



*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>

January 23, 2008

CERTIFICATE OF THE SECRETARY OF ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS  
ON THE  
ENVIRONMENTAL NOTIFICATION FORM

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 : December 10, 2007

Pursuant to the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (G. L. c. 30, ss. 61-62H) and Section 11.03 of the MEPA regulations (301 CMR 11.00), I hereby determine that this project **requires** the preparation of a mandatory Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

According to the Environmental Notification Form (ENF), the project is designed to provide economical energy for Westfield and the surrounding communities. The ENF notes that the project proponent proposes to develop a 400 megawatt (MW) combined-cycle, primarily natural gas-fired, power generating facility. The facility is comprised of a combustion turbine that incorporates state-of-the-art energy generating technology. The proponent asserts that the project will directly benefit the region and surrounding community by working with Westfield Gas & Electric Company (WG&E) and other municipal light companies to provide energy cost savings and capacity price stability to local energy customers.

The ENF provides a project description, estimated impacts, a listing of anticipated permits, and conceptual site plans. The ENF has identified several areas of potential environmental impact, including but not limited to, air quality, rare species, wastewater, and

wetlands. I anticipate that the DEIR will be a substantive document that will provide greater detail regarding potential project impacts, include supporting data, and demonstrate that measures will be taken to avoid, minimize or mitigate damage to the environment.

### Project Description

The project involves the construction of a 400-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 36-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 (NO<sub>x</sub>) and an oxidation catalyst to minimize emissions of carbon monoxide (CO) and organic compounds. The facility will include: storage tanks for storage of ULSD fuel, water, and ammonia, a switching yard, various pumps and ancillary structures, and one emissions stack (likely not to exceed 181 feet in height). The electricity generated by the facility will be distributed to the commercial electricity distribution grid through existing transmission lines that bisect the project site. The ENF has indicated that the project will utilize dry cooled technology (air cooled condenser system) to minimize water consumption, wastewater discharge, and visual plume impacts.

The project is undergoing review and requires the preparation of an EIR pursuant to Section 11.03 (7)(a)(I) of the MEPA regulations, because the project involves the development of a new electric generating facility with a capacity greater than 100-megawatts. The project also exceeds 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 NO<sub>x</sub> (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: approval of a Bulk Electric Generating Facility from the Energy Facilities Siting Board (EFSB); a Major Comprehensive Plan Air Approval from the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP); a Storage Tank Permit from the Massachusetts Department of Public Safety; a Sewer Connection Permit from MassDEP; 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 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 Wastewater Discharge 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 and that are within the subject matter of required

or potentially required state permits or agency actions. 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.

## **SCOPE**

### General

The DEIR should follow the general guidelines for outline and content found in Section 11.07 of the MEPA regulations as modified by this scope. The DEIR should provide maps, site plans and other graphics at an appropriate scale and of sufficient detail to facilitate review and comment. The DEIR should include plans for the entire project site, including the proposed power plant, transmission line connections, and gas pipeline routes.

The ENF states that the Independent System Operator for the New England electric grid (ISO-NE) has identified the greater Springfield Area as an “area of concern”. The ENF also states that the project will directly benefit the region and surrounding community by providing energy cost saving and capacity price stability for local energy customers. The DEIR should provide a discussion of the objectives and anticipated benefits of the project.

### Environmental Justice - Enhanced Public Participation

In accordance with the EOEEA Environmental Justice Policy, the proponent should provide enhanced public outreach to environmental justice populations in Westfield. During the EIR 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 DEIR should provide an update on the proponent’s enhanced public outreach efforts.

### Existing Environment

The DEIR should present a description of the existing environment that includes an evaluation of air quality in the City of Westfield and its immediate surroundings. The analysis should be of sufficient detail, in accordance with 301 CMR 11.07(g) of the MEPA regulations, to provide a baseline in relation to which the project and its alternatives can be analyzed and its potential impacts and mitigation measures assessed.

