06037 BY: JEFFREY D. COCHRAN, ESQ. Also present for the Oxford Flying Club:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. This meeting is called to order this Tuesday, February the 24th, 2015, at approximately at 11:01 a.m. My name is Jerry Murphy, I'm the Vice Chairman of the Council and opening the meeting this morning. Our Chairman will be along very shortly, but we'll start on time. This hearing is held pursuant to the provisions of Title 16 of the Connecticut General Statutes and of the Uniform Administrative Procedures Act upon a motion to reopen the final decision on the Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need held by CPV Towantic, LLC for the construction, maintenance and operation of a 785 megawatt dual-fuel combined cycle electric generating facility located north of the Prokop Road and Towantic Hill Road intersection in the Town of Oxford, Connecticut. On November 13, 2014, the Council, pursuant to a request filed by CPV Towantic, LLC, and the provisions of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A p p e a r a n c e s (Cont'd.): For the Town of Middlebury: LAW FIRM OF STEPHEN L. SAVARESE 103 South Main Street Middlebury, Connecticut 06470 By: STEPHEN SAVARESE, ESQ. Also present for the Town of Middlebury: RAYMOND PIETRORAZIO For the Connecticut Light and Power Company: EVERSOURCE ENERGY 107 Selden Street Berlin, Connecticut 06037 BY: JEFFREY D. COCHRAN, ESQ. Also present for the Oxford Flying Club:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. This meeting is called to order this Tuesday, February the 24th, 2015, at approximately at 11:01 a.m. My name is Jerry Murphy, I'm the Vice Chairman of the Council and opening the meeting this morning. Our Chairman will be along very shortly, but we'll start on time. This hearing is held pursuant to the provisions of Title 16 of the Connecticut General Statutes and of the Uniform Administrative Procedures Act upon a motion to reopen the final decision on the Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need held by CPV Towantic, LLC for the construction, maintenance and operation of a 785 megawatt dual-fuel combined cycle electric generating facility located north of the Prokop Road and Towantic Hill Road intersection in the Town of Oxford, Connecticut. On November 13, 2014, the Council, pursuant to a request filed by CPV

2 (Pages 545 to 548)

	Page 549		Page 551
1	reopened the final decision rendered in this	1	hearing due to his unavailability from
2	docket.	2	February 25, 2015, through March the 20th,
3	On June 23, 1999, the Council	3	2015.
4	considered and approved granting a	4	Attorney Bachman may wish to
5	certificate to CPV Towantic, LLC's	5	comment.
6	predecessor for the construction, maintenance	6	MS. BACHMAN: Thank you,
7	and operation of a 512 megawatt natural	7	Mr. Chairman.
8	gas-fired combined cycle facility located	8	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Are you
9	north of the Prokop Road and Towantic Hill	9	going to continue with that objection?
10	Road intersection in the Town of Oxford,	10	MR. SMALL: Mr. Stevens did
11	Connecticut.	11	file something late yesterday. We've had a
12	On March 1, 2001, the Council	12	preliminary look at it. I think we may
13	considered and approved final site plans for	13	cross-examine him on this today, if that's
14	this facility. The certificate for this	14	his direct case, as long as there's no direct
15	facility is scheduled to expire June the 1st,	15	oral testimony, but we reserve the right when
16	2016.	16	we have a chance to look at it in more
17	A verbatim transcript will be	17	detail, to cross-examine him when he's back
18	made of this hearing and deposited with the	18	the latter two days of hearing, which I
19	town clerk's office in Oxford and Middlebury	19	believe are at the end of March. We may not
20	for the convenience of the public.	20	need to. I just don't want to give up that
21	We'll proceed in accordance	21	right.
22	with the prepared agenda, copies of which are	22	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: The plan
23	available, if one has not already made	23	today is to have Mr. Stevens of the Oxford
24	themselves available to them.	24	Flying Club is here?
25	The Council added one item to	25	MR. STEVENS: Yes, sir, I am.
	Page 550		Page 552
1	Page 550 its administrative notice list which is	1	Page 552 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: The plan
1 2	_	1 2	
	its administrative notice list which is		THE VICE CHAIRMAN: The plan
2	its administrative notice list which is listed as Roman numeral I, D, Item 46, Docket Number 438, Cello Partnership, d/b/a Verizon Certificate of Environmental Compatibility	2	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: The plan today is to have him cross-examine the panel.
2 3	its administrative notice list which is listed as Roman numeral I, D, Item 46, Docket Number 438, Cello Partnership, d/b/a Verizon Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction,	2 3	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: The plan today is to have him cross-examine the panel. And because he's here and he has filed this one page, as I understand it MR. SMALL: Yes.
2 3 4	its administrative notice list which is listed as Roman numeral I, D, Item 46, Docket Number 438, Cello Partnership, d/b/a Verizon Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance and operation of a	2 3 4 5 6	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: The plan today is to have him cross-examine the panel. And because he's here and he has filed this one page, as I understand it
2 3 4 5 6 7	its administrative notice list which is listed as Roman numeral I, D, Item 46, Docket Number 438, Cello Partnership, d/b/a Verizon Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance and operation of a telecommunications facility located at 53	2 3 4 5 6 7	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: The plan today is to have him cross-examine the panel. And because he's here and he has filed this one page, as I understand it MR. SMALL: Yes. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: that the cross-examination of his case will be at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	its administrative notice list which is listed as Roman numeral I, D, Item 46, Docket Number 438, Cello Partnership, d/b/a Verizon Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance and operation of a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: The plan today is to have him cross-examine the panel. And because he's here and he has filed this one page, as I understand it MR. SMALL: Yes. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	its administrative notice list which is listed as Roman numeral I, D, Item 46, Docket Number 438, Cello Partnership, d/b/a Verizon Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance and operation of a telecommunications facility located at 53	2 3 4 5 6 7	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: The plan today is to have him cross-examine the panel. And because he's here and he has filed this one page, as I understand it MR. SMALL: Yes. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: that the cross-examination of his case will be at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	its administrative notice list which is listed as Roman numeral I, D, Item 46, Docket Number 438, Cello Partnership, d/b/a Verizon Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance and operation of a telecommunications facility located at 53 Gallup Road, Voluntown, Connecticut. Record and final decision. Does any party or any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: The plan today is to have him cross-examine the panel. And because he's here and he has filed this one page, as I understand it MR. SMALL: Yes. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: that the cross-examination of his case will be at that time, and then we will move to staff cross-examination of your panel. MR. SMALL: We have no
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	its administrative notice list which is listed as Roman numeral I, D, Item 46, Docket Number 438, Cello Partnership, d/b/a Verizon Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance and operation of a telecommunications facility located at 53 Gallup Road, Voluntown, Connecticut. Record and final decision. Does any party or any intervenor have an objection to this being	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: The plan today is to have him cross-examine the panel. And because he's here and he has filed this one page, as I understand it MR. SMALL: Yes. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: that the cross-examination of his case will be at that time, and then we will move to staff cross-examination of your panel. MR. SMALL: We have no objection to that procedure, Mr. Chairman.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	its administrative notice list which is listed as Roman numeral I, D, Item 46, Docket Number 438, Cello Partnership, d/b/a Verizon Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance and operation of a telecommunications facility located at 53 Gallup Road, Voluntown, Connecticut. Record and final decision. Does any party or any intervenor have an objection to this being listed in the administrative notice list?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: The plan today is to have him cross-examine the panel. And because he's here and he has filed this one page, as I understand it MR. SMALL: Yes. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: that the cross-examination of his case will be at that time, and then we will move to staff cross-examination of your panel. MR. SMALL: We have no objection to that procedure, Mr. Chairman. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Then
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	its administrative notice list which is listed as Roman numeral I, D, Item 46, Docket Number 438, Cello Partnership, d/b/a Verizon Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance and operation of a telecommunications facility located at 53 Gallup Road, Voluntown, Connecticut. Record and final decision. Does any party or any intervenor have an objection to this being listed in the administrative notice list? MR. SMALL: No objection,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: The plan today is to have him cross-examine the panel. And because he's here and he has filed this one page, as I understand it MR. SMALL: Yes. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: that the cross-examination of his case will be at that time, and then we will move to staff cross-examination of your panel. MR. SMALL: We have no objection to that procedure, Mr. Chairman. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Then that's the way we're going to proceed today.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	its administrative notice list which is listed as Roman numeral I, D, Item 46, Docket Number 438, Cello Partnership, d/b/a Verizon Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance and operation of a telecommunications facility located at 53 Gallup Road, Voluntown, Connecticut. Record and final decision. Does any party or any intervenor have an objection to this being listed in the administrative notice list? MR. SMALL: No objection, Mr. Chairman.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: The plan today is to have him cross-examine the panel. And because he's here and he has filed this one page, as I understand it MR. SMALL: Yes. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: that the cross-examination of his case will be at that time, and then we will move to staff cross-examination of your panel. MR. SMALL: We have no objection to that procedure, Mr. Chairman. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Then that's the way we're going to proceed today. I think you have Eric Davison.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	its administrative notice list which is listed as Roman numeral I, D, Item 46, Docket Number 438, Cello Partnership, d/b/a Verizon Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance and operation of a telecommunications facility located at 53 Gallup Road, Voluntown, Connecticut. Record and final decision. Does any party or any intervenor have an objection to this being listed in the administrative notice list? MR. SMALL: No objection, Mr. Chairman. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Attorney	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: The plan today is to have him cross-examine the panel. And because he's here and he has filed this one page, as I understand it MR. SMALL: Yes. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: that the cross-examination of his case will be at that time, and then we will move to staff cross-examination of your panel. MR. SMALL: We have no objection to that procedure, Mr. Chairman. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Then that's the way we're going to proceed today. I think you have Eric Davison. MR. SMALL: Yes, we have one
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	its administrative notice list which is listed as Roman numeral I, D, Item 46, Docket Number 438, Cello Partnership, d/b/a Verizon Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance and operation of a telecommunications facility located at 53 Gallup Road, Voluntown, Connecticut. Record and final decision. Does any party or any intervenor have an objection to this being listed in the administrative notice list? MR. SMALL: No objection, Mr. Chairman. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Attorney Small indicates no.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: The plan today is to have him cross-examine the panel. And because he's here and he has filed this one page, as I understand it MR. SMALL: Yes. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: that the cross-examination of his case will be at that time, and then we will move to staff cross-examination of your panel. MR. SMALL: We have no objection to that procedure, Mr. Chairman. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Then that's the way we're going to proceed today. I think you have Eric Davison. MR. SMALL: Yes, we have one additional witness, Mr. Eric Davison. So, if
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	its administrative notice list which is listed as Roman numeral I, D, Item 46, Docket Number 438, Cello Partnership, d/b/a Verizon Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance and operation of a telecommunications facility located at 53 Gallup Road, Voluntown, Connecticut. Record and final decision. Does any party or any intervenor have an objection to this being listed in the administrative notice list? MR. SMALL: No objection, Mr. Chairman. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Attorney Small indicates no. Anyone else?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: The plan today is to have him cross-examine the panel. And because he's here and he has filed this one page, as I understand it MR. SMALL: Yes. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: that the cross-examination of his case will be at that time, and then we will move to staff cross-examination of your panel. MR. SMALL: We have no objection to that procedure, Mr. Chairman. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Then that's the way we're going to proceed today. I think you have Eric Davison. MR. SMALL: Yes, we have one additional witness, Mr. Eric Davison. So, if we could have him sworn.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	its administrative notice list which is listed as Roman numeral I, D, Item 46, Docket Number 438, Cello Partnership, d/b/a Verizon Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance and operation of a telecommunications facility located at 53 Gallup Road, Voluntown, Connecticut. Record and final decision. Does any party or any intervenor have an objection to this being listed in the administrative notice list? MR. SMALL: No objection, Mr. Chairman. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Attorney Small indicates no. Anyone else? (No response.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: The plan today is to have him cross-examine the panel. And because he's here and he has filed this one page, as I understand it MR. SMALL: Yes. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: that the cross-examination of his case will be at that time, and then we will move to staff cross-examination of your panel. MR. SMALL: We have no objection to that procedure, Mr. Chairman. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Then that's the way we're going to proceed today. I think you have Eric Davison. MR. SMALL: Yes, we have one additional witness, Mr. Eric Davison. So, if we could have him sworn. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Before we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	its administrative notice list which is listed as Roman numeral I, D, Item 46, Docket Number 438, Cello Partnership, d/b/a Verizon Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance and operation of a telecommunications facility located at 53 Gallup Road, Voluntown, Connecticut. Record and final decision. Does any party or any intervenor have an objection to this being listed in the administrative notice list? MR. SMALL: No objection, Mr. Chairman. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Attorney Small indicates no. Anyone else? (No response.) THE VICE CHAIRMAN: If not, so	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: The plan today is to have him cross-examine the panel. And because he's here and he has filed this one page, as I understand it MR. SMALL: Yes. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: that the cross-examination of his case will be at that time, and then we will move to staff cross-examination of your panel. MR. SMALL: We have no objection to that procedure, Mr. Chairman. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Then that's the way we're going to proceed today. I think you have Eric Davison. MR. SMALL: Yes, we have one additional witness, Mr. Eric Davison. So, if we could have him sworn. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Before we get to you, I take it that I'm told I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	its administrative notice list which is listed as Roman numeral I, D, Item 46, Docket Number 438, Cello Partnership, d/b/a Verizon Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance and operation of a telecommunications facility located at 53 Gallup Road, Voluntown, Connecticut. Record and final decision. Does any party or any intervenor have an objection to this being listed in the administrative notice list? MR. SMALL: No objection, Mr. Chairman. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Attorney Small indicates no. Anyone else? (No response.) THE VICE CHAIRMAN: If not, so be it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: The plan today is to have him cross-examine the panel. And because he's here and he has filed this one page, as I understand it MR. SMALL: Yes. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: that the cross-examination of his case will be at that time, and then we will move to staff cross-examination of your panel. MR. SMALL: We have no objection to that procedure, Mr. Chairman. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Then that's the way we're going to proceed today. I think you have Eric Davison. MR. SMALL: Yes, we have one additional witness, Mr. Eric Davison. So, if we could have him sworn. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Before we get to you, I take it that I'm told I didn't rule on your objection. I assumed you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	its administrative notice list which is listed as Roman numeral I, D, Item 46, Docket Number 438, Cello Partnership, d/b/a Verizon Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance and operation of a telecommunications facility located at 53 Gallup Road, Voluntown, Connecticut. Record and final decision. Does any party or any intervenor have an objection to this being listed in the administrative notice list? MR. SMALL: No objection, Mr. Chairman. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Attorney Small indicates no. Anyone else? (No response.) THE VICE CHAIRMAN: If not, so be it. The certificate holder filed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: The plan today is to have him cross-examine the panel. And because he's here and he has filed this one page, as I understand it MR. SMALL: Yes. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: that the cross-examination of his case will be at that time, and then we will move to staff cross-examination of your panel. MR. SMALL: We have no objection to that procedure, Mr. Chairman. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Then that's the way we're going to proceed today. I think you have Eric Davison. MR. SMALL: Yes, we have one additional witness, Mr. Eric Davison. So, if we could have him sworn. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Before we get to you, I take it that I'm told I didn't rule on your objection. I assumed you withdraw it for now, at least.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	its administrative notice list which is listed as Roman numeral I, D, Item 46, Docket Number 438, Cello Partnership, d/b/a Verizon Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance and operation of a telecommunications facility located at 53 Gallup Road, Voluntown, Connecticut. Record and final decision. Does any party or any intervenor have an objection to this being listed in the administrative notice list? MR. SMALL: No objection, Mr. Chairman. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Attorney Small indicates no. Anyone else? (No response.) THE VICE CHAIRMAN: If not, so be it. The certificate holder filed an objection to the request of Mr. Burton	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: The plan today is to have him cross-examine the panel. And because he's here and he has filed this one page, as I understand it MR. SMALL: Yes. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: that the cross-examination of his case will be at that time, and then we will move to staff cross-examination of your panel. MR. SMALL: We have no objection to that procedure, Mr. Chairman. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Then that's the way we're going to proceed today. I think you have Eric Davison. MR. SMALL: Yes, we have one additional witness, Mr. Eric Davison. So, if we could have him sworn. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Before we get to you, I take it that I'm told I didn't rule on your objection. I assumed you withdraw it for now, at least. MR. SMALL: Yes. Based on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	its administrative notice list which is listed as Roman numeral I, D, Item 46, Docket Number 438, Cello Partnership, d/b/a Verizon Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance and operation of a telecommunications facility located at 53 Gallup Road, Voluntown, Connecticut. Record and final decision. Does any party or any intervenor have an objection to this being listed in the administrative notice list? MR. SMALL: No objection, Mr. Chairman. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Attorney Small indicates no. Anyone else? (No response.) THE VICE CHAIRMAN: If not, so be it. The certificate holder filed an objection to the request of Mr. Burton Stevens of the Oxford Flying Club to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: The plan today is to have him cross-examine the panel. And because he's here and he has filed this one page, as I understand it MR. SMALL: Yes. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: that the cross-examination of his case will be at that time, and then we will move to staff cross-examination of your panel. MR. SMALL: We have no objection to that procedure, Mr. Chairman. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Then that's the way we're going to proceed today. I think you have Eric Davison. MR. SMALL: Yes, we have one additional witness, Mr. Eric Davison. So, if we could have him sworn. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Before we get to you, I take it that I'm told I didn't rule on your objection. I assumed you withdraw it for now, at least. MR. SMALL: Yes. Based on your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	its administrative notice list which is listed as Roman numeral I, D, Item 46, Docket Number 438, Cello Partnership, d/b/a Verizon Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance and operation of a telecommunications facility located at 53 Gallup Road, Voluntown, Connecticut. Record and final decision. Does any party or any intervenor have an objection to this being listed in the administrative notice list? MR. SMALL: No objection, Mr. Chairman. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Attorney Small indicates no. Anyone else? (No response.) THE VICE CHAIRMAN: If not, so be it. The certificate holder filed an objection to the request of Mr. Burton Stevens of the Oxford Flying Club to cross-examine the certificate holder and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: The plan today is to have him cross-examine the panel. And because he's here and he has filed this one page, as I understand it MR. SMALL: Yes. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: that the cross-examination of his case will be at that time, and then we will move to staff cross-examination of your panel. MR. SMALL: We have no objection to that procedure, Mr. Chairman. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Then that's the way we're going to proceed today. I think you have Eric Davison. MR. SMALL: Yes, we have one additional witness, Mr. Eric Davison. So, if we could have him sworn. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Before we get to you, I take it that I'm told I didn't rule on your objection. I assumed you withdraw it for now, at least. MR. SMALL: Yes. Based on your THE VICE CHAIRMAN: On our
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	its administrative notice list which is listed as Roman numeral I, D, Item 46, Docket Number 438, Cello Partnership, d/b/a Verizon Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance and operation of a telecommunications facility located at 53 Gallup Road, Voluntown, Connecticut. Record and final decision. Does any party or any intervenor have an objection to this being listed in the administrative notice list? MR. SMALL: No objection, Mr. Chairman. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Attorney Small indicates no. Anyone else? (No response.) THE VICE CHAIRMAN: If not, so be it. The certificate holder filed an objection to the request of Mr. Burton Stevens of the Oxford Flying Club to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: The plan today is to have him cross-examine the panel. And because he's here and he has filed this one page, as I understand it MR. SMALL: Yes. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: that the cross-examination of his case will be at that time, and then we will move to staff cross-examination of your panel. MR. SMALL: We have no objection to that procedure, Mr. Chairman. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Then that's the way we're going to proceed today. I think you have Eric Davison. MR. SMALL: Yes, we have one additional witness, Mr. Eric Davison. So, if we could have him sworn. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Before we get to you, I take it that I'm told I didn't rule on your objection. I assumed you withdraw it for now, at least. MR. SMALL: Yes. Based on your

3 (Pages 549 to 552)

	Page 553		Page 555
1	MR. SMALL: Right.	1	documents consist of responses to Council
2	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: You have	2	interrogatories, Late-Filed exhibits,
3	the right at a future time, of course.	3	responses to Westover interrogatories, and
4	MR. SMALL: Okay. We withdraw	4	responses and objections to Jay Halpern
5	it on that basis.	5	interrogatories.
6	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Fine.	6	Were each of those responses
7	MR. SMALL: Mr. Davison is	7	prepared by you or under your direction with
8	available to be sworn in.	8	respect to the ones that you're listed as a
9	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Sorry to	9	responsible witness?
10	interrupt.	10	THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes.
11	ERIC RICHARD DAVISON,	11	THE WITNESS (Gresock): Yes.
12	called as a witness, being first duly	12	THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes.
13	sworn by Ms. Bachman, was examined and	13	THE WITNESS (Donovan): Yes.
14	testified on his oath as follows:	14	THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes.
15	MR. SMALL: Mr. Davison, would	15	THE WITNESS (Powers): Yes.
16	you please state your full name and your	16	THE WITNESS (Fowers). Tes. THE WITNESS (Bodell): Yes.
17	occupation?	17	MR. SMALL: Do any of you have
18	THE WITNESS: Eric Richard	18	any changes or corrections to any of those
19	Davison. I'm a biologist.	19	responses?
20	MR. SMALL: And the company	20	THE WITNESS (Sellars): No.
20	filed a document which is entitled as your	20	THE WITNESS (Gresock): No.
21	resume. Was that document prepared by you or	21	THE WITNESS (Diesock). No.
23	under your direction?	23	THE WITNESS (Donovan): No.
24	THE WITNESS (Davison): It	23	
24		24	THE WITNESS (Gustafson): No. THE WITNESS (Powers): No.
20	was.	25	THE WITNESS (FOWERS). NO.
	Page 554		Page 556
1	Page 554 MR. SMALL: And is it true and	1	
1 2	MR. SMALL: And is it true and	1 2	THE WITNESS (Bodell): No.
	_		THE WITNESS (Bodell): No. MR. SMALL: And are they true
2	MR. SMALL: And is it true and correct to the best of your knowledge and	2	THE WITNESS (Bodell): No. MR. SMALL: And are they true and correct, those responses true and correct
2 3	MR. SMALL: And is it true and correct to the best of your knowledge and belief?	2 3	THE WITNESS (Bodell): No. MR. SMALL: And are they true
2 3 4	MR. SMALL: And is it true and correct to the best of your knowledge and belief? THE WITNESS (Davison): It is. MR. SMALL: Thank you.	2 3 4	THE WITNESS (Bodell): No. MR. SMALL: And are they true and correct, those responses true and correct to the best of your knowledge and belief? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes.
2 3 4 5	MR. SMALL: And is it true and correct to the best of your knowledge and belief? THE WITNESS (Davison): It is.	2 3 4 5	THE WITNESS (Bodell): No. MR. SMALL: And are they true and correct, those responses true and correct to the best of your knowledge and belief? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes. THE WITNESS (Gresock): Yes.
2 3 4 5 6	MR. SMALL: And is it true and correct to the best of your knowledge and belief? THE WITNESS (Davison): It is. MR. SMALL: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, we can go and adopt all of the interrogatory all the	2 3 4 5 6	THE WITNESS (Bodell): No. MR. SMALL: And are they true and correct, those responses true and correct to the best of your knowledge and belief? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes. THE WITNESS (Gresock): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. SMALL: And is it true and correct to the best of your knowledge and belief? THE WITNESS (Davison): It is. MR. SMALL: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, we can go and	2 3 4 5 6 7	THE WITNESS (Bodell): No. MR. SMALL: And are they true and correct, those responses true and correct to the best of your knowledge and belief? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes. THE WITNESS (Gresock): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bonovan): Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. SMALL: And is it true and correct to the best of your knowledge and belief? THE WITNESS (Davison): It is. MR. SMALL: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, we can go and adopt all of the interrogatory all the other documents along with this and then ask	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	THE WITNESS (Bodell): No. MR. SMALL: And are they true and correct, those responses true and correct to the best of your knowledge and belief? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes. THE WITNESS (Gresock): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. SMALL: And is it true and correct to the best of your knowledge and belief? THE WITNESS (Davison): It is. MR. SMALL: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, we can go and adopt all of the interrogatory all the other documents along with this and then ask that it all become full exhibits, if we may? THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE WITNESS (Bodell): No. MR. SMALL: And are they true and correct, those responses true and correct to the best of your knowledge and belief? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes. THE WITNESS (Gresock): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bonovan): Yes. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes. THE WITNESS (Powers): Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. SMALL: And is it true and correct to the best of your knowledge and belief? THE WITNESS (Davison): It is. MR. SMALL: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, we can go and adopt all of the interrogatory all the other documents along with this and then ask that it all become full exhibits, if we may? THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead. FREDERICK SELLARS,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	THE WITNESS (Bodell): No. MR. SMALL: And are they true and correct, those responses true and correct to the best of your knowledge and belief? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes. THE WITNESS (Gresock): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bonovan): Yes. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes. THE WITNESS (Powers): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bodell): Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. SMALL: And is it true and correct to the best of your knowledge and belief? THE WITNESS (Davison): It is. MR. SMALL: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, we can go and adopt all of the interrogatory all the other documents along with this and then ask that it all become full exhibits, if we may? THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	THE WITNESS (Bodell): No. MR. SMALL: And are they true and correct, those responses true and correct to the best of your knowledge and belief? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes. THE WITNESS (Gresock): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bonovan): Yes. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes. THE WITNESS (Powers): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bodell): Yes. MR. SMALL: With that, I would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. SMALL: And is it true and correct to the best of your knowledge and belief? THE WITNESS (Davison): It is. MR. SMALL: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, we can go and adopt all of the interrogatory all the other documents along with this and then ask that it all become full exhibits, if we may? THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead. F R E D E R I C K S E L L A R S, L Y N N G R E S O C K,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	THE WITNESS (Bodell): No. MR. SMALL: And are they true and correct, those responses true and correct to the best of your knowledge and belief? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes. THE WITNESS (Gresock): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bonovan): Yes. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes. THE WITNESS (Powers): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bodell): Yes. MR. SMALL: With that, I would request that the document designated as CPV
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. SMALL: And is it true and correct to the best of your knowledge and belief? THE WITNESS (Davison): It is. MR. SMALL: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, we can go and adopt all of the interrogatory all the other documents along with this and then ask that it all become full exhibits, if we may? THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead. FREDERICK SELLARS, LYNN GRESOCK, ANDREW BAZINET,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE WITNESS (Bodell): No. MR. SMALL: And are they true and correct, those responses true and correct to the best of your knowledge and belief? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes. THE WITNESS (Gresock): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bonovan): Yes. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes. THE WITNESS (Powers): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bodell): Yes. MR. SMALL: With that, I would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. SMALL: And is it true and correct to the best of your knowledge and belief? THE WITNESS (Davison): It is. MR. SMALL: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, we can go and adopt all of the interrogatory all the other documents along with this and then ask that it all become full exhibits, if we may? THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead. FREDERICK SELLARS, LYNN GRESOCK, ANDREW BAZINET, JON DONOVAN,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	THE WITNESS (Bodell): No. MR. SMALL: And are they true and correct, those responses true and correct to the best of your knowledge and belief? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes. THE WITNESS (Gresock): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bonovan): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bonovan): Yes. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes. THE WITNESS (Powers): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bodell): Yes. MR. SMALL: With that, I would request that the document designated as CPV exhibits for identification 14 through 22 be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. SMALL: And is it true and correct to the best of your knowledge and belief? THE WITNESS (Davison): It is. MR. SMALL: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, we can go and adopt all of the interrogatory all the other documents along with this and then ask that it all become full exhibits, if we may? THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead. FREDERICK SELLARS, LYNN GRESOCK, ANDREW BAZINET, JON DONOVAN, DEAN GUSTAFSON,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	THE WITNESS (Bodell): No. MR. SMALL: And are they true and correct, those responses true and correct to the best of your knowledge and belief? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes. THE WITNESS (Gresock): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bonovan): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bonovan): Yes. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bodell): Yes. MR. SMALL: With that, I would request that the document designated as CPV exhibits for identification 14 through 22 be admitted as full exhibits for the record?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. SMALL: And is it true and correct to the best of your knowledge and belief? THE WITNESS (Davison): It is. MR. SMALL: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, we can go and adopt all of the interrogatory all the other documents along with this and then ask that it all become full exhibits, if we may? THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead. FREDERICK SELLARS, LYNN GRESOCK, ANDREW BAZINET, JON DONOVAN, DEAN GUSTAFSON, DANIELLE POWERS,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE WITNESS (Bodell): No. MR. SMALL: And are they true and correct, those responses true and correct to the best of your knowledge and belief? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes. THE WITNESS (Gersock): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bonovan): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bonovan): Yes. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bodell): Yes. MR. SMALL: With that, I would request that the document designated as CPV exhibits for identification 14 through 22 be admitted as full exhibits for the record? THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Is there
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. SMALL: And is it true and correct to the best of your knowledge and belief? THE WITNESS (Davison): It is. MR. SMALL: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, we can go and adopt all of the interrogatory all the other documents along with this and then ask that it all become full exhibits, if we may? THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead. FREDERICK SELLARS, LYNN GRESOCK, ANDREW BAZINET, JON DONOVAN, DEAN GUSTAFSON, DANIELLE POWERS, TANYA BODELL,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE WITNESS (Bodell): No. MR. SMALL: And are they true and correct, those responses true and correct to the best of your knowledge and belief? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes. THE WITNESS (Gresock): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bonovan): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bonovan): Yes. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bodell): Yes. MR. SMALL: With that, I would request that the document designated as CPV exhibits for identification 14 through 22 be admitted as full exhibits for the record? THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to the admission of these
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. SMALL: And is it true and correct to the best of your knowledge and belief? THE WITNESS (Davison): It is. MR. SMALL: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, we can go and adopt all of the interrogatory all the other documents along with this and then ask that it all become full exhibits, if we may? THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead. FREDERICK SELLARS, LYNN GRESOCK, ANDREW BAZINET, JON DONOVAN, DEAN GUSTAFSON, DANIELLE POWERS, TANYA BODELL, having been previously duly sworn, were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE WITNESS (Bodell): No. MR. SMALL: And are they true and correct, those responses true and correct to the best of your knowledge and belief? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes. THE WITNESS (Gresock): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bonovan): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bonovan): Yes. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bodell): Yes. MR. SMALL: With that, I would request that the document designated as CPV exhibits for identification 14 through 22 be admitted as full exhibits for the record? THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to the admission of these documents?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. SMALL: And is it true and correct to the best of your knowledge and belief? THE WITNESS (Davison): It is. MR. SMALL: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, we can go and adopt all of the interrogatory all the other documents along with this and then ask that it all become full exhibits, if we may? THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead. FREDERICK SELLARS, LYNN GRESOCK, ANDREW BAZINET, JON DONOVAN, DEAN GUSTAFSON, DANIELLE POWERS, TANYA BODELL, having been previously duly sworn, were examined and testified further on their	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	THE WITNESS (Bodell): No. MR. SMALL: And are they true and correct, those responses true and correct to the best of your knowledge and belief? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes. THE WITNESS (Gresock): Yes. THE WITNESS (Gresock): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bonovan): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bonovan): Yes. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bodell): Yes. MR. SMALL: With that, I would request that the document designated as CPV exhibits for identification 14 through 22 be admitted as full exhibits for the record? THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to the admission of these documents? Hearing none, they're so admitted, Attorney Small.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. SMALL: And is it true and correct to the best of your knowledge and belief? THE WITNESS (Davison): It is. MR. SMALL: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, we can go and adopt all of the interrogatory all the other documents along with this and then ask that it all become full exhibits, if we may? THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead. FREDERICK SELLARS, LYNN GRESOCK, ANDREW BAZINET, JON DONOVAN, DEAN GUSTAFSON, DANIELLE POWERS, TANYA BODELL, having been previously duly sworn, were examined and testified further on their oaths as follows: MR. SMALL: I think each	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE WITNESS (Bodell): No. MR. SMALL: And are they true and correct, those responses true and correct to the best of your knowledge and belief? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes. THE WITNESS (Gresock): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bonovan): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bonovan): Yes. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bodell): Yes. MR. SMALL: With that, I would request that the document designated as CPV exhibits for identification 14 through 22 be admitted as full exhibits for the record? THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to the admission of these documents? Hearing none, they're so
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. SMALL: And is it true and correct to the best of your knowledge and belief? THE WITNESS (Davison): It is. MR. SMALL: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, we can go and adopt all of the interrogatory all the other documents along with this and then ask that it all become full exhibits, if we may? THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead. FREDERICK SELLARS, LYNN GRESOCK, ANDREW BAZINET, JON DONOVAN, DEAN GUSTAFSON, DANIELLE POWERS, TANYA BODELL, having been previously duly sworn, were examined and testified further on their oaths as follows:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE WITNESS (Bodell): No. MR. SMALL: And are they true and correct, those responses true and correct to the best of your knowledge and belief? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes. THE WITNESS (Gresock): Yes. THE WITNESS (Gazinet): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bonovan): Yes. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes. THE WITNESS (Godell): Yes. MR. SMALL: With that, I would request that the document designated as CPV exhibits for identification 14 through 22 be admitted as full exhibits for the record? THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to the admission of these documents? Hearing none, they're so admitted, Attorney Small. (Exhibits II-B-14 through
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. SMALL: And is it true and correct to the best of your knowledge and belief? THE WITNESS (Davison): It is. MR. SMALL: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, we can go and adopt all of the interrogatory all the other documents along with this and then ask that it all become full exhibits, if we may? THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead. FREDERICK SELLARS, LYNN GRESOCK, ANDREW BAZINET, JON DONOVAN, DEAN GUSTAFSON, DANIELLE POWERS, TANYA BODELL, having been previously duly sworn, were examined and testified further on their oaths as follows: MR. SMALL: I think each witness on this witness panel is listed as a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE WITNESS (Bodell): No. MR. SMALL: And are they true and correct, those responses true and correct to the best of your knowledge and belief? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes. THE WITNESS (Gresock): Yes. THE WITNESS (Gazinet): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bonovan): Yes. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes. THE WITNESS (Godell): Yes. MR. SMALL: With that, I would request that the document designated as CPV exhibits for identification 14 through 22 be admitted as full exhibits for the record? THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to the admission of these documents? Hearing none, they're so admitted, Attorney Small. (Exhibits II-B-14 through Exhibits II-B-22: Received in evidence -
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. SMALL: And is it true and correct to the best of your knowledge and belief? THE WITNESS (Davison): It is. MR. SMALL: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, we can go and adopt all of the interrogatory all the other documents along with this and then ask that it all become full exhibits, if we may? THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead. FREDERICK SELLARS, LYNN GRESOCK, ANDREW BAZINET, JON DONOVAN, DEAN GUSTAFSON, DANIELLE POWERS, TANYA BODELL, having been previously duly sworn, were examined and testified further on their oaths as follows: MR. SMALL: I think each witness on this witness panel is listed as a responsible witness for one or more of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE WITNESS (Bodell): No. MR. SMALL: And are they true and correct, those responses true and correct to the best of your knowledge and belief? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes. THE WITNESS (Gresock): Yes. THE WITNESS (Gazinet): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes. THE WITNESS (Bonovan): Yes. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes. THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes. THE WITNESS (Godell): Yes. MR. SMALL: With that, I would request that the document designated as CPV exhibits for identification 14 through 22 be admitted as full exhibits for the record? THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to the admission of these documents? Hearing none, they're so admitted, Attorney Small. (Exhibits II-B-14 through Exhibits II-B-22: Received in evidence - described in index.)

afd92593-5a55-4bf8-b43f-ab5ed436198d

4 (Pages 553 to 556)

	Page 557		Page 559
1	cross-examination, Mr. Chairman.	1	MR. STEVENS: Sure.
2	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Okay.	2	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: I guess we
3	Mr. Stevens, I guess you're	3	understand now where we're going.
4	on. What we're going to do is you weren't	4	So proceed to cross-examine.
5	here the other day when the opportunity for	5	CROSS-EXAMINATION
6	the Oxford Flying Club to cross-examine came	6	MR. STEVENS: Thank you, sir.
7	up, but you're here today, and you're going	7	I would like to thank the
8	to do it now.	8	Council and the parties for allowing me to
9	MR. STEVENS: Yes, sir.	9	proceed out of order and to accommodate my
10	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: And	10	needs, so thank you very much to all parties
11	whenever the cross-examination of the Oxford	11	involved.
12	Flying Club is concluded, then you can put on	12	Mr. Small, I'll address these
13	your case, which I believe is this letter	13	to you and you can
14	that's been prepared by you?	14	MR. SMALL: No. Mr. Bazinet
15	MR. STEVENS: Sir, I was told	15	is the lead witness so
16	by Ms. Bachman that I would not be able to	16	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Just
17	present direct testimony today, so I'm not	17	address the questions, and whoever they feel
18	prepared to present direct testimony today.	18	is the most fit or responsible to respond
19	That letter was a copy to Mr. Stein, as chair	19	will do so.
20	of this, in response to the FAA 7460	20	MR. STEVENS: Sure.
21	circulation.	21	Are your plume calculations
22	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Let	22	based on the prior duration of approximately
23	me just you can sit down.	23	512 megawatts or the latest 798 or 805
24	MR. STEVENS: Thank you.	24	megawatt plant?
25	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Let me	25	THE WITNESS (Gresock): The
	Page 558		Page 560
1		1	
1 2	explain that in these proceedings it's not like in court. Direct testimony is not	1 2	Page 560 information we've provided about temperature and velocity is based upon the current
	explain that in these proceedings it's not		information we've provided about temperature
2	explain that in these proceedings it's not like in court. Direct testimony is not	2	information we've provided about temperature and velocity is based upon the current
2 3	explain that in these proceedings it's not like in court. Direct testimony is not presented. It's presented in the form of written testimony in advance, which the parties have an opportunity to review. And	2 3	information we've provided about temperature and velocity is based upon the current project configuration.
2 3 4 5 6	explain that in these proceedings it's not like in court. Direct testimony is not presented. It's presented in the form of written testimony in advance, which the parties have an opportunity to review. And then you adopt it just as Attorney Small had	2 3 4	information we've provided about temperature and velocity is based upon the current project configuration. MR. STEVENS: And what are those discharge temperatures that you're referring to?
2 3 4 5 6 7	explain that in these proceedings it's not like in court. Direct testimony is not presented. It's presented in the form of written testimony in advance, which the parties have an opportunity to review. And then you adopt it just as Attorney Small had his witnesses adopt their written testimony,	2 3 4 5 6 7	information we've provided about temperature and velocity is based upon the current project configuration. MR. STEVENS: And what are those discharge temperatures that you're referring to? THE WITNESS (Gresock): We
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	explain that in these proceedings it's not like in court. Direct testimony is not presented. It's presented in the form of written testimony in advance, which the parties have an opportunity to review. And then you adopt it just as Attorney Small had his witnesses adopt their written testimony, which recently was presented today, and then	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	information we've provided about temperature and velocity is based upon the current project configuration. MR. STEVENS: And what are those discharge temperatures that you're referring to? THE WITNESS (Gresock): We have provided information in a number of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	explain that in these proceedings it's not like in court. Direct testimony is not presented. It's presented in the form of written testimony in advance, which the parties have an opportunity to review. And then you adopt it just as Attorney Small had his witnesses adopt their written testimony, which recently was presented today, and then they were cross-examined on them. It was my	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	information we've provided about temperature and velocity is based upon the current project configuration. MR. STEVENS: And what are those discharge temperatures that you're referring to? THE WITNESS (Gresock): We have provided information in a number of different responses. In the response to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	explain that in these proceedings it's not like in court. Direct testimony is not presented. It's presented in the form of written testimony in advance, which the parties have an opportunity to review. And then you adopt it just as Attorney Small had his witnesses adopt their written testimony, which recently was presented today, and then they were cross-examined on them. It was my assumption that your testimony was going to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	information we've provided about temperature and velocity is based upon the current project configuration. MR. STEVENS: And what are those discharge temperatures that you're referring to? THE WITNESS (Gresock): We have provided information in a number of different responses. In the response to CSC Number 10, we have information that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	explain that in these proceedings it's not like in court. Direct testimony is not presented. It's presented in the form of written testimony in advance, which the parties have an opportunity to review. And then you adopt it just as Attorney Small had his witnesses adopt their written testimony, which recently was presented today, and then they were cross-examined on them. It was my assumption that your testimony was going to be basically this letter that was submitted.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	information we've provided about temperature and velocity is based upon the current project configuration. MR. STEVENS: And what are those discharge temperatures that you're referring to? THE WITNESS (Gresock): We have provided information in a number of different responses. In the response to CSC Number 10, we have information that compares the stack exit velocity and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	explain that in these proceedings it's not like in court. Direct testimony is not presented. It's presented in the form of written testimony in advance, which the parties have an opportunity to review. And then you adopt it just as Attorney Small had his witnesses adopt their written testimony, which recently was presented today, and then they were cross-examined on them. It was my assumption that your testimony was going to be basically this letter that was submitted. MR. STEVENS: I understand	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	information we've provided about temperature and velocity is based upon the current project configuration. MR. STEVENS: And what are those discharge temperatures that you're referring to? THE WITNESS (Gresock): We have provided information in a number of different responses. In the response to CSC Number 10, we have information that compares the stack exit velocity and temperature, comparing the current project to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	explain that in these proceedings it's not like in court. Direct testimony is not presented. It's presented in the form of written testimony in advance, which the parties have an opportunity to review. And then you adopt it just as Attorney Small had his witnesses adopt their written testimony, which recently was presented today, and then they were cross-examined on them. It was my assumption that your testimony was going to be basically this letter that was submitted. MR. STEVENS: I understand that I will not have an opportunity, other	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	information we've provided about temperature and velocity is based upon the current project configuration. MR. STEVENS: And what are those discharge temperatures that you're referring to? THE WITNESS (Gresock): We have provided information in a number of different responses. In the response to CSC Number 10, we have information that compares the stack exit velocity and temperature, comparing the current project to the inputs that were used in the 2012 MITRE
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	explain that in these proceedings it's not like in court. Direct testimony is not presented. It's presented in the form of written testimony in advance, which the parties have an opportunity to review. And then you adopt it just as Attorney Small had his witnesses adopt their written testimony, which recently was presented today, and then they were cross-examined on them. It was my assumption that your testimony was going to be basically this letter that was submitted. MR. STEVENS: I understand that I will not have an opportunity, other than today, to present direct testimony. If	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	information we've provided about temperature and velocity is based upon the current project configuration. MR. STEVENS: And what are those discharge temperatures that you're referring to? THE WITNESS (Gresock): We have provided information in a number of different responses. In the response to CSC Number 10, we have information that compares the stack exit velocity and temperature, comparing the current project to the inputs that were used in the 2012 MITRE model. That response identifies the exit
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	explain that in these proceedings it's not like in court. Direct testimony is not presented. It's presented in the form of written testimony in advance, which the parties have an opportunity to review. And then you adopt it just as Attorney Small had his witnesses adopt their written testimony, which recently was presented today, and then they were cross-examined on them. It was my assumption that your testimony was going to be basically this letter that was submitted. MR. STEVENS: I understand that I will not have an opportunity, other than today, to present direct testimony. If that is the case, then you may I would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	information we've provided about temperature and velocity is based upon the current project configuration. MR. STEVENS: And what are those discharge temperatures that you're referring to? THE WITNESS (Gresock): We have provided information in a number of different responses. In the response to CSC Number 10, we have information that compares the stack exit velocity and temperature, comparing the current project to the inputs that were used in the 2012 MITRE model. That response identifies the exit temperature as 183.29 degrees Fahrenheit and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	explain that in these proceedings it's not like in court. Direct testimony is not presented. It's presented in the form of written testimony in advance, which the parties have an opportunity to review. And then you adopt it just as Attorney Small had his witnesses adopt their written testimony, which recently was presented today, and then they were cross-examined on them. It was my assumption that your testimony was going to be basically this letter that was submitted. MR. STEVENS: I understand that I will not have an opportunity, other than today, to present direct testimony. If that is the case, then you may I would like to offer that letter as my direct	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	information we've provided about temperature and velocity is based upon the current project configuration. MR. STEVENS: And what are those discharge temperatures that you're referring to? THE WITNESS (Gresock): We have provided information in a number of different responses. In the response to CSC Number 10, we have information that compares the stack exit velocity and temperature, comparing the current project to the inputs that were used in the 2012 MITRE model. That response identifies the exit temperature as 183.29 degrees Fahrenheit and identifies the exit velocity as 56.2 feet per
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	explain that in these proceedings it's not like in court. Direct testimony is not presented. It's presented in the form of written testimony in advance, which the parties have an opportunity to review. And then you adopt it just as Attorney Small had his witnesses adopt their written testimony, which recently was presented today, and then they were cross-examined on them. It was my assumption that your testimony was going to be basically this letter that was submitted. MR. STEVENS: I understand that I will not have an opportunity, other than today, to present direct testimony. If that is the case, then you may I would like to offer that letter as my direct testimony.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	information we've provided about temperature and velocity is based upon the current project configuration. MR. STEVENS: And what are those discharge temperatures that you're referring to? THE WITNESS (Gresock): We have provided information in a number of different responses. In the response to CSC Number 10, we have information that compares the stack exit velocity and temperature, comparing the current project to the inputs that were used in the 2012 MITRE model. That response identifies the exit temperature as 183.29 degrees Fahrenheit and identifies the exit velocity as 56.2 feet per second.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	explain that in these proceedings it's not like in court. Direct testimony is not presented. It's presented in the form of written testimony in advance, which the parties have an opportunity to review. And then you adopt it just as Attorney Small had his witnesses adopt their written testimony, which recently was presented today, and then they were cross-examined on them. It was my assumption that your testimony was going to be basically this letter that was submitted. MR. STEVENS: I understand that I will not have an opportunity, other than today, to present direct testimony. If that is the case, then you may I would like to offer that letter as my direct testimony. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Fine.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	information we've provided about temperature and velocity is based upon the current project configuration. MR. STEVENS: And what are those discharge temperatures that you're referring to? THE WITNESS (Gresock): We have provided information in a number of different responses. In the response to CSC Number 10, we have information that compares the stack exit velocity and temperature, comparing the current project to the inputs that were used in the 2012 MITRE model. That response identifies the exit temperature as 183.29 degrees Fahrenheit and identifies the exit velocity as 56.2 feet per second. There was also a response that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	explain that in these proceedings it's not like in court. Direct testimony is not presented. It's presented in the form of written testimony in advance, which the parties have an opportunity to review. And then you adopt it just as Attorney Small had his witnesses adopt their written testimony, which recently was presented today, and then they were cross-examined on them. It was my assumption that your testimony was going to be basically this letter that was submitted. MR. STEVENS: I understand that I will not have an opportunity, other than today, to present direct testimony. If that is the case, then you may I would like to offer that letter as my direct testimony. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Fine. Okay. That's what we'll do after the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	information we've provided about temperature and velocity is based upon the current project configuration. MR. STEVENS: And what are those discharge temperatures that you're referring to? THE WITNESS (Gresock): We have provided information in a number of different responses. In the response to CSC Number 10, we have information that compares the stack exit velocity and temperature, comparing the current project to the inputs that were used in the 2012 MITRE model. That response identifies the exit temperature as 183.29 degrees Fahrenheit and identifies the exit velocity as 56.2 feet per second. There was also a response that was provided to CSC Question 11 and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	explain that in these proceedings it's not like in court. Direct testimony is not presented. It's presented in the form of written testimony in advance, which the parties have an opportunity to review. And then you adopt it just as Attorney Small had his witnesses adopt their written testimony, which recently was presented today, and then they were cross-examined on them. It was my assumption that your testimony was going to be basically this letter that was submitted. MR. STEVENS: I understand that I will not have an opportunity, other than today, to present direct testimony. If that is the case, then you may I would like to offer that letter as my direct testimony. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Fine. Okay. That's what we'll do after the cross-examination is through.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	information we've provided about temperature and velocity is based upon the current project configuration. MR. STEVENS: And what are those discharge temperatures that you're referring to? THE WITNESS (Gresock): We have provided information in a number of different responses. In the response to CSC Number 10, we have information that compares the stack exit velocity and temperature, comparing the current project to the inputs that were used in the 2012 MITRE model. That response identifies the exit temperature as 183.29 degrees Fahrenheit and identifies the exit velocity as 56.2 feet per second. There was also a response that was provided to CSC Question 11 and Question 12 that provided additional
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	explain that in these proceedings it's not like in court. Direct testimony is not presented. It's presented in the form of written testimony in advance, which the parties have an opportunity to review. And then you adopt it just as Attorney Small had his witnesses adopt their written testimony, which recently was presented today, and then they were cross-examined on them. It was my assumption that your testimony was going to be basically this letter that was submitted. MR. STEVENS: I understand that I will not have an opportunity, other than today, to present direct testimony. If that is the case, then you may I would like to offer that letter as my direct testimony. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Fine. Okay. That's what we'll do after the cross-examination is through. MR. STEVENS: Sure.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	information we've provided about temperature and velocity is based upon the current project configuration. MR. STEVENS: And what are those discharge temperatures that you're referring to? THE WITNESS (Gresock): We have provided information in a number of different responses. In the response to CSC Number 10, we have information that compares the stack exit velocity and temperature, comparing the current project to the inputs that were used in the 2012 MITRE model. That response identifies the exit temperature as 183.29 degrees Fahrenheit and identifies the exit velocity as 56.2 feet per second. There was also a response that was provided to CSC Question 11 and Question 12 that provided additional information with regard to how that exit
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	explain that in these proceedings it's not like in court. Direct testimony is not presented. It's presented in the form of written testimony in advance, which the parties have an opportunity to review. And then you adopt it just as Attorney Small had his witnesses adopt their written testimony, which recently was presented today, and then they were cross-examined on them. It was my assumption that your testimony was going to be basically this letter that was submitted. MR. STEVENS: I understand that I will not have an opportunity, other than today, to present direct testimony. If that is the case, then you may I would like to offer that letter as my direct testimony. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Fine. Okay. That's what we'll do after the cross-examination is through. MR. STEVENS: Sure. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: And then	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	information we've provided about temperature and velocity is based upon the current project configuration. MR. STEVENS: And what are those discharge temperatures that you're referring to? THE WITNESS (Gresock): We have provided information in a number of different responses. In the response to CSC Number 10, we have information that compares the stack exit velocity and temperature, comparing the current project to the inputs that were used in the 2012 MITRE model. That response identifies the exit temperature as 183.29 degrees Fahrenheit and identifies the exit velocity as 56.2 feet per second. There was also a response that was provided to CSC Question 11 and Question 12 that provided additional information with regard to how that exit temperature attenuates with height above the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	explain that in these proceedings it's not like in court. Direct testimony is not presented. It's presented in the form of written testimony in advance, which the parties have an opportunity to review. And then you adopt it just as Attorney Small had his witnesses adopt their written testimony, which recently was presented today, and then they were cross-examined on them. It was my assumption that your testimony was going to be basically this letter that was submitted. MR. STEVENS: I understand that I will not have an opportunity, other than today, to present direct testimony. If that is the case, then you may I would like to offer that letter as my direct testimony. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Fine. Okay. That's what we'll do after the cross-examination is through. MR. STEVENS: Sure. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: And then the parties, including the Applicant, will	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	information we've provided about temperature and velocity is based upon the current project configuration. MR. STEVENS: And what are those discharge temperatures that you're referring to? THE WITNESS (Gresock): We have provided information in a number of different responses. In the response to CSC Number 10, we have information that compares the stack exit velocity and temperature, comparing the current project to the inputs that were used in the 2012 MITRE model. That response identifies the exit temperature as 183.29 degrees Fahrenheit and identifies the exit velocity as 56.2 feet per second. There was also a response that was provided to CSC Question 11 and Question 12 that provided additional information with regard to how that exit temperature attenuates with height above the stack and the velocity as well. I don't know
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	explain that in these proceedings it's not like in court. Direct testimony is not presented. It's presented in the form of written testimony in advance, which the parties have an opportunity to review. And then you adopt it just as Attorney Small had his witnesses adopt their written testimony, which recently was presented today, and then they were cross-examined on them. It was my assumption that your testimony was going to be basically this letter that was submitted. MR. STEVENS: I understand that I will not have an opportunity, other than today, to present direct testimony. If that is the case, then you may I would like to offer that letter as my direct testimony. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Fine. Okay. That's what we'll do after the cross-examination is through. MR. STEVENS: Sure. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: And then	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	information we've provided about temperature and velocity is based upon the current project configuration. MR. STEVENS: And what are those discharge temperatures that you're referring to? THE WITNESS (Gresock): We have provided information in a number of different responses. In the response to CSC Number 10, we have information that compares the stack exit velocity and temperature, comparing the current project to the inputs that were used in the 2012 MITRE model. That response identifies the exit temperature as 183.29 degrees Fahrenheit and identifies the exit velocity as 56.2 feet per second. There was also a response that was provided to CSC Question 11 and Question 12 that provided additional information with regard to how that exit temperature attenuates with height above the

5 (Pages 557 to 560)

	Page 561		Page 563
1	MR. STEVENS: No. That's	1	and faster.
2	fine. You've answered my question.	2	MR. STEVENS: Thank you.
3	MR. SMALL: Just so there's no	3	According to some response to
4	confusion about numbering, that was in our	4	the CSC's request on water management, I
5	Set II responses.	5	believe you indicate that you're going to
6	THE WITNESS (Gresock): And	6	have a roughly the same amount of water as
7	then, in Set III, there's a response to	7	fuel when you're burning fuel oil, is that
8	CSC-10 that provides further information	8	correct, you require about the same amount of
9	related to the same question with regard to	9	water as fuel oil or distillate?
10	ULSD fire.	10	THE WITNESS (Bazinet): In
11	MR. STEVENS: Thank you.	11	gallons per hour that's roughly equivalent.
12	Are these discharge plume	12	MR. STEVENS: And this water
13	calculations based on firing natural gas or	13	will exit the stacks as water vapor?
14	ultra low sulphur distillate?	14	THE WITNESS (Bazinet): No.
15	THE WITNESS (Gresock): The	15	The water is used in a number of different
16	first were based upon natural gas, and the	16	ways, so, no, that's
17	response in the CSC-3 question, response to	17	MR. STEVENS: So what will
18	CSC-10, is ULSD, the distillate.	18	happen with this water?
19	MR. STEVENS: Are the exit	19	THE WITNESS (Donovan): So,
20	velocities and temperatures the same for gas	20	the water is consumed in a number of
21	and low sulphur distillate?	21	different places in the cycle. Some of it is
22	THE WITNESS (Gresock): They	22	used for NOx control following ULSD firing,
23	do differ.	23	but other uses include make-up to the cycle
24	MR. STEVENS: And you	24	to replace the blow down.
25	indicated that the exit velocity was 62	25	MR. STEVENS: So what will
	5 5 6 0		
	Page 562		Page 564
1		1	
1 2	point correction, 56.2 feet per second	1 2	happen with that water, and what percentage
1 2 3	point correction, 56.2 feet per second with the current project, and the exhaust		
2	point correction, 56.2 feet per second with the current project, and the exhaust temperature was 183.29. Is that with natural	2	happen with that water, and what percentage is used for NOx control? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So
2 3	point correction, 56.2 feet per second with the current project, and the exhaust	2 3	happen with that water, and what percentage is used for NOx control?
2 3 4	point correction, 56.2 feet per second with the current project, and the exhaust temperature was 183.29. Is that with natural gas or with distillate?	2 3 4	happen with that water, and what percentage is used for NOx control? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So the answer is going to differ depending on
2 3 4 5	point correction, 56.2 feet per second with the current project, and the exhaust temperature was 183.29. Is that with natural gas or with distillate? THE WITNESS (Gresock): That's	2 3 4 5 6 7	happen with that water, and what percentage is used for NOx control? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So the answer is going to differ depending on ambient temperature. The water balances that I mean, I could MR. STEVENS: Just give me a
2 3 4 5 6	point correction, 56.2 feet per second with the current project, and the exhaust temperature was 183.29. Is that with natural gas or with distillate? THE WITNESS (Gresock): That's natural gas, which is what the MITRE 2012	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	happen with that water, and what percentage is used for NOx control? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So the answer is going to differ depending on ambient temperature. The water balances that I mean, I could MR. STEVENS: Just give me a range at, say, 25 degrees, a day like today.
2 3 4 5 6 7	point correction, 56.2 feet per second with the current project, and the exhaust temperature was 183.29. Is that with natural gas or with distillate? THE WITNESS (Gresock): That's natural gas, which is what the MITRE 2012 model looked at. MR. STEVENS: So what you're doing is you're comparing the current with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	happen with that water, and what percentage is used for NOx control? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So the answer is going to differ depending on ambient temperature. The water balances that I mean, I could MR. STEVENS: Just give me a range at, say, 25 degrees, a day like today. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	point correction, 56.2 feet per second with the current project, and the exhaust temperature was 183.29. Is that with natural gas or with distillate? THE WITNESS (Gresock): That's natural gas, which is what the MITRE 2012 model looked at. MR. STEVENS: So what you're doing is you're comparing the current with the MITRE 2012?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	happen with that water, and what percentage is used for NOx control? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So the answer is going to differ depending on ambient temperature. The water balances that I mean, I could MR. STEVENS: Just give me a range at, say, 25 degrees, a day like today. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So, how about 20 degrees?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	point correction, 56.2 feet per second with the current project, and the exhaust temperature was 183.29. Is that with natural gas or with distillate? THE WITNESS (Gresock): That's natural gas, which is what the MITRE 2012 model looked at. MR. STEVENS: So what you're doing is you're comparing the current with the MITRE 2012? THE WITNESS (Gresock):	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	happen with that water, and what percentage is used for NOx control? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So the answer is going to differ depending on ambient temperature. The water balances that I mean, I could MR. STEVENS: Just give me a range at, say, 25 degrees, a day like today. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So, how about 20 degrees? MR. STEVENS: Sure.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	point correction, 56.2 feet per second with the current project, and the exhaust temperature was 183.29. Is that with natural gas or with distillate? THE WITNESS (Gresock): That's natural gas, which is what the MITRE 2012 model looked at. MR. STEVENS: So what you're doing is you're comparing the current with the MITRE 2012? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	happen with that water, and what percentage is used for NOx control? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So the answer is going to differ depending on ambient temperature. The water balances that I mean, I could MR. STEVENS: Just give me a range at, say, 25 degrees, a day like today. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So, how about 20 degrees? MR. STEVENS: Sure. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): All
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	point correction, 56.2 feet per second with the current project, and the exhaust temperature was 183.29. Is that with natural gas or with distillate? THE WITNESS (Gresock): That's natural gas, which is what the MITRE 2012 model looked at. MR. STEVENS: So what you're doing is you're comparing the current with the MITRE 2012? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Correct. MR. STEVENS: And what would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	happen with that water, and what percentage is used for NOx control? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So the answer is going to differ depending on ambient temperature. The water balances that I mean, I could MR. STEVENS: Just give me a range at, say, 25 degrees, a day like today. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So, how about 20 degrees? MR. STEVENS: Sure. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): All right. So at 20 degrees about 90 percent of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	point correction, 56.2 feet per second with the current project, and the exhaust temperature was 183.29. Is that with natural gas or with distillate? THE WITNESS (Gresock): That's natural gas, which is what the MITRE 2012 model looked at. MR. STEVENS: So what you're doing is you're comparing the current with the MITRE 2012? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Correct. MR. STEVENS: And what would be the temperature and exit velocity with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	happen with that water, and what percentage is used for NOx control? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So the answer is going to differ depending on ambient temperature. The water balances that I mean, I could MR. STEVENS: Just give me a range at, say, 25 degrees, a day like today. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So, how about 20 degrees? MR. STEVENS: Sure. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): All right. So at 20 degrees about 90 percent of the water.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	point correction, 56.2 feet per second with the current project, and the exhaust temperature was 183.29. Is that with natural gas or with distillate? THE WITNESS (Gresock): That's natural gas, which is what the MITRE 2012 model looked at. MR. STEVENS: So what you're doing is you're comparing the current with the MITRE 2012? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Correct. MR. STEVENS: And what would be the temperature and exit velocity with distillate?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	happen with that water, and what percentage is used for NOx control? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So the answer is going to differ depending on ambient temperature. The water balances that I mean, I could MR. STEVENS: Just give me a range at, say, 25 degrees, a day like today. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So, how about 20 degrees? MR. STEVENS: Sure. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): All right. So at 20 degrees about 90 percent of the water. MR. STEVENS: About 90 percent
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	point correction, 56.2 feet per second with the current project, and the exhaust temperature was 183.29. Is that with natural gas or with distillate? THE WITNESS (Gresock): That's natural gas, which is what the MITRE 2012 model looked at. MR. STEVENS: So what you're doing is you're comparing the current with the MITRE 2012? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Correct. MR. STEVENS: And what would be the temperature and exit velocity with distillate? THE WITNESS (Gresock): So,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	happen with that water, and what percentage is used for NOx control? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So the answer is going to differ depending on ambient temperature. The water balances that I mean, I could MR. STEVENS: Just give me a range at, say, 25 degrees, a day like today. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So, how about 20 degrees? MR. STEVENS: Sure. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): All right. So at 20 degrees about 90 percent of the water. MR. STEVENS: About 90 percent of the water will be used for NOx control?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	point correction, 56.2 feet per second with the current project, and the exhaust temperature was 183.29. Is that with natural gas or with distillate? THE WITNESS (Gresock): That's natural gas, which is what the MITRE 2012 model looked at. MR. STEVENS: So what you're doing is you're comparing the current with the MITRE 2012? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Correct. MR. STEVENS: And what would be the temperature and exit velocity with distillate? THE WITNESS (Gresock): So, under ULSD firing, the stack exit exhaust	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	happen with that water, and what percentage is used for NOx control? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So the answer is going to differ depending on ambient temperature. The water balances that I mean, I could MR. STEVENS: Just give me a range at, say, 25 degrees, a day like today. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So, how about 20 degrees? MR. STEVENS: Sure. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): All right. So at 20 degrees about 90 percent of the water. MR. STEVENS: About 90 percent of the water will be used for NOx control? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): That's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	point correction, 56.2 feet per second with the current project, and the exhaust temperature was 183.29. Is that with natural gas or with distillate? THE WITNESS (Gresock): That's natural gas, which is what the MITRE 2012 model looked at. MR. STEVENS: So what you're doing is you're comparing the current with the MITRE 2012? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Correct. MR. STEVENS: And what would be the temperature and exit velocity with distillate? THE WITNESS (Gresock): So, under ULSD firing, the stack exit exhaust temperature is 294.5 degrees Fahrenheit, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	happen with that water, and what percentage is used for NOx control? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So the answer is going to differ depending on ambient temperature. The water balances that I mean, I could MR. STEVENS: Just give me a range at, say, 25 degrees, a day like today. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So, how about 20 degrees? MR. STEVENS: Sure. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): All right. So at 20 degrees about 90 percent of the water. MR. STEVENS: About 90 percent of the water will be used for NOx control? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): That's correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	point correction, 56.2 feet per second with the current project, and the exhaust temperature was 183.29. Is that with natural gas or with distillate? THE WITNESS (Gresock): That's natural gas, which is what the MITRE 2012 model looked at. MR. STEVENS: So what you're doing is you're comparing the current with the MITRE 2012? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Correct. MR. STEVENS: And what would be the temperature and exit velocity with distillate? THE WITNESS (Gresock): So, under ULSD firing, the stack exit exhaust temperature is 294.5 degrees Fahrenheit, and the stack exit velocity is 68.8 feet per	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	happen with that water, and what percentage is used for NOx control? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So the answer is going to differ depending on ambient temperature. The water balances that I mean, I could MR. STEVENS: Just give me a range at, say, 25 degrees, a day like today. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So, how about 20 degrees? MR. STEVENS: Sure. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): All right. So at 20 degrees about 90 percent of the water. MR. STEVENS: About 90 percent of the water will be used for NOx control? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): That's correct. MR. STEVENS: And what will
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	point correction, 56.2 feet per second with the current project, and the exhaust temperature was 183.29. Is that with natural gas or with distillate? THE WITNESS (Gresock): That's natural gas, which is what the MITRE 2012 model looked at. MR. STEVENS: So what you're doing is you're comparing the current with the MITRE 2012? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Correct. MR. STEVENS: And what would be the temperature and exit velocity with distillate? THE WITNESS (Gresock): So, under ULSD firing, the stack exit exhaust temperature is 294.5 degrees Fahrenheit, and the stack exit velocity is 68.8 feet per second.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	happen with that water, and what percentage is used for NOx control? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So the answer is going to differ depending on ambient temperature. The water balances that I mean, I could MR. STEVENS: Just give me a range at, say, 25 degrees, a day like today. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So, how about 20 degrees? MR. STEVENS: Sure. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): All right. So at 20 degrees about 90 percent of the water. MR. STEVENS: About 90 percent of the water will be used for NOx control? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): That's correct. MR. STEVENS: And what will happen to that water after it's used for NOx
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	point correction, 56.2 feet per second with the current project, and the exhaust temperature was 183.29. Is that with natural gas or with distillate? THE WITNESS (Gresock): That's natural gas, which is what the MITRE 2012 model looked at. MR. STEVENS: So what you're doing is you're comparing the current with the MITRE 2012? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Correct. MR. STEVENS: And what would be the temperature and exit velocity with distillate? THE WITNESS (Gresock): So, under ULSD firing, the stack exit exhaust temperature is 294.5 degrees Fahrenheit, and the stack exit velocity is 68.8 feet per second. MR. STEVENS: Okay. So thank	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	happen with that water, and what percentage is used for NOx control? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So the answer is going to differ depending on ambient temperature. The water balances that I mean, I could MR. STEVENS: Just give me a range at, say, 25 degrees, a day like today. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So, how about 20 degrees? MR. STEVENS: Sure. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): All right. So at 20 degrees about 90 percent of the water. MR. STEVENS: About 90 percent of the water will be used for NOx control? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): That's correct. MR. STEVENS: And what will happen to that water after it's used for NOx control?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	point correction, 56.2 feet per second with the current project, and the exhaust temperature was 183.29. Is that with natural gas or with distillate? THE WITNESS (Gresock): That's natural gas, which is what the MITRE 2012 model looked at. MR. STEVENS: So what you're doing is you're comparing the current with the MITRE 2012? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Correct. MR. STEVENS: And what would be the temperature and exit velocity with distillate? THE WITNESS (Gresock): So, under ULSD firing, the stack exit exhaust temperature is 294.5 degrees Fahrenheit, and the stack exit velocity is 68.8 feet per second. MR. STEVENS: Okay. So thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	happen with that water, and what percentage is used for NOx control? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So the answer is going to differ depending on ambient temperature. The water balances that I mean, I could MR. STEVENS: Just give me a range at, say, 25 degrees, a day like today. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So, how about 20 degrees? MR. STEVENS: Sure. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): All right. So at 20 degrees about 90 percent of the water. MR. STEVENS: About 90 percent of the water will be used for NOx control? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): That's correct. MR. STEVENS: And what will happen to that water after it's used for NOx control? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): It
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	point correction, 56.2 feet per second with the current project, and the exhaust temperature was 183.29. Is that with natural gas or with distillate? THE WITNESS (Gresock): That's natural gas, which is what the MITRE 2012 model looked at. MR. STEVENS: So what you're doing is you're comparing the current with the MITRE 2012? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Correct. MR. STEVENS: And what would be the temperature and exit velocity with distillate? THE WITNESS (Gresock): So, under ULSD firing, the stack exit exhaust temperature is 294.5 degrees Fahrenheit, and the stack exit velocity is 68.8 feet per second. MR. STEVENS: Okay. So thank you. So, 110 degrees hotter and 12	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	happen with that water, and what percentage is used for NOx control? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So the answer is going to differ depending on ambient temperature. The water balances that I mean, I could MR. STEVENS: Just give me a range at, say, 25 degrees, a day like today. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So, how about 20 degrees? MR. STEVENS: Sure. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): All right. So at 20 degrees about 90 percent of the water. MR. STEVENS: About 90 percent of the water will be used for NOx control? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): That's correct. MR. STEVENS: And what will happen to that water after it's used for NOx control? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): It will evaporate.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	point correction, 56.2 feet per second with the current project, and the exhaust temperature was 183.29. Is that with natural gas or with distillate? THE WITNESS (Gresock): That's natural gas, which is what the MITRE 2012 model looked at. MR. STEVENS: So what you're doing is you're comparing the current with the MITRE 2012? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Correct. MR. STEVENS: And what would be the temperature and exit velocity with distillate? THE WITNESS (Gresock): So, under ULSD firing, the stack exit exhaust temperature is 294.5 degrees Fahrenheit, and the stack exit velocity is 68.8 feet per second. MR. STEVENS: Okay. So thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	happen with that water, and what percentage is used for NOx control? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So the answer is going to differ depending on ambient temperature. The water balances that I mean, I could MR. STEVENS: Just give me a range at, say, 25 degrees, a day like today. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So, how about 20 degrees? MR. STEVENS: Sure. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): All right. So at 20 degrees about 90 percent of the water. MR. STEVENS: About 90 percent of the water will be used for NOx control? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): That's correct. MR. STEVENS: And what will happen to that water after it's used for NOx control? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): It

	Page 565		Page 567
1	THE WITNESS (Bazinet): The	1	they're rare to not occur unless the
2	atmosphere.	2	temperature is below 40 degrees, so they're
3	MR. STEVENS: Into the	3	more prevalent when it is cold or it is very
4	atmosphere through the stacks?	4	humid.
5	THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's	5	MR. STEVENS: So, if the
б	correct.	6	temperature like on a day like today if
7	MR. STEVENS: And the other 10	7	you're firing distillate, you'll have a
8	percent, what will happen to that?	8	visible plume?
9	THE WITNESS (Donovan): That	9	THE WITNESS (Sellars): Under
10	goes into the cycle into the boiler for	10	either condition on a day as cold as today,
11	make-up.	11	like your car or your house or every stack
12	MR. STEVENS: Back into the	12	you pass between your house and here, there
13	boiler.	13	will be a visible plume.
14	THE WITNESS (Donovan): Yes.	14	(In the presence of Chairman
15	MR. STEVENS: So approximately	15	Stein.)
16 17	90 percent of the water that is being used.	16 17	MR. STEVENS: Okay. Thank
18	And how much water per hour will be being used when you're using	17	you. On a still day well, first
19	distillate?	19	of all, we're assuming that you have two
20	THE WITNESS (Donovan): About	20	turbines here, that both of these turbines
21	45,000 gallons per hour.	21	are firing, and the numbers that you've given
22	MR. STEVENS: About 45,000	22	me are for both turbines firing?
23	gallons an hour. So	23	THE WITNESS (Donovan): Those
24	THE WITNESS (Donovan): That	24	are total numbers.
25	would be the 100 percent.	25	MR. STEVENS: So thank you.
		<u> </u>	
	Daga EGG		Daga E60
	Page 566		Page 568
1	MR. STEVENS: Right. So a	1	So, when the temperature is
2	MR. STEVENS: Right. So a little over 40,000 gallons an hour will be	2	So, when the temperature is under 40, we'll have a visible plume. How
2 3	MR. STEVENS: Right. So a little over 40,000 gallons an hour will be being discharged through your stacks and	2 3	So, when the temperature is under 40, we'll have a visible plume. How big will that plume be?
2 3 4	MR. STEVENS: Right. So a little over 40,000 gallons an hour will be being discharged through your stacks and THE WITNESS (Donovan):	2 3 4	So, when the temperature is under 40, we'll have a visible plume. How big will that plume be? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Again,
2 3 4 5	MR. STEVENS: Right. So a little over 40,000 gallons an hour will be being discharged through your stacks and THE WITNESS (Donovan): Correct.	2 3 4 5	So, when the temperature is under 40, we'll have a visible plume. How big will that plume be? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Again, it's highly variable on a number of factors,
2 3 4 5 6	MR. STEVENS: Right. So a little over 40,000 gallons an hour will be being discharged through your stacks and THE WITNESS (Donovan): Correct. MR. STEVENS: 4 or 5,000	2 3 4 5 6	So, when the temperature is under 40, we'll have a visible plume. How big will that plume be? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Again, it's highly variable on a number of factors, the temperature
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. STEVENS: Right. So a little over 40,000 gallons an hour will be being discharged through your stacks and THE WITNESS (Donovan): Correct. MR. STEVENS: 4 or 5,000 gallons will be being recycled into the	2 3 4 5 6 7	So, when the temperature is under 40, we'll have a visible plume. How big will that plume be? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Again, it's highly variable on a number of factors, the temperature MR. STEVENS: On a still day?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. STEVENS: Right. So a little over 40,000 gallons an hour will be being discharged through your stacks and THE WITNESS (Donovan): Correct. MR. STEVENS: 4 or 5,000 gallons will be being recycled into the boiler?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	So, when the temperature is under 40, we'll have a visible plume. How big will that plume be? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Again, it's highly variable on a number of factors, the temperature MR. STEVENS: On a still day? THE WITNESS (Sellars): The
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. STEVENS: Right. So a little over 40,000 gallons an hour will be being discharged through your stacks and THE WITNESS (Donovan): Correct. MR. STEVENS: 4 or 5,000 gallons will be being recycled into the	2 3 4 5 6 7	So, when the temperature is under 40, we'll have a visible plume. How big will that plume be? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Again, it's highly variable on a number of factors, the temperature MR. STEVENS: On a still day? THE WITNESS (Sellars): The temperature, the humidity on that day, you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. STEVENS: Right. So a little over 40,000 gallons an hour will be being discharged through your stacks and THE WITNESS (Donovan): Correct. MR. STEVENS: 4 or 5,000 gallons will be being recycled into the boiler? THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	So, when the temperature is under 40, we'll have a visible plume. How big will that plume be? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Again, it's highly variable on a number of factors, the temperature MR. STEVENS: On a still day? THE WITNESS (Sellars): The
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. STEVENS: Right. So a little over 40,000 gallons an hour will be being discharged through your stacks and THE WITNESS (Donovan): Correct. MR. STEVENS: 4 or 5,000 gallons will be being recycled into the boiler? THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	So, when the temperature is under 40, we'll have a visible plume. How big will that plume be? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Again, it's highly variable on a number of factors, the temperature MR. STEVENS: On a still day? THE WITNESS (Sellars): The temperature, the humidity on that day, you know, what the temperature is that day.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. STEVENS: Right. So a little over 40,000 gallons an hour will be being discharged through your stacks and THE WITNESS (Donovan): Correct. MR. STEVENS: 4 or 5,000 gallons will be being recycled into the boiler? THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's correct. MR. STEVENS: Great. Thank	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	So, when the temperature is under 40, we'll have a visible plume. How big will that plume be? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Again, it's highly variable on a number of factors, the temperature MR. STEVENS: On a still day? THE WITNESS (Sellars): The temperature, the humidity on that day, you know, what the temperature is that day. MR. STEVENS: On a day like
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. STEVENS: Right. So a little over 40,000 gallons an hour will be being discharged through your stacks and THE WITNESS (Donovan): Correct. MR. STEVENS: 4 or 5,000 gallons will be being recycled into the boiler? THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's correct. MR. STEVENS: Great. Thank you. In CSC-3, 11, you indicate that at a certain temperature these plumes	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	So, when the temperature is under 40, we'll have a visible plume. How big will that plume be? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Again, it's highly variable on a number of factors, the temperature MR. STEVENS: On a still day? THE WITNESS (Sellars): The temperature, the humidity on that day, you know, what the temperature is that day. MR. STEVENS: On a day like today, 20 degrees, no wind? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Based on information from the 2012 MITRE Report
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. STEVENS: Right. So a little over 40,000 gallons an hour will be being discharged through your stacks and THE WITNESS (Donovan): Correct. MR. STEVENS: 4 or 5,000 gallons will be being recycled into the boiler? THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's correct. MR. STEVENS: Great. Thank you. In CSC-3, 11, you indicate that at a certain temperature these plumes will be visible. At what temperature would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	So, when the temperature is under 40, we'll have a visible plume. How big will that plume be? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Again, it's highly variable on a number of factors, the temperature MR. STEVENS: On a still day? THE WITNESS (Sellars): The temperature, the humidity on that day, you know, what the temperature is that day. MR. STEVENS: On a day like today, 20 degrees, no wind? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Based on information from the 2012 MITRE Report MR. STEVENS: The 2012 MITRE
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. STEVENS: Right. So a little over 40,000 gallons an hour will be being discharged through your stacks and THE WITNESS (Donovan): Correct. MR. STEVENS: 4 or 5,000 gallons will be being recycled into the boiler? THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's correct. MR. STEVENS: Great. Thank you. In CSC-3, 11, you indicate that at a certain temperature these plumes will be visible. At what temperature would that be? That would be on CSC-3, 11.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	So, when the temperature is under 40, we'll have a visible plume. How big will that plume be? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Again, it's highly variable on a number of factors, the temperature MR. STEVENS: On a still day? THE WITNESS (Sellars): The temperature, the humidity on that day, you know, what the temperature is that day. MR. STEVENS: On a day like today, 20 degrees, no wind? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Based on information from the 2012 MITRE Report MR. STEVENS: The 2012 MITRE Report is on the older, smaller unit. Right?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. STEVENS: Right. So a little over 40,000 gallons an hour will be being discharged through your stacks and THE WITNESS (Donovan): Correct. MR. STEVENS: 4 or 5,000 gallons will be being recycled into the boiler? THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's correct. MR. STEVENS: Great. Thank you. In CSC-3, 11, you indicate that at a certain temperature these plumes will be visible. At what temperature would that be? That would be on CSC-3, 11. THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	So, when the temperature is under 40, we'll have a visible plume. How big will that plume be? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Again, it's highly variable on a number of factors, the temperature MR. STEVENS: On a still day? THE WITNESS (Sellars): The temperature, the humidity on that day, you know, what the temperature is that day. MR. STEVENS: On a day like today, 20 degrees, no wind? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Based on information from the 2012 MITRE Report MR. STEVENS: The 2012 MITRE Report is on the older, smaller unit. Right? THE WITNESS (Sellars): That
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. STEVENS: Right. So a little over 40,000 gallons an hour will be being discharged through your stacks and THE WITNESS (Donovan): Correct. MR. STEVENS: 4 or 5,000 gallons will be being recycled into the boiler? THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's correct. MR. STEVENS: Great. Thank you. In CSC-3, 11, you indicate that at a certain temperature these plumes will be visible. At what temperature would that be? That would be on CSC-3, 11. THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes. It really varies by the relative humidity of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	So, when the temperature is under 40, we'll have a visible plume. How big will that plume be? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Again, it's highly variable on a number of factors, the temperature MR. STEVENS: On a still day? THE WITNESS (Sellars): The temperature, the humidity on that day, you know, what the temperature is that day. MR. STEVENS: On a day like today, 20 degrees, no wind? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Based on information from the 2012 MITRE Report MR. STEVENS: The 2012 MITRE Report is on the older, smaller unit. Right? THE WITNESS (Sellars): That is correct, but the exhaust temperature and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. STEVENS: Right. So a little over 40,000 gallons an hour will be being discharged through your stacks and THE WITNESS (Donovan): Correct. MR. STEVENS: 4 or 5,000 gallons will be being recycled into the boiler? THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's correct. MR. STEVENS: Great. Thank you. In CSC-3, 11, you indicate that at a certain temperature these plumes will be visible. At what temperature would that be? That would be on CSC-3, 11. THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes. It really varies by the relative humidity of the area at any point in time, but generally	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	So, when the temperature is under 40, we'll have a visible plume. How big will that plume be? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Again, it's highly variable on a number of factors, the temperature MR. STEVENS: On a still day? THE WITNESS (Sellars): The temperature, the humidity on that day, you know, what the temperature is that day. MR. STEVENS: On a day like today, 20 degrees, no wind? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Based on information from the 2012 MITRE Report MR. STEVENS: The 2012 MITRE Report is on the older, smaller unit. Right? THE WITNESS (Sellars): That is correct, but the exhaust temperature and actually the exhaust velocity is fairly
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. STEVENS: Right. So a little over 40,000 gallons an hour will be being discharged through your stacks and THE WITNESS (Donovan): Correct. MR. STEVENS: 4 or 5,000 gallons will be being recycled into the boiler? THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's correct. MR. STEVENS: Great. Thank you. In CSC-3, 11, you indicate that at a certain temperature these plumes will be visible. At what temperature would that be? That would be on CSC-3, 11. THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes. It really varies by the relative humidity of the area at any point in time, but generally the visible plumes are pretty rare below	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	So, when the temperature is under 40, we'll have a visible plume. How big will that plume be? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Again, it's highly variable on a number of factors, the temperature MR. STEVENS: On a still day? THE WITNESS (Sellars): The temperature, the humidity on that day, you know, what the temperature is that day. MR. STEVENS: On a day like today, 20 degrees, no wind? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Based on information from the 2012 MITRE Report MR. STEVENS: The 2012 MITRE Report is on the older, smaller unit. Right? THE WITNESS (Sellars): That is correct, but the exhaust temperature and actually the exhaust velocity is fairly similar.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. STEVENS: Right. So a little over 40,000 gallons an hour will be being discharged through your stacks and THE WITNESS (Donovan): Correct. MR. STEVENS: 4 or 5,000 gallons will be being recycled into the boiler? THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's correct. MR. STEVENS: Great. Thank you. In CSC-3, 11, you indicate that at a certain temperature these plumes will be visible. At what temperature would that be? That would be on CSC-3, 11. THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes. It really varies by the relative humidity of the area at any point in time, but generally the visible plumes are pretty rare below about, say, 40 degrees Fahrenheit or so.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	So, when the temperature is under 40, we'll have a visible plume. How big will that plume be? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Again, it's highly variable on a number of factors, the temperature MR. STEVENS: On a still day? THE WITNESS (Sellars): The temperature, the humidity on that day, you know, what the temperature is that day. MR. STEVENS: On a day like today, 20 degrees, no wind? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Based on information from the 2012 MITRE Report MR. STEVENS: The 2012 MITRE Report is on the older, smaller unit. Right? THE WITNESS (Sellars): That is correct, but the exhaust temperature and actually the exhaust velocity is fairly similar. MR. STEVENS: I'm sorry. You
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. STEVENS: Right. So a little over 40,000 gallons an hour will be being discharged through your stacks and THE WITNESS (Donovan): Correct. MR. STEVENS: 4 or 5,000 gallons will be being recycled into the boiler? THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's correct. MR. STEVENS: Great. Thank you. In CSC-3, 11, you indicate that at a certain temperature these plumes will be visible. At what temperature would that be? That would be on CSC-3, 11. THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes. It really varies by the relative humidity of the area at any point in time, but generally the visible plumes are pretty rare below about, say, 40 degrees Fahrenheit or so. MR. STEVENS: They're rare	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	So, when the temperature is under 40, we'll have a visible plume. How big will that plume be? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Again, it's highly variable on a number of factors, the temperature MR. STEVENS: On a still day? THE WITNESS (Sellars): The temperature, the humidity on that day, you know, what the temperature is that day. MR. STEVENS: On a day like today, 20 degrees, no wind? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Based on information from the 2012 MITRE Report MR. STEVENS: The 2012 MITRE Report is on the older, smaller unit. Right? THE WITNESS (Sellars): That is correct, but the exhaust temperature and actually the exhaust velocity is fairly similar. MR. STEVENS: I'm sorry. You just indicated on distillate it's 294 degrees
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. STEVENS: Right. So a little over 40,000 gallons an hour will be being discharged through your stacks and THE WITNESS (Donovan): Correct. MR. STEVENS: 4 or 5,000 gallons will be being recycled into the boiler? THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's correct. MR. STEVENS: Great. Thank you. In CSC-3, 11, you indicate that at a certain temperature these plumes will be visible. At what temperature would that be? That would be on CSC-3, 11. THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes. It really varies by the relative humidity of the area at any point in time, but generally the visible plumes are pretty rare below about, say, 40 degrees Fahrenheit or so. MR. STEVENS: They're rare below 40 degrees, so they will be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	So, when the temperature is under 40, we'll have a visible plume. How big will that plume be? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Again, it's highly variable on a number of factors, the temperature MR. STEVENS: On a still day? THE WITNESS (Sellars): The temperature, the humidity on that day, you know, what the temperature is that day. MR. STEVENS: On a day like today, 20 degrees, no wind? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Based on information from the 2012 MITRE Report MR. STEVENS: The 2012 MITRE Report is on the older, smaller unit. Right? THE WITNESS (Sellars): That is correct, but the exhaust temperature and actually the exhaust velocity is fairly similar. MR. STEVENS: I'm sorry. You just indicated on distillate it's 294 degrees versus 201 degree
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. STEVENS: Right. So a little over 40,000 gallons an hour will be being discharged through your stacks and THE WITNESS (Donovan): Correct. MR. STEVENS: 4 or 5,000 gallons will be being recycled into the boiler? THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's correct. MR. STEVENS: Great. Thank you. In CSC-3, 11, you indicate that at a certain temperature these plumes will be visible. At what temperature would that be? That would be on CSC-3, 11. THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes. It really varies by the relative humidity of the area at any point in time, but generally the visible plumes are pretty rare below about, say, 40 degrees Fahrenheit or so. MR. STEVENS: They're rare	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	So, when the temperature is under 40, we'll have a visible plume. How big will that plume be? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Again, it's highly variable on a number of factors, the temperature MR. STEVENS: On a still day? THE WITNESS (Sellars): The temperature, the humidity on that day, you know, what the temperature is that day. MR. STEVENS: On a day like today, 20 degrees, no wind? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Based on information from the 2012 MITRE Report MR. STEVENS: The 2012 MITRE Report is on the older, smaller unit. Right? THE WITNESS (Sellars): That is correct, but the exhaust temperature and actually the exhaust velocity is fairly similar. MR. STEVENS: I'm sorry. You just indicated on distillate it's 294 degrees

7 (Pages 565 to 568)

	Page 569		Page 571
1	plume would be on oil.	1	THE WITNESS (Donovan): What
2	MR. STEVENS: How tall is it	2	temperature? It's variable on ambient
3	on gas for the smaller unit that you're	3	temperature reading and percent load.
4	quoting there?	4	MR. STEVENS: At 20 degrees
5	THE WITNESS (Sellars): It	5	and at 70 degrees?
6	would probably be a couple hundred feet above	6	THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So you
7	the stack would probably be the maximum	7	want 20 degree relative fuel burn?
8	length. On the absolute most coldest day and	8	MR. STEVENS: No, 100 a 20
9	stillest day, it would be several hundred	9	degree temperature I'm just basically
10	feet.	10	what I'm looking for is how much more fuel
11	MR. STEVENS: Several hundred	11	this will burn and if it differs with
12	feet. And that's for the older, smaller unit	12	temperature and relative humidity, and so
13	while on gas?	13	forth and so on. You can choose your best
14	THE WITNESS (Sellars): Even	14	answer and choose your worst answer. Choose
15	under oil it would be several hundred feet.	15	the best conditions and choose the worst
16	MR. STEVENS: Okay. So this	16	conditions. I'm looking for a range.
17	plume, on a day like today when you're firing	17	THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Sure.
18	distillate, will be several hundred feet?	18	So I'm going to just restate your question
19	THE WITNESS (Sellars):	19	just to make sure that we're on the same
20	Correct.	20	page.
21	MR. STEVENS: How about the	21	MR. STEVENS: Sure.
22	volume, the size? I mean, I know how tall.	22	THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So, at
23	How wide?	23	20 degrees Fahrenheit, we're going to give
24	THE WITNESS (Sellars): Again,	24	you the fuel burn for the old configuration
25	I haven't modeled the actual visible plume	25	as well as the new configuration, assuming
	Page 570		Page 572
1	Page 570 dimensions.	1	Page 572 100 percent gas turbine load. And I think
1 2		1 2	100 percent gas turbine load. And I think that's it. Right?
	dimensions. MR. STEVENS: These are very important questions for pilots.		100 percent gas turbine load. And I think
2 3 4	dimensions. MR. STEVENS: These are very important questions for pilots. THE WITNESS (Sellars):	2 3 4	100 percent gas turbine load. And I think that's it. Right? MR. STEVENS: Sure. (Pause.)
2 3 4 5	dimensions. MR. STEVENS: These are very important questions for pilots. THE WITNESS (Sellars): Understood. And I think it's pretty typical	2 3 4 5	100 percent gas turbine load. And I think that's it. Right? MR. STEVENS: Sure. (Pause.) THE WITNESS (Donovan): So,
2 3 4 5 6	dimensions. MR. STEVENS: These are very important questions for pilots. THE WITNESS (Sellars): Understood. And I think it's pretty typical if you're a pilot you've seen plumes, and	2 3 4 5 6	100 percent gas turbine load. And I think that's it. Right? MR. STEVENS: Sure. (Pause.) THE WITNESS (Donovan): So, the original, the 512 megawatt configuration,
2 3 4 5 6 7	dimensions. MR. STEVENS: These are very important questions for pilots. THE WITNESS (Sellars): Understood. And I think it's pretty typical if you're a pilot you've seen plumes, and you've seen plumes on cold days. It would be	2 3 4 5 6 7	100 percent gas turbine load. And I think that's it. Right? MR. STEVENS: Sure. (Pause.) THE WITNESS (Donovan): So, the original, the 512 megawatt configuration, had about 72 percent fuel burn the current
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	dimensions. MR. STEVENS: These are very important questions for pilots. THE WITNESS (Sellars): Understood. And I think it's pretty typical if you're a pilot you've seen plumes, and you've seen plumes on cold days. It would be very, very similar to what you see from other	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	100 percent gas turbine load. And I think that's it. Right? MR. STEVENS: Sure. (Pause.) THE WITNESS (Donovan): So, the original, the 512 megawatt configuration, had about 72 percent fuel burn the current configuration has.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	dimensions. MR. STEVENS: These are very important questions for pilots. THE WITNESS (Sellars): Understood. And I think it's pretty typical if you're a pilot you've seen plumes, and you've seen plumes on cold days. It would be very, very similar to what you see from other facilities.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	100 percent gas turbine load. And I think that's it. Right? MR. STEVENS: Sure. (Pause.) THE WITNESS (Donovan): So, the original, the 512 megawatt configuration, had about 72 percent fuel burn the current configuration has. MR. STEVENS: So, in round
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	dimensions. MR. STEVENS: These are very important questions for pilots. THE WITNESS (Sellars): Understood. And I think it's pretty typical if you're a pilot you've seen plumes, and you've seen plumes on cold days. It would be very, very similar to what you see from other facilities. MR. STEVENS: I would like an	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	100 percent gas turbine load. And I think that's it. Right? MR. STEVENS: Sure. (Pause.) THE WITNESS (Donovan): So, the original, the 512 megawatt configuration, had about 72 percent fuel burn the current configuration has. MR. STEVENS: So, in round numbers, about 30 percent more for the newer
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	dimensions. MR. STEVENS: These are very important questions for pilots. THE WITNESS (Sellars): Understood. And I think it's pretty typical if you're a pilot you've seen plumes, and you've seen plumes on cold days. It would be very, very similar to what you see from other facilities. MR. STEVENS: I would like an answer to that question, the size of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	100 percent gas turbine load. And I think that's it. Right? MR. STEVENS: Sure. (Pause.) THE WITNESS (Donovan): So, the original, the 512 megawatt configuration, had about 72 percent fuel burn the current configuration has. MR. STEVENS: So, in round numbers, about 30 percent more for the newer unit, 72 percent maybe
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	dimensions. MR. STEVENS: These are very important questions for pilots. THE WITNESS (Sellars): Understood. And I think it's pretty typical if you're a pilot you've seen plumes, and you've seen plumes on cold days. It would be very, very similar to what you see from other facilities. MR. STEVENS: I would like an answer to that question, the size of the plumes on a 20-degree day, on a still	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	100 percent gas turbine load. And I think that's it. Right? MR. STEVENS: Sure. (Pause.) THE WITNESS (Donovan): So, the original, the 512 megawatt configuration, had about 72 percent fuel burn the current configuration has. MR. STEVENS: So, in round numbers, about 30 percent more for the newer unit, 72 percent maybe THE WITNESS (Bazinet): One
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	dimensions. MR. STEVENS: These are very important questions for pilots. THE WITNESS (Sellars): Understood. And I think it's pretty typical if you're a pilot you've seen plumes, and you've seen plumes on cold days. It would be very, very similar to what you see from other facilities. MR. STEVENS: I would like an answer to that question, the size of the plumes on a 20-degree day, on a still 20-degree day.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	100 percent gas turbine load. And I think that's it. Right? MR. STEVENS: Sure. (Pause.) THE WITNESS (Donovan): So, the original, the 512 megawatt configuration, had about 72 percent fuel burn the current configuration has. MR. STEVENS: So, in round numbers, about 30 percent more for the newer unit, 72 percent maybe THE WITNESS (Bazinet): One divided by .72.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	dimensions. MR. STEVENS: These are very important questions for pilots. THE WITNESS (Sellars): Understood. And I think it's pretty typical if you're a pilot you've seen plumes, and you've seen plumes on cold days. It would be very, very similar to what you see from other facilities. MR. STEVENS: I would like an answer to that question, the size of the plumes on a 20-degree day, on a still 20-degree day. How much more fuel will this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	100 percent gas turbine load. And I think that's it. Right? MR. STEVENS: Sure. (Pause.) THE WITNESS (Donovan): So, the original, the 512 megawatt configuration, had about 72 percent fuel burn the current configuration has. MR. STEVENS: So, in round numbers, about 30 percent more for the newer unit, 72 percent maybe THE WITNESS (Bazinet): One divided by .72. MR. STEVENS: That's at 20
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	dimensions. MR. STEVENS: These are very important questions for pilots. THE WITNESS (Sellars): Understood. And I think it's pretty typical if you're a pilot you've seen plumes, and you've seen plumes on cold days. It would be very, very similar to what you see from other facilities. MR. STEVENS: I would like an answer to that question, the size of the plumes on a 20-degree day, on a still 20-degree day. How much more fuel will this plant burn per hour at 100 percent input	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	100 percent gas turbine load. And I think that's it. Right? MR. STEVENS: Sure. (Pause.) THE WITNESS (Donovan): So, the original, the 512 megawatt configuration, had about 72 percent fuel burn the current configuration has. MR. STEVENS: So, in round numbers, about 30 percent more for the newer unit, 72 percent maybe THE WITNESS (Bazinet): One divided by .72. MR. STEVENS: That's at 20 degrees. Would it be greater, would the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	dimensions. MR. STEVENS: These are very important questions for pilots. THE WITNESS (Sellars): Understood. And I think it's pretty typical if you're a pilot you've seen plumes, and you've seen plumes on cold days. It would be very, very similar to what you see from other facilities. MR. STEVENS: I would like an answer to that question, the size of the plumes on a 20-degree day, on a still 20-degree day. How much more fuel will this plant burn per hour at 100 percent input rating over the previous 512 megawatt unit?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	100 percent gas turbine load. And I think that's it. Right? MR. STEVENS: Sure. (Pause.) THE WITNESS (Donovan): So, the original, the 512 megawatt configuration, had about 72 percent fuel burn the current configuration has. MR. STEVENS: So, in round numbers, about 30 percent more for the newer unit, 72 percent maybe THE WITNESS (Bazinet): One divided by .72. MR. STEVENS: That's at 20 degrees. Would it be greater, would the difference be greater or less at 70 degrees?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	dimensions. MR. STEVENS: These are very important questions for pilots. THE WITNESS (Sellars): Understood. And I think it's pretty typical if you're a pilot you've seen plumes, and you've seen plumes on cold days. It would be very, very similar to what you see from other facilities. MR. STEVENS: I would like an answer to that question, the size of the plumes on a 20-degree day, on a still 20-degree day. How much more fuel will this plant burn per hour at 100 percent input	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	100 percent gas turbine load. And I think that's it. Right? MR. STEVENS: Sure. (Pause.) THE WITNESS (Donovan): So, the original, the 512 megawatt configuration, had about 72 percent fuel burn the current configuration has. MR. STEVENS: So, in round numbers, about 30 percent more for the newer unit, 72 percent maybe THE WITNESS (Bazinet): One divided by .72. MR. STEVENS: That's at 20 degrees. Would it be greater, would the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	dimensions. MR. STEVENS: These are very important questions for pilots. THE WITNESS (Sellars): Understood. And I think it's pretty typical if you're a pilot you've seen plumes, and you've seen plumes on cold days. It would be very, very similar to what you see from other facilities. MR. STEVENS: I would like an answer to that question, the size of the plumes on a 20-degree day, on a still 20-degree day. How much more fuel will this plant burn per hour at 100 percent input rating over the previous 512 megawatt unit? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): I'm	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	100 percent gas turbine load. And I think that's it. Right? MR. STEVENS: Sure. (Pause.) THE WITNESS (Donovan): So, the original, the 512 megawatt configuration, had about 72 percent fuel burn the current configuration has. MR. STEVENS: So, in round numbers, about 30 percent more for the newer unit, 72 percent maybe THE WITNESS (Bazinet): One divided by .72. MR. STEVENS: That's at 20 degrees. Would it be greater, would the difference be greater or less at 70 degrees? THE WITNESS (Donovan): Just
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	dimensions. MR. STEVENS: These are very important questions for pilots. THE WITNESS (Sellars): Understood. And I think it's pretty typical if you're a pilot you've seen plumes, and you've seen plumes on cold days. It would be very, very similar to what you see from other facilities. MR. STEVENS: I would like an answer to that question, the size of the plumes on a 20-degree day, on a still 20-degree day. How much more fuel will this plant burn per hour at 100 percent input rating over the previous 512 megawatt unit? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): I'm sorry. Can you repeat the question?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	100 percent gas turbine load. And I think that's it. Right? MR. STEVENS: Sure. (Pause.) THE WITNESS (Donovan): So, the original, the 512 megawatt configuration, had about 72 percent fuel burn the current configuration has. MR. STEVENS: So, in round numbers, about 30 percent more for the newer unit, 72 percent maybe THE WITNESS (Bazinet): One divided by .72. MR. STEVENS: That's at 20 degrees. Would it be greater, would the difference be greater or less at 70 degrees? THE WITNESS (Donovan): Just bear with me a second.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	dimensions. MR. STEVENS: These are very important questions for pilots. THE WITNESS (Sellars): Understood. And I think it's pretty typical if you're a pilot you've seen plumes, and you've seen plumes on cold days. It would be very, very similar to what you see from other facilities. MR. STEVENS: I would like an answer to that question, the size of the plumes on a 20-degree day, on a still 20-degree day. How much more fuel will this plant burn per hour at 100 percent input rating over the previous 512 megawatt unit? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): I'm sorry. Can you repeat the question? MR. STEVENS: Yes, sure. How	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	100 percent gas turbine load. And I think that's it. Right? MR. STEVENS: Sure. (Pause.) THE WITNESS (Donovan): So, the original, the 512 megawatt configuration, had about 72 percent fuel burn the current configuration has. MR. STEVENS: So, in round numbers, about 30 percent more for the newer unit, 72 percent maybe THE WITNESS (Bazinet): One divided by .72. MR. STEVENS: That's at 20 degrees. Would it be greater, would the difference be greater or less at 70 degrees? THE WITNESS (Donovan): Just bear with me a second. MR. STEVENS: Mr. Bazinet, my calculation says about 42 percent, one divided by 70 would be 42 percent. Someone
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	dimensions. MR. STEVENS: These are very important questions for pilots. THE WITNESS (Sellars): Understood. And I think it's pretty typical if you're a pilot you've seen plumes, and you've seen plumes on cold days. It would be very, very similar to what you see from other facilities. MR. STEVENS: I would like an answer to that question, the size of the plumes on a 20-degree day, on a still 20-degree day. How much more fuel will this plant burn per hour at 100 percent input rating over the previous 512 megawatt unit? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): I'm sorry. Can you repeat the question? MR. STEVENS: Yes, sure. How much more fuel will this plant burn than the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	100 percent gas turbine load. And I think that's it. Right? MR. STEVENS: Sure. (Pause.) THE WITNESS (Donovan): So, the original, the 512 megawatt configuration, had about 72 percent fuel burn the current configuration has. MR. STEVENS: So, in round numbers, about 30 percent more for the newer unit, 72 percent maybe THE WITNESS (Bazinet): One divided by .72. MR. STEVENS: That's at 20 degrees. Would it be greater, would the difference be greater or less at 70 degrees? THE WITNESS (Donovan): Just bear with me a second. MR. STEVENS: Mr. Bazinet, my calculation says about 42 percent, one divided by 70 would be 42 percent. Someone with better math can challenge me on that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	dimensions. MR. STEVENS: These are very important questions for pilots. THE WITNESS (Sellars): Understood. And I think it's pretty typical if you're a pilot you've seen plumes, and you've seen plumes on cold days. It would be very, very similar to what you see from other facilities. MR. STEVENS: I would like an answer to that question, the size of the plumes on a 20-degree day, on a still 20-degree day. How much more fuel will this plant burn per hour at 100 percent input rating over the previous 512 megawatt unit? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): I'm sorry. Can you repeat the question? MR. STEVENS: Yes, sure. How much more fuel will this plant burn than the older 512 megawatt unit will burn? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): At what condition?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	100 percent gas turbine load. And I think that's it. Right? MR. STEVENS: Sure. (Pause.) THE WITNESS (Donovan): So, the original, the 512 megawatt configuration, had about 72 percent fuel burn the current configuration has. MR. STEVENS: So, in round numbers, about 30 percent more for the newer unit, 72 percent maybe THE WITNESS (Bazinet): One divided by .72. MR. STEVENS: That's at 20 degrees. Would it be greater, would the difference be greater or less at 70 degrees? THE WITNESS (Donovan): Just bear with me a second. MR. STEVENS: Mr. Bazinet, my calculation says about 42 percent, one divided by 70 would be 42 percent. Someone with better math can challenge me on that. THE WITNESS (Donovan):
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	dimensions. MR. STEVENS: These are very important questions for pilots. THE WITNESS (Sellars): Understood. And I think it's pretty typical if you're a pilot you've seen plumes, and you've seen plumes on cold days. It would be very, very similar to what you see from other facilities. MR. STEVENS: I would like an answer to that question, the size of the plumes on a 20-degree day, on a still 20-degree day. How much more fuel will this plant burn per hour at 100 percent input rating over the previous 512 megawatt unit? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): I'm sorry. Can you repeat the question? MR. STEVENS: Yes, sure. How much more fuel will this plant burn than the older 512 megawatt unit will burn? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): At what condition? MR. STEVENS: At 100 percent.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	100 percent gas turbine load. And I think that's it. Right? MR. STEVENS: Sure. (Pause.) THE WITNESS (Donovan): So, the original, the 512 megawatt configuration, had about 72 percent fuel burn the current configuration has. MR. STEVENS: So, in round numbers, about 30 percent more for the newer unit, 72 percent maybe THE WITNESS (Bazinet): One divided by .72. MR. STEVENS: That's at 20 degrees. Would it be greater, would the difference be greater or less at 70 degrees? THE WITNESS (Donovan): Just bear with me a second. MR. STEVENS: Mr. Bazinet, my calculation says about 42 percent, one divided by 70 would be 42 percent. Someone with better math can challenge me on that. THE WITNESS (Donovan): Actually I think 39 percent.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	dimensions. MR. STEVENS: These are very important questions for pilots. THE WITNESS (Sellars): Understood. And I think it's pretty typical if you're a pilot you've seen plumes, and you've seen plumes on cold days. It would be very, very similar to what you see from other facilities. MR. STEVENS: I would like an answer to that question, the size of the plumes on a 20-degree day, on a still 20-degree day. How much more fuel will this plant burn per hour at 100 percent input rating over the previous 512 megawatt unit? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): I'm sorry. Can you repeat the question? MR. STEVENS: Yes, sure. How much more fuel will this plant burn than the older 512 megawatt unit will burn? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): At what condition?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	100 percent gas turbine load. And I think that's it. Right? MR. STEVENS: Sure. (Pause.) THE WITNESS (Donovan): So, the original, the 512 megawatt configuration, had about 72 percent fuel burn the current configuration has. MR. STEVENS: So, in round numbers, about 30 percent more for the newer unit, 72 percent maybe THE WITNESS (Bazinet): One divided by .72. MR. STEVENS: That's at 20 degrees. Would it be greater, would the difference be greater or less at 70 degrees? THE WITNESS (Donovan): Just bear with me a second. MR. STEVENS: Mr. Bazinet, my calculation says about 42 percent, one divided by 70 would be 42 percent. Someone with better math can challenge me on that. THE WITNESS (Donovan):

8 (Pages 569 to 572)

	Page 573		Page 575
1	THE WITNESS (Sellars):	1	basically be above the stack, plus any
2	Thirty-eight point nine.	2	downwind direction of whatever the prevailing
3	MR. STEVENS: So we're going	3	wind was.
4	to say about 40 percent more?	4	MR. STEVENS: So the stacks
5	THE WITNESS (Bazinet): You	5	are 22 feet in diameter?
6	might say that. We'll say about 38	6	THE WITNESS (Sellars):
7	percent	7	Correct.
8	MR. STEVENS: Thirty-eight	8	MR. STEVENS: So the plumes
9	point nine percent, fine.	9	are going to be 22 feet in diameter blowing
10	Is the difference greater or	10	downwind?
11	less at 70 degrees?	11	THE WITNESS (Sellars): Well,
12	THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yeah,	12	then they will expand and dissipate.
13	so it's about the same. It's 41 percent.	13	MR. STEVENS: But my question
14	MR. STEVENS: So, in round	14	is how much will they expand on a still day?
15	numbers, about 40 percent. Thank you.	15	THE WITNESS (Sellars): On a
16	Is this 40 percent increase in	16	still day, they will probably expand three to
17	fuel going to create a larger volume of	17	five times the width of the stack by the time
18	combustion gases and discharge out of your	18	you get a few hundred feet above the stack,
19	smoke pipe?	19	and then they dissipate. So there's
20	THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes.	20	technically plume, but it's at much lower
21	With a greater amount of fuel burn, there	21	velocity and less discernible than the center
22	will be a greater amount of exhaust gas,	22	line of the plume, which would essentially go
23	correct, proportionately.	23	right above the stack and then in any
24	MR. STEVENS: So the plume	24	direction the wind is blowing.
25	will volumetrically be larger than the older	25	MR. STEVENS: So you're
	Page 574		Page 576
1	Page 574 unit?	1	saying, on a still day, these plumes are
2	unit? THE WITNESS (Sellars): The	2	saying, on a still day, these plumes are going to be 22 feet wide times maybe 3 or 4,
2 3	unit? THE WITNESS (Sellars): The volume of gas that's emitted will be	2 3	saying, on a still day, these plumes are going to be 22 feet wide times maybe 3 or 4, so less than 100 feet wide going up to a
2 3 4	unit? THE WITNESS (Sellars): The volume of gas that's emitted will be proportionately larger.	2 3 4	saying, on a still day, these plumes are going to be 22 feet wide times maybe 3 or 4, so less than 100 feet wide going up to a couple hundred feet and then dissipating?
2 3 4 5	unit? THE WITNESS (Sellars): The volume of gas that's emitted will be proportionately larger. MR. STEVENS: So it will be 40	2 3 4 5	saying, on a still day, these plumes are going to be 22 feet wide times maybe 3 or 4, so less than 100 feet wide going up to a couple hundred feet and then dissipating? THE WITNESS (Sellars): No.
2 3 4 5 6	unit? THE WITNESS (Sellars): The volume of gas that's emitted will be proportionately larger. MR. STEVENS: So it will be 40 percent larger?	2 3 4 5 6	saying, on a still day, these plumes are going to be 22 feet wide times maybe 3 or 4, so less than 100 feet wide going up to a couple hundred feet and then dissipating? THE WITNESS (Sellars): No. They dissipate right from the time that
2 3 4 5 6 7	unit? THE WITNESS (Sellars): The volume of gas that's emitted will be proportionately larger. MR. STEVENS: So it will be 40 percent larger? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Plume	2 3 4 5 6 7	saying, on a still day, these plumes are going to be 22 feet wide times maybe 3 or 4, so less than 100 feet wide going up to a couple hundred feet and then dissipating? THE WITNESS (Sellars): No. They dissipate right from the time that they're emitted from the stack, but by the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	unit? THE WITNESS (Sellars): The volume of gas that's emitted will be proportionately larger. MR. STEVENS: So it will be 40 percent larger? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Plume dimensions vary on a number of different	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	saying, on a still day, these plumes are going to be 22 feet wide times maybe 3 or 4, so less than 100 feet wide going up to a couple hundred feet and then dissipating? THE WITNESS (Sellars): No. They dissipate right from the time that they're emitted from the stack, but by the time that the plume gets a couple hundred
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	unit? THE WITNESS (Sellars): The volume of gas that's emitted will be proportionately larger. MR. STEVENS: So it will be 40 percent larger? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Plume dimensions vary on a number of different things but	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	saying, on a still day, these plumes are going to be 22 feet wide times maybe 3 or 4, so less than 100 feet wide going up to a couple hundred feet and then dissipating? THE WITNESS (Sellars): No. They dissipate right from the time that they're emitted from the stack, but by the time that the plume gets a couple hundred feet above the stack, it's probably a couple,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	unit? THE WITNESS (Sellars): The volume of gas that's emitted will be proportionately larger. MR. STEVENS: So it will be 40 percent larger? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Plume dimensions vary on a number of different things but MR. STEVENS: Given the same	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	saying, on a still day, these plumes are going to be 22 feet wide times maybe 3 or 4, so less than 100 feet wide going up to a couple hundred feet and then dissipating? THE WITNESS (Sellars): No. They dissipate right from the time that they're emitted from the stack, but by the time that the plume gets a couple hundred feet above the stack, it's probably a couple, 3 or 400 feet wide.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	unit? THE WITNESS (Sellars): The volume of gas that's emitted will be proportionately larger. MR. STEVENS: So it will be 40 percent larger? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Plume dimensions vary on a number of different things but MR. STEVENS: Given the same day, the same relative humidity, the same	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	saying, on a still day, these plumes are going to be 22 feet wide times maybe 3 or 4, so less than 100 feet wide going up to a couple hundred feet and then dissipating? THE WITNESS (Sellars): No. They dissipate right from the time that they're emitted from the stack, but by the time that the plume gets a couple hundred feet above the stack, it's probably a couple, 3 or 400 feet wide. MR. STEVENS: Three or four,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	unit? THE WITNESS (Sellars): The volume of gas that's emitted will be proportionately larger. MR. STEVENS: So it will be 40 percent larger? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Plume dimensions vary on a number of different things but MR. STEVENS: Given the same day, the same relative humidity, the same temperature, what would be the difference in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	saying, on a still day, these plumes are going to be 22 feet wide times maybe 3 or 4, so less than 100 feet wide going up to a couple hundred feet and then dissipating? THE WITNESS (Sellars): No. They dissipate right from the time that they're emitted from the stack, but by the time that the plume gets a couple hundred feet above the stack, it's probably a couple, 3 or 400 feet wide. MR. STEVENS: Three or four, that's more than two or three times the
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	unit? THE WITNESS (Sellars): The volume of gas that's emitted will be proportionately larger. MR. STEVENS: So it will be 40 percent larger? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Plume dimensions vary on a number of different things but MR. STEVENS: Given the same day, the same relative humidity, the same temperature, what would be the difference in the volume of the plume?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	saying, on a still day, these plumes are going to be 22 feet wide times maybe 3 or 4, so less than 100 feet wide going up to a couple hundred feet and then dissipating? THE WITNESS (Sellars): No. They dissipate right from the time that they're emitted from the stack, but by the time that the plume gets a couple hundred feet above the stack, it's probably a couple, 3 or 400 feet wide. MR. STEVENS: Three or four, that's more than two or three times the diameter of the stack.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	unit? THE WITNESS (Sellars): The volume of gas that's emitted will be proportionately larger. MR. STEVENS: So it will be 40 percent larger? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Plume dimensions vary on a number of different things but MR. STEVENS: Given the same day, the same relative humidity, the same temperature, what would be the difference in the volume of the plume? THE WITNESS (Sellars): It	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	saying, on a still day, these plumes are going to be 22 feet wide times maybe 3 or 4, so less than 100 feet wide going up to a couple hundred feet and then dissipating? THE WITNESS (Sellars): No. They dissipate right from the time that they're emitted from the stack, but by the time that the plume gets a couple hundred feet above the stack, it's probably a couple, 3 or 400 feet wide. MR. STEVENS: Three or four, that's more than two or three times the diameter of the stack. THE WITNESS (Sellars): Each
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	unit? THE WITNESS (Sellars): The volume of gas that's emitted will be proportionately larger. MR. STEVENS: So it will be 40 percent larger? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Plume dimensions vary on a number of different things but MR. STEVENS: Given the same day, the same relative humidity, the same temperature, what would be the difference in the volume of the plume? THE WITNESS (Sellars): It would be roughly proportionate.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	saying, on a still day, these plumes are going to be 22 feet wide times maybe 3 or 4, so less than 100 feet wide going up to a couple hundred feet and then dissipating? THE WITNESS (Sellars): No. They dissipate right from the time that they're emitted from the stack, but by the time that the plume gets a couple hundred feet above the stack, it's probably a couple, 3 or 400 feet wide. MR. STEVENS: Three or four, that's more than two or three times the diameter of the stack. THE WITNESS (Sellars): Each stack, there's two stacks next to each other,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	unit? THE WITNESS (Sellars): The volume of gas that's emitted will be proportionately larger. MR. STEVENS: So it will be 40 percent larger? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Plume dimensions vary on a number of different things but MR. STEVENS: Given the same day, the same relative humidity, the same temperature, what would be the difference in the volume of the plume? THE WITNESS (Sellars): It would be roughly proportionate. MR. STEVENS: About 40 percent	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	saying, on a still day, these plumes are going to be 22 feet wide times maybe 3 or 4, so less than 100 feet wide going up to a couple hundred feet and then dissipating? THE WITNESS (Sellars): No. They dissipate right from the time that they're emitted from the stack, but by the time that the plume gets a couple hundred feet above the stack, it's probably a couple, 3 or 400 feet wide. MR. STEVENS: Three or four, that's more than two or three times the diameter of the stack. THE WITNESS (Sellars): Each stack, there's two stacks next to each other, and if you look at the total area above
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	unit? THE WITNESS (Sellars): The volume of gas that's emitted will be proportionately larger. MR. STEVENS: So it will be 40 percent larger? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Plume dimensions vary on a number of different things but MR. STEVENS: Given the same day, the same relative humidity, the same temperature, what would be the difference in the volume of the plume? THE WITNESS (Sellars): It would be roughly proportionate. MR. STEVENS: About 40 percent larger?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	saying, on a still day, these plumes are going to be 22 feet wide times maybe 3 or 4, so less than 100 feet wide going up to a couple hundred feet and then dissipating? THE WITNESS (Sellars): No. They dissipate right from the time that they're emitted from the stack, but by the time that the plume gets a couple hundred feet above the stack, it's probably a couple, 3 or 400 feet wide. MR. STEVENS: Three or four, that's more than two or three times the diameter of the stack. THE WITNESS (Sellars): Each stack, there's two stacks next to each other, and if you look at the total area above there, it dissipates in three dimensions
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	unit? THE WITNESS (Sellars): The volume of gas that's emitted will be proportionately larger. MR. STEVENS: So it will be 40 percent larger? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Plume dimensions vary on a number of different things but MR. STEVENS: Given the same day, the same relative humidity, the same temperature, what would be the difference in the volume of the plume? THE WITNESS (Sellars): It would be roughly proportionate. MR. STEVENS: About 40 percent	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	saying, on a still day, these plumes are going to be 22 feet wide times maybe 3 or 4, so less than 100 feet wide going up to a couple hundred feet and then dissipating? THE WITNESS (Sellars): No. They dissipate right from the time that they're emitted from the stack, but by the time that the plume gets a couple hundred feet above the stack, it's probably a couple, 3 or 400 feet wide. MR. STEVENS: Three or four, that's more than two or three times the diameter of the stack. THE WITNESS (Sellars): Each stack, there's two stacks next to each other, and if you look at the total area above
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	unit? THE WITNESS (Sellars): The volume of gas that's emitted will be proportionately larger. MR. STEVENS: So it will be 40 percent larger? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Plume dimensions vary on a number of different things but MR. STEVENS: Given the same day, the same relative humidity, the same temperature, what would be the difference in the volume of the plume? THE WITNESS (Sellars): It would be roughly proportionate. MR. STEVENS: About 40 percent larger? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	saying, on a still day, these plumes are going to be 22 feet wide times maybe 3 or 4, so less than 100 feet wide going up to a couple hundred feet and then dissipating? THE WITNESS (Sellars): No. They dissipate right from the time that they're emitted from the stack, but by the time that the plume gets a couple hundred feet above the stack, it's probably a couple, 3 or 400 feet wide. MR. STEVENS: Three or four, that's more than two or three times the diameter of the stack. THE WITNESS (Sellars): Each stack, there's two stacks next to each other, and if you look at the total area above there, it dissipates in three dimensions around the stack as it is emitted. The plume
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	unit? THE WITNESS (Sellars): The volume of gas that's emitted will be proportionately larger. MR. STEVENS: So it will be 40 percent larger? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Plume dimensions vary on a number of different things but MR. STEVENS: Given the same day, the same relative humidity, the same temperature, what would be the difference in the volume of the plume? THE WITNESS (Sellars): It would be roughly proportionate. MR. STEVENS: About 40 percent larger? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes. MR. STEVENS: Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	saying, on a still day, these plumes are going to be 22 feet wide times maybe 3 or 4, so less than 100 feet wide going up to a couple hundred feet and then dissipating? THE WITNESS (Sellars): No. They dissipate right from the time that they're emitted from the stack, but by the time that the plume gets a couple hundred feet above the stack, it's probably a couple, 3 or 400 feet wide. MR. STEVENS: Three or four, that's more than two or three times the diameter of the stack. THE WITNESS (Sellars): Each stack, there's two stacks next to each other, and if you look at the total area above there, it dissipates in three dimensions around the stack as it is emitted. The plume has a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	unit? THE WITNESS (Sellars): The volume of gas that's emitted will be proportionately larger. MR. STEVENS: So it will be 40 percent larger? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Plume dimensions vary on a number of different things but MR. STEVENS: Given the same day, the same relative humidity, the same temperature, what would be the difference in the volume of the plume? THE WITNESS (Sellars): It would be roughly proportionate. MR. STEVENS: About 40 percent larger? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes. MR. STEVENS: Thank you. How would a pilot know the area of these plumes if it's above roughly 40 degrees and the relative humidity is low	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	saying, on a still day, these plumes are going to be 22 feet wide times maybe 3 or 4, so less than 100 feet wide going up to a couple hundred feet and then dissipating? THE WITNESS (Sellars): No. They dissipate right from the time that they're emitted from the stack, but by the time that the plume gets a couple hundred feet above the stack, it's probably a couple, 3 or 400 feet wide. MR. STEVENS: Three or four, that's more than two or three times the diameter of the stack. THE WITNESS (Sellars): Each stack, there's two stacks next to each other, and if you look at the total area above there, it dissipates in three dimensions around the stack as it is emitted. The plume has a MR. STEVENS: Excuse me, sir. When you say "dissipate" I'm sorry. I want to make sure I understand this. When
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	unit? THE WITNESS (Sellars): The volume of gas that's emitted will be proportionately larger. MR. STEVENS: So it will be 40 percent larger? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Plume dimensions vary on a number of different things but MR. STEVENS: Given the same day, the same relative humidity, the same temperature, what would be the difference in the volume of the plume? THE WITNESS (Sellars): It would be roughly proportionate. MR. STEVENS: About 40 percent larger? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes. MR. STEVENS: Thank you. How would a pilot know the area of these plumes if it's above roughly 40 degrees and the relative humidity is low enough such that these plumes are invisible?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	saying, on a still day, these plumes are going to be 22 feet wide times maybe 3 or 4, so less than 100 feet wide going up to a couple hundred feet and then dissipating? THE WITNESS (Sellars): No. They dissipate right from the time that they're emitted from the stack, but by the time that the plume gets a couple hundred feet above the stack, it's probably a couple, 3 or 400 feet wide. MR. STEVENS: Three or four, that's more than two or three times the diameter of the stack. THE WITNESS (Sellars): Each stack, there's two stacks next to each other, and if you look at the total area above there, it dissipates in three dimensions around the stack as it is emitted. The plume has a MR. STEVENS: Excuse me, sir. When you say "dissipate" I'm sorry. I want to make sure I understand this. When you say "dissipate," do you mean that the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	unit? THE WITNESS (Sellars): The volume of gas that's emitted will be proportionately larger. MR. STEVENS: So it will be 40 percent larger? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Plume dimensions vary on a number of different things but MR. STEVENS: Given the same day, the same relative humidity, the same temperature, what would be the difference in the volume of the plume? THE WITNESS (Sellars): It would be roughly proportionate. MR. STEVENS: About 40 percent larger? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes. MR. STEVENS: Thank you. How would a pilot know the area of these plumes if it's above roughly 40 degrees and the relative humidity is low enough such that these plumes are invisible? THE WITNESS (Sellars): They	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	saying, on a still day, these plumes are going to be 22 feet wide times maybe 3 or 4, so less than 100 feet wide going up to a couple hundred feet and then dissipating? THE WITNESS (Sellars): No. They dissipate right from the time that they're emitted from the stack, but by the time that the plume gets a couple hundred feet above the stack, it's probably a couple, 3 or 400 feet wide. MR. STEVENS: Three or four, that's more than two or three times the diameter of the stack. THE WITNESS (Sellars): Each stack, there's two stacks next to each other, and if you look at the total area above there, it dissipates in three dimensions around the stack as it is emitted. The plume has a MR. STEVENS: Excuse me, sir. When you say "dissipate" I'm sorry. I want to make sure I understand this. When you say "dissipate," do you mean that the visible plume will not be visible anymore?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	unit? THE WITNESS (Sellars): The volume of gas that's emitted will be proportionately larger. MR. STEVENS: So it will be 40 percent larger? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Plume dimensions vary on a number of different things but MR. STEVENS: Given the same day, the same relative humidity, the same temperature, what would be the difference in the volume of the plume? THE WITNESS (Sellars): It would be roughly proportionate. MR. STEVENS: About 40 percent larger? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes. MR. STEVENS: Thank you. How would a pilot know the area of these plumes if it's above roughly 40 degrees and the relative humidity is low enough such that these plumes are invisible?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	saying, on a still day, these plumes are going to be 22 feet wide times maybe 3 or 4, so less than 100 feet wide going up to a couple hundred feet and then dissipating? THE WITNESS (Sellars): No. They dissipate right from the time that they're emitted from the stack, but by the time that the plume gets a couple hundred feet above the stack, it's probably a couple, 3 or 400 feet wide. MR. STEVENS: Three or four, that's more than two or three times the diameter of the stack. THE WITNESS (Sellars): Each stack, there's two stacks next to each other, and if you look at the total area above there, it dissipates in three dimensions around the stack as it is emitted. The plume has a MR. STEVENS: Excuse me, sir. When you say "dissipate" I'm sorry. I want to make sure I understand this. When you say "dissipate," do you mean that the

9 (Pages 573 to 576)

