

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
BOSTON REGION

In the Matter of:

PUBLIC HEARING:

RE: NATIONAL POLLUTANT DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM (NPDES)
PUBLIC SERVICE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, MERRIMACK STATION, BOW, NH
NPDES PERMIT NO. NH0001465

New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services
29 Hazen Drive
Concord, New Hampshire

Thursday,
November 3, 2011

The above entitled matter came on for hearing,
pursuant to Notice at 7:15 p.m.

BEFORE:

DAVID WEBSTER, Chief, Industrial Permits Branch
JOHN KING, Permit Writer
New England Region I
5 Post Office Square
Boston, MA 02109

I N D E X

<u>SPEAKERS:</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
David Webster, EPA	3
Rep. Bill Ohm	9
Rep. Don LeBrun	11
Rep. Timothy Twombly	13
Rob Frye	14
Kenneth Colburn	17
Randy Herk	20
Catherine Goldwater	22
Linda Rauter	24
Tom Irwin	26
Catherine Corkery	31
Jerry Curran	33
Marsh Feigl	34
Rick Tuttle	36
Robert Williams	39
Jeff Daly	40
Barbara Morris	44
Woodworth Winmill	46

P R O C E E D I N G S

(7:15 p.m.)

MR. WEBSTER: Good evening ladies and gentlemen. My name is David Webster. I'm the Chief of the Industrial Permits Branch of the New England Regional Office of the Environmental Protection Agency also known as the EPA. Also joining me shortly here will be John Paul King, the EPA's permit writer for the permit which is the subject of the hearing.

This hearing concerns the issuance of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System or NPDES, or "Nipdees" permit for the Public Service New Hampshire, or the PSNH Merrimack Station facility in Bow, New Hampshire.

The hearing shall come to order.

This permit is for the following facility, PSNH Merrimack Station, permit number NH0001465.

This permit will be issued to Public Service New Hampshire Merrimack Station in final form upon consideration of the comments received during the public comment period including those received during this public hearing.

The NPDES program issues permits to all facilities that discharge into waters of the United States. The permit writer develops effluent limitations as well as monitoring and reporting requirements based on information from the facility, Federal regulations, State water quality

1 standards, technical guidance published by EPA and the
2 State, State and Federal policy.

3 More information on the NPDES program is available
4 at the NPDES program summary handout entitled water
5 permitting 101. Copies of this were available this evening.

6 Along with this document, there is a list of web
7 addresses that you can find additional information on the
8 NPDES program. And I believe, there was a handout at the
9 website for -- specifically for this Draft Permit and
10 supporting materials.

11 EPA released the Draft Permit for public notice
12 for the facility on September 29, 2011. The public comment
13 period began September 30th, and as initially announced, was
14 to run through November 30, 2011. A legal notice for this
15 public comment period and for this hearing was published in
16 the Concord Monitor on September 30, 2011.

17 Since the beginning of this public comment period,
18 EPA received requests for an extension of the public comment
19 period from Public Service New Hampshire and others. After
20 consideration of these requests, EPA extended the public
21 comment period for an additional 90 days.

22 The public comment period now ends February 28,
23 2012. Public notice of this extension to the public comment
24 period is being announced here tonight as well as being
25 published on November 1, 2011 in the Concord Monitor.

1 Since September 29th, the Draft Permit, Fact Sheet
2 and the supporting documents have been available to
3 interested parties to review and comment on. The Fact Sheet
4 describes the type of facility, the type of quantities of
5 waste, a summary of the basic -- and the basis for the Draft
6 Permit conditions and significant factual legal and policy
7 questions considered in preparing the Draft Permit.

8 Here are some -- there are several attachments to
9 the Fact Sheets. And I will point out two of them because
10 they provide the rationale for several important permit
11 provisions. One is Attachment D, which is the Clean Water
12 Act NPDES permitting determination for the thermal discharge
13 and the cooling water intake structures at Merrimack Station
14 in Bow, New Hampshire. And the second is Attachment E, a
15 determination of the technology based effluent limits for
16 the flue gas desulfurization waste water at Merrimack
17 Station in Bow, New Hampshire.

18 The Draft Permit and Fact Sheet, including those
19 attachments, were all made available on EPA's website and
20 they still are. The website at <http://www.epa.gov/region1>
21 -- with a numeral -- /npdes/merrimackstation -- all one
22 word.

23 You have probably received or have seen copies of
24 the Draft Permit and the Fact Sheet without the attachments.
25 But, in any case, some of them are available, the Draft

1 Permit and the Fact Sheet without the attachments at this
2 hearing as well as being on the EPA website, of course.

3 Tonight's hearing is an formal non-adversarial
4 hearing providing interested parties with the opportunity to
5 make oral comments and to submit written comments on the
6 proposed permit. There will be no cross examination of
7 either the panel or the commenters. Any questions directed
8 to a commenter from the panel member will be for
9 clarification purposes only.

10 This public hearing is being recorded. A
11 transcript will be part of the official administrative
12 record for this permit. However, in order to ensure that --
13 the record's accuracy, we highly recommend that you submit
14 written statements in addition to your comments made
15 tonight.

16 As previously mentioned, the public comment period
17 will close at midnight on February 28, 2012. Following the
18 close of the public comment period, EPA will review and
19 consider all comments received during the public comment
20 period, both in writing and at tonight's public hearing.

21 EPA will prepare a document known as a Response to
22 Comments that will describe and address the significant
23 issues raised during the comment period and what provisions,
24 if any, of the Draft Permit have been changed and the
25 reasons for the change.

1 The Response to Comments will accompany the Final
2 Permit for the Public Service New Hampshire Merrimack
3 Station facility when the final permit is issued. Notice of
4 the availability of the Response to Comments and the Final
5 Permit will be mailed or e-mailed to everyone who commented
6 on the Draft Permit.

7 Anyone who wishes to contest the Final Permit must
8 file a petition for review or appeal with the Environmental
9 Appeals Board, also known as the EAB. A couple of important
10 things to remember if you are considering appealing the
11 Final Permit.

12 First, the petition for review or appeal must be
13 received by the EAB within 30 days of the date the Final
14 Permit is issued. More information on exactly how to
15 calculate this time period will be included in the
16 attachment to -- in an attachment with the Final Permit.

17 Second, only persons who filed comments on the
18 Draft Permit during the public comment period, or who
19 provided comments during the hearing tonight may petition
20 the EAB to review the Final Permit conditions.

21 Third, any person seeking to review a permit
22 decision must raise all reasonably ascertainable issues and
23 submit all reasonably available arguments supporting their
24 position during the public comment period, including this
25 public hearing.

1 Issues or arguments that are not raised will not
2 be considered by the EAB on appeal. There is one exception
3 to the above. Any person who failed to file comments or
4 failed to participate in the public hearing, may petition
5 the EAB only to the extent of the change in the Draft to the
6 Final Permit. More information on the appeals process can
7 be found at the EAB -- the EPA website and at the time of
8 the Final Permit issuance.

9 To begin your comments, I will first ask if there
10 is a representative of the applicant, Public Service New
11 Hampshire who wants to make a statement. I will then
12 request statements from Federal, State and local officials
13 and then, members of the public audience.

