The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs
100 Cambridge Street, Suite 900
Boston, MA 02114

Deval L. Patrick
GOVERNOR

Timothy P. Murray
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

Ian A. Bowles
SECRETARY

Tel: (617) 626-1000
Fax: (617) 626-1181
http://www.mass.gov/envir

October 17, 2008

CERTIFICATE OF THE SECRETARY OF ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS
ON THE
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

PROJECT NAME	: Pioneer Valley Energy Center
PROJECT MUNICIPALITY	: Westfield
PROJECT WATERSHED	: Westfield River
EEA NUMBER	: 14151
PROJECT PROPONENT	: Westfield Land Development Company, LLC
DATE NOTICED IN MONITOR	: August 27, 2008

As Secretary of Energy and Environmental Affairs, I hereby determine that the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) submitted on this project **adequately and properly complies** with the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (G. L. c. 30, ss. 61-62I) and with its implementing regulations (301 CMR 11.00). The proponent may prepare and submit for review a Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR).

According to the DEIR, the project involves the construction of a 400-megawatt (MW) energy generating facility, consisting of one combustion turbine and associated infrastructure, fueled primarily by natural gas, with Ultra-Low Sulfur Distillate (ULSD) fuel as a back-up for limited periods, on a 45-acre industrially zoned site located on Ampad Road in Westfield. The turbine will be equipped with a Selective Catalytic Reduction (SCR) emissions control system to minimize emissions of nitrogen oxides (NOx) and an oxidation catalyst to minimize emissions of carbon monoxide (CO) and volatile organic compounds (VOC). The facility will include: storage tanks for storage of ULSD fuel, water, and aqueous ammonia, a switching yard, various pumps and ancillary structures, and one emissions stack (180 feet in height). The electricity generated by the facility will be distributed to the commercial electricity distribution grid

through existing 115 kV transmission lines that bisect the project site. Natural gas will be provided to the project through a pipeline connection to an existing Westfield Gas and Electric (WG&E) delivery system. The DEIR has indicated a change from the Environmental Notification Form (ENF) with regard to cooling technologies to be utilized on-site. The project will use a wet cooled technology in lieu of the air cooled technology previously presented. The cooling tower makeup water supply for the project will be supplied from the City of Holyoke's Tighe-Carmody Reservoir via a new water supply pipeline connection to existing water supply lines that run between the Tighe-Carmody Reservoir and the Ashley Reservoir to the north of the project site. The Proponent submitted additional materials clarifying the potential impacts of water withdrawals from the Tighe-Carmody Reservoir in a memorandum dated September 15, 2008.

As presented in the DEIR, the project's turbine will be permitted for unrestricted operation on natural gas and up to 8 hours per day and 1,440 hours per year of operation on ULSD. The auxiliary boiler will be limited to no more than 12 hours of operation per day and up to 1,100 hours of operation per year at maximum heat input. The emergency generator and fire pump will each be limited to no more than 300 hours of operation per year. Other than one hour per week for maintenance and testing, the diesel generator and fire pump will not operate concurrently with the turbine. The environmental impact analyses conducted as part of the DEIR were presented with consideration for these limitations and represent worst-case scenarios based upon the operating limits that will be imposed on the project as part of the permitting process.

Jurisdiction

The project is undergoing review and required the preparation of an EIR pursuant to Section 11.03 (7)(a)(l) of the MEPA regulations, because the project involves the development of a new electric generating facility with a capacity greater than 100-MW. The project also exceeded ENF thresholds due to the construction of a new major stationary source with federal potential emissions, after construction and imposition of required controls, of: 100 TPY or more of CO and 50 TPY or more of NOx (301 CMR 11.03(8)(b)(1)) and the new discharge of 100,000 or more gallons per day (gpd) of industrial waste water (301 CMR 11.03(5)(b)(4)(a)). The project will require numerous State, Federal and local permits including, but not limited to: approval of a Bulk Electric Generating Facility and Gas Pipeline from the Energy Facilities Siting Board (EFSB); a Major Comprehensive Plan Air Approval and Sewer Connection Permit from the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP); a Storage Tank Permit from the Massachusetts Department of Public Safety; a Conservation and Management Permit from the Massachusetts Division of Fisheries and Wildlife Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program (NHESP); a Notice of Proposed Construction from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA); approval under the Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) program and an Acid Rain Permit from the United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA); and a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Construction General Permit from the U.S. EPA. Local permits include: an Order of Conditions from the Westfield Conservation Commission, and in the case of an appeal, a Superseding Order of Conditions from MassDEP; and Site Plan Approval, Special Permit, Building Permits, and a Sanitary Sewer Permit from the City of Westfield.

