



Daniel F. Caruso
Chairman

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

Ten Franklin Square, New Britain, CT 06051

Phone: (860) 827-2935 Fax: (860) 827-2950

E-Mail: siting.council@ct.gov

Internet: ct.gov/csc

March 7, 2011

TO: Parties and Intervenors

FROM: Linda Roberts, Executive Director *LR*

RE: **DOCKET NT-2010** - Reopening of final decisions pursuant to C.G.S. §4-181a(b) for jurisdictional natural gas-fired electric generating facilities under C.G.S. §16-50i(a)(3) and C.G.S. §16-50k(a) limited to Council consideration of changed conditions and the attachment of conditions to the certificates and declaratory rulings consistent with the findings and recommendations in the Final Report issued by the Kleen Energy Plant Investigation Review Panel (Nevas Commission) and the findings and recommendations in the Executive Report issued by the Thomas Commission.

As stated at the hearing in Hartford on December 14, 2010, after the Council issues its draft findings of fact, parties and intervenors may identify errors or inconsistencies between the Council's draft findings of fact and the record; however, no new information, evidence, argument, or reply briefs will be considered by the Council.

Parties and Intervenors may file written comments with the Connecticut Siting Council on the Draft Findings of Fact issued on this docket by March 11, 2011.

LR/laf

Enclosure

DOCKET NT-2010 - Reopening of final decisions pursuant to C.G.S. §4-181a(b) for jurisdictional natural gas-fired electric generating facilities under C.G.S. §16-50i(a)(3) and C.G.S. §16-50k(a) limited to Council consideration of changed conditions and the attachment of conditions to the certificates and declaratory rulings consistent with the findings and recommendations in the Final Report issued by the Kleen Energy Plant Investigation Review Panel (Nevas Commission) and the findings and recommendations in the Executive Report issued by the Thomas Commission.

} Connecticut

} Siting

} Council

} February 10, 2011

DOCKET NO. 54/ DOCKET NO. 54A – O'Brien Energy Systems, Inc. Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need to construct a cogeneration facility in the City of Hartford, Connecticut

Draft Findings of Fact

DOCKET NO. 59 – Capitol District Energy Center Cogeneration Associates Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a 55 MW cogeneration facility in Hartford, Connecticut.

DOCKET NO. 60/ DOCKET NO. 60A – Flagg Energy Development Corporation Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a 10,000 kW cogeneration facility located in Hartford, Connecticut.

DOCKET NO. 64/DOCKET NO. 64A/DOCKET NO. 64B Dexter Corporation Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a 48.5 MW cogeneration facility located in Windsor Locks, Connecticut.

DOCKET NO. 189 - Lake Road Generating Company, L.P. Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for an electric generating project located off of Lake Road in Killingly, Connecticut.

DOCKET NO. 192 - Towantic Energy, LLC Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a proposed electric generating facility located north of the Prokop Road and Towantic Hill Road intersection in the Town of Oxford, Connecticut.

PETITION NO. 352 - The Connecticut Light and Power Company declaratory ruling that no Certificate is required for the emergency installation of four gas turbine generating units at Devon Station, in Milford.

PETITION NO. 377 – Bridgeport Energy, LLC declaratory ruling that no Certificate is required for modifications to United Illuminating's Bridgeport Harbor Station for constructing a 520 MW combined cycle gas turbine generating project, in Bridgeport.

PETITION NO. 451 - PPL Wallingford Energy LLC declaratory ruling that no Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need is required for the construction of an electric generating facility at the site of the existing Alfred L. Pierce Station, located at 195 East Street in Wallingford.

PETITION NO. 546- Pratt & Whitney declaratory ruling that no Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need is required for the proposed modification to the existing cogeneration power facility at the Pratt & Whitney manufacturing facility located at 400 Main Street, East Hartford, Connecticut.

PETITION NO. 902 - Pratt & Whitney declaratory ruling that no Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need is required for the proposed modification to the existing cogeneration power facility at the Pratt & Whitney manufacturing facility located at 400 Main Street, East Hartford, Connecticut

PETITION NO. 563 - The Torrington Company declaratory ruling that no Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need is required for the proposed installation of two 70 kilowatt microturbine generators at 59 Field Street, Torrington, Connecticut.

PETITION NO. 778 - Connecticut Municipal Electric Energy Cooperative declaratory ruling that no Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need is required for the proposed repowering of the Alfred L. Pierce Generating Station located at 195 East Street, Wallingford, Connecticut.

