

Town of Amherst
Pipeline Taskforce Meeting
June 30, 2015
3pm

1. Introductions:

John D'Angelo	Amherst PTF and BOS
Barry Duff	Kinder Morgan Project Manager (New Hampshire Section -- NED)
Jim Hartman	Tenn. Gas Pipeline – Principal Land Specialist (Right of Way Agent)
Mark Hamarich	Kinder Morgan – Project Manager
Lucas Meyer	Kinder Morgan – Media Relations
Norman Clifton	Kinder Morgan
David Beach	Amherst PTF
Colin Lonsdale	Amherst PTF
Joseph McCool	Amherst PTF
Colleen Mailloux	Amherst Community Development Director
Shannon Chandley	Amherst PTF
Reed Panasiti	Amherst PTF

2. Kinder Morgan- Results of Alternate Routes Analysis

L. Meyer stated that April 28 was the last meeting. Since then, they have explored other route possibilities and Barry will speak on the results of the analysis.

B. Duff spoke:

Looked at alternatives.

Option 3. Route: Federal Hill rd. at power line- greenfield- 101a intersection- back down and meets original plan

Option 2. Don't leave the power line so early; otherwise similar to Option 3.

Options 2 and 3 avoid all areas of concern from PTF meeting.

Option 1. Avoids all areas of concern except one area (Patricia Lane area). Route follows the railroad to PC Connection, then follows Continental Blvd and rejoins original route at Camp Sergeant.

As a rule, pipelines do not like to follow roads because communities expand.

Continental Blvd from the dealership on is relatively undeveloped. We would be about 100' off the road.

Options 2 and 3 impact more land owners, crossing more streams and are not preferred.

They have a big concern around the rail line. It is close with not much space. How active is the rail line?

J. D'Angelo stated it is used, but not much. Not used all winter with feet of snow on it. Some residents who abut the railroad tracks report that two (slow) trains per week use it, often at night.

They will leave copies of the map with the Taskforce so that the Taskforce can review it.

Internally they are not partial to option 2 and 3, but they are interested in option 1.

Local utility line is in that area too. – Eversource/ Liberty- so they will have to be contacted.

M. Hamarich stated Option 1 will be discussed and further evaluated. Many groups have looked at it.

B. Duff stated that another reason pipelines don't like roads is that access to main line valves can be more difficult. There will be a valve in Amherst. There may need to be an offshoot to allow access to the valve.

There are large catch basins by Home Depot and Waterworks (in Merrimack). They still need to understand how those work.

J. D'Angelo stated that option 1 looks similar to what the PTF thought would make sense. The next step is to mention it in the next resource report and state that they will be investigating particularly option 1. (B. Duff stated the report is already typed up with that information included)

Timeline:

M. Hamarich said they're trying to line up construction- July- survey needs to be done. That will take a couple of months. End of September is the goal. Schedule next draft in July and file the NED application with the FERC in 4th quarter of this year. Want major routing points by that time.

D. Beach asked about the relative advantages and disadvantages of Option 1 as compared to the original route.

B. Duff stated Option 2 has less impact on original line than option 3. What they do is take that segment and do a direct comparison to the alternative. Look at land use and which option is impacting uses more. Contractors will assess different qualities of the wetland and conservation.

D. Beach followed up, what does your analysis tell you?
Option 1 looks interesting.

J. D'Angelo so the timeline is to complete work on this a couple of months and walkthrough the public land in July. Yes.

J. McCool- is Option 1 the best route in that area?

B. Duff stated this route avoided the areas of concern with the school etc.

M. Hamarich stated there are some areas in option 1 that need more attention.

Residents and Taskforce members discussed the area that includes Patricia Lane and the church.

Residents informed KM personnel that the church plans to (re)open a school on premises in the near future¹. J. D'Angelo informed KM personnel that a workforce housing development (16 units) will be built and in existence on this section of the route by the time ground is broken for pipeline construction. The proposed route bisects this housing development and runs under at least two of the planned units².

¹ Information received on 1-July from K. Bury, 7 Patricia Lane: "the minister of the Amherst Christian Church has told me that they plan to re-open the school in the church annex. This would not only violate Amherst criteria but also violate KM's policy to avoid schools. The church building includes several classrooms that were in the past used for kindergarten and pre-school classes. Please contact Pastor Ron Tannariello at 603- 672-1541 for more information.

² C. Mailloux sent a copy of the approved site plan for this planned workforce housing development (Amherst Fields) to B. Duff on 1-July.

J. D'Angelo clarified that at this time they are still exploring Option 1 and the original plan. Yes.

D. Beach asked about a scoping meeting scheduled for July 30 in Milford.

M. Hamarich explained that the scoping meetings are FERC meetings. FERC schedules and organizes and sends notices to residents and stakeholders.

D. Beach asked, do they get notices of all of the scoping meetings if they get noticed for one?

M. Hamarich- Good question. They will check with counsel and let C. Mailloux know.

J. D'Angelo will ask the Conservation Commission to look at Option 1. The ACC's two main concerns have been eliminated with Option 1.

S. Chandley asked and it was clarified that the goal is to determine by the end of September which route it will be.

Mark Bender, Milford Town Administrator- Option 3 impacts Milford so he asked for a copy of the map. He will get one and they will get it in electronic form and send it out as well.

After the meeting concluded, several PTF members asked Barry Duff and other Kinder Morgan representatives why alternate Option 1 wasn't moved further south (based on all three of the alternate routes proposed by the PTF) to distance it from Patricia Lane. Duff indicated there is a significant slope on the other side of Route 122 that has some bearing on that portion of the Option 1 alternative. He said an engineering contractor looked at options for moving it south in that area but didn't like the implications of such a move. However, at the urging of PTF members, Duff and other company officials indicated that KM would have another look at that area of Option 1 in an attempt to reduce impacts and report back to PTF at a later date.

Respectfully submitted,
Jessica Marchant