## Alternatives

A critical purpose of the DEIR is to provide the necessary context for evaluating the proposed project. The DEIR should clearly describe the environmental impacts of each alternative and its ability to meet the objectives of the project. The DEIR should provide a comparative analysis that clearly shows the differences between the environmental impacts associated with each of the alternatives. For context, the proponent should include a discussion of ISO New England's most recent Regional System Plan and other relevant studies of the region's projected future electrical energy demands. This section of the DEIR should discuss the proposed project's contribution to the region's projected future electrical energy demands in light of other power generating facilities and the projected regional demand for more peaking power resources for Massachusetts. The DEIR should evaluate the following alternatives:

### *Preferred Alternative*

The DEIR should include an analysis of project design, layout, and site conditions. It should contain a site plan that includes information on proposed lighting, vegetative plantings or buffers, materials containment/storage areas, and the proposed stormwater drainage system. The DEIR should also include schematics and diagrams to describe the proposed facility in terms of structural design, project height, the power generation process and its parameters, equipment efficiencies, and the proposed pollution control systems. The proponent should provide estimates of anticipated actual operating hours based upon a worst-case run scenario in compliance with anticipated permit limits. The DEIR should discuss when and if the project would run on extended periods of ULSD in lieu of natural gas. The DEIR should evaluate site-design alternatives that can further avoid, minimize and mitigate impacts, particularly in response to comments received from the NHESP.

The ENF has presented a preferred alternative that utilizes natural gas for the majority of the fueling purposes at the facility. ULSD fuel will be used as a back-up fuel during periods when natural gas markets shift demand to residential uses. The DEIR should include detailed information on the assumptions behind fuel usage and duration of use and outline a worst-case scenario (i.e. when ULSD is used the most in accordance with anticipated permit limits) to allow for assessment of the highest levels of potential environmental impact. The proponent indicated a willingness to look at the use of biofuels on site. As a sub-alternative and based on analysis of specified inputs, the DEIR should discuss the feasibility of utilizing this or a similar type of alternative fuel and any associated environmental benefits and impacts. I expect that this will also be addressed in the greenhouse gas emissions analysis discussed below.

The DEIR should clarify the proposed project (operating hours, power generation capabilities, stack height, etc.), as well as any changes to the project since the filing of the EENF. The DEIR should briefly describe each State permit or agency action required for the project, and should discuss how the project meets the performance standards associated with each permit. The DEIR should also discuss applicable environmental regulatory requirements, and demonstrate that the proposed project is consistent with applicable regulations. The DEIR should provide information regarding the consistency of the project with any applicable local or

state open space plans, and should include an update on the status of the local review and approval process (see Section 11.01(3) of the MEPA regulations). The DEIR should provide sufficient detail for the state permitting agencies to make informed permitting decisions, and otherwise meet their Section 61 obligations. I also encourage the proponent to include similar information for federal permits and regulations as well.

#### *No-Build Alternative*

The DEIR should present and assess the environmental impacts associated with a no-build scenario for the project site based on the baseline conditions established by analysis of the existing environment.

#### *Alternative Natural Gas Pipeline Supply Routes*

The DEIR should evaluate the potential environmental impacts (temporary and permanent) associated with the two potential natural gas fuel supply routes discussed briefly in the ENF. The DEIR should present site plans depicting each route, discuss the benefits or drawbacks of each alternative with regard to construction, operation and maintenance of the supply lines, and discuss if any easements will be necessary to achieve the preferred route. The DEIR should tabulate quantified impacts to assist in comparison of the various potential routes. The DEIR should discuss maintenance and ownership of the supply line and whom will be responsible for its construction and upkeep.

#### *Air Cooled v. Water cooled*

The proponent has proposed the use of dry cooled technology (air cooled), which minimizes water consumption and wastewater discharge. The project will require the use of water cooled technologies during periods of firing of ULSD fuel, which the proponent has indicated will be limited to two months per year.

The DEIR should compare the potential environmental impacts associated with preferred cooling system (i.e. primarily an air cooled system) versus an entirely water cooled system, assuming each utilizes Best Available Control Technologies (BACT). The DEIR should summarize and provide supporting data to assess the differences in air quality, water and wastewater impacts, and system efficiencies. The DEIR should provide a discussion of factors that may limit or enhance each technology's emission reduction capabilities, such as temperature, humidity, etc., or other potential environmental impacts.

