

 **NRPC APPROVED MINUTES**
NRPC ENERGY FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
05/08/15

Members Present:

Tad Putney, Town of Brookline
Tom Young, Town of Litchfield
Elvis Dhima, Town of Hudson
Garth Fletcher (for Steve Wells), Mason
Mark Bender, Town Administrator - Milford
Tim Thompson, Town of Merrimack
Sarah Marchant, City of Nashua

Kermit Williams, Town of Wilton

Others Present

Emily Cashman, Senator Shaheen's Office
John Greene, Congresswoman Kuster's Office
David Beach, Amherst Guest
George May, SoRLAC & LMRLAC
Nelson Disco, LMRLAC

STAFF PRESENT

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

CALL TO ORDER

Williams called the meeting to order at 2:12 pm.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Nelson Disco spoke saying he was coming in place of Gene Porter, Chair of the LMRLAC who usually attends. He added that there are some critical issues with the river that the LMRLAC would like answered by KM and that this information be included as part of the report. Williams referred to the KM response to the questions from the LMRLAC that Porter emailed over that morning and that it is available in the Dropbox.

George May, chair of the Souhegan River Local Advisory Committee, asked that their concerns with the Souhegan River also be reflected in the report. He referred to the five crossings of Souhegan River, four of which are in the NRPC Region, under the current proposed route and expressed that this be looked at carefully using an environmental aspect. May also referred to a meeting he was trying to set up with KM just for people who live along the Souhegan and Merrimack Rivers to enable them to ask questions and have any concerns they have addressed. Roache said the intention is to capture the concerns Gene has presented.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF APRIL 24, 2015

Roache asked if there were any comments or changes to the draft EFAC minutes from April 24, 2015 meeting. Thompson motioned to approve the minutes of April 24, 2015 with a second from Dhima. All were in favor.

PROGRESS TOWARDS CONSULTATION MEETINGS

Williams asked the group if they wanted the meetings with speakers to be longer so as to include the status reports. Roache commented that the next step is to summarize all the data and send out to EFAC for comments. He anticipated that when there is a speaker, there will be a minimized agenda.

- Eversource (Williams): Williams said that Donna Gamash from Eversource would be in to meet with EFAC on May 15th and would be bringing several people. There was talk about Eversource having to give up their generation facilities and how significant this is and its effect on the cost of electricity and impacts to the state's economy.
- Spectra and PNGTS (Bender): Bender said he spoke with Cynthia Armstrong from PNGTS and she said if the group wants to break it up, she could come on May 29th or June 12th instead of May 15th. Spectra was set to also come in on May 15th. After further discussion, Bender said if KM can't make May 29th, then he would have PNGTS come that day, otherwise, it would be June 12th.

- FERC (Roache): Roache was hoping to get FERC in on June 5th or 12th. Greene said he was working on getting FERC, but there have been some schedule issues since they have not determined their compression station locations. There was further discussion on the potential compression station locations and the possibility New Ipswich would be a location.
- Liberty and Kinder Morgan (Williams): Williams said there was a potential for May 22nd or May 29th to have KM. Roache encouraged Williams to push for May 29th, due to the upcoming holiday. Williams said he also asked Liberty to come with KM but had not received an answer. Bender asked when he might expect to hear back. Williams said he had hoped by today. He added that Friday is not a good day for KM as there is a lot of staff travel that happens on Fridays.
- ISO/NE (McGhee): There was no update being that McGhee was absent. . Roache said June 5th would be a good date to have them in.

Williams asked the group if there was anyone else they wanted to have come in. Roache suggested state agencies and said Wells wanted to have Ken Hartridge come in also. Thompson expressed that EFAC is not at the stage yet to meet with state agencies.

There was discussion from Fletcher on the timing of SEC and FERC application processes and approvals. Beach commented that KM's intention is to file with FERC in September; approval would be a year later.

STATUS OF OUTLINE OF DELIVERABLE TO FULL COMMISSION

Siskavich thanked all for doing their homework for the deliverable to the Commission and that she also reorganized the Dropbox folders. She proceeded to show each piece asking for any input from the EFAC group designated to write something for their section, starting with the Environmental piece. She explained that she compiled all the preliminary input based on the maps, including cul-de-sac crossings and wetland data from the National Wetlands Inventory data. Williams asked for clarification as to whether or not aquifers were represented. Siskavich said that the data included is from the USGS and Granite published data. She continued to review input received back from the towns saying that all information that was received will be called out on the maps. Siskavich reminded the group of the two weeks remaining before the handover to AECOM. The week prior she would be doing the second review. She added that written comments will be included as appendices.

Roache said that we would start compiling everything. Williams asked about having an executive summary and Siskavich said she was going to use the layout that Thompson had used for the Historic piece to aid in the Environmental summary.

