

Public FERC correspondence & comments received re Docket PF14-22 (Kinder-Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline proposed Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline)

VOLUME 5: Comments During September 1, 2015

The most recent Volume is always at: http://www.Mason-NH.org/FERC_COMMENTS.pdf

The current Table of Contents is at: http://www.Mason-NH.org/FERC_Comments_TOC.pdf

Transcripts of Scoping Meetings at: http://www.Mason-NH.org/FERC_Scoping_Transcripts.pdf

Previous volumes (*links are also provided within the current volume*):

Volume 4 (pages 1,885...3,280) August 2015

http://www.Mason-NH.org/FERC_COMMENTS_vol_4.pdf

Volume 3 (pages 1,140...1,884, 2.7 MB) June 2015 through July 2015

http://www.Mason-NH.org/FERC_COMMENTS_vol_3.pdf

Volume 2 (r2) (pages 580...1,139, 2.1 MB) March 2015 through May 2015

http://www.Mason-NH.org/FERC_COMMENTS_vol_2.pdf

Volume 1 (r3) (pages 1...579, 2.2 MB) beginning in September 2014, through February 2015

http://www.Mason-NH.org/FERC_COMMENTS_vol_1.pdf

Editor's note:

The comments sent to FERC by citizens, local governments and organizations are meant to provide important information to FERC for use in its review of a proposed project. In this role the information flows essentially in only one direction: to FERC.

A less well known function is to encourage the exchange of information between citizens, groups and local governments. In my view this exchange is as important as informing FERC, perhaps more important. Unfortunately, while the comments sent to FERC are made part of the public record and are placed on-line, they can be rather hard to access through FERC's somewhat opaque eLibrary interface. In practice they essentially disappear from the public eye.

*As a consequence, much of the value of the comments is lost. While some comments are simple "I'm all for it" or "don't allow it" expressions of opinion, many others contain thoughtful discussions of costs and benefits, suggestions for studies which would be important, considerations of alternative solutions, and other valuable contributions to the public discussion. **It is a terrible waste of human effort and knowledge to allow these comments to disappear from the public discussion.***

The intent of this document was to collect and make easily accessible the comments sent to FERC by citizens, organizations and local governments along with FERC's replies. I wanted to make the comments available as a collection in a small number of PDF files of manageable size - this meant that the comments would have to be in text form rather than as large image scans.

Most of the documents were scanned at FERC and then converted into text via OCR (Optical Character Recognition). While modern OCR can do a decent job, there always will be errors. The errors were compounded by the tendency of some FERC clerks to stamp the documents near to, often on top of, the text - which greatly confused the OCR and made it time-consuming to select and copy the remaining legible parts.

Hand-written documents are not OCR compatible and could not be converted to text. They are listed in

sequence below but without text; where possible a note is made as to author and support or opposition.

Maps and similar graphical material are also not included.

Also excluded are the very large document collections provided by Kinder Morgan in their application. Each update of their proposal includes almost 1,000 MB of files containing thousands of pages. These files are listed in sequence below and can be downloaded from FERC's eLibrary if you want them.

Much of the OCR'd text resulted in lines which did not match the page width of this collection; simply copying these short lines this would have at least tripled the length of this already very long document. Instead, after selecting the text I reformatted the paragraphs so that they would fill out the width. I did not attempt to also recreate indentations or tabular formats.

This project has been complicated by several factors:

I found it surprising that many documents which were fully OCR compatible were never converted, including a number which came from governmental bodies, tribes, or influential NGOs. These were either stored as (large) image scans in the PDF files or simply noted as not being convertible with no clue as to content. Some which had "SENT BY EMAIL" in their header, indicating they had been sent to FERC in digital text form were apparently converted into the much less useful scan image format. Processing at FERC seems somewhat inconsistent. Where possible I have applied my own OCR when only scans are provided.

Finally, there is pilot fatigue and error. Long and late hours provided ample occasion for errors and I'm sure I must have made some. I suspect the most likely would be deletions of parts of paragraphs (the Delete key being all too close to other keys I used). Please report any that you discover to Garth@Mason-NH.org and I will repair them.

In short, expect some errors. When in doubt you can consult images of the originals in FERC's eLibrary. The bolded numbers, such as "**20140917-4001(29789308).pdf**", are the FERC document file names in which the first numbers, e.g., **20140917-4001**, are the document's "Accession Number" while the numbers in () are the specific file number (there may be several files, for example a scan Image file and also a PDF version, possibly OCR'd, or not...).

You can search FERC's eLibrary at <http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/elibrary.asp> where you can use "advanced search" to find all files under a specific Accession Number.

G.Fletcher.

The files are listed in numerical order - which should correspond to date, beginning with the earliest.

Comments received in Sep 2014	(2014 09 ...) begin on page	Volume 1: 3
Comments received in Oct 2014	(2014 10 ...) begin on page	Volume 1: 41
Comments received in Nov 2014	(2014 11 ...) begin on page	Volume 1: 106
Comments received in Dec 2014	(2014 12 ...) begin on page	Volume 1: 200
Comments received in Jan 2015	(2015 01 ...) begin on page	Volume 1: 281
<u>Comments received in Feb 2015</u>	<u>(201502...) begin on page</u>	<u>Volume 1: 424</u>
Comments received in Mar 2015	(2015 03 ...) begin on page	Volume 2: 582
Comments received in Apr 2015	(2015 04 ...) begin on page	Volume 2: 778
<u>Comments received in May 2015</u>	<u>(201505...) begin on page</u>	<u>Volume 2: 965</u>
Comments received in Jun 2015	(2015 06 ...) begin on page	Volume 3: 1142
Comments received in Jul 2015	(2015 07 ...) begin on page	Volume 3: 1439
<u>Comments received in Aug 2015</u>	<u>(201508...) begin on page</u>	<u>Volume 4: 1887</u>
Comments received in Sep 2015	(2015 09 ...) begin on page	3283

20150901-0027

August 26, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426

Docket Number: PF14-22-000

Dear Secretary Bose,

My name is Jean Theberge. I am a life-long resident of Methuen Massachusetts and administrator of Methuen Pipeline Awareness. I am writing today to express my concerns with the proposed Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Pipeline and the proposed Haverhig lateral which will negatively affect the City of Methuen.

The proposed 30" Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Pipeline poses significant environmental impacts from its beginning in the fracking fields (fracturing presents harmful and detrimental repercussions for the land and groundwater) of Pennsylvania across New York, Massachusetts and New Hampshire. The proposed NED terminates in Dracut Ma. with a large compressor station amid neighborhoods and pristine food-producing farmland threatening the safety of residents, agriculture and the rural character of Dracut.

Methuen is bordered to the west by Dracut and the 20" high pressure Haverhig lateral is proposed to pass through approximately 5 miles of Methuen passing close to an elementary school and through several high-population areas in Methuen. Inherent with projects of this nature is the danger of ruptures, leaks and explosion incidents endangering residents and first responders. This pipeline lateral stands to impact several densely populated neighborhoods with construction disruption to private property and mental and emotional stress to residents.

The surrounding environment is highly impacted from leaks into ground water and compressor station emissions released into the atmosphere. Conservation land, habitats and wetlands are impacted by the Haverhill lateral. A potential threat to drinking water exists with the crossing of the Merrimack River by the 24" Lynnfield lateral upstream from Methuen's drinking water intake. The Haverhill lateral also passes in close proximity to Sands Bridge, a protected bridge structure registered on the National Historic Registry.

This pipeline project presents numerous, disturbing concerns. In May, the Methuen City Council held a special meeting (cancelled three times by Kinder Morgan) with representatives from Kinder Morgan. Senator Kathleen O'onnor Ives and Representative Linda Dean Campbell were in attendance. They both expressed strong concerns with the merit of a project that tasks a host community to bear great burden with no benefit to the community. In response, the Methuen City Council unanimously approved a resolution opposing the pipeline in early July.

Many unanswered questions exist:

- Why was the lateral increased to 20" with no new customer commitments?
- Are there documented customer commitments for this lateral?
- Where does the Haverhill lateral really end?
- Why is the pressure in the line 1460PSI?

No definitive proof exists to support the assertion that the northeast is facing or will face a natural gas shortage or that a significant increase in natural gas supply brought about by a new pipeline will result in lower prices. Peak demand shortages can be met through other alternative. Options exist that better serve the needs of the northeast; fixing existing infrastructure, upgrading existing lines to accommodate increased capacity, repairing leaks and examining appropriately-sized pipeline projects.

We the people do not need a pipeline that greatly exceeds the energy needs of the region as the pipeline company postures for export overseas. This project does not fit FERCs definition of serving "public conve-

nience and necessity.” Export for profit of a private corporation does not suit public purpose.

This project tasks Methuen residents with bearing the burden to benefit Kinder Morgan. I respectfully request FERC review the significant local impacts that this pipeline could have on the safety of Methuen residents, private and public property and the environment. Please help keep our Community safe-

PLEASE DO NOT APPROVE THIS PROIECTI

Regards,

Jean Theberge
Methuen Pipeline Awareness
5 Armory Street
Methuen, MA 01844

20150901-0028

Hand written letter, Barbara Ferullo, 50 Stowell Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071: opposing

20150901-0029

Hand written FERC Comment form: William Monahan, 1 Damon St, North Reading, MA 01864: opposing.

20150901-0030

{duplicate of 20150827-5237 in Vol 4}

20150901-0031

{duplicate of 20150826-5041 in Vol 4}

20150901-0032

August 25, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426

Docket Number: PF14-22-000

Dear Secretary Bose,

My name is Lynne Hajjar Kumm. I am a life-long Methuen resident and currently serve as Vice Chair of the Methuen School Committee. I am also a member of Methuen Pipeline Awareness. I am writing today to express my concerns with the proposed Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Pipeline which will negatively affect our City.

I have yet to see definitive proof that our area is currently facing a natural gas shortage, and that a significant increase in natural gas supply brought about by a new pipeline will truly result in lower prices for the Merrimack Valley.

The Haverhill lateral is proposed to run several miles through Methuen, and passes within 0.65 miles of the Marsh Grammar School. This Pre-K through Grade 8 school houses over 1500 students and staff members. Early in July, the Methuen City Council unanimously approved a resolution opposing the pipeline. This project will impact many citizens with construction disruption to private property, and pose a serious threat to residents and first responders in the event of a failure. This pipeline project presents numerous, disturbing concerns yet offers NO merits for Methuen.

Many questions exist with no answers:

-Why was the lateral increased to 20” with no new customer commitments? Are there documented customer

commitments for this lateral?

-Where does the Haverhill lateral really end?

This project forces Methuen residents to assume all the project risks, with Kinder Morgan reaping all the benefits. The proposed route passes through Methuen, impacting densely populated neighborhoods, wetlands, conservation land, and groundwater.

This project does not, in any way, fit FERCs definition of serving “public convenience and necessity.” Export for profit of a private corporation does not suit public purpose.

I ask that you review the potentially significant local impacts that this pipeline could have on the property and safety of Methuen residents. Please help keep our Community safe- PLEASE DO NOT APPROVE THIS PROJECT!

Regards,

Lynne Haljar Kumm
Vice-Chairperson, Methuen School Committee
180 Old Ferry Drive
Methuen, MA 01844

20150901-0033

August 26, 2015

To Whom It May Concern:

PLEASE reconsider the proposed pipeline route. Why is Kidder Morgan insisting on disrupting peoples’ lives, the ecology of this area where people have worked hard to live simply and environmentally conscientious, all for a buck? Remember there WILL BE accountability as we all pass on out. You will be judged or valued not by how much money you made, but by how you affected other peoples live - how happy or miserable you have made your fellow man, woman and child. Right now Kinder Morgan is making a lot of people pretty miserable. The company individuals involved need to think about this. We are on this planet for a short time;:. Please don’t make your time here, one of causing despair on the part of your fellow man. Please reconsider the pipeline route or even the pipeline ILxflf.

Please stop and think about what you are really doing Kinder Morgani I know this does not mean much tl ruthless business men - is this how Kinder Morgan wants to be viewed? They may laugh, but this is no laughing matter. These are people’s lives we are talking about. The land itself is some of the most agriculturally productive land on the planet (they need to do some research on that), and they want to put a hazardous substance through it! This seems so incredibly awful. There has to be another land area of little use and no population, IF pipeline truly needs to be done at all

Have you thought of taking the pipeline up through central New York state and across the New York, Vermont, New Hampshire borders with Canada and directing it through the upper regions of Maine - all very sparsely populated land. You will get your pipeline (if it is “HONESTLY” even needed - without playing nasty games) and you will not make your fellow human beings cry. This is not just a mere business deal. This is affecting peopkfs’ usinesses, their ecology, their land’s agricultural use, their future safety, their very lives.

Have you thought of keeping the gas in its current place and using a series of high functioning generators to produce the desired energy you want along a path where no one lives (see abovesentence) toyourfinaldestination? Afterallthegasisanenergygenerator, can’ machines produce the energy along hundreds of miles of land?

If you are Intelligent, creative problem solvers then you can find another distant route or other options. Can’t you?? If you are not intelligent, creative problem solvers you will continue to make peopkfs lives miserable. Right now I have no respect for Kinder Morgan. I feel their image is one of a bully. (You know what people think of bullies). Is that what they want? Do they even care? Does other people viewing their company

disrespectfully make any difference to them? Do they even care about people. So much opposition has been expressed to them for extremely good reasons and they are still pursuing this!! What kind of hearts do these people have?? This is such an extremely sad set of circumstances.

PLEASE RECONSIDER THIS ENTIRE PROPOSITION.

PLEASE, PLEASE FIND ANOTHER WAY.

Sincerely,
Jane White

20150901-0034

August 27, 2015

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First St, NE
Washington, DC 20426

RE: Northeast Energy Direct Docket 1PF14-22

Members of FFRC.

I cannot believe in this and age that we are regressing in our ability to improve renewable energy sources in Massachusetts. We are outranked as a country by at least six other countries- Switzerland, Turkey, China, Germany, Spain and Japan. (So much for being 11) Massachusetts is dismally ranked as 26th in the country- outranked by our neighboring states of New York (12th), Maine (5th), Vermont (10th) and New Hampshire (18th). And yet the United States EPA is powered 100% by biomass, small hydro, solar, wind and geothermal. Why not Massachusetts? Why are you trying to grant permission for new pipelines?

Pipelines and compressor stations not only cause noise and air pollution (in turn causing global climate change), not to mention physical illness to surrounding families and animals. Compressor stations release huge amounts of toxins that smell and produce ground level ozone that inhibits crop growth by up to 30%. I live in Windsor, MA where a compressor station is proposed to be built- we are a farming community- your approval of this pipeline is dooming the citizens who farm in our small town.

Compressor stations also emit radon- a radioactive gas that precipitates out as radioactive polonium and lead. Would you care for this in your back yard'?

We do not need or want fracked gas in our homes, our communities, and our state! This pipeline is not for the benefit of Massachusetts citizens. It is merely being transported through our state to Canada for exportation to other countries. We are not a huge corporation like Kinder Morgan, yet we have rights also. The right to disagree with bad decisions made by even government organizations- and WE DO DISAGREE! Please do not grant permission for new un-needed pipelines to go through our state of Massachusetts.

Sincerely,
Claire Townend, 123 Crane Rd. Windsor, MA

20150901-0035

94 Pleasant St.
Marlborough, NH 03455
August 28, 2015

To FERC:

I live in Cheshire County, NH, which would be impacted by the Northeast Energy Direct gas pipeline that Kinder Morgan wants to build. I also represent Troy, NH, through which the pipeline would travel. I am on the Science, Technology and Energy Committee in the NH House of Representatives, which deals with energy bills. All this is to say that I have a vested interest in whether or not this pipeline gets approved, and I

have learned a lot in the last year about this pipeline project.

I am against this project for a number of reasons. The most important one is the fact that we should be getting away from fossil fuels if we want to have any chance of mitigating climate change in our lifetimes. This project would bring more natural gas to New England when we should be looking at other ways to power our lives. What else can we look at? First we can reduce the amount of energy we need. We have a huge potential energy savings in making our buildings and businesses more energy efficient. This is the cheapest energy strategy of all and one that doesn't involve taking more fossil fuels out of the ground and homing them (thereby exasperating the problems of climate change).

What else can we do? We can be encouraging a shift to clean renewable energy-solar, wind, hydro, geothermal and biomass. We can develop smaller distributed energy sources such as solar panels on homes, businesses, parking lots, and someday even road surfaces. Distributed power would have the added advantages of limiting power outages to smaller areas and be less of a target for terrorism.

Another reason I am opposed to the NED pipeline is that it would disrupt homes and conservation areas, even wetlands, all across the southern part of our state so that a private company can profit from selling its product overseas. Property values along the route would drop. People would be subjected to noise and light if near a compression station, health impacts from leaked gas and the danger of an explosion anywhere along its route. All this for a project that few NH residents would even benefit from. This is not right for the people of NH.

I also don't think the New England ratepayers should shoulder the burden of paying for this project. New England had a spike in electricity prices two winters ago (2013-14) but last winter that was avoided through better planning, not a bigger pipeline. We don't need this pipeline. We need to develop alternative energy instead!

I ask you to consider all impacts of putting in this pipeline, not just the immediate ones on local land and wildlife but also the bigger issues of land values (including scenic value), people's health and, especially, the health of our global climate. There is a lot at stake here. We can't think of each project as an isolated event; every fossil fuel project that is approved heightens the adverse effects of climate change. Every time we add oil or gas infrastructure that is taking away investment money and the incentive to do something else with alternative energy instead.

Please do not approve the NED pipeline.

Sincerely,

Rep. Marjorie Shepardson

20150901-0036

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street NE, Room 1A
Washington, D.C. 20426

August 24, 2015

Attn. OEP-DG2E - Gas 3, PJ-11.3

RE: Docket Number PF14-22-000 Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Project

Dear Ms. Bose;

We are submitting these comments as members of the **Zoning Board of Appeals for the town of Plainfield Massachusetts**. Our community is in the path of the proposed 412 mile Tennessee Gas pipeline referenced above. We offer the following comments during this scoping period to inform the draft and final Environmental Impact studies required in this process.

The purpose of the Zoning Bylaw is to *"confirm and preserve the character and integrity of the Town of Plainfield as a rural residential and agricultural community, with all the protection authorized by the*

General Laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. To promote the health, safety and general welfare of all the inhabitants of the Town of Plainfield, to protect and conserve the value of property, the beauty of the town, its streams, ponds and waterways, and to encourage appropriate utilization of land and alternative energy sources.” Section 1:Title, Authority and Purpose, item 1.2Purposes.

According to the Zoning By-law for the town of Plainfield, a pipeline per say, is not included in the definitions of structures (Section 11.Definitions, item 2.1.50 Structure). Therefore, were this not a Federal project, a Special Permit would be required.

Section IV. General Use Regulations, item 4.2 states:

“To better secure their livelihood, the people of Plainjield are entitled to establish (business) uses that in no way conflict with the character and integrity of this rural and agricultural community, and that abide with Article 97 of the. Constitution of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, to wit: The People shall have the right to clean air and water, freedom from excessive and unnecessary noise, and the natural, scenic, historic and aesthetic qualities of their environment; and the protection of the people in their right to the conservation, development and utilization of the agricultural, mineral, forest, water, air and other natural resources is hereby declared to be a public purpose.

To secure this purpose, each (business) use NOT allowed by right and not prohibited under Prohibited Uses, Section 4.4 must receive a special permit from the Zoning Board of Appeals in full accord with all applicable criteria, including the conditions, criteria and guidelines required under the Zoning Board of Appeals Rules and Regulations, dated July 1, 1988 or as amended.

According to Section 9.4 Special Permits, Item 9.4.1P urpose, “Special permits are intended to provide detailed review of certain uses and structures which may have substantial impact upon traffic and ENVIRONMENT, HEALTH AND SAFETY, PROPERTY VALUES AND THE CHARACTER OF THE TOWN, among other things. The Special Permit review process is intended to ensure a harmonious relationship between proposed development and its surroundings and to ensure the proposals are consistent with the purpose and intent of the Bylaw.

Continuing, as stated in Section 9.4.4Criteria, the use must be found not to be detrimental to the town and is in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the by-law.

Because local zoning is pre-empted by the FERC review process, we ask then that FERC ensure what our local process would under Section 4.0 General Permitted Use Regulations, as well as the Site Plan Review Criteria in Section 1.14of the Rules and Regulations. Specifically, we ask that the following be required in the environmental reports:

- Documentation to ensure that no land or building shall be used for any purpose harmful to public health, safety or comfort by reason of transmission or emission of radiation, fumes, dust, GAS, smoke, or poisons; by reason of vibrations, noise, fire, explosion, or hazard; or by tending to pollute water;
- Documentation to ensure the protection of unique or important natural, historical or scenic features;
- Documentation to ensure the pedestrian and vehicular circulation related to construction and inspection sites, with attention to safety, convenience, ingress and egress and construction and operational noise impacts;
- Documentation to evaluate impacts upon Town facilities and services, including fire, police, emergency medical, sewage disposal, refuse disposal; and to determine that the project will not place an undue burden on those services
- Documentation to ensure the protection of the environment, water supply and aquifer resources during and after construction, adequate soil erosion plans for during and after construction;
- Documentation to ensure the protection of Town amenities and abutting properties by minimizing detrimental actions and protection of abutting properties from detrimental site characteristics.
- Documentation to ensure adequate protection during and after construction in flood hazard situations

related to erosion and sedimentation control, equipment storage, refuse disposal, storage of construction materials, extent of paving, effect of fill on flood runoff and flow.

- Documentation to ensure protection of wetlands in accordance with the Wetlands Protection Act, Chapter 131, Section 40 and Town Wetlands Bylaws.

We also request that should any work take place that a third independent party be hired to oversee and monitor construction.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. If you wish to contact us, please respond to the Chair, Robert Mellstrom. He can be reached at bob.mellstrom@gmail.com or via telephone at 413-634-2182.

Respectfully,

Robert Mellstrom
Joan Wattman
Dudley Williams
Margaret Keller, Alternate
Cc Plainfield Selectboard

20150901-0037

David Toborg
511 Terrace Mtn. Rd.
PO Box 156
Schoharie, NY 12157

August 26, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First St NE, Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Project docket number PF14-22-000
Northeast Energy Direct Project

Ms. Bose:

Regarding the proposed Tennessee Gas pipeline, as a homeowner within 1/2 mile of a Supply Path Tail compressor station (t/o Schoharie, Schoharie County, New York) and an active member of several Schoharie County snowmobile clubs, I have the following four comments:

Visual — Site the station was far from Terrace Mountain Road as possible and leave the existing trees as a visual and sound absorbing buffer.

Sound - In addition to the above, employ the best technology and practices to limit the station's sound, especially during non-daylight hours.

Light — I enjoy the darkness of being outside a village. Limit light pollution by: avoiding "always on" lighting; aiming lights down; and using side shields.

Snowmobile Trail — For many years, a formal New York State funded snowmobile trail has run through the property; and, in fact, crosses the proposed pipeline route several times in Schoharie County. As a whole, the formal statewide snowmobile trail system is a significant recreational resource for the State as well as the County itself. The trail system generates revenue for local business during the winter and sales tax for the County.

I look forward to securing the company's permission to continue the trail.

Please contact me if any questions (518 295-8554; dtoborgmidtei.net).

Sincerely

David Toborg
cc: Tennessee

20150901-0038

Robert Lidsky
622 Ridge Road
Andes NY 1373

August 27, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
The FERC 888 First Street NE, Room 1A
Washington, D.C. 20426

Re: Docket No. PF14-22-000

Subject: proposed Northeast Energy Direct pipeline would ruin my land.

I own 41 acres of beautiful, private, tranquil, hillside land on Dutch Hill Road in Davenport, NY, a short drive from Oneonta. The property was purchased for the express purpose of building a secluded private home. There is only one area near the top of the hill on this entire property that is suitable to take advantage of the view and site a home and septic system. The proposed NED pipeline runs directly through the home-site destroying any hope of building. NED is about to ruin my investment.

I have not and do not intend to let NED aided by FERC lull me into self-sacrifice for the profit of Kinder Morgan when it intends to send Marcellus gas to Canada or Nova Scotia for export. This proposed project is not in the public interest and would seriously degrade the trout stream below my property.

I and many other landowners will resist signing a right of way and will fight for compensation for putting us in danger, ruining any possibility of selling our property at a fair price, mortgaging it at a fair rate, or insuring it at all.

If FERC is to permit this pipeline because of "Public Necessity" an idea which is dubious at best, then FERC should demand that Landowners be given the chance to relocate or sell, with NED compensating them in full, including legal and relocation expenses.

I do not want to be in a "Sacrifice Zone". I demand fair play.

Stop this pipeline!

Robert Lidsky

20150901-0039

Hand written FERC Comment form: Kathleen Monahan, 1 Damon St, North Reading, MA 01864: opposing

20150901-0040

{extremely poor quality FERC scan of typed letter, see instead 20150901-0055 below }

20150901-0041

296 Homeville RD
Waynesburg, PA 15370-2654

August 26, 2015

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street NE, Room 1A

Washington, DC 20426

H-316

Docket No. PF15-22-000

Dear Kimberly,

I have two concerns about the H-316 Pipeline Project.

The first being the 3/4 mile bore job through my property. The bore site on my neighbors property will be approximately 200 yards from our house and EQT plans to bore 24 hours a day. We are concerned about the noise and being able to sleep.

The second concern being the effects of all the traffic and equipment being hauled on our narrow country road. EQT has a large well site at the beginning of our road and the traffic is terrible and the road is a mess. Our neighbors and I are about fed up with all the inconvenience caused by the traffic.

Thank You,

Earle Sanner, Jr.

20150901-0043

May 14, 2015

Dear Secretary Bose,

Two Houston billionaires propose a risky and badly funded fracked gas pipeline project destined to cause public and environmental harm in our region. The Kinder Morgan (KM) NED Gas pipeline serves no real need for the affected areas or its residents. All available evidence heavily outweighs dubious claims of public benefit

COO Richard Kinder skipped out of Enron just before it imploded then swooped back to buy its assets on the cheap. Bill Morgan was a VP at Enron. Now they are aiming their boom-and-bust business model at us. KM's initial plan had us the ratepayers funding the installation, monitoring and remediation/removal of the pipeline. Only public outrage stalled this aggressive plan; it still lurks. This KM assault would be another glaring example of public risk for private profit. The large high-pressure pipeline they propose would perpetuate dependence on a toxic energy source and an unjust land grab.

KM designates "sacrifice zones" where the industry allows the use of Class 4 minimal pipe thickness and welds. That's not safe and we don't want to live in a place where a "blast site" could scar the landscape for generations. A vast majority of fracked gas pipeline fires occur in pristine areas. I hear the testimony of current neighbors of valves, pipelines, and pump stations and I wonder if it is right to cross so many headwaters, rivers, wetlands, forests, native and historic sites for the temporary profit of a short list of gasmen. Serially bankrupting gas barons must not dictate our health, landscape and environmental futures. Reckless greed is not a constitutional right

This rural region is opposed to such a risky and inhumane proposal. We do not want months of industrial traffic bringing megaloads of materials and equipment, routine off-gassing, noise and light pollution. Increased activity from helicopters and drones sounds repulsive. We are resolved to weatherize, conserve energy, and install as much renewable power as possible. We are stewards of our land, air and water. We do not want a fracked gas pipeline as part of our legacy. We are all downwind and downstream of this bad idea. Imagine if all the R&D, lobbying, and lawyer fees were put to clean energy, community strength and a robust ecology.

Elite greed and public harm no longer mix. KM's track record is awful. Tycoon dreams do not justify spoiling 250 million miles of what we value: clean air and drinking wells, wetlands and waterways, yards and viewscapes, farms and forests, property values, mortgage, insurance and resale options, tranquility and wild-life freedom. Local and regional sovereignty must trump profit made at the expense of our common wealth and our Commonwealth. If we don't speak up, what do we tell our grandchildren?

Sincerely,

Erik W. Burcroff

49 A Mnt
Plainfield, MA 01070

20150901-0044

{typed letter attached to FERC Comment form}

08-27-15

Dear People:

I'm writing to object to the Kinder-Morgan pipeline route through our town of Lanesboro, MA— and to strongly urge you to reject this project.

There are many reasons to reject the project —but the most important one for the town of Lanesboro is the almost certain probability of destroying our town aquifer system —effectively destroying the town.

All the residents of Lanesboro depend on water from a large, high-quality aquifer —whether the water is delivered through town wells or individual wells. Pollution of the aquifer would literally leave the town high and dry, with no effective replacement alternative —except for trucking in water individually to each home and business.

The KM pipeline design guarantees that in the event of a pipeline leak, no response would be possible in time to prevent the complete pollution of the town's aquifer.

Obviously, this would destroy the property values and tax base for the town, make homes unsaleable, and require millions of dollars from the State of Massachusetts.

Allow me to make it more specific by putting a dollar cost on this. What is the financial value of our water?

Hydro-geological surveys show that Lanesboro can pump at least 1.2 million gallons per day with no negative impact on our aquifer system. This is 4,380,000 gallons per year of high-quality water. "High-quality" means no need to filter or treat the water.

A nearby international bottling company would pay 1 cent/gallon today for this water —\$4.38 million dollars per year. This is today's sales value of this resource.

To look at it from the other side, replacement cost —the nearest truck-water source cost today would be 5 cents/gallon —or \$22,000,000 per year. This is what the State of Massachusetts would have to assume after the aquifer is polluted.

Kinder-Morgan has a terrible track record nationwide for design, construction, supervision and maintenance of its other pipelines —and also a terrible record for its responses to previous pipeline disasters.

There are many reasons to reject this pipeline —but for the town of Lanesboro, destruction of our sole water source is the most important deal-breaker.

William W. Matthiesen
33 Stormview Road
Lanesboro, MA 01237
413-442-9172
bill@bfv.com

20150901-0046

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426
Date: 8-27-15

Re: Opposition to the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline natural gas pipeline and compressor installation in New Hampshire

As the owner of the property located at:
58 Brown Road
Temple, NH

I am opposed to the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline natural gas pipeline and compressor installation in my community.

I am writing to ask FERC to plan a Scoping Meeting in my Southern New Hampshire town of Temple.

Peter & Tracy Vitello

20150901-0048

August 25, 2015

Project Docket number (PF14-22)

Robert B Meyers
152 Hinsdale Rd
Windsor, MA 01270
1-413-684-3463

These scoping meetings need to be repeated when more information on the project, available and they need to include meetings in compressor station towns. It is clearly unfair that almost no Scoping Meetings are being conducted in the communities most impacted — those who will bear the brunt of the impact from compressor stations, several of which could be among the largest ever built in the US.

I would like to see a study done on the remains of a centuries-old Dutch Settlement in Berkshire County in the towns of Hinsdale and Peru their home in the 18 and early 19th centuries. This area is all along the power lines from the sub-station to Peru road. This was part of the colonial land grant of Patridgefield. This group came here to this particular spot, beginning in the 1780s. This group of four or five families settled into this five-square-mile area in these rolling hills with plenty of water. There was an ample water supply for watering livestock and to provide power for a number of mills. It was isolated from the outside world, it became very compact and a self-sufficient group. The families developed an integrated community of extended family farms, all grouped on the hilltops. They established saw mills, lime and charcoal making operations. There is evidence of a couple of very profitable dairy farms. Found where very large dairy farm foundations that indicated well-off dairy farmers. Some of the extended families lived on those lands for over 100 years.

It would be good to respect these lands.

Robert B. Meyers
windalewoods@verizon.net

CC:

Governor C Baker State Representative Paul Mark
Congressman Richie Neal
Congressman Jim McGovern
Senator Elizabeth Warren

20150901-0049

Hand written letter, C? Vinech?, 16 Greenhurst Rd, W. Hartford, CT 06107: opposing

20150901-0051

108 Summit Street

Plainfield, MA 01070
cavinemily@yahoo.com

August 25, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426

To the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission:

Re: docket number PF 14-22- Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline

I am writing to urge the commission to do the right thing, and reject the application by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co. and Kinder Morgan Inc. to build the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline. FERC is an entity of the United States Government, and as such, is obligated to represent the best interests, the well-being, and the health and safety of the citizens of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and of the United States of America, NOT the best interests of the out-dated Fossil Fuel industry and of multi-national corporations interested in the overseas market for natural gas.

Climate scientists have warned us that we are ~nt keeping up with an adequate timeline for phasing out our over-use of fossil fuels if we, as the human race, are serious about preserving the life and health of our species and of the entire biosphere of planet Earth. It is past time for our government to lead the way in making the transition to new and safer sources of energy, and as regulators of energy production in our country, FERC should be one of the most active entities in promoting this transition, despite the economic and political power of the current energy industry.

It has been widely observed that Berkshire Gas Co. has not been diligent regarding monitoring and repairing leaks in existing pipelines. These leaks are costly and dangerous to their own company and to the public, and their negligence in addressing these problems demonstrates the utter falsity of the gas company's argument that this project is necessary for meeting regional energy needs. It is crucial to remember that Berkshire Gas is now owned by a Multinational Corporation based in Spain whose first and foremost obligation is to provide profits for their shareholders, and who has no reason to prioritize the preservation of the natural resources and the well being of the citizens of the United States. But FERC is obligated to maintain these priorities and has MANY reasons to reject this project.

Everyday I hear news items about the destruction of wilderness and threats to the biodiversity essential to maintaining the healthy and functioning ecosystems necessary for the survival of all the interrelated species, including human beings, populating this planet. This proposed pipeline would violate Article 97 of the Massachusetts Constitution, which prohibits the use of public lands for any other purpose at a time when our open spaces, wilderness areas, farms and park lands are under growing stress from the expansion of development and from pollution due to human activities. The rural and wild landscapes that would be permanently affected are among the most valuable resources of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the United States of America, and should be protected with the utmost dedication. I encourage the members of this commission to sincerely consider how they would react if the 24 hour noise and light pollution and the devaluation to virtually nothing of their homes and properties resulting from the construction of the compression stations for this project, proposed to be some of the largest in the nation, were occurring in their own neighborhoods. It is so obvious that the gains being touted by huge corporate interests could in no way ever justify the real and permanent losses, or could excuse the gross negligence inherent in denying the reality of the need to act and to do the right thing to correct the very serious implications of climate change.

I am 57 years old, and came of age in the 1970's with the birth of the modern environmental movement. I remember when I could be proud of the United States Government for the passage of the Clean Air and Clean Water Acts, and the institution of the Environmental Protection Agency. I urge you to stand up and do your jobs representing the people of this nation and protecting their public health and public lands and promoting a safer, saner, energy future. Reject the application by the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co. and Kinder Morgan

Inc. to build the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline now.

Respectfully,

Emily Cavin

Copied to:

Gas Branch 3, PJ-11.3

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, NE

Washington DC 20426

20150901-0052

{NOTE: 43 hand written cards from 23 different persons expressing various concerns about, and/or} { opposition to, the NED project. Each card mailed separately but all bundled into this one entry}

Nancy G. Allen, 105 Whittemore Hill Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071

M N Edwards, 24 Stowell Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071

Barbara Ferullo, 50 Stowell Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071

John Leoutsacos, 79 Mountainview Drive, Temple, NH 03084

Elizabeth G. Torre, 609 Burton Hwy, Wilton, NH 03086

Elizabeth G. Torre, 609 Burton Hwy, Wilton, NH 03086

Michael Ferullo, 50 Stowell Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071

Barbara Ferullo, 50 Stowell Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071

Michael Ferullo, 50 Stowell Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071

Barbara Ferullo, 50 Stowell Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071

Barbara Ferullo, 50 Stowell Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071

D. Butcher, 140 New Street, Troutb?, NC

Barbara Ferullo, 50 Stowell Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071

John Allen, 105 Whittemore Hill Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071

Nancy G. Allen, 105 Whittemore Hill Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071

Mark Shemet, 255 Turnpike Rd, Jaffrey, NH 03452

Mark Shemet, 255 Turnpike Rd, Jaffrey, NH 03452

Mark Shemet, 255 Turnpike Rd, Jaffrey, NH 03452

Alice Bury, 7 Patricia Ln, Amherst, NH 03031

? Meyer, 180 Hart Rd, Conway, MA 01341

Cameros Kauffman, 178B Oxford St, Portland, ME 01101

Kay Cafasso, 73 S. State St, Shelburne Falls, MA 0137?

G? Cursand?, 481 Waverly Ave, Brooklyn, NY 11238

Debra Hoyle & David Adie, 33 Dragon Hill Rd, Shelburne, MA 01341

Alexis Arcano, 180 Hart Rd, Conway, MA 01341

Alexis Arcano, 180 Hart Rd, Conway, MA 01341

Luke Meyer, 96 Hart Rd, Conway, MA 01341

Luke Meyer, 96 Hart Rd, Conway, MA 01341

Luke Meyer, 96 Hart Rd, Conway, MA 01341

Evan Greer, 890 North Street, Windsor, MA 01270
Yurkel Murayama, 92 South Shirkshire Rd, Conway, MA 01341
Yurkel Murayama, 92 South Shirkshire Rd, Conway, MA 01341
Christine Johnson, 78 Mill Street, Greenville, NH 03048
Tracey L. Collins, 87 Ashburnham Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071
Tracey L. Collins, 87 Ashburnham Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071
Christine & James Johnson, 78 Mill Street, Greenville, NH 03048
Tracey L. Collins, 87 Ashburnham Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071
John Leoutsacos, 79 Mountainview Drive, Temple, NH 03084
Ms. Nancy Edwards, 34 Stowell Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071
Ms. N. Edwards, 34 Stowell Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071
Mark Shemet, 255 Turnpike Rd, Jaffrey, NH 03452
John Allen, 105 Whittemore Hill Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071

20150901-0053

FERC Comment form: Mr. Robert Fink, 1265 Nasseau Averill Park Rd, Nassau, NY 12123:

“See attached. Please, don’t let this happen”. *{Attached typewritten letter:}*

I purchased this property almost 20 years ago when I was married. We liked it so much because it was out of the way from things, nice & quiet, & had plenty of wildlife around. And now, they want to drop a Compression Station right across the road from my house which will destroy every reason I bought the house for in the first place. Deer run back & forth from my property & the properly across the road. Turkeys roost almost every night right across the road & walk across my yard constantly. Seen several bears in my yard too. I hear the frogs & lots of owls at night from across the road all the Ume & their are several different species too, mostly the Great Homed Owl. The nights are beautiful. The sky is so clear & it’s nice & quiet. In the past several years I’ve noticed the grand appearance of Bald Eagles. Never saw one around this area before in my life. (I’m 52 & born & raised here). Most of the times when I’ve seen them, they either came from the other side of the road or are flying to the other side of the road. I have a feeling they maybe nesting over there somewhere. One day I saw one chasing a hawk out of that area, usually it’s the other way around, the little bird chasing the bigger bird and also is a sign there could be a nest in the area. If that Compression Station goes in, you can kiss most of those animals good-bye & what a loss that would be. I heard it will go right through one of the top Nature Preserves in the state too. It’ll do that area wonders. Bye-bye to the nice clear sky at night. With the light pollution that’s going to give oif I might as well move to the city. There goes the quietness too. From what I hear, these things are very loud. Animals are not going to put up with that & I sure as Hell don’t want too. Lets not forget the wonderful gases this station will be spitting into the air for all around to breath in. They will tell us that they are at safe levels though. So comforting. No level is safe In my book if I have to live near it, especially these gases. I guess after the Benzene gives me Cancer, the undertaker won’t need a real lot of Formaldehyde, one plus.

So what this does for us in the area is pollute our air with chemicals & noise pollution. Flood the night sky with light pollution. Won’t see those stars or hear those owls anymore. Probably drive most of the wildlife away. Drive properly value down, who’s going to want to live near that thing. I know I won’t & I will get a lot less for my house If I’m able to sell It. So far, nothing but pluses. It doesn’t benefit anyone around

it because it's just passing through to go to MA, & then over seas to make money for the corporation who don't care what they do to people & their lives as long as they get the Almighty Green Backs In the end. Why not put it where it's already noisy & bright all the time, like near a city. Oh wait, it's too dangerous for that incase it explodes some day, that's right. That's just wonderful. Why is NY even considering this if we'e supposedly a state against fracking7171717 At least that's what I hear from good old Mr. Cuomo. I'm sure there must be quits a fsw people about to make some big money on this, that's why. Too bad it just screws the little guy along the way. I'm sure the State government will make out too, they always do.

20150901-0054

{copy of 20150901-0043 above}

20150901-0055

August 26, 2015

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's Northeast Energy Direct Project Docket No. PF14-22-000

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing this out of serious concern not only for myself but also for our town, our region and In fact the potential damage to a substantial portion of the northeast.

I come to you with a great deal of expertise in areas related to this proposal.

- I have lived here my whole life and am knowledgeable of the topography, the terrain, the habitat, and most significantly I am familiar with the soil, stone, bedrock and ledle conditions we live In.
- I have been provtdlng fire protectfon and emergency rescue for nearly SO years.
- I have many years' experience worklnsln the energy field, especially liquid propane.

There are many aspects of the proposal by Kinder Morgan that are very disturbing.

• this entire route Is probably 75% ledge that will need to be blasted to bury the pipe at the depth that is proposed.

1. The majority of the homes and businesses alo'l the corridor receive their water from personal wells, thus drilling and blasting will certainly be disruptive to everything surrounding It. The chemical residue (much of which Is known to cause cancer) will filter into the veins, thus polluting wells even if not above the safe standards set.
 2. Small fines will find their way also Into these veins. thus reducina the available water In our wen. These not only affect the adjacent propertles but possibly miles away. We have excellent drinking water from our wells and wish It to remain so.
 3. The blasting will undoubted IV cause damale to neighboring homes with foundation damage and crackins floors. Many homes along this route are old and have Ifanlta foundations; these foundations cannot stand the shock and vibration from such serious blasting.
 4. In Fitzwilliam alone and most like IV other areas as well, there are 2 ponds both with earthen dams. Blasting could easily disrupt either dam with the possibility of catastrophic results for miles down-stream.
- The proposed route of the pipeline will undoubtedly change the landscape of the abutting properties
 1. People who live along this route have homes; they live here and they are proud of their homes. Trees will be cut and any kind of natural screening within 50-200 feet (depending on which vague Infor-mation Is presented) will be destroyed. Trees and shrubbery not only adds to and enhances a family's home esthetics but also provide privacy, shade, nOise mltlgatlna. and help with keeping their house cooler in the summer and wanner In the winter.

2. The character of all areas will be changed forever. There are stone walls throughout the entire route that will be completely bulldozed over. Streams will be disrupted; wet lands will be ruined, mitigated, or changed.
 3. Unless very good construction discipline is used, silt and contaminants will find their way into our water resources.
 4. Water sheds will be affected as construction will surely change the level of topography.
 5. Runoff is likely to be different, thus some homeowners will have water going in different areas and will have to do landscaping to adjust for this.
- Animal and aquatic habitat will be changed and some will be lost
 1. The majority of the proposed route is very rural and as such is home to many animals as well as many species.
 2. The construction will displace countless animals many of whom will never return. Normal construction displaces enough wildlife just in road and bridge building along with general home construction.
 3. Construction of this scale will certainly ruin many acres of habitat and force some wildlife out of our areas. Some animals, for survival sake, may move into more populated areas, thus endangering the public.
 4. Fish and aquatic life will be disrupted from silt runoff, changes in water flow and vibrations from construction itself.
 - Safety is a major concern.
 1. It has been stated that if an explosion should happen, the incineration zone would be about 1000 feet, that's assuming no wind; with a wind that would surely be much further.
 2. Most of the fire service throughout this region is volunteer and the towns are small; they do not have the manpower or equipment to handle an incident of this scale.
 3. In an urban or suburban area the pipe thickness is greater than in a rural area; I can only guess at the assumption that because there are less people they are more expendable.
 4. The proposed corridor is in the same proximity as the high transmission lines. In humid weather these transmission lines have started grass and brush fires simply by convection. Natural gas is lighter than air and as such will rise into this energy field in the event of a leak; even a small leak in these conditions would be catastrophic. Therefore for safety reasons it is prudent to minimize areas where safety can easily be compromised.
 5. A large amount of the proposed route would be inaccessible to any emergency vehicles.
 6. It has been stated that a pipeline is safer than transporting by truck or rail. I disagree with that assessment, as there have been pipeline ruptures that were very bad. One in California destroyed several homes and caused many injuries and death. Natural gas isn't transported by rail or truck very often, as is liquid propane. The tanks are structurally designed and built to withstand major impacts and haven't had a rupture in many years.
 7. In the event of a leak or rupture the pipeline operator can take up to 10 minutes to shut down the line. The gas pumped in the meantime, as well as all the residual gas in the pipe will make a serious situation even worse.
 8. The blow down at the pump stations offers a very real safety hazard. Under the right conditions of air, gas concentration plus any ignition source, even static electricity, can cause an explosion.
 - The impact on the environment will be immense.
 1. There will be land erosion if not for the long term certainly during construction.
 2. Many trees will be removed, thus reducing to an extent some of our air purification features.
 3. The ecological balance will be disrupted and will take years to recover, if ever.

4. One of the main components to natural gas is methane gas. The EPA has recently determined that methane gas is a major contributor to ozone depletion. Why would we allow a dangerous procedure as we're as destructive procedure to happen; we already have pollution with laws and regulations to minimize this. It is contrary to the intent of clean air to add more pollution.
 5. Kinder Morgan said that it uses a variety of herbicides to control vegetation. These lethal chemicals include atrazine, glyphosate, dicamba, glufosinate, flumioxazin, s-metolachlor, and 2,4-D. These herbicides are so lethal that the public cannot buy or use them. Along this route there are many homeowners that have gardens, both flower and vegetables that are grown and eaten. There are also several organic gardeners as well as a commercial organic farm. These chemicals not only kill what the applicator wishes to kill but the overspray can go for thousands of yards beyond the kill zone. These chemicals, many of which are carcinogenic on their own will have a harmful health effect on anyone that comes in contact with them.
- There is very little need for the product in the area or even along most of the proposed route
 1. The only one to have signed a letter of Intent at this point is Liberty Utilities, a subsidiary of Kinder Morgan. Liberty Utilities already has agreements in place for the gas they sell and this pipeline will not offer any better pricing.
 2. Eversource, the former Public Service of NH is cited by Kinder Morgan as a possible consumer; however, they have not said they are interested. According to experts there is an excess of electricity in the region already. The country as a whole and especially the northeast is installing more solar and wind power as well as more efficient appliances, with people also practicing conservation.
 3. The sales pitch is that it will reduce energy costs. The overhead costs remain constant with an increase for inflation, so the price will only be so low. The overall price will be dictated by demand for the product. The final stop of the pipeline is at the port to ship overseas. If they can make more money overseas the cost here will also be higher. There will be no measurable savings on the cost of natural gas.
 - Kinder Morgan says that it will be an economic boom for the area.
 1. The pitch is that the pipeline owners will pay in the vicinity of \$19.5 million in taxes. They do not say, in fact deny, that property values will go down for abutters and probably their neighbors. Some homes and structures will be lost due to being in the path, thus not paying any taxes. The tax "wind-fall" may actually end up being a loss.
 2. I would expect as most utilities have done. after they are in place they will go to court saying that they are taxed too much because they are for the "public good".
 3. Representatives said construction jobs will be available for local people and boosting the economy. The fact is they already have signed agreements with different out of state unions to supply the needed manpower and equipment. There is no evidence of any local jobs being created, either temporary or permanent.

In conclusion I see very little, if any, advantage in having this pipeline. There is, however, a high degree of potential damage to be done. It appears the only winners in this venture are the pipeline owners and contractors who do not reside in the vicinity of the project. It is my belief that this entire pipeline is a profit generator and will do little or nothing for the "public good". While any business or company's goal is to make money, it also needs to do business when and where people need the service and not be dictated and forced through political channels. The residents of this country are doing a great job of conservation and efficiency, as well as utilizing renewable resources. Please consider the wishes and desires of this area and deny this pipeline, as there is no benefit as presented to anyone other than Kinder Morgan. It also appears that Kinder Morgan is not presenting all the facts, and seems to be trying to move at a pace so fast that people can't respond quickly enough.

Martin Nolan

108 Bowkerville Rd.
Fitzwilliam, NH 03447
603-242-3482
dnolan18@myfairpoint.net

20150901-4004

Transcript of August 12, 2015, Scoping Meeting at Lunenburg, MA. See separate Transcripts file:

Transcripts of Scoping Meetings at: http://www.Mason-NH.org/FERC_Scoping_Transcripts.pdf

20150901-5000

Gail LaGoy, Montague, MA.

14. Water quality impacts:

- a. Identification of ALL chemicals in the transported gas itself, along with MSDS information for each chemical
- b. Identification of ALL chemicals used in the transportation and compression of the gas, along with MSDS information for each chemical
- c. Identification of ALL chemicals used in the maintenance of the pipeline, compressors, and other related equipment, along with MSDS and health impact information for each chemical.

15. Fire danger identification, compensation, and remediation:

- a. Identification of all areas that are known high fire danger areas (example = Montague Plains)
- b. Identification of all areas that are inaccessible to fire equipment
- c. Detailed plans of how fires in high fire danger, inaccessible, and all other areas would be addressed
- d. How training and compensation would be provided to first responders and their communities.
- e. How compensation would be assessed and provided to landowners, businesses, and public entities in the event of a loss.

16. Evacuation impacts:

- a. Identification and mapping of all possible evacuation areas
- b. Evacuation routes for all areas
- c. Detailed plans of how evacuations in high fire danger, inaccessible, and all other areas would be addressed and implemented.
- d. How training and compensation would be provided to first responders and their communities.
- e. How compensation would be assessed and provided to landowners, businesses, and public entities in the event of an evacuation (example = loss of use, loss of rental income, other).

17. Health impacts:

- a. Air pollution from planned and unplanned releases
- b. Water pollution from planned and unplanned releases
- c. Soil pollution from planned and unplanned releases

18. Quality of Life impacts:

- a. Noise pollution impacts
- b. Light pollution impacts
- c. Smells

19. Security and Privacy impacts:

- a. How will trespassing onto pipeline areas be stopped?

- b. How will trespassing onto property adjacent to the pipeline areas be stopped?
 - c. How will adjacent property owner privacy be protected from pipeline employees or their contractors, both on foot and aerial?
 - d. How will the pipeline areas be protected from degradation from motor vehicles, motorcycles, all-terrain vehicles, etc. be stopped?
20. Proximity to other easements:
- a. Require thicker walled pipeline and cathodic protection near power lines.
 - b. Consider that locating next to existing easement may constitute an overburden of the easement.
 - c. Does locating next to the existing power line easement restrict upgrade or expansion for that existing easement use.
 - d. Will pipeline be engineered for potential upgrades and expansion of that existing easement use?
 - e. Require enhanced vibration controls near railroad tracks and roadways.
21. Brownfields and other potentially polluted areas:
- a. Identify all brownfields and polluted areas in pipeline areas and related structures, and provide a list of all pollutants, with MSDS and health impact information for each pollutant.
 - b. Test for and identify all areas with PCB contamination from adjacent power lines. Note: This is a known issue.
 - c. Test for and identify all pollutants present in the waterway beds that will be crossed, and provide a list of all pollutants, with MSDS and health impact information for each pollutant.
 - d. How will these waterway pollutants be captured, contained, disposed of, and downstream impacts avoided?
 - e. How will all polluted areas be remediated, contained, disposed of, and the remediation independently be verified?
22. Identification and proper decommissioning of all non-used wells and springs.
23. Short nose Sturgeon:
- a. Require pipeline path to be moved well to the south of any known habitat of this federally endangered species.
 - b. Require pipeline company to pay for independent monitoring of species impact.

20150901-5001

Thea Hardigg, Northampton, MA.

Dear FERC Commissioners,

I appreciate your careful investigation of the environmental impact of the proposed NED pipeline as well as your look at how it could impact our cultural heritage and jobs. Thank you for coming to our communities to hear our concerns. And thank you too for your thorough reading of our comments.

I respectfully request you to fully investigate System Alternatives.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Thea Hardigg
Northampton, MA
Conway, MA

20150901-5002

Thea Hardigg, Northampton, MA.

Dear FERC Commissioners,

I appreciate your careful investigation of the environmental impact of the proposed NED pipeline as well as your look at how it could impact our cultural heritage and jobs. Thank you for coming to our communities to hear our concerns. And thank you too for your thorough reading of our comments.

I respectfully request you to fully investigate System Alternatives.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Thea Hardigg
Northampton, MA
Conway, MA

20150901-5003

Kenneth Stokem, Castleton on Hudson, NY.

Compressor Stations for gas pipelines like the NED are of an industrial scale and should never or rarely be sited in communities in areas that are not zoned by the communities for heavy industry.

If a Compressor Station is sited in non-industrial zones, than full compensation and restitution should be made to not only abutting property owners, but also to property owners within earshot and emissions of the Compressor Station whom are likely or proven to be impacted by the negatives of compressor stations.

It is clear that noise, emissions, and presence of a compressor will cause property loss, quality of living loss, and in some cases the loss of livelihood to properties for a geographic area that is well beyond immediate abutters. These property owners deserve full compensation for their losses and sufficient compensation to make them whole from their losses. The cost of these losses should be made by any profit making entity like Kinder Morgan or Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. that seeks to profit by installing the pipeline and its accompanying compressor stations.

Property owners, including none abutters, similarly affected with property loss or property use losses or quality of loss losses for the installation of pipelines should also compensated fully for their losses and made whole over the period of their ownership and also at the time of sale of their properties. All these costs should be borne by the commercial enterprise seeking to profit from the installation of the pipeline and its accompanying infrastructure.

Restitution for losses should also extend to losses related to activities of engineering, surveying and construction that may be born not only by property owner in the vicinity of construction, but by property owners along routes of travel to and from construction. Losses to municipalities such as damage to roads and other public goods and property should also be borne by the commercial enterprise seeking profit from construction.

All property owners and communities impacted by construction, presence, use and maintenance of pipelines and pipeline line infrastructure including compressor stations should be made whole from their losses by the profiting entity (ies).

The profiting entity should post a bond adequate to cover these potential losses before construction is begun. The profiting entity should also bear all liabilities for property owners along the pipelines and infrastructure and the communities that the pipeline crosses.

Commercial profiting pipeline companies should provide pre-paid insurance for not only the lifetime of the pipeline and its structures but also for the afterlife/end life of the pipeline and its accompanying structures. This insurance should be more than sufficient to pay for damages to make full restitution for any losses related to the pipeline operation and afterlife.

All pipelines and structures relating to pipelines should be removed within 3 years of the end of their use for their original purposes. The properties used for the pipeline should be returned to nature and the satisfaction of the property owners. The costs for this restoration should be put in escrow with the federal government for this purpose, before any construction is begun.

20150901-5007

Daniel Cashman, Fitzwilliam, NH.

Pipeline is not needed

Just fix the leaks in the current pipelines

Area is characterized by wetlands and many vernal pools--terrible for a pipeline construction area

KM has not made a convincing case for how this pipeline will lower energy costs

FERC should not accept KM's filing until the Resource Reports have been completed

Potential negative impact on well water and on the nearby superfund site is significant. Don't believe KM when they say then can abate any problems.

Pipeline is NOT needed.

20150901-5008

Paula Byrde, Lanesborough, MA.

I would like to register my opposition to the Kinder Morgan proposal to develop a natural gas pipeline through Berkshire County. There are no proven benefits to the County, nor to any part of New England. There are, however, many negative influences and risks to our environment; these have been expressed and documented in various scoping sessions. My concern is specific to the Town of Lanesborough and surrounding communities. We live in an area that is primarily rural with a strong dependence on tourism, vacation homes and agricultural contributions to our economy. All of these may be impacted by disruptions to the environment from construction and existence of the pipeline. I demand that FERC ensure that these impacts be financially and ecologically evaluated and the risks estimated and described for public review. I can site several concerns within a mile or two of my home: four farms that are thriving as sources for local produce and meat or poultry, an aquifer through which the pipeline is to run, a town water tower that is directly adjacent to the planned route. I demand that FERC ensure that these impacts be financially and ecologically evaluated and the risks estimated and described for public review.

20150901-5010

Susan Rolke, Fitzwilliam, NH.

I am writing FERC to ask that they carefully consider this application. The majority of individuals in NH do not want this project to proceed through our lands. We, the people of the state of NH, ask that you do not give the filer permission to proceed.

The state of NH is small. The individuals who live here do so because we value our natural resources. Land is scarce. We keep it undeveloped by choice to preserve our natural resources.

The town of Fitzwilliam has many water resources. Our watershed flows into at least 4 other towns providing them with drinking water and groundwater recharge for wells. Our wetlands buffer flood zones as well as naturally filter the water. Our town also boasts the only northern stand of wild rhododendrons, Rhododendron State Park. The park also has a trail of flowering wild flowers.

The proposed pipeline currently cuts through the park and surrounding conservation areas. These tracks of land have been set aside as wildlife refuges and corridors. The construction of the pipeline will limit movement of animals, destroy habitat, potential pollute our waters.

The town of Fitzwilliam is not alone in our concerns and desire to protect our wild areas. The project will cut across at least 2 conservation areas in the neighboring town of Rindge. The conservation of the lands in

both towns was meant forever and in most cases secured by promising these lands would not be developed. Last, our economy in the Monadnock region is also driven by tourism. We pride ourselves on our towns, our woods, and our nature trails. The current ROW are a scar upon our land. We do not wish to enlarge these or expand them. Tourists do not come here to see barren or monoculture land. My family and my neighbors hope that you will not allow this project in our town.

Sincerely,
Susan Rolke

20150901-5012

Hugh and Louise Meyers, Stephentown, NY.

We are asking that you deny Kinder Morgan the right to build the proposed gas pipeline through NY State including Stephentown, NY. We feel that there are many problems with these plans, one being that the pipeline will be 3 feet deep which is not even below the frost depth that we have seen in our backyard. Thank you, Hugh and Louise Meyers

20150901-5013

karen guadagni, new ipswich, NH.

All drinking water in the surrounding areas of the proposed compression station, comes from private wells and aquifers. The blow downs associated with compressor stations emit toxins into the surrounding soil/dug wells.

Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas needs to pay for all costs associated with monitoring all wells in New Ipswich, NH. Should these wells become contaminated, Kinder Morgan should be held responsible for payment of the fair market value of any property BEFORE the installation of the compressor station. Fair Market value being as of March 2015 .. BEFORE announcement of this pipeline thru Southern New Hampshire. FERC - DO YOUR JOB !

20150901-5014

karen guadagni, new ipswich, NH.

Property values in New Ipswich, NH have already dropped due to the announcement of the potential pipeline / compressor station.

Since it will be next to impossible to sell any property within New Ipswich, NH should this project be approved, ALL property taxes should be paid for by Kinder Morgan.

20150901-5016

David W James, Meriden, CT.

I only just learned of this comment period, so this will be brief. I sampled PF14-22 docket comments from municipalities and NGOs already submitted. It would be impossible to be more informed or cogent than these well composed and researched comments all of which raised serious questions about the efficacy of this NED project. I would only add that I recreate on water co. land in West Hartford, and aesthetics is also a concern.

David James

20150901-5017

Steven McGettigan, Temple, NH.
Steven and Niki McGettigan
PO Box 101
Temple, NH 03084

August 30, 2015

Norman C. Bay, Chairman
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street NE, Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Project Docket Number PF14-22-000

Dear Chairman Bay:

We are writing to add our voices to that of New Hampshire's Governor Maggie Hassan in her August 14, 2015 letter to you regarding the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline that is being proposed by Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline.

Governor Hassan is requesting that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission require Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company to provide detailed responses to the questions and concerns of New Hampshire residents related to the Northeast Energy Direct project as part of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement process.

Those of us who live near this proposed pipeline are extremely concerned about the protection of our drinking water. We live in a rural area where almost everyone has a private well; there are no public water supplies in most of these towns. Without clean wells our families could no longer live here and our homes and properties that we've worked so hard for would become virtually worthless.

We are extremely concerned about the noise and health hazards that the proposed 40,000 to 80,000 horsepower compressor station would bring to our area. It would regularly blow off poisonous gas and toxic carcinogens in close proximity to our elementary school, hazardous emissions that never have to be disclosed to the public by the company.

We are frustrated that a private company could be permitted to take our property using the eminent domain process that was once reserved strictly for truly public projects, not extended to for-profit companies.

We are concerned that almost all the gas this pipeline would carry would not be used in New Hampshire, but would be exported to Canada where it would be then converted into Liquid Natural Gas and sold to European and Asian buyers at higher profits.

We respectfully ask that you read Governor Hassan's letter very carefully and that FERC require Tennessee Gas Pipeline to provide detailed responses to the questions and concerns of New Hampshire residents.

Respectfully,

Steven and Niki McGettigan

20150901-5018

thomas pecoraro, Stephentown, NY.

I own land abutting the north side of the national grid corridor (Stephentown, NY) where the NED pipeline would be located. The Randall Brook bounds my land and runs roughly parallel to the utility corridor. The pipeline route would require the deforestation of the stream bank. I am concerned that this will have a negative impact on the ecology of the stream. Currently, 100 year old hemlocks grace the streambank. What will be done to mitigate this? Is there anything that can be done? How will I be compensated for the aesthetic degradation of my stream bank property?

20150901-5020

Kristen Campbell, New Ipswich, NH.

The compressor stations for the pipeline will release tens of thousands of tons of cancer causing toxins into the air each year during blow downs. This is horrible and disgusting! And people for miles will be subjected to breathing that into their lungs. I don't feel that there is enough need for this pipeline to justify sickening and possibly killing people with chemicals in these affected communities.

Debra Austin, Averill Park, NY.

August 31, 2015

Regarding: Northeast Energy Direct Docket #PF14-22

Subject: FERC Filing #2, NO to NED Pipeline and Nassau NY Compressor Station

I stand in solidarity with thousands of citizens who have become self educated regarding the dangers of fracking and fracked gas infrastructure, and have voiced their strong opposition to the NED Pipeline, and for good reason. Frankly, I find it appalling that FERC and other authorities who are suppose to look out for citizens, have not already squelched this proposal/project on the basis of it being a violation of our human rights! After all, you are well aware of the detrimental impacts it will have to our climate, environment, health, water, pristine areas, peace of mind, crops, property values, future generations, etc. This does not feel like the America I once knew.

I believe there is no 'Public Necessity' for this project. Energy experts in New England have already responded in detail regarding their lack of need for this project. There is no crisis and they are already doing the responsible thing, moving towards increasing use of planet friendly sustainable energy alternatives. Also, leaky pipes could be repaired to help recoup lost gas. This is really about corporate greed, not need. Certainly, NY does not benefit from this project and yet one of the largest compressor stations in the U.S. is being sited in a rural residential zoned area, which is in very close proximity to my home and many other residences. Hello....?!!! This is a loud dangerous toxic industrial complex. There are so many reasons this is not a good idea. The Town of Nassau did a very comprehensive and thorough job, along with the NRC. They have provided FERC with several resolutions. I would not wish this on anyone but it would be more appropriately placed in a commercially zoned area, respecting our local laws.

I would like to speak to some of my personal concerns:

- How can I stay living in my home knowing how detrimental the toxic emissions and 'blow-downs' are to our health and well being? We are seniors and there are already health issues in the family.
- Who will pay to have our well water and Koi Pond Water tested regularly?
- If our water becomes unsafe, who will provide us with safe water? My horses drink 5 to 10 gallons a day!
- Who will buy our home at the pre compressor station value? We have invested our time, sweat, and life savings into our property. It is also our primary investment for our retirement.
- Who will pay our increasing insurance rates?
- How can you aptly compensate the town for lost tax revenues as the area becomes more and more depressed?
- How can Kinder Morgan make up for destroying peoples property, health, crops, wildlife, people's livelihood, and taking away our peace of mind by placing us in harms way? They cannot.
- Bigger compressor stations mean more of all of the negative consequences. People living by compressor stations much smaller (12K HP) have reported many health problems. How can a compressor station 41K to 90K HP be ok?

