STATE OF CONNECTICUT

CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

Ten Franklin Square, New Britain, CT 06051

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

E-Mail: siting.council@ct.gov

www.ct.gov/csc

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

December 1, 2016

Dawn Mahoney, Esq.
General Counsel
Doosan Fuel Cell America Inc.
195 Governor's Highway
South Windsor, CT 06074

RE: **PETITION NO. 1262** - Doosan Fuel Cell America, Inc. petition for a declaratory ruling that no Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need is required for the construction, maintenance, and operation of 1380-kilowatt customer-side combined heat and power fuel cell facility to be located at the Borough of Naugatuck Waste Water Treatment Plant, 500 Cherry Street Extension, Naugatuck, Connecticut.

Dear Attorney Mahoney:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) requests your responses to the enclosed questions no later than December 8, 2016. To help expedite the Council's review, please file individual responses as soon as they are available.

Please forward an original and 15 copies to this office, as well as send a copy via electronic mail. In accordance with the State Solid Waste Management Plan and in accordance with Section 16-50j-12 of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies the Council is requesting that all filings be submitted on recyclable paper, primarily regular weight white office paper. Please avoid using heavy stock paper, colored paper, and metal or plastic binders and separators. Fewer copies of bulk material may be provided as appropriate.

Yours very truly,

Melanie Bachman
Acting Executive Director

MB/MP

c: Council Members

Petition No. 1262
Doosan Fuel Cell America, Inc.
500 Cherry Street Extension
Naugatuck, CT
Interrogatories – Set Two

30. In Doosan Fuel Cell America, Inc.'s (Doosan) response to Council interrogatory number two, Doosan provided the certified mail receipts for state and local officials. Provide the certified mail receipts for the abutting property owners. Also, the mail receipt at the bottom of the last page of the interrogatory responses appears to be "cut off." Please attach a full copy such mail receipt.

31. In Doosan's response to Council interrogatory number three, the site plan is not attached. Provide a detailed site plan with a scale that includes but is not limited to location and dimensions of the fuel cells, cooling modules, concrete pads, fence design and bollards (if applicable), utility connections, nearby utility building, and retaining wall.

32. In Doosan's response to question seven, Doosan indicates that the proposed project would be located in an area with a 0.2 percent chance of flood. This would be equivalent to a 500-year flood zone. Approximately how many feet above the 100-year base flood elevation would the project be located?

33. In the response to question eight, Doosan indicated that the zoning designation of the subject property is Zone X. However, the Borough of Naugatuck Zoning Map dated August 27, 2015 indicates that the water treatment facility property is in the I-1 (Industrial District No. 1) Zone. Please clarify the correct zoning for the subject property.

34. In response to question 10, Doosan indicated that the closest wetland is 750 yards from the proposed site. Provide the direction (e.g. N, S, E, or W) from the proposed facility to the nearest wetland.

35. Referencing Doosan's response to question 23, rather than referring to a specifications sheet, provide a noise analysis report indicating the methodology used to compute the noise levels and identify the Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP) Land Use Zones (A, B, or C) of the noise emitter and the noise receptors and indicate if the project is in compliance with the DEEP noise standards for the applicable emitter to receptors at the host property boundaries.

36. Referencing Doosan's response to question 25, Doosan notes that the CO_2 emissions rate would be 1,050 lbs/MWh. This appears to conflict with the specifications sheet for the Model 400 Fuel Cell, which indicates an emissions rate of 998 lbs/MWh for CO_2 for "electric only," 815 lbs/MWh with "high-grade heat recovery," and 485 lbs/MWh for "full heat recovery." Since the use of waste heat is not proposed, would the correct emissions rate for the proposed project be 998 lbs/MWh? Is it also correct to say that emissions rates that are on a lbs/MWh basis are independent of the number of fuel cell units, so the CO_2 emissions rate would remain at 998 lbs/MWh even with three units proposed?

37. When the zinc-sulfide storage vessel is returned to the manufacturing facility after the fuel cell overhaul, would such vessel meet any applicable U.S. Department of Transportation standards for transportation?