



52 Nichols Road
Kingston, RI 02881
Tel. 401.789.7649
Email: divest@fossilfreeri.org

March 21, 2016

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS ENERGY FACILITY SITING BOARD

IN RE: INVENERGY THERMAL DEVELOPMENT LLC'S APPLICATION TO CONSTRUCT THE CLEAR RIVER ENERGY CENTER IN BURRILLVILLE, RHODE ISLAND—DOCKET NO. SB-2015-06

I. MOTIONS TO LET THE RECORD SHOW & AMEND THE RECORD

While Fossil Free Rhode Island's motion for intervention was arbitrarily and capriciously denied by the EFSB at its open meeting on January 29 of this year, Fossil Free Rhode Island, pursuant respectively to EFSB Rules 1.17(a) and 1.23(d) respectfully requests that:

- The attached letter to Directors Coit of the Department of Environmental Management and Alexander-Scott of the Department of Health be made part into the current docket.
- The same be done with our motion dated February 22, 2016, received received by the EFSB on February 23, 2016— see attached.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "M. P. Nightingale".

Peter Nightingale,
Fossil Free Rhode Island



52 Nichols Road
Kingston, RI 02881
Tel. 401.789.7649
Email: divest@fossilfreeri.org

February 22, 2016

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS ENERGY FACILITY
SITING BOARD

IN RE: INVENERGY THERMAL DEVELOPMENT LLC'S APPLICATION TO CONSTRUCT
THE CLEAR RIVER ENERGY CENTER IN BURRILLVILLE, RHODE ISLAND—DOCKET
NO. SB-2015-06

MOTION TO AMEND MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING OF JANUARY 29, 2016

Because of cross-talk, the rendition of my comments in the minutes is incomplete. The following is what I said before I was escorted out of the meeting:

I am Peter Nightingale and I am with Fossil Free Rhode Island.

Rhode Island government may decide to sell Rhode Island down the "Clear River."

- If it does, it may have acted in accordance with twisted statutory law.
- But government, in that case, will have failed in its fiduciary duty to protect the natural resources—air, land and water—it holds in trust for the People.
- When the time comes, those responsible will be held accountable for their crimes against humanity and nature.

I hereby request that the minutes be corrected so as to accurately reflect what I said.¹

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "M. P. Nightingale".

Peter Nightingale,
Fossil Free Rhode Island

PROVIDENCE, R.I.
MOTOR CARRIERS
DIVISION OF P.U.C.

16 FEB 23 AM 11:52

RECEIVED

¹Also see this video <https://youtu.be/vOCbnIY4qlo> on Youtube.

THE
UNIVERSITY
OF RHODE ISLAND

COLLEGE OF
ARTS AND SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS

East Hall, 2 Lippitt Road, Kingston, RI 02881 USA p: 401.874.2633 f: 401.874.2380 phys.uri.edu

March 20, 2016

Janet Coit, Director Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management
235 Promenade Street
Providence, RI 02908
Nicole Alexander-Scott, Director Department of Health
3 Capitol Hill
Providence, RI 02908

Dear Directors Coit and Alexander-Scott:

I hereby request that you, pursuant to your obligations under Title 42, Chapter 42-17.1 Section 42-17.1 (14)(i)-(iii) and Title 23, Chapter 23-1, Section 23-1-1, provide answers to the following questions raised in this writing. Please let me know within the next couple of days whether you will honor this request and, if so, by when.

Introduction & background

This writing is in part a follow up of a meeting that Robert Malin and I, members of Fossil Free RI, had with Barbara Morin, Julia Gold, and Julian Drix had a couple of weeks ago at the Department of Health. We promised to follow up with more information; please find that attached.

Let me start with a short summary of some parts of that exchange.

First of all, there is a Compendium about the health effects of fracking, compressors stations etc. The compendium (<http://concernedhealthny.org/compendium>) was published by the Concerned Health Professionals of NY and was last updated in October of 2015. For your convenience, I bookmarked and highlighted several sections that are of particular interest for the various natural gas projects in Burrillville. With a little bit of luck, you should be able to find those sections, but not all PDF readers are compatible and this may not work as intended. Please let me know in that case. I'll be happy to provide a list of the pages I bookmarked.¹

Please find also attached a plot of a scenario that that satisfies the National Ambient Air Quality Standards; see <http://www.epa.gov/criteria-air-pollutants/naaqs-table>. In spite of the fact that

¹The compendium is not attached to this letter; please see my original email

the standards are met, the plot shows the presence of levels of NO₂ that episodically exceed those standards by two orders of magnitude. The plot is a theoretical possibility that illustrates what is described in more detail in the attached by paper by Brown et al.²

In the present study we consider estimates of emissions from well pads, compressor stations and processing plants to gauge individuals possible exposures and the health risks those exposures pose. This is necessary because much of the publicly accessible emissions data has been collected to provide average exposures over a lengthy period of time and because the data collection is intended to document compliance with regional air quality standards.