PETITION NO. 805 - Ansonia Generation LLC declaratory ruling that no Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need is required for the proposed construction, maintenance, and operation of a 58.4 MW combined heat and power natural gas-fired electric generating facility and transmission line tap located at 75 Liberty Street, Ansonia, Connecticut.

PETITION NO. 813 - Kimberly-Clark Corporation declaratory ruling that no Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need is required for the proposed construction, maintenance, and operation of a combined heat and power electric generating facility, located at 58 Pickett District Road, New Milford, Connecticut.

PETITION NO. 831 – Waterbury Generation LLC declaratory ruling no Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need is required for the construction of an electric generating facility and associated transmission line tap located at 725 Bank Street, Waterbury, Connecticut.

PETITION NO. 841 – The Bridgeport Energy II, LLC declaratory ruling that no Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need is required for the proposed construction, operation and maintenance of a 350 MW Peaking Facility at the existing Bridgeport Energy Facility located at 10 Atlantic Street, Bridgeport, Connecticut.

PETITION NO. 843 – The NRG Energy, Inc. declaratory ruling that no Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need is required for the proposed installation of four 50 MW Peaking Units at its Devon Facility located at 700 Naugatuck Avenue, Milford, Connecticut.

PETITION NO. 870 – The Hartford Steam Company declaratory ruling that no Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need is required for the proposed location, installation and operation of a 3.5 megawatt co-generation facility located at 60 Columbus Boulevard, Hartford, Connecticut.

PETITION NO. 875 - GenConn Energy LLC declaratory ruling that no Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need is required for the proposed installation and operation of four 50 MW peaking units at the Middletown Station located at 1866 River Road, Middletown, Connecticut.

PETITION NO. 925 - PSEG Power Connecticut LLC declaratory ruling that no Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need is required for the installation and operation of three 48.5 MW peaking units at New Haven Harbor Station, 1 Waterfront Street, New Haven, Connecticut.

PETITION NO. 482 - HEC, Inc., acting as agent for the State of Connecticut, declaratory ruling that no Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need is required for fuel cells and emergency generating devices to be developed at the Connecticut Juvenile Training School in Middletown, Connecticut.

PETITION NO. 553 - Town of South Windsor declaratory ruling that no Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need is required for the proposed installation of a fuel cell at the South Windsor High School, 161 Nevers Road, South Windsor, Connecticut.

PETITION NO. 598 - Yale University declaratory ruling that no Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need is required for the construction of a fuel cell to be located on Yale's Campus in New Haven, Connecticut.

PETITION NO. 619E - Select Energy Services, Inc. declaratory ruling that no Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need is required is required for the construction, operation and maintenance of a fuel cell to be located at St. Francis Hospital and Medical Center, 114 Woodland Street, Hartford, Connecticut.

PETITION NO. 647 - Nxegen, Inc. declaratory ruling that no Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need is required for the installation of a fuel cell at the Water Pollution Control Authority at 345 East Shore Parkway, New Haven, Connecticut.

PETITION NO. 696 - Johnson Controls, Inc. declaratory ruling that no Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need is required for the installation of a 200-kW Fuel Cell at the Water Pollution Control Facility located at 330 One Rod Highway, Fairfield, Connecticut.

PETITION NO. 711 -PPL Energy Services Holding, LLC declaratory ruling that no Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need is required for the installation of a Fuel Cell power plant for the Pepperidge Farm Inc. Facility located at 1414 Blue Hill Avenue, Bloomfield, Connecticut.

PETITION NO. 785 - Bridgeport Fuel Cell Park declaratory ruling no Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need is required for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a 14.4 MW Fuel Cell Electric Project located on Hancock Street, Bridgeport, Connecticut.

PETITION NO. 957 - Bridgeport Fuel Cell Park, LLC declaratory ruling that no Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need is required for the proposed installation of a fuel cell generating facility located at Hancock Street, Bridgeport, Connecticut.

PETITION NO. 810 - City of Middletown declaratory ruling that no Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need is required for the proposed construction, maintenance, and operation of a 200 kW fuel cell located at the new Middletown High School, Wilderman's Way, Middletown, Connecticut.

PETITION NO. 828 – DFG-ERG Milford, LLC declaratory ruling that no Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need is required for the installation of a fuel cell facility located at 775 Oronoque Road, Milford, Connecticut.