Taking people's land and violating our local laws should not be taken lightly. They are there to protect us. There are far too many adverse impacts for the NED Pipeline to be considered viable in its current form.

Consider..... that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.--That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, --That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness.

Copies to:

Governor Andrew M. Cuomo
Senator Kirsten Gillibrand
Senator Charles Schumer
Congressman Chris Gibson

20150901-5022

David Plaza, Londonderry, NH.

Concerns and Questions. I am a landowner.

1. The quantity of gas that is going through the NED pipeline, how much is needed in the following states? Identify existing capacity required by the individual states along with the additional amount needed by each individual state and this information needs to be backed up with copies of contracts. Taking into account existing capacity, whether it is for another company, is unacceptable. The answer needs to be specific and relate to additional capacity. The answer needs to identify the usages by month.

a. New Hampshire

b. Massachusetts

2. According to the State of New Hampshire laws, justify how eminent domain applies to this pipeline. What percentage of gas in the NED pipeline is needed for New Hampshire?

3. According to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts laws, justify how eminent domain applies to this pipeline. What percentage of gas flowing through the NED pipeline needed for Massachusetts?

4. With regards to the application for NED pipeline, any arguments, justifications and answers supplied with the application are to be null and void if the answer relates to the New England region. Reasons:

a. There is no Government of New England. The Government of New England Region does not exist.

b. There is no Court of New England.

c. There are no laws of New England.

d. There are only laws of New Hampshire.

e. There are only laws of Massachusetts.

f. There are only Courts of New Hampshire.

g. There are only Courts of Massachusetts.

h. There is the Government of New Hampshire.

i. There is only the Government of Massachusetts.

j. There is only the Government of the United States.

So, I repeat, ALL DISCUSSIONS, ARGUMENTS, STATEMENTS, JUSTIFICATIONS and ANSWERS are to relate to the existing State and Federal laws and do not let Kinder Morgan or any of its subsidiaries link this discussion to an imaginary region that does not exist in any court of law.

5. What percentage of the gas flowing through the pipeline will be exported?

6. If gas is going to be exported? Are there existing contracts with countries?

7. How much of the gas is being sold to countries in Europe?

8. Is the NED pipeline just another economic noose for President Vladimir Putin and Russia? Is it really necessary to provide additional economic bad news for the people of Russia? These people have families and there has been enough pain in this world. What would we accomplish?

9. Kinder Morgan is a private For Profit company. If they want to use my land, then, they can break open the purse strings and pay significant amounts of money to cover all aspects that relate to the devaluing of my land and surrounding land in the vicinity of the NED pipeline. This applies to all landowners involved in

this project.

10. Recently, my father talked to a FERC representative, and this person stated that the NED pipeline is needed to help the allies of the United States like Germany and Japan. Please comment with regards to this statement? Is this true? The laws of Eminent Domain for the common good do not extend beyond the borders of the United States. The definition of “For the Common Good” does not apply to individuals living outside our borders or entities outside our borders.

11. Are there any government directives to supply natural gas to our allies? This question relates to Congress, Senate, Executive Branch and The President of the United States. I am requesting a copy of this information under the Freedom of Information Act and release to the public.

12. The following questions are for the individuals of FERC that will make the decision about NED pipeline.

a. Would you buy a house within 1000 feet of the pipeline?

b. If a pipeline like the NED is going through your backyard, how you live with yourself if the pipeline exploded and you were able to run away, but, you had to watch your parents, your wife, your children, your grandchildren and anything that you cared for disappear in an instant as a result of this pipeline. I repeat, will you be able to live with yourselves? I am expecting an answer from each of the individuals making this decision on this pipeline. This is the scenario that the individuals of FERC are requesting each landowner and adjacent landowners to live with.

13. Ways to save electricity / natural gas in the States of New Hampshire and Massachusetts. FERC needs to address the idea of replacing all the incandescent light bulbs with LED light bulbs. For New Hampshire, I estimate this cost will be around 70 – 100 million dollars. Replacement will save 5 – 10 % off individual’s electric bill. Simple change!

14. If there is a pipeline going through New Hampshire, how much will my oil heating bill go down? 1000 gallons per year usage.

15. With regards to the Freedom of Information Act, I am requesting copies of any correspondence in writing or verbal, related to any conversations with Governor Patrick of Massachusetts, why the NED pipeline is not good for Richmond, Massachusetts. This information is needed by the public. If the pipeline is not good for towns like Richmond and Lenox Massachusetts, then, it is not good for the other towns of Massachusetts and New Hampshire.

16. How much gas is being lost due to leaks in existing infrastructure? Provide details.

a. Quantity of gas per year for last three years that is purchased and shipped to New Hampshire and Massachusetts

b. Quantity of gas billed to customers in New Hampshire and Massachusetts

c. Calculate amount lost

17. How many existing pipelines in New Hampshire and Massachusetts are not up to standards, with regards pipeline thicknesses and population density? How many miles? What percentage? Fix these first for SAFETY.

18. To address the so-called shortage of gas that exists in New Hampshire and Massachusetts, how do the other pipeline proposals help with this so-called problem that may exist for only 30 hours of a calendar year? FERC needs to look at all other alternatives FIRST!

20150901-5023

Kristen Campbell, New Ipswich, NH.

Should an accident happen on the pipeline or at the station, we in new Ipswich don’t have enough emergency responders or the equipment to handle a disaster. We have a volunteer fire dept.

20150901-5024

Paul A. Dion, Lanesborough, MA.

Hello, I am not an avid activist, but feel the need to write and let you know that I strongly oppose the planned pipeline. There are many reasons for my opposition. I live about a mile from the location that has been proposed. I am concerned about the devaluation of properties, the disruption and potential devastation of our towns aquifer, the health risks for current and future residence and wildlife, the decimation of the landscape surrounding the pathway... I could go on and on. I don't think I can come up with anything you haven't already heard. If the leaks in the current gas lines were to be repaired there would be no need for this vastly oversized new line.

How can a privately owned corporation be allowed to cause such devastation along such a long route? How can the property and lives of so many be taken and ruined by eminent domain by a private corporation?

PLEASE...help save the people, properties, wildlife, landscape and water from this corrosive and unnecessary plan.

Thank you.

Paul A. Dion
584 North Main Street
Lanesborough, MA 01237

20150901-5025

Kristen Campbell, New Ipswich, NH.

Compressor stations release volatile organic compounds routinely and can get into private wells. The EPA recommends extensive quarterly testing for these voc's which gets very expensive for home owners.

20150901-5026

Kristen Campbell, New Ipswich, NH.

If you allow a pipeline and compressor station to be built here, the property values will decrease dramatically. People have worked hard for their homes. And people looking to leave won't be able to get much for their homes.

20150901-5027

ann putnam, wilton, NH.

RE: Docket No. PF14-22-000

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission has asked for the public to weigh in with any concerns they might have with the Northeast Energy Direct Project as they prepare an Environmental Impact Statement needed to determine whether "the project is in the public convenience and necessity." I am here to tell you IT IS NOT. We don't want the pipeline, we don't need pipeline. Not only does the pipeline NOT help us, the pipeline will hurt us.

I am a resident of New Hampshire, grew up in New Hampshire, am raising my children in New Hampshire. My daughter is attending college in New Hampshire, studying Environmental Science, and she is compelled to make a difference in this world, lessen the negative impact humans have on the environment and right the wrongs of so many who have come before her. I wish I could say to her that crimes against nature, and in turn, humanity are a thing of the past, but it appears once again that today we are faced with a decision where the greed, money and power of the few might win over the health and well-being of many. I strongly encourage you to consider my views, views that represent thousands of residents of this state. I have studied the facts surrounding the controversy of this project carefully and urge you to reject this plan.

I understand Tennessee Gas plans to construct approximately 412 miles of natural gas transmission pipeline through Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut and my home, New Hampshire, including

construction of a compressor station in New Ipswich, a few towns over from me. Doesn't sound so bad, right? You need stations to help pump that much needed natural gas along. Oh wait- much needed natural gas? Our local communities don't need it. The natural gas will be largely sold to foreign markets in Europe and Asia. New Hampshire often exports surplus energy to other areas, we don't need the energy from the pipeline. And this compressor station? What's the big deal? I'm sure it's all regulated and safe. I was horrified to learn that compressor stations have INTENTIONAL and ROUTINE so-called audibly disrupting and poisonous 'blowdowns' where they have to release built-up pressure in the pipeline into the air, releasing toxic, carcinogenic, neurotoxic chemicals which cause major adverse health effects in humans and animals. How is this legal? Stop this project immediately.

I listen to the news, watch the documentaries, those who know me know I take it all in with a grain of salt, play devil's advocate, justify both sides, do my research, and breathe a sigh of relief that it's not happening to me, not my problem. Well now it's in my backyard.

I know I am fortunate to be living in a relatively unspoiled part of the world. I like my forests, I like wilderness, I would like my family to be cancer-free. While I am enriched as I learn more about our beautiful world, I am saddened as I simultaneously learn more about the Powerful taking advantage of the less-fortunate, disregarding health and safety, manipulating the laws, disrupting the natural cycles that previously existed. We have entered a new age, the Anthropocene Era, where human activities are having a SIGNIFICANT impact on Earth's ecosystems. Look it up. And do the right thing. Not because it is easy, because it is the right thing to do.

Additionally, there are the 'what ifs' and frightening possibilities and threats that local schools and residents can anticipate from proximity to the pipeline and compressor stations, and WE KNOW Kinder Morgan has a history of safety violations, accidents and deaths. Since 2003, Kinder Morgan and its subsidiaries' pipelines have been responsible for at least 180 spills, evacuations, explosions, fires and fatalities in 24 states, despite their 'best efforts'.

A threat is now creeping toward my family, your family. Are we to become the subject of another documentary? Do the right thing and cease the pipeline now. Health impacts near compressor stations are well documented, and don't let someone else convince you otherwise.

WAKE UP! Keep New Hampshire free of these KNOWN health and safety threats.

Don't you dare say yes to something when you represent the rest of us screaming NO.

Thank you for hearing my concerns.

From the bottom of my heart,

Ann Putnam
10 Livermore Street
Wilton, NH 03086
annputnam22@gmail.com
603-831-2337

20150901-5028

Kristen Campbell, New Ipswich, NH.

Kinder Morgan has a history of safety violations. How can they be trusted? Failing to test pipeline safety devices. Failing to maintain proper firefighting equipment. Failing to inspect pipelines as required. Failing to adequately monitor pipes corrosion levels. Failing to keep a safe distance from schools or hospitals. These are not violations that can just be shrugged off. Lives and land are at stake!

20150901-5029

Maxwell Nerenberg, Averill Park, NY.

I am writing to express one of my concerns about the pipeline in question. I believe intensive research into

our emergency services' abilities to respond to any of the potential emergencies resulting from the pipeline. Much of the proposed route is through rural areas, with very small, and thinly spread emergency services, many of which rely on volunteers. As a citizen I want to know who would deal with a gas leak or explosion, how prepared they are to deal with this, how long it would take to contain the situation, what kind of casualties and destruction would be projected from some of these conceivable scenarios. Would Kinder Morgan be organizing their own response crews, and how long would they take to arrive? Given the length of the pipeline I would want to hear their plans for covering such a large area in the event of an emergency.

Thank you,

Maxwell Nerenberg

20150901-5030

Abbott, Delmar, NY.

To whom it may concern at the FERC:

We are land owners in the Town of New Scotland, NY and are commenting on the EIS for the Northeast Energy Direct Project (Docket # PF-14-22-000) involving the construction and operation of facilities by the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company in northeast states. The comment period for the decision to develop an Environmental Impact Statement for this project ends on this date (8/31/15). Thank you for the opportunity to have input on this significant project for my community, who are already impacted by long, loud and heavy oil and freight trains and emissions from industrial facilities in Feura Bush.

We understand that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) is an independent agency that regulates the interstate transmission of electricity, natural gas, and oil. FERC also reviews proposals to build liquefied natural gas (LNG) terminals and interstate natural gas pipelines as well as licensing hydropower projects - the Energy Policy Act of 2005 issued other responsibilities (thanks Dick C. & friends). We do not support the idea of constructing this pipeline to benefit corporations with fiscal interests in fossil fuel extraction and exports via the east coast.

This pipeline project is billed as filling a public need for additional natural gas capacity in the northeast. The evidence for this need was not presented in the docket. This project will not provide any benefit to those affected by the pipeline construction and operation (including compressor stations). Also not considered by this proposal, are the improvements & revisions to the energy systems made by many northeast states. These revisions have increased the use of clean, renewable energy sources and improvements to grid delivery systems to increase efficiencies and resiliency.

At this point, our interstate transmission should be reducing reliance on archaic fossil fuel systems and turning to a sustainable energy sector that mitigates global warming (i.e., very, very low carbon emission) with smart-secured energy delivery systems. We need to promote distributed energy sources since that is best for our high-tech society. More people are turning to grid-connected solar energy to reduce the need for fossil fuel use - our nascent (only had it since mid-july) PV system has generated 1.6MWh already. With more grid-connected solar, enhanced grid delivery systems and future energy storage technologies, we can get off the fossil fuels and save our only planet!

Not only are we concerned about global warming and the impact of this proposal on greenhouse gas emissions (which we know is significant, especially when considering construction & operation GHG emissions (i.e., CO₂, CH₄, NO₂, etc.), we are also concerned about the effect of drilling and land clearing on neighboring water quantity and water quality (i.e., turbidity, methane, and radioactive materials). Many people in my community rely on private wells for drinking water and wetlands are critical ecosystems and flood mitigation. In some places, wells are susceptible to changes in groundwater flow and quality due to our Karst geology.

In its Environmental Impact Statement, we want the FERC to consider the potential aforementioned impacts associated with this proposal. We also want the FERC to consider - as a viable "alternative" to this project

proposal - that any purported need for this additional natural gas pipeline capacity could be mitigated (and deemed un-necessary) by the simple addition of grid-connected solar panels all along the existing pipeline route. Solar PV panels installed along the existing pipeline route would benefit all communities through which the route passes, providing clean, distributed energy into the grid.

We think this evaluation is valuable and critical to the process in evaluating alternatives to this proposal in the EIS.

I will share this letter with my elected officials and other community members as well.

Thank you

Abbotts

Town of New Scotland, NY

20150901-5031

Kristen Campbell, New Ipswich, NH.

Kinder Morgan has a history of safety violations. How can they be trusted? Failing to test pipeline safety devices. Failing to maintain proper firefighting equipment. Failing to inspect pipelines as required. Failing to adequately monitor pipes corrosion levels. Failing to keep a safe distance from schools or hospitals. These are not violations that can just be shrugged off. Lives and land are at stake!

20150901-5032

Bryan Herrin, MASON, NH.

I would like the committee to examine the pipeline's impact on the moose population in mason, NH. In NH the moose population has dropped by 40% in the past decade. The proposed pipeline route cuts through the habitat of many moose living in the vicinity of starch mill rd. With a population already in decline I'm concerned that heavy machinery plus deforestation that bisects their range will put undue stress on the animals and further exacerbate the problem faced by a species already greatly in decline.

20150901-5033

Elizabeth Tighe, Lowell, MA.

To whom it may concern,

I respectfully ask that you reject the request by Kinder Morgan to expand the pipeline. I think that the supposed benefits do not outweigh the environmental costs. The plan to place the pipe below the Merrimack River which supplies water to several communities is ill planned. A simple web search reveals the following: From 2006 to 2014, Tennessee Gas Pipeline had 92 "significant incidents" with their pipelines, resulting in \$88,144,152 in property damage and 19 federal enforcement actions -https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tennessee_Gas_Pipeline.

Scientists have been warning us of water shortages in the coming years as climate change worsens. If the pipeline is allowed under the Merrimack River, or any river for that matter, we jeopardize a precious resource that is not easily replaced. Please deny the request. Thank you. Sincerely, Elizabeth Tighe

20150901-5034

Kristen Campbell, New Ipswich, NH.

A new pipeline is not needed. An alternative would be to increase the capacity of existing pipeline by using a wider pipe.

20150901-5035

Julie Cerny, Stephentown, NY.

To whom it may concern:

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company and Kinder Morgan should not be granted a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity for the Northeast Energy Direct Project. For the reasons described below, this project is not in the interests of the public and does not serve the greater good.

The stated “need” for this project is highly questionable, as its proposed size and capacity far exceed even the most generous projected energy demands of the New England energy consumers it claims to benefit.

It is likely the majority of the fracked gas that would flow through this pipeline (an estimated 68%) will be exported to Canada and overseas, potentially via Kinder Morgan’s own companies such as American Petroleum Tankers and State Class Tankers, which would negatively impact energy prices for the domestic customers who would be subsidizing the cost and construction of the pipeline through tariffs, property taxes and loss of their private land.

We do not support the use of public land or hundreds of acres of private property taken by force through Eminent Domain by a for-profit company, nor do we believe families, farms, churches and schools should be placed in what the industry itself terms “incineration zones.”

New York recently banned fracking statewide on the grounds that the health risks outweigh any potential benefits, yet this same fracked gas would be piped at very high pressure (1460 psi) through our communities, in close proximity to electric transmission wires and beneath numerous bodies of water if NED is approved.

Neither the process of fracking, nor the transport of the resulting gas, which contains hundreds of chemicals the industry refuses to list, is safe, sustainable or clean. This is made clear in numerous daily news items (unsolved wastewater problems, earthquakes, explosions, leaks, large-scale spills, pollution, lack of oversight, etc.) from across the country and around the world, including coverage of five major pipeline incidents in January 2015 alone.

As documented by a recent Harvard-led study, the poorly maintained existing gas infrastructure in Boston alone currently leaks “15 billion cubic feet of natural gas, worth some \$90 million” each year, enough to service 200,000 homes. There is much work to be done inspecting, servicing and maintaining the pipelines already in the ground before billions of dollars worth of larger and more dangerous pipelines are considered. In addition to the many long-term risks of the pipeline itself, the new, high-power compressor stations it would require present their own well-documented light, sound, security and environmental concerns, including the regularly scheduled venting of methane (which the EPA reports has 20 times more impact on climate change than carbon dioxide over a 100-year period) into the air called blow down.

The true cost of expanding the region’s antiquated pipeline infrastructure (tax and utility-payer burdens, air and water quality, public safety, climate change impact, continued reliance on fossil fuels, etc.) is incalculable, and many safer options with long-term benefits for local workers, energy customers and alternative energy development are available now.

The rural character of the many small towns through which this pipeline would run and the local economies supported by that rural character would be deeply compromised.

In this day and age, when there are so many viable alternatives to fossil fuels, there is no reason to put our towns, communities, local economies, environment, and health and safety at risk for a project that is simply not needed.

Thank you,
Julie Cerny

20150901-5036

Elizabeth Tighe, Lowell, MA.
To whom it may concern,

I respectfully ask that you reject the request by Kinder Morgan to expand the pipeline. I think that the sup-

posed benefits do not outweigh the environmental costs. The plan to place the pipe below the Merrimack River which supplies water to several communities is ill planned. A simple web search reveals the following: From 2006 to 2014, Tennessee Gas Pipeline had 92 “significant incidents” with their pipelines, resulting in \$88,144,152 in property damage and 19 federal enforcement actions -https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tennessee_Gas_Pipeline.

Scientists have been warning us of water shortages in the coming years as climate change worsens. If the pipeline is allowed under the Merrimack River, or any river for that matter, we jeopardize a precious resource that is not easily replaced. Please deny the request. Thank you. Sincerely, Elizabeth Tighe

20150901-5037

Kristen Campbell, New Ipswich, NH.

This pipeline should not be allowed to proceed. Keep the conservation land pristine. We have endangered species that need this land to survive. There are Blanding’s turtles, marbled salamanders and golden eagles that call this land home. There are also the threatened spotted turtles and the northern long eared bats. There are species of special concern such as the leopard frog, blue spotted salamander, wood turtle and smooth green snake. All of these depend on conservation land being left alone.

20150901-5038

Kristen Campbell, New Ipswich, NH.

There are Native American and religious sites along the path of this pipeline. These will be disturbed or destroyed. What happens if human remains are found?

20150901-5039

Kristen Campbell, New Ipswich, NH.

Heavy construction vehicles and equipment will cause damage to our local roads.

20150901-5040

Kristen Campbell, New Ipswich, NH.

Farmers near the compressor station who have struggled to get certified organic will no longer be able to claim that with all the pollution. Livelihoods are at stake with this pipeline.

20150901-5042

Hannah Putnam, Wilton, NH.

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission has asked for the public to weigh in with any concerns they might have with the Northeast Energy Direct Project as they prepare an Environmental Impact Statement needed to determine whether “the project is in the public convenience and necessity.” I am here to tell you IT IS NOT. We don’t want the pipeline, we don’t need pipeline. Not only does the pipeline NOT help us, the pipeline will hurt us.

I am a resident of New Hampshire, grew up in New Hampshire, am raising my children in New Hampshire. My daughter is attending college in New Hampshire, studying Environmental Science, and she is compelled to make a difference in this world, lessen the negative impact humans have on the environment and right the wrongs of so many who have come before her. I wish I could say to her that crimes against nature, and in turn, humanity are a thing of the past, but it appears once again that today we are faced with a decision where the greed, money and power of the few might win over the health and well-being of many. I strongly encourage you to consider my views, views that represent thousands of residents of this state. I have studied the facts surrounding the controversy of this project carefully and urge you to reject this plan.

I understand Tennessee Gas plans to construct approximately 412 miles of natural gas transmission pipeline though Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut and my home, New Hampshire, including

construction of a compressor station in New Ipswich, a few towns over from me. Doesn't sound so bad, right? You need stations to help pump that much needed natural gas along. Oh wait- much needed natural gas? Our local communities don't need it. The natural gas will be largely sold to foreign markets in Europe and Asia. New Hampshire often exports surplus energy to other areas, we don't need the energy from the pipeline. And this compressor station? What's the big deal? I'm sure it's all regulated and safe. I was horrified to learn that compressor stations have INTENTIONAL and ROUTINE so-called audibly disrupting and poisonous 'blowdowns' where they have to release built-up pressure in the pipeline into the air, releasing toxic, carcinogenic, neurotoxic chemicals which cause major adverse health effects in humans and animals. How is this legal? Stop this project immediately.

I listen to the news, watch the documentaries, those who know me know I take it all in with a grain of salt, play devil's advocate, justify both sides, do my research, and breathe a sigh of relief that it's not happening to me, not my problem. Well now it's in my backyard.

I know I am fortunate to be living in a relatively unspoiled part of the world. I like my forests, I like wilderness, I would like my family to be cancer-free. While I am enriched as I learn more about our beautiful world, I am saddened as I simultaneously learn more about the Powerful taking advantage of the less-fortunate, disregarding health and safety, manipulating the laws, disrupting the natural cycles that previously existed. We have entered a new age, the Anthropocene Era, where human activities are having a SIGNIFICANT impact on Earth's ecosystems. Look it up. And do the right thing. Not because it is easy, because it is the right thing to do.

Additionally, there are the 'what ifs' and frightening possibilities and threats that local schools and residents can anticipate from proximity to the pipeline and compressor stations, and WE KNOW Kinder Morgan has a history of safety violations, accidents and deaths. Since 2003, Kinder Morgan and its subsidiaries' pipelines have been responsible for at least 180 spills, evacuations, explosions, fires and fatalities in 24 states, despite their 'best efforts'.

A threat is now creeping toward my family, your family. Are we to become the subject of another documentary? Do the right thing and cease the pipeline now. Health impacts near compressor stations are well documented, and don't let someone else convince you otherwise.

WAKE UP! Keep New Hampshire free of these KNOWN health and safety threats.

Don't you dare say yes to something when you represent the rest of us screaming NO.

Thank you for hearing my concern,

Hannah Putnam

putnam.hannah@gmail.com

20150901-5043

Kristen Campbell, New Ipswich, NH.

Temple elementary school, emergency evacuation site and Greenville water supply are only 1/2 mi away from a proposed compressor station. Does Kinder Morgan know this? Do they care? The New Ipswich town pool and sports facility are only 1+1/2 mi away. This pipeline is not necessary and there is no good place to put a giant polluter. The project should be scrapped entirely.

20150901-5068

WOOLMAN HILL

Quaker Retreat Center

107 Keets Road Deerfield MA 01342 + 413-774-3431 + info@woolmanhill.org + www.woolmanhill.org

Norman Bay, Chairman

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

via FERC Online filing

Re: Docket No. PF 14-22-000
Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. (TGP),
Proposed Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project

August 31, 2015

Dear Norman Bay,

Please see the attached comments and public statement from the Woolman Hill board and executive director, expressing our concern about and opposition to the proposed Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Northeast Energy Direct project.

Thank you for engaging on this critical issue.

Sincerely,

Margaret Cooley
Executive Director, Woolman Hill
(margaret@woolmanhill.org)

COMMENTS for the FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Re: FERC Docket No. PF 14-22-000

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. (TGP),
Proposed Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project

August 31, 2015

NOTE: Woolman Hill Inc., (Woolman Hill) is submitting these statements in response to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's request for comments from the public. Submission of these statements is not a waiver of Woolman Hill's rights as per Civil Action No. 15-cv-30131 (MAP) filed in Federal Court for the Western District of Massachusetts on July 28, 2015.

Situated on the beautiful Pocumtuck ridge in Deerfield, Woolman Hill Retreat Center is a non-profit organization dedicated to the importance of reflection, spiritual engagement, and connection with nature. It provides simple, comfortable facilities for individual retreats, group gatherings, and programs that nurture spiritual growth. In its operations and its programming, Woolman Hill seeks to foster the values of peace-making, simplicity, integrity, social responsibility, and stewardship of the earth.

Consistent with its purpose and its Quaker values, Woolman Hill encourages lifestyles that reduce dependence on non-renewable energy and minimize negative impact on the earth. It places a high value on environmental stewardship in its operations - for example, using wood as the primary heating source, benefiting from solar panels for two of its buildings, and recently installing on-demand hot water heaters in its main building. The Nelson homestead – the area of Woolman Hill closest to the proposed pipeline route – was intentionally built with no reliance on fossil fuels or electric power. A demonstration fruit tree and nut project, begun several decades ago, continues to this day. Over the years, significant financial and human resources have been invested in the upkeep, improvement and renovation of Woolman Hill's buildings and land.

Installation of the proposed Northeast Energy Direct pipeline through Woolman Hill would seriously challenge the moral, spiritual and physical value of Woolman Hill, reducing significantly its future value as a Quaker retreat center and/or the value of the property which could be derived from other possible uses.

In addition to significant concerns about the danger, environmental destruction and economic disturbance posed to Woolman Hill by the pipeline's route across its land, the Woolman Hill community carries equal concern for the broader implications of the pipeline's regional and global impact.

In assessing the impact of the proposed Northeast Energy Direct project, we ask the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to explore the following concerns:

- The proposed pipeline route would run adjacent to an asphalt plant and quarry with active blasting, a railroad yard with noticeable impacts of freight cars coupling, and a firing range. What restrictions or consid-

erations apply when burying a gas pipeline within close proximity of heavy industrial or other explosive conditions? In particular, what level of disturbance from blasting can a 30" pipeline withstand without short- or long-term damage to its integrity?

- What environmental, aesthetic, traffic flow and use impact will construction, drilling, boring and existence of the pipeline under the Connecticut and Deerfield rivers and/or railroad have? This is of particular concern given the well-used and popular recreational bike/walking path and our nearby retreat facility that would be impacted by noise, land and wildlife disturbance, as well as damage to the uninterrupted natural aesthetic quality of the area.
- What precautions or limitations are taken when co-locating a gas pipeline with an electric power line? Within what range of the live power lines is considered safe for construction and for underground burial of a gas pipeline, and how is that designation of safety arrived at? Given that co-locating with the power line along this stretch over the Pocumtuck ridge would also mean laying pipeline through traprock, how would construction blasting affect the power line safety and dependability, as well as other infrastructure like nearby telephone, television and internet cables?
- We implore you to consider other methods of storing energy for regional use in peak demand during winter months, including already existing (but un-used) and/or expanded infrastructure, as well as investments in alternative energy generation such as solar, wind power, and increased efficiency (including through repairs to existing infrastructure).
- We particularly ask that the assessment of need include the results of the current research being compiled by the Massachusetts' Attorney General's office.
- Woolman Hill relies on income from services that depend on offering guests a peaceful, quiet, naturally beautiful setting. Woolman Hill's setting, and its financial wellbeing, would be severely impacted by the construction and installation of the pipeline. What level of noise and disruption is likely for what period of time during the construction phase? How would FERC or Kinder Morgan determine the economic impact of loss of income for that period?
- Keets Road is the only egress from the retreat center and the pipeline would cross that road in three places. Woolman Hill hosts large groups of people and emergency response or evacuation would be seriously hampered in the event of any pipeline malfunction. What measures would Kinder Morgan be required to put in place, and what recourse exists if Kinder Morgan does not comply with the required standards? Are there restrictions on pipeline installation where there is only one egress?
- Woolman Hill has a well that is designated as a public water supply. What precautions would be taken to protect the quality of the water table, and what would happen if the water table were affected and thus impacted Woolman Hill's ability to serve its customers in accordance with MA Department of Environmental Protection requirements?
- Decades ago, the Woolman Hill board approved preserving a section of forest without disturbance (though there is no formal conservation easement). This portion of Woolman Hill's property is directly in the line of the proposed pipeline route. What consideration is given to a landowner's intention of natural preservation?
- What consideration is given to the recreational, aesthetic and spiritual connection to bike and walking trails that would be decimated by blasting and clear-cutting necessary for the installation of the pipeline? Several trails are within the pipeline route along the existing power line, and the absence of trees would expose the trails to the power line as well as permanently alter the secluded feel of the trails.

In addition to these concerns, we attach the general public statement that expresses our spiritual and moral conviction that we need to pursue energy policies and infrastructure that are consistent with the protection and preservation of a sustainable environment for human, plant and animal species.

We ask you to take these concerns seriously and to deny approval of the Northeast Energy Direct project proposal.

Thank you.

Margaret Cooley, Executive Director

Patricia Higgins, Clerk, Board of Directors

Woolman Hill Quaker Retreat Center

Attachment: Public Statement in opposition to Northeast Energy Direct project

PUBLIC STATEMENT REGARDING THE PROPOSED TENNESSEE GAS NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT PIPELINE

Woolman Hill Quaker Retreat Center joins with other communities, organizations and individuals in opposing the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline through Massachusetts and New Hampshire, and in calling for sustainable solutions to energy needs.

In addition to significant concerns about the danger, environmental destruction and economic disturbance posed to Woolman Hill by the pipeline's proposed route across our land, we carry equal concern for the broader implications of the pipeline's regional and global impact. We have found no convincing demonstration that New England needs more natural gas pipelines for its residences, businesses, or power plants. Tennessee Gas has not denied that a large portion of the gas to be transported through the pipeline is for export to foreign countries. Exporting fossil fuels depletes a finite resource, increases dependence on non-renewable energy elsewhere in the world, and contributes to greenhouse gas emission levels that further damage the earth's ability to support humans and other animal and plant species.

Situated on the beautiful Pocumtuck ridge in Deerfield, our retreat center emphasizes the importance of reflection, spiritual engagement, and connection with nature. We provide simple, comfortable facilities for individual retreats, group gatherings and programs that nurture spiritual growth and foster peace-making, simplicity, integrity, social responsibility, and stewardship of the earth.

Beginning with Antoinette Spruyt's original intent to "further the causes of peace and brotherhood in the world" when she donated the land to Quakers in the 1950s, Woolman Hill has a long history of advocacy and witness in western Massachusetts and beyond. It has served as the locus of peace conferences, international youth work camps, an alternative school, the birthplace of Traprock Peace Center, the home of war tax resisters Juanita and Wally Nelson, and innumerable spiritual and social justice events.

Consistent with Woolman Hill's purpose and its Quaker values, we encourage lifestyles that reduce dependence on non-renewable energy and minimize negative impact on the earth. We acknowledge that fossil fuel and climate change issues are very complex, and that at this point in time we ourselves are often complicit with unsustainable environmental, economic, political and social systems. We grieve the destruction of the natural environment and of vulnerable communities due to human disregard for finite resources and for the sanctity of all life. We support the development of renewable and responsible energy systems which will allow us all to live sustainably on the earth.

We call on our local, state, and federal officials to promote sustainable energy use, to protect public conservation land and private landowners' rights, and to make decisions that prioritize the well-being of our natural environment and of future generations. We call on them to prevent the construction of the Tennessee Gas pipeline. May we all work towards furthering the causes of peace and kinship in the world.

May 2015

Woolman Hill Board of Directors:

Virginia Barker, Boscawen NH

Peter Bishop, Leeds MA

Kathryn Cranford, Laconia NH

Maureen Flannery, Northampton MA

Patricia Higgins, Hanover NH

Dan Hoskins, Brattleboro VT

Tom Hoskins, Putney VT
Mary Link, Ashfield MA
Greg Melville, Cheshire CT
Suzette Snow-Cobb, Turners Falls MA
Pat Wallace, Contoocook NH
Honor Woodrow, Jamaica Plain MA

Woolman Hill Executive Director:
Margaret Cooley, Greenfield MA

20150901-5069

{36 pages} {skip to end of 20150901-5069}

Bowditch & Dewey

Attorneys

Vincent DeVito
Fax: +1508-929-3019
Email: vdevito@bowditch.com

August 31, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, DC 20426

Re: DOCKET NO. PF14-22-000

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC, Proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project: Further Comments of Northeast Energy Solutions, Inc.

Dear Secretary Bose:

On behalf of Northeast Energy Solutions, Inc. (“NEES”), kindly accept these further comments concerning the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company’s (“TGP”) proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project (the “Project”) with regard to the June 30, 2015 Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”) for the Project.

On Friday, August 28, 2015, the United States of America began enforcing the Waters of the United States rule (“Rule”) which expands federal jurisdiction over small waterways, like streams and wetlands.’ Unfortunately, the potential impact of the new Rule was never disclosed, discussed or raised by TGP or the public during the scoping process with regards to the above referenced matter. The Rule opens numerous questions as to federal jurisdiction and landowner responsibilities. In fact, as a result of the Rule, a landowner could potentially be liable for nearly \$40,000 per incident per day in the form of a fine by the Environmental Protection Agency for a pipeline breach attributable to TGP. As such, the scoping process has failed and must be reopened to address all aspects of the potential impact of the Rule. Without a doubt, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (“FERC” or “Commission”) staff has not had the opportunity to receive comments to help its determinations as to what issues to evaluate in the EIS in light of the impact of the Rule.

As the Rule applies to all jurisdictions impacted by the proposed Project, the scoping process must be reopened in each state. Moreover, the failure of TGP to disclose the Rule and its potential impact during the public process further discredits TGP’s self-purported transparency and assertions of governmental and public cooperation.

The Rule broadens Environmental Protection Agency’s scope under the Clean Water Act and essentially defines “waters of the U.S.” to include virtually any wet area, including rain-fed, waterway. The Rule expands federal jurisdiction over many landscape features found on land potentially impacted by the proposed Project.

The following are a few items the scoping process must cover:

- 1) Can landowners be liable under the Rule and what actions is TGP taking to protect such landowners?
- 2) Which lands affected by the proposed project are impacted by the Rule?
- 3) Are there additional permit requirements under the Rule, if so, who pays for the full application costs?
- 4) Where can landowners go for additional information regarding the new Rule? Please note that as of this writing, not all government websites have been fully updated to reflect the new Rule.
- 5) Which businesses are at risk by the proposed Project under the new federal requirements?
- 6) Should the developer or landowners immediately request a Jurisdictional Determination from the Corps of Engineers?

In addition to continuing the scoping process to address the new Rule, another concern ineffectually addressed and relatively undisclosed during the process is the Connecticut Expansion Project (“CEP”). CEP is related to the Project and should not be subject to a separate review by the FERC. Separate permitting for the CEP amounts to unlawful segmentation of the two projects. The Project and CEP should receive joint environmental consideration due to their connectedness and financial interdependence. Currently, there is enough publically available information to conclude that TGP is in fact combining CEP’s reported shipper contract Dthld total with the Project’s Dthld total. The fact that the service areas of the three CEP shippers, Connecticut Natural Gas Corporation, Southern Connecticut Gas Corporation, and Yankee Gas, are not in the vicinity of the Project’s proposed paths strongly supports this conclusion. Further information must be made available to the Commission so that the concern of unlawfully segmentation can be ameliorated, now. Lastly, the safety of the proposed Project needs additional scoping. Even though there were appropriate inquiries, TGP failed to provide adequate answers with respect to the Project’s safety, including detailed information regarding design, testing, cathodic protection, encroachment, monitoring and inspection. The crucial economic and environmental cost of inadequate pipeline safety response and preparedness cannot be underestimated. Exhibit 1 includes a list of pipeline incidents in the United States from 2001 to 2015. Clearly, TGP must establish that each of these recent incidents would not be repeated by its proposed Project.

Until these questions, and others to be raised in the context of the Rule, are addressed the FERC cannot proceed with an EIS. As such, should TGP attempt to file an application concerning the Project, FERC should determine that TGP has failed to make progress in resolving issues during the pre-filing process and that any such application is not ready for processing. A decision to the contrary would render any proposed application and process patently defective.

Respectfully,

Vincent DeVito

Bowditch & Dewey, LLP

300 New Jersey Avenue NW, Suite 900

Washington, DC 20001

vdevito@bowditch.com

p.202.465.8785/f.508.929.3019

Attachment: Exhibit 1: List of Pipeline Incidents in the United States from 2001 to 2015

cc: Governor Charles D. Baker

Congressman James P. McGovern

Commissioner Tony Clark, FERC

Commissioner Cheryl A. LaFleur, FERC

Chairman Norman C. Bay, FERC

Commissioner Philip D. Moeller, FERC

Commissioner Colette D. Honorable, FERC

President Stanley C. Rosenberg, MA Senate

Speaker Robert A. DeLeo, MA House of Representatives

1 The Clean Water Rule: Definition of “Waters of the United States” published in the Federal Register on June 29, 2015. The Rule became effective on August 28, 2015. temporary pools and arrears close to any other body of water with a connection to a navigable

Exhibit 1: List of pipeline accidents in the United States in the 21st century from 2001 to 20151

Year 2000

1. On January 13, 2000 Koch Industries agreed to pay a \$35 million fine, due to a series of oil pipeline leaks in six states - Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Alabama, Louisiana and Missouri - including 300 leaks from 1990 to 1997. One of the allegations was the leaks were from a lack of maintenance of the pipelines. The EPA said it was the biggest civil fine levied under the Clean Water Act. The settlement resolved two lawsuits charging that for years Koch’s pipeline subsidiary had left thousands of miles of pipeline in disrepair. [2]
2. On January 21, a Chevron pipeline leaked from a welding flaw near Corinne, Utah, spilling about 100 barrels of Diesel fuel. The product spread over 38 acres of salt flat and wetlands used by birds. About 75% to 80% of the spill was intentionally burned to eliminate itY)[4]
3. An Equilon Pipeline Co. crude oil line was ruptured on January 21 off of the Louisiana coast, by an eight-ton anchor dropped by a ship. About 94,000 gallons of crude oil were spilled, creating a slick 2 miles wide by 7 miles long. [5][6]
4. On January 27, in Winchester, Kentucky, a Marathon Oil pipeline accident released about 490,000 US gallons (1,900,000 L) of crude oil. NTSB investigators found a dent on the bottom of the pipe in the rupture area. Marathon spent about \$ 7.1 million in response to the accident. [7][8]
5. On February 5, a pipeline failed and spilled over 192,000 US gallons (730,000 L) of crude oil in the John Heinz National Wildlife Refuge in Pennsylvania. The source of the spill was a break in a miter bend in the pipe, which was estimated to be at least 50 years old. [9][10]
6. An Explorer petroleum products pipeline failed in Greenville, Texas, on March 9. The 28-inch pipeline ruptured and released 13,436 barrels (2,136.2 nr’) of gasoline. The released gasoline eventually reached East Caddo Creek. The banks of the tributary and creek contained the escaping gasoline as it flowed away from the ruptured pipe. The probable cause of the pipeline failure was corrosion-fatigue cracking that initiated at the edge of the longitudinal seam weld at a likely Rreexisting weld defect. Contributing to the failure was the loss of pipe coating integrity.’)
7. A pipeline released fuel oil at Chalk Point near Aquasco, Maryland, on April 7. The Piney Point Oil Pipeline system, which was owned by the Potomac Electric Power Company (Pepco), experienced a pipe failure at the Chalk Point Generating Station in southeastern Prince George’s County, Maryland. The release was not discovered and addressed by the contract operating company, Support Terminal Services, Inc., until the late afternoon. Approximately 140,400 US gallons (531,000 L) of fuel oil were released into the surrounding wetlands and Swanson Creek and, subsequently, the Patuxent River as a result of the accident. No injuries were caused by the accident, which cost approximately \$71 million for environmental response and clean-up operations.l’f
8. A Colonial Pipeline Co. line failed near Greensboro, North Carolina on May 19. At least 714 gallons (17 barrels) of kerosene spilled, some of which entered a pond that flows into a tributary of the East Fork Deep River. The kerosene spill caused a sheen about 40 feet by 40 feet in the pond. As a result of this, and six other frevious Colonial Pipeline accidents, the EPA fined Colonial \$34 million in 2003. [3]
9. On June 7, a stopple fitting weld failed on a Wolverine Pipeline Company line, causing a rupture releasing 75,000 US gallons (280,000 L) of gasoline into the environment, and causing the evacuation of more than 500 houses in Blackman Charter Township, Michigan. The failure caused the shutdown of 30% of Michigan’s gasoline supplies for nine days, contaminated a creek which flows into the Grand River, and a railroad track near the failure site was shut down for a week. Later tests found 715 anomalies in this pipeline. Wolverine later agreed to pay for switching houses in the area from local water wells to a city water source.[14][15]
10. On July 5, two boats hit a Southern Natural Gas pipeline off the coast of Plaquemines, Louisiana, causing a gas fire that burned five members of the boat crews. The fire could be seen at 35 miles away from it.[16][17]
11. On August 19, a 30-inch diameter El Paso Natural Gas pipeline rupture and fire near Carlsbad, New Mexico killed 12 members of an extended family camping over 600 feet (180 m) from the rupture point. The force of the escaping gas created a 51-foot (16 m) wide crater about 113 feet (34 m) along the pipe. A 49-foot (15 m) section of the pipe was ejected from the crater, in three pieces measuring approximately 3 feet (0.91 m), 20 feet (6.1 m), and 26 feet (7.9 m) in length. The largest piece of pipe was found about 287 feet (87 m) northwest of the crater. The cause of the failure was determined to be severe internal corrosion of that pipeline. On July 26, 2007, a USDOJ Consent Decree was later entered into by the pipeline owner to perform pipeline system upgrades to allow better . I’ P’ . [18][19] interna pipe me inspections,
12. On August 20, a gas pipeline exploded and burned in Concord, North Carolina. A nearby . shopping mall was evacuated, but,

there were no injuries. [20]

13. On August 24, a 6-inch pipeline operated by Chevron failed from alleged external corrosion, spilling 126,000 gallons of crude oil into an unnamed creek, near Snyder, Texas. The creek was dry at the time. Later, a Federal Court ruled that the Clean Water Act did not apply, since there was no water flowing in the creek at the time.[21][22]
14. For the second time in 24 hours, a state contractor building a noise wall along the 1-475 in Toledo, Ohio struck an underground pipeline, and for a second time the contractor blamed faulty pipeline mapping for the accident. In this incident, the pipe was a 6-inch gas pipeline. The crew was digging a hole with an auger for a noise-wall support on September 8, when it hit the underground pipe less than 500 meters from the previous day's incident.
15. A bulldozer ruptured a 12-inch diameter NGL pipeline on State Route 36 south of Abilene, Texas on September 7. An Abilene police detective, with 21 years of service, was severely burned when the vapors ignited, and he later died. Nearby, a woman saved herself by going underwater in her swimming pool. Her house was destroyed by the explosion and fire. The owner of the pipeline, ExxonMobil, was later fined by the Texas Railroad Commission for the pipeline not being marked. [23][24][25][26]
16. On November 3, a front end loader punctured an 8-inch pipeline carrying Diesel fuel in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania. Diesel fuel sprayed 40 feet (12 m) into the air. The fuel flowed for over 2 hours before stopping, and contaminating the area with more than 40,000 US gallons (150,000 L) of Diesel fuel.[27]

Year 2001

17. On January 17 and 18, a series of gas explosion hit downtown Hutchinson, Kansas, resulting in 2 deaths, and 2 buildings being destroyed. Later, it was discovered that gas was leaking from an underground gas storage cavern in the area. [28][29]
18. A 12-inch natural gas pipeline exploded in Weatherford, Texas on March 22. No one was injured, but the blast created a hole in the ground about 15 feet (4.6 m) in diameter and the explosion was felt several miles away.
19. On April 1, a Dome Pipeline in North Dakota carrying gasoline ruptured and burst into flames a few miles west of Bottineau, North Dakota. An estimated 1.1 million US gallons (4,200 rrr') of gasoline burned before the pipeline could be shut down. The company attributed the break to damage by an "outside force," which A Bottineau County Sheriff said appeared to be frost that melted at uneven rates, twisting and breaking the pipeline. [30]
20. On April 14, a 6-inch petroleum productions failed near Harwood, North Dakota, spilling 40 barrels of fuel oil. There were no injuries. The failure was due to an ER W seam failure, with this particular pipeline having had other ERW seam failures in the past in 1987 and 1993yf)
21. A MAPCO 10-inch propane pipeline exploded and burned, in Platte County, Missouri, on May 1. 13,500 barrels of propane were burned. [32][33][34]
22. A bulldozer being used in Taylor County, Texas hit a f;etroleum pipeline on May 24, causing a large petroleum fire. There were no injuries. 35]
23. On June 13, in Pensacola, Florida, at least ten persons were injured when two natural gas lines ruptured and exploded after a parking lot gave way beneath a cement truck at a car dealership. The blast sent chunks of concrete flying across a four-lane road, and several employees and customers at neighboring businesses were evacuated. About 25 cars at the dealership and ten boats at a neighboring business were damaged or destroyed.
24. On July 24, a pipeline ruptured and spread burning gasoline near Manheim, Pennsylvania.[36][37]
25. At approximately 5:05 a.m. MST, on August 11, an EI Paso Natural Gas 24-inch gas transmission pipeline failed near Williams, Arizona, resulting in the release of natural gas. The natural gas continued to discharge for about an hour before iriting. Stress corrosion cracking was determined to be the cause of the failure.[38][39]
26. On August 12, a bulldozer hit a 14-inch LP gas ~ifreline near Weatherford, Texas, causing a massive fire. One person was injured. 40 [41]
27. On August 17, an Oklahoma crude oil pipeline ruptured after being struck by a machine cleaning roadside ditches, sending oil 30 feet (9.1 m) into the air and damaging nearby cotton crops with up to 150,000 US gallons (570,000 L) spilled.(42)
28. On September 3, at approximately 1 p.m. CST, a rupture occurred near the intersection of the 22-inch T-ML Pipeline and the Black Bayou in Louisiana, resulting in the release of an estimated 8.00 mmcfto 13.00 mmcf of natural gas. In addition, the liquids loss is estimated to be 15,000 gallons.[43]
29. On October 4, a drunken man used a rifle to shoot a hole in the Alaskan Pipeline. More than 285,000 gallons of crude oil were spilled, costing more \$13 million to clean up. The man was later convicted in Court. [44]
30. On October 15, a 6-inch ConocoPhillips LPG pipeline failed near Sweeny, Texas, forcing 2 dozen residents to evacuate. About 195,000 gallons of LPG were lost.[45][46]
31. On or about November 27, approximately 2,575 barrels of Jet A Kerosene (Jet Fuel) discharged from the P-62 pipeline of the TEPPCO Pipeline System into tributaries of the Neches River and the Neches River itself. The release occurred 4 miles southeast of Vidor, Texas. This spill was caused by disbonded coating and external corrosion on the pipeline. This incident was later part of a U.S. Environmental Protection Agency consent decree. [47]
32. On December 14, an anhydrous ammonia spill near Algona, Iowa killed nearly 1.3 million fish, the largest fish kill on that state's record-to-date, Iowa state officials said. More than 58,000 US gallons (220,000 L) of anhydrous ammonia over a nine-hour period spilled into Lotts Creek and the Des Moines River, killing minnows, bass and other game fish. Koch Industries

owned the 8-inch pipeline, and was doing maintenance work on a valve on the pipeline. The plume drifted over a six-mile (10 km) area causing officials to evacuate residents in its path.[48]

Year 2002

33. On February 8, a trenching machine with a new rock bit being tested hit a 20-inch gas transmission pipeline in Noble County, Oklahoma, causing an explosion that killed the trencher operator.[49]
34. On March 6, an explosion and a massive fire hit a Tennessee Gas Pipeline natural gas substation near Mount Sterling, Kentucky. 30 families in the area voluntarily evacuated. There were no injuriesYO)[51)
35. On March 13, a Buckeye Partners pipeline ruptured due to internal corrosion in Wren, Ohio, spilling about 1500 gallons of gasoline. [52]
36. On or about March 13, approximately 20 barrels of oil or jet fuel were discharged from a portion of the Plantation Pipeline in Alexandria, Virginia, some of which entered into an unnamed tributary of Hooff Run and its adjoining shorelines. The pipeline failure appears to have resulted from a hole in the pipeline caused by high-voltage arcing between the pipeline and a utility pole anchor.!
37. On March 15, a failure occurred on a 36-inch gas pipeline near Crystal Falls, Michigan. The failure resulted in a release of gas, which did not ignite, that created a crater 30 feet (9.1 m) deep, 30 feet (9.1 m) wide, and 120 feet (37 m) long. There were no deaths or injuries. [53]
38. On April 6, a BP-Amoco pipeline ruptured and released about 100,000 US gallons (380,000 L) of oil into a coastal area known as Little Lake in Louisiana.[42]
39. An 8-inch petroleum products pipeline failed on May 22, spilling about 2,000 barrels of unleaded gasoline on to a wheat field near Ottawa, Kansas. Booms had to be deployed in nearby creeks. The pipe failed along a seam, possibly due to LF-ERW pipeline failure issues.(54)
40. On June 20, PHMSA ordered Columbia Gas Transmission Company to do extensive repair to one of their gas transmission pipelines in the states of Pennsylvania and New York, after finding extensive wall thinning on sections of that pipeline system caused by external corrosion. Approximately 800 anomalies with wall thickness losses of greater than 65 percent were found during a smart pig examination, with 76 of the found anomalies having a wall thickness loss of greater than 80 percent. Many of the affected sections of pipe were older sections lacking coating, which is known to reduce external corrosion on pipelines. [55)
41. On July 4, there was a rupture of an Enbridge Pipeline, and release of crude oil near Cohasset, Minnesota. The pipeline ruptured in a marsh in Itasca County, spilling 6,000 barrels (950 nr') of crude oil. In an attempt to keep the oil from contaminating the Mississippi River, the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources set a controlled burn that lasted for one day and created a smoke plume about 1 mile (1.6 km) high and 5 miles (8 km) long. The pipe failed due to cracking caused by train shipping induced cracking of the pipe being delivered. [56)
42. A gas explosion on July 24 leveled a Hopkinton, Massachusetts house, killing a 4-yearold girl and her 5-year-old sister. A failed sleeve on the gas line in the basement of the house was suspected of being the cause.[57)
43. On August 5, a natural gas pipeline exploded and caught fire west of Rt. 622, on Poca River Road near Lanham, West Virginia. Emergency workers evacuated three or four families. Kanawha and Putnam Counties in the area were requested Shelter-In-Place. Parts of the Pipeline were thrown hundreds of yards away, around, and across Poca River. The Fire was not contained for several hours because valves to shutdown line did not exist. The Orange Glow from the fire at 11 PM; could be seen for several milesY8] The explosion and fire caused in \$2,735,339 property damage.[59]
44. At approximately 22: 10on Friday, September 20, a gasoline leak from an 8-inch pipeline operated by Cenex Pipeline (terminal) was discovered near Glendive, Montana. The release of approximately 1,000 barrels (160 rrr') of unleaded gasoline flowed into Seven Mile Creek, and then downstream to its confluence with the Yellowstone River. Several trenches were constructed near the ruptured pipe for product collection points. As of September 25,2002, a vacuum truck had recovered approximately 21,000 US ~allons (79,000 L) of gasoline [and water] from the boomed locations and trenches.!'?' 61]
45. On November 2, a Chevron pipeline ruptured near Corinne, Utah, spilling about 450 barrels of petroleum. The cause was from external corrosion. [62]
46. A farmer plowing a field hit and ruptured a Williams Companies pipeline on December 10, near Lawrence, Kansas. About 4,700 gallons of gasoline were spilled. Later, it was noted that particular pipeline lacked soil coverage in places, including some exposed spots. There were no injuries. [63][64)

Year 2003

47. An Enbridge crude oil pipeline ruptured at a terminal in Douglas County, Wisconsin on January 24. Some of the crude oil flowed into the Nemadji River. Over 100,000 US gallons (380,000 L) were spilled.[30)
48. A natural gas pipeline ruptured near Viola, Illinois on February 2, resulting in the release of natural gas which ignited. A 16-foot section of the pipe fractured into three sections, which were ejected to distances of about 300 yards from the failure site.[65)
49. A 24-inch gas transmission pipeline started leaking in Scott County, Missouri, underneath the MississWpi River on February 20. A shifted pipeline weight has caused damage to the pipeline. 66)
50. On or about February 22, 2003, approximately 788 barrels of gasoline were discharged from a portion of Plantation Pipeline in Hull, Georgia, some of which entered into an unnamed tributary of East Sandy Creek and its adjoining shorelines. The spill

resulted from a failed gasket on a buried block valve.

51. Dropping temperatures caused an Enbridge pipeline to fail in Samaria, Michigan on February 27. 130 barrels of crude oil were spilled.
52. On March 13, a seam failed on an 8-inch Dixie Pipeline propane line near Appling, Georgia, releasing about 110,000 gallons of propane. There were no injuries. The pipe split due to seam failure. [67][68]
53. On March 23, a 24-inch EI Paso Natural Gas pipeline near Eaton, Colorado exploded. The explosion sent flames 160 meters in the air, forcing evacuations. No one was injured. The heat from the flames melted the siding of two nearby houses and started many smaller grass fires. [69]
54. On April 1, a 12-inch ConocoPhillips petroleum products pipeline ruptured, spilling about 1,000 barrels of Diesel fuel near Ponca City, Oklahoma, with the fuel getting into Doga Creek. There were no injuries. Low Frequency ERW pipe seam failure was suspected as the cause. [70]
55. On May 1, a 26-inch Williams Companies natural gas transmission pipeline failed near Lake Tapps, Washington. A neighboring elementary school, a supermarket, and 30 to 40 houses in approximately a 4-mile (6.4 km) area were evacuated. There was no fire or injuries. Land movement was suspected at first, but the failure was later determined to be from stress corrosion cracking. There were four previous failures on this pipeline in the preceding eight years. [71][72]
56. An 8-inch LPG pipeline failed near Lebanon, Ohio on May 8. About 80 houses and one school in the area were evacuated. There was no fire or injuries. [73]
57. A 30-inch gas pipeline exploded and burned near Nederland, Texas on May 20. The cause of the failure was internal corrosion, and the damages were estimated to be \$6,901,322. [74][75]
58. Excavation damage to a natural gas distribution line resulted in an explosion and fire in Wilmington, Delaware on July 2. A contractor hired by the city of Wilmington to replace sidewalk and curbing, dug into an unmarked natural gas service line with a backhoe. Although the service line did not leak where it was struck, the contact resulted in a break in the line inside the basement of a nearby building, where gas began to accumulate. A manager for the contractor said that he did not smell gas and therefore did not believe there was imminent danger and that he called an employee of the gas company and left a voice mail message. At approximately 1:44 p.m., an explosion destroyed two residences and damaged two others to the extent that they had to be demolished. Other nearby residences sustained some damage, and the residents on the block were displaced from their houses for about a week. Three contractor employees sustained serious injuries. Eleven additional people sustained minor injuries. [6]
59. On July 3 a jury found Texas-New Mexico Pipeline (TNMP) Company guilty of fraud, gross negligence and willful misconduct in concealing a 1992 crude oil pipeline leak beneath a Midland, Texas residential subdivision, before selling the pipeline to EOTT Energy in 1999. Oil was discovered in the water table in late 2000, and in March 2001 a group of Midland residents sued EOTT, TNMP and Equilon. Residents living on affected land also received settlements. The spill was estimated in 2003 to be 9,000-13,000 barrels. 190 boxes full of TNMP documents about the pipeline dating from the late 1980s to early 1990s (prior to EOTT Energy taking over the pipeline) were dug up from a 45-foot-deep hole at a site along the company's pipeline in New Mexico. [78]
60. A 16-inch Citgo petroleum products pipeline failed in Cook County, Illinois on July 10. About 25 barrels of gasoline were spilled from the pipeline. A crack in the pipe had developed at a dent. There was no fire or injured reported. [79]
61. On July 16, a 12 3/4-inch pipeline burst in Barnes County, North Dakota, releasing 9,000 barrels of propane, which ignited. There were no casualties. During repairs, mechanical damage was seen on 2 nearby section of this pipeline. [80]
62. On July 30, a Kinder Morgan pipeline in Tucson, Arizona ruptured, and sprayed 16,548 gallons of gasoline on five houses under construction, and flooding nearby streets with gasoline. The resulting pipeline closure caused major gas shortages and price increases in the state. The failure at first was thought to be from LF-ERW flaws, but tests showed it was due to stress corrosion cracking. A hydrostatic test that was performed on this pipeline after repairs failed again 40 feet (12 m) from the first failure. [81][82][83][84][85]
63. A 26-inch Kinder Morgan and Myria Holdings Natural Gas Pipeline Company of America transmission pipeline ruptured in Caddo County, Oklahoma on August 8, releasing about 84,000 MCF of natural gas. A 54-foot long section of 26" diameter pipe had blown out and landed 30 feet from the ditch. Evacuations took place within 3/4 of a mile from the release, but there was no fire or casualties. Stress corrosion cracking was identified as the pipe failure's cause. [86]
64. On September 26, a propane pipeline at the Phillips Petroleum storage facility in Cahokia, Illinois ruptured, sending flames high into the air and sparking small grass fires in the area.
65. On October 6, a 12-inch petroleum products pipeline ruptured in Johnson County, Kansas, spilling about 100 to 200 barrels of Diesel fuel. Some of the Diesel contaminated a nearby waterway. There were no injuries. [87]
66. A failure on an Enbridge pipeline near Bay City, Michigan spilled 500 barrels of crude oil on October 13. [88][89]
67. A leak on what was originally the Big Inch 24-inch of natural gas occurred in Orange County, Indiana on October 14. There were no injuries or evacuations. The pipeline had been installed in 1943. [90]
68. On November 2, a Texas Eastern Transmission natural gas pipeline exploded in Bath County, Kentucky, about 1.5 km south of a Duke Energy pumping station. A fire burned for about an hour before firefighters extinguished it. No one was injured and no property damage was reported. [30]
69. An 8-inch Buckeye Partners pipeline failed near Mazon, Illinois on November 9. While repairs were being tested on this pipe-

line on November 14, another section of this pipeline failed about 1500 feet from the first leak. About ten barrels of gasoline and Diesel fuel were spilled by the two leaks, requiring soil removal. External corrosion caused both failures. There were no injuries. [91]

70. Another section of the same Williams Companies gas transmission pipeline that failed on May 1, 2003, failed in Lewis County, Washington on December 13. There was no fire this time. Gas flowed for three hours before being shut off. Gas pressure had already been reduced 20% on this pipeline after the May 1 explosion. External corrosion and stress corrosion cracking were seen in this failed area of pipe. [72]

Year 2004

71. A TEPPCO 8-inch propane pipeline failed on January 25, near Davenport, New York.

The propane ignited, destroying a trailer house, and forcing evacuations. About 5,000 barrels of propane were burned. There were no injuries. The incident resulted from a through-wall failure of the pipe material at a fitting that was attached to the top of the pipe. [2][93]

72. On March 12, a TEPPCO pipeline spilled about 500 barrels of unleaded gasoline spilled into the Moro Creek, which flows into the Sabine River near Kingsland, Arkansas. The cause was corrosion of a 1-inch bleeder line, that was part of a 20-inch pipeline block valve used to equalize pressure across the valve. [47]

73. On April 28, a petroleum pipeline of Kinder Morgan Energy Partners ruptured, and spilled an estimated 103,000 gallons of Diesel fuel into marshes, adjacent to Suisun Bay, in Northern California. The line failed from external corrosion. The company failed to notify California authorities about the spill for 18 hours, a failure for which it was later cited. (30)[94][95]

74. On May 23, a leak in a sampling tube on a pipeline in Renton, Washington spilled several thousand gallons of gasoline, which ignited. [6]

75. A series of explosions starting on August 19 hit an underground natural gas storage cavern in Moss Bluff, Texas, resulting in evacuations for a 3-mile radius. The first blast, about 4 a.m., sent flames 150 to 200 feet into the air. The second explosion was seen as far as 20 miles away. Some type of equipment failure was suspected. The cavern had just been expanded using the SMUG (solution mining under gas) process, which permits salt cavern expansion without interrupting gas storage operations. There were no injuries reported. [1][7][98]

76. On August 21, a natural gas explosion destroyed a residence located at in DuBois, Pennsylvania. Two residents were killed in this accident. The NTSB determined that the probable cause of the leak, explosion, and fire was the fracture of a defective butt-fusion joint. [99]

77. A vandal started up a trackhoe at a construction site in New Caney, Texas, and dug into a propylene pipeline on September 26. The escaping propylene ignited, causing nearby residents to evacuate. There were no injuries reported. [100]

78. On September 27, 2004, near Blair, Nebraska, an ammonia pipeline failed, releasing 193,213 pounds of ammonia, resulting in the hospitalization of one individual and emergency responders evacuated houses within a one-mile circumference of the break. An estimated 1,000 fish were killed along North Creek and in a golf course pond. [101]

79. A pipeline failed in Hughes County, Oklahoma on September 28, spilling an estimated 1,500 barrels (240 m³) of Diesel fuel. [102]

80. Crews from Shell Oil Company recovered 100,000 of an oil seawater mix in October.

Hurricane Ivan had damaged a crude oil pipeline off of the Louisiana Coast. [103]

81. On October 27, an anhydrous ammonia pipeline ruptured near Kingman, Kansas, and released approximately 4,858 barrels (772.4 m³) of anhydrous ammonia. Nobody was killed or injured due to the release. The anhydrous ammonia leak killed more than 20,000 fish along a 12.5-mile section of Smoots Creek, including some from threatened species. The pipeline had previous damage to it. The pipeline controller had misinterpreted the leak as other problems with the system operation, causing the leak to go on longer. As a result of this, and another ammonia pipeline leak the month before, the pipeline owner and its two operating companies were later fined \$3.65 million. [104]

82. A construction crew ruptured a high-pressure gas line in Little Rock, Arkansas on November 1, near one of the state's busiest intersections Mondar' triggering a fire that melted traffic lights that hung overhead. No one was injured. [105]

83. On November 8, a NGL pipeline failed in a housing division in Ivel, Kentucky. The vapor cloud from the leak ignited, seriously burning a Kentucky State Trooper evacuating

those living in the area. Eight others were injured and five houses were destroyed. The pipeline, only 65 miles (105 km) long, had 11 previous corrosion failures. [106]

