

Amherst Pipeline Taskforce Meeting
Tuesday, April 28, 2015 – 2:00PM

ATTENDEES: David Beach, Tiani Coleman, Colin Lonsdale, John D'Angelo – Selectman,
Paul Indeglia- ACC, Colleen Mailloux, Community Development Director

J. D'Angelo called the meeting to order and asked for introductions. In addition to the members of the taskforce present, Steve Keedy, Jim Hartman, Mark Hamarich and Lucas Meyer were present from Kinder Morgan. Approximately 40-50 people were in the audience.

J. D'Angelo stated that this is a work session of the Amherst Pipeline Taskforce and Kinder Morgan agreed to attend to discuss areas of the Town that the taskforce has identified as priority areas to be avoided and to discuss potential alternate routes to minimize disturbance for residents and property owners in Amherst. J. D'Angelo stated that the Amherst Board of Selectmen feels strongly that the current route is unacceptable and they would like Kinder-Morgan to look at routes that are less disruptive. ***This meeting is not to be interpreted as support from Amherst for the NED project as a whole or as an endorsement of--or acceptance of-- the current proposed route of the NED pipeline through New Hampshire.***

J. D'Angelo stated that the meeting is open to the public who are welcome to listen but cannot comment. This is not a session for public input or testimony.

C. Mailloux discussed the map prepared by the taskforce. The map was developed using a base map prepared by NRPC, but the map being discussed is a draft work product of the Amherst Pipeline Taskforce. C. Mailloux stated that the taskforce identified several criteria as priorities to be avoided: schools, town-owned conservation land, residential cul-de-sacs, environmentally sensitive areas, including Ponemah Bog (an alkaline fen) and Stump Pond (Blandings turtle habitat). Higher density residential developments were also identified, including elderly and affordable housing developments. J. Hartman asked for identification of the blacked out areas on the map. C. Mailloux will provide that list.

J. D'Angelo discussed potential alternate routes that would avoid the priority avoidance areas identified. Beginning at the Milford town line, routes similar to those proposed to FERC by Amherst residents Alice and Kenneth Bury, would avoid denser residential areas and run through the industrial area, connecting to the area of the existing metering station in Bon Terrain. M. Hamarich stated that, for discussion purposes, at the present time it appears the meter will be located in Merrimack.

J. D'Angelo reviewed alternative segments from the Milford line to Bon Terrain industrial area, and from Bon Terrain to the Merrimack town line. One potential route could follow the existing railroad (Pan-Am owned). J. D'Angelo stated that the track is rarely used. T. Coleman asked about the clear space required for the pipeline – is 100' clear of vegetation required? J. Hartman stated that typically 50' is required for permanent right of way to operate the pipeline. During construction, a 100' area is required, typically. Could be reduced to 75' in wetland areas or could require additional area at road crossings, etc. Generally 100' is standard during

construction, but it is site specific. D. Beach stated that Liberty has a gas distribution line that runs near the railroad.

J. D'Angelo stated that the goal is to keep this as far away from as many residential properties as possible. The area south of 101A/railroad is industrial and commercial zone. M. Hamarich stated that the premise of the current route is to follow the power line to cross the Merrimack River and then run south to connect to Dracut. There is an existing conduit that may be used to cross the river.

J. Hartman and M. Hamarich asked about the extension beyond Amherst and into Merrimack. C. Mailloux stated that we cannot speak for Merrimack. Showed plan that includes Amherst and Merrimack in the current pipeline route. Following railroad would not include Hollis. Members of the Merrimack Town Counsel spoke. Tom Mahon of Merrimack stated that Merrimack has two wellheads in the south east corner of the Town, and a Baptist Church located in that area. A discussion took place on school and wellhead locations in Merrimack, and Pennichuck-owned land. J. D'Angelo stated that Amherst is trying to find the least damaging alternative if the pipeline has to come through our Town. On the northeast side of Merrimack is another aquifer.

T. Coleman, aquifer protection area in Amherst as well, why is it OK to impact Amherst aquifer and wellheads but not Merrimack wellheads? P. Indeglia stated that Pennichuck had written a letter to the Hollis BOS previously that locating the pipeline in the wetlands/aquifer will not impact the deep water wells/recharge.

It was stated that 90% of Merrimack is on public water. P. Indeglia stated that 90% of Amherst is served by individual on-site wells and septic systems.

J. D'Angelo stated that to the eye of the taskforce, there are less troublesome locations for the pipeline than the currently proposed route.

J. Hartman briefly described the trench required for the pipeline, 7'-8' trench. Coated pipe, natural gas only. No oil/petroleum products. A question was asked if the pipeline could be converted in the future to be used for oil. J. Hartman – no. In well-head protection areas property owner would agree to only allow natural gas in the pipe. In order to change that in the future would need not only regulatory approval, but landowner approval would also need to be obtained for changes to easement rights. When the pipe is installed, it does not change percolation, flow or wetlands. Impacts are typically from construction, and BMPs and engineering methods are used to minimize any construction impacts.

M. Peterman asked about containment. The pipe does not have secondary containment; it is steel, coated and is its own containment. The gas is lighter than air.

M. Hamarich described horizontal direction drilling – trenchless technology that would be used at Souhegan River crossings. Pipe would be 70' deep. Would avoid impact to sensitive resource but would require larger staging areas at each side of the drill. The pipeline is monitored for pressure and leaks, but not environmental monitoring.

92 T. Mahon stated if the route ran through Fidelity and across the back of Budweiser...
93 brainstorming. Question from public – why are we discussing Merrimack? What are the
94 Amherst neighborhoods being impacted. Group looked at Amherst avoidance map again.
95

96 J. D’Angelo stated that we are not proposing a specific route, but would like Kinder Morgan to
97 analyze options that minimize disturbance to priority areas.
98

99 P. Indeglia discussed the Souhegan River and oxbow lakes, it is a fluid, meandering river.
100 Discussed impacts from power lines constructed 90 years ago still apparent in Ponemah Bog.
101

102 M. Hamarich discussed next steps. The FERC pre-filing process is a dialog to exchange
103 information and come up with a best possible route. Late June, early July will be the next filing;
104 there will be no change in route at that time (Report 10). The report will include a discussion of
105 alternatives that were looked at and discounted or looked at and need further analysis. Could sit
106 down in late May/June again after KM has a chance to review the avoidance areas and potential
107 routes and analyze.
108

109 T. Coleman asked about the timing of the overall process. M. Hamarich stated that by
110 September the route gets filed with FERC, and then scoping meetings are held. J. D’Angelo
111 stated that we need to continue to communicate. When KM has conducted an evaluation of
112 alternate routes, please contact Colleen or Jim O’ Mara. M. Hamarich stated that input is
113 important in this process.
114

115 Resource Report 10 will show an analysis of routes looked at, if any are good, they will be
116 adopted and recommended. If they pursue an alternate route, would then follow with survey
117 requests. Kinder Morgan will keep the Town informed of potential route changes in Town.
118

119 D. Beach asked if the soil is stable enough to support directional drilling. More geotechnical
120 data is needed. J. Hartman stated that when property owners grant survey permission, it allows
121 for more information to be obtained, learn more about the land instead of making assumptions.
122

123 C. Lonsdale asked about the slope of the horizontal drilling. Answer- approximately 15 degrees
124 but varies.
125

126 M. Hamarich – project team will look at this material and see if any alternates within Amherst
127 are feasible.
128

129 Public asked why is this pipeline coming to NH? C. Mailloux – that is a valid question to be
130 answered but is not the purpose of this meeting.
131

132 The meeting was adjourned at 3:10pm.