PETITION NO. 847 – Pepperidge Farm, Inc. declaratory ruling that no Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need is required for the proposed installation of a 1.2 megawatt fuel cell located at 1414 Blue Hills Avenue, Bloomfield, Connecticut.

PETITION NO. 921 - DFC-ERG CT, LLC declaratory ruling that no Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need is required for the installation of a Fuel Cell generating facility located at 535 Simsbury Road, Bloomfield, Connecticut.

PETITION NO. 922 - DFC-ERG CT, LLC declaratory ruling that no Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need is required for the installation of a Fuel Cell generating facility located at 1835 Hebron Avenue, Glastonbury, Connecticut.

PETITION NO. 923 - Fuel Cell Energy, Inc. declaratory ruling that no Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need is required for the installation and operation of a Fuel Cell test facility located at 539 Technology Park Drive, Torrington, Connecticut.

PETITION NO. 943 - UTC Power Corporation declaratory ruling that no Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need is required for the installation of a Customer-Side 400 kW Fuel Cell to be located at 931 Torrington Street, Torrington, Connecticut.

PETITION NO. 948 - UTC Power Corporation declaratory ruling that no Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need is required for the installation of a 400 kW Fuel Cell to be located at 360 State Street, New Haven, Connecticut.

PETITION NO. 949 - UTC Power Corporation declaratory ruling that no Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need is required for the installation of a 400 kW Fuel Cell to be located at 835 Washington Street, Middletown, Connecticut.

PETITION NO. 953 - UTC Power Corporation declaratory ruling that no Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need is required for the installation of two 400 kW Fuel Cells to be located at 1 Aircraft Road, Middletown, Connecticut.

PETITION NO. 961 - UTC Power Corporation declaratory ruling that no Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need is required for the installation of a 400 kW Fuel Cell to be located at 170 Dewitt Street, New Haven, Connecticut.

DRAFT Findings of Fact

Introduction

1. On October 21, 2010, the Connecticut Siting Council (Council), on its own motion, voted to reopen the final decisions of jurisdictional natural gas-fired power plants pursuant to C.G.S. §4-181a(b), and specifically limited the proceedings to Council consideration of changed conditions and of the attachment of conditions to the certificates and declaratory rulings consistent with the findings and recommendations contained in the Kleen Energy Plant Investigation Review Panel Final Report issued on June 3, 2010, and the findings and recommendations contained in the Executive Report issued by the Thomas Commission on September 21, 2010. (Council E/T Meeting Minutes, October 21, 2010)
2. Pursuant to C.G.S. §16-50m, the Council, after giving due notice thereof, held public hearings on December 7, 2010, December 9, 2010 and December 14, 2010 beginning at 10 a.m. at the Legislative Office Building, Room 2D, 300 Capitol Avenue, Hartford, Connecticut. (Council's Hearing Notice dated October 28, 2010)
3. Public notice of the hearings was published in the Middletown Press, the Meriden Record Journal and the New Britain Herald on November 3, 2010. (Council correspondence dated October 28, 2010)

State Agency Comments

4. Pursuant to C.G.S. § 16-50j(h), on October 28, 2010 and on December 17, 2010, the following state agencies were solicited to submit written comments regarding the reopening of the final decisions for the attachment of conditions to the certificates and declaratory rulings consistent with the findings and recommendations contained in the Kleen Energy Plant Investigation Review Panel Final Report issued on June 3, 2010, and the findings and recommendations contained in the Executive Report issued by the Thomas Commission on September 21, 2010: Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), Department of Public Health (DPH), Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ), Department of Public Utility Control (DPUC), Office of Policy and Management (OPM), Department of Economic and Community Development (DECD), Department of Agriculture (DOAg), Department of Emergency Management and Homeland Security (DEMHS), Department of Transportation (DOT), Department of Public Safety (DPS), Department of Labor (DOL), Department of Consumer Protection (DCP) and Department of Public Works (DPW). (Council Correspondence of October 28, 2010 and December 17, 2010)

