



Burrillville Conservation Commission

105 Harrisville Main Street
Harrisville, Rhode Island 02830

March 31, 2016

State of Rhode Island
Public Utilities Commission
Energy Facilities Siting Board
89 Jefferson Boulevard
Warwick, RI 02888



**RE: RI SB 2015-06
Invenergy Thermal Development, LLC.
Clear River Energy Center
Town of Burrillville, RI**

Honorable Siting Board,

The Burrillville Conservation Commission sent the Siting Board copy of a correspondence as public information on or around January 29, 2016 in regards to the subject proposal.

This correspondence is not a reiteration of the previous correspondence, but rather a short list of relevant issues the Burrillville Conservation Commission has identified during our review of the siting proposal and subsequent exhibits that have been submitted to the Board since the initial filing.

The list of issues below is not an all-inclusive list of items surrounding the proposal, but an indication of short comings that otherwise merit the denial of the application as submitted:

Prefix: The project lacks sufficient information for the impacts of the entire site disturbance proposed. All elements of the project and the impacts of all the improvements scheduled including: land, power corridor expansion, wetlands, water quality, air pollution, noise pollution, waste-water, traffic, construction and post construction are not adequately detailed for the rendering of a competent determination by the Siting Board.

1. Air pollution is not adequately addressed on a local order of magnitude. Using regional approaches to satisfy the issue of air pollution is not appropriate for ascertaining the local impacts to air quality immediate to Burrillville, North Smithfield, Smithfield, Glocester (Rhode Island), Thompson, Danielson (Connecticut), Uxbridge, Webster, Douglas (Massachusetts). Measurable expectations of local air pollution and the immediate dispersion of harmful pollutants to the local surrounding of inhabitants should be quantified and presented to the Board. Compliance with the Clean Air Act has not been sufficiently demonstrated and the application should not be approved by the Board at this time.
2. Water pollution is not adequately addressed in sufficient detail for Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management to provide the Board with a sufficient advisory to warrant the

3A well site would be detrimental to this project. The intended means of acquiring an alternate water source along with the impacts around an alternate water source location should be required by the Board for consideration. Industrial impacts to the local publicly owned treatment facility should be better detailed for the Board's consideration. For the reasons stated above the application should not be approved by the Board at this time.

6. Fuel sources to be used in the project are Natural Gas and #2 Diesel Fuel as a co-generation facility. Sufficient detail is not provided in siting proposal to adequately address storage containment, conveyance, transport, emergency conditions and suppression needs to satisfy an approval of the Siting Board. Use of #2 Diesel Fuel in the project needs clarification as to the output levels of air pollution, periods of use, transport of these volumes of hazardous materials to the site, as identified in bullet 3 above and services satisfactory to provide emergency response. An advisory opinion from the State Fire Marshall's Office should be provided to the Board for consideration of use of the fuel sources cited for use, the applicability in this project and safety concerns for the surrounding inhabitants. For these reasons the Board should not approve the application at this time.
7. Other hazardous chemicals used on site are not detailed sufficiently for the Board to make an appropriate determination at this time, additionally. Other chemicals are proposed for use at the project site, but the siting proposal lacks sufficient detail as to the storage, use, destination, output, treatment, transport and ultimate disposal of these constituents as related to this proposal. Until more detail is provided for the other hazardous chemicals being employed at the site, the Board should not approve the application at this time.
8. Noise impacts associated with the project are not fully addressed. In tandem with the AIM project sponsored by Spectra Energy, which is adjacent to this project, noise impacts are not sufficiently detailed in the siting proposal satisfactory for the Board to make an informed decision. Noise from this facility will not comply with the local Zoning Ordinance regarding Noise Limits and exemptions, as cited by the applicant as applicable should not be authorized. For that the Board should not approve this application at this time.
9. Critical Wildlife Habitats and biodiversity impacts associated with the project are not sufficiently detailed to satisfy a siting approval of the project. The wildlife inventory presented in the environmental assessment is not an all-inclusive list of the biodiversity at the site, along the power grid expansion limits or within the limits of the proposed utility extensions from Pascoag. All the fragments of this project are not clearly interlaced within the specific siting of the facility proposed. All aspects of the project should be presented in a complete format, along with a biodiversity inventory inclusive to the entire project limit. This information is grossly lacking in the siting proposal for the Board to make an informed decision over the appropriateness of this application. An advisory opinion from the US Environmental Protection Agency and the requirement to complete an Environmental Impact Statement should be remanded for the project. For these reasons the Board should not approve this application at this time.
10. Impacts to local property are not addressed sufficiently in the siting proposal. Very little detail

is provided to make a clear determination on what the impacts to local properties, abutting properties and the community will be. A realization of the impacts to the local community should be wholly quantified for the Board to make an informed decision on the merits of siting this facility. Financial impacts to the local real estate, entire community and more importantly the abutting Conservation Areas (Pulaski Park, George Washington Management and Buck Hill Management) are not addressed. For these reasons the Board should not approve the application at this time.

