

In The Matter Of:
Petition from PSEG Power Connecticut, LLC

Public Hearing
May 5, 2016

BCT Reporting LLC
PO Box 1774
Bristol, CT 06010
860.302.1876

1 STATE OF CONNECTICUT
2 CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

3
4 Petition No. 1218

5 Petition from PSEG Power Connecticut, LLC, for a
6 Declaratory Ruling that no Certificate of
7 Environmental Compatibility and Public Need is
8 required for the Construction, Maintenance, and
9 Operation of a new 485 Megawatt Dual Fuel
10 Combined-Cycle Electric Generating Facility at the
11 Existing Bridgeport Harbor Station Located at 1
12 Atlantic Street, Bridgeport, Connecticut

13
14 Siting Council Meeting held at the Bridgeport
15 City Hall, Council Chambers, 45 Lyon Terrace,
16 Bridgeport, Connecticut, Thursday, May 5, 2016,
17 beginning at 3:00 p.m.

18
19 H e l d B e f o r e :

20 JAMES J. MURPHY, Vice Chairman
21
22
23
24
25

1 A p p e a r a n c e s :

2 Council Members:

3 ROBERT HANNON,

4 DEEP Designee

5

6 COMM. MICHAEL A. CARON

7 PURA Designee

8

9 MICHAEL HARDER

10 DANIEL P. LYNCH, JR.

11 DR. MICHAEL W. KLEMENS

12

13 Council Staff:

14 MELANIE BACHMAN, ESQ.,

15 Executive Director and

16 Staff Attorney

17

18 MICHAEL PERRONE

19 Siting Analyst

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 A p p e a r a n c e s:(cont'd)

2 For PSEG POWER CONNECTICUT:

3 HOLLAND & KNIGHT

4 31 West 52nd Street

5 New York, New York 10019

6 BY: STEPHEN J. HUMES, ESQ.

7 MEREDITH HILLER, ESQ.

8

9 For THE UNITED ILLUMINATING COMPANY:

10 UIL HOLDINGS CORPORATION

11 157 Church Street

12 New Haven, Connecticut 06506

13 By: JAMES R. MORRISSEY, ESQ.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and
2 gentlemen, I'd like to call this hearing to order
3 this Thursday May the 5th, 2016, a few minutes
4 after 3 p.m. My name is James J. Murphy, Jr. I'm
5 the Vice Chairman of the Connecticut Siting
6 Council and I'm chairing today in the absence of
7 Robin Stein, our Chairman, who was with us on the
8 field review, but had to leave and won't be with
9 us for the rest of the day.

10 Other Council members present today
11 are Robert Hannon, designee for Commissioner
12 Robert Klee of the Department of Energy and
13 Environmental Protection; Commissioner Michael
14 Caron, designee for Chairman Arthur House, Public
15 Utilities Regulatory Authority; Michael Harder;
16 Dr. Michael W. Klemens; and Daniel P. Lynch Jr.

17 Members of the staff are Melanie
18 Bachman, our Acting Executive Director and staff
19 attorney; and Michael Perrone, our siting analyst.

20 This hearing is held pursuant to
21 Title 16 of the Connecticut General Statutes and
22 of the Uniform Administrative Procedures Act upon
23 a petition from PSEG Power Connecticut, LLC, for a
24 declaratory ruling that no certificate of
25 environmental compatibility and public need is

1 required for the construction, maintenance and
2 operation of a new 485-megawatt dual-fuel combine
3 cycle electric generating facility at the existing
4 Bridgeport Harbor Station, located at 1 Atlantic
5 Street, Bridgeport, Connecticut. This petition
6 was received by the Council on March 9, 2016.

7 A reminder to all, off-the-record
8 communications with a member of this Council or a
9 member of the Council's staff upon the merits of
10 this petition is prohibited by law.

11 The parties and intervenors to the
12 proceedings as of this date are as follows. The
13 petitioner is PSEG Power Connecticut, LLC. It's
14 represented by Stephen J. Humes, Esq., and
15 Meredith Hiller, Esq., of Holland & Knight, LLP.

16 We have as an intervener the United
17 Illuminating Company. It is represented by James
18 R. Morrisey, Esq., of UIL Holdings Corporation.

19 We will proceed in accordance with
20 the prepared agenda, copies of which are
21 available. And if anyone doesn't have one, ask
22 for it and we'll provide it to you. Also
23 available here are copies of the Council's
24 Citizen's Guide to Siting Council procedures.

25 At the end of the afternoon's

1 session we will recess and again resume at 7 p.m.
2 This 7 p.m. hearing will be reserved for the
3 public to make brief oral arguments into the
4 record. I wish to note that parties and
5 intervenors including their representatives and
6 witnesses are not allowed to participate in this
7 public comment session.

8 I also wish to note for those who
9 are here and for the benefit of your friends and
10 neighbors who are unable to join us for the public
11 comment session, that you or they may send written
12 statements to the Council within 30 days of this
13 date, and such written statements will be given
14 the same weight as if spoken at the public
15 hearing.

16 If necessary, parties' and
17 intervenors' presentations may be continued after
18 the public comment session, if time requires this
19 evening. A verbatim transcript will be made of
20 this hearing and deposited with the city clerk's
21 office in Bridgeport for the convenience of the
22 public.

23 Is there any public official who
24 wishes to comment at this time before we move into
25 the evidentiary portion?

1 (No response.)

2 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: If not, we have
3 before us a motion which was received from the
4 applicant for a protective order dated April 28,
5 2016. And perhaps Attorney Bachman may want to
6 comment on that?

7 MS. BACHMAN: Thank you,
8 Mr. Chairman.

9 On April 28th, in response to the
10 Council's interrogatories, PSEG had filed a motion
11 for a protective order for material that is
12 considered commercial proprietary information that
13 is not subject to the Freedom of Information Act.
14 And we did not receive any objections,
15 Mr. Chairman. So staff recommends that we approve
16 the motion for protective order.

17 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Klemens?

18 DR. KLEMENS: That also covers --
19 as I'm looking through the interrogatories, there
20 were several that were redacted areas. So that is
21 actually some of the stuff that we're talking
22 about now, were redacted from the interrogatory
23 responses?

24 MS. BACHMAN: That's correct,
25 Dr. Klemens. The full responses are in a sealed

1 envelope in our office for councilmembers to
2 review.

3 DR. KLEMENS: Thank you.

4 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: We have a
5 motion for a protective order pending before us.
6 What's the pleasure of the Council?

7 DR. KLEMENS: Move it.

8 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Is there a
9 second?

10 MR. HANNON: Second.

11 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: A second from
12 Mr. Hannon. Any discussion?

13 (No response.)

14 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Hearing none,
15 all those in favor of the motion to approve the
16 protective order signify by saying, aye.

17 THE COUNCIL: Aye.

18 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Those opposed?

19 (No response.)

20 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: The ayes have
21 it. The protective order is approved.

22 Also under administrative notice, I
23 wish to call your attention to those items shown
24 on hearing program marked as Roman numeral 1D,
25 items 1 through and including 73. Does the

1 petitioner or any party or intervener have an
2 objection to the items or any item that the
3 Council has administratively noticed?

4 MR. HUMES: The petitioner has no
5 objection.

6 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Hearing no
7 objection, the Council will take administrative
8 notice of the 73 items so numerated. And I guess
9 we now turn to you, Attorney Humes, to introduce
10 to us your panel, please.

11 MR. HUMES: Thank you very much and
12 I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you.

13 Prior to introducing our witnesses,
14 if I could mark for identification several
15 supplemental exhibits that we have. We propose
16 using as an exhibit the material that Mr. Pantazes
17 distributed at the field review. And so we would
18 call that the field review exhibit, and that would
19 be item number three on the agenda.

20 Also, we have distributed here, and
21 we will have the witness verify it shortly, a
22 report prepared from Exponent, Mr. William Bailey,
23 and he will be describing his work and available
24 to respond to questions on the subject. It's a
25 technical memorandum Exponent dated May 4th. So

1 we propose adding that to the agenda as Exhibit
2 Number 4 for identification.

3 If I may proceed with the
4 witnesses, would you like to have them all stand
5 and be sworn in and then we can go from there?

6 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: You might as
7 well. As you introduce them have them rise and
8 then Attorney Bachman will administer the oath to
9 all them.

10 MR. HUMES: Mr. Stagliola, would
11 you please rise? Would you please state your name
12 for the record and your title?

13 MICHAEL STAGLIOLA: Michael
14 Stagliola, PSEG Power, the project manager for
15 Bridgeport, station combined cycle project unit
16 five.

17 MR. HUMES: Mr. Silvestri, would
18 you please stand and identify yourself for the
19 record?

20 ROBERT SILVESTRI: Robert
21 Silvestri, environmental compliance and programs
22 manager for PSEG.

23 MR. HUMES: Ms. Gerlach, would you
24 please rise and identify yourself for the record.

25 KATE GERLACH: Kate Gerlach,

1 Director of fossil development, PSEG Power.

2 MR. HUMES: Mr. Gordon, would you
3 please rise and identify yourself for the record?
4 Sorry, Mr. Joel Gordon?

5 JOEL GORDON: Joel Gordon, for the
6 record. Director of market policy, PSEG Power
7 Connecticut, LLC.

8 MR. HUMES: Mr. Na, would you
9 please rise and identify yourself for the record?

10 BRUCE NA: Bruce Na, Manager of
11 Engineering, PSEG.

12 MR. HUMES: Mr. Doug Gordon, would
13 you please rise and identify yourself the record?

14 DOUGLAS GORDON: Douglas Gordon,
15 Program Manager, PSEG Power.

16 MR. HUMES: Mr. Brown, would you
17 please rise and identify yourself the record?

18 NEIL BROWN: Neil Brown, Manager of
19 External Affairs, PSEG, and designated community
20 liaison officer for this project.

21 MR. HUMES: Mr. Pantazes, would you
22 please rise and identify yourself the record?

23 JEFFREY PANTAZES: Jeff Pantazes,
24 Senior Technical Director with AKRF, Incorporated.

25 MR. HUMES: Mr. Bailey, would you

1 please rise and identify yourself for the record?

2 WILLIAM H. BAILEY: William H.
3 Bailey from Exponent.

4 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: If you will
5 have them all rise, Attorney Humes, we'll have the
6 oath administered by Attorney Bachman.

7 M I C H A E L S T A G L I O L A,
8 R O B E R T S I L V E S T R I,
9 J O E L G O R D O N,
10 K A T E G E R L A C H,
11 B R U C E N A,
12 D O U G L A S G O R D O N,
13 N E I L B R O W N,
14 J E F F R E Y P A N T A Z E S,
15 W I L L I A M H. B A I L E Y,

16 called as witnesses, being first duly sworn
17 by the Executive Director, were examined and
18 testified on their oaths as follows:

19 MR. HUMES: Mr. Stagliola, did you
20 prepare or assist in the preparation of the
21 petition and the exhibits to the petition?

