

Rebuttal to testimony given by Andrew Manitt, Research Director of the Neighborhood Network, as reprinted in The March Issue of the Civic Sentinel; based on written Comments to the Public Service Commission and related testimony given by Dr. Carmine F. Vasile, a Patchogue Resident, to the Brookhaven Town Council at the March 9 public hearing on Caithness at Brookhaven Town Hall.

(Dr. Vasile's testimony paraphrased written comments linked to www.gfxtechnology.com/KKK.html)

I testified on March 9th before the Town Council not as a "NIMBY", but as a concerned scientist with a B.S.E.E., M.S. and Ph.D. in Electrophysics. My closing statement paraphrased this warning to the Public Service Commission ("PSC"):

- "Clearly, if the Petitioner's request is approved, and its 346 MW electric generating plant is built near a toxic dump, this and future generations will *"Inherit the Wind"*; a *Toxic Wind* destined to be uplifted from toxic waste sites that the Petitioner failed to identify in its Site Location Map".

This conclusion differs significantly from the following conclusions published in the latest issue of the Civic Sentinel:

- (1) the Caithness power plant will be the cleanest source of base-load energy generation on Long Island;
- (2) it will help to advance efforts to repower existing power plants; and
- (3) once the plant is operating, it will immediately deliver tangible results by displacing - at very significant rates air pollution from older power plants."

In the interest of Public safety, I pray the PSC will heed my warnings and reject Mr. Manitt's testimony in the event it's submitted for review. (According to Paul Agresta, as of March 9, 2006, no comments had been submitted to the PSC either opposing or advancing Caithness' Petition for an operating license; not even by the Caithness attorneys.)

One could argue Mr. Manitt knows, or should know, his testimony, allegedly *"grounded in science"*, would be discredited by PSC experts; especially this part:

- "The Neighborhood Network ["NN"] has reviewed the extensive record created during the environmental review of the Caithness power plant proposal", yet failed to discover its Environmental Impact Study ("EIS") is a fraud!

Be that as it may, my testimony was given before his was published in the Civic Sentinel and therefore I am entitled to rebut discrepancies, as follows.

How could there be vast discrepancies?

One could argue NN-experts failed to do their homework, or were incompetent, or had some hidden agenda.

Perhaps the PSC or District Attorney Spota will investigate such issues and answer the question:

- If NN-experts did perform an analysis *"grounded in science"*, as Mr. Manitt alleged, why did they miss obvious defects raised by so-called unscientific NIMBY's in their testimony before the Council?

Significantly, no NN-expert testified during the Q&A session following extensive testimony before the Town Council in support of testimony by an expert witness for Caithness/LIPA. I seem to recall he testified all HAZMAT concerns raised by me and others are covered in the EIS; presumably Section 9 (Air Quality) and/or 13 (Contaminated Materials).

Not so, based on a simple example from Section 13, pp. 13-1,-4. The former page defines hazardous substances in accordance with ASTM E 1527-00 and 13-4 states: "...EDR was contracted to search records for

violations of hazardous material (HAZMAT) regulations *"...within a distance of up to one mile from the 96-acre parcel in accordance with the requirements of with ASTM E 1527-00."* This is an example that I didn't have time to include in my PSC-comments. Be that as it may, the Caithness EIS, as certified by LIPA, fails to identify, analyze, or model potentially harmful fumes from known toxic sites; some of which may contain PCB's that could produce deadly dioxins if inhaled by Caithness then overheated or burned. (See *"Oil catastrophe at Ground Zero"* by Juan Gonzalez (NY Daily News, 11/20/01), *"Making Brownfields Green Again"* and *"State Checking Dozens of Sites for Hidden Contaminants"*, by John Rather, (LI NY Times, 2/19/06 & 2/5/06, respectively).

Range circles superimposed on the illustration presented @ www.gfxtechnology.com/V.pdf verify the presence of toxic-air vents from known HAZMAT sites within *"one mile from the 96-acre parcel"*. Other HAZMAT sites may be within a mile of the Caithness' thermal plume and corresponding updrafts, but the EIS is silent on all this, according to this fraudulent statement: *"Air-cooled condensing would be employed to...(3) eliminate cooling tower plume impacts."*

GFR Option

www.gfxtechnology.com/GFR.pdf

Sadly, Caithness would have been the *"cleanest source of base-load energy generation on Long Island"* had LIPA exercised its Grant of Future Right ("GFR") option, so Caithness could have been located on clear land near the existing Port Jefferson and/or Northport power plants, for example.

Had this been done, there would be no toxic-thermal plume issue, no wind-shear issue, no toxic-air intake, no costly Caithness litigation, no adverse comments --- and the thermal pollution of Long Island Sound or Port Jefferson harbor would have been halved.

BUT, KeySpan's antiquated power plants would have become too expensive to operate and National Grid probably would never have paid over \$7 billion to buy them and KeySpan; even with LIPA's illegal surcharge crafted to keep Green Power off Long Island by making it cost more than dirty power produced by KeySpan.

Re-powering KeySpan

During the Q&A session, the Council raise the re-powering issue, which was also addressed by the Caithness/LIPA team. When pressed, they testified this option may be prohibited by environmental laws because KeySpan's power plants are so contaminated.

Nevertheless, after this testimony the NN failed to caution the Civic Sentinel about these suspect conclusions: "(2) it will help to advance efforts to repower existing power plants;" and "(3) once the plant is operating, it will immediately deliver tangible results by displacing - at very significant rates air pollution from older power plants".

In conclusion, Civic Sentinel readers have a right to know the NN misled them, their Town Council, the LIPA Board of Trustees, etc.