14 I will use the attendance cards to call on people
15 who wish to comment. These cards will also be used to
16 notify persons of our subsequent Final Permit decision.

17 If, when I call you, we would ask the speakers to
18 come to the podium, right up here where there is a live mic
19 that I believe is on. And that I ask you, before you begin
20 your statement, to please identify yourself and your
21 affiliation if you have one for the record, if you would.

22 It looks like a fairly large group that wish to
23 comment tonight. In order that the participants are allowed
24 to express their views, I ask that you try to limit your
25 comments to five minutes. If, at any time, you are asked to

1 stop and you are not finished, I will ask you to defer the
2 remainder of your comments until each person has an
3 opportunity to comment. Then, if there is time at the end
4 of the meeting, and I fully anticipate that there will be
5 time for everybody to comment, we will give you a short
6 opportunity to finish your comments.

7 If you have a written statement, you may read it
8 if it is done in five minutes. If not, I'd ask you to
9 summarize it.

10 In either case, I encourage you to submit written
11 comments tonight before the close of the public comment
12 period on February 28, 2012.

13 So, I understand that the permittee does not have
14 a stated representative. So, I'm going to go move towards
15 the -- Representative Bill Ohm, State Representative from
16 Nashua. Thank you.

17 MR. OHM: Thank you, Mr. Webster.

18 For the record, my name is Bill Ohm. I'm a State
19 Representative of Hillsborough 26 which is the district
20 representing South Nashua.

21 Let me make sure I understand this proposal.

22 As I understand it, the EPA in Washington is
23 asking the taxpayers of New Hampshire to spend \$112,000,000
24 on pollution mitigation. What is this pollution mitigation?
25 Is this mercury that goes into the tissue of fish that we

1 eat? Oh, no, it's not that. Is this sulfur dioxide,
2 something that produces acid rain and harms the forest of
3 the northeast? No, no. It's not that. Is this
4 \$112,000,000 for CO2? No, it's not that. So, what is this
5 for?

6 This is for clean water, warm water. This is to
7 mitigate warm, clean water at a cost of \$112,000,000 to
8 taxpayers of New Hampshire for the PSNH customers of my
9 district in Nashua. That's \$85 for every man, woman and
10 child of New Hampshire to prevent warm clean water from
11 going into the Merrimack River.

12 I'm very skeptical that this is an appropriate
13 expense for the taxpayers of New Hampshire. And I urge the
14 EPA to rescind this requirement of a thermal variance for
15 the Bow power plant and indeed, grant Public Service New
16 Hampshire the requested thermal variance so they can get
17 down to the business of supplying low cost power to the
18 taxpayers of New Hampshire.

19 Thank you.

20 MR. WEBSTER: Thank you very much.

21 I would next call on Timothy Twombly, State
22 Representative from Nashua, New Hampshire.

23 MR. TWOMBLY: Excuse me. Could I have Mr. LeBrun
24 go before me?

25 MR. WEBSTER: Sure.

1 MR. TWOMBLY: Thank you.

2 MR. WEBSTER: Representative Don LeBrun is going
3 to be next.

4 MR. LEBRUN: For the record. My name is Don
5 LeBrun, a representative from South Nashua, Wards 589.
6 Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I have a letter
7 from Speaker of the House, William O'Brien, that I would
8 like to read and submit for the record.

9 The letter is addressed to Lisa P. Jackson,
10 Administrator, US Environmental Protection Agency, 633 3rd
11 Street NW, Washington, DC.

12 "Dear Administrator Jackson. I am writing to
13 express my concerns with the recent Draft National Pollutant
14 Discharge Elimination System Permit mandating a water
15 cooling facility at Public Service of New Hampshire's
16 Merrimack Station in Bow, New Hampshire.

17 The EPA's Draft Permit shows great disregard for
18 our State's economy and is a significant threat to jobs in
19 our state. At a time when we're doing everything we can to
20 make New Hampshire more competitive and attractive to
21 employers, the Federal Government is seeking to punish our
22 residents and small businesses with higher electric rates
23 through unnecessary regulation.

24 The Granite State already has among the highest
25 energy costs in the nation. And this Federal mandate will

1 make these costs even higher and make it harder to expand
2 our economy and grow good new jobs here.

3 If the current administration is truly interested
4 in helping create new jobs, it would stop -- it would stop
5 the over zealous regulatory mandate immediately. We accept
6 the fact that the Obama administration will not be
7 assisting our country and allowing businesses to create new
8 jobs. In New Hampshire, all we ask is that, it not actively
9 work to prevent job growth here.

10 The working families and small businesses of New
11 Hampshire simply can't afford EPA adding a 112,000,000
12 mandate onto our electric bills. I also object to the EPA
13 attempting to burden New Hampshire electric customers with
14 costly mandates that is based on regulations that have not
15 been approved.

16 As the agency recognized in its recent letter
17 extending the comment period on this permit, it remains
18 unavoidably uncertain at the present time when any new final
19 regulations will go into effect under Section 316B. The EPA
20 should not burden New Hampshire electric customers with the
21 cost associated with regulation that is not legally in
22 effect.

23 Finally, the Obama administration and EPA have
24 shown a disregard to New Hampshire's residents by scheduling
25 this public hearing in the midst of one of our states worst

1 storms -- storm related electrical outages. At a time when
2 more than 40,000 New Hampshire businesses and families are
3 suffering through an extended period without basic electric
4 services, due to the recent snowstorm, and our state is
5 relying on PSNH to devote all of its resources to the
6 restoration effort, the EPA has forced PSNH to divert
7 resources away from the critical effort.

8 Clearly, rescheduling this hearing would have been
9 in the best interest of the people of New Hampshire.

10 The attempt to implement this crushing job killing
11 Federal mandate needs to stop now. And we call on the EPA
12 to stop this absurd and outrageous assault on New Hampshire
13 electric taxpayers.

14 Sincerely, William O'Brien, Speaker of the House.

15 I would like to submit this for the record.

16 MR. WEBSTER: Thank you.

17 Now, Timothy Twombly?

18 MR. TWOMBLY: Thank you for giving me the
19 opportunity to speak.

20 I am Timothy Twombly, State Representative from
21 Nashua, New Hampshire, Hillsborough 25. That's Ward 7 in
22 Nashua.

23 All I want to say is that I agree with the
24 previous two speakers have said, that \$112,000,000 to
25 prevent clean, clear water from going into the Merrimack

1 River seems to be a very expensive proposition for the
2 ratepayers of New Hampshire.

3 They are all going to have to pay public service,
4 because public service is going to have to put that in
5 rates. This is going to increase the cost to all men, women
6 and children by \$85 a year.

7 I would like you to allow the Public Service of
8 New Hampshire to go ahead and not have to put this
9 \$112,000,000 cooling tower in place.

10 As a matter of fact, they already spent, I
11 believe, something like \$400,000,000 to put a scrubber in
12 place which is protecting our air quality. Public Service
13 of New Hampshire is the only residential provider of
14 electricity. I hope that they are not -- that the
15 administration is not trying to put them out of business,
16 but, I have my concerns.