#### *Cumulative Impact*

The DEIR should assess (in quantitative terms, to the maximum extent practicable) the direct and indirect potential environmental impacts from all aspects of the project that are within MEPA jurisdiction. This assessment should include both short-term and long-term impacts for all phases of the project and cumulative impacts of the project, any other projects, and other work or activity in the immediate surroundings and region. The cumulative impact assessment should discuss ambient air quality and evaluate the potential cumulative effect of the project and

existing air quality stressors. The cumulative impact analysis should assess any trade offs among conflicting environmental impacts, particularly where mitigation for one type of impact has the effect of increasing another type of impact. The DEIR should discuss how an appropriate balance will be achieved among conflicting environmental concerns.

### Air Quality

The proponent will need to provide additional information in the DEIR submittal to satisfactorily demonstrate that the project will not have significant impacts on air quality. The proponent should work with MassDEP's Division of Air Quality to demonstrate that the project meets the requirements for MassDEP's Major Comprehensive Plan Approval pursuant to 310 CMR 7.02 prior to project construction.

The DEIR should describe the methodology and models used, and assumptions inherent in the air quality analysis. The DEIR should identify sources of data used in the analysis, including sources used to establish background concentrations for all pollutants. The DEIR should describe any data gaps or limitations of the models used. The DEIR should include the results of dispersion modeling to evaluate impacts associated with the project, and additional data and discussion as necessary to substantiate conclusions regarding air quality. Consideration in modeling techniques should be given to facilitate the evaluation of the project emissions on the nearby Westfield-Barnes Airport. The DEIR should also discuss the how the air quality model will evaluate potential project impacts based upon the geographic features of the project site and surrounding area. The DEIR should explain why the model used is the most appropriate in projecting impacts. The DEIR should describe proposed sampling and monitoring plans, and how the results of monitoring will be used to avoid and minimize or mitigate air quality and public health impacts.

The DEIR should quantify emissions from the proposed plant, including criteria and non-criteria pollutants, and clarify maximum potential emissions as well as emission levels expected after implementation of proposed controls. The DEIR should identify and quantify Hazardous Air Pollutant (HAP) emissions. The DEIR should describe proposed pollution controls and their effectiveness. The DEIR should include an air quality impact analysis that compares project impacts with National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), Significant Impact Levels (SILs), and MassDEP's Acceptable Ambient Levels (AALs) and Threshold Effects Exposure Limits (TELEs). The proponent should consult with MassDEP regarding the modeling protocol and methodology for impact analysis. MassDEP relies on the application of BACT to minimize emissions impacts from new facilities. The net emissions of a proposed facility are modeled to assess off-site air pollutant concentrations. These are compared to NAAQS, which are set to protect public health and public welfare.

The DEIR should include an air toxics analysis of the project's emissions, including USEPA-approved air quality computer dispersion modeling results for the applicable non-criteria air pollutants (i.e. metals, metal oxides, ammonia, phosphoric acid, sulfuric acid, and formaldehyde). The maximum ground level concentrations of the project's potential air toxics emissions should be compared to MassDEP's air toxics guideline levels.

To meet the requirements for BACT, the project is proposing to use a natural gas-fired combustion turbine, Selective Catalytic Reduction (SCR), and a variety of add-on emission controls. The DEIR should include information to satisfactorily demonstrate that the project meets the Best Available Control Technology (BACT) requirements for air pollutants including any/all proposed combustion and post-combustion controls to demonstrate that the project will meet these requirements.

The MassDEP comment letter indicates that because the Lowest Achievable Emission Rate of NOx is applicable to the project, the requirements of 310 CMR 7.00, Appendix A – Emission Offsets and Nonattainment Review would be applicable. As part of the comprehensive plan approval application, the proponent will need to demonstrate that the required emissions offsets have been guaranteed or secured. The DEIR should discuss how the project will comply with this review requirement.

The DEIR should include projections of annual carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) emissions. The Commonwealth recently joined the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (RGGI) and any power plants above nameplate capacity of 25 megawatts will be subject to RGGI carbon dioxide implementation mechanisms. This may include the implementation of a Cap and Trade system to control emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> from power plants in Massachusetts. The DEIR should discuss the proposed project in the context of RGGI and the Massachusetts emissions cap under RGGI.

#### Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG)

This project is subject to the EEA Greenhouse Gas Emissions Policy and Protocol, and the DEIR must demonstrate consistency with the analysis and mitigation provisions therein. The Policy is available on-line at <http://www.mass.gov/envir/mepa/pdffiles/misc/GHG%20Policy%20FINAL.pdf>. The proponent should coordinate a meeting with the MEPA office to discuss the GHG analysis prior to preparation of the DEIR.

The proponent should calculate and compare GHG emissions associated with: 1) a baseline derived from the proponent's Preferred Alternative (the sum of direct emissions from stationary sources and indirect emissions from energy consumption and transportation); 2) an alternative incorporating renewable fuels and/or technologies (the sum of direct emissions from stationary sources, indirect emissions from energy consumption, and transportation for the project as proposed); and 3) project alternatives with greater GHG emissions-related mitigation than the preferred alternative. Note that the proponent is required to quantify mitigation benefits. The Appendix to the Policy contains a partial, non-exhaustive list of measures to reduce GHG emissions.

When comparing the preferred alternative to other alternatives with greater GHG reduction, the proponent should explain which alternatives were rejected, and the reasons for rejecting them. The alternatives analysis should clearly demonstrate consistency with the objectives of MEPA review, one of which is to document the means by which the proponent

plans to avoid, minimize or mitigate damage to the environment to the maximum extent feasible. The proponent should fully explain any trade-offs inherent in the evaluation of GHG reduction measures, such as increased impacts on some resources to avoid impacts to other resources.

### Noise

The DEIR should include a noise impact analysis. The analysis should address all sources of sound associated with the proposed facility, including those associated with the anticipated types of technologies to be employed on-site. The DEIR should describe all proposed measures to avoid, minimize and mitigate noise impacts. The DEIR should describe how the proposed project will comply with the MassDEP noise policy.

### Stormwater

The DEIR should include existing and proposed conditions stormwater drainage calculations, including clear plans delineating drainage areas, stormwater flow patterns, best management practices (BMP) designs, and discharge points. The DEIR should provide details of the stormwater drainage system in the vicinity of the fuel and ammonia tanks. The drainage analysis should ensure that on- and off-site wetlands are not impacted by changes in stormwater runoff patterns. The DEIR should respond to comments related to the possibility of infiltration of stormwater runoff and potential impacts or benefits to groundwater. The DEIR should evaluate stormwater runoff impacts during construction and post-construction, and demonstrate that source controls, pollution prevention measures, erosion and sediment controls, and the post-development drainage system will be designed in compliance with the MassDEP Stormwater Management Policy (SMP). The DEIR should demonstrate that water quality and quantity impacts will be controlled in compliance with the SMP. The DEIR should demonstrate that the project will be constructed and operated in a manner consistent with the anticipated NPDES Construction General Permit. I encourage the proponent to consider use of low impact development (LID) measures as a part of their overall stormwater management plan.

### Wetlands

The project site contains areas of Bordering Vegetated Wetlands (BVWs) located in the central portion of the project site and along the property boundary adjacent to Ampad Road associated with a drainage swale. Wetland resource areas or 100-foot buffer zone to BVW may be altered to accommodate the access driveway or facility construction.

The DEIR should provide plans at an appropriate scale to accurately discern the location of each wetland area regulated under the Wetlands Protection Act (WPA) located on the project site. Each wetland resource area should be characterized according to 310 CMR 10.00. The DEIR should address the significance of the wetland resources on site, including public and private water supply; riverfront areas; flood control; storm damage prevention; fisheries; shellfish; and wildlife habitat. The DEIR should provide an accurate measurement of each wetland resource area that will be affected by the project and describe the amount of alteration



necessary to achieve the Preferred Alternative. The DEIR should specifically address potential wetland alteration, and wetland replication areas if necessary, associated with the gas supply line location alternatives for fuel delivery to the project site.

