



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>

November 1, 2007

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

PROJECT NAME : Brockton Power
PROJECT MUNICIPALITY : Brockton
PROJECT WATERSHED : Taunton River
EOEA NUMBER : 14017
PROJECT PROPONENT : **Brockton Power** Company LLC (an affiliate of Advanced Power Services (NA) LLC)
DATE NOTICED IN MONITOR : September 25, 2007

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 (M.G.L. c. 30, ss. 61-62H) and with its implementing regulations (301 CMR 11.00). The DEIR is generally responsive to the requirements of 301 CMR 11.07 and the Scope, and in accordance with 301 CMR 11.08(8)(b), I have determined that the DEIR is adequate even though certain aspects of the project or issues require additional description or analysis in a Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR). The proponent should prepare a FEIR as further detailed in the scope below.

I acknowledge the many comment letters requesting that I deny the project based on air quality and human health impacts and general principles of environmental justice. Commenters have also expressed concern about the number of similar projects that have been proposed in Massachusetts, and have questioned the need for so many power plants of this type. A number of projects such as this have been submitted for my review and have or are in the process of receiving necessary state permits. It is important to note that only a small percentage of these plants will actually get built, based on the economics and management of the New England energy market. Moreover, it is the policy of this office to favor energy conservation and alternative and renewable energy sources over fossil fuel energy sources.

However, it is my obligation under the MEPA statute to entertain all projects submitted for MEPA review. MEPA is not a permitting process, and does not allow me to approve or deny a project. Rather, it is a process designed to ensure that state permitting agencies have adequate information on which to base their permit decisions and their Section 61 findings, and to ensure

that potential environmental impacts are fully described and avoided, minimized and mitigated to the maximum extent feasible. I have also received several comment letters requesting that I require a supplemental DEIR to provide additional information and analysis of impacts and alternatives. I am satisfied that the DEIR has adequately responded to the Scope and I am confident that the level of description and analysis required by the scope for the draft and final EIR will ensure that the potential impacts of the project are thoroughly evaluated.

Project Description

The proposed project consists of construction and operation of a state of the art 300-Megawatt (MW) gas turbine combined cycle (GTCC) power plant which will be equipped with duct firing and evaporative cooling of air intake to the turbine to increase capacity to 350 MW. The gas turbine is classified as "Quick Start", capable of achieving 100% load within 30 minutes of start-up. The proposed power plant will use natural gas as the primary fuel and will also be capable of burning Ultra-Low Sulfur Distillate (ULSD) during periods when natural gas is not available (ULSD use will be limited to the equivalent of 60 days per year).

The project will be located on a 13.2-acre parcel in the Oak Hill Industrial Park (located off Route 28 in southern Brockton). The project includes three 2,000-kilowatt (kW) emergency generators, a gas compressor, auxiliary boiler, fire pump, transformers, water and wastewater treatment equipment, fully-dike ULSD and ammonia storage tanks, and a ULSD unloading station. ULSD will be stored on-site in a 750,000 gallon above ground tank, providing supply for two days of full-load operation. The proposed plant includes a wet mechanical cooling tower, which will use treated wastewater from the adjacent Brockton Advanced Water Reclamation Facility (AWRF). Approximately 1.9 million gallons per day (MGD) of wastewater will be purified and filtered prior to use as cooling tower makeup water. Approximately 0.3 mgd will be returned to the AWRP. The remainder of the wastewater will evaporate for a net use of 1.6 mgd on average. Most of the recycled water used will be evaporated from the cooling towers and approximately 0.3-0.5 MGD of wastewater will be discharged from the plant to the AWRP. The balance of process and potable water required (0.1-0.25 mgd, depending on which fuel is fired) will be obtained from the City of Brockton system.

The project includes construction of approximately 0.1 miles of new water mains for connection with the City of Brockton water supply, a 0.2-mile recycled-water supply line and a 0.2-mile wastewater line with a connection to the AWRP. Natural gas will be supplied to the site via a new pipeline that will extend approximately 1,500-foot northeast of the project site to an interconnection with an existing Spectra Energy (formerly Algonquin Gas Transmission Company) pipeline within Sargents Way. Electricity from the proposed plant will be fed to the transmission network via a new connection with two existing National Grid 115 kilovolt (kv) transmission lines located approximately 3,000 feet southeast of the site. A new two-acre interconnection substation will be constructed at the interconnection site, and a 3,000-foot 115-kv overhead circuit will connect the power plant with the interconnection site.

The project will result in 1.4 acres of land alteration associated with the transmission line Right-of-Way (ROW). According to the DEIR, selective trimming along the ROW will result in 29,000 square feet (sf) of temporary alteration of Bordering Vegetated Wetlands (BVW).

Approximately 60 sf of floodplain associated with Edson Brook will be impacted by placement of transmission poles. The project will create approximately 3 acres of new impervious area. Total building square footage proposed is 101,200 sf, with proposed heights of 130 feet for the building and 250 feet for the stack. Twenty-four parking spaces are proposed. The project is expected to generate approximately 50 new vehicle trips per day during the operational phase.

Air quality impacts have been revised in the DEIR. The projected emissions from the proposed project are: 85 tons per year (tpy) of particulate matter (PM); 109 tpy of Carbon Monoxide (CO); 7 tpy of Sulfur dioxide (SO₂); 31 tpy Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC); 107 tpy of Oxides of Nitrogen (NO_x); 1,134,000 tpy of Carbon dioxide (CO₂); and 7.247 tpy of Hazardous Air Pollutants (HAPs). According to the DEIR, the use of cleaner fuels (natural gas and ULSD) and highly efficient combustion and state of the art control systems will limit emissions to the Lowest Achievable Emission Rate (LAER) or Best Available Control Technology (BACT) levels.

The project is undergoing review and requires the preparation of a mandatory EIR pursuant to Section 11.03(7)(a)(1) of the MEPA regulations because it involves construction of a new electric generating facility with a capacity greater than 100 megawatts. The project is also under review pursuant to Section 11.03(8)(b) of the MEPA regulations because it involves construction of a new stationary source with potential emissions of more than 50 tons per year of NO_x, Section 11.03 (3)(b)(1)(d) because it will result in alteration of more than 5,000 sf of BVW, Section 11.03(5)(b)(4)(a) because it will result in new discharge of more than 100,000 gallons per day (gpd) of industrial waste water, and Section 11.03(7)(b)(4) because it involves construction of an electric transmission line with a capacity greater than 69 kilovolts (kv).