Because the proponent is not seeking financial assistance from the Commonwealth for the project, MEPA jurisdiction is limited to those aspects of the project that are likely to directly or indirectly cause Damage to the Environment as defined in the MEPA regulations and that are within the subject matter of required or potentially required state permits or agency actions. However, given the numerous state agency actions required and the broad scope of the EFSB review, MEPA jurisdiction extends to virtually all aspects of the project.

Project Changes Since the ENF

The DEIR outlined several changes to the project since the review of the ENF. Due to the scale of these changes, the project met the criteria for the filing of a Notice of Project Change (NPC) in accordance with the MEPA regulations (301 CMR 11.10(1)). Upon consultation with the MEPA Office, it was determined that the proponent could fulfill this procedural obligation by including the NPC form in the DEIR.

Notable project changes include:

- Acquisition of an additional nine (9) acres of land abutting the site perimeter, increasing the overall project land area to 45 acres;
- Proposal to utilize wet cooled technology instead of the dry (air) cooled technologies originally proposed in the ENF. Cooling tower makeup water will be supplied by the City of Holyoke's Tighe-Carmody Reservoir;
- An increase in typical water use from 200,000 gallons per day (gpd) to 1,900,000 gpd during normal operations;
- An increase in typical wastewater discharge from 150,000 gpd to 230,000 gpd during normal operations;
- Identification of the preferred natural gas pipeline route as "Alternative 2" which was presented in the ENF; and
- Reconfiguration and consolidation of the facility footprint resulting in a reduction of impacts to on-site wetlands and rare species habitat.

Review of the DEIR

The DEIR included a summary of the anticipated benefits and objectives of the project, notably the provision of low cost energy and long-term capacity supply to four local municipal electric companies, Westfield, Holyoke, Chicopee, and South Hadley. The DEIR included a description of the existing environment generally in accordance with 301 CMR 11.07(6)(g). The information provided in the DEIR serves to provide a sufficient description of baseline conditions by which to compare the project's potential impacts and mitigation measures. A summary of anticipated project permits and consistency with local planning documents and policies was also outlined in the DEIR.

The DEIR included a complete alternatives analysis that evaluated site design, potential environmental impacts, and various operational scenario assumptions for several different project alternatives. The DEIR addressed overall site selection criteria and provided more detailed analyses for site specific alternatives. Alternatives evaluated included a No-Build Alternative, Generating Facility Fueling Alternatives (i.e. natural gas, ULSD, biodiesel, or combinations thereof), and Generating Facility Cooling Technology Alternatives (i.e. wet (water) cooled and dry (air) cooled). Gas pipeline route alternatives, including a discussion of the route selection process and the preferred route evaluation criteria, were also presented in the DEIR. Generally, the DEIR and supplemental information addressed the potential environmental impacts of the gas pipeline and water main rehabilitation at a conceptual level.

In accordance with the Certificate on the ENF, the DEIR included an analysis of existing and proposed air quality impacts, with consideration for ambient air quality, meteorological and climatological conditions, nearby land uses and topography. The DEIR described the methodology, models, assumptions, and sources of data utilized for the air quality analysis. The DEIR described the applicable regulatory requirements for Federal and State air quality permitting. As requested, the DEIR quantified emissions from the proposed plant for the Preferred Alternative, including criteria and non-criteria pollutants, and Hazardous Air Pollutant (HAP) emissions. Project impacts were compared with National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), Significant Impact Levels (SILs), and MassDEP's Acceptable Ambient Levels (AALs) and Threshold Effects Exposure Limits (TELs). The DEIR included an air toxics analysis, a discussion of Best Available Control Technologies (BACT) and Lowest Achievable Emission Rates (LAERs). The DEIR contained a Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG) analysis in accordance with the EEA Greenhouse Gas Emissions Policy and Protocol, as modified by the Certificate on the ENF.

