1	STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS
2	PROVIDENCE, SC. BURRILLVILLE ZONING BOARD
3	
4	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
5	IN RE: *
6	INVENERGY THERMAL DEVELOPMENT, LLC, APPLICANT, * and *
7	ALGONQUIN GAS TRANSMISSION, LLC, OWNERS * OF PROPERTY LOCATED ON WALLUM LAKE ROAD * IN THE VILLAGE OF PASCOAG *
8	* APPLICATION FOR AN ADVISORY OPINION PER THE *
9	RHODE ISLAND ENERGY FACILITY SITING BOARD * RELATIVE TO THE CLEAR RIVER ENERGY CENTER *
10	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
11	
12	HEARD before the Burrillville Zoning Board at
13	the Burrillville High School Auditorium,
14	425 East Avenue, Harrisville, Rhode Island
15	on August 30, 2016 at 7:00 p.m.
16	
17	ZONING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT ALSO PRESENT
18	Mr. Ray Cloutier, Chairman Mr. Joseph Raymond, Ms. Michele Carboni Building Official
19	Mr. George Keeling Mr. Ken Johnson Mr. Thomas Kravitz,
20	Mr. John Patriarca Planning Director Ms. Sandra Cooney, 1st Alt.
21	Mr. Jeremy Page, 2nd Alt.
22	
23	APPEARANCES
24	OLEG NIKOLYSZYN, ESQUIRE TOWN SOLICITOR
25	ELIZABETH M. NOONAN, ESQUIRE FOR INVENERGY THERMAL DEVELOPMENT, LLC

4		
1	<u>UITNESS</u>	PAGE
2	CYNDY LUSSIER	14
3	ROBERT WOODS	17
4	STEPHANIE SLOMAN	19
5	THOMAS KRAVITZ	26
6	KENNETH W. PUTNAM, JR	29
7	DENISE POTVIN	34
8	JEREMY BAILEY	35
9	KATHRYN SHERMAN	36
10	FRANK SILVA	40
11		
12	JOINT EXHIBITS	
13	C. Stenographic transcript of the Planning Board hearing	
14	dated 8/15/16	6
15	D. Stenographic transcript of the Planning Board hearing	
16	dated 8/22/16	6
17	E. Department of Health Advisory dated 8/9/16	7
18	F. Memo from McMahon Engineers	,
19	Dated 7/29/16	7
20	MOTION ON ADVISORY OPINION	61
21	rotton on advisord of inton	OI
22		
23		
24		
25		

IN RE: BURRILLVILLE ZONING BOARD HEARING ON

ADVISORY OPINION PER THE EFSB

ON

-

INVENERGY THERMAL DEVELOPMENT, LLC'S

CLEAR RIVER ENERGY CENTER

AUGUST 30, 2016

(Meeting commenced at 7:08 p.m.)

MR. CLOUTIER: Calling tonight's -- calling tonight's meeting of the Zoning Board to order.

I'm going to let Oleg explain the procedure tonight.

It's going to be quite a bit different than our normal Zoning Board hearing; but with us tonight,

Members of the Board: George Keeling, Sandra Cooney,

Michele -- excuse me, who is there? -- Jeremy Page,

John Patriarca, Ken Johnson; our legal counsel,

Oleg Nikolyszyn; myself; our Building Official,

Mr. Joe Raymond. Joe is doing double, triple duty tonight. We've had turmoil in the office at the

Building Department. There's a family crisis.

Pauline Hopkins will not be here. We wish her well, whatever happens over there; and we have our court reporter, Mr. Andy D'Angelo.

Like I said, procedure is totally different, and with us is representatives from Invenergy led by Beth Noonan, their attorney.

I'm going to let Oleg explain what the process is going to be tonight.

MR. NIKOLYSZYN: Ladies and gentlemen, we had previously conducted the hearings, heard the testimony, heard public comments from everyone, and we continued this hearing 'till tonight to see the advisory opinion from the Planning Board to the Zoning Board. That is the sole purpose for which this hearing was continued. So, there won't be any more testimony or public hearings.

The order sent to us by the Energy Facility
Siting Board was for the Zoning Board to consider
three issues. One is whether the facility would meet
the requirements of our respective Zoning Ordinances
and whether any variance should be granted. Now, I
interpret that to mean that this facility is to be
located in an F-5 zone, and this facility needs a
Special Use Permit;

Item Number 2: Whether a Special Use Permit should be granted to exempt the facility from construction hour restrictions;

And, 3, whether Invenergy would be able to be compliant with our Town Noise Ordinance during construction and operation and, if not, whether a variance should be granted.

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I have previously prepared a memorandum which I have given to the Board outlining what the law provides as to under what conditions a Special Use Permit is to be granted. I've outlined the Supreme Court cases on the issue; and, basically, what it provides for, in a nutshell, that a Special Use Permit -- that a decision by the zoning authority granting or denying a Special Use Permit must be based on a finding that the proposed use is in accord with the public convenience and welfare; and, explaining what those terms mean, the Supreme Court went on to describe certain criteria. One of them is that there must be hardship established; and hardship is also defined by the Supreme Court in various phraseology, one of which is that, "The granting of the requested variance will not alter the general character of the surrounding area or impair the intent or purpose of the Zoning Ordinance or the Comprehensive Plan upon which the ordinance is based."

We have recently received the Planning Board advisory opinion which is approximately 26 pages in length. The Planning Board's advisory opinion that's addressed to us, the Zoning Board, is I believe on Page 24 through 26; and it makes specific

)

recommendations, and that's why we are here.

Before we proceed, however, I understand that Invenergy would like to add to the record some documents, which are transcripts of what happened in front of the Planning Board, which is something that I would want on behalf of the Zoning Board as well. I want to rely upon what happened at the Planning Board. So, Ms. Noonan, would you like to describe what it is that you're presenting.

MS. NOONAN: Yes, certainly. Good evening,
Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board. Again,
Elizabeth Noonan, on behalf of Invenergy. As we did
at the last hearing, we are introducing the
transcripts from the Planning Board hearings that
have been held since we last met on July 12th; and so
I have provided each of you with a copy of these, and
I would like to ask that they be marked as our next
Exhibits D and E. D would be the August 15th
Planning Board transcript, and E would be the
August 22nd Planning Board transcript.

MR. NIKOLYSZYN: I have no objection on behalf of the Board to the admittance of these transcripts to the record.

MS. NOONAN: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, thank you.

MR. RAYMOND: Which one is Exhibit F? This is Exhibit F.

opinion, and those are dated August 9th, 2016.

We do have two other items that have been in the

public record. They've been up on the website.

that I would like to add in, because there was a

question raised earlier, these are the responses of

Invenergy to the Rhode Island Department of Health

opinion; and, again, this has been out in the public

for a while; but I just -- it came up I think at the

last meeting, the advisory opinion from the

Department of Health; and if you could make that

Exhibit F. And that is our, again, Invenergy's

responses to the Department of Health's advisory

They've been all part of this process. The first one

MS. NOONAN: And then the final one is
Exhibit G, which is again something that's been out
in the public domain; but, since our last meeting,
this is dated July 29th, 2016, and it's a memo from
McMahon, who are the transportation engineers,
addressed to me addressing various issues; but one in
particular that was raised at the last Zoning Board
meeting dealt with alternate truck routes. So, I
would ask that that be marked as Exhibit G.

MR. NIKOLYSZYN: No objections.

1415

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

12

13

2425

1 MS. NOONAN: And that's all we have to present. 2 MR. NIKOLYSZYN: Mr. Chairman, if I may ask a 3 couple of questions before we proceed? 4 MR. CLOUTIER: Certainly. 5 MR. R. TRINQUE: Mr. Chairman, at this time, 6 representing Keep Burrillville Beautiful, I would 7 like to ask a point of clarification. Seeing this is 8 a continuation of a meeting that began on July 12th, 9 at that meeting it was stated that if time permits 10 there would be additional public comment. 11 My question is -- my clarification point is: 12 (A) Why were there no written agendas available to 13 the people that are here this evening? And (B) Are we going to go through with what we said at the 14 15 beginning of this meeting, which was, if time 16 permits, there will be public comment? Thank you. 17 (Pause.) 18 MR. CLOUTIER: Our attorney has said that if 19 it's something that hasn't been revealed, if it's 20 something that is not in any of this pile of 21 documents, if it's something brand new to the case, 22 we'll give you two minutes. 23 WOMAN FROM THE AUDIENCE: How do we know that? 24 The letter was dated the 29th. Today is the 30th. 25 So, in the two days we had a chance to review it, I

mean how would we know?

_

MR. NIKOLYSZYN: I think you have a good point. This was just given to us as well, and this deals I believe with the traffic. Maybe Ms. Noonan can summarize what it says.

WOMAN FROM THE AUDIENCE: Well, why didn't we get the chance to talk? I don't get it. We pay the taxes here.

MR. NIKOLYSZYN: Sorry.