The project requires a Major Comprehensive Air Plan Approval and Title V Operating Permit from the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP) and an Approval to Construct a Bulk Electric Generating Facility from the Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities (DPU), Energy Facility Siting Board (EFSB). The project requires a DPU Section 72 Approval to Construct a Transmission line and the proponent intends to file a Petition for Exemption from Zoning Bylaws with the DPU. The project requires a MassDEP Sewer Connection Permit and Treatment Work Plan Approval, and a Massachusetts Department of Public Safety Storage Tank Permit. The project may require a 401 Water Quality Certificate from MassDEP and requires an Order of Conditions from the Brockton Conservation Commission (and, on appeal only, a Superseding Order from MassDEP). The project requires a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Construction General Permit from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and a New Source Review (NSR)/Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) Approval from EPA. The project also requires other federal and local permits and approvals.

The project exceeds an ENF threshold for air and is located within five miles of an Environmental Justice (EJ) population. Therefore, it is subject to the EEA Environmental Justice Policy requirements for enhanced public participation under MEPA. The project does not exceed a mandatory EIR threshold for air. Therefore, it is not subject to the requirement for enhanced analysis of impacts and mitigation pursuant to the EJ policy. As a natural gas plant with a

capacity greater than 25 MW, the project will be subject to the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (RGGI) carbon dioxide implementation mechanisms.

The project is not seeking financial assistance from the Commonwealth. Therefore, MEPA jurisdiction is limited to the subject matter of state agency Permits required. 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 that have the potential to cause damage to the environment as defined in the MEPA regulations.

DEIR REVIEW

General

The DEIR is well organized and generally thorough in its response to the Scope. It includes a project summary, an analysis of impacts and alternatives, mitigation commitments, and detailed technical information and data to support the discussions and conclusions presented in the main text. Additional information and analysis should be provided in the FEIR as further detailed in the Scope below. The DEIR also includes a separate chapter covering the regulatory and policy framework for the project, and responses to comments on the ENF. The DEIR describes how the proposed project will meet applicable state regulatory requirements and performance standards, and federal requirements relating to EPA's New Source Review for Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD). The DEIR provided good quality maps, site plans, and other graphics, including aerial photographs with overlays of project elements and wetland resource areas. The proponent should provide more detailed plans with floodplain and other resource area delineations to the Brockton Conservation Commission and MADEP during the Notice of Intent (NOI) and permitting process as further detailed in the MADEP comment letter.

The DEIR discusses the proposed project in the context of the ISO-NE goals (with reference to ISO-NE's June 23, 2006 New England Regional Power Systems Update) and forecasted need for additional capacity in 2008 and each subsequent year until 2015. As further detailed in the DEIR, the project will help meet needs identified by ISO-NE, including the need to develop more dual-fueled capacity and quick start resources. I note, as did several commenters, that the DEIR makes several references to the mitigating effect of the proposed project on the basis that it will displace older, more polluting power plants. However, the DEIR also indicates that the proposed project will be needed, in addition to existing sources, to meet future energy demands in the region. Construction of the proposed power plant is not a guarantee that older facilities will be shut down. The proponent will be required to provide adequate mitigation for air quality impacts associated with the project independent of speculations regarding potential displacement of older, less fuel-efficient facilities.

Changes since the filing of the Environmental Notification Form (ENF)

There have been no major changes to the project design since the filing of the ENF. However, as described in the DEIR, emission calculations have been revised resulting in higher emission levels as further detailed in the air quality section below. According to the DEIR, the

change in air emissions is due to a revised analysis based on more conservative estimates of the number of starts and stops, and the incorporation of emissions from the auxiliary boiler and black start generators. Based on the revised emissions estimates, the project now exceeds Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) Thresholds for NO_x and CO and will require a PSD permit from EPA as well as the purchase of additional NO_x offsets. Project design changes include improved drift eliminators, which will reduce particulate matter emissions from the cooling tower. Wetlands impacts have been re-evaluated and the amount of alteration has increased from 22,000 sf (as proposed in the ENF) to 29,000 sf. In addition, the project's color scheme has been modified to reduce visual impacts, the alignment of the water/wastewater line to the AWRF has been modified to avoid the landfill, and building is proposed to enclose the ammonia storage tank as an added safety precaution.

Environmental Justice (EJ)

According to the DEIR, the project will not adversely impact EJ populations because the emission levels are below Significant Impact Levels (SILs). The DEIR indicates that the proponent has provided enhanced outreach to EJ communities, including provision of interpreters at the MEPA consultation and EFSB hearing. The proponent provided additional information during DEIR review indicating that notices regarding the availability of the DEIR and comment period were distributed to local churches and schools, and posted on the City of Brockton website and a Cape Verdian community website.

Existing Conditions

The DEIR includes a description of existing conditions at the project site and surrounding area including topography, soils, hydrology, and the location of public water supplies. The DEIR includes an analysis of stream flow in the Salisbury Plain River and combined flow based on AWRF discharges. The DEIR provides background pollutant levels for the project area and includes an air quality modeling protocol. Background sound levels are provided in the DEIR along with a Sound Level Measurement Report. The site description section of the DEIR also includes information on land uses and zoning in the project area, and existing energy and utility infrastructure. The DEIR includes an analysis of existing traffic volumes and turning movements for the Main Street/Sargents Way intersection.

Alternatives

The DEIR includes a separate chapter on alternatives, which includes an evaluation of the no-build alternative and alternative site layouts (including building layouts and orientation, transmission line, natural gas pipeline and water pipeline routes, and alternative interconnection substation locations). The DEIR also evaluates alternative building and stack heights and alternative process and cooling water supplies. The alternatives analysis includes an evaluation of alternative sites as well as alternative technologies for ammonia emission control and cooling.