The DEIR should demonstrate that all wetland impacts have been avoided, and where unavoidable impacts occur, impacts are minimized and mitigated. The DEIR should demonstrate that the project will be accomplished in a manner that is consistent with the Performance Standards of the Wetlands Regulations (310 CMR 10.00). Proposed activities, including construction mitigation, erosion and sedimentation control, phased construction, and drainage discharges or overland flow into wetland areas, should be evaluated. The DEIR should specifically address the impact, if any, to the placement of stormwater outfalls within resource areas. The DEIR should clarify what portions of the project may result in the permanent alteration of wetland resource areas versus temporary impacts to facilitate construction.

### Rare Species

The project site has been determined by the Massachusetts Division of Fisheries and Wildlife Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program (NHESP) to be 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).

According to comments submitted by the NHESP, the proponent has engaged constructively with the NHESP to address state-listed species for the site. The DEIR should demonstrate that as part of the alternatives analysis the proponent has examined options that would condense the work area footprint, minimize or avoid impacts east of the existing utility right-of-way, and minimize or avoid impacts along the southern portion of the site.

The project will be required to obtain a Conservation and Management Permit (C&M Permit) from the NHESP prior to commencement of any work on-site. The NHESP has indicated that a C&M Permit must demonstrate that the project has avoided, minimized, and mitigated impacts to State-listed Species consistent with the performance standards outlined in the NHESP comment letter on the ENF. The DEIR should discuss in a general fashion how the proponent intends to meet these performance standards in accordance with the MESA Regulations.

### Water Supply

The ENF states that the project will utilize approximately 200,000 gallons per day (gpd) of water during periods of normal daily use. The ENF indicates that an additional 10,500 gallons per hour will be utilized during periods of oil firing. Based upon the anticipated permit limit requests for oil usage for the facility and market predictions for the year-round availability of natural gas, the DEIR should address potential worst-case scenario water withdrawals. The DEIR should demonstrate that adequate water capacity exists, both on an average basis and

during peak demand and withdrawal periods, to service the facility in a scenario requiring maximum water demand (i.e. extended periods of oil firing). The DEIR should verify the adequacy of water supply infrastructure to service the facility and outline water conservation measures that may be utilized during facilities operations.

As part of the alternatives analysis and the review of BACT associated with air quality, the DEIR should evaluate the impact of various cooling technologies and related evaporative loss rates on the potential typical water consumption rates associated with the project. While the proponent has focused on air-cooled technologies to reduce impact to the Barnes Aquifer, comparisons between various air-cooled and water-cooled technologies should be presented to allow for an evaluation of potential environmental impacts and tradeoffs. Additionally, the DEIR should respond to concerns outlined by the Connecticut River Watershed Council regarding opportunities to recharge a percentage of cooling water to the groundwater and alternative water supply sources.

### Wastewater

The ENF states that approximately 150,000 gpd of wastewater will be discharged for treatment at the Westfield wastewater treatment plant. The DEIR should clarify if wastewater numbers will increase during periods of increased water use when ULSD fuel is used. The DEIR should demonstrate that sufficient infrastructure and treatment capacity is available to effectively treat the wastewater flows in accordance with approved treatment permits at the Westfield treatment facility. The DEIR should address concerns about potential thermal impacts of wastewater discharges to receiving water bodies. The DEIR should explain the discrepancy between estimated water use and wastewater discharge; will 50,000gpd of water be lost per day via evaporation?

### Oil and Hazardous Materials Management

The DEIR should describe proposed plans and on-site locations for storage and containment of fuel oil, ammonia and other chemicals. The DEIR should document site design and safety measures to be incorporated into facility operations, storage and delivery in accordance with applicable local, state and federal regulations. The project site is located within the high yielding Barnes Aquifer. The DEIR should discuss how groundwater and wetland resources will be protected in the event of a spill, and how the stormwater management system would be designed to avoid or mitigate any potential impacts to the aquifer. The DEIR should include a draft pollution prevention and emergency response plan.