17 Thank you very much.

18 MR. WEBSTER: Thank you.

19 Were there any other elected public officials that
20 wanted an opportunity to speak? I didn't get any other ones
21 signing up.

22 And then, I will call on Rob Frye from the
23 Rockingham Fishing and Hunting Expo.

24 MR. FRYE: Thank you. My name is Rob Frye. And
25 I'd like to thank you for allowing me to speak at this

1 forum. First off, I want to thank you also and respect all
2 the work you have done, you, being the EPA. You know, I
3 definitely respect that. I'm not putting that aside.

4 But, I am going -- I am asked to be here. I
5 decided to be here on a different perspective, from
6 basically, a fisherman's perspective. And let me share a
7 few credentials about myself.

8 I am a New Hampshire resident. Father of two with
9 a loving wife and the founder of the -- what used to be the
10 largest bass fishing organizations that was founded in 1996.
11 I was the president of the New Hampshire Bass Federation for
12 six years. I was a board of director for New Hampshire
13 Lakes Association for two years. And as you mentioned, I am
14 the founder of the Rockingham Fishing and Hunting Expo. I
15 have been bass tournament fishing, since 1993, one time
16 State champion, and two time angler of the year. And I have
17 been commercial saltwater fishing for three years.

18 So, basically, I am a hard core avid angling
19 enthusiast.

20 And I do have a job. I am a software engineer.
21 Basically, I'm a computer geek.

22 So, I personally fish all year round. And I have
23 been fishing the Hooksett pool of the Merrimack River since
24 1992 since I first owned a boat. That was almost 20 years
25 ago. And I fish what we call as the Bow power plant, at

1 least six to 12 times a year.

2 And I've even posted YouTube videos with some
3 friends. And you can view these today, where I have been
4 fishing the Bow power plant during Thanksgiving, Christmas
5 and New Year's Eve, because it's just an excellent fishery.

6 So, -- you know, so, I have been sharing my
7 personal experiences. And my personal experience is the Bow
8 power plant is an incredible sustaining fishery.

9 And I understand the work that was done as far as
10 the data collected for the slide show. But, you know, I
11 have questions -- I question a lot of that data. I mean,
12 for one, you can't tell me where that data came from or who
13 it came from.

14 There's a lot of dimensions or variables in
15 fishing. You know, the slide that you showed that only four
16 fish were caught, that's definitely a better day of fishing
17 at Hooksett River. Because I can bring you to places -- I
18 mean, to that Bow power plant and catch sometimes 50 fish a
19 day. And you catch multiple species there.

20 And if you know where the dam is in that section,
21 there is a ton of yellow perch in that area. And I've
22 actually brought an aqua view camera there just to kind of
23 check out the terrain of the area. And, you know, I was
24 very impressed by the amount of white suckers that are
25 there.

1 So, you know, I question where you're getting your
2 data. I mean, it looks like you guys are looking in the
3 wrong place to be honest with you, because it is an
4 incredible fishery.

5 So, the perspective is, you know, this piece of
6 water, this water body, it is the only place in New
7 Hampshire where you can fish all year round from a boat.
8 Because of the rest of the waters, you know, they are pretty
9 much frozen or not accessible.

10 And so, if this closed loop system goes into
11 place, it's going to be unfortunate, because we're going to
12 lose a resource which is the bass fishing.

13 And I think that's about it. I did have more,
14 but, I'm going to submit my paper as well. Thank you.

15 MR. WEBSTER: Thank you very much, Mr. Frye.

16 Kenneth Colburn, Stonyfield Farm.

17 MR. COLBURN: Thanks very much for the opportunity
18 to speak to you tonight. I want to offer just a couple of
19 thoughts.

20 First, by way of introduction, I am here on behalf
21 of Stonyfield Farm and the commercial ratepayers group that
22 was a group of 20 companies that challenged the idea of
23 investing nearly half a billion dollars into a 40 plus year
24 old coal plant in the first place, of which, this project is
25 -- is one in a continuing series. That was back in 2008.

1 Stonyfield, as you may know, is the country's
2 largest organic dairy producer which means that nutrition,
3 health and the environment goes to the core of our business.

4 We applaud the EPA's Draft Permit for its
5 environment and public health protections.

6 The first comment or perspective that I'd like to
7 share is actually, one of mystification. Judging, at least
8 by its blog, I interpret that PSNH does not agree with the
9 EPA Draft Permit. And this mystifies me because it probably
10 relates to cost.

11 But then, I am still confused. Because, back in
12 2008, when the cost of the scrubber project and the turbine
13 enhancements went from \$250,000,000 to \$457,000,000, an
14 increase of nearly \$200,000,000, that was good news. PSNH
15 supported that, indeed, pushed it very, very hard, indeed
16 suggested, in terms of labor and so forth, that it was good
17 for jobs.

18 So, I'm confused why, if you can add \$200,000,000
19 and that's a good thing and you can rate base another
20 \$200,000,000, even though you had cheaper cost options on
21 the market, or in a different plant replacement, and that's
22 good for jobs, why another \$100,000,000, so a total of
23 \$300,000,000, isn't better. So, I'm very confused on this.

24 PSNH chose to do that. So, surely, they knew that
25 this permit process was coming up. So, surely, as a public

1 utility, it planned, it has an obligation to plan for this
2 kind of permit determination.

3 So, I'm sure that it was aware of the risk of a
4 closed loop cooling system. Indeed, I assisted in the
5 drafting of a compendium of issues associated with this
6 plant issued in late 2008 in which this issue was called out
7 and the cost estimates were approximately in the range that
8 we have described tonight. That, having been called out
9 also was not a surprise.

10 So, fundamentally, my confusion rests over the
11 issues that PSNH can't argue about cost. It can't argue
12 about jobs. And it can't argue about surprise.

13 So, I'm not sure why we are here and why they are
14 opposing.

15 My second concern is related to the fate of
16 mercury itself. As you know, mercury is a persistent bio
17 cumulative toxin. What bio cumulative means is that, just a
18 little bit is not safe, because little bits build up over
19 time in the food chain and become big bits and harmful and
20 neurotoxic to developing fetuses.

21 As you also know, that the Merrimack River system
22 is a TMDL limited river, that means total maximum daily
23 load. What it means in layman's terms is, the river is
24 already maxed out for mercury. And that means, it can
25 accept no more under Federal provisions.

1 Well, hence, the importance of the stringent Draft
2 Permit conditions that you have included.

3 I would just like to ask that you also include
4 equally stringent near term constraints because, you see,
5 the scrubber removes sulfur. And in the process, it also
6 captures the majority of the mercury.

7 Some of that mercury winds up in the scrubber
8 wastewater. If that wastewater is not subject to
9 comprehensive and thorough zero discharge treatment at the
10 plant, but, is instead shipped elsewhere, probably to
11 municipal publicly owned treatment works, some of those
12 treatment works, and because mercury then adheres to the
13 solids in the treatment process, some of those treatment
14 works incinerate their solids as a way to dispose of them.
15 That means that the mercury that is with the solids that
16 then are incinerated, is readmitted, PSNH's coal mercury is
17 readmitted. It is just being emitted out of a different
18 stack.