The DEIR considers alternatives to avoid and minimize wetlands alteration. Three alternative transmission line routes were evaluated. The preferred route will involve placement of two poles in the 100 year floodplain of Edson Brook, resulting in 60 sf of impact to Bordering

Land Subject to Flooding (BLSF), and 29,000 sf of BVW impact associated with tree trimming. According to the DEIR, one of the alternatives would result in tree clearing and BVW impact along MBTA Right-of-Way (ROW). The second would cross South Brockton LLC land, which contains large wetlands area and would require pole placement in BVW and substantially more tree trimming than the preferred alternative. The DEIR considers two alternatives for the interconnection substation, an on-site location and South Brockton LLC land to the south of project site. According to the DEIR, the preferred location is closer to transmission lines and would result in less wetlands impacts than the alternatives.

The DEIR considered alternative natural gas pipeline routes. The preferred route along Oak Hill Way is selected rather than Industrial Boulevard because the latter has been recently paved. The proposed pipeline will run along the west side of Oak Hill Way to avoid wetlands impacts on the east side of the road. A possible connection to the Bay State Company is considered but this route would be longer and the preferred connection is to Spectra Energy (formerly Algonquin). Alternative water and wastewater lines were considered and the most direct route with no wetlands impacts was selected.

The DEIR discusses alternative stack and building heights and includes a comparison of air quality, cost and visual impacts associate with the alternatives. According to the DEIR, a shorter stack would create more low level pollution. The modeling analysis for a 225-ft stack indicates that impacts would exceeded significant Impact Levels (SILs) for 24-hr for PM₁₀. The proponent's preferred alternative, a 250-ft stack, would not exceed SILs. The DEIR proposes a 130ft height for the main building and indicates that the proponent is requesting a DPU exemption from City of Brockton height limit, which is 5 floors or 60 feet. According to the DEIR, compliance with the 60-foot building height limit would require a deeper excavation to lower the building, resulting in a lower stack height (150-ft at grade) and exceedance of SILs for PM₁₀.

According to the DEIR, the City of Brockton can serve as an alternate source of process and cooling water if the Aquaria desalinization plant is not operational by mid-2008 as expected. The DEIR indicates that Brockton has sufficient additional capacity to supply the project needs based on 2005 water use data and efficiencies anticipated from the City's leak detection and water conservation program. The DEIR also identifies the Hubbard Well, which would need to be reactivated, as a possible alternate source for cooling water. This would require construction of a new water supply line from the west side of Route 28 across the Salisbury Plain River. The DEIR includes a comparative analysis of dry cooling and wet cooling. The dry cooling option, which would eliminate the need for wastewater reuse, is rejected in the DEIR on the basis of reduced fuel efficiencies and higher costs.

As further detailed in the DEIR, the proponent considered four alternative sites, the proposed Brockton site, IDC Bellingham, Nickel Hill in Dracut and Cabot Power in Everett. The DEIR includes a discussion of the site selection process, a comparison of the advantages and limitations of the four sites. According to the DEIR, the Everett and Bellingham sites were unavailable to the proponent. Nickel was considered as a finalist in the selection process and the DEIR includes a summary comparison of the site development and interconnection factors for

Brockton and Nickel Hill. The Brockton site was rated higher based on land and cooling water availability criteria and was selected as the preferred alternative.

The proposed Selective Catalytic Reduction (SCR) system to control NO_x emissions uses ammonia. The DEIR identifies two alternative ammonia-free emission controls technologies and notes that neither have been used for a combined cycle combustion turbine of the size proposed (i.e. 350 MW). The DEIR proposes that ULSD be permitted for use as an alternate fuel for the equivalent of 60 days of full load operation to provide a back-up fuel in the event that the natural gas supply is disrupted. The DEIR includes a comparison of emissions based on use of ULSD, natural gas, and transportation grade distillate (formerly used in power plants prior to the advent of ULSD). According to the DEIR, the project's modeled emissions are below SILs for all pollutants and all averaging periods. Modeled rates presented in the DEIR assume 60 days per year use of ULSD.

Air Quality and Climate

The DEIR quantifies air emissions and describes proposed controls to meet Best Available Control Technology (BACT) and Lowest Achievable Emission Rate (LAER) requirements. The DEIR presents potential emissions calculated on the basis of 8,760 hours per year of full load operation, although, according to the DEIR, the facility is expected to operate approximately 5,000 hours per year. A comparison of emissions from natural gas versus ULSD at varying loads is provided. Maximum potential emissions for the project are 107 tons per year (tpy) of NO_x, 7 tpy of SO₂, 85 tpy of PM, 115 tpy of CO and 31 tpy of VOC. The DEIR includes data on background air quality and a comparison with National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) set by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Comparisons with NAAQS indicate that, with the exception of ozone, none of the criteria pollutant concentrations exceed ambient air quality standards. The DEIR includes an analysis of the cumulative impacts of project emissions and background levels, which indicates that the incremental increase in project emissions would not cause an exceedance of NAAQS for NO_x, SO₂, PM and CO in the project area.

Massachusetts is designated as a moderate non-attainment area for ozone. New major sources in non-attainment areas are subject to specific requirements for control of VOC and NO_x, two of the ozone precursors regulated by the Clean Air Act. The project is subject to the non-attainment new source review (NSR) requirements for NO_x, because emissions will exceed the threshold of 50 tons per year. Proposed emissions of VOC are less than 50 tpy. Therefore the facility is not subject to non-attainment NSR for VOC. The project is required to meet LAER for NO_x and purchase emission offsets. Proposed LAER for NO_x as described in the DEIR consists of Selective Catalytic Reduction (SCR) combined with water injection during ULSD firing. The proponent will purchase 135 tpy of NO_x offsets as required to provide mitigation for NO_x emissions. Offsets are available for purchase from facilities that have demonstrated real and quantifiable reductions in emissions by either shutting down or over-controlling beyond regulatory requirements.

As further detailed in the DEIR, the project is subject to Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) requirements for NO_x and CO because its emissions will exceed the PSD

threshold of 100 tpy. The project will be required to meet BACT for both pollutants. As further detailed in the DEIR, the BACT for NO_x is the same as the LAER technology, which is proposed as SCR combined with water injection during ULSD firing. Proposed BACT for CO is the use of an oxidation catalyst and combustion controls. The project will require a Major Source Air Plan Approval from MADEP and will be required to incorporate BACT for all pollutants regulated as part of the air plan review. The DEIR proposes MA BACT limits that are the same as proposed federal BACT and LAER requirements.