### Construction Management

The DEIR should include a construction management plan (CMP) describing project activities and their schedule and sequencing, site access and truck routing, and best management practices (BMPs) that will be used to avoid and minimize adverse environmental impacts. The

CMP should address potential impacts and mitigation relating to land disturbance, noise, dust, odor, nuisance, vehicle emissions, construction and demolition debris, and construction-related traffic. Such measures must comply with MassDEP's Bureau of Waste Prevention (BWP) Regulations (310 CMR 7.01, 7.09, and 7.10). The DEIR should discuss plans for reuse and recycling of construction materials.

I strongly encourage the proponent to outline a commitment within the DEIR to using lower emission equipment in addition to requiring its contractors to retrofit diesel-powered equipment with emissions controls, such as particulate filters or traps, and use low-sulfur diesel fuel. The proponent should require its contractors to use On-Road Low Sulfur Diesel (LSD) fuel in their off-road construction equipment which can increase the removal of particulate matter (PM) by approximately 25% beyond that which can be removed by retrofitting diesel-powered equipment. 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.

### Decommissioning

The DEIR should discuss the lifespan of the proposed project and plans for decommissioning. The DEIR should describe potential impacts and mitigation related to the decommissioning phase.

### Mitigation and Section 61 Findings

The DEIR should include a separate chapter on mitigation with a summary of mitigation measures to which the proponent is committed. The DEIR should describe and assess measures and management techniques designed to limit negative environmental impacts or cause positive environmental impacts during development and operation of the project. The DEIR should include proposed Section 61 findings for all state permits required. 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 DEIR should include a copy of each comment received. The DEIR need not reproduce every form letter, but should include one "template" from each form letter category. The DEIR should respond to the substantive comments received, including the substantive issues raised in the form letters, to the extent that it is within MEPA jurisdiction. The proponent should circulate a hard copy of the DEIR to each state agency from which the proponent will seek

permits or approvals. The proponent should also circulate a copy of the DEIR to those submitting individual written comments.

To save paper and other resources, I will allow the proponent to circulate the DEIR 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 DEIR (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 e-mail addresses are available in association with some many commenters. A hard copy of the DEIR should be made available for review at the Westfield Public Library.

January 23, 2008

Date



Ian A. Bowles

Comments received:

12/21/2007	Westfield – Barnes Airport
12/27/2007	Ruth Ohayon
1/03/2008	State Senator Michael R. Knapik – 2 <sup>nd</sup> Hampden and Hampshire District
1/04/2008	Greater Westfield Chamber of Commerce
1/04/2008	Westfield Gas & Electric Light Department
1/07/2008	Representative Donald F. Humason, Jr. - Westfield
1/08/2008	Chicopee Electric Light Department
1/08/2008	K. Dulude
1/09/2008	Glenn Avery
1/09/2008	Robert Bachmann
1/09/2008	Kathy Meyer
1/09/2008	Jason Garand – as a citizen
1/09/2008	Jason Garand – representing Carpenters Local 108 NERCC
1/10/2008	François Grondín
1/10/2008	Gerald Crochiere
1/10/2008	Noiel R. Brill, Jr.
1/11/2008	Camilio Bisson
1/11/2008	Mary Ann Babinski
1/11/2008	Jean Carpenter
1/11/2008	Barbara Rokosz
1/11/2008	Pamela Keene-Perreault
1/11/2008	Barnes Aquifer Protection Advisory Committee
1/11/2008	Westfield Water Resources Department
1/11/2008	David Borat
1/14/2008	Mr. and Mrs. Henry Cadorette

1/14/2008 Paul T. Gour  
1/14/2008 **Massachusetts** Department of Environmental Protection - WERO  
1/14/2008 Connecticut River Watershed Council  
1/14/2008 Division of Fisheries and Wildlife – Natural Heritage and Endangered Species  
Program  
1/15/2008 Christopher Keefe – Westfield City Council – Ward 1  
1/15/2008 Gary Watts  
1/15/2008 David W. Rice  
1/15/2008 Marcus DiKane  
1/15/2008 **Pioneer Valley** Planning Commission  
1/16/2008 unsigned comment letter  
1/18/2008 **Mayor Michael R. Boulanger**, City of Westfield  
1/18/2008 illegible signature  
62 form letters

IAB/HSJ/hsj