22 THE WITNESS (Stagliola): I did.

23 MR. HUMES: Do you have any
24 corrections to the petition or the exhibits to the
25 petition?

1 THE WITNESS (Stagliola): No, I do
2 not, not at this time.

3 MR. HUMES: Did you assist in the
4 preparation of the responses to the
5 interrogatories in this proceeding?

6 THE WITNESS (Stagliola): Yes, I
7 did.

8 MR. HUMES: Do you have any
9 corrections to the responses to the
10 interrogatories?

11 THE WITNESS (Stagliola): No, I do
12 not.

13 MR. HUMES: Would you like to adopt
14 those materials as your prefiled testimony here
15 today?

16 THE WITNESS (Stagliola): Yes, I
17 do.

18 MR. HUMES: Mr. Silvestri, did you
19 assist in the preparation of the petition, the
20 exhibits to the petition and the responses to
21 interrogatories filed in this proceeding?

22 THE WITNESS (Silvestri): Yes, I
23 did.

24 MR. HUMES: Do you have any
25 corrections to those materials?

1 THE WITNESS (Silvestri): No, I do
2 not.

3 MR. HUMES: Would you like to adopt
4 those materials as your prefiled testimony?

5 THE WITNESS (Silvestri): Yes.

6 MR. HUMES: Ms. Gerlach, did you
7 assist in the preparation of the petition, the
8 exhibits to the petition and the responses to the
9 interrogatories filed in this proceeding?

10 THE WITNESS (Gerlach): Yes, I did.

11 MR. HUMES: Do you have any
12 corrections or supplements to those materials?

13 THE WITNESS (Gerlach): No, I do
14 not.

15 MR. HUMES: Would you like to adopt
16 the materials as your prefiled testimony here
17 today?

18 THE WITNESS (Gerlach): Yes, I
19 would.

20 MR. HUMES: Mr. Joel Gordon, did
21 you assist in the preparation of the petition, the
22 responses to the interrogatories and the exhibits
23 to the petition?

24 THE WITNESS (J. Gordon): Yes, I
25 did.

1 MR. HUMES: Do you have any
2 corrections to your prefiled materials?

3 THE WITNESS (J. Gordon): Yes, I
4 do.

5 MR. HUMES: Please describe your
6 correction.

7 THE WITNESS (J. Gordon): In
8 attachment H to the petition --

9 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: The acustics in
10 here aren't very good.

11 THE WITNESS (J. Gordon): And it
12 would help if I turn the microphone on as well.
13 Thank you.

14 The correction I have is in Exhibit
15 H to our petition for A declaratory ruling, which
16 is a report to the City of Bridgeport, a technical
17 report to the City of Bridgeport. On page 13
18 there is a sentence that was incorrect and we
19 provide -- and I have a correction to that.

20 We did prepare a letter to outline
21 exactly the wording that I would like to submit,
22 but it is addressing the current market clearing
23 prices for the capacity market, and let me read it
24 to you if I may?

25 Looking to change the sentence on

1 page 13 of that Exhibit H that says, based on
2 capacity selected by ISO New England in the
3 forward capacity auction conducted in February
4 2015, capacity prices are already committed to
5 rising by more than 400 percent from approximately
6 \$10 per kW a month now, to \$52 per kW month
7 beginning in June 2018.

8 The sentence should read instead --
9 we'd like to strike that sentence and replace it
10 with the following. Based on capacity selected by
11 ISO New England, and that the FCA conducted in
12 February 2015, capacity prices are already
13 committed to rising by more than 175 percent from
14 approximately \$3.40 per kW month now, to \$9.50 per
15 kW month beginning in June 2018 in Connecticut,
16 and more than 400 percent, to \$17.73 per kW month
17 for new resources in neighboring Rhode Island and
18 Southeastern Massachusetts.

19 MR. HUMES: Subject to that
20 correction, would you like to adopt your prefiled
21 testimony, the prefiled materials as your
22 testimony here today?

23 THE WITNESS (J. Gordon): I would.

24 MR. HUMES: Mr. Na, did you assist
25 in the preparation of the petition, the exhibits

1 to the petition and the responses to the
2 interrogatories filed in this proceeding?

3 THE WITNESS (Na): Yes, I did.

4 MR. HUMES: Do you have any
5 corrections to those materials?

6 THE WITNESS (Na): No, I do not.

7 MR. HUMES: Would you like to adopt
8 those materials as your prefiled testimony here
9 today?

10 THE WITNESS (Na): Yes, I would.

11 MR. HUMES: Mr. Doug Gordon, did
12 you assist in the preparation of the petition, the
13 exhibits to the petition, and the responses to the
14 interrogatories filed in this proceeding?

15 THE WITNESS (D. Gordon): Yes, I
16 did.

17 MR. HUMES: Do you have any
18 corrections to those materials?

19 THE WITNESS (D. Gordon): No, I
20 don't.

21 MR. HUMES: Would you like to adopt
22 those materials as your prefiled testimony here
23 today?

24 THE WITNESS (D. Gordon): Yes, I
25 do.

1 MR. HUMES: Mr. Brown, did you
2 assist in the preparation of the petition, the
3 exhibits to the petition and the responses to the
4 interrogatories filed in this proceeding?

5 THE WITNESS (Brown): Yes, I did.

6 MR. HUMES: Do you have any
7 corrections to those materials?

8 THE WITNESS (Brown): No, I do not.

9 MR. HUMES: Would you like to adopt
10 those materials as your testimony here today?

11 THE WITNESS (Brown): Yes, I would.

12 MR. HUMES: Mr. Pantazes, did you
13 assist in the preparation of the petition, the
14 exhibits to the petition, and the responses to the
15 interrogatories filed in this proceeding?

16 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): Yes, I
17 did.

18 MR. HUMES: Do you have any
19 corrections to those materials?

20 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): No, I do
21 not.

22 MR. HUMES: Would you like to adopt
23 those materials as your prefiled testimony here
24 today?

25 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): Yes, sir.

1 MR. HUMES: Mr. Bailey, did you
2 prepare a report dated May 4th, entitled a
3 Technical Memorandum, on Exponent letterhead?

4 THE WITNESS (Bailey): Yes, I did.

5 MR. HUMES: Are there any
6 corrections to that report?

7 THE WITNESS (Bailey): No, there
8 are not.

9 MR. HUMES: Would you like to adopt
10 that report as your testimony here today?

11 THE WITNESS (Bailey): I do.

12 MR. HUMES: With that, Mr.
13 Chairman, the panel is available for cross
14 examination and we move the prefiled materials as
15 full exhibits in this proceeding.

16 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Is there any
17 objection by the intervener or anyone else to the
18 admission of the exhibits enumerated on behalf of
19 the applicant?

20 MR. MORRISSEY: No.

21 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Hearing none,
22 they'll be admitted as full exhibits.

23 We'll start the cross examination
24 today with staff, Mr. Perrone.

25 MR. PERRONE: Thank you. Did the

1 petitioner put up a sign to inform the public
2 about the project and the hearing?

3 THE WITNESS (Stagliola): Yes, we
4 did.

5 MR. PERRONE: Where was the sign
6 located?

7 THE WITNESS (Stagliola): 1
8 Atlantic Street, Bridgeport, Connecticut.

9 MR. PERRONE: Was the size of the
10 sign about four by six feet?

11 THE WITNESS (Stagliola): Yes, it
12 was.

13 MR. PERRONE: And generally did it
14 contain the name of the petitioner, type of
15 facility, public hearing date and location and
16 contact info for the Council?

17 THE WITNESS (Stagliola): Yes, it
18 did.

19 MR. PERRONE: Great. On page 4 of
20 the petition where it talks about the existing
21 units, existing unit three and unit four, just so
22 we have that. My understanding is unit 3 is about
23 384 megawatts summer, and unit 4 is about 17. Is
24 that approximately correct?

25 THE WITNESS (Stagliola): That's

1 correct.

2 MR. PERRONE: I'd like to ask you
3 about security fencing. I understand it's within
4 the PSEG property, but do you propose any new
5 fencing around the powerplant project itself?

6 THE WITNESS (Stagliola): The
7 existing powerplant property is all surrounded by
8 fence currently and we will maintain that fence.

9 MR. PERRONE: And I understand you
10 have existing access into the PSEG property. For
11 your existing access on the property outside of
12 the power plant footprint would you have to make
13 any upgrades to that for the project?

14 THE WITNESS (Stagliola): No, we
15 currently have three access points to the property
16 for larger outages, or other projects.

17 MR. PERRONE: And regarding the
18 approximately 300-foot stack, I had asked the
19 question about the orange and white color, and I
20 understand it wouldn't have that. But the actual
21 color, would it be like a dull gray or a white?

22 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): I believe
23 it will be gray.

24 MR. PERRONE: And is it correct to
25 say that the purpose of the gray is to have a sort

1 of dull color to blend in with the sky?

2 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): No, I
3 believe it's just based upon the construction, the
4 materials that the stack will be constructed of.

5 MR. PERRONE: Regarding the fuel
6 dock terminal facility and the rehabilitation to
7 that part of the facility, would all work be
8 performed above the waterline?

9 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): There are
10 two aspects to the work for the fuel dock repair.
11 One is independent of the unit five combined-cycle
12 project. There will be work performed in 2016 to
13 make the dock safe for personnel access. That's
14 not part of this petition.

15 In 2017 during the construction of
16 the proposed combined-cycle plant, the fuel
17 handling, the fuel supply dock will be
18 refurbished. It's approximately 50 years old now.
19 It will be refurbished above the water and at the
20 splash zone. The concrete piers will need to be
21 repaired and several of the piles, the wooden
22 piles that hold up the walkway will also need to
23 be replaced.

24 MR. PERRONE: Okay. And if this
25 project is approved could the final plans for the

1 fuel dock modifications as part of this project be
2 included in the development and management plan?

3 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): Yes.

4 MR. PERRONE: As far as cut and
5 fill for the proposed project, my understanding is
6 there would be fill brought in, about
7 160,000 cubic yards. Is that correct?

8 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): That is
9 correct.

10 MR. PERRONE: So no cut. Basically
11 just fill?

12 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): There will
13 be local grading around facilities and small
14 foundation excavations, but there's no gross
15 fill -- no gross cuts involved with the
16 construction of the combined-cycle unit.

17 MR. PERRONE: And just to recap
18 some other numbers, the hundred-year flood
19 elevation, my understanding is that's 14 feet.
20 The 500, my understanding is 15.3. Are those both
21 correct?

22 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): Those are
23 correct and the datum is NAVD-1998.

24 MR. PERRONE: Okay. And the
25 facility would be brought up to about 16.5.

1 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): The grade
2 elevation internal to the retaining wall is 16.5
3 NAVD.