5. On November 10, 2010, the DPH submitted comments on the reopening of the final decisions for the attachment of conditions to the certificates and declaratory rulings consistent with the findings and recommendations contained in the Kleen Energy Plant Investigation Review Panel Final Report issued on June 3, 2010, and the findings and recommendations contained in the Executive Report issued by the Thomas Commission on September 21, 2010. With reference to both the initial construction phase and any future construction or maintenance activities at the facilities, the DPH recommended:
 - a) prohibition of the use of flammable gas for the purposes of cleaning fuel gas piping;
 - b) prohibition of venting flammable gas indoors or outdoors where the gas may form a flammable atmosphere in the vicinity of workers and/or ignition sources;
 - c) prohibition of work activity in areas where the concentration of flammable gas exceeds 10% of the lower explosive limit (LEL) and requiring continuous monitoring of gas concentrations;
 - d) a requirement of adherence to the most current version of the *National Fuel Gas Code*, as outlined in National Fire Protection Association Standard 54 (NFPA 54);
 - e) a requirement of adherence to the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) Standards for *Process Safety Management of Highly Hazardous Chemicals*;
 - f) a requirement for an independent Site Safety Manager during the construction phase;
 - g) a requirement for flammable gas safety procedures and training activities be provided to the Siting Council; and
 - h) prohibit or attach conditions to the Certificate that pertain to financial incentives for early completion construction contracts. One such condition could be any financial incentives received by the contractors to be contingent on a “zero injury rate” achieved during construction.(DPH comments dated November 10, 2010)

6. The following state agencies did not file written comment on the reopening of the final decision for the attachment of conditions to the certificates and declaratory rulings consistent with the findings and recommendations contained in the Kleen Energy Plant Investigation Review Panel Final Report issued on June 3, 2010, and the findings and recommendations contained in the Executive Report issued by the Thomas Commission on September 21, 2010: DEP, CEQ, DPUC, OPM, DECD, DOAg, DEMHS, DOT, DPS, DOL, DCP and DPW. (Record)

Changed Conditions

7. The Kleen Energy Plant Investigation Review Panel Final Report issued on June 3, 2010 recommended that the Siting Council determine whether its “changed conditions” authority under C.G.S. § 4-181a(b) would enable it to review all power plants within its jurisdiction to determine whether such plants warrant the attachment of conditions to incorporate the recommendations of the panel into existing certificates and declaratory rulings. (Council Admin. Notice Item 38)
8. Changed conditions since the certificates and declaratory rulings were issued are changes in industry practice standards specifically pertaining to the gas pipe cleaning process. (Council Admin. Notice Items 38, 39, 40)

Kleen Energy Plant Investigation Review Panel (Nevas Commission)

9. On February 7, 2010, there was an explosion at the Kleen Energy Systems, LLC facility (Kleen facility) in Middletown, Connecticut. The explosion was due to the release and ignition of natural gas from a process used to clean the natural gas pipeline using high quantities of natural gas, a procedure known as a “gas blow.” (Council Admin. Notice Item 38)
10. After the explosion, Governor M. Jodi Rell established a commission, the Kleen Energy Plant Investigation Review Panel, chaired by Judge Alan Nevas (the “Nevas Commission”), that included representatives of the DEP, DOL, Connecticut State Police (including the State Fire Marshal and the Office of the State Building Inspector), DCP, and the DPUC, to identify the cause and origin of the explosion. (Council Admin. Notice Item 38)
11. The findings of the Nevas Commission were to be applied by a second, separate commission established by the Governor, the “Thomas Commission,” whose charge was to recommend any necessary specific legislative or regulatory changes to prevent such an event from occurring again. (Council Admin. Notice Item 38; Council Admin. Notice Item 40)
12. On June 3, 2010, the Nevas Commission issued a Final Report titled “Governor’s Commission Re: Kleen Energy Explosion – Final Report.” The Final Report included findings and recommendations regarding pipe cleaning procedures used at the Kleen facility and recommended that the Council review all gas-fired baseload power plants within its jurisdiction, including those that have already been permitted. In addition, the report included an analysis of existing regulations concerning such activities and recommended changes to regulatory criteria to prevent such an event in the future. (Council Admin. Notice Item 38)
13. The United States Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board (USCSB), an independent federal agency, also investigated the cause of the explosion and developed its own set of recommendations to prevent similar accidents. The USCSB issued its final report on June 28, 2010. One of the recommendations of the USCSB is to ban the use of flammable gas that is released into the atmosphere as a pipe cleaning procedure at power plants. (Council Admin. Notice Item 39; Council Admin. Notice Item 40)