	Page 577		Page 579
1	were talking about a nonvisible plume, I	1	proportional, but we had the ability to do
2	believe.	2	forensic calculations while you were talking,
3	So what I'm saying is as you	3	and it's approximately 27 percent higher for
4	move from the center line of the plume as it	4	the new configuration.
5	goes up in the atmosphere, as you move	5	MR. STEVENS: So, at 20
6	further and further away from it, the	6	degrees it's 25, and at 70 degrees it would
7	velocity and turbulence associated with it	7	be 30?
8	that would make it discernible as a plume as	8	THE WITNESS (Donovan): That
9	opposed to just ambient air, it's less and	9	27 percent is at an annual average of 50
10	less.	10	degree case.
11	MR. STEVENS: Sure. I do	11	MR. STEVENS: That's at 50
12	apologize if I confused you about the	12	degrees?
13	difference between visible and nonvisible	13	THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's
14	plumes. Both are of concern to pilots for	14	correct.
15	different reasons.	15	MR. STEVENS: So the fuel burn
16	So, if I could ask you this	16	is approximately 27 percent more at 50
17	question about a visible plume, so we're	17	degrees?
18	discussing when the relative humidity is such	18	THE WITNESS (Bazinet): The
19	or the temperature is such that we're going	19	fuel burn is 40 percent, but the exhaust flow
20	to have a visible plume, so under 40 degrees,	20	is 27 percent. So it's proportional but
21	so a day like today. How wide you know,	20	less.
22	when you say it dissipates, are you	22	MR. STEVENS: So you're
23	suggesting that when it would normally be	23	running more efficiently?
24	visible, are you suggesting that it will no	24	THE WITNESS (Bazinet): That's
25	longer be visible?	25	correct.
23		25	
	Page 578		Page 580
1	_	1	
1 2	THE WITNESS (Sellars): When	1 2	MR. STEVENS: But it's,
	THE WITNESS (Sellars): When you get far enough away from the center line		
2	THE WITNESS (Sellars): When you get far enough away from the center line of the plume and the concentration of water	2	MR. STEVENS: But it's, nonetheless, 25 percent greater discharge
2 3	THE WITNESS (Sellars): When you get far enough away from the center line	2 3	MR. STEVENS: But it's, nonetheless, 25 percent greater discharge than
2 3 4	THE WITNESS (Sellars): When you get far enough away from the center line of the plume and the concentration of water vapor gets to below the condensation point, then the water vapor would no longer be	2 3 4	MR. STEVENS: But it's, nonetheless, 25 percent greater discharge than THE WITNESS (Donovan): On the
2 3 4 5	THE WITNESS (Sellars): When you get far enough away from the center line of the plume and the concentration of water vapor gets to below the condensation point,	2 3 4 5	MR. STEVENS: But it's, nonetheless, 25 percent greater discharge than THE WITNESS (Donovan): On the flow?
2 3 4 5 6	THE WITNESS (Sellars): When you get far enough away from the center line of the plume and the concentration of water vapor gets to below the condensation point, then the water vapor would no longer be condensed and no longer visible.	2 3 4 5 6	MR. STEVENS: But it's, nonetheless, 25 percent greater discharge than THE WITNESS (Donovan): On the flow? MR. STEVENS: On the flow.
2 3 4 5 6 7	THE WITNESS (Sellars): When you get far enough away from the center line of the plume and the concentration of water vapor gets to below the condensation point, then the water vapor would no longer be condensed and no longer visible. MR. STEVENS: And I'm really	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. STEVENS: But it's, nonetheless, 25 percent greater discharge than THE WITNESS (Donovan): On the flow? MR. STEVENS: On the flow. THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	THE WITNESS (Sellars): When you get far enough away from the center line of the plume and the concentration of water vapor gets to below the condensation point, then the water vapor would no longer be condensed and no longer visible. MR. STEVENS: And I'm really asking for, on a still day like today, how	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. STEVENS: But it's, nonetheless, 25 percent greater discharge than THE WITNESS (Donovan): On the flow? MR. STEVENS: On the flow. THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's roughly 25, 27 percent.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	THE WITNESS (Sellars): When you get far enough away from the center line of the plume and the concentration of water vapor gets to below the condensation point, then the water vapor would no longer be condensed and no longer visible. MR. STEVENS: And I'm really asking for, on a still day like today, how big is that plume going to be, so if you said	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. STEVENS: But it's, nonetheless, 25 percent greater discharge than THE WITNESS (Donovan): On the flow? MR. STEVENS: On the flow. THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's roughly 25, 27 percent. MR. STEVENS: Okay. I'm glad you'll agree with me at 25 but not at 40. THE WITNESS (Donovan): Well,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	THE WITNESS (Sellars): When you get far enough away from the center line of the plume and the concentration of water vapor gets to below the condensation point, then the water vapor would no longer be condensed and no longer visible. MR. STEVENS: And I'm really asking for, on a still day like today, how big is that plume going to be, so if you said it was going to dissipate when it gets to a couple hundred feet above the stack. THE WITNESS (Sellars): As	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. STEVENS: But it's, nonetheless, 25 percent greater discharge than THE WITNESS (Donovan): On the flow? MR. STEVENS: On the flow. THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's roughly 25, 27 percent. MR. STEVENS: Okay. I'm glad you'll agree with me at 25 but not at 40. THE WITNESS (Donovan): Well, you recognize that it's variable with ambient
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE WITNESS (Sellars): When you get far enough away from the center line of the plume and the concentration of water vapor gets to below the condensation point, then the water vapor would no longer be condensed and no longer visible. MR. STEVENS: And I'm really asking for, on a still day like today, how big is that plume going to be, so if you said it was going to dissipate when it gets to a couple hundred feet above the stack. THE WITNESS (Sellars): As I've testified earlier, the vertical extent	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. STEVENS: But it's, nonetheless, 25 percent greater discharge than THE WITNESS (Donovan): On the flow? MR. STEVENS: On the flow. THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's roughly 25, 27 percent. MR. STEVENS: Okay. I'm glad you'll agree with me at 25 but not at 40. THE WITNESS (Donovan): Well, you recognize that it's variable with ambient temperatures, loads. There's a lot of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	THE WITNESS (Sellars): When you get far enough away from the center line of the plume and the concentration of water vapor gets to below the condensation point, then the water vapor would no longer be condensed and no longer visible. MR. STEVENS: And I'm really asking for, on a still day like today, how big is that plume going to be, so if you said it was going to dissipate when it gets to a couple hundred feet above the stack. THE WITNESS (Sellars): As I've testified earlier, the vertical extent of the plume being visible would be several	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. STEVENS: But it's, nonetheless, 25 percent greater discharge than THE WITNESS (Donovan): On the flow? MR. STEVENS: On the flow. THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's roughly 25, 27 percent. MR. STEVENS: Okay. I'm glad you'll agree with me at 25 but not at 40. THE WITNESS (Donovan): Well, you recognize that it's variable with ambient temperatures, loads. There's a lot of variables that go into the calculation.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	THE WITNESS (Sellars): When you get far enough away from the center line of the plume and the concentration of water vapor gets to below the condensation point, then the water vapor would no longer be condensed and no longer visible. MR. STEVENS: And I'm really asking for, on a still day like today, how big is that plume going to be, so if you said it was going to dissipate when it gets to a couple hundred feet above the stack. THE WITNESS (Sellars): As I've testified earlier, the vertical extent of the plume being visible would be several hundred feet. And as you've witnessed other	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. STEVENS: But it's, nonetheless, 25 percent greater discharge than THE WITNESS (Donovan): On the flow? MR. STEVENS: On the flow. THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's roughly 25, 27 percent. MR. STEVENS: Okay. I'm glad you'll agree with me at 25 but not at 40. THE WITNESS (Donovan): Well, you recognize that it's variable with ambient temperatures, loads. There's a lot of variables that go into the calculation. MR. STEVENS: I do recognize
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE WITNESS (Sellars): When you get far enough away from the center line of the plume and the concentration of water vapor gets to below the condensation point, then the water vapor would no longer be condensed and no longer visible. MR. STEVENS: And I'm really asking for, on a still day like today, how big is that plume going to be, so if you said it was going to dissipate when it gets to a couple hundred feet above the stack. THE WITNESS (Sellars): As I've testified earlier, the vertical extent of the plume being visible would be several hundred feet. And as you've witnessed other plumes this is not the only plume, I'm	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. STEVENS: But it's, nonetheless, 25 percent greater discharge than THE WITNESS (Donovan): On the flow? MR. STEVENS: On the flow. THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's roughly 25, 27 percent. MR. STEVENS: Okay. I'm glad you'll agree with me at 25 but not at 40. THE WITNESS (Donovan): Well, you recognize that it's variable with ambient temperatures, loads. There's a lot of variables that go into the calculation. MR. STEVENS: I do recognize that. Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE WITNESS (Sellars): When you get far enough away from the center line of the plume and the concentration of water vapor gets to below the condensation point, then the water vapor would no longer be condensed and no longer visible. MR. STEVENS: And I'm really asking for, on a still day like today, how big is that plume going to be, so if you said it was going to dissipate when it gets to a couple hundred feet above the stack. THE WITNESS (Sellars): As I've testified earlier, the vertical extent of the plume being visible would be several hundred feet. And as you've witnessed other plumes this is not the only plume, I'm sure, that you've seen flying they are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. STEVENS: But it's, nonetheless, 25 percent greater discharge than THE WITNESS (Donovan): On the flow? MR. STEVENS: On the flow. THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's roughly 25, 27 percent. MR. STEVENS: Okay. I'm glad you'll agree with me at 25 but not at 40. THE WITNESS (Donovan): Well, you recognize that it's variable with ambient temperatures, loads. There's a lot of variables that go into the calculation. MR. STEVENS: I do recognize that. Thank you. Are these plumes generally
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE WITNESS (Sellars): When you get far enough away from the center line of the plume and the concentration of water vapor gets to below the condensation point, then the water vapor would no longer be condensed and no longer visible. MR. STEVENS: And I'm really asking for, on a still day like today, how big is that plume going to be, so if you said it was going to dissipate when it gets to a couple hundred feet above the stack. THE WITNESS (Sellars): As I've testified earlier, the vertical extent of the plume being visible would be several hundred feet. And as you've witnessed other plumes this is not the only plume, I'm sure, that you've seen flying they are much longer than they are wide.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. STEVENS: But it's, nonetheless, 25 percent greater discharge than THE WITNESS (Donovan): On the flow? MR. STEVENS: On the flow. THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's roughly 25, 27 percent. MR. STEVENS: Okay. I'm glad you'll agree with me at 25 but not at 40. THE WITNESS (Donovan): Well, you recognize that it's variable with ambient temperatures, loads. There's a lot of variables that go into the calculation. MR. STEVENS: I do recognize that. Thank you. Are these plumes generally going to be greater at night or less at night
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	THE WITNESS (Sellars): When you get far enough away from the center line of the plume and the concentration of water vapor gets to below the condensation point, then the water vapor would no longer be condensed and no longer visible. MR. STEVENS: And I'm really asking for, on a still day like today, how big is that plume going to be, so if you said it was going to dissipate when it gets to a couple hundred feet above the stack. THE WITNESS (Sellars): As I've testified earlier, the vertical extent of the plume being visible would be several hundred feet. And as you've witnessed other plumes this is not the only plume, I'm sure, that you've seen flying they are much longer than they are wide. MR. STEVENS: Okay. So	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. STEVENS: But it's, nonetheless, 25 percent greater discharge than THE WITNESS (Donovan): On the flow? MR. STEVENS: On the flow. THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's roughly 25, 27 percent. MR. STEVENS: Okay. I'm glad you'll agree with me at 25 but not at 40. THE WITNESS (Donovan): Well, you recognize that it's variable with ambient temperatures, loads. There's a lot of variables that go into the calculation. MR. STEVENS: I do recognize that. Thank you. Are these plumes generally going to be greater at night or less at night than during the day and why?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE WITNESS (Sellars): When you get far enough away from the center line of the plume and the concentration of water vapor gets to below the condensation point, then the water vapor would no longer be condensed and no longer visible. MR. STEVENS: And I'm really asking for, on a still day like today, how big is that plume going to be, so if you said it was going to dissipate when it gets to a couple hundred feet above the stack. THE WITNESS (Sellars): As I've testified earlier, the vertical extent of the plume being visible would be several hundred feet. And as you've witnessed other plumes this is not the only plume, I'm sure, that you've seen flying they are much longer than they are wide.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. STEVENS: But it's, nonetheless, 25 percent greater discharge than THE WITNESS (Donovan): On the flow? MR. STEVENS: On the flow. THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's roughly 25, 27 percent. MR. STEVENS: Okay. I'm glad you'll agree with me at 25 but not at 40. THE WITNESS (Donovan): Well, you recognize that it's variable with ambient temperatures, loads. There's a lot of variables that go into the calculation. MR. STEVENS: I do recognize that. Thank you. Are these plumes generally going to be greater at night or less at night than during the day and why? THE WITNESS (Sellars): The
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE WITNESS (Sellars): When you get far enough away from the center line of the plume and the concentration of water vapor gets to below the condensation point, then the water vapor would no longer be condensed and no longer visible. MR. STEVENS: And I'm really asking for, on a still day like today, how big is that plume going to be, so if you said it was going to dissipate when it gets to a couple hundred feet above the stack. THE WITNESS (Sellars): As I've testified earlier, the vertical extent of the plume being visible would be several hundred feet. And as you've witnessed other plumes this is not the only plume, I'm sure, that you've seen flying they are much longer than they are wide. MR. STEVENS: Okay. So MR. SMALL: Excuse me one second.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. STEVENS: But it's, nonetheless, 25 percent greater discharge than THE WITNESS (Donovan): On the flow? MR. STEVENS: On the flow. THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's roughly 25, 27 percent. MR. STEVENS: Okay. I'm glad you'll agree with me at 25 but not at 40. THE WITNESS (Donovan): Well, you recognize that it's variable with ambient temperatures, loads. There's a lot of variables that go into the calculation. MR. STEVENS: I do recognize that. Thank you. Are these plumes generally going to be greater at night or less at night than during the day and why? THE WITNESS (Sellars): The plumes or the plumes would be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE WITNESS (Sellars): When you get far enough away from the center line of the plume and the concentration of water vapor gets to below the condensation point, then the water vapor would no longer be condensed and no longer visible. MR. STEVENS: And I'm really asking for, on a still day like today, how big is that plume going to be, so if you said it was going to dissipate when it gets to a couple hundred feet above the stack. THE WITNESS (Sellars): As I've testified earlier, the vertical extent of the plume being visible would be several hundred feet. And as you've witnessed other plumes this is not the only plume, I'm sure, that you've seen flying they are much longer than they are wide. MR. STEVENS: Okay. So MR. SMALL: Excuse me one second. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. STEVENS: But it's, nonetheless, 25 percent greater discharge than THE WITNESS (Donovan): On the flow? MR. STEVENS: On the flow. THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's roughly 25, 27 percent. MR. STEVENS: Okay. I'm glad you'll agree with me at 25 but not at 40. THE WITNESS (Donovan): Well, you recognize that it's variable with ambient temperatures, loads. There's a lot of variables that go into the calculation. MR. STEVENS: I do recognize that. Thank you. Are these plumes generally going to be greater at night or less at night than during the day and why? THE WITNESS (Sellars): The plumes or the plumes would be approximately the same at night or day. They
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE WITNESS (Sellars): When you get far enough away from the center line of the plume and the concentration of water vapor gets to below the condensation point, then the water vapor would no longer be condensed and no longer visible. MR. STEVENS: And I'm really asking for, on a still day like today, how big is that plume going to be, so if you said it was going to dissipate when it gets to a couple hundred feet above the stack. THE WITNESS (Sellars): As I've testified earlier, the vertical extent of the plume being visible would be several hundred feet. And as you've witnessed other plumes this is not the only plume, I'm sure, that you've seen flying they are much longer than they are wide. MR. STEVENS: Okay. So MR. SMALL: Excuse me one second. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So, just with respect to exhaust flow, I think	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. STEVENS: But it's, nonetheless, 25 percent greater discharge than THE WITNESS (Donovan): On the flow? MR. STEVENS: On the flow. THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's roughly 25, 27 percent. MR. STEVENS: Okay. I'm glad you'll agree with me at 25 but not at 40. THE WITNESS (Donovan): Well, you recognize that it's variable with ambient temperatures, loads. There's a lot of variables that go into the calculation. MR. STEVENS: I do recognize that. Thank you. Are these plumes generally going to be greater at night or less at night than during the day and why? THE WITNESS (Sellars): The plumes or the plumes would be approximately the same at night or day. They vary with temperature, of course, but being
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	THE WITNESS (Sellars): When you get far enough away from the center line of the plume and the concentration of water vapor gets to below the condensation point, then the water vapor would no longer be condensed and no longer visible. MR. STEVENS: And I'm really asking for, on a still day like today, how big is that plume going to be, so if you said it was going to dissipate when it gets to a couple hundred feet above the stack. THE WITNESS (Sellars): As I've testified earlier, the vertical extent of the plume being visible would be several hundred feet. And as you've witnessed other plumes this is not the only plume, I'm sure, that you've seen flying they are much longer than they are wide. MR. STEVENS: Okay. So MR. SMALL: Excuse me one second. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So, just with respect to exhaust flow, I think that answer we gave earlier was that it's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. STEVENS: But it's, nonetheless, 25 percent greater discharge than THE WITNESS (Donovan): On the flow? MR. STEVENS: On the flow. THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's roughly 25, 27 percent. MR. STEVENS: Okay. I'm glad you'll agree with me at 25 but not at 40. THE WITNESS (Donovan): Well, you recognize that it's variable with ambient temperatures, loads. There's a lot of variables that go into the calculation. MR. STEVENS: I do recognize that. Thank you. Are these plumes generally going to be greater at night or less at night than during the day and why? THE WITNESS (Sellars): The plumes or the plumes would be approximately the same at night or day. They vary with temperature, of course, but being diurnal or nocturnal has no particular
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE WITNESS (Sellars): When you get far enough away from the center line of the plume and the concentration of water vapor gets to below the condensation point, then the water vapor would no longer be condensed and no longer visible. MR. STEVENS: And I'm really asking for, on a still day like today, how big is that plume going to be, so if you said it was going to dissipate when it gets to a couple hundred feet above the stack. THE WITNESS (Sellars): As I've testified earlier, the vertical extent of the plume being visible would be several hundred feet. And as you've witnessed other plumes this is not the only plume, I'm sure, that you've seen flying they are much longer than they are wide. MR. STEVENS: Okay. So MR. SMALL: Excuse me one second. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So, just with respect to exhaust flow, I think	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. STEVENS: But it's, nonetheless, 25 percent greater discharge than THE WITNESS (Donovan): On the flow? MR. STEVENS: On the flow. THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's roughly 25, 27 percent. MR. STEVENS: Okay. I'm glad you'll agree with me at 25 but not at 40. THE WITNESS (Donovan): Well, you recognize that it's variable with ambient temperatures, loads. There's a lot of variables that go into the calculation. MR. STEVENS: I do recognize that. Thank you. Are these plumes generally going to be greater at night or less at night than during the day and why? THE WITNESS (Sellars): The plumes or the plumes would be approximately the same at night or day. They vary with temperature, of course, but being

10 (Pages 577 to 580)

	Page 581		Page 583
1	MR. STEVENS: So it's normally	1	MR. STEVENS: And at what
2	cooler during the evening than during the	2	altitude will aircraft normally, in a VFR
3	day, so it would be greater?	3	condition, be flying over this stack?
4	THE WITNESS (Sellars): In	4	THE WITNESS (Gresock): The
5	terms of visibility, the plume itself would	5	lowest height at which aircraft should be
6	be the same. So, if it's cooler, there's	6	flying over the stack would be 300 feet above
7	more likely to be condensation.	7	the stack, and that's the circling minimum
8	MR. STEVENS: When the plumes	8	distance in altitude.
9	are invisible I'd like to ask this	9	MR. STEVENS: Is any
10	question again how would a pilot know the	10	principal, officer or employee of CPV
11	volumetric size of the plume when they are	11	Towantic related to any principal, officer or
12	invisible?	12	employee of Connecticut Airport Authority,
13	THE WITNESS (Sellars): So,	13	owner of Oxford Airport?
14	with regard to discerning a plume, the pilot	14	MR. SMALL: Objection on
15	would feel any sort of wind or turbulence	15	relevance grounds.
16	associated with the plume. And so the first	16	THE CHAIRMAN: We need you to
17	clue is the stack, you see the stack, and	17	explain the relevance of the question as far
18	under day or night conditions the stack would	18	as the Siting Council is involved.
19	be lighted. And, for example, in the	19	MR. STEVENS: The CAA is going
20	response to CSC-11, we calculated what that	20	to be involved with this proceeding, and I
21	different velocity would be and how that	21	believe that there's a relationship that
22	velocity would reduce with height above the	22	should be identified between an employee of
23	stack.	23	CPV and a chairperson of CAA. And my
24	So, with a stack exit velocity	24	follow-up question, just so you know where
25	of 56.2 feet per second, that's about 38	25	I'm going, is I just want to make sure to
	or 50.2 reet per second, that's about 50	20	The going, is i just white to make sure to
	Page 582		Page 584
1		1	
1 2	miles an hour, by the time the plume was 250	1 2	know what measures are being taken to ensure
1 2 3	miles an hour, by the time the plume was 250 feet above the stack, it would have reduced	2	know what measures are being taken to ensure that an unbiased determination of these
2	miles an hour, by the time the plume was 250 feet above the stack, it would have reduced to about 13 miles per hour, and by the time		know what measures are being taken to ensure that an unbiased determination of these proceedings occur.
2 3 4	miles an hour, by the time the plume was 250 feet above the stack, it would have reduced to about 13 miles per hour, and by the time it was about 500 feet above the stack, it	2 3	know what measures are being taken to ensure that an unbiased determination of these proceedings occur. THE CHAIRMAN: I'm going to
2 3	miles an hour, by the time the plume was 250 feet above the stack, it would have reduced to about 13 miles per hour, and by the time	2 3 4	know what measures are being taken to ensure that an unbiased determination of these proceedings occur. THE CHAIRMAN: I'm going to ask our executive director to comment on the
2 3 4 5	miles an hour, by the time the plume was 250 feet above the stack, it would have reduced to about 13 miles per hour, and by the time it was about 500 feet above the stack, it would reduce to about 9 and a half miles per	2 3 4 5	know what measures are being taken to ensure that an unbiased determination of these proceedings occur. THE CHAIRMAN: I'm going to
2 3 4 5 6	miles an hour, by the time the plume was 250 feet above the stack, it would have reduced to about 13 miles per hour, and by the time it was about 500 feet above the stack, it would reduce to about 9 and a half miles per hour. MR. STEVENS: And I see that	2 3 4 5 6	know what measures are being taken to ensure that an unbiased determination of these proceedings occur. THE CHAIRMAN: I'm going to ask our executive director to comment on the objection. MR. STEVENS: Sure.
2 3 4 5 6 7	miles an hour, by the time the plume was 250 feet above the stack, it would have reduced to about 13 miles per hour, and by the time it was about 500 feet above the stack, it would reduce to about 9 and a half miles per hour.	2 3 4 5 6 7	know what measures are being taken to ensure that an unbiased determination of these proceedings occur. THE CHAIRMAN: I'm going to ask our executive director to comment on the objection.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	miles an hour, by the time the plume was 250 feet above the stack, it would have reduced to about 13 miles per hour, and by the time it was about 500 feet above the stack, it would reduce to about 9 and a half miles per hour. MR. STEVENS: And I see that you're using the Australian Government Civil	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	know what measures are being taken to ensure that an unbiased determination of these proceedings occur. THE CHAIRMAN: I'm going to ask our executive director to comment on the objection. MR. STEVENS: Sure. MS. BACHMAN: Thank you,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	miles an hour, by the time the plume was 250 feet above the stack, it would have reduced to about 13 miles per hour, and by the time it was about 500 feet above the stack, it would reduce to about 9 and a half miles per hour. MR. STEVENS: And I see that you're using the Australian Government Civil Aviation Safety Authority for those calculations?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	know what measures are being taken to ensure that an unbiased determination of these proceedings occur. THE CHAIRMAN: I'm going to ask our executive director to comment on the objection. MR. STEVENS: Sure. MS. BACHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Stevens, the FAA review of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	miles an hour, by the time the plume was 250 feet above the stack, it would have reduced to about 13 miles per hour, and by the time it was about 500 feet above the stack, it would reduce to about 9 and a half miles per hour. MR. STEVENS: And I see that you're using the Australian Government Civil Aviation Safety Authority for those	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	know what measures are being taken to ensure that an unbiased determination of these proceedings occur. THE CHAIRMAN: I'm going to ask our executive director to comment on the objection. MR. STEVENS: Sure. MS. BACHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	miles an hour, by the time the plume was 250 feet above the stack, it would have reduced to about 13 miles per hour, and by the time it was about 500 feet above the stack, it would reduce to about 9 and a half miles per hour. MR. STEVENS: And I see that you're using the Australian Government Civil Aviation Safety Authority for those calculations? THE WITNESS (Gresock): We are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	know what measures are being taken to ensure that an unbiased determination of these proceedings occur. THE CHAIRMAN: I'm going to ask our executive director to comment on the objection. MR. STEVENS: Sure. MS. BACHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Stevens, the FAA review of the plant and its impacts on the airport is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	miles an hour, by the time the plume was 250 feet above the stack, it would have reduced to about 13 miles per hour, and by the time it was about 500 feet above the stack, it would reduce to about 9 and a half miles per hour. MR. STEVENS: And I see that you're using the Australian Government Civil Aviation Safety Authority for those calculations? THE WITNESS (Gresock): We are using that method, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	know what measures are being taken to ensure that an unbiased determination of these proceedings occur. THE CHAIRMAN: I'm going to ask our executive director to comment on the objection. MR. STEVENS: Sure. MS. BACHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Stevens, the FAA review of the plant and its impacts on the airport is an ancillary issue to this proceeding. For
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	miles an hour, by the time the plume was 250 feet above the stack, it would have reduced to about 13 miles per hour, and by the time it was about 500 feet above the stack, it would reduce to about 9 and a half miles per hour. MR. STEVENS: And I see that you're using the Australian Government Civil Aviation Safety Authority for those calculations? THE WITNESS (Gresock): We are using that method, yes. MR. STEVENS: Have you done	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	know what measures are being taken to ensure that an unbiased determination of these proceedings occur. THE CHAIRMAN: I'm going to ask our executive director to comment on the objection. MR. STEVENS: Sure. MS. BACHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Stevens, the FAA review of the plant and its impacts on the airport is an ancillary issue to this proceeding. For our purposes certainly that question really
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	miles an hour, by the time the plume was 250 feet above the stack, it would have reduced to about 13 miles per hour, and by the time it was about 500 feet above the stack, it would reduce to about 9 and a half miles per hour. MR. STEVENS: And I see that you're using the Australian Government Civil Aviation Safety Authority for those calculations? THE WITNESS (Gresock): We are using that method, yes. MR. STEVENS: Have you done that with distillate as well?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	know what measures are being taken to ensure that an unbiased determination of these proceedings occur. THE CHAIRMAN: I'm going to ask our executive director to comment on the objection. MR. STEVENS: Sure. MS. BACHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Stevens, the FAA review of the plant and its impacts on the airport is an ancillary issue to this proceeding. For our purposes certainly that question really has no relevance, but in the FAA review, it may have relevance. But our purpose here is to balance the public benefit of this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	miles an hour, by the time the plume was 250 feet above the stack, it would have reduced to about 13 miles per hour, and by the time it was about 500 feet above the stack, it would reduce to about 9 and a half miles per hour. MR. STEVENS: And I see that you're using the Australian Government Civil Aviation Safety Authority for those calculations? THE WITNESS (Gresock): We are using that method, yes. MR. STEVENS: Have you done that with distillate as well? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	know what measures are being taken to ensure that an unbiased determination of these proceedings occur. THE CHAIRMAN: I'm going to ask our executive director to comment on the objection. MR. STEVENS: Sure. MS. BACHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Stevens, the FAA review of the plant and its impacts on the airport is an ancillary issue to this proceeding. For our purposes certainly that question really has no relevance, but in the FAA review, it may have relevance. But our purpose here is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	miles an hour, by the time the plume was 250 feet above the stack, it would have reduced to about 13 miles per hour, and by the time it was about 500 feet above the stack, it would reduce to about 9 and a half miles per hour. MR. STEVENS: And I see that you're using the Australian Government Civil Aviation Safety Authority for those calculations? THE WITNESS (Gresock): We are using that method, yes. MR. STEVENS: Have you done that with distillate as well? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes. In the third set of responses, CSC-3, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	know what measures are being taken to ensure that an unbiased determination of these proceedings occur. THE CHAIRMAN: I'm going to ask our executive director to comment on the objection. MR. STEVENS: Sure. MS. BACHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Stevens, the FAA review of the plant and its impacts on the airport is an ancillary issue to this proceeding. For our purposes certainly that question really has no relevance, but in the FAA review, it may have relevance. But our purpose here is to balance the public benefit of this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	miles an hour, by the time the plume was 250 feet above the stack, it would have reduced to about 13 miles per hour, and by the time it was about 500 feet above the stack, it would reduce to about 9 and a half miles per hour. MR. STEVENS: And I see that you're using the Australian Government Civil Aviation Safety Authority for those calculations? THE WITNESS (Gresock): We are using that method, yes. MR. STEVENS: Have you done that with distillate as well? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes. In the third set of responses, CSC-3, the response to question CSC-10 provides the same	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	know what measures are being taken to ensure that an unbiased determination of these proceedings occur. THE CHAIRMAN: I'm going to ask our executive director to comment on the objection. MR. STEVENS: Sure. MS. BACHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Stevens, the FAA review of the plant and its impacts on the airport is an ancillary issue to this proceeding. For our purposes certainly that question really has no relevance, but in the FAA review, it may have relevance. But our purpose here is to balance the public benefit of this facility against the potential adverse
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	miles an hour, by the time the plume was 250 feet above the stack, it would have reduced to about 13 miles per hour, and by the time it was about 500 feet above the stack, it would reduce to about 9 and a half miles per hour. MR. STEVENS: And I see that you're using the Australian Government Civil Aviation Safety Authority for those calculations? THE WITNESS (Gresock): We are using that method, yes. MR. STEVENS: Have you done that with distillate as well? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes. In the third set of responses, CSC-3, the response to question CSC-10 provides the same information for distillate.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	know what measures are being taken to ensure that an unbiased determination of these proceedings occur. THE CHAIRMAN: I'm going to ask our executive director to comment on the objection. MR. STEVENS: Sure. MS. BACHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Stevens, the FAA review of the plant and its impacts on the airport is an ancillary issue to this proceeding. For our purposes certainly that question really has no relevance, but in the FAA review, it may have relevance. But our purpose here is to balance the public benefit of this facility against the potential adverse environmental impacts.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	miles an hour, by the time the plume was 250 feet above the stack, it would have reduced to about 13 miles per hour, and by the time it was about 500 feet above the stack, it would reduce to about 9 and a half miles per hour. MR. STEVENS: And I see that you're using the Australian Government Civil Aviation Safety Authority for those calculations? THE WITNESS (Gresock): We are using that method, yes. MR. STEVENS: Have you done that with distillate as well? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes. In the third set of responses, CSC-3, the response to question CSC-10 provides the same information for distillate. MR. STEVENS: Okay. And would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	know what measures are being taken to ensure that an unbiased determination of these proceedings occur. THE CHAIRMAN: I'm going to ask our executive director to comment on the objection. MR. STEVENS: Sure. MS. BACHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Stevens, the FAA review of the plant and its impacts on the airport is an ancillary issue to this proceeding. For our purposes certainly that question really has no relevance, but in the FAA review, it may have relevance. But our purpose here is to balance the public benefit of this facility against the potential adverse environmental impacts. MR. STEVENS: Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	miles an hour, by the time the plume was 250 feet above the stack, it would have reduced to about 13 miles per hour, and by the time it was about 500 feet above the stack, it would reduce to about 9 and a half miles per hour. MR. STEVENS: And I see that you're using the Australian Government Civil Aviation Safety Authority for those calculations? THE WITNESS (Gresock): We are using that method, yes. MR. STEVENS: Have you done that with distillate as well? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes. In the third set of responses, CSC-3, the response to question CSC-10 provides the same information for distillate. MR. STEVENS: Okay. And would you provide those numbers to me?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	know what measures are being taken to ensure that an unbiased determination of these proceedings occur. THE CHAIRMAN: I'm going to ask our executive director to comment on the objection. MR. STEVENS: Sure. MS. BACHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Stevens, the FAA review of the plant and its impacts on the airport is an ancillary issue to this proceeding. For our purposes certainly that question really has no relevance, but in the FAA review, it may have relevance. But our purpose here is to balance the public benefit of this facility against the potential adverse environmental impacts. MR. STEVENS: Thank you. What is the standard FAA VFR
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	miles an hour, by the time the plume was 250 feet above the stack, it would have reduced to about 13 miles per hour, and by the time it was about 500 feet above the stack, it would reduce to about 9 and a half miles per hour. MR. STEVENS: And I see that you're using the Australian Government Civil Aviation Safety Authority for those calculations? THE WITNESS (Gresock): We are using that method, yes. MR. STEVENS: Have you done that with distillate as well? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes. In the third set of responses, CSC-3, the response to question CSC-10 provides the same information for distillate. MR. STEVENS: Okay. And would you provide those numbers to me? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Sure.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	know what measures are being taken to ensure that an unbiased determination of these proceedings occur. THE CHAIRMAN: I'm going to ask our executive director to comment on the objection. MR. STEVENS: Sure. MS. BACHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Stevens, the FAA review of the plant and its impacts on the airport is an ancillary issue to this proceeding. For our purposes certainly that question really has no relevance, but in the FAA review, it may have relevance. But our purpose here is to balance the public benefit of this facility against the potential adverse environmental impacts. MR. STEVENS: Thank you. What is the standard FAA VFR approach for the three different aircrafts
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	miles an hour, by the time the plume was 250 feet above the stack, it would have reduced to about 13 miles per hour, and by the time it was about 500 feet above the stack, it would reduce to about 9 and a half miles per hour. MR. STEVENS: And I see that you're using the Australian Government Civil Aviation Safety Authority for those calculations? THE WITNESS (Gresock): We are using that method, yes. MR. STEVENS: Have you done that with distillate as well? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes. In the third set of responses, CSC-3, the response to question CSC-10 provides the same information for distillate. MR. STEVENS: Okay. And would you provide those numbers to me? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Sure. The stack exit velocity of about 47 miles per	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	know what measures are being taken to ensure that an unbiased determination of these proceedings occur. THE CHAIRMAN: I'm going to ask our executive director to comment on the objection. MR. STEVENS: Sure. MS. BACHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Stevens, the FAA review of the plant and its impacts on the airport is an ancillary issue to this proceeding. For our purposes certainly that question really has no relevance, but in the FAA review, it may have relevance. But our purpose here is to balance the public benefit of this facility against the potential adverse environmental impacts. MR. STEVENS: Thank you. What is the standard FAA VFR approach for the three different aircrafts that are referenced in the MITRE Report that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	miles an hour, by the time the plume was 250 feet above the stack, it would have reduced to about 13 miles per hour, and by the time it was about 500 feet above the stack, it would reduce to about 9 and a half miles per hour. MR. STEVENS: And I see that you're using the Australian Government Civil Aviation Safety Authority for those calculations? THE WITNESS (Gresock): We are using that method, yes. MR. STEVENS: Have you done that with distillate as well? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes. In the third set of responses, CSC-3, the response to question CSC-10 provides the same information for distillate. MR. STEVENS: Okay. And would you provide those numbers to me? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Sure. The stack exit velocity of about 47 miles per hour would reduce to about 16 miles per hour	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	know what measures are being taken to ensure that an unbiased determination of these proceedings occur. THE CHAIRMAN: I'm going to ask our executive director to comment on the objection. MR. STEVENS: Sure. MS. BACHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Stevens, the FAA review of the plant and its impacts on the airport is an ancillary issue to this proceeding. For our purposes certainly that question really has no relevance, but in the FAA review, it may have relevance. But our purpose here is to balance the public benefit of this facility against the potential adverse environmental impacts. MR. STEVENS: Thank you. What is the standard FAA VFR approach for the three different aircrafts that are referenced in the MITRE Report that you referenced in question CSC-2, 10?

11 (Pages 581 to 584)

	Page 585		Page 587
1	MR. STEVENS: What is the	1	sorry.
2	standard recommended VFR approach for the	2	THE WITNESS (Gresock): No,
3	three different aircraft types that you	3	he's not. But all of the information that
4	reference when you referenced the MITRE	4	he's provided and gathered can be seen on
5	Report that you reference in your	5	those two figures.
6	Question 10, CSC-10. I believe it's CSC-2,	6	MR. STEVENS: What is the
7	10.	7	distance of this proposed power plant to the
8	THE WITNESS (Gresock): Are	8	runway 36/18?
9	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	9	THE WITNESS (Gresock): It's
	you talking about circling procedures, or are	10	
10 11	you talking about approach to land? MR. STEVENS: VFR conditions.		0.59 nautical miles from the edge of the
		11	pavement for the runway.
12	THE WITNESS (Gresock): We've	12	THE CHAIRMAN: Can you
13	provided information in response to	13	translate that into feet?
14	Interrogatory CSC-2, in response to Question	14	THE WITNESS (Gresock): I can,
15	CSC-14, and also as part of a Late-Filed	15	3,563 feet.
16	Exhibit 2H that provide an illustration of	16	THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
17	the various patterns. But as can be shown on	17	MR. STEVENS: Are you folks
18	one of those, the lowest recommended flight	18	familiar with the Airplane Flying Handbook?
19	altitude when preparing to land, according to	19	THE WITNESS (Gresock): We're
20	VFR traffic pattern airspace is at 1,700 feet	20	familiar with it, yes.
21	above mean sea level. There are aircraft	21	MR. STEVENS: On page 7.3
22	surfaces that do exist for various	22	and I can hand it to you, if you wish it
23	configurations like what I was just referring	23	states that the downwind leg of a course
24	to, the circling minimum descent altitude,	24	flown parallel to the landing runway, but in
25	within the expanded Category A circling area	25	the direction opposite to the intended
	Page 586	<u> </u>	5.00
			Page 588
1	is the lowest at 1,280 feet above mean sea	1	landing direction, this leg should be
2	is the lowest at 1,280 feet above mean sea level above the stack top, and that's what's	2	landing direction, this leg should be approximately one-half to one mile out from
2 3	is the lowest at 1,280 feet above mean sea level above the stack top, and that's what's approximately 300 feet above the top of the	2 3	landing direction, this leg should be approximately one-half to one mile out from the landing runway. Do you agree with that
2 3 4	is the lowest at 1,280 feet above mean sea level above the stack top, and that's what's approximately 300 feet above the top of the stack.	2 3 4	landing direction, this leg should be approximately one-half to one mile out from the landing runway. Do you agree with that statement? I'd be happy to show you.
2 3 4 5	is the lowest at 1,280 feet above mean sea level above the stack top, and that's what's approximately 300 feet above the top of the stack. MR. STEVENS: You still didn't	2 3 4 5	landing direction, this leg should be approximately one-half to one mile out from the landing runway. Do you agree with that statement? I'd be happy to show you. THE WITNESS (Gresock): I
2 3 4 5 6	is the lowest at 1,280 feet above mean sea level above the stack top, and that's what's approximately 300 feet above the top of the stack. MR. STEVENS: You still didn't answer my question of what's the recommended	2 3 4 5 6	landing direction, this leg should be approximately one-half to one mile out from the landing runway. Do you agree with that statement? I'd be happy to show you. THE WITNESS (Gresock): I don't disagree with that statement.
2 3 4 5 6 7	is the lowest at 1,280 feet above mean sea level above the stack top, and that's what's approximately 300 feet above the top of the stack. MR. STEVENS: You still didn't answer my question of what's the recommended FAA VFR approach for the three different	2 3 4 5 6 7	landing direction, this leg should be approximately one-half to one mile out from the landing runway. Do you agree with that statement? I'd be happy to show you. THE WITNESS (Gresock): I don't disagree with that statement. MR. STEVENS: So you agree
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	is the lowest at 1,280 feet above mean sea level above the stack top, and that's what's approximately 300 feet above the top of the stack. MR. STEVENS: You still didn't answer my question of what's the recommended FAA VFR approach for the three different types of aircraft that are referenced in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	landing direction, this leg should be approximately one-half to one mile out from the landing runway. Do you agree with that statement? I'd be happy to show you. THE WITNESS (Gresock): I don't disagree with that statement. MR. STEVENS: So you agree with it?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	is the lowest at 1,280 feet above mean sea level above the stack top, and that's what's approximately 300 feet above the top of the stack. MR. STEVENS: You still didn't answer my question of what's the recommended FAA VFR approach for the three different types of aircraft that are referenced in the MITRE Report.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	landing direction, this leg should be approximately one-half to one mile out from the landing runway. Do you agree with that statement? I'd be happy to show you. THE WITNESS (Gresock): I don't disagree with that statement. MR. STEVENS: So you agree with it? MR. SMALL: I think the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	is the lowest at 1,280 feet above mean sea level above the stack top, and that's what's approximately 300 feet above the top of the stack. MR. STEVENS: You still didn't answer my question of what's the recommended FAA VFR approach for the three different types of aircraft that are referenced in the MITRE Report. THE WITNESS (Gresock): I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	landing direction, this leg should be approximately one-half to one mile out from the landing runway. Do you agree with that statement? I'd be happy to show you. THE WITNESS (Gresock): I don't disagree with that statement. MR. STEVENS: So you agree with it? MR. SMALL: I think the question has been answered.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	is the lowest at 1,280 feet above mean sea level above the stack top, and that's what's approximately 300 feet above the top of the stack. MR. STEVENS: You still didn't answer my question of what's the recommended FAA VFR approach for the three different types of aircraft that are referenced in the MITRE Report. THE WITNESS (Gresock): I can't answer that question. There are a lot	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	landing direction, this leg should be approximately one-half to one mile out from the landing runway. Do you agree with that statement? I'd be happy to show you. THE WITNESS (Gresock): I don't disagree with that statement. MR. STEVENS: So you agree with it? MR. SMALL: I think the question has been answered. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): We
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	is the lowest at 1,280 feet above mean sea level above the stack top, and that's what's approximately 300 feet above the top of the stack. MR. STEVENS: You still didn't answer my question of what's the recommended FAA VFR approach for the three different types of aircraft that are referenced in the MITRE Report. THE WITNESS (Gresock): I can't answer that question. There are a lot of traffic patterns. We have an aviation	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	landing direction, this leg should be approximately one-half to one mile out from the landing runway. Do you agree with that statement? I'd be happy to show you. THE WITNESS (Gresock): I don't disagree with that statement. MR. STEVENS: So you agree with it? MR. SMALL: I think the question has been answered. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): We haven't had a chance to review that. The
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	is the lowest at 1,280 feet above mean sea level above the stack top, and that's what's approximately 300 feet above the top of the stack. MR. STEVENS: You still didn't answer my question of what's the recommended FAA VFR approach for the three different types of aircraft that are referenced in the MITRE Report. THE WITNESS (Gresock): I can't answer that question. There are a lot of traffic patterns. We have an aviation consultant that has considered the range of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	landing direction, this leg should be approximately one-half to one mile out from the landing runway. Do you agree with that statement? I'd be happy to show you. THE WITNESS (Gresock): I don't disagree with that statement. MR. STEVENS: So you agree with it? MR. SMALL: I think the question has been answered. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): We haven't had a chance to review that. The materials that you're discussing, I'm sure,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	is the lowest at 1,280 feet above mean sea level above the stack top, and that's what's approximately 300 feet above the top of the stack. MR. STEVENS: You still didn't answer my question of what's the recommended FAA VFR approach for the three different types of aircraft that are referenced in the MITRE Report. THE WITNESS (Gresock): I can't answer that question. There are a lot of traffic patterns. We have an aviation consultant that has considered the range of patterns that exist at this airport and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	landing direction, this leg should be approximately one-half to one mile out from the landing runway. Do you agree with that statement? I'd be happy to show you. THE WITNESS (Gresock): I don't disagree with that statement. MR. STEVENS: So you agree with it? MR. SMALL: I think the question has been answered. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): We haven't had a chance to review that. The materials that you're discussing, I'm sure, you just read them out loud, but if you'd
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	is the lowest at 1,280 feet above mean sea level above the stack top, and that's what's approximately 300 feet above the top of the stack. MR. STEVENS: You still didn't answer my question of what's the recommended FAA VFR approach for the three different types of aircraft that are referenced in the MITRE Report. THE WITNESS (Gresock): I can't answer that question. There are a lot of traffic patterns. We have an aviation consultant that has considered the range of patterns that exist at this airport and MR. STEVENS: Is he here	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	landing direction, this leg should be approximately one-half to one mile out from the landing runway. Do you agree with that statement? I'd be happy to show you. THE WITNESS (Gresock): I don't disagree with that statement. MR. STEVENS: So you agree with it? MR. SMALL: I think the question has been answered. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): We haven't had a chance to review that. The materials that you're discussing, I'm sure, you just read them out loud, but if you'd like us to answer the question, then perhaps
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	is the lowest at 1,280 feet above mean sea level above the stack top, and that's what's approximately 300 feet above the top of the stack. MR. STEVENS: You still didn't answer my question of what's the recommended FAA VFR approach for the three different types of aircraft that are referenced in the MITRE Report. THE WITNESS (Gresock): I can't answer that question. There are a lot of traffic patterns. We have an aviation consultant that has considered the range of patterns that exist at this airport and MR. STEVENS: Is he here today?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	landing direction, this leg should be approximately one-half to one mile out from the landing runway. Do you agree with that statement? I'd be happy to show you. THE WITNESS (Gresock): I don't disagree with that statement. MR. STEVENS: So you agree with it? MR. SMALL: I think the question has been answered. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): We haven't had a chance to review that. The materials that you're discussing, I'm sure, you just read them out loud, but if you'd like us to answer the question, then perhaps you could submit it in advance, and we could
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	is the lowest at 1,280 feet above mean sea level above the stack top, and that's what's approximately 300 feet above the top of the stack. MR. STEVENS: You still didn't answer my question of what's the recommended FAA VFR approach for the three different types of aircraft that are referenced in the MITRE Report. THE WITNESS (Gresock): I can't answer that question. There are a lot of traffic patterns. We have an aviation consultant that has considered the range of patterns that exist at this airport and MR. STEVENS: Is he here today? THE WITNESS (Gresock):	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	landing direction, this leg should be approximately one-half to one mile out from the landing runway. Do you agree with that statement? I'd be happy to show you. THE WITNESS (Gresock): I don't disagree with that statement. MR. STEVENS: So you agree with it? MR. SMALL: I think the question has been answered. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): We haven't had a chance to review that. The materials that you're discussing, I'm sure, you just read them out loud, but if you'd like us to answer the question, then perhaps you could submit it in advance, and we could review the materials and provide an answer to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	is the lowest at 1,280 feet above mean sea level above the stack top, and that's what's approximately 300 feet above the top of the stack. MR. STEVENS: You still didn't answer my question of what's the recommended FAA VFR approach for the three different types of aircraft that are referenced in the MITRE Report. THE WITNESS (Gresock): I can't answer that question. There are a lot of traffic patterns. We have an aviation consultant that has considered the range of patterns that exist at this airport and MR. STEVENS: Is he here today? THE WITNESS (Gresock): identified for us which ones would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	landing direction, this leg should be approximately one-half to one mile out from the landing runway. Do you agree with that statement? I'd be happy to show you. THE WITNESS (Gresock): I don't disagree with that statement. MR. STEVENS: So you agree with it? MR. SMALL: I think the question has been answered. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): We haven't had a chance to review that. The materials that you're discussing, I'm sure, you just read them out loud, but if you'd like us to answer the question, then perhaps you could submit it in advance, and we could review the materials and provide an answer to your question.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	is the lowest at 1,280 feet above mean sea level above the stack top, and that's what's approximately 300 feet above the top of the stack. MR. STEVENS: You still didn't answer my question of what's the recommended FAA VFR approach for the three different types of aircraft that are referenced in the MITRE Report. THE WITNESS (Gresock): I can't answer that question. There are a lot of traffic patterns. We have an aviation consultant that has considered the range of patterns that exist at this airport and MR. STEVENS: Is he here today? THE WITNESS (Gresock): identified for us which ones would be affected and which ones	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	landing direction, this leg should be approximately one-half to one mile out from the landing runway. Do you agree with that statement? I'd be happy to show you. THE WITNESS (Gresock): I don't disagree with that statement. MR. STEVENS: So you agree with it? MR. SMALL: I think the question has been answered. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): We haven't had a chance to review that. The materials that you're discussing, I'm sure, you just read them out loud, but if you'd like us to answer the question, then perhaps you could submit it in advance, and we could review the materials and provide an answer to your question. MR. STEVENS: All right. You
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	is the lowest at 1,280 feet above mean sea level above the stack top, and that's what's approximately 300 feet above the top of the stack. MR. STEVENS: You still didn't answer my question of what's the recommended FAA VFR approach for the three different types of aircraft that are referenced in the MITRE Report. THE WITNESS (Gresock): I can't answer that question. There are a lot of traffic patterns. We have an aviation consultant that has considered the range of patterns that exist at this airport and MR. STEVENS: Is he here today? THE WITNESS (Gresock): identified for us which ones would be affected and which ones MR. STEVENS: Is that expert	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	landing direction, this leg should be approximately one-half to one mile out from the landing runway. Do you agree with that statement? I'd be happy to show you. THE WITNESS (Gresock): I don't disagree with that statement. MR. STEVENS: So you agree with it? MR. SMALL: I think the question has been answered. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): We haven't had a chance to review that. The materials that you're discussing, I'm sure, you just read them out loud, but if you'd like us to answer the question, then perhaps you could submit it in advance, and we could review the materials and provide an answer to your question. MR. STEVENS: All right. You state that this proposed power plant is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	is the lowest at 1,280 feet above mean sea level above the stack top, and that's what's approximately 300 feet above the top of the stack. MR. STEVENS: You still didn't answer my question of what's the recommended FAA VFR approach for the three different types of aircraft that are referenced in the MITRE Report. THE WITNESS (Gresock): I can't answer that question. There are a lot of traffic patterns. We have an aviation consultant that has considered the range of patterns that exist at this airport and MR. STEVENS: Is he here today? THE WITNESS (Gresock): identified for us which ones would be affected and which ones MR. STEVENS: Is that expert here today?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	landing direction, this leg should be approximately one-half to one mile out from the landing runway. Do you agree with that statement? I'd be happy to show you. THE WITNESS (Gresock): I don't disagree with that statement. MR. STEVENS: So you agree with it? MR. SMALL: I think the question has been answered. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): We haven't had a chance to review that. The materials that you're discussing, I'm sure, you just read them out loud, but if you'd like us to answer the question, then perhaps you could submit it in advance, and we could review the materials and provide an answer to your question. MR. STEVENS: All right. You state that this proposed power plant is approximately .59 or six-tenths of a nautical
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	is the lowest at 1,280 feet above mean sea level above the stack top, and that's what's approximately 300 feet above the top of the stack. MR. STEVENS: You still didn't answer my question of what's the recommended FAA VFR approach for the three different types of aircraft that are referenced in the MITRE Report. THE WITNESS (Gresock): I can't answer that question. There are a lot of traffic patterns. We have an aviation consultant that has considered the range of patterns that exist at this airport and MR. STEVENS: Is he here today? THE WITNESS (Gresock): identified for us which ones would be affected and which ones MR. STEVENS: Is that expert here today? MR. SMALL: Please let the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	landing direction, this leg should be approximately one-half to one mile out from the landing runway. Do you agree with that statement? I'd be happy to show you. THE WITNESS (Gresock): I don't disagree with that statement. MR. STEVENS: So you agree with it? MR. SMALL: I think the question has been answered. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): We haven't had a chance to review that. The materials that you're discussing, I'm sure, you just read them out loud, but if you'd like us to answer the question, then perhaps you could submit it in advance, and we could review the materials and provide an answer to your question. MR. STEVENS: All right. You state that this proposed power plant is approximately .59 or six-tenths of a nautical mile east of the airport. In your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	is the lowest at 1,280 feet above mean sea level above the stack top, and that's what's approximately 300 feet above the top of the stack. MR. STEVENS: You still didn't answer my question of what's the recommended FAA VFR approach for the three different types of aircraft that are referenced in the MITRE Report. THE WITNESS (Gresock): I can't answer that question. There are a lot of traffic patterns. We have an aviation consultant that has considered the range of patterns that exist at this airport and MR. STEVENS: Is he here today? THE WITNESS (Gresock): identified for us which ones would be affected and which ones MR. STEVENS: Is that expert here today? MR. SMALL: Please let the witness answer the question; then you can	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	landing direction, this leg should be approximately one-half to one mile out from the landing runway. Do you agree with that statement? I'd be happy to show you. THE WITNESS (Gresock): I don't disagree with that statement. MR. STEVENS: So you agree with it? MR. SMALL: I think the question has been answered. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): We haven't had a chance to review that. The materials that you're discussing, I'm sure, you just read them out loud, but if you'd like us to answer the question, then perhaps you could submit it in advance, and we could review the materials and provide an answer to your question. MR. STEVENS: All right. You state that this proposed power plant is approximately .59 or six-tenths of a nautical mile east of the airport. In your understanding, would this be precisely under
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	is the lowest at 1,280 feet above mean sea level above the stack top, and that's what's approximately 300 feet above the top of the stack. MR. STEVENS: You still didn't answer my question of what's the recommended FAA VFR approach for the three different types of aircraft that are referenced in the MITRE Report. THE WITNESS (Gresock): I can't answer that question. There are a lot of traffic patterns. We have an aviation consultant that has considered the range of patterns that exist at this airport and MR. STEVENS: Is he here today? THE WITNESS (Gresock): identified for us which ones would be affected and which ones MR. STEVENS: Is that expert here today? MR. SMALL: Please let the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	landing direction, this leg should be approximately one-half to one mile out from the landing runway. Do you agree with that statement? I'd be happy to show you. THE WITNESS (Gresock): I don't disagree with that statement. MR. STEVENS: So you agree with it? MR. SMALL: I think the question has been answered. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): We haven't had a chance to review that. The materials that you're discussing, I'm sure, you just read them out loud, but if you'd like us to answer the question, then perhaps you could submit it in advance, and we could review the materials and provide an answer to your question. MR. STEVENS: All right. You state that this proposed power plant is approximately .59 or six-tenths of a nautical mile east of the airport. In your

12 (Pages 585 to 588)

	Page 589		Page 591
1	THE WITNESS (Gresock): It's	1	just not worth taking all this time, as
2	our understanding that Category A aircraft,	2	Attorney Bachman said, on a more or less
3	which those aircraft would be, do have the	3	peripheral issue to the Siting Council.
4	shortest turning radius. They do have a	4	THE CHAIRMAN: Well, but I'd
5	maneuver area that could result in them	5	prefer the former that you find out the
6	flying in the vicinity of the project, yes.	6	information and let us know after the break.
7	MR. STEVENS: Over the	7	MR. SMALL: Yes. We'll try to
8	project?	8	do it as a Read-In.
9	THE WITNESS (Gresock): They	9	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I'm
10	could. And that's what we have reflected in	10	getting a little overwhelmed with these
11	the heights that we've shown in those other	11	Late-Filings.
12	graphics.	12	MR. SMALL: So are we,
13	MR. STEVENS: Are the types of	13	Mr. Chairman.
14	aircraft that were used in the MITRE Report	14	MR. STEVENS: Do you know the
15	representative of the types of aircraft that	15	definition of a light sport aircraft?
16	are being flown into and out of Oxford in	16	THE WITNESS (Gresock): I
17	2015?	17	don't know it to define it to you right now.
18	THE WITNESS (Gresock): We	18	I know that we can look that up.
19	don't have information about specifically the	19	MR. STEVENS: Would you think
20	aircraft being flown in 2015, but we do know	20	that it might be an aircraft that has a gross
21	that, for example, in 2012, there were 128	21	weight of less than 1,400 pounds?
22	single-engine, 8 multi-engine, 31 jet	22	THE WITNESS (Gresock): I
23	aircraft based at the airport, plus one	23	can't answer that.
24	helicopter. Certainly MITRE considers a	24	MR. STEVENS: Do you know the
25	range of aircraft types in a number of	25	weight of the Navion aircraft that before
	range of anerart types in a number of	23	weight of the ration and all before
	Page 590		Page 592
1	_	1	
1 2	different categories, including light aircraft.	1 2	Page 592 I ask about the Navion aircraft, generally, if an aircraft flies through this plume, is
	different categories, including light		I ask about the Navion aircraft, generally,
2	different categories, including light aircraft.	2	I ask about the Navion aircraft, generally, if an aircraft flies through this plume, is
2 3 4 5	different categories, including light aircraft. MR. STEVENS: Did MITRE	2 3 4 5	I ask about the Navion aircraft, generally, if an aircraft flies through this plume, is it more dangerous to be in a large heavy
2 3 4	different categories, including light aircraft. MR. STEVENS: Did MITRE include light aircraft, LSA aircraft, in their report? THE WITNESS (Gresock): In the	2 3 4	I ask about the Navion aircraft, generally, if an aircraft flies through this plume, is it more dangerous to be in a large heavy aircraft or a small light aircraft; which is
2 3 4 5	different categories, including light aircraft. MR. STEVENS: Did MITRE include light aircraft, LSA aircraft, in their report? THE WITNESS (Gresock): In the 2012 report the Navion GA, the Lockheed	2 3 4 5 6 7	I ask about the Navion aircraft, generally, if an aircraft flies through this plume, is it more dangerous to be in a large heavy aircraft or a small light aircraft; which is more dangerous? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Clearly the lighter aircraft have more
2 3 4 5 6	different categories, including light aircraft. MR. STEVENS: Did MITRE include light aircraft, LSA aircraft, in their report? THE WITNESS (Gresock): In the	2 3 4 5 6	I ask about the Navion aircraft, generally, if an aircraft flies through this plume, is it more dangerous to be in a large heavy aircraft or a small light aircraft; which is more dangerous? THE WITNESS (Gresock):
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	different categories, including light aircraft. MR. STEVENS: Did MITRE include light aircraft, LSA aircraft, in their report? THE WITNESS (Gresock): In the 2012 report the Navion GA, the Lockheed Jetstar and the Convair CV-ADM jet are the three types.	2 3 4 5 6 7	I ask about the Navion aircraft, generally, if an aircraft flies through this plume, is it more dangerous to be in a large heavy aircraft or a small light aircraft; which is more dangerous? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Clearly the lighter aircraft have more vulnerabilities to turbulence, in general, in the atmosphere.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	different categories, including light aircraft. MR. STEVENS: Did MITRE include light aircraft, LSA aircraft, in their report? THE WITNESS (Gresock): In the 2012 report the Navion GA, the Lockheed Jetstar and the Convair CV-ADM jet are the three types. MR. STEVENS: Are any of those	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	I ask about the Navion aircraft, generally, if an aircraft flies through this plume, is it more dangerous to be in a large heavy aircraft or a small light aircraft; which is more dangerous? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Clearly the lighter aircraft have more vulnerabilities to turbulence, in general, in the atmosphere. MR. STEVENS: And what is the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	different categories, including light aircraft. MR. STEVENS: Did MITRE include light aircraft, LSA aircraft, in their report? THE WITNESS (Gresock): In the 2012 report the Navion GA, the Lockheed Jetstar and the Convair CV-ADM jet are the three types. MR. STEVENS: Are any of those types representative of light sport aircraft,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	I ask about the Navion aircraft, generally, if an aircraft flies through this plume, is it more dangerous to be in a large heavy aircraft or a small light aircraft; which is more dangerous? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Clearly the lighter aircraft have more vulnerabilities to turbulence, in general, in the atmosphere. MR. STEVENS: And what is the weight of the Navion aircraft that MITRE
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	different categories, including light aircraft. MR. STEVENS: Did MITRE include light aircraft, LSA aircraft, in their report? THE WITNESS (Gresock): In the 2012 report the Navion GA, the Lockheed Jetstar and the Convair CV-ADM jet are the three types. MR. STEVENS: Are any of those types representative of light sport aircraft, LSA aircraft?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	I ask about the Navion aircraft, generally, if an aircraft flies through this plume, is it more dangerous to be in a large heavy aircraft or a small light aircraft; which is more dangerous? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Clearly the lighter aircraft have more vulnerabilities to turbulence, in general, in the atmosphere. MR. STEVENS: And what is the weight of the Navion aircraft that MITRE used? It's in the MITRE Report.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	different categories, including light aircraft. MR. STEVENS: Did MITRE include light aircraft, LSA aircraft, in their report? THE WITNESS (Gresock): In the 2012 report the Navion GA, the Lockheed Jetstar and the Convair CV-ADM jet are the three types. MR. STEVENS: Are any of those types representative of light sport aircraft, LSA aircraft? THE WITNESS (Gresock): The	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I ask about the Navion aircraft, generally, if an aircraft flies through this plume, is it more dangerous to be in a large heavy aircraft or a small light aircraft; which is more dangerous? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Clearly the lighter aircraft have more vulnerabilities to turbulence, in general, in the atmosphere. MR. STEVENS: And what is the weight of the Navion aircraft that MITRE used? It's in the MITRE Report. MR. SMALL: We'll add that to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	different categories, including light aircraft. MR. STEVENS: Did MITRE include light aircraft, LSA aircraft, in their report? THE WITNESS (Gresock): In the 2012 report the Navion GA, the Lockheed Jetstar and the Convair CV-ADM jet are the three types. MR. STEVENS: Are any of those types representative of light sport aircraft, LSA aircraft? THE WITNESS (Gresock): The report describes the Navion GA as in that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	I ask about the Navion aircraft, generally, if an aircraft flies through this plume, is it more dangerous to be in a large heavy aircraft or a small light aircraft; which is more dangerous? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Clearly the lighter aircraft have more vulnerabilities to turbulence, in general, in the atmosphere. MR. STEVENS: And what is the weight of the Navion aircraft that MITRE used? It's in the MITRE Report. MR. SMALL: We'll add that to our Read-In.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	different categories, including light aircraft. MR. STEVENS: Did MITRE include light aircraft, LSA aircraft, in their report? THE WITNESS (Gresock): In the 2012 report the Navion GA, the Lockheed Jetstar and the Convair CV-ADM jet are the three types. MR. STEVENS: Are any of those types representative of light sport aircraft, LSA aircraft? THE WITNESS (Gresock): The report describes the Navion GA as in that category and representative of that category.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	I ask about the Navion aircraft, generally, if an aircraft flies through this plume, is it more dangerous to be in a large heavy aircraft or a small light aircraft; which is more dangerous? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Clearly the lighter aircraft have more vulnerabilities to turbulence, in general, in the atmosphere. MR. STEVENS: And what is the weight of the Navion aircraft that MITRE used? It's in the MITRE Report. MR. SMALL: We'll add that to our Read-In. MR. STEVENS: I think that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	different categories, including light aircraft. MR. STEVENS: Did MITRE include light aircraft, LSA aircraft, in their report? THE WITNESS (Gresock): In the 2012 report the Navion GA, the Lockheed Jetstar and the Convair CV-ADM jet are the three types. MR. STEVENS: Are any of those types representative of light sport aircraft, LSA aircraft? THE WITNESS (Gresock): The report describes the Navion GA as in that category and representative of that category. MR. STEVENS: Of light sport	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I ask about the Navion aircraft, generally, if an aircraft flies through this plume, is it more dangerous to be in a large heavy aircraft or a small light aircraft; which is more dangerous? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Clearly the lighter aircraft have more vulnerabilities to turbulence, in general, in the atmosphere. MR. STEVENS: And what is the weight of the Navion aircraft that MITRE used? It's in the MITRE Report. MR. SMALL: We'll add that to our Read-In. MR. STEVENS: I think that their record will show that light aircraft is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	different categories, including light aircraft. MR. STEVENS: Did MITRE include light aircraft, LSA aircraft, in their report? THE WITNESS (Gresock): In the 2012 report the Navion GA, the Lockheed Jetstar and the Convair CV-ADM jet are the three types. MR. STEVENS: Are any of those types representative of light sport aircraft, LSA aircraft? THE WITNESS (Gresock): The report describes the Navion GA as in that category and representative of that category. MR. STEVENS: Of light sport aircraft, LSA aircraft, as defined by the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	I ask about the Navion aircraft, generally, if an aircraft flies through this plume, is it more dangerous to be in a large heavy aircraft or a small light aircraft; which is more dangerous? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Clearly the lighter aircraft have more vulnerabilities to turbulence, in general, in the atmosphere. MR. STEVENS: And what is the weight of the Navion aircraft that MITRE used? It's in the MITRE Report. MR. SMALL: We'll add that to our Read-In. MR. STEVENS: I think that their record will show that light aircraft is half the weight of the smallest aircraft that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	different categories, including light aircraft. MR. STEVENS: Did MITRE include light aircraft, LSA aircraft, in their report? THE WITNESS (Gresock): In the 2012 report the Navion GA, the Lockheed Jetstar and the Convair CV-ADM jet are the three types. MR. STEVENS: Are any of those types representative of light sport aircraft, LSA aircraft? THE WITNESS (Gresock): The report describes the Navion GA as in that category and representative of that category. MR. STEVENS: Of light sport aircraft, LSA aircraft, as defined by the FAA?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I ask about the Navion aircraft, generally, if an aircraft flies through this plume, is it more dangerous to be in a large heavy aircraft or a small light aircraft; which is more dangerous? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Clearly the lighter aircraft have more vulnerabilities to turbulence, in general, in the atmosphere. MR. STEVENS: And what is the weight of the Navion aircraft that MITRE used? It's in the MITRE Report. MR. SMALL: We'll add that to our Read-In. MR. STEVENS: I think that their record will show that light aircraft is half the weight of the smallest aircraft that MITRE used in their report and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	different categories, including light aircraft. MR. STEVENS: Did MITRE include light aircraft, LSA aircraft, in their report? THE WITNESS (Gresock): In the 2012 report the Navion GA, the Lockheed Jetstar and the Convair CV-ADM jet are the three types. MR. STEVENS: Are any of those types representative of light sport aircraft, LSA aircraft? THE WITNESS (Gresock): The report describes the Navion GA as in that category and representative of that category. MR. STEVENS: Of light sport aircraft, LSA aircraft, as defined by the FAA? (Pause.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	I ask about the Navion aircraft, generally, if an aircraft flies through this plume, is it more dangerous to be in a large heavy aircraft or a small light aircraft; which is more dangerous? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Clearly the lighter aircraft have more vulnerabilities to turbulence, in general, in the atmosphere. MR. STEVENS: And what is the weight of the Navion aircraft that MITRE used? It's in the MITRE Report. MR. SMALL: We'll add that to our Read-In. MR. STEVENS: I think that their record will show that light aircraft is half the weight of the smallest aircraft that MITRE used in their report and MR. SMALL: You're not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	different categories, including light aircraft. MR. STEVENS: Did MITRE include light aircraft, LSA aircraft, in their report? THE WITNESS (Gresock): In the 2012 report the Navion GA, the Lockheed Jetstar and the Convair CV-ADM jet are the three types. MR. STEVENS: Are any of those types representative of light sport aircraft, LSA aircraft? THE WITNESS (Gresock): The report describes the Navion GA as in that category and representative of that category. MR. STEVENS: Of light sport aircraft, LSA aircraft, as defined by the FAA? (Pause.) MR. SMALL: Mr. Chairman,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	I ask about the Navion aircraft, generally, if an aircraft flies through this plume, is it more dangerous to be in a large heavy aircraft or a small light aircraft; which is more dangerous? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Clearly the lighter aircraft have more vulnerabilities to turbulence, in general, in the atmosphere. MR. STEVENS: And what is the weight of the Navion aircraft that MITRE used? It's in the MITRE Report. MR. SMALL: We'll add that to our Read-In. MR. STEVENS: I think that their record will show that light aircraft is half the weight of the smallest aircraft that MITRE used in their report and MR. SMALL: You're not testifying now, Mr. Stevens, you're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	different categories, including light aircraft. MR. STEVENS: Did MITRE include light aircraft, LSA aircraft, in their report? THE WITNESS (Gresock): In the 2012 report the Navion GA, the Lockheed Jetstar and the Convair CV-ADM jet are the three types. MR. STEVENS: Are any of those types representative of light sport aircraft, LSA aircraft? THE WITNESS (Gresock): The report describes the Navion GA as in that category and representative of that category. MR. STEVENS: Of light sport aircraft, LSA aircraft, as defined by the FAA? (Pause.) MR. SMALL: Mr. Chairman, rather than take time on whether or not this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	I ask about the Navion aircraft, generally, if an aircraft flies through this plume, is it more dangerous to be in a large heavy aircraft or a small light aircraft; which is more dangerous? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Clearly the lighter aircraft have more vulnerabilities to turbulence, in general, in the atmosphere. MR. STEVENS: And what is the weight of the Navion aircraft that MITRE used? It's in the MITRE Report. MR. SMALL: We'll add that to our Read-In. MR. STEVENS: I think that their record will show that light aircraft is half the weight of the smallest aircraft that MITRE used in their report and MR. SMALL: You're not testifying now, Mr. Stevens, you're cross-examining, so please confine
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	different categories, including light aircraft. MR. STEVENS: Did MITRE include light aircraft, LSA aircraft, in their report? THE WITNESS (Gresock): In the 2012 report the Navion GA, the Lockheed Jetstar and the Convair CV-ADM jet are the three types. MR. STEVENS: Are any of those types representative of light sport aircraft, LSA aircraft? THE WITNESS (Gresock): The report describes the Navion GA as in that category and representative of that category. MR. STEVENS: Of light sport aircraft, LSA aircraft, as defined by the FAA? (Pause.) MR. SMALL: Mr. Chairman, rather than take time on whether or not this particular aircraft is a light sports	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I ask about the Navion aircraft, generally, if an aircraft flies through this plume, is it more dangerous to be in a large heavy aircraft or a small light aircraft; which is more dangerous? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Clearly the lighter aircraft have more vulnerabilities to turbulence, in general, in the atmosphere. MR. STEVENS: And what is the weight of the Navion aircraft that MITRE used? It's in the MITRE Report. MR. SMALL: We'll add that to our Read-In. MR. STEVENS: I think that their record will show that light aircraft is half the weight of the smallest aircraft that MITRE used in their report and MR. SMALL: You're not testifying now, Mr. Stevens, you're cross-examining, so please confine yourself
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	different categories, including light aircraft. MR. STEVENS: Did MITRE include light aircraft, LSA aircraft, in their report? THE WITNESS (Gresock): In the 2012 report the Navion GA, the Lockheed Jetstar and the Convair CV-ADM jet are the three types. MR. STEVENS: Are any of those types representative of light sport aircraft, LSA aircraft? THE WITNESS (Gresock): The report describes the Navion GA as in that category and representative of that category. MR. STEVENS: Of light sport aircraft, LSA aircraft, as defined by the FAA? (Pause.) MR. SMALL: Mr. Chairman, rather than take time on whether or not this particular aircraft is a light sports aircraft, let us either we do a Read-In	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I ask about the Navion aircraft, generally, if an aircraft flies through this plume, is it more dangerous to be in a large heavy aircraft or a small light aircraft; which is more dangerous? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Clearly the lighter aircraft have more vulnerabilities to turbulence, in general, in the atmosphere. MR. STEVENS: And what is the weight of the Navion aircraft that MITRE used? It's in the MITRE Report. MR. SMALL: We'll add that to our Read-In. MR. STEVENS: I think that their record will show that light aircraft is half the weight of the smallest aircraft that MITRE used in their report and MR. SMALL: You're not testifying now, Mr. Stevens, you're cross-examining, so please confine yourself MR. STEVENS: If you can
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	different categories, including light aircraft. MR. STEVENS: Did MITRE include light aircraft, LSA aircraft, in their report? THE WITNESS (Gresock): In the 2012 report the Navion GA, the Lockheed Jetstar and the Convair CV-ADM jet are the three types. MR. STEVENS: Are any of those types representative of light sport aircraft, LSA aircraft? THE WITNESS (Gresock): The report describes the Navion GA as in that category and representative of that category. MR. STEVENS: Of light sport aircraft, LSA aircraft, as defined by the FAA? (Pause.) MR. SMALL: Mr. Chairman, rather than take time on whether or not this particular aircraft is a light sports aircraft, let us either we do a Read-In after the lunch break, if we can find it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I ask about the Navion aircraft, generally, if an aircraft flies through this plume, is it more dangerous to be in a large heavy aircraft or a small light aircraft; which is more dangerous? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Clearly the lighter aircraft have more vulnerabilities to turbulence, in general, in the atmosphere. MR. STEVENS: And what is the weight of the Navion aircraft that MITRE used? It's in the MITRE Report. MR. SMALL: We'll add that to our Read-In. MR. STEVENS: I think that their record will show that light aircraft is half the weight of the smallest aircraft that MITRE used in their report and MR. SMALL: You're not testifying now, Mr. Stevens, you're cross-examining, so please confine yourself MR. STEVENS: If you can answer these questions, I wouldn't have to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	different categories, including light aircraft. MR. STEVENS: Did MITRE include light aircraft, LSA aircraft, in their report? THE WITNESS (Gresock): In the 2012 report the Navion GA, the Lockheed Jetstar and the Convair CV-ADM jet are the three types. MR. STEVENS: Are any of those types representative of light sport aircraft, LSA aircraft? THE WITNESS (Gresock): The report describes the Navion GA as in that category and representative of that category. MR. STEVENS: Of light sport aircraft, LSA aircraft, as defined by the FAA? (Pause.) MR. SMALL: Mr. Chairman, rather than take time on whether or not this particular aircraft is a light sports aircraft, let us either we do a Read-In	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I ask about the Navion aircraft, generally, if an aircraft flies through this plume, is it more dangerous to be in a large heavy aircraft or a small light aircraft; which is more dangerous? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Clearly the lighter aircraft have more vulnerabilities to turbulence, in general, in the atmosphere. MR. STEVENS: And what is the weight of the Navion aircraft that MITRE used? It's in the MITRE Report. MR. SMALL: We'll add that to our Read-In. MR. STEVENS: I think that their record will show that light aircraft is half the weight of the smallest aircraft that MITRE used in their report and MR. SMALL: You're not testifying now, Mr. Stevens, you're cross-examining, so please confine yourself MR. STEVENS: If you can

13 (Pages 589 to 592)

	Page 593		Page 595
1	MR. SMALL: These questions go	1	Cessna 172 I don't know if they still even
2	at the periphery of the Siting Council's	2	make them anymore but
3	jurisdiction.	3	MR. STEVENS: A small training
4	MR. STEVENS: Excuse me, sir.	4	plane.
5	They go right to the heart of the matter.	5	THE CHAIRMAN: you know,
6	They go right to the heart of the matter	6	how a pilot would be properly aware and
7	because as a flight instructor, I'm afraid	7	therefore avoid the turbulence and stay in
8	for pilots. They go right to the heart of	8	the pattern, I think, without getting into
9	the matter.	9	all the detail you've been asking for, that
10	MR. SMALL: Let's not have	10	is a legitimate question.
11	testimony.	11	THE WITNESS (Gresock): You
12	THE CHAIRMAN: I mean, the	12	know, and we've certainly provided
13	Applicant has said they're going to research	13	information that we have available relative
14	this and get us the information, and we'll	14	to how the temperature and the exhaust
15	have to leave it at that. They don't have	15	velocity dissipates as it leaves the stack.
16	anything else to add at this point.	16	We know that there is the possibility that
17	MR. STEVENS: What is the FAA	17	lighter aircraft could fly in this vicinity,
18	requirement for a VFR pilot to remain apart	18	but we also know that there is considerable
19	from clouds?	19	additional space in that area to allow them
20	THE WITNESS (Gresock): I	20	to fly in that area without flying directly
21	don't know.	21	over the stacks as well.
22	MR. STEVENS: How do you	22	THE CHAIRMAN: Could I ask
23	propose when you don't know that answer,	23	maybe a follow-up where there are similar
24	how do you propose a pilot maintain legal	24	situations elsewhere, and is there some way,
25	separation of 2,000 feet from a cloud	25	the markings on the stack or something, that
		<u> </u>	
	Page 594		
	i dge op i		Page 596
1		1	Page 596 can alert pilots that at least a zone of
1 2	produced by your plant and still remain in the traffic pattern at Oxford for a left	1 2	
	produced by your plant and still remain in		can alert pilots that at least a zone of
2	produced by your plant and still remain in the traffic pattern at Oxford for a left	2	can alert pilots that at least a zone of something? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Obviously, any structure like this would be
2 3	produced by your plant and still remain in the traffic pattern at Oxford for a left downwind for 18? These are not peripheral questions. MR. SMALL: Mr. Chairman,	2 3 4 5	can alert pilots that at least a zone of something? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Obviously, any structure like this would be indicated as an obstruction, and pilots would
2 3 4 5 6	produced by your plant and still remain in the traffic pattern at Oxford for a left downwind for 18? These are not peripheral questions. MR. SMALL: Mr. Chairman, these are really questions for the FAA to	2 3 4 5 6	can alert pilots that at least a zone of something? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Obviously, any structure like this would be indicated as an obstruction, and pilots would be aware that it existed. It also, under
2 3 4 5 6 7	produced by your plant and still remain in the traffic pattern at Oxford for a left downwind for 18? These are not peripheral questions. MR. SMALL: Mr. Chairman, these are really questions for the FAA to deal with, not the Council. We suggest that	2 3 4 5 6 7	can alert pilots that at least a zone of something? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Obviously, any structure like this would be indicated as an obstruction, and pilots would be aware that it existed. It also, under good visibility conditions, would be clearly
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	produced by your plant and still remain in the traffic pattern at Oxford for a left downwind for 18? These are not peripheral questions. MR. SMALL: Mr. Chairman, these are really questions for the FAA to deal with, not the Council. We suggest that we've all given Mr. Stevens a lot of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	can alert pilots that at least a zone of something? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Obviously, any structure like this would be indicated as an obstruction, and pilots would be aware that it existed. It also, under good visibility conditions, would be clearly able to be seen. And there are many airports
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	produced by your plant and still remain in the traffic pattern at Oxford for a left downwind for 18? These are not peripheral questions. MR. SMALL: Mr. Chairman, these are really questions for the FAA to deal with, not the Council. We suggest that we've all given Mr. Stevens a lot of latitude, as we do in these proceedings all	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	can alert pilots that at least a zone of something? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Obviously, any structure like this would be indicated as an obstruction, and pilots would be aware that it existed. It also, under good visibility conditions, would be clearly able to be seen. And there are many airports that have similar facilities in very close
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	produced by your plant and still remain in the traffic pattern at Oxford for a left downwind for 18? These are not peripheral questions. MR. SMALL: Mr. Chairman, these are really questions for the FAA to deal with, not the Council. We suggest that we've all given Mr. Stevens a lot of latitude, as we do in these proceedings all the time, but at some point we're getting	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	can alert pilots that at least a zone of something? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Obviously, any structure like this would be indicated as an obstruction, and pilots would be aware that it existed. It also, under good visibility conditions, would be clearly able to be seen. And there are many airports that have similar facilities in very close proximity without any records of accidents or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	produced by your plant and still remain in the traffic pattern at Oxford for a left downwind for 18? These are not peripheral questions. MR. SMALL: Mr. Chairman, these are really questions for the FAA to deal with, not the Council. We suggest that we've all given Mr. Stevens a lot of latitude, as we do in these proceedings all the time, but at some point we're getting into intricate FAA-related details that are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	can alert pilots that at least a zone of something? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Obviously, any structure like this would be indicated as an obstruction, and pilots would be aware that it existed. It also, under good visibility conditions, would be clearly able to be seen. And there are many airports that have similar facilities in very close proximity without any records of accidents or incident.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	produced by your plant and still remain in the traffic pattern at Oxford for a left downwind for 18? These are not peripheral questions. MR. SMALL: Mr. Chairman, these are really questions for the FAA to deal with, not the Council. We suggest that we've all given Mr. Stevens a lot of latitude, as we do in these proceedings all the time, but at some point we're getting into intricate FAA-related details that are extremely complex and, frankly, beyond the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	can alert pilots that at least a zone of something? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Obviously, any structure like this would be indicated as an obstruction, and pilots would be aware that it existed. It also, under good visibility conditions, would be clearly able to be seen. And there are many airports that have similar facilities in very close proximity without any records of accidents or incident. MR. STEVENS: You just
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	produced by your plant and still remain in the traffic pattern at Oxford for a left downwind for 18? These are not peripheral questions. MR. SMALL: Mr. Chairman, these are really questions for the FAA to deal with, not the Council. We suggest that we've all given Mr. Stevens a lot of latitude, as we do in these proceedings all the time, but at some point we're getting into intricate FAA-related details that are extremely complex and, frankly, beyond the jurisdiction or competence of any of us.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	can alert pilots that at least a zone of something? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Obviously, any structure like this would be indicated as an obstruction, and pilots would be aware that it existed. It also, under good visibility conditions, would be clearly able to be seen. And there are many airports that have similar facilities in very close proximity without any records of accidents or incident. MR. STEVENS: You just indicated that there are many facilities in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	produced by your plant and still remain in the traffic pattern at Oxford for a left downwind for 18? These are not peripheral questions. MR. SMALL: Mr. Chairman, these are really questions for the FAA to deal with, not the Council. We suggest that we've all given Mr. Stevens a lot of latitude, as we do in these proceedings all the time, but at some point we're getting into intricate FAA-related details that are extremely complex and, frankly, beyond the jurisdiction or competence of any of us. MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	can alert pilots that at least a zone of something? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Obviously, any structure like this would be indicated as an obstruction, and pilots would be aware that it existed. It also, under good visibility conditions, would be clearly able to be seen. And there are many airports that have similar facilities in very close proximity without any records of accidents or incident. MR. STEVENS: You just indicated that there are many facilities in proximity to airports. Are there any that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	produced by your plant and still remain in the traffic pattern at Oxford for a left downwind for 18? These are not peripheral questions. MR. SMALL: Mr. Chairman, these are really questions for the FAA to deal with, not the Council. We suggest that we've all given Mr. Stevens a lot of latitude, as we do in these proceedings all the time, but at some point we're getting into intricate FAA-related details that are extremely complex and, frankly, beyond the jurisdiction or competence of any of us. MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman THE CHAIRMAN: Can the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	can alert pilots that at least a zone of something? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Obviously, any structure like this would be indicated as an obstruction, and pilots would be aware that it existed. It also, under good visibility conditions, would be clearly able to be seen. And there are many airports that have similar facilities in very close proximity without any records of accidents or incident. MR. STEVENS: You just indicated that there are many facilities in proximity to airports. Are there any that are over the downwind leg of the only runway
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	produced by your plant and still remain in the traffic pattern at Oxford for a left downwind for 18? These are not peripheral questions. MR. SMALL: Mr. Chairman, these are really questions for the FAA to deal with, not the Council. We suggest that we've all given Mr. Stevens a lot of latitude, as we do in these proceedings all the time, but at some point we're getting into intricate FAA-related details that are extremely complex and, frankly, beyond the jurisdiction or competence of any of us. MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman THE CHAIRMAN: Can the Chairman say something?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	can alert pilots that at least a zone of something? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Obviously, any structure like this would be indicated as an obstruction, and pilots would be aware that it existed. It also, under good visibility conditions, would be clearly able to be seen. And there are many airports that have similar facilities in very close proximity without any records of accidents or incident. MR. STEVENS: You just indicated that there are many facilities in proximity to airports. Are there any that are over the downwind leg of the only runway to an airport, to a publicly-owned airport?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	produced by your plant and still remain in the traffic pattern at Oxford for a left downwind for 18? These are not peripheral questions. MR. SMALL: Mr. Chairman, these are really questions for the FAA to deal with, not the Council. We suggest that we've all given Mr. Stevens a lot of latitude, as we do in these proceedings all the time, but at some point we're getting into intricate FAA-related details that are extremely complex and, frankly, beyond the jurisdiction or competence of any of us. MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman THE CHAIRMAN: Can the Chairman say something? MR. STEVENS: Sure.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	can alert pilots that at least a zone of something? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Obviously, any structure like this would be indicated as an obstruction, and pilots would be aware that it existed. It also, under good visibility conditions, would be clearly able to be seen. And there are many airports that have similar facilities in very close proximity without any records of accidents or incident. MR. STEVENS: You just indicated that there are many facilities in proximity to airports. Are there any that are over the downwind leg of the only runway to an airport, to a publicly-owned airport? THE WITNESS (Gresock): That
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	produced by your plant and still remain in the traffic pattern at Oxford for a left downwind for 18? These are not peripheral questions. MR. SMALL: Mr. Chairman, these are really questions for the FAA to deal with, not the Council. We suggest that we've all given Mr. Stevens a lot of latitude, as we do in these proceedings all the time, but at some point we're getting into intricate FAA-related details that are extremely complex and, frankly, beyond the jurisdiction or competence of any of us. MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman THE CHAIRMAN: Can the Chairman say something? MR. STEVENS: Sure. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	can alert pilots that at least a zone of something? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Obviously, any structure like this would be indicated as an obstruction, and pilots would be aware that it existed. It also, under good visibility conditions, would be clearly able to be seen. And there are many airports that have similar facilities in very close proximity without any records of accidents or incident. MR. STEVENS: You just indicated that there are many facilities in proximity to airports. Are there any that are over the downwind leg of the only runway to an airport, to a publicly-owned airport? THE WITNESS (Gresock): That would require a more detailed scrutiny of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	produced by your plant and still remain in the traffic pattern at Oxford for a left downwind for 18? These are not peripheral questions. MR. SMALL: Mr. Chairman, these are really questions for the FAA to deal with, not the Council. We suggest that we've all given Mr. Stevens a lot of latitude, as we do in these proceedings all the time, but at some point we're getting into intricate FAA-related details that are extremely complex and, frankly, beyond the jurisdiction or competence of any of us. MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman THE CHAIRMAN: Can the Chairman say something? MR. STEVENS: Sure. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. While I tend to agree with you, Attorney	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	can alert pilots that at least a zone of something? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Obviously, any structure like this would be indicated as an obstruction, and pilots would be aware that it existed. It also, under good visibility conditions, would be clearly able to be seen. And there are many airports that have similar facilities in very close proximity without any records of accidents or incident. MR. STEVENS: You just indicated that there are many facilities in proximity to airports. Are there any that are over the downwind leg of the only runway to an airport, to a publicly-owned airport? THE WITNESS (Gresock): That would require a more detailed scrutiny of that specific issue, so I don't know the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	produced by your plant and still remain in the traffic pattern at Oxford for a left downwind for 18? These are not peripheral questions. MR. SMALL: Mr. Chairman, these are really questions for the FAA to deal with, not the Council. We suggest that we've all given Mr. Stevens a lot of latitude, as we do in these proceedings all the time, but at some point we're getting into intricate FAA-related details that are extremely complex and, frankly, beyond the jurisdiction or competence of any of us. MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman THE CHAIRMAN: Can the Chairman say something? MR. STEVENS: Sure. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. While I tend to agree with you, Attorney Small, I mean, there is something I think	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	can alert pilots that at least a zone of something? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Obviously, any structure like this would be indicated as an obstruction, and pilots would be aware that it existed. It also, under good visibility conditions, would be clearly able to be seen. And there are many airports that have similar facilities in very close proximity without any records of accidents or incident. MR. STEVENS: You just indicated that there are many facilities in proximity to airports. Are there any that are over the downwind leg of the only runway to an airport, to a publicly-owned airport? THE WITNESS (Gresock): That would require a more detailed scrutiny of that specific issue, so I don't know the specific answer to that question. But I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	produced by your plant and still remain in the traffic pattern at Oxford for a left downwind for 18? These are not peripheral questions. MR. SMALL: Mr. Chairman, these are really questions for the FAA to deal with, not the Council. We suggest that we've all given Mr. Stevens a lot of latitude, as we do in these proceedings all the time, but at some point we're getting into intricate FAA-related details that are extremely complex and, frankly, beyond the jurisdiction or competence of any of us. MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman THE CHAIRMAN: Can the Chairman say something? MR. STEVENS: Sure. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. While I tend to agree with you, Attorney Small, I mean, there is something I think that the Council has to be concerned about.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	can alert pilots that at least a zone of something? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Obviously, any structure like this would be indicated as an obstruction, and pilots would be aware that it existed. It also, under good visibility conditions, would be clearly able to be seen. And there are many airports that have similar facilities in very close proximity without any records of accidents or incident. MR. STEVENS: You just indicated that there are many facilities in proximity to airports. Are there any that are over the downwind leg of the only runway to an airport, to a publicly-owned airport? THE WITNESS (Gresock): That would require a more detailed scrutiny of that specific issue, so I don't know the specific answer to that question. But I certainly know there are airports where not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	produced by your plant and still remain in the traffic pattern at Oxford for a left downwind for 18? These are not peripheral questions. MR. SMALL: Mr. Chairman, these are really questions for the FAA to deal with, not the Council. We suggest that we've all given Mr. Stevens a lot of latitude, as we do in these proceedings all the time, but at some point we're getting into intricate FAA-related details that are extremely complex and, frankly, beyond the jurisdiction or competence of any of us. MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman THE CHAIRMAN: Can the Chairman say something? MR. STEVENS: Sure. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. While I tend to agree with you, Attorney Small, I mean, there is something I think that the Council has to be concerned about. If the plume is right, potentially right in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	can alert pilots that at least a zone of something? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Obviously, any structure like this would be indicated as an obstruction, and pilots would be aware that it existed. It also, under good visibility conditions, would be clearly able to be seen. And there are many airports that have similar facilities in very close proximity without any records of accidents or incident. MR. STEVENS: You just indicated that there are many facilities in proximity to airports. Are there any that are over the downwind leg of the only runway to an airport, to a publicly-owned airport? THE WITNESS (Gresock): That would require a more detailed scrutiny of that specific issue, so I don't know the specific answer to that question. But I certainly know there are airports where not only stack exhaust, but cooling tower plumes
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	produced by your plant and still remain in the traffic pattern at Oxford for a left downwind for 18? These are not peripheral questions. MR. SMALL: Mr. Chairman, these are really questions for the FAA to deal with, not the Council. We suggest that we've all given Mr. Stevens a lot of latitude, as we do in these proceedings all the time, but at some point we're getting into intricate FAA-related details that are extremely complex and, frankly, beyond the jurisdiction or competence of any of us. MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman THE CHAIRMAN: Can the Chairman say something? MR. STEVENS: Sure. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. While I tend to agree with you, Attorney Small, I mean, there is something I think that the Council has to be concerned about. If the plume is right, potentially right in the middle of the down what is it the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	can alert pilots that at least a zone of something? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Obviously, any structure like this would be indicated as an obstruction, and pilots would be aware that it existed. It also, under good visibility conditions, would be clearly able to be seen. And there are many airports that have similar facilities in very close proximity without any records of accidents or incident. MR. STEVENS: You just indicated that there are many facilities in proximity to airports. Are there any that are over the downwind leg of the only runway to an airport, to a publicly-owned airport? THE WITNESS (Gresock): That would require a more detailed scrutiny of that specific issue, so I don't know the specific answer to that question. But I certainly know there are airports where not only stack exhaust, but cooling tower plumes emanate from power plants very, very close to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	produced by your plant and still remain in the traffic pattern at Oxford for a left downwind for 18? These are not peripheral questions. MR. SMALL: Mr. Chairman, these are really questions for the FAA to deal with, not the Council. We suggest that we've all given Mr. Stevens a lot of latitude, as we do in these proceedings all the time, but at some point we're getting into intricate FAA-related details that are extremely complex and, frankly, beyond the jurisdiction or competence of any of us. MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman THE CHAIRMAN: Can the Chairman say something? MR. STEVENS: Sure. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. While I tend to agree with you, Attorney Small, I mean, there is something I think that the Council has to be concerned about. If the plume is right, potentially right in the middle of the down what is it the downwind flight path, and if one is flying in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	can alert pilots that at least a zone of something? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Obviously, any structure like this would be indicated as an obstruction, and pilots would be aware that it existed. It also, under good visibility conditions, would be clearly able to be seen. And there are many airports that have similar facilities in very close proximity without any records of accidents or incident. MR. STEVENS: You just indicated that there are many facilities in proximity to airports. Are there any that are over the downwind leg of the only runway to an airport, to a publicly-owned airport? THE WITNESS (Gresock): That would require a more detailed scrutiny of that specific issue, so I don't know the specific answer to that question. But I certainly know there are airports where not only stack exhaust, but cooling tower plumes emanate from power plants very, very close to airports, for example, up in Londonderry, New
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	produced by your plant and still remain in the traffic pattern at Oxford for a left downwind for 18? These are not peripheral questions. MR. SMALL: Mr. Chairman, these are really questions for the FAA to deal with, not the Council. We suggest that we've all given Mr. Stevens a lot of latitude, as we do in these proceedings all the time, but at some point we're getting into intricate FAA-related details that are extremely complex and, frankly, beyond the jurisdiction or competence of any of us. MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman THE CHAIRMAN: Can the Chairman say something? MR. STEVENS: Sure. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. While I tend to agree with you, Attorney Small, I mean, there is something I think that the Council has to be concerned about. If the plume is right, potentially right in the middle of the down what is it the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	can alert pilots that at least a zone of something? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Obviously, any structure like this would be indicated as an obstruction, and pilots would be aware that it existed. It also, under good visibility conditions, would be clearly able to be seen. And there are many airports that have similar facilities in very close proximity without any records of accidents or incident. MR. STEVENS: You just indicated that there are many facilities in proximity to airports. Are there any that are over the downwind leg of the only runway to an airport, to a publicly-owned airport? THE WITNESS (Gresock): That would require a more detailed scrutiny of that specific issue, so I don't know the specific answer to that question. But I certainly know there are airports where not only stack exhaust, but cooling tower plumes emanate from power plants very, very close to

UNITED REPORTERS, INC. info@unitedreporters.com Nationwide-866-534-3383-Toll-Free www.unitedreporters.com

14 (Pages 593 to 596)

	Page 597		Page 599
1	MR. STEVENS: But you answered	1	question was asking about how we would notify
2	my question that you didn't know of any power	2	a pilot of
3	plants that are over the downwind leg of the	3	MR. STEVENS: Yes.
4	only runway	4	THE WITNESS (Bazinet): of
5	THE WITNESS (Gresock): I have	5	when we were operating. Correct?
6	not specifically researched that individual	6	MR. STEVENS: Yes.
7	question.	7	THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Okay.
8	MR. STEVENS: Does CPV plan to	8	That's a decision that's made on a daily
9	keep the Oxford tower appraised of times when	9	basis. So, if the NOTAM you're referring to
10	the unit is being fired?	10	is an on-line system that can be updated on a
11	THE WITNESS (Bazinet): When	11	daily basis or even an hourly basis for that
12	the plant is operating?	12	matter, well then, sure, by all means, we'd
13	MR. STEVENS: Yes.	13	be happy to notify people.
14	THE WITNESS (Bazinet): We	14	MR. STEVENS: On CSC-2, 11
15	would have certainly no objection to doing	15	question, 2, 11, you state that the 90th
16	that.	16	percentile value for turbulent plumes is at
17	MR. STEVENS: And how would	17	133 feet above the stack top.
18	you so you don't have any objection to	18	THE WITNESS (Gresock): Is
19	notifying the Oxford tower when the Oxford	19	that a question?
20	tower is open. How would you notify pilots	20	MR. STEVENS: No. I just
21	when the tower is closed?	21	wanted to get
22	THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So I	22	THE WITNESS (Gresock): Yes,
23	think the operating or the presumption	23	found it.
24	based on our forecasts and the market data,	24	MR. STEVENS: Thank you. No,
25	et cetera, is that the plant will be	25	just to prep for a question.
	Page 598		Page 600
1	_	1	
1 2	Page 598 operating nearly three-quarters of the year, so call it on average over a 20-year horizon,	1 2	What is the FAA targeted level
	operating nearly three-quarters of the year,		
2	operating nearly three-quarters of the year, so call it on average over a 20-year horizon, about 75 percent of the year. So I think pilots at that airport should be working	2	What is the FAA targeted level of safety? Does that 90th percentile fall into the FAA's targeted level of safety? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Well,
2 3	operating nearly three-quarters of the year, so call it on average over a 20-year horizon, about 75 percent of the year. So I think pilots at that airport should be working under that assumption. But specifically,	2 3	What is the FAA targeted level of safety? Does that 90th percentile fall into the FAA's targeted level of safety? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Well, the FAA has not issued any target, and the
2 3 4 5 6	operating nearly three-quarters of the year, so call it on average over a 20-year horizon, about 75 percent of the year. So I think pilots at that airport should be working under that assumption. But specifically, with respect to your question, I'm not sure	2 3 4 5 6	What is the FAA targeted level of safety? Does that 90th percentile fall into the FAA's targeted level of safety? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Well, the FAA has not issued any target, and the FAA has fairly consistently stated that the
2 3 4 5 6 7	operating nearly three-quarters of the year, so call it on average over a 20-year horizon, about 75 percent of the year. So I think pilots at that airport should be working under that assumption. But specifically, with respect to your question, I'm not sure how you notify a pilot otherwise.	2 3 4 5 6 7	What is the FAA targeted level of safety? Does that 90th percentile fall into the FAA's targeted level of safety? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Well, the FAA has not issued any target, and the FAA has fairly consistently stated that the risks associated with turbulence associated
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	operating nearly three-quarters of the year, so call it on average over a 20-year horizon, about 75 percent of the year. So I think pilots at that airport should be working under that assumption. But specifically, with respect to your question, I'm not sure how you notify a pilot otherwise. MR. STEVENS: There is a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	What is the FAA targeted level of safety? Does that 90th percentile fall into the FAA's targeted level of safety? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Well, the FAA has not issued any target, and the FAA has fairly consistently stated that the risks associated with turbulence associated with such plumes is minimal.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	operating nearly three-quarters of the year, so call it on average over a 20-year horizon, about 75 percent of the year. So I think pilots at that airport should be working under that assumption. But specifically, with respect to your question, I'm not sure how you notify a pilot otherwise. MR. STEVENS: There is a mechanism.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	What is the FAA targeted level of safety? Does that 90th percentile fall into the FAA's targeted level of safety? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Well, the FAA has not issued any target, and the FAA has fairly consistently stated that the risks associated with turbulence associated with such plumes is minimal. MR. STEVENS: Would you look
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	operating nearly three-quarters of the year, so call it on average over a 20-year horizon, about 75 percent of the year. So I think pilots at that airport should be working under that assumption. But specifically, with respect to your question, I'm not sure how you notify a pilot otherwise. MR. STEVENS: There is a mechanism. THE WITNESS (Bazinet):	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	What is the FAA targeted level of safety? Does that 90th percentile fall into the FAA's targeted level of safety? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Well, the FAA has not issued any target, and the FAA has fairly consistently stated that the risks associated with turbulence associated with such plumes is minimal. MR. STEVENS: Would you look in the MITRE Report, page 4.3, and read the
2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11	operating nearly three-quarters of the year, so call it on average over a 20-year horizon, about 75 percent of the year. So I think pilots at that airport should be working under that assumption. But specifically, with respect to your question, I'm not sure how you notify a pilot otherwise. MR. STEVENS: There is a mechanism. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Perhaps you could share it with us.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	What is the FAA targeted level of safety? Does that 90th percentile fall into the FAA's targeted level of safety? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Well, the FAA has not issued any target, and the FAA has fairly consistently stated that the risks associated with turbulence associated with such plumes is minimal. MR. STEVENS: Would you look in the MITRE Report, page 4.3, and read the first sentence, please?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	operating nearly three-quarters of the year, so call it on average over a 20-year horizon, about 75 percent of the year. So I think pilots at that airport should be working under that assumption. But specifically, with respect to your question, I'm not sure how you notify a pilot otherwise. MR. STEVENS: There is a mechanism. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Perhaps you could share it with us. MR. STEVENS: It is called a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	What is the FAA targeted level of safety? Does that 90th percentile fall into the FAA's targeted level of safety? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Well, the FAA has not issued any target, and the FAA has fairly consistently stated that the risks associated with turbulence associated with such plumes is minimal. MR. STEVENS: Would you look in the MITRE Report, page 4.3, and read the first sentence, please? MR. SMALL: Are you in Section
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	operating nearly three-quarters of the year, so call it on average over a 20-year horizon, about 75 percent of the year. So I think pilots at that airport should be working under that assumption. But specifically, with respect to your question, I'm not sure how you notify a pilot otherwise. MR. STEVENS: There is a mechanism. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Perhaps you could share it with us. MR. STEVENS: It is called a NOTAM, Notice to Airmen. It's filed with the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	What is the FAA targeted level of safety? Does that 90th percentile fall into the FAA's targeted level of safety? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Well, the FAA has not issued any target, and the FAA has fairly consistently stated that the risks associated with turbulence associated with such plumes is minimal. MR. STEVENS: Would you look in the MITRE Report, page 4.3, and read the first sentence, please? MR. SMALL: Are you in Section 4.3.1.1, sir?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	operating nearly three-quarters of the year, so call it on average over a 20-year horizon, about 75 percent of the year. So I think pilots at that airport should be working under that assumption. But specifically, with respect to your question, I'm not sure how you notify a pilot otherwise. MR. STEVENS: There is a mechanism. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Perhaps you could share it with us. MR. STEVENS: It is called a NOTAM, Notice to Airmen. It's filed with the FAA. There is a NOTAM right now. There's an	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	What is the FAA targeted level of safety? Does that 90th percentile fall into the FAA's targeted level of safety? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Well, the FAA has not issued any target, and the FAA has fairly consistently stated that the risks associated with turbulence associated with such plumes is minimal. MR. STEVENS: Would you look in the MITRE Report, page 4.3, and read the first sentence, please? MR. SMALL: Are you in Section 4.3.1.1, sir? MR. STEVENS: Just page 4.3.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	operating nearly three-quarters of the year, so call it on average over a 20-year horizon, about 75 percent of the year. So I think pilots at that airport should be working under that assumption. But specifically, with respect to your question, I'm not sure how you notify a pilot otherwise. MR. STEVENS: There is a mechanism. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Perhaps you could share it with us. MR. STEVENS: It is called a NOTAM, Notice to Airmen. It's filed with the FAA. There is a NOTAM right now. There's an FDC NOTAM right now requiring pilots to avoid	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	What is the FAA targeted level of safety? Does that 90th percentile fall into the FAA's targeted level of safety? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Well, the FAA has not issued any target, and the FAA has fairly consistently stated that the risks associated with turbulence associated with such plumes is minimal. MR. STEVENS: Would you look in the MITRE Report, page 4.3, and read the first sentence, please? MR. SMALL: Are you in Section 4.3.1.1, sir? MR. STEVENS: Just page 4.3. It's just below Table 4.2.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	operating nearly three-quarters of the year, so call it on average over a 20-year horizon, about 75 percent of the year. So I think pilots at that airport should be working under that assumption. But specifically, with respect to your question, I'm not sure how you notify a pilot otherwise. MR. STEVENS: There is a mechanism. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Perhaps you could share it with us. MR. STEVENS: It is called a NOTAM, Notice to Airmen. It's filed with the FAA. There is a NOTAM right now. There's an FDC NOTAM right now requiring pilots to avoid power plants such as this power plant.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	What is the FAA targeted level of safety? Does that 90th percentile fall into the FAA's targeted level of safety? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Well, the FAA has not issued any target, and the FAA has fairly consistently stated that the risks associated with turbulence associated with such plumes is minimal. MR. STEVENS: Would you look in the MITRE Report, page 4.3, and read the first sentence, please? MR. SMALL: Are you in Section 4.3.1.1, sir? MR. STEVENS: Just page 4.3. It's just below Table 4.2. MR. SMALL: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	operating nearly three-quarters of the year, so call it on average over a 20-year horizon, about 75 percent of the year. So I think pilots at that airport should be working under that assumption. But specifically, with respect to your question, I'm not sure how you notify a pilot otherwise. MR. STEVENS: There is a mechanism. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Perhaps you could share it with us. MR. STEVENS: It is called a NOTAM, Notice to Airmen. It's filed with the FAA. There is a NOTAM right now. There's an FDC NOTAM right now requiring pilots to avoid power plants such as this power plant. THE WITNESS (Gresock): In the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	What is the FAA targeted level of safety? Does that 90th percentile fall into the FAA's targeted level of safety? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Well, the FAA has not issued any target, and the FAA has fairly consistently stated that the risks associated with turbulence associated with such plumes is minimal. MR. STEVENS: Would you look in the MITRE Report, page 4.3, and read the first sentence, please? MR. SMALL: Are you in Section 4.3.1.1, sir? MR. STEVENS: Just page 4.3. It's just below Table 4.2. MR. SMALL: Okay. MR. STEVENS: And TLS is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	operating nearly three-quarters of the year, so call it on average over a 20-year horizon, about 75 percent of the year. So I think pilots at that airport should be working under that assumption. But specifically, with respect to your question, I'm not sure how you notify a pilot otherwise. MR. STEVENS: There is a mechanism. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Perhaps you could share it with us. MR. STEVENS: It is called a NOTAM, Notice to Airmen. It's filed with the FAA. There is a NOTAM right now. There's an FDC NOTAM right now requiring pilots to avoid power plants such as this power plant. THE WITNESS (Gresock): In the interest of national security. Correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	What is the FAA targeted level of safety? Does that 90th percentile fall into the FAA's targeted level of safety? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Well, the FAA has not issued any target, and the FAA has fairly consistently stated that the risks associated with turbulence associated with such plumes is minimal. MR. STEVENS: Would you look in the MITRE Report, page 4.3, and read the first sentence, please? MR. SMALL: Are you in Section 4.3.1.1, sir? MR. STEVENS: Just page 4.3. It's just below Table 4.2. MR. SMALL: Okay. MR. STEVENS: And TLS is targeted level of safety.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	operating nearly three-quarters of the year, so call it on average over a 20-year horizon, about 75 percent of the year. So I think pilots at that airport should be working under that assumption. But specifically, with respect to your question, I'm not sure how you notify a pilot otherwise. MR. STEVENS: There is a mechanism. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Perhaps you could share it with us. MR. STEVENS: It is called a NOTAM, Notice to Airmen. It's filed with the FAA. There is a NOTAM right now. There's an FDC NOTAM right now requiring pilots to avoid power plants such as this power plant. THE WITNESS (Gresock): In the interest of national security. Correct? MR. STEVENS: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	What is the FAA targeted level of safety? Does that 90th percentile fall into the FAA's targeted level of safety? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Well, the FAA has not issued any target, and the FAA has fairly consistently stated that the risks associated with turbulence associated with such plumes is minimal. MR. STEVENS: Would you look in the MITRE Report, page 4.3, and read the first sentence, please? MR. SMALL: Are you in Section 4.3.1.1, sir? MR. STEVENS: Just page 4.3. It's just below Table 4.2. MR. SMALL: Okay. MR. STEVENS: And TLS is targeted level of safety. THE WITNESS (Gresock): It
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	operating nearly three-quarters of the year, so call it on average over a 20-year horizon, about 75 percent of the year. So I think pilots at that airport should be working under that assumption. But specifically, with respect to your question, I'm not sure how you notify a pilot otherwise. MR. STEVENS: There is a mechanism. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Perhaps you could share it with us. MR. STEVENS: It is called a NOTAM, Notice to Airmen. It's filed with the FAA. There is a NOTAM right now. There's an FDC NOTAM right now requiring pilots to avoid power plants such as this power plant. THE WITNESS (Gresock): In the interest of national security. Correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	What is the FAA targeted level of safety? Does that 90th percentile fall into the FAA's targeted level of safety? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Well, the FAA has not issued any target, and the FAA has fairly consistently stated that the risks associated with turbulence associated with such plumes is minimal. MR. STEVENS: Would you look in the MITRE Report, page 4.3, and read the first sentence, please? MR. SMALL: Are you in Section 4.3.1.1, sir? MR. STEVENS: Just page 4.3. It's just below Table 4.2. MR. SMALL: Okay. MR. STEVENS: And TLS is targeted level of safety. THE WITNESS (Gresock): It says, "To be consistent with the 2006 FAA
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	operating nearly three-quarters of the year, so call it on average over a 20-year horizon, about 75 percent of the year. So I think pilots at that airport should be working under that assumption. But specifically, with respect to your question, I'm not sure how you notify a pilot otherwise. MR. STEVENS: There is a mechanism. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Perhaps you could share it with us. MR. STEVENS: It is called a NOTAM, Notice to Airmen. It's filed with the FAA. There is a NOTAM right now. There's an FDC NOTAM right now requiring pilots to avoid power plants such as this power plant. THE WITNESS (Gresock): In the interest of national security. Correct? MR. STEVENS: Yes. THE WITNESS (Gresock): Yes. MR. STEVENS: And there's also	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	What is the FAA targeted level of safety? Does that 90th percentile fall into the FAA's targeted level of safety? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Well, the FAA has not issued any target, and the FAA has fairly consistently stated that the risks associated with turbulence associated with such plumes is minimal. MR. STEVENS: Would you look in the MITRE Report, page 4.3, and read the first sentence, please? MR. SMALL: Are you in Section 4.3.1.1, sir? MR. STEVENS: Just page 4.3. It's just below Table 4.2. MR. SMALL: Okay. MR. STEVENS: And TLS is targeted level of safety. THE WITNESS (Gresock): It
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	operating nearly three-quarters of the year, so call it on average over a 20-year horizon, about 75 percent of the year. So I think pilots at that airport should be working under that assumption. But specifically, with respect to your question, I'm not sure how you notify a pilot otherwise. MR. STEVENS: There is a mechanism. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Perhaps you could share it with us. MR. STEVENS: It is called a NOTAM, Notice to Airmen. It's filed with the FAA. There is a NOTAM right now. There's an FDC NOTAM right now requiring pilots to avoid power plants such as this power plant. THE WITNESS (Gresock): In the interest of national security. Correct? MR. STEVENS: Yes. THE WITNESS (Gresock): Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	What is the FAA targeted level of safety? Does that 90th percentile fall into the FAA's targeted level of safety? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Well, the FAA has not issued any target, and the FAA has fairly consistently stated that the risks associated with turbulence associated with such plumes is minimal. MR. STEVENS: Would you look in the MITRE Report, page 4.3, and read the first sentence, please? MR. SMALL: Are you in Section 4.3.1.1, sir? MR. STEVENS: Just page 4.3. It's just below Table 4.2. MR. STEVENS: And TLS is targeted level of safety. THE WITNESS (Gresock): It says, "To be consistent with the 2006 FAA study on exhaust plumes, a TLS of one times ten to the minus seventh was used to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	operating nearly three-quarters of the year, so call it on average over a 20-year horizon, about 75 percent of the year. So I think pilots at that airport should be working under that assumption. But specifically, with respect to your question, I'm not sure how you notify a pilot otherwise. MR. STEVENS: There is a mechanism. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Perhaps you could share it with us. MR. STEVENS: It is called a NOTAM, Notice to Airmen. It's filed with the FAA. There is a NOTAM right now. There's an FDC NOTAM right now requiring pilots to avoid power plants such as this power plant. THE WITNESS (Gresock): In the interest of national security. Correct? MR. STEVENS: Yes. THE WITNESS (Gresock): Yes. MR. STEVENS: And there's also an airmen information manual requirement to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	What is the FAA targeted level of safety? Does that 90th percentile fall into the FAA's targeted level of safety? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Well, the FAA has not issued any target, and the FAA has fairly consistently stated that the risks associated with turbulence associated with such plumes is minimal. MR. STEVENS: Would you look in the MITRE Report, page 4.3, and read the first sentence, please? MR. SMALL: Are you in Section 4.3.1.1, sir? MR. STEVENS: Just page 4.3. It's just below Table 4.2. MR. STEVENS: And TLS is targeted level of safety. THE WITNESS (Gresock): It says, "To be consistent with the 2006 FAA study on exhaust plumes, a TLS of one times
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	operating nearly three-quarters of the year, so call it on average over a 20-year horizon, about 75 percent of the year. So I think pilots at that airport should be working under that assumption. But specifically, with respect to your question, I'm not sure how you notify a pilot otherwise. MR. STEVENS: There is a mechanism. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Perhaps you could share it with us. MR. STEVENS: It is called a NOTAM, Notice to Airmen. It's filed with the FAA. There is a NOTAM right now. There's an FDC NOTAM right now requiring pilots to avoid power plants such as this power plant. THE WITNESS (Gresock): In the interest of national security. Correct? MR. STEVENS: Yes. THE WITNESS (Gresock): Yes. MR. STEVENS: And there's also an airmen information manual requirement to fly upwind of power plants.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	What is the FAA targeted level of safety? Does that 90th percentile fall into the FAA's targeted level of safety? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Well, the FAA has not issued any target, and the FAA has fairly consistently stated that the risks associated with turbulence associated with such plumes is minimal. MR. STEVENS: Would you look in the MITRE Report, page 4.3, and read the first sentence, please? MR. SMALL: Are you in Section 4.3.1.1, sir? MR. STEVENS: Just page 4.3. It's just below Table 4.2. MR. SMALL: Okay. MR. STEVENS: And TLS is targeted level of safety. THE WITNESS (Gresock): It says, "To be consistent with the 2006 FAA study on exhaust plumes, a TLS of one times ten to the minus seventh was used to ultimately determine the likelihood of an

15 (Pages 597 to 600)

	Page 601		Page 603
1	THE WITNESS (Gresock): It	1	Connecticut.
2	doesn't state that that's any kind of	2	MR. STEVENS: You indicated
3	standard or target. It's simply a study	3	you stated before that a circle-to-land
4	method.	4	approach an aircraft would be 300 feet above
5	MR. STEVENS: It's a targeted	5	the stack. Would you explain the
6	level of safety.	6	circle-to-land approach, an IFR
7	THE WITNESS (Gresock): And	7	circle-to-land approach, for the Council?
8	the standard to which it's referring is a	8	THE WITNESS (Gresock): So,
9	standard that is really associated with the	9	under IFR conditions, the circling minimum
10	consequences of an aircraft colliding with a	10	descent altitude is defined as a minimum
11	physical obstacle.	11	height, and the aircraft would be circling to
12	MR. STEVENS: It is actually	12	determine their next move to determine
13	the likelihood provided by the ATOS manual,	13	whether they're going to land. In order to
14	and it's	14	circle-to-land at the airport, as a circling
15	MR. SMALL: Okay. Can you ask	15	aircraft would go over our stack, it would
16	questions?	16	have to fly straight and wouldn't be able to
17	MR. STEVENS: Yes. Would you	17	turn until it was quite some distance past
18	go to 7.7.	18	where our stacks would be located if it were
19	MR. SMALL: Of the MITRE	19	to angle in and decide to land at that point
20	Report?	20	in time.
21	MR. STEVENS: Of the MITRE	21	MR. STEVENS: So, in a
22	Report, yes.	22	circle-to-land and IFR stands for?
23	MR. SMALL: Okay, we're there.	23	THE WITNESS (Gresock):
24	MR. STEVENS: And would you	24	Instrument flight rule.
25	read the first and second sentence?	25	MR. STEVENS: So that's when
	Page 602		Page 604
1	_	1	
1 2	THE WITNESS (Gresock): Again,	1 2	Page 604 there are clouds and visibility issues, and so forth?
	_		there are clouds and visibility issues, and so forth?
2	THE WITNESS (Gresock): Again, the tail of the data is extremely large for	2	there are clouds and visibility issues, and
2 3	THE WITNESS (Gresock): Again, the tail of the data is extremely large for the Navion GA aircraft, as shown in Table	2 3	there are clouds and visibility issues, and so forth? THE WITNESS (Gresock): There
2 3 4	THE WITNESS (Gresock): Again, the tail of the data is extremely large for the Navion GA aircraft, as shown in Table 7-4, for stable conditions the 99th	2 3 4	there are clouds and visibility issues, and so forth? THE WITNESS (Gresock): There could be.
2 3 4 5	THE WITNESS (Gresock): Again, the tail of the data is extremely large for the Navion GA aircraft, as shown in Table 7-4, for stable conditions the 99th percentile of the data extends to 344 feet	2 3 4 5	there are clouds and visibility issues, and so forth? THE WITNESS (Gresock): There could be. (In the presence of Councilor Lynch.) MR. STEVENS: Okay. So it is
2 3 4 5 6	THE WITNESS (Gresock): Again, the tail of the data is extremely large for the Navion GA aircraft, as shown in Table 7-4, for stable conditions the 99th percentile of the data extends to 344 feet above the stack, but the 99.9th percentile	2 3 4 5 6	there are clouds and visibility issues, and so forth? THE WITNESS (Gresock): There could be. (In the presence of Councilor Lynch.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE WITNESS (Gresock): Again, the tail of the data is extremely large for the Navion GA aircraft, as shown in Table 7-4, for stable conditions the 99th percentile of the data extends to 344 feet above the stack, but the 99.9th percentile and maximum extend to 788 and 1,294 feet	2 3 4 5 6 7	there are clouds and visibility issues, and so forth? THE WITNESS (Gresock): There could be. (In the presence of Councilor Lynch.) MR. STEVENS: Okay. So it is not when it's clear out and you can see for 5 or 10 miles?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	THE WITNESS (Gresock): Again, the tail of the data is extremely large for the Navion GA aircraft, as shown in Table 7-4, for stable conditions the 99th percentile of the data extends to 344 feet above the stack, but the 99.9th percentile and maximum extend to 788 and 1,294 feet respectively. "Under unstable conditions and perfectly calm winds, less than one knot, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	there are clouds and visibility issues, and so forth? THE WITNESS (Gresock): There could be. (In the presence of Councilor Lynch.) MR. STEVENS: Okay. So it is not when it's clear out and you can see for 5 or 10 miles? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Sorry?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	THE WITNESS (Gresock): Again, the tail of the data is extremely large for the Navion GA aircraft, as shown in Table 7-4, for stable conditions the 99th percentile of the data extends to 344 feet above the stack, but the 99.9th percentile and maximum extend to 788 and 1,294 feet respectively. "Under unstable conditions and perfectly calm winds, less than one knot, the maximum height of possible severe turbulence	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	there are clouds and visibility issues, and so forth? THE WITNESS (Gresock): There could be. (In the presence of Councilor Lynch.) MR. STEVENS: Okay. So it is not when it's clear out and you can see for 5 or 10 miles? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Sorry? MR. STEVENS: I'm sorry. So,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	THE WITNESS (Gresock): Again, the tail of the data is extremely large for the Navion GA aircraft, as shown in Table 7-4, for stable conditions the 99th percentile of the data extends to 344 feet above the stack, but the 99.9th percentile and maximum extend to 788 and 1,294 feet respectively. "Under unstable conditions and perfectly calm winds, less than one knot, the maximum height of possible severe turbulence rises to 1,551 feet above the stack."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	there are clouds and visibility issues, and so forth? THE WITNESS (Gresock): There could be. (In the presence of Councilor Lynch.) MR. STEVENS: Okay. So it is not when it's clear out and you can see for 5 or 10 miles? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Sorry? MR. STEVENS: I'm sorry. So, it is not when it's clear out and you can see
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE WITNESS (Gresock): Again, the tail of the data is extremely large for the Navion GA aircraft, as shown in Table 7-4, for stable conditions the 99th percentile of the data extends to 344 feet above the stack, but the 99.9th percentile and maximum extend to 788 and 1,294 feet respectively. "Under unstable conditions and perfectly calm winds, less than one knot, the maximum height of possible severe turbulence rises to 1,551 feet above the stack." However, it continues and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	there are clouds and visibility issues, and so forth? THE WITNESS (Gresock): There could be. (In the presence of Councilor Lynch.) MR. STEVENS: Okay. So it is not when it's clear out and you can see for 5 or 10 miles? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Sorry? MR. STEVENS: I'm sorry. So, it is not when it's clear out and you can see for 5 or 10 miles?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	THE WITNESS (Gresock): Again, the tail of the data is extremely large for the Navion GA aircraft, as shown in Table 7-4, for stable conditions the 99th percentile of the data extends to 344 feet above the stack, but the 99.9th percentile and maximum extend to 788 and 1,294 feet respectively. "Under unstable conditions and perfectly calm winds, less than one knot, the maximum height of possible severe turbulence rises to 1,551 feet above the stack." However, it continues and says, "By executing the Houbolt roll model	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	there are clouds and visibility issues, and so forth? THE WITNESS (Gresock): There could be. (In the presence of Councilor Lynch.) MR. STEVENS: Okay. So it is not when it's clear out and you can see for 5 or 10 miles? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Sorry? MR. STEVENS: I'm sorry. So, it is not when it's clear out and you can see for 5 or 10 miles? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Under
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	THE WITNESS (Gresock): Again, the tail of the data is extremely large for the Navion GA aircraft, as shown in Table 7-4, for stable conditions the 99th percentile of the data extends to 344 feet above the stack, but the 99.9th percentile and maximum extend to 788 and 1,294 feet respectively. "Under unstable conditions and perfectly calm winds, less than one knot, the maximum height of possible severe turbulence rises to 1,551 feet above the stack." However, it continues and says, "By executing the Houbolt roll model over the three years of environmental data,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	there are clouds and visibility issues, and so forth? THE WITNESS (Gresock): There could be. (In the presence of Councilor Lynch.) MR. STEVENS: Okay. So it is not when it's clear out and you can see for 5 or 10 miles? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Sorry? MR. STEVENS: I'm sorry. So, it is not when it's clear out and you can see for 5 or 10 miles? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Under IFR conditions, not necessarily, right, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE WITNESS (Gresock): Again, the tail of the data is extremely large for the Navion GA aircraft, as shown in Table 7-4, for stable conditions the 99th percentile of the data extends to 344 feet above the stack, but the 99.9th percentile and maximum extend to 788 and 1,294 feet respectively. "Under unstable conditions and perfectly calm winds, less than one knot, the maximum height of possible severe turbulence rises to 1,551 feet above the stack." However, it continues and says, "By executing the Houbolt roll model over the three years of environmental data, it was determined that aircraft upset	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	there are clouds and visibility issues, and so forth? THE WITNESS (Gresock): There could be. (In the presence of Councilor Lynch.) MR. STEVENS: Okay. So it is not when it's clear out and you can see for 5 or 10 miles? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Sorry? MR. STEVENS: I'm sorry. So, it is not when it's clear out and you can see for 5 or 10 miles? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Under IFR conditions, not necessarily, right, yes. MR. STEVENS: So under 3 miles
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE WITNESS (Gresock): Again, the tail of the data is extremely large for the Navion GA aircraft, as shown in Table 7-4, for stable conditions the 99th percentile of the data extends to 344 feet above the stack, but the 99.9th percentile and maximum extend to 788 and 1,294 feet respectively. "Under unstable conditions and perfectly calm winds, less than one knot, the maximum height of possible severe turbulence rises to 1,551 feet above the stack." However, it continues and says, "By executing the Houbolt roll model over the three years of environmental data, it was determined that aircraft upset criteria were never reached at this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	there are clouds and visibility issues, and so forth? THE WITNESS (Gresock): There could be. (In the presence of Councilor Lynch.) MR. STEVENS: Okay. So it is not when it's clear out and you can see for 5 or 10 miles? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Sorry? MR. STEVENS: I'm sorry. So, it is not when it's clear out and you can see for 5 or 10 miles? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Under IFR conditions, not necessarily, right, yes. MR. STEVENS: So under 3 miles visibility and 1,000 feet of cloud cover?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE WITNESS (Gresock): Again, the tail of the data is extremely large for the Navion GA aircraft, as shown in Table 7-4, for stable conditions the 99th percentile of the data extends to 344 feet above the stack, but the 99.9th percentile and maximum extend to 788 and 1,294 feet respectively. "Under unstable conditions and perfectly calm winds, less than one knot, the maximum height of possible severe turbulence rises to 1,551 feet above the stack." However, it continues and says, "By executing the Houbolt roll model over the three years of environmental data, it was determined that aircraft upset criteria were never reached at this particular power plant at this proposed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	there are clouds and visibility issues, and so forth? THE WITNESS (Gresock): There could be. (In the presence of Councilor Lynch.) MR. STEVENS: Okay. So it is not when it's clear out and you can see for 5 or 10 miles? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Sorry? MR. STEVENS: I'm sorry. So, it is not when it's clear out and you can see for 5 or 10 miles? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Under IFR conditions, not necessarily, right, yes. MR. STEVENS: So under 3 miles visibility and 1,000 feet of cloud cover? THE WITNESS (Gresock):
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	THE WITNESS (Gresock): Again, the tail of the data is extremely large for the Navion GA aircraft, as shown in Table 7-4, for stable conditions the 99th percentile of the data extends to 344 feet above the stack, but the 99.9th percentile and maximum extend to 788 and 1,294 feet respectively. "Under unstable conditions and perfectly calm winds, less than one knot, the maximum height of possible severe turbulence rises to 1,551 feet above the stack." However, it continues and says, "By executing the Houbolt roll model over the three years of environmental data, it was determined that aircraft upset criteria were never reached at this particular power plant at this proposed power plant."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	there are clouds and visibility issues, and so forth? THE WITNESS (Gresock): There could be. (In the presence of Councilor Lynch.) MR. STEVENS: Okay. So it is not when it's clear out and you can see for 5 or 10 miles? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Sorry? MR. STEVENS: I'm sorry. So, it is not when it's clear out and you can see for 5 or 10 miles? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Under IFR conditions, not necessarily, right, yes. MR. STEVENS: So under 3 miles visibility and 1,000 feet of cloud cover? THE WITNESS (Gresock): (Nodding.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE WITNESS (Gresock): Again, the tail of the data is extremely large for the Navion GA aircraft, as shown in Table 7-4, for stable conditions the 99th percentile of the data extends to 344 feet above the stack, but the 99.9th percentile and maximum extend to 788 and 1,294 feet respectively. "Under unstable conditions and perfectly calm winds, less than one knot, the maximum height of possible severe turbulence rises to 1,551 feet above the stack." However, it continues and says, "By executing the Houbolt roll model over the three years of environmental data, it was determined that aircraft upset criteria were never reached at this particular power plant at this proposed power plant." MR. SMALL: And just for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	there are clouds and visibility issues, and so forth? THE WITNESS (Gresock): There could be. (In the presence of Councilor Lynch.) MR. STEVENS: Okay. So it is not when it's clear out and you can see for 5 or 10 miles? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Sorry? MR. STEVENS: I'm sorry. So, it is not when it's clear out and you can see for 5 or 10 miles? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Under IFR conditions, not necessarily, right, yes. MR. STEVENS: So under 3 miles visibility and 1,000 feet of cloud cover? THE WITNESS (Gresock): (Nodding.) MR. STEVENS: And you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE WITNESS (Gresock): Again, the tail of the data is extremely large for the Navion GA aircraft, as shown in Table 7-4, for stable conditions the 99th percentile of the data extends to 344 feet above the stack, but the 99.9th percentile and maximum extend to 788 and 1,294 feet respectively. "Under unstable conditions and perfectly calm winds, less than one knot, the maximum height of possible severe turbulence rises to 1,551 feet above the stack." However, it continues and says, "By executing the Houbolt roll model over the three years of environmental data, it was determined that aircraft upset criteria were never reached at this particular power plant at this proposed power plant." MR. SMALL: And just for clarification, the power plant here, Ms.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	there are clouds and visibility issues, and so forth? THE WITNESS (Gresock): There could be. (In the presence of Councilor Lynch.) MR. STEVENS: Okay. So it is not when it's clear out and you can see for 5 or 10 miles? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Sorry? MR. STEVENS: I'm sorry. So, it is not when it's clear out and you can see for 5 or 10 miles? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Under IFR conditions, not necessarily, right, yes. MR. STEVENS: So under 3 miles visibility and 1,000 feet of cloud cover? THE WITNESS (Gresock): (Nodding.) MR. STEVENS: And you indicated before, I believe, that the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE WITNESS (Gresock): Again, the tail of the data is extremely large for the Navion GA aircraft, as shown in Table 7-4, for stable conditions the 99th percentile of the data extends to 344 feet above the stack, but the 99.9th percentile and maximum extend to 788 and 1,294 feet respectively. "Under unstable conditions and perfectly calm winds, less than one knot, the maximum height of possible severe turbulence rises to 1,551 feet above the stack." However, it continues and says, "By executing the Houbolt roll model over the three years of environmental data, it was determined that aircraft upset criteria were never reached at this particular power plant at this proposed power plant." MR. SMALL: And just for clarification, the power plant here, Ms. Gresock, is which plant?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	there are clouds and visibility issues, and so forth? THE WITNESS (Gresock): There could be. (In the presence of Councilor Lynch.) MR. STEVENS: Okay. So it is not when it's clear out and you can see for 5 or 10 miles? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Sorry? MR. STEVENS: I'm sorry. So, it is not when it's clear out and you can see for 5 or 10 miles? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Under IFR conditions, not necessarily, right, yes. MR. STEVENS: So under 3 miles visibility and 1,000 feet of cloud cover? THE WITNESS (Gresock): (Nodding.) MR. STEVENS: And you indicated before, I believe, that the standard VFR traffic pattern was 1,000 feet
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE WITNESS (Gresock): Again, the tail of the data is extremely large for the Navion GA aircraft, as shown in Table 7-4, for stable conditions the 99th percentile of the data extends to 344 feet above the stack, but the 99.9th percentile and maximum extend to 788 and 1,294 feet respectively. "Under unstable conditions and perfectly calm winds, less than one knot, the maximum height of possible severe turbulence rises to 1,551 feet above the stack." However, it continues and says, "By executing the Houbolt roll model over the three years of environmental data, it was determined that aircraft upset criteria were never reached at this particular power plant at this proposed power plant." MR. SMALL: And just for clarification, the power plant here, Ms. Gresock, is which plant? THE WITNESS (Gresock): This	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	there are clouds and visibility issues, and so forth? THE WITNESS (Gresock): There could be. (In the presence of Councilor Lynch.) MR. STEVENS: Okay. So it is not when it's clear out and you can see for 5 or 10 miles? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Sorry? MR. STEVENS: I'm sorry. So, it is not when it's clear out and you can see for 5 or 10 miles? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Under IFR conditions, not necessarily, right, yes. MR. STEVENS: So under 3 miles visibility and 1,000 feet of cloud cover? THE WITNESS (Gresock): (Nodding.) MR. STEVENS: And you indicated before, I believe, that the standard VFR traffic pattern was 1,000 feet above the runway 1,700 feet?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE WITNESS (Gresock): Again, the tail of the data is extremely large for the Navion GA aircraft, as shown in Table 7-4, for stable conditions the 99th percentile of the data extends to 344 feet above the stack, but the 99.9th percentile and maximum extend to 788 and 1,294 feet respectively. "Under unstable conditions and perfectly calm winds, less than one knot, the maximum height of possible severe turbulence rises to 1,551 feet above the stack." However, it continues and says, "By executing the Houbolt roll model over the three years of environmental data, it was determined that aircraft upset criteria were never reached at this particular power plant at this proposed power plant." MR. SMALL: And just for clarification, the power plant here, Ms. Gresock, is which plant?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	there are clouds and visibility issues, and so forth? THE WITNESS (Gresock): There could be. (In the presence of Councilor Lynch.) MR. STEVENS: Okay. So it is not when it's clear out and you can see for 5 or 10 miles? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Sorry? MR. STEVENS: I'm sorry. So, it is not when it's clear out and you can see for 5 or 10 miles? THE WITNESS (Gresock): Under IFR conditions, not necessarily, right, yes. MR. STEVENS: So under 3 miles visibility and 1,000 feet of cloud cover? THE WITNESS (Gresock): (Nodding.) MR. STEVENS: And you indicated before, I believe, that the standard VFR traffic pattern was 1,000 feet