Included in the DEIR was a discussion of potential project impacts to groundwater, water demand and wastewater generation. The DEIR provided information of projected water demand for the Preferred Alternative, including a discussion of indirect impacts on the Tighe-Carmody Reservoir and the City of Westfield municipal water system. The DEIR also described the anticipated wastewater impacts from project wastewater discharges on the Westfield Wastewater Treatment Facility and existing permitting limitations.

The DEIR included a noise impact analysis that compared existing and proposed conditions to standards set by both the MassDEP Noise Policy and the local Westfield Noise Ordinance. The DEIR included existing and proposed stormwater drainage calculations, a discussion of compliance with the MassDEP Stormwater Management Policy (SMP), and the relationship of various on-site storage tanks to the overall stormwater management system. The DEIR contained plans and a description of potential wetland impacts, along with a discussion of wetland resources on-site and the project's compliance with the Performance Standards of the Wetlands Regulations (310 CMR 10.00).

The DEIR and supplemental materials described the habitat features of both the project site, gas pipeline route, and the water main rehabilitation route. The DEIR included a discussion of how the project proposes to meet performance standards in association with the Massachusetts

Endangered Species Act (MESA), facility consolidation to reduce impact to rare species habitat, and potential mitigation measures to offset rare species impact.

The DEIR evaluated the potential cultural and visual impact of the project, including an analysis of viewshed impacts from sensitive resources and the nearest residences to the project site. The DEIR contained a discussion of oil and hazardous materials management measures to be implemented on-site, including safety measures and the relationship of materials stored on-site to groundwater and wetland resources. The DEIR described construction management protocols, erosion and sedimentation controls, and compliance with MassDEP regulations regarding construction activities. The DEIR presented project mitigation measures associated with potential environmental impacts and a tabular summary of mitigation measures to be incorporated into State permits. The DEIR included a response to comments section in accordance with the MEPA regulations and the Certificate on the ENF.

SCOPE

While I am allowing the proponent to proceed to the preparation of an FEIR, I note the requests for additional information to assist State agencies with future permitting processes. I anticipate that the FEIR will respond to the scope outlined below with sufficient detail to satisfy State agencies. I retain my authority to require further review in the form of a Supplemental Final Environmental Impact Report if issues outlined in this Scope and in comments are not thoroughly addressed in the FEIR.

General

The FEIR should follow the general guidelines for outline and content found in Section 11.07 of the MEPA regulations as modified by this scope. The FEIR should provide maps, site plans and other graphics at an appropriate scale and of sufficient detail to facilitate review and comment.

Environmental Justice - Enhanced Public Participation

In accordance with the EOEEA Environmental Justice Policy, the proponent should continue to provide enhanced public outreach to environmental justice populations in Westfield. During the FEIR process, documents should be available to the public via the public library, city hall, on the City's web site, and upon request by residents. Notification of these documents should be published in the local paper as well as in alternative community resources such as newsletters and church bulletins, if appropriate. The FEIR should provide an update on the proponent's enhanced public outreach efforts and summarize steps taken during the FEIR process to advise environmental justice populations of the project.

Alternatives

The FEIR should include a detailed comparison of wet and dry cooled technology alternatives to allow for a thorough evaluation of potential environmental impacts and tradeoffs between each cooling technology. The FEIR should present this comparison in a tabular format, with a clear explanation of cooling technologies, assumptions for fuel use and operation durations, seasonal fluctuations, and ambient air temperatures. Supporting data corroborating estimated impacts should be provided as necessary. At a minimum, each technology should be compared using the environmental impact parameters outlined in Table 1 of the Connecticut River Watershed Council comment letter on the DEIR. Additional parameters may be added to effectively clarify the differences between the two cooling technologies. Consideration should be given to the potential indirect environmental impacts associated with a particular cooling technology (e.g., drawdown of the Tighe-Carmody Reservoir, or the upgrade of water supply infrastructure).