The DEIR includes the results of air quality modeling and describes the methodology and models used. According to the DEIR, modeled ground-level concentrations for all pollutants and averaging periods are below the Significant Impact Levels (SILs), and therefore a PSD increment analysis is not required. SILs are expressed as fractions of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). Projects that exceed SILs are considered to have the potential to significantly alter ambient air quality and are required to perform interactive source modeling for further evaluation of cumulative impacts. According to the DEIR, the project emissions will be well below SILs for all pollutants and interactive modeling is not required. The DEIR also indicates that, based on the initial screening model, the 24-hour PM₁₀ emissions are 5.75 micrograms per cubic meter (ug/m³), which is above the SIL of 5 ug/m³. Therefore, refined modeling is required to demonstrate compliance with the NAAQS and Massachusetts Ambient Air Quality Standards (MAAQS). The results of refined modeling are included in the DEIR.

According to the DEIR, projected PM emissions from the proposed facility are within NAAQS and less than SILs. The DEIR presents background regional levels of PM₁₀ as 28% (24-hour) and 40% (annual) of the NAAQS. Cumulative impacts (project emissions and background) are projected to be 29.1% and 41% of NAAQS (for 24-hour and annual average respectively). The DEIR includes results of refined modeling for PM₁₀, which predicts 24-hour and annual concentrations that are 68.6% and 25% of the SILs respectively (table 5.1-5 of the DEIR). As further described in the DEIR, data from the Brockton monitoring station indicates background concentrations of PM_{2.5} that are 85% of the NAAQS (24-hour average) and 67% of NAAQS (annual average). According to the DEIR, the EPA has not yet established SILs for PM_{2.5}. However, MADEP requires that the proponent conduct air dispersion modeling to compare PM_{2.5} emissions to the annual standard of 15ug/m³ and the 24-hour standard of 35 ug/m³. The DEIR compares cumulative impacts (based on combined project emission concentrations and background levels) with the NAAQS. The results of modeling predicts cumulative PM_{2.5} concentrations of 30.75 ug/m³ for the 24-hour average (87.9% of NAAQS) and 10.4 ug/m³ for the annual average (69.3% of the NAAQS).

The DEIR includes the results of modeling for non-criteria emissions from the stack and cooling towers, which indicates that emissions will be below threshold levels and MADEP Allowable Ambient Limits (AALs) and Threshold Effect Exposure Levels (TELs). The DEIR discusses New Source Performance Standards (NSPS) for gas turbines, steam generating units, and Title IV SO₂ allowances and monitoring. According to the DEIR, the project will meet all applicable NSPS for emission rates, sulfur content of fuel, and NO_x and PM emission limits. The proposed project will be designated as a Phase II Acid Rain "new affected unit" and will be required to purchase offsets for SO₂ emissions. The project will also have a Designated

Representative (DR) and implement a Continuous Emission Monitoring System (CEMS) as required.

The DEIR has adequately responded to the Scope with regard to air quality information and analysis. Based on the information provided in the DEIR, the proposed project will meet all applicable air quality standards and will not contribute to a significant deterioration in air quality. As noted in the MADEP comment letter, the MADEP Southeast Regional Office (SERO) Division of Air Quality/Permitting has reviewed the DEIR and has no issues, questions or comments on the information for the project as presented at this time.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

As a natural gas plant with a capacity greater than 25 MW, the project will be subject to the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (RGGI). RGGI is a cap-and-trade program aimed at stabilizing and then reducing carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions from large fossil-fuel-fired electric generating facilities. Any power plants above nameplate capacity of 25 megawatts will be subject to RGGI carbon dioxide implementation mechanisms.

In addition, to address growing concern about the impacts of climate change and development of solutions, EEA recently issued the final MEPA Greenhouse Gas Policy and Protocol. Prior to issuance of the final policy, MEPA has been requiring a qualitative analysis of greenhouse gas emissions and mitigation measures from a specific class of projects including those that are required to develop an EIR and require an air permit.

The DEIR discusses compliance with RGGI and the EEA/MEPA Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions Policy. The DEIR includes a GHG emissions analysis and proposes measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate damage to the environment. CO₂ emissions for the project are projected in the DEIR at 1,134,427 tons per year. Methane emissions are estimated at 15 tpy and nitrous oxide (NO) at 5 tpy. Indirect emissions associated with transportation are estimated at 338 tpy of CO₂. Mitigation proposed in the DEIR includes obtaining emission allowances as required under RGGI and use of the most efficient fossil fuel combustion technology.

Noise Impacts

The DEIR includes a Sound Level Measurement Report and discusses compliance with the MADEP policy which limits sources to a 10 decibels (dBA) increase in the ambient sound measured at the project site property line and at the nearest residences. The DEIR includes the results of short-term and continuous sound level monitoring, which indicates ambient levels that range from 36-42 dBA at residential receptor locations in the project area. Based on the analysis provided in the DEIR, project sound levels are expected to range from 33-43 dBA at the nearest residences and 51-66 dBA at the property line. The proposed project is expected to increase sound levels by 1-5 dBA over night-time background at the nearest residence. Sound levels at the property line are expected to increase by 15-30 dBA.

The DEIR describes measures used to minimize noise impacts, including alignment of cooling towers, enclosures for generating equipment, and a stack silencer for the turbine exhaust.

The noise analysis in the DEIR indicates that the project will meet MADEP noise policy standards for impacts to the nearest residences. However, noise levels at the property line will exceed the 10 dBA increase limit. The DEIR proposes that MADEP apply a waiver provision for the project because there are no noise sensitive land uses at the property line. The DEIR indicates that the City of Brockton noise regulations do not apply to the project because it is not located in a C-7 zone or used for entertainment purposes.

Fogging and Icing

The DEIR includes an analysis of potential fogging and icing and concluded that impacts will generally be limited to the nearby vicinity of the tower. The DEIR analyzed and quantified potential off-site fogging and icing episodes. Modeling results are presented in the DEIR and predict impacts for different sensitive receptor locations ranging from 0.02 hours per year at Sargents Way (540 meters to the northwest) to 8.5 hours per year of fogging episodes at Route 28 (500 meters to the west of the cooling tower). The analysis indicates that rime icing may occur for less than one hour per year at the above receptor locations.