Most of the questions in this writing are about the Air Dispersion Modeling Report - Clear River Energy Center - Burrillville, October 30, 2015, by ESS group. This report is part of the docket of the Energy Facility Siting Board (http://www.ripuc.org/efsb/2015_SB.6.html) *Invenergy Response to CLF - First Set*: http://www.ripuc.org/efsb/efsb/SB2015_05_DR1_R.pdf A second data set submitted by Invenergy may raise further questions.

As you know, several segmented projects will be coming together in Burrillville:

1. Spectra Energy's Aim Project
2. Invenergy's Clear River Energy Center
3. Access Northeast, a project of Eversource Energy, National Grid and Spectra Energy: <http://accessnortheastenergy.com/News-and-Events/#events>
4. TransCanada's Ocean State Power Phase III, submitted to the Energy Facility Siting Board on December 1 of last year.

First of all, please note the date of the EES report: October 30, 2015. To the best of my knowledge, the expansion of the Algonquin compressor station had not yet been completed on that date. Obviously, no data are available yet to DEM about the environmental impact of the expanded compressor station. Nor will there be any such data for some time as the National Ambient Air Quality Standards requires three-year averages.

Consequently, the report cannot possibly provide the reliable multi-source modeling analysis requested, as the ESS report mentions, by RI DEM. Instead, the report stacks hypotheticals upon hypotheticals and the resulting lack of reliability puts public health at risk.

Indeed, as the time line makes painfully clear, Burrillville may be subjected to a sequence of projects that exemplify impermissible segmentation as defined in item 46 on page 18 of this Federal Energy Regulatory Commission document <http://www.ferc.gov/CalendarFiles/20160128180805-CP14-96-001.pdf> Also see Request for Rehearing of Coalition of AIM Intervenors under CP14-96, http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/file_list.asp?accession_num=20150402-5290

Some of the questions in the list below are related to the episodic nature of the emissions mentioned above in the work of Brown et. al.

Average Moisture Conditions

²Once again to save paper this paper is not attached but it can be found here <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10934529.2015.992663>

The second paragraph of Section 2.0 of the ESS report states that the simulations were conducted at two typical temperature, namely 10F and 59F. Section 5.1 mentions that the simulations were run assuming average moisture conditions.

According to this EPA web site

(<http://www3.epa.gov/airquality/airtrends/2007/report/groundlevelozone.pdf>), ground-level ozone forms when emissions of nitrogen oxides (NO_x) and volatile organic compounds (VOCs) react in the presence of sunlight. These ingredients come from motor vehicle exhaust, power plant and industrial emissions, gasoline vapors, chemical solvents, and some natural sources.

Question 1: How can a modeling done at average temperature and humidity conditions capture the true episodic impact of CERC and the other nearby pollution sources on public health? Temperature, humidity and sunlight fluctuate wildly in Rhode Island and, due to climate change, they are expected to vary even more fiercely during the lifetime of the proposed Clear River Energy Center.

Effect of the 2015 build-out of the Algonquin Compressor Station

Table 15, NAAQS Compliance Determination, of the ESS's Air Dispersion Report on PDF page 45 contains the results of the simulations including the effect of the "Algonquin" Compressor Station up to 2014.

Question 2: How does the ESS modeling account for the AIM Project build-out of the compressor station that took place in 2015?

Question 3: Did the ESS modeling simultaneously simulate the four Rhode Island sources of pollution: Algonquin Station, Ocean State Power, RISE and CERC? If so, was the Algonquin compressor station characterized by its state before or after the 2015 AIM build-out? Due to the paucity of detail provided about the modeling, I cannot tell if it only simulated CERC while adding the other sources merely into the average background. Either way it seems that the simulation can only have been based on obsolete information that predates the 2015 build-out and ignores the fact that there also out-of-state pollution sources.

Question 4: If the modeling did not simulate all four sources mentioned above simultaneously and in their post-AIM-build-out configuration, how did the modeling estimate the percentiles required to check that CERC will operate according to the National Ambient Air Quality Standards? (See *Reviewing National Ambient Air Quality Standards Scientific and Technical Information*, <http://www3.epa.gov/ttn/naaqs/criteria.html>)

How, in particular, did the simulations deal with the fact that it is mathematically impossible to obtain the required percentiles computed under those circumstances? For clarity let me add that this mathematical impossibility is the result of the fact that there are no addition laws that allow one to add averages to percentiles or percentiles to each other. Of course, some uncontrolled approximation might have been used to circumvent this problem. In that case, please supply the answer to question what approximation was used.