Air Quality

MassDEP has provided several comments on the air quality analysis presented in the DEIR. In response to these comments, the FEIR should include supporting data and documentation to demonstrate compliance with applicable regulations. In addition to a general response to comments, the Proponent shall provide a detailed response to subsections entitled "Air Pollution Control" and "Ambient Air Quality Impact Analysis Comments" in the comment letter dated October 10, 2008 submitted by MassDEP, and I hereby incorporate by reference the additional requests for information contained in that letter as part of the scope of the FEIR.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG)

The DEIR included an analysis of potential GHG emissions associated with several design and operation scenarios in accordance with the EEA Greenhouse Gas Emission Policy and Protocol (the GHG Policy). The DEIR analyzed the CO_2 stack emissions produced by stationary or direct sources (stack emissions) and mobile or indirect sources (transportation-related emissions). Carbon dioxide reductions associated with several alternatives were presented including:

- Preferred Alternative – Worst Case Scenario of Natural Gas and ULSD (1,440 hrs/year);
- Preferred Alternative - Expected Scenario of Natural Gas and ULSD (720 hrs/year);
- Renewable Fuel Alternative – Natural Gas/Advanced Biofuel with 50-percent GHG Reduction (720 hrs/year in turbine);
- Renewable Fuel Alternative – Natural Gas/Advanced Biofuel with 50-percent GHG Reduction (720 hrs/year in turbine) and in other sources; and
- Greater GHG Emissions-Related Mitigation Alternative – Natural Gas Fuel Only

MassDEP has noted significant reservations on the Proponent's characterization of several of its alternatives as credible mitigation measures in compliance with the Policy. These measures include the selection of the type of turbine, ISO-NE dispatch assumptions, reduced hours of operation leading to reduced ULSD consumption, and mitigation credit for not developing portions of the project site by choice. I agree with MassDEP that these aspects of the project are not cognizable mitigation measures under the Policy. The GHG analysis should be revised and presented in the FEIR based upon the guidance in the MassDEP comment letter. The FEIR should commit to the building design and operations GHG mitigation measures presented in the DEIR. The FEIR should include a quantification of the GHG reductions associated with these measures even if emissions reduced are relatively insignificant in comparison to stack emissions.

The FEIR should include an expanded discussion of the role biofuels may play in the project and possible technical challenges associated with using biofuels on-site. The FEIR should discuss the potential technical barriers to implementation, and what is necessary to overcome them. As requested by MassDEP, if biofuels supply is the governing factor, the FEIR should demonstrate why using biofuel in lower consumption equipment such as the auxiliary boiler, emergency generator, and fire pump are not viable. I strongly encourage the Proponent to make a commitment in the form of a future Preferred Alternative to use biofuels contingent on adequate supply, as this commitment would further reduce GHG emissions and send a positive message to the biofuels market.

The project is subject to the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (RGGI) which will require the purchase of allowances equivalent to the annual tons of CO_2 the facility will emit. Furthermore, the recently enacted Climate Protection and Green Economy Act, M.G.L.c. 21N, requires that all significant new and existing sources of GHGs will need to be considered for mitigation in order to meet the Act's target for new CO_2 reductions in 2020 and beyond. The Act specifically contemplates early action credit for entities that have voluntarily reduced their GHG emissions prior to the establishment of mandatory reduction targets. The Proponent could be eligible for early action credit in accordance with the Act if it commits to additional mitigation measures (including off-site measures such as promoting or financially supporting local municipal energy efficiency efforts).

At the recommendation of MassDEP, the FEIR should include, at a minimum, a plan or proposal that describes and reasonably quantifies the range of future on-site GHG mitigation measures, such as a conversion to renewable fuels or more advanced turbine systems, as well as off-site mitigation measures that could support energy efficiency and conservation in the surrounding communities. The FEIR should identify near term mitigation commitments, and where commitments may be contingent upon future developments, those contingencies should be identified. I anticipate that these commitments will be memorialized in the draft Section 61 findings for the MassDEP Major Comprehensive Plan Air Approval.

Noise

At the request of MassDEP, the FEIR should include an updated noise analysis that includes a more comprehensive data evaluation by evaluating all ambient noise data and

comparing the lowest L90 levels, irrespective or the time of day, to the modeled plant operating noise levels. The FEIR should summarize consistency of the updated noise analysis with the MassDEP noise guideline, and as necessary, any additional mitigation measures to be undertaken on-site beyond those presented in the DEIR to meet noise guideline requirements.