Accidental Release of Aqueous Ammonia

As required by the Scope, the DEIR includes an analysis of potential impacts associated with accidental release of ammonia, which indicates that maximum hourly ground level ammonia concentrations at the property boundary, under a worst-case spill of the entire tank, would be 0.8 parts per million (ppm). According to the DEIR, this concentration is below the ammonia Emergency Response Planning Guideline ERPG-2 level of 150 ppm and the odor threshold of approximately 5-50 ppm. The DEIR proposes a diked ammonia tank which will be enclosed within a building to provide additional containment.

Electric and Magnetic Fields (EMF)

According to the DEIR, the proponent has presented an ENF analysis in its petition to the Energy Facilities Siting Board (EFSB). Based on information provided in the DEIR, the projected impacts from the new transmission line are electric field levels of 32 mG and magnetic field levels of 0.061 kV/m at 100 feet from the right-of-way (ROW). The DEIR indicates that no maximum levels have been established for Massachusetts. The DEIR includes EMF limits for seven other states that limit field strengths on transmission line ROWs. The levels predicted for the proposed project are less than other state limits for EMF within or at the edge of ROWs. The DEIR notes that the proposed transmission interconnection and lines are sited further away from residences than potential alternatives in order to reduce impacts. I expect that the EMF issues will be further evaluated and mitigation developed as appropriate during the EFSB process.

Wetlands and Stormwater Management

The DEIR includes a description of existing site conditions, including wetlands resources identified on and adjacent to the project site and proposed restoration plantings. According to the DEIR, the proposed project will permanently impact 29,000 sf of BVW, which will be converted

from forested wetland to scrub-shrub wetland. The project will also impact 1.13 acres of wetland buffer zone, 712 sf of riverfront area, 60 sf of BLSF, and 4,835 of isolated vegetated wetlands.

The DEIR includes a draft Spill Prevention, Control and Countermeasures (SPCC) Plan and draft Emergency Action Plan. The DEIR includes a comparative analysis of pre- and post-development drainage calculations and stormwater management calculations. The proposed stormwater management system has been depicted conceptually in the DEIR, which identifies approximate locations of wetland resource areas. The proponent should provide detailed stormwater management plans with actual wetland resource area delineations in any filings to the Brockton Conservation Commission and MADEP.

Water Reuse and Waste Treatment

MADEP in its comment letter indicates that the water re-use proposal is acceptable. The proponent should continue to work with MADEP on issues related to nitrogen, required wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) modifications and all permitting issues.

The DEIR includes a discussion on local and regional health concerns, including potential health risks associated with cooling towers and use of reclaimed water. According to the DEIR, the use of appropriate water treatment methods, system maintenance, and high-efficiency drift eliminators will minimize the potential for adverse health impacts. According to the DEIR, the AWRF effluent will be purified using filtration, clarification and disinfection, and the project will be consistent with MADEP's proposed draft standards for aerosol water reuse and project design.

As further detailed in the DEIR, treated wastewater from the Brockton AWRF represents virtually the entire stream flow during periods of natural extreme low flow. The proposed project will withdraw approximately 1.9 mgd, which would reduce the minimum monthly discharge from the AWRF to the Salisbury Plain River by 15.3 percent. Based on the DEIR analysis, this would result in a base flow of 16.8 cubic feet per second (cfs) during the most extreme low flow 7Q10 conditions. The DEIR concludes that the proposed withdrawal will not significantly impact the river since discharge from the AWRF will continue to maintain flow in the range of naturally occurring mean flows. The DEIR indicates that river flows will be above the 2.5cfs minimum stream flow threshold identified in the 1991 Draft Taunton River Basin Plan and the more generalized New England Base Flow (ABF) minimum stream flow threshold of 8.3 cfs. I note the comments from Mass Audubon, the Taunton River Watershed Association and others that express concerns regarding low-flow conditions and water quality. I am satisfied that the DEIR has adequately responded to the Scope as it relates to wastewater reuse and I expect that stream flow and water quality issues will be considered further by MADEP during the permit review process.

Mitigation

The proponent has committed in the DEIR to a range of measures to avoid, minimize and mitigate impacts including:

Air Quality: Project emissions will be controlled to BACT and LAER levels using selective catalytic reduction (SCR), water injection, combustion controls, and an oxidation catalyst. Natural gas and ultra-low sulfur diesel (ULSD) are proposed as the cleanest fossil fuels available. Offsets will be obtained for NO_x, CO₂, and SO₂. The DEIR estimates that air quality mitigation will cost \$3.5 million. The cost of emission offsets is estimated in the DEIR at \$350,000 to \$540,000.

Noise: Equipment, including generators, pumps and compressors, will be housed within weatherproof, acoustical enclosures. The ventilation system will include intake and exhaust silencing. The gas turbine will be equipped with an exhaust silencer. Site layout is oriented to direct primary noise sources away from the nearest residential receptors. The cost of acoustical treatments, including enclosures, is estimated in the DEIR at \$8 million.

Wetlands: The proposed project will comply with the performance standards of the Wetland Protection Act. A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and Erosion Control and Sedimentation Plan will be implemented. The cost of the proposed stormwater management system is estimated in the DEIR at \$250,000.

Water Supply: The project will include an on-site cooling water storage tank (1 million gallon capacity) in case of a problem with the AWRP supply, and a demineralized water tank (275,000-gallon) so that water withdrawal from the City system can be limited during high demand periods. The cost of these tanks is estimated in the DEIR at \$875,000.

Wastewater: The project will include an on-site wastewater holding tank that will discharge to the AWRP during low flow conditions. The cost of the tank is estimated at \$100,000. Portable demineralizers will be sent off-site for regeneration and reuse of resins at a cost of approximately \$300,000.

Stormwater: The stormwater management system, which will be in place during construction and operation, will be designed to meet MADEP Stormwater Management Policy standards and maximize on-site recharge to groundwater to the extent practical.

Construction and Traffic: the project will include mitigation measures for traffic management, dust and noise control, and erosion and sedimentation control, and will comply with the MADEP Clean Air Construction Initiative. Erosion control and dust management during construction is estimated at \$50,000.