Question 5: If the modeling did simulate all four Rhode Island pollution sources simultaneously, please point us to the information that DEM supplied for the modeling, including start-up, shut-downs, scheduled and unscheduled maintenance. Without this information it is impossible to ascertain even the feasibility of the modeling that presumably leads to the conclusion that the

NAAQS standards are met upon construction of CERC.

Of particular concern in this context is the impact of coincidences such as a purge or blowdown of the Algonquin compressor station occurring during a startup-shutdown event of CERC? How was the impact of such coincidences obtained in the modeling used by ESS?

Question 6: One would assume that DEM has regulatory procedures in place to prevent the simultaneous occurrence of high-pollution episodes at the various sources and dangerous weather condition. Is this correct and, if so, what are those procedures?

Question 7: Are there any other sources of pollution in Massachusetts or Connecticut? If so, how were they accounted for in the modeling and in particular in the required NAASQ percentile estimates?

Nonattainment in Providence County

Question 8: How did the ESS simulations take into account that the Final Environmental Impact Statement of the AIM Project lists Providence County as Moderate NA (nonattainment) for NO_x and VOC and that purge and blowdown episodes of the Algonquin compressor station are listed in this context. Please see TABLE 4.11.1-3 (cont'd) Nonattainment and Maintenance Areas Within the Vicinity page 4-224 of (the first PDF of the list at the bottom of this web page:

<http://www.ferc.gov/industries/gas/enviro/eis/2015/01-23-15-eis.asp>)

Forgive me if I repeat myself, but clearly, the results in this AIM project table predate the 2015 build-out and Invenergy's CERC proposal, both of which will be contributing to making a bad situation worse. How does the ESS dispersion report account for this?

Question 9: Once again, how could the relevant estimates be made if, as is clear from the years mentioned in Table 15 of the ESS Air Dispersion Report, the impact of the 2015 AIM build-out is as yet to be determined? For clarity let me reiterate that the National Ambient Air Quality Standards require three-year averages, the accumulation of which could not have started before 2015.

Question 10: The third paragraph of page 4-228 of the FEIS of the AIM Project states: Although the facility has existing GHG potential emissions greater than 100,000 tpy [ton per year] of CO₂e in Rhode Island, a major source of GHGs is not considered a major PSD [Prevention of Significant Deterioration] source if it is not also major for another PSD pollutant." Why does CERC, as major new source/modification at an existing source, not trigger a Nonattainment New Source Review? For more details see

<https://www.epa.gov/nsr/nonattainment-nsr-basic-information>

Question 11: The numbers in Table 15, NAAQS Compliance Determination, of the ESS Air Dispersion Report and those in TABLE 4.11.1-14 (con'd) on page 4-243 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement of the AIM Project appear to be inconsistent. To just give one example: according to Table 15, the one-hour number is 61.81% of the NAAQS impact, while the latter has 83.9%. There are two possibilities: (a) I am reading the table incorrectly, which is quite possible because of the difference in nomenclature of the two tables and the absence of units in the ESS table; (b) CERC will be cleansing the atmosphere of NO₂, which sounds too good to be true. How

can the numbers in these tables be reconciled with the national standards?

Noise Problems

Question 12: Pages 4-246 and 4-248 of the AIM Project's Final Environmental Impact Statement discuss noise problems of Algonquin compressor station, which in one area was rated as 57 decibels for its A-weighted sound pressure level even before the AIM Project. That is above the legal day-night limit of 55 dB.

What will DEM do to make sure that Spectra Energy/Algonquin will implement the remedies required by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission? Will CERC push the noise pollution over the legal limit and if so by how much and what remedies will DEM and DOH require?

Changing Climate Conditions

As is well-known, one of the major effects of climate change will be an increase in the variability of the weather. To be specific, Hansen and Sato have shown that: The summer bell curves for the United States and (North and Central) Europe are shifted more than one standard deviation (1), while the shift in the winter is only about half of a standard deviation. The shift in summer is enough to increase the frequency of summers warmer than from less than 1% to greater than 10%. (<http://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1748-9326/11/3/034009>)

The shift to which Hansen and Sato refer compares 2005–2015 data to the 1951–1980 period, which they use as their base. In other words, the more than ten-fold increase in weather extremes they describe have occurred in a period of 45 years is comparable to the expected life time of the power plant Invenergy is proposing.

Question 13: What is the meaning of simulations that ignore the fact that conditions are likely to change during the lifetime of CERC?

Respectfully submitted,



Peter Nightingale
Professor of Physics
email: nightingale@uri.edu
tel. 401.789.7649

encl: Plot of NO₂: unhealthy in agreement with standards