1 which is yes. 1 sir. 2 MR. STEVENS: A thousand feet 2 mean structure of the smoke stack? 3 above the runway. And how much above the top 3 these exhibits as your testimony? 4 of the smoke stack? 3 these exhibits as your testimony? 5 THE WITNESS (Gresock): And 5 sir. 6 that would be 720 feet above the stack. 6 THE CHAIRMAN: We'll now start 7 MR. STEVENS: So, on an IFR 7 the cross-examination with staff. 8 flight where the weather is worse and the 8 MR. PERRONE: Thank you, 9 conditions are worse, the plane could likely 9 MR. PERRONE: How long have 10 be not at 720 feet over the stack, but at 300 10 MR. PERRONE: How long have 11 feet over the stack? 11 you been a flight instructor, sir? 12 THE WITNESS (Gresock): That 12 THE WITNESS (Stevens): I've 14 MR. STEVENS: I have no 18 MR. PERRONE: And what types 15 further questions. Thank you. 19 flow neverything from light sport aircraft, which are aircraft 1,400 pounds or less, up
2MR. STEVENS: A thousand feet2THE CHAIRMAN: Do you adopt3above the runway. And how much above the top3these exhibits as your testimony?4of the smoke stack?4THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes,5THE WITNESS (Gresock): And5sir.6that would be 720 feet above the stack.6THE CHAIRMAN: We'll now start7MR. STEVENS: So, on an IFR7the cross-examination with staff.8flight where the weather is worse and the8MR. PERRONE: Thank you,9conditions are worse, the plane could likely9Mr. Chairman.10be not at 720 feet over the stack, but at 30010MR. PERRONE: How long have11feet over the stack?11you been a flight instructor, sir?12THE WITNESS (Gresock): That12THE WITNESS (Stevens): I've13is the minimum altitude, yes.13been a flight instructor for approximately 1114MR. STEVENS: And you consider14years.15that safe?15MR. STEVENS: I have no1816THE WITNESS (Gresock): Yes, I16of aircraft have you flown in and out of the airport?18MR. STEVENS: I have no18THE WITNESS (Stevens): I've19further questions. Thank you.19flown everything from light sport aircraft. which are aircraft 1,400 pounds or less, up21to start the process with you, so we have to swear you in, unless you have other22MR. PERRONE: Could you23witnen
3 above the runway. And how much above the top of the smoke stack? 3 these exhibits as your testimony? 4 of the smoke stack? 4 THE WITNESS (Gresock): Yes, sir. 5 THE WITNESS (Gresock): And 6 5 sir. 6 that would be 720 feet above the stack. 6 THE CHAIRMAN: We'll now start the cross-examination with staff. 8 flight where the weather is worse and the 9 6 MR. PERRONE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 10 be not at 720 feet over the stack, but at 300 10 MR. PERRONE: How long have you been a flight instructor, sir? 12 THE WITNESS (Gresock): That 12 THE WITNESS (Stevens): I've 13 is the minimum altitude, yes. 13 been a flight instructor, for approximately 11 years. 14 MR. STEVENS: And you consider 14 years. 15 that safe? 15 16 THE WITNESS (Gresock): Yes, I 16 17 do. 17 18 MR. STEVENS: I have no 18 19 further questions. Thank you. 19 20 THE CHAIRMAN: We're now going 20 21 to start the process with you, so we
4of the smoke stack?4THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes,5THE WITNESS (Gresock): And5sir.6that would be 720 feet above the stack.6THE CHAIRMAN: We'll now start7MR. STEVENS: So, on an IFR7the cross-examination with staff.8flight where the weather is worse and the8MR. PERRONE: Thank you,9conditions are worse, the plane could likely9Mr. Chairman.10be not at 720 feet over the stack, but at 30010MR. PERRONE: How long have11feet over the stack?11you been a flight instructor, sir?12THE WITNESS (Gresock): That12THE WITNESS (Stevens): I've13is the minimum altitude, yes.13been a flight instructor for approximately 1114MR. STEVENS: And you consider14years.15that safe?15MR. PERRONE: And what types16THE WITNESS (Gresock): Yes, I16of aircraft have you flown in and out of the aircraft have you flown in and out of the aircraft have you flown in and out of the aircraft have you flown in and out of the aircraft, which are aircraft 1,400 pounds or less, up11to start the process with you, so we have to swear you in, unless you have other2122swear you in, unless you have other2223witnesses. I don't know.2424MR. STEVENS: I do not.2425THE CHAIRMAN: Please stand.2526THE CHAIRMAN: Please stand.2527called as a witne
5THE WITNESS (Gresock): And that would be 720 feet above the stack.5sir.7MR. STEVENS: So, on an IFR flight where the weather is worse and the conditions are worse, the plane could likely6THE CHAIRMAN: We'll now start the cross-examination with staff.8flight where the weather is worse and the conditions are worse, the plane could likely9MR. PERRONE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.10be not at 720 feet over the stack, but at 30010MR. PERRONE: How long have you been a flight instructor, sir?12THE WITNESS (Gresock): That12THE WITNESS (Stevens): I've13is the minimum altitude, yes.13been a flight instructor for approximately 11 years.14MR. STEVENS: And you consider14 years.15that safe?15MR. PERRONE: And what types
7MR. STEVENS: So, on an IFR7the cross-examination with staff.8flight where the weather is worse and the8MR. PERRONE: Thank you,9conditions are worse, the plane could likely9Mr. Chairman.10be not at 720 feet over the stack, but at 30010MR. PERRONE: How long have11feet over the stack?11you been a flight instructor, sir?12THE WITNESS (Gresock): That12THE WITNESS (Stevens): I've13is the minimum altitude, yes.13been a flight instructor for approximately 1114MR. STEVENS: And you consider14years.15that safe?15MR. PERRONE: And what types16THE WITNESS (Gresock): Yes, I16of aircraft have you flown in and out of the airport?18MR. STEVENS: I have no18THE WITNESS (Stevens): I've19further questions. Thank you.19flown everything from light sport aircraft, which are aircraft 1,400 pounds or less, up2swear you in, unless you have other22MR. PERRONE: Could you23witnesses. I don't know.23explain in detail your concerns about the impact on aircraft from exhaust plumes. Is25THE CHAIRMAN: Please stand.25it primarily turbulence and wind shear orPage 6061B UR T S T E V E N S, 212called as a witness, being first duly2THE WITNESS (Stevens): It's
8flight where the weather is worse and the 98MR. PERRONE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.10be not at 720 feet over the stack, but at 30010MR. PERRONE: How long have you been a flight instructor, sir?11feet over the stack?1112THE WITNESS (Gresock): That1213is the minimum altitude, yes.1314MR. STEVENS: And you consider1415that safe?1516THE WITNESS (Gresock): Yes, I1616THE WITNESS (Gresock): Yes, I1617do.1718MR. STEVENS: I have no1819further questions. Thank you, so we have to1910to start the process with you, so we have to2123witnesses. I don't know.2324MR. STEVENS: I do not.2425THE CHAIRMAN: Please stand.2426Page 606Page 6081B U R T S T E V E N S, 212called as a witness, being first duly22THE WITNESS (Stevens): It's
9conditions are worse, the plane could likely9Mr. Chairman.10be not at 720 feet over the stack, but at 30010MR. PERRONE: How long have11feet over the stack?11you been a flight instructor, sir?12THE WITNESS (Gresock): That12THE WITNESS (Stevens): I've13is the minimum altitude, yes.13been a flight instructor for approximately 1114MR. STEVENS: And you consider14years.15that safe?15MR. PERRONE: And what types16THE WITNESS (Gresock): Yes, I16of aircraft have you flown in and out of the airport?18MR. STEVENS: I have no19flown everything from light sport aircraft, which are aircraft 1,400 pounds or less, up to and including twin engine piston planes.20THE CHAIRMAN: We're now going20witnesses. I don't know.21to start the process with you, so we have to swear you in, unless you have other22MR. PERRONE: Could you explain in detail your concerns about the impact on aircraft from exhaust plumes. Is it primarily turbulence and wind shear or24MR. STEVENS; I do not.25THE CHAIRMAN: Please stand.2525THE CHAIRMAN: Please stand.2Page 6081B U R T S T E V E N S, 21reduced oxygen content? 2222called as a witness, being first duly2THE WITNESS (Stevens): It's
9conditions are worse, the plane could likely be not at 720 feet over the stack, but at 3009Mr. Chairman.10be not at 720 feet over the stack, but at 30010MR. PERRONE: How long have you been a flight instructor, sir?12THE WITNESS (Gresock): That12THE WITNESS (Stevens): I've13is the minimum altitude, yes.13been a flight instructor for approximately 1114MR. STEVENS: And you consider14years.15that safe?15MR. PERRONE: And what types16THE WITNESS (Gresock): Yes, I16of aircraft have you flown in and out of the airport?18MR. STEVENS: I have no18THE WITNESS (Stevens): I've19further questions. Thank you.19flown everything from light sport aircraft, which are aircraft 1,400 pounds or less, up to and including twin engine piston planes.22swear you in, unless you have other22MR. PERRONE: Could you23witnesses. I don't know.23explain in detail your concerns about the impact on aircraft from exhaust plumes. Is it primarily turbulence and wind shear or24MR. STEVENS; I do not.25THE CHAIRMAN: Please stand.2525THE CHAIRMAN: Please stand.25reduced oxygen content?26Page 6061Page 6081B U R T S T E V E N S, 21reduced oxygen content?2called as a witness, being first duly2THE WITNESS (Stevens): It's
10be not at 720 feet over the stack, but at 30010MR. PERRONE: How long have11feet over the stack?11you been a flight instructor, sir?12THE WITNESS (Gresock): That12THE WITNESS (Stevens): I've13is the minimum altitude, yes.13been a flight instructor for approximately 1114MR. STEVENS: And you consider14years.15that safe?15MR. PERRONE: And what types16THE WITNESS (Gresock): Yes, I16of aircraft have you flown in and out of the airport?18MR. STEVENS: I have no18THE WITNESS (Stevens): I've19further questions. Thank you.19flown everything from light sport aircraft, which are aircraft 1,400 pounds or less, up20THE CHAIRMAN: We're now going20which are aircraft 1,400 pounds or less, up21to start the process with you, so we have to swear you in, unless you have other22MR. PERRONE: Could you23witnesses. I don't know.23explain in detail your concerns about the impact on aircraft from exhaust plumes. Is it primarily turbulence and wind shear or24MR. STEVEN S, Called as a witness, being first duly2THE WITNESS (Stevens): It's
11feet over the stack?11you been a flight instructor, sir?12THE WITNESS (Gresock): That12THE WITNESS (Stevens): I've13is the minimum altitude, yes.13been a flight instructor for approximately 1114MR. STEVENS: And you consider14years.15that safe?15MR. PERRONE: And what types16THE WITNESS (Gresock): Yes, I16of aircraft have you flown in and out of the airport?18MR. STEVENS: I have no18THE WITNESS (Stevens): I've19further questions. Thank you.19flown everything from light sport aircraft, 2020THE CHAIRMAN: We're now going20which are aircraft 1,400 pounds or less, up21to start the process with you, so we have to 2321to and including twin engine piston planes.24MR. STEVENS: I do not.24MR. STEVENS: I do not.25THE CHAIRMAN: Please stand.24max. start flow exhaust plumes. Is it primarily turbulence and wind shear orPage 6061B U R T S T E V E N S, 22THE WITNESS (Stevens): It's
12THE WITNESS (Gresock): That12THE WITNESS (Stevens): I've13is the minimum altitude, yes.13been a flight instructor for approximately 1114MR. STEVENS: And you consider14years.15that safe?15MR. PERRONE: And what types16THE WITNESS (Gresock): Yes, I16of aircraft have you flown in and out of the17do.17airport?18MR. STEVENS: I have no18THE WITNESS (Stevens): I've19further questions. Thank you.19flown everything from light sport aircraft,20THE CHAIRMAN: We're now going20which are aircraft 1,400 pounds or less, up21to start the process with you, so we have to21to and including twin engine piston planes.22swear you in, unless you have other22MR. PERRONE: Could you23witnesses. I don't know.23explain in detail your concerns about the24MR. STEVENS: I do not.24impact on aircraft from exhaust plumes. Is25THE CHAIRMAN: Please stand.25it primarily turbulence and wind shear orPage 6061B U R T S T E V E N S, 212called as a witness, being first duly2THE WITNESS (Stevens): It's
13is the minimum altitude, yes.13been a flight instructor for approximately 1114MR. STEVENS: And you consider14years.15that safe?15MR. PERRONE: And what types16THE WITNESS (Gresock): Yes, I16of aircraft have you flown in and out of the17do.17airport?18MR. STEVENS: I have no18THE WITNESS (Stevens): I've19further questions. Thank you.19flown everything from light sport aircraft,20THE CHAIRMAN: We're now going20which are aircraft 1,400 pounds or less, up21to start the process with you, so we have to21to and including twin engine piston planes.22swear you in, unless you have other22MR. PERRONE: Could you23witnesses. I don't know.23explain in detail your concerns about the24MR. STEVENS: I do not.24impact on aircraft from exhaust plumes. Is25THE CHAIRMAN: Please stand.25it primarily turbulence and wind shear orPage 6061B U R T S T E V E N S, 21reduced oxygen content? 22called as a witness, being first duly2THE WITNESS (Stevens): It's
14MR. STEVENS: And you consider14years.15that safe?15MR. PERRONE: And what types16THE WITNESS (Gresock): Yes, I16of aircraft have you flown in and out of the17do.17airport?18MR. STEVENS: I have no18THE WITNESS (Stevens): I've19further questions. Thank you.19flown everything from light sport aircraft,20THE CHAIRMAN: We're now going20which are aircraft 1,400 pounds or less, up21to start the process with you, so we have to21to and including twin engine piston planes.22swear you in, unless you have other22MR. PERRONE: Could you23witnesses. I don't know.23explain in detail your concerns about the24MR. STEVENS: I do not.24impact on aircraft from exhaust plumes. Is25THE CHAIRMAN: Please stand.25it primarily turbulence and wind shear orPage 6061B U R T S T E V E N S,1reduced oxygen content?2called as a witness, being first duly2THE WITNESS (Stevens): It's
15that safe?15MR. PERRONE: And what types16THE WITNESS (Gresock): Yes, I16of aircraft have you flown in and out of the17do.17airport?18MR. STEVENS: I have no18THE WITNESS (Stevens): I've19further questions. Thank you.19flown everything from light sport aircraft,20THE CHAIRMAN: We're now going20which are aircraft 1,400 pounds or less, up21to start the process with you, so we have to21to and including twin engine piston planes.22swear you in, unless you have other22MR. PERRONE: Could you23witnesses. I don't know.23explain in detail your concerns about the24MR. STEVENS: I do not.24impact on aircraft from exhaust plumes. Is25THE CHAIRMAN: Please stand.25it primarily turbulence and wind shear orPage 6061B U R T S T E V E N S,1reduced oxygen content?2called as a witness, being first duly2THE WITNESS (Stevens): It's
16THE WITNESS (Gresock): Yes, I16of aircraft have you flown in and out of the17do.17airport?18MR. STEVENS: I have no18THE WITNESS (Stevens): I've19further questions. Thank you.19flown everything from light sport aircraft,20THE CHAIRMAN: We're now going20which are aircraft 1,400 pounds or less, up21to start the process with you, so we have to21to and including twin engine piston planes.22swear you in, unless you have other22MR. PERRONE: Could you23witnesses. I don't know.23explain in detail your concerns about the24MR. STEVENS: I do not.24impact on aircraft from exhaust plumes. Is25THE CHAIRMAN: Please stand.25it primarily turbulence and wind shear orPage 6061B U R T S T E V E N S,12called as a witness, being first duly2THE WITNESS (Stevens): It's
17do.17airport?18MR. STEVENS: I have no18THE WITNESS (Stevens): I've19further questions. Thank you.19flown everything from light sport aircraft,20THE CHAIRMAN: We're now going20which are aircraft 1,400 pounds or less, up21to start the process with you, so we have to21to and including twin engine piston planes.22swear you in, unless you have other22MR. PERRONE: Could you23witnesses. I don't know.23explain in detail your concerns about the24MR. STEVENS: I do not.24impact on aircraft from exhaust plumes. Is25THE CHAIRMAN: Please stand.25it primarily turbulence and wind shear orPage 6061B U R T S T E V E N S,1reduced oxygen content?2called as a witness, being first duly2THE WITNESS (Stevens): It's
18MR. STEVENS: I have no18THE WITNESS (Stevens): I've19further questions. Thank you.19flown everything from light sport aircraft,20THE CHAIRMAN: We're now going20which are aircraft 1,400 pounds or less, up21to start the process with you, so we have to21to and including twin engine piston planes.22swear you in, unless you have other22MR. PERRONE: Could you23witnesses. I don't know.23explain in detail your concerns about the24MR. STEVENS: I do not.24impact on aircraft from exhaust plumes. Is25THE CHAIRMAN: Please stand.25it primarily turbulence and wind shear orPage 6061B U R T S T E V E N S,12called as a witness, being first duly2THE WITNESS (Stevens): It's
20THE CHAIRMAN: We're now going 2120which are aircraft 1,400 pounds or less, up 2121to start the process with you, so we have to 22swear you in, unless you have other21to and including twin engine piston planes.23witnesses. I don't know.23explain in detail your concerns about the24MR. STEVENS: I do not.24impact on aircraft from exhaust plumes. Is25THE CHAIRMAN: Please stand.25it primarily turbulence and wind shear orPage 6061B U R T S T E V E N S, 22reduced oxygen content? 22called as a witness, being first duly2THE WITNESS (Stevens): It's
21to start the process with you, so we have to21to and including twin engine piston planes.22swear you in, unless you have other22MR. PERRONE: Could you23witnesses. I don't know.23explain in detail your concerns about the24MR. STEVENS: I do not.24impact on aircraft from exhaust plumes. Is25THE CHAIRMAN: Please stand.25it primarily turbulence and wind shear orPage 6061B U R T S T E V E N S,12called as a witness, being first duly2THE WITNESS (Stevens): It's
22swear you in, unless you have other22MR. PERRONE: Could you23witnesses. I don't know.23explain in detail your concerns about the24MR. STEVENS: I do not.24impact on aircraft from exhaust plumes. Is25THE CHAIRMAN: Please stand.25it primarily turbulence and wind shear orPage 6061B U R T S T E V E N S,12called as a witness, being first duly2THE WITNESS (Stevens): It's
23witnesses. I don't know.23explain in detail your concerns about the24MR. STEVENS: I do not.24impact on aircraft from exhaust plumes. Is25THE CHAIRMAN: Please stand.25it primarily turbulence and wind shear orPage 6061B U R T S T E V E N S,12called as a witness, being first duly2THE WITNESS (Stevens): It's
24MR. STEVENS: I do not.24impact on aircraft from exhaust plumes. Is25THE CHAIRMAN: Please stand.25it primarily turbulence and wind shear orPage 6061BURT STEVENS,12called as a witness, being first duly2THE WITNESS (Stevens): It's
25 THE CHAIRMAN: Please stand. 25 it primarily turbulence and wind shear or Page 606 Page 608 1 B U R T S T E V E N S, 1 reduced oxygen content? 2 called as a witness, being first duly 2 THE WITNESS (Stevens): It's
Page 606Page 6081BURT STEVENS,12called as a witness, being first duly2THE WITNESS (Stevens): It's
1BURT STEVENS,1reduced oxygen content?2called as a witness, being first duly2THE WITNESS (Stevens): It's
1BURT STEVENS,1reduced oxygen content?2called as a witness, being first duly2THE WITNESS (Stevens): It's
2 called as a witness, being first duly 2 THE WITNESS (Stevens): It's
3 sworn by Ms. Bachman, was examined and 3 primarily there are two concerns. When
4 testified on his oath as follows: 4 the plumes are not visible, I'm concerned
5 THE CHAIRMAN: Did you prepare 5 that a transient student pilot will come to
6 exhibits listed under 16-B-1 and 2? 6 the airport not knowing that there is a power
7 THE WITNESS (Stevens): I'd 7 plant, nor that the power plant is running
8 have to be shown those, sir. I don't know. 8 and in a plane much smaller than the types of
9 THE CHAIRMAN: One of them, 9 planes that MITRE has run calculations on
10 it's a letter from you to Specialist Clipper, 10 will be upset and unfortunately crash and
11 dated February 23, 2015. 11 die.
12 THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, 12 MR. PERRONE: So is that
13 sir, I did prepare that. 14 THE CHAID AND And the relation
14THE CHAIRMAN: And the other14THE WITNESS (Stevens): That's151515
15 one was a request for intervenor status. 15 one issue when the plumes are not visible.
16 THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, I 16 When the plumes are visible, I'm quite
17 did prepare that too. 17 concerned that the tower, which is on the 18 uset side of the simpert this prepared neuron
18THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.18west side of the airport, this proposed power19Are these exhibits true and19plant is on the east side of the airport,
20 accurate to the best of your knowledge? 20 consequently, the controllers routinely, and 21 THE WITCHESS (Staypage); Yas 21
21THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes,21almost unanimously, put small training22sir.22aircraft like the type that I normally fly in
I AA NI I DOMMALIVITI I VALUE IN THE
23 THE CHAIRMAN: Do you have any 23 on the east side of the runway directly over

17 (Pages 605 to 608)

	Page 609		Page 611
1	fly closer to the runway, which will be	1	its relationship with a general aviation
2	unsafe, or they'll have to be beyond the	2	airport. I'm not at all concerned about
3	plume and be out of sight of the tower	3	large corporate jets that routinely fly in
4	personnel.	4	and out of that airport because their traffic
5	MR. PERRONE: I understand you	5	pattern is two or three or four miles. They
6	recently filed a letter with the FAA, dated	6	will be flying around the power plant. They
7	February 23, 2015. Is this letter directed	7	will not have any problem at all. They're
8	mostly to address the plume issue, or is it	8	larger, up to 99,000 pounds.
9	to tie in with FAA's review of the project?	9	I'm talking about a small,
10	THE WITNESS (Stevens): It's	10	1,400 pound aircraft with a young fellow,
11	to respond to their FAA 7460 response in	11	maybe your age, who has ten hours, and he's
12	circulation that the Petitioner had to file	12	flying up from Groton flying into Oxford to
13	with the FAA, and it was my response to the	13	have lunch there, and he flies over this, and
14	FAA's request for that.	14	he doesn't have the time or the ability to,
15	MR. PERRONE: Have you had any	15	you know, recover from a stall spin because
16	other discussions with the FAA regarding this	16	he's only going to have 700 feet or 800 feet
17	project?	17	to recover.
18	THE WITNESS (Stevens): I	18	It's a I serve on it
19	don't believe I've had any discussions with	19	says in my letter I won't repeat what I
20	any FAA employee concerning this project	20	do, but one of our major emphasis is the
21	excuse me, other than I did e-mail Specialist	21	mitigation of risk. And what I'm trying to
22	Clipper, and he wrote me back an e-mail	22	do outside of the FAA within the FAA and
23	saying this was prior to my being an	23	for the FAA, for the flying public generally,
24	intervenor, and it was a I'd be happy to	24	I'm trying to mitigate risk, and I'm trying
25	share the e-mail with you and the parties.	25	to mitigate risk here for that poor young
	Page 610		Page 612
1	There wasn't anything substantive discussed	1	pilot who doesn't know just how severe
2	There wasn't anything substantive discussed in the e-mail.	2	pilot who doesn't know just how severe turbulence is going to be in a 1,400 to 2,000
2 3	There wasn't anything substantive discussed in the e-mail. MR. PERRONE: Other than the	2 3	pilot who doesn't know just how severe turbulence is going to be in a 1,400 to 2,000 pound aircraft.
2 3 4	There wasn't anything substantive discussed in the e-mail. MR. PERRONE: Other than the exhibits you filed and what you've already	2 3 4	pilot who doesn't know just how severe turbulence is going to be in a 1,400 to 2,000 pound aircraft. MR. PERRONE: Thank you, sir.
2 3 4 5	There wasn't anything substantive discussed in the e-mail. MR. PERRONE: Other than the exhibits you filed and what you've already discussed, is there anything else you would	2 3 4 5	pilot who doesn't know just how severe turbulence is going to be in a 1,400 to 2,000 pound aircraft. MR. PERRONE: Thank you, sir. That's all I have.
2 3 4 5 6	There wasn't anything substantive discussed in the e-mail. MR. PERRONE: Other than the exhibits you filed and what you've already discussed, is there anything else you would like the Council to know regarding this	2 3 4 5 6	pilot who doesn't know just how severe turbulence is going to be in a 1,400 to 2,000 pound aircraft. MR. PERRONE: Thank you, sir. That's all I have. THE WITNESS (Stevens): Thank
2 3 4 5 6 7	There wasn't anything substantive discussed in the e-mail. MR. PERRONE: Other than the exhibits you filed and what you've already discussed, is there anything else you would like the Council to know regarding this project?	2 3 4 5 6 7	pilot who doesn't know just how severe turbulence is going to be in a 1,400 to 2,000 pound aircraft. MR. PERRONE: Thank you, sir. That's all I have. THE WITNESS (Stevens): Thank you, sir.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	There wasn't anything substantive discussed in the e-mail. MR. PERRONE: Other than the exhibits you filed and what you've already discussed, is there anything else you would like the Council to know regarding this project? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	pilot who doesn't know just how severe turbulence is going to be in a 1,400 to 2,000 pound aircraft. MR. PERRONE: Thank you, sir. That's all I have. THE WITNESS (Stevens): Thank you, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: We'll now
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	There wasn't anything substantive discussed in the e-mail. MR. PERRONE: Other than the exhibits you filed and what you've already discussed, is there anything else you would like the Council to know regarding this project? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I have been flying out of Oxford Airport since 1972.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	pilot who doesn't know just how severe turbulence is going to be in a 1,400 to 2,000 pound aircraft. MR. PERRONE: Thank you, sir. That's all I have. THE WITNESS (Stevens): Thank you, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: We'll now continue questions from the Council.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	There wasn't anything substantive discussed in the e-mail. MR. PERRONE: Other than the exhibits you filed and what you've already discussed, is there anything else you would like the Council to know regarding this project? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I have been flying out of Oxford Airport since 1972. I've been flying since 1972. I started	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	pilot who doesn't know just how severe turbulence is going to be in a 1,400 to 2,000 pound aircraft. MR. PERRONE: Thank you, sir. That's all I have. THE WITNESS (Stevens): Thank you, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: We'll now continue questions from the Council. Senator Murphy?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	There wasn't anything substantive discussed in the e-mail. MR. PERRONE: Other than the exhibits you filed and what you've already discussed, is there anything else you would like the Council to know regarding this project? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I have been flying out of Oxford Airport since 1972. I've been flying since 1972. I started flying at Oxford Airport. I don't have a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	pilot who doesn't know just how severe turbulence is going to be in a 1,400 to 2,000 pound aircraft. MR. PERRONE: Thank you, sir. That's all I have. THE WITNESS (Stevens): Thank you, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: We'll now continue questions from the Council. Senator Murphy? THE VICE CHAIRMAN:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	There wasn't anything substantive discussed in the e-mail. MR. PERRONE: Other than the exhibits you filed and what you've already discussed, is there anything else you would like the Council to know regarding this project? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I have been flying out of Oxford Airport since 1972. I've been flying since 1972. I started flying at Oxford Airport. I don't have a concern for any student that I teach because	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	pilot who doesn't know just how severe turbulence is going to be in a 1,400 to 2,000 pound aircraft. MR. PERRONE: Thank you, sir. That's all I have. THE WITNESS (Stevens): Thank you, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: We'll now continue questions from the Council. Senator Murphy? THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Stevens, so I take it that your concern
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	There wasn't anything substantive discussed in the e-mail. MR. PERRONE: Other than the exhibits you filed and what you've already discussed, is there anything else you would like the Council to know regarding this project? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I have been flying out of Oxford Airport since 1972. I've been flying since 1972. I started flying at Oxford Airport. I don't have a concern for any student that I teach because I will be able to tell that student how to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	pilot who doesn't know just how severe turbulence is going to be in a 1,400 to 2,000 pound aircraft. MR. PERRONE: Thank you, sir. That's all I have. THE WITNESS (Stevens): Thank you, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: We'll now continue questions from the Council. Senator Murphy? THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Stevens, so I take it that your concern really is kind of for the unusual, this pilot
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	There wasn't anything substantive discussed in the e-mail. MR. PERRONE: Other than the exhibits you filed and what you've already discussed, is there anything else you would like the Council to know regarding this project? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I have been flying out of Oxford Airport since 1972. I've been flying since 1972. I started flying at Oxford Airport. I don't have a concern for any student that I teach because I will be able to tell that student how to avoid this power plant. My concern is for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	pilot who doesn't know just how severe turbulence is going to be in a 1,400 to 2,000 pound aircraft. MR. PERRONE: Thank you, sir. That's all I have. THE WITNESS (Stevens): Thank you, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: We'll now continue questions from the Council. Senator Murphy? THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Stevens, so I take it that your concern really is kind of for the unusual, this pilot who may be coming up, for example, from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	There wasn't anything substantive discussed in the e-mail. MR. PERRONE: Other than the exhibits you filed and what you've already discussed, is there anything else you would like the Council to know regarding this project? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I have been flying out of Oxford Airport since 1972. I've been flying since 1972. I started flying at Oxford Airport. I don't have a concern for any student that I teach because I will be able to tell that student how to avoid this power plant. My concern is for the transient student pilot flying a small	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	pilot who doesn't know just how severe turbulence is going to be in a 1,400 to 2,000 pound aircraft. MR. PERRONE: Thank you, sir. That's all I have. THE WITNESS (Stevens): Thank you, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: We'll now continue questions from the Council. Senator Murphy? THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Stevens, so I take it that your concern really is kind of for the unusual, this pilot who may be coming up, for example, from Groton down near my neck of the woods, who's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	There wasn't anything substantive discussed in the e-mail. MR. PERRONE: Other than the exhibits you filed and what you've already discussed, is there anything else you would like the Council to know regarding this project? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I have been flying out of Oxford Airport since 1972. I've been flying since 1972. I started flying at Oxford Airport. I don't have a concern for any student that I teach because I will be able to tell that student how to avoid this power plant. My concern is for the transient student pilot flying a small plane not aware that this power plant exists.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	pilot who doesn't know just how severe turbulence is going to be in a 1,400 to 2,000 pound aircraft. MR. PERRONE: Thank you, sir. That's all I have. THE WITNESS (Stevens): Thank you, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: We'll now continue questions from the Council. Senator Murphy? THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Stevens, so I take it that your concern really is kind of for the unusual, this pilot who may be coming up, for example, from Groton down near my neck of the woods, who's new and not familiar with this airport.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	There wasn't anything substantive discussed in the e-mail. MR. PERRONE: Other than the exhibits you filed and what you've already discussed, is there anything else you would like the Council to know regarding this project? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I have been flying out of Oxford Airport since 1972. I've been flying since 1972. I started flying at Oxford Airport. I don't have a concern for any student that I teach because I will be able to tell that student how to avoid this power plant. My concern is for the transient student pilot flying a small plane not aware that this power plant exists. And my review of power plants	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	pilot who doesn't know just how severe turbulence is going to be in a 1,400 to 2,000 pound aircraft. MR. PERRONE: Thank you, sir. That's all I have. THE WITNESS (Stevens): Thank you, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: We'll now continue questions from the Council. Senator Murphy? THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Stevens, so I take it that your concern really is kind of for the unusual, this pilot who may be coming up, for example, from Groton down near my neck of the woods, who's new and not familiar with this airport. Isn't there some indication for pilots as a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	There wasn't anything substantive discussed in the e-mail. MR. PERRONE: Other than the exhibits you filed and what you've already discussed, is there anything else you would like the Council to know regarding this project? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I have been flying out of Oxford Airport since 1972. I've been flying since 1972. I started flying at Oxford Airport. I don't have a concern for any student that I teach because I will be able to tell that student how to avoid this power plant. My concern is for the transient student pilot flying a small plane not aware that this power plant exists. And my review of power plants in association with airports is that there	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	pilot who doesn't know just how severe turbulence is going to be in a 1,400 to 2,000 pound aircraft. MR. PERRONE: Thank you, sir. That's all I have. THE WITNESS (Stevens): Thank you, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: We'll now continue questions from the Council. Senator Murphy? THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Stevens, so I take it that your concern really is kind of for the unusual, this pilot who may be coming up, for example, from Groton down near my neck of the woods, who's new and not familiar with this airport. Isn't there some indication for pilots as a whole that there's a power plant nearby with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	There wasn't anything substantive discussed in the e-mail. MR. PERRONE: Other than the exhibits you filed and what you've already discussed, is there anything else you would like the Council to know regarding this project? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I have been flying out of Oxford Airport since 1972. I've been flying since 1972. I started flying at Oxford Airport. I don't have a concern for any student that I teach because I will be able to tell that student how to avoid this power plant. My concern is for the transient student pilot flying a small plane not aware that this power plant exists. And my review of power plants in association with airports is that there aren't any in the downwind leg of primary	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	pilot who doesn't know just how severe turbulence is going to be in a 1,400 to 2,000 pound aircraft. MR. PERRONE: Thank you, sir. That's all I have. THE WITNESS (Stevens): Thank you, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: We'll now continue questions from the Council. Senator Murphy? THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Stevens, so I take it that your concern really is kind of for the unusual, this pilot who may be coming up, for example, from Groton down near my neck of the woods, who's new and not familiar with this airport. Isn't there some indication for pilots as a whole that there's a power plant nearby with these stacks?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	There wasn't anything substantive discussed in the e-mail. MR. PERRONE: Other than the exhibits you filed and what you've already discussed, is there anything else you would like the Council to know regarding this project? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I have been flying out of Oxford Airport since 1972. I've been flying since 1972. I started flying at Oxford Airport. I don't have a concern for any student that I teach because I will be able to tell that student how to avoid this power plant. My concern is for the transient student pilot flying a small plane not aware that this power plant exists. And my review of power plants in association with airports is that there aren't any in the downwind leg of primary runway to anywhere in the country, and I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	pilot who doesn't know just how severe turbulence is going to be in a 1,400 to 2,000 pound aircraft. MR. PERRONE: Thank you, sir. That's all I have. THE WITNESS (Stevens): Thank you, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: We'll now continue questions from the Council. Senator Murphy? THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Stevens, so I take it that your concern really is kind of for the unusual, this pilot who may be coming up, for example, from Groton down near my neck of the woods, who's new and not familiar with this airport. Isn't there some indication for pilots as a whole that there's a power plant nearby with these stacks? THE WITNESS (Stevens):
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	There wasn't anything substantive discussed in the e-mail. MR. PERRONE: Other than the exhibits you filed and what you've already discussed, is there anything else you would like the Council to know regarding this project? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I have been flying out of Oxford Airport since 1972. I've been flying since 1972. I started flying at Oxford Airport. I don't have a concern for any student that I teach because I will be able to tell that student how to avoid this power plant. My concern is for the transient student pilot flying a small plane not aware that this power plant exists. And my review of power plants in association with airports is that there aren't any in the downwind leg of primary runway to anywhere in the country, and I will, if the Petitioner proves me wrong, I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	pilot who doesn't know just how severe turbulence is going to be in a 1,400 to 2,000 pound aircraft. MR. PERRONE: Thank you, sir. That's all I have. THE WITNESS (Stevens): Thank you, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: We'll now continue questions from the Council. Senator Murphy? THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Stevens, so I take it that your concern really is kind of for the unusual, this pilot who may be coming up, for example, from Groton down near my neck of the woods, who's new and not familiar with this airport. Isn't there some indication for pilots as a whole that there's a power plant nearby with these stacks? THE WITNESS (Stevens): There
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	There wasn't anything substantive discussed in the e-mail. MR. PERRONE: Other than the exhibits you filed and what you've already discussed, is there anything else you would like the Council to know regarding this project? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I have been flying out of Oxford Airport since 1972. I've been flying since 1972. I started flying at Oxford Airport. I don't have a concern for any student that I teach because I will be able to tell that student how to avoid this power plant. My concern is for the transient student pilot flying a small plane not aware that this power plant exists. And my review of power plants in association with airports is that there aren't any in the downwind leg of primary runway to anywhere in the country, and I will, if the Petitioner proves me wrong, I will stand corrected, but I am unaware of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	pilot who doesn't know just how severe turbulence is going to be in a 1,400 to 2,000 pound aircraft. MR. PERRONE: Thank you, sir. That's all I have. THE WITNESS (Stevens): Thank you, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: We'll now continue questions from the Council. Senator Murphy? THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Stevens, so I take it that your concern really is kind of for the unusual, this pilot who may be coming up, for example, from Groton down near my neck of the woods, who's new and not familiar with this airport. Isn't there some indication for pilots as a whole that there's a power plant nearby with these stacks? THE WITNESS (Stevens): There THE VICE CHAIRMAN: I'm not a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	There wasn't anything substantive discussed in the e-mail. MR. PERRONE: Other than the exhibits you filed and what you've already discussed, is there anything else you would like the Council to know regarding this project? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I have been flying out of Oxford Airport since 1972. I've been flying since 1972. I started flying at Oxford Airport. I don't have a concern for any student that I teach because I will be able to tell that student how to avoid this power plant. My concern is for the transient student pilot flying a small plane not aware that this power plant exists. And my review of power plants in association with airports is that there aren't any in the downwind leg of primary runway to anywhere in the country, and I will, if the Petitioner proves me wrong, I will stand corrected, but I am unaware of any, and I've looked.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	pilot who doesn't know just how severe turbulence is going to be in a 1,400 to 2,000 pound aircraft. MR. PERRONE: Thank you, sir. That's all I have. THE WITNESS (Stevens): Thank you, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: We'll now continue questions from the Council. Senator Murphy? THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Stevens, so I take it that your concern really is kind of for the unusual, this pilot who may be coming up, for example, from Groton down near my neck of the woods, who's new and not familiar with this airport. Isn't there some indication for pilots as a whole that there's a power plant nearby with these stacks? THE WITNESS (Stevens): There THE VICE CHAIRMAN: I'm not a pilot, and I don't even like the idea of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	There wasn't anything substantive discussed in the e-mail. MR. PERRONE: Other than the exhibits you filed and what you've already discussed, is there anything else you would like the Council to know regarding this project? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I have been flying out of Oxford Airport since 1972. I've been flying since 1972. I started flying at Oxford Airport. I don't have a concern for any student that I teach because I will be able to tell that student how to avoid this power plant. My concern is for the transient student pilot flying a small plane not aware that this power plant exists. And my review of power plants in association with airports is that there aren't any in the downwind leg of primary runway to anywhere in the country, and I will, if the Petitioner proves me wrong, I will stand corrected, but I am unaware of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	pilot who doesn't know just how severe turbulence is going to be in a 1,400 to 2,000 pound aircraft. MR. PERRONE: Thank you, sir. That's all I have. THE WITNESS (Stevens): Thank you, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: We'll now continue questions from the Council. Senator Murphy? THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Stevens, so I take it that your concern really is kind of for the unusual, this pilot who may be coming up, for example, from Groton down near my neck of the woods, who's new and not familiar with this airport. Isn't there some indication for pilots as a whole that there's a power plant nearby with these stacks? THE WITNESS (Stevens): There THE VICE CHAIRMAN: I'm not a

18 (Pages 609 to 612)

	Page 613		Page 615
1	your question is, is it abnormal or unusual	1	a half a mile and a mile and looking at what
2	or is it is there a mechanism for the	2	should be, you know, oh, my Lord, there's a
3	pilot to know that this power plant will be	3	power plant over there, maybe I shouldn't fly
4	there; is that your question?	4	over that. But if he has 10 or 15 hours of
5	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: I don't	5	flight time and he's flying into an
6	know that mechanism is the right but yes,	6	unfamiliar airport I use from Groton to
7	is there something that should tell this	7	Waterbury, but any other airport he's
8	pilot or there's some place that this pilot	8	going to be so concerned that he may avoid
9	should be alerted that there is these stacks	9	the actual thing, but if there's no if the
10	nearby the airport?	10	plumes are invisible on this light plane that
11	THE WITNESS (Stevens): There	11	he'll be flying, he could he could be
12	is definitely a mechanism, sir. For the VFR	12	thrust into a circumstance that he cannot
13	pilot there's a sectional that he refers to,	13	recover from.
14	whether it's on an Ipad, which I use all the	14	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Well,
15	time, or whether it's a paper. It's very	15	whether you're talking about realistic or
16	similar to a, if we remember, road maps. I	16	hypothetical but let me ask you a very
17	remember road maps. Maybe some of the	17	practical question: If the FAA approves
18	younger people here don't, but very similar	18	whatever applications they file and they
19	to a road map. And those are marked with	19	receive approval for, would you expect this
20	power plants. It will show that there is a	20	Council to turn this down for being an unsafe
21	power plant on we call it a sectional	21	airport for flying conditions?
22	on that sectional, sir.	22	THE WITNESS (Stevens): I
23	THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Would it	23	expect this Council I hope that this
24	indicate how high the stack?	24	Council will, on its own review of what the
25	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes,	25	FAA says, and after the FAA provides their
	D (14		
	Page 614		Page 616
1	sir, it will indicate how high the stack is,	1	Page 616 testimony, review what the Connecticut
1 2	_	1 2	
	sir, it will indicate how high the stack is,		testimony, review what the Connecticut Airport CAA, I'm sorry, provides this Council, and then make an appropriate
2 3 4	sir, it will indicate how high the stack is, but it will not indicate THE VICE CHAIRMAN: So, if you had your example of a young pilot coming up	2 3 4	testimony, review what the Connecticut Airport CAA, I'm sorry, provides this Council, and then make an appropriate determination after that occurs.
2 3 4 5	sir, it will indicate how high the stack is, but it will not indicate THE VICE CHAIRMAN: So, if you had your example of a young pilot coming up from Groton, if in the reasonable precautions	2 3 4 5	testimony, review what the Connecticut Airport CAA, I'm sorry, provides this Council, and then make an appropriate determination after that occurs. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: But that's
2 3 4 5 6	sir, it will indicate how high the stack is, but it will not indicate THE VICE CHAIRMAN: So, if you had your example of a young pilot coming up from Groton, if in the reasonable precautions of flying into Oxford for the first time,	2 3 4 5 6	testimony, review what the Connecticut Airport CAA, I'm sorry, provides this Council, and then make an appropriate determination after that occurs. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: But that's quite some time down the road, isn't it?
2 3 4 5 6 7	sir, it will indicate how high the stack is, but it will not indicate THE VICE CHAIRMAN: So, if you had your example of a young pilot coming up from Groton, if in the reasonable precautions of flying into Oxford for the first time, shouldn't he look to see if there's an	2 3 4 5 6 7	testimony, review what the Connecticut Airport CAA, I'm sorry, provides this Council, and then make an appropriate determination after that occurs. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: But that's quite some time down the road, isn't it? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	sir, it will indicate how high the stack is, but it will not indicate THE VICE CHAIRMAN: So, if you had your example of a young pilot coming up from Groton, if in the reasonable precautions of flying into Oxford for the first time, shouldn't he look to see if there's an indication of a power plant and the stacks	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	testimony, review what the Connecticut Airport CAA, I'm sorry, provides this Council, and then make an appropriate determination after that occurs. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: But that's quite some time down the road, isn't it? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Of course. These processes take a long time,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	sir, it will indicate how high the stack is, but it will not indicate THE VICE CHAIRMAN: So, if you had your example of a young pilot coming up from Groton, if in the reasonable precautions of flying into Oxford for the first time, shouldn't he look to see if there's an indication of a power plant and the stacks there?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	testimony, review what the Connecticut Airport CAA, I'm sorry, provides this Council, and then make an appropriate determination after that occurs. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: But that's quite some time down the road, isn't it? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Of course. These processes take a long time, sir.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	sir, it will indicate how high the stack is, but it will not indicate THE VICE CHAIRMAN: So, if you had your example of a young pilot coming up from Groton, if in the reasonable precautions of flying into Oxford for the first time, shouldn't he look to see if there's an indication of a power plant and the stacks there? THE WITNESS (Stevens):	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	testimony, review what the Connecticut Airport CAA, I'm sorry, provides this Council, and then make an appropriate determination after that occurs. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: But that's quite some time down the road, isn't it? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Of course. These processes take a long time, sir. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: I have no
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	sir, it will indicate how high the stack is, but it will not indicate THE VICE CHAIRMAN: So, if you had your example of a young pilot coming up from Groton, if in the reasonable precautions of flying into Oxford for the first time, shouldn't he look to see if there's an indication of a power plant and the stacks there? THE WITNESS (Stevens): There's no doubt, sir. There's a power plant	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	testimony, review what the Connecticut Airport CAA, I'm sorry, provides this Council, and then make an appropriate determination after that occurs. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: But that's quite some time down the road, isn't it? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Of course. These processes take a long time, sir. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	sir, it will indicate how high the stack is, but it will not indicate THE VICE CHAIRMAN: So, if you had your example of a young pilot coming up from Groton, if in the reasonable precautions of flying into Oxford for the first time, shouldn't he look to see if there's an indication of a power plant and the stacks there? THE WITNESS (Stevens): There's no doubt, sir. There's a power plant and a stack at Brainard Airport in Hartford	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	testimony, review what the Connecticut Airport CAA, I'm sorry, provides this Council, and then make an appropriate determination after that occurs. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: But that's quite some time down the road, isn't it? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Of course. These processes take a long time, sir. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	sir, it will indicate how high the stack is, but it will not indicate THE VICE CHAIRMAN: So, if you had your example of a young pilot coming up from Groton, if in the reasonable precautions of flying into Oxford for the first time, shouldn't he look to see if there's an indication of a power plant and the stacks there? THE WITNESS (Stevens): There's no doubt, sir. There's a power plant and a stack at Brainard Airport in Hartford that we routinely fly around, and it's no	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	testimony, review what the Connecticut Airport CAA, I'm sorry, provides this Council, and then make an appropriate determination after that occurs. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: But that's quite some time down the road, isn't it? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Of course. These processes take a long time, sir. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Mr. Levesque?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	sir, it will indicate how high the stack is, but it will not indicate THE VICE CHAIRMAN: So, if you had your example of a young pilot coming up from Groton, if in the reasonable precautions of flying into Oxford for the first time, shouldn't he look to see if there's an indication of a power plant and the stacks there? THE WITNESS (Stevens): There's no doubt, sir. There's a power plant and a stack at Brainard Airport in Hartford that we routinely fly around, and it's no problem at all. There's a power plant at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	testimony, review what the Connecticut Airport CAA, I'm sorry, provides this Council, and then make an appropriate determination after that occurs. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: But that's quite some time down the road, isn't it? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Of course. These processes take a long time, sir. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Mr. Levesque? MR. LEVESQUE: No questions.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	sir, it will indicate how high the stack is, but it will not indicate THE VICE CHAIRMAN: So, if you had your example of a young pilot coming up from Groton, if in the reasonable precautions of flying into Oxford for the first time, shouldn't he look to see if there's an indication of a power plant and the stacks there? THE WITNESS (Stevens): There's no doubt, sir. There's a power plant and a stack at Brainard Airport in Hartford that we routinely fly around, and it's no problem at all. There's a power plant at Bridgeport, which we routinely fly around.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	testimony, review what the Connecticut Airport CAA, I'm sorry, provides this Council, and then make an appropriate determination after that occurs. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: But that's quite some time down the road, isn't it? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Of course. These processes take a long time, sir. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Mr. Levesque? MR. LEVESQUE: No questions. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lynch?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	sir, it will indicate how high the stack is, but it will not indicate THE VICE CHAIRMAN: So, if you had your example of a young pilot coming up from Groton, if in the reasonable precautions of flying into Oxford for the first time, shouldn't he look to see if there's an indication of a power plant and the stacks there? THE WITNESS (Stevens): There's no doubt, sir. There's a power plant and a stack at Brainard Airport in Hartford that we routinely fly around, and it's no problem at all. There's a power plant at Bridgeport, which we routinely fly around. That's no problem at all. The problem with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	testimony, review what the Connecticut Airport CAA, I'm sorry, provides this Council, and then make an appropriate determination after that occurs. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: But that's quite some time down the road, isn't it? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Of course. These processes take a long time, sir. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Mr. Levesque? MR. LEVESQUE: No questions. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lynch? MR. LYNCH: Just one
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	sir, it will indicate how high the stack is, but it will not indicate THE VICE CHAIRMAN: So, if you had your example of a young pilot coming up from Groton, if in the reasonable precautions of flying into Oxford for the first time, shouldn't he look to see if there's an indication of a power plant and the stacks there? THE WITNESS (Stevens): There's no doubt, sir. There's a power plant and a stack at Brainard Airport in Hartford that we routinely fly around, and it's no problem at all. There's a power plant at Bridgeport, which we routinely fly around. That's no problem at all. The problem with this placement of this power plant is its	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	testimony, review what the Connecticut Airport CAA, I'm sorry, provides this Council, and then make an appropriate determination after that occurs. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: But that's quite some time down the road, isn't it? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Of course. These processes take a long time, sir. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Mr. Levesque? MR. LEVESQUE: No questions. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lynch? MR. LYNCH: Just one clarification from Senator Murphy's question.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	sir, it will indicate how high the stack is, but it will not indicate THE VICE CHAIRMAN: So, if you had your example of a young pilot coming up from Groton, if in the reasonable precautions of flying into Oxford for the first time, shouldn't he look to see if there's an indication of a power plant and the stacks there? THE WITNESS (Stevens): There's no doubt, sir. There's a power plant and a stack at Brainard Airport in Hartford that we routinely fly around, and it's no problem at all. There's a power plant at Bridgeport, which we routinely fly around. That's no problem at all. The problem with this placement of this power plant is its precise location is over the traffic pattern	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	testimony, review what the Connecticut Airport CAA, I'm sorry, provides this Council, and then make an appropriate determination after that occurs. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: But that's quite some time down the road, isn't it? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Of course. These processes take a long time, sir. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Mr. Levesque? MR. LEVESQUE: No questions. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lynch? MR. LYNCH: Just one clarification from Senator Murphy's question. You mentioned I'm very familiar with the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	sir, it will indicate how high the stack is, but it will not indicate THE VICE CHAIRMAN: So, if you had your example of a young pilot coming up from Groton, if in the reasonable precautions of flying into Oxford for the first time, shouldn't he look to see if there's an indication of a power plant and the stacks there? THE WITNESS (Stevens): There's no doubt, sir. There's a power plant and a stack at Brainard Airport in Hartford that we routinely fly around, and it's no problem at all. There's a power plant at Bridgeport, which we routinely fly around. That's no problem at all. The problem with this placement of this power plant is its precise location is over the traffic pattern that I, as a flight instructor and all of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	testimony, review what the Connecticut Airport CAA, I'm sorry, provides this Council, and then make an appropriate determination after that occurs. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: But that's quite some time down the road, isn't it? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Of course. These processes take a long time, sir. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Mr. Levesque? MR. LEVESQUE: No questions. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lynch? MR. LYNCH: Just one clarification from Senator Murphy's question. You mentioned I'm very familiar with the power plant in Hartford and in Bridgeport.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	sir, it will indicate how high the stack is, but it will not indicate THE VICE CHAIRMAN: So, if you had your example of a young pilot coming up from Groton, if in the reasonable precautions of flying into Oxford for the first time, shouldn't he look to see if there's an indication of a power plant and the stacks there? THE WITNESS (Stevens): There's no doubt, sir. There's a power plant and a stack at Brainard Airport in Hartford that we routinely fly around, and it's no problem at all. There's a power plant at Bridgeport, which we routinely fly around. That's no problem at all. The problem with this placement of this power plant is its precise location is over the traffic pattern that I, as a flight instructor and all of the other 97,000 flight instructors in the U.S.,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	testimony, review what the Connecticut Airport CAA, I'm sorry, provides this Council, and then make an appropriate determination after that occurs. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: But that's quite some time down the road, isn't it? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Of course. These processes take a long time, sir. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Mr. Levesque? MR. LEVESQUE: No questions. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lynch? MR. LYNCH: Just one clarification from Senator Murphy's question. You mentioned I'm very familiar with the power plant in Hartford and in Bridgeport. And did you give me I still don't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	sir, it will indicate how high the stack is, but it will not indicate THE VICE CHAIRMAN: So, if you had your example of a young pilot coming up from Groton, if in the reasonable precautions of flying into Oxford for the first time, shouldn't he look to see if there's an indication of a power plant and the stacks there? THE WITNESS (Stevens): There's no doubt, sir. There's a power plant and a stack at Brainard Airport in Hartford that we routinely fly around, and it's no problem at all. There's a power plant at Bridgeport, which we routinely fly around. That's no problem at all. The problem with this placement of this power plant is its precise location is over the traffic pattern that I, as a flight instructor and all of the other 97,000 flight instructors in the U.S., teach all of our students to fly between a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	testimony, review what the Connecticut Airport CAA, I'm sorry, provides this Council, and then make an appropriate determination after that occurs. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: But that's quite some time down the road, isn't it? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Of course. These processes take a long time, sir. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Mr. Levesque? MR. LEVESQUE: No questions. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lynch? MR. LYNCH: Just one clarification from Senator Murphy's question. You mentioned I'm very familiar with the power plant in Hartford and in Bridgeport. And did you give me I still don't understand the difference you're talking
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	sir, it will indicate how high the stack is, but it will not indicate THE VICE CHAIRMAN: So, if you had your example of a young pilot coming up from Groton, if in the reasonable precautions of flying into Oxford for the first time, shouldn't he look to see if there's an indication of a power plant and the stacks there? THE WITNESS (Stevens): There's no doubt, sir. There's a power plant and a stack at Brainard Airport in Hartford that we routinely fly around, and it's no problem at all. There's a power plant at Bridgeport, which we routinely fly around. That's no problem at all. The problem with this placement of this power plant is its precise location is over the traffic pattern that I, as a flight instructor and all of the other 97,000 flight instructors in the U.S., teach all of our students to fly between a half a mile and a mile of beam the runway,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	testimony, review what the Connecticut Airport CAA, I'm sorry, provides this Council, and then make an appropriate determination after that occurs. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: But that's quite some time down the road, isn't it? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Of course. These processes take a long time, sir. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Mr. Levesque? MR. LEVESQUE: No questions. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lynch? MR. LYNCH: Just one clarification from Senator Murphy's question. You mentioned I'm very familiar with the power plant in Hartford and in Bridgeport. And did you give me I still don't understand the difference you're talking about between those two areas and Oxford
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	sir, it will indicate how high the stack is, but it will not indicate THE VICE CHAIRMAN: So, if you had your example of a young pilot coming up from Groton, if in the reasonable precautions of flying into Oxford for the first time, shouldn't he look to see if there's an indication of a power plant and the stacks there? THE WITNESS (Stevens): There's no doubt, sir. There's a power plant and a stack at Brainard Airport in Hartford that we routinely fly around, and it's no problem at all. There's a power plant at Bridgeport, which we routinely fly around. That's no problem at all. The problem with this placement of this power plant is its precise location is over the traffic pattern that I, as a flight instructor and all of the other 97,000 flight instructors in the U.S., teach all of our students to fly between a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	testimony, review what the Connecticut Airport CAA, I'm sorry, provides this Council, and then make an appropriate determination after that occurs. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: But that's quite some time down the road, isn't it? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Of course. These processes take a long time, sir. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Mr. Levesque? MR. LEVESQUE: No questions. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lynch? MR. LYNCH: Just one clarification from Senator Murphy's question. You mentioned I'm very familiar with the power plant in Hartford and in Bridgeport. And did you give me I still don't understand the difference you're talking
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	sir, it will indicate how high the stack is, but it will not indicate THE VICE CHAIRMAN: So, if you had your example of a young pilot coming up from Groton, if in the reasonable precautions of flying into Oxford for the first time, shouldn't he look to see if there's an indication of a power plant and the stacks there? THE WITNESS (Stevens): There's no doubt, sir. There's a power plant and a stack at Brainard Airport in Hartford that we routinely fly around, and it's no problem at all. There's a power plant at Bridgeport, which we routinely fly around. That's no problem at all. The problem with this placement of this power plant is its precise location is over the traffic pattern that I, as a flight instructor and all of the other 97,000 flight instructors in the U.S., teach all of our students to fly between a half a mile and a mile of beam the runway, and this is exactly where that is.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	testimony, review what the Connecticut Airport CAA, I'm sorry, provides this Council, and then make an appropriate determination after that occurs. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: But that's quite some time down the road, isn't it? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Of course. These processes take a long time, sir. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Mr. Levesque? MR. LEVESQUE: No questions. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lynch? MR. LYNCH: Just one clarification from Senator Murphy's question. You mentioned I'm very familiar with the power plant in Hartford and in Bridgeport. And did you give me I still don't understand the difference you're talking about between those two areas and Oxford because to me, with all due respect to

19 (Pages 613 to 616)

	Page 617		Page 619
1	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Sure.	1	haven't researched that issue as to whether
2	The smoke stack that and I'll remain with	2	if the FAA made that determination for
3	Brainard Airport in Hartford.	3	safety's sake, but that would be one way to
4	MR. LYNCH: That's the one I'm	4	mitigate this risk, just don't fly on the
5	most familiar with, so go ahead.	5	east side of the airport.
б	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Okay.	6	MR. LYNCH: If there's no fly
7	So that stack, the red and white stack, is	7	on the east side, is that for small planes,
8	northwest of runway two zero. Two zero is a	8	or is that commercial planes also?
9	heading of two zero zero, which is almost	9	THE WITNESS (Stevens): That's
10	south. So, for instance, when I fly from	10	above my pay grade, sir.
11	Oxford to Brainard, I'm coming in from the	11	MR. LYNCH: Okay. All right,
12	southwest, and I'll report to the tower to	12	I'll move on.
13	enter the right downwind with their landing	13	Would the air traffic
14	to the south, I'll report right downwind, and	14	controllers changing over to more of a GPS
15	I will fly north toward Bradley. And then I	15	rather than the old, what is it, vector
16	will turn east toward East Hartford and then	16	system or something, is that going to make a
17	south and land.	17	difference? Is that in place at Oxford?
18	So it's basically like this:	18	THE WITNESS (Stevens): That
19	That stack is right here, so I'm flying	19	will take place at Oxford in 2019 2020,
20	around it. In my routine traffic pattern I'm	20	actually, but that won't have any bearing on
21	flying around it, and I have no difficulty	21	the two concerns, the circle-to-land that was
22	with that at all. If the stack were south	22	discussed earlier where planes come in from
23 24	and west of where it is, then I'd have a	23 24	the south from Bridgeport and they line up to
24	great deal of difficulty because my standard	24	land to the north, but the prevailing winds
25	traffic pattern would be flying right over	25	suggest that the plane land to the south.
	Page 618		Page 620
1		1	Page 620 That was this IFR circle-to-land discussion.
1 2	that stack, and that stack would be a problem to and a safety concern to pilots.	1 2	
	that stack, and that stack would be a problem		That was this IFR circle-to-land discussion.
2 3 4	that stack, and that stack would be a problem to and a safety concern to pilots.	2	That was this IFR circle-to-land discussion. The next gen will not make that any different at all. And unfortunately Oxford lies precisely it lies within the New York
2 3 4 5	that stack, and that stack would be a problem to and a safety concern to pilots. MR. LYNCH: Even though it's marked and lit, it's still a problem? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It	2 3 4 5	That was this IFR circle-to-land discussion. The next gen will not make that any different at all. And unfortunately Oxford lies precisely it lies within the New York TRACON area, but New York cannot see Oxford,
2 3 4 5 6	that stack, and that stack would be a problem to and a safety concern to pilots. MR. LYNCH: Even though it's marked and lit, it's still a problem? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It would still be a problem, yes, sir. It would	2 3 4 5 6	That was this IFR circle-to-land discussion. The next gen will not make that any different at all. And unfortunately Oxford lies precisely it lies within the New York TRACON area, but New York cannot see Oxford, the planes at Oxford, with their radar. That
2 3 4 5 6 7	that stack, and that stack would be a problem to and a safety concern to pilots. MR. LYNCH: Even though it's marked and lit, it's still a problem? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It would still be a problem, yes, sir. It would be a problem in that it would have to be	2 3 4 5 6 7	That was this IFR circle-to-land discussion. The next gen will not make that any different at all. And unfortunately Oxford lies precisely it lies within the New York TRACON area, but New York cannot see Oxford, the planes at Oxford, with their radar. That will change when this happens. But routinely
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	that stack, and that stack would be a problem to and a safety concern to pilots. MR. LYNCH: Even though it's marked and lit, it's still a problem? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It would still be a problem, yes, sir. It would be a problem in that it would have to be avoided. And if I knew it was there by	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	That was this IFR circle-to-land discussion. The next gen will not make that any different at all. And unfortunately Oxford lies precisely it lies within the New York TRACON area, but New York cannot see Oxford, the planes at Oxford, with their radar. That will change when this happens. But routinely Bradley can see planes at Oxford.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	that stack, and that stack would be a problem to and a safety concern to pilots. MR. LYNCH: Even though it's marked and lit, it's still a problem? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It would still be a problem, yes, sir. It would be a problem in that it would have to be avoided. And if I knew it was there by either the tower telling me or by previous	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	That was this IFR circle-to-land discussion. The next gen will not make that any different at all. And unfortunately Oxford lies precisely it lies within the New York TRACON area, but New York cannot see Oxford, the planes at Oxford, with their radar. That will change when this happens. But routinely Bradley can see planes at Oxford. MR. LYNCH: You say New York.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	that stack, and that stack would be a problem to and a safety concern to pilots. MR. LYNCH: Even though it's marked and lit, it's still a problem? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It would still be a problem, yes, sir. It would be a problem in that it would have to be avoided. And if I knew it was there by either the tower telling me or by previous knowledge, by current knowledge of that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	That was this IFR circle-to-land discussion. The next gen will not make that any different at all. And unfortunately Oxford lies precisely it lies within the New York TRACON area, but New York cannot see Oxford, the planes at Oxford, with their radar. That will change when this happens. But routinely Bradley can see planes at Oxford. MR. LYNCH: You say New York. Is that LaGuardia and Kennedy, or does that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	that stack, and that stack would be a problem to and a safety concern to pilots. MR. LYNCH: Even though it's marked and lit, it's still a problem? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It would still be a problem, yes, sir. It would be a problem in that it would have to be avoided. And if I knew it was there by either the tower telling me or by previous knowledge, by current knowledge of that situation, I would fly around it, and I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	That was this IFR circle-to-land discussion. The next gen will not make that any different at all. And unfortunately Oxford lies precisely it lies within the New York TRACON area, but New York cannot see Oxford, the planes at Oxford, with their radar. That will change when this happens. But routinely Bradley can see planes at Oxford. MR. LYNCH: You say New York. Is that LaGuardia and Kennedy, or does that include Westchester?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	that stack, and that stack would be a problem to and a safety concern to pilots. MR. LYNCH: Even though it's marked and lit, it's still a problem? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It would still be a problem, yes, sir. It would be a problem in that it would have to be avoided. And if I knew it was there by either the tower telling me or by previous knowledge, by current knowledge of that situation, I would fly around it, and I wouldn't have any difficulty flying around	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	That was this IFR circle-to-land discussion. The next gen will not make that any different at all. And unfortunately Oxford lies precisely it lies within the New York TRACON area, but New York cannot see Oxford, the planes at Oxford, with their radar. That will change when this happens. But routinely Bradley can see planes at Oxford. MR. LYNCH: You say New York. Is that LaGuardia and Kennedy, or does that include Westchester? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	that stack, and that stack would be a problem to and a safety concern to pilots. MR. LYNCH: Even though it's marked and lit, it's still a problem? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It would still be a problem, yes, sir. It would be a problem in that it would have to be avoided. And if I knew it was there by either the tower telling me or by previous knowledge, by current knowledge of that situation, I would fly around it, and I wouldn't have any difficulty flying around it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	That was this IFR circle-to-land discussion. The next gen will not make that any different at all. And unfortunately Oxford lies precisely it lies within the New York TRACON area, but New York cannot see Oxford, the planes at Oxford, with their radar. That will change when this happens. But routinely Bradley can see planes at Oxford. MR. LYNCH: You say New York. Is that LaGuardia and Kennedy, or does that include Westchester? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It includes all of greater New York. We are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	that stack, and that stack would be a problem to and a safety concern to pilots. MR. LYNCH: Even though it's marked and lit, it's still a problem? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It would still be a problem, yes, sir. It would be a problem in that it would have to be avoided. And if I knew it was there by either the tower telling me or by previous knowledge, by current knowledge of that situation, I would fly around it, and I wouldn't have any difficulty flying around it. MR. LYNCH: Then why wouldn't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	That was this IFR circle-to-land discussion. The next gen will not make that any different at all. And unfortunately Oxford lies precisely it lies within the New York TRACON area, but New York cannot see Oxford, the planes at Oxford, with their radar. That will change when this happens. But routinely Bradley can see planes at Oxford. MR. LYNCH: You say New York. Is that LaGuardia and Kennedy, or does that include Westchester? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It includes all of greater New York. We are controlled by New York controllers. And
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	that stack, and that stack would be a problem to and a safety concern to pilots. MR. LYNCH: Even though it's marked and lit, it's still a problem? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It would still be a problem, yes, sir. It would be a problem in that it would have to be avoided. And if I knew it was there by either the tower telling me or by previous knowledge, by current knowledge of that situation, I would fly around it, and I wouldn't have any difficulty flying around it. MR. LYNCH: Then why wouldn't the tower inform someone flying into Oxford	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	That was this IFR circle-to-land discussion. The next gen will not make that any different at all. And unfortunately Oxford lies precisely it lies within the New York TRACON area, but New York cannot see Oxford, the planes at Oxford, with their radar. That will change when this happens. But routinely Bradley can see planes at Oxford. MR. LYNCH: You say New York. Is that LaGuardia and Kennedy, or does that include Westchester? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It includes all of greater New York. We are controlled by New York controllers. And consequently, even when we're landing to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	that stack, and that stack would be a problem to and a safety concern to pilots. MR. LYNCH: Even though it's marked and lit, it's still a problem? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It would still be a problem, yes, sir. It would be a problem in that it would have to be avoided. And if I knew it was there by either the tower telling me or by previous knowledge, by current knowledge of that situation, I would fly around it, and I wouldn't have any difficulty flying around it. MR. LYNCH: Then why wouldn't the tower inform someone flying into Oxford to fly around the tower?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	That was this IFR circle-to-land discussion. The next gen will not make that any different at all. And unfortunately Oxford lies precisely it lies within the New York TRACON area, but New York cannot see Oxford, the planes at Oxford, with their radar. That will change when this happens. But routinely Bradley can see planes at Oxford. MR. LYNCH: You say New York. Is that LaGuardia and Kennedy, or does that include Westchester? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It includes all of greater New York. We are controlled by New York controllers. And consequently, even when we're landing to the south, you'd think that we'd fly up to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	that stack, and that stack would be a problem to and a safety concern to pilots. MR. LYNCH: Even though it's marked and lit, it's still a problem? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It would still be a problem, yes, sir. It would be a problem in that it would have to be avoided. And if I knew it was there by either the tower telling me or by previous knowledge, by current knowledge of that situation, I would fly around it, and I wouldn't have any difficulty flying around it. MR. LYNCH: Then why wouldn't the tower inform someone flying into Oxford to fly around the tower? THE WITNESS (Stevens): When	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	That was this IFR circle-to-land discussion. The next gen will not make that any different at all. And unfortunately Oxford lies precisely it lies within the New York TRACON area, but New York cannot see Oxford, the planes at Oxford, with their radar. That will change when this happens. But routinely Bradley can see planes at Oxford. MR. LYNCH: You say New York. Is that LaGuardia and Kennedy, or does that include Westchester? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It includes all of greater New York. We are controlled by New York controllers. And consequently, even when we're landing to the south, you'd think that we'd fly up to Bradley and come down. They don't do that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	that stack, and that stack would be a problem to and a safety concern to pilots. MR. LYNCH: Even though it's marked and lit, it's still a problem? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It would still be a problem, yes, sir. It would be a problem in that it would have to be avoided. And if I knew it was there by either the tower telling me or by previous knowledge, by current knowledge of that situation, I would fly around it, and I wouldn't have any difficulty flying around it. MR. LYNCH: Then why wouldn't the tower inform someone flying into Oxford to fly around the tower? THE WITNESS (Stevens): When the tower is open, they would and they	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	That was this IFR circle-to-land discussion. The next gen will not make that any different at all. And unfortunately Oxford lies precisely it lies within the New York TRACON area, but New York cannot see Oxford, the planes at Oxford, with their radar. That will change when this happens. But routinely Bradley can see planes at Oxford. MR. LYNCH: You say New York. Is that LaGuardia and Kennedy, or does that include Westchester? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It includes all of greater New York. We are controlled by New York controllers. And consequently, even when we're landing to the south, you'd think that we'd fly up to Bradley and come down. They don't do that. They routinely fly down this ILS
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	that stack, and that stack would be a problem to and a safety concern to pilots. MR. LYNCH: Even though it's marked and lit, it's still a problem? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It would still be a problem, yes, sir. It would be a problem in that it would have to be avoided. And if I knew it was there by either the tower telling me or by previous knowledge, by current knowledge of that situation, I would fly around it, and I wouldn't have any difficulty flying around it. MR. LYNCH: Then why wouldn't the tower inform someone flying into Oxford to fly around the tower? THE WITNESS (Stevens): When the tower is open, they would and they should. And what may happen and what the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	That was this IFR circle-to-land discussion. The next gen will not make that any different at all. And unfortunately Oxford lies precisely it lies within the New York TRACON area, but New York cannot see Oxford, the planes at Oxford, with their radar. That will change when this happens. But routinely Bradley can see planes at Oxford. MR. LYNCH: You say New York. Is that LaGuardia and Kennedy, or does that include Westchester? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It includes all of greater New York. We are controlled by New York controllers. And consequently, even when we're landing to the south, you'd think that we'd fly up to Bradley and come down. They don't do that. They routinely fly down this ILS circle-to-land, and so it's going to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	that stack, and that stack would be a problem to and a safety concern to pilots. MR. LYNCH: Even though it's marked and lit, it's still a problem? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It would still be a problem, yes, sir. It would be a problem in that it would have to be avoided. And if I knew it was there by either the tower telling me or by previous knowledge, by current knowledge of that situation, I would fly around it, and I wouldn't have any difficulty flying around it. MR. LYNCH: Then why wouldn't the tower inform someone flying into Oxford to fly around the tower? THE WITNESS (Stevens): When the tower is open, they would and they should. And what may happen and what the Petitioner has suggested could happen is that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	That was this IFR circle-to-land discussion. The next gen will not make that any different at all. And unfortunately Oxford lies precisely it lies within the New York TRACON area, but New York cannot see Oxford, the planes at Oxford, with their radar. That will change when this happens. But routinely Bradley can see planes at Oxford. MR. LYNCH: You say New York. Is that LaGuardia and Kennedy, or does that include Westchester? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It includes all of greater New York. We are controlled by New York controllers. And consequently, even when we're landing to the south, you'd think that we'd fly up to Bradley and come down. They don't do that. They routinely fly down this ILS circle-to-land, and so it's going to be placing a lot of when you have to land to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	that stack, and that stack would be a problem to and a safety concern to pilots. MR. LYNCH: Even though it's marked and lit, it's still a problem? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It would still be a problem, yes, sir. It would be a problem in that it would have to be avoided. And if I knew it was there by either the tower telling me or by previous knowledge, by current knowledge of that situation, I would fly around it, and I wouldn't have any difficulty flying around it. MR. LYNCH: Then why wouldn't the tower inform someone flying into Oxford to fly around the tower? THE WITNESS (Stevens): When the tower is open, they would and they should. And what may happen and what the Petitioner has suggested could happen is that they shut down the east side of the airport	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	That was this IFR circle-to-land discussion. The next gen will not make that any different at all. And unfortunately Oxford lies precisely it lies within the New York TRACON area, but New York cannot see Oxford, the planes at Oxford, with their radar. That will change when this happens. But routinely Bradley can see planes at Oxford. MR. LYNCH: You say New York. Is that LaGuardia and Kennedy, or does that include Westchester? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It includes all of greater New York. We are controlled by New York controllers. And consequently, even when we're landing to the south, you'd think that we'd fly up to Bradley and come down. They don't do that. They routinely fly down this ILS circle-to-land, and so it's going to be placing a lot of when you have to land to the south, we're going to be placing a lot of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	that stack, and that stack would be a problem to and a safety concern to pilots. MR. LYNCH: Even though it's marked and lit, it's still a problem? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It would still be a problem, yes, sir. It would be a problem in that it would have to be avoided. And if I knew it was there by either the tower telling me or by previous knowledge, by current knowledge of that situation, I would fly around it, and I wouldn't have any difficulty flying around it. MR. LYNCH: Then why wouldn't the tower inform someone flying into Oxford to fly around the tower? THE WITNESS (Stevens): When the tower is open, they would and they should. And what may happen and what the Petitioner has suggested could happen is that they shut down the east side of the airport so that no traffic can fly on the east side	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	That was this IFR circle-to-land discussion. The next gen will not make that any different at all. And unfortunately Oxford lies precisely it lies within the New York TRACON area, but New York cannot see Oxford, the planes at Oxford, with their radar. That will change when this happens. But routinely Bradley can see planes at Oxford. MR. LYNCH: You say New York. Is that LaGuardia and Kennedy, or does that include Westchester? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It includes all of greater New York. We are controlled by New York controllers. And consequently, even when we're landing to the south, you'd think that we'd fly up to Bradley and come down. They don't do that. They routinely fly down this ILS circle-to-land, and so it's going to be placing a lot of when you have to land to the south, we're going to be placing a lot of planes at 300 feet over the stack, which is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	that stack, and that stack would be a problem to and a safety concern to pilots. MR. LYNCH: Even though it's marked and lit, it's still a problem? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It would still be a problem, yes, sir. It would be a problem in that it would have to be avoided. And if I knew it was there by either the tower telling me or by previous knowledge, by current knowledge of that situation, I would fly around it, and I wouldn't have any difficulty flying around it. MR. LYNCH: Then why wouldn't the tower inform someone flying into Oxford to fly around the tower? THE WITNESS (Stevens): When the tower is open, they would and they should. And what may happen and what the Petitioner has suggested could happen is that they shut down the east side of the airport so that no traffic can fly on the east side of the airport. I don't know whether that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	That was this IFR circle-to-land discussion. The next gen will not make that any different at all. And unfortunately Oxford lies precisely it lies within the New York TRACON area, but New York cannot see Oxford, the planes at Oxford, with their radar. That will change when this happens. But routinely Bradley can see planes at Oxford. MR. LYNCH: You say New York. Is that LaGuardia and Kennedy, or does that include Westchester? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It includes all of greater New York. We are controlled by New York controllers. And consequently, even when we're landing to the south, you'd think that we'd fly up to Bradley and come down. They don't do that. They routinely fly down this ILS circle-to-land, and so it's going to be placing a lot of when you have to land to the south, we're going to be placing a lot of planes at 300 feet over the stack, which is very low.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that stack, and that stack would be a problem to and a safety concern to pilots. MR. LYNCH: Even though it's marked and lit, it's still a problem? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It would still be a problem, yes, sir. It would be a problem in that it would have to be avoided. And if I knew it was there by either the tower telling me or by previous knowledge, by current knowledge of that situation, I would fly around it, and I wouldn't have any difficulty flying around it. MR. LYNCH: Then why wouldn't the tower inform someone flying into Oxford to fly around the tower? THE WITNESS (Stevens): When the tower is open, they would and they should. And what may happen and what the Petitioner has suggested could happen is that they shut down the east side of the airport so that no traffic can fly on the east side	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	That was this IFR circle-to-land discussion. The next gen will not make that any different at all. And unfortunately Oxford lies precisely it lies within the New York TRACON area, but New York cannot see Oxford, the planes at Oxford, with their radar. That will change when this happens. But routinely Bradley can see planes at Oxford. MR. LYNCH: You say New York. Is that LaGuardia and Kennedy, or does that include Westchester? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It includes all of greater New York. We are controlled by New York controllers. And consequently, even when we're landing to the south, you'd think that we'd fly up to Bradley and come down. They don't do that. They routinely fly down this ILS circle-to-land, and so it's going to be placing a lot of when you have to land to the south, we're going to be placing a lot of planes at 300 feet over the stack, which is

20 (Pages 617 to 620)

	Page 621		Page 623
1	know much about airport procedures or	1	the outcry of the aviation public, you know,
2	anything in the Late-File we got from the	2	the FAA, as we are I believe we all are
3	Applicant on this second set, or whatever,	3	quite aware have produced this MITRE
4	that refers to the FAA, the FAA says that	4	Report with their calculations to calculate
5	their records indicate that the airport has	5	just, you know, the effect of plumes in
6	approximately 47,000, rounded to 48,000, of	6	particular power plants.
7	operations per year. "Operations," does that	7	THE CHAIRMAN: But my
8	mean flights?	8	understanding from, I guess, your questioning
9	THE WITNESS (Stevens):	9	the MITRE Report, though, did not look at the
10	Operations are take off or landing.	10	impact on light sport aircraft.
11	MR. LYNCH: Okay. All right.	11	THE WITNESS (Stevens): No,
12	That's all I wanted to I was just curious.	12	sir, it didn't.
13	I didn't understand what that meant.	13	THE CHAIRMAN: So is that
14	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes,	14	being updated? How is that issue being
15	sir.	15	resolved?
16	MR. LYNCH: Thank you very	16	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Again,
17	much. No more questions, Mr. Chairman.	17	sir, I've worked with the FAA on some very
18	THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I	18	specific things, you know, rewriting the
19	have just a couple.	19	practical test standards for all pilots. I
20	One of the issues for the	20	am not working with the FAA on the plumes. I
21	Council is there is an approved project. It	21	believe what happened was that the FAA
22	was approved in 1999, I believe, and at least	22	contracted with MITRE, and the engineers at
23	on some basis it could go forward.	23	MITRE went out to the sources to find what
24	Obviously, the Applicant is proposing	24	they thought were three representative planes
25	well, what we have before us today. But do	25	to do calculations on, and they chose this
	Page 622		Page 624
1		1	Page 624 1950 model Navion to be representative of the
1 2	Page 622 you have any feeling as to which I was going to say which is better, but maybe it's	1 2	
	you have any feeling as to which I was	2 3	1950 model Navion to be representative of the types of planes that I fly, a Cessna 172, a Cessna 150, or a light sport aircraft. The
2 3 4	you have any feeling as to which I was going to say which is better, but maybe it's which is less bad from your point of view of the two? I know you discussed the issue of	2 3 4	1950 model Navion to be representative of the types of planes that I fly, a Cessna 172, a Cessna 150, or a light sport aircraft. The Navion is a spinoff of the P-51. It was
2 3 4 5	you have any feeling as to which I was going to say which is better, but maybe it's which is less bad from your point of view of the two? I know you discussed the issue of the size of the plume, but there was also, I	2 3 4 5	1950 model Navion to be representative of the types of planes that I fly, a Cessna 172, a Cessna 150, or a light sport aircraft. The Navion is a spinoff of the P-51. It was designed by North American Aviation who built
2 3 4 5 6	you have any feeling as to which I was going to say which is better, but maybe it's which is less bad from your point of view of the two? I know you discussed the issue of the size of the plume, but there was also, I think, an issue of the placement of the	2 3 4 5 6	1950 model Navion to be representative of the types of planes that I fly, a Cessna 172, a Cessna 150, or a light sport aircraft. The Navion is a spinoff of the P-51. It was designed by North American Aviation who built the P-51, and it is about as strong as the
2 3 4 5 6 7	you have any feeling as to which I was going to say which is better, but maybe it's which is less bad from your point of view of the two? I know you discussed the issue of the size of the plume, but there was also, I think, an issue of the placement of the stacks. So, do you have any sense from your	2 3 4 5 6 7	1950 model Navion to be representative of the types of planes that I fly, a Cessna 172, a Cessna 150, or a light sport aircraft. The Navion is a spinoff of the P-51. It was designed by North American Aviation who built the P-51, and it is about as strong as the P-51. So, unfortunately I can understand why
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	you have any feeling as to which I was going to say which is better, but maybe it's which is less bad from your point of view of the two? I know you discussed the issue of the size of the plume, but there was also, I think, an issue of the placement of the stacks. So, do you have any sense from your standpoint?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	1950 model Navion to be representative of the types of planes that I fly, a Cessna 172, a Cessna 150, or a light sport aircraft. The Navion is a spinoff of the P-51. It was designed by North American Aviation who built the P-51, and it is about as strong as the P-51. So, unfortunately I can understand why MITRE chose it, but it isn't representative
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	you have any feeling as to which I was going to say which is better, but maybe it's which is less bad from your point of view of the two? I know you discussed the issue of the size of the plume, but there was also, I think, an issue of the placement of the stacks. So, do you have any sense from your standpoint? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Sir, I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	1950 model Navion to be representative of the types of planes that I fly, a Cessna 172, a Cessna 150, or a light sport aircraft. The Navion is a spinoff of the P-51. It was designed by North American Aviation who built the P-51, and it is about as strong as the P-51. So, unfortunately I can understand why MITRE chose it, but it isn't representative of the types of airplanes that are being
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	you have any feeling as to which I was going to say which is better, but maybe it's which is less bad from your point of view of the two? I know you discussed the issue of the size of the plume, but there was also, I think, an issue of the placement of the stacks. So, do you have any sense from your standpoint? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Sir, I have a sense that, you know, purely from a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	1950 model Navion to be representative of the types of planes that I fly, a Cessna 172, a Cessna 150, or a light sport aircraft. The Navion is a spinoff of the P-51. It was designed by North American Aviation who built the P-51, and it is about as strong as the P-51. So, unfortunately I can understand why MITRE chose it, but it isn't representative of the types of airplanes that are being flown in 2015.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	you have any feeling as to which I was going to say which is better, but maybe it's which is less bad from your point of view of the two? I know you discussed the issue of the size of the plume, but there was also, I think, an issue of the placement of the stacks. So, do you have any sense from your standpoint? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Sir, I have a sense that, you know, purely from a mathematical point of view and plume	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	1950 model Navion to be representative of the types of planes that I fly, a Cessna 172, a Cessna 150, or a light sport aircraft. The Navion is a spinoff of the P-51. It was designed by North American Aviation who built the P-51, and it is about as strong as the P-51. So, unfortunately I can understand why MITRE chose it, but it isn't representative of the types of airplanes that are being flown in 2015. THE CHAIRMAN: I guess back to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	you have any feeling as to which I was going to say which is better, but maybe it's which is less bad from your point of view of the two? I know you discussed the issue of the size of the plume, but there was also, I think, an issue of the placement of the stacks. So, do you have any sense from your standpoint? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Sir, I have a sense that, you know, purely from a mathematical point of view and plume calculations, a smaller plant would be better	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	1950 model Navion to be representative of the types of planes that I fly, a Cessna 172, a Cessna 150, or a light sport aircraft. The Navion is a spinoff of the P-51. It was designed by North American Aviation who built the P-51, and it is about as strong as the P-51. So, unfortunately I can understand why MITRE chose it, but it isn't representative of the types of airplanes that are being flown in 2015. THE CHAIRMAN: I guess back to my question. You say the location of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	you have any feeling as to which I was going to say which is better, but maybe it's which is less bad from your point of view of the two? I know you discussed the issue of the size of the plume, but there was also, I think, an issue of the placement of the stacks. So, do you have any sense from your standpoint? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Sir, I have a sense that, you know, purely from a mathematical point of view and plume calculations, a smaller plant would be better and would reduce the risk to pilots than a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1950 model Navion to be representative of the types of planes that I fly, a Cessna 172, a Cessna 150, or a light sport aircraft. The Navion is a spinoff of the P-51. It was designed by North American Aviation who built the P-51, and it is about as strong as the P-51. So, unfortunately I can understand why MITRE chose it, but it isn't representative of the types of airplanes that are being flown in 2015. THE CHAIRMAN: I guess back to my question. You say the location of the stacks don't I think you said don't bother
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	you have any feeling as to which I was going to say which is better, but maybe it's which is less bad from your point of view of the two? I know you discussed the issue of the size of the plume, but there was also, I think, an issue of the placement of the stacks. So, do you have any sense from your standpoint? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Sir, I have a sense that, you know, purely from a mathematical point of view and plume calculations, a smaller plant would be better and would reduce the risk to pilots than a newer plant that produces a larger plume.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	1950 model Navion to be representative of the types of planes that I fly, a Cessna 172, a Cessna 150, or a light sport aircraft. The Navion is a spinoff of the P-51. It was designed by North American Aviation who built the P-51, and it is about as strong as the P-51. So, unfortunately I can understand why MITRE chose it, but it isn't representative of the types of airplanes that are being flown in 2015. THE CHAIRMAN: I guess back to my question. You say the location of the stacks don't I think you said don't bother you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	you have any feeling as to which I was going to say which is better, but maybe it's which is less bad from your point of view of the two? I know you discussed the issue of the size of the plume, but there was also, I think, an issue of the placement of the stacks. So, do you have any sense from your standpoint? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Sir, I have a sense that, you know, purely from a mathematical point of view and plume calculations, a smaller plant would be better and would reduce the risk to pilots than a newer plant that produces a larger plume. And I have to say that I, as a pilot, am not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	1950 model Navion to be representative of the types of planes that I fly, a Cessna 172, a Cessna 150, or a light sport aircraft. The Navion is a spinoff of the P-51. It was designed by North American Aviation who built the P-51, and it is about as strong as the P-51. So, unfortunately I can understand why MITRE chose it, but it isn't representative of the types of airplanes that are being flown in 2015. THE CHAIRMAN: I guess back to my question. You say the location of the stacks don't I think you said don't bother you. THE WITNESS (Stevens): The
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	you have any feeling as to which I was going to say which is better, but maybe it's which is less bad from your point of view of the two? I know you discussed the issue of the size of the plume, but there was also, I think, an issue of the placement of the stacks. So, do you have any sense from your standpoint? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Sir, I have a sense that, you know, purely from a mathematical point of view and plume calculations, a smaller plant would be better and would reduce the risk to pilots than a newer plant that produces a larger plume. And I have to say that I, as a pilot, am not at all concerned about the smoke stacks, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	1950 model Navion to be representative of the types of planes that I fly, a Cessna 172, a Cessna 150, or a light sport aircraft. The Navion is a spinoff of the P-51. It was designed by North American Aviation who built the P-51, and it is about as strong as the P-51. So, unfortunately I can understand why MITRE chose it, but it isn't representative of the types of airplanes that are being flown in 2015. THE CHAIRMAN: I guess back to my question. You say the location of the stacks don't I think you said don't bother you. THE WITNESS (Stevens): The height.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	you have any feeling as to which I was going to say which is better, but maybe it's which is less bad from your point of view of the two? I know you discussed the issue of the size of the plume, but there was also, I think, an issue of the placement of the stacks. So, do you have any sense from your standpoint? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Sir, I have a sense that, you know, purely from a mathematical point of view and plume calculations, a smaller plant would be better and would reduce the risk to pilots than a newer plant that produces a larger plume. And I have to say that I, as a pilot, am not at all concerned about the smoke stacks, the physical smoke stacks. Those are easy to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	1950 model Navion to be representative of the types of planes that I fly, a Cessna 172, a Cessna 150, or a light sport aircraft. The Navion is a spinoff of the P-51. It was designed by North American Aviation who built the P-51, and it is about as strong as the P-51. So, unfortunately I can understand why MITRE chose it, but it isn't representative of the types of airplanes that are being flown in 2015. THE CHAIRMAN: I guess back to my question. You say the location of the stacks don't I think you said don't bother you. THE WITNESS (Stevens): The height. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	you have any feeling as to which I was going to say which is better, but maybe it's which is less bad from your point of view of the two? I know you discussed the issue of the size of the plume, but there was also, I think, an issue of the placement of the stacks. So, do you have any sense from your standpoint? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Sir, I have a sense that, you know, purely from a mathematical point of view and plume calculations, a smaller plant would be better and would reduce the risk to pilots than a newer plant that produces a larger plume. And I have to say that I, as a pilot, am not at all concerned about the smoke stacks, the physical smoke stacks. Those are easy to avoid. It's the plume, both the invisible	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	1950 model Navion to be representative of the types of planes that I fly, a Cessna 172, a Cessna 150, or a light sport aircraft. The Navion is a spinoff of the P-51. It was designed by North American Aviation who built the P-51, and it is about as strong as the P-51. So, unfortunately I can understand why MITRE chose it, but it isn't representative of the types of airplanes that are being flown in 2015. THE CHAIRMAN: I guess back to my question. You say the location of the stacks don't I think you said don't bother you. THE WITNESS (Stevens): The height. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, the height. But the fact that this application
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	you have any feeling as to which I was going to say which is better, but maybe it's which is less bad from your point of view of the two? I know you discussed the issue of the size of the plume, but there was also, I think, an issue of the placement of the stacks. So, do you have any sense from your standpoint? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Sir, I have a sense that, you know, purely from a mathematical point of view and plume calculations, a smaller plant would be better and would reduce the risk to pilots than a newer plant that produces a larger plume. And I have to say that I, as a pilot, am not at all concerned about the smoke stacks, the physical smoke stacks. Those are easy to avoid. It's the plume, both the invisible and the visible plumes that I as a pilot, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	1950 model Navion to be representative of the types of planes that I fly, a Cessna 172, a Cessna 150, or a light sport aircraft. The Navion is a spinoff of the P-51. It was designed by North American Aviation who built the P-51, and it is about as strong as the P-51. So, unfortunately I can understand why MITRE chose it, but it isn't representative of the types of airplanes that are being flown in 2015. THE CHAIRMAN: I guess back to my question. You say the location of the stacks don't I think you said don't bother you. THE WITNESS (Stevens): The height. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, the height. But the fact that this application has moved the stacks and, therefore, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	you have any feeling as to which I was going to say which is better, but maybe it's which is less bad from your point of view of the two? I know you discussed the issue of the size of the plume, but there was also, I think, an issue of the placement of the stacks. So, do you have any sense from your standpoint? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Sir, I have a sense that, you know, purely from a mathematical point of view and plume calculations, a smaller plant would be better and would reduce the risk to pilots than a newer plant that produces a larger plume. And I have to say that I, as a pilot, am not at all concerned about the smoke stacks, the physical smoke stacks. Those are easy to avoid. It's the plume, both the invisible and the visible plumes that I as a pilot, and more importantly as a flight instructor, am	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	1950 model Navion to be representative of the types of planes that I fly, a Cessna 172, a Cessna 150, or a light sport aircraft. The Navion is a spinoff of the P-51. It was designed by North American Aviation who built the P-51, and it is about as strong as the P-51. So, unfortunately I can understand why MITRE chose it, but it isn't representative of the types of airplanes that are being flown in 2015. THE CHAIRMAN: I guess back to my question. You say the location of the stacks don't I think you said don't bother you. THE WITNESS (Stevens): The height. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, the height. But the fact that this application has moved the stacks and, therefore, the plume presumably is moved, what impact does
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	you have any feeling as to which I was going to say which is better, but maybe it's which is less bad from your point of view of the two? I know you discussed the issue of the size of the plume, but there was also, I think, an issue of the placement of the stacks. So, do you have any sense from your standpoint? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Sir, I have a sense that, you know, purely from a mathematical point of view and plume calculations, a smaller plant would be better and would reduce the risk to pilots than a newer plant that produces a larger plume. And I have to say that I, as a pilot, am not at all concerned about the smoke stacks, the physical smoke stacks. Those are easy to avoid. It's the plume, both the invisible and the visible plumes that I as a pilot, and more importantly as a flight instructor, am concerned about.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	1950 model Navion to be representative of the types of planes that I fly, a Cessna 172, a Cessna 150, or a light sport aircraft. The Navion is a spinoff of the P-51. It was designed by North American Aviation who built the P-51, and it is about as strong as the P-51. So, unfortunately I can understand why MITRE chose it, but it isn't representative of the types of airplanes that are being flown in 2015. THE CHAIRMAN: I guess back to my question. You say the location of the stacks don't I think you said don't bother you. THE WITNESS (Stevens): The height. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, the height. But the fact that this application has moved the stacks and, therefore, the plume presumably is moved, what impact does that have?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	you have any feeling as to which I was going to say which is better, but maybe it's which is less bad from your point of view of the two? I know you discussed the issue of the size of the plume, but there was also, I think, an issue of the placement of the stacks. So, do you have any sense from your standpoint? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Sir, I have a sense that, you know, purely from a mathematical point of view and plume calculations, a smaller plant would be better and would reduce the risk to pilots than a newer plant that produces a larger plume. And I have to say that I, as a pilot, am not at all concerned about the smoke stacks, the physical smoke stacks. Those are easy to avoid. It's the plume, both the invisible and the visible plumes that I as a pilot, and more importantly as a flight instructor, am concerned about. And back in 1999 the FAA did	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	1950 model Navion to be representative of the types of planes that I fly, a Cessna 172, a Cessna 150, or a light sport aircraft. The Navion is a spinoff of the P-51. It was designed by North American Aviation who built the P-51, and it is about as strong as the P-51. So, unfortunately I can understand why MITRE chose it, but it isn't representative of the types of airplanes that are being flown in 2015. THE CHAIRMAN: I guess back to my question. You say the location of the stacks don't I think you said don't bother you. THE WITNESS (Stevens): The height. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, the height. But the fact that this application has moved the stacks and, therefore, the plume presumably is moved, what impact does
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	you have any feeling as to which I was going to say which is better, but maybe it's which is less bad from your point of view of the two? I know you discussed the issue of the size of the plume, but there was also, I think, an issue of the placement of the stacks. So, do you have any sense from your standpoint? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Sir, I have a sense that, you know, purely from a mathematical point of view and plume calculations, a smaller plant would be better and would reduce the risk to pilots than a newer plant that produces a larger plume. And I have to say that I, as a pilot, am not at all concerned about the smoke stacks, the physical smoke stacks. Those are easy to avoid. It's the plume, both the invisible and the visible plumes that I as a pilot, and more importantly as a flight instructor, am concerned about.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	1950 model Navion to be representative of the types of planes that I fly, a Cessna 172, a Cessna 150, or a light sport aircraft. The Navion is a spinoff of the P-51. It was designed by North American Aviation who built the P-51, and it is about as strong as the P-51. So, unfortunately I can understand why MITRE chose it, but it isn't representative of the types of airplanes that are being flown in 2015. THE CHAIRMAN: I guess back to my question. You say the location of the stacks don't I think you said don't bother you. THE WITNESS (Stevens): The height. But the fact that this application has moved the stacks and, therefore, the plume presumably is moved, what impact does that have? THE WITNESS (Stevens): For a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	you have any feeling as to which I was going to say which is better, but maybe it's which is less bad from your point of view of the two? I know you discussed the issue of the size of the plume, but there was also, I think, an issue of the placement of the stacks. So, do you have any sense from your standpoint? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Sir, I have a sense that, you know, purely from a mathematical point of view and plume calculations, a smaller plant would be better and would reduce the risk to pilots than a newer plant that produces a larger plume. And I have to say that I, as a pilot, am not at all concerned about the smoke stacks, the physical smoke stacks. Those are easy to avoid. It's the plume, both the invisible and the visible plumes that I as a pilot, and more importantly as a flight instructor, am concerned about. And back in 1999 the FAA did approve the smaller plant, but that was prior	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	1950 model Navion to be representative of the types of planes that I fly, a Cessna 172, a Cessna 150, or a light sport aircraft. The Navion is a spinoff of the P-51. It was designed by North American Aviation who built the P-51, and it is about as strong as the P-51. So, unfortunately I can understand why MITRE chose it, but it isn't representative of the types of airplanes that are being flown in 2015. THE CHAIRMAN: I guess back to my question. You say the location of the stacks don't I think you said don't bother you. THE WITNESS (Stevens): The height. But the fact that this application has moved the stacks and, therefore, the plume presumably is moved, what impact does that have? THE WITNESS (Stevens): For a pilot infinitesimal. The movement of the

afd92593-5a55-4bf8-b43f-ab5ed436198d

	Page 625		Page 627
1	feet. I'm not sure, but I believe that's it.	1	THE WITNESS (Stevens): I
2	It's totally insignificant. I was the person	2	believe that the FAA, they, like any other
3	who was actually flying the plane over the	3	large bureaucracy, you know, have a
4	project during your walk in January, and, you	4	particular range of safety, and they say
5	know, I flew at three different levels. I	5	and I was attempting to discuss this or ask
6	flew at the standard 1,700 foot traffic	6	these questions before. Unfortunately the
7	pattern, and I flew at the 300 foot traffic	7	Applicant, you know, wasn't aware of how the
8	pattern, and I flew between a half a mile and	8	FAA determines what is safe and what isn't
9	three-quarters of a mile. That's what I	9	safe, what is acceptable risk and what is
10	teach my students to fly.	10	unacceptable risk. And I think what they're
11	The FAA does say between a	11	really trying to say there is that these
12	half a mile and a mile. I'm inclined to	12	heights that they're suggesting are
13	favor closer because the highest time of risk	13	unacceptable risks, and to mitigate the
14	in an airplane is when you're closest to the	14	Applicant will have to mitigate those risks,
15	ground, when you're taking off and when	15	those unacceptable risks.
16	you're landing. And when you're taking off	16	THE CHAIRMAN: We're going to
17	and when you're landing, you want to be	17	break at one for lunch, but since there's
18	prepared. If you're going to be taking off	18	still a few minutes left, we'll now continue
19	or landing at an airport, you want to be	19	cross-examination by the Applicant, and then
20	prepared to land at that airport. So it's	20	at one o'clock we'll break and resume after.
21	critical to stay within that, in my opinion,	21	MR. SMALL: Let me start, Mr.
22	within that half mile to three-quarters of a	22	Stevens, with your discussion of the visible
23	mile.	23	and not visible plume. And you have concerns
24	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I don't	24	that would you restate again your concern
25	know if you're the best one to ask, and the	25	when there's a visible plume?
	Page 626		Page 628
1	Page 626	1	Page 628
1	Applicant may have previously answered this	1	THE WITNESS (Stevens): My
2	Applicant may have previously answered this question, but in their responses and I	2	THE WITNESS (Stevens): My concern, when there's a visible plume, is
2 3	Applicant may have previously answered this question, but in their responses and I have it 2B as a Siting Council Late-Filed	2 3	THE WITNESS (Stevens): My concern, when there's a visible plume, is that the pilot will have difficulty
2 3 4	Applicant may have previously answered this question, but in their responses and I have it 2B as a Siting Council Late-Filed exhibit, they have and I didn't bring it	2 3 4	THE WITNESS (Stevens): My concern, when there's a visible plume, is that the pilot will have difficulty maintaining the required 2,000 foot avoidance
2 3 4 5	Applicant may have previously answered this question, but in their responses and I have it 2B as a Siting Council Late-Filed exhibit, they have and I didn't bring it because I didn't want to give my chiropractor	2 3 4 5	THE WITNESS (Stevens): My concern, when there's a visible plume, is that the pilot will have difficulty maintaining the required 2,000 foot avoidance of that plume while still remaining in a safe
2 3 4 5 6	Applicant may have previously answered this question, but in their responses and I have it 2B as a Siting Council Late-Filed exhibit, they have and I didn't bring it because I didn't want to give my chiropractor anymore business than he already gets from	2 3 4 5 6	THE WITNESS (Stevens): My concern, when there's a visible plume, is that the pilot will have difficulty maintaining the required 2,000 foot avoidance of that plume while still remaining in a safe condition in the traffic pattern,
2 3 4 5 6 7	Applicant may have previously answered this question, but in their responses and I have it 2B as a Siting Council Late-Filed exhibit, they have and I didn't bring it because I didn't want to give my chiropractor anymore business than he already gets from carrying all this stuff. There were a whole	2 3 4 5 6 7	THE WITNESS (Stevens): My concern, when there's a visible plume, is that the pilot will have difficulty maintaining the required 2,000 foot avoidance of that plume while still remaining in a safe condition in the traffic pattern, particularly while on downwind. While
2 3 4 5 6	Applicant may have previously answered this question, but in their responses and I have it 2B as a Siting Council Late-Filed exhibit, they have and I didn't bring it because I didn't want to give my chiropractor anymore business than he already gets from carrying all this stuff. There were a whole list of, I guess, FAA notice of presumed	2 3 4 5 6	THE WITNESS (Stevens): My concern, when there's a visible plume, is that the pilot will have difficulty maintaining the required 2,000 foot avoidance of that plume while still remaining in a safe condition in the traffic pattern, particularly while on downwind. While there's a visible plume, they realize that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Applicant may have previously answered this question, but in their responses and I have it 2B as a Siting Council Late-Filed exhibit, they have and I didn't bring it because I didn't want to give my chiropractor anymore business than he already gets from carrying all this stuff. There were a whole list of, I guess, FAA notice of presumed hazard. You're aware of that?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE WITNESS (Stevens): My concern, when there's a visible plume, is that the pilot will have difficulty maintaining the required 2,000 foot avoidance of that plume while still remaining in a safe condition in the traffic pattern, particularly while on downwind. While there's a visible plume, they realize that they have to comply with Section 7-15-5 of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Applicant may have previously answered this question, but in their responses and I have it 2B as a Siting Council Late-Filed exhibit, they have and I didn't bring it because I didn't want to give my chiropractor anymore business than he already gets from carrying all this stuff. There were a whole list of, I guess, FAA notice of presumed hazard. You're aware of that? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	THE WITNESS (Stevens): My concern, when there's a visible plume, is that the pilot will have difficulty maintaining the required 2,000 foot avoidance of that plume while still remaining in a safe condition in the traffic pattern, particularly while on downwind. While there's a visible plume, they realize that they have to comply with Section 7-15-5 of the AIM which requires them to fly upwind of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Applicant may have previously answered this question, but in their responses and I have it 2B as a Siting Council Late-Filed exhibit, they have and I didn't bring it because I didn't want to give my chiropractor anymore business than he already gets from carrying all this stuff. There were a whole list of, I guess, FAA notice of presumed hazard. You're aware of that? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: There's one	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE WITNESS (Stevens): My concern, when there's a visible plume, is that the pilot will have difficulty maintaining the required 2,000 foot avoidance of that plume while still remaining in a safe condition in the traffic pattern, particularly while on downwind. While there's a visible plume, they realize that they have to comply with Section 7-15-5 of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Applicant may have previously answered this question, but in their responses and I have it 2B as a Siting Council Late-Filed exhibit, they have and I didn't bring it because I didn't want to give my chiropractor anymore business than he already gets from carrying all this stuff. There were a whole list of, I guess, FAA notice of presumed hazard. You're aware of that? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: There's one sentence that I just don't quite understand.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	THE WITNESS (Stevens): My concern, when there's a visible plume, is that the pilot will have difficulty maintaining the required 2,000 foot avoidance of that plume while still remaining in a safe condition in the traffic pattern, particularly while on downwind. While there's a visible plume, they realize that they have to comply with Section 7-15-5 of the AIM which requires them to fly upwind of any power plant. So, since this power plant is 0.59 nautical miles east of the airport,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Applicant may have previously answered this question, but in their responses and I have it 2B as a Siting Council Late-Filed exhibit, they have and I didn't bring it because I didn't want to give my chiropractor anymore business than he already gets from carrying all this stuff. There were a whole list of, I guess, FAA notice of presumed hazard. You're aware of that? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: There's one	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	THE WITNESS (Stevens): My concern, when there's a visible plume, is that the pilot will have difficulty maintaining the required 2,000 foot avoidance of that plume while still remaining in a safe condition in the traffic pattern, particularly while on downwind. While there's a visible plume, they realize that they have to comply with Section 7-15-5 of the AIM which requires them to fly upwind of any power plant. So, since this power plant
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Applicant may have previously answered this question, but in their responses and I have it 2B as a Siting Council Late-Filed exhibit, they have and I didn't bring it because I didn't want to give my chiropractor anymore business than he already gets from carrying all this stuff. There were a whole list of, I guess, FAA notice of presumed hazard. You're aware of that? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: There's one sentence that I just don't quite understand. I'll read it to you, and if you can and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE WITNESS (Stevens): My concern, when there's a visible plume, is that the pilot will have difficulty maintaining the required 2,000 foot avoidance of that plume while still remaining in a safe condition in the traffic pattern, particularly while on downwind. While there's a visible plume, they realize that they have to comply with Section 7-15-5 of the AIM which requires them to fly upwind of any power plant. So, since this power plant is 0.59 nautical miles east of the airport, they're going to have to fly closer to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Applicant may have previously answered this question, but in their responses and I have it 2B as a Siting Council Late-Filed exhibit, they have and I didn't bring it because I didn't want to give my chiropractor anymore business than he already gets from carrying all this stuff. There were a whole list of, I guess, FAA notice of presumed hazard. You're aware of that? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: There's one sentence that I just don't quite understand. I'll read it to you, and if you can and they have it on the various elements, but I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	THE WITNESS (Stevens): My concern, when there's a visible plume, is that the pilot will have difficulty maintaining the required 2,000 foot avoidance of that plume while still remaining in a safe condition in the traffic pattern, particularly while on downwind. While there's a visible plume, they realize that they have to comply with Section 7-15-5 of the AIM which requires them to fly upwind of any power plant. So, since this power plant is 0.59 nautical miles east of the airport, they're going to have to fly closer to the airport than the power plant because the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Applicant may have previously answered this question, but in their responses and I have it 2B as a Siting Council Late-Filed exhibit, they have and I didn't bring it because I didn't want to give my chiropractor anymore business than he already gets from carrying all this stuff. There were a whole list of, I guess, FAA notice of presumed hazard. You're aware of that? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: There's one sentence that I just don't quite understand. I'll read it to you, and if you can and they have it on the various elements, but I think it's a standard sentence: "Therefore,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	THE WITNESS (Stevens): My concern, when there's a visible plume, is that the pilot will have difficulty maintaining the required 2,000 foot avoidance of that plume while still remaining in a safe condition in the traffic pattern, particularly while on downwind. While there's a visible plume, they realize that they have to comply with Section 7-15-5 of the AIM which requires them to fly upwind of any power plant. So, since this power plant is 0.59 nautical miles east of the airport, they're going to have to fly closer to the airport than the power plant because the prevailing winds at Oxford are from the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Applicant may have previously answered this question, but in their responses and I have it 2B as a Siting Council Late-Filed exhibit, they have and I didn't bring it because I didn't want to give my chiropractor anymore business than he already gets from carrying all this stuff. There were a whole list of, I guess, FAA notice of presumed hazard. You're aware of that? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: There's one sentence that I just don't quite understand. I'll read it to you, and if you can and they have it on the various elements, but I think it's a standard sentence: "Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that an average	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE WITNESS (Stevens): My concern, when there's a visible plume, is that the pilot will have difficulty maintaining the required 2,000 foot avoidance of that plume while still remaining in a safe condition in the traffic pattern, particularly while on downwind. While there's a visible plume, they realize that they have to comply with Section 7-15-5 of the AIM which requires them to fly upwind of any power plant. So, since this power plant is 0.59 nautical miles east of the airport, they're going to have to fly closer to the airport than the power plant because the prevailing winds at Oxford are from the northwest, as your wind rows showed, I believe. MR. SMALL: And are you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Applicant may have previously answered this question, but in their responses and I have it 2B as a Siting Council Late-Filed exhibit, they have and I didn't bring it because I didn't want to give my chiropractor anymore business than he already gets from carrying all this stuff. There were a whole list of, I guess, FAA notice of presumed hazard. You're aware of that? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: There's one sentence that I just don't quite understand. I'll read it to you, and if you can and they have it on the various elements, but I think it's a standard sentence: "Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that an average of at least one VFR operation per day would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	THE WITNESS (Stevens): My concern, when there's a visible plume, is that the pilot will have difficulty maintaining the required 2,000 foot avoidance of that plume while still remaining in a safe condition in the traffic pattern, particularly while on downwind. While there's a visible plume, they realize that they have to comply with Section 7-15-5 of the AIM which requires them to fly upwind of any power plant. So, since this power plant is 0.59 nautical miles east of the airport, they're going to have to fly closer to the airport than the power plant because the prevailing winds at Oxford are from the northwest, as your wind rows showed, I believe. MR. SMALL: And are you familiar with the Algonquin compressor
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Applicant may have previously answered this question, but in their responses and I have it 2B as a Siting Council Late-Filed exhibit, they have and I didn't bring it because I didn't want to give my chiropractor anymore business than he already gets from carrying all this stuff. There were a whole list of, I guess, FAA notice of presumed hazard. You're aware of that? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: There's one sentence that I just don't quite understand. I'll read it to you, and if you can and they have it on the various elements, but I think it's a standard sentence: "Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that an average of at least one VFR operation per day would be affected, and this would constitute substantial adverse effect unless the heights are reduced."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE WITNESS (Stevens): My concern, when there's a visible plume, is that the pilot will have difficulty maintaining the required 2,000 foot avoidance of that plume while still remaining in a safe condition in the traffic pattern, particularly while on downwind. While there's a visible plume, they realize that they have to comply with Section 7-15-5 of the AIM which requires them to fly upwind of any power plant. So, since this power plant is 0.59 nautical miles east of the airport, they're going to have to fly closer to the airport than the power plant because the prevailing winds at Oxford are from the northwest, as your wind rows showed, I believe. MR. SMALL: And are you familiar with the Algonquin compressor station that's very close to this site?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Applicant may have previously answered this question, but in their responses and I have it 2B as a Siting Council Late-Filed exhibit, they have and I didn't bring it because I didn't want to give my chiropractor anymore business than he already gets from carrying all this stuff. There were a whole list of, I guess, FAA notice of presumed hazard. You're aware of that? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: There's one sentence that I just don't quite understand. I'll read it to you, and if you can and they have it on the various elements, but I think it's a standard sentence: "Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that an average of at least one VFR operation per day would be affected, and this would constitute substantial adverse effect unless the heights are reduced."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE WITNESS (Stevens): My concern, when there's a visible plume, is that the pilot will have difficulty maintaining the required 2,000 foot avoidance of that plume while still remaining in a safe condition in the traffic pattern, particularly while on downwind. While there's a visible plume, they realize that they have to comply with Section 7-15-5 of the AIM which requires them to fly upwind of any power plant. So, since this power plant is 0.59 nautical miles east of the airport, they're going to have to fly closer to the airport than the power plant because the prevailing winds at Oxford are from the northwest, as your wind rows showed, I believe. MR. SMALL: And are you familiar with the Algonquin compressor station that's very close to this site? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Very
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Applicant may have previously answered this question, but in their responses and I have it 2B as a Siting Council Late-Filed exhibit, they have and I didn't bring it because I didn't want to give my chiropractor anymore business than he already gets from carrying all this stuff. There were a whole list of, I guess, FAA notice of presumed hazard. You're aware of that? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: There's one sentence that I just don't quite understand. I'll read it to you, and if you can and they have it on the various elements, but I think it's a standard sentence: "Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that an average of at least one VFR operation per day would be affected, and this would constitute substantial adverse effect unless the heights are reduced." From your point of view, what is "one VFR operation per day will be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE WITNESS (Stevens): My concern, when there's a visible plume, is that the pilot will have difficulty maintaining the required 2,000 foot avoidance of that plume while still remaining in a safe condition in the traffic pattern, particularly while on downwind. While there's a visible plume, they realize that they have to comply with Section 7-15-5 of the AIM which requires them to fly upwind of any power plant. So, since this power plant is 0.59 nautical miles east of the airport, they're going to have to fly closer to the airport than the power plant because the prevailing winds at Oxford are from the northwest, as your wind rows showed, I believe. MR. SMALL: And are you familiar with the Algonquin compressor station that's very close to this site?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Applicant may have previously answered this question, but in their responses and I have it 2B as a Siting Council Late-Filed exhibit, they have and I didn't bring it because I didn't want to give my chiropractor anymore business than he already gets from carrying all this stuff. There were a whole list of, I guess, FAA notice of presumed hazard. You're aware of that? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: There's one sentence that I just don't quite understand. I'll read it to you, and if you can and they have it on the various elements, but I think it's a standard sentence: "Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that an average of at least one VFR operation per day would be affected, and this would constitute substantial adverse effect unless the heights are reduced." From your point of view, what is "one VFR operation per day will be affected"? I'm trying to figure out what the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE WITNESS (Stevens): My concern, when there's a visible plume, is that the pilot will have difficulty maintaining the required 2,000 foot avoidance of that plume while still remaining in a safe condition in the traffic pattern, particularly while on downwind. While there's a visible plume, they realize that they have to comply with Section 7-15-5 of the AIM which requires them to fly upwind of any power plant. So, since this power plant is 0.59 nautical miles east of the airport, they're going to have to fly closer to the airport than the power plant because the prevailing winds at Oxford are from the northwest, as your wind rows showed, I believe. MR. SMALL: And are you familiar with the Algonquin compressor station that's very close to this site? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Very close to your site? MR. SMALL: Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Applicant may have previously answered this question, but in their responses and I have it 2B as a Siting Council Late-Filed exhibit, they have and I didn't bring it because I didn't want to give my chiropractor anymore business than he already gets from carrying all this stuff. There were a whole list of, I guess, FAA notice of presumed hazard. You're aware of that? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: There's one sentence that I just don't quite understand. I'll read it to you, and if you can and they have it on the various elements, but I think it's a standard sentence: "Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that an average of at least one VFR operation per day would be affected, and this would constitute substantial adverse effect unless the heights are reduced." From your point of view, what is "one VFR operation per day will be affected"? I'm trying to figure out what the heck what that means. And if you don't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	THE WITNESS (Stevens): My concern, when there's a visible plume, is that the pilot will have difficulty maintaining the required 2,000 foot avoidance of that plume while still remaining in a safe condition in the traffic pattern, particularly while on downwind. While there's a visible plume, they realize that they have to comply with Section 7-15-5 of the AIM which requires them to fly upwind of any power plant. So, since this power plant is 0.59 nautical miles east of the airport, they're going to have to fly closer to the airport than the power plant because the prevailing winds at Oxford are from the northwest, as your wind rows showed, I believe. MR. SMALL: And are you familiar with the Algonquin compressor station that's very close to this site? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Very close to your site? MR. SMALL: Yes. THE WITNESS (Stevens): I'm
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Applicant may have previously answered this question, but in their responses and I have it 2B as a Siting Council Late-Filed exhibit, they have and I didn't bring it because I didn't want to give my chiropractor anymore business than he already gets from carrying all this stuff. There were a whole list of, I guess, FAA notice of presumed hazard. You're aware of that? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. THE CHAIRMAN: There's one sentence that I just don't quite understand. I'll read it to you, and if you can and they have it on the various elements, but I think it's a standard sentence: "Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that an average of at least one VFR operation per day would be affected, and this would constitute substantial adverse effect unless the heights are reduced." From your point of view, what is "one VFR operation per day will be affected"? I'm trying to figure out what the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE WITNESS (Stevens): My concern, when there's a visible plume, is that the pilot will have difficulty maintaining the required 2,000 foot avoidance of that plume while still remaining in a safe condition in the traffic pattern, particularly while on downwind. While there's a visible plume, they realize that they have to comply with Section 7-15-5 of the AIM which requires them to fly upwind of any power plant. So, since this power plant is 0.59 nautical miles east of the airport, they're going to have to fly closer to the airport than the power plant because the prevailing winds at Oxford are from the northwest, as your wind rows showed, I believe. MR. SMALL: And are you familiar with the Algonquin compressor station that's very close to this site? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Very close to your site? MR. SMALL: Yes.