Visual: Tree plantings will be used to create a visual buffer. Buildings colors and materials will be selected to minimize visual impact. High efficiency drift eliminators will be used on cooling towers to minimize visual plume impacts.

Hazardous Materials and Waste Management: Containment will be provided for ULSD and ammonia storage tanks. A spill Prevention control and Countermeasure Plan (SPCCC) and an Emergency Response Plan will be in place. The cost of secondary containment and spill controls is estimated in the DEIR at \$200,000

SCOPE

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. The FEIR project summary, and table summarizing impacts and mitigation, should describe and quantify all project impacts, including temporary and permanent wetlands impacts.

Environmental Justice - Enhanced Public Participation

In accordance with the EEA Environmental Justice Policy, the proponent should provide enhanced public outreach to environmental justice populations in Brockton. 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. As there is a significant non-English speaking population in the City of Brockton, project summary documents should be made available in Portuguese, Spanish, Vietnamese, Haitian Creole, and Cape Verdean Creole upon request. I expect that the FEIR will provide a detailed update describing the proponent's enhanced public outreach efforts.

Alternatives

The FEIR should expand upon the analysis of alternatives to avoid and minimize wetlands impacts associated with project and respond to the comments and recommendations of the Brockton Conservation Commission and others. The Commission, in its comment letter, suggests that a transmission line route through Lots 13 and 14 (east of the project site) is a realistic alternative that would avoid wetlands impacts and that should be pursued further by the proponent. The FEIR should compare wetlands impacts associated with the DEIR-preferred alternative and the alternatives suggested by the Commission. The FEIR should discuss the feasibility of an alternate transmission line route, moving the right-of-way (ROW) closer to the UPS facility to avoid 13,000 sf of wetlands alteration, and relocating the transmission line and ROW to avoid wetlands impacts at the South Brockton LLC land as suggested by the Commission. The FEIR should explain how the preferred alternative will avoid and minimize impacts to the maximum extent feasible. The FEIR should describe and quantify unavoidable impacts and describe how such impacts will be mitigated. The FEIR should include a rationale for rejection of any alternatives that would have less wetland impacts than the preferred alternative.

The DEIR indicates that, as an alternative to the Aquaria source proposed, the city of Brockton has sufficient additional capacity to supply the project needs based on 2005 water use data and efficiencies anticipated from the City's leak detection and water conservation program. The FEIR should provide additional analysis in the FEIR taking into account the City's future needs as requested in the comment letter from the Mayor of Brockton.

Air Quality and Climate

As noted in its comment letter, the MADEP Southeast Regional Office (SERO) Division of Air Quality/Permitting has reviewed the DEIR and has no issues, questions or comments on the information for the project as presented at this time. The FEIR should present additional narrative or quantitative analysis as necessary to respond to the Scope and comments received from others on air quality issues.

Based on consultations with MADEP, additional information relating to the BACT analysis for the proposed cooling towers will be required during permitting. The DEIR states that the 0.0005% drift eliminator efficiency is BACT for the cooling towers. The FEIR should provide additional information to justify this statement. The FEIR should explain why the lower efficiency rate of 0.0001% for Cecil Power in Louisiana is not BACT, as concluded in the DEIR. The FEIR should provide additional information on the selection of drift eliminators to support the conclusion that the proponent has selected the most efficient drift eliminator possible in order to minimize potential cooling tower impacts.

Several commenters have expressed concerns about particulate matter (PM) emissions from the proposed project. The FEIR should clarify incremental increases in particulate emissions that would result from the proposed project, and describe measures that will be implemented to avoid, minimize and mitigate particulate matter emissions.

The DEIR includes a Good Engineering Practice (GEP) analysis for stack height, which indicates that the GEP formula stack height for the proposed project is 325 feet (ft). The DEIR indicates that downwash effects were considered in modeling for the proposed 250-foot stack as required for a stack height lower than GEP. The FEIR indicates that a stack height lower than the proposed 250-foot would result in emissions that exceed SILs. The FEIR should compare the emission and visual impacts of the GEP 325-ft and the proposed 250-ft stack. The FEIR should discuss air quality impacts associated with a higher stack height also and provide a rationale as to why the 250-ft stack is proposed instead of the alternative 325-foot GEP formula height.

The DEIR notes that MADEP guidance specifies use of the last three years of available monitoring data from within 10km of the project site to estimate background pollutant levels representative of the area. The monitoring sites indicated in the DEIR (table 5.1-4), with the exception of the PM_{2.5} site, appear to be located further than 10km from the project site. The FEIR should explain the rationale for selection of monitoring locations and how they are representative of conditions at the project site and consistent with MADEP guidance.

The DEIR indicates that treatment of water prior to use in cooling towers, along with the highly aerobic conditions in the cooling towers, will minimize any potential odor problems. The DEIR states that no odors are expected from the project and that all air emissions will be emitted at concentrations below their respective odor thresholds. The FEIR should include additional information to support the conclusions on odor impacts as requested in several comment letters received. Based on consultations with MADEP, it appears unlikely that odor issues will be a problem for the proposed facility providing appropriate controls are in place to manage water quality and maintain aerobic conditions in the cooling towers. The FEIR should discuss the

history of other facilities using wastewater for cooling with respect to odor issues, and if odor problems have occurred for these facilities, the FEIR should include a modeling analysis to describe potential odor impacts from the proposed project.

A number of commenters have questioned whether some of the monitoring locations selected for noise are representative of baseline conditions in residential areas, and requested additional noise impact analysis for nearby residential areas with an EJ population. I note that the proposed project is not subject to enhanced review requirements of the EEA Environmental Justice Policy. However, I believe it is appropriate that the FEIR include additional information on potential noise impacts. The DEIR indicates that monitoring locations were chosen to represent the quietest night-time noise levels as a baseline from which to project potential impacts. Based on the DEIR, and consultations with MADEP, it appears that appropriate locations were selected to represent the nearest residential receptors likely to be adversely impacted. However, the FEIR should explain the rationale for selection of monitoring locations and include an analysis of sound impacts for the closest residential area north of the project site in the Millet Street/Meadow Lane area, to support the conclusion in the DEIR that residential areas will not be significantly impacted. The FEIR should also describe how the project will comply with BACT requirements for noise.

