

 **NRPC APPROVED MINUTES**  
**NRPC ENERGY FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**06/05/15**

**Members Present:**

Tad Putney, Town of Brookline  
Tom Young, Town of Litchfield  
Elvis Dhima, Town of Hudson  
Kat McGhee, Hollis  
Steve Wells, Mason

Tim Thompson, Town of Merrimack  
Mark Bender, Town of Milford  
Kermit Williams, Town of Wilton  
**Others Present**  
John Greene, Congresswoman Kuster'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 2:11pm.

**PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR**

The members from the public that were present did not wish to speak.

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF MAY 29, 2015**

Roache asked if there were any comments or changes to the draft EFAC minutes from May 29, 2015 meeting. Thompson motioned to approve the minutes of May 29, 2015 with a second from Young. All were in favor.

**PROGRESS TOWARDS CONSULTATION MEETINGS**

Roache confirmed with EFAC the list of consultation meetings upcoming as follows:

**June 12<sup>th</sup>, 2015**

- Liberty and Kinder Morgan – 9:00-10:30am
- Professor Michael Mooiman Franklin Pierce College – 10:30am
- Cynthia Armstrong, PNGTS – 11:30

There was discussion on who would be presenting from Liberty and KM. Williams thought Michael Licata from Liberty would be coming. From KM, Williams thought Lucas Meyer would be here to set up and typically it would be Alan Fore and Curtis Cole at an event such as this. He did get word that KM's economic point person was not available. Williams said he figured on 2 to 3 people from KM.

Williams said that Liberty would most likely talk about their commitment to the line and marketing if it happens and KM would talk about their latest updates, specifically the recent announcement of the location of their compressor station in New Ipswich.

Roache asked the group what they were going to ask the presenters. After further discussion, the group came up with the following questions:

- Wells – Why the need for a lateral in Mason and reason why no need for Massachusetts lateral?
- What does this mean for consumer prices and is there any benefit to us in relation to cost?
- How soon would gas be available to towns?
- Williams - Liberty Q – Are there specific locations identified for the 65,000 residential equivalents and are there going to be lines run where there is no gas?
- Williams - Where do they currently get their gas (understanding the infrastructure)?
- Putney - Big question is what is the benefit? How many power generators is this going to feed?

- McGhee – Important question, which is cited in media coverage, is will prices go down? That is, energy costs or only heat? Is the increased gas for electric generation or for heat? Is the 5% (115,000 dekatherms) accurate? Does it represent incremental gas over what is being delivered?

Williams recommended the group read the FERC PL99-3 Policy Statement. He also suggested the towns should be thinking of what to do for a route if it is going to happen for least impact on citizens and before FERC approval. He added that when FERC looks at a project they weigh the impact with other issues. Williams also suggested that towns should be getting joint intervenor status and put together a team, hire a lawyer and plan to go to court. Putney said that the 13 town alliance he is associated with is already doing what Williams suggested above. McGhee raised the question again, how do we benefit, and commented that she sees it coming to the path of least resistance and the reason why the pipeline came through NH.

#### **STATUS OF OUTLINE OF DELIVERABLE TO FULL COMMISSION**

Siskavich referred to the Draft 2 of the whitepaper proceeded to review the following sections with the group.

#### ***Summary of Activities – Page 4***

Wells asked that Professor Mooiman be added under Summary of Activities under the bullet “Consulted with various agencies and bodies including”

#### ***Summary of Municipal Actions to Date – Page 14***

- Dhima referred to the report done by Weston & Sampson on leaks associated with facilities specifically the Supply Wells which are in Litchfield and the result was low risk.
- Thompson said there was a preliminary yes from Merrimack on surveying and no warrant articles or petitions for Merrimack and they have an attorney Drummond & Woodson.
- Putney said Brookline has experts and they are in progress in relation to environmental. He added that there are 9 NH towns with petition warrant articles.