22 (Pages 625 to 628)

	Page 629		Page 631
1	MR. SMALL: And is that a	1	NOTAM.
2	critical infrastructure facility?	2	MR. SMALL: But the power
3	THE WITNESS (Stevens): I have	3	plant would. Correct?
4	no idea.	4	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, I
5	MR. SMALL: If it were a	5	believe it would.
6	critical infrastructure facility, would the	6	MR. SMALL: And what would the
7	various guidelines and requirements of the	7	implications of that be under that NOTAM?
8	FAA and these other institutions you	8	THE WITNESS (Stevens): That
9	mentioned require that the air space over	9	you would have to avoid that airspace.
10	that compressor station be avoided?	10	MR. SMALL: And what diameter
11	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Is it	11	around there, what area around that airspace
12	producing a plume?	12	would you have to avoid?
13	MR. SMALL: Is this a	13	THE WITNESS (Stevens): You
14	THE WITNESS (Stevens): If	14	would probably want to avoid it by at least a
15	it's producing a plume, yes, it would have to	15	mile.
16	be avoided. If it isn't producing a plume,	16	MR. SMALL: And so, given that
17	it would not necessarily have to be avoided.	17	NOTAM, am I correct that if pilots comply
18	MR. SMALL: But I thought you	18	with that, they would be avoiding the
19	spoke at one point that critical	19	airspace over the Towantic Power Plant?
20	infrastructure facilities need to be avoided	20	THE WITNESS (Stevens): The
21	as well; is that correct?	21	power plant, yes. If they complied with that
22	THE WITNESS (Stevens): I	22	NOTAM, they would have to fly there are
23	never brought that term up.	23	actually two there's a NOTAM and
24	MR. SMALL: Under the Homeland	24	there's there are two requirements.
25	Security under Homeland Security	25	There's that NOTAM, and then there's the AIM,
	5 (20		
	Page 630		Page 632
1	requirements?	1	
1 2	-	1 2	Page 632 which we discussed before. They would have to fly upwind or down upwind meaning
	requirements?	2 3	which we discussed before. They would have
2	requirements? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I	2 3 4	which we discussed before. They would have to fly upwind or down upwind meaning
2 3 4 5	requirements? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I brought up an FDC NOTAM. And is that what you're requiring? MR. SMALL: Yes, please.	2 3 4 5	which we discussed before. They would have to fly upwind or down upwind meaning between if the plumes were going southeast where they normally go, they'd have to fly northwest of that power plant.
2 3 4 5 6	requirements? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I brought up an FDC NOTAM. And is that what you're requiring? MR. SMALL: Yes, please. THE WITNESS (Stevens): It	2 3 4 5 6	which we discussed before. They would have to fly upwind or down upwind meaning between if the plumes were going southeast where they normally go, they'd have to fly northwest of that power plant. MR SMALL: Okay. And so a
2 3 4 5 6 7	requirements? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I brought up an FDC NOTAM. And is that what you're requiring? MR. SMALL: Yes, please. THE WITNESS (Stevens): It says this is a restatement of a	2 3 4 5 6 7	which we discussed before. They would have to fly upwind or down upwind meaning between if the plumes were going southeast where they normally go, they'd have to fly northwest of that power plant. MR SMALL: Okay. And so a pilot would not be allowed or certainly be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	requirements? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I brought up an FDC NOTAM. And is that what you're requiring? MR. SMALL: Yes, please. THE WITNESS (Stevens): It says this is a restatement of a previously-issued advisory notice in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	which we discussed before. They would have to fly upwind or down upwind meaning between if the plumes were going southeast where they normally go, they'd have to fly northwest of that power plant. MR SMALL: Okay. And so a pilot would not be allowed or certainly be advised not to fly over the stacks the way
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	requirements? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I brought up an FDC NOTAM. And is that what you're requiring? MR. SMALL: Yes, please. THE WITNESS (Stevens): It says this is a restatement of a previously-issued advisory notice in the interest of National Security, and to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	which we discussed before. They would have to fly upwind or down upwind meaning between if the plumes were going southeast where they normally go, they'd have to fly northwest of that power plant. MR SMALL: Okay. And so a pilot would not be allowed or certainly be advised not to fly over the stacks the way you flew over the balloons on the site visit
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	requirements? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I brought up an FDC NOTAM. And is that what you're requiring? MR. SMALL: Yes, please. THE WITNESS (Stevens): It says this is a restatement of a previously-issued advisory notice in the interest of National Security, and to the extent practicable, pilots are strongly	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	which we discussed before. They would have to fly upwind or down upwind meaning between if the plumes were going southeast where they normally go, they'd have to fly northwest of that power plant. MR SMALL: Okay. And so a pilot would not be allowed or certainly be advised not to fly over the stacks the way you flew over the balloons on the site visit day; is that correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	requirements? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I brought up an FDC NOTAM. And is that what you're requiring? MR. SMALL: Yes, please. THE WITNESS (Stevens): It says this is a restatement of a previously-issued advisory notice in the interest of National Security, and to the extent practicable, pilots are strongly advised to avoid the air space above or in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	which we discussed before. They would have to fly upwind or down upwind meaning between if the plumes were going southeast where they normally go, they'd have to fly northwest of that power plant. MR SMALL: Okay. And so a pilot would not be allowed or certainly be advised not to fly over the stacks the way you flew over the balloons on the site visit day; is that correct? THE WITNESS (Stevens): When
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	requirements? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I brought up an FDC NOTAM. And is that what you're requiring? MR. SMALL: Yes, please. THE WITNESS (Stevens): It says this is a restatement of a previously-issued advisory notice in the interest of National Security, and to the extent practicable, pilots are strongly advised to avoid the air space above or in proximity to such sites as power plants,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	which we discussed before. They would have to fly upwind or down upwind meaning between if the plumes were going southeast where they normally go, they'd have to fly northwest of that power plant. MR SMALL: Okay. And so a pilot would not be allowed or certainly be advised not to fly over the stacks the way you flew over the balloons on the site visit day; is that correct? THE WITNESS (Stevens): When practicable, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	requirements? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I brought up an FDC NOTAM. And is that what you're requiring? MR. SMALL: Yes, please. THE WITNESS (Stevens): It says this is a restatement of a previously-issued advisory notice in the interest of National Security, and to the extent practicable, pilots are strongly advised to avoid the air space above or in proximity to such sites as power plants, nuclear, hydroelectric or coal, dams,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	which we discussed before. They would have to fly upwind or down upwind meaning between if the plumes were going southeast where they normally go, they'd have to fly northwest of that power plant. MR SMALL: Okay. And so a pilot would not be allowed or certainly be advised not to fly over the stacks the way you flew over the balloons on the site visit day; is that correct? THE WITNESS (Stevens): When practicable, yes. MR. SMALL: And what was your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	requirements? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I brought up an FDC NOTAM. And is that what you're requiring? MR. SMALL: Yes, please. THE WITNESS (Stevens): It says this is a restatement of a previously-issued advisory notice in the interest of National Security, and to the extent practicable, pilots are strongly advised to avoid the air space above or in proximity to such sites as power plants, nuclear, hydroelectric or coal, dams, refineries, industrial complexes, military	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	which we discussed before. They would have to fly upwind or down upwind meaning between if the plumes were going southeast where they normally go, they'd have to fly northwest of that power plant. MR SMALL: Okay. And so a pilot would not be allowed or certainly be advised not to fly over the stacks the way you flew over the balloons on the site visit day; is that correct? THE WITNESS (Stevens): When practicable, yes. MR. SMALL: And what was your lowest just for perspective, your lowest
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	requirements? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I brought up an FDC NOTAM. And is that what you're requiring? MR. SMALL: Yes, please. THE WITNESS (Stevens): It says this is a restatement of a previously-issued advisory notice in the interest of National Security, and to the extent practicable, pilots are strongly advised to avoid the air space above or in proximity to such sites as power plants, nuclear, hydroelectric or coal, dams, refineries, industrial complexes, military facilities, and other similar facilities.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	which we discussed before. They would have to fly upwind or down upwind meaning between if the plumes were going southeast where they normally go, they'd have to fly northwest of that power plant. MR SMALL: Okay. And so a pilot would not be allowed or certainly be advised not to fly over the stacks the way you flew over the balloons on the site visit day; is that correct? THE WITNESS (Stevens): When practicable, yes. MR. SMALL: And what was your lowest just for perspective, your lowest flight over those balloons?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	requirements? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I brought up an FDC NOTAM. And is that what you're requiring? MR. SMALL: Yes, please. THE WITNESS (Stevens): It says this is a restatement of a previously-issued advisory notice in the interest of National Security, and to the extent practicable, pilots are strongly advised to avoid the air space above or in proximity to such sites as power plants, nuclear, hydroelectric or coal, dams, refineries, industrial complexes, military facilities, and other similar facilities. Pilots should not circle as to loiter in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	which we discussed before. They would have to fly upwind or down upwind meaning between if the plumes were going southeast where they normally go, they'd have to fly northwest of that power plant. MR SMALL: Okay. And so a pilot would not be allowed or certainly be advised not to fly over the stacks the way you flew over the balloons on the site visit day; is that correct? THE WITNESS (Stevens): When practicable, yes. MR. SMALL: And what was your lowest just for perspective, your lowest flight over those balloons? THE WITNESS (Stevens):
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	requirements? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I brought up an FDC NOTAM. And is that what you're requiring? MR. SMALL: Yes, please. THE WITNESS (Stevens): It says this is a restatement of a previously-issued advisory notice in the interest of National Security, and to the extent practicable, pilots are strongly advised to avoid the air space above or in proximity to such sites as power plants, nuclear, hydroelectric or coal, dams, refineries, industrial complexes, military facilities, and other similar facilities. Pilots should not circle as to loiter in the area over these types of facilities.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	which we discussed before. They would have to fly upwind or down upwind meaning between if the plumes were going southeast where they normally go, they'd have to fly northwest of that power plant. MR SMALL: Okay. And so a pilot would not be allowed or certainly be advised not to fly over the stacks the way you flew over the balloons on the site visit day; is that correct? THE WITNESS (Stevens): When practicable, yes. MR. SMALL: And what was your lowest just for perspective, your lowest flight over those balloons? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Thirteen hundred feet MSL, which purports
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	requirements? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I brought up an FDC NOTAM. And is that what you're requiring? MR. SMALL: Yes, please. THE WITNESS (Stevens): It says this is a restatement of a previously-issued advisory notice in the interest of National Security, and to the extent practicable, pilots are strongly advised to avoid the air space above or in proximity to such sites as power plants, nuclear, hydroelectric or coal, dams, refineries, industrial complexes, military facilities, and other similar facilities. Pilots should not circle as to loiter in the area over these types of facilities. So I think to answer your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	which we discussed before. They would have to fly upwind or down upwind meaning between if the plumes were going southeast where they normally go, they'd have to fly northwest of that power plant. MR SMALL: Okay. And so a pilot would not be allowed or certainly be advised not to fly over the stacks the way you flew over the balloons on the site visit day; is that correct? THE WITNESS (Stevens): When practicable, yes. MR. SMALL: And what was your lowest just for perspective, your lowest flight over those balloons? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Thirteen hundred feet MSL, which purports closely to the 1,280 feet that we discussed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	requirements? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I brought up an FDC NOTAM. And is that what you're requiring? MR. SMALL: Yes, please. THE WITNESS (Stevens): It says this is a restatement of a previously-issued advisory notice in the interest of National Security, and to the extent practicable, pilots are strongly advised to avoid the air space above or in proximity to such sites as power plants, nuclear, hydroelectric or coal, dams, refineries, industrial complexes, military facilities, and other similar facilities. Pilots should not circle as to loiter in the area over these types of facilities. So I think to answer your question, a natural gas compressor would not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	which we discussed before. They would have to fly upwind or down upwind meaning between if the plumes were going southeast where they normally go, they'd have to fly northwest of that power plant. MR SMALL: Okay. And so a pilot would not be allowed or certainly be advised not to fly over the stacks the way you flew over the balloons on the site visit day; is that correct? THE WITNESS (Stevens): When practicable, yes. MR. SMALL: And what was your lowest just for perspective, your lowest flight over those balloons? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Thirteen hundred feet MSL, which purports closely to the 1,280 feet that we discussed circle-to-land.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	requirements? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I brought up an FDC NOTAM. And is that what you're requiring? MR. SMALL: Yes, please. THE WITNESS (Stevens): It says this is a restatement of a previously-issued advisory notice in the interest of National Security, and to the extent practicable, pilots are strongly advised to avoid the air space above or in proximity to such sites as power plants, nuclear, hydroelectric or coal, dams, refineries, industrial complexes, military facilities, and other similar facilities. Pilots should not circle as to loiter in the area over these types of facilities. So I think to answer your question, a natural gas compressor would not fall under that NOTAM.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	which we discussed before. They would have to fly upwind or down upwind meaning between if the plumes were going southeast where they normally go, they'd have to fly northwest of that power plant. MR SMALL: Okay. And so a pilot would not be allowed or certainly be advised not to fly over the stacks the way you flew over the balloons on the site visit day; is that correct? THE WITNESS (Stevens): When practicable, yes. MR. SMALL: And what was your lowest just for perspective, your lowest flight over those balloons? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Thirteen hundred feet MSL, which purports closely to the 1,280 feet that we discussed circle-to-land. MR. SMALL: So, roughly 300
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	requirements? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I brought up an FDC NOTAM. And is that what you're requiring? MR. SMALL: Yes, please. THE WITNESS (Stevens): It says this is a restatement of a previously-issued advisory notice in the interest of National Security, and to the extent practicable, pilots are strongly advised to avoid the air space above or in proximity to such sites as power plants, nuclear, hydroelectric or coal, dams, refineries, industrial complexes, military facilities, and other similar facilities. Pilots should not circle as to loiter in the area over these types of facilities. So I think to answer your question, a natural gas compressor would not fall under that NOTAM. MR. SMALL: At least not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	which we discussed before. They would have to fly upwind or down upwind meaning between if the plumes were going southeast where they normally go, they'd have to fly northwest of that power plant. MR SMALL: Okay. And so a pilot would not be allowed or certainly be advised not to fly over the stacks the way you flew over the balloons on the site visit day; is that correct? THE WITNESS (Stevens): When practicable, yes. MR. SMALL: And what was your lowest just for perspective, your lowest flight over those balloons? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Thirteen hundred feet MSL, which purports closely to the 1,280 feet that we discussed circle-to-land. MR. SMALL: So, roughly 300 feet over where the stacks would be, or 300
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	requirements? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I brought up an FDC NOTAM. And is that what you're requiring? MR. SMALL: Yes, please. THE WITNESS (Stevens): It says this is a restatement of a previously-issued advisory notice in the interest of National Security, and to the extent practicable, pilots are strongly advised to avoid the air space above or in proximity to such sites as power plants, nuclear, hydroelectric or coal, dams, refineries, industrial complexes, military facilities, and other similar facilities. Pilots should not circle as to loiter in the area over these types of facilities. So I think to answer your question, a natural gas compressor would not fall under that NOTAM.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	which we discussed before. They would have to fly upwind or down upwind meaning between if the plumes were going southeast where they normally go, they'd have to fly northwest of that power plant. MR SMALL: Okay. And so a pilot would not be allowed or certainly be advised not to fly over the stacks the way you flew over the balloons on the site visit day; is that correct? THE WITNESS (Stevens): When practicable, yes. MR. SMALL: And what was your lowest just for perspective, your lowest flight over those balloons? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Thirteen hundred feet MSL, which purports closely to the 1,280 feet that we discussed circle-to-land. MR. SMALL: So, roughly 300 feet over where the stacks would be, or 300 feet over where the balloons were?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	requirements? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I brought up an FDC NOTAM. And is that what you're requiring? MR. SMALL: Yes, please. THE WITNESS (Stevens): It says this is a restatement of a previously-issued advisory notice in the interest of National Security, and to the extent practicable, pilots are strongly advised to avoid the air space above or in proximity to such sites as power plants, nuclear, hydroelectric or coal, dams, refineries, industrial complexes, military facilities, and other similar facilities. Pilots should not circle as to loiter in the area over these types of facilities. So I think to answer your question, a natural gas compressor would not fall under that NOTAM. MR. SMALL: At least not specifically. It's not one of the enumerated facilities. Correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	which we discussed before. They would have to fly upwind or down upwind meaning between if the plumes were going southeast where they normally go, they'd have to fly northwest of that power plant. MR SMALL: Okay. And so a pilot would not be allowed or certainly be advised not to fly over the stacks the way you flew over the balloons on the site visit day; is that correct? THE WITNESS (Stevens): When practicable, yes. MR. SMALL: And what was your lowest just for perspective, your lowest flight over those balloons? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Thirteen hundred feet MSL, which purports closely to the 1,280 feet that we discussed circle-to-land. MR. SMALL: So, roughly 300 feet over where the stacks would be, or 300
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	requirements? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I brought up an FDC NOTAM. And is that what you're requiring? MR. SMALL: Yes, please. THE WITNESS (Stevens): It says this is a restatement of a previously-issued advisory notice in the interest of National Security, and to the extent practicable, pilots are strongly advised to avoid the air space above or in proximity to such sites as power plants, nuclear, hydroelectric or coal, dams, refineries, industrial complexes, military facilities, and other similar facilities. Pilots should not circle as to loiter in the area over these types of facilities. So I think to answer your question, a natural gas compressor would not fall under that NOTAM. MR. SMALL: At least not specifically. It's not one of the enumerated	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	which we discussed before. They would have to fly upwind or down upwind meaning between if the plumes were going southeast where they normally go, they'd have to fly northwest of that power plant. MR SMALL: Okay. And so a pilot would not be allowed or certainly be advised not to fly over the stacks the way you flew over the balloons on the site visit day; is that correct? THE WITNESS (Stevens): When practicable, yes. MR. SMALL: And what was your lowest just for perspective, your lowest flight over those balloons? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Thirteen hundred feet MSL, which purports closely to the 1,280 feet that we discussed circle-to-land. MR. SMALL: So, roughly 300 feet over where the stacks would be, or 300 feet over where the balloons were? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes.

	Page 633		Page 635
1	when a plume is visible. When a plume is	1	conditions that cause the most severe impacts
2	visible, we all agree that's cold weather.	2	are typically cold temperatures, calm winds
3	Correct?	3	and unstable atmospheric stratification"?
4	THE WITNESS (Stevens): I	4	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes,
5	believe with certain types of relative	5	sir.
6	humidity, too, that you folks know better	6	MR. SMALL: And am I correct
7	than I.	7	that during those conditions a plume would be
8	MR. SMALL: And the plume	8	fully visible?
9	would be visible during the day in cold	9	THE WITNESS (Stevens): It
10	weather?	10	depends on the temperature.
11	THE WITNESS (Stevens): It	11	MR. SMALL: Well, it says
12	will be visible during the day, yes.	12	"typically cold temperatures."
13	MR. SMALL: Would it be	13	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Well,
14	visible at night as well?	14	I think we discussed if it's less if
15	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Clouds	15	typically cold is less than 40 degrees, then
16	are very difficult to discern at night. So	16	your own experts have indicated that it would
17	it really depends on the overall visibility	17	be visible.
18	of the evening. I have flown into clouds at	18	MR. SMALL: Okay. So the
19	night not knowing that I was flying into	19	only, if I'm understanding this section of
20	clouds.	20	the MITRE Report right, the most the
21 22	MR. SMALL: While flying under	21 22	riskiest conditions are the ones where you would have a visible plume; is that correct?
22	visual flight rules? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes.	22	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes,
23	MR. SMALL: And, by the way,	24	sure.
25	the tower at are planes allowed to land in	25	MR. SMALL: And that plume
	the tower at and planes arrowed to land in		
	Page 634		
	2030 001		Page 636
1	the Waterbury Oxford Airport using visual	1	would be, at least during the day, would be
2	the Waterbury Oxford Airport using visual flight rules when there's no controller?	2	would be, at least during the day, would be visible. Correct? At night you have the
2 3	the Waterbury Oxford Airport using visual flight rules when there's no controller? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes,	2 3	would be, at least during the day, would be visible. Correct? At night you have the stack is lighted, so the stack would be
2 3 4	the Waterbury Oxford Airport using visual flight rules when there's no controller? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, they are.	2 3 4	would be, at least during the day, would be visible. Correct? At night you have the stack is lighted, so the stack would be the lighting would be visible to a pilot.
2 3 4 5	the Waterbury Oxford Airport using visual flight rules when there's no controller? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, they are. MR. SMALL: And that's day or	2 3 4 5	would be, at least during the day, would be visible. Correct? At night you have the stack is lighted, so the stack would be the lighting would be visible to a pilot. Correct?
2 3 4 5 6	the Waterbury Oxford Airport using visual flight rules when there's no controller? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, they are. MR. SMALL: And that's day or night?	2 3 4 5 6	would be, at least during the day, would be visible. Correct? At night you have the stack is lighted, so the stack would be the lighting would be visible to a pilot. Correct? THE WITNESS (Stevens): At
2 3 4 5 6 7	the Waterbury Oxford Airport using visual flight rules when there's no controller? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, they are. MR. SMALL: And that's day or night? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7	would be, at least during the day, would be visible. Correct? At night you have the stack is lighted, so the stack would be the lighting would be visible to a pilot. Correct? THE WITNESS (Stevens): At night, again, it depends on the weather
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the Waterbury Oxford Airport using visual flight rules when there's no controller? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, they are. MR. SMALL: And that's day or night? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. SMALL: Interesting.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	would be, at least during the day, would be visible. Correct? At night you have the stack is lighted, so the stack would be the lighting would be visible to a pilot. Correct? THE WITNESS (Stevens): At night, again, it depends on the weather conditions.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the Waterbury Oxford Airport using visual flight rules when there's no controller? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, they are. MR. SMALL: And that's day or night? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. SMALL: Interesting. Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	would be, at least during the day, would be visible. Correct? At night you have the stack is lighted, so the stack would be the lighting would be visible to a pilot. Correct? THE WITNESS (Stevens): At night, again, it depends on the weather conditions. MR. SMALL: Right. But are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the Waterbury Oxford Airport using visual flight rules when there's no controller? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, they are. MR. SMALL: And that's day or night? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. SMALL: Interesting. Okay. One of the concerns you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	would be, at least during the day, would be visible. Correct? At night you have the stack is lighted, so the stack would be the lighting would be visible to a pilot. Correct? THE WITNESS (Stevens): At night, again, it depends on the weather conditions. MR. SMALL: Right. But are you going to have visual flight rules
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the Waterbury Oxford Airport using visual flight rules when there's no controller? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, they are. MR. SMALL: And that's day or night? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. SMALL: Interesting. Okay. One of the concerns you expressed was an invisible plume and pilots	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	would be, at least during the day, would be visible. Correct? At night you have the stack is lighted, so the stack would be the lighting would be visible to a pilot. Correct? THE WITNESS (Stevens): At night, again, it depends on the weather conditions. MR. SMALL: Right. But are you going to have visual flight rules THE WITNESS (Stevens): Oh,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the Waterbury Oxford Airport using visual flight rules when there's no controller? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, they are. MR. SMALL: And that's day or night? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. SMALL: Interesting. Okay. One of the concerns you expressed was an invisible plume and pilots flying into that; is that correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	would be, at least during the day, would be visible. Correct? At night you have the stack is lighted, so the stack would be the lighting would be visible to a pilot. Correct? THE WITNESS (Stevens): At night, again, it depends on the weather conditions. MR. SMALL: Right. But are you going to have visual flight rules THE WITNESS (Stevens): Oh, the visual flight rules, yes, the stack
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the Waterbury Oxford Airport using visual flight rules when there's no controller? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, they are. MR. SMALL: And that's day or night? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. SMALL: Interesting. Okay. One of the concerns you expressed was an invisible plume and pilots flying into that; is that correct? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	would be, at least during the day, would be visible. Correct? At night you have the stack is lighted, so the stack would be the lighting would be visible to a pilot. Correct? THE WITNESS (Stevens): At night, again, it depends on the weather conditions. MR. SMALL: Right. But are you going to have visual flight rules THE WITNESS (Stevens): Oh, the visual flight rules, yes, the stack lighting will be visible under visual flight
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the Waterbury Oxford Airport using visual flight rules when there's no controller? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, they are. MR. SMALL: And that's day or night? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. SMALL: Interesting. Okay. One of the concerns you expressed was an invisible plume and pilots flying into that; is that correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	would be, at least during the day, would be visible. Correct? At night you have the stack is lighted, so the stack would be the lighting would be visible to a pilot. Correct? THE WITNESS (Stevens): At night, again, it depends on the weather conditions. MR. SMALL: Right. But are you going to have visual flight rules THE WITNESS (Stevens): Oh, the visual flight rules, yes, the stack lighting will be visible under visual flight rules. Yes, sir.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the Waterbury Oxford Airport using visual flight rules when there's no controller? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, they are. MR. SMALL: And that's day or night? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. SMALL: Interesting. Okay. One of the concerns you expressed was an invisible plume and pilots flying into that; is that correct? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, sir.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	would be, at least during the day, would be visible. Correct? At night you have the stack is lighted, so the stack would be the lighting would be visible to a pilot. Correct? THE WITNESS (Stevens): At night, again, it depends on the weather conditions. MR. SMALL: Right. But are you going to have visual flight rules THE WITNESS (Stevens): Oh, the visual flight rules, yes, the stack lighting will be visible under visual flight
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the Waterbury Oxford Airport using visual flight rules when there's no controller? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, they are. MR. SMALL: And that's day or night? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. SMALL: Interesting. Okay. One of the concerns you expressed was an invisible plume and pilots flying into that; is that correct? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, sir. MR. SMALL: You had mentioned	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	would be, at least during the day, would be visible. Correct? At night you have the stack is lighted, so the stack would be the lighting would be visible to a pilot. Correct? THE WITNESS (Stevens): At night, again, it depends on the weather conditions. MR. SMALL: Right. But are you going to have visual flight rules THE WITNESS (Stevens): Oh, the visual flight rules, yes, the stack lighting will be visible under visual flight rules. Yes, sir. MR. SMALL: Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the Waterbury Oxford Airport using visual flight rules when there's no controller? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, they are. MR. SMALL: And that's day or night? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. SMALL: Interesting. Okay. One of the concerns you expressed was an invisible plume and pilots flying into that; is that correct? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, sir. MR. SMALL: You had mentioned the 2012 MITRE Report. Do you have that in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	would be, at least during the day, would be visible. Correct? At night you have the stack is lighted, so the stack would be the lighting would be visible to a pilot. Correct? THE WITNESS (Stevens): At night, again, it depends on the weather conditions. MR. SMALL: Right. But are you going to have visual flight rules THE WITNESS (Stevens): Oh, the visual flight rules, yes, the stack lighting will be visible under visual flight rules. Yes, sir. MR. SMALL: Thank you. This would probably be a good
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	the Waterbury Oxford Airport using visual flight rules when there's no controller? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, they are. MR. SMALL: And that's day or night? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. SMALL: Interesting. Okay. One of the concerns you expressed was an invisible plume and pilots flying into that; is that correct? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, sir. MR. SMALL: You had mentioned the 2012 MITRE Report. Do you have that in front of you? Would you look at page Roman III, page 3 of the executive summary? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Sure.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	would be, at least during the day, would be visible. Correct? At night you have the stack is lighted, so the stack would be the lighting would be visible to a pilot. Correct? THE WITNESS (Stevens): At night, again, it depends on the weather conditions. MR. SMALL: Right. But are you going to have visual flight rules THE WITNESS (Stevens): Oh, the visual flight rules, yes, the stack lighting will be visible under visual flight rules. Yes, sir. MR. SMALL: Thank you. This would probably be a good can we pause at this point?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the Waterbury Oxford Airport using visual flight rules when there's no controller? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, they are. MR. SMALL: And that's day or night? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. SMALL: Interesting. Okay. One of the concerns you expressed was an invisible plume and pilots flying into that; is that correct? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, sir. MR. SMALL: You had mentioned the 2012 MITRE Report. Do you have that in front of you? Would you look at page Roman III, page 3 of the executive summary? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Sure. The abstract?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 would be, at least during the day, would be visible. Correct? At night you have the stack is lighted, so the stack would be the lighting would be visible to a pilot. Correct? THE WITNESS (Stevens): At night, again, it depends on the weather conditions. MR. SMALL: Right. But are you going to have visual flight rules THE WITNESS (Stevens): Oh, the visual flight rules, yes, the stack lighting will be visible under visual flight rules. Yes, sir. MR. SMALL: Thank you. This would probably be a good can we pause at this point? THE CHAIRMAN: Sure. That's fine. We'll take a 45-minute break, so see you all back at 1:45.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the Waterbury Oxford Airport using visual flight rules when there's no controller? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, they are. MR. SMALL: And that's day or night? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. SMALL: Interesting. Okay. One of the concerns you expressed was an invisible plume and pilots flying into that; is that correct? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, sir. MR. SMALL: You had mentioned the 2012 MITRE Report. Do you have that in front of you? Would you look at page Roman III, page 3 of the executive summary? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Sure. The abstract? MR. SMALL: Correct. Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 would be, at least during the day, would be visible. Correct? At night you have the stack is lighted, so the stack would be the lighting would be visible to a pilot. Correct? THE WITNESS (Stevens): At night, again, it depends on the weather conditions. MR. SMALL: Right. But are you going to have visual flight rules THE WITNESS (Stevens): Oh, the visual flight rules, yes, the stack lighting will be visible under visual flight rules. Yes, sir. MR. SMALL: Thank you. This would probably be a good can we pause at this point? THE CHAIRMAN: Sure. That's fine. We'll take a 45-minute break, so see you all back at 1:45. (Whereupon, the witnesses were
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the Waterbury Oxford Airport using visual flight rules when there's no controller? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, they are. MR. SMALL: And that's day or night? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. SMALL: Interesting. Okay. One of the concerns you expressed was an invisible plume and pilots flying into that; is that correct? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, sir. MR. SMALL: You had mentioned the 2012 MITRE Report. Do you have that in front of you? Would you look at page Roman III, page 3 of the executive summary? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Sure. The abstract? MR. SMALL: Correct. Yes. THE WITNESS (Stevens): I have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 would be, at least during the day, would be visible. Correct? At night you have the stack is lighted, so the stack would be the lighting would be visible to a pilot. Correct? THE WITNESS (Stevens): At night, again, it depends on the weather conditions. MR. SMALL: Right. But are you going to have visual flight rules THE WITNESS (Stevens): Oh, the visual flight rules, yes, the stack lighting will be visible under visual flight rules. Yes, sir. MR. SMALL: Thank you. This would probably be a good can we pause at this point? THE CHAIRMAN: Sure. That's fine. We'll take a 45-minute break, so see you all back at 1:45. (Whereupon, the witnesses were excused, and a recess for lunch was taken at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the Waterbury Oxford Airport using visual flight rules when there's no controller? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, they are. MR. SMALL: And that's day or night? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. SMALL: Interesting. Okay. One of the concerns you expressed was an invisible plume and pilots flying into that; is that correct? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, sir. MR. SMALL: You had mentioned the 2012 MITRE Report. Do you have that in front of you? Would you look at page Roman III, page 3 of the executive summary? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Sure. The abstract? MR. SMALL: Correct. Yes. THE WITNESS (Stevens): I have that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 would be, at least during the day, would be visible. Correct? At night you have the stack is lighted, so the stack would be the lighting would be visible to a pilot. Correct? THE WITNESS (Stevens): At night, again, it depends on the weather conditions. MR. SMALL: Right. But are you going to have visual flight rules THE WITNESS (Stevens): Oh, the visual flight rules, yes, the stack lighting will be visible under visual flight rules. Yes, sir. MR. SMALL: Thank you. This would probably be a good can we pause at this point? THE CHAIRMAN: Sure. That's fine. We'll take a 45-minute break, so see you all back at 1:45. (Whereupon, the witnesses were
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the Waterbury Oxford Airport using visual flight rules when there's no controller? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, they are. MR. SMALL: And that's day or night? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. SMALL: Interesting. Okay. One of the concerns you expressed was an invisible plume and pilots flying into that; is that correct? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, sir. MR. SMALL: You had mentioned the 2012 MITRE Report. Do you have that in front of you? Would you look at page Roman III, page 3 of the executive summary? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Sure. The abstract? MR. SMALL: Correct. Yes. THE WITNESS (Stevens): I have that. MR. SMALL: Is it correct that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 would be, at least during the day, would be visible. Correct? At night you have the stack is lighted, so the stack would be the lighting would be visible to a pilot. Correct? THE WITNESS (Stevens): At night, again, it depends on the weather conditions. MR. SMALL: Right. But are you going to have visual flight rules THE WITNESS (Stevens): Oh, the visual flight rules, yes, the stack lighting will be visible under visual flight rules. Yes, sir. MR. SMALL: Thank you. This would probably be a good can we pause at this point? THE CHAIRMAN: Sure. That's fine. We'll take a 45-minute break, so see you all back at 1:45. (Whereupon, the witnesses were excused, and a recess for lunch was taken at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the Waterbury Oxford Airport using visual flight rules when there's no controller? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, they are. MR. SMALL: And that's day or night? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. SMALL: Interesting. Okay. One of the concerns you expressed was an invisible plume and pilots flying into that; is that correct? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, sir. MR. SMALL: You had mentioned the 2012 MITRE Report. Do you have that in front of you? Would you look at page Roman III, page 3 of the executive summary? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Sure. The abstract? MR. SMALL: Correct. Yes. THE WITNESS (Stevens): I have that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 would be, at least during the day, would be visible. Correct? At night you have the stack is lighted, so the stack would be the lighting would be visible to a pilot. Correct? THE WITNESS (Stevens): At night, again, it depends on the weather conditions. MR. SMALL: Right. But are you going to have visual flight rules THE WITNESS (Stevens): Oh, the visual flight rules, yes, the stack lighting will be visible under visual flight rules. Yes, sir. MR. SMALL: Thank you. This would probably be a good can we pause at this point? THE CHAIRMAN: Sure. That's fine. We'll take a 45-minute break, so see you all back at 1:45. (Whereupon, the witnesses were excused, and a recess for lunch was taken at

24 (Pages 633 to 636)

-	Page 637		Page 639
1	AFTERNOON SESSION	1	CONTINUED CROSS-EXAMINATION
2	1:47 P.M.	2	MR. SMALL: Let me start with
3	1.1/1.1/1.	3	the document we were talking about when we
4	FREDERICK SELLARS,	4	broke for lunch, which was the 2012 MITRE
5	LYNN GRESOCK,	5	Report. Do you have a copy of that?
6	ANDREW BAZINET,	6	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Sure.
7	JON DONOVAN,	7	MR. SMALL: Could you turn to
8	DEAN GUSTAFSON,	8	page 4-7 of that report, Section 4.3.3? I'm
9	ERIC DAVISON,	9	sorry, correction. I have the wrong would
10	TANYA BODELL,	10	you turn to sorry page 7-7? My
11	DANIELLE POWERS,	11	apologies.
12	BURT STEVENS,	12	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Sure.
13	having been previously duly sworn were	13	MR. SMALL: If you turn back
14	examined and testified further on their	14	one page, am I correct that this section,
15	oaths as follows:	15	7.3, deals with the Towantic Energy project?
16	THE CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon.	16	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes,
17	We'll resume cross-examination by Attorney	17	sir.
18	Small.	18	MR. SMALL: And there's a
19	MR. SMALL: Thank you,	19	Table 7-4, and underneath and that lists
20	Mr. Chairman. Before that, we do have the	20	three different types of aircraft and various
21	Read-Ins from this morning's session	21	heights?
22	regarding FAA issues, and Ms. Gresock can do	22	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes,
23	those just to get those on the record.	23	sir.
24	THE WITNESS (Gresock): I	24	MR. SMALL: Then there's a
25	believe the first one was a question about	25	sentence underneath that or there's two
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
	Page 638		Page 640
1	the weight of the North American Navion GA	1	
~			sentences. Can you read those sentences,
2	aircraft used in the MITRE 2012 Study. On	2	sentences. Can you read those sentences, please?
2 3	aircraft used in the MITRE 2012 Study. On page 3-3 of that study, Table 3-1, it	2 3	
		2 3 4	please?
3	page 3-3 of that study, Table 3-1, it	2 3	please? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes,
3 4	page 3-3 of that study, Table 3-1, it specifies that the weight assumed for that aircraft is 2,750 pounds. And the second question that	2 3 4 5 6	please? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, sir. It's the same sentence that Ms. Gresock, is it MR. SMALL: Gresock.
3 4 5 6 7	page 3-3 of that study, Table 3-1, it specifies that the weight assumed for that aircraft is 2,750 pounds. And the second question that was asked was with regard to FAA rules for	2 3 4 5 6 7	please? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, sir. It's the same sentence that Ms. Gresock, is it MR. SMALL: Gresock. THE WITNESS (Stevens):
3 4 5 6 7 8	page 3-3 of that study, Table 3-1, it specifies that the weight assumed for that aircraft is 2,750 pounds. And the second question that was asked was with regard to FAA rules for distance from clouds. Federal Aviation	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	please? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, sir. It's the same sentence that Ms. Gresock, is it MR. SMALL: Gresock. THE WITNESS (Stevens): that she provided in her question to the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	page 3-3 of that study, Table 3-1, it specifies that the weight assumed for that aircraft is 2,750 pounds. And the second question that was asked was with regard to FAA rules for distance from clouds. Federal Aviation Regulation Part 91, Section 155, provides	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	please? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, sir. It's the same sentence that Ms. Gresock, is it MR. SMALL: Gresock. THE WITNESS (Stevens): that she provided in her question to the Siting Council already. It said, "By
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	page 3-3 of that study, Table 3-1, it specifies that the weight assumed for that aircraft is 2,750 pounds. And the second question that was asked was with regard to FAA rules for distance from clouds. Federal Aviation Regulation Part 91, Section 155, provides some basic BFR weather minimums in that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	please? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, sir. It's the same sentence that Ms. Gresock, is it MR. SMALL: Gresock. THE WITNESS (Stevens): that she provided in her question to the Siting Council already. It said, "By executing the Houbolt roll model over the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	page 3-3 of that study, Table 3-1, it specifies that the weight assumed for that aircraft is 2,750 pounds. And the second question that was asked was with regard to FAA rules for distance from clouds. Federal Aviation Regulation Part 91, Section 155, provides some basic BFR weather minimums in that section. There are a number of different	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	please? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, sir. It's the same sentence that Ms. Gresock, is it MR. SMALL: Gresock. THE WITNESS (Stevens): that she provided in her question to the Siting Council already. It said, "By executing the Houbolt roll model over the three years of environmental data, it was
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	page 3-3 of that study, Table 3-1, it specifies that the weight assumed for that aircraft is 2,750 pounds. And the second question that was asked was with regard to FAA rules for distance from clouds. Federal Aviation Regulation Part 91, Section 155, provides some basic BFR weather minimums in that section. There are a number of different distances, depending upon a lot of different	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	please? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, sir. It's the same sentence that Ms. Gresock, is it MR. SMALL: Gresock. THE WITNESS (Stevens): that she provided in her question to the Siting Council already. It said, "By executing the Houbolt roll model over the three years of environmental data, it was determined that aircraft upset criteria were
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	page 3-3 of that study, Table 3-1, it specifies that the weight assumed for that aircraft is 2,750 pounds. And the second question that was asked was with regard to FAA rules for distance from clouds. Federal Aviation Regulation Part 91, Section 155, provides some basic BFR weather minimums in that section. There are a number of different distances, depending upon a lot of different circumstances. But focusing on when the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	please? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, sir. It's the same sentence that Ms. Gresock, is it MR. SMALL: Gresock. THE WITNESS (Stevens): that she provided in her question to the Siting Council already. It said, "By executing the Houbolt roll model over the three years of environmental data, it was determined that aircraft upset criteria were never reached at this proposed power plant.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	page 3-3 of that study, Table 3-1, it specifies that the weight assumed for that aircraft is 2,750 pounds. And the second question that was asked was with regard to FAA rules for distance from clouds. Federal Aviation Regulation Part 91, Section 155, provides some basic BFR weather minimums in that section. There are a number of different distances, depending upon a lot of different circumstances. But focusing on when the tower is open, there's a requirement to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	please? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, sir. It's the same sentence that Ms. Gresock, is it MR. SMALL: Gresock. THE WITNESS (Stevens): that she provided in her question to the Siting Council already. It said, "By executing the Houbolt roll model over the three years of environmental data, it was determined that aircraft upset criteria were never reached at this proposed power plant. There is an area above the stack where
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	page 3-3 of that study, Table 3-1, it specifies that the weight assumed for that aircraft is 2,750 pounds. And the second question that was asked was with regard to FAA rules for distance from clouds. Federal Aviation Regulation Part 91, Section 155, provides some basic BFR weather minimums in that section. There are a number of different distances, depending upon a lot of different circumstances. But focusing on when the tower is open, there's a requirement to maintain the 2,000 foot radial horizontal	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	please? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, sir. It's the same sentence that Ms. Gresock, is it MR. SMALL: Gresock. THE WITNESS (Stevens): that she provided in her question to the Siting Council already. It said, "By executing the Houbolt roll model over the three years of environmental data, it was determined that aircraft upset criteria were never reached at this proposed power plant. There is an area above the stack where elevated temperatures pose a risk for
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	page 3-3 of that study, Table 3-1, it specifies that the weight assumed for that aircraft is 2,750 pounds. And the second question that was asked was with regard to FAA rules for distance from clouds. Federal Aviation Regulation Part 91, Section 155, provides some basic BFR weather minimums in that section. There are a number of different distances, depending upon a lot of different circumstances. But focusing on when the tower is open, there's a requirement to maintain the 2,000 foot radial horizontal distance or 500 feet below or 1,000 feet	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	please? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, sir. It's the same sentence that Ms. Gresock, is it MR. SMALL: Gresock. THE WITNESS (Stevens): that she provided in her question to the Siting Council already. It said, "By executing the Houbolt roll model over the three years of environmental data, it was determined that aircraft upset criteria were never reached at this proposed power plant. There is an area above the stack where elevated temperatures pose a risk for helicopters, and it was determined that 180
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	page 3-3 of that study, Table 3-1, it specifies that the weight assumed for that aircraft is 2,750 pounds. And the second question that was asked was with regard to FAA rules for distance from clouds. Federal Aviation Regulation Part 91, Section 155, provides some basic BFR weather minimums in that section. There are a number of different distances, depending upon a lot of different circumstances. But focusing on when the tower is open, there's a requirement to maintain the 2,000 foot radial horizontal distance or 500 feet below or 1,000 feet above. And if the tower is not open, there's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	please? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, sir. It's the same sentence that Ms. Gresock, is it MR. SMALL: Gresock. THE WITNESS (Stevens): that she provided in her question to the Siting Council already. It said, "By executing the Houbolt roll model over the three years of environmental data, it was determined that aircraft upset criteria were never reached at this proposed power plant. There is an area above the stack where elevated temperatures pose a risk for helicopters, and it was determined that 180 foot above the stack was the maximum height
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	page 3-3 of that study, Table 3-1, it specifies that the weight assumed for that aircraft is 2,750 pounds. And the second question that was asked was with regard to FAA rules for distance from clouds. Federal Aviation Regulation Part 91, Section 155, provides some basic BFR weather minimums in that section. There are a number of different distances, depending upon a lot of different circumstances. But focusing on when the tower is open, there's a requirement to maintain the 2,000 foot radial horizontal distance or 500 feet below or 1,000 feet above. And if the tower is not open, there's a requirement to maintain a three statute	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	please? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, sir. It's the same sentence that Ms. Gresock, is it MR. SMALL: Gresock. THE WITNESS (Stevens): that she provided in her question to the Siting Council already. It said, "By executing the Houbolt roll model over the three years of environmental data, it was determined that aircraft upset criteria were never reached at this proposed power plant. There is an area above the stack where elevated temperatures pose a risk for helicopters, and it was determined that 180 foot above the stack was the maximum height where temperatures greater than 52 degrees
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	page 3-3 of that study, Table 3-1, it specifies that the weight assumed for that aircraft is 2,750 pounds. And the second question that was asked was with regard to FAA rules for distance from clouds. Federal Aviation Regulation Part 91, Section 155, provides some basic BFR weather minimums in that section. There are a number of different distances, depending upon a lot of different circumstances. But focusing on when the tower is open, there's a requirement to maintain the 2,000 foot radial horizontal distance or 500 feet below or 1,000 feet above. And if the tower is not open, there's a requirement to maintain a three statute mile distance. There is, in Part 157, I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	please? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, sir. It's the same sentence that Ms. Gresock, is it MR. SMALL: Gresock. THE WITNESS (Stevens): that she provided in her question to the Siting Council already. It said, "By executing the Houbolt roll model over the three years of environmental data, it was determined that aircraft upset criteria were never reached at this proposed power plant. There is an area above the stack where elevated temperatures pose a risk for helicopters, and it was determined that 180 foot above the stack was the maximum height where temperatures greater than 52 degrees celsius could be experienced."
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	page 3-3 of that study, Table 3-1, it specifies that the weight assumed for that aircraft is 2,750 pounds. And the second question that was asked was with regard to FAA rules for distance from clouds. Federal Aviation Regulation Part 91, Section 155, provides some basic BFR weather minimums in that section. There are a number of different distances, depending upon a lot of different circumstances. But focusing on when the tower is open, there's a requirement to maintain the 2,000 foot radial horizontal distance or 500 feet below or 1,000 feet above. And if the tower is not open, there's a requirement to maintain a three statute mile distance. There is, in Part 157, I believe, also discretion that the tower can	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	please? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, sir. It's the same sentence that Ms. Gresock, is it MR. SMALL: Gresock. THE WITNESS (Stevens): that she provided in her question to the Siting Council already. It said, "By executing the Houbolt roll model over the three years of environmental data, it was determined that aircraft upset criteria were never reached at this proposed power plant. There is an area above the stack where elevated temperatures pose a risk for helicopters, and it was determined that 180 foot above the stack was the maximum height where temperatures greater than 52 degrees celsius could be experienced." MR. SMALL: Okay. And am I
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	page 3-3 of that study, Table 3-1, it specifies that the weight assumed for that aircraft is 2,750 pounds. And the second question that was asked was with regard to FAA rules for distance from clouds. Federal Aviation Regulation Part 91, Section 155, provides some basic BFR weather minimums in that section. There are a number of different distances, depending upon a lot of different circumstances. But focusing on when the tower is open, there's a requirement to maintain the 2,000 foot radial horizontal distance or 500 feet below or 1,000 feet above. And if the tower is not open, there's a requirement to maintain a three statute mile distance. There is, in Part 157, I believe, also discretion that the tower can adjust those differences, as appropriate, but	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	please? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, sir. It's the same sentence that Ms. Gresock, is it MR. SMALL: Gresock. THE WITNESS (Stevens): that she provided in her question to the Siting Council already. It said, "By executing the Houbolt roll model over the three years of environmental data, it was determined that aircraft upset criteria were never reached at this proposed power plant. There is an area above the stack where elevated temperatures pose a risk for helicopters, and it was determined that 180 foot above the stack was the maximum height where temperatures greater than 52 degrees celsius could be experienced." MR. SMALL: Okay. And am I correct that I mean, do you accept this
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	page 3-3 of that study, Table 3-1, it specifies that the weight assumed for that aircraft is 2,750 pounds. And the second question that was asked was with regard to FAA rules for distance from clouds. Federal Aviation Regulation Part 91, Section 155, provides some basic BFR weather minimums in that section. There are a number of different distances, depending upon a lot of different circumstances. But focusing on when the tower is open, there's a requirement to maintain the 2,000 foot radial horizontal distance or 500 feet below or 1,000 feet above. And if the tower is not open, there's a requirement to maintain a three statute mile distance. There is, in Part 157, I believe, also discretion that the tower can adjust those differences, as appropriate, but there is a lot of information in that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	please? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, sir. It's the same sentence that Ms. Gresock, is it MR. SMALL: Gresock. THE WITNESS (Stevens): that she provided in her question to the Siting Council already. It said, "By executing the Houbolt roll model over the three years of environmental data, it was determined that aircraft upset criteria were never reached at this proposed power plant. There is an area above the stack where elevated temperatures pose a risk for helicopters, and it was determined that 180 foot above the stack was the maximum height where temperatures greater than 52 degrees celsius could be experienced." MR. SMALL: Okay. And am I correct that I mean, do you accept this MITRE document as an accurate document?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	page 3-3 of that study, Table 3-1, it specifies that the weight assumed for that aircraft is 2,750 pounds. And the second question that was asked was with regard to FAA rules for distance from clouds. Federal Aviation Regulation Part 91, Section 155, provides some basic BFR weather minimums in that section. There are a number of different distances, depending upon a lot of different circumstances. But focusing on when the tower is open, there's a requirement to maintain the 2,000 foot radial horizontal distance or 500 feet below or 1,000 feet above. And if the tower is not open, there's a requirement to maintain a three statute mile distance. There is, in Part 157, I believe, also discretion that the tower can adjust those differences, as appropriate, but there is a lot of information in that particular rule.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	please? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, sir. It's the same sentence that Ms. Gresock, is it MR. SMALL: Gresock. THE WITNESS (Stevens): that she provided in her question to the Siting Council already. It said, "By executing the Houbolt roll model over the three years of environmental data, it was determined that aircraft upset criteria were never reached at this proposed power plant. There is an area above the stack where elevated temperatures pose a risk for helicopters, and it was determined that 180 foot above the stack was the maximum height where temperatures greater than 52 degrees celsius could be experienced." MR. SMALL: Okay. And am I correct that I mean, do you accept this MITRE document as an accurate document? THE WITNESS (Stevens): To the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	page 3-3 of that study, Table 3-1, it specifies that the weight assumed for that aircraft is 2,750 pounds. And the second question that was asked was with regard to FAA rules for distance from clouds. Federal Aviation Regulation Part 91, Section 155, provides some basic BFR weather minimums in that section. There are a number of different distances, depending upon a lot of different circumstances. But focusing on when the tower is open, there's a requirement to maintain the 2,000 foot radial horizontal distance or 500 feet below or 1,000 feet above. And if the tower is not open, there's a requirement to maintain a three statute mile distance. There is, in Part 157, I believe, also discretion that the tower can adjust those differences, as appropriate, but there is a lot of information in that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	please? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, sir. It's the same sentence that Ms. Gresock, is it MR. SMALL: Gresock. THE WITNESS (Stevens): that she provided in her question to the Siting Council already. It said, "By executing the Houbolt roll model over the three years of environmental data, it was determined that aircraft upset criteria were never reached at this proposed power plant. There is an area above the stack where elevated temperatures pose a risk for helicopters, and it was determined that 180 foot above the stack was the maximum height where temperatures greater than 52 degrees celsius could be experienced." MR. SMALL: Okay. And am I correct that I mean, do you accept this MITRE document as an accurate document?

	Page 641		Page 643
1	1,400 pound aircraft.	1	right to cross-examine later on on the more
2	MR. SMALL: And you agree it	2	technical documents. Thank you.
3	says that and how do you define the term	3	Thank you, and enjoy your
4	"aircraft upset criteria"?	4	vacation.
5	THE WITNESS (Stevens):	5	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Thank
6	Aircraft upset criteria is the FAA	6	you.
7	terminology is a roll greater than 45	7	THE CHAIRMAN: We'll now
8	degrees, a pitch, I believe, up greater than	8	continue with the other parties, intervenors,
9	30, down greater than 10.	9	and just go down the list.
10	MR. SMALL: And what's the	10	Mr. Halpern, is he here?
11	consequences of those sort of upset criteria?	11	(No response.)
12	What does that mean in layman's terms?	12	THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Stevens,
13	THE WITNESS (Stevens): In	13	just stay there. Everybody is now going to
14	layman's terms, that's the threshold that a	14	get a chance.
15	pilot could experience an upset and be	15	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Oh,
16	required to recover.	16	I'm sorry. Forgive me.
17	MR. SMALL: Okay. And it does	17	THE CHAIRMAN: You thought you
18	say in that sentence that those upset	18	had enough, just getting warmed up.
19	criteria were never reached for the Towantic	19	Town of Middlebury?
20	Power Plant that was modeled. Correct?	20	MR. SAVARESE: Where shall we
21	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Given	21	sit, Mr. Chair?
22	a 2,700 pound aircraft, yes.	22	THE WITNESS (Stevens):
23	MR. SMALL: Okay, good. Just	23	Forgive me. I'm sorry. I didn't know the
24	one more item. You mentioned in I think it	24	procedure.
25	was your discussion with either the Chairman	25	THE CHAIRMAN: That's fine.
	Page 642		Page 644
1	Page 642 or Vice Chairman Murphy, the FAA approval in	1	Page 644 This is rather unique with the number of
1 2	or Vice Chairman Murphy, the FAA approval in 1999. Do you recall that discussion?	1 2	
	or Vice Chairman Murphy, the FAA approval in 1999. Do you recall that discussion? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes.		This is rather unique with the number of parties and intervenors. MR. SMALL: I have a
2 3 4	or Vice Chairman Murphy, the FAA approval in 1999. Do you recall that discussion? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. SMALL: And you're aware	2 3 4	This is rather unique with the number of parties and intervenors. MR. SMALL: I have a clarification or a question. Various parties
2 3 4 5	or Vice Chairman Murphy, the FAA approval in 1999. Do you recall that discussion? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. SMALL: And you're aware that that was not the last FAA approval of	2 3 4 5	This is rather unique with the number of parties and intervenors. MR. SMALL: I have a clarification or a question. Various parties were grouped together. I don't recall
2 3 4 5 6	or Vice Chairman Murphy, the FAA approval in 1999. Do you recall that discussion? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. SMALL: And you're aware that that was not the last FAA approval of the stacks for this power plant, correct?	2 3 4 5 6	This is rather unique with the number of parties and intervenors. MR. SMALL: I have a clarification or a question. Various parties were grouped together. I don't recall whether Mr. Stevens and the Flying Club were
2 3 4 5 6 7	or Vice Chairman Murphy, the FAA approval in 1999. Do you recall that discussion? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. SMALL: And you're aware that that was not the last FAA approval of the stacks for this power plant, correct? Let me rephrase.	2 3 4 5 6 7	This is rather unique with the number of parties and intervenors. MR. SMALL: I have a clarification or a question. Various parties were grouped together. I don't recall whether Mr. Stevens and the Flying Club were grouped with they were not grouped.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	or Vice Chairman Murphy, the FAA approval in 1999. Do you recall that discussion? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. SMALL: And you're aware that that was not the last FAA approval of the stacks for this power plant, correct? Let me rephrase. THE WITNESS (Stevens): Sure.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	This is rather unique with the number of parties and intervenors. MR. SMALL: I have a clarification or a question. Various parties were grouped together. I don't recall whether Mr. Stevens and the Flying Club were grouped with they were not grouped. MS. BACHMAN: They were not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	or Vice Chairman Murphy, the FAA approval in 1999. Do you recall that discussion? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. SMALL: And you're aware that that was not the last FAA approval of the stacks for this power plant, correct? Let me rephrase. THE WITNESS (Stevens): Sure. MR. SMALL: Are you aware	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	This is rather unique with the number of parties and intervenors. MR. SMALL: I have a clarification or a question. Various parties were grouped together. I don't recall whether Mr. Stevens and the Flying Club were grouped with they were not grouped. MS. BACHMAN: They were not grouped.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	or Vice Chairman Murphy, the FAA approval in 1999. Do you recall that discussion? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. SMALL: And you're aware that that was not the last FAA approval of the stacks for this power plant, correct? Let me rephrase. THE WITNESS (Stevens): Sure. MR. SMALL: Are you aware whether the FAA approved this plant, this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	This is rather unique with the number of parties and intervenors. MR. SMALL: I have a clarification or a question. Various parties were grouped together. I don't recall whether Mr. Stevens and the Flying Club were grouped with they were not grouped. MS. BACHMAN: They were not grouped. THE CHAIRMAN: No.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	or Vice Chairman Murphy, the FAA approval in 1999. Do you recall that discussion? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. SMALL: And you're aware that that was not the last FAA approval of the stacks for this power plant, correct? Let me rephrase. THE WITNESS (Stevens): Sure. MR. SMALL: Are you aware whether the FAA approved this plant, this plant, including the stacks, subsequent to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	This is rather unique with the number of parties and intervenors. MR. SMALL: I have a clarification or a question. Various parties were grouped together. I don't recall whether Mr. Stevens and the Flying Club were grouped with they were not grouped. MS. BACHMAN: They were not grouped. THE CHAIRMAN: No. MR. SMALL: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	or Vice Chairman Murphy, the FAA approval in 1999. Do you recall that discussion? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. SMALL: And you're aware that that was not the last FAA approval of the stacks for this power plant, correct? Let me rephrase. THE WITNESS (Stevens): Sure. MR. SMALL: Are you aware whether the FAA approved this plant, this plant, including the stacks, subsequent to 1999?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	This is rather unique with the number of parties and intervenors. MR. SMALL: I have a clarification or a question. Various parties were grouped together. I don't recall whether Mr. Stevens and the Flying Club were grouped with they were not grouped. MS. BACHMAN: They were not grouped. THE CHAIRMAN: No. MR. SMALL: Okay. THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, sir.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	or Vice Chairman Murphy, the FAA approval in 1999. Do you recall that discussion? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. SMALL: And you're aware that that was not the last FAA approval of the stacks for this power plant, correct? Let me rephrase. THE WITNESS (Stevens): Sure. MR. SMALL: Are you aware whether the FAA approved this plant, this plant, including the stacks, subsequent to 1999? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	This is rather unique with the number of parties and intervenors. MR. SMALL: I have a clarification or a question. Various parties were grouped together. I don't recall whether Mr. Stevens and the Flying Club were grouped with they were not grouped. MS. BACHMAN: They were not grouped. THE CHAIRMAN: No. MR. SMALL: Okay. THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	or Vice Chairman Murphy, the FAA approval in 1999. Do you recall that discussion? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. SMALL: And you're aware that that was not the last FAA approval of the stacks for this power plant, correct? Let me rephrase. THE WITNESS (Stevens): Sure. MR. SMALL: Are you aware whether the FAA approved this plant, this plant, including the stacks, subsequent to 1999?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	This is rather unique with the number of parties and intervenors. MR. SMALL: I have a clarification or a question. Various parties were grouped together. I don't recall whether Mr. Stevens and the Flying Club were grouped with they were not grouped. MS. BACHMAN: They were not grouped. THE CHAIRMAN: No. MR. SMALL: Okay. THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you. Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	or Vice Chairman Murphy, the FAA approval in 1999. Do you recall that discussion? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. SMALL: And you're aware that that was not the last FAA approval of the stacks for this power plant, correct? Let me rephrase. THE WITNESS (Stevens): Sure. MR. SMALL: Are you aware whether the FAA approved this plant, this plant, including the stacks, subsequent to 1999? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I have no personal knowledge.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	This is rather unique with the number of parties and intervenors. MR. SMALL: I have a clarification or a question. Various parties were grouped together. I don't recall whether Mr. Stevens and the Flying Club were grouped with they were not grouped. MS. BACHMAN: They were not grouped. THE CHAIRMAN: They were not grouped. THE CHAIRMAN: No. MR. SMALL: Okay. THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you. Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon. THE COURT REPORTER: Would you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	or Vice Chairman Murphy, the FAA approval in 1999. Do you recall that discussion? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. SMALL: And you're aware that that was not the last FAA approval of the stacks for this power plant, correct? Let me rephrase. THE WITNESS (Stevens): Sure. MR. SMALL: Are you aware whether the FAA approved this plant, this plant, including the stacks, subsequent to 1999? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I have no personal knowledge. MR. SMALL: Okay. And last,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	This is rather unique with the number of parties and intervenors. MR. SMALL: I have a clarification or a question. Various parties were grouped together. I don't recall whether Mr. Stevens and the Flying Club were grouped with they were not grouped. MS. BACHMAN: They were not grouped. THE CHAIRMAN: No. MR. SMALL: Okay. THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you. Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	or Vice Chairman Murphy, the FAA approval in 1999. Do you recall that discussion? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. SMALL: And you're aware that that was not the last FAA approval of the stacks for this power plant, correct? Let me rephrase. THE WITNESS (Stevens): Sure. MR. SMALL: Are you aware whether the FAA approved this plant, this plant, including the stacks, subsequent to 1999? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I have no personal knowledge. MR. SMALL: Okay. And last, and I believe I heard you say I just want to make sure I understand this that you're not terribly concerned about the stacks	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	This is rather unique with the number of parties and intervenors. MR. SMALL: I have a clarification or a question. Various parties were grouped together. I don't recall whether Mr. Stevens and the Flying Club were grouped with they were not grouped. MS. BACHMAN: They were not grouped. THE CHAIRMAN: No. MR. SMALL: Okay. THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you. Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon. THE COURT REPORTER: Would you tell me who you are, please, just to refresh
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	or Vice Chairman Murphy, the FAA approval in 1999. Do you recall that discussion? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. SMALL: And you're aware that that was not the last FAA approval of the stacks for this power plant, correct? Let me rephrase. THE WITNESS (Stevens): Sure. MR. SMALL: Are you aware whether the FAA approved this plant, this plant, including the stacks, subsequent to 1999? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I have no personal knowledge. MR. SMALL: Okay. And last, and I believe I heard you say I just want to make sure I understand this that you're not terribly concerned about the stacks themselves; your concern is almost	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	This is rather unique with the number of parties and intervenors. MR. SMALL: I have a clarification or a question. Various parties were grouped together. I don't recall whether Mr. Stevens and the Flying Club were grouped with they were not grouped. MS. BACHMAN: They were not grouped. THE CHAIRMAN: No. MR. SMALL: Okay. THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you. Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon. THE COURT REPORTER: Would you tell me who you are, please, just to refresh my memory?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	or Vice Chairman Murphy, the FAA approval in 1999. Do you recall that discussion? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. SMALL: And you're aware that that was not the last FAA approval of the stacks for this power plant, correct? Let me rephrase. THE WITNESS (Stevens): Sure. MR. SMALL: Are you aware whether the FAA approved this plant, this plant, including the stacks, subsequent to 1999? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I have no personal knowledge. MR. SMALL: Okay. And last, and I believe I heard you say I just want to make sure I understand this that you're not terribly concerned about the stacks themselves; your concern is almost exclusively with respect to the plumes. Did	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	This is rather unique with the number of parties and intervenors. MR. SMALL: I have a clarification or a question. Various parties were grouped together. I don't recall whether Mr. Stevens and the Flying Club were grouped with they were not grouped. MS. BACHMAN: They were not grouped. THE CHAIRMAN: No. MR. SMALL: Okay. THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you. Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon. THE COURT REPORTER: Would you tell me who you are, please, just to refresh my memory? MR. PIETRORAZIO: Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	or Vice Chairman Murphy, the FAA approval in 1999. Do you recall that discussion? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. SMALL: And you're aware that that was not the last FAA approval of the stacks for this power plant, correct? Let me rephrase. THE WITNESS (Stevens): Sure. MR. SMALL: Are you aware whether the FAA approved this plant, this plant, including the stacks, subsequent to 1999? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I have no personal knowledge. MR. SMALL: Okay. And last, and I believe I heard you say I just want to make sure I understand this that you're not terribly concerned about the stacks themselves; your concern is almost exclusively with respect to the plumes. Did I hear you correctly?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	This is rather unique with the number of parties and intervenors. MR. SMALL: I have a clarification or a question. Various parties were grouped together. I don't recall whether Mr. Stevens and the Flying Club were grouped with they were not grouped. MS. BACHMAN: They were not grouped. THE CHAIRMAN: No. MR. SMALL: Okay. THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you. Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon. THE COURT REPORTER: Would you tell me who you are, please, just to refresh my memory? MR. PIETRORAZIO: Yes. Raymond Pietrorazio.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	or Vice Chairman Murphy, the FAA approval in 1999. Do you recall that discussion? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. SMALL: And you're aware that that was not the last FAA approval of the stacks for this power plant, correct? Let me rephrase. THE WITNESS (Stevens): Sure. MR. SMALL: Are you aware whether the FAA approved this plant, this plant, including the stacks, subsequent to 1999? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I have no personal knowledge. MR. SMALL: Okay. And last, and I believe I heard you say I just want to make sure I understand this that you're not terribly concerned about the stacks themselves; your concern is almost exclusively with respect to the plumes. Did I hear you correctly? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	This is rather unique with the number of parties and intervenors. MR. SMALL: I have a clarification or a question. Various parties were grouped together. I don't recall whether Mr. Stevens and the Flying Club were grouped with they were not grouped. MS. BACHMAN: They were not grouped. THE CHAIRMAN: No. MR. SMALL: Okay. THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you. Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon. THE COURT REPORTER: Would you tell me who you are, please, just to refresh my memory? MR. PIETRORAZIO: Yes. Raymond Pietrorazio. THE COURT REPORTER: Thank you. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Mr. Stevens,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	or Vice Chairman Murphy, the FAA approval in 1999. Do you recall that discussion? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. SMALL: And you're aware that that was not the last FAA approval of the stacks for this power plant, correct? Let me rephrase. THE WITNESS (Stevens): Sure. MR. SMALL: Are you aware whether the FAA approved this plant, this plant, including the stacks, subsequent to 1999? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I have no personal knowledge. MR. SMALL: Okay. And last, and I believe I heard you say I just want to make sure I understand this that you're not terribly concerned about the stacks themselves; your concern is almost exclusively with respect to the plumes. Did I hear you correctly? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, you did.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	This is rather unique with the number of parties and intervenors. MR. SMALL: I have a clarification or a question. Various parties were grouped together. I don't recall whether Mr. Stevens and the Flying Club were grouped with they were not grouped. MS. BACHMAN: They were not grouped. THE CHAIRMAN: No. MR. SMALL: Okay. THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you. Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon. THE COURT REPORTER: Would you tell me who you are, please, just to refresh my memory? MR. PIETRORAZIO: Yes. Raymond Pietrorazio. THE COURT REPORTER: Thank you. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Mr. Stevens, are you familiar with we had a great
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	or Vice Chairman Murphy, the FAA approval in 1999. Do you recall that discussion? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. SMALL: And you're aware that that was not the last FAA approval of the stacks for this power plant, correct? Let me rephrase. THE WITNESS (Stevens): Sure. MR. SMALL: Are you aware whether the FAA approved this plant, this plant, including the stacks, subsequent to 1999? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I have no personal knowledge. MR. SMALL: Okay. And last, and I believe I heard you say I just want to make sure I understand this that you're not terribly concerned about the stacks themselves; your concern is almost exclusively with respect to the plumes. Did I hear you correctly? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	This is rather unique with the number of parties and intervenors. MR. SMALL: I have a clarification or a question. Various parties were grouped together. I don't recall whether Mr. Stevens and the Flying Club were grouped with they were not grouped. MS. BACHMAN: They were not grouped. THE CHAIRMAN: No. MR. SMALL: Okay. THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you. Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon. THE COURT REPORTER: Would you tell me who you are, please, just to refresh my memory? MR. PIETRORAZIO: Yes. Raymond Pietrorazio. THE COURT REPORTER: Thank you. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Mr. Stevens,

26 (Pages 641 to 644)

Page 645 Page 647 1 goes down and night comes on, is there a 1 weight between that plane and the Navion used 2 2 change in the physical aspects of the plume in the MITRE Report? 3 produced by such a plant? 3 THE WITNESS (Stevens): It's a 4 THE WITNESS (Stevens): Sir, 4 significantly different plane. The Navion 5 I'm not an expert in plumes. I believe, 5 that MITRE used is comparable to today's 6 6 through my questioning to the Applicant, I Beechcraft Baron -- correction, Beechcraft 7 7 ascertained that plumes were larger in the Bonanza, which is a single engine, 300 8 8 evening or at night than in the daytime horsepower plane with a gross weight of about 9 9 because there's usually a temperature 3,600 pounds. The weight that they used was 10 10 decrease at night. So my understanding is 2,750 pounds for the Navion, which is under 11 the gross weight of 3,160 pounds that the 11 that the plumes are larger at night. I 12 also answered to a question, I believe, of 12 Navion is certified to fly at. 13 Chairman Stein, I indicated that clouds very 13 MR. PIETRORAZIO: And this 14 14 often are not visible at night. So, those discussion is important because we're talking 15 15 are my answers to your question. about the turbulent effect of a rising plume 16 MR. PIETRORAZIO: Well, do you 16 and the effect that that would have on an 17 17 have any input on whether the plumes would aircraft of specific weight? 18 be -- would attain a greater height at night? 18 THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. 19 THE WITNESS (Stevens): I 19 And it's my understanding that the lighter 20 believe Mr. Sellars indicated that they would 20 the aircraft, the more significant the plume, 21 attain a greater height at night because it 21 a given plume will have a greater impact on a 22 would be colder at night. So, my 22 wider plane, and that is why I chose my line 23 understanding is that plumes would be 23 of questioning in questioning the Applicant 24 volumetrically higher because of the lower 24 about light sport aircraft, which was only 25 25 recently certified by the FAA to be flown. temperature. Page 646 Page 648 MR. PIETRORAZIO: So that's in 1 1 And that type of plane, of which there are 2 several at Oxford flying out of Oxford, can conflict with the previous testimony with our 2 3 earlier session by CPV? 3 only be flown at a maximum gross weight of 4 THE WITNESS (Stevens): I'm 4 1,400 pounds, which is just over 50 percent 5 sorry. I don't know whether it's in 5 of the weight that the Navion was tested at 6 conflict. I believe Mr. Sellars indicated 6 in the MITRE report at 2,750 or 2,730, 2,760 7 that plumes at night, because of the lower 7 pounds -- 2,700 and some odd pounds. 8 temperature, would be greater. 8 So that is the type of 9 9 MR. PIETRORAZIO: Okay. Would aircraft that is of utmost concern to me as a 10 you happen to know the weight of the most 10 flight instructor. 11 common LA type aircraft being the 172 or not 11 MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you. 12 Cirrus but --12 And isn't the Cessna 172 the 13 13 THE WITNESS (Stevens): Cessna. most popular light aircraft in this country? THE WITNESS (Stevens): That 14 MR. PIETRORAZIO: -- Cessna, 14 15 the 172 aircraft? 15 along with the Piper Archer, yes, yes. The 16 16 THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, Cessna 172 is the ubiquitous training plane 17 sir. The Cessna 172 has a maximum gross 17 that's a four-seat training plane. The 18 weight of 2,400 pounds in its normal category 18 Cessna 150 is even lighter coming in at 1,600 19 19 and a maximum gross weight of 2,100 pounds in pounds gross weight. 20 its utility category, and it's normally flown 20 MR. PIETRORAZIO: So neither 21 in utility category when a student and flight 21 you nor I know the reason why MITRE used the 22 22 Navion? instructor are in there, so it should not 23 23 THE WITNESS (Stevens): Well, exceed 2,100 pounds at that point. 24 MR. PIETRORAZIO: Would you 24 I believe that MITRE used the Navion because 25 25 the Navion had a significant amount of data, say that there's an appreciable difference in

27 (Pages 645 to 648)

	Page 649		Page 651
1	but it's an incredibly strong plane. As I	1	IFR conditions, if you are not in instrument
2	indicated to the Council before, it is a	2	meteorological conditions if you're not
3	it was manufactured by the it was designed	3	IMC is the acronym you are not in the
4	by the same people that designed the P-51,	4	clouds, you must, whether you're IFR or VFR
5	which won World War II, as far as I'm	5	flying under visual flight rules or
6	concerned.	6	instrument flight rules, you must at all
7	MR. PIETRORAZIO: I agree.	7	times remain vigilant and see and avoid any
8	And are you familiar with the Casa Australian	8	dangers.
9	Aviation circular that specified the	9	MR. PIETRORAZIO: And that's
10	threshold at which thermal plumes could	10	particularly true at an airport?
11	endanger aircraft and even cause damage to	11	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Oh,
12	aircraft which is 4.3 meters per second	12	absolutely.
13	discharge rate out of the stacks which the	13	MR. PIETRORAZIO: In the
14	FAA has accepted as the criteria to use?	14	vicinity of an airport?
15	THE WITNESS (Stevens): I	15	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes,
16	believe it's referenced in the MITRE Report	16	sir.
17	that we've been discussing, yes, sir.	17	MR. PIETRORAZIO: I mean, it's
18	MR. PIETRORAZIO: And 4.3	18	true when you're flying anywhere at any time,
19	meters per second is roughly how many feet?	19	but particularly at an airport?
20	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Well,	20	THE WITNESS (Stevens): More
21	there's 39 inches per meter, so 3 feet, 12,	21	so at an airport than anywhere else, yes,
22	15 feet.	22	sir.
23	MR. PIETRORAZIO: Fifteen feet	23	MR. PIETRORAZIO: Because of
24	roughly?	24	the traffic?
25	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, I	25	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes,
	Page 650		Page 652
1		1	Page 652 sir.
1 2	Page 650 would guess. MR. PIETRORAZIO: And with the	1 2	
	would guess.		sir.
2	would guess. MR. PIETRORAZIO: And with the	2	sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you.
2 3	would guess. MR. PIETRORAZIO: And with the previous 512 megawatt plant, we had discharge	2 3 4 5	sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you. And the pilot is doing more with his aircraft than when cruising at his designed altitude of whatever. When he is
2 3 4	would guess. MR. PIETRORAZIO: And with the previous 512 megawatt plant, we had discharge rates fully six times that, did we not?	2 3 4	sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you. And the pilot is doing more with his aircraft than when cruising at his designed altitude of whatever. When he is constantly reducing his altitude and his air
2 3 4 5 6 7	would guess. MR. PIETRORAZIO: And with the previous 512 megawatt plant, we had discharge rates fully six times that, did we not? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe there were. MR. PIETRORAZIO: And in this	2 3 4 5 6 7	sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you. And the pilot is doing more with his aircraft than when cruising at his designed altitude of whatever. When he is constantly reducing his altitude and his air speed as he makes his approach, he's fooling
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	would guess. MR. PIETRORAZIO: And with the previous 512 megawatt plant, we had discharge rates fully six times that, did we not? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe there were. MR. PIETRORAZIO: And in this case at least four and well, that's a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you. And the pilot is doing more with his aircraft than when cruising at his designed altitude of whatever. When he is constantly reducing his altitude and his air speed as he makes his approach, he's fooling with his machine a little bit more and is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	would guess. MR. PIETRORAZIO: And with the previous 512 megawatt plant, we had discharge rates fully six times that, did we not? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe there were. MR. PIETRORAZIO: And in this case at least four and well, that's a question for CPV. I'm getting a little	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you. And the pilot is doing more with his aircraft than when cruising at his designed altitude of whatever. When he is constantly reducing his altitude and his air speed as he makes his approach, he's fooling with his machine a little bit more and is more attentive to that, plus see and avoid
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	would guess. MR. PIETRORAZIO: And with the previous 512 megawatt plant, we had discharge rates fully six times that, did we not? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe there were. MR. PIETRORAZIO: And in this case at least four and well, that's a question for CPV. I'm getting a little confused. That's fine. Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you. And the pilot is doing more with his aircraft than when cruising at his designed altitude of whatever. When he is constantly reducing his altitude and his air speed as he makes his approach, he's fooling with his machine a little bit more and is more attentive to that, plus see and avoid and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	would guess. MR. PIETRORAZIO: And with the previous 512 megawatt plant, we had discharge rates fully six times that, did we not? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe there were. MR. PIETRORAZIO: And in this case at least four and well, that's a question for CPV. I'm getting a little confused. That's fine. Thank you. Would you say that in the left	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you. And the pilot is doing more with his aircraft than when cruising at his designed altitude of whatever. When he is constantly reducing his altitude and his air speed as he makes his approach, he's fooling with his machine a little bit more and is more attentive to that, plus see and avoid and THE CHAIRMAN: Is this a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	would guess. MR. PIETRORAZIO: And with the previous 512 megawatt plant, we had discharge rates fully six times that, did we not? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe there were. MR. PIETRORAZIO: And in this case at least four and well, that's a question for CPV. I'm getting a little confused. That's fine. Thank you. Would you say that in the left downwind leg of a landing pattern a pilot is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you. And the pilot is doing more with his aircraft than when cruising at his designed altitude of whatever. When he is constantly reducing his altitude and his air speed as he makes his approach, he's fooling with his machine a little bit more and is more attentive to that, plus see and avoid and THE CHAIRMAN: Is this a question or a statement?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	would guess. MR. PIETRORAZIO: And with the previous 512 megawatt plant, we had discharge rates fully six times that, did we not? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe there were. MR. PIETRORAZIO: And in this case at least four and well, that's a question for CPV. I'm getting a little confused. That's fine. Thank you. Would you say that in the left downwind leg of a landing pattern a pilot is under considerable workload?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you. And the pilot is doing more with his aircraft than when cruising at his designed altitude of whatever. When he is constantly reducing his altitude and his air speed as he makes his approach, he's fooling with his machine a little bit more and is more attentive to that, plus see and avoid and THE CHAIRMAN: Is this a question or a statement? MR. PIETRORAZIO: Yes. And
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	would guess. MR. PIETRORAZIO: And with the previous 512 megawatt plant, we had discharge rates fully six times that, did we not? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe there were. MR. PIETRORAZIO: And in this case at least four and well, that's a question for CPV. I'm getting a little confused. That's fine. Thank you. Would you say that in the left downwind leg of a landing pattern a pilot is under considerable workload? THE WITNESS (Stevens):	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you. And the pilot is doing more with his aircraft than when cruising at his designed altitude of whatever. When he is constantly reducing his altitude and his air speed as he makes his approach, he's fooling with his machine a little bit more and is more attentive to that, plus see and avoid and THE CHAIRMAN: Is this a question or a statement? MR. PIETRORAZIO: Yes. And the question is: Does having to pay
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	would guess. MR. PIETRORAZIO: And with the previous 512 megawatt plant, we had discharge rates fully six times that, did we not? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe there were. MR. PIETRORAZIO: And in this case at least four and well, that's a question for CPV. I'm getting a little confused. That's fine. Thank you. Would you say that in the left downwind leg of a landing pattern a pilot is under considerable workload? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Whenever you're close to the ground, whenever	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you. And the pilot is doing more with his aircraft than when cruising at his designed altitude of whatever. When he is constantly reducing his altitude and his air speed as he makes his approach, he's fooling with his machine a little bit more and is more attentive to that, plus see and avoid and THE CHAIRMAN: Is this a question or a statement? MR. PIETRORAZIO: Yes. And the question is: Does having to pay particular attention to a possible hazard of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	would guess. MR. PIETRORAZIO: And with the previous 512 megawatt plant, we had discharge rates fully six times that, did we not? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe there were. MR. PIETRORAZIO: And in this case at least four and well, that's a question for CPV. I'm getting a little confused. That's fine. Thank you. Would you say that in the left downwind leg of a landing pattern a pilot is under considerable workload? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Whenever you're close to the ground, whenever you're in the traffic pattern, you're	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you. And the pilot is doing more with his aircraft than when cruising at his designed altitude of whatever. When he is constantly reducing his altitude and his air speed as he makes his approach, he's fooling with his machine a little bit more and is more attentive to that, plus see and avoid and THE CHAIRMAN: Is this a question or a statement? MR. PIETRORAZIO: Yes. And the question is: Does having to pay particular attention to a possible hazard of a thermal plume, does that increase his
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	would guess. MR. PIETRORAZIO: And with the previous 512 megawatt plant, we had discharge rates fully six times that, did we not? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe there were. MR. PIETRORAZIO: And in this case at least four and well, that's a question for CPV. I'm getting a little confused. That's fine. Thank you. Would you say that in the left downwind leg of a landing pattern a pilot is under considerable workload? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Whenever you're close to the ground, whenever you're in the traffic pattern, you're MR. PIETRORAZIO: Low and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you. And the pilot is doing more with his aircraft than when cruising at his designed altitude of whatever. When he is constantly reducing his altitude and his air speed as he makes his approach, he's fooling with his machine a little bit more and is more attentive to that, plus see and avoid and THE CHAIRMAN: Is this a question or a statement? MR. PIETRORAZIO: Yes. And the question is: Does having to pay particular attention to a possible hazard of a thermal plume, does that increase his workload even further?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	would guess. MR. PIETRORAZIO: And with the previous 512 megawatt plant, we had discharge rates fully six times that, did we not? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe there were. MR. PIETRORAZIO: And in this case at least four and well, that's a question for CPV. I'm getting a little confused. That's fine. Thank you. Would you say that in the left downwind leg of a landing pattern a pilot is under considerable workload? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Whenever you're close to the ground, whenever you're in the traffic pattern, you're MR. PIETRORAZIO: Low and slow?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you. And the pilot is doing more with his aircraft than when cruising at his designed altitude of whatever. When he is constantly reducing his altitude and his air speed as he makes his approach, he's fooling with his machine a little bit more and is more attentive to that, plus see and avoid and THE CHAIRMAN: Is this a question or a statement? MR. PIETRORAZIO: Yes. And the question is: Does having to pay particular attention to a possible hazard of a thermal plume, does that increase his workload even further? THE WITNESS (Stevens): The
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	would guess. MR. PIETRORAZIO: And with the previous 512 megawatt plant, we had discharge rates fully six times that, did we not? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe there were. MR. PIETRORAZIO: And in this case at least four and well, that's a question for CPV. I'm getting a little confused. That's fine. Thank you. Would you say that in the left downwind leg of a landing pattern a pilot is under considerable workload? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Whenever you're close to the ground, whenever you're in the traffic pattern, you're MR. PIETRORAZIO: Low and slow? THE WITNESS (Stevens):	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you. And the pilot is doing more with his aircraft than when cruising at his designed altitude of whatever. When he is constantly reducing his altitude and his air speed as he makes his approach, he's fooling with his machine a little bit more and is more attentive to that, plus see and avoid and THE CHAIRMAN: Is this a question or a statement? MR. PIETRORAZIO: Yes. And the question is: Does having to pay particular attention to a possible hazard of a thermal plume, does that increase his workload even further? THE WITNESS (Stevens): The short answer is absolutely. To flesh out
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	would guess. MR. PIETRORAZIO: And with the previous 512 megawatt plant, we had discharge rates fully six times that, did we not? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe there were. MR. PIETRORAZIO: And in this case at least four and well, that's a question for CPV. I'm getting a little confused. That's fine. Thank you. Would you say that in the left downwind leg of a landing pattern a pilot is under considerable workload? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Whenever you're close to the ground, whenever you're in the traffic pattern, you're MR. PIETRORAZIO: Low and slow? THE WITNESS (Stevens): you're under increased workload, yes, sir.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you. And the pilot is doing more with his aircraft than when cruising at his designed altitude of whatever. When he is constantly reducing his altitude and his air speed as he makes his approach, he's fooling with his machine a little bit more and is more attentive to that, plus see and avoid and THE CHAIRMAN: Is this a question or a statement? MR. PIETRORAZIO: Yes. And the question is: Does having to pay particular attention to a possible hazard of a thermal plume, does that increase his workload even further? THE WITNESS (Stevens): The short answer is absolutely. To flesh out that answer a little bit more, when a pilot
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	would guess. MR. PIETRORAZIO: And with the previous 512 megawatt plant, we had discharge rates fully six times that, did we not? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe there were. MR. PIETRORAZIO: And in this case at least four and well, that's a question for CPV. I'm getting a little confused. That's fine. Thank you. Would you say that in the left downwind leg of a landing pattern a pilot is under considerable workload? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Whenever you're close to the ground, whenever you're in the traffic pattern, you're MR. PIETRORAZIO: Low and slow? THE WITNESS (Stevens): you're under increased workload, yes, sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you. And the pilot is doing more with his aircraft than when cruising at his designed altitude of whatever. When he is constantly reducing his altitude and his air speed as he makes his approach, he's fooling with his machine a little bit more and is more attentive to that, plus see and avoid and THE CHAIRMAN: Is this a question or a statement? MR. PIETRORAZIO: Yes. And the question is: Does having to pay particular attention to a possible hazard of a thermal plume, does that increase his workload even further? THE WITNESS (Stevens): The short answer is absolutely. To flesh out that answer a little bit more, when a pilot is under an increased a pilot is under an
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	would guess. MR. PIETRORAZIO: And with the previous 512 megawatt plant, we had discharge rates fully six times that, did we not? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe there were. MR. PIETRORAZIO: And in this case at least four and well, that's a question for CPV. I'm getting a little confused. That's fine. Thank you. Would you say that in the left downwind leg of a landing pattern a pilot is under considerable workload? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Whenever you're close to the ground, whenever you're in the traffic pattern, you're MR. PIETRORAZIO: Low and slow? THE WITNESS (Stevens): you're under increased workload, yes, sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you. And what in the aviation	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you. And the pilot is doing more with his aircraft than when cruising at his designed altitude of whatever. When he is constantly reducing his altitude and his air speed as he makes his approach, he's fooling with his machine a little bit more and is more attentive to that, plus see and avoid and THE CHAIRMAN: Is this a question or a statement? MR. PIETRORAZIO: Yes. And the question is: Does having to pay particular attention to a possible hazard of a thermal plume, does that increase his workload even further? THE WITNESS (Stevens): The short answer is absolutely. To flesh out that answer a little bit more, when a pilot is under an increased a pilot is under an increased workload when the conditions
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	would guess. MR. PIETRORAZIO: And with the previous 512 megawatt plant, we had discharge rates fully six times that, did we not? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe there were. MR. PIETRORAZIO: And in this case at least four and well, that's a question for CPV. I'm getting a little confused. That's fine. Thank you. Would you say that in the left downwind leg of a landing pattern a pilot is under considerable workload? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Whenever you're close to the ground, whenever you're in the traffic pattern, you're MR. PIETRORAZIO: Low and slow? THE WITNESS (Stevens): you're under increased workload, yes, sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you. And what in the aviation community do we mean by "see and avoid"?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you. And the pilot is doing more with his aircraft than when cruising at his designed altitude of whatever. When he is constantly reducing his altitude and his air speed as he makes his approach, he's fooling with his machine a little bit more and is more attentive to that, plus see and avoid and THE CHAIRMAN: Is this a question or a statement? MR. PIETRORAZIO: Yes. And the question is: Does having to pay particular attention to a possible hazard of a thermal plume, does that increase his workload even further? THE WITNESS (Stevens): The short answer is absolutely. To flesh out that answer a little bit more, when a pilot is under an increased a pilot is under an increased workload when the conditions deteriorate. So when the weather is bad
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	would guess. MR. PIETRORAZIO: And with the previous 512 megawatt plant, we had discharge rates fully six times that, did we not? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe there were. MR. PIETRORAZIO: And in this case at least four and well, that's a question for CPV. I'm getting a little confused. That's fine. Thank you. Would you say that in the left downwind leg of a landing pattern a pilot is under considerable workload? THE WITNESS (Stevens): Whenever you're close to the ground, whenever you're in the traffic pattern, you're MR. PIETRORAZIO: Low and slow? THE WITNESS (Stevens): you're under increased workload, yes, sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you. And what in the aviation	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you. And the pilot is doing more with his aircraft than when cruising at his designed altitude of whatever. When he is constantly reducing his altitude and his air speed as he makes his approach, he's fooling with his machine a little bit more and is more attentive to that, plus see and avoid and THE CHAIRMAN: Is this a question or a statement? MR. PIETRORAZIO: Yes. And the question is: Does having to pay particular attention to a possible hazard of a thermal plume, does that increase his workload even further? THE WITNESS (Stevens): The short answer is absolutely. To flesh out that answer a little bit more, when a pilot is under an increased a pilot is under an increased workload when the conditions

28 (Pages 649 to 652)

Page 653 Page 655 1 feet over the top of the stack. When a 1 substation. 2 2 person is flying an instrument approach in THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, 3 3 the Runway 36 with a circle-to-land into sir. 4 Runway 18, he is probably under the most 4 MR. PIETRORAZIO: Is that 5 incredible pressure when the weather is bad 5 correct? 6 that a pilot can possibly imagine, and 6 THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, 7 circle-to-land landings are probably the most 7 sir. 8 dangerous landing that a pilot can 8 MR. PIETRORAZIO: And isn't it 9 experience. 9 true that -- well, I think the investigation 10 10 We had the misfortune of showed that no one could say why he was that 11 losing an airplane down in New Haven two 11 low; is that correct? 12 years ago when he was approaching Runway 2 to 12 THE WITNESS (Stevens): I 13 the north and he had to -- the controller 13 think he -- I'm not -- I haven't -- I don't 14 14 required him to circle-to-land, and recall the NTSB report, so I can't comment on 15 15 what happened. I don't recall. unfortunately we lost a former Microsoft executive and his son who were coming from THE CHAIRMAN: Excuse me. I'm 16 16 17 Seattle to visit Yale. We lost them in a 17 trying to figure out the relevance of this 18 crash in a circle-to-land. 18 accident. Because somebody flew low into 19 I had the privilege and the 19 wires. I don't understand how that --20 honor of going to Sun 'n Fun, which is one of 20 MR. PIETRORAZIO: I'm sorry, 21 the two major aviation exhibitions of the 21 Mr. Chairman, I'll clarify that now. 22 year, and I went there last April, and I was 22 The point I'm driving at here 23 one of three master flight instructors that 23 is -- and I'm not a pilot, but I have studied 24 offered scenarios to pilots who were visiting 24 the issue for a number of years. And is it 25 Sun 'n Fun in a full motion simulator. One 25 not true that flying is not a perfect science Page 654 Page 656 1 of the scenarios allowed the pilot to choose 1 and you get into -- pilots have to handle 2 whether he was going to land downwind or 2 conditions as they present themselves when 3 whether he was going to circle-to-land. My 3 they present themselves at that time at that 4 personal experience with the 20 participants 4 moment and make decisions kind of from the 5 that I had, the ten that chose landing with a 5 holster. It's not -- everything doesn't work б tail wind landed safely; the ten that circled б out perfectly, is that true, when flying? 7 to land at a reduced altitude of 7 THE CHAIRMAN: Again, I'm 8 approximately 500 feet over the runway 8 not -- I just don't understand the relevance. 9 9 crashed the simulator. I think that's a given. Everybody 10 So circle-to-land -- landing 10 understands flying, like other activities, 11 is the most dangerous portion of flying. 11 is -- under certain conditions, the workload 12 Whenever you're slow and whenever you're 12 is greater -- we all understand that -- when 13 13 close to the ground is the most dangerous you're landing. I'm still trying to figure 14 14 out your point, and I wish you'd get to it. phase of flying. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Well, I 15 MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you. 15 16 16 And when we had the loss of guess I was drawing a relationship between 17 life pilot at Waterbury Oxford Airport just a 17 the accident that took place where the pilot 18 18 should not have been that low, but he was, few years ago --19 19 THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, and the --20 sir. 20 THE CHAIRMAN: Well, but 21 MR. PIETRORAZIO: -- that 21 again --22 airplane caught the electrical -- one of the 22 MR. PIETRORAZIO: -- same 23 23 thing can happen with these stacks, and most outward portions of the steel lattice 24 towers, and flipped him over, and he impacted 24 that's the point I'm trying to make. 25 25 the electrical generating -- the electrical THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. That's

29 (Pages 653 to 656)

	Page 657		Page 659
1	the point. Well, I'm glad you got to the	1	Airport. You can rephrase the question.
2	point.	2	THE CHAIRMAN: Rephrase the
3	MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you.	3	question, please, or else I'm going to
4	With regard to the NOTAM that	4	sustain the objection.
5	was mentioned that you responded to, that	5	MR. PIETRORAZIO: In your
6	NOTAM was issued after 9/11; is that correct?	6	professional opinion as a pilot, wouldn't it
7	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes,	7	be better for Waterbury Oxford Airport not to
8	sir.	8	have this power plant under its left downwind
9	MR. PIETRORAZIO: And the	9	leg?
10	purpose of that NOTAM was to try to have a	10	MR. SMALL: Same objection.
11	handle on aircraft hanging around certain	11	He can't speak on behalf of the airport.
12	facilities and the threat that that might	12	THE CHAIRMAN: Well, he said
13	present	13	as a pilot. And a simple yes or no answer
14	THE WITNESS (Stevens): I	14	would be fine.
15	believe that's correct.	15	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Okay.
16	MR. PIETRORAZIO: from the	16	THE CHAIRMAN: I think we
17	standpoint of terrorism?	17	all
18	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes, I	18	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Then I
19	believe that's correct.	19	want to make sure I answer it correctly, so
20	MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you.	20	can I ask the question he asked real quick?
21	And that NOTAM is still in	21	Would it be safer, is that your question, if
22	effect?	22	there were no power plant?
23	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes,	23	MR. PIETRORAZIO: Yes. And
24	sir, it is.	24	considering the NOTAM, as well that that
25	MR. PIETRORAZIO: And that	25	complicates the issue, the NOTAM exists, and
	Page 658		Page 660
1		1	Page 660 therefore, if the power plant were not a
1 2	Page 658 NOTAM was brought up by CPV? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It was	1 2	_
	NOTAM was brought up by CPV?		therefore, if the power plant were not a
2	NOTAM was brought up by CPV? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It was	2	therefore, if the power plant were not a factor of its relationship to the airport,
2 3	NOTAM was brought up by CPV? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It was brought up in my line of questioning, and	2 3	therefore, if the power plant were not a factor of its relationship to the airport, wouldn't that be a positive thing?
2 3 4	NOTAM was brought up by CPV? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It was brought up in my line of questioning, and they did respond and discuss we did	2 3 4	therefore, if the power plant were not a factor of its relationship to the airport, wouldn't that be a positive thing? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I'll
2 3 4 5	NOTAM was brought up by CPV? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It was brought up in my line of questioning, and they did respond and discuss we did discuss that NOTAM during my line of	2 3 4 5	therefore, if the power plant were not a factor of its relationship to the airport, wouldn't that be a positive thing? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I'll answer very briefly. If the power plant did
2 3 4 5 6	NOTAM was brought up by CPV? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It was brought up in my line of questioning, and they did respond and discuss we did discuss that NOTAM during my line of questioning, yes, sir.	2 3 4 5 6	therefore, if the power plant were not a factor of its relationship to the airport, wouldn't that be a positive thing? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I'll answer very briefly. If the power plant did not exist, then there would be no need to
2 3 4 5 6 7	NOTAM was brought up by CPV? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It was brought up in my line of questioning, and they did respond and discuss we did discuss that NOTAM during my line of questioning, yes, sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Well, am I	2 3 4 5 6 7	therefore, if the power plant were not a factor of its relationship to the airport, wouldn't that be a positive thing? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I'll answer very briefly. If the power plant did not exist, then there would be no need to comply with the NOTAM or the AIM which pilots
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	NOTAM was brought up by CPV? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It was brought up in my line of questioning, and they did respond and discuss we did discuss that NOTAM during my line of questioning, yes, sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Well, am I mistaken? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe that's correct. I may be wrong. I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	therefore, if the power plant were not a factor of its relationship to the airport, wouldn't that be a positive thing? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I'll answer very briefly. If the power plant did not exist, then there would be no need to comply with the NOTAM or the AIM which pilots have to comply with. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you. You did a much better job than I did.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	NOTAM was brought up by CPV? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It was brought up in my line of questioning, and they did respond and discuss we did discuss that NOTAM during my line of questioning, yes, sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Well, am I mistaken? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	therefore, if the power plant were not a factor of its relationship to the airport, wouldn't that be a positive thing? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I'll answer very briefly. If the power plant did not exist, then there would be no need to comply with the NOTAM or the AIM which pilots have to comply with. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	NOTAM was brought up by CPV? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It was brought up in my line of questioning, and they did respond and discuss we did discuss that NOTAM during my line of questioning, yes, sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Well, am I mistaken? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe that's correct. I may be wrong. I may have discussed it in response to questioning from the parties. I don't recall	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	therefore, if the power plant were not a factor of its relationship to the airport, wouldn't that be a positive thing? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I'll answer very briefly. If the power plant did not exist, then there would be no need to comply with the NOTAM or the AIM which pilots have to comply with. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you. You did a much better job than I did. Are you familiar with Blythe 1 plant in California, Blythe 1 electrical
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	NOTAM was brought up by CPV? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It was brought up in my line of questioning, and they did respond and discuss we did discuss that NOTAM during my line of questioning, yes, sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Well, am I mistaken? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe that's correct. I may be wrong. I may have discussed it in response to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	therefore, if the power plant were not a factor of its relationship to the airport, wouldn't that be a positive thing? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I'll answer very briefly. If the power plant did not exist, then there would be no need to comply with the NOTAM or the AIM which pilots have to comply with. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you. You did a much better job than I did. Are you familiar with Blythe 1 plant in California, Blythe 1 electrical generating station in California?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	NOTAM was brought up by CPV? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It was brought up in my line of questioning, and they did respond and discuss we did discuss that NOTAM during my line of questioning, yes, sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Well, am I mistaken? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe that's correct. I may be wrong. I may have discussed it in response to questioning from the parties. I don't recall	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	therefore, if the power plant were not a factor of its relationship to the airport, wouldn't that be a positive thing? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I'll answer very briefly. If the power plant did not exist, then there would be no need to comply with the NOTAM or the AIM which pilots have to comply with. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you. You did a much better job than I did. Are you familiar with Blythe 1 plant in California, Blythe 1 electrical
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	NOTAM was brought up by CPV? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It was brought up in my line of questioning, and they did respond and discuss we did discuss that NOTAM during my line of questioning, yes, sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Well, am I mistaken? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe that's correct. I may be wrong. I may have discussed it in response to questioning from the parties. I don't recall specifically. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Okay. Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	therefore, if the power plant were not a factor of its relationship to the airport, wouldn't that be a positive thing? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I'll answer very briefly. If the power plant did not exist, then there would be no need to comply with the NOTAM or the AIM which pilots have to comply with. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you. You did a much better job than I did. Are you familiar with Blythe 1 plant in California, Blythe 1 electrical generating station in California?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	NOTAM was brought up by CPV? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It was brought up in my line of questioning, and they did respond and discuss we did discuss that NOTAM during my line of questioning, yes, sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Well, am I mistaken? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe that's correct. I may be wrong. I may have discussed it in response to questioning from the parties. I don't recall specifically. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Okay. Thank you. And the point here is wouldn't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	therefore, if the power plant were not a factor of its relationship to the airport, wouldn't that be a positive thing? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I'll answer very briefly. If the power plant did not exist, then there would be no need to comply with the NOTAM or the AIM which pilots have to comply with. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you. You did a much better job than I did. Are you familiar with Blythe 1 plant in California, Blythe 1 electrical generating station in California? THE WITNESS (Stevens): You'll have to refresh. I'm not sure. MR. PIETRORAZIO: In Blythe,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	NOTAM was brought up by CPV? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It was brought up in my line of questioning, and they did respond and discuss we did discuss that NOTAM during my line of questioning, yes, sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Well, am I mistaken? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe that's correct. I may be wrong. I may have discussed it in response to questioning from the parties. I don't recall specifically. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Okay. Thank you. And the point here is wouldn't it be advantageous for wouldn't it serve	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	therefore, if the power plant were not a factor of its relationship to the airport, wouldn't that be a positive thing? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I'll answer very briefly. If the power plant did not exist, then there would be no need to comply with the NOTAM or the AIM which pilots have to comply with. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you. You did a much better job than I did. Are you familiar with Blythe 1 plant in California, Blythe 1 electrical generating station in California? THE WITNESS (Stevens): You'll have to refresh. I'm not sure. MR. PIETRORAZIO: In Blythe, California, there was a siting taking place
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	NOTAM was brought up by CPV? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It was brought up in my line of questioning, and they did respond and discuss we did discuss that NOTAM during my line of questioning, yes, sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Well, am I mistaken? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe that's correct. I may be wrong. I may have discussed it in response to questioning from the parties. I don't recall specifically. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Okay. Thank you. And the point here is wouldn't it be advantageous for wouldn't it serve Waterbury Oxford Airport well concerning	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	therefore, if the power plant were not a factor of its relationship to the airport, wouldn't that be a positive thing? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I'll answer very briefly. If the power plant did not exist, then there would be no need to comply with the NOTAM or the AIM which pilots have to comply with. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you. You did a much better job than I did. Are you familiar with Blythe 1 plant in California, Blythe 1 electrical generating station in California? THE WITNESS (Stevens): You'll have to refresh. I'm not sure. MR. PIETRORAZIO: In Blythe, California, there was a siting taking place for a second plant, Blythe 2, a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	NOTAM was brought up by CPV? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It was brought up in my line of questioning, and they did respond and discuss we did discuss that NOTAM during my line of questioning, yes, sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Well, am I mistaken? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe that's correct. I may be wrong. I may have discussed it in response to questioning from the parties. I don't recall specifically. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Okay. Thank you. And the point here is wouldn't it be advantageous for wouldn't it serve Waterbury Oxford Airport well concerning that, when you consider this NOTAM that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	therefore, if the power plant were not a factor of its relationship to the airport, wouldn't that be a positive thing? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I'll answer very briefly. If the power plant did not exist, then there would be no need to comply with the NOTAM or the AIM which pilots have to comply with. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you. You did a much better job than I did. Are you familiar with Blythe 1 plant in California, Blythe 1 electrical generating station in California? THE WITNESS (Stevens): You'll have to refresh. I'm not sure. MR. PIETRORAZIO: In Blythe, California, there was a siting taking place for a second plant, Blythe 2, a combined-cycle generating plant.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	NOTAM was brought up by CPV? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It was brought up in my line of questioning, and they did respond and discuss we did discuss that NOTAM during my line of questioning, yes, sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Well, am I mistaken? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe that's correct. I may be wrong. I may have discussed it in response to questioning from the parties. I don't recall specifically. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Okay. Thank you. And the point here is wouldn't it be advantageous for wouldn't it serve Waterbury Oxford Airport well concerning that, when you consider this NOTAM that applies to it and the fact that a power plant	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	therefore, if the power plant were not a factor of its relationship to the airport, wouldn't that be a positive thing? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I'll answer very briefly. If the power plant did not exist, then there would be no need to comply with the NOTAM or the AIM which pilots have to comply with. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you. You did a much better job than I did. Are you familiar with Blythe 1 plant in California, Blythe 1 electrical generating station in California? THE WITNESS (Stevens): You'll have to refresh. I'm not sure. MR. PIETRORAZIO: In Blythe, California, there was a siting taking place for a second plant, Blythe 2, a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	NOTAM was brought up by CPV? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It was brought up in my line of questioning, and they did respond and discuss we did discuss that NOTAM during my line of questioning, yes, sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Well, am I mistaken? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe that's correct. I may be wrong. I may have discussed it in response to questioning from the parties. I don't recall specifically. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Okay. Thank you. And the point here is wouldn't it be advantageous for wouldn't it serve Waterbury Oxford Airport well concerning that, when you consider this NOTAM that applies to it and the fact that a power plant would be sitting under the left downwind leg,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	therefore, if the power plant were not a factor of its relationship to the airport, wouldn't that be a positive thing? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I'll answer very briefly. If the power plant did not exist, then there would be no need to comply with the NOTAM or the AIM which pilots have to comply with. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you. You did a much better job than I did. Are you familiar with Blythe 1 plant in California, Blythe 1 electrical generating station in California? THE WITNESS (Stevens): You'll have to refresh. I'm not sure. MR. PIETRORAZIO: In Blythe, California, there was a siting taking place for a second plant, Blythe 2, a combined-cycle generating plant.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	NOTAM was brought up by CPV? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It was brought up in my line of questioning, and they did respond and discuss we did discuss that NOTAM during my line of questioning, yes, sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Well, am I mistaken? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe that's correct. I may be wrong. I may have discussed it in response to questioning from the parties. I don't recall specifically. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Okay. Thank you. And the point here is wouldn't it be advantageous for wouldn't it serve Waterbury Oxford Airport well concerning that, when you consider this NOTAM that applies to it and the fact that a power plant would be sitting under the left downwind leg, wouldn't it be so much better if there were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	therefore, if the power plant were not a factor of its relationship to the airport, wouldn't that be a positive thing? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I'll answer very briefly. If the power plant did not exist, then there would be no need to comply with the NOTAM or the AIM which pilots have to comply with. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you. You did a much better job than I did. Are you familiar with Blythe 1 plant in California, Blythe 1 electrical generating station in California? THE WITNESS (Stevens): You'll have to refresh. I'm not sure. MR. PIETRORAZIO: In Blythe, California, there was a siting taking place for a second plant, Blythe 2, a combined-cycle generating plant. THE CHAIRMAN: So the question
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	NOTAM was brought up by CPV? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It was brought up in my line of questioning, and they did respond and discuss we did discuss that NOTAM during my line of questioning, yes, sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Well, am I mistaken? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe that's correct. I may be wrong. I may have discussed it in response to questioning from the parties. I don't recall specifically. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Okay. Thank you. And the point here is wouldn't it be advantageous for wouldn't it serve Waterbury Oxford Airport well concerning that, when you consider this NOTAM that applies to it and the fact that a power plant would be sitting under the left downwind leg, wouldn't it be so much better if there were no power plant under the left downwind leg?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	therefore, if the power plant were not a factor of its relationship to the airport, wouldn't that be a positive thing? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I'll answer very briefly. If the power plant did not exist, then there would be no need to comply with the NOTAM or the AIM which pilots have to comply with. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you. You did a much better job than I did. Are you familiar with Blythe 1 plant in California, Blythe 1 electrical generating station in California? THE WITNESS (Stevens): You'll have to refresh. I'm not sure. MR. PIETRORAZIO: In Blythe, California, there was a siting taking place for a second plant, Blythe 2, a combined-cycle generating plant. THE CHAIRMAN: So the question is, are you familiar? And if you're not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	NOTAM was brought up by CPV? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It was brought up in my line of questioning, and they did respond and discuss we did discuss that NOTAM during my line of questioning, yes, sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Well, am I mistaken? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe that's correct. I may be wrong. I may have discussed it in response to questioning from the parties. I don't recall specifically. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Okay. Thank you. And the point here is wouldn't it be advantageous for wouldn't it serve Waterbury Oxford Airport well concerning that, when you consider this NOTAM that applies to it and the fact that a power plant would be sitting under the left downwind leg, wouldn't it be so much better if there were no power plant under the left downwind leg? MR. SMALL: Objection.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	therefore, if the power plant were not a factor of its relationship to the airport, wouldn't that be a positive thing? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I'll answer very briefly. If the power plant did not exist, then there would be no need to comply with the NOTAM or the AIM which pilots have to comply with. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you. You did a much better job than I did. Are you familiar with Blythe 1 plant in California, Blythe 1 electrical generating station in California? THE WITNESS (Stevens): You'll have to refresh. I'm not sure. MR. PIETRORAZIO: In Blythe, California, there was a siting taking place for a second plant, Blythe 2, a combined-cycle generating plant. THE CHAIRMAN: So the question is, are you familiar? And if you're not THE WITNESS (Stevens): The
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	NOTAM was brought up by CPV? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It was brought up in my line of questioning, and they did respond and discuss we did discuss that NOTAM during my line of questioning, yes, sir. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Well, am I mistaken? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe that's correct. I may be wrong. I may have discussed it in response to questioning from the parties. I don't recall specifically. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Okay. Thank you. And the point here is wouldn't it be advantageous for wouldn't it serve Waterbury Oxford Airport well concerning that, when you consider this NOTAM that applies to it and the fact that a power plant would be sitting under the left downwind leg, wouldn't it be so much better if there were no power plant under the left downwind leg?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	therefore, if the power plant were not a factor of its relationship to the airport, wouldn't that be a positive thing? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I'll answer very briefly. If the power plant did not exist, then there would be no need to comply with the NOTAM or the AIM which pilots have to comply with. MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you. You did a much better job than I did. Are you familiar with Blythe 1 plant in California, Blythe 1 electrical generating station in California? THE WITNESS (Stevens): You'll have to refresh. I'm not sure. MR. PIETRORAZIO: In Blythe, California, there was a siting taking place for a second plant, Blythe 2, a combined-cycle generating plant. THE CHAIRMAN: So the question is, are you familiar? And if you're not THE WITNESS (Stevens): The answer is I don't believe I am.

30 (Pages 657 to 660)

	Page 661		Page 663
1	MR. PIETRORAZIO: I	1	MR. PIETRORAZIO: Well,
2	understand. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.	2	without mentioning cooling tower, I don't see
3	Are you aware that cooling	3	how I can do that, so I'll go on to the next
4	tower thermal plumes can have an effect on	4	question.
5	aviation as well as	5	The upset criteria and that
б	MR. SMALL: I'm going to	6	was discussed with CPV they do ask whether
7	object because this plant does not have a	7	the findings that were that supported
8	cooling tower, so the question is irrelevant.	8	their response from the modeling, did you not
9	THE CHAIRMAN: So is there	9	ask if those results were for the 512
10	relevancy to the question since it does not	10	megawatt plant and not the new plant?
11	have cooling tower?	11	THE WITNESS (Stevens): I did,
12	MR. PIETRORAZIO: Absolutely.	12	and I believe their response was that the
13	The relevancy is plume and its effect on	13	2012 MITRE report referenced the 512 megawatt
14	aviation.	14	plant, but the calculations that they
15	THE CHAIRMAN: But you talked	15	provided were for a distillate plant that was
16	specifically about a cooling tower in your	16	for the proposed present plant of 798 or 805
17	question. Rephrase the question, please, to	17	megawatts.
18	make it relevant to, you know, the	18	MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you.
19	application before us.	19	Are you familiar with the SAIC
20	MR. PIETRORAZIO: Isn't it	20	report that preceded the MITRE report?
21	true that the plumes emanating from a cooling	21	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Again,
22	tower	22	I believe that was referenced in the MITRE
23	THE CHAIRMAN: If there's no	23	report as well.
24	cooling tower associated with the project,	24	MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you.
25	why the question? There are plumes	25	Are you familiar with the
1			
	Page 662		Page 664
1	associated with other	1	finding of that SAIC report, if I may use the
2	associated with other MR. PIETRORAZIO: The MITRE	2	finding of that SAIC report, if I may use the term "SAIC," that stated specifically if the
2 3	associated with other MR. PIETRORAZIO: The MITRE report, Mr. Chairman, and the previous	2 3	finding of that SAIC report, if I may use the term "SAIC," that stated specifically if the Towantic plant, at that time the 512 megawatt
2 3 4	associated with other MR. PIETRORAZIO: The MITRE report, Mr. Chairman, and the previous report, the SAIC report, do not necessarily	2 3 4	finding of that SAIC report, if I may use the term "SAIC," that stated specifically if the Towantic plant, at that time the 512 megawatt plant, were sited at that place in Oxford,
2 3 4 5	associated with other MR. PIETRORAZIO: The MITRE report, Mr. Chairman, and the previous report, the SAIC report, do not necessarily relegate themselves to plumes from power	2 3 4 5	finding of that SAIC report, if I may use the term "SAIC," that stated specifically if the Towantic plant, at that time the 512 megawatt plant, were sited at that place in Oxford, Connecticut, next to that airport, that the
2 3 4 5 6	associated with other MR. PIETRORAZIO: The MITRE report, Mr. Chairman, and the previous report, the SAIC report, do not necessarily relegate themselves to plumes from power plants. It's all thermal plumes.	2 3 4 5 6	finding of that SAIC report, if I may use the term "SAIC," that stated specifically if the Towantic plant, at that time the 512 megawatt plant, were sited at that place in Oxford, Connecticut, next to that airport, that the adverse effect to the airport there would
2 3 4 5 6 7	associated with other MR. PIETRORAZIO: The MITRE report, Mr. Chairman, and the previous report, the SAIC report, do not necessarily relegate themselves to plumes from power plants. It's all thermal plumes. THE CHAIRMAN: Right, but the	2 3 4 5 6 7	finding of that SAIC report, if I may use the term "SAIC," that stated specifically if the Towantic plant, at that time the 512 megawatt plant, were sited at that place in Oxford, Connecticut, next to that airport, that the adverse effect to the airport there would be an adverse unacceptable risk, excuse me,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	associated with other MR. PIETRORAZIO: The MITRE report, Mr. Chairman, and the previous report, the SAIC report, do not necessarily relegate themselves to plumes from power plants. It's all thermal plumes. THE CHAIRMAN: Right, but the application before us is specific. So the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	finding of that SAIC report, if I may use the term "SAIC," that stated specifically if the Towantic plant, at that time the 512 megawatt plant, were sited at that place in Oxford, Connecticut, next to that airport, that the adverse effect to the airport there would be an adverse unacceptable risk, excuse me, unacceptable risk, within the whole area of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	associated with other MR. PIETRORAZIO: The MITRE report, Mr. Chairman, and the previous report, the SAIC report, do not necessarily relegate themselves to plumes from power plants. It's all thermal plumes. THE CHAIRMAN: Right, but the application before us is specific. So the questions that you're asking Mr. Stevens	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	finding of that SAIC report, if I may use the term "SAIC," that stated specifically if the Towantic plant, at that time the 512 megawatt plant, were sited at that place in Oxford, Connecticut, next to that airport, that the adverse effect to the airport there would be an adverse unacceptable risk, excuse me, unacceptable risk, within the whole area of the airport? Are you familiar with that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	associated with other MR. PIETRORAZIO: The MITRE report, Mr. Chairman, and the previous report, the SAIC report, do not necessarily relegate themselves to plumes from power plants. It's all thermal plumes. THE CHAIRMAN: Right, but the application before us is specific. So the questions that you're asking Mr. Stevens should relate to facilities that are going to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	finding of that SAIC report, if I may use the term "SAIC," that stated specifically if the Towantic plant, at that time the 512 megawatt plant, were sited at that place in Oxford, Connecticut, next to that airport, that the adverse effect to the airport there would be an adverse unacceptable risk, excuse me, unacceptable risk, within the whole area of the airport? Are you familiar with that statement?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	associated with other MR. PIETRORAZIO: The MITRE report, Mr. Chairman, and the previous report, the SAIC report, do not necessarily relegate themselves to plumes from power plants. It's all thermal plumes. THE CHAIRMAN: Right, but the application before us is specific. So the questions that you're asking Mr. Stevens should relate to facilities that are going to be part of this power plant, and my	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	finding of that SAIC report, if I may use the term "SAIC," that stated specifically if the Towantic plant, at that time the 512 megawatt plant, were sited at that place in Oxford, Connecticut, next to that airport, that the adverse effect to the airport there would be an adverse unacceptable risk, excuse me, unacceptable risk, within the whole area of the airport? Are you familiar with that statement? MR. SMALL: I'm going to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	associated with other MR. PIETRORAZIO: The MITRE report, Mr. Chairman, and the previous report, the SAIC report, do not necessarily relegate themselves to plumes from power plants. It's all thermal plumes. THE CHAIRMAN: Right, but the application before us is specific. So the questions that you're asking Mr. Stevens should relate to facilities that are going to be part of this power plant, and my understanding, and correct me if I'm wrong,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	finding of that SAIC report, if I may use the term "SAIC," that stated specifically if the Towantic plant, at that time the 512 megawatt plant, were sited at that place in Oxford, Connecticut, next to that airport, that the adverse effect to the airport there would be an adverse unacceptable risk, excuse me, unacceptable risk, within the whole area of the airport? Are you familiar with that statement? MR. SMALL: I'm going to object to that question primarily because the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	associated with other MR. PIETRORAZIO: The MITRE report, Mr. Chairman, and the previous report, the SAIC report, do not necessarily relegate themselves to plumes from power plants. It's all thermal plumes. THE CHAIRMAN: Right, but the application before us is specific. So the questions that you're asking Mr. Stevens should relate to facilities that are going to be part of this power plant, and my understanding, and correct me if I'm wrong, is a cooling tower is not part of this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	finding of that SAIC report, if I may use the term "SAIC," that stated specifically if the Towantic plant, at that time the 512 megawatt plant, were sited at that place in Oxford, Connecticut, next to that airport, that the adverse effect to the airport there would be an adverse unacceptable risk, excuse me, unacceptable risk, within the whole area of the airport? Are you familiar with that statement? MR. SMALL: I'm going to object to that question primarily because the SAIC model was never accepted or acknowledged
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	associated with other MR. PIETRORAZIO: The MITRE report, Mr. Chairman, and the previous report, the SAIC report, do not necessarily relegate themselves to plumes from power plants. It's all thermal plumes. THE CHAIRMAN: Right, but the application before us is specific. So the questions that you're asking Mr. Stevens should relate to facilities that are going to be part of this power plant, and my understanding, and correct me if I'm wrong, is a cooling tower is not part of this facility.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	finding of that SAIC report, if I may use the term "SAIC," that stated specifically if the Towantic plant, at that time the 512 megawatt plant, were sited at that place in Oxford, Connecticut, next to that airport, that the adverse effect to the airport there would be an adverse unacceptable risk, excuse me, unacceptable risk, within the whole area of the airport? Are you familiar with that statement? MR. SMALL: I'm going to object to that question primarily because the SAIC model was never accepted or acknowledged by the FAA. In fact, the FAA asked MITRE to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	associated with other MR. PIETRORAZIO: The MITRE report, Mr. Chairman, and the previous report, the SAIC report, do not necessarily relegate themselves to plumes from power plants. It's all thermal plumes. THE CHAIRMAN: Right, but the application before us is specific. So the questions that you're asking Mr. Stevens should relate to facilities that are going to be part of this power plant, and my understanding, and correct me if I'm wrong, is a cooling tower is not part of this facility. MR. PIETRORAZIO: I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	finding of that SAIC report, if I may use the term "SAIC," that stated specifically if the Towantic plant, at that time the 512 megawatt plant, were sited at that place in Oxford, Connecticut, next to that airport, that the adverse effect to the airport there would be an adverse unacceptable risk, excuse me, unacceptable risk, within the whole area of the airport? Are you familiar with that statement? MR. SMALL: I'm going to object to that question primarily because the SAIC model was never accepted or acknowledged by the FAA. In fact, the FAA asked MITRE to review it. MITRE severely criticized it for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	associated with other MR. PIETRORAZIO: The MITRE report, Mr. Chairman, and the previous report, the SAIC report, do not necessarily relegate themselves to plumes from power plants. It's all thermal plumes. THE CHAIRMAN: Right, but the application before us is specific. So the questions that you're asking Mr. Stevens should relate to facilities that are going to be part of this power plant, and my understanding, and correct me if I'm wrong, is a cooling tower is not part of this facility. MR. PIETRORAZIO: I understand.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	finding of that SAIC report, if I may use the term "SAIC," that stated specifically if the Towantic plant, at that time the 512 megawatt plant, were sited at that place in Oxford, Connecticut, next to that airport, that the adverse effect to the airport there would be an adverse unacceptable risk, excuse me, unacceptable risk, within the whole area of the airport? Are you familiar with that statement? MR. SMALL: I'm going to object to that question primarily because the SAIC model was never accepted or acknowledged by the FAA. In fact, the FAA asked MITRE to review it. MITRE severely criticized it for its inaccuracy, if you look at the two 2012
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	associated with other MR. PIETRORAZIO: The MITRE report, Mr. Chairman, and the previous report, the SAIC report, do not necessarily relegate themselves to plumes from power plants. It's all thermal plumes. THE CHAIRMAN: Right, but the application before us is specific. So the questions that you're asking Mr. Stevens should relate to facilities that are going to be part of this power plant, and my understanding, and correct me if I'm wrong, is a cooling tower is not part of this facility. MR. PIETRORAZIO: I understand. THE CHAIRMAN: There are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	finding of that SAIC report, if I may use the term "SAIC," that stated specifically if the Towantic plant, at that time the 512 megawatt plant, were sited at that place in Oxford, Connecticut, next to that airport, that the adverse effect to the airport there would be an adverse unacceptable risk, excuse me, unacceptable risk, within the whole area of the airport? Are you familiar with that statement? MR. SMALL: I'm going to object to that question primarily because the SAIC model was never accepted or acknowledged by the FAA. In fact, the FAA asked MITRE to review it. MITRE severely criticized it for its inaccuracy, if you look at the two 2012 reports that MITRE issued and some other
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	associated with other MR. PIETRORAZIO: The MITRE report, Mr. Chairman, and the previous report, the SAIC report, do not necessarily relegate themselves to plumes from power plants. It's all thermal plumes. THE CHAIRMAN: Right, but the application before us is specific. So the questions that you're asking Mr. Stevens should relate to facilities that are going to be part of this power plant, and my understanding, and correct me if I'm wrong, is a cooling tower is not part of this facility. MR. PIETRORAZIO: I understand. THE CHAIRMAN: There are MR. PIETRORAZIO: Maybe I'll	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	finding of that SAIC report, if I may use the term "SAIC," that stated specifically if the Towantic plant, at that time the 512 megawatt plant, were sited at that place in Oxford, Connecticut, next to that airport, that the adverse effect to the airport there would be an adverse unacceptable risk, excuse me, unacceptable risk, within the whole area of the airport? Are you familiar with that statement? MR. SMALL: I'm going to object to that question primarily because the SAIC model was never accepted or acknowledged by the FAA. In fact, the FAA asked MITRE to review it. MITRE severely criticized it for its inaccuracy, if you look at the two 2012 reports that MITRE issued and some other reports that Mr. Pietrorazio has provided.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	associated with other MR. PIETRORAZIO: The MITRE report, Mr. Chairman, and the previous report, the SAIC report, do not necessarily relegate themselves to plumes from power plants. It's all thermal plumes. THE CHAIRMAN: Right, but the application before us is specific. So the questions that you're asking Mr. Stevens should relate to facilities that are going to be part of this power plant, and my understanding, and correct me if I'm wrong, is a cooling tower is not part of this facility. MR. PIETRORAZIO: I understand. THE CHAIRMAN: There are MR. PIETRORAZIO: Maybe I'll ask that question at the brief I'll	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	finding of that SAIC report, if I may use the term "SAIC," that stated specifically if the Towantic plant, at that time the 512 megawatt plant, were sited at that place in Oxford, Connecticut, next to that airport, that the adverse effect to the airport there would be an adverse unacceptable risk, excuse me, unacceptable risk, within the whole area of the airport? Are you familiar with that statement? MR. SMALL: I'm going to object to that question primarily because the SAIC model was never accepted or acknowledged by the FAA. In fact, the FAA asked MITRE to review it. MITRE severely criticized it for its inaccuracy, if you look at the two 2012 reports that MITRE issued and some other reports that Mr. Pietrorazio has provided. So, on that basis, I don't think it's a valid
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	associated with other MR. PIETRORAZIO: The MITRE report, Mr. Chairman, and the previous report, the SAIC report, do not necessarily relegate themselves to plumes from power plants. It's all thermal plumes. THE CHAIRMAN: Right, but the application before us is specific. So the questions that you're asking Mr. Stevens should relate to facilities that are going to be part of this power plant, and my understanding, and correct me if I'm wrong, is a cooling tower is not part of this facility. MR. PIETRORAZIO: I understand. THE CHAIRMAN: There are MR. PIETRORAZIO: Maybe I'll ask that question at the brief I'll rephrase it for a later cross.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	finding of that SAIC report, if I may use the term "SAIC," that stated specifically if the Towantic plant, at that time the 512 megawatt plant, were sited at that place in Oxford, Connecticut, next to that airport, that the adverse effect to the airport there would be an adverse unacceptable risk, excuse me, unacceptable risk, within the whole area of the airport? Are you familiar with that statement? MR. SMALL: I'm going to object to that question primarily because the SAIC model was never accepted or acknowledged by the FAA. In fact, the FAA asked MITRE to review it. MITRE severely criticized it for its inaccuracy, if you look at the two 2012 reports that MITRE issued and some other reports that Mr. Pietrorazio has provided. So, on that basis, I don't think it's a valid question. It's not a valid model. It's been
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	associated with other MR. PIETRORAZIO: The MITRE report, Mr. Chairman, and the previous report, the SAIC report, do not necessarily relegate themselves to plumes from power plants. It's all thermal plumes. THE CHAIRMAN: Right, but the application before us is specific. So the questions that you're asking Mr. Stevens should relate to facilities that are going to be part of this power plant, and my understanding, and correct me if I'm wrong, is a cooling tower is not part of this facility. MR. PIETRORAZIO: I understand. THE CHAIRMAN: There are MR. PIETRORAZIO: Maybe I'll ask that question at the brief I'll rephrase it for a later cross. THE CHAIRMAN: No. Rephrase	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	finding of that SAIC report, if I may use the term "SAIC," that stated specifically if the Towantic plant, at that time the 512 megawatt plant, were sited at that place in Oxford, Connecticut, next to that airport, that the adverse effect to the airport there would be an adverse unacceptable risk, excuse me, unacceptable risk, within the whole area of the airport? Are you familiar with that statement? MR. SMALL: I'm going to object to that question primarily because the SAIC model was never accepted or acknowledged by the FAA. In fact, the FAA asked MITRE to review it. MITRE severely criticized it for its inaccuracy, if you look at the two 2012 reports that MITRE issued and some other reports that Mr. Pietrorazio has provided. So, on that basis, I don't think it's a valid question. It's not a valid model. It's been invalidated by subsequent documents not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	associated with other MR. PIETRORAZIO: The MITRE report, Mr. Chairman, and the previous report, the SAIC report, do not necessarily relegate themselves to plumes from power plants. It's all thermal plumes. THE CHAIRMAN: Right, but the application before us is specific. So the questions that you're asking Mr. Stevens should relate to facilities that are going to be part of this power plant, and my understanding, and correct me if I'm wrong, is a cooling tower is not part of this facility. MR. PIETRORAZIO: I understand. THE CHAIRMAN: There are MR. PIETRORAZIO: Maybe I'll ask that question at the brief I'll rephrase it for a later cross. THE CHAIRMAN: No. Rephrase it now, please, because Mr. Stevens is not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	finding of that SAIC report, if I may use the term "SAIC," that stated specifically if the Towantic plant, at that time the 512 megawatt plant, were sited at that place in Oxford, Connecticut, next to that airport, that the adverse effect to the airport there would be an adverse unacceptable risk, excuse me, unacceptable risk, within the whole area of the airport? Are you familiar with that statement? MR. SMALL: I'm going to object to that question primarily because the SAIC model was never accepted or acknowledged by the FAA. In fact, the FAA asked MITRE to review it. MITRE severely criticized it for its inaccuracy, if you look at the two 2012 reports that MITRE issued and some other reports that Mr. Pietrorazio has provided. So, on that basis, I don't think it's a valid question. It's not a valid model. It's been invalidated by subsequent documents not validated.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	associated with other MR. PIETRORAZIO: The MITRE report, Mr. Chairman, and the previous report, the SAIC report, do not necessarily relegate themselves to plumes from power plants. It's all thermal plumes. THE CHAIRMAN: Right, but the application before us is specific. So the questions that you're asking Mr. Stevens should relate to facilities that are going to be part of this power plant, and my understanding, and correct me if I'm wrong, is a cooling tower is not part of this facility. MR. PIETRORAZIO: I understand. THE CHAIRMAN: There are MR. PIETRORAZIO: Maybe I'll ask that question at the brief I'll rephrase it for a later cross. THE CHAIRMAN: No. Rephrase it now, please, because Mr. Stevens is not going to be here. He, I believe, is going to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	finding of that SAIC report, if I may use the term "SAIC," that stated specifically if the Towantic plant, at that time the 512 megawatt plant, were sited at that place in Oxford, Connecticut, next to that airport, that the adverse effect to the airport there would be an adverse unacceptable risk, excuse me, unacceptable risk, within the whole area of the airport? Are you familiar with that statement? MR. SMALL: I'm going to object to that question primarily because the SAIC model was never accepted or acknowledged by the FAA. In fact, the FAA asked MITRE to review it. MITRE severely criticized it for its inaccuracy, if you look at the two 2012 reports that MITRE issued and some other reports that Mr. Pietrorazio has provided. So, on that basis, I don't think it's a valid question. It's not a valid model. It's been invalidated by subsequent documents not validated.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	associated with other MR. PIETRORAZIO: The MITRE report, Mr. Chairman, and the previous report, the SAIC report, do not necessarily relegate themselves to plumes from power plants. It's all thermal plumes. THE CHAIRMAN: Right, but the application before us is specific. So the questions that you're asking Mr. Stevens should relate to facilities that are going to be part of this power plant, and my understanding, and correct me if I'm wrong, is a cooling tower is not part of this facility. MR. PIETRORAZIO: I understand. THE CHAIRMAN: There are MR. PIETRORAZIO: Maybe I'll ask that question at the brief I'll rephrase it for a later cross. THE CHAIRMAN: No. Rephrase it now, please, because Mr. Stevens is not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	finding of that SAIC report, if I may use the term "SAIC," that stated specifically if the Towantic plant, at that time the 512 megawatt plant, were sited at that place in Oxford, Connecticut, next to that airport, that the adverse effect to the airport there would be an adverse unacceptable risk, excuse me, unacceptable risk, within the whole area of the airport? Are you familiar with that statement? MR. SMALL: I'm going to object to that question primarily because the SAIC model was never accepted or acknowledged by the FAA. In fact, the FAA asked MITRE to review it. MITRE severely criticized it for its inaccuracy, if you look at the two 2012 reports that MITRE issued and some other reports that Mr. Pietrorazio has provided. So, on that basis, I don't think it's a valid question. It's not a valid model. It's been invalidated by subsequent documents not validated.