WOMAN FROM THE AUDIENCE: What gives her the right to talk?

MS. NOONAN: If I may, those items were included mainly because they supplement the Planning Board record that we have made part of this hearing in accordance with how we did it last time. So, what that report goes into from McMahon is a discussion about alternate truck routes that was raised; and, again, this was part of the Planning Board hearing on August 15th and the questions that were raised there, and also at the Zoning Board. What it goes through, and again this has been part of the record for a period of time, and it was a review of alternate truck routes and a determination by McMahon about the use of the routes and that there really wasn't any viable alternate route for the trucks than what was

already proposed. That's it. That was part of the Planning Board record. If it's going to cause a problem, I'll withdraw it because this is nothing new to the Planning Board, and it has been part of the record for a month.

MR. NIKOLYSZYN: It's part of the Planning Board's record?

MS. NOONAN: It is.

MR. NIKOLYSZYN: I don't see a problem with that.

MS. NOONAN: Both items were, so --

MR. CRAIG: Mr. Chair, my name is Barry Craig, 180 Maroney Road, Pascoag. We do have a person here who has expertise and is prepared to testify on low octave vibrations. She prepared a written report. If you have that written — that written report was submitted to the Planning Board. If you have that written report and you considered it, then her testimony would not be necessary; but, if not, we'd appreciate two minutes for her to be able to tell what her findings were.

MR. NIKOLYSZYN: My understanding is everything that has transpired in front of the Planning Board is part of the record with the Zoning Board. So, if it was admitted --

MR. CRAIG: I'd like a specific assurance, or maybe you can spare the two minutes, counsel, and let her talk.

MR. NIKOLYSZYN: Do you know who that person is?

MS. SLOMAN: Stephanie Sloman. Ray, you have a copy of that. I put it in your mailbox.

MR. CLOUTIER: This report was discussed with Mr. Hessler at length. Mr. Hessler disregards this report that Mrs. Sloman wrote. He rebuts what she wrote. He distances himself from the facts of that report, and he — his finding — Mr. Hessler, who is the Town's consultant, the Town's professional, expert, paid-for consultant, said that the bottom line is the low octave is within — is not negotiable here. That's Mr. Hessler's —

MAN FROM THE AUDIENCE: What do you mean "not negotiable"; what does that mean, please?

MR. CLOUTIER: It means -- it's all in the report where the noise experts -- I'll read it in our summary later on. It's in the Planning Board.

It's all in the Planning Board where the low octave -- as a matter of fact, the Planning Board recommends that we grant the waiver for the low octave because -- (Noise from the audience.)

We're not going to get anywhere by trying to shout me

down or anybody else down. I'm just telling you -I'm telling you what's in the Planning Board report.
We just said if we don't -- if you want to submit
something new, that's all well and good; but, as far
as the noise goes, it's all detailed in the Planning
Board report from testimony that they got; and that
testimony (noise from the audience) -- please,
please.

WOMAN FROM THE AUDIENCE: Could I make a point of order?

MR. CLOUTIER: Come down. State your name, please, and spell it. State your name and spell it, please.

MR. CRAIG: May I finish, and I'll turn the podium over to her. I'll state my name again.

My name is Barry Craig, C-R-A-I-G, 180 Maroney Road,

Pascoag, Rhode Island 02856. My question is whether that document has been submitted to the members of the Planning Board -- I'm sorry, the Zoning Board; and, if not, will you entertain two minutes to listen to what she has to say?

MR. CLOUTIER: I'm sorry, sir. I didn't hear your question. Would you repeat it.

MR. CRAIG: Sure. Can you hear me now?

All right. What I'm asking you to do is give

explain to the person who wrote that report to explain to the Zoning Board why she believes that the low octave decibel levels are levels that can be controlled. Now, I know you say that the Town's expert disagrees, but the Town's experts have disagreed with a lot of things, including information that has been submitted by Invenergy. So, it seems to me only fair that the Zoning Board, since that is one of the major bones of contention in the Planning Board report, that the Zoning Board spend two minutes, two minutes, to listen to what she has to say.

MR. CLOUTIER: Okay. Under these conditions, as you've stated, so we'll give two minutes, and with the understanding that this witness is not a sound expert, is not a sound professional, in any way, shape or form.

MR. CRAIG: The Zoning Board can listen to her professional qualifications.

MR. CLOUTIER: I said we'll listen to her with those conditions. I think that's fair.

MAN FROM THE AUDIENCE: Barry was going to say she's going to list her credentials.

MR. CRAIG: She is entitled I think to present her credentials.

1	MR. CLOUTIER: Yes, she is, and we're going to
2	listen to her.
3	MR. CRAIG: Okay, thank you, sir.
4	MS. LUSSIER: Hi. My name is Cyndy Lussier,
5	L-U-S-S-I-E-R, 150 Old Wallum Lake Road.
6	MR. CLOUTIER: Would you raise your right hand,
7	please.
8	MS. LUSSIER: Honestly?
9	MR. CLOUTIER: Yes, honestly.
10	MS. LUSSIER: Okay.
11	CYNDY LUSSIER, first having been duly
12	sworn, testified as follows:
13	MS. LUSSIER: My question is: Will other people
14	be similarly sworn?
15	MR. CLOUTIER: Are we going to have to go
16	through this? We said if it's brand new and if it's
17	something that has not been submitted to the Planning
18	Board or the Zoning Board.
19	MS. LUSSIER: I just had a point of order, sir.
20	I'm not submitting any I have a point of order.
21	I understand that you have a copy of the Planning
22	Board opinion, advisory opinion that's been supplied
23	to you this evening, correct?
24	MR. CLOUTIER: That's
25	MS. LUSSIER: You've had time to review it and

read it and --

eve

MR. CLOUTIER: It was not supplied to us this evening. It was supplied to us again this evening, but we have had it.

MS. LUSSIER: So, I had made a request to have a copy of that opinion when it was prepared and ready to be shared, and I was denied that. So, I'm wondering why, when it's -- you know, like, it's really hard to be sitting here and not have had the same -- I don't know how we're expected to either reflect, understand, agree or disagree, if we're not allowed to have the information. So, I'm wondering in your role as Chairman if you will order that to be disbursed and made available to the general public, since it is a public document.

MR. CLOUTIER: That's beyond my realm, ma'am. To whom did you make your request?

MS. LUSSIER: I made a request to the Planning Board Chairman.

MR. NIKOLYSZYN: If I may clarify, I spoke to Mr. McElroy, my assistant, today, this morning, requesting information. The decision or the opinion has been written. It's 26 pages long, but attached to that is going to be an index. It's going to have all the reports from all the experts. It's going to

have comments from everyone attached, and it 1 2 literally is going to be a three-ring binder that 3 stands about five to seven inches tall; and it's 4 being printed and bound, and I understand it should 5 be ready tomorrow; and we need 10 copies to be 6 submitted to the Energy Facility Siting Board; and, 7 of course, it will be put on the web page of the Town 8 as well. It just hasn't been manually compiled yet, 9 but the 26-page opinion that they wrote which is 10 supported by all that other documentation --11 MS. LUSSTER: Uh-huh. 12 MR. NIKOLYSZYN: -- has been prepared and given 13 to all the members; and, most likely, tomorrow it will probably be posted on the web page. 14 15 MS. LUSSIER: I didn't want the five-inch 16 loose-leaf binder. I want the same 26-page report that you all have had the opportunity to look at. 17 18 MR. NIKOLYSZYN: You are entitled to it, 19 absolutely. 20 MS. LUSSIER: Could you advise Mr. Wood of that, 21 please? 22 MR. NIKOLYSZYN: Absolutely. 23 MS. LUSSIER: Thank you. 24 MS. LUBY: I just have a quick question. 25 I'm Jan Luby.

1	MR. CLOUTIER: Are you going to be testifying?
2	MS. LUBY: No, I just have a question.
3	MR. CLOUTIER: Let's let the person testify that
4	we agreed to have him up here.
5	MS. LUBY: This is a very short question.
6	What was just submitted to you by Invenergy from the
7	Department of Health, was that the draft opinion, or
8	was that a final draft?
9	MR. NIKOLYSZYN: I know the answer to that.
0	The Department of Health has so far presented only
1	the draft. I understand that within a week
.2	MS. LUBY: That will be finalized from them.
.3	MR. NIKOLYSZYN: the Department of Health
4	will have a final version of that, but I don't have
_5	that. Nobody has it yet.
- 6	MS. LUBY: Okay, thank you.
_7	MR. WOODS: Mr. Chairman, just a quick point of
8 -	order. The Noise Ordinance
9	MR. CLOUTIER: Would you raise your right hand,
20	please.
21	ROBERT WOODS, first having been duly
22	sworn, testified as follows:
23	MR. CLOUTIER: Would you state your name,
24	please, and spell it for us.