19 I would suggest to you, under those conditions,
20 that we didn't accomplish a whole lot in terms of mercury
21 reductions.

22 Thanks for the opportunity to speak.

23 MR. WEBSTER: Thank you.

24 I next call on Randy Herk.

25 MR. HERK: For the record, my name is Randy Herk.

1 I am a PSNH employee. And I am here today to share my
2 perspective on the EPA's recent Draft Permit regarding the
3 impact the operation of the Merrimack Station is having on
4 the health of the Merrimack River.

5 Much of the focus of the EPA's recent Draft Permit
6 is on the plant's impact on the fish population. So, I
7 think it is important, people like myself, who fish the
8 river regularly share my experience.

9 The Merrimack River has undergone some dramatic
10 changes over the last decades, all of which are for the
11 better. During my time fishing on the river, I have caught
12 plenty of fish. Of course, all my fishing is catch and
13 release so the fish go right back into the population.

14 In addition to being a very active fishing spot,
15 the Merrimack River is also home to many other types of
16 wildlife. I have observed ducks, blue heron, bald eagles,
17 minx, beavers, weasels and other form of wildlife all
18 actively enjoying the healthy waters and ecosystem of the
19 Merrimack River.

20 It is no secret that the Merrimack River is a
21 great spot for fishing and wildlife. The river is normally
22 fished by several bass boats and used by others looking to
23 enjoy the outdoors.

24 I was very grateful to PSNH for installing a
25 community boat launch near the Merrimack Station allowing

1 many others to enjoy the river and all it has to offer.

2 In closing, as someone who spends a lot of time
3 near the river and on it, it is my observation that the
4 river is healthier and cleaner than it ever has been. I
5 believe, my experience as a fisherman and my observation of
6 so many others enjoying the river are a testament to that.

7 Thank you, very much.

8 MR. WEBSTER: Thank you, Mr. Herk.

9 Catherine Goldwater.

10 MS. GOLDWATER: Hello. Thanks for letting me
11 speak. I am Catherine Goldwater from Hollis, New Hampshire.
12 I am a member of the New Hampshire Green Coalition and
13 Sierra Club of New Hampshire and National Sierra Club. I
14 have lived in Hollis, New Hampshire for 30 years, raised two
15 kids there.

16 I want to thank the EPA very much for the work
17 they are doing to try to protect and enhance the wonderful
18 environment of our state of New Hampshire which, I just -- I
19 love the state. I think we all do here. And just view it a
20 little differently.

21 I just have a few really brief comments. One
22 thing this made me think about was that, decades ago, Marion
23 Stoddard began to notice the pollution in the Nashua River
24 that, at that time, was so visible, it was -- the factories
25 were discharging into the river so that you could look and

1 see yellow foam. And it was almost like plastic or blue.
2 The river was colored. And it was just being treated like a
3 garbage dump.

4 But now, the kinds of pollution are not visible.
5 And yet, we know the harm of mercury, arsenic and other
6 chemicals in minute amounts. You know, I was glad to hear
7 that the fisherman who just spoke so passionately, doesn't
8 eat the fish, because, although it wasn't commented on, we
9 know there is a lot of mercury in the fish in New Hampshire
10 Lakes, mostly from the air. And that's not all from the Bow
11 plant. It also comes from Ohio and drops into our lakes.

12 But, we have been told to eat very few fish from
13 the lakes. You know, maybe one a month is a safe, none if
14 you are pregnant and so forth.

15 So, I am concerned about these chemicals and how
16 they are hurting people and animals.

17 A Fact Sheet that I got indicated -- I don't think
18 this was from the EPA. I think this was from Sierra Club,
19 indicated that some of the Merrimack water down stream is
20 used for drinking water in Lowell. And I hope that that's
21 properly cleaned if it is really being used for drinking
22 water.

23 I also have a question which I hope to get
24 answered someday, that the water that is heated, and it goes
25 over the dam and then gradually mixes so it cools down, but,

1 it stays warmer, I'm sure, then it was 30, 40 years ago.
2 And I wonder what the effect of that heated water is on the
3 growth of bacteria or what kinds of insects may be more
4 common because the water is warmer. Just another aspect
5 that wasn't touched on today.

6 PSNH, as somebody just spoke about, just invested
7 in those new scrubbers to reduce the sulfur, but not remove
8 all of it, I don't believe, reduce the mercury. And we
9 know, for that reason that this PSNH is likely to be around
10 for quite a while.

11 So, therefore, I fully support and am in favor of
12 the EPA draft to make it as strong as possible.

13 So, thank you for letting me speak.

14 MR. WEBSTER: Thank you.

15 MS. GOLDWATER: I will write this out for you.

16 MR. WEBSTER: Yeah. Again, I'd encourage anybody
17 to submit in writing as well.

18 Linda Rauter.

19 MS. RAUTER: Thank you for the opportunity to
20 speak. My name is Linda Rauter. I live in Chichester, New
21 Hampshire. My family and I have lived in the greater
22 Concord area for about 38 years.

23 Concord, with its beautiful Merrimack River has
24 been the center of most of our activities over the years.
25 Not too long ago, before we arrived, the Merrimack was so

1 polluted that one could not even safely swim in it. I
2 understand that now, it is safe for swimming, boating and
3 for wildlife.

4 Because of the Bow power plant, I personally
5 believe that only the area above the plant is safe for water
6 activities.

7 Sadly, extremely polluted discharge water from the
8 plant continues to foul the river below it. Warmer water
9 temperatures and the discharge also affect life in the river
10 below the plant.

11 In addition, it is my understanding that the
12 287,000,000 gallons of water withdrawn every day by the
13 plant results in horrible deaths for whatever creatures may
14 be in that water.

15 A short distance up river along the Forest Society
16 Conservation area, I have noted turtles, mink, muskrats,
17 otter and water birds in addition to the fish that live in
18 the water. It is extremely disturbing to imagine these
19 creatures being sucked into the plant turbines or drowned on
20 the intake screens.

21 The right thing to do is to drastically limit the
22 amount of water withdrawn by the river -- withdrawn from the
23 river, and to make certain that whatever water is discharged
24 is first cooled and cleaned.

25 I am also extremely concerned about the amount of

1 mercury discharged by the plant. There is absolutely no
2 question that mercury is a toxic substance and it is falling
3 indiscriminately into our sewers and every water body. This
4 is dangerous to all life and must be stopped.

5 Thank you.

6 MR. WEBSTER: Thank you for your comments.

7 Tom Irwin?

8 MR. IRWIN: Thank you. For the record, my name is
9 Tom Irwin. I direct the New Hampshire office of the
10 Conservation Law Foundation.

11 We appreciate you being here tonight and
12 appreciate the opportunity to comment on this Draft Permit.

13 For the bulk of my time, I'd like to read into the
14 record a joint statement of a number of environmental
15 organizations, specifically, the Conservation Law
16 Foundation, the Appalachian Mountain Club, Conservation New
17 Hampshire, New Hampshire Audubon, Environment New Hampshire,
18 the New Hampshire chapter of the Sierra Club, Clean Water
19 Action, and The Society for the Protection of New Hampshire
20 Forests.