84. On November 9, in Walnut Creek, California, a petroleum pipeline carrying gasoline to San Jose, California, owned and operated by Kinder Morgan Energy Partners (KMEP) was struck by a backhoe used by Mountain Cascade, Inc., a contractor operating in the construction of a water pipeline for the East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD). A large gasoline spill was subsequently ignited, resulting in an explosive fireball that caused the deaths, by burns, of four workers and one supervisor and the severe injury of five others. A Kinder Morgan worker had misread an as-built map, and had incorrectly marked the pipeline's route before the accident. [108]

85. On November 21, a 14-inch petroleum products pipeline sprung a leak while it was shipping gasoline in the Mojave Desert. The Calnev Pipeline, owned and operated by the California-Nevada Pipeline Company, a subsidiary of Kinder-Morgan Energy Partners, is the main source of petroleum fuel products for the Las Vegas Valley, Nevada. An 80-foot (24 m) geyser of gasoline was discovered on the next morning, after numerous complaints of a strong gasoline odor along Interstate 15 in

northern San Bernardino County, CA.[I09][1 10)

86. Employees were performing maintenance on a propane pipeline near Mantador, North Dakota on December 15, when a gasket on the pipeline's valve failed, causing a leak. Nearby residents were evacuated, and a rail line was shut down temporarily. There were no injuries.[III]
87. As much as 5,000 gallons of crude oil spilled on December 24 from a ConocoPhillips pipeline south of Laurel, Montana near the Yellowstone River. Hydrogen sulfide gas from the oil could have posed a major danger, but "the wind helped immensely" to dissipate the gas. [112]

Year 2005

88. In January, a Mid-Valley owned and Sunoco operated pipeline ruptured, spilling 260,000 US gallons (980,000 L) of oil into the Kentucky and Ohio rivers. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency fined the companies \$2.5 million for the spill. [113]
89. On January 18, an Enbridge pipeline failed from temperature problems, causing a spill of 100 barrels of crude oil in Bay City, Michigan. The pipe was just two years old at the time.[189][114]
90. On January 26, a Mid Valley 22-inch pipeline ruptured in Carrollton, Kentucky, spilling about 290,000 gallons of crude oil. Some of the crude entered the Ohio River. The pipe failure was caused by earth movement. [I 15][116]
91. An ExxonMobil gasoline pipeline fire forced 43 families from their houses near Allentown, Pennsylvania on February 1. The fire burned for over 72 hours. There were no reported injuries.[117][118]
92. On or about February 28, 2005, approximately 2,497 barrels of Jet A Kerosene discharged from a 14-inch TEPPCO pipeline, reaching the Big Cow Creek, flowing into the Sabine River, near Newton, Texas. The discharge was caused by the over-tightening of a coupling at a 3/8-inch cooling line at the top of a 14-inch mainline pump. [4
93. On March 16, a crew installing a communications cable nicked a gas distribution pipeline in Moon Township, Pennsylvania. The crew then notified the local One Call center, but, failed to alert first responders. Two hours after the nick, gas exploded in a house, burning two teenagers there.!' 9]
94. A Kinder Morgan Energy Partners petroleum products pipeline was found to be leaking gasoline, near Truckee, California, on April 1. Gasoline spread into Summit Creek, then, into Donner Lake. About 300 gallons spilled.Y20)[121]
95. On May 13, an underground natural gas pipeline exploded near Marshall, Texas, sending a giant fireball into the sky and hurling a 160-foot (49 m) section of pipe onto the grounds of a nearby electric power generating plant. Two people were hurt. The OPS concluded that stress corrosion cracking was the culprit.Y2]
96. On May 13, the 30-inch Seaway Pipeline, operated by TEPPCO at the time, failed in Bryan County, Oklahoma, spilling approximately 898 barrels of crude oil. Oil reached Eastman Creek. The discharge was caused by a 6-inch longitudinal seam split on the pipeline that resulted from a stress crack that may have been induced by conditions occurring during rail transport of the pipe, and enlarged by pressure-cycle-induced stresses over years of operation of the pipeline.[47][12)
97. On May 23, a Magellan Pipeline petroleum products pipeline broke near Kansas City, Kansas, spilling gasoline into the nearby Missouri River. About 2,936 barrels of gasoline were spilled, with about 2,400 barrels being lost.[124][125)
98. A 12-inch (300 mm) Kinder Morgan Energy Partners pipeline ruptured in El Paso, Texas on May 28, releasing gasoline.[126
99. On August 11, a bulldozer hit a crude oil pipeline north of Lufkin, Texas. The escaping crude ignited, injuring the bulldozer operator. About 18,500 gallons of crude oil were lost. [127][128)
100. On August 18, a leak was detected in an insulating flange along the BP Amoco Whiting to River Rouge pipeline at a monitoring well in Granger, Indiana. Initially, the bolts and nuts were replaced around the flange to mitigate any leaks; on August 25, when supply concerns diminished, the insulating flange was cut out and replaced with a straight section of pipe. Approximately 21 gallons of gasoline were removed from the ground, with no injuries or fatalities. Metallurgical analysis revealed that the fiber ring joint gasket had evidence of a prior leak.[12]
101. Hurricane Katrina caused a protective levee to fail near Nairn in Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana, causing a Shell 20-inch pipeline to rupture on August 29. About 13,400 gallons were spilled, with about 10,500 gallons of this spill reaching the shoreline, and coastal marshes_(130)
102. A pipeline pumping station employee was killed in Monroe, Ohio, when leaking propane was ignited and exploded by an arc-ing pump on September 18. Flames reached 300 feet (91 m) high in the following fire.Y31]
103. A natural gas compressor station exploded near Rifle, Colorado on December 6, about 200 yards from Interstate 70. There was only one minor injury to a nearby truck driver.[132]
104. On December 13, workers removing an underground oil tank in Bergenfield, New Jersey undermined a 1 1/4-inch steel gas pipeline. The gas line later failed, causing an explosion. Three residents of a nearby apartment building were killed. Four other residents and a tank removal worker were injured. Failure to evacuate the apartment building after the gas line ruptured was listed as a contributing factor.[133]

Year 2006

105. On February 28, a gas compressor station explosion severely burned a worker, and set off a raging fire near De Beque, Colorado. A second explosion at that site soon after caused no injuries.(134)
106. The Prudhoe Bay oil spill: On March 2, a surveillance crew discovered a crude oil spill from a BP crude pipeline near North Slope Borough, Alaska. The pipeline failure resulted in a release currently estimated at 5,000 barrels (790 m³) of processed

crude oil, impacting the arctic tundra and covering approximately 2 acres (8,100 m²) of permafrost. The pipeline's leak detection system was not effective in recognizing and identifying the failure. Failure to run cleaning pigs to remove internal corrosive build up. The failure caused crude oil price to spike throughout the World.[135][136]

107. On March 23, a pipeline failed west of Toledo, Ohio, spilling about 200 barrels (32 m³) of unleaded gasoline. During the repair work, another smaller nearby leak was also found.[137]
108. On April 17, a Plantation Pipeline line experienced a failure in Henrico County, near Richmond, Virginia. The failure resulted in the release of 23,226 gallons of jet fuel in a residential area. The jet fuel sprayed for approximately 14 minutes and the spray traveled the distance of approximately 200 feet (61 m). The jet fuel did not ignite.[138][139]
109. On June 27, a Koch Industries pipeline carrying crude oil failed near the town of Little Falls, Minnesota. The pipeline estimated that approximately 3,200 barrels (510 m³) of crude oil were released. The pipeline failed from previous mechanical damage to the pipeline.[140][141]
110. On July 22, a Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company gas transmission pipeline ruptured, resulting in an estimated release of 42,946,000 cu ft (1,216,100 m³) of natural gas near Clay City in Clark County, Kentucky. The gas ignited, but there were no injuries, and just minor property damage. External corrosion was suspected.[142][143]
111. A Kinder Morgan petroleum pipeline failed in Romeoville, Illinois on August 12. About 59,000 US gallons (220,000 L) of butane were lost. External corrosion was the cause, but there were no injuries.[144][145]
112. On September 29, a crew replacing an old pipeline hit a high pressure gas pipeline in Labette County, Kansas, killing a crewman. Resident with a mile of the incident were evacuated for a time.[146]
113. On October 12, a pipeline exploded when a tugboat pushing two barges hit that pipeline Thursday in West Cote Blanche Bay, about two miles (3 km) from shore and 100 miles (160 km) southwest of New Orleans, Louisiana. Four crew members were killed, and two were missing and later presumed dead.[147][148]
114. An ammonia pipeline failed from corrosion near Clay Center, Kansas on October 25, releasing about 4500 barrels of ammonia. Two people were injured by the fumes.[149]
115. A jet-black, 300-acre (1.2 km²) burn site surrounded the skeletal hulk of a bulldozer that struck a natural-gas pipeline during construction of another pipeline, on November 11, and produced a powerful explosion near Cheyenne, Wyoming. The bulldozer operator was killed. The company building the new pipeline was fined \$2.3 million for failing to obtain a locate on the other pipeline.[150][151]
116. On or about November 27, 2006, approximately 97 barrels of gasoline were discharged from a portion of Plantation Pipeline in Mecklenburg County, North Carolina, into Paw Creek and its adjoining shorelines. The leak resulted from a failed gasket on an aboveground block valve.”
117. On December 19, a lineman for Midwest Energy hit a natural gas transmission pipeline near Mason, Michigan. The lineman was killed in the following explosion and fire.[152][153]
118. A Plains All American Pipeline ruptured on December 24, spilling about 23,856 gallons of crude oil in the Gulf of Mexico, about 30 miles southeast of Galveston, Texas. [154][155]

Year 2007

119. On January 1, an Enbridge pipeline that runs from Superior, Wisconsin to near Whitewater, Wisconsin failed, resulting in a spill of 1,500 barrels of crude oil onto farmland and into a drainage ditch. Incomplete fusion of a longitudinal weld at the pipe maker that failed as pressure cycle was established as the cause.[156][157]
120. On February 2, a construction crew struck an Enbridge pipeline in Rusk County, Wisconsin with equipment, spilling 4,800 barrels (760 m³) of crude oil, of which only 2,066 barrels were recovered.[158] Some of the oil filled a hole more than 20 feet (6.1 m) deep and was reported to have contaminated the local water table.[159]
121. On Feb 17, in a rural area of Harris County, Texas, a Tennessee Gas Pipeline transmission pipeline was damaged, and later exploded and burned. Grass fires spread across a three-square mile rural area. There were no injuries.[160][161]
122. On March 29, near Yutan, Nebraska, a pipeline was hit by construction equipment. About 1,697 barrels of natural gasoline were lost. [162][163]
123. On April 27, a 22-inch gas transmission pipeline failed near near Pawnee, Illinois. The failure ejected a 109 inch long section of pipe, and, releasing 38 mmcf of natural gas that ignited. The rupture and resulting fire required the evacuation of a residence and the death of farm animals. The failure was due to external corrosion.[164]
124. A backhoe helping to lay a gas pipeline hit another gas pipeline on May 4 in Weatherford, Texas. The gas ignited, sending flames hundreds of feet into the air. Vehicles, equipment, and power lines in the area were destroyed, but, there were no injuries. (165)
125. May 16: 63,000 US gallons (240,000 L) of gasoline spilled into an old stripping pit that covers a three-acre area in Coal Township, Pennsylvania. The Kerris and Helfrick company owns the property where the gas leak occurred, and the excavator, was working for the company when he accidentally ruptured the Sunoco Logistics 14-inch petroleum pipeline. The gasoline was mostly absorbed into areas of soil, fill and coal strippings at the site.[166] Several residents made U.S. Rep. Christopher P. Carney aware of complaints about gasoline odors in residential basements. “Moreover, many residents are legitimately concerned about groundwater contamination as well as a host of future problems associated with the spill,” Carney wrote to Department of Environmental Protection Secretary Kathleen McGinty. [167] The pipeline was installed in 1964 by the Atlantic Richfield Co.(ARCO) and purchased in 1990 by Sunoco. On Sept. 29, the PADEP Environmental Cleanup program final-

ized a consent order and agreement with Mallard Contracting, which included a \$45,000 civil penalty covering both DEP's response costs and a fine for violations of the Pa. Solid Waste Management Act.[168]

126.The 2007 New York City steam explosion, on July 18.

127.In August, a gas compressor turbine caught fire inside BP's Gathering Center 1 in Alaska, after an oil hose ruptured and spewed flammable liquid across the motor. A mechanic on patrol in the facility - seeing smoke - fled the room as the turbine burst into flames. Automatic fire and gas alarms were never triggered. A subsequent investigation by Alaska state authorities found that a ruptured hydraulic oil hose was Jerry-rigged in a position that chafed against the turbine's hot engine. The investigation also found that the facility's fire and gas detectors were not powered on at the time.[169]

128.On October 8, a gas pipeline at a gas storage facility in Salem, Michigan ruptured and caught fire. Siding was melted on nearby houses.[170]

129.An ethylene pipeline explosion early on October 18, was heard for miles around Port Arthur, Texas, waking residents. The following fire spread to a nearby butadiene pipeline, causing it to rupture and burn. Later, over 300 residents sued the pipeline's owners for health issues claimed to be caused from the chemicals released by the accident. External corrosion of the ethylene pipeline caused the first pipeline failure. [171][172]

130.A 12-inch propane pipeline exploded, killing two people, and injuring five others, near Carmichael in the southeast portion of Clarke County, Mississippi on November 1. The NTSB determined the probable cause was an LF-ERW seam failure. During hydrostatic testing of the pipeline after repair, another LF-ERW seam failed nearby. Inadequate education of residents near the pipeline about the existence of this pipeline, and how to respond to a pipeline accident, were also cited as a factors in the deaths.[173]

131.On November 12, three teen aged boys drilled into an ammonia pipeline, in Tampa Bay, Florida, causing a major ammonia leak. They later claimed they did it due to stories of money being hidden inside that pipeline. The leak took two days to be capped. One of the teens had serious chemical burns from the ammonia. Residents within a half miles from the leak were evacuated. PHMSA later noted the pipeline company failed to adequately plan for emergencies with the local Fire Agency, as required by CFR 195.402(c)(12).[174]

132.On November 13, 2007, Enbridge discovered a leak on their 34-inch Line 3, at Mile Post 912, near Clearbrook, Minnesota. Later, the pipeline exploded during repairs, on November 27, causing the deaths of two employees. DOT officials said that two Enbridge workers died in a crude oil explosion as they worked to make repairs on the former Lakehead system pipeline. Enbridge was cited for failing to safely and adequately perform' maintenance and repair activities, clear the designated work area from possible sources of ignition, and hire properly trained and qualified workersY75)[176]

133:A 30-inch gas transmission pipeline failed on November 21, near Haven, Kansas. The gas ignited, resulting in road closuresY64]

134.On December 14, two men were driving east in a pickup truck, on Interstate 20, Near Delhi, Louisiana, when a 30-inch gas transmission pipeline exploded. One of the men were killed, and the other injured. External corrosion was later identified as the cause of the failure.[177][178]

Year 2008

135.A pipeline ruptured at a fillet weld, leaking natural gasoline in Oologah, Oklahoma on January 5, 2008. 690 barrels of the gasoline were IOST.[179)(180)

136.A pipeline split oRen on January 7, near Denver City, Texas, spilling 1.3 million US gallons (4,900 m) of crude oil. The pipeline company failed to detect and stop the leak for more than 24 hours. ERW seam failure appears to be the cause.[181J[182]

137.A natural gas pipeline compressor station exploded and caught fire on February 5, near Hartsville, Tennessee, and was believed to have been caused by a tornado hitting the facility.[183) .

138.On February 15, a 20-inch distillate pipeline exploded and burned in Hidalgo County, Texas, closing road FM490'p84)

139.In an explosion that could be felt for miles, a house in a Columbia, Missouri neighborhood exploded on March 14, causing fatal injuries to the elderly couple living there. Problems with the gas distribution line there were blamed for the explosion. Another house nearby also suffered damage'p85]

140.A crew boring to install a new gas main hit an existing 4-inch gas line in McKinney, Texas on May 16. Escaping gas caused two houses to eXRlode, and one other house to catch fire. Three people were burned from this incident. [86]

141.On July 28, the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Illinois ordered Apex Oil Company Inc., to clean up ground water and soil contamination, at an expected cost of at least \$150 million. During the period 1967 through 1988, Apex Oil's legal predecessor, Clark Oil and Refining Corp., released gasoline from leaking pipelines and other spills, that commingled with other responsible parties' releases and resulted in the large plume of refined petroleum substances beneath Hartford, Illinois. Vapors from the underground plume of millions of gallons of leaked and spilled petroleum products have migrated into houses in the village, causing years of fires, explosions, and evacuations.(187)

142.A 20-inch crude oil pipeline ruptured near Golden Gate, Illinois on August 10. About 243,000 gallons of crude were spilled, with about 33,000 gallons being lost. The cause was listed as a pipe seam failureY88)(189)[190)

143.On August 25, a 24-inch gas transmission pipeline failed in a rural area west of Pilot Grove, Missouri. The longitudinal rupture in the pipe body created a 50 foot by 33-foot by 7-foot deep crater in the ground. The cause of the rupture was external corrosion.[164)

144.A 36-inch gas pipeline failed near Stairtown, Texas on August 28, causing a fire with flames 400 feet (120 m) tall. The failure

- was caused by external corrosion.[191][192)
145. On August 29, a 24-inch gas transmission pipeline ruptured in Cooper County, Missouri. Corrosion had caused the pipeline to lose 75% of its wall thickness in the failure area.[193)
146. Workers constructing a new pipeline hit an existing natural gas pipeline in Wheeler County, Texas, on September 9. Two workers were burned by this accident.[194)
147. A 30-inch Williams Companies gas pipeline ruptured and gas ignited near Appomattox, Virginia on September 14. Two houses were destroyed by the fire. External corrosion was the cause of the failure.[195][196)
148. A ruptured pipeline causes a fire at a Pipeline Terminal in Pasadena, Texas on September 23. One worker was killed, and another injured, with about 190,000 US gallons (720,000 L) of product being lost. The failure was caused by internal corrosionY97)[198)
149. On October 3, a crew working on a Turnpike expansion drill into a petroleum products pipeline in Hamilton, New Jersey. Over 25,000 US gallons (95,000 L) of Diesel fuel were spilled. [199)
150. On October 3, construction equipment hit a Mid Valley Pipeline Company pipeline in Florence, Kentucky, spilling 3,650 barrels of crude oil.[200)
151. On the night of November 15, a gas compressor for a pipeline at an entry exploded and burned near Godley, Texas. The fire spread to another company's gas compressor station next to it. A 24-inch gas pipeline had to be shut down to stop the fire. There were no injuries, and damages were estimated at \$2 millionyol)
152. A gasoline release from a Sunoco petroleum pipeline occurred on November 25, near a retail mall in Murrysville, P A. Officials said the release occurred from the 6-inch line at about 9:30 a.m. while a Sunoco Logistics crew was working on a ball valve. It was suspected the ball valve was improperly installed. The failure resulted in the evacuation of numerous stores, restaurants and roads in the immediate vicinity due to the dousing of gasoline and subsequent vapors emitting from the 11,760 US gallons (44,500 L) of spilled product. [202)

Year 2009

153. On January 4, 2009, a 6.625-inch storage well line operated by Columbia Gas Transmission Company in Elk View (near Charleston), Kanawha County, WV, ruptured due to internal corrosion pitting complicated by low impact toughness of the pipe material, causing \$29,011 in damagey03)
154. An accidental massive gas release at Pump Station 1 of the trans-Alaskan pipeline (Alyeska Pipeline Service Company) on January 15 threatened the site at the time. The company that runs the pipeline acknowledges a fire or explosion, had the gas ignited, could have imperiled the station's 60-plus workers and caused "an extended shutdown" of oil fields. There was no ignition or explosion. The incident occurred as BP workers used a cleaning device called a pig to swab oil out of an old pipeline the company was preparing to decommission. The 34-inch pipe was among major Prudhoe trunk lines found in 2006 to be ravaged with corrosion, due to BP's admitted lack of proper maintenance. A large volume of gas then bypassed the pig somehow, and rushed to Pump Station 1, a key asset through which every drop of oil coming off the North Slope must pass.[204)
155. On February 1, a gas pipeline explosion rocked the area 2 miles (3.2 km) east of Carthage, Texas.[20S)
156. On February 11, an explosion and fire occurred on a pipeline near a natural gas treatment plant, near Carthage, Texas. There were no injuriesy06)
157. A rupture of pipeline near Cygnet, Ohio, owned by Philadelphia-based Sunoco, resulted in one of the largest oil spills in Wood County history. At approximately 5 p.m. on February 18, the company discovered the release at the pump station and terminal located in Cygnet, Ohio. [207) Upon learning of the release, the company immediately shut down the pipeline, stopped operations at the pump station and terminal, notified the appropriate authorities, and began an emergency response. As of 11 :05 a.m. ET on February 19, the release had been stopped from the pipe. The damaged pipeline, which was operating at the time, released 1,250 barrels (199 rrr') of crude oil into a farm field. Eventually, 782 of the 1,250 barrels (199 rrr') released were recovered. Some of the crude oil, approximately 200 barrels (32 nr'), did contaminate a local creek. There were no fatalities, or injuries. [208)[209]
158. A gas pipeline bursts near Hobe City (near Port Salerno, Florida) on May 4, injuring two people on the Florida Turnpike from flying debris. The escaping gas does not igniteY10]
159. On May 5, a natural gas pipeline exploded and caught on fire, near Rockville, Indiana in Parke County, about 24 miles (39 km) north of Terre Haute, Indiana. The cause of this failure was determined to be external corrosion. Additional work performed as a result of this order provided significant indications of external corrosion in various sections of this line. Pictures have been released around the area showing the damage caused. 52 peoNle were evacuated in a one-mile (1.6 km) area of the explosion. No injuries reported.l'" [211)
160. An Enbridge pipeline pig sending trap in Superior, Wisconsin leaked on May 21 from operator error, spilling about 6500 gallons of crude oil. 700 cubic yards of contaminated soil had to be removedYI2)[213)
161. On July 15, an explosion occurred at a natural gas metering station under construction, while it was being pressure tested with nitrogen, in Smith Countr, Mississippi. One worker was killed, and two others injured. There was no fire.[214)
162. On August 17, a pipeline was found leaking by an aerial patrol in Atoka County, Oklahoma. 50 barrels (7.9 rrr') of Diesel fuel were estimated to have been released as a result of this accident, and none of it was recoveredp15]
163. A leaking pipeline carrying jet fuel was accidentally ignited by a pipeline repair crew in Upton County, Texas, on October 7.[216]

164. On November 5, two people were hurt when an EI Paso Natural Gas pipeline exploded in the Texas Panhandle near Bushland, Texas. The explosion left a hole about 30 yards by 20 yards and close to 15 feet (4.6 m) deep. The blast shook houses, melted window blinds and shot flames hundreds of feet into the air. The house nearest the blast - about 100 yards away - was destroyed, and three residents from that houses were injured. About 200 residents in the area were evacuated. Bushland is in Potter County, about 15 miles (24 km) west of Amarillo. The failure was in an abandoned tap, but the exact failure reason remains unknown ,12 17)[218][219][220]
165. A fire at a gas compressor station near Cameron, West Virginia on November 14 slightly burned one employee, and causes \$5.6 million of damage to the facility.[221]
166. A Minnesota Pipeline crude oil pipeline leaked December 3-4 in Todd County, Minnesota, spilling about 5,000 barrels of crude. Pipeline workers on December 3 had been repairing sections of the 16-inch pipe in a rural area. They left on the afternoon of December 3, and the spill occurred during the evening hours of December 3-4.[222][223][224]
167. On December 23, a crude oil pipeline started leaking in Galveston, Texas. There was no fire or explosion as a result of the accident, and an estimated 120 barrels (19 rrr') of crude oil were released to the environment. [225]
168. A newly built 42-inch gas transmission pipeline near Philo, Ohio failed on the second day of operation. There was no fire, but evacuations resulted. Several indications of pipe deformation were found.(November 14, 2009)[226][227]

Year 2010

169. On January 2, Enbridge's Line 2 ruptured near Neche, North Dakota, releasing about 3,784 barrels of crude oil, of which only 2,237 barrels of were recovered. The cause was a material defect. [228][229]
170. A gas pipeline exploded near Barksdale Air Force Base, Louisiana, in January, killing a pipeline employee. [230]
171. On February 1, a plumber trying to unclog a sewer line in st. Paul, Minnesota ruptured a gas service line that has been "cross bored" through the house's sewer line. The plumber and resident escape the house moments before as an explosion and following fire destroyed the house. The Minnesota Office of Pipeline Safety ordered that gas utility, Xcel, to check for more cross bored gas lines. In the following year, 25,000 sewer lines inspected showed 57 other cross bored gas lines. In Louisville, Kentucky, 430 gas line cross bores were found in 200 miles (320 km) of a sewer project, including some near schools and a hospital. The NTSB had cited such cross bore incidents as a known hazard since 1976P31][23i]
172. On February 25, a natural gas liquids (NGL) pipeline ruptured near Pond Creek, Oklahoma, releasing over 575,000 US gallons (2,180,000 L) of NGL's, and forcing road closures. There was no fire.[233][234]
173. At approximately 8:10 am CST, March 1, Mid-Valley Pipeline identified a release of crude oil in the manifold area of the Mid-Valley tank farm in Longview, TX. Crude oil was observed "gushing" from the soil in the manifold area, and 198 barrels of crude oil were estimated to have been released and 196 barrels were recovered from the secondary containment area within Mid-Valley's site. [235]
174. A 24-inch gas pipeline burst, but did not ignite near Pampa, Texas on March 15Y36]
175. On March 25, there was a release of 1700 barrels of Vacuum Gas Oil (VGO) from the FM-1 pipeline into an open in-ground valve pit and the surrounding area in the West Yard of the Sunoco, R&M Philadelphia refinery in Philadelphia, P A. The area was under the control of the Operator in a fenced off area that is off-limits to the public. [237]
176. A crude oil pipeline ruptures near Green River, Wyoming, on April 5. At least 84,000 US gallons (320,000 L) of crude were spilled. Corrosion in the pipeline was the causeYO]
177. Enbridge discovered a leak on the 26-inch Line 2 on April 17, near Deer River, Minnesota. This leak was due to a crack-like feature associated with the longitudinal weld seam on the inside of the pipe.
178. On April 23, near Niles, Kansas, a pipeline ruptured, due to previous excavation damage. About 1,659 barrels of natural gasoline were lost. [238]
179. A BP pipeline carrying gasoline leaked nearly 93,000 US gallons (350,000 L) into a farm field over the Memorial Day weekend. The leak occurred in Constantine Township, St. Joseph County, MichiganYO][239]
180. On June 7, a 36-inch gas pipeline explosion and fire in Johnson County, Texas, was caused by workers installing poles for electrical lines. One worker killed, and six were injured. Confusion over the location and status of the construction work lead to the pipeline not being marked beforehand.[240][241]
181. On June 8, construction workers hit an unmarked 14-inch gas gathering pipeline near Darrouzett, Texas. Two workers were killed.[240][242]
182. On June 12, a Chevron crude oil pipeline, damage by lightning, ruptured, causing 800 barrels (130 rrr') of crude to spill into Red Butte Creek in Salt Lake City, Utah. Crude then flowed in a pond in Liberty Park. [243]
183. A landowner operating a bulldozer hit an 8-inch LPG/propane pipeline near Thomson, Georgia on July 5. Later, the propane fumes ignited, killing the adult son of the landowner, and igniting fires that destroyed a trailer house and woodlands. [244]
184. On July 26, the Kalamazoo River oil spill: Enbridge Energy Partners LLP (Enbridge), reported that a 30-inch (760 mm) pipeline belonging to Enbridge burst in Marshall, Michigan. Enbridge had numerous alarms from the affected Line 6B, but controllers thought the alarms were from phase separation, and the leak was not reported to Enbridge for 17 hours. Enbridge estimates over 800,000 US gallons (3,000,000 L) of crude oil leaked into Talmadge Creek, a waterway that feeds the Kalamazoo River,[245][246] whereas EPA reports over 1,139,569 gallons of oil have been recovered as of November 2011.[247] On July 27,2010, an Administrative Order was issued by U.S. EPA requiring the performance of removal actions in connec-

tion with the facility. The Order requires Enbridge to immediately conduct removal of a discharge or to mitigate or prevent a substantial threat of a discharge of oil and to submit a Work Plan for the cleanup activities that was to include a Health and Safety Plan, [248] as required by 29 CFR 1910.120 (HAZWOPER). An oil spill cleanup contractor from Texas, Hallmark, bussed numerous undocumented workers to Battle Creek to work on the cleanup of oil spill and had them work in unsafe conditions [249] In 2012, the NTSB later cited known but unrepaired cracks and external corrosion as the cause. [250]

185. On August 10, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Justice Department announced that Plains All American Pipeline and several of its operating subsidiaries have agreed to spend approximately \$41 million to upgrade 10,420 miles (16,770 km) of crude oil pipeline operated in the United States. The settlement resolves Plains' Clean Water Act violations for ten crude oil spills in Texas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Kansas, and requires the company to pay a \$3.25 million civil penalty [251]
186. A construction crew installing a gas pipeline in Roberts County, Texas hits an unmarked pipeline on August 25, seriously burning one man. [252]
187. A gas compressor station in Shongaloo, Louisiana on August 24 injured one worker. [253]
188. On August 27, a LPG pipeline sprang a leak in Gilboa, New York, forcing the evacuation of 23 people. The cause was stress corrosion cracking. There were no injuries or ignition. [254][255][256]
189. On September 9, a pipeline leaks crude oil near Lockport, Illinois. EPA officials say the spill is near wetlands that house several endangered species. Federal officials say about 270,000 US gallons (1,000,000 L) of oil were released in Lockport and Romeoville, about 35 miles (56 km) southwest of Chicago. [257]
190. On Thursday, September 9, a high pressure gas pipeline exploded in San Bruno, CA, a suburb of San Francisco. The blast destroyed 38 houses and damaged 120 houses. Eight people died and many were injured. Ten acres of brush also burned. Later, PG&E was unable to supply the California Public Utilities Commission with documents on how PG&E established pressure limits on some of its gas transmission pipelines. It was also revealed that this pipeline had 26 leaks between Milpitas and San Francisco during the time of 1951 to 2009, with some of the leak causes listed in records as "unknown". Later hydrostatic testing of the same pipeline that failed found a pinhole leak, and a previously damaged section blew out [258][259][260][261][262]
191. A 20-inch diameter Columbia Gas Transmission Company pipeline failed in Lawrence County, Kentucky on September 9. While there was no fire or evacuations, the condition of this uncoated, non-cathodic protected, unknown grade pipeline caused PHMSA to enter into a Consent Order to eventually replace this pipeline. [263]
192. A repair crew was working on a corroded gas pipe in Cairo, Georgia on September 28, when the line exploded. One crew member was killed, and three others burned. [264]
193. A gas pipeline under construction in Grand Prairie, Texas was running a cleaning pig on October 15 without a pig "trap" at the end of the pipe. The 150 pound pig was expelled from the pipeline with enough force to fly 500 feet (150 m), and crash through the side of a house. No one was injured. [265]
194. On November 12, three men working on natural gas lines were injured when a pipeline ruptured in Monroe, Louisiana [266]
195. A Tennessee Gas Pipeline 30-inch gas pipeline failed at Natchitoches, Louisiana on November 30. There was no fire, but the pipeline had a Magnetic Flux smart pig test earlier in the year that indicated no flaws in the pipeline. The failure was at a crack in a wrinkle bend. The deadly 1965 gas pipeline accident occurred on a different pipeline owned by the same company nearby. [267]
196. A valve on a crude oil pipeline leaked about 500 barrels (79 m³) of crude in Salt Lake City, Utah on December 1. This failure was only 100 yards from a June 2010 failure on the same pipeline. [268]
197. A pipeline was discovered leaking gasoline near Livingston, Illinois, on December 2. [269]
198. On December 17, a gas line fire and explosion just outside of Corpus Christi, Texas city limits leaves one person critically injured. A man was working on removing an abandoned pipeline when it exploded, and the man's face was severely burned. [270]
199. A crude oil pipeline was discovered leaking into the Dominguez Channel in the Port of Los Angeles, California on December 21. Over 1,000 gallons of crude oil was recovered, but the pipeline company was alleged to have failed to report the spill to State or Federal pipeline authorities. A 61 count criminal complaint was later filed in this accident. [271]
200. A pipeline at an underground gas storage facility in Covington County, Mississippi on December 28, forcing the evacuation of about two-dozen families for over a week. [272]

Year 2011

201. On January 11, personnel from Millennium Pipeline noticed that gas transmission pipeline leaking in Tioga County, New York. This 30-inch diameter pipeline was built in 2007 and 2008. A pinhole in a rejected girth weld was found to be the cause of the failure. It appears that during the course of the construction project for the line, the subject pipe section was inadvertently picked up and subsequently installed in the pipeline. PHMSA ordered testing of this pipeline for similar flaws. [273]
202. A 12-inch cast iron gas main leaking Philadelphia, Pennsylvania explodes, killing a repair crew member and injuring six others on January 18 [274][275]
203. Multiple gas pressure regulators failed, and caused a gas pressure surge in Fairport Harbor, Ohio, on January 24, causing gas fires in 11 houses, and one apartment. 150 gas appliances were damaged or destroyed, but there were no injuries. Gas company Dominion East Ohio says it found fluids and debris in a failed regulator. A year after the explosion, the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio recommended a \$500,000 fine for Dominion. [276][277][278][279]

204. Five people were killed, and eight houses were destroyed, in a gas explosion and fire in Allentown, Pennsylvania on February 9. The NTSB had warned UGI about cast iron gas mains needing replacement after the 1990 gas explosion in that city. Between 1976 and the date of the letter, July 10, 1992, two more gas explosions occurred. Three people were killed, 23 injured and 11 houses were destroyed or damaged in those explosions. UGI was cited in 2012 for several safety violations, including a lack of valves on their gas system. [280][281][282][283]
205. Late on February 10, a Tennessee Gas Pipeline 36-inch gas transmission pipeline exploded and burned near Lisbon, Ohio. No injuries resulted. The cause was from stress on a girth weld on the pipeline. A failure on another girth weld on the pipeline system led to a PHMSA Consent Agreement. [284][285][286]
206. Early on February 24, a pipeline near Texas City, Texas ruptured, sending up to 5,000 US gallons (19,000 L) of gasoline into Bayou Pierre P87. [288]
207. On March 1, a Tennessee Gas Pipeline gas transmission pipeline failed near Cumberland, Ohio. A material or weld defect was the cause. [289][290]
208. Early on March 17, a 20-inch steel natural gas line running through a Minneapolis, Minnesota neighborhood ruptured and gas from it ignited, caused evacuations to buildings nearby, and Interstate 35W was closed from downtown Minneapolis to Highway 62. There were no injuries. The Minnesota Office of Pipeline Safety later found the pipe there wasn't designed to handle the weight of soil and passing cars gressinm down on it, and efforts to shore up the pipeline were incorrectly carried out. 291][292][293]
209. A farmer and rancher near White Oak Township, Michigan smelled gasoline on April 13, and discovered gasoline from a products pipeline leaking into a drainage ditch. As of late September, an estimated 460,000 §allons of gasoline had been released, with about 111,000 gallons of it recovered. [29]
210. On May 7, a threaded connection failed on a Keystone Pipeline pump at a station in Sargent County, North Dakota, spilling about 400 barrels of crude oil. Due to a number of other leaks on this pipeline system, Keystone's owner, TransCanada Corporation, was given a Corrective Action Order by PHMSA. [295]
211. An 8-inch NGL pipeline failed in Romeoville, Illinois on May 14, leaking about 4200 gallons of butane. Corrosion inside a casing under a road was the cause of the failure. Corrosion only 2.5 feet from the failure had been seen by a smart pig run in 2007, but was not within action limits at the time. [296]
212. On May 19, a 10-inch crude oil pipeline ruptured near Maysville, Oklahoma. Over 42,000 US gallons (160,000 L) of crude were lost. There was no fire. Internal pipeline corrosion was the cause. [297][298]
213. A 2-inch lateral on a crude oil pipeline rupture in Huntington Beach, California on July 1. A major road, Goldenwest Street, had to be closed for cleaning and pipeline repairs. [299]
214. Late on July 1, a 12-inch Exxon Mobil crude oil pipeline, also known as the Silvertip Pipeline, ruptured, and spilled about 63,000 gallons of oil into the Yellowstone River in south-central Montana. There was confusion in the pipeline control room, causing a delayed pipeline shutdown. Some residents of Laurel, Montana had to be evacuated. 300][301] The break near Billings fouled the riverbank and forced municipalities and irrigation districts to close intakes. [302][303] Exxon later increased the spill size estimate to 1500 barrels in January 2012 after seeing the damage to the pipeline. [304] About 140 people were evacuated starting about 12:15 a.m. Saturday due to concerns about possible explosions and the overpowering fumes. All were allowed to return after instruments showed petroleum odors had decreased, [305] although no information was available regarding the concentrations of benzene in air. Speculation involves high water flow in the Yellowstone River may have scoured the river bed and exposed the pipe. Consequently, with three oil refineries are located in the Billings area, the fire chief for the city of Laurel said he asked all three to turn off the flow of oil in their pipelines under the river after the leak was reported. Exxon Mobil and Cenex Harvest Refinery did so, and that Conoco Phillips said its pipe was already shutdown. [305] Cenex had a release into the Yellowstone River in September 2002. Exxon Mobil later announced the cleanup would cost \$135 million. In 2015, Exxon Mobil was fined \$1 million by PHMSA for this incident. [306][307][308][309]
215. On July 20, a six-month-old, 30-inch natural gas pipeline exploded near Gillette, Wyoming, creating a 60-foot (18 m) crater. There was no fire, nor any injuries. Construction or installation issues caused the failure. [31 0][311]
216. A pipeline carrying jet fuel ruptured in Mango, Florida on July 22. About 31,500 US gallons (119,000 L) of fuel spilled. There was no fire or injuries. [312]
217. On August 13, an 8-inch NGL pipeline ruptured near Onawa, Iowa at a Missouri River crossing, during flooding conditions. About 818 barrels of Natural Gasoline was lost. There were no evacuations or injuries, but two other pipelines in the same right of way were forced to shut down. [313][314][315][316]
218. On August 17, Kinder Morgan's Natural Gas Pipeline Company of America had a flash fire and explosion at a plant south of Herscher, Illinois. Five employees went to the hospital. Kinder Morgan was later cited for pipeline and workplace safety violations Y17][31S]
219. A pipeline carrying heating oil was hit by construction workers in East Providence, Rhode Island on August 31, spraying oil on roofs, trees, and pavement, and flowed into storm drains. At least 56,000 US gallons (210,000 L) of oil were spilled. [319]
220. A Cupertino, California condominium was gutted August 31, after a plastic pipeline fitting cracked, filling the garage with natural gas that exploded just minutes after the owner left for lunch. PG&E later found six other plastic pipe failures near the blast site. The line was an especially problematic type of pipe manufactured by DuPont called Aldyl-A. PG&E has 1,231 miles (1,981 km) of the early-1970s-vintage pipe in its system. Federal regulators singled out pre-1973 Aldyl-A starting in

2002 as being at risk of failing because of premature cracking. Explosions caused by failed Aldyl-A and other types of plastic pipe have killed more than 50 people in the United States since 1971, the federal government says. [320]

221. A 10-inch LPG pipeline failed on September 8 in Mitchell County, Texas. The escaping gas ignited, starting a small brush fire. The cause of the failure was a crack in the weld of a repair sleeve from bending and heat hardening. There were no injuries [321]
222. On September 20, a farmer digging to lay drainage tile hit a 10-inch gasoline pipeline near Aurelius, New York, spilling about 3,300 US gallons (12 m³) of gasoline. There was no fire or injuries. [322]
223. A 2-inch crude oil gathering pipeline failed in Oklahoma on October 12, spilling about 120 barrels of oil. There were no injuries or fire from the failure [323]
224. Early on November 3, an explosion and fire hit a gas Columbia Gas Transmission pipeline compressor station at Artemas in Mann Township, Bedford County, Pennsylvania. There were no injuries. The cause was internal corrosion. [324] [325]
225. On November 8, a contractor for Vectren Corp. working on a bare gas main replacement project broke a “short stub” on the main, then failed to notify New Albany, Indiana authorities about the leak. Gas migrated through the soil, and built up in a nearby house, then exploded. Five people had to be hospitalized. [326]
226. A crew working on a waterline hit a gas distribution pipeline in Fairborn, Ohio on November 12, leading to a gas explosion that killed one man, and injured five others, including children. [32]
227. On November 16, a Tennessee Gas Pipeline 36-inch gas transmission pipeline exploded and burned near Glouster, Ohio. Two people were injured, with three houses and a barn destroyed, and a barn damaged. The pipeline failed at a girth weld, with land sliding causing more stress on the weld. [328] [29]
228. Late on November 21, a Tennessee Gas Pipeline 24-inch gas transmission pipeline exploded and burned near Batesville, Mississippi. Twenty houses were evacuated for a time, but there were no injuries or major property damage. The pipeline failed at a sleeve over a wrinkle bend installed in 1946. [330]
229. On December 3, a Williams Companies gas transmission pipeline exploded and burned in Marengo County, Alabama. A 47-foot section of the pipe was hurled more than 200 feet from the failure area. The gas burned for several hours, and a nearby pipeline was damaged. There were no injuries, or serious property damage. External corrosion was the cause of the failure, due to issues with the pipeline coating, the cathodic protection level, and the local soil corrosiveness. [331] [332] [333]
230. On December 6, explosions and fire erupted at a natural gas pipeline compressor station in Sublette County, Wyoming. Two workers were injured [34]
231. On December 10, a landowner using a bulldozer hit an 8-inch and a 12-inch petroleum pipelines near Nemaha, Nebraska, rupturing both lines. The spill size was estimated to be 119,000 gallons of gasoline, jet fuel, and Diesel fuel. Some of the fuels flowed into a creek leading into Jasper Creek. There were questions about the depth of soil coverage for this pipeline. [335] [336] [337] [338]
232. A 42-inch natural gas transmission pipeline failed and ignited at a valve on December 10 in Cache County, Utah. [339] [340]

Year 2012

233. A gas pipeline exploded and burned in Estill County, Kentucky on the evening of January 2. Flames were reported reaching over 1,000 feet high. Residents up to a mile away from the failure were evacuated. There were no injuries. [341]
234. A forest fire caused a gas pipeline to explode and burn in Floyd County, Kentucky on January 7. There were no injuries from this incident. [342]
235. On January 9, a man was killed, and another person injured, in a fiery house explosion from a leaking 4-inch cast iron gas main installed in 1950 in Austin, Texas. Gas had been smelled in the area for several weeks prior to this. Gas company crews had looked along the affected property for a leak, but were unable to find it. [25] [343]
236. A Sunoco pipeline ruptured and spilled about 117,000 gallons of gasoline in Wellington, Ohio, late on January 12. Some residents were evacuated for a week. [344] [345]
237. On January 13, an 8-inch gas pipeline exploded and burned in a vacant agricultural field in Rio Vista, California. There were no injuries or evacuations. [346]
238. A Tennessee Gas Pipeline gas compressor had a major leak “that sounded like a rocket” in Powell County, Kentucky, forcing evacuations of nearby residents on January 14. There was no fire or injuries reported. [347]
239. A contractor excavating for a communications company caused a massive gas explosion and fire at a condominium complex on January 16 in West Haverstraw, New York, injuring two firefighters and two utility workers. Afterwards, it was found that the excavator’s insurance will be insufficient to cover all of the property damage of the incident. [348]
240. On January 18, the original Colonial Pipeline mainline failed in Belton, South Carolina, spilling about 13,500 gallons of petroleum product. The failure was caused by internal corrosion. [349]
241. Workers in Topeka, Kansas were installing a yard sprinkler system on January 30, hit a gas line. Gas from the leak later on exploded in a nearby house, burning a 73-year-old woman, who died several weeks later. [350] [351]
242. On January 31, a Shell Oil Company fuel pipeline to the Milwaukee, Wisconsin Mitchell International Airport was found to be leaking. Jet fuel had been smelled for about two weeks in the area, and was found in runoff water in the area. The cause was from external corrosion. About 9,000 gallons of fuel were spilled. In 2014, a Shell employee was scheduled to plead guilty to charges of falsifying records of the pipeline. [353]

243. A Florida Gas Transmission Company 30-inch gas transmission pipeline burst near Baton Rouge, Louisiana on February 13. Residents in the area were evacuated for a time, but there was no fire. [354][355]
244. On February 15, 2012, in Arenac County, Michigan, oil was discovered in the soil around a 30-inch Enbridge crude oil pipeline. About 800 gallons of crude oil was spilled. [356]
245. Two cars that were drag racing went off the road they were on, and crash through a fence and into a crude oil pipeline in New Lenox, Illinois on March 3. The pipeline was ruptured, and the crude oil ignited. Two men from the vehicles were killed, and three others seriously burned. [357][58]
246. On March 5, a leak at an Enid, Oklahoma pipeline storage facility spread propane fumes in the area, forcing evacuations. There was no fire or explosion. [359]
247. A crude oil pipeline leaked near Grand Isle, Louisiana on March 17, spilling as much as 8,400 gallons of crude oil. There were no injuries reported. [360]
248. On March 29, an employee accidentally left a valve open during maintenance work on a Williams Companies gas compressor station near Springville Township, Pennsylvania. Later, gas leaked through the valve, causing alarms to evacuate workers in the compressor building. Later, the gas exploded and burned. There were no injuries. It was also found there are no agencies enforcing rules on rural gas facilities in that state. [361][362]
249. A 12-inch gas pipeline exploded and burned for five hours near Gary, Texas on April 4. There were no injuries, but the rupture site was only 200 feet from that pipeline's compressor station. [363]
250. On April 6, two gas company workers were mildly burned when attempting to fix a leak on a 4-inch gas pipeline in DeSoto County, Mississippi. The pipeline exploded and burned during the repairs. [364]
251. A gas pipeline exploded and burned in Terrebonne Parish, Louisiana, on April 9. The accident was reported first by a satellite monitoring the area to the NRC. There were no injuries. [365]
252. Two men escaped with only minor burns after a bulldozer they were using hit a 24-inch gas pipeline near Hinton, Iowa on April 25. Authorities later announced the men did not call 811 for an underground utility locate. [366]
253. On April 28, an ExxonMobil 20/22-inch-diameter pipeline ruptured near Torbert in Pointe Coupee Parish, Louisiana, about 20 miles west of Baton Rouge, and crude oil spilled into the surrounding area, and flowed into an unnamed tributary connected to Bayou Cholpe. About 117,000 gallons of crude were spilled, with about 37,000 gallons being lost. The pipeline failed due to a manufacturing defect. [367][368][369]
254. A 26-inch gas transmission pipeline ruptured on June 6 in a compressor station near Laketon in northeastern Gray County, Texas. Gas escaped from the 50-foot-long rupture, igniting, leaving a crater 30 feet in diameter, burning two acres of agricultural area and telephone poles. There were no injuries. [370]
255. On June 8, near Canadian, Texas, a trackhoe operator suffered burns, after a fire from leaking 4-inch gas-gathering pipeline that was undergoing maintenance. Fumes entered the engine of the trackhoe and ignited. [371]
256. A contractor was killed and two others injured after an explosion at a BP gas compressor station in Durango, Colorado on June 25. BP, Halliburton, and the other contractors were fined \$7,000 each for safety violations in that work. [372][373]
257. A West Shore Pipe Line petroleum products pipeline burst near Jackson, Wisconsin on July 17, releasing about 54,000 gallons of gasoline. At least one family self evacuated due to the leak. At least 44 water wells nearby were contaminated from benzene in the gasoline, including a municipal well. A LF-ERW seam failure was suspected as the cause. Further testing revealed that at least 26 other areas on this pipeline needed repairs, with 22 within the Jackson Marsh Wildlife Area. [374][375][376][377][318]
258. A 14-inch gas gathering pipeline exploded and burned on July 18 near Intracoastal City, Louisiana. There were no injuries or major property damage reported. [379]
259. On July 23, a compressor station operated by Williams Companies in Windsor, New York was venting gas in a "routine procedure" - during a lightning storm - when the vent was ignited by lightning, causing a fireball "hundreds of feet into the air." [380][381]
260. An Enbridge crude oil pipeline ruptured in Grand Marsh, Wisconsin, releasing an estimated 1,200 barrels of crude oil. The pipeline had been installed in 1998. Flaws in the longitudinal welds had been seen during X-ray checks of girth welds. [382]
261. Four contract workers were injured during a flash fire at a Wyoming gas processing plant on August 22. [383]
262. A jet fuel pipeline near Chicago, Illinois began leaking on August 27. The burst pipeline spilled an estimated 42,000 gallons of jet fuel into a ditch that empties into the Calumet Sag Channel in Palos Heights, Illinois. External corrosion was the cause of the pipeline failure. [384][385][386]
263. On August 28, an Atmos Energy repair crew struck an 8-inch gas main in McKinney, Texas, causing a fire. Four Atmos workers were treated for injuries. 1,000 Atmos gas customers lost gas service for a time. [387][388]
264. On September 6, a 10-inch gas gathering pipeline exploded and burned near Alice, Texas. Flames reached 100 feet high, and caused a 10-acre brush fire. There were no injuries. [389]
265. An explosion and fire hit a Crestwood Midstream Partners gas compressor station in Hood County, Texas on September 6. Heavy damage to a sheet metal building resulted, but, there were no injuries reported to crew there. [390]
266. A Colorado Interstate Gas gas compressor in Rio Blanco County, Colorado caught fire on September 11. There were no

reported injuriesY91][392]

267. On September 24, an excavator struck a 4-inch natural gas line on Route 416 in Montgomery, New York. Escaping gas ignited, and it took 90 minutes before the gas was shut off. There were no injuries. [393]
268. The operator of an excavator machine narrowly escaped serious injury in Lewiston, Idaho on November 19, when his machine hit a gas pipeline during road work. The resulting fire destroyed a railroad signal, along with several telephone poles, and road construction equipment. The depth of the pipeline has been misjudged at that location. [394][395]
269. On November 20, about 38,000 gallons of crude oil spilled from an Enbridge pipeline at a tank farm in Mokena, Illinois. [96][397]
270. Two men were injured in an explosion and fire at a natural gas production facility east of Price, Utah on November 20. [398]
271. On November 23, a gas company worker looking for the source of a reported gas leak in a Springfield, Massachusetts strip club pierced a gas line. The gas later exploded, injuring 21, devastating the strip club, and damaging numerous nearby buildings. [399]
272. On November 30, a heavy equipment operator punctured a 12-inch gas transmission pipeline, near the city of Madera, California. The adjacent highway, along with several rural roads, was shut down for hours, while houses and businesses in the area were evacuated. [400]
273. A malfunction in a gas compressor caused a fire on December 4, north of Fort Worth, Texas. There were no injuries. [401]
274. On December 5, a 16-inch gas pipeline at 500 psi of pressure exploded and burned near a natural gas plant in Goldsmith, Texas. A fireball 250 feet high was created after the explosion, destroying 12 to 15 utility poles, and caliche and rocks the size of bowling balls damaged a road. There were no injuries reported. [402]
275. On December 11, at approximately 12:40pm, a 20-inch gas pipeline owned by NiSource Inc., parent of Columbia Gas, exploded along I-77 between Sissonville and Pocatalico, West Virginia. Several people suffered minor injuries, four houses were destroyed, and other buildings were damaged. Early reports announced the NTSB was investigating as to why alarms in the control room for this pipeline did not sound for this failure. [403][404][405][406]
276. On December 26, a 20-inch Florida Gas Transmission Company pipeline ruptured near Melbourne, Florida, ejecting a 20-foot section of the pipeline. There was no fire or injuries. [407]

Year 2013

277. On January 15, a utility crew struck and ruptured a 4-inch gas pipeline in Lewisville, Texas, causing a nearby house to explode later on. The explosion killed a man. [408]
278. An independent contractor installing fiber-optic cable for a cable company in Kansas City, Missouri inadvertently struck an underground gas line on February 19. Gas later caught fire, and created an explosion that destroyed a popular local restaurant, killing one of the workers there, and injuring about 15 others near the scene. [409][410]
279. A tug towing a barge struck and ruptured a Chevron LPG pipeline at Bayou Perot, a marshy area on the borders of Jefferson Parish and Lafourche Parish, Louisiana on March 12. The tug Captain was severely burned when the escaping gas ignited, and died several weeks later from those injuries. [411][412]
280. On March 18, a Chevron 8-inch petroleum products pipeline ruptured along a seam, spilling Diesel fuel into Willard Bay State Park near Ogden, Utah. Wildlife was coated with Diesel, but, the fuel was prevented from entering into water supply intakes. About 25,000 gallons of Diesel were spilled. [413][414]
281. A Williams Companies 24-inch gas gathering pipeline failed in Marshall County, West Virginia on March 22. There were no injuries. [415]
282. The 2013 Mayflower oil spill occurred when ExxonMobil's 20-inch Pegasus crude oil pipeline spilled near Mayflower, Arkansas on March 29, causing crude to flow through yards and gutters, and towards Lake Conway. Wildlife was coated in some places. Twenty-two houses were evacuated, due to the fumes and fire hazard. Some estimates say the total amount spilled could reach upwards of 300,000 gallons diluted bitumen were spilled. Hook cracks and extremely low impact toughness in the LF-ERW seam were identified as causes of the failure. [416][417][418][419]
283. On April 4, an explosion and fire occurred at a gas compressor station near Guthrie, Oklahoma. Nearby houses were evacuated. There were no injuries reported. [420]
284. A flash fire at a pipeline gas compressor station broke out when natural gas liquids ignited in Tyler County, West Virginia on April 11, seriously burning three workers, two of whom later died. The workers were performing pipeline pigging operations. [421][422]
285. On April 30, the Pegasus oil pipeline spilled a small amount of crude into a residential yard in Ripley County, Missouri, a month after the same pipe spilled thousands of barrels of crude in Arkansas. The Pegasus pipeline was out of service from the Mayflower, Arkansas spill, accounting for the minimal amount of oil spilled in Missouri. [423]
286. On May 9, Diesel fuel was detected to be leaking from a Marathon pipeline in Indianapolis, Indiana. Over 20,000 gallons of Diesel leaked, at a slow rate that was not detected by SCADA systems. Cleanup caused a nearby major road to be shut down for five days. There were no injuries reported. [424]
287. Late night on May 14, an explosion and fire hit a Williams Companies gas compressor station near Brooklyn Township, Pennsylvania. There were no reported injuries. [425]

288. On May 8, the Kinder Morgan Tejas pipeline compressor station near Crockett, Texas, required an emergency shutdown and subsequently had a fire that caused \$7,502,188 in property damage.[426][427]
289. On May 30, two construction workers were injured, when a fire erupted during welding at a Williams Companies natural gas facility in Hunterdon County, New Jersey.[428]
290. A 12-inch gas transmission pipeline failed near Torrington, Wyoming on June 13. LFERW seam failure was suspected as cause. There was no fire or injuries.[429]
291. A 30-inch Florida Gas Transmission Company natural gas pipeline exploded and burned on June 18 near Franklinton, Louisiana. Power lines were damaged, causing a loss of electricity to 17,000 people, and a trailer was destroyed. There was no injuries reported.[430][431]
292. On July 4, a fire involved a gas compressor and a nearby ruptured 2-inch gas pipeline in Gilmore Township, Pennsylvania. There were no injuries.[432]
293. An 8-inch natural gas pipeline released gas from a rupture at 1,400 psi, for 90 minutes in New Franklin, Ohio on July 22, forcing 75 people to evacuate the area. Afterward, the local Fire Chief said that pipeline owners refused to give information to first responders in previous requests.[433]
294. Early on July 23, a downed 13,000 volt power line sparked a massive gas fire in Mamaroneck, New York when a gas main was damaged by the electricity. Three automobiles were destroyed, and houses were threatened for a time.[434]
295. On July 26, a leaking BP 20-inch crude oil pipeline spilled 50 to 100 barrels of crude oil in Washington County, Oklahoma. Some of the crude spilled into a drainage ditch leading to a water reservoir.[435]
296. On the evening of August 12, a 10-inch NGL pipeline exploded and caused a massive propane-ethane mix fire in Erie, Illinois. A number of nearby residents were evacuated for a while, but, there were no injuries.[436]
297. A leak developed on a valve on Longhorn Pipeline in Austin, Texas during maintenance on August 14, spilling about 300 gallons of crude oil. There were no evacuations. [437]
298. Atmos Energy crews dug into a 4-inch gas pipeline in Overland Park, Kansas on September 2, causing an explosion and fire. There was no major damage or injuries.[438]
299. A 10-inch gas gathering pipeline ruptured and burned in Newton County, Texas on September 21. About a dozen people from nearby houses were evacuated for a time. There were no injuries. [439]
300. On September 24, a Denton TX city water utility worker ruptured a 112-inch gas pipeline in Denton, Texas, which immediately caused a fire that gave the worker minor burns. There was no other significant damage.[440]
301. A farmer near Tioga, North Dakota smelled oil for several days, before discovering a leaking 6-inch 20-year-old Tesoro pipeline under his wheat field, on September 29. Crews tried to burn off the oil at first. The spill size was estimated at 865,000 gallons, and covered over seven acres. There were no injuries. Corrosion was suspected as being the cause. Governor Jack Dalrymple said he wasn't told of the spill until October 9. In May of 2014, it was announced that it would take 112 more years before the spilled crude would be cleaned up. [441][442]
302. On October 7, a gas pipeline burst in Howard County, Texas. There was no fire, but, dangerous hydrogen sulfide in the gas forced evacuations of nearby residents. There were no injuries. [443]
303. On October 7, authorities were notified of a Lion Oil Trading and Transportation crude oil pipeline leak in Columbia County, Arkansas. It was estimated that the leak started on September 21. Oil spread into a Horsehead Creek tributary.[444]
304. A 30-inch Northern Natural Gas pipeline exploded and burned in Harper County, Oklahoma on October 8. 220 feet of the pipe was ejected from the ground. Flames were seen for a number of miles, and four houses nearby were evacuated. Oklahoma Highway 283 was closed for several hours until the fire was determined to be under control and safe. There were no injuries.[445][446][447]
305. On October 29, a Koch Industries 8-inch pipeline spill about 400 barrels of crude oil near Smithville, Texas. The oil polluted a private stock pond and two overflow reservoirs.[448]
306. A Chevron operated 10-inch LPG pipeline was ruptured by contractors for the company installing a Cathodic protection system, near Milford, Texas, on November 14, causing a large fire, and forcing the evacuation of Milford and 200 students of a nearby school. A nearby 14-inch pipeline was threatened by the failure, but did not fail. There were no injuries reported. [449][450][451]
307. An ExxonMobil gas plant exploded and burned on November 17, near Kingsville, Texas. The plant burned for over a day, but there were no reported injuries.[452]
308. On November 18, a gas pipeline burst near Ranger, Texas, causing a fire in a field, with flames reaching 100 feet high. Some houses nearby were evacuated for a time. The owner of the pipeline, Hanlon Gas, had been installing a new compressor station, and they believe a malfunction led to the rupture and fire. There were no injuries reported.[453]
309. On November 28 a 30-inch Panhandle Eastern natural gas pipeline exploded in Hughesville, Missouri causing several nearby buildings to catch fire. There was a local evacuation but no injuries. Metallurgical examination determined the root cause of the failure to be corrosion.[164][454]
310. On December 9, a 2-inch pipe on a propane dehydrator failed at the Dixie Pipeline Terminal in Apex, North Carolina, forcing evacuations and sheltering in place at nearby businesses. There was no fire or explosion. [455]
311. A Sunoco pipeline was found leaking gasoline on December 20, near Coal Township, Pennsylvania, from external corrosion.

