

 **NRPC APPROVED MINUTES**
NRPC ENERGY FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
04/10/15

Members Present:

Tad Putney, Town Administrator - Brookline
Kat McGhee, Hollis Pipeline Impact Study Taskforce
Tom Young, Town of Litchfield
Elvis Dhima, Town of Hudson
Steve Wells, Mason
Tim Thompson, Town of Merrimack
Mark Bender, Town Administrator - Milford

Sarah Marchant, City of Nashua
Kermit Williams, Town of Wilton

Others Present

David Beach, Amherst
Gene Porter, LMRLAC
Keith Sonia, Congresswoman Kuster's Office
Emily Cashman, Senator Shaheen's Office

STAFF PRESENT

Tim Roache, MPO Coordinator Sara Siskavich, GIS Manager Karen Baker, Program Assistant

CALL TO ORDER

Williams called the meeting to order at 2:10 pm.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Emily Cashman from Senator Shaheen's office and Keith Sonia (filling in for John Greene) from Congresswoman Kuster's office said they were working on letters of support for the PHIMSA Grant that NRPC was applying for.

Gene Porter informed the group that the Souhegan Valley Local Advisory Committee (SoRLAC) and the Lower Merrimack River Local Advisory Committee (LMRLAC) is having a public meeting with Kinder Morgan (KM) to discuss river crossings. No date has been set yet, but KM accepted in principal.

Roache asked Cashman about requesting KM do additional open houses. Cashman said a letter was sent to KM and KM said they would be scheduling more and restated the ones they had already done. McGhee commented that science fair type set ups are what KM considers open houses, as opposed to the longer information sessions they've agreed to do for towns. Cashman said for clarification on the wording they used she would forward the letter to EFAC.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF MARCH 27, 2015

Roache asked if there were any comments or changes to the draft EFAC minutes from March 27, 2015 meeting. Thompson motioned to approve the minutes of March 27, 2015 with a second from Bender. All were in favor.

PERTINENT LOCAL TASK FORCE AND WORKGROUPS UPDATES

Williams discussed with the group the need to schedule some meetings with key people or groups (ex. KM, Liberty Utilities) and asked the EFAC how they should go about doing this. He asked if they wanted have them come meet as a group here at the NRPC, or on a smaller subset and report out. Next, he asked the EFAC who they felt they should have meetings with for example, Eversource, Keene Gas, Liberty Utilities or should they identify industrial users and meet with them like Hitchiner), or with groups who have issues with the pipeline (e.g. NH Pipeline Awareness, NE Energy Solutions, Plan Group). McGhee asked what they are looking to learn or get information on. Williams asked what the groups focus was and to structure it. Roache informed the group of the Executive Committee request that the EFAC try to hear from the public for input. The group decided that they should meet with Eversource (Bender had a contacts there & placed info in the Dropbox) and Spectra Energy on one day and KM and FERC for a separate day.

There was discussion on what the questions EFAC should prepare for FERC and KM. Williams felt the primary question to FERC from EFAC should be the basis upon which they will make their determination. Roache felt it would be beneficial to have FERC and KM talk to the group and to also advertise it and open it to the public.

Putney asked who the best person is to set up the meeting. Roache said NRPC could work on that, and that a push from the legislative delegation would be necessary to get Eric Tomasi from KM; he would work on this for May. Williams said he would work on Eversource and Spectra for a May meeting. Williams asked if they should invite the anti-pipeline groups to come. Marchant felt that due to the limited timeframe that the EFAC should meet with who they want to first. Thompson was not sure if there would be any benefit to having a meeting with businesses. McGhee agreed but felt the public advertised meeting through Plan, Merrimack Pipeline Awareness group or representatives of active groups would be good. She had some contacts and would look into this. Other suggestions were to hold it in the evening.

Bender informed the group of "Relieving the Energy Crisis: Update on New Hampshire Infrastructure Projects" meeting being held by the BIA on April 17th at the Radisson Manchester which will have representatives from KM, Spectra, and Eversource amongst others. Bender said he would be attending and anyone else interested should coordinate with him.