31 (Pages 661 to 664)

	Page 665		Page 667
1	are you familiar with it? We may not need	1	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes,
2	to	2	sir, it was referenced. I believe it was
3	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes,	3	referenced in the MITRE Report.
4	sir, I am.	4	MR. PIETRORAZIO: Thank you.
5	THE CHAIRMAN: Then respond as	5	And are you familiar with the
6	to why, in light of the objection, that I	6	findings from both reports that multiple
7	should overrule the objection.	7	plumes complement the effect of turbulence in
8	MR. PIETRORAZIO: So you don't	8	an adverse manner; in other words, when you
9	overrule the objection?	9	have multiple plumes merging that even more
10	THE CHAIRMAN: I'm asking you	10	dangerous eddies are produced that have to be
11	to give me some guidance as to	11	considered?
12	MR. PIETRORAZIO: Okay. Sure.	12	THE CHAIRMAN: So I
13	Okay. First, the FAA did not endorse the	13	understand, you talk about multiple plumes.
14	SAIC report, and I have verbiage from FAA	14	Are you stating, therefore, that this project
15	personnel that the SAIC report is not	15	will produce multiple plumes because,
16	rejected in any way, shape or form, that the	16	otherwise, I don't see the relevance?
17	FAA had the latitude to endorse or not	17	MR. PIETRORAZIO: Yes,
18	endorse, but I have the flat statement from	18	multiple plumes, and that those plumes,
19	the FAA that in no way do they diminish the	19	Mr. Chairman, will merge, and it's that
20	accuracy, and so on, of the SAIC Report. So	20	merging of the plumes that creates an
21	it's not a rejection.	21	additional risk. There are two stacks.
22	THE CHAIRMAN: Well, okay.	22	THE CHAIRMAN: There are two
23	I'm going to we'll have to have that. I	23	stacks, right. They talked about two stacks.
24	mean, it's just your word, unless you have	24	Okay, you're talking about the plume from the
25	something in writing, but I'll allow this	25	two stacks and talked about what that would,
_			······································
	Page 666		Page 668
1		1	
1 2	questioning to continue up to a point because	1 2	Page 668 in your previous examination, but if there's anything else you want to add to that in
	questioning to continue up to a point because I don't want to go too far on this because I		in your previous examination, but if there's
2	questioning to continue up to a point because	2	in your previous examination, but if there's anything else you want to add to that in
2 3	questioning to continue up to a point because I don't want to go too far on this because I think what you're also saying is it was not	2 3	in your previous examination, but if there's anything else you want to add to that in response to what, I guess, is a question.
2 3 4	questioning to continue up to a point because I don't want to go too far on this because I think what you're also saying is it was not endorsed, so I'm not exactly sure why we're	2 3 4	in your previous examination, but if there's anything else you want to add to that in response to what, I guess, is a question. THE WITNESS (Stevens): I
2 3 4 5	questioning to continue up to a point because I don't want to go too far on this because I think what you're also saying is it was not endorsed, so I'm not exactly sure why we're going to continue this. If you have one or	2 3 4 5	in your previous examination, but if there's anything else you want to add to that in response to what, I guess, is a question. THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe that when the, in this particular case and we discussed my line of questioning with the Applicant was that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	questioning to continue up to a point because I don't want to go too far on this because I think what you're also saying is it was not endorsed, so I'm not exactly sure why we're going to continue this. If you have one or two very specific questions relating to this,	2 3 4 5 6	in your previous examination, but if there's anything else you want to add to that in response to what, I guess, is a question. THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe that when the, in this particular case and we discussed my line of
2 3 4 5 6 7	questioning to continue up to a point because I don't want to go too far on this because I think what you're also saying is it was not endorsed, so I'm not exactly sure why we're going to continue this. If you have one or two very specific questions relating to this, and if Mr. Stevens is able to answer, that's	2 3 4 5 6 7	in your previous examination, but if there's anything else you want to add to that in response to what, I guess, is a question. THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe that when the, in this particular case and we discussed my line of questioning with the Applicant was that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	questioning to continue up to a point because I don't want to go too far on this because I think what you're also saying is it was not endorsed, so I'm not exactly sure why we're going to continue this. If you have one or two very specific questions relating to this, and if Mr. Stevens is able to answer, that's fine, but if this is going to go beyond that, then I'm going to have to cut you off. MR. SMALL: Mr. Chairman, just	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	in your previous examination, but if there's anything else you want to add to that in response to what, I guess, is a question. THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe that when the, in this particular case and we discussed my line of questioning with the Applicant was that these numbers they were providing were when both turbines were operating and exhaust plumes were emanating from the two stacks
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	questioning to continue up to a point because I don't want to go too far on this because I think what you're also saying is it was not endorsed, so I'm not exactly sure why we're going to continue this. If you have one or two very specific questions relating to this, and if Mr. Stevens is able to answer, that's fine, but if this is going to go beyond that, then I'm going to have to cut you off. MR. SMALL: Mr. Chairman, just one more point of clarification. Based on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	in your previous examination, but if there's anything else you want to add to that in response to what, I guess, is a question. THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe that when the, in this particular case and we discussed my line of questioning with the Applicant was that these numbers they were providing were when both turbines were operating and exhaust plumes were emanating from the two stacks that they would merge and at some point
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	questioning to continue up to a point because I don't want to go too far on this because I think what you're also saying is it was not endorsed, so I'm not exactly sure why we're going to continue this. If you have one or two very specific questions relating to this, and if Mr. Stevens is able to answer, that's fine, but if this is going to go beyond that, then I'm going to have to cut you off. MR. SMALL: Mr. Chairman, just one more point of clarification. Based on our reading of the SAIC Report,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	in your previous examination, but if there's anything else you want to add to that in response to what, I guess, is a question. THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe that when the, in this particular case and we discussed my line of questioning with the Applicant was that these numbers they were providing were when both turbines were operating and exhaust plumes were emanating from the two stacks that they would merge and at some point become one, and the merger of those two
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	questioning to continue up to a point because I don't want to go too far on this because I think what you're also saying is it was not endorsed, so I'm not exactly sure why we're going to continue this. If you have one or two very specific questions relating to this, and if Mr. Stevens is able to answer, that's fine, but if this is going to go beyond that, then I'm going to have to cut you off. MR. SMALL: Mr. Chairman, just one more point of clarification. Based on our reading of the SAIC Report, Mr. Pietrorazio is mischaracterizing it. So	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	in your previous examination, but if there's anything else you want to add to that in response to what, I guess, is a question. THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe that when the, in this particular case and we discussed my line of questioning with the Applicant was that these numbers they were providing were when both turbines were operating and exhaust plumes were emanating from the two stacks that they would merge and at some point become one, and the merger of those two exhaust plumes would create one larger plume,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	questioning to continue up to a point because I don't want to go too far on this because I think what you're also saying is it was not endorsed, so I'm not exactly sure why we're going to continue this. If you have one or two very specific questions relating to this, and if Mr. Stevens is able to answer, that's fine, but if this is going to go beyond that, then I'm going to have to cut you off. MR. SMALL: Mr. Chairman, just one more point of clarification. Based on our reading of the SAIC Report, Mr. Pietrorazio is mischaracterizing it. So I would just ask if he has a specific	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	in your previous examination, but if there's anything else you want to add to that in response to what, I guess, is a question. THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe that when the, in this particular case and we discussed my line of questioning with the Applicant was that these numbers they were providing were when both turbines were operating and exhaust plumes were emanating from the two stacks that they would merge and at some point become one, and the merger of those two exhaust plumes would create one larger plume, yes, that was my understanding of my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	questioning to continue up to a point because I don't want to go too far on this because I think what you're also saying is it was not endorsed, so I'm not exactly sure why we're going to continue this. If you have one or two very specific questions relating to this, and if Mr. Stevens is able to answer, that's fine, but if this is going to go beyond that, then I'm going to have to cut you off. MR. SMALL: Mr. Chairman, just one more point of clarification. Based on our reading of the SAIC Report, Mr. Pietrorazio is mischaracterizing it. So I would just ask if he has a specific statement in that report that he believes	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	in your previous examination, but if there's anything else you want to add to that in response to what, I guess, is a question. THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe that when the, in this particular case and we discussed my line of questioning with the Applicant was that these numbers they were providing were when both turbines were operating and exhaust plumes were emanating from the two stacks that they would merge and at some point become one, and the merger of those two exhaust plumes would create one larger plume, yes, that was my understanding of my questioning.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	questioning to continue up to a point because I don't want to go too far on this because I think what you're also saying is it was not endorsed, so I'm not exactly sure why we're going to continue this. If you have one or two very specific questions relating to this, and if Mr. Stevens is able to answer, that's fine, but if this is going to go beyond that, then I'm going to have to cut you off. MR. SMALL: Mr. Chairman, just one more point of clarification. Based on our reading of the SAIC Report, Mr. Pietrorazio is mischaracterizing it. So I would just ask if he has a specific statement in that report that he believes supports his position, if he wants to read	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	in your previous examination, but if there's anything else you want to add to that in response to what, I guess, is a question. THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe that when the, in this particular case and we discussed my line of questioning with the Applicant was that these numbers they were providing were when both turbines were operating and exhaust plumes were emanating from the two stacks that they would merge and at some point become one, and the merger of those two exhaust plumes would create one larger plume, yes, that was my understanding of my questioning. MR. PIETRORAZIO: And do you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	questioning to continue up to a point because I don't want to go too far on this because I think what you're also saying is it was not endorsed, so I'm not exactly sure why we're going to continue this. If you have one or two very specific questions relating to this, and if Mr. Stevens is able to answer, that's fine, but if this is going to go beyond that, then I'm going to have to cut you off. MR. SMALL: Mr. Chairman, just one more point of clarification. Based on our reading of the SAIC Report, Mr. Pietrorazio is mischaracterizing it. So I would just ask if he has a specific statement in that report that he believes supports his position, if he wants to read that in context, that's different than just	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	in your previous examination, but if there's anything else you want to add to that in response to what, I guess, is a question. THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe that when the, in this particular case and we discussed my line of questioning with the Applicant was that these numbers they were providing were when both turbines were operating and exhaust plumes were emanating from the two stacks that they would merge and at some point become one, and the merger of those two exhaust plumes would create one larger plume, yes, that was my understanding of my questioning. MR. PIETRORAZIO: And do you know if, in the MITRE Report, the findings
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	questioning to continue up to a point because I don't want to go too far on this because I think what you're also saying is it was not endorsed, so I'm not exactly sure why we're going to continue this. If you have one or two very specific questions relating to this, and if Mr. Stevens is able to answer, that's fine, but if this is going to go beyond that, then I'm going to have to cut you off. MR. SMALL: Mr. Chairman, just one more point of clarification. Based on our reading of the SAIC Report, Mr. Pietrorazio is mischaracterizing it. So I would just ask if he has a specific statement in that report that he believes supports his position, if he wants to read that in context, that's different than just making a broad statement about what the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	in your previous examination, but if there's anything else you want to add to that in response to what, I guess, is a question. THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe that when the, in this particular case and we discussed my line of questioning with the Applicant was that these numbers they were providing were when both turbines were operating and exhaust plumes were emanating from the two stacks that they would merge and at some point become one, and the merger of those two exhaust plumes would create one larger plume, yes, that was my understanding of my questioning. MR. PIETRORAZIO: And do you know if, in the MITRE Report, the findings that underscored the plume rise and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	questioning to continue up to a point because I don't want to go too far on this because I think what you're also saying is it was not endorsed, so I'm not exactly sure why we're going to continue this. If you have one or two very specific questions relating to this, and if Mr. Stevens is able to answer, that's fine, but if this is going to go beyond that, then I'm going to have to cut you off. MR. SMALL: Mr. Chairman, just one more point of clarification. Based on our reading of the SAIC Report, Mr. Pietrorazio is mischaracterizing it. So I would just ask if he has a specific statement in that report that he believes supports his position, if he wants to read that in context, that's different than just making a broad statement about what the report says, which we don't believe the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	in your previous examination, but if there's anything else you want to add to that in response to what, I guess, is a question. THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe that when the, in this particular case and we discussed my line of questioning with the Applicant was that these numbers they were providing were when both turbines were operating and exhaust plumes were emanating from the two stacks that they would merge and at some point become one, and the merger of those two exhaust plumes would create one larger plume, yes, that was my understanding of my questioning. MR. PIETRORAZIO: And do you know if, in the MITRE Report, the findings that underscored the plume rise and turbulence effects of the plumes, do you know
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	questioning to continue up to a point because I don't want to go too far on this because I think what you're also saying is it was not endorsed, so I'm not exactly sure why we're going to continue this. If you have one or two very specific questions relating to this, and if Mr. Stevens is able to answer, that's fine, but if this is going to go beyond that, then I'm going to have to cut you off. MR. SMALL: Mr. Chairman, just one more point of clarification. Based on our reading of the SAIC Report, Mr. Pietrorazio is mischaracterizing it. So I would just ask if he has a specific statement in that report that he believes supports his position, if he wants to read that in context, that's different than just making a broad statement about what the report does, in fact, say.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	in your previous examination, but if there's anything else you want to add to that in response to what, I guess, is a question. THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe that when the, in this particular case and we discussed my line of questioning with the Applicant was that these numbers they were providing were when both turbines were operating and exhaust plumes were emanating from the two stacks that they would merge and at some point become one, and the merger of those two exhaust plumes would create one larger plume, yes, that was my understanding of my questioning. MR. PIETRORAZIO: And do you know if, in the MITRE Report, the findings that underscored the plume rise and turbulence effects of the plumes, do you know whether that was reported as a single plume
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	questioning to continue up to a point because I don't want to go too far on this because I think what you're also saying is it was not endorsed, so I'm not exactly sure why we're going to continue this. If you have one or two very specific questions relating to this, and if Mr. Stevens is able to answer, that's fine, but if this is going to go beyond that, then I'm going to have to cut you off. MR. SMALL: Mr. Chairman, just one more point of clarification. Based on our reading of the SAIC Report, Mr. Pietrorazio is mischaracterizing it. So I would just ask if he has a specific statement in that report that he believes supports his position, if he wants to read that in context, that's different than just making a broad statement about what the report says, which we don't believe the report does, in fact, say. THE CHAIRMAN: We're going to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	in your previous examination, but if there's anything else you want to add to that in response to what, I guess, is a question. THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe that when the, in this particular case and we discussed my line of questioning with the Applicant was that these numbers they were providing were when both turbines were operating and exhaust plumes were emanating from the two stacks that they would merge and at some point become one, and the merger of those two exhaust plumes would create one larger plume, yes, that was my understanding of my questioning. MR. PIETRORAZIO: And do you know if, in the MITRE Report, the findings that underscored the plume rise and turbulence effects of the plumes, do you know whether that was reported as a single plume or merged plumes?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	questioning to continue up to a point because I don't want to go too far on this because I think what you're also saying is it was not endorsed, so I'm not exactly sure why we're going to continue this. If you have one or two very specific questions relating to this, and if Mr. Stevens is able to answer, that's fine, but if this is going to go beyond that, then I'm going to have to cut you off. MR. SMALL: Mr. Chairman, just one more point of clarification. Based on our reading of the SAIC Report, Mr. Pietrorazio is mischaracterizing it. So I would just ask if he has a specific statement in that report that he believes supports his position, if he wants to read that in context, that's different than just making a broad statement about what the report does, in fact, say. THE CHAIRMAN: We're going to take what he said for what it's worth. So,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	in your previous examination, but if there's anything else you want to add to that in response to what, I guess, is a question. THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe that when the, in this particular case and we discussed my line of questioning with the Applicant was that these numbers they were providing were when both turbines were operating and exhaust plumes were emanating from the two stacks that they would merge and at some point become one, and the merger of those two exhaust plumes would create one larger plume, yes, that was my understanding of my questioning. MR. PIETRORAZIO: And do you know if, in the MITRE Report, the findings that underscored the plume rise and turbulence effects of the plumes, do you know whether that was reported as a single plume or merged plumes? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	questioning to continue up to a point because I don't want to go too far on this because I think what you're also saying is it was not endorsed, so I'm not exactly sure why we're going to continue this. If you have one or two very specific questions relating to this, and if Mr. Stevens is able to answer, that's fine, but if this is going to go beyond that, then I'm going to have to cut you off. MR. SMALL: Mr. Chairman, just one more point of clarification. Based on our reading of the SAIC Report, Mr. Pietrorazio is mischaracterizing it. So I would just ask if he has a specific statement in that report that he believes supports his position, if he wants to read that in context, that's different than just making a broad statement about what the report says, which we don't believe the report does, in fact, say. THE CHAIRMAN: We're going to take what he said for what it's worth. So, if you have a specific I guess you did	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	in your previous examination, but if there's anything else you want to add to that in response to what, I guess, is a question. THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe that when the, in this particular case and we discussed my line of questioning with the Applicant was that these numbers they were providing were when both turbines were operating and exhaust plumes were emanating from the two stacks that they would merge and at some point become one, and the merger of those two exhaust plumes would create one larger plume, yes, that was my understanding of my questioning. MR. PIETRORAZIO: And do you know if, in the MITRE Report, the findings that underscored the plume rise and turbulence effects of the plumes, do you know whether that was reported as a single plume or merged plumes? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe the MITRE Report reported it as a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	questioning to continue up to a point because I don't want to go too far on this because I think what you're also saying is it was not endorsed, so I'm not exactly sure why we're going to continue this. If you have one or two very specific questions relating to this, and if Mr. Stevens is able to answer, that's fine, but if this is going to go beyond that, then I'm going to have to cut you off. MR. SMALL: Mr. Chairman, just one more point of clarification. Based on our reading of the SAIC Report, Mr. Pietrorazio is mischaracterizing it. So I would just ask if he has a specific statement in that report that he believes supports his position, if he wants to read that in context, that's different than just making a broad statement about what the report does, in fact, say. THE CHAIRMAN: We're going to take what he said for what it's worth. So, if you have a specific I guess you did answer that you are familiar with that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	in your previous examination, but if there's anything else you want to add to that in response to what, I guess, is a question. THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe that when the, in this particular case and we discussed my line of questioning with the Applicant was that these numbers they were providing were when both turbines were operating and exhaust plumes were emanating from the two stacks that they would merge and at some point become one, and the merger of those two exhaust plumes would create one larger plume, yes, that was my understanding of my questioning. MR. PIETRORAZIO: And do you know if, in the MITRE Report, the findings that underscored the plume rise and turbulence effects of the plumes, do you know whether that was reported as a single plume or merged plumes? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe the MITRE Report reported it as a merged plume.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	questioning to continue up to a point because I don't want to go too far on this because I think what you're also saying is it was not endorsed, so I'm not exactly sure why we're going to continue this. If you have one or two very specific questions relating to this, and if Mr. Stevens is able to answer, that's fine, but if this is going to go beyond that, then I'm going to have to cut you off. MR. SMALL: Mr. Chairman, just one more point of clarification. Based on our reading of the SAIC Report, Mr. Pietrorazio is mischaracterizing it. So I would just ask if he has a specific statement in that report that he believes supports his position, if he wants to read that in context, that's different than just making a broad statement about what the report says, which we don't believe the report does, in fact, say. THE CHAIRMAN: We're going to take what he said for what it's worth. So, if you have a specific I guess you did	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	in your previous examination, but if there's anything else you want to add to that in response to what, I guess, is a question. THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe that when the, in this particular case and we discussed my line of questioning with the Applicant was that these numbers they were providing were when both turbines were operating and exhaust plumes were emanating from the two stacks that they would merge and at some point become one, and the merger of those two exhaust plumes would create one larger plume, yes, that was my understanding of my questioning. MR. PIETRORAZIO: And do you know if, in the MITRE Report, the findings that underscored the plume rise and turbulence effects of the plumes, do you know whether that was reported as a single plume or merged plumes? THE WITNESS (Stevens): I believe the MITRE Report reported it as a

32 (Pages 665 to 668)

	Page 669		Page 671
1	you. That's all I have, Mr. Chairman.	1	Anecdotally. I've lived there a long time.
2	THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.	2	MR. SAVARESE: Are there
3	Yes, we have a follow-up question from	3	currently any structures, if you will,
4	Mr. Lynch.	4	between the tarmac and the proposed plant in
5	MR. LYNCH: Mr. Stevens, you	5	that 3,000 feet area?
6	referenced earlier a simulator test?	6	THE WITNESS (Stevens): I
7	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes,	7	don't quite understand your question. If you
8	sir.	8	would ask the question again?
9	MR. LYNCH: Of which ten	9	MR. SAVARESE: Is it, in fact,
10	pilots took the tailwind landing and	10	vacant land currently between the tarmac and
11	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes.	11	the proposed site?
12	MR. LYNCH: they all landed	12	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes.
13	safely. Then you said there was a circular	13	Other than what's on the airport itself, it's
14	pattern and they crashed. All ten crashed?	14	quite vacant between the end of the airport
15 16	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes,	15 16	property and the proposed power plant, yes,
16 17	sir.	10	sir.
18	MR. LYNCH: Okay. That's all I wanted to know. Thanks.	18	MR. SAVARESE: So, if the shortening of the leg with a tighter turn,
19	THE WITNESS (Stevens): This	19	which maybe a more experienced pilot could
20	was a full motion simulator. It was a	20	handle, would bring them over vacant
21	Redbird Full Motion Simulator. And yes, it	21	territory; is that correct?
22	was shocking to me as well.	22	THE WITNESS (Stevens): If the
23	MR. LYNCH: Well, you just	23	power plant has to be avoided, you're either
24	left it there, so I wanted to make sure it	24	going to avoid recall that we're flying
25	was all ten.	25	either north or south when we are on our
	Page 670		Page 672
1		1	
1 2	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. LYNCH: Thank you.	1 2	Page 672 downwind leg of landing. And we are approximately, as I had indicated before,
2 3	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. LYNCH: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Now	2 3	downwind leg of landing. And we are approximately, as I had indicated before, we're approximately we should be between a
2 3 4	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. LYNCH: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Now we'll continue with the Town of Middlebury.	2 3 4	downwind leg of landing. And we are approximately, as I had indicated before, we're approximately we should be between a half a mile and three-quarters of a mile off
2 3 4 5	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. LYNCH: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Now we'll continue with the Town of Middlebury. MR. SAVARESE: For the record,	2 3 4 5	downwind leg of landing. And we are approximately, as I had indicated before, we're approximately we should be between a half a mile and three-quarters of a mile off of the runway, away from the runway, flying
2 3 4 5 6	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. LYNCH: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Now we'll continue with the Town of Middlebury. MR. SAVARESE: For the record, Attorney Stephen Savarese for the Town of	2 3 4 5 6	downwind leg of landing. And we are approximately, as I had indicated before, we're approximately we should be between a half a mile and three-quarters of a mile off of the runway, away from the runway, flying in the opposite direction to the runway. We
2 3 4 5 6 7	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. LYNCH: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Now we'll continue with the Town of Middlebury. MR. SAVARESE: For the record, Attorney Stephen Savarese for the Town of Middlebury.	2 3 4 5 6 7	downwind leg of landing. And we are approximately, as I had indicated before, we're approximately we should be between a half a mile and three-quarters of a mile off of the runway, away from the runway, flying in the opposite direction to the runway. We call that the downwind leg. And then when we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. LYNCH: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Now we'll continue with the Town of Middlebury. MR. SAVARESE: For the record, Attorney Stephen Savarese for the Town of Middlebury. Mr. Stevens, you suggested a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	downwind leg of landing. And we are approximately, as I had indicated before, we're approximately we should be between a half a mile and three-quarters of a mile off of the runway, away from the runway, flying in the opposite direction to the runway. We call that the downwind leg. And then when we get past the end of the runway, we proceed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. LYNCH: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Now we'll continue with the Town of Middlebury. MR. SAVARESE: For the record, Attorney Stephen Savarese for the Town of Middlebury. Mr. Stevens, you suggested a scenario in trying to satisfy the AIM and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	downwind leg of landing. And we are approximately, as I had indicated before, we're approximately we should be between a half a mile and three-quarters of a mile off of the runway, away from the runway, flying in the opposite direction to the runway. We call that the downwind leg. And then when we get past the end of the runway, we proceed another quarter to half a mile past the end
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. LYNCH: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Now we'll continue with the Town of Middlebury. MR. SAVARESE: For the record, Attorney Stephen Savarese for the Town of Middlebury. Mr. Stevens, you suggested a scenario in trying to satisfy the AIM and this NOTAM that a pilot may have to travel	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	downwind leg of landing. And we are approximately, as I had indicated before, we're approximately we should be between a half a mile and three-quarters of a mile off of the runway, away from the runway, flying in the opposite direction to the runway. We call that the downwind leg. And then when we get past the end of the runway, we proceed another quarter to half a mile past the end of the runway, and then we turn our base leg,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. LYNCH: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Now we'll continue with the Town of Middlebury. MR. SAVARESE: For the record, Attorney Stephen Savarese for the Town of Middlebury. Mr. Stevens, you suggested a scenario in trying to satisfy the AIM and this NOTAM that a pilot may have to travel further away from the runway to make that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	downwind leg of landing. And we are approximately, as I had indicated before, we're approximately we should be between a half a mile and three-quarters of a mile off of the runway, away from the runway, flying in the opposite direction to the runway. We call that the downwind leg. And then when we get past the end of the runway, we proceed another quarter to half a mile past the end of the runway, and then we turn our base leg, and then we come and turn final and land.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. LYNCH: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Now we'll continue with the Town of Middlebury. MR. SAVARESE: For the record, Attorney Stephen Savarese for the Town of Middlebury. Mr. Stevens, you suggested a scenario in trying to satisfy the AIM and this NOTAM that a pilot may have to travel further away from the runway to make that pattern. Would that bring the flight in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	downwind leg of landing. And we are approximately, as I had indicated before, we're approximately we should be between a half a mile and three-quarters of a mile off of the runway, away from the runway, flying in the opposite direction to the runway. We call that the downwind leg. And then when we get past the end of the runway, we proceed another quarter to half a mile past the end of the runway, and then we turn our base leg, and then we come and turn final and land. So, if we are flying downwind,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. LYNCH: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Now we'll continue with the Town of Middlebury. MR. SAVARESE: For the record, Attorney Stephen Savarese for the Town of Middlebury. Mr. Stevens, you suggested a scenario in trying to satisfy the AIM and this NOTAM that a pilot may have to travel further away from the runway to make that pattern. Would that bring the flight in approaching the landing further into the Town	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	downwind leg of landing. And we are approximately, as I had indicated before, we're approximately we should be between a half a mile and three-quarters of a mile off of the runway, away from the runway, flying in the opposite direction to the runway. We call that the downwind leg. And then when we get past the end of the runway, we proceed another quarter to half a mile past the end of the runway, and then we turn our base leg, and then we come and turn final and land. So, if we are flying downwind, the downwind portion is where the power plant
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. LYNCH: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Now we'll continue with the Town of Middlebury. MR. SAVARESE: For the record, Attorney Stephen Savarese for the Town of Middlebury. Mr. Stevens, you suggested a scenario in trying to satisfy the AIM and this NOTAM that a pilot may have to travel further away from the runway to make that pattern. Would that bring the flight in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	downwind leg of landing. And we are approximately, as I had indicated before, we're approximately we should be between a half a mile and three-quarters of a mile off of the runway, away from the runway, flying in the opposite direction to the runway. We call that the downwind leg. And then when we get past the end of the runway, we proceed another quarter to half a mile past the end of the runway, and then we turn our base leg, and then we come and turn final and land. So, if we are flying downwind,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. LYNCH: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Now we'll continue with the Town of Middlebury. MR. SAVARESE: For the record, Attorney Stephen Savarese for the Town of Middlebury. Mr. Stevens, you suggested a scenario in trying to satisfy the AIM and this NOTAM that a pilot may have to travel further away from the runway to make that pattern. Would that bring the flight in approaching the landing further into the Town of Middlebury if he widened his circle-to-land? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	downwind leg of landing. And we are approximately, as I had indicated before, we're approximately we should be between a half a mile and three-quarters of a mile off of the runway, away from the runway, flying in the opposite direction to the runway. We call that the downwind leg. And then when we get past the end of the runway, we proceed another quarter to half a mile past the end of the runway, and then we turn our base leg, and then we come and turn final and land. So, if we are flying downwind, the downwind portion is where the power plant intends to be. The downwind portion, if we fly over that if we have to avoid that, we either have to fly closer to the runway and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. LYNCH: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Now we'll continue with the Town of Middlebury. MR. SAVARESE: For the record, Attorney Stephen Savarese for the Town of Middlebury. Mr. Stevens, you suggested a scenario in trying to satisfy the AIM and this NOTAM that a pilot may have to travel further away from the runway to make that pattern. Would that bring the flight in approaching the landing further into the Town of Middlebury if he widened his circle-to-land? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It would yes, it would actually. In either	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	downwind leg of landing. And we are approximately, as I had indicated before, we're approximately we should be between a half a mile and three-quarters of a mile off of the runway, away from the runway, flying in the opposite direction to the runway. We call that the downwind leg. And then when we get past the end of the runway, we proceed another quarter to half a mile past the end of the runway, and then we turn our base leg, and then we come and turn final and land. So, if we are flying downwind, the downwind portion is where the power plant intends to be. The downwind portion, if we fly over that if we have to avoid that, we either have to fly closer to the runway and aim, you know, 7-5-15 would require a pilot
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. LYNCH: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Now we'll continue with the Town of Middlebury. MR. SAVARESE: For the record, Attorney Stephen Savarese for the Town of Middlebury. Mr. Stevens, you suggested a scenario in trying to satisfy the AIM and this NOTAM that a pilot may have to travel further away from the runway to make that pattern. Would that bring the flight in approaching the landing further into the Town of Middlebury if he widened his circle-to-land? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It would yes, it would actually. In either instrument conditions, you know, cloud	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	downwind leg of landing. And we are approximately, as I had indicated before, we're approximately we should be between a half a mile and three-quarters of a mile off of the runway, away from the runway, flying in the opposite direction to the runway. We call that the downwind leg. And then when we get past the end of the runway, we proceed another quarter to half a mile past the end of the runway, and then we turn our base leg, and then we come and turn final and land. So, if we are flying downwind, the downwind portion is where the power plant intends to be. The downwind portion, if we fly over that if we have to avoid that, we either have to fly closer to the runway and aim, you know, 7-5-15 would require a pilot to avoid the plume by flying closer to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. LYNCH: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Now we'll continue with the Town of Middlebury. MR. SAVARESE: For the record, Attorney Stephen Savarese for the Town of Middlebury. Mr. Stevens, you suggested a scenario in trying to satisfy the AIM and this NOTAM that a pilot may have to travel further away from the runway to make that pattern. Would that bring the flight in approaching the landing further into the Town of Middlebury if he widened his circle-to-land? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It would yes, it would actually. In either instrument conditions, you know, cloud conditions or visual flight rule conditions,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	downwind leg of landing. And we are approximately, as I had indicated before, we're approximately we should be between a half a mile and three-quarters of a mile off of the runway, away from the runway, flying in the opposite direction to the runway. We call that the downwind leg. And then when we get past the end of the runway, we proceed another quarter to half a mile past the end of the runway, and then we turn our base leg, and then we come and turn final and land. So, if we are flying downwind, the downwind portion is where the power plant intends to be. The downwind portion, if we fly over that if we have to avoid that, we either have to fly closer to the runway and aim, you know, 7-5-15 would require a pilot to avoid the plume by flying closer to the runway, then a half a mile because it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. LYNCH: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Now we'll continue with the Town of Middlebury. MR. SAVARESE: For the record, Attorney Stephen Savarese for the Town of Middlebury. Mr. Stevens, you suggested a scenario in trying to satisfy the AIM and this NOTAM that a pilot may have to travel further away from the runway to make that pattern. Would that bring the flight in approaching the landing further into the Town of Middlebury if he widened his circle-to-land? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It would yes, it would actually. In either instrument conditions, you know, cloud conditions or visual flight rule conditions, it would increase the flight path over	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	downwind leg of landing. And we are approximately, as I had indicated before, we're approximately we should be between a half a mile and three-quarters of a mile off of the runway, away from the runway, flying in the opposite direction to the runway. We call that the downwind leg. And then when we get past the end of the runway, we proceed another quarter to half a mile past the end of the runway, and then we turn our base leg, and then we come and turn final and land. So, if we are flying downwind, the downwind portion is where the power plant intends to be. The downwind portion, if we fly over that if we have to avoid that, we either have to fly closer to the runway and aim, you know, 7-5-15 would require a pilot to avoid the plume by flying closer to the runway, then a half a mile because it specifically instructs when able to fly
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. LYNCH: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Now we'll continue with the Town of Middlebury. MR. SAVARESE: For the record, Attorney Stephen Savarese for the Town of Middlebury. Mr. Stevens, you suggested a scenario in trying to satisfy the AIM and this NOTAM that a pilot may have to travel further away from the runway to make that pattern. Would that bring the flight in approaching the landing further into the Town of Middlebury if he widened his circle-to-land? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It would yes, it would actually. In either instrument conditions, you know, cloud conditions or visual flight rule conditions, it would increase the flight path over Middlebury and over Naugatuck.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	downwind leg of landing. And we are approximately, as I had indicated before, we're approximately we should be between a half a mile and three-quarters of a mile off of the runway, away from the runway, flying in the opposite direction to the runway. We call that the downwind leg. And then when we get past the end of the runway, we proceed another quarter to half a mile past the end of the runway, and then we turn our base leg, and then we come and turn final and land. So, if we are flying downwind, the downwind portion is where the power plant intends to be. The downwind portion, if we fly over that if we have to avoid that, we either have to fly closer to the runway and aim, you know, 7-5-15 would require a pilot to avoid the plume by flying closer to the runway, then a half a mile because it specifically instructs when able to fly upwind. That means if the wind is going this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. LYNCH: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Now we'll continue with the Town of Middlebury. MR. SAVARESE: For the record, Attorney Stephen Savarese for the Town of Middlebury. Mr. Stevens, you suggested a scenario in trying to satisfy the AIM and this NOTAM that a pilot may have to travel further away from the runway to make that pattern. Would that bring the flight in approaching the landing further into the Town of Middlebury if he widened his circle-to-land? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It would yes, it would actually. In either instrument conditions, you know, cloud conditions or visual flight rule conditions, it would increase the flight path over Middlebury and over Naugatuck. MR. SAVARESE: You're familiar	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	downwind leg of landing. And we are approximately, as I had indicated before, we're approximately we should be between a half a mile and three-quarters of a mile off of the runway, away from the runway, flying in the opposite direction to the runway. We call that the downwind leg. And then when we get past the end of the runway, we proceed another quarter to half a mile past the end of the runway, and then we turn our base leg, and then we come and turn final and land. So, if we are flying downwind, the downwind portion is where the power plant intends to be. The downwind portion, if we fly over that if we have to avoid that, we either have to fly closer to the runway and aim, you know, 7-5-15 would require a pilot to avoid the plume by flying closer to the runway, then a half a mile because it specifically instructs when able to fly upwind. That means if the wind is going this way, to fly this way.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. LYNCH: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Now we'll continue with the Town of Middlebury. MR. SAVARESE: For the record, Attorney Stephen Savarese for the Town of Middlebury. Mr. Stevens, you suggested a scenario in trying to satisfy the AIM and this NOTAM that a pilot may have to travel further away from the runway to make that pattern. Would that bring the flight in approaching the landing further into the Town of Middlebury if he widened his circle-to-land? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It would yes, it would actually. In either instrument conditions, you know, cloud conditions or visual flight rule conditions, it would increase the flight path over Middlebury and over Naugatuck. MR. SAVARESE: You're familiar with the density of the population around the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	downwind leg of landing. And we are approximately, as I had indicated before, we're approximately we should be between a half a mile and three-quarters of a mile off of the runway, away from the runway, flying in the opposite direction to the runway. We call that the downwind leg. And then when we get past the end of the runway, we proceed another quarter to half a mile past the end of the runway, and then we turn our base leg, and then we come and turn final and land. So, if we are flying downwind, the downwind portion is where the power plant intends to be. The downwind portion, if we fly over that if we have to avoid that, we either have to fly closer to the runway and aim, you know, 7-5-15 would require a pilot to avoid the plume by flying closer to the runway, then a half a mile because it specifically instructs when able to fly upwind. That means if the wind is going this way, to fly this way. MR. SAVARESE: But is it, if I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Yes. MR. LYNCH: Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Now we'll continue with the Town of Middlebury. MR. SAVARESE: For the record, Attorney Stephen Savarese for the Town of Middlebury. Mr. Stevens, you suggested a scenario in trying to satisfy the AIM and this NOTAM that a pilot may have to travel further away from the runway to make that pattern. Would that bring the flight in approaching the landing further into the Town of Middlebury if he widened his circle-to-land? THE WITNESS (Stevens): It would yes, it would actually. In either instrument conditions, you know, cloud conditions or visual flight rule conditions, it would increase the flight path over Middlebury and over Naugatuck. MR. SAVARESE: You're familiar	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	downwind leg of landing. And we are approximately, as I had indicated before, we're approximately we should be between a half a mile and three-quarters of a mile off of the runway, away from the runway, flying in the opposite direction to the runway. We call that the downwind leg. And then when we get past the end of the runway, we proceed another quarter to half a mile past the end of the runway, and then we turn our base leg, and then we come and turn final and land. So, if we are flying downwind, the downwind portion is where the power plant intends to be. The downwind portion, if we fly over that if we have to avoid that, we either have to fly closer to the runway and aim, you know, 7-5-15 would require a pilot to avoid the plume by flying closer to the runway, then a half a mile because it specifically instructs when able to fly upwind. That means if the wind is going this way, to fly this way.

33 (Pages 669 to 672)

	Page 673		Page 675
1	THE WITNESS (Stevens): It	1	THE CHAIRMAN: Town of
2	would almost be what we would have to do	2	Southbury?
3	is we'd have to fly around, come back out,	3	(No response.)
4	and we'd have to do a dog leg around the	4	THE CHAIRMAN: GE Energy
5	power plant.	5	Financial Services?
6	MR. SAVARESE: Which maneuver	6	(No response.)
7	is entirely over the neighborhoods of	7	THE CHAIRMAN: Borough of
8	Middlebury?	8	Naugatuck Water Pollution Control Authority?
9	THE WITNESS (Stevens): Well,	9	(No response.)
10	it would. The placement of this power plant	10	THE CHAIRMAN: Wayne
11	would, whether you fly upwind or downwind of	11	McCormack?
12	the power plant, would create more aircraft	12	MR. McCORMACK: Mr. Chairman,
13	flight over the Town of Middlebury.	13	I have no questions.
14	MR. SAVARESE: Thank you. I	14	THE CHAIRMAN: Westover
15	have no further questions.	15	School?
16	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank	16	(No response.)
17	you.	17	THE CHAIRMAN: Westover Hills
18	Middlebury Land Trust?	18	Subdivision Homeowners?
19	(No response.)	19	MR. CORNACCHIA: Mr. Chairman,
20	THE CHAIRMAN: CL&P?	20	Chester Cornacchia for Westover Hills
21	MR. COCHRAN: Mr. Chairman, we	21	Subdivision. If I may, I have no questions
22	have no questions.	22	for Mr. Stevens.
23	THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.	23	The last hearing I was here,
24	Town of Oxford?	24	and I got called to a family issue I had to
25	(No response.)	25	deal with, so I was apparently called in my
	Page 674		Page 676
1	THE CHAIRMAN: Naugatuck	1	absence. If I may have the opportunity for
1 2	THE CHAIRMAN: Naugatuck Valley Chapter Trout Unlimited?	1 2	absence. If I may have the opportunity for cross-exam of the Applicant at this time?
1 2 3	Valley Chapter Trout Unlimited?		cross-exam of the Applicant at this time?
2		2	
2 3	Valley Chapter Trout Unlimited? (No response.)	2 3	cross-exam of the Applicant at this time? THE CHAIRMAN: You will at
2 3 4	Valley Chapter Trout Unlimited? (No response.) THE CHAIRMAN: A little cold	2 3 4	cross-exam of the Applicant at this time? THE CHAIRMAN: You will at some point. I have to confer. As you can
2 3 4 5	Valley Chapter Trout Unlimited? (No response.) THE CHAIRMAN: A little cold for everybody to be out fishing.	2 3 4 5	cross-exam of the Applicant at this time? THE CHAIRMAN: You will at some point. I have to confer. As you can see, when you have 15 different intervenors
2 3 4 5 6	Valley Chapter Trout Unlimited? (No response.) THE CHAIRMAN: A little cold for everybody to be out fishing. Pomperaug River Watershed	2 3 4 5 6	cross-exam of the Applicant at this time? THE CHAIRMAN: You will at some point. I have to confer. As you can see, when you have 15 different intervenors and parties scheduling, so we'll let you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Valley Chapter Trout Unlimited? (No response.) THE CHAIRMAN: A little cold for everybody to be out fishing. Pomperaug River Watershed Coalition? MR. DeJONG: Mr. Chairman, we have no questions.	2 3 4 5 6 7	cross-exam of the Applicant at this time? THE CHAIRMAN: You will at some point. I have to confer. As you can see, when you have 15 different intervenors and parties scheduling, so we'll let you know. MR. CORNACCHIA: Thank you. I appreciate that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Valley Chapter Trout Unlimited? (No response.) THE CHAIRMAN: A little cold for everybody to be out fishing. Pomperaug River Watershed Coalition? MR. DeJONG: Mr. Chairman, we have no questions. THE CHAIRMAN: Naugatuck River	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	cross-exam of the Applicant at this time? THE CHAIRMAN: You will at some point. I have to confer. As you can see, when you have 15 different intervenors and parties scheduling, so we'll let you know. MR. CORNACCHIA: Thank you. I appreciate that. THE CHAIRMAN: Marian Larkin
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Valley Chapter Trout Unlimited? (No response.) THE CHAIRMAN: A little cold for everybody to be out fishing. Pomperaug River Watershed Coalition? MR. DeJONG: Mr. Chairman, we have no questions. THE CHAIRMAN: Naugatuck River Revival Group?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	cross-exam of the Applicant at this time? THE CHAIRMAN: You will at some point. I have to confer. As you can see, when you have 15 different intervenors and parties scheduling, so we'll let you know. MR. CORNACCHIA: Thank you. I appreciate that. THE CHAIRMAN: Marian Larkin and Greenfields, LLC?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Valley Chapter Trout Unlimited? (No response.) THE CHAIRMAN: A little cold for everybody to be out fishing. Pomperaug River Watershed Coalition? MR. DeJONG: Mr. Chairman, we have no questions. THE CHAIRMAN: Naugatuck River Revival Group? MR. ZAK: Mr. Chairman, we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	cross-exam of the Applicant at this time? THE CHAIRMAN: You will at some point. I have to confer. As you can see, when you have 15 different intervenors and parties scheduling, so we'll let you know. MR. CORNACCHIA: Thank you. I appreciate that. THE CHAIRMAN: Marian Larkin and Greenfields, LLC? (No response.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Valley Chapter Trout Unlimited? (No response.) THE CHAIRMAN: A little cold for everybody to be out fishing. Pomperaug River Watershed Coalition? MR. DeJONG: Mr. Chairman, we have no questions. THE CHAIRMAN: Naugatuck River Revival Group? MR. ZAK: Mr. Chairman, we have no questions.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	cross-exam of the Applicant at this time? THE CHAIRMAN: You will at some point. I have to confer. As you can see, when you have 15 different intervenors and parties scheduling, so we'll let you know. MR. CORNACCHIA: Thank you. I appreciate that. THE CHAIRMAN: Marian Larkin and Greenfields, LLC? (No response.) THE CHAIRMAN: Quassy
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Valley Chapter Trout Unlimited? (No response.) THE CHAIRMAN: A little cold for everybody to be out fishing. Pomperaug River Watershed Coalition? MR. DeJONG: Mr. Chairman, we have no questions. THE CHAIRMAN: Naugatuck River Revival Group? MR. ZAK: Mr. Chairman, we have no questions. THE CHAIRMAN: Lake Quassapaug	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	cross-exam of the Applicant at this time? THE CHAIRMAN: You will at some point. I have to confer. As you can see, when you have 15 different intervenors and parties scheduling, so we'll let you know. MR. CORNACCHIA: Thank you. I appreciate that. THE CHAIRMAN: Marian Larkin and Greenfields, LLC? (No response.) THE CHAIRMAN: Quassy Amusement Park?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Valley Chapter Trout Unlimited? (No response.) THE CHAIRMAN: A little cold for everybody to be out fishing. Pomperaug River Watershed Coalition? MR. DeJONG: Mr. Chairman, we have no questions. THE CHAIRMAN: Naugatuck River Revival Group? MR. ZAK: Mr. Chairman, we have no questions. THE CHAIRMAN: Lake Quassapaug Association?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	cross-exam of the Applicant at this time? THE CHAIRMAN: You will at some point. I have to confer. As you can see, when you have 15 different intervenors and parties scheduling, so we'll let you know. MR. CORNACCHIA: Thank you. I appreciate that. THE CHAIRMAN: Marian Larkin and Greenfields, LLC? (No response.) THE CHAIRMAN: Quassy Amusement Park? Mr. Stevens, you can go and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Valley Chapter Trout Unlimited? (No response.) THE CHAIRMAN: A little cold for everybody to be out fishing. Pomperaug River Watershed Coalition? MR. DeJONG: Mr. Chairman, we have no questions. THE CHAIRMAN: Naugatuck River Revival Group? MR. ZAK: Mr. Chairman, we have no questions. THE CHAIRMAN: Lake Quassapaug Association? (No response.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	cross-exam of the Applicant at this time? THE CHAIRMAN: You will at some point. I have to confer. As you can see, when you have 15 different intervenors and parties scheduling, so we'll let you know. MR. CORNACCHIA: Thank you. I appreciate that. THE CHAIRMAN: Marian Larkin and Greenfields, LLC? (No response.) THE CHAIRMAN: Quassy Amusement Park? Mr. Stevens, you can go and enjoy your vacation.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Valley Chapter Trout Unlimited? (No response.) THE CHAIRMAN: A little cold for everybody to be out fishing. Pomperaug River Watershed Coalition? MR. DeJONG: Mr. Chairman, we have no questions. THE CHAIRMAN: Naugatuck River Revival Group? MR. ZAK: Mr. Chairman, we have no questions. THE CHAIRMAN: Lake Quassapaug Association? (No response.) THE CHAIRMAN: Middlebury	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	cross-exam of the Applicant at this time? THE CHAIRMAN: You will at some point. I have to confer. As you can see, when you have 15 different intervenors and parties scheduling, so we'll let you know. MR. CORNACCHIA: Thank you. I appreciate that. THE CHAIRMAN: Marian Larkin and Greenfields, LLC? (No response.) THE CHAIRMAN: Quassy Amusement Park? Mr. Stevens, you can go and enjoy your vacation. THE WITNESS (Stevens): Thank
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Valley Chapter Trout Unlimited? (No response.) THE CHAIRMAN: A little cold for everybody to be out fishing. Pomperaug River Watershed Coalition? MR. DeJONG: Mr. Chairman, we have no questions. THE CHAIRMAN: Naugatuck River Revival Group? MR. ZAK: Mr. Chairman, we have no questions. THE CHAIRMAN: Lake Quassapaug Association? (No response.) THE CHAIRMAN: Middlebury Bridle Land Association?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	cross-exam of the Applicant at this time? THE CHAIRMAN: You will at some point. I have to confer. As you can see, when you have 15 different intervenors and parties scheduling, so we'll let you know. MR. CORNACCHIA: Thank you. I appreciate that. THE CHAIRMAN: Marian Larkin and Greenfields, LLC? (No response.) THE CHAIRMAN: Quassy Amusement Park? Mr. Stevens, you can go and enjoy your vacation. THE WITNESS (Stevens): Thank you, Mr. Stein.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Valley Chapter Trout Unlimited? (No response.) THE CHAIRMAN: A little cold for everybody to be out fishing. Pomperaug River Watershed Coalition? MR. DeJONG: Mr. Chairman, we have no questions. THE CHAIRMAN: Naugatuck River Revival Group? MR. ZAK: Mr. Chairman, we have no questions. THE CHAIRMAN: Lake Quassapaug Association? (No response.) THE CHAIRMAN: Middlebury Bridle Land Association? (No response.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	cross-exam of the Applicant at this time? THE CHAIRMAN: You will at some point. I have to confer. As you can see, when you have 15 different intervenors and parties scheduling, so we'll let you know. MR. CORNACCHIA: Thank you. I appreciate that. THE CHAIRMAN: Marian Larkin and Greenfields, LLC? (No response.) THE CHAIRMAN: Quassy Amusement Park? Mr. Stevens, you can go and enjoy your vacation. THE WITNESS (Stevens): Thank you, Mr. Stein. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Valley Chapter Trout Unlimited? (No response.) THE CHAIRMAN: A little cold for everybody to be out fishing. Pomperaug River Watershed Coalition? MR. DeJONG: Mr. Chairman, we have no questions. THE CHAIRMAN: Naugatuck River Revival Group? MR. ZAK: Mr. Chairman, we have no questions. THE CHAIRMAN: Lake Quassapaug Association? (No response.) THE CHAIRMAN: Middlebury Bridle Land Association? (No response.) THE CHAIRMAN: Dennis Kocyla?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	cross-exam of the Applicant at this time? THE CHAIRMAN: You will at some point. I have to confer. As you can see, when you have 15 different intervenors and parties scheduling, so we'll let you know. MR. CORNACCHIA: Thank you. I appreciate that. THE CHAIRMAN: Marian Larkin and Greenfields, LLC? (No response.) THE CHAIRMAN: Quassy Amusement Park? Mr. Stevens, you can go and enjoy your vacation. THE WITNESS (Stevens): Thank you, Mr. Stein. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir. (Witness excused.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Valley Chapter Trout Unlimited? (No response.) THE CHAIRMAN: A little cold for everybody to be out fishing. Pomperaug River Watershed Coalition? MR. DeJONG: Mr. Chairman, we have no questions. THE CHAIRMAN: Naugatuck River Revival Group? MR. ZAK: Mr. Chairman, we have no questions. THE CHAIRMAN: Lake Quassapaug Association? (No response.) THE CHAIRMAN: Middlebury Bridle Land Association? (No response.) THE CHAIRMAN: Dennis Kocyla? (No response.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	cross-exam of the Applicant at this time? THE CHAIRMAN: You will at some point. I have to confer. As you can see, when you have 15 different intervenors and parties scheduling, so we'll let you know. MR. CORNACCHIA: Thank you. I appreciate that. THE CHAIRMAN: Marian Larkin and Greenfields, LLC? (No response.) THE CHAIRMAN: Quassy Amusement Park? Mr. Stevens, you can go and enjoy your vacation. THE WITNESS (Stevens): Thank you, Mr. Stein. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir. (Witness excused.) THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Valley Chapter Trout Unlimited? (No response.) THE CHAIRMAN: A little cold for everybody to be out fishing. Pomperaug River Watershed Coalition? MR. DeJONG: Mr. Chairman, we have no questions. THE CHAIRMAN: Naugatuck River Revival Group? MR. ZAK: Mr. Chairman, we have no questions. THE CHAIRMAN: Lake Quassapaug Association? (No response.) THE CHAIRMAN: Middlebury Bridle Land Association? (No response.) THE CHAIRMAN: Dennis Kocyla? (No response.) THE CHAIRMAN: Naugatuck	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	cross-exam of the Applicant at this time? THE CHAIRMAN: You will at some point. I have to confer. As you can see, when you have 15 different intervenors and parties scheduling, so we'll let you know. MR. CORNACCHIA: Thank you. I appreciate that. THE CHAIRMAN: Marian Larkin and Greenfields, LLC? (No response.) THE CHAIRMAN: Quassy Amusement Park? Mr. Stevens, you can go and enjoy your vacation. THE WITNESS (Stevens): Thank you, Mr. Stein. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir. (Witness excused.) THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Mr. Perrone, could you move
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Valley Chapter Trout Unlimited? (No response.) THE CHAIRMAN: A little cold for everybody to be out fishing. Pomperaug River Watershed Coalition? MR. DeJONG: Mr. Chairman, we have no questions. THE CHAIRMAN: Naugatuck River Revival Group? MR. ZAK: Mr. Chairman, we have no questions. THE CHAIRMAN: Lake Quassapaug Association? (No response.) THE CHAIRMAN: Middlebury Bridle Land Association? (No response.) THE CHAIRMAN: Dennis Kocyla? (No response.) THE CHAIRMAN: Naugatuck Valley Audubon?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	cross-exam of the Applicant at this time? THE CHAIRMAN: You will at some point. I have to confer. As you can see, when you have 15 different intervenors and parties scheduling, so we'll let you know. MR. CORNACCHIA: Thank you. I appreciate that. THE CHAIRMAN: Marian Larkin and Greenfields, LLC? (No response.) THE CHAIRMAN: Quassy Amusement Park? Mr. Stevens, you can go and enjoy your vacation. THE WITNESS (Stevens): Thank you, Mr. Stein. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir. (Witness excused.) THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Mr. Perrone, could you move back to your seat now?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Valley Chapter Trout Unlimited? (No response.) THE CHAIRMAN: A little cold for everybody to be out fishing. Pomperaug River Watershed Coalition? MR. DeJONG: Mr. Chairman, we have no questions. THE CHAIRMAN: Naugatuck River Revival Group? MR. ZAK: Mr. Chairman, we have no questions. THE CHAIRMAN: Lake Quassapaug Association? (No response.) THE CHAIRMAN: Middlebury Bridle Land Association? (No response.) THE CHAIRMAN: Dennis Kocyla? (No response.) THE CHAIRMAN: Naugatuck	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	cross-exam of the Applicant at this time? THE CHAIRMAN: You will at some point. I have to confer. As you can see, when you have 15 different intervenors and parties scheduling, so we'll let you know. MR. CORNACCHIA: Thank you. I appreciate that. THE CHAIRMAN: Marian Larkin and Greenfields, LLC? (No response.) THE CHAIRMAN: Quassy Amusement Park? Mr. Stevens, you can go and enjoy your vacation. THE WITNESS (Stevens): Thank you, Mr. Stein. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir. (Witness excused.) THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Mr. Perrone, could you move

34 (Pages 673 to 676)

	Page 677		Page 679
1	MR. PERRONE: Thank you,	1	MR. PERRONE: Before there was
2	Mr. Chairman.	2	some discussion about fuel consumption
3	Mr. Davison, at the last	3	compared to the previous project with the new
4	hearing Mr. Gustafson testified that a	4	project. I understand we have heat rates in
5	wildlife study 15 years old would likely	5	the filing based on 59 degrees. Would you
6	require updating; do you agree with that?	6	have the heat rates for say zero and 90
7	THE WITNESS (Davison): Yes.	7	degrees or other temperatures?
8	If you're referring to the Tetra Tech study,	8	THE WITNESS (Donovan): We
9	specifically Section 3, existing environment,	9	have I think we've provided the heat
10	Section 3.7.2, as far as I'm aware, that's	10	rates, the efficiencies, in a table for wet
11	the only discussion of wildlife. And based	11	winter which is 20 degrees and 90 degrees.
12	on that, yes, I would agree with that, it's a	12	MR. PERRONE: Also related to
13	bit cursory.	13	that, what is the Btu content of natural gas
14	MR. PERRONE: Generally	14	per cubic foot?
15	speaking, about how old would a report have	15	THE WITNESS (Donovan): It's
16	to be where it would require an update in	16	usually about 20,000 and change, 20,000 Btu's
17	your experience?	17	per pound for about I think it's about 900
18	THE WITNESS (Davison): I	18	Btu's per standard cubic foot.
19	would say anything that's exceeding a decade	19	MR. PERRONE: And for the
20	warrants taking a close look at whether it	20	distillate fuel oil how many Btu's per
21	should be updated. I think what's most	21	gallon?
22	important is how the land use has changed.	22	THE WITNESS (Donovan): For
23	If the conditions on the property hadn't	23	fuel oil for distillate it's usually about 18
24	changed, the habitat types, the way the	24	or 19,000 Btu's per pound. It's on a per
25	property is being managed, whether it's being	25	pound basis.
	Page 678		Page 680
1	managed at all, alterations to the vegetation	1	Page 680 MR. PERRONE: Now, going back
2	_	2	MR. PERRONE: Now, going back to natural gas, what line pressure in pounds
2 3	managed at all, alterations to the vegetation forest, whether it's been farmed, any real land use changes would probably be a more		MR. PERRONE: Now, going back
2 3 4	managed at all, alterations to the vegetation forest, whether it's been farmed, any real land use changes would probably be a more important trigger that would warrant doing a	2 3 4	MR. PERRONE: Now, going back to natural gas, what line pressure in pounds per square inch gauge do you require at the plant?
2 3 4 5	managed at all, alterations to the vegetation forest, whether it's been farmed, any real land use changes would probably be a more important trigger that would warrant doing a new study as opposed to the time frame, but	2 3 4 5	MR. PERRONE: Now, going back to natural gas, what line pressure in pounds per square inch gauge do you require at the plant? THE WITNESS (Donovan):
2 3 4 5 6	managed at all, alterations to the vegetation forest, whether it's been farmed, any real land use changes would probably be a more important trigger that would warrant doing a new study as opposed to the time frame, but anything over a decade, even without any	2 3 4 5 6	MR. PERRONE: Now, going back to natural gas, what line pressure in pounds per square inch gauge do you require at the plant? THE WITNESS (Donovan): Approximately 500 PSI, 500 to 525 PSIG.
2 3 4 5 6 7	managed at all, alterations to the vegetation forest, whether it's been farmed, any real land use changes would probably be a more important trigger that would warrant doing a new study as opposed to the time frame, but anything over a decade, even without any significant changes, probably warrants doing	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. PERRONE: Now, going back to natural gas, what line pressure in pounds per square inch gauge do you require at the plant? THE WITNESS (Donovan): Approximately 500 PSI, 500 to 525 PSIG. MR. PERRONE: And what's the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	managed at all, alterations to the vegetation forest, whether it's been farmed, any real land use changes would probably be a more important trigger that would warrant doing a new study as opposed to the time frame, but anything over a decade, even without any significant changes, probably warrants doing some updating.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. PERRONE: Now, going back to natural gas, what line pressure in pounds per square inch gauge do you require at the plant? THE WITNESS (Donovan): Approximately 500 PSI, 500 to 525 PSIG. MR. PERRONE: And what's the line pressure of the existing line you're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	managed at all, alterations to the vegetation forest, whether it's been farmed, any real land use changes would probably be a more important trigger that would warrant doing a new study as opposed to the time frame, but anything over a decade, even without any significant changes, probably warrants doing some updating. MR. PERRONE: Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. PERRONE: Now, going back to natural gas, what line pressure in pounds per square inch gauge do you require at the plant? THE WITNESS (Donovan): Approximately 500 PSI, 500 to 525 PSIG. MR. PERRONE: And what's the line pressure of the existing line you're going to connect to, ballpark?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	managed at all, alterations to the vegetation forest, whether it's been farmed, any real land use changes would probably be a more important trigger that would warrant doing a new study as opposed to the time frame, but anything over a decade, even without any significant changes, probably warrants doing some updating. MR. PERRONE: Thank you. As far as the USLD storage	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. PERRONE: Now, going back to natural gas, what line pressure in pounds per square inch gauge do you require at the plant? THE WITNESS (Donovan): Approximately 500 PSI, 500 to 525 PSIG. MR. PERRONE: And what's the line pressure of the existing line you're going to connect to, ballpark? THE WITNESS (Donovan):
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	managed at all, alterations to the vegetation forest, whether it's been farmed, any real land use changes would probably be a more important trigger that would warrant doing a new study as opposed to the time frame, but anything over a decade, even without any significant changes, probably warrants doing some updating. MR. PERRONE: Thank you. As far as the USLD storage tank, what measures would you have in place	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. PERRONE: Now, going back to natural gas, what line pressure in pounds per square inch gauge do you require at the plant? THE WITNESS (Donovan): Approximately 500 PSI, 500 to 525 PSIG. MR. PERRONE: And what's the line pressure of the existing line you're going to connect to, ballpark? THE WITNESS (Donovan): There's two individual lines that we'll be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	managed at all, alterations to the vegetation forest, whether it's been farmed, any real land use changes would probably be a more important trigger that would warrant doing a new study as opposed to the time frame, but anything over a decade, even without any significant changes, probably warrants doing some updating. MR. PERRONE: Thank you. As far as the USLD storage tank, what measures would you have in place to protect against fuel spillage when the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. PERRONE: Now, going back to natural gas, what line pressure in pounds per square inch gauge do you require at the plant? THE WITNESS (Donovan): Approximately 500 PSI, 500 to 525 PSIG. MR. PERRONE: And what's the line pressure of the existing line you're going to connect to, ballpark? THE WITNESS (Donovan): There's two individual lines that we'll be tying into, but the max pressure is on the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	managed at all, alterations to the vegetation forest, whether it's been farmed, any real land use changes would probably be a more important trigger that would warrant doing a new study as opposed to the time frame, but anything over a decade, even without any significant changes, probably warrants doing some updating. MR. PERRONE: Thank you. As far as the USLD storage tank, what measures would you have in place to protect against fuel spillage when the tank is being refilled?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. PERRONE: Now, going back to natural gas, what line pressure in pounds per square inch gauge do you require at the plant? THE WITNESS (Donovan): Approximately 500 PSI, 500 to 525 PSIG. MR. PERRONE: And what's the line pressure of the existing line you're going to connect to, ballpark? THE WITNESS (Donovan): There's two individual lines that we'll be tying into, but the max pressure is on the order of over 600 PSI.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	managed at all, alterations to the vegetation forest, whether it's been farmed, any real land use changes would probably be a more important trigger that would warrant doing a new study as opposed to the time frame, but anything over a decade, even without any significant changes, probably warrants doing some updating. MR. PERRONE: Thank you. As far as the USLD storage tank, what measures would you have in place to protect against fuel spillage when the tank is being refilled? THE WITNESS (Donovan): This	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. PERRONE: Now, going back to natural gas, what line pressure in pounds per square inch gauge do you require at the plant? THE WITNESS (Donovan): Approximately 500 PSI, 500 to 525 PSIG. MR. PERRONE: And what's the line pressure of the existing line you're going to connect to, ballpark? THE WITNESS (Donovan): There's two individual lines that we'll be tying into, but the max pressure is on the order of over 600 PSI. MR. PERRONE: Could you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	managed at all, alterations to the vegetation forest, whether it's been farmed, any real land use changes would probably be a more important trigger that would warrant doing a new study as opposed to the time frame, but anything over a decade, even without any significant changes, probably warrants doing some updating. MR. PERRONE: Thank you. As far as the USLD storage tank, what measures would you have in place to protect against fuel spillage when the tank is being refilled? THE WITNESS (Donovan): This is specific to unloading; is that correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. PERRONE: Now, going back to natural gas, what line pressure in pounds per square inch gauge do you require at the plant? THE WITNESS (Donovan): Approximately 500 PSI, 500 to 525 PSIG. MR. PERRONE: And what's the line pressure of the existing line you're going to connect to, ballpark? THE WITNESS (Donovan): There's two individual lines that we'll be tying into, but the max pressure is on the order of over 600 PSI. MR. PERRONE: Could you generally describe the natural gas connection
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	managed at all, alterations to the vegetation forest, whether it's been farmed, any real land use changes would probably be a more important trigger that would warrant doing a new study as opposed to the time frame, but anything over a decade, even without any significant changes, probably warrants doing some updating. MR. PERRONE: Thank you. As far as the USLD storage tank, what measures would you have in place to protect against fuel spillage when the tank is being refilled? THE WITNESS (Donovan): This is specific to unloading; is that correct? MR. PERRONE: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. PERRONE: Now, going back to natural gas, what line pressure in pounds per square inch gauge do you require at the plant? THE WITNESS (Donovan): Approximately 500 PSI, 500 to 525 PSIG. MR. PERRONE: And what's the line pressure of the existing line you're going to connect to, ballpark? THE WITNESS (Donovan): There's two individual lines that we'll be tying into, but the max pressure is on the order of over 600 PSI. MR. PERRONE: Could you generally describe the natural gas connection and the underground route it will follow?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	managed at all, alterations to the vegetation forest, whether it's been farmed, any real land use changes would probably be a more important trigger that would warrant doing a new study as opposed to the time frame, but anything over a decade, even without any significant changes, probably warrants doing some updating. MR. PERRONE: Thank you. As far as the USLD storage tank, what measures would you have in place to protect against fuel spillage when the tank is being refilled? THE WITNESS (Donovan): This is specific to unloading; is that correct? MR. PERRONE: Yes. THE WITNESS (Donovan): So	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. PERRONE: Now, going back to natural gas, what line pressure in pounds per square inch gauge do you require at the plant? THE WITNESS (Donovan): Approximately 500 PSI, 500 to 525 PSIG. MR. PERRONE: And what's the line pressure of the existing line you're going to connect to, ballpark? THE WITNESS (Donovan): There's two individual lines that we'll be tying into, but the max pressure is on the order of over 600 PSI. MR. PERRONE: Could you generally describe the natural gas connection and the underground route it will follow? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	managed at all, alterations to the vegetation forest, whether it's been farmed, any real land use changes would probably be a more important trigger that would warrant doing a new study as opposed to the time frame, but anything over a decade, even without any significant changes, probably warrants doing some updating. MR. PERRONE: Thank you. As far as the USLD storage tank, what measures would you have in place to protect against fuel spillage when the tank is being refilled? THE WITNESS (Donovan): This is specific to unloading; is that correct? MR. PERRONE: Yes. THE WITNESS (Donovan): So there's typically a curbing, like the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. PERRONE: Now, going back to natural gas, what line pressure in pounds per square inch gauge do you require at the plant? THE WITNESS (Donovan): Approximately 500 PSI, 500 to 525 PSIG. MR. PERRONE: And what's the line pressure of the existing line you're going to connect to, ballpark? THE WITNESS (Donovan): There's two individual lines that we'll be tying into, but the max pressure is on the order of over 600 PSI. MR. PERRONE: Could you generally describe the natural gas connection and the underground route it will follow? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So we're actually working through those details
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	managed at all, alterations to the vegetation forest, whether it's been farmed, any real land use changes would probably be a more important trigger that would warrant doing a new study as opposed to the time frame, but anything over a decade, even without any significant changes, probably warrants doing some updating. MR. PERRONE: Thank you. As far as the USLD storage tank, what measures would you have in place to protect against fuel spillage when the tank is being refilled? THE WITNESS (Donovan): This is specific to unloading; is that correct? MR. PERRONE: Yes. THE WITNESS (Donovan): So there's typically a curbing, like the equivalent of curbing on the sides and a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. PERRONE: Now, going back to natural gas, what line pressure in pounds per square inch gauge do you require at the plant? THE WITNESS (Donovan): Approximately 500 PSI, 500 to 525 PSIG. MR. PERRONE: And what's the line pressure of the existing line you're going to connect to, ballpark? THE WITNESS (Donovan): There's two individual lines that we'll be tying into, but the max pressure is on the order of over 600 PSI. MR. PERRONE: Could you generally describe the natural gas connection and the underground route it will follow? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So we're actually working through those details with Spectra currently, and we're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	managed at all, alterations to the vegetation forest, whether it's been farmed, any real land use changes would probably be a more important trigger that would warrant doing a new study as opposed to the time frame, but anything over a decade, even without any significant changes, probably warrants doing some updating. MR. PERRONE: Thank you. As far as the USLD storage tank, what measures would you have in place to protect against fuel spillage when the tank is being refilled? THE WITNESS (Donovan): This is specific to unloading; is that correct? MR. PERRONE: Yes. THE WITNESS (Donovan): So there's typically a curbing, like the equivalent of curbing on the sides and a speed bump for containment in case of an	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. PERRONE: Now, going back to natural gas, what line pressure in pounds per square inch gauge do you require at the plant? THE WITNESS (Donovan): Approximately 500 PSI, 500 to 525 PSIG. MR. PERRONE: And what's the line pressure of the existing line you're going to connect to, ballpark? THE WITNESS (Donovan): There's two individual lines that we'll be tying into, but the max pressure is on the order of over 600 PSI. MR. PERRONE: Could you generally describe the natural gas connection and the underground route it will follow? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So we're actually working through those details with Spectra currently, and we're contemplating one of two routes. One would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	managed at all, alterations to the vegetation forest, whether it's been farmed, any real land use changes would probably be a more important trigger that would warrant doing a new study as opposed to the time frame, but anything over a decade, even without any significant changes, probably warrants doing some updating. MR. PERRONE: Thank you. As far as the USLD storage tank, what measures would you have in place to protect against fuel spillage when the tank is being refilled? THE WITNESS (Donovan): This is specific to unloading; is that correct? MR. PERRONE: Yes. THE WITNESS (Donovan): So there's typically a curbing, like the equivalent of curbing on the sides and a speed bump for containment in case of an incidental spill.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. PERRONE: Now, going back to natural gas, what line pressure in pounds per square inch gauge do you require at the plant? THE WITNESS (Donovan): Approximately 500 PSI, 500 to 525 PSIG. MR. PERRONE: And what's the line pressure of the existing line you're going to connect to, ballpark? THE WITNESS (Donovan): There's two individual lines that we'll be tying into, but the max pressure is on the order of over 600 PSI. MR. PERRONE: Could you generally describe the natural gas connection and the underground route it will follow? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So we're actually working through those details with Spectra currently, and we're contemplating one of two routes. One would be going directly north on the site and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	managed at all, alterations to the vegetation forest, whether it's been farmed, any real land use changes would probably be a more important trigger that would warrant doing a new study as opposed to the time frame, but anything over a decade, even without any significant changes, probably warrants doing some updating. MR. PERRONE: Thank you. As far as the USLD storage tank, what measures would you have in place to protect against fuel spillage when the tank is being refilled? THE WITNESS (Donovan): This is specific to unloading; is that correct? MR. PERRONE: Yes. THE WITNESS (Donovan): So there's typically a curbing, like the equivalent of curbing on the sides and a speed bump for containment in case of an incidental spill. MR. PERRONE: Could an updated	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. PERRONE: Now, going back to natural gas, what line pressure in pounds per square inch gauge do you require at the plant? THE WITNESS (Donovan): Approximately 500 PSI, 500 to 525 PSIG. MR. PERRONE: And what's the line pressure of the existing line you're going to connect to, ballpark? THE WITNESS (Donovan): There's two individual lines that we'll be tying into, but the max pressure is on the order of over 600 PSI. MR. PERRONE: Could you generally describe the natural gas connection and the underground route it will follow? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So we're actually working through those details with Spectra currently, and we're contemplating one of two routes. One would be going directly north on the site and tapping both lines directly to the adjacent
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	managed at all, alterations to the vegetation forest, whether it's been farmed, any real land use changes would probably be a more important trigger that would warrant doing a new study as opposed to the time frame, but anything over a decade, even without any significant changes, probably warrants doing some updating. MR. PERRONE: Thank you. As far as the USLD storage tank, what measures would you have in place to protect against fuel spillage when the tank is being refilled? THE WITNESS (Donovan): This is specific to unloading; is that correct? MR. PERRONE: Yes. THE WITNESS (Donovan): So there's typically a curbing, like the equivalent of curbing on the sides and a speed bump for containment in case of an incidental spill. MR. PERRONE: Could an updated fuel storage and handling plan be provided in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. PERRONE: Now, going back to natural gas, what line pressure in pounds per square inch gauge do you require at the plant? THE WITNESS (Donovan): Approximately 500 PSI, 500 to 525 PSIG. MR. PERRONE: And what's the line pressure of the existing line you're going to connect to, ballpark? THE WITNESS (Donovan): There's two individual lines that we'll be tying into, but the max pressure is on the order of over 600 PSI. MR. PERRONE: Could you generally describe the natural gas connection and the underground route it will follow? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So we're actually working through those details with Spectra currently, and we're contemplating one of two routes. One would be going directly north on the site and tapping both lines directly to the adjacent northern boundary of the site. A second
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	managed at all, alterations to the vegetation forest, whether it's been farmed, any real land use changes would probably be a more important trigger that would warrant doing a new study as opposed to the time frame, but anything over a decade, even without any significant changes, probably warrants doing some updating. MR. PERRONE: Thank you. As far as the USLD storage tank, what measures would you have in place to protect against fuel spillage when the tank is being refilled? THE WITNESS (Donovan): This is specific to unloading; is that correct? MR. PERRONE: Yes. THE WITNESS (Donovan): So there's typically a curbing, like the equivalent of curbing on the sides and a speed bump for containment in case of an incidental spill. MR. PERRONE: Could an updated	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. PERRONE: Now, going back to natural gas, what line pressure in pounds per square inch gauge do you require at the plant? THE WITNESS (Donovan): Approximately 500 PSI, 500 to 525 PSIG. MR. PERRONE: And what's the line pressure of the existing line you're going to connect to, ballpark? THE WITNESS (Donovan): There's two individual lines that we'll be tying into, but the max pressure is on the order of over 600 PSI. MR. PERRONE: Could you generally describe the natural gas connection and the underground route it will follow? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So we're actually working through those details with Spectra currently, and we're contemplating one of two routes. One would be going directly north on the site and tapping both lines directly to the adjacent

35 (Pages 677 to 680)

	Page 681		Page 683
1	Spectra property and tapping running the	1	there is it's not limited to gas
2	line north and tapping both lines on the	2	detectors. I believe there will be gas
3	northern end of Spectra's property.	3	detectors incorporated in the design of the
4	MR. PERRONE: And that would	4	plant, but there's other instrumentation that
5	be an interruptible rather than a firm gas	5	will be used for safety purposes as well,
6	service. Correct?	6	such as pressure sensors to, you know,
7	THE WITNESS (Bazinet): That's	7	quickly react in the event of a loss of
8	correct.	8	pressure.
9	MR. PERRONE: Also, at the	9	MR. PERRONE: And would
10	last hearing, there was some mention of	10	ammonia be stored at the site?
11	safety concerns, especially as related to the	11	THE WITNESS (Donovan): Yes.
12	explosion at Kleen Energy. Is it correct to	12	MR. PERRONE: And that would
13	say that the primary risk that contributed to	13	be used for?
14	that accident, natural gas blows, would be	14	THE WITNESS (Donovan): That
15	eliminated with this project?	15	would be used as a reagent in the SER system
16	THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's	16	to control NOx, and it would be 19 percent
17	correct.	17	aqueous ammonia, so 19 percent solution,
18	MR. PERRONE: What type of	18	mostly water.
19	cleaning media would you use to clear the	19	MR. PERRONE: And hydrogen
20	lines?	20	would also be stored?
21	THE WITNESS (Donovan): It's	21	THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's
22	envisioned that it would be compressed air.	22	correct.
23	MR. LYNCH: That microphone	23	MR. PERRONE: And that would
24	doesn't seem to be working. Could you speak	24	be used for?
25	up a little louder?	25	THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's
	•		
	Page 682		
	10.90 001		Page 684
1	THE WITNESS (Donovan): Sure.	1	used as a cooling medium within the
2	_	2	
2 3	THE WITNESS (Donovan): Sure. It's envisioned that compressed air will be used to clean the pipeline.	2 3	used as a cooling medium within the generators, but it's usually a small volume. MR. PERRONE: Turning to the
2 3 4	THE WITNESS (Donovan): Sure. It's envisioned that compressed air will be used to clean the pipeline. MR. PERRONE: So would you	2 3 4	used as a cooling medium within the generators, but it's usually a small volume. MR. PERRONE: Turning to the comments from the Connecticut Airport
2 3 4 5	THE WITNESS (Donovan): Sure. It's envisioned that compressed air will be used to clean the pipeline. MR. PERRONE: So would you truck in a large compressor or a	2 3 4 5	used as a cooling medium within the generators, but it's usually a small volume. MR. PERRONE: Turning to the comments from the Connecticut Airport Authority, what type of consultations has CPV
2 3 4 5 6	THE WITNESS (Donovan): Sure. It's envisioned that compressed air will be used to clean the pipeline. MR. PERRONE: So would you truck in a large compressor or a THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's	2 3 4 5 6	used as a cooling medium within the generators, but it's usually a small volume. MR. PERRONE: Turning to the comments from the Connecticut Airport Authority, what type of consultations has CPV had with the CAA in addition to those related
2 3 4 5 6 7	THE WITNESS (Donovan): Sure. It's envisioned that compressed air will be used to clean the pipeline. MR. PERRONE: So would you truck in a large compressor or a THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's correct or possibly use the permanent air	2 3 4 5 6 7	used as a cooling medium within the generators, but it's usually a small volume. MR. PERRONE: Turning to the comments from the Connecticut Airport Authority, what type of consultations has CPV had with the CAA in addition to those related to the balloon float?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	THE WITNESS (Donovan): Sure. It's envisioned that compressed air will be used to clean the pipeline. MR. PERRONE: So would you truck in a large compressor or a THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's correct or possibly use the permanent air compressors on site, but probably mobile.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	used as a cooling medium within the generators, but it's usually a small volume. MR. PERRONE: Turning to the comments from the Connecticut Airport Authority, what type of consultations has CPV had with the CAA in addition to those related to the balloon float? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE WITNESS (Donovan): Sure. It's envisioned that compressed air will be used to clean the pipeline. MR. PERRONE: So would you truck in a large compressor or a THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's correct or possibly use the permanent air compressors on site, but probably mobile. MR. PERRONE: But such	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	used as a cooling medium within the generators, but it's usually a small volume. MR. PERRONE: Turning to the comments from the Connecticut Airport Authority, what type of consultations has CPV had with the CAA in addition to those related to the balloon float? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): I apologize. I'm going to track down a date
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	THE WITNESS (Donovan): Sure. It's envisioned that compressed air will be used to clean the pipeline. MR. PERRONE: So would you truck in a large compressor or a THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's correct or possibly use the permanent air compressors on site, but probably mobile. MR. PERRONE: But such measures would ultimately be in compliance	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	used as a cooling medium within the generators, but it's usually a small volume. MR. PERRONE: Turning to the comments from the Connecticut Airport Authority, what type of consultations has CPV had with the CAA in addition to those related to the balloon float? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): I apologize. I'm going to track down a date for you, but I'll describe. So we met with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	THE WITNESS (Donovan): Sure. It's envisioned that compressed air will be used to clean the pipeline. MR. PERRONE: So would you truck in a large compressor or a THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's correct or possibly use the permanent air compressors on site, but probably mobile. MR. PERRONE: But such measures would ultimately be in compliance with the findings and recommendations in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	used as a cooling medium within the generators, but it's usually a small volume. MR. PERRONE: Turning to the comments from the Connecticut Airport Authority, what type of consultations has CPV had with the CAA in addition to those related to the balloon float? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): I apologize. I'm going to track down a date for you, but I'll describe. So we met with the Connecticut Airport Authority on January
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	THE WITNESS (Donovan): Sure. It's envisioned that compressed air will be used to clean the pipeline. MR. PERRONE: So would you truck in a large compressor or a THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's correct or possibly use the permanent air compressors on site, but probably mobile. MR. PERRONE: But such measures would ultimately be in compliance with the findings and recommendations in the executive report issued by the Thomas	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	used as a cooling medium within the generators, but it's usually a small volume. MR. PERRONE: Turning to the comments from the Connecticut Airport Authority, what type of consultations has CPV had with the CAA in addition to those related to the balloon float? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): I apologize. I'm going to track down a date for you, but I'll describe. So we met with the Connecticut Airport Authority on January 6th, and the purpose of that visit was to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE WITNESS (Donovan): Sure. It's envisioned that compressed air will be used to clean the pipeline. MR. PERRONE: So would you truck in a large compressor or a THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's correct or possibly use the permanent air compressors on site, but probably mobile. MR. PERRONE: But such measures would ultimately be in compliance with the findings and recommendations in the executive report issued by the Thomas Commission?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	used as a cooling medium within the generators, but it's usually a small volume. MR. PERRONE: Turning to the comments from the Connecticut Airport Authority, what type of consultations has CPV had with the CAA in addition to those related to the balloon float? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): I apologize. I'm going to track down a date for you, but I'll describe. So we met with the Connecticut Airport Authority on January 6th, and the purpose of that visit was to describe to the Connecticut Airport Authority
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	THE WITNESS (Donovan): Sure. It's envisioned that compressed air will be used to clean the pipeline. MR. PERRONE: So would you truck in a large compressor or a THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's correct or possibly use the permanent air compressors on site, but probably mobile. MR. PERRONE: But such measures would ultimately be in compliance with the findings and recommendations in the executive report issued by the Thomas Commission? THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	used as a cooling medium within the generators, but it's usually a small volume. MR. PERRONE: Turning to the comments from the Connecticut Airport Authority, what type of consultations has CPV had with the CAA in addition to those related to the balloon float? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): I apologize. I'm going to track down a date for you, but I'll describe. So we met with the Connecticut Airport Authority on January 6th, and the purpose of that visit was to describe to the Connecticut Airport Authority the proposal, in general, but also the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	THE WITNESS (Donovan): Sure. It's envisioned that compressed air will be used to clean the pipeline. MR. PERRONE: So would you truck in a large compressor or a THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's correct or possibly use the permanent air compressors on site, but probably mobile. MR. PERRONE: But such measures would ultimately be in compliance with the findings and recommendations in the executive report issued by the Thomas Commission? THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	used as a cooling medium within the generators, but it's usually a small volume. MR. PERRONE: Turning to the comments from the Connecticut Airport Authority, what type of consultations has CPV had with the CAA in addition to those related to the balloon float? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): I apologize. I'm going to track down a date for you, but I'll describe. So we met with the Connecticut Airport Authority on January 6th, and the purpose of that visit was to describe to the Connecticut Airport Authority the proposal, in general, but also the changes relative to the certificated project
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE WITNESS (Donovan): Sure. It's envisioned that compressed air will be used to clean the pipeline. MR. PERRONE: So would you truck in a large compressor or a THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's correct or possibly use the permanent air compressors on site, but probably mobile. MR. PERRONE: But such measures would ultimately be in compliance with the findings and recommendations in the executive report issued by the Thomas Commission? THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's correct. MR. PERRONE: Also, regarding	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	used as a cooling medium within the generators, but it's usually a small volume. MR. PERRONE: Turning to the comments from the Connecticut Airport Authority, what type of consultations has CPV had with the CAA in addition to those related to the balloon float? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): I apologize. I'm going to track down a date for you, but I'll describe. So we met with the Connecticut Airport Authority on January 6th, and the purpose of that visit was to describe to the Connecticut Airport Authority the proposal, in general, but also the changes relative to the certificated project and get any feedback that they might have for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE WITNESS (Donovan): Sure. It's envisioned that compressed air will be used to clean the pipeline. MR. PERRONE: So would you truck in a large compressor or a THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's correct or possibly use the permanent air compressors on site, but probably mobile. MR. PERRONE: But such measures would ultimately be in compliance with the findings and recommendations in the executive report issued by the Thomas Commission? THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's correct. MR. PERRONE: Also, regarding natural gas safety, what type of safety	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	used as a cooling medium within the generators, but it's usually a small volume. MR. PERRONE: Turning to the comments from the Connecticut Airport Authority, what type of consultations has CPV had with the CAA in addition to those related to the balloon float? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): I apologize. I'm going to track down a date for you, but I'll describe. So we met with the Connecticut Airport Authority on January 6th, and the purpose of that visit was to describe to the Connecticut Airport Authority the proposal, in general, but also the changes relative to the certificated project and get any feedback that they might have for us at that point in time.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE WITNESS (Donovan): Sure. It's envisioned that compressed air will be used to clean the pipeline. MR. PERRONE: So would you truck in a large compressor or a THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's correct or possibly use the permanent air compressors on site, but probably mobile. MR. PERRONE: But such measures would ultimately be in compliance with the findings and recommendations in the executive report issued by the Thomas Commission? THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's correct. MR. PERRONE: Also, regarding natural gas safety, what type of safety features would the plant have itself, any gas	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	used as a cooling medium within the generators, but it's usually a small volume. MR. PERRONE: Turning to the comments from the Connecticut Airport Authority, what type of consultations has CPV had with the CAA in addition to those related to the balloon float? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): I apologize. I'm going to track down a date for you, but I'll describe. So we met with the Connecticut Airport Authority on January 6th, and the purpose of that visit was to describe to the Connecticut Airport Authority the proposal, in general, but also the changes relative to the certificated project and get any feedback that they might have for us at that point in time. MR. PERRONE: Because in their
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	THE WITNESS (Donovan): Sure. It's envisioned that compressed air will be used to clean the pipeline. MR. PERRONE: So would you truck in a large compressor or a THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's correct or possibly use the permanent air compressors on site, but probably mobile. MR. PERRONE: But such measures would ultimately be in compliance with the findings and recommendations in the executive report issued by the Thomas Commission? THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's correct. MR. PERRONE: Also, regarding natural gas safety, what type of safety features would the plant have itself, any gas sensors, et cetera, emergency shut-offs, in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	used as a cooling medium within the generators, but it's usually a small volume. MR. PERRONE: Turning to the comments from the Connecticut Airport Authority, what type of consultations has CPV had with the CAA in addition to those related to the balloon float? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): I apologize. I'm going to track down a date for you, but I'll describe. So we met with the Connecticut Airport Authority on January 6th, and the purpose of that visit was to describe to the Connecticut Airport Authority the proposal, in general, but also the changes relative to the certificated project and get any feedback that they might have for us at that point in time. MR. PERRONE: Because in their comments they mention a need to file a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE WITNESS (Donovan): Sure. It's envisioned that compressed air will be used to clean the pipeline. MR. PERRONE: So would you truck in a large compressor or a THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's correct or possibly use the permanent air compressors on site, but probably mobile. MR. PERRONE: But such measures would ultimately be in compliance with the findings and recommendations in the executive report issued by the Thomas Commission? THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's correct. MR. PERRONE: Also, regarding natural gas safety, what type of safety features would the plant have itself, any gas sensors, et cetera, emergency shut-offs, in general?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	used as a cooling medium within the generators, but it's usually a small volume. MR. PERRONE: Turning to the comments from the Connecticut Airport Authority, what type of consultations has CPV had with the CAA in addition to those related to the balloon float? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): I apologize. I'm going to track down a date for you, but I'll describe. So we met with the Connecticut Airport Authority on January 6th, and the purpose of that visit was to describe to the Connecticut Airport Authority the proposal, in general, but also the changes relative to the certificated project and get any feedback that they might have for us at that point in time. MR. PERRONE: Because in their comments they mention a need to file a document with the FAA, the FAA forms 7460.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE WITNESS (Donovan): Sure. It's envisioned that compressed air will be used to clean the pipeline. MR. PERRONE: So would you truck in a large compressor or a THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's correct or possibly use the permanent air compressors on site, but probably mobile. MR. PERRONE: But such measures would ultimately be in compliance with the findings and recommendations in the executive report issued by the Thomas Commission? THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's correct. MR. PERRONE: Also, regarding natural gas safety, what type of safety features would the plant have itself, any gas sensors, et cetera, emergency shut-offs, in general? THE WITNESS (Donovan): There	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	used as a cooling medium within the generators, but it's usually a small volume. MR. PERRONE: Turning to the comments from the Connecticut Airport Authority, what type of consultations has CPV had with the CAA in addition to those related to the balloon float? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): I apologize. I'm going to track down a date for you, but I'll describe. So we met with the Connecticut Airport Authority on January 6th, and the purpose of that visit was to describe to the Connecticut Airport Authority the proposal, in general, but also the changes relative to the certificated project and get any feedback that they might have for us at that point in time. MR. PERRONE: Because in their comments they mention a need to file a document with the FAA, the FAA forms 7460. What's the status of that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE WITNESS (Donovan): Sure. It's envisioned that compressed air will be used to clean the pipeline. MR. PERRONE: So would you truck in a large compressor or a THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's correct or possibly use the permanent air compressors on site, but probably mobile. MR. PERRONE: But such measures would ultimately be in compliance with the findings and recommendations in the executive report issued by the Thomas Commission? THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's correct. MR. PERRONE: Also, regarding natural gas safety, what type of safety features would the plant have itself, any gas sensors, et cetera, emergency shut-offs, in general? THE WITNESS (Donovan): There definitely would be emergency shut-off	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	used as a cooling medium within the generators, but it's usually a small volume. MR. PERRONE: Turning to the comments from the Connecticut Airport Authority, what type of consultations has CPV had with the CAA in addition to those related to the balloon float? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): I apologize. I'm going to track down a date for you, but I'll describe. So we met with the Connecticut Airport Authority on January 6th, and the purpose of that visit was to describe to the Connecticut Airport Authority the proposal, in general, but also the changes relative to the certificated project and get any feedback that they might have for us at that point in time. MR. PERRONE: Because in their comments they mention a need to file a document with the FAA, the FAA forms 7460. What's the status of that? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE WITNESS (Donovan): Sure. It's envisioned that compressed air will be used to clean the pipeline. MR. PERRONE: So would you truck in a large compressor or a THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's correct or possibly use the permanent air compressors on site, but probably mobile. MR. PERRONE: But such measures would ultimately be in compliance with the findings and recommendations in the executive report issued by the Thomas Commission? THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's correct. MR. PERRONE: Also, regarding natural gas safety, what type of safety features would the plant have itself, any gas sensors, et cetera, emergency shut-offs, in general? THE WITNESS (Donovan): There definitely would be emergency shut-off valves.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	used as a cooling medium within the generators, but it's usually a small volume. MR. PERRONE: Turning to the comments from the Connecticut Airport Authority, what type of consultations has CPV had with the CAA in addition to those related to the balloon float? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): I apologize. I'm going to track down a date for you, but I'll describe. So we met with the Connecticut Airport Authority on January 6th, and the purpose of that visit was to describe to the Connecticut Airport Authority the proposal, in general, but also the changes relative to the certificated project and get any feedback that they might have for us at that point in time. MR. PERRONE: Because in their comments they mention a need to file a document with the FAA, the FAA forms 7460. What's the status of that? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So, the 7460 process is in its circularization
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE WITNESS (Donovan): Sure. It's envisioned that compressed air will be used to clean the pipeline. MR. PERRONE: So would you truck in a large compressor or a THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's correct or possibly use the permanent air compressors on site, but probably mobile. MR. PERRONE: But such measures would ultimately be in compliance with the findings and recommendations in the executive report issued by the Thomas Commission? THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's correct. MR. PERRONE: Also, regarding natural gas safety, what type of safety features would the plant have itself, any gas sensors, et cetera, emergency shut-offs, in general? THE WITNESS (Donovan): There definitely would be emergency shut-off	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	used as a cooling medium within the generators, but it's usually a small volume. MR. PERRONE: Turning to the comments from the Connecticut Airport Authority, what type of consultations has CPV had with the CAA in addition to those related to the balloon float? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): I apologize. I'm going to track down a date for you, but I'll describe. So we met with the Connecticut Airport Authority on January 6th, and the purpose of that visit was to describe to the Connecticut Airport Authority the proposal, in general, but also the changes relative to the certificated project and get any feedback that they might have for us at that point in time. MR. PERRONE: Because in their comments they mention a need to file a document with the FAA, the FAA forms 7460. What's the status of that? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So,

	Page 685		Page 687
1	at which point the FAA will take and consider	1	I mean, I would imagine that's the logic that
2	all that information in their analysis and	2	ISO New England employs, but their specific
3	their final determination.	3	ambient data point is 90 degrees Fahrenheit,
4	MR. PERRONE: Has the FAA	4	which you submit your qualification package
5	asked for a plume analysis?	5	and subsequent capacity supply
6	THE WITNESS (Bazinet): No.	6	applications
7	MR. PERRONE: Has one been	7	MR. PERRONE: In the first set
8	performed?	8	of Late-File exhibits, CPV was asked about
9	THE WITNESS (Gresock): We've	9	the possibility of black start capability. I
10	done some of the calculations in response to	10	know that's something CPV was going to look
11	the questions that have been asked. We have	11	into and consult with the ISO. Do you have
12	been looking at the MITRE modeling results	12	any updates on that at this time?
13	and looking at the most recent MITRE model.	13	THE WITNESS (Bazinet): No
14	It has not proven very easy to work with.	14	updates with regard to ISO consultation.
15	We've noticed some output errors that we're	15	MR. PERRONE: Could that issue
16	not really sure how they might reflect on	16	be addressed in the D&M phase?
17	results. And so, at this point in time, we	17	THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Sure.
18	have no updated modeling done in that regard,	18	Absolutely.
19	which is why we reverted to using the Casa	19	MR. PERRONE: But ultimately,
20	because it was providing a more direct answer	20	black start capability, whether it's economic
21	to the questions that were asked.	21	or not, would depend a lot on ISO determining
22	MR. PERRONE: In response to	22	if it would benefit the system; is that
23	the CAA comments, have the data from that	23	correct?
24	analysis been provided to the CAA?	24	THE WITNESS (Bazinet): That's
25	THE WITNESS (Gresock): We	25	part of it. This particular site has a more
	Page 686		Page 688
1	Page 686 haven't provided any updated information to	1	Page 688 practical constraint relative to real estate.
2		1 2	
	haven't provided any updated information to the CAA on that at this point in time. We did provide a package of information update,		practical constraint relative to real estate. We did do quite a bit of analysis to understand sort of what the equipment would
2	haven't provided any updated information to the CAA on that at this point in time. We did provide a package of information update, as a result of the meeting on January 26th,	2	practical constraint relative to real estate. We did do quite a bit of analysis to understand sort of what the equipment would look like and the type of real estate that
2 3 4 5	haven't provided any updated information to the CAA on that at this point in time. We did provide a package of information update, as a result of the meeting on January 26th, that provided the FAA filings, some	2 3 4 5	practical constraint relative to real estate. We did do quite a bit of analysis to understand sort of what the equipment would look like and the type of real estate that would consume on our site, and without a
2 3 4 5 6	haven't provided any updated information to the CAA on that at this point in time. We did provide a package of information update, as a result of the meeting on January 26th,	2 3 4 5 6	practical constraint relative to real estate. We did do quite a bit of analysis to understand sort of what the equipment would look like and the type of real estate that would consume on our site, and without a it's kind of a I don't think there's
2 3 4 5 6 7	haven't provided any updated information to the CAA on that at this point in time. We did provide a package of information update, as a result of the meeting on January 26th, that provided the FAA filings, some historical information about the project, et cetera.	2 3 4 5 6 7	practical constraint relative to real estate. We did do quite a bit of analysis to understand sort of what the equipment would look like and the type of real estate that would consume on our site, and without a it's kind of a I don't think there's enough land on the site to actually
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	haven't provided any updated information to the CAA on that at this point in time. We did provide a package of information update, as a result of the meeting on January 26th, that provided the FAA filings, some historical information about the project, et cetera. MR. SMALL: And just for the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	practical constraint relative to real estate. We did do quite a bit of analysis to understand sort of what the equipment would look like and the type of real estate that would consume on our site, and without a it's kind of a I don't think there's enough land on the site to actually accommodate black start at this point, so it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	haven't provided any updated information to the CAA on that at this point in time. We did provide a package of information update, as a result of the meeting on January 26th, that provided the FAA filings, some historical information about the project, et cetera. MR. SMALL: And just for the record, that was in Late-Filed Exhibit 2B	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	practical constraint relative to real estate. We did do quite a bit of analysis to understand sort of what the equipment would look like and the type of real estate that would consume on our site, and without a it's kind of a I don't think there's enough land on the site to actually accommodate black start at this point, so it would require some other land acquisition or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	haven't provided any updated information to the CAA on that at this point in time. We did provide a package of information update, as a result of the meeting on January 26th, that provided the FAA filings, some historical information about the project, et cetera. MR. SMALL: And just for the record, that was in Late-Filed Exhibit 2B filed on January 22nd, I believe.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	practical constraint relative to real estate. We did do quite a bit of analysis to understand sort of what the equipment would look like and the type of real estate that would consume on our site, and without a it's kind of a I don't think there's enough land on the site to actually accommodate black start at this point, so it would require some other land acquisition or something to that effect.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	haven't provided any updated information to the CAA on that at this point in time. We did provide a package of information update, as a result of the meeting on January 26th, that provided the FAA filings, some historical information about the project, et cetera. MR. SMALL: And just for the record, that was in Late-Filed Exhibit 2B filed on January 22nd, I believe. MR. PERRONE: Moving on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	practical constraint relative to real estate. We did do quite a bit of analysis to understand sort of what the equipment would look like and the type of real estate that would consume on our site, and without a it's kind of a I don't think there's enough land on the site to actually accommodate black start at this point, so it would require some other land acquisition or something to that effect. MR. PERRONE: But generally
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	haven't provided any updated information to the CAA on that at this point in time. We did provide a package of information update, as a result of the meeting on January 26th, that provided the FAA filings, some historical information about the project, et cetera. MR. SMALL: And just for the record, that was in Late-Filed Exhibit 2B filed on January 22nd, I believe. MR. PERRONE: Moving on MR. SMALL: Yes, Late-File	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	practical constraint relative to real estate. We did do quite a bit of analysis to understand sort of what the equipment would look like and the type of real estate that would consume on our site, and without a it's kind of a I don't think there's enough land on the site to actually accommodate black start at this point, so it would require some other land acquisition or something to that effect. MR. PERRONE: But generally speaking, economics aside, if the entire grid
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	haven't provided any updated information to the CAA on that at this point in time. We did provide a package of information update, as a result of the meeting on January 26th, that provided the FAA filings, some historical information about the project, et cetera. MR. SMALL: And just for the record, that was in Late-Filed Exhibit 2B filed on January 22nd, I believe. MR. PERRONE: Moving on MR. SMALL: Yes, Late-File Exhibit 2B filed on January 22nd.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	practical constraint relative to real estate. We did do quite a bit of analysis to understand sort of what the equipment would look like and the type of real estate that would consume on our site, and without a it's kind of a I don't think there's enough land on the site to actually accommodate black start at this point, so it would require some other land acquisition or something to that effect. MR. PERRONE: But generally speaking, economics aside, if the entire grid is down, a complete blackout situation, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	haven't provided any updated information to the CAA on that at this point in time. We did provide a package of information update, as a result of the meeting on January 26th, that provided the FAA filings, some historical information about the project, et cetera. MR. SMALL: And just for the record, that was in Late-Filed Exhibit 2B filed on January 22nd, I believe. MR. PERRONE: Moving on MR. SMALL: Yes, Late-File Exhibit 2B filed on January 22nd. MR. PERRONE: Turning to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	practical constraint relative to real estate. We did do quite a bit of analysis to understand sort of what the equipment would look like and the type of real estate that would consume on our site, and without a it's kind of a I don't think there's enough land on the site to actually accommodate black start at this point, so it would require some other land acquisition or something to that effect. MR. PERRONE: But generally speaking, economics aside, if the entire grid is down, a complete blackout situation, the black start units are the ones that are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	haven't provided any updated information to the CAA on that at this point in time. We did provide a package of information update, as a result of the meeting on January 26th, that provided the FAA filings, some historical information about the project, et cetera. MR. SMALL: And just for the record, that was in Late-Filed Exhibit 2B filed on January 22nd, I believe. MR. PERRONE: Moving on MR. SMALL: Yes, Late-File Exhibit 2B filed on January 22nd. MR. PERRONE: Turning to MR. SMALL: It was a big thick	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	practical constraint relative to real estate. We did do quite a bit of analysis to understand sort of what the equipment would look like and the type of real estate that would consume on our site, and without a it's kind of a I don't think there's enough land on the site to actually accommodate black start at this point, so it would require some other land acquisition or something to that effect. MR. PERRONE: But generally speaking, economics aside, if the entire grid is down, a complete blackout situation, the black start units are the ones that are started first?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	haven't provided any updated information to the CAA on that at this point in time. We did provide a package of information update, as a result of the meeting on January 26th, that provided the FAA filings, some historical information about the project, et cetera. MR. SMALL: And just for the record, that was in Late-Filed Exhibit 2B filed on January 22nd, I believe. MR. PERRONE: Moving on MR. SMALL: Yes, Late-File Exhibit 2B filed on January 22nd. MR. PERRONE: Turning to MR. SMALL: It was a big thick document provided, the whole group of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	practical constraint relative to real estate. We did do quite a bit of analysis to understand sort of what the equipment would look like and the type of real estate that would consume on our site, and without a it's kind of a I don't think there's enough land on the site to actually accommodate black start at this point, so it would require some other land acquisition or something to that effect. MR. PERRONE: But generally speaking, economics aside, if the entire grid is down, a complete blackout situation, the black start units are the ones that are started first? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	haven't provided any updated information to the CAA on that at this point in time. We did provide a package of information update, as a result of the meeting on January 26th, that provided the FAA filings, some historical information about the project, et cetera. MR. SMALL: And just for the record, that was in Late-Filed Exhibit 2B filed on January 22nd, I believe. MR. PERRONE: Moving on MR. SMALL: Yes, Late-File Exhibit 2B filed on January 22nd. MR. PERRONE: Turning to MR. SMALL: It was a big thick document provided, the whole group of materials that was provided to the airport	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	practical constraint relative to real estate. We did do quite a bit of analysis to understand sort of what the equipment would look like and the type of real estate that would consume on our site, and without a it's kind of a I don't think there's enough land on the site to actually accommodate black start at this point, so it would require some other land acquisition or something to that effect. MR. PERRONE: But generally speaking, economics aside, if the entire grid is down, a complete blackout situation, the black start units are the ones that are started first? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes, that's correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	haven't provided any updated information to the CAA on that at this point in time. We did provide a package of information update, as a result of the meeting on January 26th, that provided the FAA filings, some historical information about the project, et cetera. MR. SMALL: And just for the record, that was in Late-Filed Exhibit 2B filed on January 22nd, I believe. MR. PERRONE: Moving on MR. SMALL: Yes, Late-File Exhibit 2B filed on January 22nd. MR. PERRONE: Turning to MR. SMALL: It was a big thick document provided, the whole group of materials that was provided to the airport authority.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	practical constraint relative to real estate. We did do quite a bit of analysis to understand sort of what the equipment would look like and the type of real estate that would consume on our site, and without a it's kind of a I don't think there's enough land on the site to actually accommodate black start at this point, so it would require some other land acquisition or something to that effect. MR. PERRONE: But generally speaking, economics aside, if the entire grid is down, a complete blackout situation, the black start units are the ones that are started first? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes, that's correct. MR. PERRONE: Any updates on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	haven't provided any updated information to the CAA on that at this point in time. We did provide a package of information update, as a result of the meeting on January 26th, that provided the FAA filings, some historical information about the project, et cetera. MR. SMALL: And just for the record, that was in Late-Filed Exhibit 2B filed on January 22nd, I believe. MR. PERRONE: Moving on MR. SMALL: Yes, Late-File Exhibit 2B filed on January 22nd. MR. PERRONE: Turning to MR. SMALL: It was a big thick document provided, the whole group of materials that was provided to the airport authority. MR. PERRONE: Regarding the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	practical constraint relative to real estate. We did do quite a bit of analysis to understand sort of what the equipment would look like and the type of real estate that would consume on our site, and without a it's kind of a I don't think there's enough land on the site to actually accommodate black start at this point, so it would require some other land acquisition or something to that effect. MR. PERRONE: But generally speaking, economics aside, if the entire grid is down, a complete blackout situation, the black start units are the ones that are started first? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes, that's correct. MR. PERRONE: Any updates on the status of the FAA circularization review
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	haven't provided any updated information to the CAA on that at this point in time. We did provide a package of information update, as a result of the meeting on January 26th, that provided the FAA filings, some historical information about the project, et cetera. MR. SMALL: And just for the record, that was in Late-Filed Exhibit 2B filed on January 22nd, I believe. MR. PERRONE: Moving on MR. SMALL: Yes, Late-File Exhibit 2B filed on January 22nd. MR. PERRONE: Turning to MR. SMALL: It was a big thick document provided, the whole group of materials that was provided to the airport authority. MR. PERRONE: Regarding the forward capacity auction, I understand	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	practical constraint relative to real estate. We did do quite a bit of analysis to understand sort of what the equipment would look like and the type of real estate that would consume on our site, and without a it's kind of a I don't think there's enough land on the site to actually accommodate black start at this point, so it would require some other land acquisition or something to that effect. MR. PERRONE: But generally speaking, economics aside, if the entire grid is down, a complete blackout situation, the black start units are the ones that are started first? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes, that's correct. MR. PERRONE: Any updates on the status of the FAA circularization review process?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	haven't provided any updated information to the CAA on that at this point in time. We did provide a package of information update, as a result of the meeting on January 26th, that provided the FAA filings, some historical information about the project, et cetera. MR. SMALL: And just for the record, that was in Late-Filed Exhibit 2B filed on January 22nd, I believe. MR. PERRONE: Moving on MR. SMALL: Yes, Late-File Exhibit 2B filed on January 22nd. MR. PERRONE: Turning to MR. SMALL: It was a big thick document provided, the whole group of materials that was provided to the airport authority. MR. PERRONE: Regarding the forward capacity auction, I understand Towantic's numbers for that was 725 megawatt.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	practical constraint relative to real estate. We did do quite a bit of analysis to understand sort of what the equipment would look like and the type of real estate that would consume on our site, and without a it's kind of a I don't think there's enough land on the site to actually accommodate black start at this point, so it would require some other land acquisition or something to that effect. MR. PERRONE: But generally speaking, economics aside, if the entire grid is down, a complete blackout situation, the black start units are the ones that are started first? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes, that's correct. MR. PERRONE: Any updates on the status of the FAA circularization review process? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Just
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	haven't provided any updated information to the CAA on that at this point in time. We did provide a package of information update, as a result of the meeting on January 26th, that provided the FAA filings, some historical information about the project, et cetera. MR. SMALL: And just for the record, that was in Late-Filed Exhibit 2B filed on January 22nd, I believe. MR. PERRONE: Moving on MR. SMALL: Yes, Late-File Exhibit 2B filed on January 22nd. MR. PERRONE: Turning to MR. SMALL: It was a big thick document provided, the whole group of materials that was provided to the airport authority. MR. PERRONE: Regarding the forward capacity auction, I understand Towantic's numbers for that was 725 megawatt. So do you basically just go by a summer	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	practical constraint relative to real estate. We did do quite a bit of analysis to understand sort of what the equipment would look like and the type of real estate that would consume on our site, and without a it's kind of a I don't think there's enough land on the site to actually accommodate black start at this point, so it would require some other land acquisition or something to that effect. MR. PERRONE: But generally speaking, economics aside, if the entire grid is down, a complete blackout situation, the black start units are the ones that are started first? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes, that's correct. MR. PERRONE: Any updates on the status of the FAA circularization review process? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Just what I mentioned a few moments ago. That
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	haven't provided any updated information to the CAA on that at this point in time. We did provide a package of information update, as a result of the meeting on January 26th, that provided the FAA filings, some historical information about the project, et cetera. MR. SMALL: And just for the record, that was in Late-Filed Exhibit 2B filed on January 22nd, I believe. MR. PERRONE: Moving on MR. SMALL: Yes, Late-File Exhibit 2B filed on January 22nd. MR. PERRONE: Turning to MR. SMALL: It was a big thick document provided, the whole group of materials that was provided to the airport authority. MR. PERRONE: Regarding the forward capacity auction, I understand Towantic's numbers for that was 725 megawatt. So do you basically just go by a summer rating because it's based on the peak season,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	practical constraint relative to real estate. We did do quite a bit of analysis to understand sort of what the equipment would look like and the type of real estate that would consume on our site, and without a it's kind of a I don't think there's enough land on the site to actually accommodate black start at this point, so it would require some other land acquisition or something to that effect. MR. PERRONE: But generally speaking, economics aside, if the entire grid is down, a complete blackout situation, the black start units are the ones that are started first? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes, that's correct. MR. PERRONE: Any updates on the status of the FAA circularization review process? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Just what I mentioned a few moments ago. That window is closing, and I suspect and I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	haven't provided any updated information to the CAA on that at this point in time. We did provide a package of information update, as a result of the meeting on January 26th, that provided the FAA filings, some historical information about the project, et cetera. MR. SMALL: And just for the record, that was in Late-Filed Exhibit 2B filed on January 22nd, I believe. MR. PERRONE: Moving on MR. SMALL: Yes, Late-File Exhibit 2B filed on January 22nd. MR. PERRONE: Turning to MR. SMALL: It was a big thick document provided, the whole group of materials that was provided to the airport authority. MR. PERRONE: Regarding the forward capacity auction, I understand Towantic's numbers for that was 725 megawatt. So do you basically just go by a summer rating because it's based on the peak season, the peak load conditions?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	practical constraint relative to real estate. We did do quite a bit of analysis to understand sort of what the equipment would look like and the type of real estate that would consume on our site, and without a it's kind of a I don't think there's enough land on the site to actually accommodate black start at this point, so it would require some other land acquisition or something to that effect. MR. PERRONE: But generally speaking, economics aside, if the entire grid is down, a complete blackout situation, the black start units are the ones that are started first? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes, that's correct. MR. PERRONE: Any updates on the status of the FAA circularization review process? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Just what I mentioned a few moments ago. That window is closing, and I suspect and I think the notices that they provided on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	haven't provided any updated information to the CAA on that at this point in time. We did provide a package of information update, as a result of the meeting on January 26th, that provided the FAA filings, some historical information about the project, et cetera. MR. SMALL: And just for the record, that was in Late-Filed Exhibit 2B filed on January 22nd, I believe. MR. PERRONE: Moving on MR. SMALL: Yes, Late-File Exhibit 2B filed on January 22nd. MR. PERRONE: Turning to MR. SMALL: It was a big thick document provided, the whole group of materials that was provided to the airport authority. MR. PERRONE: Regarding the forward capacity auction, I understand Towantic's numbers for that was 725 megawatt. So do you basically just go by a summer rating because it's based on the peak season,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	practical constraint relative to real estate. We did do quite a bit of analysis to understand sort of what the equipment would look like and the type of real estate that would consume on our site, and without a it's kind of a I don't think there's enough land on the site to actually accommodate black start at this point, so it would require some other land acquisition or something to that effect. MR. PERRONE: But generally speaking, economics aside, if the entire grid is down, a complete blackout situation, the black start units are the ones that are started first? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes, that's correct. MR. PERRONE: Any updates on the status of the FAA circularization review process? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Just what I mentioned a few moments ago. That window is closing, and I suspect and I

37 (Pages 685 to 688)

