

 **NRPC APPROVED MINUTES**
NRPC ENERGY FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
02/27/15

Members Present:

| | |
|--|--|
| Eric Hahn, Amherst | Jillian Harris, Town of Merrimack CDD |
| Tad Putney, Town Administrator - Brookline | Mark Bender, Town Administrator - Milford |
| Kat McGhee, Hollis Pipeline Impact Study Taskforce | Sarah Marchant, Community Dev. Director - Nashua |
| Elvis Dhima, Town of Hudson | Kermit Williams, Town of Wilton |
| Tom Young, Town of Litchfield | John Greene, Congresswoman Kuster's Office |
| Steve Wells, Mason | Kari Thurman, Senator Shaheen's Office |
| | David Beach, Amherst Guest |

STAFF PRESENT

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

CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS

Tim Roache opened the meeting with introductions at 2:10pm.

SUMMARY OF NRPC'S INVOLVEMENT AROUND NED PIPELINE

Roache started off by summarizing what NRPC does and how we are involved with in this. He explained that we provide a forum for the Commissioners to come together to discuss issues of the region. He added that the EFAC came about from discussions at the December Commission meeting and was approved at January Executive Committee meeting. At the February 10th meeting the Executive Committee appointed Kermit Williams as chair.

Siskavich provided more detail as to how NRPC become involved from the GIS aspect. She said it started with a map request from Hollis on proposed pipeline and then from Brookline and several requests from other towns along the pipeline route. Kinder Morgan stopped into NRPC to provide information on the project. This is when Siskavich requested the pipeline route map. She explained that the current proposed pipeline route map was originally the proposed alternate that become the preferred and is available on the NRPC webpage along with other helpful resources. Siskavich informed the group that NRPC has also set up an account with FERC to have access to the docket and has been in touch with Congresswoman Kuster's office to have a meeting set up with FERC. Siskavich talked about the Site Evaluation Committee workshop that NRPC hosted and the Coalition group between the affected towns. Lastly, Siskavich talked about the ACOM letter sent to the towns and the open houses attended by NRPC in both Hudson and Milford.

Roache asked what the group what the NRPC can do. He emphasized that he wanted to reduce redundancy and the desire to pool resources. Lastly he said that the EFAC is neither for nor against the pipeline.

REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF THE EFAC CHARGE

Williams asked the group who amongst them had already made their mind up about the pipeline. Wells said half of Mason is for it half is not and that more info is needed. Williams referred to the 13 towns included in this committee and said it would be good to share meetings with other groups established and to gather as much information from different groups and individuals. Roache asked the group if anyone had were any changes to the charge. There were none.

DISCUSSION OF POTENTIAL EFAC ACTIONS

Williams said the group would be tasked with looking at all energy facilities and gathering information. Beach asked if alternate routes would be looked at. There was discussion if offering an alternate was even

possible. Williams said they should look at alternatives: Is this pipeline necessary and are there alternatives? There was discussion on the current pipeline route not being the actual route. Wells asked who makes that decision. Roache said the final decision would come from FERC.

McGhee explained the process that Hollis went through when the pipeline was originally proposed to go through Hollis. She added that Kinder Morgan will not entertain alternatives from lay people. She suggested looking at the ROW is being used in each of the communities affected. Williams asked if she could share their process with the group. She said she could share the charge, the RSA's they used and the categories they looked at. Williams reminded the group that these are public meetings and too keep in mind the RSA for public meetings.

There were questions and discussions on who defines the energy demand and the FERC process. Greene said he is hoping to get FERC in for a meeting to discuss their process. Roache commented that a well-managed meeting can be done, we just need to continue to ask and emphasize the importance. Williams said that it would be good to have the congresswoman and senator ask the higher ups in FERC.

Roache asked the group who else they think they should meet with besides FERC. Williams said the Office of Energy and Planning, the Site Evaluation Committee. The PUC was also mentioned. There was further discussion on the case for need, the definition of need, where the establishment of need comes from, finding out the facts, who says what the needs are in the decision making process, how this info will be used and focusing on what's on the map today. There was more discussion about who controls the direction the pipeline takes.

Siskavich read a copy of the letter from AECOM that went to all the towns along the pipeline route requesting affected resources within certain buffers from the pipeline. Roache responded to a comment from Putney asking him and the group if an analysis of resources within the buffers defined for each town would be helpful to the committee. He added that he would need a sense of what these are from each town and was anticipating NRPC would also receive a letter. McGhee asked if NRPC was communicating with other regions. Roache said he has been in contact with SNRPC and other RPCs in MA and has been sharing information back and forth. Williams said the letter was sent to all towns in the region; Litchfield, Pelham, Brookline and Milford who did not send the information requested but notified AECOM that they would be doing a consolidated report with NRPC. Hahn cautioned each town submitting separately saying that it could inadvertently change the exit or entrance point to another town. Williams asked if towns could send their files to Siskavich. Siskavich said she has some of the data being requested and she relies on State and DES data.

There was discussion on what types of resources to include. The group talked about individual wells. Hahn suggested a regional strategy rather than getting into the weeds of individual homes. Environmental impacts were an important issue for the group. Roache suggested doing a higher level analysis than what was requested by ACOM, but maybe not individual wells.

Williams suggested not grabbing onto what people said about technology, ROW and to collect data and get the facts. Dhima asked about the powerline for Hudson and Pelham. Roache did not have much information on that but said he would know more in a couple weeks.

Dhima talked about the soil testing, cage design setup, blast range, and auto shutoffs in regards to the pipeline. The group discussed the potential safety impacts further and said it should be part of an environmental impact statement.

McGhee referred the group to Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA), for safety related information.

Bender asked if NRPC was going to wait for a letter from ACOM or send one before. Roache said it would make sense to gather the letters sent to towns and send a letter to ACOM and say NRPC would do an analysis but for a price.

The final list of potential EFAC Actions based on input from the group:

- Share information: What you have via emails. No conversation through email.
- Establish list of Agencies to have meetings with
- Establish how does need support decision making process
- Higher level overview of analysis of resources
- Safety/First Responders/Assessment of Risk

PROPOSAL FOR A STANDING AGENDA FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

- Agenda structured around important things that happen today
- Status Update
- Progress Report based on project
- Meeting weekly kept to 1 hour unless presenter brought in

Williams said it would make sense to have FERC come to NRPC for a meeting down the road. Siskavich said she would talk to Eric at FERC and have Williams meet with them with a set of questions to bring with him. Thurman emphasized having the meeting with Eric at FERC. Siskavich suggested the group subscribe to the docket. If meetings get too large, City Hall Auditorium is an option and empty offices at 9 Executive Park Drive, Merrimack. Siskavich will set up a drop box for sharing documents.

OTHER BUSINESS

No other business was discussed.

The meeting ended at 3:43 pm. The next meeting will be held on March 6th, 2015 from 2:00-3:30pm