#### ***4 Questions on Orderly Development – Page 13***

Siskavich suggested that this could be the framework for the full commission to consider. Roache added that these questions would be used to come up with a recommendation to the Full Commission. There was discussion between Bender and McGhee on whether we had a story. Bender felt there were a lot of stories for all of the towns and gave some examples, adding that specific areas of concern need to be identified for the stories. Thompson referenced the Horse Hill Nature Preserve and the MVD Wells as areas of concern that were in the AECOM submittal. Wells asked if he could share the white paper with the Mason Pipeline Advisory Committee. Roache said yes, it is public and we could put the updated version with dates as a working document on the NRPC webpage. There was further discussion on public comments for the white paper. He told the group not to anticipate the white paper being finalized until sometime after the 17<sup>th</sup>. Siskavich said she would also post the response to AECOM with the sensitive water information redacted.

Thompson asked that Mile Post 23.5 Old Kings Highway listed in the Construction Impacts table also be listed in the Historic Impact table.

Williams felt that a whole lot more on FERC needed to be incorporated into the document. He referred to the PL99-3 Policy Statement adding that it does not lean either way. He added that he sees this as a decision process. Williams said he would add a summary of the PL99-3 to the white paper. Thompson suggested this go under “What We’ve Learned” as a bullet with the full Policy as an appendix. Roache said a summary of the presenters presentations should also be under “What We’ve Learned”. Roache added that after June 12<sup>th</sup>, presentations will be added to the white paper.

McGhee asked what we want to know from PNGTS. Bender said Armstrong would provide an overview on their current pipelines, markets served and how to increase with minimal impact. Bender added that he felt the information on the 36" transmission pipe and capacity information should be under "Background" or "Demand & Need".

Putney spoke up saying that the Commission will be looking for guidance and there will be questions on the neutrality of the group and asked if we are advocating for a position or making a statement. There was discussion from the group on the type of statement, guidance or recommendation to provide to the Commission. Roache suggested a concern statement with preliminary findings that lead the group to lean one way or the other. He added that if you look at the report, most towns are against. After further discussion on a statement for the Commission, Putney made a motion that the Committee has significant concerns that the NED project may not be worth it due to the adverse impacts to the region. The group discussed the wording of the current motion. After further discussion Putney re-motioned with:

"The NRPC EFAC has significant concern that the impacts of the proposed NED project outweigh its perceived benefits based on the information received to date". Wells seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion passed.

There was discussion from the group about making a recommendation that the towns get involved and start thinking about Williams's previous suggestion about thinking about alternative routes with the least impact to residents. Thompson said that Merrimack does not want to propose alternate routes and it that it was too soon. He added that currently, Town Council is against such an activity. Putney did not verify this information, but he heard that Winchester's attorney advised the town against proposing an alternate route due to the possible implications down the road. Dhima said that Hudson takes a similar position—the project may not be desirable, but the town is not necessarily the best party to affect change in the route due to liability. Williams commented that FERC expects people to want to minimize the impacts, not eliminate. McGhee said it comes down to timing. There was further discussion on proposing alternative routes and FERC valuing the input from RPC's.

McGhee asked if there was a state piece that should be mentioned in the white paper regarding historical or cultural resources and should towns be looking to these state agencies. Roache said that towns should be identifying places to avoid and he did not want towns to miss out on identifying what areas of towns are important. Siskavich and Thompson both referred to the AECOM submittal that this covered. Roache asked the group to get their information to NRPC to be incorporated into the white paper and another draft would be available in the Dropbox. Roache said there would be no EFAC meeting on the 19<sup>th</sup> due to the 17<sup>th</sup> Commission meeting. Thompson referred Christensen as a moderator at the Commission meeting if needed. Putney thanked Siskavich for all her work.

#### **NEXT MEETING**

Motion to adjourn came from Thompson and seconded by Putney. The meeting ended at 3:27pm. The next meeting would be on Friday, June 12<sup>th</sup> beginning at 9:00am with presentations from Liberty Utilities, Kinder Morgan, Professor Mooiman from Franklin Pierce and Cynthia Armstrong with PNGTS.