The initial spill size was reported as two gallons, but, later on, 480 tons of soil were removed as part of the remediation of that leak. [456][457][458]

312. On December 27, two natural gas company workers had minor burns when the pipeline they were working leaked, and the escaping gas exploded and ignited in Shrewsbury, Massachusetts. Flames 30 feet high knocked out phone service in the area. [459]

Year 2014

313. On January 10, a 12-inch PSNC gas transmission pipeline exploded and burned in Asheville, North Carolina. The cause was damage to the pipeline during installation in 2003. There were no injuries, but the costs of property damage was around \$825,000. [460]

314. On February 10, a gas pipeline exploded and burned near Tioga, North Dakota. There were no injuries. [461]

315. On February 13, a 30-inch diameter Columbia Gulf Transmission gas pipeline carrying natural gas exploded near Knifley, Kentucky, sending two people to the hospital with injuries, destroying two houses, and alarming residents, who saw flames from miles away. Later, it was determined that Hydrogen embrittlement had caused the pipe failure from when the pipeline was installed in 1965. [462][463]

316. On March 6, contractors working for Shell Oil Company hit Shell's Houston-to-Houma (Ho-Ho) crude oil pipeline near Port Neches, Texas, spilling 364 barrels of crude oil. [464]

317. On March 12, there was a East Harlem apartment explosion in New York City, New York. NTSB investigators found natural gas in the soil nearby, indicating that the gas leak had existed for a while before the explosion. [465]

318. On March 18, a 20-inch Mid-Valley Pipeline Company pipeline failed in Hamilton County, Ohio, spilling at least 364 barrels of crude oil into the adjacent Oak Glen Nature Preserve. Animals in the area were affected. [466][467]

319. On March 18, a 3-inch, half-mile flare waste gas pipeline in a neighborhood in Arvin, California, was discovered leaking, a few blocks from Arvin High School, in a residential area. It had been leaking for as long as two years. [468]

320. On 31 March, a pipeline running to a Williams Companies LNG storage facility in Plymouth, Washington exploded and sent shrapnel flying that ruptured an LNG storage tank. Nearly 1,000 residents were evacuated and at least five employees at the facility were injured. [469][470]

321. A 12-inch Williams Companies gas pipeline failed at a weld in Moundsville, West Virginia. The following explosion and fire explosion scorched trees over a 2-acre area near Moundsville. Several houses were evacuated as a precaution. There were no injuries reported. [471]

322. On April 17, a private excavator accidentally cut a gas line while doing some work in Union Township, Licking County, Ohio on April 17. The man suffered second degree burns to the upper portion of his body. There was no damage to any buildings. [472]

323. On April 23, an explosion and fire hit a Williams Companies gas processing plant in Opal, Wyoming. All 95 residents of the town were evacuated, and part of US Highway 30 was closed for a time. [473][474]

324. On May 6, Sinclair Oil Corporation pipeline operators detected a pressure drop on a pipeline, with the problem being traced two days later to a leak in Knox County, Missouri. A mixture of gasoline and Diesel fuel contaminated soil on a farm. [475]

325. On May 12, three workers from Plantation Pipeline inadvertently ruptured their pipeline at a pump station in Anderson County, South Carolina, causing a geyser of gasoline, and spraying the workers with it. There was no fire, but the workers had to be decontaminated at a hospital. [476]

326. On June 26, near East Bernard, Texas, a gas pipeline adjacent to a Kinder Morgan gas compressor plant blew out, destroying the roadway and setting a nearby truck on fire just south of Highway 59. Flames as high as 150 feet were shooting out of the pipeline. The focus is on a 27-inch pipeline that sends gasoline to different tank farms along the line. [477]

327. On July 10, a vent stack at a Williams Field Services gas pipeline compressor station in Susquehanna County, Pennsylvania caught fire. Only minor damage was reported at other parts of the station. [478]

328. On August 4, a Greka 6 inch pipeline spilled over 1,200 gallons of crude oil at the Zick Compressor Station by Williams Field Services in Hop Bottom near Santa Barbara County, California. The oil spread out over less than a mile from the leak and did not enter a river. The station can process 455 million cubic feet of natural gas per day. [479]

329. On August 12, a mulching machine hit a 12-inch natural gas pipeline in Rusk County, Texas. The operator of the machine was killed in the following explosion. [480]

330. On August 21, four workers were injured in a fire while a crew was performing maintenance on a natural gas pipeline in Garvin County, Oklahoma. The injured workers were treated and released from a hospital, and there was no explosion. [481]

331. On September 14, a contract worker performing routine maintenance on a Chevron offshore gas pipeline was killed, and two other workers were injured. The accident occurred 6 miles south of Timbalier Bay off the southeast coast of Louisiana. [482]

332. On September 16, more than 500 residents of Benton Harbor, Michigan, were forced to leave their houses for 10 to 12 hours, after authorities discovered a leak on a 22-inch TransCanada Corporation gas transmission pipeline. [483][484]

333. On October 13, a gas transmission pipeline failed near Centerview, Missouri, causing an explosion and massive fire for several hours. There were no injuries. [485]

334. On October 13, a Sunoco/Mid-Valley crude oil pipeline ruptured, and spilled about 168,000 gallons of crude oil in Caddo Par-

ish, Louisiana. Wildlife was killed. [486]

335. A 24-inch gas transmission pipeline was hit by excavators on October 23, near Newport, Arkansas. Five nearby houses were evacuated, and two highways and a railroad were closed for a time. There was no fire or injuries. [487]
336. On October 28, an 8-inch natural gas condensate pipeline exploded in Monroe County, Ohio. A large fire followed. There were no injuries. [488]
337. On December 8, fuel was discovered leaking from Plantation Pipeline in Belton, South Carolina. It was found that the 26 inch products pipeline had leaked gasoline into a nearby creek. As of April 2015, it was estimated that 300,000 gallons of gasoline had leaked. The cause was a failure at a sleeve that was part of a repair in 1979 had failed. [489][490]

Year 2015

338. On January 14, during work to free a trapped inline inspection unit, a leak was discovered on the Evangeline Pipeline, near Cameron Parish, Louisiana. This pipeline had been given a Corrective Action Order in October 2014, due to a number of leaks. [491][492][493]
339. Also on January 14, a gas pipeline exploded and burned, near the Ross Barnett Reservoir in Brandon, Mississippi, creating a sizable crater in the ground and burning 6 acres of vegetation, before the fire was extinguished. No injuries were reported. The failure was due to a "hard spot" from manufacturing, that already had a repair sleeve on it. There are 788 sleeves on the Index 129 pipeline from Edna, Texas, to Sterlington, Louisiana; and, 726 sleeves on the Index 130 pipeline from Marchand Junction, Louisiana to Kosciusko, Mississippi. Both were built from pipe made in 1952. [494][495][496]
340. On January 19, oil from a broken pipeline seeped into the Yellowstone River, and contaminated the water supply 10 miles south of Glendive, Montana. The release was from Bridger Pipeline LLC's 12-inch Poplar line, which can carry 42,000 barrels a day of crude from the Bakken formation and runs from Canada south to Baker, Montana. Bridger Pipeline is a subsidiary of True Cos., a privately held Wyoming-based company. The company said in a statement that the pipeline was shut down within an hour of the leak. [497][498]
341. On January 21, a crude oil pipeline pump station caught fire northwest of Texas City, Texas. Texas City fire officials said that company officials reported that there had been issues with the pump station over the weekend. [499]
342. On January 26, a 20-inch ATEX pipeline carrying ethane exploded and burned in Brooke County, West Virginia. Despite snow in the area, five acres of woodlands burned, and 24,000 gallons of ethane were consumed. Initial reports suspect a girth weld failure, with the pipeline being less than two years old. There were no injuries. [500]
343. On February 25, a 26-inch crude oil pipeline in Navarro County near the Town of Dawson, Texas, failed, spill about 50 barrels of crude oil. Near the failure, investigation showed that the pipe had lost about 80% of its thickness, due to external corrosion. This anomaly was not seen in a 2011 test of this pipeline. [501]
344. A pipeline Patrol pilot identified an oil sheen on a pond near Tehuacana Creek, Texas, which was then linked to a leaking 10 inch petroleum products pipeline on March 13. About 50 barrels of diesel fuel were spilled. [502]
345. On April 9, 2 Williams Companies pipelines broke within hours of each other in Marshall County, West Virginia. A 4-inch condensate pipeline broke at 8 pm local time, spilling about 132 barrels of condensate into a creek. Around 10:50 pm local time, a 12-inch gas pipeline ruptured. There was no fire or injuries. Heavy rains were said to be the cause of the failures. [503][504]
346. On April 13, a Kinder Morgan gas pipeline exploded and burned near Borger, Texas. One home was evacuated, but, there were no injuries or serious damage. [505]
347. On April 17, a 12 inch natural gas pipeline near Fresno, CA operated by Pacific Gas and Electric Corp was ruptured by a backhoe. The resulting explosion killed 1 person and injured 12 others. [506]
348. On May 19, a Plains All American Pipeline oil pipeline ruptured near Refugio State Beach, spilling about 105,000 gallons of crude oil. It is referred to as the Refugio Oil Spill [507][508]
349. On May 31, a 24 inch natural gas back-up pipeline that runs under the Arkansas River in Little Rock, Arkansas ruptured releasing 3.9 million cubic feet of natural gas. The pipeline was not currently in use. No one was injured. A tugboat was damaged. [509][510]
350. On June 10, a 24 inch natural gas pipeline ruptured in Lycoming County, PA. 130 individuals were evacuated from their homes. No injuries or damage reported. [511]
351. On June 13, a 42 inch gas gathering pipeline exploded and burned near Cuero, Texas. 7 homes were evacuated for a time, but there were no injuries. [512]
352. On June 22, a truck driver was killed when his rig veered off a highway, & broke above ground facilities for a propylene pipeline in Houston, Texas. The highway had to be closed for several hours, until the gas dissipated. [513]
353. Four workers were hurt on June 25, when a 4 inch gas pipeline exploded at a gas pipeline facility, near White Deer, Texas. 2 of the workers were critically injured. The cause of the explosion was not immediately known. [514]
354. On July 10, a fitting on a 20 inch Plains All American Pipeline crude oil pipeline broke, spilling 4200 gallons of crude oil near Grantfork, Illinois. Much of the crude reached a nearby creek. There were no injuries. [515]
355. On July 15, two workers were hurt by an explosion, when a bulldozer hit a 4 inch gas pipeline, at an EQT gas compressor station in Worthington, Pennsylvania. [516]

356. On August 3, two individuals were injured in Falfurrias, TX when a natural gas pipeline operated by Kinder Morgan ruptured. [S17]
357. On August 7, a natural gas liquids pipeline in Weld County, CO burned, after being struck by a third party [S18]
358. Two maintenance divers, at a Gulf South Pipeline offshore of Louisiana were injured, when the pipeline ruptured, and the gas ignited. [S19]

{NOTE: difficult OCR conditions resulted in many errors in the following material}

1. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_pipeline_accidents_in_the_United_States_in_the_21st_century
2. H Josef Herbert (IS January 2000). "Oil pipeline pollution fine hits \$3S million". Los Angeles Times. Associated Press. Retrieved IS January 20 IS.
3. Use of In Situ Burning at a Diesel Spill in Wetlands and Salt Flats, Northern Utah, U.S.A: Remediation Operations and IS Years of Post-Burn Monitoring". Retrieved 2014-04-12.
4. Jan. 21, 2000 - ProPublica". Projects.propublica.org. 2000-01-21. Retrieved 2014-04-12.
5. Jan. 21, 2000 - ProPublica". Retrieved IS January 2015.
6. The Item - Google News Archive Search". Retrieved IS January 2015.
7. http://www.nts.gov/investigations/AccidentReports/Pages/PABO_I02.aspx
8. http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/commlreports/enforce/documents/22000SO_II_H122000SO_11_H_Corrective%20Action%20order_10172000.pdf
9. "Ron Rothschild (200S-0S-03). "SUNOCO Oil Spill Settlement". Fws.gov. Retrieved 2013-04-02. 10.
10. Sunary. "IncidentNews: Sun Oil Pipeline". Incidentnews.gov. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
11. "http://www.nts.gov/investigations/AccidentReports/Reports/PABO_I03.pdf
12. "http://www.nts.gov/investigations/AccidentReports/Pages/PAR020_I.aspx
13. "Settlement: Colonial Pipeline Company Clean Water Act Settlement I Civil Enforcement I Compliance and Enforcement I US EPA". Epa.gov. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
14. "http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/commlreports/enforce/documents/32002S00_IH132002S00_IH_CAO_022S2002.pdf
15. "The Argus-Press - Google News Archive Search". Retrieved IS January 2015.
16. "Reading Eagle - Google News Archive Search". Retrieved IS January 2015.
17. "July S, 2000 - ProPublica". Retrieved IS January 2015.
18. "http://www.nts.gov/investigations/AccidentReports/Pages/PAR030_I.aspx
19. "USDOJ: Environment and Natural Resources Division: U.S. v. El Paso Natural Gas Co". Justice.gov. 2007-07-26. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
20. "The Spokesman-Review - Google News Archive Search". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
21. "When is a lake not a lake? When is a river not a river? - Clean Water Fund". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
22. "http://rapanos.typepad.com/chevron.pdf
23. "Haurwitz, Ralph K.M.; Nesmith, Jeff (July 24, 2001). "Digs gone awry: a top cause of tragedy". Austin, Texas: The American Statesman. Archived from the original on 2003-07-07. Retrieved 2013_04_02.Id,adUakj
24. "Williams, Brian (September 8,2000). "Abilene pipeline blast injures two". Lubbock Avalanche-Journal. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
25. "Associated Press (November 7, 2001). "Exxon Mobil ordered to pay for pipeline blast". Lubbock Avalanche-Journal. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
26. "The Victoria Advocate - Google News Archive Search". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
27. "Pipeline Rupture: A Case Study". Fire Engineering. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
28. "Lawrence Journal-World - Google News Archive Search". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
29. "Boca Raton News - Google News Archive Search". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
30. "to: • b , i, "http://www.nwf.org/News-and-Magazines/Media-Center/News-by-Topic/Global-Warming/20101-01-/medialPDFs/Global%20Warming/Reports/Full-Oil-Incident-List.ashx
31. "http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/commlreports/enforceldocuments/3200150_15H/3200_150_15H_CAO_0622200_I.pdf
32. "May 1,200 I - ProPublica". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
33. "Big blast, but no injuries Pipeline explodes in Platte County field". Retrieved 2013-07-18.
34. "Lawrence Journal-World - Google News Archive Search". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
35. "Local News - Potosi oil pipeline blaze doused, but dispute smolders". Texnews.com. 2001-05-26. Retrieved 2014-02-14.
36. "Gasoline Pipeline Explosion". Hazmat2-9.com. 2001-07-24. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
37. "Beaver County Times - Google News Archive Search". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
38. "PHMSA - Southwest - CPF 4-2001-1005-H". Phmsa.dot.gov. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
39. "http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/commlreports/enforce/documents/4200_II_005H14200_II_005H.pdf
40. "The Argus-Press - Google News Archive Search". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
41. "Aug. 12,2001 - ProPublica". Projects.propublica.org. 2001-08-12. Retrieved 2014-02-14.
42. "to: ' b http://www.ukopa.co.uk/publications/pdf/020035.pdt/deadUakj
43. "PHMSA _ Southwest _ CPF 4-2001-1006-H". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
44. "Ludington Daily News - Google News Archive Search". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
45. "The Victoria Advocate - Google News Archive Search". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
46. "Oct. 15,2001 - ProPublica". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
47. "to: • b , d http://www2.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2013-09/documents/teppco-cd.pdf
48. "The Danish Villages Voice - Google News Archive Search". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
49. "Document I Oklahoma Corporation Commission Pipeline Failure Investigation Report (manually redacted) Filing Date April 17,2008 13 page(s) of Text (PDF) Photos". Dms.nts.gov. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
50. "Times Daily - Google News Archive Search". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
51. "March 6, 2002 - ProPublica". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
52. "Toledo Blade - Google News Archive Search". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
53. "http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/commlreports/enforce/documents/32002I_003H/32002I_003H_CAO_03282002.pdf
54. "http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/commlreports/enforce/documents/320025011_HI320025011h_text.pdf

55. “ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/commlreports/enforce/documents/120021_004H1120021_004_H_Corrective%20Action%20order_06202002.pdf”
56. “http://www.nlsb.gov/investigations/AccidentReports/Pages/PAR040_I.aspx”
57. ““Family still grieves ten years after fatal Hopkinton explosion - News - Framingham, MA”. The MetroWest Daily News. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
58. ““PHMSA - Data and Statistics - Distribution, Transmission, and Liquid Accident and Incident Data”. Phmsa.dot.gov. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
59. ““PHMSA: Stakeholder Communications”. Primis.phmsa.dot.gov. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
60. ““U.S. EPA On-Scene Coordinator Report” (PDF). Docket No. CWA-08-2002-35. EPA.gov. Nov 20, 2002.
61. “<http://www.scribd.com/doc/2011842/Environmental-Protection-Agency-CW-A0820040033CAFO>”
62. ““Nov. 2,2002 - ProPublica”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
63. ““Dec. 10,2002 - ProPublica”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
64. ““Lawrence Journal-World - Google News Archive Search”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
65. “http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/colmnireports/enforce/documents/320031_002H1320031_002H_CAO_02072003.pdf”
66. “http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comlnireports/enforce/documents/320031_005H1320031_j05h_cao_03042003_text.pdf”
67. “http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/cOimnireports/enforce/documents/220035002H1220035002h_cao_03242003_text.pdf”
68. ““March 13,2003 - ProPublica”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
69. “ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comm/reports/enforce/documents/520031_002H1520031_002h_corrective%20action%20order_04032003_text.pdf”
70. “<http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/cOimnireports/enforce/documents/420035009H1CPF420035009H.pdf>”
71. “http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/commlreports/enforce/documents/520031_003H/520031_003H.pdf”
72. “to: • b http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comlnireports/enforce/documents/520031_003H1520031_003HA.pdf”
73. “http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/cOimnireports/enforce/documents/320035014H/320035014H_CAO_05162003.pdf”
74. ““Natural Gas Pipeline Explodes in Texas”. Firehouse. 2003-05-21. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
75. ““May 20, 2003 - ProPublica”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
76. “http://www.nts.gov/investigations/AccidentReports/Reports/PAB040_I.pdf”
77. “http://lubbockonline.com/stories/070303/reg_07030306S.shtml”
78. ““More pipeline documents may be collecting dust near Midland””.
79. “http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comm/reports/enforce/documents/320035019H1320035019H_CAO_07172003.pdf”
80. “http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comm/reports/enforce/documents/320035020H/320035020H_CAO_07252003.pdf”
81. “http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrnireports/enforce/documents/42003501_OH/42003501_OH.pdf”
82. ““Pipeline fails tests; gas shortage likely to continue”. Azcentral.com. 2003-05-20. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
83. ““Google Drive Viewer”. Docs.google.com. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
84. ““Microsoft Word - ArizonaFuelSupplyReport13_03.doc” (PDF). Retrieved 2013-04-02.
85. ““July 30, 2003 - ProPublica”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
86. “PHMSA Corrective Action Order, CPF No.4-2003-100SH, http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrnireports/enforce/documents/420031_008H1420031_OOSH.pdf”
87. “http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comm/reports/enforce!documents/320035023H1320035023H_CAO_I_0242003.pdf” 8S. ““Oct. 13,2003 - ProPublica”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
89. “to: • b “Addicting Info”. Addicting Info. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
90. “http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comm/reports/enforce/documents/3200310_IOH1320031_01_OH_CAO_I_0242003.pdf”
91. “http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comm/reports/enforce/documents/320035026H1320035026H_CAO_112S2003.pdf”
92. “<http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrnireports/enforce/documents/120045002H1120045002H.pdf>”
93. “http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrnireports/enforce/documents/120_IOSOOSHII201_0500SH_CAO_090220_I0_text.pdf”
94. “Bulwa, Demian; St. John, Kelly; Fimrite, Peter (June 24,20 II). “Pipeline spills 60,000 US gallons (230,000 L) of fuel into Suisun Marsh I Operators noticed problem Tuesday but waited to report it”. The San Francisco Chronicle.
95. ““ApriI27, 2004 - ProPublica”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
96. “Gordy Holt And Robert Mcclur (2004-05-24). “Wear caused gas leak in Olympic pipeline”. Seattlepi.com. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
97. ““Second explosion rocks gas storage facility in Texas”. USA Today. August 20, 2004.
98. “ http://www.spectraenergywatch.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/article_singlepointfailurerisk.pdf”
99. “http://www.nts.gov/investigations/AccidentReports/Reports/PAB060_I.pdf”
100. ““Trespassers blamed for pipeline explosion _ Houston Chronicle”. Chron.com. 2004-09-27. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
101. “to: • b “Pipeline Finns to Pay \$3.65 Million to Settle Claims Related to 2004 Ammonia Spills in Nebraska and Kansas - OPA - Department of Justice”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
102. “ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrnireports/enforce/documents/42004502SH/420045028H_Corrective%20Action%20order_10012004.pdf”
103. ““Star-News - Google News Archive Search”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
104. ““Ammonia Spills in Nebraska, Kansas Cost Pipeline Firms \$3.65M”. ENS-Newswire.com. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
105. ““Gas Line Explodes In West Little Rock, Arkansas”. Firehouse. 2004-11-01. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
106. “http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrnireports/enforce/documents/220045017H/CPF2_2004_5017H_CAO.pdf”
107. ““Kentucky New Era - Google News Archive Search”. Retrieved 15 January 2015. IOS. ““Pipeline System” (PDF). Retrieved 2013-04-02.
109. ““Mojave River Pipeline Spill, San Bernardino County, CA” (PDF). Part 2. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
110. ““Mojave River Pipeline Spill, San Bernardino County, CA” (PDF). Part 1. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
- III. ““Propane Pipeline Leaks In Richland County, North Dakota”. Firehouse.com. December 16,2004. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
112. ““Up To 5,000 Gallons Of Crude Oil Spilled From Montana Pipeline”. Firehouse.com. 2004-12-27. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
113. ““Federal Government Reaches Settlement with Pipeline Companies Regarding Crude Oil Spills”. Justice.gov. 15 August 2006. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
114. ““Jan. IS, 2005 - ProPublica”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
115. ““Jan. 26,2005 - ProPublica”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
116. ““Kentucky New Era - Google News Archive Search”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
117. ““Pennsylvania Pile Line Fire Finally Dies Out”. Firehouse. 2005-02-05. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
116. http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrn/reports/enforce/documents/120055002H/120055002h_amendment%20to%20corrective

- %20action%20order_02102005_text.pdf
119. “Beaver County Times - Google News Archive Search”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
 120. “http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrn/reports/enforce/documents/520055020H1520055020H_corrective%20action%20order_042 I 2005.pdf?nocache=4253
 121. “Kinder Morgan Pays \$5.3M For California Oil Spills”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
 122. “http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrn/reports/enforce/documents/4200510 II Hlcpf_420051011 H.pdf?nocache=S618
 123. “http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comm/reports/enforce/documents/420055020Hlcpf_420055020H.pdf?nocache=6120
 124. “Lawrence Journal-World - Google News Archive Search”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
 125. “PHMSA: Stakeholder Communications”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
 126. “http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrn/reports/enforce/documents/420055021 H/cpf_420055021 H.pdf?nocache=6836
 127. “The Victoria Advocate - Google News Archive Search”. Retrieved 15 January 2015. 12S. “Aug. 11,2005 - ProPublica”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
 129. “US Department of Transportation Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Office of Pipeline Safety - Failure Investigation Report” (PDF). Retrieved 13 July 2015.
 130. “19.2_text.indd” (PDF). Retrieved 2013-04-02.
 131. “http://www.phmsa.dot.gov/pv_obLcache/pv_obLid_62F AI511 09EF7E5E6S067 AE644C9CCD599530600/filenameITEPP CO%20HL%200H%202005-09-IS%2050S.pdf
 132. “Rice, Heidi (2005-12-07). “Natural gas explosion shakes up Colo. between Rifle and Rulison”. SummitDaily.com. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
 133. “http://www.nts.gov/investigations/AccidentReports/Reports/PAB070 I.pdf
 134. “Man Injured In Natural Gas Explosion”. NBCllnews.com. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
 135. “http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/commreports/enforce/documents/5200650 15H1BP%205-2006-50 15H%20- %20Final.pdf?nocache=9340
 136. “Pipe corrosion in Alaska takes the issue off back burner _ Houston Chronicle”. Chron.com. 2006-OS-13. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
 137. “http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/commreports/enforce/documents/320065033H1320065033H_Corrective%20Action%20order_03292006.pdf
 138. “http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/commireports/enforce/documents/120065003H1120065003 H _ CAO _ 04202006.pdf?nocache=4 592
 139. “April 17,2006 - ProPublica”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
 140. “http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/commreports/enforce/documents/32006503 7H/CPF_NO_3-2006-503 7H.pdf?nocache= 1341
 141. “June27, 2006 - ProPublica”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
 142. “http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/commreports/enforce/documents/22006I 007H/22006I 007H _ Corrective%20Action%20order_07272006.pdf
 143. “Gas Explosion Was Kentucky’s Fourth In Last Decade”. Lexington, Kentucky: LEXIS.com. January 3, 2012. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
 144. “PHMSA: Stakeholder Communications”. DOT.gov. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
 145. “http://www .phmsa.dot.gov/staticfiles/PHMSNDownloadableFiles/Files/liquidO I 02.zip
 146. “Lawrence Journal-World - Google News Archive Search”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
 147. “Searchers Find Body of Fourth Victim of Deadly Louisiana Gas Pipeline Explosion”. Fox News. October 13, 2006.[d,ad /i”k)
 148. “Clark, Dwayne (October 5, 2006). “Jacksonville Florida Maritime Lawyers”. Lawboat.blogspot.com. Retrieved 2013-04- 02.
 149. “PHMSA: Stakeholder Communications”. DOT.gov. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
 150. “I Dead After Wyoming Gas Pipeline Explodes”. Fox News. November 11,2006. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
 151. “EI Paso Corp. Fined \$2.3 million For Wyoming Pipeline Explosion”. Huffington Post. December 1,2009.
 152. “News”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
 153. “PHMSA: Stakeholder Communications”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
 154. “The Victoria Advocate - Google News Archive Search”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
 155. “Dec. 24, 2006 - ProPublica”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
 156. “Content, Thomas (2007-01-04). “Milwaukee Journal Sentinel: “Oil group cleans spill in Clark County “. Jsonline.com. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
 157. “to: b http://www .phmsa.dot.gov/staticfiles/PHMSAIDownloadableFiles/Files/Pipeline/Corrective _ Action _ Order _ 0730 I 2.pdf
 158. “PHMSA: Stakeholder Communications”. Primis.phmsa.dot.gov. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
 159. “Bergquist, Lee (2007-02-16). “Milwaukee Journal Sentinel: “Oil spill tainted water table “. Jsonline.com. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
 160. “Pipeline Fire”. You Tube. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
 161. “Explosion rocks northwest Harris County”. Houston Chronicle. Retrieved 15 January 2015. 162 ... http://www.I0llnow.cominews/headlines/64223167.html
 163. “http://ens-newswire.com120 12/06/04/pipeline-companies-fined-1-million-for-spills-in-three-states!
 164. “to: b c d, f http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrn/reports/enforce/documents/320 141 00SS/320 141 008S _ Notice%20t%20Proposed%20S afety%20order_1 22420 14.pdf
 165. “Bangor Daily News - Google News Archive Search”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
 166. “Sunoco Pipeline Release, Coal Township, Northumberland County http://dothemountain.wordpress.com/2009/1 01 l6/spill- in-jackson-township-tioga-county- in-the-ncro-weekly-reportl
 167. “Carney troubled by line rupture http://findarticles.comip/news-articles/news-item-the-sharnokin- palmi_ SI54/is_ 20070602/carney-troubled-rupture/ai _ n537074501
 168. “Small gas leak on Little Mountain posed no danger”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
 169. “November 7, 2010 (2010-11-07). “BP Alaska facilities still at risk”. Alaska Dispatch. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
 170. “Investigation begins into what caused natural gas explosion”. wzzm13.com. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
 171. “Dow Chemical Ethylene Pipe Explodes in Port Arthur, Texas”. LiveLeak.com. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
 172. “Ryan Myers (200S-10-02). “Pipeline explosion spurs lawsuit”. Beaumont Enterprise. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
 173. “http://www.nts.gov/investigations/AccidentReports/Pages/PAR090 I.aspx
 174. “http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comm/reports/enforce/documents/2200S6002/2200S6002 _FinalOrder _ 042620 I O.pdf
 175. “Enbridge fined in fatal Minnesota accident _ Houston Chronicle”. Chron.com. 20 I O-OS-IS. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
 176. “Griese, Noel (2009-OS-OS). “Energy Pipeline News: Enbridge will appeal \$2.4 million fine levied for fatal Minnesota accident”. Energypipelinenews.blogspot.com. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
 177. “Three-million dollar settlement in explosion case from hwnn.comldead/ink]
 178. “Fayetteville man hurt in deadly Louisiana interstate blast”. TuscaloosaNews.com. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
 179. “Federal Register I Notice of Lodging of Consent Decree Pursuant to the Clean Water Act”. Federalregister.gov. 20 I O- 02-22. Retrieved

- 2013-04-02.
180. “PHMSA: Stakeholder Communications”. Primis.phmsa.dot.gov. Retrieved 2013-04-02. ISI. “Jan. 7, 2005 - ProPublica”. Retrieved IS January 2015.
 182. “Old pipelines are a hidden menace | Energy | Chron.com _ Houston Chronicle”. Chron.com. 2010-11-IS. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
 183. “No Fatalities From Gas Plant Explosion _ NewsChannelS.com | Nashville News, Weather and Sports”. NewsChannelS.com. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
 184. <http://www.foxnews.com/story/2005/02/15/explosion-reported-at-south-texas-oil-pipeline.html>
 185. “Michler, Caroline. “Ameren Missouri wrongful death trial set to begin Tuesday”. Columbia Missourian. Retrieved 2013- 04-02.
 186. “Document I DOT Incident Report (manually redacted) Filing Date November 06, 2005 3 page(s) of Text (PDF) Photos”. Dms.nts.gov. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
 187. “Apex Oil Ordered to Clean Soil, Water Under Illinois Village”. ENS-Newswire.com. July 29, 2005. Retrieved 2013-04- 02.
 187. “PHMSA: Stakeholder Communications”. Primis.phmsa.dot.gov. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
 188. “Kebede, Rebekah (August II, 2005). “Marathon KY refinery cuts rates after pipe leak”. Reuters.
 190. “Workers cleaning up Illinois oil spill; crude valued around \$25,000 “ Evansville Courier and Press”. Courierpress.com. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
 191. “PHMSA Stakeholder Communications: Operator Information -Incident and Mileage Data”. Primis.phmsa.dot.gov. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
 192. “Gas pipeline fire bums out in Caldwell County from Texas_Fire.comldem//ink]
 193. “ http://www.phmsa.dot.gov/staticfiles/PHMSAIDownloadableFiles/Files/Pipeline/Failure%20ReportsIPanhandle_Eastern_GT_MO_SOS_2005-0S-2S.pdf
 194. “Janelle Stecklein (2005-09-10). “Gas explosion bums 2”. Amarillo Globe-News. Retrieved 2013-04-02. 19S. “ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/commlreports/enforce/documents/1200SI004H11200SI004H_CAO_09252005.pdf?nocache=S422
 196. “Three Years Later, Residents Moved on After Gas Pipeline Explosi _ WSET.com _ ABCI3”. WSET.com. 2011-09-14. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
 197. “McGurty, Janet (September 24, 2005). “Longhorn Pipeline stops fuel flow due to fire”. Reuters.
 198. “PHMSA: Stakeholder Communications”. Primis.phmsa.dot.gov. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
 199. “Sunday, October 05, 2008 BY JEFF TRENTLY (2005-IO-0S). “Cleanup of oil spill continues”. NJ.com. Retrieved 2013- 04-02.
 200. “Oct. 3, 2005 - ProPublica”. Retrieved IS January 2015.
 201. “Compressor station blows up”. Retrieved 2013-07-15.
 202. “Sunoco faces \$2.3 million DEP fine for Murrysville pipeline leak”. TribL/VE.com. Retrieved IS January 2015.
 203. “http://www.phmsa.dot.gov/staticfiles/PHMSAIPipelineFailureReportsICGT_GT_WV_20090104.pdf
 204. “Loy, Wesley (2009-02-06). “Inquiry launched after pump station accident”. ADN.com. Retrieved 2013-04-02. 20S. “Gas pipeline explosion near Carthage from Texas_Fire.comlead/ink]
 206. “UPDATE I-Explosion near DCP Midstream’s Texas natgas plant”. Reuters. February II, 2009.
 207. “Press release by Sunoco Logistics <http://www.wto1.com/story/9S73737/press-release-by-sunoco-logistics>
 208. “Ohio, Michigan score among highest for states with oil spills”. Toledoblade.com. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
 209. “ http://www.phmsa.dot.gov/staticfiles/PHMSAIDownloadableFiles/Files/Pipeline/Failure%20ReportsIMid_Valley_HL_OH_2009-02-1S_SOS.pdf
 210. “ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/commlreports/enforce/documents/220091002H1220091002H_CAO_05072009.pdf?nocache=42S3
 211. “ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/commlreports/enforce/documents/320091009H1320091009H_CAO_05132009.pdf?nocache=6515
 212. “http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/commlreports/enforce/documents/32012S0IS/32012S0IS_NOPV%20PCP_OS272012.pdf
 213. “May 21, 2009 - ProPublica”. Retrieved IS January 2015.
 214. “Pipeline accident investigation could take months _ KLTv.com-Tyler, Longview, Jacksonville, Texas | ETX News”. Kltv.com. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
 215. “ http://www.phmsa.dot.gov/staticfiles/PHMSAIDownloadableFiles/Files/Pipeline/Failure%20ReportsIExplorer_HL_OK_2009-OS-17_S08.pdf
 216. “Upton County Gas Line Fire Caused by Leak from Texas-Fire.com”” /ink]
 217. “ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrn/reports/enforce/documents/420091021H/420091021H_CAO_III02009.pdf?nocache=4008
 218. “http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comm/reports/enforce/documents/420091021H/420091021H_CAO_11102009.pdf
 219. “FireFightingNews.com (2009-11-05). “Home Destroyed In Texas Gas Line Blast”. Firefightingnews.com. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
 220. “http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comm/reports/enforce/documents/420091021H/420091021H_Closure_04132011.pdf
 221. “http://phmsa.dot.gov/staticfiles/PHMSAIDownloadableFiles/Pipeline/Columbia_GasTrans_GT_WV_2009-11-14.pdf
 222. “Noel Griese. “Energy Pipeline News”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
 223. “Dec. 4, 2009 - ProPublica”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
 224. “Pipeline leaks 210,000 gallons of oil - www.staplesworld.com - Staples World”. Retrieved IS January 2015.
 225. “ <http://www.phmsa.dot.gov/staticfiles/PHMSAIDownloadableFiles/Files/Pipeline/Failure%20ReportsIEnterprise%20HL%20TX%202009-12-23.pdf>
 226. “ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comm/reports/enforce/documents/320091024H/320091024H_CAO_02172010.pdf?nocache=I083
 227. “ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/commlreports/enforce!documents/320091024H1320091024H_Notice%20of%20Proposed%20CAO_I2212009.pdf
 228. “PHMSA: Stakeholder Communications”. Primis.phmsa.dot.gov. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
 229. “http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comm/reports/enforce!documents/32010500IH/32010500IH_CAO_01192010.pdf
 230. “Pipeline explosion at Barksdale kills civilian _ Air Force News | News from Afghanistan & Iraq”. Air Force Times., Retrieved 2013-04-02.
 231. “A year later, gas line checks continue from Star’Iribune.com”” /iuk)
 232. “History”. CrossboreSafety.org. 1999-02-09. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
 233. “Highway closed for gas leak” Local news” The Enid News and Eagle, Enid, OK”. Enidnews.com. 2010-02-25. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
 234. “PHMSA: Stakeholder Communications”. Primis.phmsa.dot.gov. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
 235. “<http://www.phmsa.dot.gov/staticfiles/PHMSAIPipelineFailureReportsIMid-Valley%20Pipeline%20HL%20TX%202010-03-0I%20508.pdf>
 236. “Gamm, Joe (2010-03-16). “No injuries in gas line rupture north of Pampa”. Amarillo Globe-News. Retrieved 2013-04- 02.
 237. “<http://www.phmsa.dot.gov/staticfiles/PHMSAIPipelineFailureReports/Sunoco%20RM%20HL%20PA%202010-03-25.pdf>

297. "McGurty, Janet (January 20, 2011). "UPDATE 2-Sunoco shuts Oklahoma crude line after Weds. leak". Reuters.
298. ""PHMSA: Stakeholder Communications". Retrieved IS January 20 IS.
299. " <http://www.ktla.com/news/landing/ktla-southwest-oil-leak.O.7386337> .story
300. "O'Connor, Anahad (July 2, 2011). "Ruptured Pipeline Spills Oil Into Yellowstone River". The New York Times.
301. ""Laurel residents evacuate after oil pipeline break". KTVQ.com. Retrieved IS January 2015.
302. ""Exxon Oil Spill in Montana River Prompts Evacuations". Fox News. July 3, 2011.
303. ""Exxon oil spill prompts evacuations". The Washington Post. July 3, 2011.
304. ""Greenspace". Los Angeles Times. July 3, 2011.
305. A to; • b ExxonMobil pipe spills oil into Yellowstone River http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id143619388/nslus_news- environment!
306. A "Exxon; Yellowstone spill 1,500 barrels, not 1,000". Fox News. January 19,2012.
307. A "Lawsuits against Exxon Mobil mount over big oil pipeline spills". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
308. A "Montana DEQ - Page Not Found". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
309. A http://www.dailyinterlake.com/news/state_news/ exxon-mobil-gets-million-penalty- for-pipeline-spill/artic Ie_I 99baf3c- a380-11e4-9674-d3ebafa4Ic24.html
310. A "Wyoming nat gas pipeline out of commission". UPI. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
311. A "Quality concerns arose before TransCanada pipeline blast". CBC News.
312. A <http://brandon.patch.com/articles/officials-probe-leak-of-31500-gallons-of-jet-fuel-near-mango-cleanup-ongoing>
313. A http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrnreports/enforce/documents/32011501OH/32011501OH_CAO_09162011.pdf
314. A http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrnreports/enforce!documents!320115009H/320115009H_CAO_08192011.pdf
315. A The Associated Press. "Pipeline Leak Sends Gasoline Into Missouri River". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
316. A "Mid-America Pipeline Company and Enterprise Products Operating to Pay \$1 Million for Spills in Iowa, Kansas and Nebraska - OPA - Department of Justice". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
317. A "Kinder Morgan, Owner of Illinois Natural Gas Pipeline Co. Where Explosion Occurred, Has Lengthy Record of Pipeline, Workplace Safety Violations - Natural Gas Watch.org". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
318. A "HazardEx - Gas plant explosion injures five". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
319. A "Providence Journal- Rhode Island news, sports, weather and more". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
320. A Van Derbeken, Jaxon (October 17,2011). "Plastic natural gas pipe failure data kept secret". The San Francisco Chronic/e.
321. A <http://www.phmsa.dot.gov/staticfiles/PHMSAIDownloadableFiles/Files/Pipeline/Failure%20ReportsiChevron%20HL%20TX%202011-09-08%20508.pdf>
322. A "Ruptured gasoline pipeline fixed in Aurelius; testing of nearby private wells continues". syracuse. com. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
323. A McGurty, Janet (October 24, 2011). "Blueknight reopens Oklahoma crude line after leak". Reuters.
324. A http://times-news.com/latest_news/x459213779/ Artemas-gas-explosion-forces-temporary-evacuation
325. A "PHMSA; Stakeholder Communications". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
326. A <http://newsandtribune.com/local/xI241962523IVectren-agrees-to-75-000-settlement-in-2011-gas-explosion>
327. A "Missing Man Found Dead After Deadly Ohio House Explosion". Fox News. November 13,2011.
328. A http://www.phmsa.dot.gov/staticfiles/PHMSAIDownloadableFiles/320111018H_CAO_1I1720II%20-%20Tennessee%20Gas.pdf
329. A <http://www.mariettatimes.com/page!content.detailid15454751N0v--pipeline-blast-leaves-lasting-impact-on- lives.html?nav=5002>
330. A http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrnreports/enforce/documents/220111010H/220111010H_CAO_11282011.pdf
331. A <http://www.wsfa.com/story/16181245/pipeline-explodes-in-marengo-county-causes-massive-fire>
332. A http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrnreports/enforce!documents/220111011H/220111011H_CAO_12062011.pdf
333. A "Corrosion cited in pipeline explosion - The Demopolis Times". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
334. A JEREMY FUGLEBERG Star-Tribune energy reporter. "Two suffer injuries due to fire at Wyoming natural gas site". Casper Star-Tribune Online. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
335. A staff and wire reports. "Magellan; Pipeline fixed near Nemaha, fuel pumping resumes". Joumatstar.com. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
336. A ALGIS J. LAUKAITIS / Lincoln Journal Star. "Pipeline fixed near Nemaha; fuel pumping resumes". JournalStar.com. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
337. A Paul Burkhardt. "Magellan Reduces Nebraska Line Spill Estimate to 2,834 Barrels". Businessweek.com. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
338. A <http://www.omaha.com/article/20111214NEWSOIII1219854>
339. A "EI Paso says no estimate for Return of Ruby gas line in Utah". Denver Post. December 12,2011.
340. A "Ruby Pipeline LLC ;; Informational Postings". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
341. A <http://www.wkvt.com/wymtnews/headlines/136548983.html>
342. A <http://www.therepublic.com/view/story/4d82ff96216f484dacf765751Oabcaa/KY--Explosion-Fire!>
343. A "Man feared dead in home explosion had hoped to move near son". Retrieved IS January 2015.
344. A WK YC Staff, WKYC (13 January 2012). "Wellington; Families still evacuated after massive pipeline spill". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
345. A "Wellington may have answers in the coming weeks". newsnet5. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
346. A "No injuries, damage after gas line explodes in Rio Vista". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
347. A <http://www.lex18.com/news/gas-leak-in-powell-county>
348. A "Cortlandt contractor in gas explosion may lack enough insurance, lawyer for homeowners says". The Journal News - lohud.com. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
349. A "Jan. 18,2012 - ProPublica". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
350. A Giang Nguyen, Marques White. "Details About Victim Of Home Explosion Released". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
351. A 13 News - Stephanie Ramos-Tomeoni. "Home Explosion Victim Dies". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
352. A "Jet Fuel Leaks For 2 Weeks Into Sewer". WISN. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
353. A Bruce Vielmetti. "Fonner Shell Pipeline monitor to plead guilty in airport leak". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
354. A http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrnreports/enforce/documents/420131014HI420131014H_Corrective%20Action%20Order_06242013.pdf
355. A "PHMSA; Stakeholder Communications". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
356. A "PHMSA; Stakeholder Communications". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
357. A "2 killed by Ill. oil pipeline explosion". Firekescue l.com. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
358. A "Late-night car race that caused pipeline fire rare, not unique". Reuters. March 7, 2012.
359. A http://www.tulsaworld.com/business/article.aspx?subjectid=49&articleid=20120306_49_0_ENIDCr320893

360. A “Officials finish cleaning crude from leaky pipeline in Barataria Bay”. NOLA.com. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
361. A “Northern Pennsylvania gas explosion was out of regulatory reach”. Philly.com. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
362. A Laura Legere (Staff Writer). “Explosion rocks natural gas compressor station”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
363. A <http://www.kcentv.com/story/173370-12/pipeline-explodes-near-carthage>
364. A “In brief; Repairs continue on leaking line”. MCA. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
365. A “Natural gas pipeline ruptures, sending flames soaring in Terrebonne Parish marshes”. NOLA.com. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
366. A <http://www.ktiv.com/story/17797831/northern-natural-gas-men-did-not-check-for-line>
367. A “PHMSA; Stakeholder Communications”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
368. A http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/conunreports/enforce/documents/420-125019H1420125019H_CAO_05082012.pdf
369. A “ExxonMobil Pipeline Company To Pay Civil Penalty Under Proposed Settlement For Torbert Louisiana Oil Spill Settlement Resolves Clean Water Act Violation Stemming From 2012 Spill”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
370. ^ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrn/reports/enforce/documents/420121-0-11H1420-121-0-II-H_Corrective%20Action%20Order_061-220-12.pdf
371. A <http://www.kristv.com/news/pipeline-worker-hurt-in-texas-panhandle-explosion/>
372. ^ “HazardEx - BP gas compressor station explosion in Colorado kills one”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
373. ^ http://www.krqe.com/ldpp/news/colorado/ap_colorado/BP-Halliburton-fmed-in-fatal-pipeline-explosion_54659132
374. A WTMJ News Team. “Family evacuates near pipeline in Jackson, Wis. - 620 WTMJ - Milwaukee’s Source for Local News and Weather”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
375. A Don Behm. “Tests reveal chemicals in 23 more Jackson wells”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
376. A Don Behm. “Fuel company seeks to divert Cedar Creek for pipeline fixes”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
377. A Don Behm. “Fuel pipeline repairs force closure of parts of Jackson Marsh”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
378. A Don Behm. “Large gasoline spill linked to benzene in Village of Jackson well”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
379. ^ http://www.eunicetoday.com/view/full_story/119367444/article-Gas-line-blows-in-Intracoastal-City-no-one-hurt?instance=secondary_news_left_column
380. A “This Week In Natural Gas Leaks and Explosions _ July 30, 2012 - Natural Gas Watch.org”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
381. A “Lightning Causes Compressor Explosion”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
382. A “UPDATE 4-Enbridge to replace leaky Wisconsin oil pipeline Monday”. Reuters. July 29, 2012.
383. A Jeremy Fugleberg Star-Tribune business editor. “Four burned in Lost Cabin gas plant flash fire”. Casper Star-Tribune Online. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
384. A “Jet Fuel Spill Near Chicago Closes Canal, Highway”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
385. A http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrn/reports/enforce/documents/320-1250-19H/320-1250-19H_Corrective%20Action%20Order_08302012.pdf
386. A “Pipeline in Palos Park Was Corroded; Company Rep”. Palos, Illinois Patch. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
387. A “Gas Line Fire Snuffed Out”. NBC 10 Philadelphia. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
388. ^ “Gas line explosion in McKinney leaves four injured, 1,000 without gas”. The Scoop Blog. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
389. A “Production impact ‘minimal’ from pipe blast”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
390. A “Cause of Sept. 6 explosion at gas plant still being investigated”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
391. A “Colorado Interstate Gas sets force majeure after compressor fire”. Reuters. September 12, 2012.
392. A <http://www.colorado.gov/cs/Satellite?blobcol=urldata&blobheademame1=ContentDisposition&blobheademame2=Content-Type&blobheademame3=application%2Fpdf&blobkey=id&blobtable=MungoBlobs&blobwhere=1251808828542&ssbinary=true>
393. A “Natural gas line struck by excavator near Orange County Airport”. recordonline.com. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
394. A “Gas explosion lights the sky in downtown Lewiston”. Idaho Press-Tribune. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
395. A “OSHA Fines Company Over Natural Gas Explosion”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
396. ^ Aaron Clark. “BP Chicag Pipe Spilled Oil at Illinois Tank Farm, Filing Shows”. Businessweek.com. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
397. A <http://www.wlsam.com/Article.asp?id=2581701&spid=>
398. A “2 workers hurt in natural gas explosion near Price”. NewsOK.com. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
399. A “Claims for losses in Springfield explosion continue to mount”. masslive.com. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
400. A “Hwy 99 reopens after a Madera County gas leak”. ABC30 Fresno. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
401. A <http://www.star-telegram.com/2012/12/04/4459948/fire-at-fort-worth-gas-well-site.html#my-headlinesdefault#storylink=c>
402. A “Pipe explodes near Goldsmith plant”. Odessa American. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
403. A <http://www.statejournal.com/History/20328434/explosion-highlights-pipeline-safety>
404. A “PHOTOS; West Virginia Gas Line Explodes, Sends Flames Up To 75 Feet In The Air”. Huffington Post. December 11, 2012.
405. A <http://www.register-herald.com/breakingnews/x-13-3-23-54-23-3/Gas-line-explodes-bums-homes-and-roads-near-Sissonville>
406. A <http://www.dailymail.com/News/2012121202SI>
407. A http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrn/reports/enforce/documents/220121-005H1220121-005H_CAO_12282012.pdf 40S. ^ “Investigation of deadly Lewisville explosion continues”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
409. A “Cable Contractor Involved in KC Gas Explosion”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
410. A “OSHA cites drilling company in fatal explosion at JJ’s restaurant”. kansascity. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
411. A “Fire erupts after tug hits Chevron LPG pipeline; Coast Guard”. Reuters. March 13, 2013.
412. ^ “Tug captain Chad Breaux dies of burns after Louisiana gas explosion”. UPI. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
413. A “Utah Local News - Salt Lake City News, Sports, Archive - The Salt Lake Tribune”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
414. A http://phmsa.dot.gov/staticfiles/PHMSAIDownloadableFiles/Files/520-135006H-cao_03222013.pdf
415. A “UPDATE I-Williams natgas line ruptures in West Virginia”. Reuters. March 22, 2013.
416. A Visser, Nick (April 9, 2013). “Maddow Slams Exxon’s ‘Paper Towel’ Cleanup Efforts”. Huffington Post.
417. A “Web Extra; Background on Pipeline that Ruptured Near Mayflower”. Retrieved 15 January 2015. 41S. A http://www.phmsa.dot.gov/staticfiles/PHMSAIDownloadableFiles/File/4%202013%205006H_Corrective%20Action%20Order_4%2002%2013.pdf
419. A THV II Staff, news source (10 July 2013). “Exxon; Cause of pipeline failure ‘manufacturing defects...’”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
420. A “Employee ran 1 mile to escape Guthrie natural gas explosion”. koco. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
421. ^ <http://www.therepublic.com/view/story/af39190844784b7eac485e85c9b9522d1WV--Gas-Explosion>
422. A <http://www.wtov9.com/9news/news/2nd-worker-dies-result-tyler-co-pipeline-explosion/nXNHZl>
423. ^ “Exxon says Missouri oil spills from already-ruptured Pegasus line”. Reuters. May 1, 2013.

424. ^ http://www.wishtv.com/olndpp/news/local/marion_county/idem-evaluates-impact-of-fuel-spill
425. ^ “DEP; Compressor stations shows signs of explosion”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
426. A “PHMSA; Stakeholder Communications”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
427. ^ “Skytruth Alert; NRC Report; Natural Gas near Crockett, TX 2013-05-08”. SkyTruth Alerts. Retrieved 15 January 2015. 42S. A “News - MyCentralJersey.com - mycentraljersey.com”. MyCentralJersey.com. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
429. ^ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/colmnreports/enforce/documents/520131007H/520131007H_Corrective%20Action%20order_06192013_text.pdf
430. ^ <http://www.foxSlive.com/lnistory/22625662/natural-gas-pipeline-blast-creates-massive-crater>
431. ^ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/colmnireports/enforce/documents/420131014H1420131014H_Corrective%20Action%20order_06242013_text.pdf
432. ^ “Observer-Reporter - Blaze hits compressor station in Gilmore Township”. Observer-Reporter. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
433. A Kathy Antoniotti. “City not privy to pipeline locations inside own borders”. www.ohio.com. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
434. ^ “Downed Wires Lead To Car Fires, Ruptured Gas Line In Mamaroneck” CBS New York”. Retrieved 15 January 2015. 4 3 5. ^ <http://www.newson6.com/story/229445661-crews-working-to-halt-bp-pipeline-leak-in-washington-county>
436. ^ <http://www.galesburg.com/article/20130814NEWS/130819969/101801NEWS>
437. ^ “Search Results - KEYE-TV Austin”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
438. ^ “Update to gas explosion in Overland Park”. fox4kc.com. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
439. ^ “Gas line not yet repaired after explosion in Buna”. Beaumont Enterprise. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
440. ^ “City worker hits gas line”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
441. ^ “Corrosion may have led to North Dakota pipeline leak; regulator”. Yahoo News. 11 October 2013. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
442. ^ <http://www.greenfieldreporter.com/view/story/12Iae083847f4744a934a459c9e0d09d1ND--ND-Pipeline-Break-Cleanup>
443. A <http://www.newswest9.com/lnistory/23630636/officials-working-pipeline-explosion-in-howard-county>
444. A “(With video and three photos) Oil spill cleanup continues along Horsehead Creek tributary near Macedonia”. Magnolia Reporter - Magnolia, Arkansas News. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
445. A <http://www.news9.com/lnistory/23650973/resident-recalls-pipeline>
446. ^ The Christian Science Monitor. “Pipeline explosion shoots flames into Oklahoma sky”. The Christian Science Monitor. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
447. ^ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/colmnreports/enforce/documents/420131016H/420131016H_Corrective%20Action%20order_10112013_text.pdf
448. ^ <http://www.kvue.com/lninews/local/Officials-cleaning-up-400-barrel-oil-spill-near-Smithville-229756751.html>
449. A “Small Town Residents Allowed To Return After Fiercy Blast”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
450. ^ “UPDATE 4-Chevron pipeline explodes, burns in rural Texas”. Reuters. November 14, 2013.
451. A http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/colmnireports/enforce/documents/420145012/420145012_NOPV%20PCP%20PCO_05212014_text.pdf
452. ^ <http://www.kiiitv.com/lnistory/24003322/exxonmobils-king-ranch-gas-plant-continues-burning-after-overnight-fire>
453. A Associated Press. “Gas Pipeline Rupture Send Flames 100 Feet Into Air”. BigCountryHomepage. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
454. ^ “Pipeline explosion sends fireball 300 feet into air”. fox4kc.com. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
455. A <http://www.wncn.com/story/24171804/gas-line-leak-reported-in-apex>
456. ^ “PHMSA; Stakeholder Communications”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
457. ^ “480 tons of soil removed from site of winter gas leak”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
458. ^ “Lawsuit filed over gasoline leak”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
459. ^ “Crews respond to gas-line fire in Shrewsbury”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
460. ^ “Asheville gas line explosion costs \$825,000”. The Asheville Citizen-Times. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
461. ^ <http://www.greenfieldreporter.com/view/story/9fd80ef83364d64818f3134913ff72a1ND--Tioga-Gas-Explosion>
462. ^ Marcus Green (18 September 2014). “Analysis; Existing cracks a cause in Kentucky pipeline blast”. WorldNow and WDRB.
463. ^ The Wichita Eagle. 13 February 2014 <http://www.kansas.com/2014/02/13/3286103/ky-gas-line-blast-hospitalizes.html>. Missing or empty |title= (help)|adUnk]
464. A <http://www.bayoubuzz.com/top-stories/item/623940-shell-says-ho-ho-pipeline-shut-after-leak-in-texas>
465. ^ “NTSB; Abnormal Concentration Of Gas Found Near East Harlem Blast Scene”. CBS New York. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
466. ^ “Oil spill cleanup ending; 20 salamanders being cared for off-site”. WLWT.com. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
467. A http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/colmnreports/enforce/documents/320145002H/320145002H_Corrective%20Action%20order_03252014_text.pdf
468. A “Arvin still in the dark about leaking gas line”. The Bakersfield Californian. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
469. ^ “Massive Explosion Rocks Washington State Natural Gas Plant”. thinkprogress.com. 2014-03-31. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
470. A <http://co.williams.com/williams/news-medialplymouth-wa-update/>
471. ^ [http://www.theintennountain.com/page!content.detail/id/493996/Company-won-t-be-cited-for-W-Va--pipelineblast.html?isap=I&nav=5023\[d,ad U.k\]](http://www.theintennountain.com/page!content.detail/id/493996/Company-won-t-be-cited-for-W-Va--pipelineblast.html?isap=I&nav=5023[d,ad U.k])
472. ^ “Natural gas line ruptures in Union Township; man taken to hospital”. The Newark Advocate. 17 April 2014. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
473. ^ <http://www.localnews8.com/lninews/explosion-and-fire-force-evacuation-of-town/25627492>
474. ^ Associated Press. “Fire still burns at damaged Wyoming gas plant”. Casper Star-Tribune Online. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
475. ^ “Pipeline Rupture, Hazardous Material Spill in Knox”. nemonews.net. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
476. ^ “Gas line ruptures, ISO-foot geyser of gas spews onto workers”. WYFF4. 13 May 2014. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
477. A “Wharton County gas line explosion sends ISO-foot flames up in air”. ABC13 Houston. 13 May 2014. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
478. ^ Go Lackawanna (10 July 2014). “Susquehanna County compressor station shut down after morning fire”. Times Leader. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
479. A “Crews contain oil spill near Santa Maria”. KSBY.com. 4 August 2014. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
480. A “White Oak man killed in Rusk Co. pipeline explosion”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
481. ^ “Four hurt after natural gas line catches fire near Lindsay”. Tulsa World. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
482. ^ Lynn Cook (15 September 2014). “Chevron Shuts Gas Pipeline After Worker Dies in Gulf of Mexico Accident - WSJ”. WSJ. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
483. ^ “TransCanada Pipeline Rupture Prompts Evacuation Of Benton Harbor”. The Huffington Post. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
484. ^ WSBT. “TransCanada; After pipeline rupture, repairs may take several weeks”. wsbt.com. Retrieved 15 January 2015.

485. ^ <http://www.kctv5.com/story/267723561-emergency-crews-respond-to-pipeline-rupture-fire-near-centervieW#ixzz3G3Gp4le3>
486. ^ Vickie Welborn, (18 October 2014). "Crude oil spills into Caddo bayou, kills wildlife". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
487. A <http://www.kait8.com/inistry/26866351-Roads-open-repairs-underway-after-gas-leak>
488. ^ <http://www.theintelligencer.net/page/content.detailid/615683/Blue-Racer-Pipeline-Shut-Down-After-Explosion.html?nav=510>
489. ^ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/cOImnireports/enforce/documents/22015500IS/22015500IS_NOPSO_03092015_text.pdf
490. ^ <http://savannahnow.com/news/zu15-04-30/kinder-morgan-pipeline-leak-reaches-300000-gallons-south-carolina>
491. A "US Evangeline Pipeline shuts down after leak discovered". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
492. ^ "News - Argus Media". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
493. ^ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/cOImnireports/enforce!documents/420I45027H/420145027H_Corrective%20Action%20order_10202014_text.pdf
494. A "Gas line explodes, bums near reservoir". WAPT News. 14 January 2015. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
495. A "Reservoir gas pipeline fire extinguished". The Clarion-Ledger. 14 January 2015. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
496. A http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/cOImnireports/enforce/documents/220151001S/220151001S_nopso_03272015_text.pdf
497. ^ Sider, Alison. "Oil Spill Contaminates Montana Town's Water Supply, EPA Says".
498. ^ <http://www.inform.com/news/accidents/3661267-clean-water-likely-be-restored-glendive-thursday-after-oi-spill-along>
499. A http://www.galvestondailynews.com/free/article_699f91e8-9c22-11e4-97c3-63576ec5eff6.html
500. ^ <http://www.theintelligencer.net/page/content.detailid/623827/Fire-Burned-24-000-Barrels-of-Ethane.html?nav=515>
501. A http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/cOImnireports/enforce/documents/420I55005H/420155005H_Corrective%20Action%20order_03122015_text.pdf
502. ^ <http://www.wacotrib.com/news/environment/cleanup-begins-on-diesel-pipeline-spill-near-tehuacanacreek/article20e9cb1d-75ad-5b17-90a5-374c35f6876a.html>
503. ^ <http://www.theintelligencer.net/page/content.detailid/630275/-Heavy-Rains--Cited-In-Marshall---.html>
504. ^ <http://www.theintelligencer.net/page/content.detailid/630514/DEP--132-Barrels-Spilled-Into-Marshall-County-Creek.html?nav=515>
505. ^ <http://www.newschannel9.com/story/128788786/natural-gas-pipeline-fire-near-borger-extinguished>
506. ^ "Pipeline explosion at Fresno shooting range caused by front loader, state report says". Retrieved 2015-08-21.
507. A <http://edition.cnn.com/2015/10/20/us/california-oil-spill/>
508. A <http://www.independent.com/news/2015/may/123/refugio-pipeline-shutdown-puts-brakes-oil-producti/>
509. ^ "Arkansas River pipeline blowout occurred on Sunday morning, cause still unknown". Retrieved 2015-08-21.
510. ^ "Natural gas pipeline ruptures east of 1-30 bridge, closing two miles of Arkansas River". Retrieved 2015-08-21.
511. ^ "Williams natgas pipeline in Pennsylvania ruptures; no injuries". Reuters. 2015-06-11. Retrieved 2015-08-21.
512. A <https://www.victoriadvocate.com/news/2015/jun/17/pipeline-rupture-released-thousands-of-pounds-of-gi>
513. ^ <http://www.chron.com/houston/article/Truck-collision-with-pipeline-backs-up-traffic-on-6342233.php#comments>
514. ^ <http://www.nbcdfw.com/news/local/4-Injured-in-White-Deer-Gas-Line-Explosion-310324841.html>
515. A <http://www.bnd.com/news/local/community/highland-news-leader/article27426022.html>
516. ^ <http://www.wtae.com/news/worker-injured-in-pipeline-accident!34188004>
517. ^ "Sheriff's Office; Natural gas pipeline 'explosion' forced 150 Falfurrias families from their homes". Valley Central. Retrieved 2015-08-21.
518. A "Fire on Williams pipeline". www.upstreamonline.com. Retrieved 2015-08-21.
519. ^ <http://maritime-executive.com/article/two-injured-in-louisiana-pipeline-fire>
-
- I. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_pipeline_accidents_in_the_United_States_in_the_21st_century
2. ^ H Josef Herbert (15 January 2000). "Oil pipeline pollution fine hits \$35 million". Los Angeles Times. Associated Press. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
3. ^ "Use of In Situ Burning at a Diesel Spill in Wetlands and Salt Flats, Northern Utah, U.S.A; Remediation Operations and 1.5 Years of Post-Bum Monitoring". Retrieved 2014-04-12.
4. A "Jan. 21, 2000 - ProPublica". projects.propublica.org. 2000-01-21. Retrieved 2014-04-12.
5. ^ "Jan. 21, 2000 - ProPublica". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
6. ^ "The Item - Google News Archive Search". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
7. ^ <http://www.nts.gov/investigations/AccidentReports/Pages/PABO102.aspx>
8. A http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrn/reports/enforce!documents/2200050I/2200050I_H_Corrective%20Action%20order_IOI72000.pdf
9. ^ Ron Rothschild (2005-08-03). "SUNOCO Oil Spill Settlement". fws.gov. Retrieved 2013-04-02. 10. ^ Sununary. "IncidentNews; Sun Oil Pipeline". incidentnews.gov. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
- II. A <http://www.nts.gov/investigations/AccidentReports/Reports/PABO103.pdf>
12. A <http://www.nts.gov/investigations/AccidentReports/Pages/PAR020I.aspx>
13. ^ "Settlement; Colonial Pipeline Company Clean Water Act Settlement I Civil Enforcement I Compliance and Enforcement I US EPA". Epa.gov. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
14. ^ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrn/reports/enforce/documents/32002500I/32002500I_H_CAO_02252002.pdf
15. ^ "The Argus-Press - Google News Archive Search". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
16. ^ "Reading Eagle - Google News Archive Search". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
17. ^ "July 5, 2000 - ProPublica". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
18. A <http://www.nts.gov/investigations/AccidentReports/Pages/PAR030I.aspx>
19. ^ "USDOJ; Environment and Natural Resources Division; U.S. v. El Paso Natural Gas Co". Justice.gov. 2007-07-26. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
20. A "The Spokesman-Review - Google News Archive Search". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
21. A "When is a lake not a lake? When is a river not a river? - Clean Water Fund". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
22. ^ <http://rapanos.typepad.com/lchevron.pdf>
23. ^ Haurwitz, Ralph K.M.; Nesmith, Jeff (July 24, 2001). "Digs gone awry; a top cause of tragedy". Austin, Texas; The American Statesman. Archived from the original on 2003-07-07. Retrieved 2013-04-02. [dead I;*]
24. ^ Williams, Brian (September 8, 2000). "Abilene pipeline blast injures two". Lubbock Avalanche-Journal. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
25. A Associated Press (November 7, 2001). "Exxon Mobil ordered to pay for pipeline blast". Lubbock Avalanche-Journal. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
26. A "The Victoria Advocate - Google News Archive Search". Retrieved 15 January 2015.