4 MR. PERRONE: As far as the on-site
5 lighting design for the plant, would the lighting
6 itself be limited to just the power plant site and
7 not impact abutting properties?

8 THE WITNESS (Gerlach): The
9 lighting design for the project has not yet been
10 established.

11 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): The
12 drawings that were included with the petition
13 however were focused on the power plant site
14 primarily. There should not be leakage of light
15 in any substantive way into the surrounding
16 community.

17 MR. PERRONE: As far as the
18 auxiliary boiler on the proposed powerplant, would
19 that only operate during start up?

20 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): Mike,
21 would you like to take that one?

22 THE WITNESS (Stagliola): The
23 auxiliary boiler would be used during startup and
24 it would --

25 MR. LYNCH: Use the microphone when

1 you speak.

2 THE WITNESS (Stagliola): Yes, the
3 auxiliary boiler is primarily for startup only.

4 MR. PERRONE: And I also understand
5 from the response to interrogatory 16 that on-site
6 gas compression would be necessary. So would you
7 also have a compressor building on your site plan?

8 THE WITNESS (Stagliola): Yes, we
9 do.

10 MR. PERRONE: Okay. And could the
11 final design and location of that be included in
12 the D and M plan?

13 THE WITNESS (Stagliola): Yes, it
14 will.

15 MR. PERRONE: And lastly on that
16 same topic for the gas compressor building, if
17 that impacts your noise analysis at all, could
18 that also been included in the D and M plan?

19 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): The
20 compressor building was considered in the noise
21 evaluation we have conducted. Because the
22 compressor is inside of the building it is not a
23 substantial source and doesn't contribute to the
24 on-site noise, or contribute to an increase in
25 noise from the site.

1 MR. PERRONE: I understand there
2 will be a backup generator on-site. As far as
3 containment measures would it have, like, a double
4 walled fuel tank or other type of fuel containment
5 measure?

6 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): Yes, all
7 the tanks on site that will have petroleum or
8 hazardous materials will have containment. The
9 standard practice is for the containments to be
10 designed to 110 percent of the volume of the
11 largest container plus 6 inches of rain.

12 MR. PERRONE: And would the
13 generator base itself also provide containment
14 for, like, oil or coolant, or other fluids?

15 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): I don't
16 believe the specific generator has been specified.
17 I know very often they come with interval
18 containments, but I don't know if that's the case
19 in this instance.

20 MR. PERRONE: Okay. But could the
21 final design of that also be included in the D and
22 M plan if approved?

23 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): Yes.

24 MR. PERRONE: And in the 345 kV GIS
25 building, would you utilize sulfur hexafluoride as

1 a dielectric insulating gas?

2 THE WITNESS (Na): Yes.

3 MR. PERRONE: Okay. Moving onto
4 the comments from the Connecticut Airport
5 Authority. In the first bullet point it requests
6 that the applicant or petitioner file a federal
7 form 7460-1, notice of proposed construction or
8 alteration. But given your interrogatory response
9 to question 24, my understanding is you've already
10 filed that form and gotten your determination of
11 no-hazard letter.

12 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): That is
13 correct.

14 MR. PERRONE: Now I understand that
15 letter focuses on the stack itself. Did you have
16 to get separate letters from other structures such
17 as the auxiliary boiler stack, or any other
18 structures?

19 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): No, we did
20 not. We are approximately 2 and half, 2.4 miles
21 from the airport, which is far enough away for
22 that to not be a consideration.

23 MR. PERRONE: And I understand that
24 the FAA letter expires October 20, 2016. Would
25 you reapply if necessary, because your

1 construction if approved is slated to begin
2 March 2017?

3 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): That is
4 correct. We are planning to request an extension
5 of that notification from the FAA approximately
6 mid summer of 2016.

7 MR. PERRONE: And in the remainder
8 of the CAA letter it talks about the exhaust plume
9 analysis. Has PSEG performed an exhaust plume
10 analysis?

11 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): We have
12 runs, made preliminary runs in the software that's
13 recommended that the FAA technical advisor
14 bulletin defines. The way that software is set up
15 is it uses three years of meteorological data to
16 determine probabilities that one of four different
17 aircraft types, two general aviation type
18 aircraft, small business jets and a -- then a
19 narrow bodied jet, which in essence is a fairly
20 large commercial jet, would experience either
21 severe turbulence or an upset.

22 Severe turbulence is defined as one
23 G of vertical acceleration, which is the
24 equivalent of a 200 pound person weighing 400
25 pounds for whatever period of time the

1 acceleration lasts. And an upset is defined as
2 more -- a 45 degree or larger, forcing a 45 degree
3 or larger wing bank angle.

4 The preliminary runs that we've
5 worked through from the software indicate that,
6 for example, for a light general aviation
7 aircraft, that the area where the probability of
8 severe turbulence occurring in a 1 in 10,000
9 probability is approximately 120 feet from the
10 centerline of the stack and extending up to about
11 900 to a thousand feet. So in essence an aircraft
12 would need to, number one, be in that area and
13 then 1 in 10,000 times there is a probability that
14 they would see turbulence upset.

15 The model runs on probabilities.
16 What it does not include is how many aircraft
17 could be expected to advertently or inadvertently
18 fly into the stack plume. In the middle of 2014,
19 I believe it was July, the FAA added to the
20 pilot's training manual warnings about flying into
21 the vicinity of powerplants. And also their
22 standard ceilings for pilots are 2,000 -- I'm
23 sorry 1 -- 2,000 feet in congested areas and a
24 congested area, obviously, would be the city of
25 Bridgeport.

1 So from a probabilistic point of
2 view there's somewhat below 200 aircraft in and
3 out of the Sikorsky Airport each day. Scaling
4 that up to an annual number of 60 or 70 thousand,
5 some percentage of which is runway 29 which is the
6 one that is directly -- is close to online with
7 the plant. It's about 15 -- the centerline of
8 that runway, if extended, would be 15 to 17
9 hundred feet north of the new combined-cycle plant
10 site.

11 Some percentage of those planes are
12 general aviation. Some are larger jets. They --
13 some percentage of them could fly into the plume
14 area, but when you do the statistical math it ends
15 up being -- let's just say if one in 10,000 got
16 near the plant, a one in 10,000 probability upset.
17 You're into the one in a million or more
18 probabilities, so we don't view it at this point
19 as some -- as an issue of concern.

20 MR. LYNCH: I have one follow-up
21 question.

22 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead,
23 Mr. Lynch.

24 MR. LYNCH: More out of curiosity
25 than anything else. With regards to the flight

1 patterns to Sikorsky or Tweed, or onto Long
2 Island, they're all controlled by the New York
3 airports. You have to, besides informing the FAA
4 about what this new stack and what the plumes
5 could do, do you have to let flight control know
6 in New York City?

7 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): No, once
8 the -- once we notify the FAA that construction
9 has started and that the stack has reached its
10 height they take the action to add it to the
11 appropriate charts. So we have no formal
12 notification process to any of the local air
13 traffic.

14 We would need to notify them, for
15 example, if the stack lights were out of service,
16 the stack lighting system went out of service.

17 MR. LYNCH: Just one question I had
18 as a followup. Thank you very much.

19 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Perrone?

20 MR. PERRONE: Would we be able to
21 get as a late file exhibit the printout from
22 running that model, so basically it would show the
23 stack and then the colors with the probability?

24 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): We're
25 preparing a document that will define that. So I

1 will leave it to Counsel.

2 MR. HUMES: We can file that as a
3 late file. Do you have a plan for the date for
4 late files due?

5 MR. PERRONE: May 25th.

6 MR. HUMES: May 25th. Is that
7 sufficient?

8 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): That's
9 sufficient.

10 MR. PERRONE: So if you could have
11 the printout which is basically the output and
12 then maybe list the assumptions going in, so we
13 have the input and the output. That would be
14 great.

15 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): Yes,
16 that's acceptable.

17 MR. PERRONE: And just some final
18 cleanup on plume issues. My understanding is the
19 air-cooled condenser, because it's a sealed system
20 does not emit a plume. Is that correct?

21 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): Yes.

22 MR. PERRONE: And the auxiliary
23 boiler stack, while it could emit a plume, it
24 would be only for a very short time because it's
25 only for start up. Is that correct?

1 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): Yes, and
2 it's a relatively small combustion source.

3 MR. PERRONE: So the primary plume
4 source is a 300-foot stack. Is that correct?

5 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): Yes, sir.

6 MR. PERRONE: As far as powerplant
7 safety, I understand PSEG would not use natural
8 gas as a fuel pipeline cleaning medium. Would you
9 use nitrogen or compressed air, or that has not
10 yet been determined?

11 THE WITNESS (Stagliola): PSEG
12 would not use natural gas and we would use an
13 inert gas to clean the pipe.

14 THE WITNESS (Silvestri): If I
15 could add on that, the Siting Council's docket
16 NT-2010 reviewed the recommendations that were
17 contained within the clean energy plant review
18 that the Nevis Commission as well as the Thomas
19 Commission did. And a number of reference
20 decisions and orders, and declaratory rulings and
21 petitions were opened as a result of that, and we
22 would follow those recommendations and conditions.

23 MR. PERRONE: Okay. Great. And
24 Dr. Bailey, now I'll turn to the EMF technical
25 memorandum. I'll look at that, as well as where

1 it talks about the electrical interconnection in
2 PSEG's interrogatories. So I'll have response to
3 question 17 and also the EMF memo.

4 So my understanding is this
5 underground cable would be a single circuit. Is
6 that correct?

7 THE WITNESS (Bailey): Yes.

8 MR. PERRONE: And looking at PSEG's
9 drawing, it's marked CSE-17, Exhibit 17-A. My
10 understanding, at the corner of Henry Street and
11 Main Street, would that be where the nearest
12 residence would be from that electrical
13 interconnection?

14 THE WITNESS (Bailey): I'm sorry.
15 I'm just getting to that exhibit. Could you
16 restate the question and turn up the volume a
17 little bit please? Thank you.

18 MR. PERRONE: Sure. On Exhibit
19 17-A, under response to CSE-17 we have a drawing
20 with the underground cable, and on the far left
21 side of the drawing at the corner of Henry Street
22 and Main Street would you say that is the closest
23 residence to the proposed underground line?

24 THE WITNESS (Bailey): Yes.

25 MR. PERRONE: Approximately how do

1 you think -- how would that residential structure
2 be impacted in terms of magnetic fields?

3 THE WITNESS (Bailey): Looking at
4 table one of the memorandum it shows that the
5 fields are highest directly over the underground
6 cable, but then diminish very quickly thereafter.
7 And so one would not expect any change in the
8 magnetic field levels at residences at much
9 further distances from the cable.