21 We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the US
22 EPA's Draft NPDES Permit for Public Service Company of New
23 Hampshire's Merrimack Station coal fired power plant in Bow.
24 We appreciate that EPA is addressing the harmful impacts on
25 the Merrimack River that occur as a result of the massive

1 water intake and heated and chemical wastewater discharges
2 associated with the coal plant's obsolete water cooling
3 system.

4 Although we are frustrated that 14 years have
5 elapsed since the expiration of the current permit, we
6 commend EPA for requiring PSNH to ensure that Merrimack
7 Station is operating in a way that is both protective of the
8 fragile river ecosystem and in compliance with the Clean
9 Water Act, a law that is essential to protecting the health
10 of New Hampshire's natural environment, economy and
11 communities.

12 We fully support EPA, at long last, requiring the
13 installation at Merrimack Station of a modern closed cycle
14 cooling system that will nearly eliminate the harmful
15 impacts associated with the power plant's current system.
16 Impacts that, as EPA acknowledges, have resulted over the
17 plant's lifetime in a 94 percent decline of species in that
18 part of the Merrimack River.

19 The current method of cooling the plant pulls
20 living creatures into the system, crushing, mutilating and
21 suffocating them. It traps fish and other aquatic life
22 against the screens, covering pipes, that pull water into
23 the system injuring or killing them, and then, subjects the
24 river and its aquatic life to the further stresses of heated
25 waste water discharges.

1 The upgrades to Merrimack Station that EPA is
2 requiring are long overdue. Installing a modern, closed
3 cycle cooling system and operating it year round will
4 decrease the plant's discharge of heated water by nearly 100
5 percent.

6 In addition, because it will not require the same
7 volume of water from the river, the upgraded system will
8 dramatically reduce the loss of adult fish, fish larvae and
9 fish eggs, that today are getting sucked into the structures
10 and killed.

11 While we strongly support the EPA's intent to
12 require the construction of a modern, closed cycle cooling
13 system, we are greatly disappointed with the Draft Permit's
14 failure to limit the power plant's discharge of mercury to
15 zero. The State of New Hampshire and the EPA have
16 determined that the Merrimack River already violates State
17 water quality standards for mercury.

18 Because it is a biocumulative and persistent
19 neurotoxin, even small amounts of mercury discharges build
20 up over time in fish threatening people, other mammals and
21 birds that consume fish from the river. And as a result, no
22 amount of mercury discharge into this already impaired water
23 is safe.

24 Indeed, PSNH previously informed the New Hampshire
25 Site Evaluation Committee, in a 2009 hearing on its

1 installation of a wet flue gas desulfurization scrubber,
2 that the scrubber waste water treatment system, PSNH was
3 constructing, would not discharge any mercury waste water to
4 the Merrimack River.

5 EPA, in its permit fact sheet, appropriately
6 acknowledges that PSNH designed, financed and constructed
7 the new Merrimack Station waste water treatment system
8 without first discussing with EPA whether it would meet the
9 standards required under the Clean Water Act.

10 We strongly urge EPA to amend its Draft Permit to
11 require zero liquid discharge to prevent further pollution
12 of the river with mercury, selenium and other toxic
13 pollutants.

14 To be clear, these comments should not be
15 interpreted as support for the continued operation for
16 PSNH's Merrimack Station coal fired power plant. The plant
17 is the single largest source of greenhouse gas emissions in
18 New Hampshire, perpetuates the adverse health impacts
19 associated with burning coal and cannot generate power cost
20 effectively in comparison to more efficient power plants
21 operating in New England today.

22 No matter what PSNH spends to upgrade this
23 facility, it will not be able to turn this 50 year old plant
24 into a desirable source of energy that benefits the people
25 of New Hampshire and New England.

1 Nonetheless, as long as this plant remains in
2 operation, it must, as a matter of law, comply with the
3 Clean Water Act.

4 We commend EPA for finally addressing the
5 Merrimack Station's out dated and environmentally harmful
6 cooling system. And we urge EPA to amend its Draft Permit
7 to require the elimination of any mercury discharge from the
8 plant.

9 We request that EPA proceed expeditiously with the
10 finalization of this Draft Permit.

11 That concludes the joint statement. And I will
12 leave you with a written copy of it.

13 The last point I want to make, and it picks up on
14 a point made by Mr. Colburn, relates to our understanding
15 that the Department of Environmental Services has authorized
16 for waste water -- municipal waste water treatment plants to
17 accept indirect discharges of scrubber wastewater from
18 Merrimack Station. Specifically, we understand that the
19 city of Concord is authorized to accept up to 25,000 gallons
20 per day of the scrubber waste water, that the city of
21 Manchester and the towns of Hooksett and Allenstown are each
22 authorized to accept up to 100,000 gallons per day of
23 scrubber waste water.

24 We are concerned about the potential impacts. And
25 not only the potential impacts to the Merrimack River, but,

1 as Mr. Colburn suggested, with the impacts of mercury from
2 this waste water absorbing into solids and ending up either
3 on the land or potentially even incinerated.

4 So, it is an issue of concern that we hope EPA
5 will closely address.

6 Thank you very much.

7 MR. WEBSTER: Thank you, Mr. Irwin.

8 Catherine Corkery?

9 MS. CORKERY: Thank you for coming this evening
10 and having -- sorry -- it won't be the last time. My name
11 is Catherine Corkery. I live here in Concord. I am
12 representing New Hampshire Sierra Club and just have a
13 couple of additional comments to add.

14 First off, we do -- New Hampshire Sierra Club
15 supports the permit in requiring the closed cycle water
16 facility. It is a huge improvement from what is there now,
17 just the modern technology. This is like going from the
18 tape recorder to the iPod all at once. It's very exciting.

19 A 90 plus improvement on reducing the water
20 intake. It's about time. The Merrimack River has been
21 abused and used and dumped in -- dumped on for too long.
22 And the other abusers, if you will, have been eliminated.

23 And now, we just have the Merrimack Station here
24 in Bow as one of the few polluters left.

25 And what's nice is that it is a simple solution

1 with the thermal pollution.

2 Secondly, it is such an improvement with the
3 wildlife. We really commend you for that.

4 The concern that we do have is, no surprise,
5 concerns the waste water treatment with the effort to take
6 the mercury out of the smoke stack only to be going out to
7 the outfall pipe into the river is something that we asked
8 the EPA to regulate.

9 As stated earlier, mercury -- the Merrimack River
10 is maxed out on mercury. And there should be no more
11 allowable mercury added to the river, or the other
12 pollutants.

13 The Merrimack is a source of drinking water for
14 many communities. In New Hampshire, it's over a hundred
15 thousand people in the Nashua area alone. It is drinking
16 water for the cities of Lawrence and Lowell in Massachusetts
17 and many other communities along the way.

18 And adding more pollution into the Merrimack River
19 through the waste water treatment facility is -- is a step
20 in the wrong direction. And we ask that the EPA re-examine
21 that and put tougher standards in.