W-O-O-D-S, with an "S". The Noise Ordinance is in the Municipal Code. It's not in the Zoning Ordinance. The Zoning Board gets its authority from the enabling legislation which is part of the General Laws. So, even though the Energy Siting Board has asked you to give an advisory opinion on that, it has as much weight as asking me or anyone else in this audience because you don't have the authority to answer that question.

MR. CLOUTIER: Your point being?

MR. WOODS: My point being is that it's a moot point, so move on to the next item on the agenda and forget entertaining that question.

MR. CLOUTIER: So, sir, you want me to disregard whoever has an opinion or a question on noise tonight, is that what you're saying?

MR. WOODS: What I'm saying is that, if you're going to entertain anything on the noise, you should have a conversation with the Town Council and ask how to handle that because you're not the authority to make that assumption.

MR. CLOUTIER: Thank you for the advice, sir.

MR. WOODS: Weigh it heavily.

MR. CLOUTIER: Would you raise your right hand, please.

2

3

4

5

67

8

9

11

12

1314

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

STEPHANIE SLOMAN, first having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

MR. CLOUTIER: State your name, please, and spell it for us.

Stephanie Sloman, MS. SLOMAN: S-T-E-P-H-A-N-I-E, S-L-O-M-A-N. I feel very badly that you guys didn't get a copy of this report. I feel badly that when I was at the Planning Board, obviously, the Planning Board members didn't get a copy of this report. I know I have only two minutes. Let me just read a couple of things from this report. You have the report. You read it. On Page 97 of Invenergy's application concerning low frequency octave bands, and I can tell you what they are; and the fact that Burrillville's Ordinance is among the stringent we have seen in the United States, it states on that page, and I quote, "This is particularly relevant since low frequency emissions are generally more difficult to mitigate than are high frequency noise emissions." This statement in their application proves that it is indeed possible to mitigate low octave, low frequency noise that Invenergy's proposed power plant will produce. if it's possible, then why give them the variance is my point.

25

I talk about how bad low frequency noise is for people, and then I go into the negative effects on wildlife, farm animals, etcetera. I just wanted to read one section, and I'm going to, you know, read right off here. So, if I go too fast, let me know. Okay, I want to admit that I emailed Important: Mr. Hessler anonymously concerning combined cycle natural gas power plants and low frequency noise. I know: Me bad. This is a quote from his email. "For critical sites with nearby houses and/or very low permissible noise limits, the plate thickness on this part of the HRSG is increased from a standard one-quarter inch thickness to one-half inch," and then, in parentheses, I have, "I believe that Invenergy is already doing this to mitigate the dBA limit of Burrillville's Noise Ordinance." He continued, however, "When more of a reduction is required, an external shroud is often used which consists of metal panels forming barrier walls on the sides or a complete enclosure with a roof over the HRSG . . . " metal on the interior face -- I'm sorry, ". . . transition duct. These panels are typically 20 gauge steel on the exterior, four inches of fiberglass insulation and 24 gauge perforated metal on the interior face. The exterior sheet resists the

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1314

15

16

17

18

19

20

2122

23

24

25

penetration of noise to the outside, and its acoustically-absorptive lining prevents noise from reflecting back and building up inside the noise enclosure."

Mr. Hessler continues, "Another source of moderate low frequency noise in a combined cycle plant are the fans in the cooling tower or . . .", cooling, which Invenergy doesn't have cooling towers, ". . . or air-cooled condensors, ACC, as the case may When needed . . . ", this is still quoted from the email. "When needed, which is often, low noise fans are used instead of standard fans which usually produce significant noise in the 125 to 250 Hz octave Low noise fans typically rotate at a slower bands. speed which leads to much less noise, and these blades have a very wide width, or chord, that allows them to move more air at a slower speed." One more He continues, "The very quietest fans, the sentence. Model SX made by Howden Fans in the Netherlands, are extremely wide to the point where there is almost no open area in the fan wheel." And, basically, as you can see above, Mr. Hessler has relayed to me other ways that Invenergy is not including in its noise mitigation low frequency noise, and it is possible for Invenergy to reduce the low octave band levels in

1 its proposed design. 2 MR. NIKOLYSZYN: Mr. Chairman, can I ask a 3 question? Did the Planning Board have that letter from Mr. Hessler? 4 5 MS. SLOMAN: I gave it to Mr. Hessler. 6 here. He can verify it. I emailed him this report 7 as an attachment. What he told me was that he had, and you can verify this, he emailed it to the 8 9 attorney and -- I can't remember if you told me that 10 the Chairperson of the Planning Board, and it was 11 ignored. 12 MR. NIKOLYSZYN: Can you give the date of that 13 letter, please. 14 MS. SLOMAN: I -- I emailed it to Mr. Kravitz on 15 Sunday night, on the 21st. 16 MR. NIKOLYSZYN: No, Mr. Hessler's letter to you, what's the date of that letter? 17 18 MS. SLOMAN: Well, I could give you a guess. 19 It was the week before. I can give it to you, if you 20 I have a copy of it. I would say it was the 21 Friday; so, let's see, the 22nd, 20 -- I would say 22 the 18th or 19th. 23 MR. NIKOLYSZYN: Of what month? I'm sorry. 24 MS. SLOMAN: Of August. 25 MR. NIKOLYSZYN: Because the Planning Board

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1314

15

16

17

18

1920

21

22

23

24

25

lists the dates of certain letters from Mr. Hessler. I believe there are three dates from August that Mr. Hessler wrote letters that are included in the Planning Board's opinion, which should also be attached to the Planning Board's opinion as an exhibit. So --

MS. SLOMAN: So, the email that Mr. Hessler sent me, is that what you're saying?

MR. NIKOLYSZYN: That was my question. Did that letter or that email --

MS. SLOMAN: What I just -- yes, I did. I emailed him anonymously because I knew if I said who I was or where I was from he was going to -- do You want to speak? Okay, anyway, I sent him a tell. letter anonymously because I knew if I told him who I was and where I was from, he would just take his report that he submitted to the Town Council, and he would just say exactly the same thing. However, I did more research on it. So, I knew that there were ways that they could reduce -- the power plant could reduce the low frequency noise which is dangerous to human beings and wildlife, farm animals; dairy cows would produce less milk; chickens will produce less I can go on. It's an 11-page report. I spent eggs. the whole week prior to that meeting on this.

1 MR. NIKOLYSZYN: If I may --2 MS. SLOMAN: Yes. 3 MR. NIKOLYSZYN: -- get to the point? According to the opinion from the Planning Board, the Planning 4 5 Board lists numerous recommendations to the Siting 6 Board, asking the Siting Board adopt as conditions, 7 in the event they choose to grant the permit, as conditions the recommendations made by Mr. Hessler; 8 9 and then it lists Mr. Hessler's recommendations 10 contained in the letters. I'm going to give you the 11 dates of those letters. Maybe it coincides with what 12 you're reading. The letters -- the memoranda dated 13 May 26, July 12, August 8, August 10, August 16, and 14 August 22nd. So, if what you're referring to is 15 already in there, then it's been considered. 16 MS. SLOMAN I don't have a copy of it with me. 17 MR. NIKOLYSZYN: Well --18 MS. SLOMAN: But I mean I have --19 MR. NIKOLYSZYN: Your email. I save 20 MS. SLOMAN: I have it at home. 21 everything. 22 MR. NIKOLYSZYN: Well, what you just read from, 23 is that a copy of the email from Mr. Hessler? 24 That is excerpts. I didn't want to MS. SLOMAN: 25 put the whole email in here. I did think about

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

13

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

attaching it, but --

MR. NIKOLYSZYN: Well, I don't know whether or not the Planning Board has that or not. So, I can't comment.

MS. SLOMAN: Yeah, I do know that Mr. -- you know, Mr. Kravitz had it, and I believe that he told me that he had given it to Mr. McElroy, --

MR. KRAVITZ: Yes.

MS. SLOMAN: -- the attorney.

MR. KRAVITZ: And Mr. Hessler.

MS. SLOMAN: And Mr. Hessler. And I don't know, so you can --

MAN FROM THE AUDIENCE: Stephanie, could you just give us your credentials.

MS. SLOMAN: Well, I have a BS in biology and a minor in chemistry, and I'm a retired environmental engineer. So, there -- I mean I -- you know, I'm not an expert in noise, but you don't have to be because you have the internet. You can learn from, you know, not only other noise experts. I mean I was -- I was back and forth with Noise Solutions in Canada; and I explained everything that I knew about the plant, and they were willing to say, hey, we can do -- we can take care of this. This is a problem, and we can take care of it. So, I have that whole email

conversation with them. So, they can do it. So, this is my point. If they can do it, it's possible. Even if they have to go to the Netherlands to get the damn fans, why should we allow them the variance for a low octave band? (Applause.) They admitted it on Page 27 of the application, the original application. They admit it. But it's — you know, maybe it will cost a little more money. Come on. This is a multi-million dollar corporation. They can afford it, and we poor slobs are over here fighting amongst ourselves; and this is part of the game plan. That's all I have to say.