27. A “Pipeline Rupture; A Case Study”. Fire Engineering. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
28. A “Lawrence Journal-World - Google News Archive Search”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
29. ^ “Boca Raton News - Google News Archive Search”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
30. A to; • b, d, ‘<http://www.nwf.org/News-and-Magazines/Media-Center/News-by-Topic/GlobalWanning120101-ImedialPDFs/Global%20WanningiReports/Full-Oil-Incident-List.aspx>
31. ^ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/colmnireports/enforce/documents/320015015H/320015015H_CAO_06222001.pdf
32. ^ “May 1,2001 - ProPublica”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
33. ^ “Big blast, but no injuries Pipeline explodes in Platte County field”. Retrieved 2013-07-18.
34. ^ “Lawrence Journal-World - Google News Archive Search”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
35. A “Local News _ Potosi oil pipeline blaze doused, but dispute smolders”. Texnews.com. 2001-05-26. Retrieved 2014-02- 14.
36. ^ “Gasoline Pipeline Explosion”. Hazmat2-9.com. 2001-07-24. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
37. ^ “Beaver County Times - Google News Archive Search”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
38. A “PHMSA _ Southwest _ CPF 4-2001-1005-H”. Phmsa.dot.gov. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
39. ^ <http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrnreports/enforce/documents/420011005H1420011005H.pdf>
40. ^ “The Argus-Press - Google News Archive Search”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
41. ^ “Aug. 12,2001 _ ProPublica”. Projects.propublica.org. 2001-08-12. Retrieved 2014-02-14.
42. A to; • b <http://www.ukopa.co.uk/publications/pdf/020035.pdf>.ad/ink]
43. ^ “PHMSA - Southwest - CPF 4-2001-1006-H”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
44. ^ “Ludington Daily News - Google News Archive Search”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
45. ^ “The Victoria Advocate - Google News Archive Search”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
46. ^ “Oct. 15,2001 - ProPublica”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
47. A to; • b, d <http://www2.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2013-09/documents/teppco-cd.pdf>
48. ^ “The Danish Villages Voice - Google News Archive Search”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
49. ^ “Document I Oklahoma Corporation Commission Pipeline Failure Investigation Report (manually redacted) Filing Date April 17, 200813 page(s) of Text (PDF) Photos”. Dms.nts.gov. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
50. A “Times Daily - Google News Archive Search”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
51. ^ “March 6, 2002 - ProPublica”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
52. ^ “Toledo Blade - Google News Archive Search”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
53. A http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/cOlmnireports/enforce/documents/320021003H/320021003H_CAO_03282002.pdf
54. ^ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/cOlmnireports/enforce/documents/320025011H/320025011H_text.pdf
55. A http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrnreports/enforce/documents/120021004H/120021004H_Corrective%20Action%20order_06202002.pdf
56. ^ <http://www.nts.gov/investigations/AccidentReports/Pages/PAR0401.aspx>
57. ^ “Family still grieves ten years after fatal Hopkinton explosion _ News _ Framingham, MA”. The MetroWest Daily News. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
58. A “PHMSA _ Data and Statistics _ Distribution, Transmission, and Liquid Accident and Incident Data”. Phmsa.dot.gov. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
59. A “PHMSA; Stakeholder Communications”. Primis.phmsa.dot.gov. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
60. A “U.S. EPA On-Scene Coordinator Report” (PDF). Docket No. CWA-08-2002-35. EPA.gov. Nov 20, 2002.
61. ^ <http://www.scribd.com/doc/2011842/Environmental-Protection-Agency-CW-A0820040033CAFO>
62. ^ “Nov. 2,2002 - ProPublica”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
63. ^ “Dec. 10,2002 - ProPublica”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
64. ^ “Lawrence Journal-World - Google News Archive Search”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
65. ^ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrnreports/enforce/documents/320031002H/320031002H_CAO_02072003.pdf
66. ^ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrnreports/enforce/documents/320031005H/320031005H_cao_03042003_text.pdf
67. ^ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrnreports/enforce/documents/220035002H/220035002H_cao_03242003_text.pdf
68. ^ “March 13,2003 - ProPublica”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
69. ^ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/cOlmnireports/enforce/documents/520031002H/520031002H_corrective%20action%20order_04032003_text.pdf
70. ^ <http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrnreports/enforce/documents/420035009H/CPF420035009H.pdf>
71. ^ <http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrnreports/enforce/documents/520031003H/520031003H.pdf>
72. A to; • b <http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/cOlmnireports/enforce/documents/520031003H/520031003HA.pdf>
73. A http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrnreports/enforce/documents/320035014H/320035014H_CAO_05162003.pdf
74. A “Natural Gas Pipeline Explodes in Texas”. Firehouse. 2003-05-21. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
75. A “May 20, 2003 - ProPublica”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
76. A <http://www.nts.gov/investigations/AccidentReports/Reports/PAB0401.pdf>
77. ^ http://lubbockonline.com/stories/070303/reg_070303068.shtml
78. ^ “More pipeline documents may be collecting dust near Midland”.
79. A http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/cOlmnireports/enforce/documents/320035019H/320035019H_CAO_07172003.pdf
80. ^ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrnreports/enforce/documents/320035020H/320035020H_CAO_07252003.pdf
81. ^ <http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrnreports/enforce/documents/42003501OH/42003501OH.pdf>
82. ^ “Pipeline fails tests; gas shortage likely to continue”. Azcentral.com. 2003-08-20. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
83. A “Google Drive Viewer”. Docs.google.com. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
84. ^ “Microsoft Word - ArizonaFuelSupplyReport11_13_03.doc” (PDF). Retrieved 2013-04-02.
85. ^ “July 30, 2003 - ProPublica”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
86. ^ PHMSA Corrective Action Order, CPF No.4-2003-1008H, <http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrnreports/enforce/documents/420031008H/420031008H.pdf>
87. ^ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrnreports/enforce/documents/320035023H/320035023H_CAO_I0242003.pdf
88. A “oct. 13,2003 - ProPublica”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
89. A to; • b “Addicting Info”. Addicting Info. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
90. A http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/cOlmnireports/enforce/documents/320031010H/320031010H_CAO_I0242003.pdf
91. ^ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/cOlmnireports/enforce/documents/320035026H/320035026H_CAO_11252003.pdf

92. A <http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/cOlmnireports/enforce/documents/120045002H/120045002H.pdf>
93. ^ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrn/reports/enforce/documents/120105008H/120105008H_CAO_09022010_text.pdf
94. ^ Bulwa, Demian; St. John, Kelly; Fimrite, Peter (June 24, 20 II). "Pipeline spills 60,000 US gallons (230,000 L) of fuel into Suisun Marsh / Operators noticed problem Tuesday but waited to report it". The San Francisco Chronic/e.
95. ^ "April 27, 2004 - ProPublica". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
96. ^ Gordy Holt And Robert Mcclur (2004-05-24). "Wear caused gas leak in Olympic pipeline". Seattlepi.com. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
97. ^ "Second explosion rocks gas storage facility in Texas". USA Today. August 20, 2004.
98. ^ http://www.spectraenergywatch.com/lwp-content/uploads/2013/03/article_singlepointfailurerisk.pdf
99. A <http://www.nts.gov/investigations/AccidentReports/Reports/PAB060I.pdf>
100. ^ "Trespassers blamed for pipeline explosion _ Houston Chronicle". Chron.com. 2004-09-27. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
101. A to; • b "Pipeline Finns to Pay \$3.65 Million to Settle Claims Related to 2004 Ammonia Spills in Nebraska and Kansas - OPA - Department of Justice". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
102. ^ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/cOlmnireports/enforce/documents/420045028H/420045028H_Corrective%20Action%20Order_10012004.pdf
103. ^ "Star-News - Google News Archive Search". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
104. ^ "Ammonia Spills in Nebraska, Kansas Cost Pipeline Finns \$3.65M". ENS-Newswire.com. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
105. A "Gas Line Explodes In West Little Rock, Arkansas". Firehouse. 2004-11-01. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
106. ^ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrn/reports/enforce/documents/220045017H/CPF2_2004_5017H_CAO.pdf
107. ^ "Kentucky New Era - Google News Archive Search". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
108. ^ "Pipeline System" (PDF). Retrieved 2013-04-02.
109. ^ "Mojave River Pipeline Spill, San Bernardino County, CA" (PDF). Part 2. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
110. ^ "Mojave River Pipeline Spill, San Bernardino County, CA" (PDF). Part 1. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
- III. ^ "Propane Pipeline Leaks In Richland County, North Dakota". Firehouse.com. December 16, 2004. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
112. ^ "Up To 5,000 Gallons Of Crude Oil Spilled From Montana Pipeline". Firehouse.com. 2004-12-27. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
113. A "Federal Government Reaches Settlement with Pipeline Companies Regarding Crude Oil Spills". Justice.gov. 15 August 2006. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
114. ^ "Jan. 18, 2005 - ProPublica". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
115. A "Jan. 26, 2005 - ProPublica". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
116. ^ "Kentucky New Era - Google News Archive Search". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
117. ^ "Pennsylvania Pile Line Fire Finally Dies Out". Firehouse. 2005-02-05. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
118. ^ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrn/reports/enforce/documents/120055002H/120055002H_amendmentto/020to%20corrective%20action%20Order_02102005_text.pdf
119. ^ "Beaver County Times - Google News Archive Search". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
120. ^ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrn/reports/enforce/documents/520055020H/520055020H_cOITective%20action%20Order_04212005.pdf?nocache=4253
121. ^ "Kinder Morgan Pays \$5.3M For California Oil Spills". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
122. ^ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/cOlmnireports/enforce/documents/420051011H/cpf_420051011H.pdf?nocache=8618
123. A http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/cOlmnireports/enforce/documents/420055020H/cpf_420055020H.pdf?nocache=6120
124. ^ "Lawrence Journal-World - Google News Archive Search". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
125. A "PHMSA; Stakeholder Communications". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
126. A http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrn/reports/enforce/documents/420055021H/cpf_420055021H.pdf?nocache=6836
127. ^ "The Victoria Advocate - Google News Archive Search". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
128. ^ "Aug. 11, 2005 - ProPublica". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
129. ^ "US Department of Transportation Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Office of Pipeline Safety - Failure Investigation Report" (PDF). Retrieved 13 July 2015.
130. A "19.2_text.indd" (PDF). Retrieved 2013-04-02.
131. ^ http://www.phmsa.dot.gov/pv_obj_cache/pv_obj_id_62FAI51109EF7E5E68067AE644C9CCD599530600/filename/TEPP_CO%20HL%200H%202005-09-18%20508.pdf
132. ^ Rice, Heidi (2005-12-07). "Natural gas explosion shakes up Colo. between Rifle and Rulison". SummitDaily.com. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
133. ^ <http://www.nts.gov/investigations/AccidentReports/Reports/PAB0701.pdf>
134. A "Man Injured In Natural Gas Explosion". NBCIInews.com. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
135. A <http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrn/reports/enforce/documents/520065015H/15HBPo/0205-2006-5015H%20-%20Final.pdt?nocache=9340>
136. ^ "Pipe corrosion in Alaska takes the issue off back burner _ Houston Chronicle". Chron.com. 2006-08-13. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
137. ^ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrn/reports/enforce/documents/320065033H/320065033H_Corrective%20Action%20Order_03292006.pdf
138. A http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/cOlmnireports/enforce/documents/120065003H/120065003H_CAO_04202006.pdf?nocache=4592
139. A "April 17, 2006 - ProPublica". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
140. ^ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/cOlmnireports/enforce/documents/320065037H/CPF_NO_3-2006-5037H.pdf?nocache=1341
141. ^ "June 27, 2006 - ProPublica". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
142. ^ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrn/reports/enforce/documents/220061007H/220061007H_Corrective%20Action%20Order_07272006.pdf
143. ^ "Gas Explosion Was Kentucky's Fourth In Last Decade". Lexington, Kentucky; LEXIS.com. January 3, 2012. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
144. A "PHMSA; Stakeholder Communications". DOT.gov. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
145. ^ <http://www.phmsa.dot.gov/staticfiles/PHMSA/DownloadableFiles/Files/LiquidOI02.zip>
146. A "Lawrence Journal-World - Google News Archive Search". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
147. ^ "Searchers Find Body of Fourth Victim of Deadly Louisiana Gas Pipeline Explosion". Fox News. October 13, 2006.[,ad Jill"]
148. ^ Clark, Dwayne (October 5, 2006). "Jacksonville Florida Maritime Lawyers". Lawboat.blogspot.com. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
149. ^ "PHMSA; Stakeholder Communications". DOT.gov. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
150. ^ "1 Dead After Wyoming Gas Pipeline Explodes". Fox News. November 11, 2006. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
151. ^ "El Paso Corp. Fined \$2.3 million For Wyoming Pipeline Explosion". Huffington Post. December 1, 2009.
152. ^ "News". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
153. ^ "PHMSA; Stakeholder Communications". Retrieved 15 January 2015.

154. A “The Victoria Advocate - Google News Archive Search”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
155. ^ “Dec. 24, 2006 - ProPublica”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
156. ^ Content, Thomas (2007-01-04). “Milwaukee Journal Sentinel; “Oil group cleans spill in Clark County ””, Jsonline.com. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
157. A to;’ b http://www.phmsa.dot.gov/staticfiles/PHMSAIDownloadableFiles/Files/Pipeline/Corrective_Action_Order_073012.pdf ISS. A “PHMSA; Stakeholder Communications”. Primis.phmsa.dot.gov. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
159. ^ Bergquist, Lee (2007-02-16). “Milwaukee Journal Sentinel; “Oil spill tainted water table ””. Jsonline.com. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
160. ^ “Pipeline Fire”. YouTube. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
161. ^ “Explosion rocks northwest Harris County”. Houston Chronic/e. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
162. ^ <http://www.IOllnow.cOlnnewsheadlines/64223167.html>
163. ^ <http://ens-newswire.com/12/06/04/pipeline-companies-fined-1-million-for-spills-in-three-states/> 164.lto;:b<4’f http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrnreports/enforce/documents/32014100SS/32014100SS_Notify%20i%20Proposed%20Saftey%20order_12242014.pdf
165. ^ “Bangor Daily News - Google News Archive Search”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
166. ^ Sunoco Pipeline Release. Coal Township, Northumberland County <http://dothemountain.wordpress.cOln2009/10116/spill-in-jackson-township-tioga-county-in-the-ncro-weekly-report/>
167. A Carney troubled by line rupture http://findarticles.comlp/news-articles/news-item-the-shamokin-palmi_SI54/is_20070602/carney-troubled-rupture/ai_n53707450/
168. ^ “Small gas leak on Little Mountain posed no danger”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
169. ^ November 7, 2010 (2010-11-07). “BP Alaska facilities still at risk”. Alaska Dispatch. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
170. A “Investigation begins into what caused natural gas explosion”. wzzml3.com. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
171. A “Dow Chemical Ethylene Pipe Explodes in Port Arthur, Texas”. LiveLeak.com. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
172. ^ Ryan Myers (2005-10-02). “Pipeline explosion spurs lawsuit”. Beaumont Enterprise. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
173. A <http://www.nts.gov/investigations/AccidentReports/Pages/PAR0901.aspx>
174. ^ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrn/reports/enforce/documents/220086002/220086002_FinalOrder_04262010.pdf
175. ^ “Enbridge fined in fatal Minnesota accident _ Houston Chronicle”. Chron.com. 2010-05-15. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
176. A Griesse, Noel (2009-05-05). “Energy Pipeline News; Enbridge will appeal \$2.4 million fine levied for fatal Minnesota accident”. Energypipelinenews.blogspot.com. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
177. ^ Three-million dollar settlement in explosion case from hwnn.com””” Unit]
178. A “Fayetteville man hurt in deadly Louisiana interstate blast”. TuscaloosaNews.com. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
179. ^ “Federal Register I Notice of Lodging of Consent Decree Pursuant to the Clean Water Act”. Federalregister.gov. 2010-02-22. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
180. ^ “PHMSA; Stakeholder Communications”. Primis.phmsa.dot.gov. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
181. ^ “Jan. 7, 2008 - ProPublica”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
182. ^ “Old pipelines are a hidden menace I Energy I Chron.com _ Houston Chronicle”. Chron.com. 2010-11-15. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
- IS3. A “No Fatalities From Gas Plant Explosion _ NewsChannel5.com I Nashville News, Weather and Sports”. NewsChanneI5.com. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
- IS4. A <http://www.foxnews.com/story/2005/02/15/explosion-reported-at-south-texas-oil-pipeline.html>
- ISS. A Michler, Caroline. “Ameren Missouri wrongful death trial set to begin Tuesday”. Columbia Missourian. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
- IS6. A “Document I DOT Incident Report (manually redacted) Filing Date November 06, 20083 page(s) of Text (PDF) Photos”. Dms.nts.gov. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
- IS7. A “Apex Oil Ordered to Clean Soil, Water Under Illinois Village”. ENS-Newswire.com. July 29, 2005. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
- IS8. A “PHMSA; Stakeholder Communications”. Primis.phmsa.dot.gov. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
- IS9. ^ Kebede, Rebekah (August 11, 2005). “Marathon KY refinery cuts rates after pipe leak”. Reuters.
190. ^ “Workers cleaning up Illinois oil spill; crude valued around \$525,000 “ Evansville Courier and Press”. Courierpress.com. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
191. ^ “PHMSA Stakeholder Communications; Operator Information _ Incident and Mileage Data”. Primis.phmsa.dot.gov. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
192. ^ Gas pipeline fire bums out in Caldwell County from “Texas-Fire.com””” I”~]
193. ^ http://www.phmsa.dot.gov/staticfiles/PHMSAIDownloadableFiles/Files/Pipeline/Failure%20ReportsIPanhandleEastemGT_MO_50S_2005-OS-25.pdf
194. A Janelle Stecklein (2008-09-10). “Gas explosion bums 2”. Amarillo Globe-News. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
195. ^ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrnreports/enforce/documents/1200SI004H11200SI004H_CA0_0925200S.pdf?nocache=S422
196. A “Three Years Later, Residents Moved on After Gas Pipeline Explosi _ WSET.com _ ABCI3”. WSET.com. 2011-09-14. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
197. ^ McGurty, Janet (September 24, 2005). “Longhorn Pipeline stops fuel flow due to fire”. Reuters.
198. ^ “PHMSA; Stakeholder Communications”. Primis.phmsa.dot.gov. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
199. A Sunday, October 05, 2005 BY JEFF TRENTLY (2005-10-05). “Cleanup of oil spill continues”. NJ.com. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
200. ^ “Oct. 3, 2005 - ProPublica”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
201. A “Compressor station blows up”. Retrieved 2013-07-18.
202. ^ “Sunoco faces \$2.3 million DEP fine for Murrysville pipeline leak”. TribL/VE.com. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
203. ^ http://www.phmsa.dot.gov/staticfilesIPHMSAIPipelineFailureReports/CGT_GT_WV_20090100.pdf
204. A Loy, Wesley (2009-02-06). “Inquiry launched after pump station accident”. ADN.com. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
205. A Gas pipeline explosion near Carthage <http://www.Fire.com/deadUnk/>
206. A “UPDATE I-Explosion near DCP Midstream’s Texas natgas plant”. Reuters. February 11, 2009.
207. ^ Press release by Sunoco Logistics <http://www.wtol.com/story/9S73737/press-release-by-sunoco-logistics>
208. ^ “Ohio, Michigan score among highest for states with oil spills”. Toledoblade.com. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
209. ^ http://www.phmsa.dot.gov/staticfiles/PHMSAIDownloadableFiles/Files/Pipeline/Failure%20ReportsIMid_Valley_HL_OH_2009-02-18_50S.pdf
210. ^ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/cOlmnreports/enforce/documents/220091002H1120091002H_CA0_05072009.pdf?nocache=42S3
211. A http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/cOlmnreports/enforce/documents/320091009H/320091009H_CA0_05132009.pdf?nocache=6515
212. ^ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrnreports/enforce/documents/320125018/320125018_NOPV%20PCP_08272012.pdf
213. ^ “May 21, 2009 - ProPublica”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.

214. ^ "Pipeline accident investigation could take months _ KLTv.com-Tyler, Longview, Jacksonville, Texas I ETX News". Kltv.com. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
215. ^ http://www.phmsa.dot.gov/staticfiles/PHMSAIDownloadableFiles/Files/Pipeline/Failure%20ReportsExplorer_HL_OK_2009-OS-17_50S.pdf
216. ^ Upton County Gas Line Fire Caused by Leak from Texas-Fire.com'f' Unk]
217. ^ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/conunireports/enforce/documents/420091021HI420091021H_CAO_III02009.pdf?nocache=400S
218. A http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/conunireports/enforce/documents/420091021HI420091021H_CAO_11102009.pdf
219. A FireFightingNews.com (2009-11-05). "Home Destroyed In Texas Gas Line Blast". Firefightingnews.com. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
220. A http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/conunireports/enforce/documents/420091021HI/420091021H_Closure_04132011.pdf
221. A http://www.phmsa.dot.gov/staticfiles/PHMSAIDownloadableFiles/Pipeline/Columbia_GasTrans_GT_WV_2009-11-14.pdf
222. ^ Noel Griese. "Energy Pipeline News". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
223. A "Dec. 4, 2009 - ProPublica". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
224. A "Pipeline leaks 210,000 gallons of oil- www.staplesworld.com- Staples World". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
225. A <http://www.phmsa.dot.gov/staticfiles/PHMSAIDownloadableFiles/Files/Pipeline/Failure%20ReportsEnterprise%20HL%20TX%202009-12-23.pdf>
226. A http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/cOlmnireports/enforce/documents/320091024H1320091024H_CAO_02172010.pdf?nocache=1083
227. ^ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrn/reports/enforce/documents/320091024H1320091024H_Notice%20of%201020Proposed%20CAO_12212009.pdf
228. ^ "PHMSA; Stakeholder Communications". Primis.phmsa.dot.gov. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
229. A http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrn/reports/enforce/documents/320105001HI320105001H_CAO_01192010.pdf
230. A "Pipeline explosion at Barksdale kills civilian _ Air Force News I News from Afghanistan & Iraq". Air Force Times. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
231. A A year later, gas line checks continue from StarTribune.com'U'k]
232. A "History". CrossboreSafety.org. 1999-02-09. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
233. ^ "Highway closed for gas leak" Local news" The Enid News and Eagle, Enid, OK". Enidnews.com. 2010-02-25. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
234. A "PHMSA; Stakeholder Conununications". Primis.phmsa.dot.gov. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
235. ^ <http://www.phmsa.dot.gov/staticfiles/PHMSAIPipelineFailureReportsMid-Valley%20Pipeline%20HL%20TX%202010-03-01%20508.pdf>
236. ^ Gamm, Joe (2010-03-16). "No injuries in gas line rupture north of Pampa". Amarillo Globe-News. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
237. A <http://www.phmsa.dot.gov/staticfiles/PHMSAIPipelineFailureReports/Sunoco%20RM%20HL%20PA%202010-03-25.pdf>
238. A <http://ens-newswire.com/2012/06/04/pipeline-companies-fined-1-million-for-spills-in-three-states/>
239. A "PHMSA Stakeholder Communications; Operator Information -Incident and Mileage Data". Primis.phmsa.dot.gov. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
240. A to; b Wilder, Forrest (2010-11-26). "The Fire Down Below". The Texas Observer. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
241. ^ [http://www.platts.com/lnRSSFeedDetailedNews/RSSFeediHeadlineNewsINaturalGas/6158630\[dcodU'k\]](http://www.platts.com/lnRSSFeedDetailedNews/RSSFeediHeadlineNewsINaturalGas/6158630[dcodU'k])
242. ^ "Another Gas Pipeline Explosion in Texas Kills 2 _ KFSA _ NewsChannelIO / Amarillo News, Weather, Sports". NewschannelIO.com. 2010-06-09. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
243. A http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrn/reports/enforce/documents/520105028/520105028_NOPV%20PCP%20PCO_11012010.pdf?nocache=2771
244. ^ http://www.phmsa.dot.gov/staticfiles/PHMSAIPipelineFailureReports/Dixie_HL_GA_20100705.pdf
245. A "U.S. EPA "EPA Response to Enbridge Spill in Michigan """, Epa.gov. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
246. A "Containment Intensifies Along River", Toledo Blade
247. A "EPA Response to Enbridge Spill in Michigan I US EPA". Epa.gov. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
248. ^ "U.S. EPA REMOV AL ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER UNDER SECTION 311 (c) OF THE CLEAN WATER ACT, REGION 5" (PDF). Retrieved 2013-04-02.
249. A "Investigation reveals undocumented workers, unsafe conditions in oil spill cleanup" from michiganmessenger.com'link)
250. A "Press Release July 10, 2012". Ntsb.gov. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
251. A "Plains All American Pipeline Settlement I Compliance and Enforcement I US EPA". Epa.gov. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
252. A Ganun, Joe (2010-08-26). "Canadian man injured in pipeline accident". Amarillo Globe-News. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
253. A "I Injured in Gas Compressor Station Explosion I KATC.com I Acadiana-Lafayette, Louisiana". KATC.com. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
254. A "Liquid propane pipeline set to reopen in January .. Local News" The Daily Star, Oneonta, NY _ otsego county news, delaware county news, oneonta news, oneonta sports". Thedailystar.com. 2010-12-17. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
255. ^ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/cOlmnireports/enforce/documents/120105008H1120105008H_Amended%20CAO_11242010.p.pdf
256. A <http://www.phmsa.dot.gov/staticfiles/PHMSAIPipelineFailureReports/Enterprise%20HL%20NY%202010-08-27%20508.pdf>
257. ^ National Transportation Safety Board Pipeline Accident Brief from ntsb.gov I date= December 2014
258. ^ Wittenstein, Jeran (2010-09-10). "Gas Explosion Engulfs Houses in San Francisco suburb of San Bruno". Bloomberg.com. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
259. A "San Bruno explosion and fire kills 4, destroys 38 homes". Mercurynews.com. 2010-09-12. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
260. A Worth, Katie. "PG&E threatened with fines of\$1 million for pipeline data I Katie Worth I Bay Area I San Francisco Examiner". Sfxaminer.com. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
261. A Van Derbeken, Jaxon (October 24, 2011). "PG&E knew of many leaks in San Bruno pipeline". The San Francisco Chronicle.
262. A "Pacific Gas & Electric Pipeline Bursts During Test, Closing Freeway". Huffington Post. November 7, 2011.
263. ^ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/cOlmnireports/enforce/documents/22010101OS/22010101OS_Notice%20of%201020Proposed%20SAfty%20Order_09302010.pdf
264. ^ "Investigation Report Released for Cairo Gasline Explosion". Wctv.tv. 2011-01-05. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
265. ^ Shipp, Brett (2010-10-20). "Pipeline 'pig' crashes through Grand Prairie home I wfaa.com I Dallas _ Fort Worth Local News". wfaa.com. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
266. ^ "Natural gas pipeline ruptures, injures 3 I KA TC.com I Acadiana-Lafayette, Louisiana". KA TC.com. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
267. ^ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrn/reports/enforce/documents/420101007H1420101007H_CAO_12032010.pdf
268. ^ [http://www.sltrib.com\(2010-12-03\)... WasChevron-sresponsetooslow?ITheSaltLakeTribune](http://www.sltrib.com(2010-12-03)... WasChevron-sresponsetooslow?ITheSaltLakeTribune) ", Sltrib.com. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
269. ^ [http://abclocal.go.com/wIs/story?id=7836222§ion=news/localillinois\[dem/linkJ](http://abclocal.go.com/wIs/story?id=7836222§ion=news/localillinois[dem/linkJ)
270. ^ "Gas Line Fire Explosion Critically Burns Man's Face". South Texas; Kiiitv.com. Retrieved 2013-04-02.

271. ^ “Long Beach pipeline company charged in oil spill”. Press-Telegram. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
272. A “Covington evacuees still await word to return home _ WDAM _ Channel 7 _ Serving Hattiesburg, Laurel and the Pine Belt”. WDAM. 2013-03-29. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
273. A http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/conunireports/enforce/documents/120 III 013S/120111 013S _ NOPS0 _ 07062011.pdf
274. ^ 2nd UPDATE; Philadelphia Gas-Line Blast Kills One, Hurts Six _ WScom[deadlin’J
275. A to;’ b “Page has moved”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
276. A “Fairport Harbor blasts probed”. news-herald.com. 2011-02-02. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
277. ^ Press, Associated. “Lawsuit filed over natural gas fires in Fairport Harbor”. Newsnet5.com. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
278. ^ “Dominion officials respond to Fairport residents”. news-herald.com. 2011-10-19. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
279. A <http://www.fox8 .colnnews/wjw-news-puco-staff-report-fire-investigation,O,9100 14.storyIdead li””J>
280. ^ <http://www. firehouse.cOlnnews/top-headlines/five-killed-massive-pennsylvania-gas-ex plosion””?” Ii,,, J>
281. ^ Allentown gas explosion from mcall.com””?” Iin’J
282. A Allentown Explosion from YouTube
283. ^ “UGI cited for multiple safety violations leading to Allentown gas explosion I Regional; Lehigh Valley _ Home”. Wfmz.com. 2012-06-11. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
284. ^ “Huge Natural Gas Explosion Near Lisbon _ 33 News _ We Believe in This Valley”. Wytv.com. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
285. ^ “Cause of explosion in Hanover Township determined _ 21 News Now, More Local News for Youngstown, Ohio”. Wfmj.com. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
286. ^ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrn/reports/enforce/documents/320 III 00 I S/320111 00 I S _ Consent%20Agreement_ 033120 II.pdf
287. ^ Ruptured line held 250,000 USgal of gasoline from GalvestonDailyNews.com[deadlin’J
288. ^ About 5,000 US gallons (19,000 L) of fuel spilled, TCEQ says[dMlinkJ
289. A “PHMSA; Stakeholder Communications”. DOT.gov. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
290. A http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/cOlmnireports/enforce/documents/320111018H/3201 I 101 8 H_CAO_ I 117201 I_text.pdf
291. A Gas Line Explosion at 60th and Nicollet, 35W and 62 Closed from myfoxtwincities.com””?” Ii”””J
292. A David Joles, Star Tribune. “Light ‘like the sun’ rose above Mpls. blast crater”. StarTribune.com. Retrieved 2013-04-02.
293. A “Report ID’s Cause of Windom Pipeline Explosion”. Southwest Minneapolis, Minnesota Patch. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
294. ^ <http://www.lansingstatejournal.comIarticleI20 III 002INEWSO I III 0020513/One-man-s-battle-against-bigoil?odyssey=tab% 7Ctopnews% 7Ctext% 7CNews>
295. A http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/cOlmnireports/enforce/documents/320 115006H1320 115006H _ AmendedO/020CAO _ 06282011_t_ext. pdf
296. ^ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/cOlmnireports/enforceidocuments/320 115008S/320 115008S _ Notice%200f””1020Proposed%20S afety%200rder _ 06152011_ text.pdf
297. A McGurty, Janet (January 20, 2011). “UPDATE 2-Sunoco shuts Oklahoma crude line after Weds. leak”. Reuters.
298. A “PHMSA; Stakeholder Communications”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
299. ^ <http://www.ktla.cOlnnews/landingIktla-southwest-oil-leak,O, 7386337 .story>
300. A O’Connor, Anahad (July 2, 2011). “Ruptured Pipeline Spills Oil Into Yellowstone River”. The New York Times.
301. A “Laurel residents evacuate after oil pipeline break”. KTVQ.com. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
302. A “Exxon Oil Spill in Montana River Prompts Evacuations”. Fox News. July 3, 2011.
303. ^ “Exxon oil spill prompts evacuations”. The Washington Post. July 3, 2011.
304. A “Greenspace”. Los Angeles Times. July 3, 2011.
305. A to; • b ExxonMobil pipe spills oil into Yellowstone River http://www.msnbc.msn.cOlnIid43619388/nslus_news- environment!
306. ^ “Exxon; Yellowstone spill 1,500 barrels, not 1,000”. Fox News. January 19,2012.
307. A “Lawsuits against Exxon Mobil mount over big oil pipeline spills”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
308. ^ “Montana DEQ - Page Not Found”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
309. A http://www.dailyinterlake.cOlnnews/state_ newsI exxon-mobil-gets-million-penalty- for-pipeline-spi Illarticle _199baf3c- a380-11e4- 9674-d3ebafa41c24.html
310. ^ “Wyoming nat gas pipeline out of commission”. UPI. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
311. ^ “Quality concerns arose before TransCanada pipeline blast”. CBC News.
312. A <http://brandon.patch .comIarticles/officials-probe-leak-of- 31500-gallons-of-jet -fuel-near -mango-cleanup-ongoing>
313. ^ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/connnlreports/enforce/documents/320 11501 OH/320 11501 OH_ CAO _ 09162011.pdf
314. A http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/cOlmnireports/enforce/documents/320 115009H1320 115009H_ CAO _ 08192011.pdf
315. ^ The Associated Press. “Pipeline Leak Sends Gasoline Into Missouri River”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
316. A “Mid-America Pipeline Company and Enterprise Products Operating to Pay \$1 Million for Spills in Iowa, Kansas and Nebraska - OPA - Department of Justice”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
317. ^ “Kinder Morgan, Owner of Illinois Natural Gas Pipeline Co. Where Explosion Occurred, Has Lengthy Record of Pipeline, Workplace Safety Violations - Natural Gas Watch.org”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
318. ^ “HazardEx - Gas plant explosion injures five”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
319. A “Providence Journal - Rhode Island news, sports, weather and more”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
320. ^ Van Derbeken, Jaxon (October 17,2011). “Plastic natural gas pipe failure data kept secret”. The San Francisco Chronicle.
321. ^ <http://www.phmsa.dot.gov/staticfiles/PHMSAIDownloadableFiles/Files/Pipeline/Failure%20ReportsIchevron%20HL%20 TX%2020 11-09-08%20508.pdf>
322. ^ “Ruptured gasoline pipeline fixed in Aurelius; testing of nearby private wells continues”. syracuse. com. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
323. ^ McGurty, Janet (October 24, 2011). “Blueknight reopens Oklahoma crude line after leak”. Reuters.
324. ^ http://times-news.com/latest_news/x459213 7791 Artemas-gas-explosion-forces-temporary-evacuation
325. ^ “PHMSA; Stakeholder Communications”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
326. ^ <http://newsandtribune.colnilocallxI241962523I Vectren-agrees-to-75-000-settlement-in-20 II-gas-explosion>
327. ^ “Missing Man Found Dead After Deadly Ohio House Explosion”. Fox News. November 13,2011.
328. A http://www.phmsa.dot.gov/staticfiles/PHMSNDownloadableFiles/320 III 018H_ CAO_ I I 17201 10/020- %20Tennessee%20Gas.pdf
329. ^ <http://www.mariettatimes.comIpage/content.detailIidI5454751N0v--pipeline-blast-leaves-Iasting-impact-on- lives.html?nav=5002>
330. ^ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/cOlmnireports/enforce/documents/220II 1010HI2201 I 1010H_CAO_ I 128201 I.pdf
331. ^ <http://www. wsfa.cOlnistory/16181245/pipeline-explodes-in-marengo-county-causes-massive-fire>
332. ^ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrn/reports/enforce/documents/220 III 011 HI220111 011 H_ CAO _ 120620 II.pdf

333. ^ "Corrosion cited in pipeline explosion - The Demopolis Times". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
334. ^ JEREMY FUGLEBERG Star-Tribune energy reporter. "Two suffer injuries due to fire at Wyoming natural gas site". Casper Star- Tribune Online. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
335. ^ staff and wire reports. "Magellan; Pipeline fixed near Nemaha, fuel pumping resumes". JournalStar.com. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
336. ^ ALGIS 1. LAUKAITIS / Lincoln Journal Star. "Pipeline fixed near Nemaha; fuel pumping resumes". JournalStar.com. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
337. ^ Paul Burkhardt. "Magellan Reduces Nebraska Line Spill Estimate to 2,834 Barrels". Businessweek.com. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
338. ^ <http://www.omaha.com/article/20111214/NEWSOIII1219854>
339. A "EI Paso says no estimate for Return of Ruby gas line in Utah". Denver Post. December 12,2011.
340. ^ "Ruby Pipeline LLC ;; Informational Postings". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
341. A <http://www.wkyt.com/wymtnewsheadlines/136548983.html>
342. ^ <http://www.therepublic.com/view/story/adxzfl962I6f484dacfd76575I0abcaalKY--Explosion-Fire!>
343. A "Man feared dead in home explosion had hoped to move near son". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
344. ^ WKYC Staff, WKYC (13 January 2012). "Wellington; Families still evacuated after massive pipeline spill". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
345. ^ "Wellington may have answers in the coming weeks". newsnet5. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
346. ^ "No injuries, damage after gas line explodes in Rio Vista". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
347. ^ <http://www.lex18.com/news/gas-leak-in-powell-county>
348. A "Cortlandt contractor in gas explosion may lack enough insurance, lawyer for homeowners says". 17,e Journal News - lohud.com. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
349. A "Jan. 18,2012 - ProPublica". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
350. ^ Giang Nguyen, Marques White. "Details About Victim Of Home Explosion Released". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
351. ^ 13 News - Stephanie Ramos- Tomeoni. "Home Explosion Victim Dies". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
352. A "Jet Fuel Leaks For 2 Weeks Into Sewer". WISN. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
353. ^ Bruce Viehnetti. "Fonner Shell Pipeline monitor to plead guilty in airport leak". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
354. ^ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/conunlreports/enforce/documents/420131014H1420131014H_Corrective%20Action%20Order_06242013.pdf
355. ^ "PHMSA; Stakeholder Communications", Retrieved 15 January 2015.
356. ^ "PHMSA; Stakeholder Communications", Retrieved 15 January 2015.
357. ^ "2 killed by Ill. oil pipeline explosion". FireRescue.com. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
358. ^ "Late-night car race that caused pipeline fire rare, not unique". Reuters. March 7, 2012.
359. ^ http://www.tulsaworld.com/business/article.aspx?subjectid=49&articleid=20120306_49_0_ENIDCr320893
360. ^ "Officials finish cleaning crude from leaky pipeline in Barataria Bay". NOLA.com. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
361. ^ "Northern Pennsylvania gas explosion was out of regulatory reach". Philly.com. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
362. ^ Laura Legere (Staff Writer). "Explosion rocks natural gas compressor station". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
363. A <http://www.kcentv.com/story/17337012/pipeline-explodes-near-carthage>
364. ^ "In brief; Repairs continue on leaking line". MCA. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
365. ^ "Natural gas pipeline ruptures, sending flames soaring in Terrebonne Parish marshes". NOLA.com. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
366. ^ <http://www.ktiv.com/story/17797831/northern-natural-gas-men-did-not-check-for-line>
367. ^ "PHMSA; Stakeholder Communications". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
368. ^ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrnreports/enforce/documents/420125019H/420125019H_CAO_05082012.pdf
369. A "ExxonMobil Pipeline Company To Pay Civil Penalty Under Proposed Settlement For Torbert Louisiana Oil Spill Settlement Resolves Clean Water Act Violation Stemming From 2012 Spill". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
370. A http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrnreports/enforce/documents/420121011H/420121011H_Corrective%20Action%20Order_06122012.pdf
371. ^ <http://www.kristv.com/news/pipeline-worker-hurt-in-texas-panhandle-explosion/>
372. ^ "HazardEx - BP gas compressor station explosion in Colorado kills one". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
373. ^ http://www.krqe.com/news/colorado/ap_colorado/BP-Halliburton-fined-in-fatal-pipeline-explosion_54659132
374. ^ WTMJ News Team. "Family evacuates near pipeline in Jackson, Wis. - 620 WTMJ - Milwaukee's Source for Local News and Weather". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
375. ^ Don Behm. "Tests reveal chemicals in 23 more Jackson wells". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
376. ^ Don Behm. "Fuel company seeks to divert Cedar Creek for pipeline fixes". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
377. ^ Don Behm. "Fuel pipeline repairs force closure of parts of Jackson Marsh". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
378. A Don Behm. "Large gasoline spill linked to benzene in Village of Jackson well". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
379. A http://www.eunicetoday.com/view/full_story/19367444/article-Gas-line-blows-in-Intracoastal-City--no-one-hurt?instance=secondary_news_left_column
380. ^ "This Week In Natural Gas Leaks and Explosions _ July 30, 2012 - Natural Gas Watch.org". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
381. A "Lightning Causes Compressor Explosion". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
382. A "UPDATE 4-Enbridge to replace leaky Wisconsin oil pipeline Monday". Reuters. July 29, 2012.
383. ^ Jeremy Fugleberg Star-Tribune business editor. "Four bumed in Lost Cabin gas plant flash fire". Casper Star-Tribune Online. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
384. A "Jet Fuel Spill Near Chicago Closes Canal, Highway". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
385. A http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/cOlmnreports/enforce/documents/320125019H/320125019H_Corrective%20Action%20Order_08302012.pdf
386. ^ "Pipeline in Palos Park Was Corroded; Company Rep". Palos, Illinois Patch. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
387. ^ "Gas Line Fire Snuffed Out". NBC 10 Philadelphia. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
388. ^ "Gas line explosion in McKinney leaves four injured, 1,000 without gas". The Scoop Blog. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
389. A "Production impact 'minimal' from pipe blast". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
390. A "Cause of Sept. 6 explosion at gas plant still being investigated". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
391. A "Colorado Interstate Gas sets force majeure after compressor fire". Reuters. September 12,2012.
392. ^ <http://www.colorado.gov/cs/Satellite?blobcol=urldata&blobheademame=ContentDisposition&blobheademame2=Content-Type&blobheademame3=inline%3B+filename%3D%22Revised+Technical+Review+Document+%28April+20%2C+2012%29.pdf%271022&blobheademame4=application%2Fpdf&blobkey=id&blobtable=MungoBlobs&blobwhere=1251808828542&ssbinary=true>

393. A “Natural gas line struck by excavator near Orange County Airport”. recordonline.com. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
394. A “Gas explosion lights the sky in downtown Lewiston”. Idaho Press-Tribune. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
395. ^ “OSHA Fines Company Over Natural Gas Explosion”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
396. ^ Aaron Clark. “BP Chicap Pipe Spilled Oil at Illinois Tank Farm, Filing Shows”. Businessweek.com. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
397. ^ <http://www.wlsam.com/Article.asp?id=2581701&spid=>
398. ^ “2 workers hurt in natural gas explosion near Price”. NewsOK.com. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
399. ^ “Claims for losses in Springfield explosion continue to mount”. mass live. com. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
400. ^ “Hwy 99 reopens after a Madera County gas leak”. ABC30 Fresno. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
401. ^ <http://www.star-telegram.com/2012/12/04/4459948/fire-at-fort-worth-gas-well-site.html#my-headlines-default#storylink=c>
402. A “Pipe explodes near Goldsmith plant”. Odessa American. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
403. A <http://www.statejournal.com/story/203284341-explosion-highlights-pipeline-safety>
404. ^ “PHOTOS; West Virginia Gas Line Explodes, Sends Flames Up To 75 Feet In The Air”. Huffington Post. December 11, 2012.
405. A <http://www.register-herald.com/breakingnews/x1332354233/Gas-line-explodes-burns-homes-and-roads-near-Strisleville>
406. ^ <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/News/2012/12/120281>
407. ^ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/cOlmnireports/enforce/documents/220121005H1220121005H_CAO_12282012.pdf
408. ^ “Investigation of deadly Lewisville explosion continues”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
409. ^ “Cable Contractor Involved in KC Gas Explosion”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
410. ^ “OSHA cites drilling company in fatal explosion at JJ’s restaurant”. kansascity. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
411. ^ “Fire erupts after tug hits Chevron LPG pipeline; Coast Guard”. Reuters. March 13, 2013.
412. ^ “Tug captain Chad Breaux dies of burns after Louisiana gas explosion”. UP!. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
413. ^ “Utah Local News - Salt Lake City News, Sports, Archive - The Salt Lake Tribune”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
414. A http://phmsa.dot.gov/staticfiles/PHMSA/DownloadableFiles/Files/520135006H_cao_03222013.pdf
415. A “UPDATE I-Williams natgas line ruptures in West Virginia”. Reuters. March 22, 2013.
416. ^ Visser, Nick (April 9, 2013). “Maddow Slams Exxon’s ‘Paper Towel’ Cleanup Efforts”. Huffington Post.
417. ^ “Web Extra; Background on Pipeline that Ruptured Near Mayflower”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
418. A http://www.phmsa.dot.gov/staticfiles/PHMSA/DownloadableFiles/File/4%202013%205006H_Corrective%20Action%20order_4%2002%2013.pdf
419. A THV 11 Staff, news source (10 July 2013). “Exxon; Cause of pipeline failure ‘manufacturing defects’”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
420. ^ “Employee ran 1 mile to escape Guthrie natural gas explosion”. koco. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
421. A <http://www.therepublic.com/view/story/af39190844784b7eac485e85c9b9522d1WV--Gas-Explosion>
422. ^ <http://www.wtov9.com/news/2nd-worker-dies-result-tyler-co-pipeline-explosion/nXNHzi>
423. ^ “Exxon says Missouri oil spills from already-ruptured Pegasus line”. Reuters. May 1, 2013.
424. A http://www.wishtv.com/dpp/news/local/marion_county/idem-evaluates-impact-of-fuel-spill
425. ^ “DEP; Compressor stations shows signs of explosion”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
426. A “PHMSA; Stakeholder Communications”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
427. ^ “Skytruth Alert; NRC Report; Natural Gas near Crockett, TX 2013-05-08”. SkyTruth Alerts. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
428. ^ “News - MyCentralJersey.com - mycentraljersey.com”. MyCentralJersey.com. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
429. ^ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrn/reports/enforce/documents/520131007H1520131007H_Corrective%20Action%20order06192013text.pdf
430. A <http://www-v.fox8live.com/story/22625662/natural-gas-pipeline-blast-creates-massive-crater>
431. ^ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrn/reports/enforce/documents/420131014H/420131014H_Corrective%20Action%20order_06242013_text.pdf
432. A “Observer-Reporter - Blaze hits compressor station in Gilmore Township”. Observer-Reporter. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
433. ^ Kathy Antoniotti. “City not privy to pipeline locations inside own borders”. www.ohio.com. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
434. A “Downed Wires Lead To Car Fires, Ruptured Gas Line In Mamaroneck” CBS New York”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
435. A <http://www.news6.com/story/22944566/crews-working-to-halt-bp-pipeline-leak-in-washington-county>
436. ^ <http://www.galesburg.com/article1e120130814INews1130819969/10180INews>
437. ^ “Search Results - KEYE-TV Austin”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
438. A “Update to gas explosion in Overland Park”. fox4kc.com. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
439. ^ “Gas line not yet repaired after explosion in Buna”. Beaumont Enterprise. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
440. ^ “City worker hits gas line”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
441. ^ “Corrosion may have led to North Dakota pipeline leak; regulator”. Yahoo News. 11 October 2013. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
442. ^ <http://www.greenfieldreporter.com/view/story/12Iae083847f4744a934a459c9eOd09d1ND--ND-Pipeline-Break-Cleanup>
443. ^ <http://www.news9.com/story/23630636/officials-working-pipeline-explosion-in-howard-county>
444. ^ “(With video and three photos) Oil spill cleanup continues along Horsehead Creek tributary near Macedonia”. Magnolia Reporter - Magnolia, Arkansas News. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
445. A <http://www.news9.com/story/23650973/resident-recalls-pipeline>
446. ^ The Christian Science Monitor. “Pipeline explosion shoots flames into Oklahoma sky”. The Christian Science Monitor. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
447. ^ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/cOlmnireports/enforce/documents/420131016H/420131016H_Corrective%20Action%20order_10112013_text.pdf
448. A <http://www.kvue.com/news/local/Officials-cleaning-up-400-barrel-oil-spill-near-Smithville-229756751.html>
449. A “Small Town Residents Allowed To Return After Fiery Blast”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
450. ^ “UPDATE 4-Chevron pipeline explodes, burns in rural Texas”. Reuters. November 14, 2013.
451. A http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrn/reports/enforce/documents/420145012/420145012_NOPV%20PCP%20PCO_05212014_text.pdf
452. ^ <http://www.kiiitv.com/story/24003322/exxonmobils-king-ranch-gas-plant-continues-burning-after-overnight-fire>
453. A Associated Press. “Gas Pipeline Rupture Send Flames 100 Feet Into Air”. BigCountryHomepage. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
454. ^ “Pipeline explosion sends fireball 300 feet into air”. fox4kc.com. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
455. A <http://www.wncn.com/story/24171804/gas-line-leak-reported-in-apex>
456. A “PHMSA; Stakeholder Communications”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
457. A “480 tons of soil removed from site of winter gas leak”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
458. ^ “Lawsuit filed over gasoline leak”. Retrieved 15 January 2015.

459. ^ "Crews respond to gas-line fire in Shrewsbury". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
460. A "Asheville gas line explosion costs \$825,000". The Asheville Citizen-Times. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
461. ^ <http://www.greenfieldreporter.com/onlineview/story/9f9d80ef83364d64818f3134913ff72a1ND--Tioga-Gas-Explosion>
462. ^ Marcus Green (18 September 2014). "Analysis; Existing cracks a cause in Kentucky pipeline blast". WorldNow and WDRB.
463. A. The Wichita Eagle. 13 February 2014 <http://www.kansas.com/2014/02/13/32861031ky-gas-line-blast-hospitalizes.html>. Missing or empty title= (help id,ad Unk)
464. ^ <http://www.bayoubuzz.com/top-stories/item/623940-shell-says-ho-ho-pipeline-shut-after-leak-in-texas>
465. A "NTSB; Abnormal Concentration Of Gas Found Near East Harlem Blast Scene". CBS New York. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
466. A "Oil spill cleanup ending; 20 salamanders being cared for off-site". WLWT.com. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
467. A http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrn/reports/enforce!documents/320145002H/320145002H_Corrective%20Action%20Order_03252014_text.pdf
468. ^ "Arvin still in the dark about leaking gas line". The Bakersfield Californian. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
469. A "Massive Explosion Rocks Washington State Natural Gas Plant". thinkprogress.com. 2014-03-31. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
470. ^ <http://co.williams.cornellwilliams/news-media/plymouth-wa-update/>
471. ^ [http://www.theintelligencer.net/page/content.detail/id1493996/Company-won-t-be-cited-for-W-Va--pipelineblast.html?isap=I&nav=5023\[id,ad Unk\]](http://www.theintelligencer.net/page/content.detail/id1493996/Company-won-t-be-cited-for-W-Va--pipelineblast.html?isap=I&nav=5023[id,ad Unk])
472. ^ "Natural gas line ruptures in Union Township; man taken to hospital". The Newark Advocate. 17 April 2014. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
473. A <http://www.localnews8.com/news/explosion-and-fire-force-evacuation-of-town/25627492>
474. ^ Associated Press. "Fire still bums at damaged Wyoming gas plant". Casper Star-Tribune Online. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
475. A "Pipeline Rupture, Hazardous Material Spill in Knox". nemonews.net. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
476. A "Gas line ruptures, ISO-foot geyser of gas spews onto workers". WYFF4. 13 May 2014. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
477. ^ "Wharton County gas line explosion sends ISO-foot flames up in air". ABC13 Houston. 13 May 2014. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
478. A Go Lackawanna (10 July 2014). "Susquehanna County compressor station shut down after morning fire". Times Leader. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
479. ^ "Crews contain oil spill near Santa Maria". KSBY.com. 4 August 2014. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
480. ^ "White Oak man killed in Rusk Co. pipeline explosion". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
481. ^ "Four hurt after natural gas line catches fire near Lindsay". Tulsa World. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
482. A Lynn Cook (15 September 2014). "Chevron Shuts Gas Pipeline After Worker Dies in Gulf of Mexico Accident - WSJ". WSJ. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
483. ^ "TransCanada Pipeline Rupture Prompts Evacuation Of Benton Harbor". The Huffington Post. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
484. ^ WSBT. "TransCanada; After pipeline rupture, repairs may take several weeks". wsbt.com. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
485. A <http://www.kctv5.com/history/267723561-emergency-crews-respond-to-pipeline-rupture-fire-near-centerville/#ixzz3G3Gp4Ie3>
486. ^ Vickie Welborn, (18 October 2014). "Crude oil spills into Caddo bayou, kills wildlife". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
487. ^ <http://www.kait8.com/story/26866351/roads-open-repairs-underway-after-gas-leak>
488. ^ <http://www.theintelligencer.net/page/content.detail/id1615683/Blue-Racer-Pipeline-Shut-Down-After-Explosion.html?nav=510>
489. A http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrn/reports/enforce/documents/220155001S/220155001S_NOPSO_03092015_text.pdf
490. ^ <http://savannahnow.com/news/2015-04-30/kinder-morgan-pipeline-leak-reaches-300000-gallons-south-carolina>
491. A "US Evangeline Pipeline shuts down after leak discovered". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
492. ^ "News - Argus Media". Retrieved 15 January 2015.
493. ^ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrn/reports/enforce/documents/420145027H/420145027H_Corrective%20Action%20Order_10202014_text.pdf
494. ^ "Gas line -explodes, bums near reservoir". WAPT News. 14 January 2015. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
495. ^ "Reservoir gas pipeline fire extinguished". The Clarion-Ledger. 14 January 2015. Retrieved 15 January 2015.
496. ^ http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/conun/reports/enforce/documents/220151001S/220151001S_nopso_03272015_text.pdf
497. ^ Sider, Alison. "Oil Spill Contaminates Montana Town's Water Supply, EPA Says".
498. ^ <http://www.inforum.com/news/accidents/3661267-clean-water-likely-be-restored-glendive-thursday-after-oil-spill-along>
499. ^ http://www.galvestondailynews.com/free/article_699f91e8-9c22-11e4-97c3-63576ec5eff6.html
500. ^ <http://www.theintelligencer.net/page/content.detail/id/623827/Fire-Bumed-24-000-Barrels-of-Ethane.html?nav=515>
501. A http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comrn/reports/enforce/documents/420155005H/420155005H_Corrective%20Action%20Order_03122015_text.pdf
502. A <http://www.wacotrib.com/news/environment/cleanup-begins-on-diesel-pipeline-spill-near-tehuacanacreek/article20e9cbld-75ad-5b17-90a5-374c35f6876a.html>
503. A <http://www.theintelligencer.net/page/content.detail/id16302751-Heavy-Rains--Cited-In-Marshall---.html>
504. A <http://www.theintelligencer.net/page/content.detail/id1630514/DEP--132-Barrels-Spilled-Into-Marshall-County-Creek.html?nav=515>
505. ^ <http://www.newschannel10.com/story/128788786/natural-gas-pipeline-fire-near-borger-extinguished>
506. A "Pipeline explosion at Fresno shooting range caused by front loader, state report says". Retrieved 2015-08-21.
507. ^ <http://edition.cnn.com/2015/05/20/us/california-oil-spill>
508. ^ <http://www.independent.com/news/Zf/15/may/23/refugio-pipeline-shutdown-puts-brakes-oil-product?on>
509. ^ "Arkansas River pipeline blowout occurred on Sunday morning, cause still unknown". Retrieved 2015-08-21.
510. A "Natural gas pipeline ruptures east of I-30 bridge, closing two miles of Arkansas River". Retrieved 2015-08-21.
511. A "Williams natgas pipeline in Pennsylvania ruptures; no injuries". Reuters. 2015-06-11. Retrieved 2015-08-21.
512. ^ <https://www.victoriaadvocate.com/news/2015/jun/17/pipeline-rupture-released-thousands-of-pounds-of-g/>
513. ^ <http://www.chron.com/houston/article/Truck-collision-with-pipeline-backs-up-traffic-on-6342233.php#comments>
514. ^ <http://www.nbcdfw.com/news/local/4-Injured-in-White-Deer-Gas-Line-Explosion-310324841.html>
515. ^ <http://www.bnd.com/news/local/Olmunity/highland-news-leader/article27426022.html>
516. ^ <http://www.wtae.com/news/worker-injured-in-pipeline-accident/34188004>
517. A "Sheriffs Office; Natural gas pipeline 'explosion' forced 150 Falfurrias families from their homes". Valley Central. Retrieved 2015-08-21.
518. ^ "Fire on Williams pipeline". www.upstreamonline.com. Retrieved 2015-08-21.
519. ^ <http://maritime-executive.com/article/two-injured-in-louisiana-pipeline-fire>

{end of 20150901-5069}

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street NE, Room 1A
Washington, DC 20216

RE: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., Docket No. PF14-22-000, Northeast Energy Direct Project
Dear Ms. Bose,

A small group of Northfield residents met with Stan Rosenberg, President of the Massachusetts Senate, on Friday, August 21, at the Richardson-Zlogar Hikers Cabin on the New England Trail. Coordinated by Select Board member, Jed Proujansky, we had an opportunity to express our concerns about the proposed pipeline. Stan listened carefully, queried each participant about some aspect of their presentation, and received a considerable amount of research documents. Afterwards, he spoke about his work on the pipeline in the last year and a half, and explained some of the procedural issues involved in the FERC process. It was a good meeting, and people seemed pleased to be heard. We were reassured that our concerns have his attention. The following are my brief remarks.

Welcome to this hikers' cabin. Over there (on a clear day) you can see Mt. Wachusett, over there Mt. Grace, there is Monadnock, and up there is Mt. Ascutney. Here's a short history of how this cabin came to be and why the wide swath on our land along the power line that Kinder-Morgan plans to take by eminent domain is a concern to us.

When my wife Barbara and I purchased this 38-acre parcel in the year 2000, there was only forest here – no clearing, no view, no logging roads, no National Scenic Trail, and of course, no hikers cabin. We bought the land in order to complete a loop trail permitted by DCR (then DEM), and designed and cleared by Joanne McGee and me. Being refused permission to cross private land that separated state forest parcels, Barbara and I were able to buy the land at an affordable price.

Authorized under the National Trails System Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-543), National Scenic Trail is a designation for protected areas in the United States that consist of trails of particular natural beauty. Sponsored by Massachusetts Congressman John Olver, Congress passed Public Law 111-11 (Section 5202) in March 2009, and the New England Trail (NET) became the 11th National Scenic Trail.

Coordinating with Appalachian Mountain Club and Mass. DCR, we re-routed the NET off private land onto our land and began to pursue a Conservation Restriction that would guarantee public access for hikers as well as protect our land and the trail, from any kind of development, forever. The Conservation Restriction was finalized in May 2011.

We communicated our interest to the Appalachian Mountain Club in locating a shelter on the NET on our land. When a half-price sale for a cabin kit was announced for the Labor Day Weekend, we were able to get the go-ahead for financial backing from the AMC and the National Park Service. The exterior of the cabin was constructed by volunteers from the Berkshire Chapter of the AMC, as well as Northfield friends, by snowfall, and the interior was completed in the spring of 2012. When Congressman Olver cut the ribbon to the cabin in June 2012, he lauded the partnership of the National Park Service, the Appalachian Mountain Club, the Town of Northfield, the Mount Grace Land Conservation Trust, and our family. Working together we were able to protect and preserve this special place for future generations.

Regarding the pipeline proposed by Kinder-Morgan, there is a long list of serious and heartfelt concerns. I wish to speak only to my greatest personal concern: a possible breach of trust by my government.

When we put our land into a Conservation Restriction, we believed that it would be protected forever. Now there is the possibility that the trust that is part of Mount Grace's name will be trumped by the desire for increased corporate profits. Is it really possible that a corporation will be able to take some of our land by eminent domain and desecrate our forest with a fracked gas pipeline? How can this be? Historically, taking land by eminent domain, has been justified by appealing to the greater public good. The argument that

exporting natural gas for corporate profit is in any way for the greater public good is a mockery of our trust in our government's responsibility to protect us from injustice and oppression.

Sam and Barbara Richardson
64 Highland Avenue
Northfield, MA 01360
(413) 695-6764
srichardson19623@gmail.com

20150901-5074

Elizabeth and Robert Tatro
PO Box 747
248 N Main St
Lanesboro, MA 01237
Federal Energy Regulation Commission
888 First St NE
Washington, DC 20426

August 31, 2015

RE: Docket PF14-22-000 NED project via Tennessee Pipeline, Kinder Morgan Natural gas pipeline

To Whom it May Concern:

My husband and I reside on 19 acres in Lanesboro, MA, which the Kinder Morgan Pipeline will be cutting through. We feel it is a horrible thing to have in our town, and impossible to remain in our home should you allow it to come through our land. We have spent the past 25 plus years renovating our circa 1780 home, which is irreplaceable. We live here peacefully and bother no one. We are asking you to stop this hideous pipeline of fracked gas to be allowed to go through our community and land. We know you have heard from everyone how dangerous it is. I, Mrs. Tatro, have PTSD, severe depression and cannot cope with the "thought" of living in an incineration zone of 1000 ft". It is destroying the peace we share here on our gorgeous property after working our entire married life of 37 years to accomplish. We have exhausted ourselves trying to find another home to move to, because just the threat of this pipeline deems our property worthless, unsalable, uninsurable and as far as I am concerned uninhabitable. Please ask yourself how you would feel if a bomb were sitting on your front steps, which would pollute the water, incinerate the land, trees, our animals, the wildlife, etc. and threaten your very life.

Please look into alternative energy sources, such as solar, wind, and the burning of seawater, which aired on Channel 3 News. The video is on Youtube – Dr. John Kanzius, looking for a cure for cancer, made a radio frequency generator which uses radio waves to burn the hydrogen and oxygen in seawater, which we do not have to export, that might be the answer to the world's energy crisis and almost no one knows about it. Search Youtube and see for yourself.

I feel that eminent domain should be abolished in this country – it is legally stealing from the poor to give to the filthy rich disguised as for the good of the "people". We are "people" and do not wish to have this done to us, I feel it violates our constitutional right to the "pursuit of happiness". It has caused a huge amount of stress in my life since I received the letter December 14, 2014 to survey our land, which we have denied.

Thank you,

Elizabeth and Robert Tatro

20150901-5094

**TOWN OF
BROOKLINE, NEW HAMPSHIRE
SELECTBOARD**

August 31, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Kinder Morgan Proposed Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project Docket No. PF14-22-000

Dear Ms. Bose:

This letter provides the Town of Brookline's written scoping submission for the above project.

Our comments fall into two categories:

- 1.) General comments on the NED pipeline
- 2.) NED comments that are specific to Brookline

1. General Comments

Alternative Pipeline Projects

The Selectboard is aware of several competitive pipeline projects aimed at addressing New England's needs for natural gas. These include Kinder Morgan's NED project, as well as pipeline projects by Spectra and Portland Natural Gas Transmission System (PNGTS). The Spectra and PNGTS projects have significant advantages to NED. Both would increase natural gas supplies along existing gas pipeline routes and therefore avoid the environmental impact of Kinder Morgan's "greenfield" project.

Spectra and PNGTS pipelines are also close to existing power generation plants and therefore will effectively address the region's electricity cost issues in the winter months. The current route for NED does not service such plants and therefore will not have the same benefit.

New England does not need all three pipelines. We urge FERC to carefully evaluate the advantages and disadvantages of these three pipeline projects rather than looking at each project in isolation to ensure the region is not strapped with an overbuild of infrastructure that ratepayers must unnecessarily fund for years.

Need

FERC has a significant process in place for the assessment of NED's environmental impact through the development of an Environmental Impact Statement. This process allows for substantial public input and places significant requirements on Kinder Morgan to address concerns. Furthermore, the process is highly transparent.

We are troubled that there is not a similarly transparent process in place for FERC, and the public, to assess the need of the NED pipeline. We believe it is important to confirm the "need" for a pipeline before evaluating its "environmental impact"; there should be no environmental impact if there is no need.

Based on the limited long-term contracts currently subscribed for on NED, along with the existence of more environmentally friendly pipeline alternatives, we fail to see a need for NED and urge FERC to specifically address the "need" for this particular pipeline, in a public fashion, should this project continue through the permitting process.

2.) Brookline-Specific Comments

Qualified Experts Studying Environmental Impacts

In Brookline, a total of 15 parcels will be impacted by the pipeline, including six parcels that have been purchased by the Town's Conservation Commission at a cost of over \$571,000 and totaling over 163 acres. The Town of Brookline has engaged qualified experts to assess the potential impacts of the pipeline project. We ask that the record reflect such resources have been retained. As the results of these studies are finalized,

we reserve the right to utilize them in requests to Kinder Morgan, its affiliates as well as FERC, the NH Site Evaluation Committee and other agencies.

Town Meeting Votes on Pipeline

At Brookline's annual town meeting on March 11, 2015, voters overwhelmingly passed several warrant articles related to the proposed pipeline.

The following were **passed**:

- #1 - Shall the Town of Brookline vote to oppose approval of the Northeast Energy Direct Project because the proposal is inconsistent with the Town's goal of protecting and preserving aquifers, drinking water including community and private wells, wetlands, streams, and other bodies of water. In addition, the proposal to extract water to use in drilling or other operations, whether from a body of water or well, is inconsistent with the Town's goal to protect such waters.
- #2 - Shall the Town of Brookline vote to oppose approval of the Northeast Energy Direct Project because the proposal is inconsistent with the basic tenet of individual property rights whereas if approved, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC shall have the power to force private property owners to give up rights under Eminent Domain proceedings in order to create a new corridor for the installation of the pipeline project.
- #3 - Shall we impose a moratorium on any interstate gas pipeline projects within the Town of Brookline? The moratorium became effective immediately upon the vote and included, but was not be limited to, land acquisition, surveying, tree removal, or any physical alteration of any land within the Town of Brookline intended for pipeline construction or development.

A fourth article appropriated funds to assist the Town in opposing the pipeline project.

Property Values

We are concerned about the impact of the pipeline on property values for our community members that are co-located with the planned pipeline. You may refer to them as pipeline abutters.

We request that Kinder Morgan be required to provide tangible, substantiated data regarding the impact of similarly sized gas pipelines on local property values. An assessment of the potential impact on property values should be clearly detailed. We request the information be provided for values during two different timeframes. The first is from project announcement through completion of construction and the second set of values would be for after construction. We expect the impacts to be more substantial up to and through construction.

Blasting

Considerable blasting is expected for construction of the pipeline. In May of 2014, prior to the announcement of the proposed route, Brookline passed a Blasting Ordinance. We request that the Ordinance be followed by Kinder Morgan and its affiliates, including the pre- and post- blast surveying of all structures within 500 feet of any blasting.