Stormwater

The Stormwater Management Plan presented in the DEIR did not specifically address how Low Impact Development (LID) techniques were considered in the site design process. The consideration of LID techniques must be presented in the Notice of Intent submission. I encourage the proponent to discuss the incorporation of LID techniques into the project design in the FEIR. In response to the comment submitted by the Connecticut River Watershed Council, the FEIR should demonstrate that the project will comply with the MassDEP Stormwater Management Regulations requirements for removal of Total Suspended Solids (TSS). The project may require either certification under the MassDEP Underground Injection Control (UIC) program or the proposed revisions to 314 CMR 5.00 requiring a General Permit for stormwater discharge into the ground from facilities with "high intensity use". Applicability of these regulations should be determined at the time of permitting and construction.

Wetlands

The Proponent will be required to file a Notice of Intent with the Westfield Conservation Commission to allow for review of potential wetland impacts associated with both the facility site and the gas and water pipeline routes. All portions of the project will be required to meet applicable wetland general performance standards or limited project provisions in accordance with the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act and associated Regulations.

MassDEP has indicated that the project may require a Section 401 Water Quality Certificate (401 WQC) due to possible discharge of dredged or fill material within Waters of the United States within the Commonwealth. The FEIR should conceptually discuss the cumulative impacts to Waters of the United States within the Commonwealth (Bordering and Isolated Vegetated Wetlands and Land Under Water) associated with the project. This analysis should strive to determine if 310 CMR 9.03 and 314 CMR 9.04 are applicable to the project.

Rare Species

The project is located within the mapped habitat of the Eastern Box Turtle (*Terrapene carolina*), a species of Special Concern pursuant to the Massachusetts Endangered Species Act (MESA, M.G.L. c.131A) and its implementing regulations (MESA, 321 CMR 10.00). The NHESP has noted that the Proponent has revised the project consistent with consultations with their office, reducing the facility footprint from 14 acres to 12.1 acres of land disturbance and preserving an important wooded area.

The FEIR should contain an update on collaborative efforts with the NHESP regarding outstanding issues related to the endangered species permitting of the project. This discussion should include information on potential mitigation measures to facilitate compliance with the performance standards at 321 CMR 10.23 as addressed in the NHESP comment letter. While the final details associated with endangered species permitting should be described in detail as part of the FEIR, the NHESP will not render a final decision regarding the MESA Conservation and Management Permit until the MEPA review process and MESA application process is completed.

Water Supply

The DEIR states that the project will utilize approximately 240,000 gallons per day (gpd) of potable water from the City of Westfield's water supply system during periods of peak demand and ULSD firing. The DEIR states that typical potable water usage is estimated at less than 120,000 gpd. Estimated water withdrawals for the cooling tower makeup from the City of Holyoke's Tighe-Carmody Reservoir are expected to be approximately 1.9 million gallons per day (mgpd) based on the permitted days of oil and natural gas firing. Peak water usage from the Tighe-Carmody Reservoir may reach up to 2.2 mgpd in the unlikely event that ULSD firing coincides with high to moderate ambient air temperatures. MassDEP has indicated that due to the nature of the withdrawals no MassDEP permits are required for either the use of water from the City of Westfield water supply system or the withdrawals from the Tighe-Carmody Reservoir.

MassDEP has indicated that the project will not result in an exceedance of permitted water withdrawal volumes under the Water Management Act (WMA) for either the City of Westfield or the City of Holyoke. No new or modified MassDEP permit under the WMA will be required for the project. The Proponent has proposed an emergency back-up connection to the cooling towers from the Westfield Water Department supply. As requested by MassDEP, the Proponent should consult with the Westfield Water Department to ensure cross connection control compliance, as well as to confirm that adequate capacity, infrastructure, and pressures are available to provide water to the project (both for potable sources or cooling tower emergency back-up).