MR. CLOUTIER: Thank you. I asked, and he kindly agreed, our Town Planner, to possibly address this. Would you raise your right hand, please, sir.

THOMAS KRAVITZ, first having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

MR. CLOUTIER: State your name, please, for us.

MR. KRAVITZ: Thomas Kravitz. The only clarification I can provide is that the Planning Board did not, in fact, see that report that was prepared by Ms. Sloman; but I did, as soon as I got it, I forwarded it right away to McElroy and Hessler to confirm as to what, you know, what the findings are. I asked Hessler to give us some feedback. This

24

25

was happening by email because it was very close to the Planning Board's meeting, and Hessler -- Hessler, when he saw who it was from, Ms. Sloman, he fell back on his position -- without getting into the specifics of the facility she was describing, he fell back on the position that the low octave bands, and this is on Page 19 of the advisory opinion of the Planning Board, that, "CREC won't substantially change or increase the low frequency sound in any meaningful That means that any potential impact on wildlife from the low frequency noise, if there is one, is already present from the existing Spectra turbine." So, his position has always been that he said the facility will not add to what Spectra is already doing. So, that's what the Planning Board has. The last paragraph on this Page 19 of the section, says, "Accordingly, it is our opinion . . . ", and that is the opinion of the Planning Board, ". . . that the CREC facility will be able to comply with our Noise Ordinance provided the Zoning Board of Review grants Invenergy a waiver/special use permit exempting the CREC from the octave band limits of the Ordinance." So, they're really just throwing it on you guys.

MR. CLOUTIER: Thank you. Thank you for that,

9

8

11

12

13

10

1415

1617

18

1920

21

2223

24

25

too. I'm going to read this into my advisory opinion later on; but his opinion, I'll read to you what the advisory that the Planning Board sent to us on this matter; but also remember that when we make our advisory opinion, we can put a condition on it that, if this noise is not — these noise standards are not met, that the plant permit be revoked. We'll make that one of the conditions of our advisory opinion.

MAN FROM THE AUDIENCE: Just say no. Just say no.

MR. CLOUTIER: I will put that in as a condition on our advisory opinion to the EFSB; but here's what the Planning Board told us, and the Planning Board --I mean I have to believe that the Planning Board did extensive studies on everything, and here's what they said to us. "As to the requested octave band review Special Use Permit, we are of the opinion that the evidence, especially the testimony of the Town's noise consultant, has shown that the octave band limits are unreasonably restrictive. The waiver will not increase the low frequency noise already present in the area due to the Spectra Algonquin Facility, and there will be no adverse effect on residents or wildlife if the waiver is granted. We, therefore, recommend to the Zoning Board that the waiver should

1	be approved, if the conditions set forth in Paragraph
2	3 on Page 20 are strictly complied with," which
3	basically they're saying the same thing. If they
4	don't comply with all the noise, it will be rejected.
5	WOMAN FROM THE AUDIENCE: How do we know if
6	they're going to comply? It's already going to be
7	built. Come on, guys.
8	MR. PUTNAM: Can I just say a couple of words?
9	MR. CLOUTIER: You have something new, sir?
10	MR. PUTNAM: Yes, I do. My name is Kenneth W.
11	Putnam, Jr.
12	MR. CLOUTIER: Raise your right hand.
13	KENNETH W. PUTNAM, JR., first
14	having been duly sworn, testified as follows:
15	MR. CLOUTIER: Let's hear something new, sir, or
16	we'll stop it now.
17	MR. PUTNAM: Well, I don't know if it's new or
18	not, but
19	MR. CLOUTIER: I asked you, and you said it was
20	new.
21	MR. PUTNAM: Well, to me, everything here is
22	pretty new to me.
23	MR. CLOUTIER: Well, you've been to all the
24	hearings, sir.
25	MR. PUTNAM: I have been to all of them, yes.

25

Believe me, I've been to all of them. One thing I want yous to know. You folks are like us. You live here in town, right; and I'm only going to give you common sense. I don't have that college degree, but I'm going to tell you, there's so many things that's This woman that came in that said wrong with this. these trucks could come up through Pascoag without any problems, she was shot down up there. She didn't even know. She never traveled the road or anything. They hit her with that. But here's the other thing here. You have to realize that this noise up there, DEM has not come out in the zoning -- and the other Board said they weren't going to make any decisions on it until DEM come out and said something about it, about the wild animals that are going to -- they haven't, and they came out after that and said they don't want to give a report until after the first of the year. Well, how can we give a report if they're not going to give a report? We shouldn't give them a report. We should hold it down and say no, unless they can come up and say, oh, hey, DEM says it's not going to interfere with the animals. They're the experts here. We aren't here. DEM is the experts, right. Why am I the experts? They should be given us that opinion before you guys here should be voting on that and giving them any variance whatsoever for that project. (Applause.)

And you guys here, this is our home. I would like to tell you something new here, too. You see, there's not many people here, but do you know how many people are interested in this in this Town? There's so many people. And, if you just ride around the back roads, you'll see it. A lot of people can't, and they're scared to even come to these meetings. A lot of them work late. They can't get here, and they're counting on us; and that's why we here are counting on you folks up there to hold up this for us. That's all I can say.

MR. CLOUTIER: Thank you, sir. A couple of phrases that you used, Mr. Putnam, make an awful lot of sense, common sense. As you know, we're going to try our best here; but, as you know from attending the Planning Board meetings, the Chairman of the Planning Board stated frequently, many, many times, that they don't have all the information they need. We don't have (noise from the audience) — shouting me down is not going to help matters. I agree if things were done in an orderly manner the way they should be done, we would, all of us, have all the facts necessary to make an informed decision.

25

However, that's not how this works. So, we're going to do as the Planning Board did. We're going to do our due diligence. We're going to do the best we can. We're going to give some kind of an advisory opinion with what we have, but we're limited. constrained. We have time limits. We have all kinds of limits. We have deadlines. This is the way it is. And we can yell, shout, curse, get mad at each other, raise our tempers, raise our voices; none of it is going to matter. None of it is going to help. We have to do what we have to do. We're going to get through this. We're going to give our advisory opinion. Some of you I'm sure will not agree with Hopefully, people will agree with what we're doing. As Mr. Putnam just so eloquently stated, we are also Town residents. We're not here to harm the Give me a break. So, you know, we're going to do the best we can with what we have is basically the best way that I can put this, but shouting at each other is not going to help anybody; and repeated, repeated, repeated the same things over and over again is not going to drive home any points that have not been made. So, you know, I mean if you want to waste more of our time and your time, feel free. I guess it's the way it's going to be, but,

you know, --

25

1

I'd like to add to that. MR. NIKOLYSZYN: Mr. Putnam raised a very good point. We do not have all the information that we would like. There are other agencies that are doing their work. They will not do or finish their job, most likely -- let's take DEM, for an example. They probably won't finish their job for another year. Under the law, we have a responsibility to give us -- give the Siting Board our opinion; and they gave us a certain time limit, and that time limit is not arbitrary. It's written into the law. That time limit provides that, if we do not provide our opinion as to what we want, whether we think something should be done or something should not be done by a certain date, and that date happens to be, I believe, September 12th because it falls on a Monday; if we don't provide them with our advisory opinion by that date, we waive our right to have our voices heard. So, if we don't like what Invenergy is doing and we don't provide our opinion to the Siting Board by that date, they ignore it. We waive our right to be heard. So, we have to do what we can by that date. We would love to hold back and wait for everybody to finish their job to our satisfaction and then render an opinion; but, if

we don't have that, we still should be heard.

We should tell the Siting Board what we want or don't want, or we just waive our right. Your voices will not be heard. So, please allow us to do what we can with what we have.

MS. POTVIN: I just have a brief statement.

MR. CLOUTIER: Raise your right hand, please, so I can swear you in.

DENISE POTVIN, first having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

MR. CLOUTIER: State your name, please.

MS. POTVIN: Denise Potvin from Harrisville.

Most of us in this room have raised children or are in the process of raising children. I have three that are in their 20's. If they come to me and they ask me to go out to a party with their friends, and I ask them whose house, who is going to be there, is there going to be alcohol, who is driving, if they can't answer those questions to me, the answer is?

SEVERAL VOICES FROM THE AUDIENCE: No.

MS. POTVIN: Your advisory opinion, we understand. We want our voices heard. We know that you're part of our family in some ways. Our voices are telling you, if you don't have enough information or you have conflicting information, just say no.

1 MR. CLOUTIER: Raise your right hand, please.

JEREMY BAILEY, first having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

MR. CLOUTIER: State your name, please.

MR. BAILEY: Jeremy Bailey, J-E-R-E-M-Y, B-A-I-L-E-Y. I'd like to address the letter that I've heard read at several different meetings from Mr. Hessler, and I'm deeply disturbed by it; and, to paraphrase what you just read, was that since Invenergy -- since Spectra is already making the noise, then we're not making it any worse.