Road Crossings

The proposed pipeline would cross three different types of roads in Brookline. One is a state road, a second is a paved town road, and the third is an unmaintained, "class VI" road. Each of these roads will experience heavy logging trucks. As a result, we request that FERC require construction techniques that will ensure the ability to handle heavy logging trucks on all road crossings in Brookline, including any "class VI" roads.

Electricity Rates

One of the alleged benefits of NED is reduced electricity rates. We have trouble understanding how a pipeline that does not serve existing power generation plants will aid in reducing electricity rates. The gas from NED will be used for heating not electricity.

To assist in quantifying the benefits of NED, we request that Kinder Morgan and its partners be required to:

- 1.) Provide the results of a study that evaluates the cost/benefit analysis of this specifically proposed pipeline for electricity prices in NH (similar to a recently completed study in Maine). This study should also consider the potential cost impact of the project on ratepayers.
- 2.) Provide quantifiable figures on the predicted reduction in electricity prices as a result of this particular pipeline and over what period of time

Such an analysis can then be weighed against the significant personal and environmental impact of this project.

High Consequence Area

Our final request is specifically for Section J of the Alignment sheets in Brookline, NH. Given the crossing of Route 13 (with a traffic count approaching 10,000 vehicles per day), the nearly 20 buildings intended for human occupancy, and numerous building lots actively on the market within the potential impact circle, we request FERC study whether the area between station 783+62 and 820+00 could reasonably be designated a "High Consequence Area" as allowable under the applicable area of Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Section 192 and thus be included in the applicant's integrity management plan if the project is approved.

Sincerely,

Darrell Philpot
John J. Carr

Susan Adams
Brendan Denehy

Karl D. Dowling

20150901-5166

Velitchka LaPier, Nassau, NY.

Negative Impacts of the NED Pipeline Project and Specifically the Compressor Station Proposed for the Town of Nassau

Prepared by Eric J. LaPier of 1218 Nassau Averill Park Rd, Nassau, NY 12123

Page 1

It is important to note that the proposed NED pipeline project, if approved, will have significant negative impact to the quality of life of residents along the pipeline corridor and particularly those in close proximity to the compressor stations required to maintain functionality of that pipeline. I am one of those residents and will describe the concerns that I have:

The Pipeline

My primary concern with the proposed pipeline is with regards to eminent domain. The lands required to provide a corridor for the new project will force residents to turn over portions of land which are owned and have had taxes paid by citizens who, for the most part, will not receive any benefit from the project whose delivery destination is in Dracut, Massachusetts. On the contrary these people will be exposed to potential harm in the event of a malfunction or failure. There will be no "opt-out" available to these people. In fact I have already received a statement from Kinder-Morgan stating: "...if the commission approves the Project, that approval conveys with it the right to eminent domain. Therefore, if easement negotiations fail to produce an agreement, the pipeline company could initiate condemnation proceedings ...". Is this the reason I have paid taxes for 10 years on my land? To lose say with the way I develop and use it? If eminent domain is to be allowed on this project, my feeling is the need must be clear. Delivery of inexpensive fossil fuel (more than half of which is expected to be exported) is not a necessity. If the corridor were used to deliver high efficiency renewable energy, I would be more willing to accept this as a need. At this point there is no definite route for the pipeline (only proposals which may change after the approval) and so the number of effected residents and the potential for property loss is unknown.

Additional concerns that I have with the pipeline itself are:

- Safety: In the event of a failure, those within the "incineration zone" are at a high potential for harm. Accord-

ing to the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration there have been 360 fatalities and over \$7 billion in property damages in the past 20 years. This does not include incidents in which there was an outside force or nearby fire that caused the incident. Failures happen.

In the event of a failure there is a significant risk to the environment by both water and air pollution. The NYSDEC has produced a "Final Supplemental Generic Environmental Impact Statement on the Oil, Gas and Solution Mining Regulatory Program" with regards to the impact of hydrofracking wells and many of these same hazards exist along the pipeline if an accidental release occurs. I therefore wish to make the statement a part of the scoping project review in terms of accidental release via incident or maintenance to the pipeline or compressor station.

•Construction: Considerable disruption of wildlife habitat. In the area where I live I have observed the following: Bald Eagle, Golden Eagle, Snowy Owl, Pileated Woodpecker, Wild Turkey, Blue Heron, Red Tailed Hawk, Peregrine Falcon, Black Bear, Fisher, Red Fox, Gray Fox, Thriving Colonies of Brown Bats, Many song birds, Monarch Butterfly (and Viceroy), Karner Blue Butterfly, Along with many other small and large common mammals, amphibians, reptiles and insects.

- Effect on well water. Blasting is proven to have an adverse impact on well flow and water purity. I have walked the power lines and dug the ground in this area—there are significant rock shelves that will likely require blasting.

20150901-5167

Velitchka LaPier, Nassau, NY.

Negative Impacts of the NED Pipeline Project and Specifically the Compressor Station Proposed for the Town of Nassau

Prepared by Eric J. LaPier of 1218 Nassau Averill Park Rd, Nassau, NY 12123

Page 2

The Compressor Station

To me the greatest concern lies with the poor location choice for the compressor station proposed in the Town of Nassau. This is a three compressor unit facility totaling ~90,000 hp of output. The proposed site is located in a residential zone on the opposite side of the road from my house. I am likely to be the nearest inhabited dwelling to the proposed station.

I have raised my two children in this house and expect to continue to do so. My house is over 100 years old. I have spent years improving the systems and grounds. I often sit outside at night in the summer and listen to the peepers in the swamp, the owls talking from one hilltop to another and the crickets singing in the grass. I catch lightning bugs with the kids and look up at the stars. My 5 year old can already recognize Venus, Mars and Jupiter.

I am not alone. The 0.5 mile buffer zone has 63 little yellow dots on the map each representing a residence. A large portion of these dots are inhabited by children (I know because my 11 year old daughter told me—they rode her school bus). Those are 63 families who will directly be affected by the proposed compressor station. Due to spillage, maintenance and pressure relief, a majority of the chemicals found at well pads will be released to the environment at the compressor station. A study published in ScienceDirect by Lisa McKenzie found that "residents living $\leq 1/2$ mile from wells are at greater risk for health effects from NGD [natural gas development] than are residents living $>1/2$ mile from wells".

Those that aren't in the 0.5 mile buffer zone will be affected too. Another article published by PLOS ONE on June 3rd and authored by Bruce Pitt correlated low birth weight to the proximity of natural gas wells (up to 10 miles away). The findings indicate that "... a small but significant association between proximity to UGD [unconventional gas development] and decreased birth weight was noted after accounting for a large number of contributing factors available...".

With so much data available why would a chemical polluting compressor station be located close to so

many residences? I have hiked, biked and off-roaded this area for most of my life (I was raised here). There are locations less than 10 miles from this proposed site that have 0 residences within a 0.5 mile. Why were these locations not chosen? Did Kinder-Morgan decide that 63 families health weren't worth investigating other options?

There are other forms of pollution given off by the compressor station as well. It will be lit all night long - 7 days per week, 365 days per year. So much for star gazing. All those compressor units give off sound too. The noise pollution allowed at my house will be an average of 55db. I guess I won't be listening to the owls anymore either. I wonder if the owls will even want to stick around if they can't hear each other. Maybe the bald eagles will like it - on the other hand probably not. I wonder if any of the animals I listed earlier will appreciate all the light and noise? I doubt it - I suspect they will just move on to some other neighborhood.

I digress-this is a serious matter. I have to come back to the poor choice of location for a known health hazard which is the compressor station in the Town of Nassau. The data is mounting that the contaminants that will be released from the facility are harmful (particularly to children and pregnant women). I have a list of publications and reports that detail the harm caused by hydraulic fracture wells, and by association, the infrastructure that transports the raw natural gas (which I would like to submit for the record and for review). You will see many of them are dated within the past year. The amount of information out there is enormous. The PSE Health Energy is a repository for peer reviewed publications relating to shale gas development. Of the over 550 publications currently in the literature, 194 were published in 2014 and 103 more were published in the last 6 months. It is important to make the right decision - not a fast decision. I urge you to weigh the need of a natural gas pipeline with a goal of over 50% exports against the harm that it will cause to our families, communities and property.

References

1. New York State Department of Environmental Conservation. Final Supplemental Generic Environmental Impact Statement on the Oil, Gas and Solution Mining Regulatory Program-Findings Statement. June 2015.
2. McKenzie LM, Witter RZ, Newman LS, Adgate JL. Human health risk assessment of air emissions from development of unconventional natural gas resources. *Science Total Environment*. 2012;424: 79-87. doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2012.02.018. pmid:22444058
3. Stacy SL, Brink LL, Larkin JC, Sadovsky Y, Goldstein BD, Pitt BR, et al. (2015) Perinatal Outcomes and Unconventional Natural Gas Operations in Southwest Pennsylvania. *PLoS ONE* 10(6): e0126425. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0126425
4. Andy Greenspon. Natural Gas Pipeline Leaks and Emissions. March 18, 2015.
5. Jake Hays, Seth B.C. Shonkoff. Toward an understanding of the environmental and public health impacts of shale gas development: an analysis of the peer-reviewed scientific literature. June, 2015.

20150901-5222

P. WHITCOMB SANFORD
59 Maple Street
Shelburne Falls, MA 01370

August 23, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street NE, Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.
Northeast Energy Direct Project – Docket No. PF14-22-000
SCOPING COMMENTS

Dear Secretary Bose:

I am a resident of Shelburne Falls MA, and a retired, full-time volunteer. I lived and worked in the Catskill region for 25 years where I directed two nonprofit organizations and served on the Boards of the Catskill Center for Conservation and Development and Catskill Forestry Association. Until 2005, I co-directed the Connecticut River Watershed Council in Greenfield, MA, for 12 years, working on issues of regional concern. Currently, I am on the Board of the Greater Shelburne Falls Area Business Association and an At-Large Member of the Mohawk Trail Woodland Partnership Advisory Committee for the U.S. Forest Service and MA Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs. I have a BS in Business and MA in Regional Planning. I am knowledgeable about rural conservation and development issues and the towns, counties and regions through which the NED pipeline is proposed.

STATEMENT

The NED pipeline will have a detrimental impact of on rural areas like the Berkshires (and Catskills) where tourism, farming, forestry and outdoor recreation are a significant and growing part of our regional economy. These business sectors and industries are based in and dependent upon the quality of our lands and waters, the scenic beauty of our mountain landscapes, the rural character, culture and heritage of our communities, and the wellbeing of our natural and historic resources. In other words, the quality of our rural, natural and cultural resources are inseparable from our efforts to grow the economy of the Berkshires. If the pipe goes through, it will compromise the region's prosperity and sustainability and the ongoing public-private efforts in Massachusetts to address climate change and transition to renewable energy sources.

The natural gas industry and Kinder Morgan NED pipeline run counter to the growth of our rural economy by impairing the operation of our farms, the management of our forests, the protection and restoration of our waters and wildlife habitat, and the preservation of our scenic beauty and rural heritage.

The pipeline will contribute little to our prosperity. Few if any full-time, year-round jobs will be created in our area, even as the pipeline crosses and scars our rural landscape for a long, long time. In addition, only a very small percentage of the Marcellus shale gas will be used in the Berkshires. Instead, the pipeline will change our communities and impair our quality of life, because it is an industrial use that heretofore has not existed in northwest Massachusetts.

This creates an inequity. Rural areas are forced to bear the financial and economic burden of the pipeline, while urban and suburban residents and businesses elsewhere reap the benefits of lower electric rates and Kinder Morgan and TGP profit from the pipeline year after year.

Assess and Mitigate the Inequity Created for Rural Natural Resource-Based Economies

To insure the financial and economic burdens of the pipeline are not solely or unfairly born by rural places, businesses and residents, FERC should require that the Draft Environmental Impact Statement first and foremost, analyze and justify the need for the pipeline and assess alternatives to electric generation other than building a hugely expensive and ultimately obsolete pipeline.¹

Then the DEIS should: (1) Fully examine and assess issues and concerns of rural towns, business interests and landowners, (2) Recommend measures Kinder Morgan and TGP will take to remediate untenable and unfair situations, and (3) Study and report on the inequity of taking of lands in perpetuity for the benefit of privately held corporations and predominately urban areas year-in-year out for as long as the pipeline exists.

Most important, it is imperative that the DEIS evaluate the impact of the pipeline on the natural resource-based economy of rural regions, and in particular Franklin County, one of the poorest in Massachusetts.

Background

Large-lot landowners and rural businesses related to farming, forestry, recreation and tourism bear the majority of the burden of conserving the lands and natural resources that contribute to the health and well-being of Massachusetts residents. These rural assets provide the annual and ongoing environmental services from which the Commonwealth as a whole and urban residents and businesses specifically benefit – pure drinking

water, clean air, wildlife habitat, food and fiber, working landscapes, recreational amenities, scenic vistas, and flood control.² However, rural landowners are not and have never been adequately compensated for the services their properties provide to the residents and businesses of the Commonwealth.³

Neither are property owners compensated for the value/income of the crop or timber sale or field and trail used that have been lost year-to-year as a consequent of the taking of their properties. These losses by property owners should be tied to and compensated by Kinder Morgan and TGP based on their annual profitability from the pipeline.⁴

As such, the DEIS should:

- a. Determine the value of environmental services that rural lands provide to the State.
- b. Study the impact on farming, forestry, tourism and recreation, where lands are taken via one-time eminent domain payments, but land owners lose the productivity of their land in perpetuity. These costs to property owners could include – loss of workable farm and forest lands, scenic value or rural character of the lands, uninterrupted recreational trails and/or annual crop production, and the cost of rethinking the management and operation of the business on the property.
- c. Study and report on ways private enterprises like Kinder Morgan and TGP could compensate farmers and large-lot landowners for the loss of the more intangible value of their property and business – sweat equity can and should be monetized to pay farmers for the work they put into making a farm viable and prosperous; interruption to the operation and management of a business; loss of scenic, pastoral, and resale value to land owners and businesses that rely on these to operate successfully.
- d. Determine how Kinder Morgan and TGP will compensate landowners and towns overtime for the use of the lands and natural resources taken for the pipeline in perpetuity.
- e. Determine how there can be economic parity for urban and rural residents and businesses. Simply because there are fewer people in rural areas does not mean their economy is of less value than in urban areas or that rural landowners/businesses should not be compensated properly for a natural gas supply provided via their properties and towns and that is destined mainly for cities and their surrounding suburbs to bolster urban economies.

Tourism in the Rural New York, Massachusetts and New Hampshire

While the comments and requests below focus on Franklin County in Massachusetts, they are applicable to the Berkshires in MA, Catskill Region in New York State and Southern New Hampshire, because the pipeline will effect rural economic development efforts long-term and along its entire length.

The overall prosperity and stability of rural economies are based on two factors: (1) The quality of a region's natural, scenic, historic, open space, and land and water resources, and (2) the ability of civic groups, business sectors and localities to preserve, improve and integrate the use of rural resources and values into a long-term program to sustain and build a region's economy. An industrial facility such as the pipeline that is imposed on a rural landscape and at odds with rural farm, forestry, and tourism development strategies is not conducive to sustaining rural economies.

Background

The Shelburne Falls Region known as “West County” began an effort through the Greater Shelburne Falls Area Business Association (GSFABA) and a number of citizens groups to improve different sectors of the region's economy that together is boosting the fiscal health of the interrelated and natural resource-based business sectors of West County – scenic, heritage, creative, recreation, and eco-tourism; tourist amenity businesses (retail, restaurants and accommodations); and the agricultural, forestry and recreational industries.

At the same time, the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) and the MA Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs (EEA) are in the process of discovering if the 20-town Mohawk Trail Region in the northern Berkshires (including many of the towns for the proposed pipeline) is appropriate for a new type of national

designation. The Mohawk Trail Woodland Partnership Advisory Committee, made up of representatives of the farming, forestry, recreation and tourism industries and the 20 towns, is working with the USFS, EEA, and Regional Planning Agencies⁵ to plan, propose and develop the new model of public-private cooperation to grow the region's forest, tourism and recreation industries.

There a number of basic questions that should be answered by Kinder Morgan and TGP concerning the impact of the pipeline on individual sectors of the economy and tourism as a whole in the Berkshires and other rural regions it crosses.

- a. Determine how the pipeline will conflict with scenic values and rural quality.
- b. Study how the pipeline will make the region less appealing for second-home owners and tourism development.
- c. Assess whether a new pipeline, costing billions of dollars, should be routed through pristine wild and rural lands when existing pipeline rights-of-ways could be used to support a new or expanded pipeline. 6
- d. Examine the tax implications for towns and property owners.

Below is a listing of information that FERC should require Kinder Morgan to provide the public so it and the State will understand the full impact of the pipeline on the rural natural-resource-based economy as a whole, and on its individual business sectors specifically – agriculture, forestry, tourism, recreation, ecology, and heritage.

Requested Information about Ecological, Heritage and Recreational Tourism

- a. Provide an inventory of ecological, heritage and recreational sites along the proposed route, including their locations and extents.
- b. Provide the locations, total areas, and durations of impacts, such as temporary road closures in the vicinity of each inventoried site.
- c. Determine how the operation of sites and businesses will be disrupted as a result of temporary construction impacts through a fiscal impact analysis quantifying loss of revenue due to required closures, decreased patronage, and other disruptions.
- d. For each site and business (including farms) impacted by the proposal, provide a mitigation plan to ensure their continued operation during any construction activities.

Requested Information for the Recreation Industry

- a. Identify the types of recreational land directly and indirectly impacted by acreage, number of owners, and soil types and anticipated radius of impact.
- b. Identify impacts of soil disturbance, altered drainage patterns, and mitigation activities on the various types of recreational activities, including disruption of economies of scale.
- c. Provide a fiscal impact study showing the value of lost recreational productivity on the local and regional economy, in terms of lost revenue, income, and jobs.
- d. Provide an assessment of the potential impacts on access to parks, trails, tourist destinations, vistas, and other sites under all types of ownership throughout the study area for area residents.

Requested Information for Farming and Forestry

- a. Identify the types of agricultural and forested land directly and indirectly impacted by acreage, number of owners, and soil types and anticipated radius of impact.
- b. Identify impacts of soil disturbance, altered drainage patterns, and mitigation activities on the various types of agricultural and forestry activities, including disruption of economies of scale.
- c. Identify impacts of the pipeline itself to long-term soil productivity, due to increased temperatures, altered drainage, and/or anticipated maintenance activities (such as applications of herbicides).
- d. Provide a fiscal impact study showing the value of lost agricultural and forestry productivity on the

- local, regional and State economy, in terms of lost revenue, income, jobs and environmental services.
- e. Provide an assessment of the potential impacts on access to local food and fiber for area residents in Massachusetts.
 - f. Determine the monetary value/cost of losing working lands to property owners individually and collectively.
 - g. Determine the monetary value of timber taken.

In addition, there are over 600 chemicals used in the hydro-fracking process, many of them are proven carcinogens, endocrine disruptors, and neurotoxins. Most, if not all, of these chemicals are heavier than air, so when they are released with the gas, they first travel with the prevailing wind and then settle out, falling to the ground. The blow-off valve could vent the pipeline at any time, day or night, any day of the year. This is expected to happen several times per year at a minimum. The chemicals released would pose a serious health threat to farmers, their children, workers, all of their animals and customers by contaminating the food that is raised.

Most farms have been built with a phenomenal amount of labor over many, many years, not just by the farmer, but countless apprentices, employees, volunteers, friends, and extended family. Embodied in these farms are not only the manifestations of each farmers' dreams, but all of their financial resources as well.

As such, the DEIS should:

- a. Identify and list the chemicals used in the hydro-fracking process and thoroughly discuss their effects on humans, animals, soils, plants, and the food chain.
- b. Identify impacts of chemical blow-offs of the pipeline to long-term soil productivity.
- c. Determine the number of properties, humans, and animals that would be impacted by blow-offs from the pipeline.
- d. Provide an assessment of the potential impacts on the quality of the food and fiber in Massachusetts.

Requested Information about National and Special Private Designation⁷

- a. Identify regions in the northeastern U.S. along the proposed pipeline that have been designated as a National Forest, National Refuge, National Heritage Area, American Heritage River, National Blueway, or National Recreational Trail including their locations and extents.
- b. Provide an inventory of benefits and downsides accrued to the regions over time as a consequence of the National designation it was awarded.
- c. Determine if any such nationally designated areas have natural gas pipelines or energy/utility facilities running through them.
- d. Repeat this analysis for any State designated forests, corridors, trails or areas.
- e. Assess if the pipeline will compete with the Northern Berkshires region's potential designation as a new model, public-private forest by the US Forest Service.

Impact on Heritage & Recreation Sites, Farming, Forestry and Towns

The March 2015 Resource Report submitted by TGP outlines several prevention and mitigation measures to protect soil compaction and loss of agricultural productivity. Approximately 1/3 of the prime farmland along the proposed route is anticipated to be permanently lost to construction (540.78 out of 1,681.04 acres, Page 7-11), which is a significant amount. After several decades of declining farmland, and now with a scarcity of agricultural land available for new generations of farmers, the loss of any additional farmland (particularly prime) is extremely detrimental to the agricultural economy, Massachusetts and the Nation.

It is important to provide an analysis of potentially lost agricultural land (e.g. pipeline R-O-W located amid active crops, grazing areas, and rotational fields) and to evaluate the impact of the lost acreage on the viability and economy of scale of the farm or forestry operation. Long-term crop and livestock-specific impacts

of the pipeline and related activities that will impact the productivity of agricultural lands should be understood.⁸

Long-term Disruptions to Farming, Forestry, Property Values and the Tax Base of Towns

Fragmentation of forested areas and farmland by the pipeline and associated facilities may impact management and operation of lands by property owners and associated agricultural and woodland businesses/industries, e.g. rotation of crops and livestock, elimination of lands and income from forestry and farming enterprises, and compromise organic farming operations. The existence of the pipeline may also effect the health and safety of property owners and livestock, e.g. air pollution and/or pipeline failures/accidents.

Requested Information

- a. Determine whether farming and forestry operations and management will be disrupted as a result of permanent installation of a natural gas pipeline, its associated facilities, or its rights of way.
- b. Summarize the acreage of farm and forest land that will be permanently impacted by the proposed facilities.
- c. Determine the occupancy of farm and forest lands throughout the year (humans and livestock) to understand the threat to safety and health.
- d. Determine how the operation of farm and forested lands will be disrupted as a result of permanent construction impacts through a fiscal impact analysis.
- e. Provide a mitigation plan for farmers and private property owners to address potential losses in views, changes to the physical character of the land, and any potential hazards due to pipeline activities.
- f. Address impacts on the safety of farm and forest land owners, and to assets of the location/business, including insurances, emergency preparedness, and increased liabilities associated with the proposed pipeline facilities.
- g. Conduct an economic impact study showing the potential negative impacts to recreational, farming and forestry businesses in terms of lost revenue, income, and jobs as a result of the pipeline.
- h. Determine if the pipeline would impact the region's potential for earning special designations from federal and state government, e.g. National Forest, National Recreational Trail, National Heritage Area, Heritage Landscape, Cultural District, Historic District, Scenic Byway, etc. designations

Temporary Disruptions to Heritage & Recreational Sites during Construction

Parks, trails, tracts of land, tourist destinations, vistas, and other sites under all types of ownership exist throughout the study area. Direct economic patronage to and indirect expenditures associated with visits to these sites may be disrupted by construction activities associated with a pipeline construction project.

Requested Information

- a. Provide an inventory of heritage and recreational sites along the proposed route, including their locations and extents.
- b. Provide the locations, total areas, and durations of impacts, such as temporary road closures in the vicinity of each inventoried site.
- c. Determine how the operation of sites will be disrupted as a result of temporary construction impacts through a fiscal impact analysis quantifying loss of revenue due to required closures, decreased patronage, and other disruptions.
- d. For each site impacted by the proposal, provide a mitigation plan to ensure their continued operation during any construction activities.

Long-Term Disruptions to Heritage & Recreational Sites

Direct economic patronage to and indirect expenditures associated with visits to heritage and recreational sites may be permanently disrupted by the proposed project and its associated

facilities. Changes to scenic vistas, the physical character of the land, and liabilities/restrictions on certain activities near the facilities in question will impact these sites and their public benefit.

Requested Information

- a. Determine whether a site's operations and visitor attraction will be disrupted as a result of permanent installation of a natural gas pipeline, its associated facilities, or its rights of way.
- b. Summarize the acreage of heritage, recreational, farm and forest land that will be permanently impacted by the proposed facilities.
- c. Determine the occupancy of recreational and heritage sites throughout the year, and during appropriate peak times where number of visitors and human impacts on an area may be significantly higher than normal.
- d. Determine how the operation of heritage and recreational sites and farm and forested lands will be disrupted as a result of permanent construction impacts through a fiscal impact analysis.
- e. Provide a mitigation plan for heritage and recreational sites to address potential losses in views, changes to the physical character of the land, and any potential hazards due to pipeline activities.
- f. Address impacts on the safety of visitors and land owners at each heritage and recreational site and to assets of the location/business, including insurances, emergency preparedness, and increased liabilities associated with the proposed pipeline facilities.
- g. Conduct an economic impact study showing the potential negative impacts on recreational and heritage tourism in terms of lost revenue, income, and jobs as a result of the pipeline.

Costs to Towns and Residents – Property Values, Infrastructure, Emergency Management

No matter how you slice it rural communities do not have the means, personnel, capacity or information needed to deal with the NED pipeline.

Requested Information

- a. Study and report on how the pipeline will effect property values and the local tax base in each town.
- b. Analyze and quantify the impacts of the pipeline and related facilities on the cost to Towns in maintaining existing infrastructure (roads, bridges, culverts, water, sewer, etc.) needed by Kinder Morgan for the maintenance, monitoring and operation of its facilities and the Towns to deal with hazardous materials or emergencies associated with the pipeline's operation.
- c. Assess the capabilities of each and every town to address emergency situations that could occur along the pipeline.
- d. Provide an accounting of what it would cost each town to be trained in emergency management of the pipeline and what equipment towns would need to acquire to deal with the emergencies.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Whitty Sanford

Cc: Members, State Legislative Delegation
Franklin Regional Council of Governments
Massachusetts Association of Conservation Commissions
Massachusetts Office of Travel and Tourism

¹ Renewable energy generation is growing while oil and gas energy generation is waning. As a rate-payer for energy, I would rather pay for the installation of solar panels on every building in Massachusetts than to subsidize the natural gas industry through my electric bill.

² For example, clean water from the Quabbin and Wachusett Reservoir System for the greater Boston area.

³ There are tax credits through Chapter 61 and nonprofit conservation restrictions, and the "Right to Farm" Act that in theory let farmers use their lands as they see fit, but none of these tools is equal to the value that working lands give other parts of the

State and Nation, day-in and day-out.

4 For example, an easy, straightforward fix for the annual use of lands by corporations through eminent domain would be to give property owners stock equal to the loss of their current use – woodland, farming, recreation or property value.

5 Franklin Regional Council of Governments and Berkshire Regional Planning Commission.

6 Also, an area in Vermont and MA that includes the Northern Berkshires is one of four Resilient Landscapes in the eastern U.S.A. – the Middle Connecticut River region – that is strongly positioned to facilitate wildlife adaptation to climate change, according to the Open Space Institute’s analysis based on data from The Nature Conservancy’s Resilient Sites for Terrestrial Conservation.

7 E.g. The Open Space Institute has designated the Middle Connecticut River in VT and MA the Northeast Resilient Landscapes Initiative.

8 E.g., mature orchard trees lost to construction or R-O-W may not be replaced, despite achieving restored soil conditions or the pipeline may not fit into a farmers plans for rotating crops and fields with respect to raising cattle or improving his/her organic farming techniques.

20150902-0014

Peter J. Soucy
3 Mockingbird Lane
Litchfield, NH03052

August 26, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street NE, Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., Docket No. PF14-22-000 Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Ms. Bose,

There are several things in the Tennessee Gas proposal that I wish to comment on and I believe that need to be addressed as they relate to the state of New Hampshire. First of all is it even needed in New Hampshire now or in the future? The route it takes is not the best or most efficient way to supply New Hampshire. Last but certainly not least is the safety of all people around the pipeline including the people that have to handle any emergencies that arise. I’ve been to several of the meetings now in different towns in my area; Litchfield, Hudson, Londonderry and Nashua, and the legitimate concerns of the citizens at all of them seem to relate to these things.

This pipeline has been proposed because of an alleged increase in demand for natural gas in the “New England” area but after questioning Kinder Morgan representatives at their open houses and town meetings it sounds more like the demand is around existing facilities in the Dracut area and other locations south of there. I personally know no one in New Hampshire that has any Natural gas appliances so I can’t imagine the demand is great in this state. Those types of appliances are only replaced every 15 or more years so residential demand has to be low. Since the economic downturn commercial capital expenditure has been low and I don’t imagine that will change drastically until something drastic happens with the economy in this area. Are their generating facilities being built in New Hampshire? As you know the proposed NED pipeline begins in Wright New York and ends in Dracut, Massachusetts. If you draw a line between these two places you’ll probably ask as I did why are we even talking about New Hampshire? That has come up at the meetings and Kinder Morgan has admitted that they estimate less than 10% of the gas will likely go to New Hampshire accounts. A 30 inch pipeline in our backyards so we can use less than 3 inches of it doesn’t sound like a wise plan at all and Kinder Morgan answered my first question; ‘Is a natural gas pipeline needed in New Hampshire?’ ‘3” maybe some time in the future, any bigger than that definitely not.

The original proposed and more direct route through Massachusetts is apparently being avoided because of opposition from Massachusetts residents. Tennessee Gas also has said that part of the reason for the change is to avoid article 97 properties in Massachusetts. That’s wonderful, but just because New Hampshire doesn’t have an article 97 doesn’t mean the people that live there don’t care about their properties. Just ask New Hampshire residents why they live in New Hampshire and most will probably tell you that they wanted

to get away from the city to a more rural life and some have sacrificed in order to do that. I for instance opted out of a much higher paying job in Boston for a lower stress position in New Hampshire to gain a higher quality of life in a rural setting. Excessive infrastructure is not wanted here and in my opinion there is already too much.

A phrase pertaining to routing contained in the Tennessee Gas proposal is “co-located along existing power utility corridor” and someone apparently really likes that phrase because the Northern Pass people are using it as well. This is a great thought but brings to light an already existing problem that wastes resources, ruins private property, and mutilates the landscape. The way the existing utility corridors are laid out is ridiculous and seemingly in no order whatever. There are too many places where there are three, four, or more existing power lines running adjacent to each other. So instead of coming up with a pole that can carry multiple lines or increasing the size of the line so that fewer need to be used we are allowing utility companies to create new parallel pathways that take property &om landowners and create an eyesore. This needs to stop. Someone at the state or federal level needs to come up with regulations that prevent this waste. The federal body should require &om the state a master plan for routing power/eneqgr and require all future projects and updates to existing projects adhere to it. The corridors should be no more than 400 feet wide and the different utility companies will have to figure out how use them safely. I would think that the easiest way to run any utilities would be to follow existing roadways in the rights-of-way adjacent to those roadways... especially here in New Hampshire. If a gas company truly wanted to provide gas to New Hampshire the best route to take would be to run a main line right up route 93 with spur lines off of that. Most major population centers in the state would then be serviced. Massachusetts would be best serviced by a line along route 90 and then in Boston it could turn north on route 95 to cover the coast and into Maine.

Another benefit of using existing roadways in these northern climates is emergency access. What happens in the event of an emergency with the proposed pipeline in the middle of winter and in the middle of the woods? My area received more than 10 feet of snow last winter, how will the repair crews access the damage? ...Through private property along the power line easement? If that’s the case then that’s poor planning. Kinder Morgan has not been able to answer that at any meeting. What happens if the local roads aren’t cleared, sometimes that takes a couple days or up to a week. Even the major routes are sometimes difficult to use but they are always the first priority to clear and so the easiest way to access any emergency that arises. Another question yet unanswered by Kinder Morgan is what happens any time of the year with regard to emergency response? They say that they have a great record but it only takes one failure to mess up ecologically sensitive areas like waterways and wetlands which this proposed route crosses many...too many. I hope we’ve learned the hard lesson from California that there is nothing on this planet more important than our water and we need to protect it by any means available. I’ve heard there may be rules in place not allowing pipelines to be near roadways. Is that because of hazards associated with the pipelines? Do those hazards miraculously become safe when the pipeline is near homes?

Clean energy is a great idea but a 30 or 36 inch high pressure pipeline should not be placed haphazardly in people’s backyards. It should be well thought out and placed so that the most people benefit while inconveniencing the least. When I look at the current proposed rout, read the history of the project, and see who’s benefiting I can only guess that the reason New Hampshire is involved is likely because it was the cheapest and least painful choice for Tennessee Gas to route around the opposition groups in Massachusetts. That’s not fair to the people of New Hampshire. Energy should not be routed in the cheapest way it should be routed in the most efficient way possible. As far as an alternative goes well maybe the gas that Massachusetts needs should be routed through Massachusetts or dip down to Connecticut where there is more existing demand. Then sometime in the future when New Hampshire needs a pipeline bigger than three inches we can call them or maybe by that time we’ll have developed an energy source that doesn’t bum fossil fuels. The pipeline is not needed in this state at this time!

Docket No. PF14-22-0000

20150902-0015

{copy of 20150827-5201 above}

20150902-0016

FERC comment

Project Docket Number: PF14-22

My family lives in Windsor, MA which is the “sacrifice zone” for a proposed Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas pipeline compressor station.

I am deeply concerned about the impact of the unnecessary NED pipeline and specifically the toxic compressor stations upon the air, water and soil along the length of this project:

The pipeline is unnecessary because storage and conservation can easily meet peak demand and renewables are steeply increasing. So, with most of the gas earmarked for overseas, it can hardly be classified as “for the public good and necessity” but for corporate greed and profit!

It is toxic because it emits benzene, toluene, xylene and dozens of other carcinogens and neuro-disrupters as a normal part of compressor operation, leaks and explosions aside. Please determine all chemicals contained in transported fracked gas and make it public information under The Freedom of Information Act.

In Windsor, and the other compressor towns, I respectfully request that independent Environmental Impact Studies of air, water and soil samples be conducted, paid for by Kinder Morgan, to determine current baseline status. This must be done again after completion and frequently into the future so that changes resulting from pipeline construction and operation can be assessed. Our rainfall and fog will rapidly bring these poisons to earth rendering our environment forever poisoned!

Further, please determine how to avoid, minimize and/or offset the impacts of those toxins on human health, critical habitats of migratory birds and rare species as well as wetlands, vernal pools, streams, wells/springs, aquifers natural flora and agricultural soils. To that end, please require that all compressor apparatus be built underground with filters, scrubbers, shields and all necessary mitigations to light, sound and emission concerns.

Thank you.

Best Regards,

Marilyn (Marnie) Meyers
152 Hinsdale Rd.
Windsor, MA 01270-9690
413-684-3463
windalewoods@verizon.net

20150902-0020

August 15, 2015

Norman C. Bay, Chairman
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street NE
Washington, DC 20426

RE: Docket No. PF14-22-000

Dear Chairman Bay:

I respectfully request that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission reject Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company’s proposed Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project. I base this request upon the following:

1. The pipeline and compressor station are located too close to Our Lady of Hope, our religious facility.

This high-pressure, high-capacity station will bring significant human safety risks to our Sisters living there.

2. The pipeline and compressor station are located too close to a farm containing Newfoundland ponies, an endangered animal. There are only 250 left on earth.
3. The pipeline and compressor station are located too close an annual migration path of thousands of raptors. The high-pressure, high-capacity station's exhaust plumes of heated gases will bring significant safety risks to these birds.
4. The pipeline and compressor station are located too close to a school whose heating system uses outside air to heat the facility. This high-pressure, high-capacity station will bring significant human safety risks to our teachers and children attending the school.
5. The pipeline and compressor station are located too close to our water supplies, parks, and conserved land and will bring significant environmental hazards.
6. FERC has already approved another pipeline to satisfy New England's natural gas-fired electric generation needs on the coldest days. We don't appreciate the need to add more supply.
7. The particular gas that would be carried in the proposed pipeline is likely to be particularly high in toxins and radiation, and the health impact upon our families, animals and plants must be avoided.
8. The proposed pipeline route requires a new right-of-way that would cut through many miles of environmentally sensitive areas and take permanently protected land out of that protection.
9. Some "fracking" compounds and chemicals negatively impact the skin, eyes, sensory organs, the respiratory system, the gastrointestinal system, the liver; the nervous system; and are candidate endocrine disrupting chemicals. Endocrine disrupting chemicals (EDCs) present unique hazards, particularly during fetal and early childhood growth and development. We do not want to be exposed to any of these chemicals.

Respectfully submitted,

Name: Cathleen M. Doonan, 124 Wind Row, Peterborough, NH

20150902-0021

Hand written card, Barbara Ferullo, 50 Stowell Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071: addressed to Commissioner Honorable, asking for help in opposing.

20150902-0022

Hand written card, Barbara Ferullo, 50 Stowell Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071: addressed to Commissioner Bay, asking for help in opposing.

20150902-0023

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515-2102

JAMES P. MCGOVERN
2nd District, Massachusetts

August 31, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Room A1
Washington, D. C. 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L. L. C. Docket No. PF14-22-000 Northeast Energy

Direct Project

Dear Secretary Bose:

I want to thank the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) for holding this scoping process to gather information from members of the public and interested agencies with regard to the development of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project. The following comments are submitted in response to FERC's Notice of Intent to Prepare an EIS for the proposed NED Project and Request for Comments on Environmental Issues.

My constituents and I have many concerns regarding the direct and indirect effects that this pipeline will have on the environment along the proposed route and Massachusetts' ecosystem as a whole. This pipeline goes through land specifically set aside for conservation purposes in order to protect it from development. To allow the pipeline to disregard these environmental protections sets a dangerous precedent and shows a wanton disregard for past efforts to ensure a healthy environment. It is my strong belief that if land has been protected from development in perpetuity by public dollars, it should be protected from the construction of a pipeline which would run directly through it.

Concerns have also been raised about the effects the pipeline will have on historic farmland that still provides the sole income for many western Massachusetts families. The New England states have worked hard to restore our region's environment. The recent and successful efforts to have the Blackstone Valley adopted as a National Park is a prime example of these efforts.

I look forward to FERC addressing the following questions: What effect will the project have on endangered and protected species? What plans are in place to increase conservation land in order to compensate for the portions of land the project will disrupt? What effects will the project have on water quality, specifically drinking water quality? How will farmers be affected by the project and what compensation will they be awarded for negative effects of production? What plans are in place to mitigate potential leaks from the pipeline and what plans are in place to ensure that soil and ground water are kept contaminant-free?

Constituents have also been very vocal on issues of the negative impact that this project will have on their property values. Additionally, constituents have raised concerns about the lack of communication between homeowners and developers. Will there be compensation provided to local property owners who see a loss of value in their land? Will FERC guarantee that the areas that are affected by the project will see the economic benefits from the use of the natural gas and that the natural gas will not be exported? Will FERC ensure that the towns affected by the construction will be guaranteed access to the pipeline?

This project has followed a path that has left many of my constituents with the impression that they are looked upon by FERC and NED as merely impediments to their project, and not as crucial stakeholders who need to be fully involved in the entire process. While the project has mostly maintained the proper timeline for the release of the proper reports, the majority of the content has directed those who need the information to conduct future reports. For a project of this size to continue through the FERC process, more information must be presented to the public. Scoping comments and future comment periods are useless if the information about the project is not publicly available, or only made available at the latest possible moment. For the public to be adequately informed about this project, it is paramount that FERC delay its process and require that the necessary information be made public for all parties interested. Along with a delay in the process, I also request that FERC hold additional scoping meetings that will give residents of Massachusetts the opportunity they deserve to have their concerns addressed and for FERC to ensure that information about the project is fully and fairly disseminated.

In addition, the extension will allow for greater exploration of alternatives to this project, which will allow for the most comprehensive review possible. I applaud the efforts of Massachusetts State Attorney General Maura Healy who has recently undertaken a comprehensive study of the electric reliability needs in the New England region through 2030. Attorney General Healy's office has stated that the report is expected to be completed in October 2015. This report will provide important information that deserves consideration with regard to the entirety of this Tennessee Gas Pipeline. Before we invest and commit our resources to

one specific project, we must be fully informed of the alternatives; both other potential pipeline projects and potential renewable energy projects.

It is critically important to me that this federally regulated process is conducted in an open and transparent way. I will continue to advocate on behalf of my constituents of the 2nd Congressional District in order to ensure that concerns are heard loud and clear. I look forward to FERC addressing the concerns I have raised here on behalf of my constituents and the concerns raised in the countless other scoping letters that you have received.

Sincerely,

James P. McGovern
Member of Congress

20150902-0024

Hand written letter, Cathleen M. Doonan: opposing

20150902-0028

{copy of 20150828-5230}

20150902-0030

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street NE, 1A
Washington, DC 20426-0001

August 28, 2015

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LLC., Northeast Energy Direct Project; Docket No. PF14-22-000 Scoping Comments

Dear Ms. Bose:

I have served on the **Fitzwilliam, NH Planning Board** for 13 years and am **Chair of the Fitzwilliam Economic Development Committee**.

While I understand and respect the need to supply the Northeast with adequate energy resources, I ask that you consider all issues in front of you, including those listed below, prior to rendering your decision on the NED project.

I have reviewed the Environmental Report dated July 24, 2015 submitted by Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LLC a Kinder Morgan Company, Volume 1, Section Five "Socioeconomics".

Section 5.10.2.9 "Project Economic Benefits" refers to impact on affected towns. Fitzwilliam is a small rural town, year round population of 2,396. In summer our population grows as we welcome summer residents with houses and cabins along our lakes, ponds and streams and tourists.

The business revenue is derived primarily from tourism. We are eight miles from the most climbed mountain in North America, Mt Monadnock. The mountain is within the view shed from many locations in town. Fitzwilliam has many antiques shops, inns and B&Bestablishments. The tourists and summer residents provide significant revenue to Fitzwilliam and the surrounding towns. Fitzwilliam is known as the "antique mecca" for the entire state of New Hampshire. I have enclosed a copy of Fitzwilliam's 2015 Visitor Brochure for your reference.

The towns of Fitzwilliam and Troy share Rhododendron State Park, a 2,723 acre park which attracts many to this area.

The proposed pipeline runs through Rhododendron State Park, New Hampshire's only designated botanical park, and home to "The Old Patch Place" an historic home on the National Register of Historic Places. This

park is visited by thousands every year. There is hiking, picnicking and bird/wildlife watching in the warm months and cross country skiing and snow shoeing the winter months. [https://en.wikioedia.ore/wiki/Rhododendron State Park](https://en.wikioedia.ore/wiki/Rhododendron%20State%20Park)

The proposed NED Pipeline would clear cut a hundred foot wide swath through this region. Construction is expected to last for a year to a year and a half. During that time, many tourists who would typically visit this area for a peaceful, rural get-away, will go elsewhere. There is nothing rural or peaceful about the type of destruction this construction necessitates and it will cause irreparable damage to our tourism industry. The economic benefits listed in section 5.10.2.9"Project Economic Benefits" fails to properly study the immediate and long term adverse impact of the pipeline on tourism and our businesses.

REOUESTS OF FERC

- Please study the long term economic effects of construction of and existence of a 30-36" pipeline in rural towns which depend on tourism as the primary source of business revenue. How will the businesses be compensated for the initial and subsequent loss of tourism revenue?
- How will TGP avoid or mitigate impacts to regional tourism, which would negatively affect businesses and state parks/forests, as well as private recreational areas?
- Please study the true effect of property valuations due to the proximity of a 30 or 36 inch pipeline in rural areas where people desire a quiet, peaceful and safe environment. Note: The following link listed in Section 5.11"REFERENCES" as a resource for property valuations is not currently active. [http://www.oalomaraas.com/docs/resources/Pioeline Imoact on Prooerty Values.odf](http://www.oalomaraas.com/docs/resources/Pioeline%20Imoact%20on%20Prooerty%20Values.odf)
- Please communicate and solicit feedback from other permitting agencies such as the EPA and DES regarding their analysis of the pipeline's initial and residual effects of the route through natural resources such as Rhododendron State Park.
- Please communicate with NH Park System regarding the fragility of the ecosystem in and around Rhododendron State Park. How can impacts to these and other natural resources along the route be avoided or fully mitigated? How will the pipeline construction be minimized to avoid disruption to the State Park?
- The Troy Superfund site is literally within feet of the proposed pipeline route. Please ask the EPA to comment on concerns with disruption of that site.
- Please request reports from the EPA, DES, NH Park System and land conservation groups to consider
 - o the full value of all impacted conservation land recognizing. Significant public dollars go into identifying, purchasing, and stewarding conservation land'hose costs be identified when considering value
 - o the value of conservation land is greater than the acreage value, both in ecosystem services and in recreation and dollars into local economies
 - o that all of the above be considered when assessing likely extent of eminent domain, as well as percentage of natural gas meant for New Hampshire markets verses for export. Eminent domain is meant only to be used when there is clear public benefit.
- Please require a survey for state-listed rare species be conducted by experts, survey done during the appropriate time of year, when species are most likely to be found
- Please identify conservation and agricultural preservation restrictions, as well as deed restrictions for each affected parcel
- Please extend the scoping period until proper research can be completed on the sensitive and fragile areas of New Hampshire.
- Please consider the burdens already imposed on rural NH towns which also benefit the energy needs of the greater good. Fitzwilliam is currently burdened with an EverSource (formerly PSNH) substation that creates noise, disrupting abutters, wildlife and view shed.

- Is this route the “best” route available- destroying virgin land of forests, wetlands, conservation areas, State Parks, wildlife and individually owned properties.
- And lastly, please consider review of the Connecticut proposed pipeline and NED together as a potential solution to the energy needs of the Northeast, please examine solutions with the least risk to the ratepayer and least impact to the affected property owners and environment.

Thanking you in advance for you thoughtful consideration regarding the NED project.

Suzanne E. Gray
 180 Upper Troy Road
 Fitzwilliam, NH 03447
 603.585.3110

Enc: Fitzwilliam, NH Visitor Brochure

{brochure not included in FERC file, omitted}

20150902-0032

Hand written card, Beth Preston, West Road, Temple, NH: opposing.

20150902-4004

{19 pages} {skip to end of 20150902-4004}

IN THE MATTER OF TENNESSEE GAS PIPELINE COMPANY, L.L.C.
 PF14-22, BEFORE THE FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
 COMMENTS ON DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT
 (RESOURCE REPORTS 1 THROUGH 13) AND PROJECT SCOPE
 BY THE NATURAL RESOURCE COMMITTEE OF THE
 TOWN OF NASSAU, RENSSELAER COUNTY, NEW YORK,
 AND THE TOWN OF NASSAU, RENSSELAER COUNTY, NEW YORK

AUGUST 29, 2015

This Report and Comments on the Kinder Morgan — Tennessee Gas Pipeline (TGPL) Pre-Application Resource Reports and facility design and location information included in the July 24, 2015 submittal to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for the Northeast Direct Pipeline Project (NED) was prepared by the Natural Resource Committee (NRC), an advisory committee to the Town of Nassau, Rensselaer County, New York. The Committee provides expert advice and guidance regarding environmental and natural resource matters, planning, and major land use development proposals before the Town of Nassau.

Over the past 10 years, the NRC has been instrumental in providing objective analysis, review and advisory guidance as well as drafting and refinement of documents of significant planning and regulatory matters including; natural resource evaluations and background documentation for development and implementation of major revisions to the Town of Nassau Comprehensive Plan; the Town Land Use and Zoning Regulations; the Town Emergency Preparedness Plan component of the Rensselaer County Emergency Preparedness Plan; and the Town Aquifer Protection Regulations; as well as matters before the Town Board, the Town Planning Board, and other Town, County and New York State regulatory matters potentially affecting the environment, natural and cultural resources, community character and the residents of the Town of Nassau, New York.

The members of the Town of Nassau NRC are long-standing residents of the town with experience and lengthy careers in professional environmental positions including both public service and private practice involving land use planning, public health, environmental policy, regulatory requirements, environmental analysis, environmental impact assessment, and natural resource management, project licensing, major facilities siting and project licensing including major energy projects and both electric and gas transmission lines. The NRC members serve in a strictly volunteer capacity.

The Town of Nassau NRC is submitting this critical review and recommendations for a significantly expanded Scope of Studies for a full Environmental Impact Study and Environmental Impact Statement by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) for the proposed NED project by TGPL, which is proposed to establish a lengthy right-of-way across many parcels of privately-owned lands within the Town of Nassau and adjacent municipalities. The comments provided in the attached document are the product of the NRC review of the significant volume of documents recently submitted by TGPL on July 24, 2015. The NRC notes the many incomplete sections of the various Resource Reports submitted by TGPL at that late date, and suggests that the public interest in this matter would be best served by reserving establishment of a final Scope of Studies, and extension of the public review and comment period for the Scoping Phase of project review, until after the project proponent submits a complete set of Resource Reports, which from statements included in the July 24, 2015 submittal appears to be planned for October, 2015.

The Town of Nassau NRC supports the request by the Nassau Town Supervisor's August 12, 2015 request to the FERC for extension of the scoping comment period until submittal of complete Resource Reports, and request for access to Critical Energy Infrastructure Information. Access to the full range of information expected to be submitted in supplemental filings by TGPL will make for fully informed review of the range of project components, identification of the proposed location of all facilities, and initial assessment of studies and parameters appropriate for identifying significant impacts, both positive and negative, that may result from siting, construction and operation of the proposed facilities. The NRC encourages the FERC to grant the relief requested by the Nassau Town Supervisor.

Introduction

For reasons not fully articulated in any documents produced to date, TGPL was quick to abandon its originally-proposed project alignment along its existing "200" pipeline corridor through the southern portion of the Town of Nassau, and to adopt the revised route along high voltage electric transmission lines for many miles through the Rensselaer County, New York towns of Schodack, Nassau, and Stephentown, and eastward on into the towns in Berkshire County, IVIA. This change has potentially profound impacts on New York State communities, but does not appear to have been made due to any resource considerations within New York State.

Town officials, the NRC members, and many residents and landowners in the Town of Nassau are fully aware of the nature of major gas transmission pipeline construction and operation, since the existing TGPL "200" line right-of-way crosses through the southern portion of the Town, and the TGPL Compressor Station 254 is located a short distance south of the Town of Nassau on NYS Route 66 in the adjacent Town of Chatham, Columbia County. Moreover, the residents and landowners are aware that the original proposal by TGPL was to locate the NED pipeline through the Town along the existing TGPL "200" line corridor, adjacent to two existing major gas transmission lines in a slightly widened TGPL right-of-way. The basis for proposing to relocate the additional pipeline away from the existing TGPL pipeline corridor has not been explained or justified to the concerned citizens and residents of the Town of Nassau.

This significant change in project location was also made with apparently no consideration of a fundamental difference between siting and construction-related impacts of overhead electric transmission lines and those associated with underground transmission infrastructure. Overhead electric lines can be located to span over many resource and landscape constraints with little direct - or even indirect - impacts on those resources. Streams, non-forested wetlands, ravines, steep slopes and side-hill or sidling areas may be crossed with minimal disturbance of those resources by strategic placement of electric transmission structures and access roads, and long spans of overhead conductor wires. This is contrasted with underground facilities, such as the proposed 30-inch (or potentially greater) NED gas transmission line, which require grading to establish working right-of-way construction grades, and generally continuous accessibility for heavy construction equipment along the length of the facility (except in instances where trenchless installations may be feasible). Many of the important resource locations in the Town of Nassau and adjacent municipalities represent conditions that are unlikely to support trenchless installation, such as Horizontal Directional Drilling

(HDD), and thus the construction impacts of large-diameter pipeline installation along the electric transmission right-of-way will be extensive and highly intrusive.

RESOURCE REPORT 2- WATER RESOURCES

Groundwater

Insufficient geo-technical data exists along the proposed TGPL pipeline route along the Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation (NMPC) transmission line in northern Nassau to make a thorough analysis of potential groundwater impacts. USDA soils maps identify soil type and depth down only as far as 5 feet, however the bottom depth of the pipeline trench to provide 3 feet of cover over a 30 inch or greater high pressure gas transmission pipeline will need to be in the range of 7 feet. A trench at that depth, along with the blasting that may be necessary, has the potential to impact artesian influenced wells and springs along the proposed pipeline route. Approximately 2.0 miles of the revised TGPL route in northern Nassau is located on steep side hills, upslope from at least 20 private water wells. The maps of known water well locations - Figure 2.1-4 - provided as attachments to the TGPL July 24, 2015 Resource Report 2 are incomplete, do not represent many private water wells and supply sources that pre-date the information included in the inventory that mapping is based on; the inventory should be amended following completion of a survey of owners of property within and around the pipeline corridor.

Approximately 1.5 miles of the revised pipeline route in Nassau passes through a major groundwater aquifer along the upper Tsatsawassa Creek. This aquifer is included in the groundwater protection overlay zone per the Town of Nassau Zoning Regulations. This area was designated in local regulations because it serves as the principle water supply for the numerous homes along Taborton and Dunham Hollow Roads. The EIS analysis of the NED pipeline and its effects on groundwater resources needs to account for these groundwater features and uses for basic household water supply. Figure 2.1-2 attached to Resource Report 2 does not indicate the location of these known aquifers. Figure 2.1-4 purports to show aquifer protection areas and surface water protection areas, however the legally protected water resource locations in the Town of Nassau are not indicated in project mapping, including locations nearby and crossed by the proposed NED pipeline project.

The TGPL Resource Report 2 is deficient because: (1) the important groundwater resources within the Town of Nassau are not identified; and (2) the Town of Nassau groundwater protection regulations are not identified. The FERC Draft EIS must identify the location of the aquifers providing groundwater supply to Nassau residents, and address the substantive provisions within the local regulations for assessing impacts on these resources and avoiding impacts to the Town's designated aquifers and groundwater resources. Mapping and analysis of groundwater resources and protection zones should be revised accordingly. The scope of studies should be expanded to include development of additional information to identify all groundwater resources, and to include information regarding the location of and protection measures associated with the Town of Nassau Groundwater Protection Overlay zone. Identification of mitigation measures appropriate to avoid impacts to the groundwater resources must be specified.

The assessment of impacts associated with siting and constructing the NED project along the initially proposed "New York route" parallel to the two existing TGPL "200" pipelines located in the southern portion of Nassau along the existing TGPL pipeline rightof- way corridor should acknowledge that there are fewer impacts to groundwater supplies to Town of Nassau residents than along the significantly longer and more vulnerable groundwater resource areas along the proposed route along the NMPC electric transmission corridor route. This comparison should be addressed in consideration of Alternatives to the NED proposed location.

Surface Water

Hydrostatic test water for pipeline facilities in Rensselaer County is proposed to be withdrawn from several water bodies including the Hudson River, Valatie Kill, and Tsatsawassa Creek. The use of Hudson River water raises concerns regarding the potential to discharge the hydrostatic test water into other water bodies, including headwaters streams within the Hudson River watershed. The potential to spread contaminants

from the pipeline interior or invasive aquatic species and from Hudson River water into headwaters streams, including small streams with native coldwater species and natural trout populations is a significant concern for maintaining the integrity of these populations and aquatic habitats in these water bodies.

Water withdrawal for pipeline testing from smaller headwaters sources, such as Valatie Kill or Tsatsawassa Creek, or discharge of Hudson River water to these small streams, would adversely affect streamflows, stream dynamics, water quality, and aquatic habitats within those water bodies. The scope of studies should require that the LIS identify specific water sources, discharge locations, and testing and control procedures to avoid any potential transfers of Hudson River water to headwaters streams and avoid withdrawals from and discharges to sensitive headwaters streams that could affect water quality, aquatic habitats or recreational uses of these water bodies.

RESOURCE REPORT 3- FISH, WILDLIFE AND VEGETATION

Ecosystem resource impact evaluations for the NED pipeline and compressor station should take note of and analyze potential significant adverse impacts on fish, wildlife and vegetation habitats and identified natural areas along the NMPC corridor not adequately accounted for in the Resource Reports submitted by TGPL. Please refer to Dr. David Hunt's report entitled "Important Biodiversity Sites Along the Proposed Kinder-Morgan Pipeline", dated May 3, 2015. Table 1 in that report lists numerous sites along the NMPC route through northern portions of Nassau where significant and important aquatic networks, ecosystem complexes, natural community areas, probable presence of rare species, and fish and herpetile habitat areas have been identified. Many of these resources have been noted as having significance at both the County and State levels.

The proposed Market Path Mid-Station 1 compressor station site appears to have vegetation and hydrologic features that suggest the presence of acidic sphagnum bog or fen characteristics in close proximity of the potential facility footprint. Detailed analysis of this site is warranted to identify significant wetland resources that may not have been identified in the initial wetlands and vegetation reviews.

RESOURCE REPORT 5- SOCIOECONOMICS

The EJS should include socioeconomic information for rural communities proposed to host compressor stations, including the Town of Nassau (as well as other rural New York and Massachusetts towns). Compressor stations will be the source of many emergency provider responses due to minor incidents including reports of gas releases, and major incidents potentially involving fires and personnel injuries requiring emergency responses. Rural areas, such as Nassau, are served only by volunteer fire and EMT response crews, with equipment limited to serving the existing needs of the community. Equipment suitable for fighting fires and assuring public safety at a major source of fuel gas leakage or highpressure compressor and gas-conditioning equipment will require fiscal commitments beyond the capability of existing local government budgets, including fire districts. Likewise, limited transportation routes in the vicinity of the proposed Market Path Mid- Station 1 in Nassau will potentially require updates to provide access for delivery of over size components and on-going access for operational and maintenance support. These costs should be identified and analyzed in the FIS.

The 1315 should acknowledge that there are no local police (other than within the Village of Nassau and well outside of the proposed pipeline location) or full-time fire protection services in the Town of Nassau. Nuisance calls related to repeated leaks and response to emergency blow-downs of odorized natural gas from the proposed 41,000 horsepower Market Path Mid-Station 1 will quickly overburden volunteer emergency responders. (The emergency response units responsible for the location of the proposed Market Path Mid-Station 1 compressor station are located approximately 6 miles away: emergency response times are anticipated as being 20 to 30 minutes at a minimum.)

Experiences of other gas compressor stations, including those mid-stream and transmission grade facilities operating within New York State that are associated with transport of natural gas from high-volume hydraulic fractured gas extraction production wells in Pennsylvania, as proposed by TGPL in this proceeding,

should be evaluated for numbers and frequency of emergency shut-downs, blow-downs, emergency incidents and community complaints associated with the transportation of gas and related contaminants, fluids and condensates that may impede optimal performance of compressor station equipment and component operations. Compilation of statistics from operation of those facilities should inform the analysis and results of operational characteristics and need for emergency response for the proposed Nassau station and the several other gas compressor facilities proposed by TGPL for the NED project.

The Socioeconomic Analysis should report on projected tax revenues, as well as government expenditures including public safety, fire and emergency response expectations and upgrades of equipment needed to address the level of response needed for the proposed high-pressure gas compressor station and blow-down facilities for each municipality affected by the proposed NED project.

The analysis of Alternatives should consider Socioeconomic effects of alternative compressor station locations along the alternate routes under consideration, and alternate sites proposed by the applicant, FERC staff and parties as well as within comments on the scope of studies and in public comments. The analysis should address the range of Socioeconomics issues raised in these comments by the Town of Nassau NRC.

RESOURCE REPORT 6- GEOLOGIC RESOURCES and 7- SOILS

An extremely uncommon geologic formation called “Lag Gravel” is present along the proposed route in northern Nassau in at least two known areas. This resource is generally associated with porous surface aquifers. This geologic feature supports a habitat for rare species of spiders, insects and amphibians. Impacts of proposed pipeline right-of-way grading, excavation and construction should be investigated and assessed in detail in these areas. (See Dr. David Hunt report, pg. 22 under “Subterranean invertebrate habitat.”)

Topography and Effect on Soil Erosion and Construction Impacts

There are significant and frequent elevation changes along the proposed NMPC corridor route. The proposed pipeline route in Nassau ranges from an elevation of approximately 500 above sea level at the western boundary and eventually climbs to an elevation of 1100 feet in the Alps region in northeast Nassau before crossing into Stephentown. In some cases, the pipeline descends and ascends over 300 feet of elevation change within a distance of 0.2 mile, representing slopes of 30%. Most of these steep valleys have streams and wetland areas at the bottom of the grades. This type of topography will require extensive movement of earth to develop grades for construction that enable the pipe to be laid without sharp bends.

While the spoils will be put back into place and the finished project profiles should reasonably resemble the original topography, even with extensive mitigation measures the history of pipeline projects (such as the FERC-approved Columbia Gas Millennium Pipeline) constructed in rough terrain (as is encountered along the NMPC transmission ROW) has shown that there are often extensive natural resource impacts as a result of construction impacts including grading, trenching, and soil erosion from pipeline construction areas, resulting in sedimentation in susceptible water bodies. The bio-diversity and productivity of the streams and wetlands will be negatively impacted by the widened electric utility corridor, eventual sedimentation, and establishment of invasive species that are more easily introduced on the disturbed lands. The potential for these impacts must be fully evaluated in the EIS.

On the steep side hill sections of the proposed route in northern Nassau, significant cut and fill areas will have to be created to develop two-tiered rights-of-way to allow trenching equipment to properly and safely operate. This type of construction means greater disturbed area to establish suitable conditions for pipeline construction, with wide temporary construction and permanent ROW corridors. As noted above, these side-slope or “sidling” areas are located adjacent to high voltage 345 kV high voltage electric transmission lines and upslope of many private water wells.

Assessment of impacts associated with the proposed pipeline construction should take into account factors including; areas of disturbance in the vicinity of water resources including water wells and protected streams; the erosion potential of soil types encountered in slopes above these resources; and potential permanent impacts associated with disturbance of large areas of steep slopes near important water resources.

Furthermore, serious consideration of the constraints associated with close offset of the pipeline construction work zone from the high voltage electric transmission line needs to be addressed. The TGPL Resource Reports do not recognize that the steep side-hill slopes adjoining parts of the electric transmission right-of-way will necessarily result in much greater construction right-of-way widths to establish safe and reasonable separation distances from high-voltage overhead electric transmission lines for safe work zones, and avoidance of interference with electric transmission facilities including buried counterpoise grounding facilities.

Topography — Existing TGPL “200” ROW Route

The ETS evaluation of alternative routes should acknowledge that the existing TGPL “200” pipeline corridor “New York Alternative” has a much gentler topography with far fewer significant slope changes than the proposed NMPC corridor route through New York State. Using the New York Alternative TGPL “200” pipeline corridor, the pipeline would enter Nassau at an elevation of approximately 450 feet. Over the next 1.6 miles, the pipeline would climb to a high point of approximately 640 feet (mile marker 37.8), and then over the next 1.35 miles would leave Nassau at an elevation of 510 feet. Construction along this route will impact fewer steep slopes, fewer streams and wetlands and the amount of earth needed to be moved near these streams and wetlands will be significantly less.

RESOURCE REPORT 8: LAND USE, RECREATION AND AESTHETICS

For purposes of agricultural operations and land management, installation of a major gas transmission pipeline along the proposed NMPC Transmission Line corridor adds an underground impediment to agricultural land fitting and farming operations in addition to the existing above-ground impediments including the electric transmission poles and buried counterpoise grounding facilities on that line. Location of the additional pipeline along the existing TGPL “200” pipeline corridor will have less impact on farming operations, where farm operators are accustomed to working over the two existing underground pipelines in the TGPL “200” corridor. Consideration of alternative routing that locates the proposed NED pipeline along existing underground pipeline corridors should be a priority in minimizing agricultural land use impacts.