22 But, as a whole, the Sierra Club does support this
23 permit. And again, it's about time. Thank you.

24 Oh, and I'm sorry, I've got some mercury studies
25 that I have that just talk about the accumulation, not from

1 the air pollution, but, different water source mercury
2 pollution like the waste water treatment. I will just bring
3 it up.

4 MR. WEBSTER: You can leave it here or you can
5 mail them in, which ever one you want.

6 MS. CORKERY: Yeah. Yes. Thank you.

7 MR. WEBSTER: In fact, if you mail them in
8 electronically, it might even be helpful.

9 I call Jerry Curran.

10 MR. CURRAN: I'm Jerry Curran. I am chair of the
11 New Hampshire chapter of the Sierra Club.

12 I'd like to thank the EPA for starting this whole
13 process. And I am just struck by the words of warm, clean
14 water coming out of the Merrimack Station power plant. I
15 don't know how many of you have actually seen that power
16 plant. But, terms like warm, clean water coming from the
17 power plant it seems a little odd.

18 I think it will provide jobs. If we kind of leave
19 it as it is, there will be jobs for healthcare providers.
20 If we were to keep this power plant operating, which we
21 don't agree with, if we were to keep it operating, we've got
22 the third highest asthma rate in the country. We've got
23 18,000 children who suffer from asthma in New Hampshire.
24 And we are in an EPA non-attainment area for ozone. And
25 that exacerbates the 18,000 children with asthma.

1 So, even in the best situation, if we keep the
2 plant running, when there are so many other ways to produce
3 power other than with coal in a 40 year old power plant, and
4 keeping it running is really not a great option.

5 If we were to keep it running, cleaning the warm
6 clean water from the effluent would be a good idea.

7 Also, as other people have mentioned, the slurry
8 from the scrubbers, all of that water will end up back in
9 the Merrimack with other chemicals, along with mercury in
10 the Merrimack, and that's even water that is drinking water
11 for Nashua, as I understand. It just seems kind of hard to
12 call that warm, clean water.

13 I do support the denial of the thermal variance.
14 And just to keep it brief, I would like to thank EPA for the
15 work they are doing. And it's overdue. And we thank you
16 very much.

17 MR. WEBSTER: Thank you.

18 Is it Marsh Feigl? Excuse me.

19 MR. FEIGL: Good evening. My name is Marsh Feigl
20 and I am just a citizen of Concord, New Hampshire.

21 I'd like to thank the EPA and all the speakers for
22 providing a lot of really good information. I learned a lot
23 tonight.

24 I just want to start off by saying, for those of
25 you who don't know, the Merrimack River, and rivers in

1 general in New Hampshire are real -- I'm an avid paddler,
2 paddled almost all of the Merrimack. And it's thanks in
3 large measure to the Clean Water Act.

4 Some of the people in this room, it's really a
5 wonderful place to -- to paddle and to be on. And I
6 encourage people to access this wonderful resource.

7 But, it hasn't been for naught. And it hasn't
8 been -- just hasn't happened overnight is what I'm trying to
9 say.

10 I've paddled on the, what people refer to as the
11 Hooksett pool, probably upwards of 50 times. And all -- the
12 thing that I wanted to share with folks tonight who haven't
13 seen it -- that area, and the reason that I paddle there in
14 the winter, -- I usually don't paddle there the rest of the
15 year, because it's -- I just have other spots to go. But, a
16 group of friends and I, we paddle there in January, February
17 and March, because there is open water.

18 And we've heard a little bit about that earlier
19 from some of the fishermen who I've probably seen out there.
20 And it's a great place to paddle. It really is. Because,
21 everywhere else in New Hampshire is locked up. There is
22 nowhere else to go.

23 But, it's also very strange and weird, almost a
24 surreal thing to be in that river and to look upstream from
25 the power plant and see this much ice just locked up, as I

1 suppose it should be. And below the power plant, all the
2 way down to what I call the Hooksett dam, or down by the
3 Hooksett District Court, it's probably three quarters of a
4 mile, generally open water the whole way. Beautiful. Lots
5 of ducks. I view lots of fish. I'm not a fisherman, lots
6 of bald eagles, a little hint there for folks.

7 It's great. But, it is a strange and odd thing to
8 see, and clearly unnatural. But, I will leave it to others
9 to decide whether it's a good thing or a bad thing. But,
10 it's -- it's not a natural thing, that's for darn sure.

11 MR. WEBSTER: Thank you.

12 Rick Tuttle?

13 MR. TUTTLE: My name is Rick Tuttle, actually,
14 Frederick S. Tuttle, Jr. And I appreciate you being here
15 and I thank you for allowing me to make a statement.

16 I was not planning on making a statement. But,
17 after listening, and seeing what really was at stake, I felt
18 I had to make my thoughts made.

19 And I have lived on the Merrimack River in
20 Hooksett. I seem to be the first one here from Hooksett.
21 But, I have lived on the river for 19 years.

22 I have seen what is there. I've seen -- I paddle.
23 I kayak. I have paddled, like the previous speaker, I have
24 paddled that Hooksett pool many, many times. I have very
25 rarely seen much wildlife on that pool. And I believe it's

1 simply because of the change in thermal. I wish to support
2 the strongest possible controls on thermal output from that
3 power plant.

4 In 19 years, I've seen the effluent coming down
5 the river. I've seen the effluent coming out of the stacks.
6 I just hate the thought of seeing more yellow smoke coming
7 out of those stacks. And if it doesn't come out of the
8 stacks, it's going to come in the water. I don't want to
9 have to paddle in that water.

10 Also, my drinking water is from Hooksett. Guess
11 where Hooksett gets its drinking water. It comes from
12 wells, deep wells. Those wells are supplied by water in
13 some way, shape or form, from the river. I don't want to
14 drink that water. But, at this point, it's filtered good.
15 And we're able to drink it without getting too sick.

16 My strongest concerns though really revolve around
17 the wildlife of the river. Everybody here has spoken --
18 almost everybody has spoken very eloquently about the fish
19 populations. To me, the fish populations are almost the
20 smallest part of the overall equation.

21 When you look at the fish, what do the fish depend
22 on to eat, what depends on the fish to feed them. We've got
23 bald eagles. We've got osprey. We have probably a half
24 dozen species of herons. We have otter. We have weasels.
25 We have beaver, herons, fishermen, and many other things

1 that we don't even know about that are part of the food web
2 of that area.

3 This to me is the more important aspect of why we
4 should have control over those thermal outputs. Simply,
5 because we don't know what we're doing to the food web. We
6 don't know what we're doing to the environment web in a lot
7 of cases.

8 I also -- my property almost abuts the river and
9 it is right next to the B&M railroad. I listen to the B&M
10 railroad, the coal cars coming up and down the tracks,
11 three, four, five times a day. That's a lot of coal from
12 listening to and seeing it go by. And to think that's all
13 being burned and all of the effluent is either going into
14 the air or into the water. And not just the physical
15 effluent. Again, we're talking about the heat.