I'm going to make a little analogy for you. If I tell my kids, "Be quiet, it's time to go to bed," and I go upstairs and I find two of my children making noise, and one of them says, "Yeah, but, daddy, she was making more noise," guess what? They're both in trouble. They're both being disciplined. How dare Mr. Hessler take it upon himself to say, "You know what? Spectra is already putting these low frequencies in; so, why not let somebody else?" As a matter of fact, you may or may not be aware, but our Town, this, our Town, has already written a letter to FERC addressing those low frequency noises and those low frequency vibrations that we're getting, and they're — they're strongly

hands.)

worded, I believe Oleg wrote it, that they need to mitigate it. They need to change the turbines. They need to do something to fix it. So, the excuses that you're going to allow or advise that they waive any type of our Noise Ordinance because someone else is already violating it is wrong; and, to Mrs. Potvin's -- (Applause.) And, to Mrs. Potvin's point, your job in this case is to just say no.

And I'd like to finish with this: I'd like to, by a show of hands, how many people on our Zoning Board live within one mile of the proposed site of this power plant, please?

(Whereupon, Mr. Johnson and Mr. Keeling raised their

MR. BAILEY: One, two. Thank you. So, there's two of you up there that do. Thank you, that's it.

MR. CLOUTIER: Raise your right hand, please.

KATHRYN SHERMAN, first having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

MR. CLOUTIER: State your name, please.

MS. SHERMAN: Kathryn Sherman, K-A-T-H-R-Y-N, S-H-E-R-M-A-N. I'd like to thank the Board for being here tonight. I know this is difficult for you, just as it is for us. I'd like to address the data that came in today, specifically, the letter from Hankard

Environmental addressing the octave band noise levels on the site. First of all, if the octave band noise levels that we have here in Burrillville are extremely low, they must be low for a reason because good men and women like you set that limit; and, if you want to do business in this Town, like any other business, you have to adhere to the rules. We hear — we have to adhere to the rules. You've asked us to comply with your rules. That's our octave band level, and there's no reason why we should have to submit a waiver.

My second point, again with Mr. Putnam's common sense, I'd like to know who asked for this waiver. That property is owned by Spectra. There's only an intent to purchase it by Invenergy. They don't even own the land. So, if the octave band level is going to be granted and it's going to be granted to Spectra, they're non-complying anyway. So, you wouldn't provide a waiver to a non-complying property. So, if it's a non-complying entity that's asked for the waiver, then they don't have standing. If it's Invenergy that asked for the waiver, they don't own the property. So, there's your out with common sense. (Applause.)

Secondly, in this document from Hankard

23

24

25

Environmental, on the second page, the first sentence states that, "The site of the proposed CREC facility is within an industrial-zoned parcel next to the site of a natural gas compressor station." It's not an industrial-zoned site. It's an F-5 site, an F-5. (Applause.) F-5 is farming, and what do we have on farms? We have animals on farms. So, if the octave band level disrupts wildlife, or any life, it's a little unfortunate that maybe my human life isn't as important as some animal life, but I'll go with anything right now. If the octave band level is going to negatively impact farm life, that's the That's the zone for that property. Again, if Invenergy cannot live within the rules, then they shouldn't be granted a waiver. (Applause.)

One last point in Mr. Hankard's letter. He did literature review because he's not an expert in noise for octave band levels and the impacts on animals; and, to quote, "The literature I have read does not speak in terms of absolute levels," and the phrases, "data lacking" and "needs more study" are frequent. That sounds like Invenergy's application to me. Thank you.

MR. CLOUTIER: We've heard from you, sir.

MR. WOODS: Yeah, but --

1 MR. CLOUTIER: We've heard from you, sir. 2 You didn't hear about this. MR. WOODS: 3 MR. CLOUTIER: No, it's okay, just once. 4 MR. WOODS: Just once? 5 MR. CLOUTIER: No, no, no. 6 MR. WOODS: Just the process. Granting a 7 variance before you grant the special exception is out of order because, if you're granting a variance, 8 9 why would you grant a variance to something that it 10 might not fit? If it fits, you're allowed by 11 Superior Court -- Supreme Court case, Oleg, which I'm 12 sure you know, is City of Newport vs. Lloyd; and what 13 it says is that a variance cannot be given to someone looking for a special exception until the special 14 15 exception is approved because, by nature of a 16 variance or a waiver, it says that it does not fit. 17 It does not meet all the requirements. It is not in 18 harmony with the ordinance. So, it has to be 19 approved first or at least given a consent for a 20 special exception before you can entertain a variance 21 or a waiver. 22 MR. CLOUTIER: You are way over your two minutes 23 please. 24 MS. SLOMAN: I just want to answer.

Is there someone else?

MR. CLOUTIER:

25

1 MS. SLOMAN: I just wanted to answer Oleg. 2 MR. CLOUTIER: You have been way, way over your 3 two minutes. 4 MS. SLOMAN: Mr. Oleg, my -- the email that I 5 received from Mr. Hessler, the letter that I 6 received, the email that I received back from 7 Mr. Hessler was on Sunday, the 21st of August. 8 MR. CLOUTIER: Raise your right hand. 9 FRANK SILVA, first having been duly 10 sworn, testified as follows: 11 MR. CLOUTIER: State your name, please. 12 MR. SILVA: Frank Silva, F-R-A-N-K, S-I-L-V-A. 13 With regards to Spectra, Mr. Hessler mentioned that the low octave band would basically be hiding what 14 15 Invenergy's output would be from their low octave 16 band, is that correct? 17 MR. CLOUTIER: State your case, sir. 18 MR. SILVA: No, I'm just asking you. 19 MR. CLOUTIER: We're not answering questions 20 from the audience. State your case, please. 21 MR. SILVA: All right. So, what I'm getting at 22 is right now Spectra is applying before the FERC to do some more expansion. This whole octave band is 23 24 not going to go away; and, believe me, this whole 25 audience is really interested in this sound and

2
 3
 4

getting it mitigated. So, at some point, there's a very good chance that Spectra is going to bring down those low octave bands; and, if you give them a waiver, where's their octave bands going to be? That sound is just going to be radiating all the way through. You get my picture? You can't give them a waiver, all right. Thank you.

MR. CLOUTIER: Okay, thank you. That concludes the public portion of the hearing. Public portion is closed.

MR. NIKOLYSZYN: Mr. Chairman, I do have one question to Ms. Noonan. Since this application was filed and since we last met, the project envisioned the use of water from Pascoag Well Number 3-A, which I understand Pascoag and Harrisville both have now retracted their commitment to do so. Can you shed any light to this Board as to what your proposal now will be with respect to use of water?

SEVERAL VOICES FROM THE AUDIENCE: Swear her in.

MS. NOONAN: In response to that question, the issue is the water, obviously. We are in discussions to obtain an alternate source that's not related in any way to Well 3-A. Those discussions are progressing, but there's nothing that we can provide or state publicly at this time. So, those are --

obviously, the water is essential to the project; 1 2 but, at this time, as I said, we can't disclose those 3 negotiations. We will as soon as we can make it 4 public. 5 MR. CLOUTIER: Are you in active negotiations 6 with a water source? 7 MS. NOONAN: We are, yes. 8 MR. CLOUTIER: And you're not going to divulge 9 any source at all? 10 MS. NOONAN: I can't at this point except to tell you it's not 3-A. 11 12 MR. CLOUTIER: I think I'll give you my -- also, 13 I find it a little unfair we were given this report, 14 and correct me if I'm wrong, but we had no advance 15 warning that there was going to be any alternate 16 truck routes being submitted to us tonight. 17 MS. NOONAN: They are -- as I said, the report 18 submitted previously had been provided. I had spoken 19 with the Solicitor this morning. If it causes a 20 problem, I can retract them; but they are already a 21 public record. I didn't know what the Zoning Board 22 had access to. They were part of the Planning Board 23 record, and I provided them to supplement the 24 transcripts that are admitted as part of the record. 25 MR. PATRIARCA: Ms. Noonan, I have a question

for you. Please explain to me why you think we 1 2 should grant you a waiver on the octave band waiver. 3 Why do you think you should get that? Because I have 4 a problem with that. 5 MS. NOONAN: Certainly. 6 Hold on. Number 2, where do you MR. PATRIARCA: 7 plan on getting --VOICE FROM THE AUDIENCE: Use the mike. 8 9 MR. PATRIARCA: Sorry. Where do you plan on 10 getting your water from? I would like to know that 11 because I also have a problem with that. What are 12 you doing with traffic control, road construction, everything? I just have a big problem with the 13 14 octave band waiver. 15 WOMAN FROM THE AUDIENCE: Can she please be 16 sworn in like everyone else. 17 VOICE FROM THE AUDIENCE (different voice): 18 She's a lawyer. 19 MS. NOONAN: Mr. Patriarca, were you present? 20 You weren't present at the last Zoning Board hearing? 21 MR. PATRIARCA: No, but I can still ask 22 questions. 23 MS. NOONAN: Oh, no, no, that wasn't my point. The point I am going to is the issue of traffic and 24 25 construction. We did go through all that. In fact,

. .