10 MR. PERRONE: And is it also
11 correct to say that the location of the line tends
12 to favor the northern side closer to the
13 substation, so it's actually on the opposite side
14 of the road as the potential residential
15 structure? Is that correct?

16 THE WITNESS (Bailey): Yes. It
17 appears so, yes.

18 MR. PERRONE: Okay. Thank you.
19 That's all I have on the EMF.

20 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Thank you,
21 Mr. Perrone.

22 Dr. Klemens?

23 DR. KLEMENS: Thank you,
24 Mr. Chairman. I just have a few questions.

25 The first one goes back -- actually

1 I'm going to join together the interrogatory
2 concerning the closest residence, I guess the
3 interrogatory number SC-02 that responded. And he
4 says that the residence, that the location, the
5 nearest residence is approximately 900 feet to the
6 west of the western boundary of the proposed
7 development.

8 Is that the actual physical
9 structure of the plant, or the footprint of the
10 proposed development?

11 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): That
12 900 feet is from the property boundary.

13 DR. KLEMENS: From the property
14 boundary?

15 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): Yes, sir.

16 DR. KLEMENS: So can you speculate
17 how far it is actually from a structure? I assume
18 the property boundary, it's the area in red, not
19 the entire site?

20 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): It is at
21 least another 3 or 4 hundred feet from the
22 property boundary to, I would say, the beginning
23 of the powerplant development area and another 2
24 to 3 hundred feet to the centerline of the
25 development site.

1 DR. KLEMENS: So that leads me to
2 ask a question of Dr. Bailey. In your last line
3 of your report on page 10 you talk about statutory
4 abutting land uses. Would you explain to me what
5 that is?

6 THE WITNESS (Bailey): This refers
7 to the implementation of the statutes into the
8 best management practices that cull out certain
9 types of facilities such as day care centers,
10 schools, areas where children might congregate as
11 statutory facilities where particular emphasis
12 would be taken on applying best management
13 practices.

14 DR. KLEMENS: Thank you. And I
15 tried to read through your report, but at the end
16 line, the people who are living closest to this
17 facility, are their exposure levels below, well
18 below what is considered to be safe?

19 THE WITNESS (Bailey): The only
20 determinations as to levels that are safe or
21 unsafe are represented by the standards that we
22 referenced in our memorandum. And the magnetic
23 fields from the cable, even directly over the
24 cable are a tiny fraction of those allowable
25 standards.

1 In fact, exposures would have to be
2 considerably higher than those values that are
3 recommended by these two organizations in order
4 for there to be even a noticeable biological
5 response.

6 DR. KLEMENS: Thank you. That's
7 what I assumed, but it was hard to discern from
8 that.

9 Who did the environmental, the
10 actual environmental review on this, the natural
11 resource review? I see AKRF on there.

12 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): Yes, sir.

13 DR. KLEMENS: Is that you?

14 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): That's me
15 and the folks I work with.

16 DR. KLEMENS: And you know, I
17 looked everywhere through there. I am assuming --
18 is this Allee King Rosen and then Fleming?

19 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): Yes, it
20 is.

21 DR. KLEMENS: Okay. Well one of
22 the things here is this acronym city, this thing.
23 And it's very hard to figure it out. Nowhere does
24 it actually say this is -- I assumed it was. And
25 one of the things maybe we could get as a late

1 file, which I find very unusual here, is we don't
2 have any of the CVs of the professionals on this
3 project, and I'm used to seeing that.

4 Because I've right away said I
5 wanted to see who these people were, and I
6 couldn't find anything but an acronym. So could
7 we get -- would that be okay to get that as a late
8 file, also the CVs of the people that have --

9 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Attorney Humes,
10 I assume that's not a problem?

11 MR. HUMES: That's no problem at
12 all.

13 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: So the May 25th
14 deadline would be sufficient?

15 MR. HUMES: That's fine. So that's
16 Late-File 2.

17 DR. KLEMENS: So I have a few
18 questions from the environmental. We didn't get
19 as far as to get around to the wetlands at the
20 other end. Can you tell me, is the entire site,
21 that entire peninsula ripped in the manner that
22 we saw on our site walk?

23 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): Generally,
24 yes. There's a few areas where it's not as thick
25 or not as deep from, in other words, it doesn't

1 come as far ashore, but the entire site perimeter
2 is ripraped.

3 DR. KLEMENS: Did you -- I'm sorry.

4 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): I was
5 going to add the southernmost wetland is
6 coastal -- is tidal, so there is an inlet, not an
7 inlet per se, but it's flowed by pipe and it's a
8 tidal exchange in that southernmost wetland area.

9 DR. KLEMENS: And did you do any
10 kind of studies as to what was living in those
11 wetlands?

12 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): There,
13 there was a wetlands report prepared by another
14 consultant whose name slips my mind at the moment,
15 but not for professional reasons. It actually did
16 slip my mind.

17 DR. KLEMENS: Is that in this
18 application?

19 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): I do
20 not -- I think the name is in there, but it was
21 not submitted with the application. We recently
22 in the last week and a half filed a jurisdictional
23 determination with the Army Corps of Engineers
24 including that.

25 DR. KLEMENS: So there is a report

1 on the wetlands?

2 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): Yes, sir.

3 DR. KLEMENS: We don't have that in
4 this application?

5 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): That's
6 correct.

7 DR. KLEMENS: Another late File?

8 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Attorney Humes,
9 I assume that will be filed with the other late
10 file. Thank you.

11 MR. HUMES: No objection, yeah.

12 DR. KLEMENS: Okay. Because that
13 was -- they are just some pieces that are -- I'm
14 not used to what I'm seeing. I think that pretty
15 much summarizes, because I can't really ask any
16 questions about that wetland and the proximity of
17 the development to that wetland, whether it will
18 have any impacts on any species in that wetland,
19 because we don't know. There's no information.

20 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): There's no
21 part of the development plan that will encroach
22 upon the wetlands. Our intent is -- I'm sorry.

23 DR. KLEMENS: I understand that,
24 but it's very proximal. How much of the 17 -- or
25 it was very close in places.

1 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): Roughly 28
2 to 30 feet. Correct.

3 DR. KLEMENS: Right. And my
4 question was in that circumstance were there any
5 species in that wetland using that wetland that
6 may be impacted by the proximity of that plant?

7 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): We do not
8 believe so. The primary species that utilized the
9 site, the entire site are avian and that's
10 primarily for breeding, in some cases osprey, and
11 forage in the surrounding waters. There are
12 wetland species present, both aquatic and
13 terrestrial in the wetland complex and those are
14 documented in the wetland report.

15 DR. KLEMENS: So if I want to know,
16 for example, for instance, about the presence of
17 diamondback terrapins that's going to be in the
18 wetland report?

19 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): Correct.

20 DR. KLEMENS: Which I don't have
21 yet.

22 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): What I can
23 say is there were no diamondback terrapins
24 identified.

25 DR. KLEMENS: When did you look?

1 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): The study
2 was performed, I believe, in 2012.

3 DR. KLEMENS: What time of year?

4 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): I don't
5 recall.

6 DR. KLEMENS: Okay. We'll look at
7 that. The only other question I have is with the
8 visual. And again, it's again trying to orient
9 myself on this, the visual perspectives. I had a
10 great deal of difficulty, and maybe it's just me,
11 trying to tie the photographs to the viewpoints.
12 And I did some of it just by, you know, figuring
13 it out by looking at the maps.

14 But is there a way that we could
15 actually have these views? The figure is 5-2;
16 5-3, 4, 5 and 6. Could you actually say what
17 viewpoint these are from? Because that is not --
18 at least I couldn't find that.

19 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): Yes, on
20 figure 5.1 there are triangles that show each of
21 the locations from which photo representation was
22 created. And on the very upper right-hand corner,
23 in print that is very small, is each of the
24 view -- I'm sorry, of figures 5-2 through 5-5 --
25 I'm sorry, 5-6. There's very small print in the

1 upper right-hand corner to the view location.

2 So for example, 5-2 is from
3 location 1 looking towards the site, view
4 number 1. 5-3 is view number 2. 5-4 is view
5 number 3. 5-5 is view number 4, and finally 5-6
6 is view number 5.

7 DR. KLEMENS: So view number five,
8 which is the only one that I think is kind of a
9 bit of an impact, that's actually not from the
10 Seaside Park. That's from a -- yes, it is from
11 Seaside Park.

12 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): Yes, it
13 is.

14 DR. KLEMENS: And did you receive
15 any feedback from anyone concerned with Seaside
16 Park about it? That's the only, what I would say,
17 a big change is this new plant out on that
18 peninsula. Did you get any feedback from the
19 public in your public -- all the meetings you had
20 and meetings with the City, meetings with the
21 public about that particular visual impact?

22 THE WITNESS (Brown): Not -- not as
23 yet, no.

24 DR. KLEMENS: Okay. I have no
25 further questions. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: I guess I
2 misunderstood Mr. Perrone. He was not done and I
3 guess I interrupted him. So back to Mr. Perrone.

4 MR. PERRONE: Thank you. Just a
5 few more. Do you anticipate any blasting being
6 required to construct the project?

7 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): No.

8 MR. PERRONE: What is the
9 approximate total cost of the new powerplant
10 project?

11 THE WITNESS (Gerlach): A little
12 bit in excess of \$550 million.

13 MR. PERRONE: And just to be clear,
14 that's for the installation of the new plant,
15 whereas the decommissioning of the older plant is
16 separate. Is that correct?

17 THE WITNESS (Gerlach): That's
18 correct.

19 MR. PERRONE: And could the details
20 of the decommissioning of unit three, could those
21 details be submitted to the Council in the future?

22 THE WITNESS (Brown): It's our
23 intention to work with the City, the community and
24 the environmental task force that will be created
25 by the City to study all aspects of the aesthetics

1 of the site and the improvements, landscaping as
2 well as a longer-term study to determine the
3 decommissioning of the existing unit three. And
4 once that study is complete I don't see any
5 problem with sharing that with the Council.

6 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: When might that
7 study be done? I'm thinking, you know, maybe long
8 after we make a decision here. So how far down
9 the road are you?

10 THE WITNESS (Brown): We have yet
11 to embark on that planning study. It's a
12 component of the community environmental benefits
13 agreement that we completed in February. I don't
14 have a timetable for you today.

15 MR. PERRONE: And what is the
16 approximate service life of the plant? 40 years,
17 45 approximately?

18 THE WITNESS (Gerlach): PSEG will
19 put it on our books at 40 years.

20 MR. PERRONE: And could a
21 decommission plan for the new powerplant, if this
22 project is approved, be included in the D and M
23 plan?

24 THE WITNESS (Gerlach): That's not
25 something that we -- we do not have the

1 decommissioning plan for this new project.

2 MR. PERRONE: Just to be clear, I'm
3 not suggesting the plant is decommissioned. I'm
4 saying once the plant reaches the end of its
5 useful life could a plan be produced that the
6 Council could have on file?