Utilization of NMPC electric transmission corridor for co-location of gas transmission pipelines represents a land-use impact, since the entire right-of-way area encompasses an important and critical land use in providing essential electric transmission service. In this instance, the New Scotland-Alps-Berkshire 345 kV transmission line is an essential critical interconnection between the New York and New England Control Areas. Grounding counterpoise within the electric transmission corridor generally occupies a significant amount of area beyond the footprint of the transmission structures. The EIS should not characterize the right-of-way area as “vacant” or “undeveloped” land as is sometimes done in assessing impacts of gas transmission pipelines, rather the use is “utility” with essential service requirements and important safety and reliability considerations.

Visual And Aesthetic Considerations

The Compressor Station will be proposed to include some degree of outdoor lighting to provide safe work conditions during times of intermittent station attendance. Kinder Morgan personnel reported to NRC members at the April Open House meeting that the station will not be attended on a full-time basis, but will be remotely operated. While the project will in all likelihood propose to fully light the station even when unattended for security purposes, this may not be necessary or appropriate.

A survey of night-time lighting conditions in the compressor station study corridor was undertaken by a member of the NRC to determine the nature of night-lighting, and to characterize the existing conditions experienced by residents of the community. There are very few full-time outdoor lights that are operated in the community surrounding the compressor station study corridor within Nassau. There is one street light (with a notably dim bulb), located at the intersection of Clarks Chapel Road and Center Nassau Road. There are two “farm-light” fixtures in the area, one attached to a roadside residence on Clarks Chapel Road east of County Route 15 that is located on the property proposed for siting the Market Path Mid-Station 1 compressor station, and one on a barn on Slivko Road near Clarks Chapel Road. Otherwise, the area is lighted only intermittently by household lighting, and by passing cars which are infrequent during night-time hours.

(Traffic counts over several mid-week nights in August, 2015 indicate that fewer than 4 cars passed per night between the hours of 10:00 PM and 5:00 AM.)

The area can be characterized as experiencing dark-sky conditions, with stars and planets readily observable on average nights with skies clear of clouds. Astronomical conditions are readily observed and appreciated in the community. Obtrusive lighting is rare, and dark conditions are encouraged by the community as reported by the Town of Nassau Comprehensive Plan (pg. 34).

The NRC suggests that since there will be no full-time employees in attendance at the station, that full-time night lighting of the compressor station yard is not essential for worker safety considerations, and therefore the station can be illuminated as needed by task lighting that can be turned on when needed to perform inspection or maintenance activities. Task lighting can be installed for operation on an 'as-needed' basis, as is normal at similar facilities including electric utility substation sites, which operate automatically without attendance. For security or other nominal lighting needs, appropriate lighting standards should be required to avoid off-site lighting impacts. Lighting designed to illuminate areas within the station yard. avoid light trespass beyond station limits, and avoid up-lighting should be required. Lighting should be designed by a lighting engineer and detailed in an illumination plan to specifically avoid off-site lighting impacts by use of full cut-off lighting fixtures (to eliminate off-site light spread and glare); dropdown optics that can spread light horizontally should not be allowed. Lighting that does not glare or obscure colors should be used to enhance security as needed. Spot lights should be discouraged, and only be used for task lighting as needed to accomplish maintenance.

The Resource Reports do not indicate whether the project will require installation of tall communications towers. NRC members have previously inquired about this topic at the April 13, 2015 Kinder Morgan Open House held in Schodack, NY. The NRC notes that the existing TGPL Compressor Station 254 in Chatham NY includes a tower over 200 feet tall for communication with a remote control center (reportedly located in Texas). That tower includes a required aviation hazard warning light, pursuant to FAA aviation hazard marking requirements. The Resource Reports submitted to date are incomplete in addressing communications system facilities that will be required for the NED project. The NRC also notes that the recently-approved Constitution Pipeline to be constructed largely in parallel to the proposed TGPL NED project between the Pennsylvania gas production fields and the Wright Interconnection station located in Schoharie County, NY will require that 14 telecommunication towers be installed at intervals along the length of that pipeline corridor to provide remote control capability for operation of pipeline sectionalizing shut-off valves. Those communications towers, to each be over 100 feet tall, were not identified until late in the EIS review stages of the Constitution Pipeline. The FERC should not allow TGPL to postpone identification of system communication facilities that would be required for the NED project beyond the time the developer submits revised Resource Reports, scheduled for October 2015. Communication towers of 100 feet or greater heights have the potential to affect visual and cultural resource evaluations, due to potential visibility from visual receptors including historic properties, recreational areas, and other locations. If these communication facilities require aviation hazard warning lighting, then there are potential adverse effects on cultural resources, residential areas as well as public use locations and other receptors. The location of these project component facilities must be taken into account for consideration of a range of resource impacts, consideration of mitigation measures and alternatives, including alternative routes, and the "no action" alternative.

In the specific case of the proposed Market path Mid-Station 1 compressor station proposed for Nassau, the NRC notes that the proposed facility location is in the direct take off flight path of pontoon aircraft that are based at Burden Lake, a short distance directly north of the proposed compressor facility location. There are also properties that are potentially eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places within the areas around the compressor station site that should be assessed for potential visual effects of any tall communication towers associated with the compressor station. The EIS should address this location and identify any potential adverse effects on aviation safety, historic resources and their settings, and residential settings, and identify alternatives to avoid adverse impacts as appropriate.

Aff QUALIFY AND NOISE EMISSIONS - RESOURCE REPORT 9

Compressor Stations

While the natural gas fired compressor station is generally anticipated to fully comply with the Title V permit requirements for air pollution controls, this is not an assurance that emissions are minimized and public health and environmental quality impacts are reduced to either the “best available” or “reasonably achievable” levels available through the use of alternative technologies. An alternative technology to natural gas-fired compressor turbines that should be fully considered in the DEIS is the use of electric powered compressor facilities.

Operational efficiencies of gas turbine combustion compressors as proposed by Kinder Morgan are in the range of 30 percent, rather lower than the operational efficiencies of modern combined cycle electric generation facilities, which are in the range of 60 percent, including those operating in the upstate New York area serving the area through which the pipeline and compressor stations are proposed to be sited. The efficiency gains of utilizing the waste heat from gas combustion to create additional electric power at electric generating stations should make electric powered gas compressors the right choice for minimizing overall impacts of pipeline system operations.

The EIS should include an analysis of life-cycle emissions and efficiency of gas-fired compressor station versus electric powered facilities and should be required as part of protect scoping. Kinder Morgan reportedly proposes to site an electric powered compressor at one of nine planned compressor locations as part of the Northeast Direct project, as reported by Kinder Morgan personnel to NRC members at the April 13, 2015 Open House meeting in Schodack, NY. The NRC recommends that any compressor station that is located within the Town of Nassau or otherwise within Rensselaer, Columbia or Berkshire Counties should be electric powered to significantly reduce the emission of air pollutants and CO₂ (as well as operational noise). Reductions in emissions of pollutants, CO₂, and noise from use of electric powered generators as an alternative should be reported in the EIS.

Likewise, the cumulative emissions of the 9 compressor stations associated with the TGPL NED project should be considered in detail in the EIS. Analysis of total life-cycle emissions and efficiency of gas-fired compressor stations versus electric powered compressor facilities should be required as part of project impact analysis. The full range of air pollutants should be reported, identification of all greenhouse gas emissions, including CO₂. The comparison study should be based on the fuels mix in the New York State grid expected for the proposed build-year(s) of the compressor stations and modified over time to address energy usage and fuels mix assumptions as modeled in the New York Energy Plan 2015.

Air quality analysis should also be required to address emissions of methane, ethane and related components of natural gas. Analysis should consider leaks and releases — whether planned or related to emergency blowdowns — and provide estimated emissions for pipeline sources as well as from compressor station facilities. Sub-totals should be reported for these two categories, by pipeline segment, by compressor station, and total emissions for the overall facility should be provided by state and for the overall NED project.

The EIS should include analysis of consistency with federal and state policies and programs for reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, and with federal and state policies and proposed programs for reduction of methane, ethane and related compound emissions. The recently-announced EPA proposal to reduce methane emissions from gas production and transmission systems should be assessed, and strategies for applying the program goals should be applied to EIS analysis of the proposed NED project and its individual Project components.

Likewise, the recently published New York State Energy Plan 2015 calls for reduction of greenhouse gas emissions from energy and transportation sources. The proposed NED project is an energy-related transportation project, and the EN should provide analysis and identify strategies for demonstrating conformance with the stated goals and intent of the New York State Energy Plan 2015, including reductions of greenhouse gas emissions. Consideration of electric-driven compressor stations and other strategies for controlling leaks and other emissions should be focused on achieving reductions of greenhouse gas, methane and VOC emis-

sions and demonstrating conformance with federal and state policy and program goals, as well as minimizing impacts on local communities where facilities are proposed to be located.

Noise — Compressor Stations

Due to the incomplete nature of the project proposal, the lack of specific compressor station design or capacity criteria, or the unwillingness of the developer to publicly disclose details of the most significant components of its proposal, the Noise assessment is incomplete as of the July 24, 2015 Resource Reports filing. The developer proposes to identify further details of noise in a further future update to the Resource Report 9.

Potential noise sources at a compressor station are numerous and include components such as the combustion turbine, the exhaust stack outlet of the combustion turbine, air inlets, cooling system fans, exposed station piping, gas heaters, dehydrators and gas treatment equipment and gas blowdown vents.

In a description of applicable regulatory criteria, regulations and rules regarding noise, the Resource Report describes the FERC-adopted Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) recommended methodology for addressing significant noise impacts. This methodology is based on assumptions including that ambient noise levels are in the 40 deciBel (dB) range, and that increases from that level are acceptable up to a day-night level of 55 dB if nighttime noise levels are not greater than 45 dB(A), or a daytime and nighttime equivalent level of 48.6 dB.

The Report also characterizes the New York State DEC Noise Program Policy as not having any specific goals or design objectives. While the DEC Noise Program Policy has limitations, the NYS DEC Noise Program Policy does identify specific design goals and objectives of minimizing noise level increases and limiting allowable increases of up to 6 dB above ambient. This is consistent with several significant expert authors and accepted methodologies that conclude that the L90 is the appropriate metric for determining ambient noise, and an increase in noise levels of 5 dB(A) or less above L90 ambient levels can be considered of marginal significance. The Nassau NRC recommends that the FERC ETS provide an assessment of the conformance of proposed facilities with the specific design goals and objectives in the NYS DEC Noise Policy.

The Scope of Studies required by FERC for preparation of an EIS should require that ambient noise level determinations be made using L90 metric with measurements made under appropriate environmental conditions and at locations selected to address actual ambient conditions in the rural residential setting present in the area surrounding the proposed Market Path Mid-Station 1 compressor station site (and alternative locations). Literature sources include the following rationales and conclusions in recommending use of L90 rather than Leq or Ldn for establishing ambient:

1. Leq is extremely sensitive to discrete high-level events (J.P. Cowan, Handbook of Environmental Acoustics, 1994, pg. 165). Short-term high level events can skew ambient averages to the advantage of the proponent of noise level increases.
2. The use of L90 is consistent with most authors and commonly used methodologies for establishing ambient/background noise levels, and increases of 5 dBA above ambient is considered a marginal increase (Crocker, Malcolm, ed., Handbook of Noise and Vibration Control, 2007; Chapter 127, subsection 5.1); (D.A.Bies and C. Hansen, Engineering Noise Control — Theory and Practice, 4th edition, 2006; Section 3.7 and Section 4.9); (ISO Recommendation R1996, May 1971 — Assessment of Noise with Respect to Community Response); (British Standard BS 4142: 1997- Method for Rating Industrial Noise Affecting Mixed Residential and Industrial Areas).
3. Many governmental requirements and utility industry advisory groups use the L90 for describing ambient noise levels (US Environmental Protection Agency — Community Noise — December 31, 1971); (US National Park Service — Director's Order #47 — Soundscape Preservation and Noise Management, Section D.4); (New York State Public Service Commission, Article 10 regulations, 16 NYCRR 1001.19); (Edison Electric Institute, Electric Power Plant Environmental Noise Control, 2 edition, Bolt Berenek and Newman, Inc.).

4. The use of the L90 will automatically remove transient background sounds from the results (ANSI/ASA 512.9-2013/Part 3, Section 6.6b (2) and (3)).
5. “Although it is intuitively appealing to compare the compressor station Leq or Ldn with the background (ambient) Leq or Ldn that comparison is misleading when evaluating the environmental impact of a new source of noise. People judge the loudness of a new noise in relation to the continuous (residual) background sound level represented by the L90 which is controlled by sources of nearly constant background noise, not in relation to the Leq or Ldn.” (New York State Public Service Commission, Case 29419, Proceeding on Motion of the Commission to Establish Appropriate Conditions for Certificates of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need; Proposed Statement of Policy Regarding the Noise Guidelines for Gas Compressor Stations. October 28, 1986, pp. 6-7.)

Town of Nassau

There is only one industrial noise source in the entire Town of Nassau. There are no such noise sources within the rural residential vicinity of the proposed Market Path Mid- Station 1 compressor station at Clarks Chapel Road. The major noise source in the TGPL study area for the Market Path Mid-Station 1 facility is the Nassau Sportsman’s Club on Boyce Road in the Town of Schodack and bordering on the Town of Nassau. Occasional gun range noise is an intermittent noise source limited to day time occurrences. Proposed compressor station noise for pipeline operations will be continuous, with limited interruptions for planned or unplanned outages. Periods of outages are likely to be associated with extreme noise events including station blowdown, when high-pressure gas is vented to atmosphere in relatively short-duration (approximately 3 minutes or more in duration) events that can sound similar to jet engine or rocket take-off. Resource Report 9 does not include any information about blow-down noise. (Note: blow-down events, as witnessed by an NRC member, at the TGPL Chatham Compressor Station 254, are extremely loud and are associated with emission of large volumes of natural gas that is strongly odorized for smell detection. Blowdown noise and odors of odorized natural gas are very notable at extensive areas around the source — potentially exceeding 1.5 miles or more in range.)

The standard EPA Ldn methodology assumption that ambient noise levels in rural areas are in the range of 40 dB, and that increases of noise above that level up to 48.6 dB at night-time are acceptable, is misplaced for the proposed compressor station site vicinity in Nassau. Noise measurements in the vicinity of the area identified in the TGPL March 2015 preliminary Resource Reports as the study corridor for the 90,000 horsepower compressor station were made by a member of the NRC over a period of several nights in the early part of April, 2015. The measurements were meant to provide a characterization of the existing ambient sound environment.

Measurements were short-term, made at night-time conditions (between 10:00 PM and midnight) during periods of no wind or low wind (zero to 2 miles-per hour) and during dry ground and no-rain weather conditions. Measurements were discarded if intermittent noises occurred during measurement, such as dogs barking, birds chirping, cars passing, or aircraft fly-overs per appropriate protocols for determining ambient sound levels. Measurements were intentionally conducted prior to the emergence of spring peepers in mid-April. Measurement locations were intentionally located away from roadways, trees, or reflective surfaces and water bodies. Based on a series of measurements made on several nights of favorable conditions, the sound environment in the rural area of the proposed pipeline compressor station study area can be characterized as very quiet: levels of 26 to 30 dB(A) were recorded on a setting which approximates the L90 metric appropriate for determining ambient sound environment. These levels were at or below the effective “floor” or lowest level capability of the Type 2 sound meter used for measurement and may not be fully representative of the actual levels, which are potentially even quieter than the meter used was capable of registering. These results, however, are consistent with measured noise levels at locations for many types of projects in rural areas of New York and adjacent states.

With ambient sound levels at these very quiet conditions, the FERC sound level criteria of 55 Ldn (effectively 48.6 dB(A) at night) would represent an increase of 20 dB or more at noise-sensitive receptors, and

should be expected to result in very strong adverse community response and community action. (See ISOTC 43, Nov. 1969.) An increase of 20 dB or more represents a significant and adverse increase in noise above ambient levels under any noise impact assessment or community response methodology, and particularly at residences during night-time hours of 10 PM to 5 AM.

Noise measurements for proposed compressor station locations, as provided in Resource Report 9 by TGPL, warrant close scrutiny, and should be discounted in that actual ambient noise levels are undoubtedly significantly lower than the Resource Report indicates. Specific consideration of appropriate standards and protocol provisions for measuring ambient noise are warranted. Conditions including weather, wind, insect, bird and traffic noise were all problematic as close analysis will indicate. Monitoring locations, microphone placement, weather conditions and noise descriptors were apparently selected to include maximum achievable effects of wind, road and vehicular noises, and temporal environmental noises, rather than being selected to be representative of the generally quiet rural setting proposed to “host” the industrial nature and scale of the proposed Market Path Mid-Station 1 compressor station in the Town of Nassau.

Weather conditions: weather conditions for the Nassau, N Y area are generally represented by the continuous records of the Albany, NY (KALB) and the Pittsfield, MA (KPTS) airports. Review of weather records from those two locations indicate that on the dates reported for sampling ambient noise in Resource Report 9, wind conditions were highly variable but generally very windy, including average wind speeds exceeding 11 miles per hour and with recorded gusts as high as 39 mph. There were intermittent periods of precipitation, which would make road surfaces wet thus increasing tire noise from vehicles passing, and potentially decreasing ground absorption due to wet soil conditions. These conditions should be considered to be excessively windy and wet for purposes of collecting ambient noise levels for development of an ES for a major federal action. The NRC notes that sound level measurements were not made in conformance with the wind velocity conditions per ANSI 51.13-2005 (Revision of ANSI S113-1995) Measurement of Sound Pressure Levels in Air. Section 9.2.3 Meteorological Conditions states: In order for outdoor sound pressure level measurements to be considered in conformance with this standard, the wind speed at the measurement point and at all times during the measurement time interval shall not exceed 2 [meters/second, or approximately 4.5 miles per hour].

Wildlife sounds: At least two of the measurement locations selected by TGPL noise consultant for the proposed Market Path Mid-Station 1 site in Nassau, NY are in close proximity to water bodies. These water bodies include an emergent marsh — scrub-shrub swamp (directly adjoining location MP-1 at Figure 9.2-6), and a freshwater pond with varied habitat at shorelines (near MP-4 at Figure 9.2-6). Both of these water bodies support thriving populations of amphibian species, including spring peepers and gray tree frogs, which are in full vocalization during late evening and night-time hours in mid-May. The time period selected for measuring ambient noise in the vicinity was apparently chosen to include the maximum likelihood that these noises would be included in any night-time measurements. These sounds are predictable to anyone (even to noise engineers) with the least familiarity with northeastern conditions and would readily be avoided in responsible investigation and reporting of ambient noise conditions for development of an EIS for a major federal action. The NRC notes that the TGPL measurements were not in conformance with ANSI standards 512.9: Procedures for Description and Measurement of Environmental Sound for Insect and Bird Noise: “Weighted levels shall never be considered valid if there is audible insect, bird, or leaf noise.” ANSI S 12.9/2013 part 3, section 6.9.c.

In addition, community noise reaction methodologies are based on the masking capability of existing sounds to reduce the perception of new intruding noise sources. Insect noise and animal sounds (such as spring peepers) are concentrated at high frequency range and have a dominant effect on increasing the overall db(A) descriptor, but in practice are not able to mask lower frequency sounds typical of the proposed project compressor station noise sources. Limiting the analysis to the broad band noise descriptor such as the Leq or the Ldn rather than analyzing the noise component of fractional bands is inadequate and misleading.

Microphone placement: the locations selected by TGPL for placement of microphones for recording ambi-

ent conditions were all in close proximity to public roadways. One location, indicated as MP-1 on Figure 9.2-6, is within five feet of the edge of road pavement. Attached photograph #A shows the specific placement of the microphone and sound meter enclosure adjoining a roadside utility pole. Standard protocols for ambient noise measurements address this issue and were not applied by TGPL in this instance. ANSI S1.13-2005 5.1 calls for ambient noise levels to be taken in the absence of intermittent noise sources such as sounds of passing cars. Measurement of ambient sound at this location is entirely dominated by the sound of vehicles passing extremely close to the sound meter microphone. There was likely a degree of reflectance of traffic sound from the nearby steep cut bank facing this location from across the road. This is an uncharacteristic location for determining ambient noise in a rural residential setting, unless the test is designed to be biased by road noise.

Photograph A — MP-1 at edge of Clarks Chapel Road, Nassau NY

{photo omitted}

The nearest noise sensitive area to the location indicated for compressor station placement at Figure 9.2-6 is a private residence (indicated as NSA-i) situated at a distance of over 850 feet southerly from the public road, and is not influenced by road noise to any significant degree. Likewise, there are two additional residences located westerly of the proposed compressor station and NSA-i which are located at significant setback distances of 700 to over 1000 feet from Clarks Chapel Road, and are not influenced by the roadside noise conditions that would be represented by the roadside noise monitoring locations selected by the TGPL noise consultant.

Timing of Site Assessment: measurements were made by TGPL at the one time when traffic on this rural town road is predictably the busiest out of the entire calendar year — just prior to Memorial Day weekend -- when owners of camps and cottages at nearby Burden Lake are stocking their camps for the pending summer season, making numerous trips from more developed areas to the west, delivering supplies, trailered boats, recreation vehicles, camp firewood, etc. to the Burden Lake area. Road use and road noise is uncommonly high for the 2 to 3 days immediately preceding the start of the ‘summer season’, but this is an uncharacteristic time period for assessing year-round ambient noise conditions

Comparison of TGPL ambient noise level reporting with other information sources: an interesting and revealing assessment of the validity, veracity and usefulness of ambient noise levels reported by TGPL for the NED project can be provided by comparison of the information in Resource Report 9 with the information reported in the Draft EIS for another FERC jurisdictional project for, in two instances, identical noise sensitive areas. Consideration should be given to the ambient noise level projections reported by TGPL for the proposed Market Path Head Station with those reported by Williams Pipeline and analyzed in the EIS for the proposed Constitution Pipeline and Wright Compressor Station, located in the Town of Wright, Schoharie County, NY.

See pages 4-179 at Constitution Draft EIS — Table 4.ii.2-2; and Figure 4.li.2-3, labeled “NSAs nearest to Wright Interconnect Project”. Compare with TGPL Resource Report 9, pages 9-42 Table 9.2-9 Market Path Head Station Baseline Sound Level Measurement Results at Noise Sensitive Areas, and Figure 9.2-5 “Compressor Station: Market Path Head Station NSA Directions and Distances.” These tables are reproduced below for review.

Tennessee Gas Pipeline
Company, L.L.C.
a Kinder Morgan company

Environmental Report
Northeast Energy Direct Project
Resource Report 9
Air and Noise Quality
9-43

Table 9.2-10

Compressor Station: Market Path Head Station Anticipated Sound Level Contributions at Noise Sensitive Areas During Normal Operations

Potential

	Distance to NSA	Direction	Calculated Ambient L _{dn}	Estimated L _{dn} of Station	Combined Station L _{dn} and Ambient L _{dn}	Increase Above Ambient
1	1,550	SW	53.5	TBD	TBD	TBD
2	2,150	SE	53.5	TBD	TBD	TBD
3	1,720	N	56.7	TBD	TBD	TBD
4	2.810	NW	58.5	TBD	TBD	TBD

Table 4.11.2-2 from FERC Draft EIS for Constitution Pipeline — Iroquois Wright Station

TABLE 4.11.2-2

Background Noise Levels at the Nearest NSAs to the Existing Wright Compressor Station

NSA	Direction to NSA	Distance to NSA (feet)	Calculated Ambient L _{dn} (dBA)
NSA#4	NNE	900	44
NSA #5	NW	2.250	47
NSA *6	S	2.800	41
NSA *7	NE	1,400	39
NSA #6	SW	2.600	41
NSA *9	SE	3,000	40

Review of maps associated with these Tables indicates that TGPL NSA 1 is the same location as Constitution — Iroquois NSA #5; and TGPL NSA 2 is the same location as Constitution — Iroquois NSA #4. Thus the ambient noise level differences are:

TGPL NSA 1 = 53.5 dB vs. C-I NSA #5 = 47 dB for a difference of + 6.5 dB L_{dn};

TGPL NSA 2 = 53.5 dB vs. C-I NSA #4 = 44 dB for a difference of + 9.5 dB L_{dn}

Although the TGPL evaluation used the Leq and L_{dn} noise descriptors and not the L₉₀ as recommended by many standard references, the TGPL projections of ambient sound conditions are from 6.5 dB to 9.5 dB higher than those projections for the Iroquois Gas

Transmission Wright Station for identical receptor locations. TGPL projections of ambient sound levels for this location and for the Market Path Mid-Station 1 location are not representative of appropriate noise measurement and characterization of ambient conditions.

The FERC should not rely on the TGPL Resource Report 9 for Noise, and should commission an independent noise assessment for use in developing the US for the proposed TGPL NED Pipeline Project. TGPL consultants have developed a highly questionable assessment of ambient conditions which should be disregarded and replaced with a responsible assessment made to accepted standards at a time and location representative of the conditions actually experienced by residents that would be most affected by siting and operation of this major utility infrastructure. The NRC recommends that ambient surveys be scheduled for conditions including: leaf-off to reduce any masking effects of foliage; dry surfaces with no wind or low wind; and measurements made in accordance with appropriate protocols and accepted acoustic engineering principles and standards as referenced herein.

Predictions of project noise impacts should account for additional potential noise emissions from turbine and compressor station operations, including additional measures of significance such as:

- Community Noise Reaction;
- low frequency noise, including potential for airborne sound-induced vibrations and rattles;
- tonal noise;
- potential for sleep interference;
- potential health effects of long-term exposure, such as the World Health Organization standard of 40 dB as a limit for long-term noise exposure that is protective of human health.

In addition, expected operational noise levels at compressor station property lines should be evaluated

against imposed limitations of current or future land uses or developments on adjoining properties. The burden of providing mitigation against noise impacts must be appropriately the responsibility of the project proponent and occur on the facility site, not relying on buffering effects of open area on property of adjoining and nearby landowners whose properties may otherwise be directly affected by noise emissions.

In addition to the recommendations above, the Final Scope of the 1315 should also specifically address:

Community Noise reaction: Scoping documents should identify the methodologies that will be used to evaluate community noise reaction along with a discussion of applicability to the specific noise sources on low ambient noise settlements. FERC should select a goal in terms of community noise reaction to minimize the environmental noise impact along with applicable corrections based on existing residual noise levels, tonality, low frequency noise, impulsive noise, time of the day or night, previous exposure to community noise as applicable and appropriate, and specify whether the methodology is based on broadband or fractional band noise analysis.

Low frequency noise: Since the use of the “A” weighting scale gives more weight to noise levels at the high- and mid-frequency ranges than to those in the low frequency range, the Leq(A) and the Ldn(A) noise descriptors are totally inappropriate to evaluate, predict and prevent low frequency noise issues. Sounds with strong low frequency content have the potential to produce annoyance in residents; vibrations and rattles on windows, walls, ceilings and doors; and standing waves at indoor spaces. Low frequency noise emissions should be part of the scope of analysis and studies including but not limited to, estimates at the fractional frequencies of interest and at the infrasound range, if applicable; locations for evaluation; goals and recommended outdoor and indoor noise limits; noise descriptors and metrics for evaluation; as well as identification of proposed mitigation to address any of these issues. Contingency plans to address unanticipated effects of low frequency noise should also be considered.

Prominent tones: The Leq broadband noise descriptor and therefore the Ldn are totally inappropriate for evaluation of tones, pure tones or prominent tones. The scope of studies should specify a standard method to predict if tones are likely to occur, such as use of 1/3 octave band analysis, as well as a definition of what constitutes a tone, identify a method of evaluation and weighted penalties to compensate for the increase in community noise reaction that tones will produce. Most methodologies include penalties on the overall predicted noise levels if a tone occurs.

Health issues: Health issues were not addressed by the Environmental Protection Agency in 1974 when the Ldn methodology was adopted by that agency, because of the limited studies on the health effects of noise on people that had occurred at that time. More recently the World Health Organization has recommended a maximum standard limit of 40 dB as a limit for long-term noise exposure to protect the health of people after a comprehensive review of studies of the incidence of noise on cardiovascular disease such as hypertension and myocardial infarctions, as well as sleep disruptions and psychological illnesses. Scoping should include goals to prevent health issues of potentially affected receptors. Given the likelihood that compressor station operation will generally be continuous, the WHO standards should apply to residential receptors in this case.

Finally, the NRC is concerned about the potential for the situation indicated above for the proposed Market Path Head Station at Wright, Schoharie County, which is indicative of potential for being subject to the phenomenon of “creeping ambient” noise analysis. This can occur through repeated rounds of adding more facilities at existing noise sources. Under certain methodologies, the addition of a noise source that complies with the “ambient plus 5 dB” or similar allowed incremental increase is followed by subsequent determinations that ambient is now the “former ambient including the 5 dB increase” previously allowed, so another incremental 5 dB increase is allowed for a new “ambient plus 5 dB,” and so on, ad finitum. This phenomenon is of particular concern at facilities such as gas pipeline compressor stations, where increases in gas demand call for increased supplies, most readily provided by increased station horsepower and thus potentially increased noise emissions. Ambient sound must be established in the absence of noise from the sources of interest. This issue is of particular interest to the Town of Nassau NRC and residents of the area

near the proposed Market Path Mid-Station 1 facility, since the community is faced with the potential for increases in station horsepower — and in operational noise - in the future, potentially as soon as the filing of an application by TOPL, since solicitations of interest in receiving gas service contracts are reportedly still being made by TGPL throughout New England. The NRC recommends that the FERC address the issue of creeping ambient noise levels head-on in developing the final Scope of Studies for the instant application and EIS for the NED project.

RESOURCE REPORT 10- ALTERNATIVES

Alternative Compressor Station Locations for Market Path Mid-Station 1

The EIS should address alternative locations for compressor stations. Important considerations in assessing compressor station siting should include ambient noise levels, land use and land use sensitivity in the project area; consistency with local zoning districts and allowed uses; consistency with community goals and community character as expressed in master plans, long-range plans, and zoning and land use regulations; natural and cultural resources impacts; accessibility; security and accessibility for police protection and emergency responders including fire and rescue crews.

One potential area for siting a gas compressor station for the Market Path Mid-Station facility is in the vicinity of Market Path milepost 32.8 east of US Route 9. North of the existing TGPL 200 line there is a vacant, 60+ acre ‘Highway-Commercial’ zoned property (tax parcel 200.-9-6.11) currently available for sale with limited natural resource or land use constraints in an area that currently experiences significant noise and traffic levels due to nearby highways (1-90 corridor a short distance west; and with ready access from 1560 feet of site frontage on US Route 9). South of the existing TGPL 200 pipelines there is a reclaimed gravel quarry and apparently vacant area east of the existing gravel sorting and mixing facilities. Siting the compressor station at this location would not have land use impacts or require development of heavy access roads for construction and equipment deliveries, and existing noise levels are affected by traffic at NYS Route 9 and Interstate Route 90. Neither location in this vicinity is co-located with high voltage electric transmission lines. Both of these locations are near fire, EMT and police stations. And both of these locations would support development of TGPL pipeline on either the existing TGPL “200”-line right-of-way (the “New York Alternative”) or on the proposed electric transmission line route. These areas should be evaluated as suitable alternatives for siting of the proposed Market Path Mid-Station Compressor Station.

Minor Alternative Pipeline Alignments

The Nassau NRC recommends consideration of routing deviations and alignment shifts to increase separation of pipeline facilities in areas of residential uses immediately adjoining the proposed pipeline corridor. Several examples of such minor shifts follow.

Review of proposed facility mapping indicates potentially significant increases in separation from residences by adoption of a minor routing alternative in the area depicted on alignment sheet for Market Path Pipeline TE-SEG F-041 (sheet 13 of 28): switch the pipeline alignment to the south side of the Niagara Mohawk Power Co. corridor to increase separation of the pipeline from multiple residences along Slivko Road, and directly access the existing electric corridor access road NED-TAR-F-2600 and -2700. In this area the Nassau NRC also notes that the proposed ball valve location is directly at the streambank of stream NHD-159 east of Milepost 40.2. This location should be shifted to increase separation from the streambank to prevent erosion from affecting the ball valve, and to enable full streambank restoration and revegetation.

The Nassau NRC notes that the alignment sheets do not indicate pipeline routing from the electric line corridor to the proposed compressor station site, making analysis of pipeline impacts impossible in this area. Detailed routing to the station should be indicated for impact evaluations.

The Nassau NRC recommends consideration of a minor routing alternative in the area depicted on alignment sheet for Market Path Pipeline TE-SEG F-043: re-align the pipeline to the south side of the Niagara Mohawk Power Co. corridor to increase separation from residences at Nassau-Averill Park Road (County Route 15). and to directly use access road NED-TAR-F-2700 and -2800 without crossing under overhead

high voltage 345 kV transmission lines.

Consider a minor realignment to the north between mileposts 42.3 and 42.7 to reduce cut and fill on very steep ground and reduce impacts on water wells at downslope positions.

The Nassau NRC recommends consideration of a minor routing alternative in the area depicted on alignment for Market Path Pipeline at Segment F sheet 18 of 28: the pipeline route has an acute angle at roadside location. Consider moving the angle back to station 2265+60 past the stream; this will minimize impacts on the stream and make a more perpendicular crossing at Radley Road.

The Nassau NRC recommends consideration of a minor routing alternative in the area depicted on alignment for Market Path Pipeline at Segment F sheet 19 of 28: at NY State Route 43, the pipeline location has an angle turn immediately at the highway shoulder which does not make sense for major pipeline installation.

The Nassau NRC recommends consideration of a minor routing alternative in the area depicted on alignment for Market Path Pipeline at Segment F sheet 21 of 28: near milepost 45.3, make an HDD installation across the area from +1- 2402+00 to +1- 2425+00. staying along the NMPC right-of-way, drilling under wetlands, increasing separation from residences at Firetower Road, while reducing clearing and private land takings.

Alternative Technologies: Alternative Power Source for Compressor Motors

The EIS should provide a robust analysis of electric powered compressor drivers, to reduce noise and emissions impacts of operating.

Alternative Technologies: Lift-and-Lay Pipeline Construction

The adoption of the electric transmission line corridor to avoid constrained areas in Columbia County, NY, and in Massachusetts should be re-evaluated by consideration of use of “lift-and lay” replacement of existing TGPL pipeline facilities with larger pipeline. The FERC has approved this methodology in recent decision to approve the Algonquin Incremental Market Project MM — SPECTRA pipeline expansion (FERC Docket No. CP14- 96-000) in Rockland and Westchester Counties in New York, and into Connecticut, as needed to upgrade capacity and deliverability of gas in eastern New England regions, generally the same service areas proposed to be served by the TGPL NED project.

This approach would better utilize existing TGPL rights —of-way and avoid significant amounts of electric transmission corridor co-location, with attendant reduction in risks to construction workers and critical electric energy infrastructure during construction and operation. Construction risks include damage to electric transmission facilities, including potential outages of electric transmission service. The Alps-Berkshire transmission line is one of two key interconnections between the New York and New England electric system control areas. The EIS should present an analysis of risks of electric system outages both during construction of the NED pipeline along the transmission line, and during ongoing operation of both facilities. A pipeline operational incident would be potentially catastrophic if it resulted in destruction of a portion of the electric transmission line providing an essential interconnection between the two control areas. The EIS should weigh this against environmental effects identified for the proposed pipeline corridor and all available alternatives, including replacement of old TGPL pipeline segments with increased capacity pipelines in constrained areas along the “200” pipeline system.

SAFETY AND RELIABILITY - RESOURCE REPORT 11

The Safety of the proposed pipeline and compressor station facilities are of utmost concern to all Town of Nassau officials and the residents of the Town. The NRC has concerns about the information reported in statements in the Draft Environmental Report, some of which does not correspond with information provided by TGPL at the April 13, 2015 Public Information Meeting held in Schodack, NY. There are statements in the Resource Reports that are factually incorrect. And there is a great amount of information not yet reported in the Draft Resources Reports. The incomplete information provided in the July 24, 2015 Draft Environmental Reports makes the development of a robust Scoping Statement difficult. The Town of Nas-

sau NRC urges the FERC to extend the comment period until after a reasonable comment period allowing review of complete Resource Reports by TGPL providing the multitude of information identified in the July 24, 2015 reports as “To Be Determined” or “To Be Provided in October Update.”

At page 11-8, the Safety and Reliability report states that there are existing facilities in the Project area that will provide support in emergency situations, including at “Nassau, New York.” The only existing TGPL facilities located in Nassau, New York are two underground gas pipeline segments of the TGPL “200 line” system located in one right-of-way in the south western portion of the Town. Buried high pressure pipelines located approximately eight miles away from the proposed Market Path Mid-Station 1 compressor facility location will not provide any support in emergency situations. If the statement is intended to indicate that there is an existing operating compressor facility with personnel generally available on—site, the statement should indicate that there is an existing compressor station located in the Town of Chatham, Columbia County, New York located south of the Town of Nassau, Rensselaer County, New York. The Report should indicate the number of personnel regularly available to provide support, the equipment available for emergency support, and the nature and extent of such support that the company will commit to providing for emergency response at locations remote from the Chatham Compressor Station facility site.

According to personnel in attendance at Kinder Morgan’s Open House Public Meeting on April 13, 2015, including direct statements by TGPL’s Northeast Operations Manager, the proposed Market Path Mid-Station 1 compressor facility will not have any regular staffing or operational personnel on-site during typical operations, since the facility would be un-manned and would be operated from remote Operations Center located in the state of Texas. Resource Report 11 states the following at page 11-8:

Tennessee will have personnel supporting the new compressor stations proposed at the following locations that would be available for emergency response; New Milford, Pennsylvania, Franklin, New York, Schoharie, New York, Wright, New York, Nassau, New York, Windsor, Massachusetts, Northfield, Massachusetts, New Ipswich, New Hampshire, and Dracut, Massachusetts. Tennessee Gas estimates adding 26 employees that support the locations mentioned above.

Based on this statement, it appears the TGPL may be planning on having at the most two or three personnel at each proposed compressor station site. The EIS should provide an evaluation of the numbers of personnel necessary to staff and safely operate and maintain high-pressure natural gas compressor stations and pipeline systems of the size, scale and operating pressure proposed by TGPL.

Resource Report 11 states that the proposed facilities will have operating pressures that will greatly exceed the pressure of existing TGPL facilities. The EIS should provide a robust examination of TGPL’s experience with operating facilities of this operating pressure.

The EIS should provide an analysis of pipeline construction and worker safety in the vicinity of high voltage electric transmission lines. Access, equipment operation and pipe handling in the vicinity of high voltage electric transmission lines presents special problems and safety considerations including: grounding of equipment and construction materials due to induced voltages on exposed metal materials; potential for contact of electric transmission lines by heavy equipment including excavators, cranes, and side-boom tractors; near-misses of high-voltage conductors can also lead to electric shocks and worker safety issues. Both direct contacts and near-misses can result in electrocution injury or fatality. Comparison of alternate routes not located along electric transmission lines should address the greatly reduced levels of these hazards on those routes.

The alignment sheets showing the facility co-located with electric transmission corridors should clearly indicate transmission structure locations for planning access routes and ROW cross-over locations, as well as identifying sag points on electric transmission lines where there is reduced separation of electric transmission lines from pipeline construction equipment operating beneath those conductors.

Furthermore, the proposed Nassau, NY, Market Path Mid-Station 1 compressor station will apparently be located extremely close to the Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation New Scotland-to-Alps high voltage 345 kV electric transmission line. TGPL personnel responsible for compressor station engineering in atten-

dance at the April 13, 2015 Public Information Meeting held in Schodack, NY, were asked by Nassau NRC members to identify other locations in the TGPL system that had high pressure gas transmission compressor stations located adjacent to high voltage overhead electric transmission facilities. The NRC offered as an example for consideration the Iroquois Gas Transmission (IOT) compressor station located in Athens, Greene County, NY, where the IOT pipeline veers over one quarter mile away to significantly increase separation of all pipeline, valves, Athens Compressor Station facility components and related facilities from electric transmission facilities for the site. The Northeast Regional Operations Manager of the TGPL system could not identify any such co-locations on the TGPL system, and even admitted that minimum setback distances for compressor stations from such high voltage electric transmission lines would be important design consideration in selecting safe compressor station locations. Nothing in the public version or information available to the Nassau NRC in the subsequently-filed Resource Reports indicates the setback distances, design features, safety features or any other consideration of co-locating high pressure gas compressor stations, including both belowground and above-ground facilities, venting and blowdown features, valves, fixtures, piglaunching/receiving facilities, and other points of potential gas emissions, in close relative proximity to high voltage electric transmission lines.

The EIS should evaluate the potential safety implications of locating the compressor station in such close proximity of this high voltage overhead electric transmission line; specify the safe distance for compressor facilities from the high voltage electric transmission line; and assess safety features and design characteristics of the compressor station located near the electric transmission line. The EIS should also report on TGPL's operational history with safe operation of compressor stations located within close proximity of high voltage transmission lines. Minimum setback distances should be specified; safe emergency blowdown venting location design in proximity to high voltage transmission lines should be disclosed, including statements regarding design criteria for avoiding unsafe conditions. Furthermore, alternative compressor station locations with greater separation distances from overhead high voltage electric transmission lines should be identified and evaluated.

Resource Report 11 addresses pipeline safety and reliability matters. The report is incomplete, as it does not identify important safety features including location of sectionalizing valves, blow down valves, or system communications facilities. These facilities will need to be located on the pipeline and be separated from overhead high voltage electric transmission lines, to avoid venting of gas directly beneath the electric conductors. Areas of additional lands needed for valve stations and access improvements have not been identified.

System communication facilities have not been identified in the Resource Reports, and there is contradictory information regarding whether sectionalizing valves will be manually or remotely operated. Remotely activated controls require system communications facilities. For reference, the Constitution Pipeline, recently authorized by FERC for the same routing corridor now proposed by Kinder Morgan for the Northeast Direct Supply line from Pennsylvania to the Town of Wright, in Schoharie County, New York, will install communications towers, each 100 feet tall, at sectionalizing valves located approximately every 15 to 20 miles (depending on population densities and pipeline class location) along the length of the 120 mile pipeline. The Resource Report for the Northeast Direct Project does not identify the type of communications system facilities needed for either the sectionalizing valve system or the proposed compressor station. For reference, the TGPL Chatham Compressor Station 254 has a communications tower exceeding 200 feet in height, with aviation hazard lights as required by the Federal Aviation Administration. Kinder Morgan personnel at the April 13, 2005 Open House were either not able or not willing to state whether the proposed compressor station would require similar tower-mounted communications facilities with FAA hazard lighting. The potential for large communications towers has not been reported in the Resource Reports for this project to date: this is a significant deficiency in identifying major project components, their potential locations, and characterizing the analysis that will be made of them as well as potential siting limitations and environmental impacts that will be assessed. The NRC recommends that scoping comments address the need to identify major system communications facilities early in project review and that full consideration of siting and

environmental issues be addressed.

For purposes of comparing the existing pipeline corridor and the proposed Transmission Line pipeline route, there are at least two buildings where people congregate located within the class location corridor of 660 feet from the pipeline: the Nassau Sportsman's Club on Boyce Road (located in the Town of Schodack a short distance east of the Nassau town boundary, and the church located at the intersection of North Nassau Road and County Route 18. There are no corresponding places of public assembly located along the existing Tennessee Gas Pipeline (Kinder Morgan) corridor in the Town of Nassau.

CUMULATIVE IMPACT CONSIDERATIONS

The Resource Reports do not acknowledge the recent previous disturbances along the National Grid 345 kV New Scotland — Alps electric transmission line related to maintenance overhaul activities undertaken by that utility company in the 2013-2014 timeframe. The residents along the transmission corridor and public roadways surrounding the corridor sustained an extensive and prolonged period of disturbance due to major construction activity, noise and exhaust emissions of heavy construction equipment operations, deliveries and movement of heavy equipment that interfered with traffic and left mud and dust on roadways, and continuous deliveries and removal of oversized transmission poles and gravel for access road improvements. These impacts were associated with the maintenance rebuilding of a significant amount of the high-voltage electric transmission line through Rensselaer County towns of Stephentown, Nassau and Schodack. Within the Town of Nassau, there are lingering aspects of the activities that remain unresolved, including damage to road infrastructure and disposal of creosote-treated wood pole sections at a roadside area.

In addition to these impacts on the residents of the project area, there were impacts on natural resources associated with this construction-maintenance activity, including significant amounts of vegetation clearing, ground disturbance, habitat disruptions, soil erosion and sedimentation and associated water Quality impacts. These impacts on the human and natural environment need to be quantified and addressed in a full cumulative impacts analysis for the TGPL NED project.

By comparison, there has been no significant degree of construction or maintenance activity on the existing Tennessee Gas Pipeline "200" line corridor through the Towns of Nassau and Schodack since the looping line construction of the second pipeline installation that occurred in the 1989-90 timeframe over 20 years ago.

Cumulative impact considerations of that historic construction are negligible in contrast to the recently-experienced disruptions on the electric transmission corridor.

Another potentially significant cumulative impact of the proposed development of a new pipeline corridor through the Town of Nassau is the increase in the numbers of properties and residences that are exposed to the risk of catastrophic incidents along pipeline corridors in the town. The two existing pipelines within the common corridor at the southern end of the town represent a risk within the hazard area along that corridor. The operation of a third line at that existing pipeline corridor will not add any significant degree of exposure in terms of additional buildings or residences to the threat of catastrophic incidents, whereas the proposed new northern pipeline corridor adds thousands of acres of area and many residences to the total number of locations in the Town that will be exposed to the threat of catastrophic incidents.

VOLUME II- APPENDIX E - FACILITY MAPPING

Mapping included in support of several of the Resource Reports should be replaced due to figures being out-of-date and being misleading of actual conditions in many portions of the project areas. The mapping exhibits include many pages of USGS topographic edition maps which are labelled (at lower left corner of legend) as follows: "Map compiled using the most current quadrangle map available from the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS)." Review of many project area quadrangle topographic maps within New York State as are currently available at the on-line USGS Map Store for the most current editions available indicate that there are newer editions available for most areas in New York State, many dated 2012 or 2013. These later edition maps are indicative of much more up-to-date conditions of representations of settlement patterns and

land use in the proposed project areas than the undated topographic sheets provided.

For instance, the maps of the proposed facility location in the Schoharie County Town of Wright indicate no buildings in the vicinity of the existing Wright Compressor Station, including components constructed by TGPL over ten years ago (See “Page 1 of 51, Wright to Dracut Quad Mapbook — Segment F, drawn by HMM on 03/13/2015; Checked by 11MM, Approved by 11MM; Rev. Date 07/2015; Issued for FERC.” Residences in the vicinity are likewise not shown. The existing structures and buildings associated with the tap of the existing TGPL 200-1 pipeline east of NYS Route 9J within the Town of Schodack near MP 28.5, installed over 4 years ago, are not depicted in Page 6 of 51, Wright to Dracut Mapbook (as otherwise cited above). Most current topographic mapping should be required to be provided in the EIS, regardless of whether base mapping is on aerial photography (as in most recent versions of USGS topographic quadrangle mapping for New York State) or otherwise.

VOLUME II, APPENDIX G - TYPICAL CONSTRUCTION DRAWINGS

The Nassau NRC notes that the “Typical Construction Drawings” do not indicate diagrams for side-hill or sidling area construction right-of-way. This is of particular concern for co-location of large-diameter, high pressure gas transmission pipeline along high voltage electric transmission corridor. Development of construction access and level gradient for stable operation of construction equipment will result in significant degrees of cut and fill to establish two-tiered (two-tone) right-of-way. Areas of fill or cut near electric transmission lines can reduce separation of ground to overhead electric conductors, increasing risks of contact or entry of wire security zones; and also in risk of damage to electric facilities grounding beds (counterpoise). Likewise the Volume TI Appendix H Plan and Procedures does not address these types of activities and appropriate controls and communications. Appendix G and H should be amended to provide a range of scenarios including cut and fill at sites immediately adjacent to and within the electric transmission line right-of-way. Relation to work in areas involving sag points of overhead electric conductors, transmission pole structures, and buried counterpoise and other underground facilities should be addressed.

{end of 20150902-4004}

20150902-5006

Jeanne Sable, Fitzwilliam, NH.

Thank you for extending the comment period for the scoping phase of the Tennessee Gas Pipeline (TGP) Company’s proposal known or formerly known as the Northeast Energy Direct Project, (NED).

I have lived in the Monadnock Region of New Hampshire for over 40 years, where I have written and reported extensively on environmental issues and served many years as secretary of the Fitzwilliam conservation commission. I also sit on the advisory board of the Sustainability Project, a 15-year-old, 501 C-3 non-profit educational environmental organization based in Gilsum, NH. I wish to submit the following points for FERC’s careful consideration during the scoping process of the NED application.

At the July 30th, 2015 scoping meeting in Milford, NH, FERC Commissioner Eric J. Tomasi encouraged abutters and others affected by the proposed pipeline to suggest to Kinder Morgan/TGP any special areas or natural features we’d prefer be undisturbed by the project. An example he gave was “your grandfather’s favorite tree.” At a previous “open house” event in Winchester, NH, a Kinder Morgan official displayed pictures of an existing pipeline corridor, saying, “You won’t even be able to tell the pipeline is there.” Both of these statements show a lack of understanding about what makes New Hampshire New Hampshire.

While a buried pipeline may not be visible, the treeless corridor above it would be an ugly scar to those of us who live in New Hampshire, and the many who come here to enjoy its scenic beauty. Denuded corridors 125 feet wide, added to existing power line ROW’s, would slash through the breathtaking vistas that many thousands of tourists come to see, including the 125,000 hikers a year who climb Mt. Monadnock, the most-climbed mountain on this continent. Equipment staging areas, new access roads, compressor stations and other industrial uses of our rural landscape are expected to result in 6,761 acres of clearing, according to FERC literature. This is not even counting the numerous clearings for so-called “temporary” access roads,

field offices, and other sites anticipated for this project. How “temporary” can a clearing be, considering the many decades it takes to regenerate a forest? Where would the wildlife go in the mean time?

It is no mystery why more tourists visit the Monadnock Region during peak foliage season than at any other time of year. NED would forever mar the sea of color that attracts the folks we fondly call “leaf peepers”. The reason they faithfully flock to our bed & breakfast establishments, inns, resorts, stores, restaurants, antique shops, and other local businesses is foliage, and that takes trees—masses of them—not just a chosen few like “your grandfather’s favorite”.

In the 1990’s, a powerful lightning bolt struck our 12-acre woodlot, splintering a single pine tree and knocking out power all down our road. We called our local insurance agency to claim the loss of several electronic items, and were surprised when they added payment to cover the loss of one tree. Every tree has value.

Please have TGP/Kinder Morgan address the following questions:

- Has the intrinsic value of trees, forested landscapes and wildlife habitat potentially lost to this project been assessed for its impact on tourism and the mental and physical well being of NH residents and wildlife? How could these losses be mitigated? The very mitigation efforts proposed by TGP for NED (“Benefits to New Hampshire”, page 5) – purchasing lands for preservation, donating to worthy conservation organizations, etc. are the same efforts that our conservation-minded towns have been undertaking over decades, and which would be undermined by NED.
- Has the total volume of wood to be removed in order to facilitate NED been studied and quantified? If not, why not?
- How many board feet of timber would be removed and what is its value?
- Who gets the revenue from the timber?
- Who gets to harvest/sell any cord wood, wood chips, or other products generated?
- Will TGP be required to file an Intent to Cut permit with each municipality along the proposed route, as required of NH landowners and loggers?

I urge FERC to require an impartial, qualified professional forester be appointed by each municipality and paid for by Tennessee Gas/Kinder Morgan prior to the removal of any trees related to NED in order to accurately research and provide the answers to these questions.

Thanks for your consideration.

20150902-5041

Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LLC.
Northeast Energy Direct Project
Docket No. PF14-22-000

RE: Scoping Comments

September 1st, 2015

Hello,

My name is James L. Rodger. As a retired pipeline worker with eleven and one half years’ experience on the All American Pipeline Co., I have some concerns which I have expressed below.

Construction of the proposed NED project/route would disturb at least 6,761 acres, according to FERC publications. Certain locations along the proposed route conflict with special use lands such as state parks and other areas granted by dying people and earmarked as their final wish to be permanently preserved and undisturbed as conservation lands for future generations to enjoy.

A strong case in point is the land at Rhododendron State Park that was granted by the dying wishes of Mary Ware, who wanted this land to remain untouched. Another instance would be a 120- acre parcel of land that was willed to the Town of Fitzwilliam by Harvey J. Gaseau in memory of his wife, Ann K. Gaseau, just to mention a few.

This project would no doubt leave thousands of acres of land in these areas denuded of trees along a newly widened ROW totaling at least 300 feet in width. In my opinion, this is a violation of the sacred will and wishes of those who have gone before us, and would amount to the same disgraceful type of conduct our Federal Government has committed in the past, by violating over 500 treaties with Native Americans. Ref: The "Indian Treaty and Removal Act" of 1830.

On another issue, as a retired pipeline worker who understands the process, I am equally concerned about the proposed horizontal boring plan beneath Scott Pond in Fitzwilliam NH, where a stratified drift aquifer would be impacted. I believe that unless the boring process can go to extreme depths, toxic sediments in this aquifer will be disturbed, resulting in the contamination of hundreds of private wells that draw from it. Another concern with this phase of the project is the large areas of land to be disturbed at both the entry and exit points of the horizontal boring at that location. During spring "mud season", even the existing access road to homes and Scott Pond can become impassible. Heavy equipment working in these sensitive areas would contaminate surrounding wetlands, which are important recharge areas for aquifers. We live adjacent to Priest Brook, which flows downstream from Scott Brook. These brooks could also carry contaminants from the project to rivers in Massachusetts and beyond.

My suggestion for a solution here is: Since New Hampshire already exports 60% of the electricity generated here, we do not have an energy shortage. If the proposed NED project / route cannot be successfully moved to locations that can benefit from it, please do not approve this project.

Thank you for taking the time to consider these issues.

Yours Truly,

James L. Rodger
160 Dunton Rd.
Fitzwilliam, NH 03447
603 585 3348

20150902-5065

Robert Sundstrom, Milford, NH.

Is there a way to lodge an official complaint with the FERC?

Last week I submitted a comment. As a result I had an abutter contact me to reveal that there had been some survey activity on the property line connecting our properties.

I had denied the Kinder-Morgan request to survey and submitted a copy to the FERC (my abutter also denied access) yet they ignored that denial and still did trespass on our properties.

Obviously I am not happy with this situation at all!!!

I would also like to point out that depending on what side of the powerlines this project takes across my property, there is a potential to divide my 72 acres making the far side inaccessible to me. I need to harvest my timber as this is a source of income for my family. I am the owner of a Logging and Firewood business.

Thank you for listening to my concerns.

Bob Sundstrom

20150902-5155

Dear FERC,

July was the warmest month recorded since 1868. This past year was the hottest ever in recorded time. We are slowly killing ourselves. Could somebody PLEASE understand that we don't NEED more pipeline. Gas gives off the most methane which is the biggest polluter of our environment. The last thing we need is MORE pipeline. Fossil fuel energy should be decreasing. With advanced energy saving techniques, with people becoming more and more conscious, with many households going solar, we are slowly turning the

corner. The current gas pipelines are in poor shape and fixing them alone would be a huge volume of gain. Why would we possibly create more problems if the current pipes are poorly maintained and under used in Massachusetts? When Kinder Morgan already has a history of regulatory offenses and non compliance and has faced millions of dollars in fines? Why would we disrupt and destroy hundreds of miles of beautiful land in New England for a product we know is dangerous, finite, and wasteful? We desperately need someone in this country to look out for the “little guy”. You have that great opportunity. Please decide responsibly and think of the average citizen and not a multibillion corporation who may well sell it over seas where there is more profit.

I live in North Reading, Massachusetts. A beautiful little town that will have this pipeline put a scar right through it and destroy woods, wetlands, private property, and go right through the town aquifer. I do not use gas and, in fact, am very afraid of it. Now I feel that if this line comes through, I will constantly be affronted with the possibility of an explosion. I get nothing in return except higher taxes and lower property values.

But it’s not about me. It’s about the average person, quality of life, wastefulness, destruction, and future generations. Perhaps some want the pipeline but we truly don’t NEED it. Please do what is right. Thousands of people don’t want this. Will someone PLEASE listen to us??? Use the available funds to improve and move forward not to take a gross step backwards. Thank you for your time and considerations.

Stephen W. Woodbury

20150903-0016

Hand written card, June Bug, 92 S. Shirkshire Rd, Conway, MA 01341: opposing

20150903-0017

Hand written card, Luke Meyer, 96 Hart Rd, Conway, MA 01391: opposing

20150903-0018

Hand written card, Luke Meyer, 96 Hart Rd, Conway, MA 01391: opposing

20150903-0019

Hand written card, J. Doster, 26 Walker Rd, Buckland, MA 01370: opposing

20150903-0020

Hand written card, Mary Bassinger, 26 Walker Rd, Buckland, MA 01370: opposing

20150903-0021

Hand written card, Lesley Finlayson, 167 Heald Road, Wilton, NH 03086: opposing

20150903-0022

Hand written card, Michael & Betty Goen, 48 Russell Rd, Mason, NH 03048: opposing

20150903-0023

Hand written card, Lesley Finlayson, 167 Heald Road, Wilton, NH 03086: opposing

20150903-0024

Hand written card, Lesley Finlayson, 167 Heald Road, Wilton, NH 03086: opposing

20150903-3026

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC

Docket No. PF14-22-000

NOTICE OF PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING FOR THE
NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT PROJECT,
AND EXTENSION OF SCOPING COMMENT PERIOD

(September 3, 2015)

The staff of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) will hold an additional public scoping meeting for the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Project (Project) proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline in the above-referenced docket. This meeting was referenced in the previous Notice issued on June 30, 2015. The scoping comment period has also been extended until October 16, 2015. In addition to sending written comments, the Commission invites you to attend the public scoping meeting its staff will conduct in the project area to receive verbal comments on the Project. Transcripts of the meetings will be available for review in eLibrary (www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/elibrary.asp) under Docket No. PF14-22-000. The meeting time and location are provided below.

<u>Date and Time</u>	<u>Location</u>
September 29, 2015 6:00 PM	Franklin Pierce University Field House University Drive Rindge, New Hampshire 03461 603-899-4000

The Commission's staff will begin the sign-up of speakers one hour before the meeting begins. The scoping meeting will begin with a brief description of our environmental review process by Commission staff, after which speakers will be called. The meeting will end once all speakers have provided their comments or 11:00 PM, whichever comes first. A time limit may be implemented (typically no less than 3 minutes) for each commenter, to ensure all those wishing to comment have the opportunity to do so. Speakers should structure their oral comments accordingly. Time limits will be strictly enforced to ensure that as many individuals as possible are given an opportunity to comment. It is important to note that written comments provided to staff, or otherwise filed with FERC, hold the same weight as oral comments.

Kimberly D. Bose,
Secretary

20150903-5016

Joseph Pfeifer, Windsor, MA.

- 1) All hydraulic fracturing chemicals must be removed from the transmitted gas before entering the pipeline
- 2) All compressor stations must be fully contained underground. The exhaust from blow-downs must be fully contained as well, and handled as hazardous material. It must be shipped from the compressor site for transport to an appropriate storage facility remote from the compressor.
- 3) Kinder Morgan must underwrite analyses from independent laboratories of all chemicals contained in hydraulic fracturing fluid. These analyses must address :
 - a) Identification of all chemicals found in hydraulic fracturing fluid and the percent quantity found in the fluid of each chemical identified
 - b) Potential impact and nature of impact on human health of each chemical on a quantitative basis
 - c) Potential impact on health of surrounding flora and fauna at each compressor site from each chemical on a quantitative basis
 - d) Quantity of radon and other radioactive material in the hydraulic fracturing fluid

4) Continuous monitoring of compressor sites for methane and other hydrocarbon leakage, as well as leakage of hydraulic fracturing fluid. The results to be reported publicly on a monthly basis.

20150903-5086

Wiltrud R. Mott-Smith, Loudon, NH.

This comment, filed from New Hampshire, opposes the Kinder Morgan fracked-gas pipeline, proposed to run through about 71 miles across the Southern part of New Hampshire, through 17 towns and many parcels of conserved land. Opposition is on three main grounds: (1) there is no need for the pipeline; (2) the pipeline will threaten health and safety and deteriorate the beautiful and useful natural character of the New Hampshire lands along its route; (3) development of the pipeline will support the fracked-gas industry, an industry which is already threatening the health of the entire planet.

(1) There is no need for the proposed pipeline for heating fuel. It would not go into service for another 3 or more years. By that time planned improvements to certain existing pipelines will be in service. Furthermore, during the past winter there was no shortage of heating fuel, and every year New Hampshire residents increase the energy efficiency of their commercial and residential buildings. New Hampshire residents will not support the construction of a pipeline which does not benefit them directly. (They will certainly refuse any surcharges levied to support that construction).

The pipeline is not needed for electric generation either: the planned Northern Pass hydro-power line is projected to increase the electricity supply to New England by 1000MW.

(2) Pipeline construction would require the taking of private property and crossing lands conserved to protect wildlife, even where the pipeline would use existing rights of way (because many of these are not wide enough). There were 1400 pipeline spills and accidents across the US in 2010-2013, most of them discovered by nearby residents, not by official inspectors. Such events pollute water, injure wildlife and deteriorate land and water (and land values). The degradation of private and public property, and the risks to health and safety from methane emissions, potential pipeline ruptures and the possibility of explosions, is unacceptable.

(3) It is now widely recognized that the planet and all living organisms on it are seriously threatened by global warming, largely (though not exclusively) caused by the extraction and burning of fossil fuels. The Union of Concerned Scientists reports that the extraction, distribution, and storage of natural gas result in the leakage of methane, a powerful global warming gas 34 times stronger than carbon dioxide at trapping heat over a 100-year period.

Thus the proposed Kinder Morgan pipeline would not only be imminently hazardous to the communities it would traverse, it would dangerously expand a natural gas infrastructure which should ultimately be replaced by less planet-destroying renewable-energy industries.

Developing a sustainable, environmentally responsible national energy policy is among the most important challenges the country faces. FERC should contribute to this challenge by disallowing the Kinder Morgan pipeline.

20150904-0007

Hand written card, Carla Press, 17 Monadnock St, Troy, NH 03465: opposing

20150904-0008

Hand written card, John Leoutsacos, 79 Mountain View Drive, Temple, NH 03084: opposing

20150904-0009

Hand written card, John Leoutsacos, 79 Mountain View Drive, Temple, NH 03084: just possibility of pipeline has stalled real estate sales in New Ipswich, Temple and Mason.

20150904-0010

Hand written card, John Leoutsacos, 79 Mountain View Drive, Temple, NH 03084: opposing

20150904-0011

Hand written card, Cheryl Davieau, 483 Churchill Rd, Mason, NH 03048: opposing

20150904-0012

Hand written card, Paul Bush, 202 Poor Farm Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071: opposing

20150904-0013

Hand written card, Patricia Layfield, 56 Stratton Rd, Jaffrey, NH 03452: opposing

20150904-0014

Hand written card, Andrew Finlayson, 167 Heald Rd, Wilton, NH: opposing

20150904-0015

Hand written card, John Leoutsacos, 79 Mountain View Drive, Temple, NH 03084: opposing

20150904-0016

Hand written card, John Leoutsacos, 79 Mountain View Drive, Temple, NH 03084: opposing

20150904-0043

{17 pages} skip to end of 20150904-0043

The Kinder Morgan NED project (Docket PF 14-22) Scoping Response:

Range of Impacts:

Please Note: I consider TGP’s Rindge data in tables 2.1-2 Public and Private Water Supply Wells, page 2-18 and 2.3-8 Wetland Impact Summary by Wetland Type in New Hampshire page 2- 88 suspect and inaccurate. It is just another indication of how little effort they put into these reports in Rindge’s case. They haven’t had any boots on the ground here and it shows.