Considering the items listed above the Burrillville Conservation Commission does not support the project at this time. Supplemental information from the applicant should be required by the Board before a decision is rendered. The Commission does not support the application additionally, because it does not represent conservation of resources, both natural and man-made. The Commission respectfully requests the submission of an Environmental Impact Statement to fully quantify all aspects of the proposal, including use of alternate sites for this installation and alternate energy production types. A Finding of No Significant Impact is invalid for this application and compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act should be enforced by the Board. The warrants to support the inclusion of an EIS are present in this application as the Environmental Assessment does not adequately address all the issues surrounding the project's scale and magnitude.

The existing site is part of a larger un-fragmented corridor of preserved, unimproved forest lands. The Commission would suggest there are more appropriate sites available for the installation of such a facility that would have lesser impacts on the regional and local environment, economy, property and be appropriately sited for more conservative use of available resources. Until the information cited above is requested, the Board should not consider authorization of the siting proposal at this time.

Please accept this information from the Burrillville Conservation Commission as part of the public hearing on the matter and s you need additional information, please contact me at your convenience.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of the
Burrillville Conservation Commission



Kevin Cleary, PE, Chairman

Cc: Burrillville Town Council
U.S. Sen. Sheldon Whitehouse
Invenergy-Clear River Energy Center

issuance of any approvals by the Board. Storm water impacts to the two local contributing brooks to the Clear River are not satisfactory. Nutrient loadings, sediment retention, peak runoff flow, volume and water quality figures are not satisfactory within the intent of the rules and regulations under the Clean Water Act. Due to insufficient water pollution evidence the merits of the project should not be approved by the Board at this time.

3. Traffic impacts to local and State roads are not adequately addressed. Long term impacts are not identified in the proposal sufficient for Rhode Island Department of Transportation to fully quantify impacts to State highways in the region. Impacts to Greenville (Smithfield), Chepachet (Glocester) and Pascoag (Burrillville) are not clearly identified sufficient to fully understand the local shipping routes associated with the transport of the hazardous materials transported to the proposed facility. US Department of Transportation should have cursory review of this application as the transport of hazardous materials over US Federal and State highways may warrant review. The application lacks information pertaining to anticipated traffic impacts, trip generations and details relative to the transport of hazardous materials to the site, therefore the application should not be approved by the Board at this time.
4. Expansion of the existing electricity grid corridor is not adequately addressed as a component of the project. The existing National Grid corridor will see a 3rd set of new high tension overhead 345kV power lines added between Wallum Lake Road and Sherman Farm Road, a length of over 6 miles. No detail is provided in the siting proposal to ascertain the impacts to woodlands, wetlands, roads, private properties or public lands over the course of the intended route. An advisory opinion from National Grid over the expanded use of the existing corridor should be provided to the Board for consideration prior to execution of a decision. The impacts associated with this part of the project should also be included in the review of the RIDEM, USACOE and RIDOT. Impacts to private lands, both environmental and economical, over the course of the intended route should be included under the purview of the Board to consider in this application. No discussion is provided in the siting proposal to address the impacts of the additional electric corridor expansion and for those reasons the application should not be approved by the Board at this time.
5. Process water related impacts to the local groundwater aquifer are not quantified in sufficient detail. Impacts to the local groundwater aquifer are not addressed in the siting report sufficient for the Board to make a determination regarding the groundwater impacts of the proposal. The application indicates use of a contaminated groundwater resources. The application lacks sufficient detail about the withdrawal, treatment, use, conveyance and disposal of the groundwater proposed for process use in this project. Service process water volumes are indicated in the report, but the disposal of spent treatment byproduct is not addressed. Treatment of waste-water with expected byproduct characterization for industrial pre-treatment compliance is not provided and impacts to local groundwater is not detailed to a level where reasonable expectation the existing pollution will be treated and disposed of properly. The siting proposal does not indicate how the treatment byproduct within the contaminated groundwater will be disposed of. The application does not have any alternate source of process water identified for backup use in this project. A failure of the groundwater well at the Pascoag