Wetlands and Stormwater Management

The FEIR should describe compensatory storage that will be provided as mitigation for impacts in Bordering Land Subject to Flooding (BLSF). The 100-year floodplain should be shown on project plans. The FEIR should describe proposed grading and any fill to be placed in floodplain areas. The FEIR should discuss the discrepancy between 1998 and 2007 existing conditions plans with regard to floodplain and any recent filling that may have occurred.

According to the DEIR, the project will result in 29,000 sf of BVW alteration associated with tree cutting and trimming in the transmission line right-of-way. This will result in permanent conversion of forested wetlands to scrub-shrub wetland. The FEIR should provide a more detailed description of the proposed conversion and mitigation as requested by the Brockton Conservation Commission. The FEIR should describe post-construction conditions of the 100-foot transmission line ROW. As noted by MADEP in its comment letter, the Limited Project provisions at 310 CMR 10.53(3)(d) provide a mechanism for allowing more than 5,000 sf of BVW alteration. However, the FEIR should provide additional information and analysis to demonstrate that adequate attempts have been made to avoid, minimize and mitigate wetlands impacts.

The Brockton Conservation Commission notes in its comment letter that wetland resource impacts may be underestimated in the DEIR. The FEIR should address the Commission's comments, and describe and quantify all permanent and temporary wetlands impacts (including impacts to the buffer zone) associated with the project. The FEIR should clarify whether the 1.13 acres of buffer zone impacts identified in the DEIR represents the total amount of buffer zone impacts associated with entire project, including all transmission lines and the proposed sub-station. The FEIR should clarify and quantify impacts from the proposed tree canopy clearing beyond the ROW in the Riverfront Area of Edson Brook and discuss potential

vernal pool impacts and mitigation. I encourage the proponent to consult with the Brockton Conservation Commission during preparation of the FEIR regarding wetlands delineations, alternatives to minimize wetland impacts, and potential mitigation of past wetland resource area alterations on the project site. MADEP, in its comment letter, recommends that the proponent file a jurisdictional request with the United States Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE). The FEIR should provide an update on consultations with ACOE, including whether or not a Section 404 permit is required, and consultations with the Brockton Conservation Commission.

The FEIR should provide additional information on the proposed treatment of roof run-off, design of stormwater basins, and the project's consistency with Standard 5 of the MADEP Stormwater Management Policy. The FEIR should also discuss any proposed revisions to the Stormwater Management Policy that may be relevant to the project.

Visual Impacts

The FEIR should expand the visual impact assessment to consider stack lighting as well as visual impacts during times when there is little or no leaf cover, as requested by several commenters.

Water Reuse

I acknowledge the comment letters received that express concern regarding the proposed use of wastewater for cooling towers and potential impacts on water resources in the project area. The DEIR has responded adequately to the Scope and MADEP has indicated that the water reuse proposal is acceptable. I expect that the FEIR will respond to the comments received and that stream flow and other water resource issues will be further evaluated during the MADEP permit process.

Response to Comments

The FEIR should include a copy of this Certificate and a copy of each comment letter received. The FEIR should respond to the comments received on the DEIR to the extent that they are within MEPA jurisdiction. The proponent should use either an indexed response to comment format, or direct narrative response. The FEIR should present any additional narrative or quantitative analysis necessary to respond to the comments received.

Mitigation and Section 61 Findings

The FEIR should include a summary of proposed mitigation measures and revised Section 61 Findings with updates as necessary to reflect any changes since the filing of the DEIR.

Circulation

The DEIR should be circulated in compliance with Section 11.16 of the MEPA regulations and copies should be sent to all state agencies from which a permit or approval is

required, and to those who submitted comment letters as listed below. To conserve 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 on a first-come, first-served basis, to accommodate those without convenient access to a computer. A Notice of Availability of the FEIR should be sent to those who submitted form letters (the notice should include relevant comment deadlines, locations where hard copies may be reviewed). A copy of the FEIR should be made available for public review at the Brockton Public Library and at other locations to enhance public participation among the environmental justice (EJ) population in the project area. The proponent should consult with the EEA Environmental Justice Coordinator during FEIR preparation to develop an appropriate EJ circulation and participation plan for FEIR review.

November 1, 2007



Ian A. Bowles, Secretary

IAB/AE/ae

Comments received:

08/27/2007 Ray Gouthro
08/27/2007 Brian J. Callahan
08/27/2007 Andrew M.G.
08/27/2007 Peter Burns
08/27/2007 Lawrence Muhammad
08/27/2007 Peter Drovatzicos
08/27/2007 James Brogg
08/27/2007 Stephen Wyman
08/27/2007 Peter Monsi
08/27/2007 William Ameer
08/27/2007 Paul Hrenko
08/27/2007 Michael Morton
08/27/2007 Ken Kneeland
08/27/2007 Daniel Hern
08/27/2007 Ben Regan
08/27/2007 Christina Martinez
08/27/2007 Joseph Slieivs
08/27/2007 Michael FitzSimmons
08/27/2007 Steven Lawson
08/27/2007 William Conlon
08/27/2007 Jason Truehart
08/27/2007 Jared Anderson
08/27/2007 Tim Cayton
08/27/2007 Kathleen Morison
08/27/2007 Hilston Ireland
08/27/2007 Cato Adams
08/27/2007 William Jenkin
08/27/2007 Mark Speize
08/27/2007 Ben Callahan
08/27/2007 Chris Mellman
08/27/2007 Daneil Hear
09/28/2007 Michelle Ballinger
09/28/2007 Scott Protentis
09/29/2007 John R. Jr.
10/01/2007 John Kennedy
10/01/2007 Paul McDonald
10/01/2007 Ray Henningson
10/01/2007 Sean Morlock
10/01/2007 Wolfgang Falcone
10/01/2007 Jane & Paul Sousa
10/01/2007 Theresa Caldwell
10/01/2007 Bernadette Werra
10/01/2007 Bruce Caldwell
10/01/2007 Ryan Dragonetti