7 THE WITNESS (Gerlach): I'm not
8 entirely sure that I'm understanding your
9 question, but just because the plant reaches
10 end-of-book life doesn't mean it will be
11 necessarily taken out of service at the time. I
12 mean, that's a decision that PSEG makes when the
13 plant reaches that age.

14 I'm not sure I'm answering the
15 question that you're asking.

16 MR. PERRONE: So basically it would
17 be, assuming it did reach the end of its useful
18 life and you weren't able to upgrade it at that
19 time, could a plan be produced basically to show
20 removal of the facility and just restoring the
21 site? Would it be possible to have a plan such as
22 that filed with the Council?

23 THE WITNESS (Gerlach): I don't
24 think that that would be easy to do at this time.

25 MS. BACHMAN: Ms. Gerlach, what

1 we're asking for is a plan for the future in the
2 event that, in the unlikely event that the plant
3 no longer operates, how would it be
4 decommissioned? How would the buildings be
5 removed and would the site itself be returned to
6 its original condition?

7 MR. HUMES: That sounds, Attorney
8 Bachman, like you're describing a theoretical,
9 hypothetical document on what might happen in the
10 40, 50 or 60 years. Is that the case? Or are you
11 asking for a commitment on what the company will
12 do in the future?

13 MS. BACHMAN: We're asking for a
14 plan in the event, at either the end of the useful
15 life or before that if the plant determines that
16 operations are no longer feasible?

17 THE WITNESS (Gerlach): That's not
18 something that we have on any of our powerplants.

19 MS. BACHMAN: Well, that's
20 something that we ask for in all of our matters.
21 So perhaps you can discuss it with Attorney Humes
22 and we can come back to this after?

23 THE WITNESS (Gerlach): Okay.

24 MS. BACHMAN: Thanks.

25 MR. PERRONE: Going to the air

1 emissions topic, in the response to interrogatory
2 31, it mentions that no predicted exceedances of
3 PM 2.5 of a significant impact level. There
4 wouldn't be any. Would there be any exceedances
5 of the SIL for PM 10?

6 THE WITNESS (D. Gordon): No, there
7 would not.

8 MR. PERRONE: And I understand with
9 the air permit application it's a new source, so
10 it focuses exclusively on the proposed facility.
11 It's not a comparison of the proposed versus the
12 unit to be decommissioned. Is that correct?

13 THE WITNESS (D. Gordon): That is
14 correct.

15 MR. PERRONE: Would it be possible
16 to get as a late file an air emissions comparison
17 table? It could be done in tons per year or on a
18 per megawatt hour basis, basically showing the
19 plant that it's replacing versus the proposed
20 plant so we could see the difference in emissions.

21 THE WITNESS (D. Gordon): Yes, we
22 can do that.

23 MR. PERRONE: Again, it could be
24 either a tons per year or on a megawatt hour
25 basis, or both, whichever one. But since we're

1 looking at total I would say at least in tons per
2 year.

3 THE WITNESS (D. Gordon): For the
4 new unit would we be looking at potential
5 emissions? Or projected actual emissions?

6 MR. PERRONE: I'm sorry?

7 THE WITNESS (D. Gordon): For the
8 new unit, would it be projected actual emissions
9 to compare to unit three? Or potential emissions
10 as permitted?

11 MR. PERRONE: The projected.

12 THE WITNESS (D. Gordon): The
13 Projected. Projected actual?

14 MR. PERRONE: Yes.

15 And I'm going to turn to the
16 comments we received from the Department of Energy
17 and Environmental Protection dated May 4th. I
18 understand in the site description, which is on
19 the first page, it mentions a row of red pines.
20 My understanding is with the proposed project
21 those trees would be removed. Is that correct?

22 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): That is
23 correct, yes.

24 MR. PERRONE: I understand we
25 covered ULSD. Moving on. Now regarding the

1 possibility of contaminated soils at the site and
2 remediation, could you summarize for us the
3 process of what will be done at the site in terms
4 of remediation if the project is approved prior to
5 construction?

6 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): The
7 current plan, which is being implemented as part
8 of a separate project related to unit three, is to
9 perform remediation work on, at this point, three
10 separate areas of the site.

11 One is near the coal conveyor where
12 a new unit three fuel oil tank will be built --
13 will be constructed. That area will be covered
14 with an engineering control, which is per the
15 approved mediation, the Connecticut DEEP approved
16 remediation plans. That will consist of a
17 permeable warning layer for fabric, fabric with
18 six inches of stone above it.

19 Similar engineering control will be
20 installed in the area of where I -- where the
21 barge unloading will be at the south end of the
22 current coal dock. It is the area to the east,
23 I'd say southeast to the coal pile. There's an
24 area that's shown on the site development plan
25 that's adjacent to the -- to the end of the river

1 and that will get the same engineering control.

2 For the berm-ed area where the four
3 fuel oil tanks currently exist, the currently
4 approved plan is to remove the tanks and remediate
5 the soil. At this point based upon projected
6 quantities and the delineation that's been
7 performed to date, approximately 2,000 cubic yards
8 of soil would be removed off site for disposal at
9 the appropriate facility, and another 3 to 6 to 7
10 thousand cubic yards would be left on site and
11 either covered with an engineering control or
12 stockpiled beneath the footprint of the new plant
13 so that the new plant can serve as the impermeable
14 cover.

15 That last piece of the plan has
16 been discussed with the Connecticut DEEP
17 remediation, but has not yet been formally
18 submitted.

19 MR. PERRONE: And could the details
20 of how that may impact the powerplant layout,
21 could that also be included in the D and M plan if
22 approved?

23 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): Yes,
24 although there's no -- there should be no impact
25 on the powerplant layout as a result of

1 remediation. The intent is to meet the
2 remediation cleanup standards without having to
3 modify the design of the new plant and that
4 appears very feasible at this point.

5 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Excuse me,
6 Mike. Dr. Klemens, you had a follow-up question?

7 DR. KLEMENS: Yes, I do -- actually
8 two. So -- and what I've just heard is that you
9 intend to potentially bury part of this
10 contaminated soil beneath the powerplant and use
11 the powerplant almost as a cap?

12 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): That's
13 correct.

14 DR. KLEMENS: So I think getting
15 back to Mr. Perrone's earlier question, that's
16 going to have to also be addressed in the
17 decommissioning plan because now you actually have
18 the plant serving as a cap. So that's just an
19 observation.

20 The other thing, how are you going
21 to transport the contaminated soil? Is it going
22 to go by barge? By truck through the
23 neighborhoods? How is it going to be removed?

24 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): My
25 understanding is it will be by truck.

1 DR. KLEMENS: Through the streets
2 of Bridgeport?

3 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): Yes, sir.

4 DR. KLEMENS: And how many
5 truckloads, how many trucks would be involved to
6 remove that?

7 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): I don't
8 know that number offhand. I don't have the
9 capacity of the trucks. Those plans are still
10 being worked through. And as I mentioned, we're
11 working with Connecticut DEEP to submit -- and the
12 formalization of that specific part of the
13 remediation plan.

14 DR. KLEMENS: Thank you.

15 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Thank you,
16 Doctor.

17 Mr. Perrone?

18 MR. PERRONE: Thank you. Just some
19 more cleanup regarding the letter from DEEP. At
20 the end of page 4 and at the beginning of page 5
21 DEEP mentions some concerns about the
22 justification of the use of the retaining walls.

23 Could you explain to us why the use
24 of retaining walls would be unavoidable?

25 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): The

1 primary reason for the retaining walls is because
2 of space limitations and proximity to the coastal
3 jurisdiction line and the coastal waters. When we
4 file formally we will include basically
5 alternatives and justification for the design that
6 was selected.

7 MR. PERRONE: And then moving onto
8 the section called, other issues, on page 5. It
9 says that the Council should confirm the plant
10 design is consistent with the latest FEMA sea
11 level forecast and flood standards.

12 Has the petitioner considered the
13 latest sea level forecast and flood standards for
14 the duration of the proposed plant's design life?

15 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): Yes, the
16 FEMA mapping is the current mapping that was
17 developed post Sandy. And the flood insurance
18 elevation data that I cited came from 2013, which
19 again was post Sandy. So it is the latest
20 federal -- federal data on floods, flood
21 elevations.

22 MR. PERRONE: And then also in the
23 other issue section, it mentions that there are
24 some elevation of University Avenue and
25 constructing a flood protection berm from the rail

1 viaduct at Ferry Access Road southward to tie into
2 the high ground of the PSEG plant.

3 Have you reviewed this section and
4 would you expect it to impact your flood design
5 for this project?

6 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): We have
7 not seen the plans that are being discussed here.
8 So we'll work with Connecticut DEEP to understand
9 what's being proposed.

10 MR. PERRONE: And one last thing
11 regarding the late file on air emissions
12 comparison. If you could also include CO2 in
13 there for greenhouse gases, that would be helpful.

14 And turning to the response to
15 question 19, that's where it gets into visibility
16 areas and the difference in visibility areas
17 between the 300-foot stack and the 498. Would the
18 change in visibility area, would that be primarily
19 on land? Or it would also affect the views over
20 the water?

21 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): Views from
22 over the water are generally unaffected. The
23 lower height stack is visible from fewer areas on
24 land.

25 MR. PERRONE: Thank you. That's

1 all I have.

2 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Thank you,
3 Mr. Perrone.

4 Mr. Hannon -- or excuse me,
5 Dr. Klemens says he has one question.

6 DR. KLEMENS: You're building this
7 above the 500-year storm level, but one of the
8 things -- and some of my colleagues may remember I
9 raised this on another project in Bridgeport, how
10 much above -- how much extra space do you have
11 above the 500-year storm?

12 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): There's
13 two aspects that provide additional protection.
14 The retaining wall -- well, let me go back and say
15 the 500-year flood elevation is elevation 15.3.

16 DR. KLEMENS: Correct.

17 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): The
18 retaining wall is -- the top elevation of the
19 retaining wall is elevation 20. In addition, as I
20 mentioned the site grade is 16 and a half. What I
21 didn't mention is the first floor elevations of
22 the buildings for the powerplant are going to be
23 at elevation 18 to 18.5. So there's an additional
24 two feet of margin over the 16 and a half.

25 DR. KLEMENS: So in your

1 professional opinion, knowing that sea level will
2 continue to rise, and the projected life of this
3 facility, do you believe that this facility will
4 remain protected from sea level rise through its
5 entire life?

6 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): Without
7 getting into the debate on sea level rise numbers,
8 and obviously there's all kinds of different
9 numbers out there. I have not looked at the most
10 recent NOAA projections, but at an elevation of 16
11 and a half and higher, and a 500-year storm
12 projection from FEMA knowing the conservatisms
13 FEMA has built in, I am comfortable that the
14 numbers are appropriate for this plant.