I had McMahon. We went through all that.

MR. PATRIARCA: I understand; but, since you have changed your plans on the water, since you can't get it from Pascoag and Harrisville, you have to get it from somewhere else. So, this will all change going forward also.

MS. NOONAN: All right. Well, let me answer your questions sort of in the order they came through. On the octave band waiver, it is our request for the waiver; and it is, in fact, the entire reason why your Zoning Board exists is to give variations and approvals that are not directly in accordance with the letter of the law. So, our request for that is based on the science of sort of the noise frequencies; and, from our expert and from Mr. Hessler, the fact that the Ordinance: (1) is unreasonably restrictive; and, secondly, that, effectively, it does not relate to a translatable issue or problem, really, is what it is.

The question that came before the -- the question that came before the Planning Board had to do with effects on wildlife, and that was the follow-up question from the last meeting; and, again, you know, our expert looked at it, and Hessler did, saying that they did not believe that there would be

an impact. The questions were just brought up about, you know, if Spectra reduces its, if it does reduce its, what impact that will be. Mind you, Spectra is already allowed to be at the higher dB level.

I don't know if --

(Noise from the audience.)

MR. CLOUTIER: Please, you may not agree, but you've got to give her a chance to respond.

MS. NOONAN: So, that's the point on the octave is that there was no effect upon -- on the wildlife. That's the position; and, if Spectra does reduce it, as I say, they are allowed to have a higher dB level per FERC. They are above the Town's limits. We're down to 43. What impact, you know, a change or something will have on the low octave, we don't have that information at this point; but we're basing it on the science from both our expert and on the Town's that the low octave band waiver is appropriate in this case, as waivers are granted by this Board on many other occasions.

MR. PATRIARCA: That's fine. I understand we're a Board here, and we need -- (noise from the audience) we operate -- we're a Zoning Board here, and we grant variances and special use permits when we have the proper information. If we don't have

that information, how can we grant this stuff? So, I have a big problem with that. (Applause.)

MS. NOONAN: I do believe that we have provided as much evidence as we can on this through expert testimony, and you have the benefit of the peer review from your Town. I honestly don't know what else could be provided. This topic has been exhaustively, exhaustively reviewed (noise from the audience). People, really, I'm trying to address the Board member. Can you just give me a little quiet. I don't speak when you speak (further noise from the audience).

MR. CLOUTIER: Please, please. We've got to get through this. I mean why would you want to drown somebody's voice that's giving us an answer? I mean I would think we're better than that. I mean I'm sorry.

MS. NOONAN: Apparently not.

MR. CLOUTIER: I'm not in the business of admonishing people, but we got to let people answer our questions. We're all talking about how we don't have answers; and somebody wants to give us an answer, we shout them down? Is that the right thing to do? Okay, we're done.

MAN FROM THE AUDIENCE: We apologize,

Mr. Chairman. 1 2 MR. CLOUTIER: Thank you. All right, Oleg. 3 The Board should --MR. NIKOLYSZYN: 4 MR. CLOUTIER: We're up for discussion between 5 ourselves, amongst ourselves. MR. NIKOLYSZYN: You should make some sort of a 6 7 motion and open it up for discussion. 8 MR. CLOUTIER: Anybody have anything to discuss? 9 MS. COONEY: I'm confused about something. 10 I don't remember Spectra coming before us. Did we 11 not have anything to do with them? I mean that's a different issue, but --12 13 MR. CLOUTIER: Joe? MR. RAYMOND: The Energy Facility Siting Board 14 15 only addresses the power creation. Spectra Energy is 16 under a Federal program, regulated by the Federal --17 the FERC. So, they don't come to us, unless the FERC 18 requests them to. Sometimes they do. They actually 19 did in the case of the smaller compressor that was 20 put on over at the Narragansett Electric Ocean State 21 Power facility from Tennessee Gas back about 10 years 22 ago; but, normally, they don't do that. 23 MS. COONEY: I have one other question. 24 MR. CLOUTIER: Bottom line on that type of 25 question, that question, we had no input then either.

1 MS. COONEY: Okay. 2 MR. RAYMOND: We actually had to --3 I think I recall, in fact, that MS. COONEY: 4 Ocean State Power is doing some upgrades, is that 5 true? We don't know that for a fact either? Because 6 if, in fact, they are, they might be coming up to the 7 same level as the Invenergy project; but I have been 8 told or thought I read somewhere that they were doing 9 extensive upgrades. 10 MR. RAYMOND: If they are, that will be in front 11 of the Energy Facility Siting Board also. 12 MS. COONEY: Okay. So, that's -- there's 13 nothing official about that or nothing that's been 14 said? 15 MR. RAYMOND: We haven't been notified of 16 anything. 17 MS. COONEY: Okay. You know the rumour mill. 18 I'm trying to weed it all out. 19 MR. NIKOLYSZYN: If I may answer that question? 20 I was involved with the litigation with Ocean State, 21 and we're in the process of litigating and 22 negotiation on a settlement. An awful lot was 23 discussed regarding the cost versus the benefit of 24 expanding or keeping the plant operating. They were 25 even considering building a separate unit, in

addition to what they have now because the usefulness 1 2 of the present machinery is running out; and the cost 3 of renovating one particular generator was somewhere around 40 million dollars, and they weren't sure 4 5 whether or not they were going to keep it operational 6 or put more money into it; and they weren't sure how 7 much longer it was going to last. So, that happened 8 approximately six or eight months ago. 9 MS. COONEY: So, I'm not cracking up. I did 10 read in here about that --MR. NIKOLYSZYN: You did read about it. 11 12 MS. COONEY: -- potential expansion. 13 MR. NIKOLYSZYN: We discussed it at length. 14 discussed it for months. I don't know what's going 15 to happen going forward. 16 MS. COONEY: Okay. 17 MR. CLOUTIER: George, you got to have 18 something. 19 MR. KEELING: Yeah. Based on all the testimony, T --20 21 VOICE FROM THE AUDIENCE: Use the mike. 22 MR. KEELING: Based on the testimony that I've 23 heard from everybody tonight and how we conduct our 24 own affairs, until I get more facts, my answer is no, because -- (Applause.) -- because there's just too 25

much left out, too much reading between the lines here. I want to know where that water is coming from. (Applause.)

MS. COONEY: Okay, another question, and it goes to something that was testified to down here regarding whether a waiver was a legal way to handle it, whether we were allowed to give a waiver according to the law that was discussed by one of the gentleman down here. Can you address the legalities of the waiver?

MR. NIKOLYSZYN: Yes. The first question that should be addressed is whether or not a Special Use Permit is going to be granted or not; but, once again, you do not make that decision. All you can do is submit an opinion to the Advisory Board — I mean to the Siting Board. They can ignore your opinion; they can modify your opinion; they can come up with their own reasoning. But, with respect to the normal process, let's say this is not a Siting Board situation but it's a regular application that you are about to make a decision upon; you would first have to make a decision on whether or not to grant a Special Use Permit before you address the issue of the variance.

MS. COONEY: Thank you.

Thank you. You have to remember 1 MR. CLOUTIER: 2 there are too many people practicing law. 3 MAN FROM THE AUDIENCE: Especially with the right answers. 4 5 MR. CLOUTIER: Michele. 6 MS. CARBONI: Come back. 7 MR. CLOUTIER: Good. Jeremy? MR. KEELING: She said come back to her. 8 9 MS. CARBONI: Come back to me. 10 MR. PAGE: Well, I quess this is just a 11 question, but it is a concern I have is: With 12 regards to the water issue, if the plant goes through 13 beyond our control and water is not coming from a 14 local source, say, like Pascoag or any other place 15 locally, if it's trucked in or if it's brought in 16 through some other way, the added fuel to move the 17 water around would also be a concern because you're 18 burning fuels to get the water, burning more fuel for 19 energy, sort of like an added fact. So, not so much 20 a question, just a topic of discussion here. 21 MR. CLOUTIER: Would you like to ask Ms. Noonan 22 the question or --23 MR. PAGE: What is --24 MS. NOONAN: We are not contemplating trucking

25

the water in.

MR. PAGE: Okay, I guess that was my question. 1 2 Would that be a source in any situation, I suppose, 3 or --4 MS. NOONAN: I don't suppose I can say any 5 situation, not knowing -- you know, I mean I know there are situations where it's occurred here; but 6 7 it's not our plan to truck in water for the daily 8 uses of that plant. 9 MR. PAGE: Okay, thank you. 10 MR. KEELING: Would it be your plan to dig up 11 our roads and pipe it in? 12 MS. NOONAN: I said at this point we don't 13 have -- I said we're not trucking it in. So, water 14 only comes in so many ways, but we don't have -- we 15 don't have that fixed yet, due to the changes from 16 where we were before. 17 MR. KEELING: Will you provide us with that 18 information? 19 MS. NOONAN: As soon as we have it and we can do 20 it, we will. 21 MR. KEELING: If we give an advisory opinion 22 tonight, we'll have to give it without that. 23 MS. NOONAN: Sir, I understand. I wish I had 24 that for you. 25 MR. KEELING: Okay.