16 That's why I really want to stress that we need
17 those controls. We need to put that river back to its -- as
18 close to its normal running temperature as possible. Not
19 only for us, but for everything else that survives on that
20 river.

21 Thank you.

22 I don't know if I should give you this.

23 MR. WEBSTER: You don't have to give it in
24 writing.

25 MR. TUTTLE: Okay. Thanks.

1 MR. WEBSTER: Thank you, Mr. Tuttle.

2 Robert B. Williams, Jr.?

3 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you. My name is Robert
4 Williams. I live in Chichester. I'm on the board of the
5 Campaign for Ratepayers' Rights.

6 And while Ratepayers' Rights is very much
7 concerned with electric rates, we also think about the total
8 electricity picture in terms of residues from generation,
9 whether it is radioactive waste or, you mentioned plants
10 such as the Bow plant.

11 My main question, relates to, has anybody taken a
12 good look at the total picture of costs involved for both
13 capital improvements as well as, you know, annual operating
14 expenses?

15 A few years ago, we were in this room for the
16 hearing on the, at that time, the proposed Bow scrubber for
17 the mercury emissions. And there was no mention of an
18 upcoming, you know, improvement in the reduction of the hot
19 water treatment that the Bow plant involved.

20 And I wonder if there are any other capital
21 projects that may be proposed in the next five or 10 years
22 that we should think about.

23 If the Legislature had had full information about
24 the total cost involved with the scrubber, and this thermal
25 treatment, and possibly other things, then, they might have

1 made a different decision than just giving the public
2 service company a blank check to go ahead and build the
3 scrubber no matter what it costs.

4 Because then we get locked into the idea of, oh,
5 well, now can't shut down the Bow plant, because we've spent
6 so much money in it. We have to keep it going. You know,
7 and then, we have to spend some incremental money still
8 using so much coal.

9 Thank you.

10 MR. WEBSTER: Thank you.

11 Jeff Daly.

12 MR. DALY: Good evening. My name is Jeff Daly. I
13 live in Nashua. I'm also a member and sitting on the lower
14 Merrimack River LAC. I'm also an outside member of the
15 Sierra Club. I also testified here on the flue gas scrubber
16 when it was talked about. I also would like to comment on
17 the previous speaker.

18 MR. KING: Sir, could you define LAC?

19 MR. DALY: It is the river council.

20 MR. KING: Thank you.

21 MR. DALY: We are talking -- the previous
22 gentleman talked about all the costs. We know the EPA does
23 a good job in many aspects. What you've written up here in
24 60 pages is just part of your mandate. One aspect the
25 gentleman alluded to should have been talked about several

1 years ago.

2 We spent -- it went from 250 to \$475,000,000. We
3 now have got a massive great chimney stack outside here.
4 You've got a flue gas scrubbing system. And you say the
5 technology does not exist to clean up the waste coming out
6 of that.

7 Within your own document, you talk about numerous
8 outflows. Nowhere in there do you say, let's consolidate
9 all this waste water. Let's treat it in one place.

10 I can take you to the Dow Chemical plant in
11 Midland, Michigan, and Freeport, Texas, where they take very
12 toxic waste water and they remove arsenic, cyanide,
13 thialysines (phonetic), mercuries. And they put the water
14 back in their facility in Michigan cleaner than they take it
15 out of Lake Michigan.

16 The technology is there. And yet, the EPA has not
17 addressed in any of their paper work here. Other than on
18 page 39, you talk about nitrogen. You talk about discharges
19 of ammonia, nitrogen, and nitrogen can be treated to the
20 depletion of a water body's dissolved oxygen levels. This
21 can, in turn, cause a variety of adverse quality, water
22 quality habitat effects.

23 We all know dissolved oxygen's effect on the Gulf.
24 Has the EPA been down there and allowed rehabilitation of
25 the Gulf? No. We've been pouring, right now, in excess of

1 7,000,000 gallons of Corrects It 9572 (phonetic) into the
2 Gulf because nobody wants to do remediation. Let's sink it.

3 What has that done? Reduced the dissolved oxygen
4 content within the Gulf to a point where you've got vast
5 areas that are dead.

6 You can go off the coast of New Jersey, Toms
7 River, where the Seaver Geiger Company (phonetic) dumped
8 materials.

9 And in here, you talk about the US Army Corps of
10 Engineers is working on a dissolved oxygen model for the
11 Merrimack River. Gentlemen, that model has been around for
12 35 years. Why are we now talking about a new model?

13 You said the results of this modeling analysis
14 could lead to the conclusion that nitrogen limits are
15 needed. Why don't you just turn around and say zero. We've
16 got the technology.

17 The same thing with the coolant. There are air
18 cooled heat exchanging systems that are totally enclosed, do
19 not require any water discharge once they are shut up, other
20 than some make up for the regular relief valve blow outs
21 that take place in any power plant. It doesn't matter where
22 you go.

23 Also, that hot air that is driven through those
24 air cooled heat exchangers can then be used to reheat the
25 combustion air used to burn in the boilers. You don't have

1 to pump it up into the atmosphere. Go down to Manchester
2 and look at the Granite Ridge plant, which is an over
3 peaking plant. And look at the steam that comes out of
4 their cooler.

5 The other day, we measured it. It is 6000 feet
6 plume of steam rising into the atmosphere. We went to the
7 other side of Stonyfield, and the gentleman from Stonyfield
8 may be able to confirm this, it was raining a mist of rain.

9 Are we wanting the same thing, if you have an open
10 closed loop system rather than a close closed loop system.

11 This, gentleman, should have been addressed in
12 your permit. I agree, we've got to lower the temperature.
13 But, there is technology around. It's been around for
14 years. In Europe, they've been using air cooled heat
15 exchanging systems for 35 years. It's been around in the
16 United States for 20+ years. I've worked on four of them.

17 You mentioned the Everett unit down in Boston.
18 That works very well. You don't see tons of steam pouring
19 out into the atmosphere there.

20 We've got to look and utilize the best technology.
21 EPA is doing a good job. But, you've got to go out. You've
22 got to ask for help. You've got to -- you can go to round
23 tables and ask for people to come up with suggestions. Ask
24 PSNH to be part of it. Have them have some of the input.

25 I know some of the directors of PSNH. They would

1 be very willing to open up and say, hey, let's sit down and
2 let's hear from engineers. Let's hear from people who've
3 got ideas.

4 The destruction of our environment, especially,
5 the Merrimack River, cannot continue. Heat is one of the
6 killers that changes the environment dramatically. Whether
7 it is in the water or in the atmosphere.

8 We can't pump out close 1,000,000,000,000 BTUs
9 into the atmosphere of any sort. We've got to try to
10 recover it. And one way is, you take an air cooled heat
11 exchanger, take the air from that and use it as
12 pre-combustion air rather than outside cold air,
13 irrespective of what time of year it is.

14 But, this thing about the US Army Corps of
15 Engineers, please, revisit it. Re-look at it. Because, if
16 you're saying we've got to look at restructuring, and you
17 even say it here, well, the next time the permit is revised,
18 why next time, why not say zero.