14. The Thomas Commission was chaired by Commissioner James M. Thomas of the DPS and included the following members: Edward Badamo, Fire Chief of the Middletown South Fire District; Karl Baker, designee for Chairman Kevin M. DelGobbo of the DPUC and Supervisor of the Gas Pipeline Safety Unit; Dr. Vishnu Khade, design engineer of the DPW; John Olsen, President of the AFL/CIO; John Parker, Chief Building Inspector of Middletown; Robert Ross, Director of the Division of Fire, Emergency and Building Services; and Bruce J. Spiewak of the American Institute of Architects. (Council Admin. Notice Item 40)
15. On September 21, 2010, the Thomas Commission issued an Executive Report that included recommendations for regulatory changes that can be accomplished by executive order, state legislation or adoption of regulations. (Council Admin. Notice Item 40)

Nevas Commission Findings

16. The Nevas Commission findings are:
 - a. “The Commission finds that the February 7, 2010 explosion was the product of a process used to clean a natural gas pipeline using large quantities of natural gas that came into contact with an ignition source known as a gas blow”;
 - b. “The Commission finds that, although the Kleen Energy construction project was heavily regulated by a variety of agencies, no agency regulated the process used – or any process that might be used such as gas purging – to clean the natural gas pipeline that was the source of the explosion”;
 - c. “The Commission finds, and recommends to the Thomas Panel, that there are significant regulatory steps that should be taken to ensure that the events of February 7, 2010 are not repeated”.
 (Council Admin. Notice Item 38)
17. The Nevas Commission Final Report suggested that the Thomas Commission should examine the following areas pertaining to natural gas blows:
 - a. “Determine whether any other state or federal agency has developed regulatory structure applicable to natural gas pipeline cleaning”;
 - b. “Consult with industry experts to determine which methods of gas blowing are used and/or recommended, and identify the advantages and disadvantages of each method”;
 - c. “Identify the agency, or agencies, best suited to regulate the gas blow process”;
 - d. “Recommend the level of training and expertise necessary for that agency to effectively establish and enforce necessary cleaning regulations”;
 - e. “Consider recommending that the Connecticut Siting Council impose safety conditions upon any entity constructing a power plant that will employ the gas blow cleaning process”;
 - f. “Consider recommending that the Connecticut Department of Consumer Protection and/or the Connecticut Department of Labor identify, if appropriate, special licensing, credentials, and/or training for those assigned to effect power plant gas blows in Connecticut. Further, consider recommending that the latter agencies address whether work schedule limitations are appropriate for those assigned to perform power plant gas blows in Connecticut”;
 - g. consider the establishment of regulations concerning natural gas blow procedures.
 (Council Admin. Notice Item 38)

18. The Nevas Commission Final Report contained a statement by Judge Nevas to the Council urging that the Council attach conditions to Kleen's Certificate that a) address the findings of the Nevas Commission; and b) incorporate any more specific recommendations made by the Thomas Panel. (Council Admin. Notice Item 38)
19. Additionally, Judge Nevas suggested the following:
- a. "...a coordination council consisting of pertinent state agencies be assembled to share information during the course of construction of a large power facility. The Siting Council might serve as the coordinating entity using its "changed conditions authority if concerns arise that there is a pattern of violations during construction;"
 - b. "The Siting Council should review this report and ultimately the Thomas Commission report to determine whether its "changed conditions" authority would enable it to review all power plants within its jurisdiction to determine whether such plants warrant further attention;" and
 - c. "...the Thomas Commission solicit comments and input from the Siting Council as to how the Siting Council might address concerns relative to gas-fired baseload power plant facilities that have been permitted in the past and the records which are now closed."
- (Council Admin. Notice Item 38)

Thomas Commission Findings

20. At the meeting of the Thomas Commission held on August 10, 2010, Kevin M. DelGobbo, Chairman of the DPUC stated that the Nevas Commission made the following three determinations:
- a. "The February 7, 2010 explosion was the product of a process to clean a natural gas pipeline using large quantities of natural gas that came into contact with an ignition source known in the industry as a "gas blow;"
 - b. "Although the Kleen construction project was heavily regulated by a variety of agencies, no agency regulated the process used – or any process that might be used such as gas purging – to clean the natural gas pipeline that was the source of the explosion;"and
 - c. Recommendations to the Thomas Panel that "there are significant regulatory steps that should be taken to ensure that the events of February 7, 2010 are not repeated."
- (Council Admin. Notice Item 40)
21. At the meeting of the Thomas Commission held on August 24, 2010, Manuel R. Gomez, Director of Recommendations from the USCSB, testified that there are no standards and limited guidance regarding safely cleaning fuel gas piping. (Council Admin. Notice Item 40)
22. At the meeting of the Thomas Commission held on September 14, 2010, James J. Murphy, Member of the Council, testified that the Council has the authority, on its own motion, to modify the certificates of power plant facilities at any time on a finding of changed conditions pursuant to Connecticut General Statute §4-181a(b). Mr. Murphy also recommended statutory changes to include the DEMHS, DPS, DOL, DCP, and DPW as additional agencies with which the Council must consult and solicit comments from when an application for an electric generating facility is received by the Council. (Council Admin. Notice Item 40)
23. Also at the Thomas Commission meeting of September 14, 2010, the DPS Division of Fire, Emergency and Building Services testified to specific recommendations for adoption of the