Bender asked if the river crossings would be a separate subject or pieced out in each of the categories. He felt it should be separate stand-alone piece. Williams said both rivers should be combined but as a separate piece. May said he has a lot more questions and talked about how KM plans to do the crossings. Dhima said that there would be complications if KM used a sleeve method. May said he needs the KM construction people to talk to him. There was further discussion on river crossings in each of the towns, the thickness of the pipes and how the crossings would be done. The decision was to do a separate section for river impacts.

Marchant asked with all the data and information in the Dropbox and executive summary/white paper document to be produced, what will be the outline set up. Williams said that selected papers would need to be identified to be a companion to the white paper. Roache felt that those pieces mentioned, if important to the text, should be an appendix. Williams suggested links to the Dropbox. Siskavich said they could be linked on the NRPC pipeline webpage.

Beach commented about the high-level discussion on river crossings at the Amherst meeting with KM. He added that there was a hint that they were considering using HDD through Ponemah Bog. Also, what he

took from the meeting was to not expect any changes to the maps and that there may or may not be mention of alternate routes and that nothing was concrete. Williams asked if there was any consensus about re-routing around the school. Beach said he felt there was no consensus. He added that he did see helicopters fly over the route proposed over the Souhegan River.

Marchant said she sent new text for the Economic piece and added information on updated appraised values. Roache offered an anecdote: a place in Merrimack on his running route went up for sale and how it sold almost instantly even with the pipeline route right behind it. He added it would be interesting to see what the selling price is. Marchant said she could do a high level summary of the information she and Putney collected. She added that the last question, Recommended Next Steps, in the economic submission was hard to answer.

Thompson said he used the information he received from Lynde and put Historic together with what he had collected using categories of historic, potentially historic and notifying of historical societies. He also included schools and daycares and historical crossings.

Dhima summarized his piece on Infrastructure and Safety. He added that he did not hear from Hahn so he hoped what he added was correct. He said most of what he added was how the pipelines cross existing infrastructure and information on escape routes. Dhima said he did not get into the depth of the pipe because he felt that was industry-specific. Other safety related information he added was regarding drainage breaks and resident complaints and his concerns for Hudson. He hoped to get answers from KM and others on some of this. Williams said he heard that the structural format changes depending on the size of the neighborhood. There was further discussion from Dhima regarding the types of sleeves used and that he would try to get involved to find out more information on thickness and infrastructure of the pipes.

Marchant and Siskavich discussed adding a hazard mitigation map or impact radius with evacuation procedures. Siskavich said she would move critical sites from Historic into Safety and Infrastructure. Williams said critical site avoidance would be a good question to ask KM.

Fletcher talked about gas pipelines catching on fire and that it is rare but there is on average 1-2 incidents every year. He added that a 1-mile 36-inch pipe equals 80 tons of methane and it does not all burn. There was further discussion between Fletcher, Putney and Beach on impact zones, maximum allowable PSI and sizes of pipelines.

Roache said NRPC would fold all the sections into a single flowing document, share it with the EFAC and present it to the Executive Committee on May 20th.

PERTINENT LOCAL TASK FORCE AND WORKGROUPS UPDATES

Beach referred to the KM/Amherst meeting and the talk about a meter station in Amherst that may now end up being in Merrimack. Another hint from the meeting was that FERC may require a pre-application report of the resource report. Siskavich said she heard there would be a scoping meeting in Merrimack. Williams asked if there was any pipeline route change that affects other towns. Beach said he did not hear anything, but he did hear that the current exit would be at the south end of Amherst into Merrimack which would change where it enters Merrimack.

Bender referred to the Municipal Coalition Group which currently had three more towns sign in to (Troy, Winchester, & New Ipswich). He referred to the letters that went to 44 elected officials and heard back from two. Putney said the MCG feels that there are better alternatives on the table and that they are not necessarily anti-pipeline. Bender commented that Milford chose not to sign up with the MCG due to the timing being inappropriate. Roache said five NRPC Region towns have signed the letter and questioned how this affects what NRPC EFAC Committee is doing. Putney referred to the charge of the Committee and

reiterated his understanding that NRPC would not be taking a position. Marchant added that the NRPC Executive Committee would likely be submitting comments but not taking a position. Roache said he talked to Amherst in March about their list of questions to KM and how it would dovetail with what the NRPC EFAC was doing. Siskavich asked if the EFAC should take action on Amherst's questions now. Williams suggested incorporating these questions and EFAC questions into one document and submitting. Putney suggested looking to other towns to see if they have already asked some of these questions before submitting to KM. Beach said his understanding is that the Amherst Task Force is planning to submit their questions independently. Fletcher said it would be good to have a collection of all the questions that have been submitted by other towns. Thompson said that Merrimack did not submit their questions and would be consolidating all through their attorney.

NEXT MEETING

Motion to Adjourn came from Thompson with a second from Putney. The meeting ended at 3:28pm. The next meeting will be held on Friday, May 15, 2015 from 2:00-3:30pm where Eversource and Spectra will present to the EFAC.