15 DR. KLEMENS: Thank you. Thank
16 you, Mr. Chairman.

17 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hannon.

18 MR. HANNON: Thank you,
19 Mr. Chairman. One of the questions I was going to
20 ask was the hundred-year flood elevation and the
21 500. You just said the 500 is 15.3. I think the
22 hundred-year flood elevation you mentioned out at
23 the site. Can you please, you know, for the
24 record put that in?

25 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): I'm sorry,

1 Bob.

2 MR. HANNON: I'm just looking to
3 get into the record the 100-year flood elevation
4 level.

5 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): The
6 100-year flood elevation level of the FEMA mapping
7 zone AE is elevation 14.

8 MR. HANNON: Okay. And you just
9 said it was 15.3 is the 500 year?

10 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): 500 year,
11 Right.

12 MR. HANNON: One of the things that
13 I am a little confused with, and it may just be
14 the terminology, but my understanding is that
15 this, I guess, even the easiest way to do it is
16 the handout that was given at the site. The
17 aerial, or site aerial figure 1-3A where it shows
18 the two sort of loading dock areas. Or I guess
19 one is for the pipe and I'm not sure if the other
20 one is for the coal.

21 I'm just making sure that I
22 understand what repairs are going to be done to
23 sort of which dock structure, and I'm a little
24 confused on that?

25 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): All of the

1 repairs will be done on the dock structure to the
2 south, so the one that was closest to where we
3 were standing earlier when we were out on the
4 corner.

5 MR. HANNON: Okay. So there's
6 nothing being proposed over by where the coal is?

7 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): No, sir.

8 MR. HANNON: Okay. Thank you. On
9 the response to the Siting Council question
10 number 34, it's if the proposed facility is
11 approved and unit three is later decommissioned
12 would the entire unit three facility be removed,
13 or would portions of the unit three facility
14 remain?

15 If you eliminate that last word
16 "explain," is it, yes, it will be removed, or
17 portions will be removed? Or at this point in
18 time you really just don't know?

19 THE WITNESS (Brown): Those --
20 those issues are -- we expect to determine with
21 the collaboration and discussion with the City,
22 with the community and with the environmental task
23 force. So we don't know right now which
24 structures would -- will definitely be removed,
25 which could remain, but we expect to reach those

1 decisions in collaboration with the City and our
2 neighbors.

3 MR. HANNON: Okay. Thank you. One
4 of the things that is in here, Exhibit A, page 2-4
5 and 2-5. I do want to say that it is actually
6 nice to see somebody putting in the -- or dealing
7 with the DPM emissions. So that I think is a very
8 good step and hopefully that's something that may
9 be continued in the future on other projects.

10 In terms of my eyesight -- and I
11 think you guys did this deliberately. And I had
12 to use a magnifying glass on these two-foot by
13 three-foot drawings that are rendered down to an
14 eight and a half by eleven sheet. One of the
15 things in looking at it, this is Exhibit B. It's
16 behind Exhibit B4, the grading plan.

17 There's been talk about the site
18 running roughly about 16 and a half feet
19 elevation, but looking at this it looks as though
20 there are a number of areas where the elevations,
21 spot elevations are more like 17.2. So I'm just
22 wondering what the difference is in variation?

23 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): The
24 differences in grade allow for storm water
25 drainage. There has to be a little bit of grade

1 across the site to get to catchbasins.

2 MR. HANNON: Okay. And then one
3 sort of, I guess, acronym I'm not really used to
4 seeing is I understand the inner elevations on the
5 storm water drains, but what does RIM stand for?
6 I understand top of frame, but this is associated
7 with the catchbasins, and I have no clue what RIM
8 stands for.

9 And that would be on -- I think
10 it's also part of Exhibit -- is it 4B, I think?
11 Let me double check. So I'm just kind of curious.
12 I understand the invert in and the invert out
13 going in the catchbasins, but I've got no clue
14 what that is. And the reason I asked is because
15 that's also at, like, 17.2, but yet there's a
16 cross section in here that says the roadway is at
17 about 16-6. So that's why I'm a little confused
18 on what that really means?

19 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): Can I ask
20 which drawing, which exhibit you're looking at
21 specifically?

22 MR. HANNON: I don't have my
23 magnifying glass here with me. It's in Exhibit B.
24 I'm trying to find it. I believe it is on the
25 picture or diagram behind Exhibit B2, storm water

1 drainage. So looking at more of the southern part
2 of the property. It's RIM. I have no clue what
3 that is.

4 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): Top
5 elevation of the catchbasin.

6 MR. HANNON: Okay. Because I've
7 just never heard it referred to that way. I mean,
8 if it's top of frame, that's fine. That's what I
9 was looking for. Okay.

10 And then I guess the only other
11 question I have is when some people were
12 introducing themselves, they were talking about
13 unit five. In the document it talks about unit 5,
14 but in the ISO New England capacity auction it
15 talks about 484 megawatts at Bridgeport Harbor 6.

16 THE WITNESS (J. Gordon): So that's
17 been corrected, you know, at the ISO. They
18 labeled their interconnection queue projects based
19 on submittals. And this was actually submitted in
20 an order that would have labeled it under their
21 labeling mechanism as number six. We've recently,
22 a month and a half ago or so, adjusted that with
23 them. So we both use the moniker of unit number
24 five now.

25 MR. HANNON: Okay. Because this is

1 what's on their website. I printed it off today.
2 So I was -- I'm just trying to make sure we're
3 talking about the same facility. Okay. Thank
4 you. I have no further questions.

5 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Thank you
6 Mr. Hannon.

7 Mr. Harder?

8 MR. HARDER: Yes. Just a couple
9 questions. The first one would be for
10 Mr. Pantazes just to confirm the conversation we
11 had on the site earlier today concerning the
12 160,000 yards or so of fill material. My question
13 at the time was, are there any specs now for that
14 material? The point I was getting to is I was
15 wondering if it's intended to use virgin material,
16 essentially? Or if it's possible that any
17 material that might have been affected by a
18 release, whether or not that material is above or
19 below the RSRs.

20 And I think you had indicated
21 fairly clearly that it's not intended. And I just
22 want to make sure if it's definitive now then
23 please indicate that, or if it's a possibility
24 that we might get something other than virgin
25 material, then please, you know, summarize what

1 the intent is.

2 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): The civil
3 specifications have been drafted. I do not --
4 have not seen the final civil spec at this point,
5 but our normal practice is to not take on soil
6 that is -- that is contaminated as to assure that
7 it's clean fill. Whether that's definitive at
8 this moment, I can't say.

9 MR. HARDER: In any discussions
10 with DEEP has that issue been raised at all?

11 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): No, sir.

12 MR. HARDER: No? Okay. The other
13 question is on the community and environmental
14 benefits plan, I guess for Mr. Brown. I know it
15 indicates that one component of the plan is to
16 make \$5 million of renewable energy projects
17 available to the community. Are there any
18 specific projects in mind at this point?

19 THE WITNESS (Brown): Not at this
20 point. And just to be clear, under the plan we
21 will consider renewable energy investments of at
22 least \$5 million, but any project would have to
23 meet our investment criteria. But right now
24 there's nothing in the pipeline.

25 MR. HARDER: The only other

1 question, I guess, is in describing that issue or
2 that element of the plan. It says that any
3 projects or any components of those renewable
4 energy projects would go forward at the sole
5 discretion of PSEG. And I'm just wondering why is
6 that? I mean, on the surface it sounds a little
7 like one hand giveth and the other hand taketh
8 away. I'm just wondering what the involvement
9 would be of the community in selecting those
10 projects?

11 THE WITNESS (Brown): Well, we --
12 we would hope that the community would -- it's not
13 a hope. We would expect that the community would
14 have a voice in a renewable project that we would
15 consider. We would hope the community would bring
16 us potential projects for our consideration.

17 But we're -- I think there's maybe
18 a little bit of a misunderstanding. We're not
19 creating a 5 million-dollar renewable energy
20 investment fund. What we committed to doing is
21 considering renewable projects of at least
22 \$5 million that we would -- that we would consider
23 using our investment criteria that we used for
24 these kinds of projects.

25 MR. HARDER: So it's not a firm

1 commitment to actually implementing at least
2 \$5 million of projects?

3 THE WITNESS (Brown): No, it's not.
4 It's a commitment to consider projects of at least
5 \$5 million going forward. But projects, again
6 would need to meet our investment criteria.

7 MR. HARDER: Okay. Thank you.

8 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lynch?

9 MR. LYNCH: I just want to start
10 with a few general questions. And the first one
11 being, why dual source fuel? And before you
12 answer, the reason I'm asking the question is
13 we've had projects in the past that have been
14 proposed for having a dual fuel source and then
15 during the construction before it's completed the
16 second source is eliminated.

17 Where we've actually had projects
18 that have been completed and operational for a few
19 years and the owners come back and ask if they can
20 eliminate the second source of fuel. So that's
21 why I'm asking why dual fuel?

22 THE WITNESS (J. Gordon): If I
23 could? The forward capacity market that ISO New
24 England, Independent System Operator New England
25 operates --

1 MR. HARDER: I can't hear you,
2 sorry.

3 THE WITNESS (J. Gordon): The
4 forward capacity market that the ISO New England
5 operates in which we sold forward the commitment
6 to actually build this facility and deliver it
7 beginning on June 1, 2019, incorporates a high
8 penalty provision. It's referred to as pay for
9 performance or performance incentive capacity
10 market design.

11 And it would penalize resources
12 that have obligations pretty significant sums for
13 not making themselves available during what they
14 call shortage event conditions, reserve
15 efficiencies on the system. The current costs for
16 that beginning in 2017 is \$2,000 a megawatt hour
17 for failing to be available or online providing
18 reserves when there's a shortage condition.

19 By the time this facility goes
20 commercial that number will be \$3,500 per megawatt
21 hour. And in the seventh year the penalty for not
22 being online or providing reserves is \$5,450 a
23 megawatt hour. So there's an enormous amount of
24 incentive to make sure we have fuel adequacy at
25 all times.

1 And if I could add to that? The
2 Independent System Operator over the last two
3 years has implemented an oil recommissioning
4 program. And I believe they have five projects
5 that were formerly, across New England, that were
6 formally gas only -- have chosen to recommission
7 oil at their facilities.

8 MR. LYNCH: Thank you. I was
9 curious, which leads me into another direction.
10 When you're operating on the second fuel, it
11 states in the application and in the interrogatory
12 30 days. We've had other projects where it's
13 limited by hours and not days. Is that similar
14 here?

15 THE WITNESS (D. Gordon): In the
16 permit application we expect it to be actually
17 limited to an equivalent BTU limit in fuel use to
18 the 30 days, the amount of hours at full load in
19 terms of fuel.