Wells suggested Professor Moonian from Franklin Pierce as another person to come speak to the EFAC. He would be able to provide a factual unbiased neutral assessment of the pipeline.

Beach informed the group that the Amherst BOS/Task Force contacted Kinder Morgan to set up a Work Session for feedback on the issues with the current pipeline route. This WS would be noticed, open to the public, and there would be no Q&A component. Tentatively this worksession is planned during school vacation week.

Thompson informed the group that Merrimack Town Council has officially opposed the pipeline and that they were working with the attorney to put together additional information to provide to FERC and a letter to the legislative delegation on their position.

Bender said that Milford has a weekly Wednesday night televised public meeting at 6:30 in the BOS meeting room where they look at historical and construction impacts from the pipeline.

Putney informed the group that Brookline hired an engineer firm to do wetland and environmental survey work on the conservation land in Brookline. Dhima asked about associated costs. Putney said it was \$14,500 which was funded through a warrant article. McGhee said Beaver Brook, which is private, did the same type of survey work in Hollis and raised funds through donations. Williams asked if any of the towns had received any private donations for this. None had.

Beach informed the group that Amherst has expressed significant concerns with the proposed pipeline route. He added that the Amherst Task Force provided a report on safety which concluded that pipelines are safe and the conservation impacts and benefits for the long term were limited. Bender reviewed that Merrimack, Milford, Amherst and Mason have all made statements regarding the pipeline and in regards to the AECOM letter. Brookline had not met yet since receiving the letter.

UPDATE ON IMPACTS DATA GATHERING

Environmental (NRPC)

Siskavich informed the group that AECOM gave a notice to proceed to NRPC to respond on behalf of the towns and that NRPC anticipates payment shortly. She passed around draft map sets and an excel spreadsheet which outlined environmentally sensitive areas in the towns along the proposed pipeline route. She asked for input on what could make the maps more useful and asked that the maps be returned as they contained sensitive data. She added that NRPC would review with the towns for local input once the maps were complete. Roache said he wanted to be consistent with what Merrimack and Milford have. Bender said that Milford had not submitted any maps to AECOM. Siskavich talked about groundwater protection ordinances and for confirmation that Hudson did not have one. Dhima clarified that the wellhead supplying the town of Hudson is in Litchfield. Porter had concerns that the maps did not have rivers impacts listed. Siskavich informed him that the themes on the maps were what AECOM requested in their letter. Marchant commented that the ¼ mile water source point was mandated by both the State

and NHDES. Roache explained the eight week turnaround process to have the maps completed and reviewed by the towns and ready for submission to AECOM. McGhee asked if Southwest RPC was doing the same thing. Roache said yes that was their intention but they were a little behind NRPC with respect to having the dialogue with their towns about it. There were questions from Wells and Marchant regarding the private wells information. Siskavich said areas served by public water were inferred based on several DES datasets and NRPC data, but that where there was ambiguity or unknown information, residences were assumed to be on private well. She added that her analysis did not show any impacted historic features for Amherst and would want confirmation on this. Wells felt that the maps and information should be digested by the towns first before NRPC meets to review them.

Construction Impacts (Mark Bender, Tom Young)

Bender said that KM responded to his list of questions regarding NED Pipeline Construction Impacts and summarized with the group (see full document in Dropbox). He added that KM referred him their latest environmental resource report. He added that a lot of content in the resource report is still to be determined (TBD). He was still waiting for some more responses from KM and would incorporate them into the document. He suggested that towns should have Tennessee bond all their roads, bridges and railroad crossings and to also request that the proposed route through residential neighborhoods be treated as Class 3.

Economic Impacts (Sarah Marchant, Tad Putney)

Putney referred to the three buckets that he and Marchant were working on regarding Economic Impacts:

- 1) Revenue to Towns;
- 2) Property Owner Valuation Impacts; and
- 3) Emergency Response.