	Page 689		Page 691
1	days prior to final decision so	1	THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So
2	MR. PERRONE: And regarding	2	this project is a little unusual from a
3	the Set I interrogatories, Question 11,	3	normal interconnection with the ISO in that
4	what's the status of CPV addressing DEEP's	4	it's been designed more than once, so yes,
5	comments regarding the stormwater management	5	effectively.
6	system?	6	MR. PERRONE: So then would
7	THE WITNESS (Gustafson):	7	CPV have any reason to consider an
8	Those comments are going to be submitted to	8	underground connection?
9	DEEP tomorrow.	9	THE WITNESS (Bazinet): We
10	MR. SMALL: We can provide a	10	haven't contemplated that, no.
11	copy of those for the Council. We'll file	11	MR. PERRONE: I understand
12	those as a Late-Filed exhibit once we submit	12	that CPV has calculated the proposed plant
13	it so you have that for your record.	13	would run on oil for about 52 hours for
14	MR. PERRONE: In Set II, CSC	14	winter or slightly more than two days. Have
15	Question 33, it gets into average daily	15	you considered forecasts of more extreme
16	stream flow for Pomperaug River, 82 cubic	16	weather? For example, the IRP mentions New
17	feet per second. How many million gallons	17	England's generation fleet experiences a high
18	per day would that be?	18	probability of critical gas shortages on 20
19	THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Fifty-	19	to 34 days every winter by 2020. Have you
20	three million gallons a day.	20	considered such extreme conditions?
21	MR. PERRONE: And for your	21	THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So our
22	one-in-one-hundred conditions, the 7.3 cubic	22	analysis was based purely on a backcast of
23	feet per second, does that work out to about	23	last winter, which I characterized before and
24	4.7 million gallons per day?	24	has been characterized as one of the worst in
25	THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Seven	25	in the last 25 years. It's one of two of
	Page 690		
	rage 070		Page 692
1	point three cubic feet per second, is that	1	the harshest winters on record. We feel it's
2	point three cubic feet per second, is that what you said?	2	the harshest winters on record. We feel it's a pretty representative scenario, and it's
	point three cubic feet per second, is that what you said? MR. PERRONE: Yes, 7.3.	2 3	the harshest winters on record. We feel it's a pretty representative scenario, and it's unknown at this point whether future
2 3 4	point three cubic feet per second, is that what you said? MR. PERRONE: Yes, 7.3. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes,	2 3 4	the harshest winters on record. We feel it's a pretty representative scenario, and it's unknown at this point whether future expansions of pipeline and, in fact, you
2 3 4 5	point three cubic feet per second, is that what you said? MR. PERRONE: Yes, 7.3. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes, 4.7 million gallons.	2 3 4 5	the harshest winters on record. We feel it's a pretty representative scenario, and it's unknown at this point whether future expansions of pipeline and, in fact, you know, short-term market influences how they
2 3 4 5 6	point three cubic feet per second, is that what you said? MR. PERRONE: Yes, 7.3. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes, 4.7 million gallons. MR. PERRONE: Okay. And my	2 3 4 5 6	the harshest winters on record. We feel it's a pretty representative scenario, and it's unknown at this point whether future expansions of pipeline and, in fact, you know, short-term market influences how they might affect the availability of gas. For
2 3 4 5 6 7	 point three cubic feet per second, is that what you said? MR. PERRONE: Yes, 7.3. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes, 4.7 million gallons. MR. PERRONE: Okay. And my last question with the calculation. So based 	2 3 4 5 6 7	the harshest winters on record. We feel it's a pretty representative scenario, and it's unknown at this point whether future expansions of pipeline and, in fact, you know, short-term market influences how they might affect the availability of gas. For instance, the availability of LNG imports out
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 point three cubic feet per second, is that what you said? MR. PERRONE: Yes, 7.3. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes, 4.7 million gallons. MR. PERRONE: Okay. And my last question with the calculation. So based on that scenario, the 67,000 gallons per day, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the harshest winters on record. We feel it's a pretty representative scenario, and it's unknown at this point whether future expansions of pipeline and, in fact, you know, short-term market influences how they might affect the availability of gas. For instance, the availability of LNG imports out in Boston has precluded the need to switch
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 point three cubic feet per second, is that what you said? MR. PERRONE: Yes, 7.3. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes, 4.7 million gallons. MR. PERRONE: Okay. And my last question with the calculation. So based on that scenario, the 67,000 gallons per day, would that be about 1.4 percent of the stream 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the harshest winters on record. We feel it's a pretty representative scenario, and it's unknown at this point whether future expansions of pipeline and, in fact, you know, short-term market influences how they might affect the availability of gas. For instance, the availability of LNG imports out in Boston has precluded the need to switch over to fuel oil on cold days this winter in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 point three cubic feet per second, is that what you said? MR. PERRONE: Yes, 7.3. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes, 4.7 million gallons. MR. PERRONE: Okay. And my last question with the calculation. So based on that scenario, the 67,000 gallons per day, would that be about 1.4 percent of the stream flow? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the harshest winters on record. We feel it's a pretty representative scenario, and it's unknown at this point whether future expansions of pipeline and, in fact, you know, short-term market influences how they might affect the availability of gas. For instance, the availability of LNG imports out in Boston has precluded the need to switch over to fuel oil on cold days this winter in some instances.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	point three cubic feet per second, is that what you said? MR. PERRONE: Yes, 7.3. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes, 4.7 million gallons. MR. PERRONE: Okay. And my last question with the calculation. So based on that scenario, the 67,000 gallons per day, would that be about 1.4 percent of the stream flow? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): I can	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the harshest winters on record. We feel it's a pretty representative scenario, and it's unknown at this point whether future expansions of pipeline and, in fact, you know, short-term market influences how they might affect the availability of gas. For instance, the availability of LNG imports out in Boston has precluded the need to switch over to fuel oil on cold days this winter in some instances. So we could look at that. I'm
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	point three cubic feet per second, is that what you said? MR. PERRONE: Yes, 7.3. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes, 4.7 million gallons. MR. PERRONE: Okay. And my last question with the calculation. So based on that scenario, the 67,000 gallons per day, would that be about 1.4 percent of the stream flow? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): I can confirm your math, but I trust that. I think	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the harshest winters on record. We feel it's a pretty representative scenario, and it's unknown at this point whether future expansions of pipeline and, in fact, you know, short-term market influences how they might affect the availability of gas. For instance, the availability of LNG imports out in Boston has precluded the need to switch over to fuel oil on cold days this winter in some instances. So we could look at that. I'm not sure if it would change the dispatch
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	point three cubic feet per second, is that what you said? MR. PERRONE: Yes, 7.3. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes, 4.7 million gallons. MR. PERRONE: Okay. And my last question with the calculation. So based on that scenario, the 67,000 gallons per day, would that be about 1.4 percent of the stream flow? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): I can confirm your math, but I trust that. I think we reflected 1.3 percent in our response, but	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the harshest winters on record. We feel it's a pretty representative scenario, and it's unknown at this point whether future expansions of pipeline and, in fact, you know, short-term market influences how they might affect the availability of gas. For instance, the availability of LNG imports out in Boston has precluded the need to switch over to fuel oil on cold days this winter in some instances. So we could look at that. I'm not sure if it would change the dispatch cycle demonstrably, but it would be dependent
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	point three cubic feet per second, is that what you said? MR. PERRONE: Yes, 7.3. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes, 4.7 million gallons. MR. PERRONE: Okay. And my last question with the calculation. So based on that scenario, the 67,000 gallons per day, would that be about 1.4 percent of the stream flow? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): I can confirm your math, but I trust that. I think we reflected 1.3 percent in our response, but 1.35 is what we calculated.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the harshest winters on record. We feel it's a pretty representative scenario, and it's unknown at this point whether future expansions of pipeline and, in fact, you know, short-term market influences how they might affect the availability of gas. For instance, the availability of LNG imports out in Boston has precluded the need to switch over to fuel oil on cold days this winter in some instances. So we could look at that. I'm not sure if it would change the dispatch cycle demonstrably, but it would be dependent on what fuel prices are doing at that point
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	point three cubic feet per second, is that what you said? MR. PERRONE: Yes, 7.3. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes, 4.7 million gallons. MR. PERRONE: Okay. And my last question with the calculation. So based on that scenario, the 67,000 gallons per day, would that be about 1.4 percent of the stream flow? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): I can confirm your math, but I trust that. I think we reflected 1.3 percent in our response, but 1.35 is what we calculated. MR. PERRONE: Okay. Regarding	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the harshest winters on record. We feel it's a pretty representative scenario, and it's unknown at this point whether future expansions of pipeline and, in fact, you know, short-term market influences how they might affect the availability of gas. For instance, the availability of LNG imports out in Boston has precluded the need to switch over to fuel oil on cold days this winter in some instances. So we could look at that. I'm not sure if it would change the dispatch cycle demonstrably, but it would be dependent on what fuel prices are doing at that point in time, which is driven by a number of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	point three cubic feet per second, is that what you said? MR. PERRONE: Yes, 7.3. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes, 4.7 million gallons. MR. PERRONE: Okay. And my last question with the calculation. So based on that scenario, the 67,000 gallons per day, would that be about 1.4 percent of the stream flow? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): I can confirm your math, but I trust that. I think we reflected 1.3 percent in our response, but 1.35 is what we calculated. MR. PERRONE: Okay. Regarding CSC, Set III, Question 2, the demineralized	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the harshest winters on record. We feel it's a pretty representative scenario, and it's unknown at this point whether future expansions of pipeline and, in fact, you know, short-term market influences how they might affect the availability of gas. For instance, the availability of LNG imports out in Boston has precluded the need to switch over to fuel oil on cold days this winter in some instances. So we could look at that. I'm not sure if it would change the dispatch cycle demonstrably, but it would be dependent on what fuel prices are doing at that point in time, which is driven by a number of different factors, not just weather.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	point three cubic feet per second, is that what you said? MR. PERRONE: Yes, 7.3. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes, 4.7 million gallons. MR. PERRONE: Okay. And my last question with the calculation. So based on that scenario, the 67,000 gallons per day, would that be about 1.4 percent of the stream flow? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): I can confirm your math, but I trust that. I think we reflected 1.3 percent in our response, but 1.35 is what we calculated. MR. PERRONE: Okay. Regarding CSC, Set III, Question 2, the demineralized water would be made at a rate of 131,000	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the harshest winters on record. We feel it's a pretty representative scenario, and it's unknown at this point whether future expansions of pipeline and, in fact, you know, short-term market influences how they might affect the availability of gas. For instance, the availability of LNG imports out in Boston has precluded the need to switch over to fuel oil on cold days this winter in some instances. So we could look at that. I'm not sure if it would change the dispatch cycle demonstrably, but it would be dependent on what fuel prices are doing at that point in time, which is driven by a number of different factors, not just weather. MR. PERRONE: Regarding
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	point three cubic feet per second, is that what you said? MR. PERRONE: Yes, 7.3. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes, 4.7 million gallons. MR. PERRONE: Okay. And my last question with the calculation. So based on that scenario, the 67,000 gallons per day, would that be about 1.4 percent of the stream flow? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): I can confirm your math, but I trust that. I think we reflected 1.3 percent in our response, but 1.35 is what we calculated. MR. PERRONE: Okay. Regarding CSC, Set III, Question 2, the demineralized water would be made at a rate of 131,000 gallons per day, is that based on one trailer	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the harshest winters on record. We feel it's a pretty representative scenario, and it's unknown at this point whether future expansions of pipeline and, in fact, you know, short-term market influences how they might affect the availability of gas. For instance, the availability of LNG imports out in Boston has precluded the need to switch over to fuel oil on cold days this winter in some instances. So we could look at that. I'm not sure if it would change the dispatch cycle demonstrably, but it would be dependent on what fuel prices are doing at that point in time, which is driven by a number of different factors, not just weather. MR. PERRONE: Regarding MR. SMALL: Just one second.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	point three cubic feet per second, is that what you said? MR. PERRONE: Yes, 7.3. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes, 4.7 million gallons. MR. PERRONE: Okay. And my last question with the calculation. So based on that scenario, the 67,000 gallons per day, would that be about 1.4 percent of the stream flow? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): I can confirm your math, but I trust that. I think we reflected 1.3 percent in our response, but 1.35 is what we calculated. MR. PERRONE: Okay. Regarding CSC, Set III, Question 2, the demineralized water would be made at a rate of 131,000 gallons per day, is that based on one trailer or two?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	the harshest winters on record. We feel it's a pretty representative scenario, and it's unknown at this point whether future expansions of pipeline and, in fact, you know, short-term market influences how they might affect the availability of gas. For instance, the availability of LNG imports out in Boston has precluded the need to switch over to fuel oil on cold days this winter in some instances. So we could look at that. I'm not sure if it would change the dispatch cycle demonstrably, but it would be dependent on what fuel prices are doing at that point in time, which is driven by a number of different factors, not just weather. MR. PERRONE: Regarding MR. SMALL: Just one second. (Pause.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	point three cubic feet per second, is that what you said? MR. PERRONE: Yes, 7.3. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes, 4.7 million gallons. MR. PERRONE: Okay. And my last question with the calculation. So based on that scenario, the 67,000 gallons per day, would that be about 1.4 percent of the stream flow? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): I can confirm your math, but I trust that. I think we reflected 1.3 percent in our response, but 1.35 is what we calculated. MR. PERRONE: Okay. Regarding CSC, Set III, Question 2, the demineralized water would be made at a rate of 131,000 gallons per day, is that based on one trailer or two? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): One	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the harshest winters on record. We feel it's a pretty representative scenario, and it's unknown at this point whether future expansions of pipeline and, in fact, you know, short-term market influences how they might affect the availability of gas. For instance, the availability of LNG imports out in Boston has precluded the need to switch over to fuel oil on cold days this winter in some instances. So we could look at that. I'm not sure if it would change the dispatch cycle demonstrably, but it would be dependent on what fuel prices are doing at that point in time, which is driven by a number of different factors, not just weather. MR. PERRONE: Regarding MR. SMALL: Just one second. (Pause.) THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Just
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	point three cubic feet per second, is that what you said? MR. PERRONE: Yes, 7.3. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes, 4.7 million gallons. MR. PERRONE: Okay. And my last question with the calculation. So based on that scenario, the 67,000 gallons per day, would that be about 1.4 percent of the stream flow? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): I can confirm your math, but I trust that. I think we reflected 1.3 percent in our response, but 1.35 is what we calculated. MR. PERRONE: Okay. Regarding CSC, Set III, Question 2, the demineralized water would be made at a rate of 131,000 gallons per day, is that based on one trailer or two? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): One trailer can support that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the harshest winters on record. We feel it's a pretty representative scenario, and it's unknown at this point whether future expansions of pipeline and, in fact, you know, short-term market influences how they might affect the availability of gas. For instance, the availability of LNG imports out in Boston has precluded the need to switch over to fuel oil on cold days this winter in some instances. So we could look at that. I'm not sure if it would change the dispatch cycle demonstrably, but it would be dependent on what fuel prices are doing at that point in time, which is driven by a number of different factors, not just weather. MR. PERRONE: Regarding MR. SMALL: Just one second. (Pause.) THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Just to clarify, the 52 hours is consecutive hours
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	point three cubic feet per second, is that what you said? MR. PERRONE: Yes, 7.3. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes, 4.7 million gallons. MR. PERRONE: Okay. And my last question with the calculation. So based on that scenario, the 67,000 gallons per day, would that be about 1.4 percent of the stream flow? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): I can confirm your math, but I trust that. I think we reflected 1.3 percent in our response, but 1.35 is what we calculated. MR. PERRONE: Okay. Regarding CSC, Set III, Question 2, the demineralized water would be made at a rate of 131,000 gallons per day, is that based on one trailer or two? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): One trailer can support that. MR. PERRONE: Okay. Regarding	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the harshest winters on record. We feel it's a pretty representative scenario, and it's unknown at this point whether future expansions of pipeline and, in fact, you know, short-term market influences how they might affect the availability of gas. For instance, the availability of LNG imports out in Boston has precluded the need to switch over to fuel oil on cold days this winter in some instances. So we could look at that. I'm not sure if it would change the dispatch cycle demonstrably, but it would be dependent on what fuel prices are doing at that point in time, which is driven by a number of different factors, not just weather. MR. PERRONE: Regarding MR. SMALL: Just one second. (Pause.) THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Just to clarify, the 52 hours is consecutive hours before we run into a constraint on water, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	point three cubic feet per second, is that what you said? MR. PERRONE: Yes, 7.3. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes, 4.7 million gallons. MR. PERRONE: Okay. And my last question with the calculation. So based on that scenario, the 67,000 gallons per day, would that be about 1.4 percent of the stream flow? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): I can confirm your math, but I trust that. I think we reflected 1.3 percent in our response, but 1.35 is what we calculated. MR. PERRONE: Okay. Regarding CSC, Set III, Question 2, the demineralized water would be made at a rate of 131,000 gallons per day, is that based on one trailer or two? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): One trailer can support that. MR. PERRONE: Okay. Regarding the breaker-and-a-half switchyard design and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the harshest winters on record. We feel it's a pretty representative scenario, and it's unknown at this point whether future expansions of pipeline and, in fact, you know, short-term market influences how they might affect the availability of gas. For instance, the availability of LNG imports out in Boston has precluded the need to switch over to fuel oil on cold days this winter in some instances. So we could look at that. I'm not sure if it would change the dispatch cycle demonstrably, but it would be dependent on what fuel prices are doing at that point in time, which is driven by a number of different factors, not just weather. MR. PERRONE: Regarding MR. SMALL: Just one second. (Pause.) THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Just to clarify, the 52 hours is consecutive hours before we run into a constraint on water, and we were actually able to run up to 720 hours
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	point three cubic feet per second, is that what you said? MR. PERRONE: Yes, 7.3. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes, 4.7 million gallons. MR. PERRONE: Okay. And my last question with the calculation. So based on that scenario, the 67,000 gallons per day, would that be about 1.4 percent of the stream flow? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): I can confirm your math, but I trust that. I think we reflected 1.3 percent in our response, but 1.35 is what we calculated. MR. PERRONE: Okay. Regarding CSC, Set III, Question 2, the demineralized water would be made at a rate of 131,000 gallons per day, is that based on one trailer or two? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): One trailer can support that. MR. PERRONE: Okay. Regarding	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the harshest winters on record. We feel it's a pretty representative scenario, and it's unknown at this point whether future expansions of pipeline and, in fact, you know, short-term market influences how they might affect the availability of gas. For instance, the availability of LNG imports out in Boston has precluded the need to switch over to fuel oil on cold days this winter in some instances. So we could look at that. I'm not sure if it would change the dispatch cycle demonstrably, but it would be dependent on what fuel prices are doing at that point in time, which is driven by a number of different factors, not just weather. MR. PERRONE: Regarding MR. SMALL: Just one second. (Pause.) THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Just to clarify, the 52 hours is consecutive hours before we run into a constraint on water, and

38 (Pages 689 to 692)

	Page 693		Page 695
1	plant's ability to ramp up and down in	1	Mr. Chair.
2	megawatts, is that affected at all, whether	2	THE CHAIRMAN: And we'll get
3	you're on oil or gas, how quickly you can	3	you a seat here.
4	ramp up your megawatts? Is that affected by	4	MR. CORNACCHIA: I appreciate
5	the fuel type?	5	the accommodation very much.
6	THE WITNESS (Donovan): The	6	And can everybody hear? Okay.
7	ramp rate is the same after you make the	7	Let's start with some basic
8	switch after you make the transition.	8	questions. And, again, I'm Chester
9	MR. PERRONE: Also, we have	9	Cornacchia with Westover Hills Subdivision in
10	two different numbers in the record regarding	10	Naugatuck, Connecticut. We're roughly a
11	the size of the oil tanker truck. There's a	11	subdivision of 62 single-family homes with
12	mention of 7,000 gallons versus 7,500. Which	12	approximately 212 residents. Approximately
13	would be the most up-to-date number?	13	96 of them are between the ages of two and
14	THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So	14	the ages of twelve years old.
15	we've estimated that the tanks would be	15	So I'm going to start with
16	filled to roughly 7,500 gallons of capacity,	16	questions
17	but that number is remarkably difficult to	17	THE CHAIRMAN: Excuse me.
18	track down.	18	Could you tell us roughly the distance
19	MR. PERRONE: Lastly, going	19	between your
20	back to visible plumes, I understand it was	20	MR. CORNACCHIA: We're
21	testified that plumes are likely at	21	approximately two miles from the proposed
22 23	temperatures less than 40 degrees, but also	22	site. We actually straddle the viewshed
23 24	under very humid conditions. How much would the relative humidity have to be on a mild	23 24	cutoff that is right at the base of the subdivision on the Late-Filed exhibit.
24	day where the plume might be visible?	24	
23	day where the plume hight be visible:	23	So this is with regards to
	Page 694		Page 696
1	Page 694 THE WITNESS (Sellars): It's a	1	Page 696 Late-Filed Exhibit 2A through 2I, which is
2	THE WITNESS (Sellars): It's a function of both temperature and humidity.	2	Late-Filed Exhibit 2A through 2I, which is community outreach activities, and this is to
2 3	THE WITNESS (Sellars): It's a function of both temperature and humidity. So there's, obviously, two variables there.	2 3	Late-Filed Exhibit 2A through 2I, which is community outreach activities, and this is to the Applicant. Can you detail any outreach
2 3 4	THE WITNESS (Sellars): It's a function of both temperature and humidity. So there's, obviously, two variables there. So a relatively mild day, if the relative	2 3 4	Late-Filed Exhibit 2A through 2I, which is community outreach activities, and this is to the Applicant. Can you detail any outreach or informational meetings that were held by
2 3 4 5	THE WITNESS (Sellars): It's a function of both temperature and humidity. So there's, obviously, two variables there. So a relatively mild day, if the relative humidity was near 100, in other words, be a	2 3 4 5	Late-Filed Exhibit 2A through 2I, which is community outreach activities, and this is to the Applicant. Can you detail any outreach or informational meetings that were held by CPV or made to Naugatuck residents or
2 3 4 5 6	THE WITNESS (Sellars): It's a function of both temperature and humidity. So there's, obviously, two variables there. So a relatively mild day, if the relative humidity was near 100, in other words, be a foggy-type of condition, then the plume would	2 3 4 5 6	Late-Filed Exhibit 2A through 2I, which is community outreach activities, and this is to the Applicant. Can you detail any outreach or informational meetings that were held by CPV or made to Naugatuck residents or specifically Westover Hills Subdivision
2 3 4 5 6 7	THE WITNESS (Sellars): It's a function of both temperature and humidity. So there's, obviously, two variables there. So a relatively mild day, if the relative humidity was near 100, in other words, be a foggy-type of condition, then the plume would also be visible, but generally, if it's not	2 3 4 5 6 7	Late-Filed Exhibit 2A through 2I, which is community outreach activities, and this is to the Applicant. Can you detail any outreach or informational meetings that were held by CPV or made to Naugatuck residents or specifically Westover Hills Subdivision community residents?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	THE WITNESS (Sellars): It's a function of both temperature and humidity. So there's, obviously, two variables there. So a relatively mild day, if the relative humidity was near 100, in other words, be a foggy-type of condition, then the plume would also be visible, but generally, if it's not foggy out, then it would have to be cold.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Late-Filed Exhibit 2A through 2I, which is community outreach activities, and this is to the Applicant. Can you detail any outreach or informational meetings that were held by CPV or made to Naugatuck residents or specifically Westover Hills Subdivision community residents? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Are we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE WITNESS (Sellars): It's a function of both temperature and humidity. So there's, obviously, two variables there. So a relatively mild day, if the relative humidity was near 100, in other words, be a foggy-type of condition, then the plume would also be visible, but generally, if it's not foggy out, then it would have to be cold. MR. PERRONE: Because under	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Late-Filed Exhibit 2A through 2I, which is community outreach activities, and this is to the Applicant. Can you detail any outreach or informational meetings that were held by CPV or made to Naugatuck residents or specifically Westover Hills Subdivision community residents? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Are we talking about the original Late-Filed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	THE WITNESS (Sellars): It's a function of both temperature and humidity. So there's, obviously, two variables there. So a relatively mild day, if the relative humidity was near 100, in other words, be a foggy-type of condition, then the plume would also be visible, but generally, if it's not foggy out, then it would have to be cold. MR. PERRONE: Because under the high humidity conditions the air is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Late-Filed Exhibit 2A through 2I, which is community outreach activities, and this is to the Applicant. Can you detail any outreach or informational meetings that were held by CPV or made to Naugatuck residents or specifically Westover Hills Subdivision community residents? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Are we talking about the original Late-Filed exhibits? I'm sorry, can you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	THE WITNESS (Sellars): It's a function of both temperature and humidity. So there's, obviously, two variables there. So a relatively mild day, if the relative humidity was near 100, in other words, be a foggy-type of condition, then the plume would also be visible, but generally, if it's not foggy out, then it would have to be cold. MR. PERRONE: Because under the high humidity conditions the air is largely saturated so it starts to show very	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Late-Filed Exhibit 2A through 2I, which is community outreach activities, and this is to the Applicant. Can you detail any outreach or informational meetings that were held by CPV or made to Naugatuck residents or specifically Westover Hills Subdivision community residents? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Are we talking about the original Late-Filed exhibits? I'm sorry, can you MR. CORNACCHIA: I'm a little
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	THE WITNESS (Sellars): It's a function of both temperature and humidity. So there's, obviously, two variables there. So a relatively mild day, if the relative humidity was near 100, in other words, be a foggy-type of condition, then the plume would also be visible, but generally, if it's not foggy out, then it would have to be cold. MR. PERRONE: Because under the high humidity conditions the air is largely saturated so it starts to show very quickly?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Late-Filed Exhibit 2A through 2I, which is community outreach activities, and this is to the Applicant. Can you detail any outreach or informational meetings that were held by CPV or made to Naugatuck residents or specifically Westover Hills Subdivision community residents? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Are we talking about the original Late-Filed exhibits? I'm sorry, can you MR. CORNACCHIA: I'm a little overwhelmed also with the Late-Filed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE WITNESS (Sellars): It's a function of both temperature and humidity. So there's, obviously, two variables there. So a relatively mild day, if the relative humidity was near 100, in other words, be a foggy-type of condition, then the plume would also be visible, but generally, if it's not foggy out, then it would have to be cold. MR. PERRONE: Because under the high humidity conditions the air is largely saturated so it starts to show very quickly? THE WITNESS (Sellars):	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Late-Filed Exhibit 2A through 2I, which is community outreach activities, and this is to the Applicant. Can you detail any outreach or informational meetings that were held by CPV or made to Naugatuck residents or specifically Westover Hills Subdivision community residents? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Are we talking about the original Late-Filed exhibits? I'm sorry, can you MR. CORNACCHIA: I'm a little overwhelmed also with the Late-Filed exhibits. This is 2A through 2I.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	THE WITNESS (Sellars): It's a function of both temperature and humidity. So there's, obviously, two variables there. So a relatively mild day, if the relative humidity was near 100, in other words, be a foggy-type of condition, then the plume would also be visible, but generally, if it's not foggy out, then it would have to be cold. MR. PERRONE: Because under the high humidity conditions the air is largely saturated so it starts to show very quickly? THE WITNESS (Sellars): There's nothing to dissipate the water;	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Late-Filed Exhibit 2A through 2I, which is community outreach activities, and this is to the Applicant. Can you detail any outreach or informational meetings that were held by CPV or made to Naugatuck residents or specifically Westover Hills Subdivision community residents? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Are we talking about the original Late-Filed exhibits? I'm sorry, can you MR. CORNACCHIA: I'm a little overwhelmed also with the Late-Filed exhibits. This is 2A through 2I. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	THE WITNESS (Sellars): It's a function of both temperature and humidity. So there's, obviously, two variables there. So a relatively mild day, if the relative humidity was near 100, in other words, be a foggy-type of condition, then the plume would also be visible, but generally, if it's not foggy out, then it would have to be cold. MR. PERRONE: Because under the high humidity conditions the air is largely saturated so it starts to show very quickly? THE WITNESS (Sellars): There's nothing to dissipate the water; that's correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Late-Filed Exhibit 2A through 2I, which is community outreach activities, and this is to the Applicant. Can you detail any outreach or informational meetings that were held by CPV or made to Naugatuck residents or specifically Westover Hills Subdivision community residents? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Are we talking about the original Late-Filed exhibits? I'm sorry, can you MR. CORNACCHIA: I'm a little overwhelmed also with the Late-Filed exhibits. This is 2A through 2I. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Of which set?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	THE WITNESS (Sellars): It's a function of both temperature and humidity. So there's, obviously, two variables there. So a relatively mild day, if the relative humidity was near 100, in other words, be a foggy-type of condition, then the plume would also be visible, but generally, if it's not foggy out, then it would have to be cold. MR. PERRONE: Because under the high humidity conditions the air is largely saturated so it starts to show very quickly? THE WITNESS (Sellars): There's nothing to dissipate the water;	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Late-Filed Exhibit 2A through 2I, which is community outreach activities, and this is to the Applicant. Can you detail any outreach or informational meetings that were held by CPV or made to Naugatuck residents or specifically Westover Hills Subdivision community residents? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Are we talking about the original Late-Filed exhibits? I'm sorry, can you MR. CORNACCHIA: I'm a little overwhelmed also with the Late-Filed exhibits. This is 2A through 2I. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Of which set? MR. CORNACCHIA: I believe it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE WITNESS (Sellars): It's a function of both temperature and humidity. So there's, obviously, two variables there. So a relatively mild day, if the relative humidity was near 100, in other words, be a foggy-type of condition, then the plume would also be visible, but generally, if it's not foggy out, then it would have to be cold. MR. PERRONE: Because under the high humidity conditions the air is largely saturated so it starts to show very quickly? THE WITNESS (Sellars): There's nothing to dissipate the water; that's correct. MR. PERRONE: Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Late-Filed Exhibit 2A through 2I, which is community outreach activities, and this is to the Applicant. Can you detail any outreach or informational meetings that were held by CPV or made to Naugatuck residents or specifically Westover Hills Subdivision community residents? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Are we talking about the original Late-Filed exhibits? I'm sorry, can you MR. CORNACCHIA: I'm a little overwhelmed also with the Late-Filed exhibits. This is 2A through 2I. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Of which set?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE WITNESS (Sellars): It's a function of both temperature and humidity. So there's, obviously, two variables there. So a relatively mild day, if the relative humidity was near 100, in other words, be a foggy-type of condition, then the plume would also be visible, but generally, if it's not foggy out, then it would have to be cold. MR. PERRONE: Because under the high humidity conditions the air is largely saturated so it starts to show very quickly? THE WITNESS (Sellars): There's nothing to dissipate the water; that's correct. MR. PERRONE: Thank you. That's all I have.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Late-Filed Exhibit 2A through 2I, which is community outreach activities, and this is to the Applicant. Can you detail any outreach or informational meetings that were held by CPV or made to Naugatuck residents or specifically Westover Hills Subdivision community residents? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Are we talking about the original Late-Filed exhibits? I'm sorry, can you MR. CORNACCHIA: I'm a little overwhelmed also with the Late-Filed exhibits. This is 2A through 2I. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Of which set? MR. CORNACCHIA: I believe it was the second set. It says community
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE WITNESS (Sellars): It's a function of both temperature and humidity. So there's, obviously, two variables there. So a relatively mild day, if the relative humidity was near 100, in other words, be a foggy-type of condition, then the plume would also be visible, but generally, if it's not foggy out, then it would have to be cold. MR. PERRONE: Because under the high humidity conditions the air is largely saturated so it starts to show very quickly? THE WITNESS (Sellars): There's nothing to dissipate the water; that's correct. MR. PERRONE: Thank you. That's all I have. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Late-Filed Exhibit 2A through 2I, which is community outreach activities, and this is to the Applicant. Can you detail any outreach or informational meetings that were held by CPV or made to Naugatuck residents or specifically Westover Hills Subdivision community residents? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Are we talking about the original Late-Filed exhibits? I'm sorry, can you MR. CORNACCHIA: I'm a little overwhelmed also with the Late-Filed exhibits. This is 2A through 2I. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Of which set? MR. CORNACCHIA: I believe it was the second set. It says community outreach activities. There was a list of, I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE WITNESS (Sellars): It's a function of both temperature and humidity. So there's, obviously, two variables there. So a relatively mild day, if the relative humidity was near 100, in other words, be a foggy-type of condition, then the plume would also be visible, but generally, if it's not foggy out, then it would have to be cold. MR. PERRONE: Because under the high humidity conditions the air is largely saturated so it starts to show very quickly? THE WITNESS (Sellars): There's nothing to dissipate the water; that's correct. MR. PERRONE: Thank you. That's all I have. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you. Before we go to further questions from the Council, and maybe this is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Late-Filed Exhibit 2A through 2I, which is community outreach activities, and this is to the Applicant. Can you detail any outreach or informational meetings that were held by CPV or made to Naugatuck residents or specifically Westover Hills Subdivision community residents? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Are we talking about the original Late-Filed exhibits? I'm sorry, can you MR. CORNACCHIA: I'm a little overwhelmed also with the Late-Filed exhibits. This is 2A through 2I. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Of which set? MR. CORNACCHIA: I believe it was the second set. It says community outreach activities. There was a list of, I guess, outreach activities that were performed by CPV. My question was specifically with regards to Naugatuck
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE WITNESS (Sellars): It's a function of both temperature and humidity. So there's, obviously, two variables there. So a relatively mild day, if the relative humidity was near 100, in other words, be a foggy-type of condition, then the plume would also be visible, but generally, if it's not foggy out, then it would have to be cold. MR. PERRONE: Because under the high humidity conditions the air is largely saturated so it starts to show very quickly? THE WITNESS (Sellars): There's nothing to dissipate the water; that's correct. MR. PERRONE: Thank you. That's all I have. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you. Before we go to further questions from the Council, and maybe this is the time for the representative of Westover	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Late-Filed Exhibit 2A through 2I, which is community outreach activities, and this is to the Applicant. Can you detail any outreach or informational meetings that were held by CPV or made to Naugatuck residents or specifically Westover Hills Subdivision community residents? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Are we talking about the original Late-Filed exhibits? I'm sorry, can you MR. CORNACCHIA: I'm a little overwhelmed also with the Late-Filed exhibits. This is 2A through 2I. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Of which set? MR. CORNACCHIA: I believe it was the second set. It says community outreach activities. There was a list of, I guess, outreach activities that were performed by CPV. My question was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE WITNESS (Sellars): It's a function of both temperature and humidity. So there's, obviously, two variables there. So a relatively mild day, if the relative humidity was near 100, in other words, be a foggy-type of condition, then the plume would also be visible, but generally, if it's not foggy out, then it would have to be cold. MR. PERRONE: Because under the high humidity conditions the air is largely saturated so it starts to show very quickly? THE WITNESS (Sellars): There's nothing to dissipate the water; that's correct. MR. PERRONE: Thank you. That's all I have. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you. Before we go to further questions from the Council, and maybe this is the time for the representative of Westover Hills Subdivision, Attorney Cornacchia, your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Late-Filed Exhibit 2A through 2I, which is community outreach activities, and this is to the Applicant. Can you detail any outreach or informational meetings that were held by CPV or made to Naugatuck residents or specifically Westover Hills Subdivision community residents? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Are we talking about the original Late-Filed exhibits? I'm sorry, can you MR. CORNACCHIA: I'm a little overwhelmed also with the Late-Filed exhibits. This is 2A through 2I. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Of which set? MR. CORNACCHIA: I believe it was the second set. It says community outreach activities. There was a list of, I guess, outreach activities that were performed by CPV. My question was specifically with regards to Naugatuck residents or specifically Westover Hills residents.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE WITNESS (Sellars): It's a function of both temperature and humidity. So there's, obviously, two variables there. So a relatively mild day, if the relative humidity was near 100, in other words, be a foggy-type of condition, then the plume would also be visible, but generally, if it's not foggy out, then it would have to be cold. MR. PERRONE: Because under the high humidity conditions the air is largely saturated so it starts to show very quickly? THE WITNESS (Sellars): There's nothing to dissipate the water; that's correct. MR. PERRONE: Thank you. That's all I have. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you. Before we go to further questions from the Council, and maybe this is the time for the representative of Westover	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Late-Filed Exhibit 2A through 2I, which is community outreach activities, and this is to the Applicant. Can you detail any outreach or informational meetings that were held by CPV or made to Naugatuck residents or specifically Westover Hills Subdivision community residents? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Are we talking about the original Late-Filed exhibits? I'm sorry, can you MR. CORNACCHIA: I'm a little overwhelmed also with the Late-Filed exhibits. This is 2A through 2I. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Of which set? MR. CORNACCHIA: I believe it was the second set. It says community outreach activities. There was a list of, I guess, outreach activities that were performed by CPV. My question was specifically with regards to Naugatuck residents or specifically Westover Hills

39 (Pages 693 to 696)

	Page 697		Page 699
1	MR. CORNACCHIA: And, again,	1	contamination for Naugatuck residents in the
2	there was a list of community outreach	2	discharge impact area?
3	activities. There were a number of them.	3	THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Are
4	There were an Oxford Greens meeting, for	4	you perhaps referring to interrogatories
5	example, a Seymour Chamber of Commerce, a	5	submitted or
6	listing.	6	MR. CORNACCHIA: Did you
7	THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So I	7	receive any requests by any Naugatuck
8	think your question was what activities were	8	residents for further information on any type
9	specifically targeted at either Naugatuck	9	of hazard to human PM 2.5 particulate
10	residents or Westover Hills subdivision?	10	exposure or ground well contamination through
11	MR. CORNACCHIA: Yes.	11	either runoff or from the particulate
12	THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So,	12	effluent discharge to the community?
13	typically, we tend to do these things in more	13	THE WITNESS (Bazinet): We've
14	of an open format where we will conduct	14	received a number of those questions over the
15	meetings or open houses so that folks are	15	past six months, primarily since after the
16	able to attend at their leisure.	16	open house on August 5th at Oxford High
17	Specifically, with respect to your question,	17	School. Whether they were from Naugatuck
18	there were no meetings targeted directly at	18	residents or not, I don't specifically
19	the Westover Hills Subdivision. Naugatuck	19	remember, but we have received a number of
20	I'd have to review the list I don't recall	20	those inquiries.
21	off the top of my head.	21	MR. CORNACCHIA: Is it fair to
22	MR. CORNACCHIA: Were there	22	say that there was no effort made to hold any
23	any notifications or solicitations that had	23	kind of an informational hearing or seminar,
24	gone out to Naugatuck residents? And this	24	specifically to Naugatuck residents,
25	would be with regards specifically to there	25	addressing those concerns over PM 2.5
	would be will regulas specifically to ulere		
	Page 698		Page 700
1	Page 698 was, I believe, one public hearing that was	1	Page 700 contamination or over ground well
1 2		1 2	
	was, I believe, one public hearing that was		contamination or over ground well contamination? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): No. I
2	was, I believe, one public hearing that was held in Oxford in the summer. I believe it was August 5th. And with regards to that particular meeting.	2	contamination or over ground well contamination?
2 3 4 5	was, I believe, one public hearing that was held in Oxford in the summer. I believe it was August 5th. And with regards to that particular meeting. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So we	2 3 4 5	contamination or over ground well contamination? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): No. I don't see why Naugatuck residents are any more entitled to that type of information
2 3 4	was, I believe, one public hearing that was held in Oxford in the summer. I believe it was August 5th. And with regards to that particular meeting. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So we publicly noticed that. We sent out mailers	2 3 4	contamination or over ground well contamination? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): No. I don't see why Naugatuck residents are any more entitled to that type of information relative to any of the other surrounding
2 3 4 5 6 7	was, I believe, one public hearing that was held in Oxford in the summer. I believe it was August 5th. And with regards to that particular meeting. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So we publicly noticed that. We sent out mailers to Oxford residents. We posted it on our	2 3 4 5 6 7	contamination or over ground well contamination? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): No. I don't see why Naugatuck residents are any more entitled to that type of information relative to any of the other surrounding communities or Oxford.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	was, I believe, one public hearing that was held in Oxford in the summer. I believe it was August 5th. And with regards to that particular meeting. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So we publicly noticed that. We sent out mailers	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	contamination or over ground well contamination? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): No. I don't see why Naugatuck residents are any more entitled to that type of information relative to any of the other surrounding communities or Oxford. MR. CORNACCHIA: I guess the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	was, I believe, one public hearing that was held in Oxford in the summer. I believe it was August 5th. And with regards to that particular meeting. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So we publicly noticed that. We sent out mailers to Oxford residents. We posted it on our website. We posted it on the town web site as well, I believe, in actually newspapers of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	contamination or over ground well contamination? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): No. I don't see why Naugatuck residents are any more entitled to that type of information relative to any of the other surrounding communities or Oxford. MR. CORNACCHIA: I guess the question I had was with regard to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	was, I believe, one public hearing that was held in Oxford in the summer. I believe it was August 5th. And with regards to that particular meeting. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So we publicly noticed that. We sent out mailers to Oxford residents. We posted it on our website. We posted it on the town web site as well, I believe, in actually newspapers of circulation, as well, in the area. I'm not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	contamination or over ground well contamination? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): No. I don't see why Naugatuck residents are any more entitled to that type of information relative to any of the other surrounding communities or Oxford. MR. CORNACCHIA: I guess the question I had was with regard to the requests that were made. And if there was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	was, I believe, one public hearing that was held in Oxford in the summer. I believe it was August 5th. And with regards to that particular meeting. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So we publicly noticed that. We sent out mailers to Oxford residents. We posted it on our website. We posted it on the town web site as well, I believe, in actually newspapers of circulation, as well, in the area. I'm not sure if Voices makes its way to Naugatuck,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	contamination or over ground well contamination? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): No. I don't see why Naugatuck residents are any more entitled to that type of information relative to any of the other surrounding communities or Oxford. MR. CORNACCHIA: I guess the question I had was with regard to the requests that were made. And if there was no there was a meeting held in Oxford that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	was, I believe, one public hearing that was held in Oxford in the summer. I believe it was August 5th. And with regards to that particular meeting. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So we publicly noticed that. We sent out mailers to Oxford residents. We posted it on our website. We posted it on the town web site as well, I believe, in actually newspapers of circulation, as well, in the area. I'm not sure if Voices makes its way to Naugatuck, but there are a couple of papers that we also	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	contamination or over ground well contamination? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): No. I don't see why Naugatuck residents are any more entitled to that type of information relative to any of the other surrounding communities or Oxford. MR. CORNACCHIA: I guess the question I had was with regard to the requests that were made. And if there was no there was a meeting held in Oxford that was a broad-based meeting to the surrounding
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	was, I believe, one public hearing that was held in Oxford in the summer. I believe it was August 5th. And with regards to that particular meeting. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So we publicly noticed that. We sent out mailers to Oxford residents. We posted it on our website. We posted it on the town web site as well, I believe, in actually newspapers of circulation, as well, in the area. I'm not sure if Voices makes its way to Naugatuck, but there are a couple of papers that we also published that in.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	contamination or over ground well contamination? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): No. I don't see why Naugatuck residents are any more entitled to that type of information relative to any of the other surrounding communities or Oxford. MR. CORNACCHIA: I guess the question I had was with regard to the requests that were made. And if there was no there was a meeting held in Oxford that was a broad-based meeting to the surrounding communities, but requests, you had indicated,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	was, I believe, one public hearing that was held in Oxford in the summer. I believe it was August 5th. And with regards to that particular meeting. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So we publicly noticed that. We sent out mailers to Oxford residents. We posted it on our website. We posted it on the town web site as well, I believe, in actually newspapers of circulation, as well, in the area. I'm not sure if Voices makes its way to Naugatuck, but there are a couple of papers that we also published that in. MR. CORNACCHIA: But nothing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	contamination or over ground well contamination? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): No. I don't see why Naugatuck residents are any more entitled to that type of information relative to any of the other surrounding communities or Oxford. MR. CORNACCHIA: I guess the question I had was with regard to the requests that were made. And if there was no there was a meeting held in Oxford that was a broad-based meeting to the surrounding communities, but requests, you had indicated, had come also from Naugatuck residents, if I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	was, I believe, one public hearing that was held in Oxford in the summer. I believe it was August 5th. And with regards to that particular meeting. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So we publicly noticed that. We sent out mailers to Oxford residents. We posted it on our website. We posted it on the town web site as well, I believe, in actually newspapers of circulation, as well, in the area. I'm not sure if Voices makes its way to Naugatuck, but there are a couple of papers that we also published that in. MR. CORNACCHIA: But nothing that was specifically targeting Naugatuck	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	contamination or over ground well contamination? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): No. I don't see why Naugatuck residents are any more entitled to that type of information relative to any of the other surrounding communities or Oxford. MR. CORNACCHIA: I guess the question I had was with regard to the requests that were made. And if there was no there was a meeting held in Oxford that was a broad-based meeting to the surrounding communities, but requests, you had indicated, had come also from Naugatuck residents, if I read you correctly a minute ago, and no
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 was, I believe, one public hearing that was held in Oxford in the summer. I believe it was August 5th. And with regards to that particular meeting. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So we publicly noticed that. We sent out mailers to Oxford residents. We posted it on our website. We posted it on the town web site as well, I believe, in actually newspapers of circulation, as well, in the area. I'm not sure if Voices makes its way to Naugatuck, but there are a couple of papers that we also published that in. MR. CORNACCHIA: But nothing that was specifically targeting Naugatuck residents or nothing held specifically in 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	contamination or over ground well contamination? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): No. I don't see why Naugatuck residents are any more entitled to that type of information relative to any of the other surrounding communities or Oxford. MR. CORNACCHIA: I guess the question I had was with regard to the requests that were made. And if there was no there was a meeting held in Oxford that was a broad-based meeting to the surrounding communities, but requests, you had indicated, had come also from Naugatuck residents, if I read you correctly a minute ago, and no effort was made to hold any kind of an
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	was, I believe, one public hearing that was held in Oxford in the summer. I believe it was August 5th. And with regards to that particular meeting. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So we publicly noticed that. We sent out mailers to Oxford residents. We posted it on our website. We posted it on the town web site as well, I believe, in actually newspapers of circulation, as well, in the area. I'm not sure if Voices makes its way to Naugatuck, but there are a couple of papers that we also published that in. MR. CORNACCHIA: But nothing that was specifically targeting Naugatuck residents or nothing held specifically in Naugatuck?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	contamination or over ground well contamination? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): No. I don't see why Naugatuck residents are any more entitled to that type of information relative to any of the other surrounding communities or Oxford. MR. CORNACCHIA: I guess the question I had was with regard to the requests that were made. And if there was no there was a meeting held in Oxford that was a broad-based meeting to the surrounding communities, but requests, you had indicated, had come also from Naugatuck residents, if I read you correctly a minute ago, and no effort was made to hold any kind of an informational hearing or any kind of a public
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	was, I believe, one public hearing that was held in Oxford in the summer. I believe it was August 5th. And with regards to that particular meeting. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So we publicly noticed that. We sent out mailers to Oxford residents. We posted it on our website. We posted it on the town web site as well, I believe, in actually newspapers of circulation, as well, in the area. I'm not sure if Voices makes its way to Naugatuck, but there are a couple of papers that we also published that in. MR. CORNACCHIA: But nothing that was specifically targeting Naugatuck residents or nothing held specifically in Naugatuck? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): It was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	contamination or over ground well contamination? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): No. I don't see why Naugatuck residents are any more entitled to that type of information relative to any of the other surrounding communities or Oxford. MR. CORNACCHIA: I guess the question I had was with regard to the requests that were made. And if there was no there was a meeting held in Oxford that was a broad-based meeting to the surrounding communities, but requests, you had indicated, had come also from Naugatuck residents, if I read you correctly a minute ago, and no effort was made to hold any kind of an informational hearing or any kind of a public informational discourse in Naugatuck as an
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	was, I believe, one public hearing that was held in Oxford in the summer. I believe it was August 5th. And with regards to that particular meeting. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So we publicly noticed that. We sent out mailers to Oxford residents. We posted it on our website. We posted it on the town web site as well, I believe, in actually newspapers of circulation, as well, in the area. I'm not sure if Voices makes its way to Naugatuck, but there are a couple of papers that we also published that in. MR. CORNACCHIA: But nothing that was specifically targeting Naugatuck residents or nothing held specifically in Naugatuck? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): It was targeting the residents of Oxford and the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	contamination or over ground well contamination? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): No. I don't see why Naugatuck residents are any more entitled to that type of information relative to any of the other surrounding communities or Oxford. MR. CORNACCHIA: I guess the question I had was with regard to the requests that were made. And if there was no there was a meeting held in Oxford that was a broad-based meeting to the surrounding communities, but requests, you had indicated, had come also from Naugatuck residents, if I read you correctly a minute ago, and no effort was made to hold any kind of an informational hearing or any kind of a public informational discourse in Naugatuck as an affected community as a neighboring
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	was, I believe, one public hearing that was held in Oxford in the summer. I believe it was August 5th. And with regards to that particular meeting. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So we publicly noticed that. We sent out mailers to Oxford residents. We posted it on our website. We posted it on the town web site as well, I believe, in actually newspapers of circulation, as well, in the area. I'm not sure if Voices makes its way to Naugatuck, but there are a couple of papers that we also published that in. MR. CORNACCHIA: But nothing that was specifically targeting Naugatuck residents or nothing held specifically in Naugatuck? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): It was targeting the residents of Oxford and the surrounding communities, including Naugatuck.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	contamination or over ground well contamination? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): No. I don't see why Naugatuck residents are any more entitled to that type of information relative to any of the other surrounding communities or Oxford. MR. CORNACCHIA: I guess the question I had was with regard to the requests that were made. And if there was no there was a meeting held in Oxford that was a broad-based meeting to the surrounding communities, but requests, you had indicated, had come also from Naugatuck residents, if I read you correctly a minute ago, and no effort was made to hold any kind of an informational hearing or any kind of a public informational discourse in Naugatuck as an affected community as a neighboring community?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 was, I believe, one public hearing that was held in Oxford in the summer. I believe it was August 5th. And with regards to that particular meeting. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So we publicly noticed that. We sent out mailers to Oxford residents. We posted it on our website. We posted it on the town web site as well, I believe, in actually newspapers of circulation, as well, in the area. I'm not sure if Voices makes its way to Naugatuck, but there are a couple of papers that we also published that in. MR. CORNACCHIA: But nothing that was specifically targeting Naugatuck residents or nothing held specifically in Naugatuck? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): It was targeting the residents of Oxford and the surrounding communities, including Naugatuck. MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. Are 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	contamination or over ground well contamination? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): No. I don't see why Naugatuck residents are any more entitled to that type of information relative to any of the other surrounding communities or Oxford. MR. CORNACCHIA: I guess the question I had was with regard to the requests that were made. And if there was no there was a meeting held in Oxford that was a broad-based meeting to the surrounding communities, but requests, you had indicated, had come also from Naugatuck residents, if I read you correctly a minute ago, and no effort was made to hold any kind of an informational hearing or any kind of a public informational discourse in Naugatuck as an affected community as a neighboring community? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 was, I believe, one public hearing that was held in Oxford in the summer. I believe it was August 5th. And with regards to that particular meeting. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So we publicly noticed that. We sent out mailers to Oxford residents. We posted it on our website. We posted it on the town web site as well, I believe, in actually newspapers of circulation, as well, in the area. I'm not sure if Voices makes its way to Naugatuck, but there are a couple of papers that we also published that in. MR. CORNACCHIA: But nothing that was specifically targeting Naugatuck residents or nothing held specifically in Naugatuck? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): It was targeting the residents of Oxford and the surrounding communities, including Naugatuck. MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. Are you aware of new informational meetings or 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	contamination or over ground well contamination? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): No. I don't see why Naugatuck residents are any more entitled to that type of information relative to any of the other surrounding communities or Oxford. MR. CORNACCHIA: I guess the question I had was with regard to the requests that were made. And if there was no there was a meeting held in Oxford that was a broad-based meeting to the surrounding communities, but requests, you had indicated, had come also from Naugatuck residents, if I read you correctly a minute ago, and no effort was made to hold any kind of an informational hearing or any kind of a public informational discourse in Naugatuck as an affected community as a neighboring community? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So, we've responded to virtually every question
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 was, I believe, one public hearing that was held in Oxford in the summer. I believe it was August 5th. And with regards to that particular meeting. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So we publicly noticed that. We sent out mailers to Oxford residents. We posted it on our website. We posted it on the town web site as well, I believe, in actually newspapers of circulation, as well, in the area. I'm not sure if Voices makes its way to Naugatuck, but there are a couple of papers that we also published that in. MR. CORNACCHIA: But nothing that was specifically targeting Naugatuck residents or nothing held specifically in Naugatuck? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): It was targeting the residents of Oxford and the surrounding communities, including Naugatuck. MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. Are you aware of new informational meetings or information that was requested by Naugatuck 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	contamination or over ground well contamination? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): No. I don't see why Naugatuck residents are any more entitled to that type of information relative to any of the other surrounding communities or Oxford. MR. CORNACCHIA: I guess the question I had was with regard to the requests that were made. And if there was no there was a meeting held in Oxford that was a broad-based meeting to the surrounding communities, but requests, you had indicated, had come also from Naugatuck residents, if I read you correctly a minute ago, and no effort was made to hold any kind of an informational hearing or any kind of a public informational discourse in Naugatuck as an affected community as a neighboring community? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So, we've responded to virtually every question we've received, and if there have been some
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 was, I believe, one public hearing that was held in Oxford in the summer. I believe it was August 5th. And with regards to that particular meeting. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So we publicly noticed that. We sent out mailers to Oxford residents. We posted it on our website. We posted it on the town web site as well, I believe, in actually newspapers of circulation, as well, in the area. I'm not sure if Voices makes its way to Naugatuck, but there are a couple of papers that we also published that in. MR. CORNACCHIA: But nothing that was specifically targeting Naugatuck residents or nothing held specifically in Naugatuck? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): It was targeting the residents of Oxford and the surrounding communities, including Naugatuck. MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. Are you aware of new informational meetings or information that was requested by Naugatuck residents with regards to PM 2.5 hazards to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	contamination or over ground well contamination? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): No. I don't see why Naugatuck residents are any more entitled to that type of information relative to any of the other surrounding communities or Oxford. MR. CORNACCHIA: I guess the question I had was with regard to the requests that were made. And if there was no there was a meeting held in Oxford that was a broad-based meeting to the surrounding communities, but requests, you had indicated, had come also from Naugatuck residents, if I read you correctly a minute ago, and no effort was made to hold any kind of an informational hearing or any kind of a public informational discourse in Naugatuck as an affected community as a neighboring community? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So, we've responded to virtually every question we've received, and if there have been some that have gotten lost in the shuffle, that's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 was, I believe, one public hearing that was held in Oxford in the summer. I believe it was August 5th. And with regards to that particular meeting. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So we publicly noticed that. We sent out mailers to Oxford residents. We posted it on our website. We posted it on the town web site as well, I believe, in actually newspapers of circulation, as well, in the area. I'm not sure if Voices makes its way to Naugatuck, but there are a couple of papers that we also published that in. MR. CORNACCHIA: But nothing that was specifically targeting Naugatuck residents or nothing held specifically in Naugatuck? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): It was targeting the residents of Oxford and the surrounding communities, including Naugatuck. MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. Are you aware of new informational meetings or information that was requested by Naugatuck 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	contamination or over ground well contamination? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): No. I don't see why Naugatuck residents are any more entitled to that type of information relative to any of the other surrounding communities or Oxford. MR. CORNACCHIA: I guess the question I had was with regard to the requests that were made. And if there was no there was a meeting held in Oxford that was a broad-based meeting to the surrounding communities, but requests, you had indicated, had come also from Naugatuck residents, if I read you correctly a minute ago, and no effort was made to hold any kind of an informational hearing or any kind of a public informational discourse in Naugatuck as an affected community as a neighboring community? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So, we've responded to virtually every question we've received, and if there have been some

Page 703 Page 701 1 1 those questions were received from Naugatuck 5.4 percent improvement in efficiency over 2 2 the General Electric F Series turbine residents specifically. If they came from 3 3 Naugatuck residents, I'm unaware of that at previously contemplated in the 512 megawatt 4 this point. And I'd also offer up that this 4 configuration. And that, coupled with 5 entire proceeding is being documented and is 5 additional energy output, provides economies 6 б of scale that, quote, benefit project available to the entire state 10f Connecticut 7 7 economics as a result -- and as a result to as well as any other folks that want to jump 8 8 on the Connecticut Siting Council website. the ratepayers. 9 9 There are a number of different issues, some Is it accurate to say that the 10 10 of which you've mentioned, that have been actual savings realized and contemplated in 11 11 addressed in various interrogatories, the year 2024 as being approximately \$2.84 12 Late-Filed exhibits, and we're not making any 12 per month and projected savings to the 13 effort that would unreasonably preclude one 13 ratepayers by having Towantic added as an 800 14 14 citizen's group from another. megawatt facility, is it accurate to say that 15 15 MR. CORNACCHIA: Are you still these are nameplate designations and the 16 nominal output would likely be lower? 16 prepared to offer any kind of an 17 17 THE WITNESS (Bazinet): The informational gathering for the residents in 18 Naugatuck so they can better inform 18 values that you see in Table 2.1 are net, not 19 themselves over the pros and the cons of the 19 nominal or nameplate. 20 20 MR. CORNACCHIA: So they would project? 21 THE WITNESS (Bazinet): I 21 be at the expected daily rate of whatever it 22 believe we've offered that up a number of 22 may be then? 23 different times to a number of different 23 THE WITNESS (Bazinet): That's 24 24 people. correct. 25 MR. CORNACCHIA: But not in 25 MR. CORNACCHIA: Are they Page 704 Page 702 1 Naugatuck, though. 1 provided in the table, though? It was not 2 THE CHAIRMAN: I think we have 2 clear to me. Is it 600 megawatts, is it 500, 3 sort of the answers. And really we have our 3 is it less than that, or is it more than 4 own proceedings. Obviously, if an applicant 4 that? 5 wants to do their own outreach additional, 5 THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Are 6 that's fine too. 6 you asking about Table 2.1 in the Exhibit 1 7 MR. CORNACCHIA: I understand, 7 or -- I'm not sure. 8 Mr. Chairman, and I appreciate that. 8 MR. CORNACCHIA: I guess what 9 9 I'm looking at is I'm really asking about the Let's move on to Section 10 2.1.3, which was under another Late-Filing 10 increased efficiency between the H Series and 11 entitled "Increased Output." 11 the F Series, and you've got it corrected in 12 MR. SMALL: Sorry, 2.1.3 of 12 a Late-Filing as 5.4 percent; is that 13 13 what document. sir? correct? 14 THE WITNESS (Bazinet): That's MR. CORNACCHIA: It should 14 15 15 have been filing number 2, and it was under correct. 16 16 "Increased Output," and it was a Late-Filing. MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. So, my 17 This is with regards to the F Series and the 17 question, I guess, is wouldn't it be better 18 18 overall for local impact and regional H Series turbines. 19 19 emissions if the greater efficiency H turbine MR. SMALL: I believe you're 20 looking at the so-called "Tetra Tech report." 20 were used on, say, a smaller footprint plant, 21 It was Exhibit 1 to our petition. 21 as previously applied for, say the 512 22 MR. CORNACCHIA: Exhibit 1. I 22 megawatt facility? 23 THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So the 23 stand corrected. 24 You detailed that the General 24 megawatts are going to be needed. And if you 25 25 don't get the megawatts from this one site, Electric H Series turbines offer a corrected

UNITED REPORTERS, INC. info@unitedreporters.com Nationwide-866-534-3383-Toll-Free www.unitedreporters.com

41 (Pages 701 to 704)

	Page 705		Page 707
1	you're going to get them from two sites. And	1	think I've answered that question. So
2	by definition, the economies of scale is	2	whether it comes from one site or two sites,
3	not is not realized as a result of that.	3	the megawatts are going to come in some form.
4	So I would answer your question no that it's	4	So, having, for example, this efficiency
5	not. It's more beneficial to ratepayers to	5	generating at 785 megawatts is better than
6	have it consolidated in one location and	6	having a 500 megawatt plant and a couple of
7	provide that economies of scale.	7	simple cycle units to make up the difference.
8	MR. CORNACCHIA: The question	8	THE WITNESS (Bodell): So say
9	was whether or not it was more advantageous	9	you have to consider the emissions that are
10	to have less emissions locally. And I guess	10	being displaced throughout the rest of the
11	the question is: At a 512 megawatt	11	region in Connecticut because of the larger
12	configuration, it would be less emissions	12	configuration. Because the larger
13	based upon even today's earlier testimony	13	configuration is more efficient, it will
14	that your plant would operate at	14	displace more than a less efficient set of
15	approximately a 40 percent increase?	15	two or three units. So you're looking at the
16	THE WITNESS (Sellars): I	16	local impacts is one thing, but many of these
17	guess I would refer you to Table 4-4 of that	17	pollutants are regional, and they have an
18	same document that shows that, for example,	18	impact regardless of where they are emitted.
19	for particulate emissions, the higher	19	So the more efficient, the better for the
20	efficiency but larger H technology would	20	environment.
21	actually emit 43.3 tons per year less of	21	MR. CORNACCHIA: I know that.
22	particulate emissions than the F size machine	22	And the more efficient is the 5.4 percent
23	even though it is smaller.	23	corrected higher efficiency of the H versus
24	MR. CORNACCHIA: Is that a	24	the F. My question again was couldn't we use
25	comparable megawattage?	25	an H on a 512 megawatt plant? I mean, we
	Page 706		Page 708
1	_	1	
1 2	THE WITNESS (Sellars): No.	1 2	Page 708 were previously approved at 512 with an F Series, and it's been pretty clear that the F
11	_		were previously approved at 512 with an F Series, and it's been pretty clear that the F
2	THE WITNESS (Sellars): No. That's total. That is not adjusted for	2	were previously approved at 512 with an F
2 3	THE WITNESS (Sellars): No. That's total. That is not adjusted for megawatt output. That is at 800 or so	2 3	were previously approved at 512 with an F Series, and it's been pretty clear that the F Series is older technology and it's less
2 3 4	THE WITNESS (Sellars): No. That's total. That is not adjusted for megawatt output. That is at 800 or so megawatts of the H machine, there would be	2 3 4	were previously approved at 512 with an F Series, and it's been pretty clear that the F Series is older technology and it's less efficient by 5.4 percent. My question again
2 3 4 5	THE WITNESS (Sellars): No. That's total. That is not adjusted for megawatt output. That is at 800 or so megawatts of the H machine, there would be 43.3 tons per year less particulate than the	2 3 4 5	were previously approved at 512 with an F Series, and it's been pretty clear that the F Series is older technology and it's less efficient by 5.4 percent. My question again was using the H Series at the increased
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	THE WITNESS (Sellars): No. That's total. That is not adjusted for megawatt output. That is at 800 or so megawatts of the H machine, there would be 43.3 tons per year less particulate than the 512 megawatts from the F machine because of	2 3 4 5 6	were previously approved at 512 with an F Series, and it's been pretty clear that the F Series is older technology and it's less efficient by 5.4 percent. My question again was using the H Series at the increased efficiency with a smaller nameplate capacity
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE WITNESS (Sellars): No. That's total. That is not adjusted for megawatt output. That is at 800 or so megawatts of the H machine, there would be 43.3 tons per year less particulate than the 512 megawatts from the F machine because of the improved efficiency. MR. CORNACCHIA: And then in the other categories, again, they're not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	were previously approved at 512 with an F Series, and it's been pretty clear that the F Series is older technology and it's less efficient by 5.4 percent. My question again was using the H Series at the increased efficiency with a smaller nameplate capacity would reduce local emissions and regional emissions just exponentially by the output and the decrease in emissions?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	THE WITNESS (Sellars): No. That's total. That is not adjusted for megawatt output. That is at 800 or so megawatts of the H machine, there would be 43.3 tons per year less particulate than the 512 megawatts from the F machine because of the improved efficiency. MR. CORNACCHIA: And then in the other categories, again, they're not lower, though?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	were previously approved at 512 with an F Series, and it's been pretty clear that the F Series is older technology and it's less efficient by 5.4 percent. My question again was using the H Series at the increased efficiency with a smaller nameplate capacity would reduce local emissions and regional emissions just exponentially by the output and the decrease in emissions? THE WITNESS (Bodell): That is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	THE WITNESS (Sellars): No. That's total. That is not adjusted for megawatt output. That is at 800 or so megawatts of the H machine, there would be 43.3 tons per year less particulate than the 512 megawatts from the F machine because of the improved efficiency. MR. CORNACCHIA: And then in the other categories, again, they're not lower, though? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Some	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	were previously approved at 512 with an F Series, and it's been pretty clear that the F Series is older technology and it's less efficient by 5.4 percent. My question again was using the H Series at the increased efficiency with a smaller nameplate capacity would reduce local emissions and regional emissions just exponentially by the output and the decrease in emissions? THE WITNESS (Bodell): That is not true because what I just said. I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	THE WITNESS (Sellars): No. That's total. That is not adjusted for megawatt output. That is at 800 or so megawatts of the H machine, there would be 43.3 tons per year less particulate than the 512 megawatts from the F machine because of the improved efficiency. MR. CORNACCHIA: And then in the other categories, again, they're not lower, though? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Some are lower; some are slightly higher. For	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	were previously approved at 512 with an F Series, and it's been pretty clear that the F Series is older technology and it's less efficient by 5.4 percent. My question again was using the H Series at the increased efficiency with a smaller nameplate capacity would reduce local emissions and regional emissions just exponentially by the output and the decrease in emissions? THE WITNESS (Bodell): That is not true because what I just said. I understand what you're saying, which is break
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE WITNESS (Sellars): No. That's total. That is not adjusted for megawatt output. That is at 800 or so megawatts of the H machine, there would be 43.3 tons per year less particulate than the 512 megawatts from the F machine because of the improved efficiency. MR. CORNACCHIA: And then in the other categories, again, they're not lower, though? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Some are lower; some are slightly higher. For example, NOx would be a little bit higher, 56	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	were previously approved at 512 with an F Series, and it's been pretty clear that the F Series is older technology and it's less efficient by 5.4 percent. My question again was using the H Series at the increased efficiency with a smaller nameplate capacity would reduce local emissions and regional emissions just exponentially by the output and the decrease in emissions? THE WITNESS (Bodell): That is not true because what I just said. I understand what you're saying, which is break apart the configuration that's set up to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	THE WITNESS (Sellars): No. That's total. That is not adjusted for megawatt output. That is at 800 or so megawatts of the H machine, there would be 43.3 tons per year less particulate than the 512 megawatts from the F machine because of the improved efficiency. MR. CORNACCHIA: And then in the other categories, again, they're not lower, though? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Some are lower; some are slightly higher. For example, NOx would be a little bit higher, 56 tons per year, and VOC would be a little bit	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	were previously approved at 512 with an F Series, and it's been pretty clear that the F Series is older technology and it's less efficient by 5.4 percent. My question again was using the H Series at the increased efficiency with a smaller nameplate capacity would reduce local emissions and regional emissions just exponentially by the output and the decrease in emissions? THE WITNESS (Bodell): That is not true because what I just said. I understand what you're saying, which is break apart the configuration that's set up to be very efficient, but once you break it apart,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	THE WITNESS (Sellars): No. That's total. That is not adjusted for megawatt output. That is at 800 or so megawatts of the H machine, there would be 43.3 tons per year less particulate than the 512 megawatts from the F machine because of the improved efficiency. MR. CORNACCHIA: And then in the other categories, again, they're not lower, though? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Some are lower; some are slightly higher. For example, NOx would be a little bit higher, 56 tons per year, and VOC would be a little bit higher, about 20 tons per year, but CO would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	were previously approved at 512 with an F Series, and it's been pretty clear that the F Series is older technology and it's less efficient by 5.4 percent. My question again was using the H Series at the increased efficiency with a smaller nameplate capacity would reduce local emissions and regional emissions just exponentially by the output and the decrease in emissions? THE WITNESS (Bodell): That is not true because what I just said. I understand what you're saying, which is break apart the configuration that's set up to be very efficient, but once you break it apart, you're no longer getting the economies of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE WITNESS (Sellars): No. That's total. That is not adjusted for megawatt output. That is at 800 or so megawatts of the H machine, there would be 43.3 tons per year less particulate than the 512 megawatts from the F machine because of the improved efficiency. MR. CORNACCHIA: And then in the other categories, again, they're not lower, though? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Some are lower; some are slightly higher. For example, NOx would be a little bit higher, 56 tons per year, and VOC would be a little bit higher, about 20 tons per year, and the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	were previously approved at 512 with an F Series, and it's been pretty clear that the F Series is older technology and it's less efficient by 5.4 percent. My question again was using the H Series at the increased efficiency with a smaller nameplate capacity would reduce local emissions and regional emissions just exponentially by the output and the decrease in emissions? THE WITNESS (Bodell): That is not true because what I just said. I understand what you're saying, which is break apart the configuration that's set up to be very efficient, but once you break it apart, you're no longer getting the economies of scale, and as a result, you're not going to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE WITNESS (Sellars): No. That's total. That is not adjusted for megawatt output. That is at 800 or so megawatts of the H machine, there would be 43.3 tons per year less particulate than the 512 megawatts from the F machine because of the improved efficiency. MR. CORNACCHIA: And then in the other categories, again, they're not lower, though? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Some are lower; some are slightly higher. For example, NOx would be a little bit higher, 56 tons per year, and VOC would be a little bit higher, about 20 tons per year, and the particulate would be less, 43.3 tons per	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	were previously approved at 512 with an F Series, and it's been pretty clear that the F Series is older technology and it's less efficient by 5.4 percent. My question again was using the H Series at the increased efficiency with a smaller nameplate capacity would reduce local emissions and regional emissions just exponentially by the output and the decrease in emissions? THE WITNESS (Bodell): That is not true because what I just said. I understand what you're saying, which is break apart the configuration that's set up to be very efficient, but once you break it apart, you're no longer getting the economies of scale, and as a result, you're not going to get as much displacement throughout the rest
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE WITNESS (Sellars): No. That's total. That is not adjusted for megawatt output. That is at 800 or so megawatts of the H machine, there would be 43.3 tons per year less particulate than the 512 megawatts from the F machine because of the improved efficiency. MR. CORNACCHIA: And then in the other categories, again, they're not lower, though? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Some are lower; some are slightly higher. For example, NOx would be a little bit higher, 56 tons per year, and VOC would be a little bit higher, about 20 tons per year, but CO would be less, say 43 tons per year, and the particulate would be less, 43.3 tons per year.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	were previously approved at 512 with an F Series, and it's been pretty clear that the F Series is older technology and it's less efficient by 5.4 percent. My question again was using the H Series at the increased efficiency with a smaller nameplate capacity would reduce local emissions and regional emissions just exponentially by the output and the decrease in emissions? THE WITNESS (Bodell): That is not true because what I just said. I understand what you're saying, which is break apart the configuration that's set up to be very efficient, but once you break it apart, you're no longer getting the economies of scale, and as a result, you're not going to get as much displacement throughout the rest of the region from what I just said.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	THE WITNESS (Sellars): No. That's total. That is not adjusted for megawatt output. That is at 800 or so megawatts of the H machine, there would be 43.3 tons per year less particulate than the 512 megawatts from the F machine because of the improved efficiency. MR. CORNACCHIA: And then in the other categories, again, they're not lower, though? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Some are lower; some are slightly higher. For example, NOx would be a little bit higher, 56 tons per year, and VOC would be a little bit higher, about 20 tons per year, but CO would be less, say 43 tons per year, and the particulate would be less, 43.3 tons per year. MR. CORNACCHIA: And again, I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	were previously approved at 512 with an F Series, and it's been pretty clear that the F Series is older technology and it's less efficient by 5.4 percent. My question again was using the H Series at the increased efficiency with a smaller nameplate capacity would reduce local emissions and regional emissions just exponentially by the output and the decrease in emissions? THE WITNESS (Bodell): That is not true because what I just said. I understand what you're saying, which is break apart the configuration that's set up to be very efficient, but once you break it apart, you're no longer getting the economies of scale, and as a result, you're not going to get as much displacement throughout the rest of the region from what I just said.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE WITNESS (Sellars): No. That's total. That is not adjusted for megawatt output. That is at 800 or so megawatts of the H machine, there would be 43.3 tons per year less particulate than the 512 megawatts from the F machine because of the improved efficiency. MR. CORNACCHIA: And then in the other categories, again, they're not lower, though? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Some are lower; some are slightly higher. For example, NOx would be a little bit higher, 56 tons per year, and VOC would be a little bit higher, about 20 tons per year, but CO would be less, say 43 tons per year, and the particulate would be less, 43.3 tons per year. MR. CORNACCHIA: And again, I guess the question I'm trying to ask is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	were previously approved at 512 with an F Series, and it's been pretty clear that the F Series is older technology and it's less efficient by 5.4 percent. My question again was using the H Series at the increased efficiency with a smaller nameplate capacity would reduce local emissions and regional emissions just exponentially by the output and the decrease in emissions? THE WITNESS (Bodell): That is not true because what I just said. I understand what you're saying, which is break apart the configuration that's set up to be very efficient, but once you break it apart, you're no longer getting the economies of scale, and as a result, you're not going to get as much displacement throughout the rest of the region from what I just said. MR. CORNACCHIA: I'm not clear on that. And I'm going to pause on that for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE WITNESS (Sellars): No. That's total. That is not adjusted for megawatt output. That is at 800 or so megawatts of the H machine, there would be 43.3 tons per year less particulate than the 512 megawatts from the F machine because of the improved efficiency. MR. CORNACCHIA: And then in the other categories, again, they're not lower, though? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Some are lower; some are slightly higher. For example, NOx would be a little bit higher, 56 tons per year, and VOC would be a little bit higher, about 20 tons per year, but CO would be less, say 43 tons per year, and the particulate would be less, 43.3 tons per year. MR. CORNACCHIA: And again, I guess the question I'm trying to ask is wouldn't it be better to use the more	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	were previously approved at 512 with an F Series, and it's been pretty clear that the F Series is older technology and it's less efficient by 5.4 percent. My question again was using the H Series at the increased efficiency with a smaller nameplate capacity would reduce local emissions and regional emissions just exponentially by the output and the decrease in emissions? THE WITNESS (Bodell): That is not true because what I just said. I understand what you're saying, which is break apart the configuration that's set up to be very efficient, but once you break it apart, you're no longer getting the economies of scale, and as a result, you're not going to get as much displacement throughout the rest of the region from what I just said. MR. CORNACCHIA: I'm not clear on that. And I'm going to pause on that for now, but again, it was my understanding and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE WITNESS (Sellars): No. That's total. That is not adjusted for megawatt output. That is at 800 or so megawatts of the H machine, there would be 43.3 tons per year less particulate than the 512 megawatts from the F machine because of the improved efficiency. MR. CORNACCHIA: And then in the other categories, again, they're not lower, though? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Some are lower; some are slightly higher. For example, NOx would be a little bit higher, 56 tons per year, and VOC would be a little bit higher, about 20 tons per year, but CO would be less, say 43 tons per year, and the particulate would be less, 43.3 tons per year. MR. CORNACCHIA: And again, I guess the question I'm trying to ask is wouldn't it be better to use the more efficient turbine, the H Series turbine, in a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	were previously approved at 512 with an F Series, and it's been pretty clear that the F Series is older technology and it's less efficient by 5.4 percent. My question again was using the H Series at the increased efficiency with a smaller nameplate capacity would reduce local emissions and regional emissions just exponentially by the output and the decrease in emissions? THE WITNESS (Bodell): That is not true because what I just said. I understand what you're saying, which is break apart the configuration that's set up to be very efficient, but once you break it apart, you're no longer getting the economies of scale, and as a result, you're not going to get as much displacement throughout the rest of the region from what I just said. MR. CORNACCHIA: I'm not clear on that. And I'm going to pause on that for now, but again, it was my understanding and still is my understanding that the H Series
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE WITNESS (Sellars): No. That's total. That is not adjusted for megawatt output. That is at 800 or so megawatts of the H machine, there would be 43.3 tons per year less particulate than the 512 megawatts from the F machine because of the improved efficiency. MR. CORNACCHIA: And then in the other categories, again, they're not lower, though? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Some are lower; some are slightly higher. For example, NOx would be a little bit higher, 56 tons per year, and VOC would be a little bit higher, about 20 tons per year, but CO would be less, say 43 tons per year, and the particulate would be less, 43.3 tons per year. MR. CORNACCHIA: And again, I guess the question I'm trying to ask is wouldn't it be better to use the more efficient turbine, the H Series turbine, in a smaller nameplate capacity plant that was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	were previously approved at 512 with an F Series, and it's been pretty clear that the F Series is older technology and it's less efficient by 5.4 percent. My question again was using the H Series at the increased efficiency with a smaller nameplate capacity would reduce local emissions and regional emissions just exponentially by the output and the decrease in emissions? THE WITNESS (Bodell): That is not true because what I just said. I understand what you're saying, which is break apart the configuration that's set up to be very efficient, but once you break it apart, you're no longer getting the economies of scale, and as a result, you're not going to get as much displacement throughout the rest of the region from what I just said. MR. CORNACCHIA: I'm not clear on that. And I'm going to pause on that for now, but again, it was my understanding and still is my understanding that the H Series is a more efficient turbine than the F, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	THE WITNESS (Sellars): No. That's total. That is not adjusted for megawatt output. That is at 800 or so megawatts of the H machine, there would be 43.3 tons per year less particulate than the 512 megawatts from the F machine because of the improved efficiency. MR. CORNACCHIA: And then in the other categories, again, they're not lower, though? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Some are lower; some are slightly higher. For example, NOx would be a little bit higher, 56 tons per year, and VOC would be a little bit higher, about 20 tons per year, but CO would be less, say 43 tons per year, and the particulate would be less, 43.3 tons per year. MR. CORNACCHIA: And again, I guess the question I'm trying to ask is wouldn't it be better to use the more efficient turbine, the H Series turbine, in a smaller nameplate capacity plant that was previously applied for?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	were previously approved at 512 with an F Series, and it's been pretty clear that the F Series is older technology and it's less efficient by 5.4 percent. My question again was using the H Series at the increased efficiency with a smaller nameplate capacity would reduce local emissions and regional emissions just exponentially by the output and the decrease in emissions? THE WITNESS (Bodell): That is not true because what I just said. I understand what you're saying, which is break apart the configuration that's set up to be very efficient, but once you break it apart, you're no longer getting the economies of scale, and as a result, you're not going to get as much displacement throughout the rest of the region from what I just said. MR. CORNACCHIA: I'm not clear on that. And I'm going to pause on that for now, but again, it was my understanding and still is my understanding that the H Series is a more efficient turbine than the F, and at a lower megawattage, whether instead of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE WITNESS (Sellars): No. That's total. That is not adjusted for megawatt output. That is at 800 or so megawatts of the H machine, there would be 43.3 tons per year less particulate than the 512 megawatts from the F machine because of the improved efficiency. MR. CORNACCHIA: And then in the other categories, again, they're not lower, though? THE WITNESS (Sellars): Some are lower; some are slightly higher. For example, NOx would be a little bit higher, 56 tons per year, and VOC would be a little bit higher, about 20 tons per year, but CO would be less, say 43 tons per year, and the particulate would be less, 43.3 tons per year. MR. CORNACCHIA: And again, I guess the question I'm trying to ask is wouldn't it be better to use the more efficient turbine, the H Series turbine, in a smaller nameplate capacity plant that was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	were previously approved at 512 with an F Series, and it's been pretty clear that the F Series is older technology and it's less efficient by 5.4 percent. My question again was using the H Series at the increased efficiency with a smaller nameplate capacity would reduce local emissions and regional emissions just exponentially by the output and the decrease in emissions? THE WITNESS (Bodell): That is not true because what I just said. I understand what you're saying, which is break apart the configuration that's set up to be very efficient, but once you break it apart, you're no longer getting the economies of scale, and as a result, you're not going to get as much displacement throughout the rest of the region from what I just said. MR. CORNACCHIA: I'm not clear on that. And I'm going to pause on that for now, but again, it was my understanding and still is my understanding that the H Series is a more efficient turbine than the F, and

42 (Pages 705 to 708)

	Page 709		Page 711
1	smoke stack producing X amount of output is	1	MR. CORNACCHIA: Yes.
2	going to reduce the environmental strain on	2	THE WITNESS (Donovan): The
3	the local area and, as a result, also on the	3	answer is no.
4	region.	4	MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. So
5	And part of this application	5	it's not available, and it would be less
6	includes carbon offsets, and in this	6	efficient than an F Series configuration?
7	particular case and again, you just	7	THE WITNESS (Donovan): So
8	testified a little while ago that there's	8	it's not available. The H Series technology
9	going to be 39 percent more increase,	9	is not available in a smaller gas turbine
10	depending on the temperature, whether it's 20	10	that in the same two-on-one configuration
11	degrees at 39 percent or 41 percent at 70	11	would net a 512 megawatt plant.
12	degrees.	12	MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. Have
13	THE WITNESS (Bazinet): And I	13	CPV's models contemplated the need for grid
14	guess what I'm offering up to you is that	14	offset by energy conservation measures? How
15	that the capacity from this facility is going	15	much has been allotted in 2018 or, say, 2024
16	to be procured whether it's from one site or	16	calculations?
17	two sites, and I'm just telling you that the	17	THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Can
18	additional sites that would offer up the	18	you just repeat that question again?
19	additional capacity are not going to come at	19	MR. CORNACCHIA: CPV's
20	the same efficiency, economies of scale that	20	modeling, has it contemplated energy
21	this site offers. So, by definition, it will	21	conservation measures in their calculations?
22	be less efficient and less economic, cost	22	THE WITNESS (Bodell): The
23	ratepayers more, and contribute more to	23	answer is yes it has. And the energy
24	overall emissions in the region and locally.	24	efficiency was contemplated in accordance
25	MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. Cost	25	with the ISO projections.
	Page 710		Page 712
1		1	Page 712 MR.CORNACCHIA: Okay. And
1 2	Page 710 ratepayers more would be a function of the \$2.84 \$2.80, excuse me?	1 2	
11	ratepayers more would be a function of the		MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. And
2	ratepayers more would be a function of the \$2.84 \$2.80, excuse me?	2	MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. And which methodology was utilized other than the
2 3	ratepayers more would be a function of the \$2.84 \$2.80, excuse me? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): No.	2 3	MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. And which methodology was utilized other than the ISO projections? Was there a how much was
2 3 4	ratepayers more would be a function of the \$2.84 \$2.80, excuse me? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): No. It would cost ratepayers more because some	2 3 4	MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. And which methodology was utilized other than the ISO projections? Was there a how much was offset from conservation, or do you expect to
2 3 4 5	ratepayers more would be a function of the \$2.84 \$2.80, excuse me? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): No. It would cost ratepayers more because some new unit would enter the system not yet	2 3 4 5	MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. And which methodology was utilized other than the ISO projections? Was there a how much was offset from conservation, or do you expect to be offset from conservation in Connecticut
2 3 4 5 6	ratepayers more would be a function of the \$2.84 \$2.80, excuse me? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): No. It would cost ratepayers more because some new unit would enter the system not yet identified at a higher cost because smaller	2 3 4 5 6	MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. And which methodology was utilized other than the ISO projections? Was there a how much was offset from conservation, or do you expect to be offset from conservation in Connecticut and the New England markets? In other words,
2 3 4 5 6 7	ratepayers more would be a function of the \$2.84 \$2.80, excuse me? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): No. It would cost ratepayers more because some new unit would enter the system not yet identified at a higher cost because smaller plants cost more money, and most likely these would be simple cycle generating units which operate at an efficiency or a heat rate of,	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. And which methodology was utilized other than the ISO projections? Was there a how much was offset from conservation, or do you expect to be offset from conservation in Connecticut and the New England markets? In other words, is there an area inside any of your filings,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	ratepayers more would be a function of the \$2.84 \$2.80, excuse me? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): No. It would cost ratepayers more because some new unit would enter the system not yet identified at a higher cost because smaller plants cost more money, and most likely these would be simple cycle generating units which operate at an efficiency or a heat rate of, say, 9 to 10,000 Btu's a kilowatt hour versus	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. And which methodology was utilized other than the ISO projections? Was there a how much was offset from conservation, or do you expect to be offset from conservation in Connecticut and the New England markets? In other words, is there an area inside any of your filings, because I haven't found anything, that depicts that in any of the timely or Late-Filings?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	ratepayers more would be a function of the \$2.84 \$2.80, excuse me? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): No. It would cost ratepayers more because some new unit would enter the system not yet identified at a higher cost because smaller plants cost more money, and most likely these would be simple cycle generating units which operate at an efficiency or a heat rate of,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. And which methodology was utilized other than the ISO projections? Was there a how much was offset from conservation, or do you expect to be offset from conservation in Connecticut and the New England markets? In other words, is there an area inside any of your filings, because I haven't found anything, that depicts that in any of the timely or Late-Filings? THE WITNESS (Bodell): So, in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	ratepayers more would be a function of the \$2.84 \$2.80, excuse me? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): No. It would cost ratepayers more because some new unit would enter the system not yet identified at a higher cost because smaller plants cost more money, and most likely these would be simple cycle generating units which operate at an efficiency or a heat rate of, say, 9 to 10,000 Btu's a kilowatt hour versus	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. And which methodology was utilized other than the ISO projections? Was there a how much was offset from conservation, or do you expect to be offset from conservation in Connecticut and the New England markets? In other words, is there an area inside any of your filings, because I haven't found anything, that depicts that in any of the timely or Late-Filings? THE WITNESS (Bodell): So, in Exhibit 2 to the petition, there's a section
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	ratepayers more would be a function of the \$2.84 \$2.80, excuse me? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): No. It would cost ratepayers more because some new unit would enter the system not yet identified at a higher cost because smaller plants cost more money, and most likely these would be simple cycle generating units which operate at an efficiency or a heat rate of, say, 9 to 10,000 Btu's a kilowatt hour versus the 6,400 Btu's a kilowatt hour that this plant generates at. MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. So the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. And which methodology was utilized other than the ISO projections? Was there a how much was offset from conservation, or do you expect to be offset from conservation in Connecticut and the New England markets? In other words, is there an area inside any of your filings, because I haven't found anything, that depicts that in any of the timely or Late-Filings? THE WITNESS (Bodell): So, in Exhibit 2 to the petition, there's a section that describes the economic modeling that was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	ratepayers more would be a function of the \$2.84 \$2.80, excuse me? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): No. It would cost ratepayers more because some new unit would enter the system not yet identified at a higher cost because smaller plants cost more money, and most likely these would be simple cycle generating units which operate at an efficiency or a heat rate of, say, 9 to 10,000 Btu's a kilowatt hour versus the 6,400 Btu's a kilowatt hour that this plant generates at. MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. So the H Series turbine in a smaller configuration	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. And which methodology was utilized other than the ISO projections? Was there a how much was offset from conservation, or do you expect to be offset from conservation in Connecticut and the New England markets? In other words, is there an area inside any of your filings, because I haven't found anything, that depicts that in any of the timely or Late-Filings? THE WITNESS (Bodell): So, in Exhibit 2 to the petition, there's a section that describes the economic modeling that was performed to calculate the benefits in terms
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	ratepayers more would be a function of the \$2.84 \$2.80, excuse me? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): No. It would cost ratepayers more because some new unit would enter the system not yet identified at a higher cost because smaller plants cost more money, and most likely these would be simple cycle generating units which operate at an efficiency or a heat rate of, say, 9 to 10,000 Btu's a kilowatt hour versus the 6,400 Btu's a kilowatt hour that this plant generates at. MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. So the H Series turbine in a smaller configuration is not possible then?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. And which methodology was utilized other than the ISO projections? Was there a how much was offset from conservation, or do you expect to be offset from conservation in Connecticut and the New England markets? In other words, is there an area inside any of your filings, because I haven't found anything, that depicts that in any of the timely or Late-Filings? THE WITNESS (Bodell): So, in Exhibit 2 to the petition, there's a section that describes the economic modeling that was performed to calculate the benefits in terms of lower energy costs and lower emittents
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	ratepayers more would be a function of the \$2.84 \$2.80, excuse me? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): No. It would cost ratepayers more because some new unit would enter the system not yet identified at a higher cost because smaller plants cost more money, and most likely these would be simple cycle generating units which operate at an efficiency or a heat rate of, say, 9 to 10,000 Btu's a kilowatt hour versus the 6,400 Btu's a kilowatt hour that this plant generates at. MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. So the H Series turbine in a smaller configuration is not possible then? THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. And which methodology was utilized other than the ISO projections? Was there a how much was offset from conservation, or do you expect to be offset from conservation in Connecticut and the New England markets? In other words, is there an area inside any of your filings, because I haven't found anything, that depicts that in any of the timely or Late-Filings? THE WITNESS (Bodell): So, in Exhibit 2 to the petition, there's a section that describes the economic modeling that was performed to calculate the benefits in terms of lower energy costs and lower emittents tied to the dispatch of this plant on the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	ratepayers more would be a function of the \$2.84 \$2.80, excuse me? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): No. It would cost ratepayers more because some new unit would enter the system not yet identified at a higher cost because smaller plants cost more money, and most likely these would be simple cycle generating units which operate at an efficiency or a heat rate of, say, 9 to 10,000 Btu's a kilowatt hour versus the 6,400 Btu's a kilowatt hour that this plant generates at. MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. So the H Series turbine in a smaller configuration is not possible then? THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's correct. If you broke the configuration into	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. And which methodology was utilized other than the ISO projections? Was there a how much was offset from conservation, or do you expect to be offset from conservation in Connecticut and the New England markets? In other words, is there an area inside any of your filings, because I haven't found anything, that depicts that in any of the timely or Late-Filings? THE WITNESS (Bodell): So, in Exhibit 2 to the petition, there's a section that describes the economic modeling that was performed to calculate the benefits in terms of lower energy costs and lower emittents tied to the dispatch of this plant on the system. And in that section it has a load
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	ratepayers more would be a function of the \$2.84 \$2.80, excuse me? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): No. It would cost ratepayers more because some new unit would enter the system not yet identified at a higher cost because smaller plants cost more money, and most likely these would be simple cycle generating units which operate at an efficiency or a heat rate of, say, 9 to 10,000 Btu's a kilowatt hour versus the 6,400 Btu's a kilowatt hour that this plant generates at. MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. So the H Series turbine in a smaller configuration is not possible then? THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's correct. If you broke the configuration into a one-on-one, it wouldn't have that same	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. And which methodology was utilized other than the ISO projections? Was there a how much was offset from conservation, or do you expect to be offset from conservation in Connecticut and the New England markets? In other words, is there an area inside any of your filings, because I haven't found anything, that depicts that in any of the timely or Late-Filings? THE WITNESS (Bodell): So, in Exhibit 2 to the petition, there's a section that describes the economic modeling that was performed to calculate the benefits in terms of lower energy costs and lower emittents tied to the dispatch of this plant on the system. And in that section it has a load projection, and it was in the load projection
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	ratepayers more would be a function of the \$2.84 \$2.80, excuse me? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): No. It would cost ratepayers more because some new unit would enter the system not yet identified at a higher cost because smaller plants cost more money, and most likely these would be simple cycle generating units which operate at an efficiency or a heat rate of, say, 9 to 10,000 Btu's a kilowatt hour versus the 6,400 Btu's a kilowatt hour that this plant generates at. MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. So the H Series turbine in a smaller configuration is not possible then? THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's correct. If you broke the configuration into a one-on-one, it wouldn't have that same efficiency benefit.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. And which methodology was utilized other than the ISO projections? Was there a how much was offset from conservation, or do you expect to be offset from conservation in Connecticut and the New England markets? In other words, is there an area inside any of your filings, because I haven't found anything, that depicts that in any of the timely or Late-Filings? THE WITNESS (Bodell): So, in Exhibit 2 to the petition, there's a section that describes the economic modeling that was performed to calculate the benefits in terms of lower energy costs and lower emittents tied to the dispatch of this plant on the system. And in that section it has a load projection, and it was in the load projection that we incorporated the energy efficiency
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	ratepayers more would be a function of the \$2.84 \$2.80, excuse me? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): No. It would cost ratepayers more because some new unit would enter the system not yet identified at a higher cost because smaller plants cost more money, and most likely these would be simple cycle generating units which operate at an efficiency or a heat rate of, say, 9 to 10,000 Btu's a kilowatt hour versus the 6,400 Btu's a kilowatt hour that this plant generates at. MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. So the H Series turbine in a smaller configuration is not possible then? THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's correct. If you broke the configuration into a one-on-one, it wouldn't have that same efficiency benefit. MR. CORNACCHIA: Would it be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. And which methodology was utilized other than the ISO projections? Was there a how much was offset from conservation, or do you expect to be offset from conservation in Connecticut and the New England markets? In other words, is there an area inside any of your filings, because I haven't found anything, that depicts that in any of the timely or Late-Filings? THE WITNESS (Bodell): So, in Exhibit 2 to the petition, there's a section that describes the economic modeling that was performed to calculate the benefits in terms of lower energy costs and lower emittents tied to the dispatch of this plant on the system. And in that section it has a load projection, and it was in the load projection that we incorporated the energy efficiency which, in effect, with respect to the system
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	ratepayers more would be a function of the \$2.84 \$2.80, excuse me? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): No. It would cost ratepayers more because some new unit would enter the system not yet identified at a higher cost because smaller plants cost more money, and most likely these would be simple cycle generating units which operate at an efficiency or a heat rate of, say, 9 to 10,000 Btu's a kilowatt hour versus the 6,400 Btu's a kilowatt hour that this plant generates at. MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. So the H Series turbine in a smaller configuration is not possible then? THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's correct. If you broke the configuration into a one-on-one, it wouldn't have that same efficiency benefit. MR. CORNACCHIA: Would it be more or less efficient than the F Series?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. And which methodology was utilized other than the ISO projections? Was there a how much was offset from conservation, or do you expect to be offset from conservation in Connecticut and the New England markets? In other words, is there an area inside any of your filings, because I haven't found anything, that depicts that in any of the timely or Late-Filings? THE WITNESS (Bodell): So, in Exhibit 2 to the petition, there's a section that describes the economic modeling that was performed to calculate the benefits in terms of lower energy costs and lower emittents tied to the dispatch of this plant on the system. And in that section it has a load projection, and it was in the load projection that we incorporated the energy efficiency which, in effect, with respect to the system economics shows itself in the form of a lower
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	ratepayers more would be a function of the \$2.84 \$2.80, excuse me? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): No. It would cost ratepayers more because some new unit would enter the system not yet identified at a higher cost because smaller plants cost more money, and most likely these would be simple cycle generating units which operate at an efficiency or a heat rate of, say, 9 to 10,000 Btu's a kilowatt hour versus the 6,400 Btu's a kilowatt hour that this plant generates at. MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. So the H Series turbine in a smaller configuration is not possible then? THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's correct. If you broke the configuration into a one-on-one, it wouldn't have that same efficiency benefit. MR. CORNACCHIA: Would it be more or less efficient than the F Series? THE WITNESS (Donovan): So	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. And which methodology was utilized other than the ISO projections? Was there a how much was offset from conservation, or do you expect to be offset from conservation in Connecticut and the New England markets? In other words, is there an area inside any of your filings, because I haven't found anything, that depicts that in any of the timely or Late-Filings? THE WITNESS (Bodell): So, in Exhibit 2 to the petition, there's a section that describes the economic modeling that was performed to calculate the benefits in terms of lower energy costs and lower emittents tied to the dispatch of this plant on the system. And in that section it has a load projection, and it was in the load projection that we incorporated the energy efficiency which, in effect, with respect to the system economics shows itself in the form of a lower load forecast, lower energy demand than what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	ratepayers more would be a function of the \$2.84 \$2.80, excuse me? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): No. It would cost ratepayers more because some new unit would enter the system not yet identified at a higher cost because smaller plants cost more money, and most likely these would be simple cycle generating units which operate at an efficiency or a heat rate of, say, 9 to 10,000 Btu's a kilowatt hour versus the 6,400 Btu's a kilowatt hour that this plant generates at. MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. So the H Series turbine in a smaller configuration is not possible then? THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's correct. If you broke the configuration into a one-on-one, it wouldn't have that same efficiency benefit. MR. CORNACCHIA: Would it be more or less efficient than the F Series? THE WITNESS (Donovan): So that I understand your question, are you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. And which methodology was utilized other than the ISO projections? Was there a how much was offset from conservation, or do you expect to be offset from conservation in Connecticut and the New England markets? In other words, is there an area inside any of your filings, because I haven't found anything, that depicts that in any of the timely or Late-Filings? THE WITNESS (Bodell): So, in Exhibit 2 to the petition, there's a section that describes the economic modeling that was performed to calculate the benefits in terms of lower energy costs and lower emittents tied to the dispatch of this plant on the system. And in that section it has a load projection, and it was in the load projection that we incorporated the energy efficiency which, in effect, with respect to the system economics shows itself in the form of a lower load forecast, lower energy demand than what would otherwise be required.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	ratepayers more would be a function of the \$2.84 \$2.80, excuse me? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): No. It would cost ratepayers more because some new unit would enter the system not yet identified at a higher cost because smaller plants cost more money, and most likely these would be simple cycle generating units which operate at an efficiency or a heat rate of, say, 9 to 10,000 Btu's a kilowatt hour versus the 6,400 Btu's a kilowatt hour that this plant generates at. MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. So the H Series turbine in a smaller configuration is not possible then? THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's correct. If you broke the configuration into a one-on-one, it wouldn't have that same efficiency benefit. MR. CORNACCHIA: Would it be more or less efficient than the F Series? THE WITNESS (Donovan): So that I understand your question, are you asking if the H technology is available in a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. And which methodology was utilized other than the ISO projections? Was there a how much was offset from conservation in Connecticut and the New England markets? In other words, is there an area inside any of your filings, because I haven't found anything, that depicts that in any of the timely or Late-Filings? THE WITNESS (Bodell): So, in Exhibit 2 to the petition, there's a section that describes the economic modeling that was performed to calculate the benefits in terms of lower energy costs and lower emittents tied to the dispatch of this plant on the system. And in that section it has a load projection, and it was in the load projection that we incorporated the energy efficiency which, in effect, with respect to the system economics shows itself in the form of a lower load forecast, lower energy demand than what would otherwise be required.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	ratepayers more would be a function of the \$2.84 \$2.80, excuse me? THE WITNESS (Bazinet): No. It would cost ratepayers more because some new unit would enter the system not yet identified at a higher cost because smaller plants cost more money, and most likely these would be simple cycle generating units which operate at an efficiency or a heat rate of, say, 9 to 10,000 Btu's a kilowatt hour versus the 6,400 Btu's a kilowatt hour that this plant generates at. MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. So the H Series turbine in a smaller configuration is not possible then? THE WITNESS (Donovan): That's correct. If you broke the configuration into a one-on-one, it wouldn't have that same efficiency benefit. MR. CORNACCHIA: Would it be more or less efficient than the F Series? THE WITNESS (Donovan): So that I understand your question, are you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. And which methodology was utilized other than the ISO projections? Was there a how much was offset from conservation, or do you expect to be offset from conservation in Connecticut and the New England markets? In other words, is there an area inside any of your filings, because I haven't found anything, that depicts that in any of the timely or Late-Filings? THE WITNESS (Bodell): So, in Exhibit 2 to the petition, there's a section that describes the economic modeling that was performed to calculate the benefits in terms of lower energy costs and lower emittents tied to the dispatch of this plant on the system. And in that section it has a load projection, and it was in the load projection that we incorporated the energy efficiency which, in effect, with respect to the system economics shows itself in the form of a lower load forecast, lower energy demand than what would otherwise be required.

43 (Pages 709 to 712)

	Page 713		Page 715
1	talk about in their forecast, their 2014	1	out there.
2	forecast, that actions across the region are	2	MR. CORNACCHIA: And again, my
3	advancing energy efficiency and developing	3	concern is from a conservation and load
4	renewable resources and reducing pollutants	4	management standpoint. We all know that
5	from power plants will have a major impact on	5	technology moves faster than the speed of
6	the region, and this is their quote. And	6	light. I mean, if you look at, say, 1999
7	they're talking about the addition of	7	when this application was originally approved
8	approximately 700 megawatts of wind turbine	8	for 512, your cell phone looked remarkably
9	power which is expected. Are those	9	different than the one you're currently using
10	calculations part of your calculations in the	10	now, and efficiency measures likely could
11	determination of need?	11	increase exponentially depending upon the
12	THE WITNESS (Bodell): Yes.	12	decreased demands of our particular area or
13	If you go to page 40 of Exhibit 2, we	13	the region. I don't see in your modeling
14	describe a summary of our load growth and	14	anywhere where Exhibit 2 takes into account
15	peak demand forecasts. So there's two	15	the Integrated Resource Plan for Connecticut,
16	aspects. One is the total energy required by	16	and this is the 2014 cumulative energy
17	the system by end users. The other is what's	17	savings that are contemplated.
18	the peak demand or the highest amount of	18	Is that in there, or again, am
19	energy that's required. That's important	19	I missing something? And I'm talking about
20	because that peak demand is, in most part,	20	the cumulative energy savings which is
21	being met by very inefficient, high polluting	21	expected to reach between 309 and 413
22	combustion turbines or oil-fired units.	22	megawatts. If you go back since 1999, the
23	So we have both the load	23	energy savings that were incorporated in the
24	growth and the peak demand forecast. We used	24	conservation and load management programs
25	a combination of NERC data from 2012 to '13	25	that Connecticut was very diligent in
	$D_{a} = 714$		
	Page 714		Page 716
1	and the ISO New England report from June 4th	1	Page 716 implementing, it negated the need for further
1 2		1 2	
	and the ISO New England report from June 4th of last year. And if you look at page 40 of Exhibit 2, it says the base case analysis		implementing, it negated the need for further
2 3 4	and the ISO New England report from June 4th of last year. And if you look at page 40 of Exhibit 2, it says the base case analysis assumed 1,900 megawatts of passive demand	2	implementing, it negated the need for further generation at the time and actually MR. SMALL: Is there a question here?
2 3 4 5	and the ISO New England report from June 4th of last year. And if you look at page 40 of Exhibit 2, it says the base case analysis assumed 1,900 megawatts of passive demand response in 2018, growing to 2,200 megawatts	2 3 4 5	implementing, it negated the need for further generation at the time and actually MR. SMALL: Is there a question here? MR. CORNACCHIA: There is a
2 3 4 5 6	and the ISO New England report from June 4th of last year. And if you look at page 40 of Exhibit 2, it says the base case analysis assumed 1,900 megawatts of passive demand response in 2018, growing to 2,200 megawatts in 2028. And in addition to that, we assumed	2 3 4	implementing, it negated the need for further generation at the time and actually MR. SMALL: Is there a question here? MR. CORNACCHIA: There is a question, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7	and the ISO New England report from June 4th of last year. And if you look at page 40 of Exhibit 2, it says the base case analysis assumed 1,900 megawatts of passive demand response in 2018, growing to 2,200 megawatts in 2028. And in addition to that, we assumed active demand response, which is going to be	2 3 4 5 6 7	implementing, it negated the need for further generation at the time and actually MR. SMALL: Is there a question here? MR. CORNACCHIA: There is a question, yes. MR. SMALL: Please state your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	and the ISO New England report from June 4th of last year. And if you look at page 40 of Exhibit 2, it says the base case analysis assumed 1,900 megawatts of passive demand response in 2018, growing to 2,200 megawatts in 2028. And in addition to that, we assumed active demand response, which is going to be price responsive, of 994 megawatts in 2018,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	implementing, it negated the need for further generation at the time and actually MR. SMALL: Is there a question here? MR. CORNACCHIA: There is a question, yes. MR. SMALL: Please state your question.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	and the ISO New England report from June 4th of last year. And if you look at page 40 of Exhibit 2, it says the base case analysis assumed 1,900 megawatts of passive demand response in 2018, growing to 2,200 megawatts in 2028. And in addition to that, we assumed active demand response, which is going to be price responsive, of 994 megawatts in 2018, and we kept that constant through 2028. Now,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	implementing, it negated the need for further generation at the time and actually MR. SMALL: Is there a question here? MR. CORNACCHIA: There is a question, yes. MR. SMALL: Please state your question. MR. CORNACCHIA: I'm trying to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	and the ISO New England report from June 4th of last year. And if you look at page 40 of Exhibit 2, it says the base case analysis assumed 1,900 megawatts of passive demand response in 2018, growing to 2,200 megawatts in 2028. And in addition to that, we assumed active demand response, which is going to be price responsive, of 994 megawatts in 2018, and we kept that constant through 2028. Now, that's how much potential demand response	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	implementing, it negated the need for further generation at the time and actually MR. SMALL: Is there a question here? MR. CORNACCHIA: There is a question, yes. MR. SMALL: Please state your question. MR. CORNACCHIA: I'm trying to preface a statement towards the conservation
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	and the ISO New England report from June 4th of last year. And if you look at page 40 of Exhibit 2, it says the base case analysis assumed 1,900 megawatts of passive demand response in 2018, growing to 2,200 megawatts in 2028. And in addition to that, we assumed active demand response, which is going to be price responsive, of 994 megawatts in 2018, and we kept that constant through 2028. Now, that's how much potential demand response there is, and as a result, we kept that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	implementing, it negated the need for further generation at the time and actually MR. SMALL: Is there a question here? MR. CORNACCHIA: There is a question, yes. MR. SMALL: Please state your question. MR. CORNACCHIA: I'm trying to preface a statement towards the conservation and load management questions that I'm not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	and the ISO New England report from June 4th of last year. And if you look at page 40 of Exhibit 2, it says the base case analysis assumed 1,900 megawatts of passive demand response in 2018, growing to 2,200 megawatts in 2028. And in addition to that, we assumed active demand response, which is going to be price responsive, of 994 megawatts in 2018, and we kept that constant through 2028. Now, that's how much potential demand response there is, and as a result, we kept that constant. Whether or not it's being used is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 implementing, it negated the need for further generation at the time and actually MR. SMALL: Is there a question here? MR. CORNACCHIA: There is a question, yes. MR. SMALL: Please state your question. MR. CORNACCHIA: I'm trying to preface a statement towards the conservation and load management questions that I'm not seeing addressed, and the increased product
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	and the ISO New England report from June 4th of last year. And if you look at page 40 of Exhibit 2, it says the base case analysis assumed 1,900 megawatts of passive demand response in 2018, growing to 2,200 megawatts in 2028. And in addition to that, we assumed active demand response, which is going to be price responsive, of 994 megawatts in 2018, and we kept that constant through 2028. Now, that's how much potential demand response there is, and as a result, we kept that constant. Whether or not it's being used is going to be a function of the demand on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 implementing, it negated the need for further generation at the time and actually MR. SMALL: Is there a question here? MR. CORNACCHIA: There is a question, yes. MR. SMALL: Please state your question. MR. CORNACCHIA: I'm trying to preface a statement towards the conservation and load management questions that I'm not seeing addressed, and the increased product efficiency standards back then and now
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	and the ISO New England report from June 4th of last year. And if you look at page 40 of Exhibit 2, it says the base case analysis assumed 1,900 megawatts of passive demand response in 2018, growing to 2,200 megawatts in 2028. And in addition to that, we assumed active demand response, which is going to be price responsive, of 994 megawatts in 2018, and we kept that constant through 2028. Now, that's how much potential demand response there is, and as a result, we kept that constant. Whether or not it's being used is going to be a function of the demand on the system and the availability of the price	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 implementing, it negated the need for further generation at the time and actually MR. SMALL: Is there a question here? MR. CORNACCHIA: There is a question, yes. MR. SMALL: Please state your question. MR. CORNACCHIA: I'm trying to preface a statement towards the conservation and load management questions that I'm not seeing addressed, and the increased product efficiency standards back then and now resulted in Connecticut going from a net
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	and the ISO New England report from June 4th of last year. And if you look at page 40 of Exhibit 2, it says the base case analysis assumed 1,900 megawatts of passive demand response in 2018, growing to 2,200 megawatts in 2028. And in addition to that, we assumed active demand response, which is going to be price responsive, of 994 megawatts in 2018, and we kept that constant through 2028. Now, that's how much potential demand response there is, and as a result, we kept that constant. Whether or not it's being used is going to be a function of the demand on the system and the availability of the price point.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 implementing, it negated the need for further generation at the time and actually MR. SMALL: Is there a question here? MR. CORNACCHIA: There is a question, yes. MR. SMALL: Please state your question. MR. CORNACCHIA: I'm trying to preface a statement towards the conservation and load management questions that I'm not seeing addressed, and the increased product efficiency standards back then and now resulted in Connecticut going from a net importing to a net exporting state.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	and the ISO New England report from June 4th of last year. And if you look at page 40 of Exhibit 2, it says the base case analysis assumed 1,900 megawatts of passive demand response in 2018, growing to 2,200 megawatts in 2028. And in addition to that, we assumed active demand response, which is going to be price responsive, of 994 megawatts in 2018, and we kept that constant through 2028. Now, that's how much potential demand response there is, and as a result, we kept that constant. Whether or not it's being used is going to be a function of the demand on the system and the availability of the price point. MR. CORNACCHIA: Do you expect	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 implementing, it negated the need for further generation at the time and actually MR. SMALL: Is there a question here? MR. CORNACCHIA: There is a question, yes. MR. SMALL: Please state your question. MR. CORNACCHIA: I'm trying to preface a statement towards the conservation and load management questions that I'm not seeing addressed, and the increased product efficiency standards back then and now resulted in Connecticut going from a net importing to a net exporting state. So I guess my question is: In
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	and the ISO New England report from June 4th of last year. And if you look at page 40 of Exhibit 2, it says the base case analysis assumed 1,900 megawatts of passive demand response in 2018, growing to 2,200 megawatts in 2028. And in addition to that, we assumed active demand response, which is going to be price responsive, of 994 megawatts in 2018, and we kept that constant through 2028. Now, that's how much potential demand response there is, and as a result, we kept that constant. Whether or not it's being used is going to be a function of the demand on the system and the availability of the price point. MR. CORNACCHIA: Do you expect that to remain constant, or do you expect it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 implementing, it negated the need for further generation at the time and actually MR. SMALL: Is there a question here? MR. CORNACCHIA: There is a question, yes. MR. SMALL: Please state your question. MR. CORNACCHIA: I'm trying to preface a statement towards the conservation and load management questions that I'm not seeing addressed, and the increased product efficiency standards back then and now resulted in Connecticut going from a net importing to a net exporting state. So I guess my question is: In your plan does it contemplate the integrated
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	and the ISO New England report from June 4th of last year. And if you look at page 40 of Exhibit 2, it says the base case analysis assumed 1,900 megawatts of passive demand response in 2018, growing to 2,200 megawatts in 2028. And in addition to that, we assumed active demand response, which is going to be price responsive, of 994 megawatts in 2018, and we kept that constant through 2028. Now, that's how much potential demand response there is, and as a result, we kept that constant. Whether or not it's being used is going to be a function of the demand on the system and the availability of the price point. MR. CORNACCHIA: Do you expect it to increase or decrease?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 implementing, it negated the need for further generation at the time and actually MR. SMALL: Is there a question here? MR. CORNACCHIA: There is a question, yes. MR. SMALL: Please state your question. MR. CORNACCHIA: I'm trying to preface a statement towards the conservation and load management questions that I'm not seeing addressed, and the increased product efficiency standards back then and now resulted in Connecticut going from a net importing to a net exporting state. So I guess my question is: In your plan does it contemplate the integrated resource plan for Connecticut and their
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	and the ISO New England report from June 4th of last year. And if you look at page 40 of Exhibit 2, it says the base case analysis assumed 1,900 megawatts of passive demand response in 2018, growing to 2,200 megawatts in 2028. And in addition to that, we assumed active demand response, which is going to be price responsive, of 994 megawatts in 2018, and we kept that constant through 2028. Now, that's how much potential demand response there is, and as a result, we kept that constant. Whether or not it's being used is going to be a function of the demand on the system and the availability of the price point. MR. CORNACCHIA: Do you expect that to remain constant, or do you expect it to increase or decrease? THE WITNESS (Bodell):	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 implementing, it negated the need for further generation at the time and actually MR. SMALL: Is there a question here? MR. CORNACCHIA: There is a question, yes. MR. SMALL: Please state your question. MR. CORNACCHIA: I'm trying to preface a statement towards the conservation and load management questions that I'm not seeing addressed, and the increased product efficiency standards back then and now resulted in Connecticut going from a net importing to a net exporting state. So I guess my question is: In your plan does it contemplate the integrated resource plan for Connecticut and their findings?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	and the ISO New England report from June 4th of last year. And if you look at page 40 of Exhibit 2, it says the base case analysis assumed 1,900 megawatts of passive demand response in 2018, growing to 2,200 megawatts in 2028. And in addition to that, we assumed active demand response, which is going to be price responsive, of 994 megawatts in 2018, and we kept that constant through 2028. Now, that's how much potential demand response there is, and as a result, we kept that constant. Whether or not it's being used is going to be a function of the demand on the system and the availability of the price point. MR. CORNACCHIA: Do you expect that to remain constant, or do you expect it to increase or decrease? THE WITNESS (Bodell): Depending on market conditions, I would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 implementing, it negated the need for further generation at the time and actually MR. SMALL: Is there a question here? MR. CORNACCHIA: There is a question, yes. MR. SMALL: Please state your question. MR. CORNACCHIA: I'm trying to preface a statement towards the conservation and load management questions that I'm not seeing addressed, and the increased product efficiency standards back then and now resulted in Connecticut going from a net importing to a net exporting state. So I guess my question is: In your plan does it contemplate the integrated resource plan for Connecticut and their findings? THE WITNESS (Bodell): So, to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	and the ISO New England report from June 4th of last year. And if you look at page 40 of Exhibit 2, it says the base case analysis assumed 1,900 megawatts of passive demand response in 2018, growing to 2,200 megawatts in 2028. And in addition to that, we assumed active demand response, which is going to be price responsive, of 994 megawatts in 2018, and we kept that constant through 2028. Now, that's how much potential demand response there is, and as a result, we kept that constant. Whether or not it's being used is going to be a function of the demand on the system and the availability of the price point. MR. CORNACCHIA: Do you expect that to remain constant, or do you expect it to increase or decrease? THE WITNESS (Bodell): Depending on market conditions, I would expect it to change, and that's what the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 implementing, it negated the need for further generation at the time and actually MR. SMALL: Is there a question here? MR. CORNACCHIA: There is a question, yes. MR. SMALL: Please state your question. MR. CORNACCHIA: I'm trying to preface a statement towards the conservation and load management questions that I'm not seeing addressed, and the increased product efficiency standards back then and now resulted in Connecticut going from a net importing to a net exporting state. So I guess my question is: In your plan does it contemplate the integrated resource plan for Connecticut and their findings? THE WITNESS (Bodell): So, to address your question, the answer is, yes, it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	and the ISO New England report from June 4th of last year. And if you look at page 40 of Exhibit 2, it says the base case analysis assumed 1,900 megawatts of passive demand response in 2018, growing to 2,200 megawatts in 2028. And in addition to that, we assumed active demand response, which is going to be price responsive, of 994 megawatts in 2018, and we kept that constant through 2028. Now, that's how much potential demand response there is, and as a result, we kept that constant. Whether or not it's being used is going to be a function of the demand on the system and the availability of the price point. MR. CORNACCHIA: Do you expect that to remain constant, or do you expect it to increase or decrease? THE WITNESS (Bodell): Depending on market conditions, I would expect it to change, and that's what the model incorporates and takes into account,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 implementing, it negated the need for further generation at the time and actually MR. SMALL: Is there a question here? MR. CORNACCHIA: There is a question, yes. MR. SMALL: Please state your question. MR. CORNACCHIA: I'm trying to preface a statement towards the conservation and load management questions that I'm not seeing addressed, and the increased product efficiency standards back then and now resulted in Connecticut going from a net importing to a net exporting state. So I guess my question is: In your plan does it contemplate the integrated resource plan for Connecticut and their findings? THE WITNESS (Bodell): So, to address your question, the answer is, yes, it does. The forecast of the active and passive
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and the ISO New England report from June 4th of last year. And if you look at page 40 of Exhibit 2, it says the base case analysis assumed 1,900 megawatts of passive demand response in 2018, growing to 2,200 megawatts in 2028. And in addition to that, we assumed active demand response, which is going to be price responsive, of 994 megawatts in 2018, and we kept that constant through 2028. Now, that's how much potential demand response there is, and as a result, we kept that constant. Whether or not it's being used is going to be a function of the demand on the system and the availability of the price point. MR. CORNACCHIA: Do you expect that to remain constant, or do you expect it to increase or decrease? THE WITNESS (Bodell): Depending on market conditions, I would expect it to change, and that's what the model incorporates and takes into account, but as far as the 994 megawatts of active	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 implementing, it negated the need for further generation at the time and actually MR. SMALL: Is there a question here? MR. CORNACCHIA: There is a question, yes. MR. SMALL: Please state your question. MR. CORNACCHIA: I'm trying to preface a statement towards the conservation and load management questions that I'm not seeing addressed, and the increased product efficiency standards back then and now resulted in Connecticut going from a net importing to a net exporting state. So I guess my question is: In your plan does it contemplate the integrated resource plan for Connecticut and their findings? THE WITNESS (Bodell): So, to address your question, the answer is, yes, it does. The forecast of the active and passive demand response that we incorporate into our
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	and the ISO New England report from June 4th of last year. And if you look at page 40 of Exhibit 2, it says the base case analysis assumed 1,900 megawatts of passive demand response in 2018, growing to 2,200 megawatts in 2028. And in addition to that, we assumed active demand response, which is going to be price responsive, of 994 megawatts in 2018, and we kept that constant through 2028. Now, that's how much potential demand response there is, and as a result, we kept that constant. Whether or not it's being used is going to be a function of the demand on the system and the availability of the price point. MR. CORNACCHIA: Do you expect that to remain constant, or do you expect it to increase or decrease? THE WITNESS (Bodell): Depending on market conditions, I would expect it to change, and that's what the model incorporates and takes into account, but as far as the 994 megawatts of active demand response, I think these are estimates	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 implementing, it negated the need for further generation at the time and actually MR. SMALL: Is there a question here? MR. CORNACCHIA: There is a question, yes. MR. SMALL: Please state your question. MR. CORNACCHIA: I'm trying to preface a statement towards the conservation and load management questions that I'm not seeing addressed, and the increased product efficiency standards back then and now resulted in Connecticut going from a net importing to a net exporting state. So I guess my question is: In your plan does it contemplate the integrated resource plan for Connecticut and their findings? THE WITNESS (Bodell): So, to address your question, the answer is, yes, it does. The forecast of the active and passive demand response that we incorporate into our model includes the Connecticut projections as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and the ISO New England report from June 4th of last year. And if you look at page 40 of Exhibit 2, it says the base case analysis assumed 1,900 megawatts of passive demand response in 2018, growing to 2,200 megawatts in 2028. And in addition to that, we assumed active demand response, which is going to be price responsive, of 994 megawatts in 2018, and we kept that constant through 2028. Now, that's how much potential demand response there is, and as a result, we kept that constant. Whether or not it's being used is going to be a function of the demand on the system and the availability of the price point. MR. CORNACCHIA: Do you expect that to remain constant, or do you expect it to increase or decrease? THE WITNESS (Bodell): Depending on market conditions, I would expect it to change, and that's what the model incorporates and takes into account, but as far as the 994 megawatts of active	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 implementing, it negated the need for further generation at the time and actually MR. SMALL: Is there a question here? MR. CORNACCHIA: There is a question, yes. MR. SMALL: Please state your question. MR. CORNACCHIA: I'm trying to preface a statement towards the conservation and load management questions that I'm not seeing addressed, and the increased product efficiency standards back then and now resulted in Connecticut going from a net importing to a net exporting state. So I guess my question is: In your plan does it contemplate the integrated resource plan for Connecticut and their findings? THE WITNESS (Bodell): So, to address your question, the answer is, yes, it does. The forecast of the active and passive demand response that we incorporate into our

44 (Pages 713 to 716)

	Page 717		Page 719
1	New England.	1	and part of looking at the reality of how
2	And I also think it's	2	much can get built versus how much has been
3	important to say we're concerned very much,	3	announced, we look at what's been announced,
4	and the region is very concerned about	4	and on top of that we include additional
5	potential generation capacity between now and	5	build-out to reflect the emissions and
6	2018. And that is a critical, as the recent	6	renewable energy targets that the different
7	capacity market showed, that's a critical	7	states have declared as part of their policy.
8	need that is needed today. The potential for	8	THE WITNESS (Bazinet): And I
9	improved energy efficiency and demand	9	would add to that, in that regard, our
10	response in the 2020 period, we do take that	10	forecasts are extremely conservative in the
11	into account with the numbers that I	11	benefits that Towantic can provide in the
12	indicated, and it's listed in the assumptions	12	state because the reality is it's not likely
13	in our report. It does incorporate	13	that the build-out of renewables is going to
14	Connecticut as well as New Hampshire,	14	happen in accordance with renewable portfolio
15	Massachusetts, Vermont, the New England	15	standards just because there's not enough out
16	systems' projections of demand response and	16	there today, and if they don't get started
17	energy efficiency.	17	today, they're just never going to or
18	So we have taken that into	18	they're never going to happen in the time
19	account. It is identified in Exhibit 2. And	19	frame that this plant will be commercial.
20	the load projection that comes from that,	20	So you could argue that
21	which is fairly tepid frankly, to be honest	21	beginning with 2018 the benefits that this
22	with you, is also part of our projections.	22	plant will generate are far in excess of what
23	MR. CORNACCHIA: And these are	23	we've projected, however, we've taken a
24	for Connecticut or for all of New England?	24	conservative
25	THE WITNESS (Bodell): It's	25	THE WITNESS (Bodell): And you
	Page 718		Page 720
1	for Connecticut and New England. Our	1	mentioned the IRP. Once the IRP did come
2	electricity market model has every generating	2	out, we looked at the assumptions in the IRP.
3	unit, every transmission line, basically	3	For the most part the conclusions and the
4	every transmission line that's on the high	4	assumptions are very consistent with what
5	voltage system, and it has a number. When I	5	we've used. There are some things on the
6	say "number," like thousands, hundreds of	6	edges, but I think CPV is going to provide
7 8	load nodes. So we use GE MAPS. It's a very, very detailed model. So we have Connecticut	7 8	comments, apparently, on that.
			THE WITNESS (D_{-}) (D_{-})
			THE WITNESS (Bazinet): Yes,
9	modeled. We have every state in New England	9	we did. The final thing that I'd like to
9 10	modeled. We have every state in New England modeled. And we have assumptions with	9 10	we did. The final thing that I'd like to mention is that we haven't at all quantified
9 10 11	modeled. We have every state in New England modeled. And we have assumptions with respect to imports and exports that are part	9 10 11	we did. The final thing that I'd like to mention is that we haven't at all quantified the benefits of our plant clearing the
9 10 11 12	modeled. We have every state in New England modeled. And we have assumptions with respect to imports and exports that are part of the analysis.	9 10 11 12	we did. The final thing that I'd like to mention is that we haven't at all quantified the benefits of our plant clearing the capacity market. So, as you know or as you
9 10 11 12 13	modeled. We have every state in New England modeled. And we have assumptions with respect to imports and exports that are part of the analysis. So, yes, Connecticut is	9 10 11 12 13	we did. The final thing that I'd like to mention is that we haven't at all quantified the benefits of our plant clearing the capacity market. So, as you know or as you may know, the wholesale power markets are
9 10 11 12 13 14	modeled. We have every state in New England modeled. And we have assumptions with respect to imports and exports that are part of the analysis. So, yes, Connecticut is modeled. The Connecticut projections for	9 10 11 12 13 14	we did. The final thing that I'd like to mention is that we haven't at all quantified the benefits of our plant clearing the capacity market. So, as you know or as you may know, the wholesale power markets are divided into three segments, capacity,
9 10 11 12 13 14 15	modeled. We have every state in New England modeled. And we have assumptions with respect to imports and exports that are part of the analysis. So, yes, Connecticut is modeled. The Connecticut projections for energy efficiency demand response are	9 10 11 12 13 14 15	we did. The final thing that I'd like to mention is that we haven't at all quantified the benefits of our plant clearing the capacity market. So, as you know or as you may know, the wholesale power markets are divided into three segments, capacity, energy, and ancillary services. This plant
9 10 11 12 13 14	modeled. We have every state in New England modeled. And we have assumptions with respect to imports and exports that are part of the analysis. So, yes, Connecticut is modeled. The Connecticut projections for energy efficiency demand response are incorporated as with the rest of New England.	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	we did. The final thing that I'd like to mention is that we haven't at all quantified the benefits of our plant clearing the capacity market. So, as you know or as you may know, the wholesale power markets are divided into three segments, capacity, energy, and ancillary services. This plant will provide all three. We've only
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	modeled. We have every state in New England modeled. And we have assumptions with respect to imports and exports that are part of the analysis. So, yes, Connecticut is modeled. The Connecticut projections for energy efficiency demand response are incorporated as with the rest of New England. MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. So	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	we did. The final thing that I'd like to mention is that we haven't at all quantified the benefits of our plant clearing the capacity market. So, as you know or as you may know, the wholesale power markets are divided into three segments, capacity, energy, and ancillary services. This plant will provide all three. We've only quantified the energy benefits associated
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	modeled. We have every state in New England modeled. And we have assumptions with respect to imports and exports that are part of the analysis. So, yes, Connecticut is modeled. The Connecticut projections for energy efficiency demand response are incorporated as with the rest of New England. MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. So each individual New England state is also	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	we did. The final thing that I'd like to mention is that we haven't at all quantified the benefits of our plant clearing the capacity market. So, as you know or as you may know, the wholesale power markets are divided into three segments, capacity, energy, and ancillary services. This plant will provide all three. We've only
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	modeled. We have every state in New England modeled. And we have assumptions with respect to imports and exports that are part of the analysis. So, yes, Connecticut is modeled. The Connecticut projections for energy efficiency demand response are incorporated as with the rest of New England. MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. So	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	we did. The final thing that I'd like to mention is that we haven't at all quantified the benefits of our plant clearing the capacity market. So, as you know or as you may know, the wholesale power markets are divided into three segments, capacity, energy, and ancillary services. This plant will provide all three. We've only quantified the energy benefits associated with this power plant. The capacity market benefits are a lot more nebulous and much
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	modeled. We have every state in New England modeled. And we have assumptions with respect to imports and exports that are part of the analysis. So, yes, Connecticut is modeled. The Connecticut projections for energy efficiency demand response are incorporated as with the rest of New England. MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. So each individual New England state is also contemplated with regards to energy	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	we did. The final thing that I'd like to mention is that we haven't at all quantified the benefits of our plant clearing the capacity market. So, as you know or as you may know, the wholesale power markets are divided into three segments, capacity, energy, and ancillary services. This plant will provide all three. We've only quantified the energy benefits associated with this power plant. The capacity market benefits are a lot more nebulous and much tougher to quantify, but there are benefits.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	modeled. We have every state in New England modeled. And we have assumptions with respect to imports and exports that are part of the analysis. So, yes, Connecticut is modeled. The Connecticut projections for energy efficiency demand response are incorporated as with the rest of New England. MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. So each individual New England state is also contemplated with regards to energy conservation and load management and that	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	we did. The final thing that I'd like to mention is that we haven't at all quantified the benefits of our plant clearing the capacity market. So, as you know or as you may know, the wholesale power markets are divided into three segments, capacity, energy, and ancillary services. This plant will provide all three. We've only quantified the energy benefits associated with this power plant. The capacity market benefits are a lot more nebulous and much tougher to quantify, but there are benefits. By virtue of this project
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	modeled. We have every state in New England modeled. And we have assumptions with respect to imports and exports that are part of the analysis. So, yes, Connecticut is modeled. The Connecticut projections for energy efficiency demand response are incorporated as with the rest of New England. MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. So each individual New England state is also contemplated with regards to energy conservation and load management and that impact on the demand	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	we did. The final thing that I'd like to mention is that we haven't at all quantified the benefits of our plant clearing the capacity market. So, as you know or as you may know, the wholesale power markets are divided into three segments, capacity, energy, and ancillary services. This plant will provide all three. We've only quantified the energy benefits associated with this power plant. The capacity market benefits are a lot more nebulous and much tougher to quantify, but there are benefits.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	modeled. We have every state in New England modeled. And we have assumptions with respect to imports and exports that are part of the analysis. So, yes, Connecticut is modeled. The Connecticut projections for energy efficiency demand response are incorporated as with the rest of New England. MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. So each individual New England state is also contemplated with regards to energy conservation and load management and that impact on the demand THE WITNESS (Bodell): As well	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	we did. The final thing that I'd like to mention is that we haven't at all quantified the benefits of our plant clearing the capacity market. So, as you know or as you may know, the wholesale power markets are divided into three segments, capacity, energy, and ancillary services. This plant will provide all three. We've only quantified the energy benefits associated with this power plant. The capacity market benefits are a lot more nebulous and much tougher to quantify, but there are benefits. By virtue of this project clearing in FCA-9, we've, by definition,

45 (Pages 717 to 720)