2010 Edition of the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) 37, adoption of the 2009 Edition of NFPA 54 including Temporary Interim Amendment (TIA) 09-3, adoption of American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) B31, including a requirement that the Connecticut Siting Council to require the owner to hire a special inspector for the inspection of piping installed in accordance with ASME B31, amendments to the Fire Prevention Code, C.G.S. §29-291a and adoption of the 2010 edition of NFPA 850. (Council Admin. Notice Item 40)

24. The Executive Report issued by the Thomas Commission contains the following Final Recommendations:
- a. "Use of flammable gases to conduct "gas blows" should be banned in Connecticut; at least until such time as there are accepted national standards published and in place;"
 - b. "Requirement of special inspectors, development of safety plans and payment of cost by power plant applicant;"
 - c. "Assembly of a "Coordinating Council" for future power plant applications;"
 - d. "Attachment of conditions to certificates issued by the Siting Council that include a ban on flammable gas blows and compliance with code recommendations;"
 - e. "Review of existing power plants by the Siting Council to modify final decisions of power plants within its jurisdiction to determine whether such plants warrant further attention;"
 - f. "Adoption of the following codes and regulations by the DPS:
 - i. Amend the Flammable & Combustible Liquids Code, C.G.S. §29-320 to adopt the 2010 Edition of NFPA 37, "Standard for the Installation and Use of Stationary Combustion Engines and Gas Turbines";
 - ii. Amend the Gas Equipment and Piping Code, C.G.S. §29-329 to adopt the 2009 Edition of NFPA 54, "National Fuel Gas Code" including Temporary Interim Amendment 09-3 and, by Connecticut amendment, remove the exception regarding fuel gas piping at electric utility power plants; and to adopt ASME Standard B31, "Code for Pressure Piping", including mandatory compliance with Appendices IV and V of ASME B31.1 for newly constructed electric utility power plants;
 - iii. Amend the Connecticut Fire Prevention Code adopted pursuant to C.G.S. §29-291a to add new sections in the Hazardous Materials Chapter regarding "Gas Piping Cleaning Operations";
 - iv. Amend the Fire Prevention Code adopted pursuant to C.G.S. §29-291a to delete and revise sections 29-291a-2(a) and (b) regarding "Relationship to State Fire Safety and Building Codes" and adopt the requirements of the 2010 Edition of NFPA 850 "Fire Protection for Electric Generating Plants and High Voltage Current Converter Stations;" and
 - g. "Adopt legislation to provide for payment into a code training fund by any power plant applicant who is required to obtain Siting Council approval."
(Council Admin. Notice Item 40)

Certificate and Declaratory Ruling Holders' Response to the Thomas Commission Recommendations

25. The Certificate and Declaratory Ruling Holders have no objections to the Council's attachment of the Thomas Commission recommendations to the final decisions. (Tr. 1, pp. 18, 33, 64-65, 75, 90, 120-121; Tr.2, pp. 9, 33, 47-48, 54, 65, 75, 85, 107; Tr. 3, pp. 24, 57, 73, 122)

26. The Certificate and Declaratory Ruling Holders have emergency response plans unique to the facilities.
(Tr. 1, pp. 16-17, 49, 73-74; Tr. 2, pp. 10, 29-30, 54, 62-63, 73, 84, 89-90, 106-107, 124; Tr. 3, pp. 24, 57, 73, 122)

27. The Certificate and Declaratory Ruling Holders would examine the possibility of establishing a Reverse 911 system for the facilities.
(Tr.1, pp. 17, 22; Tr. 2, pp. 11, 55, 74, 76, 84, 89-90, 107)