19 Thank you very much.

20 MR. WEBSTER: Thank you, Mr. Daly.

21 Barbara Morris?

22 MS. MORRIS: I just wanted to explain my attire.
23 This is the third event I've been at tonight. And one of
24 them was a cocktail reception.

25 I wanted to applaud this gentleman who was before

1 me. And I wanted to find out, is what you are describing
2 known as pumped hydro system?

3 Is he allowed to address that? Is that a pumped
4 hydro system that you're talking about?

5 MR. WEBSTER: Why don't we have a dialogue after
6 the hearing.

7 MS. MORRIS: Okay. I am just going to be brief in
8 saying that, I just moved to the Concord area from the
9 beautiful and pristine Monadnock region of New Hampshire.
10 Our lakes, our rivers, our streams, are isolated from smoke
11 stacks and highways. And when I did move to Concord, I
12 thought, oh, I'm going to have to join a public swimming
13 pool. I was so happy to find out about the society for the
14 protection of New Hampshire forests conservation center that
15 abuts the Merrimack River and does have access to the river
16 for people, their dogs. And I can say that I enjoyed that
17 thoroughly this summer during the heat wave.

18 And it's just as recently that I found out just
19 how polluted the Merrimack River is. And even worse, now
20 that I'm finding out what's going on with the river from the
21 Bow power station.

22 Just in brief, I applaud what he says, I concur
23 with what he says. I think you all need to really
24 reevaluate the technology that is available. Why does the
25 Merrimack always have to learn and apply what is being done

1 across the pond, no pun intended.

2 And I think, -- I think, before you go ahead with
3 things as they are, I think there needs to be a lot more
4 discussion and bringing in scientists and engineers, and
5 authorities about putting the best system in, because I
6 don't think there is going to be a next time. I think this
7 is the time. And the changes have to be made with the best
8 -- the best technology that is available.

9 Thank you.

10 MR. WEBSTER: Thank you.

11 The next speaker is the last card I have. So, I
12 anticipate asking, after that, if there is anybody that
13 hasn't spoken to have an opportunity to do so.

14 Now, Woodworth Winmill.

15 MR. WINMILL: I'm a high school student. I live
16 in Walpole, New Hampshire. First, I'd like to ask a
17 question. You were talking about the -- the ash and how you
18 are going into, I think, the Tennessee type scenario, but,
19 that was unclear, because you said you are keeping the ash
20 at the site of the plant; correct?

21 MR. WEBSTER: I cannot answer a question because
22 this is a public hearing. And all I can -- we can do is to
23 listen. If you want a clarification, after this official
24 hearing is over, I will be happy to discuss it with you.

25 MR. WINMILL: Okay. I was also looking through

1 the original permit that was handed out, this document that
2 says draft. I assume this is the original permit. It is
3 the authorization to discharge under the National Pollutant
4 Discharge Elimination System?

5 MR. WEBSTER: That is the Draft Permit we are
6 receiving comments on.

7 MR. WINMILL: Okay. Well, I was looking at it,
8 and it was really confusing. Because one of the problems I
9 get, limitations of the discharges. And it has the one
10 column that is the average monthly discharge, and the column
11 that's the daily maximum. But, almost all the pollutants
12 are measured only on a per week basis, which is confusing
13 me. I don't understand why -- the chemistry of that or not.
14 Why do you have a maximum, if you only measure the weekly
15 content. What is the applicability of that.

16 Additionally, I was looking down at it, and
17 basically, most toxic heavy metals are listed here. I mean,
18 you've got a chromium and cadmium and arsenic and lead, and
19 you have -- (inaudible) the catchall category more or less
20 of mercury and manganese.

21 And there also was like various quality
22 quantities. You've got the daily maximum of arsenic is 15
23 micrograms per liter. Which means, if you're discharging
24 thousands of gallons of water and that's 15 -- that's 15
25 micrograms per liter. And add to that -- (inaudible) a

1 meaningful amount and it had them at a macroscopic level
2 which they -- like the recoverable lead is 100 -- 100
3 micrograms per liter, unless you -- on page 6, which was
4 kind of a shock, 100 micrograms and you discharge thousands
5 of gallons and that's pretty vague.

6 That -- oh, that was a weird noise.

7 Okay. Any way, moving on, and then if you look at
8 the chlorides, like you have 18,000 micrograms of chlorides
9 -- of -- no, excuse me, -- that -- it's actually measured in
10 milligrams. So, you have 18,000 milligrams, which
11 corresponds to 18 grams per liter of chlorides, which is a
12 significant amount of chlorides if you -- especially if
13 you're going to list thousand gallons again.

14 But, it also addressed the issue of pollutant
15 (inaudible) the metabolic rates of different fish but, in
16 terms of water temperature, if you reduce the water
17 temperature, you reduce the total saturation capacity of
18 oxygen. As one of the previous speakers mentioned, the
19 idea, because, the dead area of the Gulf of Mexico, and how
20 it's -- how it's directly correlated between the ability of
21 liquid to dissolve the gas and the temperature.

22 So, if you had like the top layer, which has the
23 most like aquatic life in it, reduce the amount of like --
24 the carbon dioxide could be dissolved in that for the
25 aquatic plants to digest. And you would reduce the amount

1 of oxygen that can be held in the top layer of water.

2 And then, finally -- what else -- oh, I have one
3 other point. Oh, yeah, and then, my last point was the
4 issue of currents and how that this -- if you had a region
5 of -- of like a flow area of water, how it could affect the
6 currents. And especially, like trying to bring back salmon
7 in northeastern rivers. And if you have other water, moving
8 fast, it'll make it more difficult for fish in general to
9 travel upstream beyond actually getting killed by the
10 (inaudible) of the plant.

11 That's all I have to say. Thank you.

12 MR. WEBSTER: Thank you.

13 Is there anybody that has not had an opportunity
14 to speak that would like to make a statement for the record
15 during this public hearing?

16 Okay. I'd like to thank you for coming this
17 evening and your interest in the permit. I think, we heard
18 a lot of thoughtful comments from a lot of different
19 perspectives. I think you'd have to agree with that. A lot
20 of information was shared tonight. And we look forward to
21 receiving your comments, both the ones that you gave tonight
22 and those we will receive in writing in deliberating on the
23 final permit here.

24 Please remember, the public comment period ends at
25 midnight, February 28th. And you may send in written

1 comments until then.

2 If you have any questions on that procedure, we
3 will be here to ask.

4 This ends the public hearing at 8:33 p.m.

5 (Whereupon, at 8:33 p.m., the public hearing was
6 concluded.)

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER AND TRANSCRIBER

This is to certify that the attached proceedings
in the Matter of:

RE: NATIONAL POLLUTANT DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM (NPDES)
PUBLIC SERVICE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, MERRIMACK STATION, BOW, NH
NPDES PERMIT NO. NH0001465

Place: Concord, New Hampshire

Date: November 3, 2011

were held as herein appears, and that this is the true,
accurate and complete transcript prepared from the notes
and/or recordings taken of the above entitled proceeding.

M. Rossi
Reporter

11/03/2011
Date

M. Rossi
Transcriber

11/22/2011
Date