20 MR. LYNCH: And what's that hour?

21 THE WITNESS (D. Gordon): I'm
22 sorry.

23 MR. LYNCH: What is the hour limit?

24 THE WITNESS (D. Gordon): Well, it
25 will be 744 hours -- I'm sorry, 720 hours times

1 the full load rate of the turbine, whatever that
2 comes out to for BTUs.

3 MR. LYNCH: Thank you. And my next
4 question, again it's kind of a general question.
5 You're talking about going into operation in 2019,
6 but then the existing coal plants that are there
7 don't go offline until -- or they're probably
8 offline, but they don't get completely removed
9 until 2021. Why the two-year delay?

10 THE WITNESS (J. Gordon): The
11 question was why? Why the delay? The final
12 question again?

13 MR. LYNCH: Yeah.

14 THE WITNESS (J. Gordon): Why the
15 delay?

16 MR. LYNCH: Yeah, why does it take
17 two years to take down the old retiring coal
18 plants, is my question?

19 THE WITNESS (J. Gordon): So the
20 retirement date for Bridgeport harbor number 3 was
21 a negotiated date and it started from the position
22 that we already had obligations with the ISO New
23 England to deliver that capacity and energy from
24 that unit at the ISO's discretion through 2020.

25 And we knew we were going into this

1 upcoming auction that just finished in February.
2 The one that this unit cleared in, that unit also
3 had an obligation to participate in it and it had
4 already been preprogrammed.

5 So we knew we were going to have an
6 obligation through 2021, or through June of --
7 through May of 2021, and that's why the date was
8 agreed upon at that point. We already had
9 obligations to sell the capacity.

10 MR. LYNCH: Okay. Thank you. And
11 units three and four operate on two different fuel
12 sources, one diesel and one jet fuel. Why the
13 difference and what type of kerosene are they
14 using for the jet fuel?

15 THE WITNESS (Silvestri): I'd like
16 to answer that one for you. Unit three actually
17 is our coal burner. When the unit starts up it
18 will use like oil, which is number two oil, then
19 six oil, then coal. And then when it shuts down
20 the reverse is true, but it doesn't use jet fuel.

21 The unit that uses jet fuel on the
22 property is what we call unit four, which is a
23 Pratt & Whitney jet turbine. So they're two
24 separate units.

25 MR. LYNCH: I was just curious.

1 And in one of the interrogatories when you were
2 asked about baseload you used a term "load
3 following." Is that just another term for
4 baseload?

5 THE WITNESS (Gerlach): So we had a
6 whole discussion. We had a whole discussion here
7 about the definition of baseload and load
8 following. And in our organization we typically
9 consider load following any unit that moves up and
10 down. So --

11 MR. LYNCH: I'm sorry. I can't
12 hear you.

13 THE WITNESS (Gerlach): Oh, I'm
14 sorry. Okay. So we had a whole discussion about
15 the baseload and load following in response to
16 this interrogatory. And we would consider this
17 unit to be load following because it moves up and
18 down, as opposed to a baseload unit which tends to
19 park at a certain megawatt level.

20 That being said, we do expect this
21 unit to have a relatively high capacity factor.

22 MR. LYNCH: Okay. And probably
23 along the same line with during the winter when
24 there's some kind of strains on the gas supply,
25 are there plans if, you know, Southern Connecticut

1 Gas has to slow down your operation because of the
2 constraints on the gas load that you have a
3 contingency plan?

4 THE WITNESS (Gerlach): Well, the
5 contingency plan, of course, is the secondary
6 fuel. But we're currently in negotiations with
7 Southern Connecticut Gas and they are actually
8 reserving a certain amount of gas on the lateral
9 for themselves for home heating in the winter.
10 And the size of the plant was based on the amount
11 of gas that they were willing to give us after
12 they had made that reserve for themselves in the
13 winter.

14 MR. LYNCH: Okay. Thank you. And
15 I have a couple more. On the backup generator,
16 Mr. Humes has heard me say this many times, you
17 know, with the telecommunication people. Instead
18 of using a diesel generator why don't you look
19 into using a fuel cell?

20 THE WITNESS (J. Gordon): One of
21 the -- the primary driver of a fuel cell would be
22 natural gas, and one of the events that we want to
23 create as a contingency is the loss of the natural
24 gas pipeline. So using a diesel backup provides
25 the ability to use the on-site fuel for that

1 particular one.

2 MR. LYNCH: But couldn't you also
3 use propane in a fuel cell? You don't have to
4 answer. Like I say, I'm a proponent of fuel
5 cells, so I'm trying to get a market for it.
6 Thank you.

7 And my last question -- oh, I've
8 got a few more -- asked and answered. The problem
9 with going last is most of these get answered
10 already.

11 But I do have one question that's
12 probably a loaded question, and it's probably
13 protected in some way. But Wall Street is not
14 really banging down the doors to get energy
15 projects running and investors aren't out there.

16 And I know that PSEG is a stable
17 company and without getting into any sources of
18 funding, what I'd like to know is that there is
19 money in place to complete this project so we
20 don't end up with something that happened in
21 Oxford that takes 15 years for it to finally get
22 funded.

23 THE WITNESS (Gerlach): Yes, PSEG
24 has a very high credit rating. We will finance
25 this project on our balance sheet. We can do that

1 without issuing any equity.

2 MR. LYNCH: Thank you,
3 Mr. Chairman.

4 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Thank you,
5 Mr. Lynch.

6 In follow up to what Mr. Lynch just
7 stated, the applicant's information on page 11,
8 you have PSEG and then you have a Power
9 Connecticut, you have a Fossil and a Power, LLC.
10 And then PSEG with nothing after it is going to
11 operate this plant. Who's going to operate the
12 plant?

13 THE WITNESS (Gerlach): The plant
14 will be operated by PSEG Power Connecticut, which
15 is a subsidiary of PSEG Fossil, which is a
16 subsidiary of PSEG Power.

17 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Right. I
18 understand that. So they're going to operate.
19 And Mr. Lynch has talked about the funding. I
20 assume the funding is really on the strength of
21 PSEG Power with no Connecticut tacked on the end?

22 THE WITNESS (Gerlach): Yes, that's
23 correct. It's PSE -- Public Service Enterprise
24 Group is the funding level.

25 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: And the rest of

1 your applicant information on 11 and 12 is really
2 talking about PSEG Power, and not Power
3 Connecticut about what it's done in the past and
4 so forth. Because I believe PSEG Connecticut
5 really has nothing except this petition. Is that
6 correct?

7 THE WITNESS (Brown): PSEG power
8 Connecticut also owns and operates the New Haven
9 Harbor generating station.

10 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: I can't hear
11 you. What?

12 THE WITNESS (Brown): The PSEG
13 Power Connecticut also operates the New Haven
14 Harbor generating station in New Haven. And that
15 we in 2008 added 140 megawatts of peaking
16 generation at that site. So we have two, two
17 active assets in Connecticut.

18 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: All right. But
19 as Mr. Lynch has indicated, it was before my time
20 when Towantic was approved, but it's been a real
21 sore point because it took forever and a day to
22 finally get the thing off the ground.

23 And the other question I had is
24 that gas turbine, that you're to use GE-7 with the
25 letters and with the numbers after it, is referred

1 to as it usually is, is the state of the art. And
2 I'm really interested where in the arc it is in
3 the state of the art? How long has that turbine
4 been available from GE?

5 THE WITNESS (Gerlach): So the
6 first of those turbines is not yet in service. I
7 believe it's going to go in service sometime later
8 this year or the following year. The sister plant
9 to this one, Sea Warren I think is number nine off
10 the assembly line. Is that -- number nine.

11 So I'm not quite sure what number
12 this is. We're obviously a year behind, but it is
13 so new that they are not in service yet.

14 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: So its design
15 is, we might refer to as a rather recent vintage?

16 THE WITNESS (Gerlach): What GE
17 seems to be doing is taking their previous
18 F-series turbine and then upgrading certain
19 components of it. So they'll upgrade the
20 compressor. They'll upgrade, you know, coatings
21 and different types of nozzles and buckets to make
22 them more efficient.

23 So I would describe it as an
24 incremental -- it's incremental rather than a step
25 change in the technology, which is one of the ways

1 that we were able to get comfortable being an
2 early adopter.

3 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank
4 you. I have nothing else. Does any member of the
5 Council -- Mr. Hannon?

6 MR. HANNON: Thank you. This is in
7 tab A, or Exhibit A, page 11-1, 11-2, 11-3 to 11-3
8 and 4. At the bottom of 11-1 you say the low
9 volume waste streams generated by the facility
10 would be discharged to the City of Bridgeport
11 Water Pollution Control Authority municipal
12 wastewater system. I'm assuming by that you mean
13 the sewer system?

14 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): Yes, sir.

15 MR. HANNON: Okay. And you give a
16 list of different sources. And so for example, on
17 the top of page 11-2 you have HRSB blowdown, but
18 yet at the bottom of the page you're saying the
19 HRSB blowdown will be flashed, quenched and reused
20 in the auxiliary cooling tower. So that to me
21 sounds like there is no wastewater there.

22 The same thing for the evaporative
23 cooler blowdown. It looks as though that's being
24 reused. So there is no discharge there, but I
25 guess where I'm a little confused is it also

1 sounds like there's a wastewater collection tank
2 or sump on the site. And is that where most of
3 the water except for the sanitary wastewater from
4 the employees would be going, into that tank and
5 then that would be brought over to the treatment
6 plant?

7 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): I'll take
8 the first part and then turn it over to Bruce as
9 the engineering manager.

10 We are now looking at the
11 wastewater system design to look for ways to
12 reduce wastewater flows. The first thing you
13 mentioned, the HRSG, HRSG blowdown is the -- and
14 then down below, the discussion about it going to
15 the cooling tower, the small auxiliary cooling
16 tower basin. That's the current water balance we
17 believe will occur.

18 So any water that's blown down or
19 drained from the HRSG will flow to the cooling
20 tower basin, and from the cooling tower basin it
21 will be discharged. We're currently looking to
22 reduce our water balance flows, and the intent is
23 that we would find ways to reduce freshwater
24 demand in the facility as well as wastewater that
25 would be going to the water pollution control

1 authority.

2 In terms of specific questions, how
3 it's designed, I would defer to the engineering
4 manager.

5 THE WITNESS (Gerlach): Could you
6 please repeat the second part of the question?

7 MR. HANNON: You say in one part
8 that the waste streams will be discharged to the
9 municipal wastewater system. That to me is the
10 sewer system, but yet when you're talking about
11 the compressor wash water, the demineralization
12 system and some of the others, the floor drains,
13 that sounds like it's being collected in a sump or
14 some type of a holding tank.

15 And then that is then being pumped
16 out of that into a truck, and then it's trucked to
17 the water pollution control authority. I'm just
18 trying to make sure that I understand what's
19 happening on the site.