Comments Received

10/01/2007 Paul Donohue
10/01/2007 M. Sergio
10/01/2007 Mel Goldman
10/02/2007 Frank Gurley
10/02/2007 Eric Hafner
10/02/2007 Paul C.
10/02/2007 David Heidke
10/02/2007 Krista Burns
10/02/2007 Patricia Burns
10/02/2007 Alexander Gareld
10/02/2007 Lauren Martin
10/02/2007 Stephen Burns
10/02/2007 Ryan Gordan
10/02/2007 Brenda Rodriques
10/02/2007 John Farrell
10/02/2007 Mary Joyce Comeau
10/02/2007 Danielle P.
10/03/2007 Catherine Smith
10/03/2007 Tina Jones
10/03/2007 Angela Aude
10/03/2007 Jay Deebling
10/03/2007 Charles Morgan
10/03/2007 Virginia Jeppson
10/03/2007 Daniel Miles
10/03/2007 Carol LaCersse
10/03/2007 Carol Sickoll
10/03/2007 Catherine Sickoll
10/03/2007 Krtisten Burns
10/03/2007 Ronald Sickoll
10/03/2007 William Hoag
10/03/2007 Christine Hoag
10/03/2007 Cheryl Mahoney
10/03/2007 Paul Sickoll
10/03/2007 Gorden Sickoll
10/03/2007 Loretta Sickoll
10/04/2007 Marilyn Raymond
10/04/2007 Cheryl Kennedy and James McLoughlin
10/04/2007 Paula Saba Kaboul
10/04/2007 Patrick Murray
10/04/2007 Kenneth Schmich
10/04/2007 Phillip Mussain
10/04/2007 Noven Mussain
10/04/2007 Nicholas Coreo
10/04/2007 Adam St.Peter

Comments Received

10/04/2007 Philip F. Mussein
10/04/2007 Christine Mussain
10/04/2007 Laura Mussain Russell
10/04/2007 Joanne Cocco
10/04/2007 Danielle Kicenski
10/04/2007 Monique Tully
10/04/2007 Michelle Libby
10/04/2007 Alberto Ahen
10/04/2007 Jessie Granthary
10/04/2007 Cheryl Downing
10/04/2007 Mary Ansell
10/04/2007 Ruth Gaja
10/04/2007 Marc Raithell
10/04/2007 Maryellen Johnson
10/04/2007 Denise Bishys
10/04/2007 Jass Stewart / Candidate for Mayor of Brockton
10/04/2007 Michelle DuBois / Brockton City Councilor
10/04/2007 B. Green
10/05/2007 Janice Fernandes
10/05/2007 Michael Beady
10/05/2007 Kim Beady
10/05/2007 Thomas McGrath
10/05/2007 Peggy McGrath
10/05/2007 Edward McGrath
10/05/2007 Timothy McGrath
10/05/2007 Patrick Quinn
10/08/2007 Hange Antunes Alves
10/09/2007 Elaine Frances
10/09/2007 Judith Rosen
10/09/2007 Danina Rodrigues
10/09/2007 Pauline Perkins
10/09/2007 Roger & Adele Doucette
10/09/2007 Virginia Jeppson
10/09/2007 Mark D'Agustino
10/11/2007 Linda Milton
10/11/2007 Peter Gibbons / Bldg. And Construction Trades Council
10/12/2007 Roy & Michelle Walker
10/15/2007 James Long / Petition W/1,181 Signatures
10/15/2007 Mark Swinimer
10/15/2007 Jean-Marie Lantimo
10/15/2007 Willie Dykes
10/15/2007 Bill Healey
10/15/2007 Virginia Goodmer
10/15/2007 Dick Cook

Comments Received

10/15/2007 Kenneth Campbell
10/15/2007 Candida Robinson
10/15/2007 R.Scopa
10/16/2007 Shirley Elepon
10/16/2007 Daniel Miles
10/16/2007 Cheryl Miles
10/15/2007 Hargrove
10/17/2007 Louis Martino-Lemieux
10/18/2007 Jim Pearsons / bka
10/18/2007 Christina McMahon / bka
10/18/2007 Andrew Bedar / bka
10/18/2007 Barry Koretz / bka
10/18/2007 Christine Guillemette / bka
10/18/2007 Susan Powers / bka
10/18/2007 Alan Kearney / bka
10/18/2007 David Seibert / bka
10/18/2007 Virginia Jeppson
10/22/2007 David Pimentel
10/22/2007 Reg Strong
10/22/2007 Peter & Marie MacDonald
10/22/2007 James Jamoulis
10/22/2007 Linda Balzotti / Brockton City Council
10/23/2007 Ruth Gokool
10/23/2007 Darlene Albanys
10/23/2007 Larry Curtis
10/23/2007 Charles Hajjar
10/23/2007 John Yunits
10/24/2007 Petition W/ 39 Signatures
10/24/2007 Joseph Giovanello
10/24/2007 Peter Landerholm
10/24/2007 Carl Landerholm
10/24/2007 Richard O'Connell
10/24/2007 Robert Kostech
10/24/2007 Senator Robert Creedon & Representative Geraldine Creedon
10/25/2007 John Buckley
10/25/2007 Stephanie Danielson, Brockton Conservation Commission
10/25/2007 City of Brockton / Mayor James Harrington
10/25/2007 Department of Environmental Protection / SERO
10/25/2007 Jack Shields / Shields Health Care Group
10/25/2007 John Vlaco / Brophy & Phillips
10/25/2007 Senator Brian Joyce
10/25/2007 Brockton and West Bridgewater Residents
10/25/2007 Peter Guldberg / Tech Environmental

Comments Received

10/25/2007 Bruce Jacobs / Hydro Analysis
10/25/2007 Barbara K. Landau and Jeffrey M. Bernstein/ BCK LAW on behalf of the
Alliance Against Power Plant Location (AAPPL).
10/25/2007 Taunton River Watershed Alliance, Inc.
10/25/2007 Dara Flynn
10/25/2007 Kyla Bennett / PEER
10/25/2007 Thomas Brophy / Brockton City Councilor
10/26/2007 Mass Audubon
10/26/2007 Old Colony Planning Council
10/29/2007 John McClusky, Esq.
10/31/2007 Chris W. Mellman

Several additional comment letters on file - signatures unclear