MS. CARBONI: I have a question. What will happen to the fill while they're building this, as they're constructing --

VOICE FROM THE AUDIENCE: Can't hear her.

MS. CARBONI: I said what will happen to the fill as they're building this project?

MS. NOONAN: As I sit here, I don't --

MS. CARBONI: Where is that going?

MS. NOONAN: I don't have those plans in front of me. We do have -- we have an ordinance in town on this type of thing. We have to comply with that ordinance. So, again, I haven't -- I don't have the details on where the fill would be; but the building permits will be issued, and that will be monitored and will have to be in accordance with law; but I don't have the information tonight.

MS. CARBONI: Shouldn't you already have these?

MS. NOONAN: The way the process works I know seems cumbersome, and it's different than the normal procedure; but we're going into hearings before the Energy Facility Siting Board, and things are developed in a certain way. So, we do not have fully designed plans, as almost any project that comes before you does not have fully designed plans; and, certainly, the cuts and fills for the —

MS. CARBONI: That's not so. Most projects that 1 2 come before us do have a full set of plans. 3 (Applause.) MS. NOONAN: I don't know how Burrillville's 4 5 practice is. I have been doing this for 25 years. 6 I don't present construction plans to a Zoning Board. 7 On the Planning Board we'll have some of that information, but that detail frequently gets in on 8 9 the building plan and later, later on with the 10 building permit. The actual plans for construction 11 are different than the plans for zoning, in my 12 experience. Burrillville may be different, and I 13 understand that; but, in my experience, construction 14 plans differ from zoning and planning submissions. 15 So, my short answer is I do not have that. 16 MR. CRAIG: Mr. Chair, if counsel is going to 17 testify, --18 MR. KEELING: Sir, the public part of the 19 testimony has been closed. 20 MR. CRAIG: She has to be sworn in. 21 MR. CLOUTIER: The person testifying -- the 22 person testifying for Invenergy is an attorney. 23 VOICE FROM THE AUDIENCE: Swear her in then. 24 MR. CLOUTIER: Excuse me. 25 MR. CRAIG: I was an attorney, and they insisted

that I be sworn in. 1 2 MR. CLOUTIER: Sir, I did not know you were an 3 attorney. 4 MR. CRAIG: I am an attorney. I will concede I 5 am not licensed in Rhode Island. 6 I apologize, sir. I did not know MR. CLOUTIER: 7 that. You did not identify yourself as an attorney. MS. NOONAN: For those that don't know, it is 8 9 the practice in the State of Rhode Island that 10 attorneys are not sworn under oath. We are officers 11 of the Court. That is our obligation. 12 MR. CLOUTIER: Jeremy, you all set? 13 MR. PAGE: Yes. 14 MR. CLOUTIER: John? Michele, you done? 15 MS. CARBONI: Yes, I think so. 16 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, maybe I'm missing 17 something here. The application that we have in 18 front of us refers to a Special Use Permit and a 19 height variance; am I correct in assuming that's why 20 they're in front of the Board, a Special Use Permit, 21 obviously, and the height variance? 22 MR. CLOUTIER: Correct. 23 MR. JOHNSON: Now, just going by the way the 24 Board normally does business, obviously, this is a 25 little different than the way we normally conduct our

24

25

hearings; but, generally, we have construction documents in front of us showing -- let's just go to the variance for the height on the structures, on the super structures, the chimneys and whatnot that you're asking relief from. Generally, we have diagrams showing the structure itself. A lot of times when we were dealing with a tower issue in Town, years back, some of you remember that, when the tower companies wanted to come in, they basically had testing in the area. Where they were going to put the tower, they would either put up a big balloon or some sort of something to give the residents of the Town an idea of what they would be looking at, once this thing was built; and I find it hard to make any sort of recommendation, never mind an advisory opinion, on something that I've seen pictures of. I don't have any particular concerns. Our documents in our Zoning Ordinance specifically ask, if you want a Special Use Permit, establish detailed record, submissions of drawings, maps, plats, specifications that can be put in front of this Board to be able to make some sort of a rational decision on whether we want to move forward on something like this.

Now, I understand from our Solicitor that there is information from, basically, the Army Corp of

22

23

24

25

submitted?

Engineers, Department of Environmental Management, a number of other agencies that have not come forward with their information. I understand that's not available to us; but some of this basic information that we normally see on a general, everyday basis from somebody that comes to us if they have a garage that's going to be a little bit taller than it needs to be, they show me a drawing. They give me an idea of where it's going to go on their property. I get a picture of their house, a picture of what it's going to look like, so that I can make some sort of a determination on whether -- I mean if in the off chance that this gets approved, we, you know, as residents of the Town and this Board, we would like to know specifically what this thing is going to look like sticking up out of the ground over there. So, I know this is closed to the public, and we're speaking amongst ourselves; but I have a problem, basically, trying to come to any sort of conclusion here. I have a lot of papers. I have a lot of papers.

MS. NOONAN: Do you have the plan sets that were

MR. JOHNSON: I have a lot of information, but it's -- you know, it's not very explicit, and it's not very -- I mean, from what we're looking at and

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

from what I have to look at, and I'm in the construction field, I don't see anything that's going to make me feel comfortable with making any sort of a decision here tonight or in the future, you know, without some of this information as a Board that we normally receive.

MS. NOONAN: You have the plans, the set of plans.

MR. JOHNSON: I have a set of plans, very small set of plans, with no detail to them whatsoever. If you want to -- if you're stating -- and I'm not trying to -- I don't know if you can see that, that little picture there, but that's the plant right there (indicating); and I have a problem with that, because I can see that you're going to put a plant, but I don't see the detail. (Applause.) I apologize. I see that the plant is going there; but, normally, when we as a Board gather to make any sort of determination, whether it be advisory or not, we generally have more information; and I'm not asking for the Army Corp of Engineers to give me something. I'm not asking for DEM to give me something. I know what they're -- I know the height of a house. I just want to see how it's going to reflect, if this thing gets approved. So, as a Board

member, I have a problem with it on the most basic level, that we don't have a lot of the information. I think Invenergy should have had a little bit more information supplied to us just on the plan itself, just on what you're going to do up there. I mean never mind that you don't own the land. I'm not even going to get into that. I don't have anything here in front of me that tells me that this is going to be what it's going to be, which I don't know what it's going to be. I can't make that determination, as a Zoning Board member. I guess, getting to that point, it's going to be hard for me to make any sort of a rational decision here.

MS. NOONAN: I mean that is the submittal that we have.

MR. JOHNSON: I understand that, and you've got to understand where I'm coming from, too.

MS. NOONAN: I understand.

MR. JOHNSON: If you were sitting here and I showed you something of this small a scale on something that's going to be so big, --

MS. NOONAN: Well, those are the size that we were asked to produce. I could have given you full sheets, if that's what you wanted, but I don't think that's your point.

MR. JOHNSON: No, but this is what I was 1 2 supplied with. I mean you can have --3 MS. NOONAN: Right, I could blow it up. 4 MR. JOHNSON: You could have put them on the big 5 screen here and showed them to me; but nobody has, 6 and nobody showed me anything. So, I just have a 7 problem with, if you're going to do a project this size and spend this kind of money, you would think 8 9 that you'd have something a little bit more detailed 10 for me to look at, so -- (Applause.) Thank you. 11 MR. CLOUTIER: Thank you for mentioning that. I thought it was my age, but, really -- and, correct 12 13 me if I'm not mistaken, but didn't the Planning Board ask you to submit larger plans if they could? 14 15 I know that they had asked for a MS. NOONAN: larger copy of the survey, and we provided that. 16 17 MR. CLOUTIER: Okay, Michele, you want to get 18 back to you? 19 MS. CARBONI: I'm sorry? 20 MR. CLOUTIER: You want me to get back to you? 21 MR. JOHNSON: Are you all set? 22 MS. CARBONI: No, I'm okay right now. 23 MR. CLOUTIER: You're okay. Because we're at 24 the point now where we're going to entertain a 25 motion. Remember, it's --

MR. JOHNSON: Motion for? 1 2 MR. CLOUTIER: Denial or approval of our 3 advisory opinion of why you can't approve of this in 4 your -- remember, we're not making a decision. We're 5 only issuing an advisory opinion; and, for the 6 record, something I didn't mention earlier tonight, 7 just a little deviation from our normal voting: We had one member, Mr. Patriarca, missed one meeting; 8 9 so he's not -- while he's very eligible to 10 participate in all phases, he's not eligible to vote 11 tonight. So, our first alternate, Sandra Cooney, will be voting. Right, are you ready? 12 13 MAN FROM THE AUDIENCE: Why can't he vote? 14 MR. CLOUTIER: Thank you all so much for your 15 help in conducting this meeting tonight. 16 MR. TRINQUE: Mr. Chairman, everybody that sits 17 up on the stage is not -- and everybody that sits in 18 the audience is not an idiot. 19 MR. CLOUTIER: That's okay, we understand. 20 21 sir. 22 (Long Pause.) 23

24

25

MR. TRINQUE: I'll throw myself out. Thank you, MR. CLOUTIER: We're hopefully going to give you a very detailed advisory opinion. We're going to make a motion through the Chair.