On September 11, 2008, the Water Resources Commission (WRC) determined that the project's proposal to transfer 2.0 mgd from the Holyoke water supply system to the project site was not subject to the Interbasin Transfer Act (ITA) because of pre-existing infrastructure and legislation. As part of the FEIR, the Proponent should expand on the supplemental information provided regarding the potential impact water withdrawals will have on the Tighe-Carmody Reservoir and the Mahan River. In addition to a general response to comments, the Proponent should provide a detailed response to the comment letter dated September 26, 2008 submitted by the WRC, and I hereby incorporate by reference the additional requests for information contained in that letter as part of the scope of the FEIR.

In note the thoughtful comments received on concerns pertaining to the volumes of water proposed for use by the project. Given the broad scope jurisdiction afforded by the MEPA

regulations and the overall goal of striving to avoid, minimize and mitigate Damage to the Environment, the FEIR must include an evaluation of mitigation measures to specifically offset impacts to water resources. The FEIR should discuss the feasibility of:

- recharging a percentage of cooling water to groundwater;
- implementation of additional technologies to further reduce water evaporation;
- establishment of water releases from the Tighe-Carmody Reservoir to the Mahan River; and
- a contribution of funding to Holyoke combined sewer overflow (CSO) separation projects.

I anticipate that in response to the findings of these feasibility analyses, the FEIR will include a commitment to mitigation efforts to reduce impact to water resources.

Wastewater

The DEIR notes that the preferred alternative will result in an additional 80,000 gpd of wastewater generation in comparison to data presented in the ENF. Estimated wastewater generation discharges to the City of Westfield Waste Water Treatment Facility (WWTF) will be 230,000 gpd, with a peak discharge of 280,000 gpd during periods of ULSD firing. The FEIR should demonstrate that discharges associated with the project will not result in a violation of the current or proposed Westfield WWTF NPDES permitted discharge volumes and pollutant threshold limits. The FEIR should explain how the wastewater discharges from the project may impact the temperature of discharges from the Westfield WWTF to the receiving water body. The FEIR should describe potential direct or indirect impacts of these thermal changes to water, wetlands and habitat, if any, and outline appropriate mitigation measures.

Oil and Hazardous Materials Management

MassDEP has noted that a "spills contingency plan" addressing potential releases of oil and/or hazardous materials from pre and post construction activities, including but not limited to, refueling of machinery, storage of fuels, and potential future on-site releases, should be enforced and presented to workers at the site. The FEIR should include an updated draft Pollution Prevention and Emergency Response Plan as necessary to respond to changes to the project requested in this scope. In response to comments made by the Pioneer Valley Planning Commission (PVPC), the FEIR should clarify the relationship of site stormwater runoff to areas of infiltration and proposed measures to mitigate the potential of direct infiltration of untreated stormwater and the use of pervious surfaces in equipment areas. The FEIR should also discuss options for tertiary containment for the fuel and ammonia storage tanks on-site.

Construction Management

I acknowledge the Proponent's commitment to utilize Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel (ULSD) fuel for off-road construction equipment. In an effort to go further, I strongly encourage the proponent to make a commitment in the FEIR to participate in the MassDEP Diesel Retrofit Program. MassDEP has recommended that the Proponent work with its staff to implement construction period diesel emission mitigation, which could include the installation of after-engine emission controls such as diesel oxidation catalysts (DOCs) or diesel particulate filters DPFs. All construction-related refueling and equipment maintenance activities should be conducted under cover on impervious surface areas with containment, and outside of any wetlands resource areas.

Mitigation and Section 61 Findings

The FEIR should include a separate chapter updating commitments to project-related mitigation. This section should include a summary of mitigation commitments as well as actual draft Section 61 finding language to be incorporated by State agencies into *each* individual permitting process. As part of the FEIR, the draft Section 61 finding for the MassDEP Major Comprehensive Plan Air Approval should include commitments pertaining to reductions in GHG emissions associated with the facility in accordance with the GHG Policy. The proposed Section 61 findings should specify in detail all feasible measures the proponent will take to avoid, minimize and mitigate potential environmental impacts to the maximum extent practicable. The proposed Section 61 findings should identify parties responsible for funding and implementation, and the anticipated implementation schedule that will ensure mitigation is implemented prior to or when appropriate in relation to environmental impacts.