	Page 721		Page 723
1	what the cost model of the next 725 megawatts	1	established to protect very, very sensitive
2	is.	2	individuals.
3	MR. CORNACCHIA: I guess the	3	But beyond that, in a direct
4	modeling I'm having the difficulty	4	comparison you mentioned PM 2.5 and asthma.
5	reconciling is that locally, we are polluting	5	That's one that's mentioned a lot. The most
6	Naugatuck, we are polluting Middlebury, we	6	recent modeling of the prior smaller unit had
7	are polluting Oxford and Southbury at a much	7	pretty close to twice the PM 2.5 impact on an
8	more disproportionate rate than, say, Boston	8	ambient air quality basis than this facility
9	or Rhode Island but are the actual consumers	9	would have.
10	that are the ones demanding the need that is	10	MR. CORNACCHIA: And, again,
11	so compelling outside of the state of	11 12	that's F Series turbine. Is there a
12	Connecticut. And I'm trying to reconcile		MR. SMALL: We didn't quite
13 14	that with the fact that we went from 512,	13 14	finish our response to that question. Let us finish.
15	which was, again, an F Series turbine to 800 and change with an H Series turbine that is	14	MR. CORNACCHIA: I apologize.
16	5.4 percent more efficient but 40 percent	16	MR. SMALL: I'm sorry. We
17	more polluting, per se.	17	did. My apologies. Please go forward.
18	So is there a balance or is	18	MR. CORNACCHIA: We're even
19	there a test that is employed by applicants	19	now.
20	such as yourself, in terms of the trade-off?	20	Is there a happy medium where
21	Is it a matter of, well, are we trading off	21	we can say, okay, we are willing to sacrifice
22	\$2.84 for PM 2.5 discharge at a rate that is	22	Naugatuck, Southbury, Middlebury and Oxford's
23	higher than the DEEP would like to see, or is	23	air quality and result in PM 2.5 discharge
24	it a situation where the economies of scale	24	levels that I guess the first question is
25	don't favor a smaller microgeneration type of	25	will they be increased from any plant at 512
	Page 722		Page 724
1	facility?	1	with an increased output over, say, 805?
2	facility? THE WITNESS (Bodell): I would	2	with an increased output over, say, 805? With that kind of megawattage
2 3	facility? THE WITNESS (Bodell): I would also add there's another important	2 3	with an increased output over, say, 805? With that kind of megawattage increase of 53 percent or so, will the
2 3 4	facility? THE WITNESS (Bodell): I would also add there's another important consideration, which is timing. This is a	2 3 4	with an increased output over, say, 805? With that kind of megawattage increase of 53 percent or so, will the pollutants and the particulate matter and the
2 3 4 5	facility? THE WITNESS (Bodell): I would also add there's another important consideration, which is timing. This is a site that's ready to go, and it can be built	2 3 4 5	with an increased output over, say, 805? With that kind of megawattage increase of 53 percent or so, will the pollutants and the particulate matter and the greenhouse gases, will they exponentially
2 3 4 5 6	facility? THE WITNESS (Bodell): I would also add there's another important consideration, which is timing. This is a site that's ready to go, and it can be built within the time frame of the need for the	2 3 4 5 6	with an increased output over, say, 805? With that kind of megawattage increase of 53 percent or so, will the pollutants and the particulate matter and the greenhouse gases, will they exponentially rise with that taking into account the 5.4
2 3 4 5 6 7	facility? THE WITNESS (Bodell): I would also add there's another important consideration, which is timing. This is a site that's ready to go, and it can be built within the time frame of the need for the region.	2 3 4 5 6 7	with an increased output over, say, 805? With that kind of megawattage increase of 53 percent or so, will the pollutants and the particulate matter and the greenhouse gases, will they exponentially rise with that taking into account the 5.4 percent increased efficiency of the turbine?
2 3 4 5 6	facility? THE WITNESS (Bodell): I would also add there's another important consideration, which is timing. This is a site that's ready to go, and it can be built within the time frame of the need for the region. MR. CORNACCHIA: It's been	2 3 4 5 6	with an increased output over, say, 805? With that kind of megawattage increase of 53 percent or so, will the pollutants and the particulate matter and the greenhouse gases, will they exponentially rise with that taking into account the 5.4 percent increased efficiency of the turbine? THE WITNESS (Sellars): And I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	facility? THE WITNESS (Bodell): I would also add there's another important consideration, which is timing. This is a site that's ready to go, and it can be built within the time frame of the need for the region.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	with an increased output over, say, 805? With that kind of megawattage increase of 53 percent or so, will the pollutants and the particulate matter and the greenhouse gases, will they exponentially rise with that taking into account the 5.4 percent increased efficiency of the turbine?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	facility? THE WITNESS (Bodell): I would also add there's another important consideration, which is timing. This is a site that's ready to go, and it can be built within the time frame of the need for the region. MR. CORNACCHIA: It's been ready since 1999, quite frankly, and conservation measures have largely negated	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	with an increased output over, say, 805? With that kind of megawattage increase of 53 percent or so, will the pollutants and the particulate matter and the greenhouse gases, will they exponentially rise with that taking into account the 5.4 percent increased efficiency of the turbine? THE WITNESS (Sellars): And I guess my point is that if you compared, as we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	facility? THE WITNESS (Bodell): I would also add there's another important consideration, which is timing. This is a site that's ready to go, and it can be built within the time frame of the need for the region. MR. CORNACCHIA: It's been ready since 1999, quite frankly, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	with an increased output over, say, 805? With that kind of megawattage increase of 53 percent or so, will the pollutants and the particulate matter and the greenhouse gases, will they exponentially rise with that taking into account the 5.4 percent increased efficiency of the turbine? THE WITNESS (Sellars): And I guess my point is that if you compared, as we did in the application, the smaller F Series
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	facility? THE WITNESS (Bodell): I would also add there's another important consideration, which is timing. This is a site that's ready to go, and it can be built within the time frame of the need for the region. MR. CORNACCHIA: It's been ready since 1999, quite frankly, and conservation measures have largely negated that need is an argument that could be made	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	with an increased output over, say, 805? With that kind of megawattage increase of 53 percent or so, will the pollutants and the particulate matter and the greenhouse gases, will they exponentially rise with that taking into account the 5.4 percent increased efficiency of the turbine? THE WITNESS (Sellars): And I guess my point is that if you compared, as we did in the application, the smaller F Series turbine, in many instances, and particularly
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	facility? THE WITNESS (Bodell): I would also add there's another important consideration, which is timing. This is a site that's ready to go, and it can be built within the time frame of the need for the region. MR. CORNACCHIA: It's been ready since 1999, quite frankly, and conservation measures have largely negated that need is an argument that could be made also.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	with an increased output over, say, 805? With that kind of megawattage increase of 53 percent or so, will the pollutants and the particulate matter and the greenhouse gases, will they exponentially rise with that taking into account the 5.4 percent increased efficiency of the turbine? THE WITNESS (Sellars): And I guess my point is that if you compared, as we did in the application, the smaller F Series turbine, in many instances, and particularly with respect to PM 2.5, the approved efficiency and environmental performance of the larger turbine overwhelms the increased
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	facility? THE WITNESS (Bodell): I would also add there's another important consideration, which is timing. This is a site that's ready to go, and it can be built within the time frame of the need for the region. MR. CORNACCHIA: It's been ready since 1999, quite frankly, and conservation measures have largely negated that need is an argument that could be made also. THE WITNESS (Bodell): That's not true. THE CHAIRMAN: Let's get to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	with an increased output over, say, 805? With that kind of megawattage increase of 53 percent or so, will the pollutants and the particulate matter and the greenhouse gases, will they exponentially rise with that taking into account the 5.4 percent increased efficiency of the turbine? THE WITNESS (Sellars): And I guess my point is that if you compared, as we did in the application, the smaller F Series turbine, in many instances, and particularly with respect to PM 2.5, the approved efficiency and environmental performance of the larger turbine overwhelms the increased size of the larger turbine. So, in the case
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	facility? THE WITNESS (Bodell): I would also add there's another important consideration, which is timing. This is a site that's ready to go, and it can be built within the time frame of the need for the region. MR. CORNACCHIA: It's been ready since 1999, quite frankly, and conservation measures have largely negated that need is an argument that could be made also. THE WITNESS (Bodell): That's not true. THE CHAIRMAN: Let's get to questions. We've gone back and forth	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	with an increased output over, say, 805? With that kind of megawattage increase of 53 percent or so, will the pollutants and the particulate matter and the greenhouse gases, will they exponentially rise with that taking into account the 5.4 percent increased efficiency of the turbine? THE WITNESS (Sellars): And I guess my point is that if you compared, as we did in the application, the smaller F Series turbine, in many instances, and particularly with respect to PM 2.5, the approved efficiency and environmental performance of the larger turbine overwhelms the increased size of the larger turbine. So, in the case of PM 2.5 ambient air quality impacts, for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	facility? THE WITNESS (Bodell): I would also add there's another important consideration, which is timing. This is a site that's ready to go, and it can be built within the time frame of the need for the region. MR. CORNACCHIA: It's been ready since 1999, quite frankly, and conservation measures have largely negated that need is an argument that could be made also. THE WITNESS (Bodell): That's not true. THE CHAIRMAN: Let's get to questions. We've gone back and forth MR. SMALL: We can respond to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	with an increased output over, say, 805? With that kind of megawattage increase of 53 percent or so, will the pollutants and the particulate matter and the greenhouse gases, will they exponentially rise with that taking into account the 5.4 percent increased efficiency of the turbine? THE WITNESS (Sellars): And I guess my point is that if you compared, as we did in the application, the smaller F Series turbine, in many instances, and particularly with respect to PM 2.5, the approved efficiency and environmental performance of the larger turbine overwhelms the increased size of the larger turbine. So, in the case of PM 2.5 ambient air quality impacts, for example, a smaller 512 megawatt facility, as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	facility? THE WITNESS (Bodell): I would also add there's another important consideration, which is timing. This is a site that's ready to go, and it can be built within the time frame of the need for the region. MR. CORNACCHIA: It's been ready since 1999, quite frankly, and conservation measures have largely negated that need is an argument that could be made also. THE WITNESS (Bodell): That's not true. THE CHAIRMAN: Let's get to questions. We've gone back and forth MR. SMALL: We can respond to the prior question by Mr. Sellars.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	with an increased output over, say, 805? With that kind of megawattage increase of 53 percent or so, will the pollutants and the particulate matter and the greenhouse gases, will they exponentially rise with that taking into account the 5.4 percent increased efficiency of the turbine? THE WITNESS (Sellars): And I guess my point is that if you compared, as we did in the application, the smaller F Series turbine, in many instances, and particularly with respect to PM 2.5, the approved efficiency and environmental performance of the larger turbine overwhelms the increased size of the larger turbine. So, in the case of PM 2.5 ambient air quality impacts, for example, a smaller 512 megawatt facility, as has been previously proved and is approved
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	facility? THE WITNESS (Bodell): I would also add there's another important consideration, which is timing. This is a site that's ready to go, and it can be built within the time frame of the need for the region. MR. CORNACCHIA: It's been ready since 1999, quite frankly, and conservation measures have largely negated that need is an argument that could be made also. THE WITNESS (Bodell): That's not true. THE CHAIRMAN: Let's get to questions. We've gone back and forth MR. SMALL: We can respond to the prior question by Mr. Sellars. THE WITNESS (Sellars): As far	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	with an increased output over, say, 805? With that kind of megawattage increase of 53 percent or so, will the pollutants and the particulate matter and the greenhouse gases, will they exponentially rise with that taking into account the 5.4 percent increased efficiency of the turbine? THE WITNESS (Sellars): And I guess my point is that if you compared, as we did in the application, the smaller F Series turbine, in many instances, and particularly with respect to PM 2.5, the approved efficiency and environmental performance of the larger turbine overwhelms the increased size of the larger turbine. So, in the case of PM 2.5 ambient air quality impacts, for example, a smaller 512 megawatt facility, as has been previously proved and is approved right now, would have twice the annual PM 2.5
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	facility? THE WITNESS (Bodell): I would also add there's another important consideration, which is timing. This is a site that's ready to go, and it can be built within the time frame of the need for the region. MR. CORNACCHIA: It's been ready since 1999, quite frankly, and conservation measures have largely negated that need is an argument that could be made also. THE WITNESS (Bodell): That's not true. THE CHAIRMAN: Let's get to questions. We've gone back and forth MR. SMALL: We can respond to the prior question by Mr. Sellars. THE WITNESS (Sellars): As far as the prior assertion that there's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	with an increased output over, say, 805? With that kind of megawattage increase of 53 percent or so, will the pollutants and the particulate matter and the greenhouse gases, will they exponentially rise with that taking into account the 5.4 percent increased efficiency of the turbine? THE WITNESS (Sellars): And I guess my point is that if you compared, as we did in the application, the smaller F Series turbine, in many instances, and particularly with respect to PM 2.5, the approved efficiency and environmental performance of the larger turbine overwhelms the increased size of the larger turbine. So, in the case of PM 2.5 ambient air quality impacts, for example, a smaller 512 megawatt facility, as has been previously proved and is approved right now, would have twice the annual PM 2.5 ambient air quality impact than this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	facility? THE WITNESS (Bodell): I would also add there's another important consideration, which is timing. This is a site that's ready to go, and it can be built within the time frame of the need for the region. MR. CORNACCHIA: It's been ready since 1999, quite frankly, and conservation measures have largely negated that need is an argument that could be made also. THE WITNESS (Bodell): That's not true. THE CHAIRMAN: Let's get to questions. We've gone back and forth MR. SMALL: We can respond to the prior question by Mr. Sellars. THE WITNESS (Sellars): As far as the prior assertion that there's significant adverse air pollution impact, I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	with an increased output over, say, 805? With that kind of megawattage increase of 53 percent or so, will the pollutants and the particulate matter and the greenhouse gases, will they exponentially rise with that taking into account the 5.4 percent increased efficiency of the turbine? THE WITNESS (Sellars): And I guess my point is that if you compared, as we did in the application, the smaller F Series turbine, in many instances, and particularly with respect to PM 2.5, the approved efficiency and environmental performance of the larger turbine overwhelms the increased size of the larger turbine. So, in the case of PM 2.5 ambient air quality impacts, for example, a smaller 512 megawatt facility, as has been previously proved and is approved right now, would have twice the annual PM 2.5 ambient air quality impact than this facility, even though it's larger would have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	facility? THE WITNESS (Bodell): I would also add there's another important consideration, which is timing. This is a site that's ready to go, and it can be built within the time frame of the need for the region. MR. CORNACCHIA: It's been ready since 1999, quite frankly, and conservation measures have largely negated that need is an argument that could be made also. THE WITNESS (Bodell): That's not true. THE CHAIRMAN: Let's get to questions. We've gone back and forth MR. SMALL: We can respond to the prior question by Mr. Sellars. THE WITNESS (Sellars): As far as the prior assertion that there's significant adverse air pollution impact, I think our modeling has demonstrated quite the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	with an increased output over, say, 805? With that kind of megawattage increase of 53 percent or so, will the pollutants and the particulate matter and the greenhouse gases, will they exponentially rise with that taking into account the 5.4 percent increased efficiency of the turbine? THE WITNESS (Sellars): And I guess my point is that if you compared, as we did in the application, the smaller F Series turbine, in many instances, and particularly with respect to PM 2.5, the approved efficiency and environmental performance of the larger turbine overwhelms the increased size of the larger turbine. So, in the case of PM 2.5 ambient air quality impacts, for example, a smaller 512 megawatt facility, as has been previously proved and is approved right now, would have twice the annual PM 2.5 ambient air quality impact than this facility, even though it's larger would have because of a number of factors: It's more
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	facility? THE WITNESS (Bodell): I would also add there's another important consideration, which is timing. This is a site that's ready to go, and it can be built within the time frame of the need for the region. MR. CORNACCHIA: It's been ready since 1999, quite frankly, and conservation measures have largely negated that need is an argument that could be made also. THE WITNESS (Bodell): That's not true. THE CHAIRMAN: Let's get to questions. We've gone back and forth MR. SMALL: We can respond to the prior question by Mr. Sellars. THE WITNESS (Sellars): As far as the prior assertion that there's significant adverse air pollution impact, I think our modeling has demonstrated quite the contrary that the facility, the maximum	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	with an increased output over, say, 805? With that kind of megawattage increase of 53 percent or so, will the pollutants and the particulate matter and the greenhouse gases, will they exponentially rise with that taking into account the 5.4 percent increased efficiency of the turbine? THE WITNESS (Sellars): And I guess my point is that if you compared, as we did in the application, the smaller F Series turbine, in many instances, and particularly with respect to PM 2.5, the approved efficiency and environmental performance of the larger turbine overwhelms the increased size of the larger turbine. So, in the case of PM 2.5 ambient air quality impacts, for example, a smaller 512 megawatt facility, as has been previously proved and is approved right now, would have twice the annual PM 2.5 ambient air quality impact than this facility, even though it's larger would have because of a number of factors: It's more efficient, its environmental performance is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	facility? THE WITNESS (Bodell): I would also add there's another important consideration, which is timing. This is a site that's ready to go, and it can be built within the time frame of the need for the region. MR. CORNACCHIA: It's been ready since 1999, quite frankly, and conservation measures have largely negated that need is an argument that could be made also. THE WITNESS (Bodell): That's not true. THE CHAIRMAN: Let's get to questions. We've gone back and forth MR. SMALL: We can respond to the prior question by Mr. Sellars. THE WITNESS (Sellars): As far as the prior assertion that there's significant adverse air pollution impact, I think our modeling has demonstrated quite the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	with an increased output over, say, 805? With that kind of megawattage increase of 53 percent or so, will the pollutants and the particulate matter and the greenhouse gases, will they exponentially rise with that taking into account the 5.4 percent increased efficiency of the turbine? THE WITNESS (Sellars): And I guess my point is that if you compared, as we did in the application, the smaller F Series turbine, in many instances, and particularly with respect to PM 2.5, the approved efficiency and environmental performance of the larger turbine overwhelms the increased size of the larger turbine. So, in the case of PM 2.5 ambient air quality impacts, for example, a smaller 512 megawatt facility, as has been previously proved and is approved right now, would have twice the annual PM 2.5 ambient air quality impact than this facility, even though it's larger would have because of a number of factors: It's more

46 (Pages 721 to 724)

	Page 725		Page 727
1	MR. CORNACCHIA: So the 805	1	looking for an answer whether or not a 512
2	megawatt plant using the H Series turbine	2	THE CHAIRMAN: It's not a
3	will pollute less than the 512 megawatt	3	confusion. You're using the wrong word,
4	configuration?	4	but and, I mean, I think they've tried to
5	THE CHAIRMAN: Excuse me. I	5	answer. From their standpoint, they've given
6	think this has been answered more than once,	6	you an answer. Now, that's their standpoint.
7	and I believe, and you correct me, that some	7	Our job, and what you're supposed to be
8	of the pollutants, particularly the	8	helping us, is to get as many facts. So, I
9	particulates, because of what we just heard	9	hate to say ultimately, because I know we're
10	are going to be less, and there are others	10	not ultimate, but we're going to have to make
11	that are going to be more. So this is all a	11	a decision. They've already made their
12	balancing, but there is no but I think you	12	decision of what they're proposing.
13	asked the question, and I think you got the	13	MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay, so
14	answer. So I would ask you not to continue	14	noted, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate that.
15	to repeat.	15	I'm going to switch to the
16	MR. CORNACCHIA: I'm trying to	16	site visit and focus on the viewshed. This
17	lean on it, and I appreciate it,	17	is with regards to the January 15th red
18	Mr. Chairman. I'm just with the increase	18	balloons that were smoke stack simulations
19	in capacity from 512 to 805, turbine type	19	during the site walk, and specifically,
20	aside, would there be an increase in	20	again, I'm referring to the Late-Filing with
21	discharge and pollutants exponentially?	21	attachments, and they detail six photographs
22	THE WITNESS (Sellars): You	22	as part of the limited locations that were
23	can't increase from 512 to 800 megawatts	23	identified as where the balloons were
24	turbine aside. To increase from 512	24	visible. And I quote, "The overwhelming
25	megawatts to 800 megawatts, you need a	25	majority of the area surrounding the project
	Page 726		Page 728
1		1	
1 2	different turbine, a larger turbine. And so	1 2	Page 728 had no visibility due to intervening topography, vegetation or structures which
			had no visibility due to intervening
2	different turbine, a larger turbine. And so it's a different model, and because the	2	had no visibility due to intervening topography, vegetation or structures which
2 3	different turbine, a larger turbine. And so it's a different model, and because the larger turbine is more advanced in its technology, GE has been able to incorporate into the design significant improvements in	2 3	had no visibility due to intervening topography, vegetation or structures which impeded the view."
2 3 4	different turbine, a larger turbine. And so it's a different model, and because the larger turbine is more advanced in its technology, GE has been able to incorporate	2 3 4	had no visibility due to intervening topography, vegetation or structures which impeded the view." Can you describe the
2 3 4 5	different turbine, a larger turbine. And so it's a different model, and because the larger turbine is more advanced in its technology, GE has been able to incorporate into the design significant improvements in	2 3 4 5	had no visibility due to intervening topography, vegetation or structures which impeded the view." Can you describe the methodology utilized in determining the
2 3 4 5 6	different turbine, a larger turbine. And so it's a different model, and because the larger turbine is more advanced in its technology, GE has been able to incorporate into the design significant improvements in both efficiency as well as environmental	2 3 4 5 6	had no visibility due to intervening topography, vegetation or structures which impeded the view." Can you describe the methodology utilized in determining the visibility or the lack thereof and the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	different turbine, a larger turbine. And so it's a different model, and because the larger turbine is more advanced in its technology, GE has been able to incorporate into the design significant improvements in both efficiency as well as environmental performance.	2 3 4 5 6 7	had no visibility due to intervening topography, vegetation or structures which impeded the view." Can you describe the methodology utilized in determining the visibility or the lack thereof and the methods by means the viewshed determination
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	different turbine, a larger turbine. And so it's a different model, and because the larger turbine is more advanced in its technology, GE has been able to incorporate into the design significant improvements in both efficiency as well as environmental performance. So, even though the turbine is larger, even not taking any credit for any of the emissions displacement, which is just	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	had no visibility due to intervening topography, vegetation or structures which impeded the view." Can you describe the methodology utilized in determining the visibility or the lack thereof and the methods by means the viewshed determination was made and that the overwhelming majority of the area had no visibility? THE WITNESS (Gresock): The
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	different turbine, a larger turbine. And so it's a different model, and because the larger turbine is more advanced in its technology, GE has been able to incorporate into the design significant improvements in both efficiency as well as environmental performance. So, even though the turbine is larger, even not taking any credit for any of the emissions displacement, which is just substantial and brought about by the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	had no visibility due to intervening topography, vegetation or structures which impeded the view." Can you describe the methodology utilized in determining the visibility or the lack thereof and the methods by means the viewshed determination was made and that the overwhelming majority of the area had no visibility? THE WITNESS (Gresock): The information in that Late-Filed exhibit was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	different turbine, a larger turbine. And so it's a different model, and because the larger turbine is more advanced in its technology, GE has been able to incorporate into the design significant improvements in both efficiency as well as environmental performance. So, even though the turbine is larger, even not taking any credit for any of the emissions displacement, which is just substantial and brought about by the efficiency of the turbine, if you just looked	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	had no visibility due to intervening topography, vegetation or structures which impeded the view." Can you describe the methodology utilized in determining the visibility or the lack thereof and the methods by means the viewshed determination was made and that the overwhelming majority of the area had no visibility? THE WITNESS (Gresock): The information in that Late-Filed exhibit was intended to be representative information
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	different turbine, a larger turbine. And so it's a different model, and because the larger turbine is more advanced in its technology, GE has been able to incorporate into the design significant improvements in both efficiency as well as environmental performance. So, even though the turbine is larger, even not taking any credit for any of the emissions displacement, which is just substantial and brought about by the efficiency of the turbine, if you just looked at ambient air quality of one versus the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	had no visibility due to intervening topography, vegetation or structures which impeded the view." Can you describe the methodology utilized in determining the visibility or the lack thereof and the methods by means the viewshed determination was made and that the overwhelming majority of the area had no visibility? THE WITNESS (Gresock): The information in that Late-Filed exhibit was intended to be representative information based upon what we were doing at the time,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	different turbine, a larger turbine. And so it's a different model, and because the larger turbine is more advanced in its technology, GE has been able to incorporate into the design significant improvements in both efficiency as well as environmental performance. So, even though the turbine is larger, even not taking any credit for any of the emissions displacement, which is just substantial and brought about by the efficiency of the turbine, if you just looked at ambient air quality of one versus the other, this facility fits within the envelope	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	had no visibility due to intervening topography, vegetation or structures which impeded the view." Can you describe the methodology utilized in determining the visibility or the lack thereof and the methods by means the viewshed determination was made and that the overwhelming majority of the area had no visibility? THE WITNESS (Gresock): The information in that Late-Filed exhibit was intended to be representative information based upon what we were doing at the time, which was flying the two balloons at the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	different turbine, a larger turbine. And so it's a different model, and because the larger turbine is more advanced in its technology, GE has been able to incorporate into the design significant improvements in both efficiency as well as environmental performance. So, even though the turbine is larger, even not taking any credit for any of the emissions displacement, which is just substantial and brought about by the efficiency of the turbine, if you just looked at ambient air quality of one versus the other, this facility fits within the envelope of what was previously approved, well within	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	had no visibility due to intervening topography, vegetation or structures which impeded the view." Can you describe the methodology utilized in determining the visibility or the lack thereof and the methods by means the viewshed determination was made and that the overwhelming majority of the area had no visibility? THE WITNESS (Gresock): The information in that Late-Filed exhibit was intended to be representative information based upon what we were doing at the time, which was flying the two balloons at the height of the stacks.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	different turbine, a larger turbine. And so it's a different model, and because the larger turbine is more advanced in its technology, GE has been able to incorporate into the design significant improvements in both efficiency as well as environmental performance. So, even though the turbine is larger, even not taking any credit for any of the emissions displacement, which is just substantial and brought about by the efficiency of the turbine, if you just looked at ambient air quality of one versus the other, this facility fits within the envelope of what was previously approved, well within the envelope. In fact, for many pollutants,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	had no visibility due to intervening topography, vegetation or structures which impeded the view." Can you describe the methodology utilized in determining the visibility or the lack thereof and the methods by means the viewshed determination was made and that the overwhelming majority of the area had no visibility? THE WITNESS (Gresock): The information in that Late-Filed exhibit was intended to be representative information based upon what we were doing at the time, which was flying the two balloons at the height of the stacks. You can see in the figure one
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	different turbine, a larger turbine. And so it's a different model, and because the larger turbine is more advanced in its technology, GE has been able to incorporate into the design significant improvements in both efficiency as well as environmental performance. So, even though the turbine is larger, even not taking any credit for any of the emissions displacement, which is just substantial and brought about by the efficiency of the turbine, if you just looked at ambient air quality of one versus the other, this facility fits within the envelope of what was previously approved, well within the envelope. In fact, for many pollutants, the one that was raised as having the most	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	had no visibility due to intervening topography, vegetation or structures which impeded the view." Can you describe the methodology utilized in determining the visibility or the lack thereof and the methods by means the viewshed determination was made and that the overwhelming majority of the area had no visibility? THE WITNESS (Gresock): The information in that Late-Filed exhibit was intended to be representative information based upon what we were doing at the time, which was flying the two balloons at the height of the stacks. You can see in the figure one that was filed with that response that we've
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	different turbine, a larger turbine. And so it's a different model, and because the larger turbine is more advanced in its technology, GE has been able to incorporate into the design significant improvements in both efficiency as well as environmental performance. So, even though the turbine is larger, even not taking any credit for any of the emissions displacement, which is just substantial and brought about by the efficiency of the turbine, if you just looked at ambient air quality of one versus the other, this facility fits within the envelope of what was previously approved, well within the envelope. In fact, for many pollutants, the one that was raised as having the most concern in the area actually has half the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	had no visibility due to intervening topography, vegetation or structures which impeded the view." Can you describe the methodology utilized in determining the visibility or the lack thereof and the methods by means the viewshed determination was made and that the overwhelming majority of the area had no visibility? THE WITNESS (Gresock): The information in that Late-Filed exhibit was intended to be representative information based upon what we were doing at the time, which was flying the two balloons at the height of the stacks. You can see in the figure one that was filed with that response that we've indicated in yellow roads that were traveled
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	different turbine, a larger turbine. And so it's a different model, and because the larger turbine is more advanced in its technology, GE has been able to incorporate into the design significant improvements in both efficiency as well as environmental performance. So, even though the turbine is larger, even not taking any credit for any of the emissions displacement, which is just substantial and brought about by the efficiency of the turbine, if you just looked at ambient air quality of one versus the other, this facility fits within the envelope of what was previously approved, well within the envelope. In fact, for many pollutants, the one that was raised as having the most concern in the area actually has half the impact.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	had no visibility due to intervening topography, vegetation or structures which impeded the view." Can you describe the methodology utilized in determining the visibility or the lack thereof and the methods by means the viewshed determination was made and that the overwhelming majority of the area had no visibility? THE WITNESS (Gresock): The information in that Late-Filed exhibit was intended to be representative information based upon what we were doing at the time, which was flying the two balloons at the height of the stacks. You can see in the figure one that was filed with that response that we've indicated in yellow roads that were traveled around the site. And we basically drove
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	different turbine, a larger turbine. And so it's a different model, and because the larger turbine is more advanced in its technology, GE has been able to incorporate into the design significant improvements in both efficiency as well as environmental performance. So, even though the turbine is larger, even not taking any credit for any of the emissions displacement, which is just substantial and brought about by the efficiency of the turbine, if you just looked at ambient air quality of one versus the other, this facility fits within the envelope of what was previously approved, well within the envelope. In fact, for many pollutants, the one that was raised as having the most concern in the area actually has half the impact.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	had no visibility due to intervening topography, vegetation or structures which impeded the view." Can you describe the methodology utilized in determining the visibility or the lack thereof and the methods by means the viewshed determination was made and that the overwhelming majority of the area had no visibility? THE WITNESS (Gresock): The information in that Late-Filed exhibit was intended to be representative information based upon what we were doing at the time, which was flying the two balloons at the height of the stacks. You can see in the figure one that was filed with that response that we've indicated in yellow roads that were traveled around the site. And we basically drove along those roadways, stopping occasionally
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	different turbine, a larger turbine. And so it's a different model, and because the larger turbine is more advanced in its technology, GE has been able to incorporate into the design significant improvements in both efficiency as well as environmental performance. So, even though the turbine is larger, even not taking any credit for any of the emissions displacement, which is just substantial and brought about by the efficiency of the turbine, if you just looked at ambient air quality of one versus the other, this facility fits within the envelope of what was previously approved, well within the envelope. In fact, for many pollutants, the one that was raised as having the most concern in the area actually has half the impact.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	had no visibility due to intervening topography, vegetation or structures which impeded the view." Can you describe the methodology utilized in determining the visibility or the lack thereof and the methods by means the viewshed determination was made and that the overwhelming majority of the area had no visibility? THE WITNESS (Gresock): The information in that Late-Filed exhibit was intended to be representative information based upon what we were doing at the time, which was flying the two balloons at the height of the stacks. You can see in the figure one that was filed with that response that we've indicated in yellow roads that were traveled around the site. And we basically drove along those roadways, stopping occasionally to look towards the facility location, tried
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	different turbine, a larger turbine. And so it's a different model, and because the larger turbine is more advanced in its technology, GE has been able to incorporate into the design significant improvements in both efficiency as well as environmental performance. So, even though the turbine is larger, even not taking any credit for any of the emissions displacement, which is just substantial and brought about by the efficiency of the turbine, if you just looked at ambient air quality of one versus the other, this facility fits within the envelope of what was previously approved, well within the envelope. In fact, for many pollutants, the one that was raised as having the most concern in the area actually has half the impact. MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. And again, my confusion is over whether or not we're talking about impact to the region or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	had no visibility due to intervening topography, vegetation or structures which impeded the view." Can you describe the methodology utilized in determining the visibility or the lack thereof and the methods by means the viewshed determination was made and that the overwhelming majority of the area had no visibility? THE WITNESS (Gresock): The information in that Late-Filed exhibit was intended to be representative information based upon what we were doing at the time, which was flying the two balloons at the height of the stacks. You can see in the figure one that was filed with that response that we've indicated in yellow roads that were traveled around the site. And we basically drove along those roadways, stopping occasionally to look towards the facility location, tried to find locations where we could see the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	different turbine, a larger turbine. And so it's a different model, and because the larger turbine is more advanced in its technology, GE has been able to incorporate into the design significant improvements in both efficiency as well as environmental performance. So, even though the turbine is larger, even not taking any credit for any of the emissions displacement, which is just substantial and brought about by the efficiency of the turbine, if you just looked at ambient air quality of one versus the other, this facility fits within the envelope of what was previously approved, well within the envelope. In fact, for many pollutants, the one that was raised as having the most concern in the area actually has half the impact. MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. And again, my confusion is over whether or not we're talking about impact to the region or the increase in pollution that would be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	had no visibility due to intervening topography, vegetation or structures which impeded the view." Can you describe the methodology utilized in determining the visibility or the lack thereof and the methods by means the viewshed determination was made and that the overwhelming majority of the area had no visibility? THE WITNESS (Gresock): The information in that Late-Filed exhibit was intended to be representative information based upon what we were doing at the time, which was flying the two balloons at the height of the stacks. You can see in the figure one that was filed with that response that we've indicated in yellow roads that were traveled around the site. And we basically drove along those roadways, stopping occasionally to look towards the facility location, tried to find locations where we could see the balloons, and took pictures where we could.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	different turbine, a larger turbine. And so it's a different model, and because the larger turbine is more advanced in its technology, GE has been able to incorporate into the design significant improvements in both efficiency as well as environmental performance. So, even though the turbine is larger, even not taking any credit for any of the emissions displacement, which is just substantial and brought about by the efficiency of the turbine, if you just looked at ambient air quality of one versus the other, this facility fits within the envelope of what was previously approved, well within the envelope. In fact, for many pollutants, the one that was raised as having the most concern in the area actually has half the impact. MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. And again, my confusion is over whether or not we're talking about impact to the region or the increase in pollution that would be dispersed by one particular configuration	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	had no visibility due to intervening topography, vegetation or structures which impeded the view." Can you describe the methodology utilized in determining the visibility or the lack thereof and the methods by means the viewshed determination was made and that the overwhelming majority of the area had no visibility? THE WITNESS (Gresock): The information in that Late-Filed exhibit was intended to be representative information based upon what we were doing at the time, which was flying the two balloons at the height of the stacks. You can see in the figure one that was filed with that response that we've indicated in yellow roads that were traveled around the site. And we basically drove along those roadways, stopping occasionally to look towards the facility location, tried to find locations where we could see the balloons, and took pictures where we could. And this tried to cover as much ground as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	different turbine, a larger turbine. And so it's a different model, and because the larger turbine is more advanced in its technology, GE has been able to incorporate into the design significant improvements in both efficiency as well as environmental performance. So, even though the turbine is larger, even not taking any credit for any of the emissions displacement, which is just substantial and brought about by the efficiency of the turbine, if you just looked at ambient air quality of one versus the other, this facility fits within the envelope of what was previously approved, well within the envelope. In fact, for many pollutants, the one that was raised as having the most concern in the area actually has half the impact. MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. And again, my confusion is over whether or not we're talking about impact to the region or the increase in pollution that would be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	had no visibility due to intervening topography, vegetation or structures which impeded the view." Can you describe the methodology utilized in determining the visibility or the lack thereof and the methods by means the viewshed determination was made and that the overwhelming majority of the area had no visibility? THE WITNESS (Gresock): The information in that Late-Filed exhibit was intended to be representative information based upon what we were doing at the time, which was flying the two balloons at the height of the stacks. You can see in the figure one that was filed with that response that we've indicated in yellow roads that were traveled around the site. And we basically drove along those roadways, stopping occasionally to look towards the facility location, tried to find locations where we could see the balloons, and took pictures where we could.

47 (Pages 725 to 728)

	Page 729		Page 731
1	around the project site.	1	THE WITNESS (Gresock):
2	At the time, we did it for our	2	Correct.
3	own curiosity because we wanted to see. We	3	THE WITNESS (Bazinet): No.
4	actually had been quite challenged trying to	4	They were intended to represent stack top
5	find open views towards the project site	5	height, not the two smoke stacks.
6	because so many of the surrounding roadways	6	MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. So, I
7	do have intervening trees and vegetation.	7	guess is it accurate to say that the overall
8	But driving around the site, looking for the	8	visibility would have been much greater than
9	balloons, taking a photograph in the	9	say a hot air balloon being floated, let's
10	direction of the site is what's reflected	10	say the basket at 150 feet, and say the
11	here.	11	balloon portion simulating, say, the plume at
12	MR. CORNACCHIA: Okay. What	12	that standpoint and a greater girth than the
13	size were the balloons?	13	smoke stack, which was depicted at 5 foot
14	THE WITNESS (Gresock): The	14	rather than 22 foot, as is part of the
15	balloons were approximately 5 feet in	15	THE CHAIRMAN: Actually, a
16	diameter.	16	stationary helicopter would have been maybe
17	MR. CORNACCHIA: And they were	17	better. There are limits to
18	floated at a height of?	18	THE WITNESS (Gresock): I
19	THE WITNESS (Gresock): At the	19	believe for what we were asked to do, this
20	stack top elevation. So, it would be the	20	served the purpose.
21	finished grade elevation of 150 feet, which	21	MR. CORNACCHIA: And the
22	is 980 feet.	22	viewshed was modeled based upon the balloons,
23	MR. CORNACCHIA: And was there	23	or was it modeled on an expected view of 22
24	a tether on the balloons holding them?	24	foot tall smoke stacks only or with the plume
25	THE WITNESS (Gresock): Yes.	25	or with or without the plume?
	×		L L
	Page 730		Page 732
1	_	1	Page 732
1	MR. CORNACCHIA: Was it a	1	THE WITNESS (Gresock): The
2	MR. CORNACCHIA: Was it a rope? What was the diameter on the tether?	2	THE WITNESS (Gresock): The viewshed information that is provided on this
2 3	MR. CORNACCHIA: Was it a rope? What was the diameter on the tether? THE WITNESS (Gresock): I	2 3	THE WITNESS (Gresock): The viewshed information that is provided on this figure was actually originally provided in
2 3 4	MR. CORNACCHIA: Was it a rope? What was the diameter on the tether? THE WITNESS (Gresock): I don't recollect the diameter on the tether,	2 3 4	THE WITNESS (Gresock): The viewshed information that is provided on this figure was actually originally provided in response to Interrogatory CSC-1 in response
2 3 4 5	MR. CORNACCHIA: Was it a rope? What was the diameter on the tether? THE WITNESS (Gresock): I don't recollect the diameter on the tether, but certainly one of the constraints with	2 3 4 5	THE WITNESS (Gresock): The viewshed information that is provided on this figure was actually originally provided in response to Interrogatory CSC-1 in response to question CSC-13, and that didn't have
2 3 4 5 6	MR. CORNACCHIA: Was it a rope? What was the diameter on the tether? THE WITNESS (Gresock): I don't recollect the diameter on the tether, but certainly one of the constraints with this particular type of visibility assessment	2 3 4 5 6	THE WITNESS (Gresock): The viewshed information that is provided on this figure was actually originally provided in response to Interrogatory CSC-1 in response to question CSC-13, and that didn't have anything at all to do with the balloons. It
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. CORNACCHIA: Was it a rope? What was the diameter on the tether? THE WITNESS (Gresock): I don't recollect the diameter on the tether, but certainly one of the constraints with this particular type of visibility assessment is that the air does move, and so but the	2 3 4 5 6 7	THE WITNESS (Gresock): The viewshed information that is provided on this figure was actually originally provided in response to Interrogatory CSC-1 in response to question CSC-13, and that didn't have anything at all to do with the balloons. It had to do with the elevations of the facility
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. CORNACCHIA: Was it a rope? What was the diameter on the tether? THE WITNESS (Gresock): I don't recollect the diameter on the tether, but certainly one of the constraints with this particular type of visibility assessment is that the air does move, and so but the balloons do not always. They're not always	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	THE WITNESS (Gresock): The viewshed information that is provided on this figure was actually originally provided in response to Interrogatory CSC-1 in response to question CSC-13, and that didn't have anything at all to do with the balloons. It had to do with the elevations of the facility overall as it related to digital elevation
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. CORNACCHIA: Was it a rope? What was the diameter on the tether? THE WITNESS (Gresock): I don't recollect the diameter on the tether, but certainly one of the constraints with this particular type of visibility assessment is that the air does move, and so but the balloons do not always. They're not always aloft straight up in the air. It's the way	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE WITNESS (Gresock): The viewshed information that is provided on this figure was actually originally provided in response to Interrogatory CSC-1 in response to question CSC-13, and that didn't have anything at all to do with the balloons. It had to do with the elevations of the facility overall as it related to digital elevation models that were used. And there are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. CORNACCHIA: Was it a rope? What was the diameter on the tether? THE WITNESS (Gresock): I don't recollect the diameter on the tether, but certainly one of the constraints with this particular type of visibility assessment is that the air does move, and so but the balloons do not always. They're not always aloft straight up in the air. It's the way that kind of methodology works. And so for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	THE WITNESS (Gresock): The viewshed information that is provided on this figure was actually originally provided in response to Interrogatory CSC-1 in response to question CSC-13, and that didn't have anything at all to do with the balloons. It had to do with the elevations of the facility overall as it related to digital elevation models that were used. And there are different colors that are there intended to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. CORNACCHIA: Was it a rope? What was the diameter on the tether? THE WITNESS (Gresock): I don't recollect the diameter on the tether, but certainly one of the constraints with this particular type of visibility assessment is that the air does move, and so but the balloons do not always. They're not always aloft straight up in the air. It's the way that kind of methodology works. And so for that reason we're not representing that these	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	THE WITNESS (Gresock): The viewshed information that is provided on this figure was actually originally provided in response to Interrogatory CSC-1 in response to question CSC-13, and that didn't have anything at all to do with the balloons. It had to do with the elevations of the facility overall as it related to digital elevation models that were used. And there are different colors that are there intended to represent year-round visibility and potential
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. CORNACCHIA: Was it a rope? What was the diameter on the tether? THE WITNESS (Gresock): I don't recollect the diameter on the tether, but certainly one of the constraints with this particular type of visibility assessment is that the air does move, and so but the balloons do not always. They're not always aloft straight up in the air. It's the way that kind of methodology works. And so for that reason we're not representing that these are actual and exact heights of what you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	THE WITNESS (Gresock): The viewshed information that is provided on this figure was actually originally provided in response to Interrogatory CSC-1 in response to question CSC-13, and that didn't have anything at all to do with the balloons. It had to do with the elevations of the facility overall as it related to digital elevation models that were used. And there are different colors that are there intended to represent year-round visibility and potential seasonal visibility. All of that uses at the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. CORNACCHIA: Was it a rope? What was the diameter on the tether? THE WITNESS (Gresock): I don't recollect the diameter on the tether, but certainly one of the constraints with this particular type of visibility assessment is that the air does move, and so but the balloons do not always. They're not always aloft straight up in the air. It's the way that kind of methodology works. And so for that reason we're not representing that these are actual and exact heights of what you would see. These are intended to be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE WITNESS (Gresock): The viewshed information that is provided on this figure was actually originally provided in response to Interrogatory CSC-1 in response to question CSC-13, and that didn't have anything at all to do with the balloons. It had to do with the elevations of the facility overall as it related to digital elevation models that were used. And there are different colors that are there intended to represent year-round visibility and potential seasonal visibility. All of that uses at the most conservative, a view that is just a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. CORNACCHIA: Was it a rope? What was the diameter on the tether? THE WITNESS (Gresock): I don't recollect the diameter on the tether, but certainly one of the constraints with this particular type of visibility assessment is that the air does move, and so but the balloons do not always. They're not always aloft straight up in the air. It's the way that kind of methodology works. And so for that reason we're not representing that these are actual and exact heights of what you would see. These are intended to be representations and the best we can provide.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	THE WITNESS (Gresock): The viewshed information that is provided on this figure was actually originally provided in response to Interrogatory CSC-1 in response to question CSC-13, and that didn't have anything at all to do with the balloons. It had to do with the elevations of the facility overall as it related to digital elevation models that were used. And there are different colors that are there intended to represent year-round visibility and potential seasonal visibility. All of that uses at the most conservative, a view that is just a digital elevation model of the terrain only,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. CORNACCHIA: Was it a rope? What was the diameter on the tether? THE WITNESS (Gresock): I don't recollect the diameter on the tether, but certainly one of the constraints with this particular type of visibility assessment is that the air does move, and so but the balloons do not always. They're not always aloft straight up in the air. It's the way that kind of methodology works. And so for that reason we're not representing that these are actual and exact heights of what you would see. These are intended to be representations and the best we can provide. MR. CORNACCHIA: And they were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	THE WITNESS (Gresock): The viewshed information that is provided on this figure was actually originally provided in response to Interrogatory CSC-1 in response to question CSC-13, and that didn't have anything at all to do with the balloons. It had to do with the elevations of the facility overall as it related to digital elevation models that were used. And there are different colors that are there intended to represent year-round visibility and potential seasonal visibility. All of that uses at the most conservative, a view that is just a digital elevation model of the terrain only, assuming no vegetation, and then overlays
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. CORNACCHIA: Was it a rope? What was the diameter on the tether? THE WITNESS (Gresock): I don't recollect the diameter on the tether, but certainly one of the constraints with this particular type of visibility assessment is that the air does move, and so but the balloons do not always. They're not always aloft straight up in the air. It's the way that kind of methodology works. And so for that reason we're not representing that these are actual and exact heights of what you would see. These are intended to be representations and the best we can provide. MR. CORNACCHIA: And they were intended to represent what?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	THE WITNESS (Gresock): The viewshed information that is provided on this figure was actually originally provided in response to Interrogatory CSC-1 in response to question CSC-13, and that didn't have anything at all to do with the balloons. It had to do with the elevations of the facility overall as it related to digital elevation models that were used. And there are different colors that are there intended to represent year-round visibility and potential seasonal visibility. All of that uses at the most conservative, a view that is just a digital elevation model of the terrain only, assuming no vegetation, and then overlays information about vegetation to provide some
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. CORNACCHIA: Was it a rope? What was the diameter on the tether? THE WITNESS (Gresock): I don't recollect the diameter on the tether, but certainly one of the constraints with this particular type of visibility assessment is that the air does move, and so but the balloons do not always. They're not always aloft straight up in the air. It's the way that kind of methodology works. And so for that reason we're not representing that these are actual and exact heights of what you would see. These are intended to be representations and the best we can provide. MR. CORNACCHIA: And they were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE WITNESS (Gresock): The viewshed information that is provided on this figure was actually originally provided in response to Interrogatory CSC-1 in response to question CSC-13, and that didn't have anything at all to do with the balloons. It had to do with the elevations of the facility overall as it related to digital elevation models that were used. And there are different colors that are there intended to represent year-round visibility and potential seasonal visibility. All of that uses at the most conservative, a view that is just a digital elevation model of the terrain only, assuming no vegetation, and then overlays information about vegetation to provide some information about how, during seasonal
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. CORNACCHIA: Was it a rope? What was the diameter on the tether? THE WITNESS (Gresock): I don't recollect the diameter on the tether, but certainly one of the constraints with this particular type of visibility assessment is that the air does move, and so but the balloons do not always. They're not always aloft straight up in the air. It's the way that kind of methodology works. And so for that reason we're not representing that these are actual and exact heights of what you would see. These are intended to be representations and the best we can provide. MR. CORNACCHIA: And they were intended to represent what? THE WITNESS (Gresock): The	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE WITNESS (Gresock): The viewshed information that is provided on this figure was actually originally provided in response to Interrogatory CSC-1 in response to question CSC-13, and that didn't have anything at all to do with the balloons. It had to do with the elevations of the facility overall as it related to digital elevation models that were used. And there are different colors that are there intended to represent year-round visibility and potential seasonal visibility. All of that uses at the most conservative, a view that is just a digital elevation model of the terrain only, assuming no vegetation, and then overlays information about vegetation to provide some
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. CORNACCHIA: Was it a rope? What was the diameter on the tether? THE WITNESS (Gresock): I don't recollect the diameter on the tether, but certainly one of the constraints with this particular type of visibility assessment is that the air does move, and so but the balloons do not always. They're not always aloft straight up in the air. It's the way that kind of methodology works. And so for that reason we're not representing that these are actual and exact heights of what you would see. These are intended to be representations and the best we can provide. MR. CORNACCHIA: And they were intended to represent what? THE WITNESS (Gresock): The photographs or the balloons?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE WITNESS (Gresock): The viewshed information that is provided on this figure was actually originally provided in response to Interrogatory CSC-1 in response to question CSC-13, and that didn't have anything at all to do with the balloons. It had to do with the elevations of the facility overall as it related to digital elevation models that were used. And there are different colors that are there intended to represent year-round visibility and potential seasonal visibility. All of that uses at the most conservative, a view that is just a digital elevation model of the terrain only, assuming no vegetation, and then overlays information about vegetation to provide some information about how, during seasonal conditions, views may be screened.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. CORNACCHIA: Was it a rope? What was the diameter on the tether? THE WITNESS (Gresock): I don't recollect the diameter on the tether, but certainly one of the constraints with this particular type of visibility assessment is that the air does move, and so but the balloons do not always. They're not always aloft straight up in the air. It's the way that kind of methodology works. And so for that reason we're not representing that these are actual and exact heights of what you would see. These are intended to be representations and the best we can provide. MR. CORNACCHIA: And they were intended to represent what? THE WITNESS (Gresock): The photographs or the balloons? MR. CORNACCHIA: The balloons	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	THE WITNESS (Gresock): The viewshed information that is provided on this figure was actually originally provided in response to Interrogatory CSC-1 in response to question CSC-13, and that didn't have anything at all to do with the balloons. It had to do with the elevations of the facility overall as it related to digital elevation models that were used. And there are different colors that are there intended to represent year-round visibility and potential seasonal visibility. All of that uses at the most conservative, a view that is just a digital elevation model of the terrain only, assuming no vegetation, and then overlays information about how, during seasonal conditions, views may be screened.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. CORNACCHIA: Was it a rope? What was the diameter on the tether? THE WITNESS (Gresock): I don't recollect the diameter on the tether, but certainly one of the constraints with this particular type of visibility assessment is that the air does move, and so but the balloons do not always. They're not always aloft straight up in the air. It's the way that kind of methodology works. And so for that reason we're not representing that these are actual and exact heights of what you would see. These are intended to be representations and the best we can provide. MR. CORNACCHIA: And they were intended to represent what? THE WITNESS (Gresock): The photographs or the balloons? MR. CORNACCHIA: The balloons and the tether.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE WITNESS (Gresock): The viewshed information that is provided on this figure was actually originally provided in response to Interrogatory CSC-1 in response to question CSC-13, and that didn't have anything at all to do with the balloons. It had to do with the elevations of the facility overall as it related to digital elevation models that were used. And there are different colors that are there intended to represent year-round visibility and potential seasonal visibility. All of that uses at the most conservative, a view that is just a digital elevation model of the terrain only, assuming no vegetation, and then overlays information about vegetation to provide some information about how, during seasonal conditions, views may be screened. MR. CORNACCHIA: And that's of the 220-foot-diameter stacks?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. CORNACCHIA: Was it a rope? What was the diameter on the tether? THE WITNESS (Gresock): I don't recollect the diameter on the tether, but certainly one of the constraints with this particular type of visibility assessment is that the air does move, and so but the balloons do not always. They're not always aloft straight up in the air. It's the way that kind of methodology works. And so for that reason we're not representing that these are actual and exact heights of what you would see. These are intended to be representations and the best we can provide. MR. CORNACCHIA: And they were intended to represent what? THE WITNESS (Gresock): The photographs or the balloons? MR. CORNACCHIA: The balloons and the tether. THE WITNESS (Gresock): The	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE WITNESS (Gresock): The viewshed information that is provided on this figure was actually originally provided in response to Interrogatory CSC-1 in response to question CSC-13, and that didn't have anything at all to do with the balloons. It had to do with the elevations of the facility overall as it related to digital elevation models that were used. And there are different colors that are there intended to represent year-round visibility and potential seasonal visibility. All of that uses at the most conservative, a view that is just a digital elevation model of the terrain only, assuming no vegetation, and then overlays information about vegetation to provide some information about how, during seasonal conditions, views may be screened. MR. CORNACCHIA: And that's of the 220-foot-diameter stacks? THE WITNESS (Gresock): It's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. CORNACCHIA: Was it a rope? What was the diameter on the tether? THE WITNESS (Gresock): I don't recollect the diameter on the tether, but certainly one of the constraints with this particular type of visibility assessment is that the air does move, and so but the balloons do not always. They're not always aloft straight up in the air. It's the way that kind of methodology works. And so for that reason we're not representing that these are actual and exact heights of what you would see. These are intended to be representations and the best we can provide. MR. CORNACCHIA: And they were intended to represent what? THE WITNESS (Gresock): The photographs or the balloons? MR. CORNACCHIA: The balloons and the tether. THE WITNESS (Gresock): The balloons were intended to represent stack top	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE WITNESS (Gresock): The viewshed information that is provided on this figure was actually originally provided in response to Interrogatory CSC-1 in response to question CSC-13, and that didn't have anything at all to do with the balloons. It had to do with the elevations of the facility overall as it related to digital elevation models that were used. And there are different colors that are there intended to represent year-round visibility and potential seasonal visibility. All of that uses at the most conservative, a view that is just a digital elevation model of the terrain only, assuming no vegetation, and then overlays information about vegetation to provide some information about how, during seasonal conditions, views may be screened. MR. CORNACCHIA: And that's of the 220-foot-diameter stacks? THE WITNESS (Gresock): It's of a height that would be seen. It's not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. CORNACCHIA: Was it a rope? What was the diameter on the tether? THE WITNESS (Gresock): I don't recollect the diameter on the tether, but certainly one of the constraints with this particular type of visibility assessment is that the air does move, and so but the balloons do not always. They're not always aloft straight up in the air. It's the way that kind of methodology works. And so for that reason we're not representing that these are actual and exact heights of what you would see. These are intended to be representations and the best we can provide. MR. CORNACCHIA: And they were intended to represent what? THE WITNESS (Gresock): The photographs or the balloons? MR. CORNACCHIA: The balloons and the tether. THE WITNESS (Gresock): The balloons were intended to represent stack top height.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE WITNESS (Gresock): The viewshed information that is provided on this figure was actually originally provided in response to Interrogatory CSC-1 in response to question CSC-13, and that didn't have anything at all to do with the balloons. It had to do with the elevations of the facility overall as it related to digital elevation models that were used. And there are different colors that are there intended to represent year-round visibility and potential seasonal visibility. All of that uses at the most conservative, a view that is just a digital elevation model of the terrain only, assuming no vegetation, and then overlays information about vegetation to provide some information about how, during seasonal conditions, views may be screened. MR. CORNACCHIA: And that's of the 220-foot-diameter stacks? THE WITNESS (Gresock): It's of a height that would be seen. It's not making any judgment about what it is that

48 (Pages 729 to 732)

	Page 733		Page 735
1	THE WITNESS (Bazinet): And	1	a revisiting of a viewshed that is
2	for all structures.	2	appropriate with the size and the girth of
3	THE WITNESS (Gresock): For	3	those stacks and taking into account the
4	all structures, but obviously, the stacks are	4	plume also? Because it is a very large
5			concern for a number of residents in the
б	MR. CORNACCHIA: And so it's	6	Naugatuck area and, specifically, the
7	for the power plant as a whole based upon	7	Westover Hills Subdivision. And I thank you
8	what is expected for seasonal visibility?	8	very much.
9	THE WITNESS (Gresock): And	9	THE CHAIRMAN: Your question
10	it's really based upon the stack top heights,	10	is duly noted.
11	which are the tallest heights.	11	MR. CORNACCHIA: Thank you.
12	MR. CORNACCHIA: And these are	12	THE CHAIRMAN: Let me see if
13	for the structure only and contemplating no	13	the Council members have any questions. I
14	plume from anything coming from the	14	had a couple.
15	THE WITNESS (Gresock): There	15	On the environmental impacts,
16	was not a visibility assessment done with	16	if you have, as apparently ISO and
17	regard to a plume; that's correct.	17	particularly the State of Connecticut wants
18	MR. CORNACCHIA: Is any	18	you to be able or have, the ability to use
19	visibility assessment going to be done?	19	oil for potentially longer periods of time,
20	Because you conclude that there was virtually	20	does that affect, in other words, does oil
21 22	no view based upon the roads that were traversed. And I'm quoting your language in	21 22	have more pollution than gas? THE WITNESS (Sellars):
22	there: "As far as the viewshed, the	22	Generally the impacts from oil are a little
24	overwhelming majority of the area surrounding	23	greater than the impacts for gas, but what
25	the project had no visibility," and then you	25	was included in our environmental analysis
	the project had no visionity, and then you		was mendeed in our environmental analysis
	Page 734		Page 736
1	describe the topography and so on.	1	was the maximum amount of oil that we are
2	This was based upon viewing	2	
		2	requesting permission from the DEEP in our
3	two 5-foot balloons. And again, my question	3	air permit to use 720 hours. So our impacts,
4	is: Is there something else that could be	3 4	air permit to use 720 hours. So our impacts, relative to short-term standards, assume
4 5	is: Is there something else that could be more indicative of the size of the structures	3 4 5	air permit to use 720 hours. So our impacts, relative to short-term standards, assume worst case oil impacts, and then on in
4 5 6	is: Is there something else that could be more indicative of the size of the structures because each one of the stacks are 22 feet in	3 4 5 6	air permit to use 720 hours. So our impacts, relative to short-term standards, assume worst case oil impacts, and then on in fact, even on the annual basis it's based on
4 5 6 7	is: Is there something else that could be more indicative of the size of the structures because each one of the stacks are 22 feet in diameter, not 5, and the stacks themselves	3 4 5 6 7	air permit to use 720 hours. So our impacts, relative to short-term standards, assume worst case oil impacts, and then on in fact, even on the annual basis it's based on the numbers that I just quoted for PM 2.5.
4 5 6 7 8	is: Is there something else that could be more indicative of the size of the structures because each one of the stacks are 22 feet in diameter, not 5, and the stacks themselves are not the girth of a tether, and some of	3 4 5 6 7 8	air permit to use 720 hours. So our impacts, relative to short-term standards, assume worst case oil impacts, and then on in fact, even on the annual basis it's based on the numbers that I just quoted for PM 2.5. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
4 5 7 8 9	is: Is there something else that could be more indicative of the size of the structures because each one of the stacks are 22 feet in diameter, not 5, and the stacks themselves are not the girth of a tether, and some of the issues that have been brought up by many	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	air permit to use 720 hours. So our impacts, relative to short-term standards, assume worst case oil impacts, and then on in fact, even on the annual basis it's based on the numbers that I just quoted for PM 2.5. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Further clarification. Even though those
4 5 7 8 9 10	is: Is there something else that could be more indicative of the size of the structures because each one of the stacks are 22 feet in diameter, not 5, and the stacks themselves are not the girth of a tether, and some of the issues that have been brought up by many residents has been the viewability and the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	air permit to use 720 hours. So our impacts, relative to short-term standards, assume worst case oil impacts, and then on in fact, even on the annual basis it's based on the numbers that I just quoted for PM 2.5. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Further clarification. Even though those impacts were half of what the previous
4 5 7 8 9 10 11	is: Is there something else that could be more indicative of the size of the structures because each one of the stacks are 22 feet in diameter, not 5, and the stacks themselves are not the girth of a tether, and some of the issues that have been brought up by many residents has been the viewability and the view that they may incur of the power plant.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	air permit to use 720 hours. So our impacts, relative to short-term standards, assume worst case oil impacts, and then on in fact, even on the annual basis it's based on the numbers that I just quoted for PM 2.5. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Further clarification. Even though those impacts were half of what the previous modeling of the smaller turbine were, that
4 5 7 8 9 10	is: Is there something else that could be more indicative of the size of the structures because each one of the stacks are 22 feet in diameter, not 5, and the stacks themselves are not the girth of a tether, and some of the issues that have been brought up by many residents has been the viewability and the view that they may incur of the power plant. And I'm just trying to	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	air permit to use 720 hours. So our impacts, relative to short-term standards, assume worst case oil impacts, and then on in fact, even on the annual basis it's based on the numbers that I just quoted for PM 2.5. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Further clarification. Even though those impacts were half of what the previous modeling of the smaller turbine were, that impact assessment assumed 8,760 hours of oil
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	is: Is there something else that could be more indicative of the size of the structures because each one of the stacks are 22 feet in diameter, not 5, and the stacks themselves are not the girth of a tether, and some of the issues that have been brought up by many residents has been the viewability and the view that they may incur of the power plant.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	air permit to use 720 hours. So our impacts, relative to short-term standards, assume worst case oil impacts, and then on in fact, even on the annual basis it's based on the numbers that I just quoted for PM 2.5. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Further clarification. Even though those impacts were half of what the previous modeling of the smaller turbine were, that impact assessment assumed 8,760 hours of oil burning even though that's not going to be
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	is: Is there something else that could be more indicative of the size of the structures because each one of the stacks are 22 feet in diameter, not 5, and the stacks themselves are not the girth of a tether, and some of the issues that have been brought up by many residents has been the viewability and the view that they may incur of the power plant. And I'm just trying to THE WITNESS (Gresock): We	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	air permit to use 720 hours. So our impacts, relative to short-term standards, assume worst case oil impacts, and then on in fact, even on the annual basis it's based on the numbers that I just quoted for PM 2.5. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Further clarification. Even though those impacts were half of what the previous modeling of the smaller turbine were, that impact assessment assumed 8,760 hours of oil
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 is: Is there something else that could be more indicative of the size of the structures because each one of the stacks are 22 feet in diameter, not 5, and the stacks themselves are not the girth of a tether, and some of the issues that have been brought up by many residents has been the viewability and the view that they may incur of the power plant. And I'm just trying to THE WITNESS (Gresock): We have no plans, at this time, to do anything 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	air permit to use 720 hours. So our impacts, relative to short-term standards, assume worst case oil impacts, and then on in fact, even on the annual basis it's based on the numbers that I just quoted for PM 2.5. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Further clarification. Even though those impacts were half of what the previous modeling of the smaller turbine were, that impact assessment assumed 8,760 hours of oil burning even though that's not going to be possible. We would never burn more than 720.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 is: Is there something else that could be more indicative of the size of the structures because each one of the stacks are 22 feet in diameter, not 5, and the stacks themselves are not the girth of a tether, and some of the issues that have been brought up by many residents has been the viewability and the view that they may incur of the power plant. And I'm just trying to THE WITNESS (Gresock): We have no plans, at this time, to do anything further. The Council has asked us questions 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	air permit to use 720 hours. So our impacts, relative to short-term standards, assume worst case oil impacts, and then on in fact, even on the annual basis it's based on the numbers that I just quoted for PM 2.5. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Further clarification. Even though those impacts were half of what the previous modeling of the smaller turbine were, that impact assessment assumed 8,760 hours of oil burning even though that's not going to be possible. We would never burn more than 720. We just tried to do the analysis based on the
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 is: Is there something else that could be more indicative of the size of the structures because each one of the stacks are 22 feet in diameter, not 5, and the stacks themselves are not the girth of a tether, and some of the issues that have been brought up by many residents has been the viewability and the view that they may incur of the power plant. And I'm just trying to THE WITNESS (Gresock): We have no plans, at this time, to do anything further. The Council has asked us questions and has required us to fly the balloons to give an indication. The original application had information in it, and this is a 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	air permit to use 720 hours. So our impacts, relative to short-term standards, assume worst case oil impacts, and then on in fact, even on the annual basis it's based on the numbers that I just quoted for PM 2.5. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Further clarification. Even though those impacts were half of what the previous modeling of the smaller turbine were, that impact assessment assumed 8,760 hours of oil burning even though that's not going to be possible. We would never burn more than 720. We just tried to do the analysis based on the maximum hourly impact and assume that that impact occurred for the entire year. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Just
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 is: Is there something else that could be more indicative of the size of the structures because each one of the stacks are 22 feet in diameter, not 5, and the stacks themselves are not the girth of a tether, and some of the issues that have been brought up by many residents has been the viewability and the view that they may incur of the power plant. And I'm just trying to THE WITNESS (Gresock): We have no plans, at this time, to do anything further. The Council has asked us questions and has required us to fly the balloons to give an indication. The original application had information in it, and this is a modification of that application that was for 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	air permit to use 720 hours. So our impacts, relative to short-term standards, assume worst case oil impacts, and then on in fact, even on the annual basis it's based on the numbers that I just quoted for PM 2.5. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Further clarification. Even though those impacts were half of what the previous modeling of the smaller turbine were, that impact assessment assumed 8,760 hours of oil burning even though that's not going to be possible. We would never burn more than 720. We just tried to do the analysis based on the maximum hourly impact and assume that that impact occurred for the entire year. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Just which I think it's been answered, but on the
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	is: Is there something else that could be more indicative of the size of the structures because each one of the stacks are 22 feet in diameter, not 5, and the stacks themselves are not the girth of a tether, and some of the issues that have been brought up by many residents has been the viewability and the view that they may incur of the power plant. And I'm just trying to THE WITNESS (Gresock): We have no plans, at this time, to do anything further. The Council has asked us questions and has required us to fly the balloons to give an indication. The original application had information in it, and this is a modification of that application that was for a project that had stacks that were the same	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	air permit to use 720 hours. So our impacts, relative to short-term standards, assume worst case oil impacts, and then on in fact, even on the annual basis it's based on the numbers that I just quoted for PM 2.5. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Further clarification. Even though those impacts were half of what the previous modeling of the smaller turbine were, that impact assessment assumed 8,760 hours of oil burning even though that's not going to be possible. We would never burn more than 720. We just tried to do the analysis based on the maximum hourly impact and assume that that impact occurred for the entire year. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Just which I think it's been answered, but on the impacts on what I call global warming, or I
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 is: Is there something else that could be more indicative of the size of the structures because each one of the stacks are 22 feet in diameter, not 5, and the stacks themselves are not the girth of a tether, and some of the issues that have been brought up by many residents has been the viewability and the view that they may incur of the power plant. And I'm just trying to THE WITNESS (Gresock): We have no plans, at this time, to do anything further. The Council has asked us questions and has required us to fly the balloons to give an indication. The original application had information in it, and this is a modification of that application that was for a project that had stacks that were the same height or actually a little higher. 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	air permit to use 720 hours. So our impacts, relative to short-term standards, assume worst case oil impacts, and then on in fact, even on the annual basis it's based on the numbers that I just quoted for PM 2.5. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Further clarification. Even though those impacts were half of what the previous modeling of the smaller turbine were, that impact assessment assumed 8,760 hours of oil burning even though that's not going to be possible. We would never burn more than 720. We just tried to do the analysis based on the maximum hourly impact and assume that that impact occurred for the entire year. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Just which I think it's been answered, but on the impacts on what I call global warming, or I guess climate change is probably a better
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	is: Is there something else that could be more indicative of the size of the structures because each one of the stacks are 22 feet in diameter, not 5, and the stacks themselves are not the girth of a tether, and some of the issues that have been brought up by many residents has been the viewability and the view that they may incur of the power plant. And I'm just trying to THE WITNESS (Gresock): We have no plans, at this time, to do anything further. The Council has asked us questions and has required us to fly the balloons to give an indication. The original application had information in it, and this is a modification of that application that was for a project that had stacks that were the same height or actually a little higher. MR. CORNACCHIA: And if I can	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	air permit to use 720 hours. So our impacts, relative to short-term standards, assume worst case oil impacts, and then on in fact, even on the annual basis it's based on the numbers that I just quoted for PM 2.5. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Further clarification. Even though those impacts were half of what the previous modeling of the smaller turbine were, that impact assessment assumed 8,760 hours of oil burning even though that's not going to be possible. We would never burn more than 720. We just tried to do the analysis based on the maximum hourly impact and assume that that impact occurred for the entire year. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Just which I think it's been answered, but on the impacts on what I call global warming, or I guess climate change is probably a better description, given what's been happening
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	is: Is there something else that could be more indicative of the size of the structures because each one of the stacks are 22 feet in diameter, not 5, and the stacks themselves are not the girth of a tether, and some of the issues that have been brought up by many residents has been the viewability and the view that they may incur of the power plant. And I'm just trying to THE WITNESS (Gresock): We have no plans, at this time, to do anything further. The Council has asked us questions and has required us to fly the balloons to give an indication. The original application had information in it, and this is a modification of that application that was for a project that had stacks that were the same height or actually a little higher. MR. CORNACCHIA: And if I can just add that's all my questions for	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	air permit to use 720 hours. So our impacts, relative to short-term standards, assume worst case oil impacts, and then on in fact, even on the annual basis it's based on the numbers that I just quoted for PM 2.5. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Further clarification. Even though those impacts were half of what the previous modeling of the smaller turbine were, that impact assessment assumed 8,760 hours of oil burning even though that's not going to be possible. We would never burn more than 720. We just tried to do the analysis based on the maximum hourly impact and assume that that impact occurred for the entire year. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Just which I think it's been answered, but on the impacts on what I call global warming, or I guess climate change is probably a better description, given what's been happening THE WITNESS (Sellars): It is
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	is: Is there something else that could be more indicative of the size of the structures because each one of the stacks are 22 feet in diameter, not 5, and the stacks themselves are not the girth of a tether, and some of the issues that have been brought up by many residents has been the viewability and the view that they may incur of the power plant. And I'm just trying to THE WITNESS (Gresock): We have no plans, at this time, to do anything further. The Council has asked us questions and has required us to fly the balloons to give an indication. The original application had information in it, and this is a modification of that application that was for a project that had stacks that were the same height or actually a little higher. MR. CORNACCHIA: And if I can	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	air permit to use 720 hours. So our impacts, relative to short-term standards, assume worst case oil impacts, and then on in fact, even on the annual basis it's based on the numbers that I just quoted for PM 2.5. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Further clarification. Even though those impacts were half of what the previous modeling of the smaller turbine were, that impact assessment assumed 8,760 hours of oil burning even though that's not going to be possible. We would never burn more than 720. We just tried to do the analysis based on the maximum hourly impact and assume that that impact occurred for the entire year. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Just which I think it's been answered, but on the impacts on what I call global warming, or I guess climate change is probably a better description, given what's been happening

49 (Pages 733 to 736)

	Page 737		Page 739
1	end up modeling this winter as probably the	1	So, in terms of how much CO2
2	worst case above and beyond, but in any case,	2	is emitted from this particular plant, there
3	is that predominantly CO2?	3	would be more with a larger plant because it
4	THE WITNESS (Sellars): The	4	combusts more fuel. But if you look at on a
5	greenhouse gases are measured in terms of	5	per megawatt hour basis because the
6	what they call carbon dioxide equivalents,	6	difference in that megawatts would have to be
7	and for a combustion source like this, it's	7	made up by some other source, the facility,
8	predominantly CO2, but the facility does emit	8	because of its improved efficiency, will
9	some other pollutants that are greenhouse	9	actually emit less CO2 per megawatt hour.
10	gases that, although they're in smaller	10	And then if you look further
11	quantities, much much smaller quantities,	11	at sort of what happens on a regional basis,
12	they have a higher global warming potential	12	which probably in terms of displacement is
13	than CO2 does, so you adjust them to be the	13	probably the same as looking at it on a
14	equivalent of CO2.	14	global basis, because it is a more efficient
15	So it would include methane	15	addition into the dispatch stack or the
16	and sulphur SF6, sulphur hexafluoride. So	16	dispatch queue, it's going to displace the
17	they are greenhouse gases that are emitted in	17	operation of older, less efficient units that
18	very very small quantities, but we adjust	18	emit more CO2 per megawatt hour, and the
19	them to be CO2 by taking into account their	19	modeling that was done showed that, with the
20	different greenhouse gas warming potential	20	facility in the mix in 2018, there would be
21	and then convert it all to a CO2 equivalent.	21	in excess of 270,000 tons per year of CO2
22	But there's not much difference between CO2	22	less emitted than with the facility, and that
23	and CO2 equivalents.	23	number would grow to over 486,000 tons per
24	THE CHAIRMAN: The total with	24	year by 2020.
25	the H Series, what you're proposing of	25	THE CHAIRMAN: Getting to that
23	the firstenes, what you're proposing of	23	THE CHARGE AND COUNTY IN COUNTY IN THE
	Page 738		Page 740
1		1	
1 2	Page 738 greenhouse gases, is that less than it was on the other one or more?	1 2	question about retirements, and I know
	greenhouse gases, is that less than it was on the other one or more?		question about retirements, and I know there's a list of plants that are either
2	greenhouse gases, is that less than it was on the other one or more? THE WITNESS (Sellars): If you	2	question about retirements, and I know there's a list of plants that are either scheduled or, I guess, potentially scheduled,
2 3	greenhouse gases, is that less than it was on the other one or more?	2 3	question about retirements, and I know there's a list of plants that are either scheduled or, I guess, potentially scheduled, my question may already be answered again
2 3 4	greenhouse gases, is that less than it was on the other one or more? THE WITNESS (Sellars): If you look at it on a per megawatt hour basis,	2 3 4	question about retirements, and I know there's a list of plants that are either scheduled or, I guess, potentially scheduled,
2 3 4 5	greenhouse gases, is that less than it was on the other one or more? THE WITNESS (Sellars): If you look at it on a per megawatt hour basis, which is how the DEEP likes us to and the	2 3 4 5	question about retirements, and I know there's a list of plants that are either scheduled or, I guess, potentially scheduled, my question may already be answered again with the volume of material, but can you
2 3 4 5 6	greenhouse gases, is that less than it was on the other one or more? THE WITNESS (Sellars): If you look at it on a per megawatt hour basis, which is how the DEEP likes us to and the EPA like us to look at this, because unlike	2 3 4 5 6	question about retirements, and I know there's a list of plants that are either scheduled or, I guess, potentially scheduled, my question may already be answered again with the volume of material, but can you directly are there any plants that will
2 3 4 5 6 7	greenhouse gases, is that less than it was on the other one or more? THE WITNESS (Sellars): If you look at it on a per megawatt hour basis, which is how the DEEP likes us to and the EPA like us to look at this, because unlike the local pollutants or even the regional air	2 3 4 5 6 7	question about retirements, and I know there's a list of plants that are either scheduled or, I guess, potentially scheduled, my question may already be answered again with the volume of material, but can you directly are there any plants that will that you can say directly will be retired
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	greenhouse gases, is that less than it was on the other one or more? THE WITNESS (Sellars): If you look at it on a per megawatt hour basis, which is how the DEEP likes us to and the EPA like us to look at this, because unlike the local pollutants or even the regional air pollutants, a greenhouse gas is a global	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	question about retirements, and I know there's a list of plants that are either scheduled or, I guess, potentially scheduled, my question may already be answered again with the volume of material, but can you directly are there any plants that will that you can say directly will be retired because this, if this project were to be approved? I guess I have to say groundbreaking, given the history of the '99,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	greenhouse gases, is that less than it was on the other one or more? THE WITNESS (Sellars): If you look at it on a per megawatt hour basis, which is how the DEEP likes us to and the EPA like us to look at this, because unlike the local pollutants or even the regional air pollutants, a greenhouse gas is a global pollutant.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	question about retirements, and I know there's a list of plants that are either scheduled or, I guess, potentially scheduled, my question may already be answered again with the volume of material, but can you directly are there any plants that will that you can say directly will be retired because this, if this project were to be approved? I guess I have to say
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	greenhouse gases, is that less than it was on the other one or more? THE WITNESS (Sellars): If you look at it on a per megawatt hour basis, which is how the DEEP likes us to and the EPA like us to look at this, because unlike the local pollutants or even the regional air pollutants, a greenhouse gas is a global pollutant. THE CHAIRMAN: It does affect us locally as well as regionally THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	question about retirements, and I know there's a list of plants that are either scheduled or, I guess, potentially scheduled, my question may already be answered again with the volume of material, but can you directly are there any plants that will that you can say directly will be retired because this, if this project were to be approved? I guess I have to say groundbreaking, given the history of the '99, but can we directly say that this will result in plant X and plant Y being or is this just
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	greenhouse gases, is that less than it was on the other one or more? THE WITNESS (Sellars): If you look at it on a per megawatt hour basis, which is how the DEEP likes us to and the EPA like us to look at this, because unlike the local pollutants or even the regional air pollutants, a greenhouse gas is a global pollutant. THE CHAIRMAN: It does affect us locally as well as regionally THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes, but what affects you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	question about retirements, and I know there's a list of plants that are either scheduled or, I guess, potentially scheduled, my question may already be answered again with the volume of material, but can you directly are there any plants that will that you can say directly will be retired because this, if this project were to be approved? I guess I have to say groundbreaking, given the history of the '99, but can we directly say that this will result in plant X and plant Y being or is this just going to help the overall I figure there
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	greenhouse gases, is that less than it was on the other one or more? THE WITNESS (Sellars): If you look at it on a per megawatt hour basis, which is how the DEEP likes us to and the EPA like us to look at this, because unlike the local pollutants or even the regional air pollutants, a greenhouse gas is a global pollutant. THE CHAIRMAN: It does affect us locally as well as regionally THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes, but what affects you THE CHAIRMAN: as well as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	question about retirements, and I know there's a list of plants that are either scheduled or, I guess, potentially scheduled, my question may already be answered again with the volume of material, but can you directly are there any plants that will that you can say directly will be retired because this, if this project were to be approved? I guess I have to say groundbreaking, given the history of the '99, but can we directly say that this will result in plant X and plant Y being or is this just going to help the overall I figure there was some reason you came in this afternoon.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	greenhouse gases, is that less than it was on the other one or more? THE WITNESS (Sellars): If you look at it on a per megawatt hour basis, which is how the DEEP likes us to and the EPA like us to look at this, because unlike the local pollutants or even the regional air pollutants, a greenhouse gas is a global pollutant. THE CHAIRMAN: It does affect us locally as well as regionally THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes, but what affects you THE CHAIRMAN: as well as our children and grandchildren. Sorry. I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	question about retirements, and I know there's a list of plants that are either scheduled or, I guess, potentially scheduled, my question may already be answered again with the volume of material, but can you directly are there any plants that will that you can say directly will be retired because this, if this project were to be approved? I guess I have to say groundbreaking, given the history of the '99, but can we directly say that this will result in plant X and plant Y being or is this just going to help the overall I figure there was some reason you came in this afternoon. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	greenhouse gases, is that less than it was on the other one or more? THE WITNESS (Sellars): If you look at it on a per megawatt hour basis, which is how the DEEP likes us to and the EPA like us to look at this, because unlike the local pollutants or even the regional air pollutants, a greenhouse gas is a global pollutant. THE CHAIRMAN: It does affect us locally as well as regionally THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes, but what affects you THE CHAIRMAN: as well as our children and grandchildren. Sorry. I had to get that statement in.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	question about retirements, and I know there's a list of plants that are either scheduled or, I guess, potentially scheduled, my question may already be answered again with the volume of material, but can you directly are there any plants that will that you can say directly will be retired because this, if this project were to be approved? I guess I have to say groundbreaking, given the history of the '99, but can we directly say that this will result in plant X and plant Y being or is this just going to help the overall I figure there was some reason you came in this afternoon. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So just a first stab at this. So the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	greenhouse gases, is that less than it was on the other one or more? THE WITNESS (Sellars): If you look at it on a per megawatt hour basis, which is how the DEEP likes us to and the EPA like us to look at this, because unlike the local pollutants or even the regional air pollutants, a greenhouse gas is a global pollutant. THE CHAIRMAN: It does affect us locally as well as regionally THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes, but what affects you THE CHAIRMAN: as well as our children and grandchildren. Sorry. I had to get that statement in. THE WITNESS (Sellars): Right.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	question about retirements, and I know there's a list of plants that are either scheduled or, I guess, potentially scheduled, my question may already be answered again with the volume of material, but can you directly are there any plants that will that you can say directly will be retired because this, if this project were to be approved? I guess I have to say groundbreaking, given the history of the '99, but can we directly say that this will result in plant X and plant Y being or is this just going to help the overall I figure there was some reason you came in this afternoon. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So just a first stab at this. So the retirements that we reported are either
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	greenhouse gases, is that less than it was on the other one or more? THE WITNESS (Sellars): If you look at it on a per megawatt hour basis, which is how the DEEP likes us to and the EPA like us to look at this, because unlike the local pollutants or even the regional air pollutants, a greenhouse gas is a global pollutant. THE CHAIRMAN: It does affect us locally as well as regionally THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes, but what affects you THE CHAIRMAN: as well as our children and grandchildren. Sorry. I had to get that statement in. THE WITNESS (Sellars): Right. And how we are affected is what the global	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	question about retirements, and I know there's a list of plants that are either scheduled or, I guess, potentially scheduled, my question may already be answered again with the volume of material, but can you directly are there any plants that will that you can say directly will be retired because this, if this project were to be approved? I guess I have to say groundbreaking, given the history of the '99, but can we directly say that this will result in plant X and plant Y being or is this just going to help the overall I figure there was some reason you came in this afternoon. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So just a first stab at this. So the retirements that we reported are either retirements that have been approved and gone
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	greenhouse gases, is that less than it was on the other one or more? THE WITNESS (Sellars): If you look at it on a per megawatt hour basis, which is how the DEEP likes us to and the EPA like us to look at this, because unlike the local pollutants or even the regional air pollutants, a greenhouse gas is a global pollutant. THE CHAIRMAN: It does affect us locally as well as regionally THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes, but what affects you THE CHAIRMAN: as well as our children and grandchildren. Sorry. I had to get that statement in. THE WITNESS (Sellars): Right. And how we are affected is what the global average concentration of CO2 is because	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	question about retirements, and I know there's a list of plants that are either scheduled or, I guess, potentially scheduled, my question may already be answered again with the volume of material, but can you directly are there any plants that will that you can say directly will be retired because this, if this project were to be approved? I guess I have to say groundbreaking, given the history of the '99, but can we directly say that this will result in plant X and plant Y being or is this just going to help the overall I figure there was some reason you came in this afternoon. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So just a first stab at this. So the retirements that we reported are either retirements that have been approved and gone away or will be going away prior to this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	greenhouse gases, is that less than it was on the other one or more? THE WITNESS (Sellars): If you look at it on a per megawatt hour basis, which is how the DEEP likes us to and the EPA like us to look at this, because unlike the local pollutants or even the regional air pollutants, a greenhouse gas is a global pollutant. THE CHAIRMAN: It does affect us locally as well as regionally THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes, but what affects you THE CHAIRMAN: as well as our children and grandchildren. Sorry. I had to get that statement in. THE WITNESS (Sellars): Right. And how we are affected is what the global average concentration of CO2 is because that's how the weather patterns are affected,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	question about retirements, and I know there's a list of plants that are either scheduled or, I guess, potentially scheduled, my question may already be answered again with the volume of material, but can you directly are there any plants that will that you can say directly will be retired because this, if this project were to be approved? I guess I have to say groundbreaking, given the history of the '99, but can we directly say that this will result in plant X and plant Y being or is this just going to help the overall I figure there was some reason you came in this afternoon. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So just a first stab at this. So the retirements that we reported are either retirements that have been approved and gone away or will be going away prior to this facility going operational on June 1, 2018,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	greenhouse gases, is that less than it was on the other one or more? THE WITNESS (Sellars): If you look at it on a per megawatt hour basis, which is how the DEEP likes us to and the EPA like us to look at this, because unlike the local pollutants or even the regional air pollutants, a greenhouse gas is a global pollutant. THE CHAIRMAN: It does affect us locally as well as regionally THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes, but what affects you THE CHAIRMAN: as well as our children and grandchildren. Sorry. I had to get that statement in. THE WITNESS (Sellars): Right. And how we are affected is what the global average concentration of CO2 is because that's how the weather patterns are affected, so it's really the global concentration of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	question about retirements, and I know there's a list of plants that are either scheduled or, I guess, potentially scheduled, my question may already be answered again with the volume of material, but can you directly are there any plants that will that you can say directly will be retired because this, if this project were to be approved? I guess I have to say groundbreaking, given the history of the '99, but can we directly say that this will result in plant X and plant Y being or is this just going to help the overall I figure there was some reason you came in this afternoon. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So just a first stab at this. So the retirements that we reported are either retirements that have been approved and gone away or will be going away prior to this facility going operational on June 1, 2018, which is the projected COD date. To say that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	greenhouse gases, is that less than it was on the other one or more? THE WITNESS (Sellars): If you look at it on a per megawatt hour basis, which is how the DEEP likes us to and the EPA like us to look at this, because unlike the local pollutants or even the regional air pollutants, a greenhouse gas is a global pollutant. THE CHAIRMAN: It does affect us locally as well as regionally THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes, but what affects you THE CHAIRMAN: as well as our children and grandchildren. Sorry. I had to get that statement in. THE WITNESS (Sellars): Right. And how we are affected is what the global average concentration of CO2 is because that's how the weather patterns are affected, so it's really the global concentration of CO2. So there's not localized effects from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	question about retirements, and I know there's a list of plants that are either scheduled or, I guess, potentially scheduled, my question may already be answered again with the volume of material, but can you directly are there any plants that will that you can say directly will be retired because this, if this project were to be approved? I guess I have to say groundbreaking, given the history of the '99, but can we directly say that this will result in plant X and plant Y being or is this just going to help the overall I figure there was some reason you came in this afternoon. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So just a first stab at this. So the retirements that we reported are either retirements that have been approved and gone away or will be going away prior to this facility going operational on June 1, 2018, which is the projected COD date. To say that any one unit that will exist on June 1, 2018
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	greenhouse gases, is that less than it was on the other one or more? THE WITNESS (Sellars): If you look at it on a per megawatt hour basis, which is how the DEEP likes us to and the EPA like us to look at this, because unlike the local pollutants or even the regional air pollutants, a greenhouse gas is a global pollutant. THE CHAIRMAN: It does affect us locally as well as regionally THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes, but what affects you THE CHAIRMAN: as well as our children and grandchildren. Sorry. I had to get that statement in. THE WITNESS (Sellars): Right. And how we are affected is what the global average concentration of CO2 is because that's how the weather patterns are affected, so it's really the global concentration of CO2. So there's not localized effects from CO2 in terms of climate change. It's really	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	question about retirements, and I know there's a list of plants that are either scheduled or, I guess, potentially scheduled, my question may already be answered again with the volume of material, but can you directly are there any plants that will that you can say directly will be retired because this, if this project were to be approved? I guess I have to say groundbreaking, given the history of the '99, but can we directly say that this will result in plant X and plant Y being or is this just going to help the overall I figure there was some reason you came in this afternoon. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So just a first stab at this. So the retirements that we reported are either retirements that have been approved and gone away or will be going away prior to this facility going operational on June 1, 2018, which is the projected COD date. To say that any one unit that will exist on June 1, 2018 will directly go away as a result of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	greenhouse gases, is that less than it was on the other one or more? THE WITNESS (Sellars): If you look at it on a per megawatt hour basis, which is how the DEEP likes us to and the EPA like us to look at this, because unlike the local pollutants or even the regional air pollutants, a greenhouse gas is a global pollutant. THE CHAIRMAN: It does affect us locally as well as regionally THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes, but what affects you THE CHAIRMAN: as well as our children and grandchildren. Sorry. I had to get that statement in. THE WITNESS (Sellars): Right. And how we are affected is what the global average concentration of CO2 is because that's how the weather patterns are affected, so it's really the global concentration of CO2. So there's not localized effects from CO2 in terms of climate change. It's really on what that 400 parts per billion that we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	question about retirements, and I know there's a list of plants that are either scheduled or, I guess, potentially scheduled, my question may already be answered again with the volume of material, but can you directly are there any plants that will that you can say directly will be retired because this, if this project were to be approved? I guess I have to say groundbreaking, given the history of the '99, but can we directly say that this will result in plant X and plant Y being or is this just going to help the overall I figure there was some reason you came in this afternoon. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So just a first stab at this. So the retirements that we reported are either retirements that have been approved and gone away or will be going away prior to this facility going operational on June 1, 2018, which is the projected COD date. To say that any one unit that will exist on June 1, 2018 will directly go away as a result of the addition to this project, we can't point to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	greenhouse gases, is that less than it was on the other one or more? THE WITNESS (Sellars): If you look at it on a per megawatt hour basis, which is how the DEEP likes us to and the EPA like us to look at this, because unlike the local pollutants or even the regional air pollutants, a greenhouse gas is a global pollutant. THE CHAIRMAN: It does affect us locally as well as regionally THE WITNESS (Sellars): Yes, but what affects you THE CHAIRMAN: as well as our children and grandchildren. Sorry. I had to get that statement in. THE WITNESS (Sellars): Right. And how we are affected is what the global average concentration of CO2 is because that's how the weather patterns are affected, so it's really the global concentration of CO2. So there's not localized effects from CO2 in terms of climate change. It's really	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	question about retirements, and I know there's a list of plants that are either scheduled or, I guess, potentially scheduled, my question may already be answered again with the volume of material, but can you directly are there any plants that will that you can say directly will be retired because this, if this project were to be approved? I guess I have to say groundbreaking, given the history of the '99, but can we directly say that this will result in plant X and plant Y being or is this just going to help the overall I figure there was some reason you came in this afternoon. THE WITNESS (Bazinet): So just a first stab at this. So the retirements that we reported are either retirements that have been approved and gone away or will be going away prior to this facility going operational on June 1, 2018, which is the projected COD date. To say that any one unit that will exist on June 1, 2018 will directly go away as a result of the

50 (Pages 737 to 740)

	Page 741	Page 743
$ \begin{array}{c} 1\\2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\\25\end{array} $	However, it's highly likely that, due to a number of different factors, including sliding them further out on the dispatch stack, the addition of new rules in the markets that make those units less economic, that they will go away. Is it due directly, again, only to us? Absolutely not. And can we identify them specifically? No. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Mr. Lynch? MR. LYNCH: With regards to the Chairman's last question on retirement, if renewables in your plant don't come on line in time, would ISO keep these old fossil fuel plants on standby in case we are running in what used to be the old OP3 emergency situation? THE WITNESS (Powers): The short answer is likely yes. You know, the third rail for the ISO is always reliability. So to the extent that units didn't come in and other units went away, they would likely attempt to put these units, some of the units, on reliability must-run agreements. They'd also seek other solutions, but in the	 who has not become a party or intervenor but who desires to make his or her views known to the Council may continue to file written statements with the Council until the record closes. Copies of the transcript of this hearing will be filed at the Oxford and Middlebury Town Clerk's office. I apologize in advance to Naugatuck, but I think hopefully there's a way to cross town lines. MR. CORNACCHIA: There is. Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you all for your participation. Drive home safely. (Whereupon, the witnesses were excused, and the above proceedings were adjourned at 3:58 p.m.)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Page 742 short-term, yes, there would be a cost-of-service based agreement. MR. LYNCH: Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. THE CHAIRMAN: We're going to call it for a day, I'm told. The Council announces that it will continue the evidentiary portion of this hearing here on Thursday, March 12th, obviously, this year, at 11:00 a.m., with party and intervenor appearances in the order on the Council's hearing program. So again, please note that. And at some point, If you're not here when you're called, you're not going to get another chance, so just make sure those parties and intervenors and you all obviously know who you are any prefiled testimony is due on March 3rd. That's very important for everybody's sake, so make sure those of you that have any if you haven't already submitted any, just make sure that that prefile testimony, in writing, is submitted no later than March 3rd.	Page 744 1 CERTIFICATE 2 Ihereby certify that the foregoing 200 3 pages are a complete and accurate 4 computer-aided transcription of my original 5 stenotype notes taken of the Continued 6 Council Meeting in Re: DOCKET NO. 1928, 7 CPV TOWANTIC, LLC, MOTION TO REOPEN AND 8 MODIFY THE JUNE 23, 1999, CERTIFICATE OF 9 ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC NEED 10 BASED ON CHANGED CONDITIONS PURSUANT TO 11 CONNECTICUT GENERAL STATUTES 4-181A(B) FOR 12 THE CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION 13 OF A 785 MW DUAL-FUEL COMBINED CYCLE ELECTRIC 14 GENERATING FACILITY LOCATED NORTH OF THE 15 PROKOP ROAD AND TOWANTIC HILL ROAD 16 INTERSECTION IN THE TOWN OF OXFORD, 17 CONNECTICUT, at the Connecticut Siting 18 Council, 10 Franklin Square, New Britain, 19 Count Reporter UNITED REPORTERS, INC. 24 21 UNITED REPORTERS, INC. 22 Itasa L. Warner, L.S.R. 061 23 Court Reporter

51 (Pages 741 to 744)

SITING COUNCIL - DOCKET NO. 1928 February 24, 2015

		Page	745	
1	I N D E X WITNESSES ERIC RICHARD DAVISON - Page 553			
2	FREDERICK SELLARS LYNN GRESOCK			
3	ANDREW BAZINET JON DONOVAN			
4	DEAN GUSTAFSON TANYA BODELL			
5	DANIELLE POWERS Page 554 BURT STEVENS Page 606			
6	EXAMINATION Mr. Stevens			
7	Mr. Small Mr. Pietrorazio Mr. Savarese			
9	Mr. Savarese Mr. Perrone Mr. Comacchia			
10	EXHIBITS (Received in evidence.)			
11	EXHIBIT DESCRIPTION PAGE II-B-14 CPV Towantic's responses to 556			
12	Westover School interrogatories, dated February 10, 2015			
13	II-B-15 CPV Towantic's responses to 556			
14 15	Council interrogatories, Set II, Part II, responses to Questions 6, 18, 22-24, 28 and 29, dated			
16	February 16, 2015			
17	II-B-16 CPV Towantic's responses to 556 Council interrogatories, Set III,			
18	Question 1, dated February 16, 2015			
19	II-B-17 CPV Towantic's second 556 Late-Filed Exhibits, dated February 16, 2015			
20 21	 c. Site topography (surface 556 and subterranean) water flow 			
21	impacts			
23	 Bulk file stormwater management 556 and erosion control report, revised 2/13/15 			
24 25	i. Updated generation facility 556 retirement list			
		Page	746	
-		Lage	, 10	
1	I N D E X (Cont'd.) EXHIBIT DESCRIPTION PAGE			
2	II-B-18 CPV Towantic's third 556			
3	Late-Filed exhibits, dated February 17, 2015			
4	a. Draft water management plan 556			
5	b. Analysis of impact on wetland 556			
6 7	dependent biodiversity due to reduced river flow levels.			
8	 CPV environmental policies and 556 programs 			
9	 Drawing comparing elevations of 556 			
10	nearby hills to stack heights measured above mean sea level			
11	II-B-19 Resume of Eric R. Davison, 556 dated February 18, 2015			
12	II-B-20 CPV Towantic's responses to 556			
13	Council interrogatories, Set III, Part II, Questions 1-32, dated			
14 15	February 19, 2015 II-B-21 CPV Towantic's responses to Jay 556			
16	Halpern's interrogatories, dated February 20, 2015.			
17	II-B-22 CPV Towantic's updated 556			
18	responses to Council interrogatories, Set III, Part II,			
19	Questions 12 and 29, with attachments, dated			
20	February 20, 2015.			
21 22				
23 24				
25				

52 (Pages 745 to 746)

	_	_	-	_
A	acquisition	548:12 550:1	617:5 644:12	airplane 587:18
a.m 544:20	688:9	550:12	aim 628:10	625:14 653:11
548:4 742:11	acronym 651:3	admission	631:25 660:7	654:22
ability 579:1	Act 548:12	556:17	670:9 672:17	airplanes 624:9
611:14 693:1	actions 713:2	admitted	air 577:9	airport 583:12
735:18	active 714:7,23	556:15,20	619:13 629:9	583:13 584:11
able 557:16	716:22	adopt 554:7	630:11 652:6	586:14 588:22
	activities	558:6,7 607:2	681:22 682:2	589:23 596:16
596:8 603:16 610:13 666:7	656:10 696:2	advance 558:4	682:7 694:10	596:16,25
	696:18,19	588:16 743:9	722:21,25	598:4 603:14
672:20 692:23	697:3,8	advanced 726:3	723:8,23	607:17 608:6
697:16 726:4	actual 569:25	advancing	724:16,20	608:18,19
735:18	615:9 703:10	713:3	726:13 730:7	610:9,11
abnormal 613:1	721:9 730:12	advantageous	730:9 731:9	611:2,4
absence 676:1	add 592:13	658:17 705:9	736:3 738:7	612:16 613:10
absolute 569:8	593:16 668:2	adverse 584:17	aircraft 583:2,5	614:12 615:6
absolutely	719:9 722:3	626:19 664:6	585:3,21	615:7,21
651:12 652:19	719:9722:5	664:7 667:8	586:8 589:2,3	616:2 617:3
661:12 687:18	added 549:25	722:21	589:14,15,20	618:21,23
741:7	703:13	advised 630:11	589:23,25	619:5 621:1,5
abstract 634:20	addition 684:6	632:8	,	,
accept 640:21			590:2,4,4,11	625:19,20
acceptable	713:7 714:6	advisory 630:8	590:12,17,17	628:12,14
627:9	739:15 740:24	affect 692:6	590:22,23	634:1 651:10
accepted 649:14	741:4	735:20 738:10	591:15,20,25	651:14,19,21
664:13	additional	afraid 593:7	592:1,2,4,4,7	654:17 658:18
accident 655:18	552:16 560:20	afternoon 637:1	592:11,16,17	659:1,7,11
656:17 681:14	595:19 638:25	637:16 644:14	595:17 601:10	660:2 664:5,6
accidents	667:21 676:24	740:14	602:3,16	664:9 670:24
596:10	702:5 703:5	age 611:11	603:4,11,15	671:13,14
accommodate	709:18,19	agenda 549:22	607:16,19,20	684:4,11,13
559:9 688:8	719:4	ages 695:13,14	607:24 608:22	686:17
accommodati	address 559:12	aggressive	611:10 612:3	airports 596:8
695:5	559:17 609:8	718:24	623:10 624:3	596:14,21,24
account 714:22	716:21	ago 653:12	638:2,5	610:18
715:14 717:11	addressed	654:18 688:22	639:20 640:12	airspace 585:20
717:19 724:6	687:16 701:11	700:15 709:8	640:25 641:1	631:9,11,19
735:3 737:19	716:12	agree 580:10	641:4,6,22	alert 596:1
accuracy	addressing	588:3,7	646:11,15	alerted 613:9
665:20	689:4 699:25	594:19 633:2	647:17,20,24	Algonquin
accurate 606:20	adjacent 680:22	641:2 649:7	648:9,13	628:19
640:22 703:9	adjourned	677:6,12	649:11,12	allotted 711:15
703:14 731:7	743:17	agreement	652:4 657:11	allow 595:19
744:3	adjust 638:21	742:2	673:12	665:25
acknowledged	737:13,18	agreements	aircrafts 584:21	allowed 632:7
664:13	adjusted 706:2	741:24	airmen 598:13	633:25 654:1
	administrative	ahead 554:10	598:22	allowing 559:8
				-

aloft 730:9	586:6,11,23	application	621:6 654:8	associated
alterations	588:15,17	624:18 661:19	672:2,3 680:6	577:7 581:16
678:1	591:23 592:24	662:8 709:5	695:12,12,21	600:7,7 601:9
altitude 583:2,8	593:23 596:20	715:7 724:10	703:11 705:15	661:24 662:1
585:19,24	626:25 630:18	734:17,19	713:8 729:15	720:17
603:10 605:13	652:19,20	applications	April 653:22	association
652:5,6 654:7	659:13,19	615:18 687:6	aqueous 683:17	610:18 674:15
ambient 564:5	660:5,23	applied 704:21	Archer 648:15	674:18
571:2 577:9	666:7,24	706:24	area 566:19	assume 736:4
580:12 687:3	685:20 705:4	applies 658:20	574:21 576:16	736:16
722:24 723:8	711:3,23	appraised 597:9	585:25 589:5	assumed 552:20
724:16,20	716:21 725:14	appreciable	595:19,20	638:4 714:4,6
726:13	727:1,5,6	646:25	620:5 630:17	736:12
American 624:5	741:19	appreciate	631:11 640:14	assuming
638:1	answered 561:2	676:9 695:4	664:8 671:5	567:19 571:25
ammonia	588:10 597:1	702:8 725:17	698:10 699:2	732:15
683:10,17	626:1 645:12	727:14	709:3 712:7	assumption
amount 563:6,8	707:1 725:6	approach	715:12 726:18	558:10 598:5
573:21,22	736:19 740:4	584:21 585:2	727:25 728:9	assumptions
648:25 709:1	answers 645:15	585:10 586:7	733:24 735:6	717:12 718:10
713:18 736:1	702:3	603:4,6,7	areas 616:22	720:2,4
Amusement	anymore	652:7 653:2	argue 719:20	asthma 723:4
676:14	576:24 595:2	approaching	738:25	Asylum 545:22
analysis 685:2,5	626:6	653:12 670:13	argument	atmosphere
685:24 688:2	apart 593:18	appropriate	722:11	565:2,4 577:5
691:22 714:3	708:13,14	616:3 638:21	ascertained	592:9
718:12 735:25	apologies	735:2	645:7	atmospheric
736:15 746:5	639:11 723:17	approval	aside 688:12	635:3
Analyst 545:15	apologize	615:19 642:1	725:20,24	ATOS 601:13
545:18	577:12 684:9	642:5	asked 638:7	attachments
ancillary	723:15 743:8	approve 622:23	659:20 664:14	727:21 746:19
584:12 720:15	apparently	approved 549:4	685:5,11,21	attain 645:18
ANDREW	675:25 720:7	549:13 621:21	687:8 725:13	645:21
745:3	735:16	621:22 642:10	731:19 734:15	attempt 741:23
Anecdotally	appearances	708:1 715:7	asking 578:8	attempting
671:1	742:12	724:12,18	595:9 599:1	627:5
angle 603:19	applicant	726:15 740:9	662:9 665:10	attend 697:16
announced	558:23 593:13	740:18	704:6,9	attention
719:3,3	621:3,24	approves	710:24	652:15
announces	626:1 627:7	615:17	aspects 645:2	attentive 652:9
742:8	627:14,19	approximately	713:16	attenuates
annual 579:9	645:6 647:23	548:4 559:22	assertion	560:22
724:19 736:6	668:7 676:2	565:15 579:3	722:20	Attorney
answer 564:4	696:3 702:4	579:16 580:22	assessment	545:12 550:15
570:11 571:14	applicants	586:3 588:2	730:6 733:16	551:4 556:20
571:14 578:24	721:19	588:21 607:13	733:19 736:12	558:6 591:2

UNITED REPORTERS, INC. info@unitedreporters.com Nationwide-866-534-3383-Toll-Free

594:19 637:17	aware 595:6	ballpark 680:9	599:4,7	646:6 648:24
670:6 694:23	596:6 610:16	Baron 647:6	678:25 680:17	649:16 650:6
auction 686:20	620:24 623:3	base 672:10	681:7 684:8	657:15,19
Audubon	626:9 627:7	695:23 714:3	684:22 685:6	658:10 660:23
547:11 674:23	628:25 642:4	based 544:8	686:25 687:13	662:23 663:12
August 698:3	642:9 661:3	552:22 559:22	687:17,24	663:22 666:19
699:16	677:10 698:22	560:2 561:13	688:16,21	667:2 668:5
Australian	077.10 070.22	561:16 568:13	689:19,25	668:23 683:2
582:8 649:8	B	589:23 597:24	690:4,11,20	686:10 696:16
authority 582:9	b 544:22 554:13	666:11 677:11	691:1,9,21	698:1,2,9
583:12 675:8	554:17 606:1	679:5 686:23	692:20 693:14	701:22 702:19
684:5,11,13	637:6,10,12	690:7,18	696:8,14	725:7 731:19
686:18	746:5	691:22 705:13	697:7,12	believes 666:15
availability	Bachman	714:25 728:13	698:5,18	beneficial 705:5
692:6,7	545:10 551:4	731:22 733:7	699:3,13	benefit 584:16
714:14	551:6 553:13	733:10,21	700:3,21	687:22 703:6
available	557:16 584:8	734:2 736:6	701:21 703:17	710:19
549:23,24	591:2 606:3	736:15 742:2	703:23 704:5	benefits 712:14
553:8 556:25	644:8	744:10	704:14,23	719:11,21
595:13 701:6	back 551:17	basic 638:10	706:25 709:13	720:11,17,19
710:24 711:5	565:12 609:22	695:7	710:3 711:17	720:20
711:8,9	622:22 624:11	basically 558:11	719:8 720:8	Berlin 5 46:16
average 579:9	636:20 639:13	571:9 575:1	731:3 733:1	best 554:2
598:2 626:16	673:3 676:23	617:18 686:22	740:15 745:3	556:4 571:13
689:15 738:19	680:1 693:20	718:3 728:19	beam 614:22	571:15 606:20
aviation 582:9	715:22 716:13	basis 553:5	bear 572:18	625:25 730:14
586:12 611:1	722:16	599:9,11,11	bearing 619:20	better 572:22
623:1 624:5	backcast 691:22	621:23 664:19	Beechcraft	622:2,12
638:8 649:9	bad 622:3	679:25 723:8	647:6,6	633:6 658:22
650:22 653:21	652:23 653:5	736:6 738:4	beginning	659:7 660:10
661:5,14	balance 584:16	739:5,11,14	719:21	701:18 704:17
avoid 595:7	721:18	basket 731:10	behalf 659:11	706:21 707:5
598:15 610:14	balances 564:5	Bazinet 555:12	belief 554:3	707:19 731:17
615:8 622:18	balancing	555:22 556:7	556:4	736:21
630:11 631:9	725:12	559:14 563:10	believe 551:19	beyond 594:12
631:12,14	balloon 684:7	563:14 564:3	557:13 563:5	609:2 666:8
650:23 651:7	731:9,11	564:9,12,17	577:2 583:21	723:3 737:2
652:9 671:24	balloons 632:9	564:22 565:1	585:6 604:21	BFR 638:10
672:15,18	632:15,22	570:17,22	609:19 621:22	big 568:3 578:9
avoidance	727:18,23	571:6,17,22	623:2,21	686:15
628:4	728:14,23	572:12,19	624:25 625:1	billion 738:24
avoided 618:8	729:9,13,15	573:5,12	627:2 628:17	biodiversity
629:10,16,17	729:24 730:8	578:22 579:18	631:5 633:5	746:6
629:20 671:23	730:18,19,22	579:24 588:11	637:25 638:20	biologist 553:19
720:23	731:22 732:6	597:11,14,22	641:8 642:16	bit 632:25 652:8
avoiding 631:18	734:3,16	598:10,24	645:5,12,20	652:20 677:13
-				

UNITED REPORTERS, INC. info@unitedreporters.com Nationwide-866-534-3383-Toll-Free

Ir				
688:2 706:13	662:19	554:12 637:4	737:6	Cessna 595:1
706:14	briefly 660:5	637:5,9	carrying 626:7	624:2,3
black 687:9,20	bring 626:4	745:20 746:7	Casa 649:8	646:13,14,17
688:8,14	670:12 671:20	CAA 583:19,23	685:19	648:12,16,18
,		CAA 385:19,25 616:2 684:6		cetera 597:25
blackout 688:13	Britain 544:19		case 550:25	
blow 563:24	744:18	685:23,24	551:14 552:7	682:19 686:7
blowing 575:9	broad 666:18	686:2	557:13 558:15	chair 557:19
575:24	broad-based	calculate 623:4	579:10 650:8	643:21 695:1
blows 681:14	700:12	712:14	668:6 678:20	Chairman
Blythe 660:11	broke 639:4	calculated	700:25 709:7	544:23 545:4
660:12,16,18	710:17	581:20 690:14	714:3 724:15	548:1,5,7
Bodell 555:16	brought 629:23	691:12	736:5 737:2,2	550:14,15,19
556:1,11	630:3 658:1,3	calculation	740:25 741:15	551:7,8,22
707:8 708:10	726:11 734:9	572:20 580:14	categories	552:1,6,11,12
711:22 712:11	BROWN	690:7	590:1 706:9	552:18,24
713:12 714:19	545:21	calculations	category 585:25	553:2,6,9
716:20 717:25	Btu 679:13	559:21 561:13	589:2 590:15	554:6,10
718:22 719:25	Btu's 679:16,18	579:2 582:10	590:15 646:18	556:16 557:1
722:2,13	679:20,24	608:9 622:12	646:20,21	557:2,10,22
745:4	710:10,11	623:4,25	caught 654:22	557:25 558:18
boiler 565:10	build-out	663:14 685:10	cause 635:1	558:22 559:2
565:13 566:8	718:24 719:5	711:16,21	649:11	559:16 567:14
Bonanza 647:7	719:13	713:10,10	cell 715:8	583:16 584:4
Bonovan 556:8	built 624:5	California	Cello 550:3	584:9 587:12
Borough 675:7	719:2 722:5	660:12,13,17	celsius 640:19	587:16 590:20
Boston 692:8	Bulk 745:22	call 598:2	center 575:21	591:4,9,13
721:8	bump 678:20	613:21 672:7	577:4 578:2	593:12 594:5
bother 624:13	bureaucracy	736:20 737:6	certain 566:14	594:14,15,16
boundary	627:3	742:7	633:5 656:11	594:18 595:5
680:23	burn 570:15,20	called 548:3	657:11	595:22 605:20
Bradley 617:15	570:21 571:7	553:12 598:12	certainly	605:25 606:5
620:8,17	571:11,24	606:2 675:24	584:13 589:24	606:9,14,18
Brainard	572:7 573:21	675:25 742:15	595:12 596:21	606:23 607:2
614:12 617:3	579:15,19	calm 602:10	597:15 632:7	607:6,9 612:8
617:11 744:24	736:14	635:2	730:5	612:11,22
break 590:24	burning 563:7		certificate	612:11,22
591:6 627:17	736:13	capability 687:9 687:20	544:7 548:14	613:5,23 614:3 615:14
627:20 636:19	BURT 546:21	capacity 686:20	549:5,14 550:4 21 24	616:5,10,11
708:12,14	745:5 Branton 550:22	687:5 693:16 706:22 708:6	550:4,21,24	616:12,15
breaker-and	Burton 550:22	706:23 708:6	676:25 744:1	621:17,18
690:23	business 626:6	709:15,19	744:8	623:7,13
Bridgeport	<u> </u>	717:5,7	certificated	624:11,17
614:15 616:19	c 545:1 546:1	720:12,14,18	684:15	625:24 626:11
619:23		725:19	certified 647:12	627:16 636:18
Bridle 674:18	547:1 553:11	car 567:11	647:25	637:16,20
brief 638:25	553:11 554:11	carbon 709:6	certify 744:2	641:25 642:1
II		-		

Ľ

4

1				-
643:7,12,17	chance 551:16	669:13	closest 625:14	619:22 620:17
643:25 644:10	588:12 643:14	circularization	closing 688:23	672:11 673:3
644:12,14	742:16	684:23 688:19	cloud 593:25	700:14 707:3
645:13 652:11	change 620:7	circulation	604:17 670:18	709:19 720:1
655:16,21	645:2 679:16	557:21 609:12	clouds 593:19	741:13,21
656:7,20,25	692:12 714:21	698:10	604:1 633:15	comes 645:1
659:2,12,16	721:15 736:21	circumstance	633:18,20	707:2 717:20
660:20,24	738:23	615:12	638:8 645:13	coming 612:14
661:2,9,15,23	changed 544:8	circumstances	651:4	614:4 617:11
662:3,7,17,21	677:22,24	638:13	Club 546:20	648:18 653:16
664:24,25	077.22,24 744:10	Cirrus 646:12	550:23 551:24	733:14
665:5,10,22	changes 555:18	citizen's 701:14	557:6,12	comment 551:5
666:10,21	678:3,7	Civil 582:8	644:6	584:5 655:14
667:12,19,22	684:15	CL&P 673:20	clue 581:17	684:24
669:1,2 670:3		clarification	CO2 737:3,8,13	
673:16,20,21	changing 619:14	602:21 616:17	737:14,19,21	comments 684:4,19
673:23 674:1				
674:4,8,10,12	Chapter 674:2 characteristics	644:4 666:11 736:9	737:22,23 738:19,22,23	685:23 689:5 689:8 720:7
674:14,17,20	724:25	clarify 655:21	739:1,9,18,21	
, ,	characterized	692:21	coal 630:13	Commerce 697:5
674:22,24		clean 682:3	Coalition 547:3	
675:1,4,7,10	691:23,24			commercial 619:8 719:19
675:12,14,17	Chester 547:19	cleaning 681:19	674:7	
675:19 676:3	675:20 695:8	clear 604:8,12	COCHRAN	Commission
676:10,13,19	children 738:15	681:19 704:2	546:17 673:21	682:13
676:21 677:2	chiropractor	708:2,19	COD 740:21	common 618:24
694:18 695:2	626:5	clearing 720:11	cold 567:3,10	646:11
695:17 702:2	choose 571:13	720:22	570:7 633:2,9	communities
702:8 722:15	571:14,14,15	clearly 592:7	635:2,12,15	698:20 700:7
725:5,18	654:1	596:7	674:4 692:9	700:13
727:2,14	chose 623:25	clerk's 549:19	694:8	community
731:15 735:9	624:8 647:22	743:8	colder 645:22	650:23 696:2
735:12 736:8	654:5	climate 736:21	coldest 569:8	696:7,17
736:18,24,25	circle 630:16	738:23	colliding 601:10	697:2 699:12
737:24 738:10	circle-to-land	Clipper 606:10	colors 732:10	700:19,20
738:14 739:25	603:3,6,7,14	609:22	combination	company
741:9 742:5,6	603:22 619:21	close 596:9,23	713:25	546:13 553:20
743:13	620:1,19	628:20,22	combined	comparable
Chairman's	632:19 652:25	650:15 654:13	544:11 548:17	647:5 705:25
741:12	653:3,7,14,18	677:20 723:7	549:8 744:13	compared
chairperson	654:3,10	closed 597:21	combined-cycle	679:3 724:9
583:23	670:15	closely 632:18	660:19	compares
challenge	circled 654:6	closer 609:1	combustion	560:11
572:22	circling 583:7	625:13 628:13	573:18 713:22	comparing
challenged	585:9,24,25	672:16,18,25	737:7	560:12 562:9
729:4	603:9,11,14	closes 684:25	combusts 739:4	746:9
Chamber 697:5	circular 649:9	743:5	come 608:5	comparison
_			=	-

UNITED REPORTERS, INC. info@unitedreporters.com Nationwide-866-534-3383-Toll-Free

concerned	configuration	consequences	544:10 548:16	continues
735:5	confer 676:4	692:21	construction	744:5
715:3 726:18	conduct 697:14	consecutive	730:5	544:17 639:1
642:19 648:9	744:10	cons 701:19	constraints	Continued
627:24 628:2	714:20 732:18	691:8	688:1 692:22	743:3
612:12 618:2	693:23 694:10	680:15 690:24	constraint	725:14 742:9
610:12,14	689:22 691:20	connection	626:18	666:1,5 670:4
concern 577:14	677:23 686:24	744:19,24	constitute	643:8 660:25
738:21	670:19,19	744:11,17,17	652:6	612:9 627:18
578:3 738:19	656:11 670:18	721:12 735:17	constantly	continue 551:9
concentration	652:22 656:2	718:1,8,13,14	714:12,17	context 666:17
744:4	636:8 651:1,2	717:14,24	constant 714:9	contents 558:25
computer-aid	635:7,21	716:18,24	705:6	679:13
682:8	615:21 635:1	715:25 716:14	consolidated	content 608:1
compressors	604:15 605:9	712:5 715:15	600:6	680:20 733:13
682:5	602:4,9 603:9	701:8 707:11	consistently	contemplating
629:10 630:19	585:11 596:7	695:10 701:6	600:20 720:4	715:17 718:19
628:19,25	571:16 581:18	684:4,11,13	consistent	711:20,24
compressor	544:8 571:15	616:1 664:5	consist 555:1	703:10 711:13
681:22 682:2	conditions	583:12 603:1	589:24	691:10 703:3
compressed	694:6	549:11 550:8	considers	contemplated
660:8	583:3 628:6	548:11,21,25	659:24	716:17
631:17 660:7	567:10 570:23	546:12,16	considering	contemplate
comply 628:9	condition	545:23 546:5	691:15,20	700:1,2
631:21	578:6	544:18,19	586:13 667:11	699:1,10
complied	condensed	544:1,2,9,15	549:4,13	contamination
659:25	578:4 581:7	Connecticut	considered	678:20
complicates	condensation	connect 680:9	722:4	containment
682:10	720:3	726:21 727:3	consideration	547:1 746:1
compliance	conclusions	confusion 561:4	595:18 650:13	Cont'd 546:1
630:14	557:12	577:12 650:10	considerable	679:2
complexes	concluded	confused	734:25	consumption
complex 594:12	626:16 733:20	conflict 646:2,6	691:7 707:9	721:9
688:13 744:3	conclude	confirm 690:12	658:19 685:1	consumers
complete	681:11 699:25	confine 592:21	consider 605:14	563:20
667:7	627:23 634:10	585:23	732:13	consumed
complement	619:21 622:24	configurations	719:10,24	consume 688:5
594:13	607:23 608:3	725:4 726:24	conservative	684:5
competence	concerns	711:6,10	718:20 722:10	consultations
721:11	609:20 658:18	710:14,17	715:24 716:10	687:14
compelling	concerning	707:13 708:13	712:4,5 715:3	consultation
550:4 744:9	649:6 717:3,4	705:12 707:12	711:14,21	586:13
544:7 548:14	622:21 642:18	602:24 703:4	conservation	consultant
Compatibility	615:8 622:16	572:8 579:4	608:20 620:15	consult 687:11
723:4 compass 728:25	594:21 608:4 608:17 611:2	560:3 571:24 571:25 572:6	601:10 641:11 consequently	549:6 550:5 744:12

UNITED REPORTERS, INC. info@unitedreporters.com Nationwide-866-534-3383-Toll-Free www.unitedreporters.com

I				
602:13	702:14,22	666:25 671:21	744:18 745:14	create 573:17
contracted	703:20,25	678:15 681:6	745:17 746:13	668:13 673:12
623:22	704:8,16	681:8,12,17	746:17	creates 667:20
contrary 722:23	705:8,24	682:7,15	Council's	credit 726:9
contribute	706:8,19	683:22 687:23	554:25 593:2	criteria 602:17
709:23	707:21 708:19	688:17 694:15	742:13	640:12 641:4
contributed	709:25 710:13	703:24 704:13	Councilor	641:6,11,19
681:13	710:20 711:1	704:15 710:17	604:5	649:14 663:5
control 563:22	711:4,12,19	725:7 731:2	country 610:20	critical 625:21
564:2,16,21	712:1,24	733:17	648:13	629:2,6,19
675:8 683:16	714:16 715:2	corrected	couple 569:6	691:18 717:6
745:23	716:5,9	610:22 702:23	576:4,8,9	717:7
controlled	717:23 718:17	702:25 704:11	578:11 621:19	criticized
620:14	721:3 722:8	707:23	624:25 698:12	664:15
controller 634:2	723:10,15,18	correction	707:6 735:14	cross 662:20
653:13	725:1,16	562:1 639:9	coupled 703:4	743:10
controllers	726:20 727:13	647:6	course 553:3	cross-exam
608:20 619:14	729:12,17,23	corrections	580:23 587:23	676:2
620:14	730:1,15,19	555:18 606:24	616:8	cross-examin
Convair 590:8	730:24 731:6	correctly	court 558:2	552:7,9 557:1
convenience	731:21 732:19	642:21 659:19	644:15,20	557:11 558:20
549:20	733:6,12,18	700:15	744:23	559:5 607:7
conversation	734:22 735:11	cost 709:22,25	cover 604:17	627:19 637:17
552:25	743:11 745:9	710:4,6,7	728:24	638:25 639:1
convert 737:21	corporate 611:3	721:1	CPV 544:5	cross-examine
cooler 581:2,6	correct 554:2	cost-of-service	545:20 548:15	550:24 551:13
cooling 596:22	556:3,3	742:2	548:23 549:5	551:17 552:2
661:3,8,11,16	562:12 563:8	costs 712:15	556:13 583:10	557:6 558:24
661:21,24	564:18 565:6	Council 544:2	583:23 597:8	559:4 643:1
662:13 663:2	566:5,10	544:17,18	646:3 650:9	662:25
684:1	568:18 569:20	545:2,9 548:6	658:1 663:6	cross-examined
copies 549:22	573:23 575:7	548:23 549:3	684:5 687:8	558:9
743:6	579:14,25	549:12,25	687:10 689:4	cross-examini
copy 557:19	598:18,25	555:1 559:8	690:25 691:7	592:21
639:5 689:11	599:5 629:21	583:18 591:3	691:12 696:5	crossing 680:25
Cornacchia	630:23 631:3	594:7,21	696:20 720:6	cruising 652:4
547:19 675:19	631:17 632:10	603:7 610:6	744:7 745:11	CSC 560:10,19
675:20 676:8	633:3 634:12	612:9 615:20	745:13,16,18	689:14 690:16
694:23,25	634:21,24	615:23,24	746:2,7,12,15	CSC's 563:4
695:4,9,20	635:6,22	616:3 621:21	746:17	CSC-1 732:4
696:11,16	636:2,5	626:3 640:9	CPV's 711:13	CSC-10 561:8
697:1,11,22	639:14 640:21	649:2 689:11	711:19	561:18 582:17
698:14,21	641:20 642:6	694:21 701:8	crash 608:10	585:6
699:6,21 700:8 701:15	655:5,11	734:15,25	653:18	CSC-11 581:20
700:8 701:15	657:6,15,19	735:13 742:8	crashed 654:9	CSC-13 732:5
701:25 702:7	658:10 662:12	743:3,4 744:6	669:14,14	CSC-14 585:15
<u> </u>				

UNITED REPORTERS, INC. info@unitedreporters.com Nationwide-866-534-3383-Toll-Free

				-
585:6,14	daily 599:8,11	693:25 694:4	571:5,23	descent 585:24
599:14	689:15 703:21	742:7	572:15,16	603:10
CSC-3 561:17	damage 649:11	days 551:18	573:11 574:22	describe 680:15
566:13,16	dams 630:13	570:7 689:1	577:20 579:6	684:10,13
582:16	dangerous	691:14,19	579:6,12,17	713:14 728:4
cubic 679:14,18	592:3,5 653:8	692:9	635:15 640:18	734:1
689:16,22	654:11,13	daytime 645:8	641:8 679:5,7	described
690:1	667:10	deal 594:7	679:11,11	556:23
cumulative	dangers 651:8	617:24 675:25	687:3 693:22	describes
715:16,20	DANIEL 545:7	deals 639:15	709:11,12	590:14 712:13
CUNLIFFE	DANIELLE DANIELLE	DEAN 745:4	DeJONG 547:4	description
545:17	745:5	decade 677:19	674:8	736:22 745:11
curbing 678:18	data 597:24	678:6	demand 712:22	746:1
678:19	602:2,5,15	decide 603:19	713:15,18,20	design 683:3
curiosity 729:3	640:11 648:25	decision 548:13	713:24 714:4	690:23,24
curious 621:12	685:23 687:3	549:1 550:9	714:7,10,13	726:5
current 560:2	713:25	599:8 689:1	714:24 716:23	designated
560:12 562:2	date 684:9	727:11,12	717:9,16	556:13
562:9 572:7	740:21	decisions 656:4	718:15,21	designations
618:10	dated 606:11	declared 719:7	demanding	703:15
currently 671:3	609:6 745:12	decrease 645:10	721:10	designed 624:5
671:10 680:19	745:15,17,19	708:9 714:18	demands	649:3,4 652:5
715:9	746:3,11,13	decreased	715:12	691:4
cursory 677:13	746:15,19	715:12	demineralized	Designee 545:6
cut 666:9	Davison 552:14	DEEP 689:9	690:16	desires 743:2
cutoff 695:23	552:16 553:7	721:23 736:2	demonstrably	detail 551:17
CV-ADM 590:8	553:15,19,24	738:5	692:13	595:9 607:23
cycle 544:12	554:4 677:3,7	DEEP's 689:4	demonstrated	696:3 727:21
548:17 549:8	677:18 745:1	define 591:17	722:22	detailed 596:18
563:21,23	746:11	641:3	Dennis 674:20	702:24 718:8
565:10 692:13	day 557:5 564:8	defined 590:17	density 670:23	details 594:11
707:7 710:8	567:6,10,18	603:10	depend 687:21	680:18
744:13	568:7,9,10,11	definitely	dependent	detectors 683:2
	569:8,9,17	613:12 682:22	692:13 746:6	683:3
D	570:12,13	definition	depending	deteriorate
d 544:22 546:17	574:11 575:14	591:15 705:2	564:4 638:12	652:23
550:2 553:11	575:16 576:1	709:21 720:22	709:10 714:20	determination
553:11 554:11	577:21 578:8	degree 568:23	715:11	584:2 616:4
554:13,14,15	580:19,22	571:7,9	depends 633:17	619:2 685:3
554:16,17	581:3,18	579:10	635:10 636:7	713:11 728:7
637:4,6,7,8,9	626:17,22	degrees 560:15	depicted 731:13	determine
637:10,11	632:10 633:9	562:18,23	depicts 712:9	600:23 603:12
745:1 746:1,9	633:12 634:5	564:8,10,13	deposited	603:12
D&M 678:24	636:1 689:18	566:21,23	549:18	determined
687:16	689:20,24	567:2 568:12	DeROSA	602:16 640:12
d/b/a 550:3	690:8,18	568:22 571:4	545:25	640:16

UNITED REPORTERS, INC.