Due to the almost total lack of concrete information, we, and the Planning Board before us, have asked in several different ways, several different times, for concrete information from this company; and they've either ignored our questions or evaded them or answered in a very vague manner, where we've gotten no definite answers on, as far as I can tell, anything.

They are looking for a Special Use Permit in an F-5 zone. There's no way that I can see that that -- that that goes with our Comprehensive Plan and fits in with the land uses of this Town. And I'm going to be quoting a lot from the Planning Board advisory opinion.

We lack -- we are lacking an engineering design. As Ken was alluding to a few minutes ago, we have no plans, nothing that we can read.

The big question, and we've asked this over and over and over again, available water supply. There is no water supply. As a matter of fact, they've been denied any water from anybody in this Town; and, if they were to attempt to drill a well and draw from the groundwater, it would seriously deplete the aquifer in the whole Town. It would (Applause.) — it would stop any further development. It would

cripple the Town from developing anything further after this. And, who knows? There's no guarantees that there's enough water for them. I've heard it's up to a million gallons of water per day demand at times for this plant. That's totally irresponsible.

Now, again tonight they answered us very vaguely about a potential water source from somewhere else, but we have no information at all.

Part of the Natural and Cultural Resources chapter of our Comprehensive Plan is to maintain and improve the existing quality of drinking water and to reduce and encourage measures which reduce air pollution levels. This certainly does not do that.

Our Economic Development. We do have economic development. For those who think that this Town is just a rural town, it's just woods and animals, there is an Economic Development Plan. And "Chapter VII, Policies: Maintain industrial and commercial sector growth at a rate adequate to support the population." This does not do that.

"Chapter VIII, Recreation, Conservation,
Open Space." VII.2.a.1. (sic. - should be
VIII.2.a.1.) "Work toward prevention or mitigation
of adverse impacts of human activities on wildlife
habitat." As we heard tonight from the testimony

from the audience, no one knows how the noise is going to affect our animals which are very important to us.

"IX.5.b. Minimize the adverse impacts of power generation and transmission facilities on the environment." This certainly does not do that.

And, again, the most important is the public water. The Town will be facing a public water moratorium on future village growth if this is approved. It's unbelievable that we would would even consider that.

This goes on to say, and I will quote the Planning Board. By the way, I commend the Planning Board for all the hard work and diligence that they did; and that meant starting with and ending with our Town Planner, who did an exceptional job with all of this project.

One point I will respectfully disagree with the Planning Board: They recommend that the Zoning Board grant the octave band waiver, Special Use Permit from the octave band limits of the Noise Ordinance.

They do say that we should grant that, provided all the conditions set forth in Paragraph 3 are strictly complied with, which is what I mentioned earlier, that we could put a condition on this that, if they

didn't meet all our conditions, then the plan would be rejected; but I feel better just not granting it in the first place. (Applause.)

For the record, the reason for that is that we've heard too much testimony. We heard from a witness tonight, who did a tremendous amount of research where the octave band can be controlled, can be limited, can be mitigated; and I'm not sure of the source, but the person has quoted several sources that I believe to be legit. So, that's the way I'm going with that.

The big problem I have is with their — and they testified to this, but, of course, there is an existing access road to Algonquin Gas now. They refuse or are unable to come to an agreement with Algonquin Gas, where they insist that they have to build their own access road which would put two access roads, some of which are going through wetlands in very close proximity to each other. I would like — I do not feel the need for that, why they can't get together with their neighbor.

I think maybe I've exhausted everything that I have to put into this, but I want to thank you for your attention and your cooperation at this meeting. It's not easy on anybody, and I thank you for that.

Okay, would you pass that down to our members, please.

MR. JOHNSON: All right, in regards to the motion being made by the Chairman, I'm going to vote to deny, and I'm going to give you just a couple of reasons why. I think I've spoken to it a little bit tonight: Lack of detail, lack of information to the Board. Also, I — it's striking, the application, and I can understand why they propose it the way they do, but that this will not alter the general characteristics of the surrounding area is beyond me. (Applause.) So, with that, I vote to deny.

MR. PATRIARCA: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to put this on record, even though I do not vote, . . . I wish I could . . . I am extremely insulted that you're very vague on everything we have asked you. I take that personally as an insult. I think the people of this Town take that as an insult. (Applause.) If I were voting, I would vote no; but I'm not, but I just wanted to put that on record.

MS. CARBONI: Essentially, this does not fit in with the Town's Comprehensive Plan; and, as members of this Board, we're here to protect the Town, protect the Comprehensive Plan, and this just is too

vague. For that reason I'm voting to deny.

MS. COONEY: I would just like to say that dealing with this has been very confusing, all the contradictory testimony coming from all sides. You know, everybody can be very effective in presenting their own cases, and it's very confusing and difficult; but we did have to come to a decision. I concur with everything the Chairman said. One thing that wasn't brought up was I think that Invenergy hasn't really proven that the electricity they would generate, that they would be able to sell it and use it so it would be worthwhile to be there; but, as other people have stated, I really am concerned about the water issue and the environment and the animals. So, I vote to deny.

MR. KEELING: Well, all the reasons for denial have been made, so I won't add to it. You already know how I feel. I vote to deny.

MR. PAGE: Mr. Chairman, I don't have a vote in this as an alternate, but I am skeptical of the relief from the octave band; and I do respect our Town's consultant, Mr. Hessler's opinion; but I am skeptical of having a full relief on it. I'm also skeptical of, in the past hearings from the beginning of the summer, there was heavy reliance on the sound

1 in the start-up and the shutdown, on the contractors 2 for the valve -- there was a heavy reliance from 3 Invenergy on the contractors for making the sound 4 decibels low enough for the valves to make it where 5 they were relying on the contractors to make that 6 happen; and I don't know whether or not that's still 7 the case, but it all falls under the Invenergy 8 envelope or umbrella, ultimately; but it's just 9 another layer of -- that is my chief concern; and I 10 would vote no, if I had to vote tonight. 11 MR. CLOUTIER: Everybody good? Joe, would you 12 like to add any testimony at all to this? Any 13 concerns that you have as the Building Official or 14 Zoning Official? You don't have to, if you don't 15 want to. 16 MR. RAYMOND: I don't think it's necessary. 17 I have an advisory opinion of my own that I have to 18 respond to, and I can do it then. MR. CLOUTIER: Very good. Okay, so, we've heard 19 20 how you feel. We need to take a formal vote. 21 are you voting, Ken? 22 MR. JOHNSON: To deny. 23 Is there a second to VOICE FROM THE AUDIENCE: 24 the motion, so we can follow Roberts Rules? 25 MR. CLOUTIER: Okay.

1	MR. NIKOLYSZYN: There is no decision here to be
2	made.
3	MR. CLOUTIER: We're not making a decision.
4	We're only forming an advisory opinion. Your vote on
5	the advisory opinion is?
6	MR. JOHNSON: Is to deny the the Special Use
7	Permit which goes along with the variance.
8	MR. CLOUTIER: Michele.
9	MS. CARBONI: Voting to deny.
10	MR. CLOUTIER: Sandra.
11	MS. COONEY: Deny.
12	MR. CLOUTIER: George.
13	MR. KEELING: Deny.
14	MR. CLOUTIER: And, of course, the Chair will
15	also vote to deny. It's denied unanimously.
16	(Applause.) It doesn't meet any of the standards of
17	our Comprehensive Plan. We all set? Motion to
18	adjourn?
19	MR. KEELING: I will make a motion that we
20	adjourn.
21	MS. CARBONI: I'll second it.
22	MR. CLOUTIER: All in favor?
23	(Whereupon all the Members of the Board responded by
24	saying, "Aye.")
25	MR. CLOUTIER: Opposed?

```
(Whereupon none of the Members of the Board
 1
         responded.)
 2
              MR. CLOUTIER: We're adjourned.
 3
               (The meeting adjourned at 8:49 p.m.)
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATION I do hereby certify the foregoing pages to be a complete, true and accurate transcript, according to my stenographic notes, of the hearing HEARING ON ADVISORY OPINION ON INVENERGY IN RE: THERMAL DEVELOPMENT, LLC'S CLEAR RIVER ENERGY CENTER, heard before the Burrillville Zoning Board at the Burrillville High School Auditorium, 425 East Avenue, Harrisville, Rhode Island, on August 30, 2016 at 7:00 p.m. Andrew J. D'Angelo Andrew J. D'Angelo Court Reporter (Signed Electronically)