Putney said they were looking for more information from the towns that already have pipelines on tax revenue impacts once construction is done and the grass starts growing. Putney said that Lynde provided his information and placed it in the Dropbox. Dhima said he had some information from residents which he placed in the Dropbox. Williams said there should be some more discussion on the tax revenues. Putney said the pipelines try to include depreciation when addressing properties with pipeline. In regards to emergency response impacts, Putney said he received info that Pelham had during or following the installation of TGP facilities in Pelham, there was no increase in emergency services resources, and that they are instructed to call the gas company. Dhima said that Hudson did not have to acquire any new equipment but the fire department did have to have regular training on how to avoid spreading the fire. Porter felt there was quite a difference between an 8-inch (currently in Hudson) and a 36-inch pipeline. Young said there is not difference on the handling and gas fires have to be burned off. Putney said he was working on the effect to the cost of electricity costs after pipeline is put in. Marchant contacted Londonderry regarding residential house values before and after pipelines are installed and said she is welcome to come look through their old cards from 25 years ago which contain this information.

Historic (Tim Thompson & Hal Lynde)

Thompson said he had no new news. He was waiting for responses from the emails that he had sent to contacts regarding historic.

Infrastructure and Safety Impacts (Eric Hahn & Elvis Dhima)

Dhima said the information he received regarding infrastructure and safety impacts was to stay away and evacuate if there is a pipeline safety issue. He added that there were no records of incidents, just some burping of the lines but no issues with transmission or supply lines. Dhima also said the 8-inch line in Hudson was installed in 1983 and the 20-inch line in Pelham was installed in 2001 and there has been nothing in the last 30 years regarding major safety incidents on the infrastructure. There was discussion that natural gas goes up and dissipates, where propane pools at lower levels and presents an ignition risk

Dhima added that smaller distribution pipes can be considered somewhat more dangerous because at lower pressure the gas has a tendency to pool and migrate underground, risking building infiltration.

Demand & Need Analysis (Kat McGhee & Steve Wells)

McGhee informed the group that she interviewed Greg Wade who was the head of Public Affairs in NH for ISO/NE (see full document in the Dropbox). She went over the interview questions and answers with the EFAC. She referred to the 2015 Regional Electricity Outlook and the NE Power Grid 2014-2015 Profile that Mr. Wade provided to her for information and said she would send the links to the group. McGhee passed around the NE Power Grid 2014-2015 profile which provided information on the rapid transformation of the regional electric power resource mix currently underway. Wells talked about the data overload of information out there and suggested posing a set of questions based on the information they have currently. Putney said there might be two different stories from all this data. There was further discussion on between the group and all the data available.

Bender referred to a letter from Pipeline Awareness Network for the Northeast (available in the Dropbox) which calls to question if KM is overbuilding the pipeline. He read some excerpts from the letter.

OUTLINE OF DELIVERABLE TO FULL COMMISSION

Roache said they did not have an outline available yet but would in their hands before the next meeting. He added that NRPC would be reaching out to the towns for mapping and analysis. He reminded the group to please not to post the maps publicly as they are sensitive.

Siskavich reviewed a case regarding the replacement of an existing pipeline with a larger one and the SEC judgement regarding the orderly development of the region and how things would be interpreted by the SEC. Marchant elaborated on this referring to the RSA regarding Orderly Development of the Region and the fact that this bar is already set on this and that it would be worth looking into.

Beach asked that there be more information and education on eminent domain. McGhee said the NH Pipeline Awareness group has information on this.

Cashman asked that all correspondence be sent to the NH offices in Manchester or Nashua for Senator Shaheen's Office or Congresswoman Kuster's Office so they receive it in a timely manner and to not send it to DC as it might take significantly longer to get to them.

NEXT MEETING

Motion to Adjourn came from Thompson with a second from Bender. The meeting ended at 3:48pm. The next meeting will be held on Friday, April 24, 2015 from 2:00-3:30pm.