	_		_	
determines	dimensions	discussed 610:1	distillate 561:14	682:25 683:11
627:8	570:1 574:8	610:5 619:22	561:18,21	683:14,21,25
determining	576:17	622:4 632:1	562:4,15	693:6710:16
687:21 728:5	diminish 665:19	632:18 635:14	563:9 565:19	710:22 711:2
developing	dioxide 737:6	658:11 663:6	567:7 568:22	711:7 745:3
713:3	direct 550:25	668:6	569:18 582:14	doubt 614:11
diameter 575:5	551:14,14	discussing	582:18 663:15	downwind
575:9 576:13	557:17,18	577:18 588:13	679:20,23	575:2,10
631:10 729:16	558:2,14,16	649:17	diurnal 580:24	587:23 594:3
730:2,4 734:7	685:20 723:3	discussion	divided 572:13	594:24 596:15
die 608:11	734:24	620:1 627:22	572:21 720:14	597:3 610:19
differ 561:23	directed 609:7	641:25 642:2	docket 544:4	617:13,14
564:4	direction	644:24 647:14	549:2 550:2	628:7 650:12
difference	553:23 555:7	652:24 677:11	744:6	654:2 658:21
572:16 573:10	575:2,24	679:2	document	658:23 659:8
574:12 577:13	587:25 588:1	discussions	553:21,22	672:1,7,12,13
616:21 619:17	672:6 729:10	609:16,19	556:13 639:3	672:14 673:11
646:25 707:7	directions	dispatch 692:12	640:22,22	Draft 746:4
737:22 739:6	728:25	712:16 739:15	684:20 686:16	drawing 656:16
differences	directly 595:20	739:16 741:3	702:13 705:18	746:9
638:21	608:23 680:21	dispersed	documented	Drive 743:14
different 560:9	680:22 697:18	726:24	701:5	driven 692:15
563:15,21	740:6,7,11,23	displace 707:14	documents	driving 655:22
574:8 577:15	741:6	739:16	554:8,24	729:8
581:21 584:21	director 545:11	displaced	555:1 556:18	drove 728:19
585:3 586:7	584:5	707:10	643:2 664:21	dual-fuel
590:1 620:2	disagree 588:6	displacement	dog 673:4	544:11 548:17
625:5 638:11	discern 633:16	708:17 726:10	doing 562:9	744:13
638:12 639:20	discernible	739:12	597:15 652:3	due 551:1
647:4 666:17	575:21 577:8	disproportion	678:4,7	616:23 728:1
676:5 692:16	discerning	721:8	692:14 728:13	741:1,6
693:10 701:9	581:14	dissipate 575:12	Donovan	742:19 746:6
701:23,23	discharge 560:5	575:19 576:6	555:13,23	duly 553:12
715:9 719:6	561:12 573:18	576:21,23	563:19 565:5	554:18 606:2
724:24 726:1	580:2 649:13	578:10 694:14	565:9,14,20	637:13 735:10
726:2 732:10	650:3 699:2	dissipates	565:24 566:4	duration 559:22
737:20 741:2	699:12 721:22	576:17 577:22	566:9 567:23	
differs 571:11	723:23 725:21	595:15	571:1 572:5	E
difficult 633:16	discharged	dissipating	572:17,23	e 544:22,22,22
693:17	566:3	576:4	579:8,13	545:1,1 546:1
difficulty	discourse	distance 583:8	580:4,7,11	546:1 547:1,1
617:21,24	700:18	587:7 603:17	678:14,17	553:11 554:11
618:12 628:3	discretion	638:8,16,19	679:8,15,22	554:11,11,12
721:4	638:20	695:18	680:5,10	554:13,13,15
digital 732:8,14	discuss 627:5	distances	681:16,21	554:16,16,16
diligent 715:25	658:4,5	638:12	682:1,6,14,21	554:17 606:1

606:1 637:4,4	efficiencies	732:8,14	713:3,16,19	688:3
637:4,5,6,6,8	679:10	elevations 732:7	715:16,20,23	equivalent
637:9,10,11	efficiency 703:1	746:9	717:9,17	563:11 678:19
637:11,11,12	704:10,19	eliminated	718:15,19	737:14,21
637:12 745:1	705:20 706:7	681:15	719:6 720:15	equivalents
746:1	707:4,23	emanate 574:25	720:17	737:6,23
e-mail 609:21	708:6 709:20	596:23	engine 607:21	Eric 552:14,16
609:22,25	710:9,19	emanating	647:7	553:18 745:1
610:2	711:24 712:19	661:21 668:10	engineers	746:11
earlier 578:13	713:3 715:10	emergency	623:22	erosion 745:23
578:24 619:22	716:13 717:9	682:19,22	England 687:2	errors 685:15
646:3 652:24	717:17 718:15	741:16	712:6,25	especially
669:6 705:13	724:7,13	emissions	714:1 717:1	681:11
easily 590:25	726:6,12	704:19 705:10	717:15,24	ESQ 545:10,24
east 588:22	720.0,12	705:12,19,22	718:1,9,16,18	545:25 546:6
608:19,23	efficient 706:22	707:9 708:7,8	England's	546:17 547:19
617:16,16	707:13,14,19	708:9 709:24	691:17	essentially
618:21,22	707:22 708:4	719:5 726:10	enjoy 643:3	575:22
619:5,7	708:14,23	emit 705:21	676:16	established
628:12	709:22 710:21	737:8 739:9	ensure 584:1	723:1
easy 622:17	711:6 721:16	739:18	enter 617:13	estate 688:1,4
685:14	724:23 739:14	emitted 574:3	710:5	estimated
economic	739:17	576:7,18	entire 688:12	693:15
687:20 709:22	efficiently	707:18 737:17	701:5,6	estimates
712:13 741:5	579:23	739:2,22	736:17	714:24
economics	effluent 699:12	emittents	entirely 673:7	et 597:25
688:12 703:7	effort 699:22	712:15	entitled 553:21	682:19 686:6
712:21	700:16 701:13	emphasis	700:5 702:11	evaporate
economies	either 567:10	611:20	enumerated	564:23,25
703:5 705:2,7	590:23 608:25	employed	630:22	evening 581:2
708:15 709:20	618:9 641:25	721:19	envelope 726:14	633:18 645:8
721:24	670:17 671:23	employee	726:16	event 600:24
eddies 667:10	671:25 672:16	583:10,12,22	environment	683:7
edge 587:10	697:9 699:11	609:20	677:9 707:20	EVERSOUR
edges 720:6	740:2,17	employs 687:2	environmental	546:14
effect 580:25	electric 544:12	endanger	544:7 548:14	everybody
623:5 626:19	548:18 702:25	649:11	550:4 584:18	643:13 656:9
647:15,16	703:2 744:13	endorse 665:13	602:15 640:11	674:5 695:6
657:22 661:4	electrical	665:17,18	709:2 724:13	everybody's
661:13 664:6	654:22,25,25	endorsed 666:4	724:23 726:6	742:20
667:7 688:10	660:12	energy 546:14	735:15,25	evidence 556:22
712:20	electricity 718:2	602:25 639:15	744:9 746:7	745:10
effectively	elements 626:14	675:4 681:12	envisioned	evidentiary
691:5	elevated 640:15	703:5 711:14	681:22 682:2	742:9
effects 668:19	elevation	711:20,23	EPA 738:6	exact 730:12
738:22	729:20,21	712:15,19,22	equipment	exactly 614:23
				-

(r				_
666:4	713:13 714:3	654:4 677:17	FAA 557:20	740:20 744:14
examination	715:14 717:19	experienced	584:10,14,20	740.20 744.14 745:24
668:1 745:6	728:11 745:11	640:19 671:19	586:7 590:18	fact 624:18
examined	746:1	experiences	593:17 594:6	658:20 664:14
553:13 554:19	exhibitions	691:17	598:14 600:1	666:20 671:9
606:3 637:14	653:21	expert 586:20	600:5,6,20	672:24 692:4
example 581:19	exhibits 554:9	645:5	609:6,11,13	721:13 726:16
589:21 596:24	554:24 555:2	experts 635:16	609:16,20	736:6
612:14 614:4	556:14,15,21	expire 549:15	611:22,22,23	factor 660:2
691:16 697:5	556:22 606:6	explain 558:1	615:17,25,25	factors 568:5
705:18 706:13	606:19,24	583:17 603:5	619:2 621:4,4	692:16 724:22
707:4 724:17	607:3 610:4	607:23	622:22 623:2	741:2
exceed 646:23	687:8 696:10	explosion	623:17,20,21	facts 727:8
exceeding	696:13 701:12	681:12	625:11 626:8	Fahrenheit
677:19	745:10,19	exponentially	627:2,8 629:8	560:15 562:18
excess 719:22	746:3	708:8 715:11	637:22 638:7	566:21 571:23
739:21	exist 585:22	724:5 725:21	641:6 642:1,5	687:3
exclusively	586:14 660:6	exporting	642:10 647:25	fair 699:21
642:20	740:22	716:15	649:14 664:14	fairly 568:19
excuse 576:20	existed 596:6	exports 718:11	664:14 665:13	600:6 717:21
578:20 593:4	existing 677:9	exposure	665:14,17,19	fall 600:2
609:21 655:16	680:8	699:10	684:20,20	630:20,25
664:7 695:17	exists 610:16	expressed	685:1,4 686:5	familiar 560:24
710:2 725:5	659:25	634:11	688:19	587:18,20
excused 636:22	exit 560:11,14	extend 602:7	FAA's 600:3	612:16 616:18
676:20 743:16	560:16,21	extends 602:5	609:9,14	617:5 628:19
executing	561:19,25	extent 578:13	FAA-related	644:23,24
602:14 640:10	562:14,17,19	630:10 640:24	594:11	649:8 660:11
executive	563:13 581:24	741:21	facilities 570:9	660:21 663:19
545:11 584:5	582:22	extreme 691:15	596:9,13	663:25 664:9
634:18 653:16	expand 575:12	691:20	629:20 630:15	665:1 666:24
682:12	575:14,16	extremely	630:15,17,23	667:5 670:22
exhaust 562:2	expanded	594:12 602:2	657:12 662:10	family 675:24
562:17 568:18	585:25	719:10	facility 544:12	far 578:2
568:19 573:22	expansions		548:18 549:8	583:17 649:5
578:23 579:19	692:4	F	549:14,15	666:2 677:10
595:14 596:22	expect 615:19	f 544:22 554:11	550:7 584:17	678:10 714:23
600:21 607:24	615:23 712:4	554:15 637:4	629:2,6	719:22 722:19
668:9,13	714:16,17,21	637:8 702:17	662:14 703:14	733:23
724:24	expected 703:21	703:2 704:11	704:22 709:15	farmed 678:2
exhibit 585:16	713:9 715:21	705:22 706:6	722:1,23	faster 562:24
626:4 686:9	731:23 733:8	707:24 708:1	723:8 724:17	563:1 715:5
686:13 689:12	expensive	708:2,23	724:21 726:14	favor 625:13
695:24 696:1	720:23	710:21 711:6	728:21 732:7	721:25
702:21,22	experience	721:14 723:11	737:8 739:7	FCA-9 720:22
704:6 712:12	641:15 653:9	724:10	739:20,22	FDC 598:15

r				
630:3	Fifty- 689:19	567:7,21,22	690:10 745:21	671:24 672:5
features 682:18	figure 626:23	569:17	746:6	672:12,18
February	655:17 656:13	firm 546:3	flown 587:24	728:14
544:20 548:3	728:16 732:3	681:5	589:16,20	focus 727:16
551:2 606:11	740:13	first 553:12	607:16,19	focusing 638:13
609:7 744:19	figures 587:5	561:16 567:18	624:10 633:18	foggy 694:8
745:12,15,17	file 551:11	581:16 600:11	646:20 647:25	foggy-type
745:19 746:3	609:12 615:18	601:25 606:2	648:3	694:6
746:11,14,16	684:19 689:11	614:6 634:25	fly 595:17,20	folks 587:17
746:19	743:3 745:22	637:25 664:25	598:23 603:16	633:6 697:15
Federal 638:8	filed 548:23	665:13 687:7	608:22 609:10	701:7
feedback	550:21 552:3	688:15 723:24	611:3 614:13	follow 586:24
684:16	553:21 598:13	740:16	614:15,21,25	680:16
feel 559:17	609:6 610:4	fishing 674:5	615:3 617:10	follow-up
581:15 692:1	686:10,13	fit 559:18	617:15 618:11	583:24 595:23
feeling 622:1	728:17 743:7	fits 726:14	618:16,22	669:3
feet 560:16	filing 679:5	five 575:17	619:4,6	following
562:1,19,24	702:15	flat 665:18	620:16,18	563:22
569:6,10,12	filings 686:5	fleet 691:17	624:2 625:10	follows 553:14
569:15,18	712:7	flesh 652:19	628:10,13	554:20 606:4
575:5,9,18	filled 693:16	flew 625:5,6,7,8	631:22 632:2	637:15
576:2,3,4,9,10	final 548:13	632:9 655:18	632:4,8	fooling 652:7
578:11,15	549:1,13	flies 592:2	647:12 672:15	foot 625:6,7
581:25 582:2	550:9 672:11	611:13	672:16,20,22	628:4 638:15
582:4,24,25	685:3 689:1	flight 585:18	673:3,11	640:17 679:14
583:6 585:20	720:9	593:7 594:24	734:16	679:18 731:13
586:1,3	Financial 675:5	603:24 605:8	flying 546:19	731:14,24
587:13,15	find 590:24	607:11,13	550:23 551:24	footprint
593:25 599:17	591:5 623:23	614:19,20	557:6,12	704:20
602:5,7,12	728:22 729:5	615:5 622:20	578:17 583:3	forecast 712:22
603:4 604:17	finding 664:1	632:15 633:22	583:6 587:18	713:1,2,24
604:22,23,25	findings 663:7	634:2 636:10	589:6 594:24	716:22
605:2,6,10,11	667:6 668:17	636:12,13	595:20 610:9	forecasts
611:16,16	682:11 716:19	646:21 648:10	610:10,11,15	597:24 691:15
620:22 625:1	fine 553:6	651:5,6	611:6,12,12	713:15 719:10
632:17,18,21	558:18 561:2	653:23 670:12	611:23 614:6	foregoing 744:2
632:22 638:16	573:9 626:25	670:19,20	615:5,11,21	forensic 579:2
638:16 649:19	636:19 643:25	673:13	617:19,21,25	forest 678:2
649:21,22,23	650:10 659:14	flights 621:8	618:12,15	Forgive 643:16
653:1 654:8	666:8 702:6	flipped 654:24	625:3 633:19	643:23
671:5 689:17	finish 723:13,14	float 684:7	633:21 634:12	form 558:3
689:23 690:1	finished 729:21	floated 729:18	644:6 648:2	665:16 707:3
729:15,21,22	fire 561:10	731:9	651:5,18	712:21
731:10 734:6	fired 597:10	flow 578:23	653:2 654:11	format 697:14
fellow 611:10	firing 561:13	579:19 580:5	654:14 655:25	former 591:5
Fifteen 649:23	562:17 563:22	580:6 689:16	656:6,10	602:24 653:15

UNITED REPORTERS, INC. info@unitedreporters.com Nationwide-866-534-3383-Toll-Free

forms 684:20	561:8 577:6,6	gathering	665:11 734:17	625:18 627:16
forth 571:13	605:19 616:11	701:17	given 567:21	628:13 632:3
604:2 722:16	637:14 642:24	gauge 680:3	574:10 594:8	636:10 643:13
forward 621:23	652:17 670:11	GE 675:4 718:7	631:16 641:21	653:20 654:2
686:20 723:17	670:13 673:15	726:4	647:21 656:9	654:3 659:3
fossil 741:14	694:20 699:8	gen 620:2	727:5 736:22	661:6 662:10
found 599:23	716:1 734:15	general 544:9	740:10	662:23,23
712:8	736:9 739:10	548:11,25	glad 580:9	664:11 665:23
four 576:11	741:3	592:8 611:1	657:1	666:5,8,9,21
611:5 650:8	future 553:3	682:20 684:14	global 736:20	671:24 672:21
four-seat	692:3	702:24 703:2	737:12 738:8	680:1,9,21
648:17		744:11	738:18,21	684:9 687:10
fraction 722:24	G	generally	739:14	689:8 693:19
frame 678:5	G 554:12,15	566:19 574:25	go 554:6,10	695:15 704:24
719:19 722:6	637:5,8	580:17 592:1	564:25 575:22	705:1707:3
FRANCA	GA 590:7,14	611:23 677:14	580:14 593:1	708:16,20
545:25	602:3 638:1	680:15 688:11	593:5,6,8	709:2,9,15,19
Franklin	gallon 679:21	694:7 735:23	601:18 603:15	714:7,13
544:18 744:18	gallons 563:11	generate 719:22	617:5 621:23	716:14 719:13
frankly 594:12	565:21,23	generates	632:4 643:9	719:17,18
717:21 722:9	566:2,7	710:12	644:12 663:3	720:6 725:10
FRED 545:17	689:17,20,24	generating	666:2,8	725:11 727:10
FREDERICK	690:5,8,18	544:12 548:18	676:15 686:22	727:15 733:19
745:2	693:12,16	654:25 660:13	694:20 713:13	736:13 739:16
front 634:17	Gallup 550:8	660:19 707:5	715:22 722:5	740:13,19,20
fuel 563:7,7,9	gas 561:13,16	710:8 718:2	723:17 740:23	742:6,16
570:14,20	561:20 562:4	744:14	741:6	good 548:1
571:7,10,24	562:6 569:3	generation	goes 565:10	596:7 636:16
572:7 573:17	569:13 572:1	691:17 716:2	577:5 645:1	637:16 641:23
573:21 579:15	573:22 574:3	717:5 745:24	going 551:9	644:14
579:19 678:12	628:25 630:19	generators	552:13 557:4	gotten 700:24
678:23 679:2	679:13 680:2	684:2	557:7 558:10	Government
679:20,23	680:15 681:5	gentlemen	559:3 563:5	582:8
692:9,14	681:14 682:17	548:2	564:4 571:18	GPS 619:14
693:5 739:4	682:18 683:1	Gertrude	571:23 573:3	grade 619:10
741:15	683:2 691:18	616:24	573:17 575:9	729:21
full 553:16	692:6 693:3	getting 591:10	576:2,3	grandchildren
554:9 556:15	710:25 711:9	594:10 595:8	577:19 578:9	738:15
653:25 669:20	735:21,24	608:13 612:24	578:10 580:18	granting 549:4
669:21	737:20 738:8	643:18 650:9	583:19,25	graphics 589:12
fully 635:8	gas-fired 549:8	708:15 739:25	584:4 593:13	great 566:11
650:4	gases 573:18	girth 731:12	603:13 605:20	617:24 644:23
Fun 653:20,25	724:5 737:5	734:8 735:2	608:25 611:16	738:25
function 694:2	737:10,17	give 551:20	612:2 615:8	greater 572:15
710:1 714:13	738:1	564:7 571:23	619:16 620:19	572:16 573:10
further 554:19	gathered 587:4	616:20 626:5	620:21 622:2	573:21,22

UNITED REPORTERS, INC. info@unitedreporters.com Nationwide-866-534-3383-Toll-Free

			_	
580:2,18	730:3,17,21	629:7	happening	heights 589:11
581:3 620:13	731:1,18	Gustafson	614:24 736:22	626:19 627:12
640:18 641:7	732:1,21	555:14,24	happens 620:7	639:21 730:12
641:8,9	733:3,9,15	556:9 677:4	739:11	733:10,11
645:18,21	734:13 745:2	689:7 745:4	happy 588:4	746:9
646:8 647:21	grid 688:12		599:13 609:24	held 544:17
656:12 704:19	711:13	H	723:20	548:9,15
731:8,12	gross 591:20	H 544:22	harshest 692:1	696:4 698:2
735:24	646:17,19	553:11 702:18	Hartford	698:16 700:11
Greenfields	647:8,11	702:25 704:10	545:23 614:12	helicopter
676:11	648:3,19	704:19 705:20	616:19 617:3	589:24 731:16
greenhouse	Groton 611:12	706:4,22	617:16 744:24	helicopters
724:5 737:5,9	612:15 614:5	707:23,25	hate 727:9	640:16
737:17,20	615:6	708:5,22	Haven 653:11	help 740:13
738:1,8	ground 625:15	710:14,24	hazard 626:9	helping 727:8
Greens 697:4	650:15 654:13	711:8 721:15	652:15 699:9	hexafluoride
Gresock 555:11	698:25 699:10	725:2 737:25	hazards 698:24	737:16
555:21 556:6	700:1 728:24	habitat 677:24	he'll 615:11	high 613:24
559:25 560:7	groundbreaki	half 582:5	head 697:21	614:1 691:17
561:6,15,22	740:10	592:17 614:22	heading 617:9	694:10 699:16
562:5,11,16	grounds 583:15	615:1 625:8	hear 642:21	713:21 718:4
562:25 582:11	group 547:7	625:12,22	695:6	higher 579:3
583:4 584:24	674:11 686:16	672:4,9,19	heard 642:16	645:24 705:19
585:8,12	701:14	726:18 736:10	725:9	706:12,13,15
586:10,17	grouped 644:5	Halpern 555:4	hearing 548:9	707:23 710:6
587:2,9,14,19	644:7,7,9	643:10	549:18 551:1	721:23 734:21
588:5 589:1,9	grow 739:23	Halpern's	551:18 554:25	737:12
589:18 590:6	growing 714:5	746:15	556:19 675:23	highest 625:13
590:13 591:16	growth 713:14	Hampshire	677:4 681:10	713:18
591:22 592:6	713:24	596:25 717:14	698:1 699:23	highly 568:5
593:20 595:11	guess 557:3	hand 587:22	700:17 742:10	741:1
596:3,17	559:2 623:8	Handbook	742:13 743:7	Hill 544:14
597:5 598:17	624:11 626:8	587:18	heart 593:5,6,8	548:19 549:9
598:20 599:18	650:1 656:16	handle 656:1	heat 679:4,6,9	744:15
599:22 600:4	666:23 668:3	657:11 671:20	710:9	hills 547:17
600:19 601:1	696:19 700:8	handling	heavy 592:3	675:17,20
601:7 602:1	704:8,17	678:23	heck 626:24	694:23 695:9
602:22,23	705:10,17	hanging 657:11	height 560:22	696:6,22
603:8,23	706:20 709:14	happen 563:18	581:22 583:5	697:10,19
604:3,10,14	716:16 721:3	564:1,20	602:11 603:11	735:7 746:9
604:18,24	723:24 724:9	565:8 618:19	624:16,18	historical 686:6
605:5,12,16	731:7 736:21	618:20 646:10	640:17 645:18	history 740:10
637:22,24	740:3,9	656:23 719:14	645:21 728:15	hold 699:22
640:5,6 685:9	guidance	719:18	729:18 730:23	700:16
685:25 728:10	665:11	happened	731:5 732:22	holder 550:21
729:14,19,25	guidelines	623:21 655:15	734:21	550:24 676:25

UNITED REPORTERS, INC. info@unitedreporters.com Nationwide-866-534-3383-Toll-Free

11				_
holding 729:24	571:12 574:11	II-B-19 746:11	716:15	702:16 704:10
holster 656:5	574:22 577:18	II-B-20 746:12	imports 692:7	708:5 716:12
home 743:14	633:6 693:24	II-B-20 746:12 II-B-21 746:15	718:11	723:25 724:1
Homeland	694:2,5,10	II-B-22 556:22	improved 706:7	723.23 724.1
629:24,25	hundred 569:6	746:17	717:9 739:8	incredible
Homeowners	569:9,11,15	III 561:7 634:18	improvement	653:5
547:18 675:18	569:18 575:18	690:16 745:17	703:1	incredibly
homes 695:11	576:4,8	746:13,18	improvements	649:1
honest 717:21	578:11,15	illustration	726:5	incur 734:11
honor 653:20	604:25 624:25	585:16	inaccuracy	index 556:23
hope 615:23	632:17	ILS 620:18	664:16	indicate 563:5
hopefully	hundreds 718:6	imagine 653:6	inch 680:3	566:13 613:24
743:10		687:1	inches 649:21	614:1,2 621:5
horizon 598:2	hydroelectric 630:13	IMC 651:3		700:25
horizontal	hydrogen		incident 596:11 incidental	indicated
638:15	683:19	impact 607:24 623:10 624:20	678:21	561:25 568:22
	hypothetical	647:21 699:2	inclined 625:12	596:5,13
horsepower 647:8	• -	704:18 707:18		603:2 604:21
hot 731:9	615:16 hypothetically	713:5 718:21	include 563:23 590:4 620:11	635:16 645:13
	708:25	713:3 718:21 722:21 723:7		
hotter 562:23 562:25	/08:25	724:20 726:19	719:4 737:15	645:20 646:6
	Ι		included 735:25	649:2 672:2
Houbolt 602:14	idea 612:23	726:22 736:12	includes 620:13	700:13 717:12
640:10	629:4	736:16,17	709:6 716:24	728:18
hour 563:11	identification	746:5	including	indicates
565:17,21,23	556:14	impacted	558:23 590:1	550:16
566:2 570:15	identified	654:24	607:21 642:11	indicating
582:1,3,6,23	583:22 586:18	impacts 584:11	698:20 741:2	732:24
582:23,25	710:6 717:19	584:18 635:1	incorporate 716:23 717:13	indication
710:10,11	727:23	707:16 722:24		612:17 614:8
738:4 739:5,9 739:18	identifies	724:16 735:15	726:4	734:17
	1401111103			indiantizes 701.5
	560.14.16	735:23,24	incorporated	indicative 734:5
hourly 599:11	560:14,16 identify 741:8	736:3,5,10,20	683:3 712:19	individual
hourly 599:11 736:16	identify 741:8	736:3,5,10,20 745:21	683:3 712:19 715:23 718:16	individual 597:6 680:11
hourly 599:11 736:16 hours 611:11	identify 741:8 IFR 603:6,9,22	736:3,5,10,20 745:21 impeded 728:3	683:3 712:19 715:23 718:16 718:25	individual 597:6 680:11 718:18
hourly 599:11 736:16 hours 611:11 615:4 691:13	identify 741:8 IFR 603:6,9,22 604:15 605:7	736:3,5,10,20 745:21 impeded 728:3 implementing	683:3 712:19 715:23 718:16 718:25 incorporates	individual 597:6 680:11 718:18 individuals
hourly 599:11 736:16 hours 611:11 615:4 691:13 692:21,21,23	identify 741:8 IFR 603:6,9,22 604:15 605:7 620:1 651:1,4	736:3,5,10,20 745:21 impeded 728:3 implementing 716:1	683:3 712:19 715:23 718:16 718:25 incorporates 714:22	individual 597:6 680:11 718:18 individuals 723:2
hourly 599:11 736:16 hours 611:11 615:4 691:13 692:21,21,23 736:3,12	identify 741:8 IFR 603:6,9,22 604:15 605:7 620:1 651:1,4 II 561:5 649:5	736:3,5,10,20 745:21 impeded 728:3 implementing 716:1 implications	683:3 712:19 715:23 718:16 718:25 incorporates 714:22 increase 573:16	individual 597:6 680:11 718:18 individuals 723:2 industrial
hourly 599:11 736:16 hours 611:11 615:4 691:13 692:21,21,23 736:3,12 house 567:11,12	identify 741:8 IFR 603:6,9,22 604:15 605:7 620:1 651:1,4 II 561:5 649:5 689:14 696:25	736:3,5,10,20 745:21 impeded 728:3 implementing 716:1 implications 631:7	683:3 712:19 715:23 718:16 718:25 incorporates 714:22 increase 573:16 652:16 670:20	individual 597:6 680:11 718:18 individuals 723:2 industrial 630:14
hourly 599:11 736:16 hours 611:11 615:4 691:13 692:21,21,23 736:3,12 house 567:11,12 699:16	identify 741:8 IFR 603:6,9,22 604:15 605:7 620:1 651:1,4 II 561:5 649:5 689:14 696:25 745:14,14	736:3,5,10,20 745:21 impeded 728:3 implementing 716:1 implications 631:7 important	683:3712:19 715:23718:16 718:25 incorporates 714:22 increase 573:16 652:16670:20 705:15709:9	individual 597:6 680:11 718:18 individuals 723:2 industrial 630:14 inefficient
hourly 599:11 736:16 hours 611:11 615:4 691:13 692:21,21,23 736:3,12 house 567:11,12 699:16 houses 697:15	 identify 741:8 IFR 603:6,9,22 604:15 605:7 620:1 651:1,4 II 561:5 649:5 689:14 696:25 745:14,14 746:13,18 	736:3,5,10,20 745:21 impeded 728:3 implementing 716:1 implications 631:7 important 570:3 647:14	683:3712:19 715:23718:16 718:25 incorporates 714:22 increase 573:16 652:16670:20 705:15709:9 714:18715:11	individual 597:6 680:11 718:18 individuals 723:2 industrial 630:14 inefficient 713:21
hourly 599:11 736:16 hours 611:11 615:4 691:13 692:21,21,23 736:3,12 house 567:11,12 699:16 houses 697:15 human 699:9	 identify 741:8 IFR 603:6,9,22 604:15 605:7 620:1 651:1,4 II 561:5 649:5 689:14 696:25 745:14,14 746:13,18 II-B-14 556:21 	736:3,5,10,20 745:21 impeded 728:3 implementing 716:1 implications 631:7 important 570:3 647:14 677:22 678:4	683:3712:19 715:23718:16 718:25 incorporates 714:22 increase 573:16 652:16670:20 705:15709:9 714:18715:11 724:3725:18	<pre>individual 597:6 680:11 718:18 individuals 723:2 industrial 630:14 inefficient 713:21 infinitesimal</pre>
hourly 599:11 736:16 hours 611:11 615:4 691:13 692:21,21,23 736:3,12 house 567:11,12 699:16 houses 697:15 human 699:9 humans 698:25	 identify 741:8 IFR 603:6,9,22 604:15 605:7 620:1 651:1,4 II 561:5 649:5 689:14 696:25 745:14,14 746:13,18 II-B-14 556:21 745:11 	736:3,5,10,20 745:21 impeded 728:3 implementing 716:1 implications 631:7 important 570:3 647:14 677:22 678:4 713:19 717:3	683:3712:19 715:23718:16 718:25 incorporates 714:22 increase 573:16 652:16670:20 705:15709:9 714:18715:11 724:3725:18 725:20,23,24	individual 597:6 680:11 718:18 individuals 723:2 industrial 630:14 inefficient 713:21 infinitesimal 624:23
hourly 599:11 736:16 hours 611:11 615:4 691:13 692:21,21,23 736:3,12 house 567:11,12 699:16 houses 697:15 human 699:9 humans 698:25 humid 567:4	 identify 741:8 IFR 603:6,9,22 604:15 605:7 620:1 651:1,4 II 561:5 649:5 689:14 696:25 745:14,14 746:13,18 II-B-14 556:21 745:11 II-B-15 745:13 	736:3,5,10,20 745:21 impeded 728:3 implementing 716:1 implications 631:7 important 570:3 647:14 677:22 678:4 713:19 717:3 722:3 742:20	683:3712:19 715:23718:16 718:25 incorporates 714:22 increase 573:16 652:16670:20 705:15709:9 714:18715:11 724:3725:18 725:20,23,24 726:23	individual 597:6 680:11 718:18 individuals 723:2 industrial 630:14 inefficient 713:21 infinitesimal 624:23 influences
hourly 599:11 736:16 hours 611:11 615:4 691:13 692:21,21,23 736:3,12 house 567:11,12 699:16 houses 697:15 human 699:9 humans 698:25 humid 567:4 693:23	 identify 741:8 IFR 603:6,9,22 604:15 605:7 620:1 651:1,4 II 561:5 649:5 689:14 696:25 745:14,14 746:13,18 II-B-14 556:21 745:11 II-B-15 745:13 II-B-16 745:16 	736:3,5,10,20 745:21 impeded 728:3 implementing 716:1 implications 631:7 important 570:3 647:14 677:22 678:4 713:19 717:3 722:3 742:20 importantly	683:3712:19 715:23718:16 718:25 incorporates 714:22 increase 573:16 652:16670:20 705:15709:9 714:18715:11 724:3725:18 725:20,23,24 726:23 increased	individual 597:6 680:11 718:18 individuals 723:2 industrial 630:14 inefficient 713:21 infinitesimal 624:23 influences 692:5
hourly 599:11 736:16 hours 611:11 615:4 691:13 692:21,21,23 736:3,12 house 567:11,12 699:16 houses 697:15 human 699:9 humans 698:25 humid 567:4 693:23 humidity	 identify 741:8 IFR 603:6,9,22 604:15 605:7 620:1 651:1,4 II 561:5 649:5 689:14 696:25 745:14,14 746:13,18 II-B-14 556:21 745:11 II-B-15 745:13 II-B-16 745:16 II-B-17 745:18 	736:3,5,10,20 745:21 impeded 728:3 implementing 716:1 implications 631:7 important 570:3 647:14 677:22 678:4 713:19 717:3 722:3 742:20 importantly 622:20	683:3712:19 715:23718:16 718:25 incorporates 714:22 increase 573:16 652:16 670:20 705:15709:9 714:18715:11 724:3725:18 725:20,23,24 726:23 increased 650:20 652:21	individual 597:6 680:11 718:18 individuals 723:2 industrial 630:14 inefficient 713:21 infinitesimal 624:23 influences 692:5 inform 618:15
hourly 599:11 736:16 hours 611:11 615:4 691:13 692:21,21,23 736:3,12 house 567:11,12 699:16 houses 697:15 human 699:9 humans 698:25 humid 567:4 693:23	 identify 741:8 IFR 603:6,9,22 604:15 605:7 620:1 651:1,4 II 561:5 649:5 689:14 696:25 745:14,14 746:13,18 II-B-14 556:21 745:11 II-B-15 745:13 II-B-16 745:16 	736:3,5,10,20 745:21 impeded 728:3 implementing 716:1 implications 631:7 important 570:3 647:14 677:22 678:4 713:19 717:3 722:3 742:20 importantly	683:3712:19 715:23718:16 718:25 incorporates 714:22 increase 573:16 652:16670:20 705:15709:9 714:18715:11 724:3725:18 725:20,23,24 726:23 increased	individual 597:6 680:11 718:18 individuals 723:2 industrial 630:14 inefficient 713:21 infinitesimal 624:23 influences 692:5

Ir				
information	instrumentati	581:9,12	JEFFREY	591:18,24
560:1,8,10,21	683:4	615:10 622:18	546:17	593:21,23
561:8 568:14	integrated	634:11	Jerry 548:5	594:25 595:1
582:18 585:13	715:15 716:17	involve 680:25	jet 589:22 590:8	595:5,12,16
587:3 589:19	intended 587:25	involved 559:11	jets 611:3	595:18 596:19
591:6 593:14	728:12 730:13	583:18,20	Jetstar 590:8	596:21 597:2
595:13 598:22	730:16,22	Ipad 613:14	job 660:10	605:23 606:8
638:22 685:2	731:4 732:10	IRP 691:16	727:7	610:6 611:15
686:1,3,6	intends 672:14	720:1,1,2	JON 745:3	612:1 613:3,6
698:23 699:8	interconnection	irrelevant 661:8	JR 545:3,7	615:2 618:23
700:5 728:11	691:3	Island 721:9	judgment	618:25 621:1
728:12 732:2	interest 598:18	ISO 687:2,11,14	732:23	622:4,10
732:16,17	630:9	687:21 690:25	jump 701:7	623:1,5,18
734:18	Interesting	691:3 711:25	June 544:6	625:5,25
informational	634:8	712:3,25	549:3,15	627:3,7 633:6
696:4 698:22	interrogatories	714:1 716:25	714:1 740:20	643:23 646:5
699:23 700:17	555:2,3,5	735:16 741:14	740:22 744:8	646:10 648:21
700:18 701:17	689:3 699:4	741:20	jurisdiction	661:18 668:17
infrastructure	701:11 745:12	issue 584:12	593:3 594:13	668:19 669:18
629:2,6,20	745:14,17	591:3 596:19		670:18 672:17
input 570:15	746:13,15,18	608:13,15	K	676:7 683:6
645:17	interrogatory	609:8 619:1	K 554:11,12	687:10 692:5
inputs 560:13	554:7 585:14	622:4,6	637:4,5	707:21 715:4
inquiries	732:4	623:14 655:24	keep 597:9	720:12,13,25
699:20	interrupt	659:25 675:24	741:14	727:9 740:1
inside 712:7	553:10 672:24	687:15	Kennedy	741:19 742:18
insignificant	interruptible	issued 600:5	620:10	knowing 608:6
625:2	681:5	657:6 664:17	kept 714:9,11	633:19
instance 617:10	intersection	682:12	KEVIN 547:8	knowledge
692:7	544:14 548:20	issues 604:1	kilowatt 710:10	554:2 556:4
instances	549:10 744:16	621:20 637:22	710:11	606:20 618:10
692:10 724:11	intervening	701:9 734:9	kind 601:2	618:10 642:14
institutions	728:1 729:7	item 549:25	612:13 656:4	known 743:2
629:8	intervenor	550:2 641:24	688:6 699:23	Kocyla 674:20
instructor	550:11 606:15		700:16,17	Г <u>т</u>
593:7 607:11	609:24 742:12	J	701:16 724:2	$\frac{\mathbf{L}}{\mathbf{L}}$
607:13 614:19	743:1	J 545:3 554:14	730:10 734:25	1544:22 545:25
622:20 646:22	intervenors	637:7	Kleen 681:12	546:3 554:11
648:10	643:8 644:2	JAMES 545:3	knew 618:8	554:11,12,16
instructors	676:5 742:17	January 625:4	knot 602:10	554:16,17,17
614:20 653:23	intricate 594:11	684:11 686:4	know 560:23	637:4,4,5,10
instructs 672:20	invalidated	686:10,13	568:10 569:22	637:10,11,11 744:22
instrument	664:21	727:17	574:20 577:21	744:22
603:24 651:1	investigation	Jay 555:4	581:10 583:24	L.S.R 744:22
651:6 653:2	655:9	746:15	584:1 589:20	LA 646:11
670:18	invisible 574:23	JEFF 547:12	591:6,14,17	lack 728:6
		-	-	-

ladies 548:2	Lastly 693:19	let's 593:10	741:14	709:24 721:5
LaGuardia	late 551:11	632:25 695:7	lines 680:11,22	738:11
620:10	Late-File 621:2	702:9 722:15	681:2,20	located 544:13
Lake 674:14	686:12 687:8	731:9	743:10	548:18 549:8
land 585:10,19	Late-Filed	letter 557:13,19	Lisa 744:22	550:7 603:18
603:13,19	555:2 585:15	558:11,16,25	list 550:1,12	744:14
617:17 619:24	590:25 626:3	606:10 609:6	626:8 643:9	location 614:18
619:25 620:20	686:9 689:12	609:7 611:19	696:18 697:2	624:12 705:6
625:20 633:25	695:24 696:1	level 585:21	697:20 740:2	728:21
654:2,7	696:9,12	586:2 600:1,3	745:25	locations
671:10 672:11	701:12 728:11	600:18 601:6	listed 550:2,12	727:22 728:22
673:18 674:18	745:19 746:3	604:25 746:10	554:22,24	Lockheed 590:7
677:22 678:3	Late-Filing	levels 625:5	555:8 606:6	logic 687:1
688:7,9	702:10,16	723:24 746:6	717:12	loiter 630:16
landed 654:6	704:12 727:20	Levesque 545:5	listing 697:6	Londonderry
669:12	Late-Filings	616:13,14	lists 639:19	596:24
landing 587:24	591:11 712:10	lies 620:3,4	lit 618:4	long 551:14
588:1,3	latest 559:23	life 654:17	little 566:2	607:10 616:8
617:13 620:15	latitude 594:9	light 546:12	591:10 650:9	671:1
621:10 625:16	665:17	588:24 590:1	652:8,20	longer 577:25
625:17,19	lattice 654:23	590:4,11,16	674:4 680:24	578:5,6,18
650:12 653:8	LAW 546:3	590:22 591:15	681:25 691:2	708:15 735:19
654:5,10	layman's	592:4,16	696:11 706:13	look 551:12,16
656:13 669:10	641:12,14	607:19 615:10	706:14 709:8	576:16 591:18
670:13 672:1	lead 559:15	623:10 624:3	734:21 735:23	600:9 614:7
landings 653:7	lean 725:17	647:24 648:13	lived 671:1	623:9 634:17
language	leave 593:15	665:6 715:6	LLC 544:5	664:16 677:20
733:22	leaves 595:15	lighted 581:19	545:20 548:15	687:10 688:4
large 592:3	left 594:2	636:3	548:24 676:11	692:11 714:2
602:2 611:3	627:18 650:11	lighter 592:7	744:7	715:6 719:3
627:3 682:5	658:21,23	595:17 647:19	LLC's 549:5	728:21 738:4
735:4	659:8 669:24	648:18	LLP 545:21	738:6 739:4
largely 694:11	leg 587:23	lighting 636:4	LNG 692:7	739:10
722:10	588:1 596:15	636:13	load 571:3	looked 562:7
larger 573:17	597:3 610:19	likelihood	572:1 686:24	610:23 715:8
573:25 574:4	650:12 658:21	600:23 601:13	712:17,18,22	720:2 726:12
574:6,17	658:23 659:9	likes 738:5	713:14,23	looking 571:10
611:8 622:14	671:18 672:1	limited 683:1	715:3,24	571:16 615:1
645:7,11	672:7,10	727:22	716:11 717:20	685:12,13
668:13 705:20	673:4	limits 731:17	718:7,20	696:25 702:20
707:11,12	legal 593:24	line 575:22	loads 580:13	704:9 707:15
724:14,15,21	legitimate	577:4 578:2	local 704:18	719:1 727:1
726:1,3,9	595:10	619:23 647:22	707:16 708:7	729:8 739:13
739:3	leisure 697:16	658:3,5 668:6	709:3 738:7	Lord 615:2
Larkin 676:10	LEN 547:4	680:2,8,8	localized 738:22	losing 653:11
LARRY 545:5	length 569:8	681:2 718:3,4	locally 705:10	loss 654:16

				
683:7	705:22 706:4	market 597:24	672:21 728:7	721:1 725:23
lost 653:15,17	706:6	692:5 714:20	meant 621:13	725:25,25
700:24	mailers 698:6	717:7 718:2	measured 737:5	739:6
lot 580:13	Main 546:4	720:12,18	746:10	MELANIE
586:11 594:8	maintain	markets 712:6	measures 584:1	545:10
620:20,21	593:24 638:15	720:13 741:5	678:11 682:10	members 545:2
638:12,22	638:18	markings	711:14,21	735:13
687:21 720:19	maintaining	595:25	715:10 722:10	memory 644:17
723:5	628:4	Massachusetts	mechanism	mention 681:10
loud 588:14	maintenance	717:15	598:9 613:2,6	684:19 693:12
louder 681:25	544:10 548:16	master 653:23	613:12	720:10
low 561:14,21	549:6 550:6	material 740:5	media 681:19	mentioned
574:22 620:23	744:12	materials	medium 684:1	616:18 629:9
650:17 655:11	major 611:20	588:13,17	723:20	634:15 641:24
655:18 656:18	653:21 713:5	686:17	meeting 544:17	657:5 688:22
lower 575:20	majority 727:25	math 572:22	548:2,6 686:4	688:25 701:10
645:24 646:7	728:8 733:24	690:12	697:4 698:4	718:23 720:1
703:16 706:10	make-up	mathematical	700:11,12	723:4,5
706:12 708:24	563:23 565:11	622:11	744:6	mentioning
712:15,15,21	making 666:18	matter 593:5,6	meetings 696:4	663:2
712:22	701:12 732:23	593:9 599:12	697:15,18	mentions
lowest 583:5	managed	721:21 724:4	698:22	691:16
585:18 586:1	677:25 678:1	max 680:12	megawatt	merge 667:19
632:14,14	management	maximum	548:17 549:7	668:11
LSA 590:4,12	563:4 689:5	569:7 602:7	559:24 570:16	merged 668:21
590:17	715:4,24	602:11 640:17	570:21 572:6	668:24
lunch 590:24	716:11 718:20	646:17,19	650:3 663:10	merger 668:12
611:13 627:17	745:22 746:4	648:3 722:23	663:13 664:3	merging 667:9
636:22 639:4	Manchester	736:1,16	686:21 703:3	667:20
Lynch 545:7	596:25	McCORMA	703:14 704:22	met 684:10
604:6 616:15	maneuver	547:15 675:11	705:11 706:3	713:21
616:16 617:4	589:5 673:6	675:12	707:6,25	meteorological
618:3,14	manner 667:8	mean 564:6	711:11 724:17	651:2
619:6,11	manual 598:22	566:25 569:22	725:2,3 738:4	meter 649:21
620:9,24	601:13	576:23 585:21	739:5,9,18	meters 649:12
621:11,16	manufactured	586:1 593:12	megawattage	649:19
669:4,5,9,12	649:3	594:20 604:25	705:25 708:24	methane 737:15
669:17,23	map 613:19	621:8 640:21	724:2	method 582:12
670:2 681:23	maps 613:16,17	641:12 650:23	megawatts	601:4
741:10,11	718:7	651:17 665:24	559:23 663:17	methodology
742:3	March 549:12	687:1 707:25	693:2,4 704:2	712:2 728:5
LYNN 745:2	551:2,19	715:6 727:4	704:24,25	730:10
	742:10,19,24	746:10	706:4,6 707:3	methods 728:7
<u> </u>	Marian 676:10	meaning 632:2	707:5 713:8	MICHAEL
M 545:24	marked 613:19	means 599:12	714:4,5,8,23	545:14
machine 652:8	618:4	626:24 650:25	715:22 720:24	microgenerat

721:25	mistaken 658:8	715:13 721:4	642:1	702:1 721:6
microphone	mitigate 611:24	722:22 723:6	Murphy's	723:22 735:6
681:23	611:25 619:4	736:11 737:1	616:17	743:9
Microsoft	627:13,14	739:19	must-run	nautical 587:10
653:15	mitigation	models 711:13	741:24	588:21 628:12
middle 594:23	611:21	732:9	MW 544:11	Navion 590:7
Middlebury	MITRE 560:13	modification	744:13	590:14 591:25
546:2,5,9	562:6,10	734:19	711.15	592:1,11
549:19 643:19	568:14,15	modifications	N	602:3 624:1,4
670:4,7,14,21	584:22 585:4	606:24	n 545:1 546:1	638:1 647:1,4
673:8,13,18	586:9 589:14	Modify 544:6	547:1 553:11	647:10,12
674:17 721:6	589:24 590:3	744:8	554:12,12,13	648:5,22,24
723:22 743:8	592:11,12,18	moment 656:4	554:13,14,14	648:25
mild 693:24	600:10 601:19	moments	554:14,15,15	near 612:15
694:4	601:21 608:9	688:22	554:16,17	684:25 694:5
mile 588:2,22	623:3,9,22,23	money 710:7	606:1 637:5,5	nearby 612:18
614:22,22	624:8 634:16	720:24	637:6,6,7,7,7	613:10 746:9
615:1,1 625:8	635:20 638:2	month 703:12	637:8,8,9,10	nearly 598:1
625:9,12,12	639:4 640:22	months 699:15	637:11,12	nebulous
625:22,23	647:2,5 648:6	morning 548:2	653:20,25	720:19
631:15 638:19	648:21,24	548:7 652:24	745:1 746:1	necessarily
672:4,4,9,19	649:16 662:2	morning's	name 548:5	604:15 629:17
miles 582:1,3,5	663:13,20,22	637:21	553:16	662:4
582:22,23,24	664:14,15,17	motion 544:5	nameplate	neck 612:15
587:10 604:9	667:3 668:17	548:13 653:25	703:15,19	need 544:8
604:13,16	668:23 685:12	669:20,21	706:23 708:6	548:15 550:5
611:5 628:12	685:13	744:7	national 598:18	551:20 560:24
695:21	mix 739:20	move 552:8	630:9	583:16 629:20
military 630:14	mobile 682:8	577:4,5	natural 549:7	660:6 665:1
million 689:17	model 560:14	603:12 619:12	561:13,16	684:19 692:8
689:20,24	562:7 602:14	624:25 676:22	562:3,6	711:13 713:11
690:5	624:1 640:10	702:9 730:7	630:19 679:13	716:1 717:8
		moved 624:19	680:2,15	721:10 722:6
minimal 600:8 minimum 583:7	664:13,20 685:13 714:22	624:20	681:14 682:17	721:10 722:0
			Naugatuck	
585:24 603:9	716:24 718:2	movement 624:23	547:6,10	744:9 needed 704:24
603:10 605:13	718:8,25	624:23 moves 715:5	670:21 674:1	717:8
minimums 638:10 652:25	721:1 726:2 732:14		674:10,22	/1/:8 needs 559:10
		Moving 686:11	675:8 695:10	
minus 600:22	modeled 569:25 641:20 718:9	MSL 632:17	696:5,21	negated 716:1
minute 700:15 minutes 627:18		multi-engine	697:9,19,24	722:10
	718:10,14	589:22	698:11,15,17	neighborhoods
mischaracteri	731:22,23	multiple 667:6	698:20,23	673:7
666:13	modeling	667:9,13,15	699:1,7,17,24	neighboring
misfortune	640:24 663:8	667:18 Mumbu 545:2	700:4,14,18	700:19
653:10	685:12,18	Murphy 545:3	701:1,3,18	neither 648:20
missing 715:19	711:20 712:13	548:5 612:10	/01.1,3,10	NERC 713:25
L				

net 703:18	583:2 608:22	NTSB 655:14	597:15,18	oil-fired 713:22
711:11 716:14	632:4 646:20	nuclear 630:13	658:24 659:4	okay 553:4
716:15	north 544:13	number 550:3	659:10 665:6	557:2,22
never 602:17	548:18 549:9	560:8,10	665:7,9	558:19 562:21
629:23 640:13	617:15 619:24	563:15,20	objections	567:16 568:24
641:19 664:13	624:5 638:1	568:5 574:8	555:4	569:16 572:25
719:17,18	653:13 671:25	589:25 638:11	obstacle 601:11	578:19 580:9
736:14	680:21 681:2	644:1 655:24	obstruction	582:19 591:9
new 544:19	744:14	692:15 693:13	596:5	599:7 600:16
571:25 579:4	northern	693:17 697:3	obviously 596:4	601:15,23
596:24 612:16	680:23 681:3	699:14,19	621:24 694:3	604:7 617:6
620:4,5,9,13	northwest	701:9,22,23	702:4 733:4	619:11 621:11
620:14 653:11	617:8 628:16	701:9,22,23	742:11,18	624:17 625:24
	632:5	718:6 724:22	· · ·	632:6 634:9
663:10 678:5 679:3 687:2	NOTAM	735:5 739:23	occasionally 728:20	635:18 640:20
691:16 698:22 710:5 712:6	598:13,14,15 599:9 630:3	741:2 numbering	occupation 553:17	641:17,23 642:15 644:11
		6		
712:25 714:1	630:20 631:1	561:4	occur 567:1 584:3	646:9 656:25
717:1,14,15	631:7,17,22	numbers		658:14 659:15
717:24 718:1	631:23,25	560:25 567:21	occurred	665:12,13,22
718:9,16,18	657:4,6,10,21	567:24 572:10	736:17	667:24 668:25
741:4 744:18	658:1,5,19	573:15 582:20	occurs 616:4	669:17 670:3
newer 572:10	659:24,25	668:8 686:21	odd 648:7	673:16 676:21
622:14	660:7 670:10	693:10 717:11	offer 558:16	690:6,15,22
newspapers	note 742:14,25	736:7	701:4,16	694:18 695:6
698:9	noted 727:14	numeral 550:2	702:25 709:18	698:21 704:16
night 580:18,18	735:10	0	offered 653:24	709:25 710:13
580:22 581:18	notes 744:5		701:22	711:4,12
633:14,16,19	notice 550:1,12	o 544:22 553:11	offering 709:14	712:1 718:17
634:6 636:2,7	598:13 626:8	554:12,14,14	offers 709:21	723:21 726:20
645:1,8,10,11	630:8	554:14,15,16	office 549:19	727:13 729:12
645:14,18,21	noticed 685:15	554:17 637:5	743:8	731:6 736:18
645:22 646:7	698:6	637:7,7,7,8,9	officer 583:10	741:9
nine 573:2,9	notices 688:24	637:10,11	583:11	old 571:24
nocturnal	notifications	o'clock 627:20	offset 711:14	619:15 677:5
580:24	697:23	oath 553:14	712:4,5	677:15 695:14
Nodding 604:19	notify 597:20	606:4	offsets 709:6	741:14,16
nodes 718:7	598:7 599:1	oaths 554:20	oh 615:2 636:11	older 568:16
nominal 703:16	599:13	637:15	643:15 651:11	569:12 570:21
703:19	notifying	object 661:7	oil 563:7,9	573:25 708:3
nonvisible	597:19	664:12	569:1,15	739:17
577:1,13	November	objection	679:20,23	on-line 599:10
normal 646:18	548:22 688:25	550:11,13,22	691:13 692:9	once 689:12
691:3	NOx 563:22	551:9 552:11	693:3,11	691:4 708:14
normally	564:2,16,20	552:20 556:17	735:19,20,23	720:1 725:6
577:23 581:1	683:16 706:13	583:14 584:6	736:1,5,12	one-half 588:2

UNITED REPORTERS, INC.

one-in-one-hu	696:9 734:17	620:3,5,6,8	713:10,20	pattern 585:20
689:22	744:4	628:15 634:1	717:22 718:11	588:24 594:2
one-on-one	originally 715:7	648:2,2	719:1,7 720:3	595:8 604:22
710:18	732:3	654:17 658:18	727:22 731:14	611:5 614:18
ones 555:8		658:25 659:7	745:14 746:13	
	outcry 623:1			617:20,25
586:18,19 635:21 688:14	output 685:15	664:4 670:24	746:18	625:7,8 628:6
	702:11,16	673:24 697:4	participants	650:12,16
721:10	703:5,16	698:2,7,19	654:4	669:14 670:12
OP3 741:16	706:3 708:8	699:16 700:7	participation	patterns 585:17
open 597:20	709:1 724:1	700:11 721:7	743:14	586:12,14
618:18 638:14	outreach 696:2	743:7 744:16	particular	738:20
638:17 697:14	696:3,18,19	Oxford's	580:24 590:22	pause 572:4
697:15 699:16	697:2 702:5	723:22	602:18 623:6	590:19 636:17
729:5	outside 611:22	oxygen 608:1	627:4 638:23	682:24 692:19
opening 548:6	721:11	<u></u>	652:15 668:5	708:20
operate 705:14	outward 654:23		687:25 698:4	pavement
710:9	overall 633:17	p 545:1,1,7	709:7 715:12	587:11
operating	704:18 709:24	546:1,1 547:1	726:24 730:6	pay 619:10
597:12,23	731:7 732:8	547:1 554:16	739:2	652:14
598:1 599:5	740:13	637:11	particularly	peak 686:23,24
668:9	overhead	P-51 624:4,6,7	628:7 651:10	713:15,18,20
operation	690:24	649:4	651:19 724:11	713:24
544:11 548:16	overlays 732:15	p.m 636:23	725:8 735:17	people 599:13
549:7 550:6	overrule 665:7	637:2 743:17	particulate	613:18 649:4
626:17,22	665:9	package 686:3	699:9,11	701:24
739:17 744:12	overwhelmed	687:4	705:19,22	percent 564:13
operational	591:10 696:12	page 552:4	706:5,17	564:15 565:8
740:20	overwhelming	571:20 587:21	724:4	565:16,25
operations	727:24 728:8	600:10,14	particulates	570:15,24
621:7,7,10	733:24	634:17,18	725:9	571:3 572:1,7
opinion 625:21	overwhelms	638:3 639:8	parties 558:5,23	572:10,11,20
630:25 659:6	724:14	639:10,14	559:8,10	572:21,24
opportunity	owner 583:13	713:13 714:2	609:25 643:8	573:4,7,9,13
557:5 558:5	Oxford 544:15	745:1,5,5,11	644:2,4	573:15,16
558:13,24	546:19 548:20	746:1	658:12 676:6	574:6,16
662:24 676:1	549:10,19	pages 744:3	742:17	579:3,9,16,19
694:24	550:23 551:23	panel 552:2,9	Partnership	579:20 580:2
opposed 577:9	557:6,11	554:22	550:3	580:8 598:3
678:5	583:13 589:16	paper 613:15	parts 738:24	648:4 683:16
opposite 587:25	594:2 597:9	papers 698:12	party 550:21	683:17 690:9
672:6	597:19,19	parallel 587:24	742:12 743:1	690:13 703:1
oral 551:15	602:25 610:9	Park 676:14	pass 567:12	704:12 705:15
order 548:3	610:11 611:12	part 585:15	passive 714:4	707:22 708:4
559:9 603:13	614:6 616:22	638:9,19	716:22	709:9,11,11
680:13 742:12	617:11 618:15	662:11,13	path 594:24	707.9,11,11
original 572:6	619:17,19	687:25 709:5	670:20	724:3,7
011g111a1 372.0	017.17,17		070.20	124.3,1

UNITED REPORTERS, INC. info@unitedreporters.com Nationwide-866-534-3383-Toll-Free

I				
percentage	691:6,11	657:25 658:7	Piper 648:15	614:8,11,14
564:1	692:17,25	658:14 659:5	piston 607:21	614:17 615:3
percentile	693:9,19	659:23 660:9	pitch 641:8	616:19 622:12
599:16 600:2	694:9,16	660:16 661:1	place 610:25	622:14,23
602:5,6	745:8	661:12,20	613:8 619:17	628:11,11,14
perfect 655:25	person 625:2	662:2,15,18	619:19 656:17	631:3,19,21
perfectly	653:2	663:1,18,24	660:17 664:4	632:5 640:13
602:10 656:6	personal 642:14	664:18,23	678:11	641:20 642:6
performance	654:4	665:8,12	placement	642:10,11
724:13,23	personnel 609:4	666:13 667:4	614:17 622:6	645:3 650:3
724:13,23	665:15	667:17 668:16	673:10	658:20,23
performed	perspective	668:25 745:7	places 563:21	659:8,22
685:8 696:20	632:14	pilot 570:6	placing 620:20	660:1,5,12,18
712:14	petition 702:21	574:20 581:10	620:21	660:19 661:7
period 688:25	712:12	581:14 593:18	plan 551:22	662:11 663:10
717:10	Petitioner	593:24 595:6	552:1 597:8	663:10,14,15
periods 735:19	609:12 610:21	598:7 599:2	678:23 715:15	663:16 664:3
peripheral	618:20	608:5 610:15	716:17,18	664:4 671:4
591:3 594:3	phase 654:14	612:1,13,23	718:25 746:4	671:15,23
periphery 593:2	678:24 684:24	613:3,8,8,13	plane 588:25	672:13 673:5
permanent	687:16	614:4 622:15	595:4 605:9	673:10,12
682:7	PHILIP 545:24	622:19 624:23	608:8 610:16	680:4 682:18
permission	phone 715:8	628:3 632:7	612:24 615:10	683:4 691:12
736:2	photograph	636:4 641:15	619:25 625:3	704:20 705:14
permit 736:3	729:9	650:12 652:3	647:1,4,8,22	706:23 707:6
Perrone 545:14	photographs	652:20,21	648:1,16,17	707:25 710:12
607:8,10,15	727:21 730:18	653:6,8 654:1	649:1	711:11 712:16
607:22 608:12	physical 601:11	654:17 655:23	planes 594:25	719:19,22
609:5,15	622:17 645:2	656:17 659:6	607:21 608:9	720:11,15,18
610:3 612:4	pictures 728:23	659:13 670:10	619:7,8,22	723:25 725:2
676:22 677:1	Pietrorazio	671:19 672:17	620:6,8,22	733:7 734:11
677:14 678:9	546:10 644:13	pilot's 624:24	623:24 624:2	739:2,3
678:16,22	644:18,19,22	pilots 570:3	633:25	740:12,12,25
679:1,12,19	645:16 646:1	577:14 593:8	plans 549:13	741:13
680:1,7,14	646:9,14,24	596:1,5	734:14	plant's 693:1
681:4,9,18	647:13 648:11	597:20 598:4	plant 559:24	plants 596:23
682:4,9,16	648:20 649:7	598:15 612:17	570:15,20	597:3 598:16
683:9,12,19	649:18,23	618:2 622:13	584:11 587:7	598:23 610:17
683:23 684:3	650:2,7,17,21	623:19 630:10	588:20 594:1	613:20 623:6
684:18 685:4	651:9,13,17	630:16 631:17	597:12,25	630:12 662:6
685:7,22	651:23 652:2	634:11 653:24	598:16 602:18	710:7 713:5
686:11,14,19	652:13 654:15	656:1 660:7	602:19,21,22	740:2,6
687:7,15,19	654:21 655:4	669:10	608:7,7,19,24	741:15
688:11,18	655:8,20	pipe 573:19	610:14,16,25	please 553:16
689:2,14,21	656:15,22	pipeline 682:3	611:6 612:18	586:22 592:21
690:3,6,15,22	657:3,9,16,20	692:4	613:3,21	598:24 600:11
			Í	

UNITED REPORTERS, INC. info@unitedreporters.com Nationwide-866-534-3383-Toll-Free

605:25 630:5	575:8 576:1	690:1 692:3	737:20	630:10 632:12
640:2 644:16	577:14 578:16	692:14 701:4	potentially	practical
659:3 660:24	580:17,21,21	714:15 724:9	594:22 735:19	615:17 623:19
661:17 662:22	581:8 596:22	740:24 742:14	740:3	688:1
676:25 716:7	599:16 600:8	policies 746:7	pound 611:10	precautions
723:17 742:14	600:21 607:24	policy 719:7	612:3 640:25	614:5
742:25	608:4,15,16	pollutant 738:9	641:1,22	preceded
plume 559:21	615:10 622:19	pollutants	679:17,24,25	663:20
561:12 567:8	622:25 623:5	707:17 713:4	pounds 591:21	precise 614:18
567:13 568:2	623:20 632:3	724:4 725:8	607:20 611:8	precisely
568:3,25	642:20 644:24	725:21 726:16	638:5 646:18	588:23 620:4
569:1,17,25	644:25 645:5	737:9 738:7,8	646:19,23	preclude 701:13
573:24 574:7	645:7,11,17	pollute 725:3	647:9,10,11	precluded
574:13 575:20	645:23 646:7	polluting	648:4,7,7,19	692:8
575:22 576:8	649:10 661:4	713:21 721:5	680:2	predecessor
576:18,24	661:21,25	721:6,7,17	power 546:12	549:6
577:1,4,8,17	662:5,6 667:7	pollution 675:8	587:7 588:20	predominantly
577:20 578:3	667:9,13,15	722:21 726:23	596:23 597:2	737:3,8
578:9,14,16	667:18,18,20	735:21	598:16,16,23	preface 716:10
581:5,11,14	668:10,13,19	Pomperaug	602:18,19,21	prefer 591:5
581:16 582:1	668:21 693:20	547:2 674:6	608:6,7,18,24	prefile 742:23
592:2 594:22	693:21	689:16	610:14,16,17	prefiled 742:19
608:25 609:3	plus 575:1	poor 611:25	610:25 611:6	preliminary
609:8 622:5	589:23 652:9	popular 648:13	612:18 613:3	551:12
622:11,14,18	PM 698:24	population	613:20,21	prep 599:25
624:20 627:23	699:9,25	670:23	614:8,11,14	prepare 606:5
627:25 628:2	721:22 723:4	portfolio 719:14	614:17 615:3	606:13,17
628:5,8	723:7,23	portion 654:11	616:19 623:6	prepared
629:12,15,16	724:12,16,19	672:13,14	628:11,11,14	549:22 553:22
633:1,1,8	736:7	731:11 742:9	630:12 631:2	555:7 557:14
634:11 635:7	point 562:1	portions 654:23	631:19,21	557:18 625:18
635:22,25	566:19 573:2	pose 640:15	632:5 640:13	625:20 701:16
645:2 647:15	573:9 578:4	position 666:16	641:20 642:6	preparing
647:20,21	593:16 594:10	positive 660:3	658:20,23	585:19
652:16 661:13	603:19 622:3	possibility	659:8,22	presence 567:14
667:24 668:13	622:11 624:24	595:16 687:9	660:1,5 662:5	604:5
668:18,20,24	626:21 629:19	possible 602:11	662:11 671:15	present 546:8
672:18 685:5	636:17 646:23	652:15 710:15	671:23 672:13	546:19 547:2
693:25 694:6	655:22 656:14	728:25 736:14	673:5,10,12	547:6,10,14
731:11,24,25	656:24 657:1	possibly 653:6	713:5,9	547:17 550:25
733:14,17	657:2 658:16	682:7	720:13,18	557:17,18
735:4	666:1,11	posted 698:7,8	733:7 734:11	558:14 656:2
plumes 566:14	668:11 676:4	potential	Powers 555:15	656:3 657:13
566:20 570:6	684:17 685:1	584:17 714:10	555:25 556:10	663:16
570:7,12	685:17 686:2	717:5,8	741:18 745:5	presented 558:3
574:21,23	687:3 688:8	732:11 737:12	practicable	558:3,8
'	•	_	-	

pressure 653:5	probably 569:6	554:25 742:13	proposal 684:14	PSI 680:6,13
680:2,8,12	569:7 575:16	programs	propose 593:23	PSIG 680:6
683:6,8	576:9 631:14	715:24 746:8	593:24	public 544:8
presumably	636:16 653:4	project 560:3	proposed 587:7	548:15 549:20
624:20	653:7 678:3,7	560:12 562:2	588:20 602:18	550:5,25
presumed 626:8	682:8 736:21	589:6,8	608:18 640:13	584:16 611:23
presumption	737:1 739:12	602:25 609:9	663:16 671:4	623:1 684:24
597:23	739:13	609:17,20	671:11,15	698:1 700:17
pretty 566:20	problem 611:7	610:7 621:21	691:12 695:21	744:9
570:5 684:25	614:14,16,16	625:4 639:15	proposing	publicly 698:6
692:2 708:2	618:1,4,6,7	661:24 667:14	621:24 727:12	publicly-owned
723:7	procedure	679:3,4	737:25	596:16
prevailing	552:11 643:24	681:15 684:15	pros 701:19	published
575:2 619:24	procedures	686:6 691:2	protect 678:12	698:13
628:15	548:12 585:9	701:20 703:6	723:1	PURA 545:5
prevalent 567:3	621:1	720:21 727:25	proved 724:18	purely 622:10
previous 570:16	proceed 549:21	729:1,5	proven 685:14	691:22
618:9 646:2	552:13 559:4	733:25 734:20	proves 610:21	purports
650:3 662:3	559:9 672:8	740:8,24	provide 582:20	632:17
668:1 679:3	proceeding	projected	585:16 588:17	purpose 584:15
736:10	583:20 584:12	703:12 716:25	590:25 686:3	657:10 684:12
previously	701:5	716:25 719:23	689:10 705:7	731:20
554:18 626:1	proceedings	740:21	719:11 720:6	purposes
637:13 703:3	558:1 584:3	projection	720:16 730:14	584:13 683:5
704:21 706:24	594:9 702:4	712:18,18	732:16	pursuant 544:9
708:1 724:18	743:16	717:20	provided 560:1	548:9,23
726:15	process 605:21	projections	560:8,19,20	744:10
previously-iss	684:23 688:20	711:25 712:3	585:13 587:4	put 557:12
630:8	processes 616:8	714:25 716:24	595:12 601:13	608:21 714:25
price 714:8,14	procured	717:16,22	640:8 663:15	741:23
prices 692:14	709:16	718:14	664:18 678:23	
primarily	produce 667:15	Prokop 544:13	679:9 685:24	Q
607:25 608:3	produced 594:1	548:19 549:9	686:1,5,16,17	qualification
664:12 699:15	623:3 645:3	744:15	688:24 690:25	687:4
primary 610:19	667:10	properly 595:6	704:1 732:2,3	quality 722:25
681:13	produces	property	provides 561:8	723:8,23
principal	622:14	671:15 677:23	582:17 615:25	724:16,20
583:10,11	producing	677:25 681:1	616:2 638:9	726:13
prior 559:22	629:12,15,16	681:3	640:24 703:5	quantified
609:23 622:23	709:1	proportional	providing 668:8	720:10,17
689:1 722:18	product 716:12	578:25 579:1	685:20	quantify 720:20
722:20 723:6	production	579:20	provisions	quantities
740:19	622:25	proportionate	548:10,24	737:11,11,18
privilege 653:19	professional	574:15	proximity	quarter 672:9
probability	659:6	proportionate	596:10,14	Quassapaug
691:18	program	573:23 574:4	630:12	674:14
l'				

Quassy 676:13	726:25 732:5	R	Read-Ins	reconcile
question 560:19	734:3,24	r 544:22 545:1	637:21	721:12
560:20 561:2	735:9 740:1,4	546:1 547:1,8	reading 571:3	reconciling
561:9,17	741:12 745:17	553:11,11,11	666:12	721:5
570:11,18	questioning	554:11,11,11	ready 722:5,9	record 550:8
571:18 575:13	623:8 645:6	554:12,13,16	reagent 683:15	556:15 592:16
577:17 581:10	647:23,23	606:1 637:4,4	real 659:20	637:23 670:5
582:17 583:17	658:3,6,12	637:4,5,6,9,11	678:2 688:1,4	686:9 689:13
583:24 584:13	666:1 668:7	637:12 746:11	realistic 615:15	692:1 693:10
584:23,25	668:15	radar 620:6	reality 719:1,12	743:4
585:6,14	questions	radial 638:15	realize 628:8	records 596:10
586:6,11,23	559:17 570:3	radius 589:4	realized 703:10	621:5
588:10,15,18	592:24 593:1	rail 741:20	705:3	recover 611:15
595:10 596:20	594:4,6	raised 726:17	really 566:18	611:17 615:13
597:2,7 598:6	601:16 605:19	ramp 693:1,4,7	578:7 584:13	641:16
599:1,15,19	612:9 616:11	range 564:8	594:6 601:9	recycled 566:7
599:25 613:1	616:14 621:17	571:16 586:13	612:13 627:11	red 617:7
613:4 615:17	627:6 642:25	589:25 627:4	633:17 685:16	727:17
616:17 620:25	662:9 666:6	rare 566:20,22	702:3 704:9	Redbird 669:21
624:12 626:2	673:15,22	567:1	733:10 738:21	reduce 581:22
630:19 637:25	674:9,13,25	rate 649:13	738:23	582:5,23
638:6 640:8	675:13,21	690:17 693:7	reason 648:21	622:13 708:7
644:4 645:12	676:24 685:11	703:21 710:9	691:7 730:11	709:2
645:15 650:9	685:21 694:21	721:8,22	740:14	reduced 582:2
652:12,14	695:8,16	ratepayers	reasonable	608:1 626:20
659:1,3,20,21	699:14 701:1	703:8,13	614:5 626:16	654:7 746:6
660:20 661:8	716:11 722:16	705:5 709:23	reasons 577:15	reducing 652:6
661:10,17,17	734:15,23	710:1,4	recall 642:2	713:4
661:25 662:19	735:13 745:14	rates 650:4	644:5 655:14	refer 705:17
663:4 664:12	746:13,18	679:4,6,10	655:15 658:12	reference 585:4
664:20 668:3	queue 739:16	rating 570:16	671:24 697:20	585:5
669:3 671:7,8	quick 659:20	686:23	receive 615:19	referenced
689:3,15	quickly 683:7	Raymond	699:7	584:22,23
690:7,16	693:3 694:12	546:10 644:19	received 556:22	585:4 586:8
696:20,25	quite 603:17	reach 715:21	699:14,19	649:16 663:13
697:8,17	608:16 616:6	reached 602:17	700:23 701:1	663:22 667:2
700:9,22	623:3 626:12	640:13 641:19	745:10	667:3 669:6
704:17 705:4	671:7,14	react 683:7	recess 636:22	referring 560:6
705:8,11	688:2 722:9	read 560:25	recognize	585:23 599:9
706:20 707:1	722:22 723:12	588:14 600:10	580:12,15	601:8 677:8
707:24 708:4	729:4	601:25 626:13	recollect 730:4	699:4 712:25
710:23,25	quote 703:6	640:1 666:16	recommendat	727:20
711:18 716:4	713:6 727:24	700:15	682:11	refers 613:13
716:6,8,16,21	quoted 736:7	Read-In 590:23	recommended	621:4
722:18 723:13	quoting 569:4	591:8 592:14	585:2,18	refilled 678:13
723:24 725:13	733:22	<i>c, 1, 0, 0, 2, 1</i> , 1, 1	586:6	refineries

lr				
630:14	681:11 684:6	reopened 549:1	representations	697:10,24
reflect 685:16	732:8	repeat 570:18	730:14	698:7,16,19
719:5	relating 666:6	611:19 711:18	representative	698:24 699:1
reflected 589:10	relationship	725:15	589:15 590:11	699:8,18,24
690:13 729:10	583:21 611:1	rephrase 642:7	590:15 623:24	700:4,14
refresh 644:16	656:16 660:2	-		700.4,14 701:2,3,17
660:15		659:1,2 661:17 662:20	624:1,8 692:2 694:22 728:12	, ,
	relative 566:18			734:10 735:5
regard 560:21	571:7,12	662:21	representing	resolved 623:15
561:9 581:14	574:11,22	replace 563:24	730:11	resource 715:15
610:25 638:7	577:18 595:13	report 568:14	request 548:23	716:18
657:4 685:18	633:5 684:15	568:16 584:22	550:22 556:13	resources 713:4
687:14 700:9	688:1 693:24	585:5 586:9	563:4 606:15	respect 555:8
719:9 733:17	694:4 700:6	589:14 590:5	609:14	578:23 598:6
regarding	736:4	590:7,14	requested	616:23 642:20
609:16 610:6	relatively 694:4	592:12,18	698:23	697:17 712:20
637:22 682:16	relegate 662:5	600:10 601:20	requesting	718:11 724:12
686:19 689:2	relevance	601:22 617:12	736:2	respectively
689:5 690:15	583:15,17	617:14 623:4	requests 699:7	602:8
690:22 692:17	584:14,15	623:9 634:16	700:10,13	respond 559:18
692:25 693:10	655:17 656:8	635:20 639:5	require 563:8	609:11 658:4
regardless	667:16	639:8 647:2	596:18 629:9	664:24 665:5
707:18	relevancy	648:6 649:16	672:17 677:6	722:17
regards 695:25	661:10,13	655:14 662:3	677:16 680:3	responded
696:21 697:25	relevant 661:18	662:4,4	688:9	657:5 700:22
698:3,24,25	reliability	663:13,20,20	required 628:4	response 550:18
702:17 718:19	741:20,24	663:23 664:1	641:16 653:14	557:20 560:9
727:17 741:11	remain 593:18	665:14,15,20	712:23 713:16	560:14,18
region 707:11	594:1 617:2	666:12,15,19	713:19 734:16	561:7,17,17
708:18 709:4	644:25 651:7	666:20,25	requirement	563:3 581:20
709:24 713:2	714:17	667:3 668:17	593:18 598:22	582:17 585:13
713:6 715:13	remaining	668:23 677:15	638:14,18	585:14 609:11
717:4 720:24	628:5	682:12 702:20	requirements	609:13 643:11
722:7 726:22	remarkably	714:1 717:13	629:7 630:1	658:11 663:8
regional 704:18	693:17 715:8	745:23	631:24	663:12 668:3
707:17 708:7	remember	reported 668:20	requires 628:10	673:19,25
738:7 739:11	613:16,17	668:23 740:17	requiring	674:3,16,19
regionally	699:19	Reporter	598:15 630:4	674:21 675:3
738:11	rendered 549:1	644:15,20	672:24	675:6,9,16
Regulation	renewable	744:23	research 593:13	676:12 685:10
638:9	713:4 718:24	REPORTERS	researched	685:22 690:13
rejected 665:16	719:6,14	744:23	597:6 619:1	714:5,7,10,24
rejection	renewables	reports 664:17	reserve 551:15	716:23 717:10
665:21	718:23 719:13	664:18 667:6	642:25	717:16 718:15
relate 662:10	741:13	represent	residents	723:13 728:17
related 561:9	reopen 544:5	730:16,22	695:12 696:5	732:4,4
583:11 679:12	548:13 744:7	731:4 732:11	696:7,22,23	responses 555:1
				-

556:3 560:9	623:18	733:21	741:15	546:6 643:20
561:5 582:16	Rhode 721:9	roadways	runoff 699:11	670:5,6,22
626:2 745:11	Richard 553:18	728:20 729:6	runway 587:8	671:2,9,17
745:13,14,16	745:1	ROBERT	587:11,24	672:23 673:6
746:12,15,17	right 551:15,21	544:23	588:3 596:15	673:14 745:8
responsible	553:1,3	roll 602:14	597:4 604:23	saved 720:24
554:23 555:9	564:13 566:1	640:10 641:7	605:3 608:23	savings 703:10
559:18	568:16 572:2	Roman 550:2	609:1 610:20	703:12 715:17
responsive	575:23 576:6	634:17	614:22 617:8	715:20,23
714:8	588:19 591:17	rope 730:2	653:3,4,12	saying 576:1
rest 707:10	593:5,6,8	roughly 563:6	654:8 670:11	577:3 609:23
708:17 718:16	594:22,22	563:11 574:15	672:5,5,6,8,10	666:3 708:12
restate 571:18	598:14,15	574:21 578:25	672:16,19,25	says 572:20
627:24	600:25 604:15	578:25 580:8		600:20 602:14
restatement	613:6 617:13	632:20 649:19	<u> </u>	611:19 615:25
630:7	617:14,19,25	649:24 693:16	s 545:1 546:1	621:4 630:7
result 589:5	619:11 621:11	695:10,18	547:1 553:11	634:25 635:11
686:4 703:7,7	635:20 636:9	round 572:9	554:11,11,12	641:3 666:19
705:3 708:16	643:1 662:7	573:14	554:15,15,16	696:17 714:3
709:3 714:11	667:23 695:23	rounded 621:6	606:1,1 637:4	scale 703:6
723:23 740:11	724:19 738:17	route 680:16	637:4,5,8,8,9	705:2,7
740:23	rise 668:18	routes 680:20	637:11,12,12	708:16 709:20
resulted 716:14	724:6	routine 617:20	sacrifice 723:21	721:24
results 663:9	rises 602:12	routinely	safe 605:15	scenario 670:9
685:12,17	rising 647:15	608:20 611:3	627:8,9 628:5	690:8 692:2
resume 553:22	risk 611:21,24	614:13,15	safely 654:6	scenarios
627:20 637:17	611:25 619:4	620:7,18	669:13 743:14	653:24 654:1
746:11	622:13 625:13	routing 680:24	safer 659:21	scheduled
retired 740:7	627:9,10	rows 628:16	safety 582:9	549:15 740:3
retirement	640:15 664:7	RUDNICK	600:2,3,18	740:3
741:12 745:25	664:8 667:21	545:21	601:6 618:2	scheduling
retirements	681:13	RUHLOFF	627:4 681:11	676:6
740:1,17,18	riskiest 635:21	547:12 674:24	682:17,17	School 675:15
reverted 685:19	risks 600:7	rule 552:20	683:5	699:17 745:12
review 558:5	627:13,14,15	603:24 638:23	safety's 619:3	science 655:25
584:10,14	river 547:2,6	670:19	SAIC 662:4	screened 732:18
588:12,17	674:6,10	rules 633:22	663:19 664:1	scrutiny 596:18
609:9 610:17	689:16 746:6	634:2 636:10	664:2,13	se 721:17
615:24 616:1	road 544:13,14	636:12,14	665:14,15,20	sea 585:21
664:15 688:19	548:19,19	638:7 651:5,6	666:12	586:1 604:25
697:20	549:9,10	741:4	sake 619:3	746:10
revised 745:23	550:8 613:16	run 608:9	742:20	season 686:23
revisiting 735:1	613:17,19	691:13 692:22	satisfy 670:9	seasonal 732:12
Revival 547:7	616:6 744:15	692:23	saturated	732:17 733:8
674:11	744:15,24	running 579:23	694:11	seat 676:23
rewriting	roads 728:18	608:7 681:1	Savarese 546:3	695:3

Seattle 653:17 second 560:17	555:20 556:5 566:17,25	708:2,3,5,22 710:14,21	<pre>shortest 589:4 shortly 548:8</pre>	single-engine 589:22
562:1,20,24	567:9 568:4,8	711:6,8	show 588:4	single-family
572:18 578:21	568:13,17,24	721:14,15	592:16 613:20	695:11
581:25 601:25	569:5,14,19	723:11 724:10	694:11	sir 551:25 557:9
621:3 638:6	569:24 570:4	725:2 737:25	showed 628:16	557:15 559:6
649:12,19	573:1,20	serve 611:18	655:10 717:7	576:20 593:4
660:18 680:23	574:2,7,14,18	658:17	739:19	600:13 606:8
689:17,23	574:24 575:6	served 731:20	shown 585:17	606:13,22
690:1 692:18	575:11,15	service 681:6	589:11 602:3	607:1,5,11
696:17 745:18	576:5,14,25	services 675:5	606:8	612:4,7,25
section 600:12	578:1,12	720:15	shows 705:18	613:12,22
628:9 635:19	580:20 581:4	session 637:1,21	712:21	614:1,11
638:9,11	581:13 582:15	646:3	shuffle 700:24	616:9 618:6
639:8,14	582:21 645:20	set 561:5,7	shuffe 700.24 shut 618:21	619:10 621:15
677:9,10	646:6 694:1	582:16 621:3	shut-off 682:22	622:9 623:12
702:9 712:12	694:13 705:16	687:7 689:3	shut-offs 682:19	623:17 634:14
712:17	706:1,11	689:14 690:16	side 608:18,19	635:5 636:14
sectional 613:13	722:18,19	696:15,17,25	608:23 618:21	639:17,23
613:21,22	724:8 725:22	707:14 708:13	618:22 619:5	640:4 644:12
security 598:18	735:22 736:23	745:14,17	619:7	645:4 646:17
629:25,25	737:4 738:3	746:13,18	sides 678:19	649:17 650:20
630:9	738:12,17	Seven 689:25	sight 609:3	651:16,22
see 570:8	745:2	Seven 089.25 Seventeen	significant	652:1 654:20
581:17 582:7	seminar 699:23	604:25	622:24 647:20	655:3,7 657:8
604:8,12	Senator 545:3	seventh 600:22	648:25 678:7	657:24 658:6
614:7 620:5,8	612:10 616:17	severe 602:11	722:21 726:5	665:4 667:2
636:19 650:23	sense 622:7,10	612:1 635:1	significantly	669:8,16
651:7 652:9	sense 022.7,10 sensitive 723:1	severely 664:15	647:4	671:16 676:19
663:2 667:16	sensors 682:19	Seymour 697:5	similar 568:20	702:13
676:5 700:4	683:6	SF6 737:16	570:8 595:23	sit 557:23
703:18 715:13				643:21
	sent 698:6	shape 665:16 share 598:11	596:9 613:16	
721:23 728:16 728:22 729:3	sentence 600:11		613:18 630:15	site 549:13
	601:25 626:12	609:25	simple 659:13	628:20,22 622:0 671:11
730:13 735:12	626:15 634:25	shear 607:25	707:7 710:8	632:9 671:11 680:21 22
seeing 716:12	639:25 640:4	shocking	726:25	680:21,23
seek 741:25	641:18	669:22	simply 601:3	682:8 683:10 687:25 688:5
seeking 684:24	sentences 640:1	short 652:19	simulating	687:25 688:5
seen 570:6,7	640:1	741:19	731:11	688:7 695:22
578:17 587:4	separation	short-term	simulations 727:18	698:8 704:25 707:2 700:16
596:8 732:22 732:24 25	593:25 SED 683:15	692:5 736:4 742:1		707:2 709:16
732:24,25	SER 683:15	742:1	simulator	709:21 722:5
segments	Series 702:17	shortages	653:25 654:9	727:16,19
720:14 Soldon 546:15	702:18,25	691:18	669:6,20,21	728:19 729:1
Selden 546:15	703:2 704:10	shortening 671:18	single 647:7	729:5,8,10 745:20
Sellars 555:10	704:11 706:22	0/1:18	668:20	745:20
<u> </u>				

UNITED REPORTERS, INC. info@unitedreporters.com Nationwide-866-534-3383-Toll-Free w

sited 664:4	591:7,12	710:14,25	723:22	623:10 624:3
sites 630:12	592:4,13,19	711:9 721:25	southeast 632:3	647:24
705:1 707:2	593:1,10	723:6 724:10	southwest	sports 590:22
709:17,18	594:5,20	724:17 736:11	617:12	square 544:19
siting 544:2,18	595:3 600:12	737:10,11	space 595:19	680:3 744:18
545:15,18	600:16 601:15	smallest 592:17	629:9 630:11	stab 740:16
583:18 591:3	601:19,23	smallest 372:17 smoke 573:19	speak 658:25	stable 602:4
593:2 626:3	602:20 608:21	605:4 617:2	659:11 681:24	stack 560:11,23
640:9 660:17	610:15 611:9	622:16,17	speaking	562:17,19
701:8 744:17	619:7 627:21	708:25 709:1	677:15 688:12	567:11 569:7
sitting 658:21	628:18,23	727:18 730:25	Specialist	574:25 575:1
situate 610:25	629:1,5,13,18	731:5,13,24	606:10 609:21	575:17,18,23
situate 010.25	629:24 630:5	so-called 702:20	specific 596:19	576:7,9,13,15
688:13 721:24	630:21 631:2	Society 547:11	596:20 623:18	576:18 578:11
741:17	631:6,10,16	solicitations	647:17 662:8	581:17,17,18
situations	632:6,13,20	697:23	666:6,14,23	581:23,24
595:24	632:24 633:8	solution 683:17	678:15 687:2	582:2,4,22,24
six 650:4 699:15	633:13,21,24	solution 005.17	696:24	582:25 583:3
727:21	634:5,8,15,21	741:25	specifically	583:6,7 586:2
six-tenths	634:24 635:6	somebody	589:19 597:6	586:4 595:15
588:21	635:11,18,25	655:18	598:5 630:22	595:25 596:22
size 569:22	636:9,15	son 653:16	658:13 661:16	599:17 602:6
570:11 581:11	637:18,19	sorry 553:9	664:2 672:20	602:12 603:5
622:5 693:11	638:24 639:2	568:21 570:18	677:9 696:6	603:15 605:4
705:22 724:15	639:7,13,18	570:25 576:21	696:21,22	605:6,10,11
729:13 734:5	639:24 640:6	584:25 587:1	697:9,17,25	613:24 614:1
735:2	640:20 641:2	604:10,11	698:15,16	614:12 617:2
sliding 741:3	641:10,17,23	616:2 639:9	699:18,24	617:7,7,19,22
slightly 691:14	642:4,9,15,24	639:10 643:16	701:2 727:19	618:1,1
706:12	644:3,11	643:23 646:5	735:6 741:8	620:22 636:3
slow 650:18	658:24 659:10	655:20 696:10	specified 649:9	636:3,12
654:12	661:6 664:11	702:12 723:16	specifies 638:4	640:14,17
small 545:24	666:10 684:2	738:15	Spectra 680:19	653:1 709:1
550:13,16	686:8,12,15	sort 581:15	681:1	727:18 729:20
551:10 552:5	689:10 692:18	641:11 688:3	Spectra's 681:3	730:22 731:4
552:10,15,22	696:24 702:12	702:3 739:11	speculative	731:13 733:10
553:1,4,7,15	702:19 716:3	source 737:7	680:25	739:15 741:4
553:20 554:1	716:7 722:17	739:7	speed 652:7	746:9
554:5,21	723:12,16	sources 623:23	678:20 715:5	stacks 563:13
555:17 556:2	737:18 745:7	south 546:4	spill 678:21	565:4 566:3
556:12,20,24	smaller 568:16	617:10,14,17	spillage 678:12	575:4 576:15
558:6 559:12	569:3,12	617:22 619:23	spin 611:15	595:21 603:18
559:14 561:3	608:8 622:12	619:25 620:16	spinoff 624:4	612:19 613:9
578:20 583:14	622:23 704:20	620:21 671:25	spoke 629:19	614:8 622:7
586:22 588:9	705:23 706:23	Southbury	sport 590:11,16	622:16,17
588:24 590:20	708:6 710:6	675:2 721:7	591:15 607:19	624:13,19,24

IT				
(24.25.(22.9	716.15 719.0	562.25 564.7	600.14 17 25	645.10 646.4
624:25 632:8	716:15 718:9	563:25 564:7	600:14,17,25	645:19 646:4
632:21 642:6	718:18 719:12	564:11,15,19	601:5,12,17	646:13,16
642:11,18	721:11 735:17	564:24 565:3	601:21,24	647:3,18
649:13 656:23	stated 600:6	565:7,12,15	603:2,21,25	648:14,23
667:21,23,23	603:3 664:2	565:22 566:1	604:7,11,16	649:15,20,25
667:25 668:10	statement 588:4	566:6,11,22	604:20 605:2	650:5,14,19
708:25 728:15	588:6 652:12	567:5,16,25	605:7,14,18	650:24 651:11
730:25 731:5	664:10 665:18	568:7,11,15	605:24 606:7	651:15,20,25
731:24 732:20	666:15,18	568:21 569:2	606:12,16,21	652:18 654:19
733:4 734:6,7	716:10 738:16	569:11,16,21	606:25 607:4	655:2,6,12
734:20 735:3	statements	570:2,10,19	607:12,18	657:7,14,18
staff 545:9,12	743:4	570:24 571:4	608:2,14	657:23 658:2
552:8 607:7	states 587:23	571:8,21	609:10,18	658:9,25
676:25	719:7	572:3,9,14,19	610:8 612:6	659:15,18
stall 611:15	stating 667:14	572:25 573:3	612:12,20,25	660:4,14,22
stand 605:25	station 628:20	573:8,14,24	613:11,25	662:9,22
610:22 702:23	629:10 660:13	574:5,10,16	614:10 615:22	663:11,21
standard	stationary	574:19 575:4	616:7 617:1,6	665:3 666:7
584:20 585:2	731:16	575:8,13,25	618:5,17	667:1 668:4
601:3,8,9	status 606:15	576:11,20	619:9,18	668:22 669:5
604:22 617:24	684:21 688:19	577:11 578:7	620:12 621:9	669:7,11,15
625:6 626:15	689:4	578:19 579:5	621:14 622:9	669:19 670:1
679:18	statute 638:18	579:11,15,22	623:11,16	670:8,16,25
standards	Statutes 544:9	580:1,6,9,15	624:15,22	671:6,12,22
623:19 716:13	548:11,25	581:1,8 582:7	626:10 627:1	673:1,9
719:15 722:25	744:11	582:13,19	627:22 628:1	675:22 676:15
736:4	stay 595:7	583:1,9,19	628:21,24	676:17 745:5
standby 741:15	625:21 643:13	584:7,10,19	629:3,11,14	745:6
standpoint	steel 654:23	585:1,11	629:22 630:2	stillest 569:9
622:8 657:17	Stein 544:23	586:5,15,20	630:6,24	stopping 728:20
715:4 727:5,6	557:19 567:15	586:25 587:6	631:4,8,13,20	storage 678:10
731:12	616:24 645:13	587:17,21	632:11,16,23	678:23
stands 603:22	676:18	588:7,19	633:4,11,15	stored 683:10
start 548:8	stenotype 744:5	589:7,13	633:23 634:3	683:20
605:21 607:6	Stephen 546:3,6	590:3,10,16	634:7,13,19	stormwater
627:21 639:2	670:6	591:14,19,24	634:22 635:4	689:5 745:22
687:9,20	Stevens 546:21	592:10,15,20	635:9,13,23	straddle 695:22
688:8,14	550:23 551:10	592:23 593:4	636:6,11	straight 603:16
695:7,15	551:23,25	593:17,22	639:6,12,16	730:9
started 610:10	557:3,9,15,24	594:8,14,17	639:22 640:3	strain 709:2
688:15 719:16	558:12,21	595:3 596:12	640:7,23	stratification
starts 694:11	559:1,6,20	597:1,8,13,17	641:5,13,21	635:3
state 544:1	560:4 561:1	598:8,12,19	642:3,8,13,22	stream 689:16
553:16 588:20		598:8,12,19 598:21 599:3		690:9
	561:11,19,24		643:5,12,15 643:22 644:6	Street 545:22
599:15 601:2	562:8,13,21	599:6,14,20		
701.6716.7	= 560.01010			
701:6 716:7	563:2,12,17	599:24 600:9	644:22 645:4	546:4,15

UNITED REPORTERS, INC.

strong 624:6	suggesting	698:20 700:6	667:13 713:1	tell 610:13
649:1	577:23,24	700:12 727:25	talked 661:15	613:7 644:16
strongly 630:10	627:12	729:6 733:24	667:23,25	695:18
structure 596:4	Suite 744:24	suspect 688:23	talking 577:1	telling 618:9
733:13	sulphur 561:14	suspect 000.25 sustain 659:4	579:2 585:9	709:17
structures	561:21 737:16	swear 605:22	585:10 611:9	temperature
671:3 728:2	737:16	switch 692:8	615:15 616:21	560:1,12,15
733:2,4 734:5	summary	693:8 727:15	639:3 647:14	560:22 562:3
student 608:5	634:18 713:14	switchyard	667:24 696:9	562:14,18
610:12,13,15	summer 686:22	690:23	713:7 715:19	564:5 566:14
614:25 646:21	698:2	sworn 552:17	726:22	566:15 567:2
students 614:21	sun 644:25	553:8,13	tall 568:25	567:6 568:1,6
625:10	653:20,25	554:18 606:3	569:2,22	568:9,10,18
studied 655:23	superior 724:24	637:13	731:24	571:2,3,9,12
studied 055.25 study 600:21	Supervising	system 599:10	tallest 733:5,11	574:12 577:19
601:3 602:24	545:18	619:16 683:15	tank 678:11,13	580:23 595:14
638:2,3 677:5	supply 687:5	687:22 689:6	tank 678:11,15 tanker 693:11	635:10 645:9
677:8 678:5		710:5 712:17	tanker 693:11 tanks 693:15	645:25 646:8
stuff 626:7	support 690:21	710:5 712:17	TANYA 745:4	694:2 709:10
subdivision	supported 663:7	712:20 713:17	tapping 680:22	temperatures
				560:5 561:20
547:18 675:18	supports 666:16	systems' 717:16	681:1,2	
675:21 694:23	supposed 727:7	T	target 600:5 601:3	580:13 635:2
695:9,11,24	sure 558:21	T 554:13,15,17		635:12 640:15
696:6 697:10	559:1,20	606:1,1 637:6	targeted 600:1	640:18 679:7
697:19 735:7	564:11 570:19	637:8,10,12	600:3,18	693:22
submit 588:16	571:17,19,21	637:12	601:5 697:9	ten 544:18
687:4 689:12	572:3 576:22	table 600:15	697:18	600:22 611:11
submitted	577:11 578:17	602:3 638:3	targeting	654:5,6 669:9
558:11 689:8	582:21 583:25	639:19 679:10	698:15,19	669:14,25
699:5 742:22	584:7 586:25	703:18 704:1	targets 719:6	tend 594:19
742:24	588:13 594:17	704:6 705:17	tarmac 671:4	697:13
subsequent	598:6 599:12	tail 602:2 654:6	671:10	tepid 717:21
642:11 664:21	617:1 625:1	tailwind 669:10	taught 614:25	term 618:24
687:5	634:19 635:24	take 552:19	teach 610:12	629:23 641:3
substantial	636:18 639:6	590:21 612:12	614:21 625:10	664:2 684:25
626:19 726:11	639:12 642:8	616:8 619:19	Tech 677:8	terminology
substantive	642:17 659:19	621:10 636:19	702:20	641:7
610:1	660:15 665:12	666:22 685:1	technical 643:2	terms 581:5
substation	666:4 669:24	717:10	technically	641:12,14 712:14 721:20
655:1	682:1 685:16	taken 584:1	575:20	712:14 721:20
subterranean	687:17 692:12	636:22 717:18	technology	737:5738:23
745:21	698:11 704:7	719:23 744:5	705:20 708:3	739:1,12
suggest 594:7	742:17,21,23	takes 714:22	710:24 711:8	terrain 732:14
619:25	surface 745:20	715:14	715:5 726:4	terribly 642:18
suggested	surfaces 585:22	talk 632:25	telecommuni	territory 671:21
618:20 670:8	surrounding	ulik 032.23	550:7	terrorism
l				

UNITED REPORTERS, INC. info@unitedreporters.com Nationwide-866-534-3383-Toll-Free

1				
657.17	662.19.24	700.00 705.6	(12.15 (14.6	500.17 605.2
657:17	663:18,24	722:22 725:6	613:15 614:6	599:17 605:3
test 623:19	667:4 668:25	725:12,13	615:5 616:6,8	653:1 697:21
669:6 721:19	669:2 670:2	727:4 736:19	625:13 642:25	719:4 729:20
tested 648:5	673:14,16,23	736:25 743:9	651:18 656:3	730:22 731:4
testified 553:14	676:8,17,19	third 582:16	664:3 671:1	733:10
554:19 578:13	677:1 678:9	741:20 746:2	676:2 678:5	topography
606:4 637:14	694:16,18,25	Thirteen 632:17	684:17 685:17	728:2 734:1
677:4 693:21	735:7,11	Thirty-eight	686:2 687:12	745:20
709:8	736:8 742:3,5	573:2,8	692:15 694:22	total 567:24
testifying	743:12,13	Thomas 682:12	716:2 719:18	576:16 706:2
592:20,25	Thanks 669:18	thought 623:24	722:6 728:13	713:16 737:24
testimony	thereof 728:6	629:18 643:17	729:2 734:14	totally 625:2
551:15 557:17	thermal 649:10	thousand 605:2	735:19 741:14	tougher 720:20
557:18 558:2	652:16 661:4	thousands	timely 712:9	Towantic 544:5
558:4,7,10,14	662:6	718:6	times 575:17	544:13 545:20
558:17 593:11	they'd 632:4	threat 657:12	576:2,12	548:15,19,24
607:3 616:1	741:25	three 575:16	597:9 600:21	549:5,9
646:2 705:13	thick 686:15	576:11,12,17	650:4 651:7	583:11 602:25
742:19,23	thing 615:9	584:21 585:3	701:23	631:19 639:15
tether 729:24	656:23 660:3	586:7 590:9	timing 722:4	641:19 664:3
730:2,4,20	707:16 720:9	602:15 611:5	tiny 722:24	703:13 719:11
734:8	things 574:9	623:24 625:5	Title 548:10	744:7,15
Tetra 677:8	623:18 697:13	638:18 639:20	TLS 600:17,21	Towantic's
702:20	720:5	640:11 653:23	today 551:13,23	686:21 745:11
thank 551:6	think 551:12	689:20 690:1	552:2,13	745:13,16,18
554:5 557:24	552:14 554:21	707:15 720:14	554:25 557:7	746:2,12,15
559:6,7,10	570:5 572:1	720:16	557:17,18	746:17
561:11 562:21	572:24 578:23	three-quarters	558:8,14	tower 596:22
563:2 566:11	588:9 591:19	598:1 625:9	564:8 567:6	597:9,19,20
567:16,25	592:15 594:20	625:22 672:4	567:10 568:12	597:21 608:17
573:15 574:19	595:8 597:23	threshold	569:17 577:21	609:3 616:24
580:16 584:8	598:3,25	641:14 649:10	578:8 586:16	616:24,25
584:19 587:16	610:24 620:16	thrust 615:12	586:21 621:25	617:12 618:9
594:18 599:24	622:6,25	Thursday	717:8 719:16	618:15,16,18
605:19 606:18	624:13 626:15	742:10	719:17 736:24	633:25 638:14
607:8 612:4,6	627:10 630:18	tie 609:9	today's 647:5	638:17,20
616:12 621:16	635:14 641:24	tied 712:16	705:13	661:4,8,11,16
621:18 632:24	655:9,13	tighter 671:18	told 552:19	661:22,24
636:15 637:19	656:9 659:16	672:25	557:15 742:7	662:13 663:2
643:2,3,5	664:19 666:3	time 548:8	tomorrow	towers 654:24
644:13,20	677:21 679:9	552:8 553:3	689:9	town 544:15
648:11 650:10	679:17 688:6	566:19 575:17	tons 705:21	546:2,8
650:21 652:2	688:24 690:12	576:6,8 582:1	706:5,14,15	548:20 549:10
654:15 657:3	697:8 702:2	582:3 590:21	706:16,17	549:19 643:19
657:20 658:14	707:1 714:24	591:1 594:10	739:21,23	670:4,6,13
660:9 661:2	717:2 720:6	603:20 611:14	top 586:2,3	673:13,24

UNITED REPORTERS, INC.

IT				_
675:1 698:8	Trout 674:2	turbulent	730:6	559:3 576:22
743:8,10	truck 682:5	599:16 647:15	types 585:3	609:5 616:21
743:8,10 744:16	693:11	turn 603:17	586:8 589:13	621:13 624:7
744:16 track 684:9	true 554:1	615:20 617:16	589:15,25	626:12 642:17
			,	
693:18	556:2,3	639:7,10,13	590:9,11	655:19 656:8
TRACON	606:19 651:10	671:18 672:10	607:15 608:8	656:12 661:2
620:5	651:18 655:9	672:11,25	624:2,9	662:16 667:13
trade-off	655:25 656:6	turning 589:4	630:17 633:5	671:7 679:4
721:20	661:21 708:11	684:3 686:14	639:20 677:24	686:20 688:3
trading 721:21	722:14	twelve 695:14	typical 570:5	691:11 693:20
traffic 585:20	trust 673:18	twice 723:7	typically 635:2	702:7 708:12
586:12 588:24	690:12	724:19	635:12,15	710:23
594:2 604:22	try 591:7	twin 607:21	678:18 697:13	understanding
611:4 614:18	657:10	two 551:18		588:23 589:2
617:20,25	trying 611:21	567:19 576:12		623:8 635:19
618:22 619:13	611:24,24	576:15 587:5	U 554:15 606:1	645:10,23
625:6,7 628:6	626:23 627:11	608:3 611:5	637:8,12	647:19 662:12
650:16 651:24	655:17 656:13	616:22 617:8	U.S 614:20	668:14 708:21
trailer 690:18	656:24 670:9	617:8,9	ubiquitous	708:22
690:21	706:20 716:9	619:21 622:4	648:16	understands
training 595:3	721:12 725:16	631:23,24	ULSD 561:10	656:10
608:21 648:16	729:4 734:12	639:25 653:11	561:18 562:17	Understood
648:17	Tuesday 548:3	653:21 664:16	563:22	570:5
training-type	turbine 572:1	666:6 667:21	ultimate 727:10	unfamiliar
588:25	703:2 704:19	667:22,23,25	ultimately	615:6
transcript	706:22,22	668:10,12	600:23 682:10	unfortunately
549:17 743:6	708:23 710:14	680:11,20	687:19 727:9	608:10 620:3
transcription	710:25 711:9	690:19 691:14	ultra 561:14	624:7 627:6
744:4	713:8 721:14	691:25 693:10	unacceptable	653:15
transient 608:5	721:15 723:11	694:3 695:13	627:10,13,15	Uniform 548:12
610:15	724:7,11,14	695:21 705:1	664:7,8	unique 644:1
transition 693:8	724:15 725:2	707:2,15	unanimously	unit 568:16
translate	725:19,24	708:25 709:17	608:21	569:3,12
587:13	726:1,1,3,8,12	713:15 728:14	unavailability	570:16,21
transmission	736:11	730:24 731:5	551:1	572:11 574:1
690:24 718:3	turbines 567:20	734:3	unaware 610:22	597:10 710:5
718:4	567:20,22	two-on-one	701:3	718:3 723:6
travel 670:10	668:9 702:18	711:10	unbiased 584:2	740:22
traveled 728:18	702:25 713:22	tying 680:12	underground	UNITED
traversed	turbulence	type 608:22	680:16 691:8	744:23
733:22	577:7 581:15	646:11 648:1	underneath	units 688:14
trees 729:7	592:8 595:7	648:8 681:18	639:19,25	707:7,15
tried 727:4	600:7 602:11	682:17 684:5	underscored	710:8 713:22
	607:25 608:13	688:4 693:5	668:18	739:17 741:5
728:21,24 736:15	612:2 667:7	699:8 700:5	understand	
			552:4 558:12	741:21,22,23
ungger 0/8:4	008:19	121:23 123:19	JJ2.7 JJ0.12	/41.24
trigger 678:4	668:19	721:25 725:19	552.4 556.12	741:24

i				
unknown 692:3	usually 645:9	560:11,16,23	734:11	visual 633:22
Unlimited	679:16,23	561:25 562:14	viewability	634:1 636:10
674:2	684:2	562:19 568:19	734:10	636:12,13
unloading	utility 646:20	575:21 577:7	viewing 734:2	651:5 670:19
678:15	646:21	581:21,22,24	views 729:5	VOC 706:14
unreasonably	utilized 712:2	582:22 595:15	732:18 743:2	Voices 698:11
701:13	728:5	verbatim	viewshed	voltage 718:5
unsafe 609:2	utmost 648:9	549:17	695:22 727:16	volume 569:22
615:20		verbiage 665:14	728:7 731:22	573:17 574:3
unstable 602:9	V	Verizon 550:3	732:2 733:23	574:13 684:2
635:3	V 553:11	Vermont	735:1	740:5
unusual 612:13	554:14 606:1	717:15	vigilant 651:7	volumetric
613:1 691:2	637:7,9,12	versus 568:23	virtually 700:22	581:11
up-to-date	vacant 671:10	693:12 707:23	733:20	volumetrically
693:13	671:14,20	710:10 719:2	virtue 720:21	573:25 645:24
update 677:16	vacation 643:4	726:13,25	visibility 581:5	Voluntown
686:3	676:16	vertical 578:13	596:7 604:1	550:8
updated 599:10	valid 664:19,20	VFR 583:2	604:17 633:17	vulnerabilities
623:14 677:21	validated	584:20 585:2	728:1,6,9	592:8
678:22 685:18	664:22	585:11,20	730:6 731:8	
686:1 745:24	Valley 547:10	586:7 593:18	732:11,12	W
746:17	674:2,23	604:22 613:12	733:8,16,19	W 554:13,16
updates 687:12	value 599:16	626:17,22	733:25	637:6,11
687:14 688:18	values 703:18	650:25 651:4	visible 566:15	walk 625:4
updating 677:6	valves 682:23	Vice 545:4	566:20,24	727:19
678:8	vapor 563:13	548:1,5	567:8,13	want 551:20
upset 602:16	578:4,5	550:15,19	568:2,25	571:7 576:22
608:10 640:12	variable 568:5	551:8,22	569:25 576:24	583:25 625:17
641:4,6,11,15	571:2 580:12	552:1,6,12,18	576:24 577:13	625:19 626:5
641:18 663:5	variables	552:24 553:2	577:17,20,24	631:14 642:16
upwind 598:23	580:14 694:3	553:6,9	577:25 578:6	659:19 666:2
628:10 632:2	varies 566:18	554:10 556:16	578:14 608:4	668:2 701:7
632:2 672:21	various 585:17	557:2,10,22	608:15,16,24	wanted 599:21
673:11	585:22 626:14	557:25 558:18	622:19 627:22	621:12 669:18
use 594:25	629:7 639:20	558:22 559:2	627:23,25	669:24 729:3
613:14 615:6	644:4 701:11	559:16 612:11	628:2,8 633:1	wants 666:16
649:14 664:1	vary 574:8	612:22 613:5	633:2,9,12,14	702:5 735:17
677:22 678:3	580:23	613:23 614:3	635:8,17,22	War 649:5
681:19 682:7	vector 619:15	615:14 616:5	636:2,4,13	warmed 643:18
706:21 707:24	vegetation	616:10 642:1	645:14 693:20	warming
718:7 735:18	678:1 728:2	vicinity 589:6	693:25 694:7	736:20 737:12
736:3	729:7 732:15	595:17 651:14	727:24	737:20
users 713:17	732:16	view 622:3,11	visit 632:9	Warner 744:22
uses 563:23	velocities	624:24 626:21	653:17 684:12	warrant 678:4
732:12	561:20	728:3 731:23	727:16	warrants
USLD 678:10	velocity 560:2	732:13 733:21	visiting 653:24	677:20 678:7
[_]				

I 					
wasn't 610:1	620.15 21	Westchester	555.10 11 12	595:11 596:3	
627:7	620:15,21 627:16 647:14	620:11	555:10,11,12 555:13,14,15	596:17 597:5	
water 563:4,6,9	666:4,21	Westover	555:16,20,21	597:11,14,22	
563:12,13,15	671:24 672:3	547:17 555:3	555:22,23,24	598:10,17,20	
563:18,20	680:18,19	675:14,17,20	555:25 556:1	598:24 599:4	
564:1,5,14,16	685:15 695:10	694:22 695:9	556:5,6,7,8,9	599:7,18,22	
564:20 565:16	695:20 701:12	696:6,22	556:10,11	600:4,19	
565:17 578:3	717:3 723:18	697:10,19	559:15,25	601:1,7 602:1	
578:5 675:8	726:22 727:9	735:7 745:12	560:7 561:6	602:23 603:8	
683:18 690:17	727:10 730:11	wet 679:10	561:15,22	603:23 604:3	
692:22 694:14	742:6	wetland 746:5	562:5,11,16	604:10,14,18	
745:21 746:4	we've 551:11	white 617:7	562:25 563:10	604:24 605:5	
Waterbury	560:1 585:12	wholesale	563:14,19	605:12,16	
615:7 634:1	589:11 594:8	720:13	564:3,9,12,17	606:2,7,12,16	
654:17 658:18	595:12 649:17	wide 569:23	564:22 565:1	606:21,25	
658:25 659:7	679:9 685:9	576:2,3,10	565:5,9,14,20	607:4,12,18	
Watershed	685:15 693:15	577:21 578:18	565:24 566:4	608:2,14	
547:3 674:6	699:13 700:22	widened 670:14	566:9,17,25	609:10,18	
way 552:13	700:23 701:22	wider 647:22	567:9,23	610:8 612:6	
595:24 619:3	718:25 719:23	width 575:17	568:4,8,13,17	612:20,25	
632:8 633:24	719:23 720:5	wildlife 677:5	568:24 569:5	613:11,25	
665:16,19	720:16,22,24	677:11	569:14,19,24	614:10 615:22	
672:22,22	722:16 728:17	willing 723:21	570:4,17,22	616:7 617:1,6	
677:24 698:11	weather 605:8	wind 568:12	571:1,6,17,22	618:5,17	
730:9 743:10	633:2,10	575:3,24	572:5,12,17	619:9,18	
Wayne 547:15	634:25 636:7	581:15 607:25	572:23 573:1	620:12 621:9	
675:10	638:10 652:23	628:16 654:6	573:5,12,20	621:14 622:9	
ways 563:16	653:5 691:16	672:21 713:8	574:2,7,14,18	623:11,16	
we'll 548:8	692:16 738:20	window 684:25	574:24 575:6	624:15,22	
549:21 558:19	web 698:8	688:23	575:11,15	626:10 627:1	
568:2 573:6	website 698:8	winds 602:10	576:5,14,25	628:1,21,24	
591:7 592:13	701:8	619:24 628:15	578:1,12,22	629:3,11,14	
593:14 607:6	weight 591:21	635:2	579:8,13,18	629:22 630:2	
612:8 627:18	591:25 592:11	winter 679:11	579:24 580:4	630:6,24	
627:20 636:19	592:17 638:1	691:14,19,23	580:7,11,20	631:4,8,13,20	
637:17 643:7	638:4 646:10	692:9 737:1	581:4,13	632:11,16,23	
665:23 670:4	646:18,19	winters 692:1	582:11,15,21	633:4,11,15	
676:6 680:11	647:1,8,9,11	wires 655:19	583:4 584:24	633:23 634:3	
689:11 695:2	647:17 648:3	wish 551:4	585:8,12	634:7,13,19	
we're 552:13	648:5,19	587:22 656:14	586:10,17,23	634:22 635:4	
557:4 559:3	went 623:23	withdraw	587:2,9,14,19	635:9,13,23	
567:19 571:19	653:22 721:13	552:21 553:4	588:5,11	635:9,13,23 636:6,11	
571:23 573:3	741:22	witness 552:16	589:1,9,18	637:24 639:6	
577:17,19	weren't 557:4	553:12,18,24	590:6,13	639:12,16,22	
587:19 594:10	west 608:18	554:4,22,22	591:16,22	640:3,7,23	
601:23 605:20	617:23	554:23 555:9	592:6 593:20	641:5,13,21	

ř.				
642:3,8,13,22	697:12 698:5	623:20 680:18	714:2 736:17	632:18
642:3,8,13,22 643:5,15,22	698:18 699:3	623:20 680:18 681:24	739:21,24	632:18 1,294 602:7
645:4,19	699:13 700:3	workload	739.21,24 742:11	1,294 002.7 1,400 591:21
646:4,13,16	700:21 701:21	650:13,20	vear-round	607:20 611:10
647:3,18	703:17,23	652:17,22	732:11	612:2 641:1
648:14,23	704:5,14,23	656:11	years 602:15	648:4
649:15,20,25	705:16 706:1	works 730:10	607:14 640:11	1,551 602:12
650:5,14,19	706:11,25	World 649:5	653:12 654:18	1,600 648:18
650:24 651:11	707:8 708:10	worse 605:8,9	655:24 677:5	1,700 585:20
651:15,20,25	709:13 710:3	worst 571:14,15	691:25 695:14	604:23 625:6
652:18 654:19	710:16,22	610:24 691:24	yellow 728:18	1,900 714:4
655:2,6,12	711:2,7,17,22	736:5 737:2	yesterday	1.3 690:13
657:7,14,18	712:11 713:12	worth 591:1	551:11	1.35 690:13
657:23 658:2	714:19 716:20	666:22	York 620:4,5,9	1.3 690:14 1.4 690:9
658:9 659:15	717:25 718:22	wouldn't	620:13,14	1:45 636:20
659:18 660:4		592:24 603:16	,	1:45 630.20 1:47 637:2
660:14,22	719:8,25 720:8 722:2	618:12,14	young 611:10 611:25 614:4	1:4 / 637:2 10 560:10 565:7
,		,		
663:11,21 665:3 667:1	722:13,19 724:8 725:22	658:16,17,22 659:6 660:3	younger 613:18	584:23 585:6 585:7 604:9
668:4,22	724:8 723:22	704:17 706:21	Z	604:13 615:4
<i>'</i>	729:19,25	710:18	Z 554:13 637:6	641:9 744:18
669:7,11,15 669:19 670:1	,		ZAK 547:8	745:12
	730:3,17,21	writing 665:25 742:23	674:12	
670:16,25	731:1,3,18		zero 617:8,8,9,9	10,000 710:10
671:6,12,22	732:1,21	written 558:4,7 743:3	679:6	100 565:25
673:1,9	733:1,3,9,15		zone 596:1	570:15,24
676:17,20	734:13 735:22	wrong 598:25 610:21 639:9	Zone 570.1	571:8 572:1
677:7,18	736:23 737:4	658:10 662:12	0	576:3 694:5 103 546:4
678:14,17,25	738:3,12,17 740:15 741:18	727:3	0.59 587:10	744:24
679:8,15,22			628:12	107 546:15
680:5,10,17	witnessed 578:15	wrote 609:22	06037 546:16	
681:7,16,21		X	061 744:22	11 560:19
682:1,6,14,21	witnesses	X 709:1 740:12	06103 545:23	566:13,16
682:25 683:11 683:14 21 25	556:25 558:7	745:1 746:1	06114 744:24	599:14,15 607:13 689:3
683:14,21,25	605:23 636:21 743:15 745:1	·····	06470 546:5	607:13 689:3 11.9 582:24
684:8,22 685:6 0 25	743:15 745:1 won 649:5	Y		11:00 544:20
685:6,9,25 686:25 687:13	won 649:5 woods 612:15	Y 554:12,17	1	742:11
687:17,24	word 665:24	637:5,10	1 549:12 660:11	11:01 548:4
688:16,21	727:3	740:12	660:12 702:21	11:01 348:4 110 562:23
689:7,19,25	words 667:8	Yale 653:17	702:22 704:6	110 302.23 12 560:20
690:4,11,20	694:5 712:6	Yeah 573:12	740:20,22	562:23 649:21
691:1,9,21	735:20	year 598:1,3	745:17,22	746:18
692:20 693:6	work 656:5	621:7 653:22	1-32 746:13	12:59 636:23
693:14 694:1	685:14 689:23	703:11 705:21	1,000 604:17,22	12.39 030.23 120 688:25
694:13 696:8	worked 623:17	706:5,14,15	638:16	120 088.25 128 589:21
696:14 697:7	working 598:4	706:16,18	1,280 586:1	126 389.21 12th 742:10
070.14 077.7				1 2011 / 72.10

UNITED REPORTERS, INC. info@unitedreporters.com Nationwide-866-534-3383-Toll-Free

1				
13 548:22 582:3	2	679:16	23 544:6 549:3	33 689:15
713:25	$\frac{2}{2599:15606:6}$	200 744:2	606:11 609:7	34 691:19
131,000 690:17		2001 549:12	744:8	344 602:5
133 599:17	653:12 660:18	2001 519:12 2006 600:20	24 544:20	36 653:3
14 554:24	690:16 702:15	2000 000.20 201 568:23	744:19	36/18 587:8
556:14	712:12 713:13	201 500:25 2012 560:13	24th 548:4	38 573:6 581:25
15 615:4 649:22	714:3 715:14	562:6,10	25 551:2 564:8	39 572:24
676:5 677:5	717:19	568:14,15	579:6 580:2,8	649:21 709:9
150 624:3	2,000 593:25	589:21 590:7	580:10 691:25	709:11
648:18 729:21	612:2 628:4	634:16 638:2	250 582:1,24	3rd 742:19,24
731:10	638:15 2 100 (46:10 22	639:4 663:13	26th 686:4	
155 638:9	2,100 646:19,23	664:16 713:25	27 579:3,9,16	4
157 638:19	2,200 714:5	2014 548:22	579:20 580:8	4 566:6 576:2
15th 727:17	2,400 646:18	713:1 715:16	270,000 739:21	4-181a(b)
16 548:10	2,700 641:22	2015 544:20	270,000 739.21 28 745:15	544:10 548:25
582:23 745:15	648:7 2 730 648.6	548:4 551:2,3	29 745:15	744:11
745:17,19	2,730 648:6	589:17,20	746:18	4-4 705:17
16-B-1 606:6	2,750 638:5	606:11 609:7	294 568:22	4-7 639:8
17 746:3	640:25 647:10	624:10 744:19	294.5 562:18	4.2 600:15
172 595:1 624:2	648:6 2 760 648:6	745:12,15,17	2A 696:1,13	4.3 600:10,14
646:11,15,17	2,760 648:6 2.1 703:18	745:19 746:3	2B 626:3 686:9	649:12,18
648:12,16	2.1 703:18 704:6	746:11,14,16	686:13	4.3.1.1 600:13
17th 688:25	704:6 2.1.3 702:10,12	746:19	2H 585:16	4.3.3 639:8
18 594:3 653:4	2.1.3 702:10,12 2.5 698:24	2016 549:16	2I 696:1,13	4.7 689:24
679:23 745:15	699:9,25	2018 711:15	·	690:5
746:11	721:22 723:4	714:5,8 717:6	3	40 566:21,23
180 640:16	723:7,23	719:21 739:20	3 576:2,10	567:2 568:2
183.29 560:15	724:12,16,19	740:20,22	604:16 634:18	573:4,15,16
562:3	736:7	2019 619:19	649:21 677:9	574:5,16,21
185 545:22	2.80 710:2	2020 619:19	3-1 638:3	577:20 579:19
19 683:16,17	2.84 703:11	691:19 717:10	3-3 638:3	580:10 635:15
746:14	710:2 721:22	739:24	3,000 671:5	693:22 705:15
19,000 679:24	2/13/15 745:23	2024 703:11	3,160 647:11	713:13 714:2
192B 544:4	20 564:10,13	711:15	3,563 587:15	721:16
744:6	568:12 571:4	2028 714:6,9	3,600 647:9	40,000 566:2
1950 624:1	571:7,8,23	20th 551:2	3.7.2 677:10	400 576:10
1972 610:9,10	572:14 579:5	212 695:12	3:58 743:17	738:24
1999 544:6	654:4 679:11	22 554:24	30 572:10 579:7	41 573:13
549:3 621:22	691:18 706:15	556:14 575:5	641:9	709:11
622:22 642:2	709:10 746:16	575:9 576:2	300 583:6 586:3	413 715:21
642:12 715:6	746:19	731:14,23	603:4 605:10	42 572:20,21
715:22 722:9	20-degree	734:6	620:22 625:7	43 706:16
744:8	570:12,13	22-24 745:15	632:20,21	43.3 705:21
10f 701:6	20-year 598:2	220-foot-dia	647:7 652:25	706:5,17
1st 549:15	20,000 679:16	732:20	309 715:21	438 550:3
	-,	22nd 686:10,13	31 589:22	45 641:7

I							-
45	FECTAE 11 10			I	I	I	I
45-minute	556 745:11,13	725 686:21	Í				
636:19	745:16,18,20	720:23 721:1	Í				
45,000 565:21	745:22,24	7460 557:20					
565:22	746:2,4,5,7,9	609:11 684:20				I	
46 550:2	746:11,12,15	684:23					
47 582:22	746:17	75 598:3					
47,000 621:6	56 706:13	785 544:11					
48,000 621:6	56.2 560:16	548:17 707:5					
486,000 739:23	562:1 581:25	744:13					
4th 714:1	59 588:21 679:5	788 602:7					
	5th 698:3	798 559:23					
5	699:16	663:16					
5 604:8,13							
729:15 731:13	6	8					
734:7	6 745:14	8 589:22					
5-foot 734:3	6,400 710:11	8,760 736:12					
5,000 566:6	600 680:13	800 611:16					
5.4 703:1	704:2	703:13 706:3				I	
704:12 707:22	606 745:5	721:14 725:23					
708:4 721:16	62 561:25	725:25					
724:6	695:11	805 559:23	Í				
50 579:9,11,16	67,000 690:8	663:16 724:1	Í				
648:4	68.8 562:19	725:1,19					
500 582:4,25	6th 684:12	82 689:16					
638:16 654:8	VIII 004.12	02 007.10	Í				
	7	9					
680:6,6 704:2 707:6	7-15-5 628:9	9 582:5 710:10					
	7-1 3-3 028.7 7-4 602:4	9/11 657:6	Í			I	I
512 549:7	639:19	90 564:13,15					
559:23 570:16	7-5-15 672:17	565:16 679:6					
570:21 572:6							
650:3 663:9	7-7 639:10	679:11 687:3					
663:13 664:3	7,000 693:12	744:24					
703:3 704:21	7,500 693:12,16	900 679:17					
705:11 706:6	7.3 587:21	90th 599:15					
707:25 708:1	639:15 689:22	600:2					
711:11 715:8	690:3	91 638:9				I	
721:13 723:25	7.7 601:18	96 695:13					
724:17 725:3	70 571:5 572:16	97,000 614:20	Í				
725:19,23,24	572:21 573:11	980 729:22					
727:1	579:6 709:11	99 740:10	1				
52 640:18	700 611:16	99,000 611:8	Í				
691:13 692:21	713:8	99.9th 602:6	1				
525 680:6	72 572:7,11,13	994 714:8,23	Í			I	
53 550:7 724:3	720 605:6,10	99th 602:4	1				
553 745:1	692:23 736:3		1				
554 745:5	736:14		Í				
JJ= 14J.J	,						
	-		_	-	-	-	