20 THE WITNESS (Na): Yes, so we --
21 first of all, we're having equipment that
22 minimizes any waste water. So for example, the
23 air-cooled condensers and the -- we have a fin pan
24 cooler for waste discharge. So we can minimize
25 actual waste through the use of those equipment.

1 It is possible to have a holding tank to reduce,
2 to hold the discharge and then send it to the
3 wastewater treatment plant. That is also --

4 MR. HANNON: Because I mean, under
5 the compressor wash water it states, two to three
6 trucks per day will occasionally be needed to
7 transport the wastewater off site for processing.
8 So I'm just trying to make sure that not
9 everything is going down the sanitary sewer line.

10 I realize it's all getting to the
11 treatment plant. I have no problem with that, but
12 I'm just trying to make sure that where in one
13 spot you're saying everything is going down the
14 sanitary sewer line, and in other spots it's not.
15 I'm just trying to figure out exactly what's being
16 done with the wastewater on site?

17 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): The
18 clarification is that our online compressor wash
19 water, when the composers are online and they're
20 washed, that will go out through the normal
21 wastewater discharge path to the WPCA. Offline
22 washes have chemical constituents in them that are
23 not appropriate for discharge to the wastewater
24 system. Those are the ones that would be brought
25 on by truck.

1 MR. HANNON: Okay. So it's a
2 combination, sort of the holding tank and the
3 sanitary sewer line?

4 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): Right.

5 MR. HANNON: Okay. Thank you.
6 That's all.

7 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Harder?

8 MR. HARDER: Yes, I just had a
9 followup for Mr. Brown on the issue we were
10 discussing before. The way I read the petition,
11 it sounds like more of a commitment than what you
12 describe, and I'll just read quickly here.

13 It says, the CEBA contains
14 substantial commitments and benefits PSEG is
15 providing to the City and community. Among other
16 things PSEG agreed to, one, contribute \$2 million
17 to a fund; two, end the commercial operation of
18 unit three; and three, initiate a program with the
19 purpose of investing \$5 million in renewable
20 energy investment projects located in Bridgeport
21 that satisfies certain conditions.

22 That sounds like a commitment to
23 implement \$5 million worth of projects, not just
24 to think about it. I mean, it's in the petition.
25 So I just want to get it straight as to, you know,

1 how far you're going in that direction.

2 THE WITNESS (Brown): It is not an
3 idle comment or commitment. We fully intend to
4 make a concerted effort to find a renewable
5 investment. And it's not -- of at least
6 \$5 million.

7 And \$5 million would be a floor
8 that meets our investment requirements that are in
9 place for investments we make of this sort
10 elsewhere. We have a very active solar energy
11 subsidiary that has projects in a number of
12 states, which kind of establishes the investment
13 return that -- that we would look at.

14 But no, and this is not -- there's
15 no time limit on our commitment to consider these
16 projects. We're going to be here for a long time
17 and we're hoping to be able to find projects on
18 our own as well as have developers and members of
19 the community bring us projects that we could
20 actually invest in.

21 It is a firm commitment to do our
22 best to make that kind of investment happen in
23 this city.

24 MR. HARDER: Thank you. That's
25 all.

1 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Perrone?

2 MR. PERRONE: Just one last
3 question. So looking at the summer megawatts, if
4 this project is approved would you have
5 approximately a 100 megawatt net gain from
6 basically 384 to 484?

7 THE WITNESS (J. Gordon): Our
8 Bridgeport Harbor three unit currently is 380,
9 about 384 megawatts. So if you're making the
10 comparison of the size of the new unit, Bridgeport
11 5 at 480, 485, it's approximately a
12 hundred megawatts, yes.

13 MR. PERRONE: Thank you. That's
14 all I have.

15 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: United
16 Illuminating, any questions?

17 MR. MORRISSEY: No cross at this
18 time.

19 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Why don't we
20 take this remaining ten minutes and put your panel
21 in, then swear them in and take care of those
22 things today. And we're probably not going to get
23 to them tonight, but do that because I think
24 they're probably here. Is that okay?

25 So if you people could vacate

1 temporarily?

2 Mike only has one question, so
3 maybe we'll take care of everything. I know
4 you'll be disappointed.

5 This is the panel for United
6 Illuminating company. Attorney Morrissey, would
7 you introduce the two members of your panel,
8 please?

9 MR. MORRISSEY: Good afternoon
10 Councilmembers, staff, Executive Director Bachman.
11 My name is Jimmy Morrissey and I represent the
12 intervener, the United Illuminating company. I
13 would like to mark the following exhibits for
14 introduction.

15 The first is the United
16 Illuminating company's request for intervener
17 status dated March 22nd, 2016. And the second is
18 the United Illuminating Company's responses to
19 Council interrogatories, dated April 28, 2016. At
20 this time I would like to ask the witnesses to
21 introduce themselves.

22 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Is there any
23 objection to it being marked as exhibits?

24 (No response.)

25 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: If not,

1 proceed.

2 ELIZABETH GANDZA: Elizabeth
3 Gandza, United Illuminating Company.

4 ANTONIO BUCCHERI: Tony Buccheri,
5 United Illuminating Company.

6 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Have them both
7 rise and we'll swear them. Attorney Bachman?

8 E L I Z A B E T H G A N D Z A ,

9 A N T O N I O B U C C H E R I ,

10 called as witnesses, being first duly sworn
11 by the Executive Director, were examined and
12 testified on their oaths as follows:

13 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
14 Proceed, Mr. Morrissey.

15 MR. MORRISSEY: Ms. Gandza, did you
16 direct, prepare or assist in the preparation of
17 UI's request for intervener status and the
18 interrogatory responses we will file here today?

19 THE WITNESS (Gandza): Yes, I did.

20 MR. MORRISSEY: Do you have any
21 additions, corrections or modifications?

22 THE WITNESS (Gandza): Yes, I do.

23 MR. MORRISSEY: And what is that
24 correction?

25 THE WITNESS (Gandza): For the UI

1 interrogatory response subsection D, the first
2 statement said -- the first phrase said, except
3 for adding a communication cable. And I'd like to
4 correct that to say, except for adding two
5 communication cables.

6 MR. MORRISSEY: Okay. Any other
7 corrections?

8 THE WITNESS (Gandza): No.

9 MR. MORRISSEY: And with that
10 correction, do you file this as your sworn
11 testimony here today?

12 THE WITNESS (Gandza): Yes.

13 MR. MORRISSEY: The witnesses are
14 available for cross.

15 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: You have no
16 questions of your other witness?

17 MR. MORRISSEY: No.

18 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Do you move
19 they that be admitted as full exhibits?

20 MR. MORRISSEY: Yes.

21 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Is there any
22 objection to the admission of these items as full
23 exhibits, Mr. Humes?

24 MR. HUMES: No objection.

25 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Therefore

1 they'll be admitted as full exhibits.

2 Cross examination, Mr. Perrone?

3 MR. PERRONE: Thank you. Turning
4 to the interrogatory responses, CSC-1 part D,
5 focusing on the modifications within the
6 substation. If this project is approved would UI
7 file with the Council a petition or an energy
8 exempt mod for the proposed modifications for
9 inside the substation?

10 THE WITNESS (Gandza): Yes.

11 MR. PERRONE: And could that be
12 filed approximately the same time as PSEG's D and
13 M plan?

14 THE WITNESS (Gandza): Yes.

15 MR. PERRONE: Thank you. That's
16 all I have.

17 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Councilmembers,
18 Dr. Klemens, any questions?

19 DR. KLEMENS: No questions, Mr.
20 Chairman.

21 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hannon?

22 MR. HANNON: I have no questions.
23 Thank you.

24 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Harder, no
25 questions?

1 MR. HARDER: No questions.

2 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: I have no
3 questions. Attorney Humes, do you have any cross
4 examination of this panel?

5 MR. HUMES: No cross examination.
6 Thank you.

7 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: I guess you'll
8 be excused. Thank you.

9 With that I will recess this
10 hearing until 7 p.m. this evening. And the
11 purpose --

12 MR. HUMES: Mr. Chairman?

13 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: I guess there's
14 a correction we need to take care of before I put
15 the pen down?

16 MR. HUMES: If we can address one
17 correction at this time that would be very
18 convenient.

19 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead.

20 MR. HUMES: Mr. Pantazes, do you
21 have a correction to something you testified to?

22 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): Yes, I
23 said earlier that the wetlands delineation had
24 been performed in 2012. It was performed in 2014
25 and the work was done in April of 2014 by GEI,

1 which is a consulting firm that did the work.

2 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Actually we
3 couldn't understand from here, for some reason.

4 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): The
5 wetlands delineation work was performed in 2014.
6 I had said 2012 previously, and the field work was
7 done in April of 2014 by GEI, which is a
8 consultant that did the work.

9 DR. KLEMENS: They're going to
10 submit this as a late file, the wetland
11 delineation?

12 THE WITNESS (Pantazes): We have
13 filed the wetlands delineation report as a late
14 file.

15 DR. KLEMENS: Great. Thank you for
16 that clarification.

17 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Anything else?

18 MR. HUMES: Nothing further.

19 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: With that,
20 we'll recess until 7 p.m., which will be primarily
21 to hear public input on this project. With that
22 we'll adjourn until 7 p.m. Thank you.

23 (Whereupon, the witnesses were
24 excused and the above proceedings were concluded
25 at 4:56 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

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the foregoing 91 pages are a complete and accurate computer-aided transcription of my original verbatim notes taken of the Siting Council Meeting in Re: Petition No. 1218, PETITION FROM PSEG POWER CONNECTICUT, LLC, FOR A DECLARATORY RULING THAT NO CERTIFICATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC NEED IS REQUIRED FOR THE CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE, AND OPERATION OF A NEW 485 MEGAWATT DUAL FUEL COMBINED-CYCLE ELECTRIC GENERATING FACILITY AT THE EXISTING BRIDGEPORT HARBOR STATION LOCATED AT 1 ATLANTIC STREET, BRIDGEPORT, CONNECTICUT, which was held before JAMES J. MURPHY, Vice Chairman, at the Bridgeport City Hall, Council Chambers, 45 Lyon Terrace, Bridgeport, Connecticut, May 5, 2016.



Robert G. Dixon, CVR-M 857

Notary Public

BCT Reporting, LLC

PO Box 1774

Bristol, Connecticut 06011

My Commission Expires: 6/30/2020

I N D E X

1

2 WITNESSES

3 Michael Stagliola

4 Robert Silvestri

5 Joel Gordon

6 Bruce Na

7 Douglas Gordon

8 Neil Brown

9 Jeffrey Pantazes

10 William H. Bailey - Page 12

11 EXAMINATION

12 Mr. Perrone - Page 19

13

14 Elizabeth Gandza

15 Antonio Buccheri - Page 86

16 EXAMINATION

17 Mr. Perrone - Page 88

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25