Response to Comments / Circulation

The FEIR should include a copy of the Certificate on the DEIR and each comment received. The FEIR need not reproduce every form letter, but should include one "template" from each form letter category. In order to ensure that the issues raised by commenters are addressed, the FEIR should include a response to comments. This directive is not intended to, and shall not be construed to, enlarge the scope of the FEIR beyond what has been expressly identified in the initial scoping certificate or this certificate.

The Proponent should circulate a hard copy of the FEIR to each state agency from which the proponent will seek permits or approvals. The Proponent should also circulate a copy of the FEIR to those submitting individual written comments.

To save paper and other resources, I will allow the Proponent to circulate the FEIR in CD-ROM format to individual commenters, although the Proponent should make available a reasonable number of hard copies available on a first come, first served basis, to accommodate those without convenient access to a computer. In the interest of broad public dissemination of

information, the Proponent should send a notice of availability of the FEIR (including relevant comment deadlines, locations where hard copies may be reviewed and electronic copies obtained, and appropriate addresses) to those who submitted letters. This notification may be made by email in the instance that email addresses are available in association with some commenters. A hard copy of the FEIR should be made available for review at the Westfield Public Library.

October 17, 2008
Date

Ian A. Bowles

Comments received:

09/19/2008	Pioneer Valley Planning Commission
09/22/2008	William Armstrong
09/22/2008	Michael A. Solitario
09/22/2008	Shaun Devine
09/22/2008	Jason A. Gauthier
09/22/2008	Paul Gauthier
09/22/2008	Asante Kamau
09/22/2008	Daniel P. Bulmer
09/22/2008	Daniel Hamel
09/22/2008	Gregory A Sanette
09/22/2008	Marcus D. Kane
09/23/2008	Jon Avery
09/23/2008	Charles Payne Jr.
09/23/2008	Jason Garand
09/23/2008	Scot Gould
09/23/2008	Daniel Hitchcock
09/23/2008	Rick Dumaer
09/23/2008	Paul J. Bulmer
09/23/2008	Anthony J. Dube
09/23/2008	Steven Carrington
09/23/2008	John Lyons
09/23/2008	Eric Headly
09/23/3008	Edward Nelson
09/23/2008	Robert Driscoll
09/23/2008	Wayne Payen
09/23/2008	Dennis W. Bisson
09/23/2008	Raymond J. Grassetti
09/23/2008	Daniel Thoui
09/23/2008	Glenn J. Ewing
09/23/2008	unsigned letter
09/23/2008	2 illegible signatures
09/24/2008	Jean Carpenter
09/24/2008	Pamela Keene-Perrault

09/26/2008	Robert F. Kelley
09/26/2008	Linda and David Check
09/26/2008	Emory and Carol Merritt
09/26/2008	William Ptonozik
09/26/2008	Mary Ann and Marc Holmes
09/26/2008	Wayne and Nancy Holmes
09/26/2008	Kendrick and Doris Bishop
09/26/2008	Eileen R. Simonson
09/26/2008	Division of Fisheries and Wildlife – Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program
09/26/2008	Water Resources Commission
09/26/2008	Connecticut River Watershed Council
09/26/2008	Water Supply Citizens' Advisory Committee
09/29/2008	Barbara Rokosz
09/29/2008	City Westfield, Office of the Mayor
09/29/2008	Barbara M. Clement
09/29/2008	Richard Riley
09/29/2008	Igor and Raisa Gelmudinor
09/29/2008	Sally Oleksak
09/29/2008	Kristine Allen
09/29/2008	Brian and Nancy Connors
09/29/2008	Mark and Stephanie French
09/29/2008	Stephen and Jo-Ann Arluk
09/29/2008	Kurt and Jennifer Taylor
09/29/2008	Melissa and Sergio Alvarado
09/29/2008	Andrew Demers
09/29/2008	Robert and Lisa Murray
09/29/2008	Bharat Triredi
10/01/2008	Diana C. Barr
10/06/2008	Paul C. Lauenstein
10/09/2008	Joan H. Corell
10/09/2008	State Representative Donald F. Humanson, Jr.
10/10/2008	Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection – WERO
10/14/2008	Holyoke Water Works
10/14/2008	Petition signed by 88 people

IAB/HSJ/hsj