All Rindge residences and/or businesses, be they be abutters or hold easements have wells. The actual number varies because PSNH and National Grid in some cases actually bought the land the power line sits on, in other cases some land is held in trust. I feel it is safe to state that there are at least 150 wells along the proposed pipeline ROW. I should note that most of the wells on Atlantic drive can be seen from the air.

The Table Of Contents and a section in Resource Report 2 don’t provide accurate locations of the two tables mentioned.

1. WATER USE AND QUALITY

Please Note: I have identified 39 registered and unregistered wetlands/vernal pools along the power line ROW. There are more, but to get to them, I would have had to cross “Posted” easements.

I used a combination of the Harris Center’s and State Method to identify the vernal pools. a large number of them (22) I would class as being very productive (large numbers of amphibian egg masses).

A. Please study all 9 miles of the proposed Pipeline ROW in Rindge, and identify all wetlands within 300 feet on both sides of the centerline of the proposed pipeline.

B. Please document where these wetlands are located on a USGS 7.5 minute topographic maps or the State Of New Hampshire’s Granit Mapping tool generated maps.

C. Please provide detailed descriptions of the wetlands, vernal pools and water bodies that include their

function and values.

- D. Please audit those wetlands in late April through early June to identify amphibians and other wildlife using these wetlands in the reproductive portion of their lifecycle .

Please audit those wetlands from late April through the month of June for Rare, Special Concern (SC) Endangered and Threatened Plants, Animals and Insects.

Please create map overlays that show the locations of species identified in items C and D and place them on the maps created as described in item B.

- E. Please make the maps and descriptions created in this process available to the Rindge Conservation Commission.

2. ABOVEGROUND AND APPURTENANT FACILITIES (AS IT RELATES TO WETLANDS)

- A. Please use the information obtained in section 1 (Wetlands) to develop plans for routing the pipeline around the wetlands.
- B. Please require in the case where the wetlands in question cross the entire pipeline ROW use matting to minimize compaction of the soil minimize the damage to plants and shrubs.
- C. Please study the mitigation of local Rare, Special Concern, Endangered, Threatened species and Insects and why they aren't usually successful. Given mitigation isn't practical, have TGP develop a route around the area in question.
- D. Please identify cases where Rare, Special Concern, Endangered and Threatened species have historically been successfully mitigated, identify areas in Rindge where mitigation would be successful.
- E. Please plan the location of contractor yards, Access Roads, ML V s etc. at least 300 feet from the wetlands identified in section 1 (Wetlands).
- F. Please study and document any Rare. Special Concern (SC), Endangered and Threatened Plants and Animals that may be impacted by the construction and operation of the above ground facilities.
- G. Please plan for the installation of impervious surfaces and their post construction removal in any area where fueling, and transfer of any fluids or chemicals considered pollutants by the NHDES and the EPA.
- H. Please require TGP to create a Spill Prevention. Containment and Countermeasures Plan that insures timely containment and removal of any spilled materials in the entire construction area in Rindge, and all such spills should be reported to the NUDES and EPA (time frame?)

3. PUBLIC AND PRIVATE WATER SUPPLY WELLS

- A. Please study TGP's BMP for blasting, as it doesn't deal with blasting practices that prevent pollution or damage of wells (artesian in granite), which the preponderances of wells in Rindge are.
- B. Please Study what the Blasting Best Management Practices are and require TGP to fund a third party who will report to Rindge (Conservation Commission) that should have oversight of those practices and their execution during construction.
- C. Please study how the rubble created by the blasting can be stored, transported and disposed of without polluting ground water and aquifers.
- D. Please study what the impact of non-blasting approaches to rock removal mentioned in TGP's Resource Report has on artesian wells are and require TGP to fund a third party who will report to Rindge (Commission mD) that should have oversight of those practices and their execution during construction.
- E. Please study alternate routes that can be used to avoid areas where blasting Granite is required and wells are present.
- F. Please determine what realistic alternative water supplies are available to home owners and businesses

that have construction impacted wells. Document in the final EIS and then mail those findings to the abutters in Rindge prior to the publishing of the final EIS.

- G. Please study the following information provided by the NHDES. Please see that TGP incorporates it in their spill prevention and mitigation planning (SPCC). Please see that contractor maintenance and fueling crews and the EIs are trained on the processes and procedures documented in the spec.

Please Note: Fuel, lubrication, hydraulic and other related fluid spills will contaminate ground surface water. The NHDES has published spill prevention and mitigation BMPs. The following was extracted from WD-10-12:

Spill Prevention Measures and Spill Mitigation. Spill prevention and spill mitigation measures shall be implemented to prevent the release of fuel and other related substances to the environment. The measures shall include at a minimum:

- (a) The fuel storage requirements shall include:

1. Storage of regulated substances on an impervious surface.
2. Secure storage areas against unauthorized entry.
3. Label regulated containers clearly and visibly.
4. Inspect storage areas weekly.
5. Cover regulated containers in outside storage areas.
6. Wherever possible, keep regulated containers that are stored outside more than 50 feet from surface water and storm drains, 75 feet from private wells, and 400 feet from public wells.
7. Secondary containment is required for containers containing regulated substances stored outside, except for on premise use heating fuel tanks, or aboveground or underground storage tanks otherwise regulated.

- (b) The fuel handling requirements shall include:

1. Except when in use, keep containers containing regulated substances closed and sealed.
2. Place drip pans under spigots, valves, and pumps.
3. Have spill control and containment equipment readily available in all work areas.
4. Use funnels and drip pans when transferring regulated substances.
5. Perform transfers of regulated substances over an impervious surface.

- (c) The training of on-site employees and the on-site posting of release response information describing what to do in the event of a spill of regulated substances.

- (d) Fueling and maintenance of excavation, earthmoving and other construction related equipment will comply with the regulations of the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services [note these requirements are summarized in WD-DWGB-22-6 Best Management Practices for Fueling and Maintenance of Excavation and Earthmoving Equipment” or its successor document. Please see: <http://des.nh.gov/organization/commissioner/pip/factsheets/dwgb/documents/dwgb-22-6.pdf>

4. HYDROSTATIC TEST WATER

- A. Please determine if the bodies of water that will be used to supply hydrostatic test water are free of Eurasian milfoil, Duckweed, Elodea, Bladderwort etc. This should be determined by a third party such as NHFG or NHDES.
- B. Please document standard operating procedures that require proper cleaning process for all water uptake apparatus to remove seeds and plant material that could inadvertently be transported to another body of water.
- C. Please determine the quality of the water to be discharged after each hydrostatic test.

Require TGP to fund a third party to test the water to be discharged who will report to Rindge (Conser-

vation Commission) that should have oversight on this process.

- D. Please plan to have NHDES or the EPA Region 1 office physically review the areas and the process that will be used to discharge the water used for testing. The report from the NHDES or EPA must be shared with the Rindge Conservation Commission, which may require a site review prior to the discharge.

Please Note: Table 2.2-7 in Resource Report 2. Specific streams that support CWF in New Hampshire doesn't exist. Its existence is noted on page 3-14, where it is stated, "that 25 CWF crossings exist in Section I in New Hampshire. It TGP knows of 25 CWF streams and rivers, but can't name them!!

Table 3.2-3 is another completely TBD table, again indicating no boots on the ground. Does TGP expect to get our land environment handed to them without them working for it?

5, FISHERIES RESOURCES

Please Note: That Banded Sunfish (Endangered in New Hampshire etc.) have been identified in the Tarbell Brook and Converse Meadow wetlands.

I identified a native Brook Trout in a small un-named stream that crosses power line ROW in Rindge.

- A. Please address TGP's lackadaisical approach to dealing with New Hampshire's natural resources. New Hampshire's primary source of revenue is tourism. TGPIKM claim to be good neighbors, but they don't care what they know or do about New Hampshire's pristine environment. What I see here, is a company that is only concerned about what it costs to install this pipeline.
- B.. Please study the streams crossed by the NED project in Section I. The CWF stream crossings will have a critical impact on trout fishing and tourism in the Monadnock region. We need this information now!
- C. Please study all CWF stream crossings, crossing a three foot wide stream bed is much different than crossing a shaded 2 foot or more deep pool. The impact on the fishery will prove to be significant.
- D. Please determine from an environmental point of view (rather than cost), the appropriate size of the trees necessary to replace the trees removed at CWF crossings. Shadowing the stream beds is critical to maintaining a CWF environment.
- E. Please study the impact of preventing CWF fish moving to cooler water (shaded pools) while streams are blocked for construction. I personally don't believe any CWF stream should be blocked to install a pipeline. IIDD technology should be used when dealing with CWF streams, no matter how wide.
- F. Please look into the dates chosen to work on CWF waterways, while they prevent interfering with Brook Trout spawning, interfering with water flow during the summer can do as much damage to the fishery.
- G. Please study the impact of removing riparian undercuts and windblown trees, logs and brush as they provide shelter for CWF species.

6. WILDLIFE RESOURCES

Please Note: The wildlife section reads like a text book, I'm surprised that TGP hasn't been sued for plagiarism. They have substituted internet and text book research for boots on the ground study. The total lack of data about Rindge, and by and large the rest of New Hampshire is frightening.

We have identified and registered Blanding and Wood turtles (endangered, New Hampshire etc.) near wetlands along the power line ROW. We have identified and registered two nesting Osprey (SC) pairs in the power line ROW. A Smooth Green Snake was identified and registered on the power line ROW.

In the wetlands and vernal pools, I was able to identify and register Wood Frogs; Spotted Salamanders; Jefferson Blue Spotted hybrid Salamanders (SC), Pickerel Frogs, Leopard Frog (rare), Gray Tree Frogs, Spring Peepers, and American Toads.

- A. Please do a comprehensive study of all wildlife, with special consideration for Rare, Special Concern

(SC), Endangered and Threatened wildlife within 300 feet of either side of the centerline of the pipeline and aboveground and appurtenant facilities.

- B. Please do a comprehensive study of the impact on all breeding species that will be disturbed during construction. The study should document the species, their location and numbers as well as on a USGS 7.5 minute topographic maps or the State Of New Hampshire's Granit Mapping tool generated maps, and share those maps with the Rindge Conservation Commission.
- C. Please Study the need for creating appropriate (species dependent) sized buffers areas around sensitive habitat areas discovered in item A.
- D. Please Study seed mixes and plants used in the mitigation process and share this data with the Rindge Conservation Commission, NHFO and NUDES.

Please Note: I'm adding a section on insects: Dragonflies predate the dinosaurs, birds and man, they spend a significant part of their life cycle in a larval stage (nymphs). These nymphs live in the bottom of wetlands, streams, ponds and rivers.

The Dragonfly is significant to Rindge's environment at two levels: First, the nymphs are a significant food source for both CWF and wann water fisheries. Second, they have a more significant impact on noxious insects (mosquitoes, black flies (gnats), flies etc.) in that they hunt them during the day when we are out and about.

The NHFO has identified 87 dragon fly species in Rindge (the largest number in New Hampshire). The Ringed Boghaunter (endangered) has been identified here in Rindge.

- E. Please study the impact that the NED pipeline's construction will have on Rare, Special Concern (SC), Threatened and endangered Dragonflies located in Rindge's wetlands, streams, ponds and rivers crossed by the pipeline.
- F. Please document the species, their location and numbers as well as on a USGS 7.5 minute topographic maps or the State Of New Hampshire's Granit Mapping tool generated maps, and share those maps with the Rindge Conservation Commission.
- G. Please have TGP reroute the pipeline around areas that hold Rare, Special Concern (Se), Threatened and endangered Dragonflies or have TGP use IIDD to place the pipeline under the area in question.

7. WILDLIFE IMPACTS AND MITIGATION

Please Note: The mitigation section is self serving, it is clear that the industry has funded the sources quoted or TGP has "Cherry Picked" outliers that serve TGP's purposes. As an example there is a wealth of research, that documents that mitigation doesn't work: Amphibians use Vernal Pools and fish free wetlands. Fill the pools and wetlands and the amphibians perish, because the amphibians have a characteristic called "Site Fidelity, II it means that they return to the site where they are born year after year to reproduce (some of these amphibians live for 30 years). Trout Unlimited and others have observed that they can rebuild stream beads and the environments, but all they are doing is creating habitat for stocked fish.

When you lose the native wildlife, they are gone forever. That is why native environments are treasured.

- A. Please Study the whole wildlife mitigation issue, The Monadnock region's wildlife is a significant part of its attraction to tourism and the reason why the bulk of us live here.
- B. Please determine how to put oversight into the management process of the following statement extracted from Resource Report 3:

"final impact assessments that will be conducted for more sensitive and/or rare species habitats (e.g., interior forest birds, obligate vernal pool breeding amphibians, bats), timing restrictions on tree removal will likely be implemented to avoid and minimize impacts on wildlife." I bolded the likely (JAG).

At minimum the Town of Rindge should be funded by TGP to hire a consultant to oversee the miti-

gation process.

8. VEGETATION

Please Note: Referring people reading the New Hampshire section to New York portion of the Resource Report, insults our intelligence. It, in fact, ignores the existence of Vermont. If you understand the geology of Northern New England, you realize that the New York description more closely mirrors Vermont, not New Hampshire.

The section of South Western New Hampshire is best described as Worcester Plateau/Monadnock Region. The mountain that names the region is now used as a geological term to identify unique mountains whose peaks rose above the ice pack from the last ice age.

- A. Please study the Emergent Marsh - Shrub Swamp Systems in Rindge as the pipeline will pass through a large number of these environments and they are little understood. TGP needs to understand them and what the pipeline's impact on them will mean.
- B. Please Document the findings in item A on a on USGS 7.5 minute topographic maps or the State Of New Hampshire's Granit Mapping tool generated maps. and share these findings with the Rindge Conservation Commission.
- C. Please share with the Rindge Conservation Commission, the results of biological and botanical surveys including observations of previously undocumented natural communities of special concern, that TGP will be providing the NH Natural Heritage Bureau.

Please Note: A large colony (approximately 30 plants) of Pink Lady Slippers (native Orchid) was discovered near a vernal pool along the power line ROW. What makes it unique is that it was in a habitat that doesn't promote the existence of Lady Slippers. Construction will destroy the site.

- D. Please study the micro environments (unique soil types/water etc.) 300 feet on either side of the centerline of the pipeline ROW for plant communities that exist where they do because of those unique conditions.
- E. Please document the findings (item D above) on a on USGS 7.5 minute topographic maps or the State Of New Hampshire's Granit Mapping tool generated maps. and share these findings with the Rindge Conservation Commission.
- F. Please study the Sunny areas, wet organic soil loving wild flowers 300 feet on either side of the centerline of the pipeline ROW.
- G. Please document the findings (item F above) on a on USGS 7.5 minute topographic maps or the State Of New Hampshire's Granit Mapping tool generated maps. and share these findings with the Rindge Conservation Commission.
- H. Please document the Shady areas, wet organic soil loving wild flowers 300 feet on either side of the centerline of the pipeline ROW.
- I. Please document the findings (item H above) on a on USGS 7.5 minute topographic maps or the State Of New Hampshire's Granit Mapping tool generated maps. and share these findings with the Rindge Conservation Commission.

J. Please define alternate routes for the pipeline around the areas that have rare, se, threatened and endangered wild flowers.

Please identify all rare, SC, threatened and endangered shrubs present in the area 300 feet on either side of the centerline of the pipeline ROW, along the pipeline's route in Rindge.

L. Please document the findings (item K above) on a on USGS 7.5 minute topographic maps or the State Of New Hampshire's Granit Mapping tool generated maps. and share these findings with the Rindge Conservation Commission.

M. Please study the Shady areas, wet organic soil loving shrubs 300 feet on either side of the centerline

of the pipeline ROW.

N. Please document the findings (item M above) on a on USGS 7.5 minute topographic maps or the State Of New Hampshire's Granit Mapping tool generated maps. and share these findings with the Rindge Conservation Commission.

Please Note: Trees and shrubs are a mitigation concern. The replacements should match trees and shrubs that existed in a given disturbed area. As an example wet areas with organic soil should be replaced with appropriate trees such as red maples, white cedars, larch etc. Dry areas should have oaks, beach, hickory etc. Hemlocks are quite common in this area as a transitional tree.

We fully expect that the trees removed will be replaced with trees of a similar size. The trees they are taking were a buffer between our homes and the power line ROW.

O. Please identify the native trees present in any area that will be cut and document their location for use in the replanting process.

P. Please develop a restoration plan (created by a certified forester) that documents the species, sizes required, area to be planted and the approach (care) to be used to insure successful reestablishment of the forested areas.

Q. Please identify and fund a forestry consultant Preferably the person identified in item P above. That person will be responsible for the oversight and monitoring of the reforestation effort until the trees have been successfully reestablished. That forester will report to the Rindge Conservation Commission.

9. STATE AND FEDERAL LISTED SPECIES (NEW HAMPSHIRE)

Please Note: There are species and plants listed as SC that aren't mentioned in section 3.4.2.2.4. This is just another example of the slap-dash approach to studying the environment here. Do you really expect us to believe that they will treat pollution, noise and safety issues in a more thorough manner?

A. Please do a more comprehensive study of the species and varieties listed in tables 3.4.2 and 3.4.8. They are incomplete.

10. ECONOMY AND EMPLOYMENT EXISTING CONDITIONS

Please Note: At every open house Kinder Morgan held and at the Nashua Scoping session, the labor unions represented were from out of state (Maine and Texas etc.). The one Rotarian that spoke at the Keene Rotary Open House was from Texas. The KM Land Agent in Cheshire County is from New York. The one New Hampshire resident I've seen to date is an Environmental Consultant doing a Bat study for TGP. Believe me KM has bought up every environmental resource in Southern New Hampshire, to keep impacted towns from hiring them.

A. Please study the employment situation in Cheshire County, as TGP's own table (5.1-1) shows Cheshire County's unemployment rate 3.7% well below the national average.

B. Please study TGP's hiring practices on pipeline projects to determine what their hiring practices are. Please document your findings and forward them to the Rindge Board of Selectmen.

C. Please study TGP's housing figures, as they hold little relevance to Rindge. We are a summer tourist community, these people book years ahead. The owners aren't about to book a bunch of pipeline gypsies to displace long term customers.

D. Please study Hotel, Motel and Camp ground capacity. Rindge and the Mooadnock can't house the numbers of people TGP describes. Note that table 5.2.-2 supports this position.

Please Note: There are duplications and errors in table 5.2-2, which inflate the number of spaces available in Cheshire County.

11. PUBLIC SERVICES

Please Note: This Resource Report assumes New Hampshire is structured like the other four states this proposed pipeline runs through. The citizens of New Hampshire believe in small government and we don't have the tax structure to support the infrastructures, that other 4 states do.

- A. Please study what TGP calls a full service Police Department. The department isn't fully staffed in a 24 x 7 context. They aren't going to be able to deal the influx of itinerant labor on weekends. I will also note that all the Sheriffs department can do for us, is provide dispatch.
- B. Please Study what TGP calls a full service Fire Department. The only full time Fire Department employee is the Chief, he also acts as the town's Building Inspector. Please note we can't burn agricultural waste until after 5:00 PM to make sure, the department has enough volunteers to respond to a brush fire.
- C. Please study the impact of the NED project on Rindge's population, given that we have an influx of 1,000 students every year at a University that is the town's second largest employer.
- D. Please study the impact of pipeline gypsies deciding to park their trailers on the side of the road or go for a swim on Rindge's private beaches. Rindge doesn't have the facilities to support the influx of itinerant labor. Perhaps you should have TGP hire local labor, so that they can go home at night.

12. EMERGENCY PLAN

Please Note: Kinder Morgan representatives told me not once but three times (3 different people) that their only responsibility was to turn off the gas, should an emergency (explosion, fire etc.) happen. So you can understand my confusion when TGP says the following:

Key elements of this Plan include procedures for:

Receiving, identifying, and classifying emergency events--gas leaks, fires, explosions, and natural disasters:

1. Establishing and maintaining communications with local fire, police, and public officials, and coordinating emergency response;
 2. Making personnel, equipment, tools, and materials available at the scene of an emergency;
 3. Protecting people first and then property from actual or potential hazards; and
 4. Emergency shutdown of system and the safe restoration of service (can I assume TGP owns this item).
- A. Please study Emergency Plan and identify who is responsible for what activities, who contacts who, who supplies what equipment, where the first responders come from, what are the expected response times. What are the Rindge specific evacuation plans.
 - B. Please document your findings (item A above) and provide copies to the Rindge Board Of Selectmen.

Please Note: The proposed pipeline crosses no less than 9 roads and highways in Rindge. A prudent person would expect mass confusion should an explosion/fire happen. Couple that with narrow forested secondary roads. The word conflagration comes to mind.

13. TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

Please Note: Somebody should teach the TGP people how to read maps. They completely missed route I 91 which is the closest interstate highway to the Monadnock Region. I 93 supports Salem and Manchester. The major roads in and out of Rindge are route 119 and route 202.

- A. Please study how you are going to cross routes 119 and 202 as they are major commercial traffic corridors. New Hampshire's tax free status also causes a significant amount retail sales traffic (Massachusetts people coming to New Hampshire). Please supply copies of your findings to the Rindge Board Of Selectmen and Chamber of Commerce.
- B. Please study the impact of construction interruption on Rindge's retail business sales.

Document alternatives to minimize business impact. Please supply copies of your findings to the Rindge Board Of Selectmen and Chamber of Commerce.

C. Please study the weight of the heavy equipment and our secondary road's carrying capacity. I seriously doubt they were designed to deal with the frequent very heavy loads they will experience during construction. TGP must be required to post a bond large enough to cover all road damage due to construction.

14. AGRICULTURE

A. Please study the pollutants found in the gas carried by the proposed pipeline, as the well documented pipeline leaks, blow downs from compressor stations and ML V's etc. Please document those findings and share them with Rindge's Board of Selectmen and Conservation Commission.

B. Please study pollution caused by Pig launching and receiver stations. Their pollution of ground water (irrigation and live stock watering). Please report your finding to the New England EPA regional office 1 and UNH Extension service as well as the Rindge Conservation Commissions of all impacted New Hampshire towns.

15. PROPERTY VALUES

Please Note: This section contains the first attributed study I've seen from KMI/GP when it comes to describing the benefits etc. this pipeline will bring to the impacted people. There is nothing like a self serving study to help sell us something that we don't need or want.

A. Please study the values of the homes that abutt the proposed pipeline ROW in Rindge before December Of 2014 and now. I know in my case I've lost approximately \$70,000 in value. Document your findings and send them to the Rindge Board Of Selectmen, the Board Of Adjustment and the abutters themselves.

B. Please interview local realtors to determine what impact this proposed pipeline has had on real-estate sales in Cheshire County. Document those findings and send them to the Rindge Board Of Selectmen, the Board Of Adjustment and the abutters themselves.

C. Please get a firm answer from TGP on how much land this proposed pipeline will take of the abutters land. The land taken should be noted by the property's address. As an example, we live on 18 Atlantic Drive. I want to know how much land they are planning to take from me via eminent domain.

16. HOMEOWNERS' INSURANCE

A. Please determine what recourse the abutters will have when our insurance rates are increased due to the construction of the proposed pipeline. Document your findings and mail them to each abutter in Rindge and the New Hampshire Insurance Commissioner.

B. Please determine what our recourse is as abutters given an explosion, fire etc. during pipeline construction and operation. Document your findings and mail them to each abutter in Rindge and the New Hampshire Insurance Commissioner.

17. PROJECT ECONOMIC BENEFITS

Please Note: New Hampshire's state tax structure is geared toward tourism and "sin" tax items, i.e.: cigarettes, liquor. There is no sales tax or income tax,. Just another case of TGP and you folks not doing your home work. This project if it happens, will cost the citizens of New Hampshire, but truly have no benefit I should also point out that Cheshire County will have over one third of the length of entire Proposed pipeline that will run through Southern New Hampshire, but has zero operating (permanent) jobs.

A. Please study how Rindge, NH will realize significant property tax revenues, when, it has been historically documented that pipeline companies have never met promised tax revenue goals. Depreciation and any number tax lawyer driven reasons always finds a way to whittle it down to nickels and

dimes. Document your findings, and present them to the Rindge Board Of Selectman.

- B. Please study how the town of Rindge will recover the loss of tax revenues given the significant loss abutter of land. Document a solution to this issue and present it to the Rindge Board of Selectmen.

18. LOCAL CONSTRUCTION JOBS

Please Note: With the exception one MLV, the proposed pipeline project in Rindge consists of building and laying a bit over 9 miles of 30 inch pipe. I see little need for local labor.

- A. Please determine the actual number of local laborers required and the skills needed. Document the findings and present them to the Rindge Board Of Selectmen.

19. BLASTING

Please Note: Blasting impact on water quality is addressed in section 3 oftbis document. What I will be addressing here is NHDES document: WD-IO-12 on blasting which isn't mentioned in Resource Report 6. The document addresses Best Management Practices for blasting in Granite.

- A. Please study the NHDES Rock Blasting and Water Quality Measures that can be taken to Protect Water Quality and Mitigate Impacts. Please use what is learned to guide TGP in the creation of a BMP that is appropriate for Southern New Hampshire's Geology and Environment.
- B. Please study the impact of the use of explosive materials into blasting boreholes that intersect with fissures in granite resulting in releasing of toxic chemicals into ground water and aquifers beyond the blasting area. Given the number of artesian wells in Cheshire County, I'd strongly recommend that the distance between wells and blasting be significantly increased from the 200 feet TGP suggests.
- C. Please ask TGP to fund the hiring of a third party consultant (Geologist?) to work with NHDES in determining what is a safe distance between wells and the blasting area in a given geology. Their findings should be turned over to the Rindge Board Of Selectmen, Conservation Commission and PERC.

20. BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES FOR BLASTING

Please Note: The following text was extracted from NHDES WD-IO-12

- A. All activities related to blasting shall follow Best Management Practices (BMPs) to prevent contamination of groundwater including preparing, reviewing and following an approved blasting plan; proper drilling, explosive handing and loading procedures; observing the entire blasting procedures; evaluating blasting performance; and bandling and storage of blasted rock.
- (1) Loading pradices. The following blast hole loading practices to mjjnjmize environmental effects shall be followed:
- (a) Drilling logs shall be maintained by the driller and communicated directly to the blaster. The logs shall indicate depths and lengths of voids, cavities, and fault zones or other weak zones encountered as well as groundwater conditions.
 - (b) Explosive products shall be managed on-site so that they are either used in the borehole, returned to the delivery vehicle, or placed in secure containers for off-site disposal.
 - (e) Spillage around the borehole shall either be placed in the borehole or cleaned up and returned to an appropriate vehicle for handling or placement in secured . containers for off-site disposal.
 - (d) Loaded explosives shall be detonated as soon as possible and shall not be left in the blast holes overnight, unless weather or other safety concerns reasonably dictate that detonation should be postponed.
 - (e) Loading equipment shall be cleaned in an area where wastewater can be properly contained and handled in a manner that prevents release of contaminants to the environment.
 - (I) Explosives shall be loaded to maintain good continuity in the column load to promote com-

- plete detonation. Industry accepted loading practices for priming, stemming, decking and column rise need to be attended to.
- (2) Explosive Selection. The following BMPs shall be followed to reduce the potential for ground-water contamination when explosives are used:
 - (a) Explosive products shall be selected that are appropriate for site conditions and safe blast execution.
 - (b) Explosive products shall be selected that have the appropriate water resistance for the site conditions present to minimize the potential for hazardous effect of the product upon ground-water.
 - (3) Prevention of Misfires. Appropriate practices shall be developed and implemented to prevent misfires.
 - (4) Muck Pile Management. Muck piles (the blasted pieces of rock) and rock piles shall be managed in a manner to reduce the potential for contamination by implementing the following measures:
 - (a) Remove the muck pile from the blast area as soon as reasonably possible.
 - (b) Manage the interaction of blasted rock piles and storm water to prevent contamination of water supply wells or surface water.

21. SEISMIC RISK

Please Note: New Hampshire has a history of earthquakes, recorded as far back as February 5, 1663.

TGP even notes it is a seismic area, please see: section 6.4.2.4 of Resource Report 6, lithe state could experience large (6.5 to 1.0 magnitude on the Richter scale) earthquakes.” According to the NHDOS of Homeland Security and Emergency Management (NHDOS’ “HSEM’,) (2014) and the USOS, the overall earthquake risk to the state is high due to the historically built environment. In addition, the unique geology of New Hampshire, cold hard rock geology, can cause seismic waves that can cover an area 4 to 40 times greater than they do in western states and damages can be expected to spread over a greater area.

- A. Please study the impact of earth quakes on a pipeline given our Granite bedrock which is quite close to the surface on the proposed pipeline ROW. Please document those findings and present them to the Rindge Board Of Select:man, NHDES and the USACE. 14
- B. Please determine what construction methods should be used to prevent earthquake damage to the proposed pipeline. Please document those findings and present them to the Rindge Board Of Selectman, NHDES and the USACE.
- C. Please identify consulting resources that can oversee the use of best management practices in the construction of the pipeline to prevent earthquake damage, and have TGP fund the town of Rindge to hire such a consultant.
- D. Please ask TGP to re-examine their route through Southern N.H. as there has to be better places to route the proposed pipeline (at lower risk) or there are more practical approaches such as moving the route back to Massachusetts (a more stable environment).

22. SOILS

- A. Please study the Resource Report 6 (Segment I). The Glacial Till which is predominantly sandy, will allow construction Spills, blasting residue, and pipeline leaks, to percolate pollutants into our ground water and aquifers. The SPCC must deal with this soil type. Please Require TGP to fund a third party monitor (EI?) that will report to the Rindge Board Of Selectmen/Conservation Commission. This Monitor/EI should be able to stop work.
- B. Please study the proposed pipeline route as it has a great deal of hydric soil. I have identified over 39 wetlands (I’m sure there are many more, but posting prevented further travel) and vernal pools on the ROW, many of which stretch across the entire power line ROW. Compacting this soil will

destroy irreplaceable habitat. Matting must be used where avoiding hydric soil isn't possible, but in cases where moving/using heavy equipment can be done on rock or soil where compaction isn't an issue, that route should be chosen. The use of matting and route selection needs to be monitored the person identified in item A above.

- C. Please note that TGP states that when restonnwre-grading work in residential areas, "On agricultural and residential land crossed by the Project, topsoil will be stockpiled and separated from other excavated materials. Rock greater than 4inches in diameter will be removed from the top 12 inches (topsoil layer). " Home owners pay a premium for sifted top soil when they build a home. Rocks less than 4 inches in diameter don't happen in sifted topsoil! This is an unacceptable situation.

13. LAND USE

Please Note: Table 8.1-1 states that Cheshire County has 1.52 miles of wetland that the pipeline crosses, put some boots on the ground! Rindge has twice that amount or more itself I have driven the bulk of the 9 miles of the proposed ROW in Rindge in my Jeep. The state of New Hampshire acknowledges, that Rindge is the wettest town in the Southern tier. You don't have 87 species of Dragonflies without water! Throw in Fitzwilliam and you might add another two miles. Vegetation masks water from the air.

The same table says that the proposed ROW crosses .11 miles of water bodies in Cheshire County, by my math that is approximately 581 feet! Rindge and Fitzwilliam can claim that much. I guess the rest of Cheshire County is a desert.

Table 8.2-1, the 4 homes on Atlantic Drive are abutters the power line ROW. The proposed pipeline's ROW as currently routed will take land from all four homes. The land that will be taken contains three registered Vernal Pools. These pools are an irreplaceable resource (because of the amphibians site fidelity).

- A. Please insist that TGP have people travel the power line ROW on the ground so they truly understand the environment that they are impacting.
- B. Please Study the routing of the pipeline ROW on or about MP 26 in Rindge. Moving the route to the opposite side of the power line ROW will have far less impact on the environment and will save 3 very productive Vernal Pools.

24. EXISTING RESIDENCES AND BUILDINGS

Please Note: That table 8.2-2 in attachment 8b doesn't exist.

The 4 homes on Atlantic Drive, in Rindge, N.H. (2 acre minimum lot size) were constructed with the septic systems in the front of the houses (toward Atlantic Drive) and the wells were placed behind the houses (toward the ROW). The two acre zoning gives the home owner some flexibility should a system fail.

Given current routing of the proposed pipeline, these abutters are between a rock and a hard place. given their well (one well is under 50 feet from the proposed pipeline ROW) locations and the reduction in lot size.

- A. Please Study the routing of the pipeline ROW on or about MP 26 in Rindge. Moving the route to the opposite side of the power line ROW will protect the wells in question and give the residents some latitude given a system failure.

Please Note: The site specific drawing for 12 Atlantic drive doesn't include any of the other nearby residences, structures, roads, wetlands or water bodies.

25. PUBLIC CONSERVATION LAND

Please Note: While Rhododendron State Park is in Fitzwilliam, Richmond and Troy, we maintain the wild flower trail through the park. The park has a large number of native wild flowers, of particular interest and concern are the many wild Orchids present in the park. Please be advised that New Hampshire and

its' citizens will fight any expansion of the power line ROW through the park.

A. Please study how the proposed pipeline will impact the springs (seeps) that feed the MacGregor Meadow portion of Converse Meadow. This conservation area, sits on top of a significant (proven) aquifer, wildlife habitat, Banded Sunfish (endangered species*), Beavers, Great Blue Herons, many species of waterfowl, and amphibians in feeder wetlands. Please document your findings and present them to the Rindge Board Of Selectmen and Conservation Commission.

* Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, New Hampshire and Connecticut.

B. Please study the impact the proposed pipeline will have on the movement of wildlife from the abutting upland forest to the wetlands (Please note a wildlife study blind, which is a permanent structure has been built there for that purpose). Please document your findings and present them to the Rindge Board Of Selectmen and Conservation Commission.

Please Note: That section 8.3.1 etc. doesn't mention Converse Meadow at all. I guess Rindge shunning KMII'OP means that they don't have to research this wetlands complex from the air or on the Internet. This Conservation Area. is Rindge's most popular recreational area (ignoring our many lakes and ponds). Large numbers of people, hike, bird watch, study wildlife, and camp there.

C. Please study the impact pipeline leaks into Converse Meadow as it is the head waters of the Miller River which flows into the Connecticut River. Please present your findings to the Rindge Board Of Selectmen, Conservation Commission and USACE.

26. MUNICIPAL LAND

Please Note: Converse Meadow is jointly held (town of Rindge and Monadnock Conservancy). The Conservancy was granted an easement on 240 acres of the area. The town of Rindge Conservation Commission maintains the site. Please see section 25 above for details.

27. CEMETERIES

Please Note: Online information indicates that there are two graves of Rindge residents who died of smallpox and were buried on the family farm at a location that is currently off route 119 and within the existing utility right-of-way (Find A Grave 2015b). The New Hampshire Old Graveyard Association locates these graves within approximately 100 feet of MP 26.3 of the Wright to Dracut Segment (New Hampshire Portion) (Segment I)

I have studied this area as part of my wetlands work. The above paragraph is an accurate description of the grave sites location and its' history.

The slate head and foot stones are elaborately carved but fragile, a piece of heavy equipment backing up could destroy an irreplaceable historic site.

A. Please use your influence as a regulatory body to see that temporary barriers (Jersey Barriers?) are placed around the site to protect it from inadvertent accidents. Please confirm this mitigation approach with the Rindge Board Of Selectmen, Conservation Commission and Historical Society.

28. SPECIALTY CROP, ORGANIC, AND TREE FARMS

Please Note: There is an organic farm in Rindge that is impacted by the proposed pipeline, one would think TGP would spend a little more effort to identify it ...

29. MILLER HUC8 WATERSHED

Please Note: See item 25 C above for Miller River comments.

30. CONTOOCCOOK HUC8 WATERSHED

A. Please study the impact pipeline leaks into Contoocook watershed as flows North into the Merrimack River which is a navigable waterway. Please present your findings

to the Rindge Board Of Selectmen, Conservation Commission and USACE.

31. AIR QUALITY

Please Note: I find it interesting that section 9.1 makes no mention of Methane, Benzene, Toluene, Ethylbenzene and Xylene. I guess one can assume that the gas and oil industry lobbyists have done their usual petro-dollar sleight of hand in the congress.

I'm not a chemist or MD or environmental scientist, but I do know that Methane is the worst of the greenhouse gases and that Benzene is a known carcinogen. As to the others, I do know that they are released to the atmosphere at compressor stations.

What really galls me is the fact that I wouldn't have to breath this crap if the pipeline isn't placed here. Without dispersion modeling who knows where the New Ipswich compressor station blow downs and leaks will blow. The people in Temple, N.H. believe the historic prevailing winds will cany them to their kids school. For their sake I hope they are wrong.

You folks should all sit in a closed room and let a compressor station vent into it. Better yet why don't you require all of the compressor stations this proposed project will eventually require, to pump (compress) their leaks and blow downs to Houston, TX. Better yet, right into KM's Board Room.

I off-road in Bradford, P A. on occasion. I have firsthand experience with small compressor stations. The ones I've bumped into in the woods are usually run by 500 to 1,000 HP diesels. they make enough racket that you can hear them a mile away. Now when I think of compressor stations of 40 - 98 thousand HP, I picture large 24 X 7 airports. then you add the 24 x 7 light pollution!! I assumed we all moved here to Southern New Hampshire for KM/fGP's entertainment.

- A. Please study the standard practice of blow down (depressurizing) compressors that are taken offline as this practice typically vents 15 million cubic feet of Methane etc. into the atmosphere. Please document your findings and present them to the New Ipswich Board Of Selectmen, Conservation Commission and EPA Region 1 office.
- B. Please study how simple changes can be made to operating practices and in the design of blow down systems that can save money and significantly reduce Methane emissions. I found The following suggestions on the Internet:
 1. Keeping compressors pressurized when off-line.
 2. Connecting blow down vent lines to the fuel gas system and recovering all, or a portion, of the vented gas to the fuel gas system.
 3. Installing static seals on compressor rod packing.
 4. Installing ejectors on compressor blow down vent lines.

Keeping compressors fully pressurized when off-line achieves immediate payback there are no capital costs and emissions are avoided by reducing the net leakage rate. Routing blow down vent lines to the fuel gas system or to a lower pressure gas line reduces fuel costs for the compressor or other facility equipment, in addition to avoiding blow down emissions. Static seals installed on compression rods eliminate gas leaking back through the rod packing while a compressor is shutdown under pressure. An ejector uses the discharge of an adjacent compressor as motive to pump blow down or leaked gas from a shut down compressor into the suction of an operating compressor or a fuel gas system. Benefits of these practices include fewer bulk gas releases, lower leak rates, and lower most cases of less than a year.

- C. Please document your findings from the study (item B above) and present them to the New Ipswich Board Of Selectmen, Conservation Commission and EPA Region 1 office.

32. CLIMATE OF PROJECT AREA

Please Note: Is there a reason why table 9.1-2 avoids any mention of Pennsylvania, Connecticut, and New

Hampshire? There are no TBDs for cities in those 3 states, so I'll consider it another example of slap dash work by TGP. Just another example of Snake Oil Salesmen expecting a cake walk through New Hampshire.

I got the following off the internet, for Rindge, New Hampshire:

Rindge average weather by month

Month	Temperature °F				Avg Rainfall (mm)		Avg snow days	Avg Fog days
	Average		Absolute		Daily	Monthly		
	max	min	max	min				
January	33.1	14.4	66.9	-20.0	1.7	52.6	16	5
February	34.9	14.7	63.0	-13.0	1.8	51.1	14	4
March	44.1	22.6	77.0	-8.0	2.2	69.4	10	5
April	59.0	35.1	88.0	15.1	2.4	13.2	4	1
May	67.1	43.2	87.8	23.0	2.9	88.8	0	2
June	77.0	53.4	91.9	35.6	3.6	109.3	0	4
July	80.6	57.6	90.0	42.1	3.8	119.1	0	5
August	79.5	56.3	93.9	41.0	3.2	98.4	0	6
September	73.4	48.7	90.0	32.0	2.8	83.1	0	6
October	60.6	38.1	82.9	19.0	3.2	98.9	1	3
November	50.7	31.3	72.0	8.1	2.7	81.1	5	3
December	39.0	21.2	70.0	-11.0	2.4	13.6	12	3

As you can see we are cooler than the places noted, year round. The average and absolute minimums are real. Because of our elevation 1,100 to 1,200 feet above sea level and proximity to Monadnock Mountain (cold air sinks), visitors love to spend their summers here.

33. AMBIENT AIR QUALITY DATA (NEW HAMPSHIRE)

Please Note: Table 9.1.7 What is Quabbin Reservoir (MA) doing in the New Hampshire Table? Are they trying to make us look like a highly polluted state? My youngest daughter went to UMASS Amherst. I know the Quabbin and that area. TGP is comparing Apples and Oranges. Miller St. Park sits on the Temple Mountain Saddle (a notch). The 18 wheelers coming up both sides of the notch produce a ton of pollutants This whole thing is really becoming a creep show.

- A. Please have TGP monitor the air quality along the power line ROW before construction, during construction and again once the proposed pipeline is in operation. This I feel would be a true measure of the impact on air quality.
- B. Please document the findings (item A above) and present them to the Rindge Board Of Selectmen, Conservation Commission and EPA Region 1 office.

34. ALTERNATIVES

Please Note: New Hampshire is the only state in New England that exports power. The following is May 2015 data (Source EIA.Gov):

Fuel Type	N.H. Percentage	U.S.Average
Petroleum Fired	Alternate Source (NM)	0.03 %
Natural Gas Fired	30.7 %	31.4 %
Coal Fired	0.1 %	32.6 %
Nuclear	51.5 %	20.5 %
Hydroelectric	6.9 %	6.2 %
Other Renewables	10.5 %	8.2 %

New Hampshire was the first state to attempt to harvest wind as a power generating source (1980). While New Hampshire's current governor has found it convenient to side with the other governors of New England on the need for natural gas. The population of New Hampshire and its power generating

utilities have opted for other sources of fuel.

The population of New Hampshire has historically opted for conservation (better insulation etc.) and alternate fuel sources (wood, off the grid etc.). New Hampshire has a vibrant and growing wood pellet industry.

Three quarters of the state will never have the infrastructure to support natural gas distribution at a local level. In the rural areas of the state, customers that want to use gas for whatever reason use propane that is distributed by local providers. EIA states one in five New Hampshire homes use natural gas for home heating. I don't have a map available, but picture a line from the Massachusetts border along the west side of the Merrimack River (Nashua, Manchester and perhaps Concord). Then from the North side of Concord East to the coast and south to the Massachusetts border again.

New Hampshire has created a renewable energy portfolio standard that requires 24.8% of the electricity sold in the state to come from renewable energy resources by 2025.

You people at FERC and KMI/GP know that, but confessing and calling the proposed pipeline through Southern New Hampshire an export pipeline (from New Hampshire's perspective) would be like you taking a bullet to the head ...

35. NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE

A. Please really study and document why the No-Action alternative makes sense to New Hampshire.

I understand taking that approach isn't in your charter, but this state really doesn't want or need NED. A case hasn't been made for this pipeline. It generates a lot of cost and no benefit for New Hampshire. If you, FERC can show the citizens of New Hampshire that this makes sense, we will at least listen to you, while it has been apparent, you haven't listened to us.

B. Please study this situation, this pipeline doesn't belong in New Hampshire, we New Hampshire rate payers get absolutely no value from it but we will be taxed (rate increases) to pay for it, while Southern New England and KMI/GP will reap the benefit. This pipeline belongs in Massachusetts, not New Hampshire. I understand where the folks in southern New England are coming from, but we (New Hampshire) don't need the gas.

36. ENERGY CONSERVATION

Please Note: There is no pent up demand for Natural gas in New Hampshire. I assume you noticed how many customers Kinder Morgan has found for the gas it is peddling during the past year here in New Hampshire. If the New Hampshire PUC doesn't approve the Liberty deal Kinder Morgan won't have any contracts here.

A. Please note how New Hampshire has used energy conservation to reduce our consumption and cost.

There is no steady increase in demand for natural gas in New Hampshire.

B. The only people saying that there is a need for natural gas here in New Hampshire are the Public Relations, Advertising firms hired by Kinder Morgan and gas industry trade associations.

37. ENERGY ALTERNATIVES

Please Note: As the table I created on page 20 above the state of New Hampshire leads the national average in the use of alternative energy sources. I should note that the state has created a 10 year state energy strategy, a key element of the strategy is the development of internal (to the state) renewable energy resources. Adding more natural gas to the fuel mix only delays the development of these internal resources. Natural gas is truly a bridge fuel to nowhere.

38. WIND POWER

Please Note: TGP has only mentioned two down sides to wind power worth discussing:

A. Please study the advances made in protecting birds and bats from wind turbine blades.

As a matter of fact there is a company in Nashua, New Hampshire that manufactures blade lighting that keeps birds and bats away from the blades.

Believe me when the dust settles, it will be found that gas pipelines do more damage to the environment during construction, operation and maintenance of pipelines. The White House is even starting a crack down on gas pipeline leaks because Methane's role as a green house gas.

B. Yes wind isn't constant, but no fuel is perfect. That is why there are so many fuel choices. Here in New Hampshire biomass fueled power plant, could plug the gap when the wind isn't blowing.

Take a drive through Kansas and look at the future of wind power. The wind turbines are here to stay.

39. SOLAR POWER

Please Note: Please study how solar power has evolved. TGP is so intent on pushing the Gold Rush gas from Pennsylvania, that they are blind to evolving technology. They are now installing PV panels on South facing home roofs and connecting them to the grid with smart interface metering devices. It is a win-win situation for the home owner and the grid .

40. GEOTHERMAL POWER

Please Note: Please study how TGP missed the whole point here (I should add PERC because you folks missed it too). States like New Hampshire will do whatever is necessary with energy to move into the next century. On a local scale people are installing geothermal heat pumps when they build a new homes.

41. COAL

Please Note: I am again going to refer you to the table I created on page 20 above. New Hampshire is selling the last of its coal fired power generating plants. They are now no longer part of our power generating mix.

Yes natural gas is better than coal, but it too is an antique fuel that has no place in the 21st century. Methane is nobody's friend.

42. FUEL OIL

Please Note: I am again going to refer you to the table I created on page 20 above. Fuel oil is only used as an alternate fuel for power generation in New Hampshire. So TGP can throw stones at fuel oil all they want, it isn't going to help them sell natural gas to New Hampshire.

As to home heating, I have to admit fuel oil has a large market share in New Hampshire (and New England for that matter). Being a fossil fuel, its' days are numbered also. We heat with fuel oil, and we just installed a Mitsubishi heat pump system, it provides both heating and air conditioning. Many families I know has switched to wood pellets (locally produced fuel) for their heating needs.

43. NUCLEAR

Please Note: I am again going to refer you to the table I created on page 20 above. The Seabrook Station is the largest and youngest nuclear power plant in New England. It generates 51 % of our power. It will still be generating electricity when the Marcellus Shale runs out of gas (thirty years by KMs estimate).

44. HYDROELECTRIC POWER

Please Note: Hydroelectric power is what makes New Hampshire a power exporting state. We can make more if needed and a lot cheaper than this proposed pipeline will cost us in dollars and damage to our environment. Given New Hampshire's geography and water supplies, small scale hydro projects could be put anywhere without damaging the environment.

I should also note that EVERSOURCE appears to have come up with a compromise on NOTHERNP ASS that will work, so tons of cheap hydro power is coming our way.

45. FUEL CELLS AND OTHER ENERGY SOURCES

Please Note: None of these power sources make sense in the context of New Hampshire's power needs or New England's for that matter.

46. ENERGY ALTERNATIVES CONCLUSION

Please Note: First I think KM and TGP need to admit that New Hampshire is just a physical conduit to move gas elsewhere. Stop trying to tell us we need this gas. New Hampshire doesn't have the demand nor the infrastructure to deal with KM/TGP's NED project.

New Hampshire was chosen as a route at the last minute because, Kinder Morgan thought we would be a push over. We aren't as FERC is now learning.

Let's assume KM/TGP is really concerned about alternatives. Considering they will be going out of business in the future (not soon enough), unless they come up with an alternative business model.

I would like to suggest that they go into the business of building gas fired power generating plants in Pennsylvania and Texas and ship power to the grid, if they were really forward thinking, they could produce technology to create smart grids.

47. SYSTEM ALTERNATIVES

Please Note: The proposed NED pipeline doesn't have any power generating utility contracts. So it won't reduce New Hampshire's electricity rates. On the other hand, Spectra Energy Partners' and Northeast Energy's proposed Access Northeast Project, will supply gas to power generating utilities.

A. Please study the differences in the approaches used by Spectra Energy Partners Access Northeast project and KMII'GP's NED project:

- I. Reducing the environmental impact (flora, Fauna, wetlands etc.) on New Hampshire.
2. Protect New Hampshire's quality of life by minimizing impact on its' landscape, infrastructure and community.
3. Improve power system reliability by directly supplying natural gas to power generating utilities.
4. Making New Hampshire more economically competitive by reducing electric costs.

B. Please document your findings (ftom item A) above and present them to the Rindge Board of Selectmen, Conservation Commission, Governor Hassan, Senators Ayott and Shaheen and Representative Kuster.

Please Note: My response will be documented to Resource Reports 11 and 12 will follow in a second document.

Jan A. Griska
Rindge, N.H. 03461
603-899-3083

{end of 20150904-0043}

20150904-4006

Office of the Selectmen
TOWN OF GREENVILLE NH
P.o. Box 343
Greenville, NH 03048-0343
Phone: (603) 878-2084

September 2, 2015

Mr. Eric Tomasi/Environmental Engineer Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Re: Docket No. PF14-22-000 Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Mr. Tomasi:

I am writing to express Greenville's concerns regarding the effect that both construction and operation of a pipeline and compressor station will potentially have in relation to our Water Plant and its operations.

As you can see by the enclosed map, prepared by our Planning Commission, the proposed compressor station falls wholly within the Greenville Water Department's Drinking Water Source Protection Area. In addition, the Plant itself is within ~ mile of the proposed compressor station.

We respectfully request that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission require, as a condition of any approvals of the NED Project, that Kinder Morgan, or their subsidiaries perform preconstruction (pre-blasting or pre-horizontal drilling) testing of the source waters and of our Water Plant. This should include but not be limited to videotaping the underwater concrete structures of our Plant. In addition, they should be required to submit a plan showing how they will verify that their construction and operations will have no adverse effect on either the "Drinking Water Source Area" or on our physical Water Plant or its operations.

In addition, we would like to know what, if any, retardants would potentially be used in the case of a gas fire at the Compressor Station. Obviously, any leak of the Plant or retardant use in the case of fire would adversely affect our Drinking Water Source.

I have enclosed a copy of my testimony, delivered at the Milford, NH, FERC Scoping Session.

Please let me know if you have any questions or comments regarding this request.

Sincerely,

Kelley Collins

Town Administrator

COMPRESSOR STATION (New Ipswich) - Greenville's Water Plant (water supply)

FERC Scoping Meeting, Milford NH, July 30, 2015

My Name is Kelley Collins, I am the Town Administrator in Greenville NH, which is a member of the NH Municipal Pipeline Coalition

The Town of Greenville (population 2105) has a town-owned water plant that is physically located on Route 45 in Temple and draws its water from the Tobey Reservoir, also in Temple.

The Greenville Water Department has approximately 356 water connections, one of which services a 190 unit mobile home park. The water service includes all the downtown businesses, one of which is a manufacturing facility that produces vinegar and mustard, as well as restaurants, convenient stores, a bakery, etc. In addition, the Greenville Water Plant provides the water for the Temple Elementary School in Temple, as well as, the water for pressurized fire hydrants in that area of Route 45 in Temple.

The proposed Compressor Station for the NED project will be approximately 7/10th of a mile from the Greenville Water Plant. Since our Water Plant provides water to approximately 65% of our population, we have grave concerns regarding any type of pollution of the Tobey Reservoir, as well as any underground disruption of source waters of the Tobey Reservoir.

The Town of Greenville would like Kinder Morgan to provide environmental studies showing that the blow-downs and general operation(s) of the proposed Compressor Station will have no impact whatsoever on the volume or purity of the Tobey Reservoir and that it will not adversely affect water department operations.

20150904-4007

{PRIVILEGED}

NED Pipeline Map Compressor Station

20150904-4008

{9 pages}

skip to end of 20150904-4008

New Hampshire Fish and Game Department

11 Hazen Drive, Concord, NH 03301-6500

September 4, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, N.E., Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426

RE: Request for Comment on the second draft of the Environmental Resource Reports (dated July 24, 2015) and Project Scope for the Northeast Energy Direct Project, Docket No. PF14-22-000, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC

Dear Secretary Bose:

The NH Fish and Game Department is the State agency responsible for the protection, conservation and management of the State's fish, wildlife and marine resources and their habitats. As such, the Department is responsible to provide direction and guidance to many proposed project actions that may affect these resources. For this reason, the Department would like to take this opportunity to comment on the second draft (dated July 24, 2015) of the Environmental Resource reports for this project.

I offer the following comments.

Report #3 – Fish, Wildlife and Vegetation

As noted within the report, the information was compiled using agency correspondence, GIS and desktop searches. In addition, property access within NH has only been approximately 25% for all the impacted properties along the proposed pipeline. It will be imperative that the applicant addresses the data gaps with actual on-the-ground surveys, in order for the Department staff to adequately understand the impacts that may be associated with the construction of this project on fish and wildlife species, especially Threatened and/or Endangered species.

At this time, the Department could not determine the potential impacts on many species within NH that may be impacted; for example, Threatened and Endangered snakes and turtles within the project areas. This was discussed at the May, 2015 meeting with Department staff and the project members and consultants (Minutes enclosed).

Also, I do not understand how the pre-filing information process could aid FERC in determining the viability of a certificate of public convenience or necessity without actual ground surveys, including the information from the finalized wildlife surveys. Without this type of information, it is not possible to measure the amount of potential impacts to fish and wildlife species and their associated habitats.

In FERC's last date request to the applicant, FERC requested the identification of all perennial streams crossed by the project; however, the 55 perennial streams in NH that are proposed to be crossed were not listed as indicated in 2.2-7. The table was not within the report relative to NH. In addition, there are a number of data gaps and vague information within the Resource reports that need to be supplemented before potential direct impacts caused by this project may be determined.

It would be helpful to have maps that more clearly identify how streams are going to be crossed. For example, will the crossings be perpendicular to the pipeline or parallel. This information is important because it will depict the streambank areas that will now be exposed by the proposed tree cutting associated with the pipeline installation. If the majority of the proposed pipeline runs parallel to many of the perennial streams with cold water fish. This could have an adverse effect by the potential elevation of water temperatures within the stream. Plans for the restoration of cover within these streams should be included in mitigating for this potential affect, as suggested in a meeting with New Hampshire Fish and Game Department (NHF-GD) staff in May, 2015.

Also, there is a need for maps with a larger measured scale so that the crossings are easier to identify than has already been presented.

Table 3.1-4 lists the Brook trout as stocked in NH; however, this section does not identify the potential of "wild brook trout" populations within the affected streams. This should be included in this document, in

order to address potential impacts caused by the pipeline crossings. Continued consultation with the Department should be pursued to obtain this information from Department records and/or listing of potential “wild trout” streams based on habitats. The NH Wildlife Action plan may help with this information.

Section 3.2 and 3.1.3 does not include, but should include information from the NHF&G Department’s Wildlife Action plan, which identifies and ranks the values of habitats throughout the State, as well as, the importance of these habitats to wildlife species in NH. This information is crucial to understanding the potential loss of valuable habitats and their potential impacts on the species that utilize these habitats.

This section does not include information on the potential impacts on deer yards within the proposed pipeline corridor, as suggested in the May, 2015 meeting with staff and project members and consultants.

Section 3.2 - Identifies approximately 8.77 acres of the Souhegan River Wildlife Management Area (WMA) as potentially being affected, The Souhegan River runs through the Souhegan WMA for over one mile within a deep gorge. Any pipeline crossing through the gorge will be a challenge. The Department is concerned about how this will be attempted and what impacts it will have on the gorge and staging areas that might be needed to facilitate a crossing.

The Department also is interested in having a better understanding of the impacts on the property associated with access from Kimball Hill Road, Batchelder Road and Adams Hill Road as well as Route 31. Additional access roads are being proposed within this WMA; however, there is no information on the extent or location of these additional access roads within the reports.

Section 3.2.2.6. - Impacts to interior forest habitats does not have any information and is noted as TBD. This needs to be addressed. Also, there is no information on vernal pools in NH; which would be required for all wetland permitting. The NH Wildlife Action plan vegetation surveys could also help with identifying important vegetative habitats conducive to vernal pools.

Miscellaneous Comments:

In addition, indirect impacts of large segments of existing cold-water streams that may be exposed to higher temperatures due to deforestation of the shore banks, should be explained within the indirect impact section. Cumulative impacts should consider the development of large industrial/commercial enterprises within the Londonderry section of the proposed pipeline and its potential cumulative impacts to New England cottontail habitats and subsequent impacts to populations within Section 3.4.2.1.3 and 8.6.2.1.

BMP’s for construction should include coco matting rather than erosion control jute matting, especially in locations with Threatened and/or Endangered snakes. Although jute matting is considered biodegradable, the plastic mesh that remains after the jute has deteriorated can entrap snakes causing their mortality. If this is not required within the BMP’s for this project, then the potential of entrapping snakes should be included in the indirect impacts section of this report.

Alternative section-One of the explanations for choosing the alternative route in New Hampshire is identified within Table 10.3-3 for comparison of the Wright Dracut Segment to the Massachusetts alternative. As evidenced in this table, aside from larger impacts in Massachusetts due to State forests and trails, there are greater project impacts to New Hampshire on all other environmental factors that were measured in this table. However, the Dracut segment is still considered the preferred option for this project. This information should be further evaluated under section 10.2.

Northeast Energy Needs - It would be beneficial to see evidence that the project will have a significant benefit to the energy needs of the State of NH rather than discussion on the benefits to the Northeast, in general. There is little information within the Resource reports that seem to justify the potential environmental impacts for locating 77 miles of this pipeline in NH that would actually benefit the citizens in the State.

The Resource reports indicate that there is a blanket “need” for additional energy within the Northeast; however, the report failed to include a large project proposed in New Hampshire that will be bringing hydropower energy from Canada (Northern Pass), which will increase the energy supply within the Northeast. This project already has a docket number (2015-06) with the New Hampshire’s Site Evaluation Committee (SEC)

as of this date. Also, hydropower and wind energy have been increased in New Hampshire in recent years. These additional energy sources should also be included in the determination of energy supply and needs of the Northeast, in order to better understand the energy needs of New England.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the scope of the Resource reports for this project. If you have any comments or questions, please do not hesitate to contact me via email or phone at 603-271-3511.

Sincerely;

Carol Henderson
NH Fish and Game Department
Environmental Review Coordinator

Tennessee Gas Pipeline
Company, L.L.C.
a Kinder Morgan company

**Northeast Energy Direct Project
NH F&G Meeting Minutes**

DATE: May 19, 2015

Location: New Hampshire Fish and Game Offices, Concord, NH

TIME: 1:00 PM – 4:00 PM

Attendees

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
Carol Henderson	NH F&G	Mark Gardella*	AECOM
Kim Tuttle	NH F&G	Sergio Bonilla*	AECOM
Mike Marchand	NH F&G	Theresa Albanese*	HMM
Heidi Holman	NH F&G	Adele Fiorillo	Normandeau
Matt Carpenter	NH F&G	Sarah Barnum	Normandeau
Kasia Ingram	Kinder Morgan	Rick Simmons	Normandeau
Barry Duff*	Kinder Morgan	Harry Stewart	Normandeau
Tim O’Sullivan	AECOM		

* Teleconference

General Meeting Purpose:

Provide the New Hampshire Fish and Game Department (NH F&G) with a general overview of the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project. Present to NH F&G the Project Team’s current understanding of the relevant NH state- and federal-listed species (including MBTA) associated with NED and communicate Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company’s (Tennessee) plans to address each species and/or topic. Establish an open dialogue with NH F&G to form proactive stance in addressing NH F&G concerns. Provide NH F&G with updates regarding ongoing tasks and continue to formulate strategy to address issues related to state- and federal - listed species and associated surveys on the NED Project.

- After general introductions of those around the table in the conference room, Adele Fiorillo and Kasia Ingram present the NED Project overview. Overview discussions included describing the geographic extent of the Project, identifying the permitting agencies involved, including FERC, and bringing NH F&G up to date on the permitting process to date. Kasia noted certain survey activities kicked off on other parts of the Project last summer, but were suspended for the winter. Survey activities (wetlands, vernal pools, T&E and cultural) started back up this spring and are ongoing. Kasia also briefly described the status of the FERC pre-filing process, and the history of the Project, including the adaption of the NY and NH Powerline Alternatives back in December, which resulted in a shift of a portion of the Project alignment into NH. Kasia explained the alignment shift allowed for a large amount of collocation with existing overhead electric trans-

mission lines in NH and that some aspects of the Project design were still under development.

- Carol Henderson (NH F&G) stated DES has not been involved up to this point with the NED FERC calls. Kasia indicated Eric Tomasi setup and runs the FERC calls and call invitations were sent to those agencies who had expressed an interest in participating, and that she would need to check on who was on the standing invitation list for the call. Kasia added that the project team met with the DES in early April to discuss the Project and permitting expectations. Adele noted the NED Project team would ensure the SEC was made aware of the call information. Carol further notes that NH Congressional staff have been requesting more meetings regarding the NED Project. Adele notes Tennessee has held many public meetings, including the FERC open houses, and Kasia followed up noting that town meetings and other outreach meetings continued to be held and are ongoing. Project meetings will also be held as part of the SEC process, and FERC will be holding their own scoping meetings across the Project.
- Mike Marchand (NH F&G) questions if the Project would still go through SEC. Adele responds in the affirmative, further indicating that the filing date is currently targeted for early November, with application acceptance anticipated in December. Harry Stewart indicates SEC pre-filing hearings are also needed prior to the filing.
- Adele reiterates the majority of the route is collocated with existing Eversource Energy (Eversource) overhead transmission lines and that this was done to lessen impacts and to take advantage of existing utility corridors. Kim Tuttle (NH F&G) inquires as to the location of the specific areas that are not proposed for collocation. Mike Marchand follows Kim's inquiry with a request for Tennessee to provide these locations. Kasia indicated that there is a table (Table 1.1-2) within the filed draft Resource Report 1 which indicates by milepost the locations of collocation. The areas where the alignment is not collocated is limited, as there are certain areas across the alignment where minor deviations occur. This table includes the alignment and collocation information as it is currently proposed, however alternatives continue to be reviewed, and any change to the proposed alignment will be included in future filings of the environmental report and will also be communicated to F&G through updated consultations, as needed.
- Carol inquires as to the extent of the expansion of the existing active portion of the Eversource ROW. Kasia responds indicating these details are still being worked out with the utility companies. However, the current proposed pipeline alignment is proposed to be approximately 5 feet outside of the utility easement. Further discussions are in progress with the utility company to determine the locations of the utility poles within their easement and how much of the existing easement may be used. Kasia further explains the difference between the permanent easement and the size of the right-of-way (ROW) that will be needed for construction. Kasia states that the typical construction workspace is planned to be approximately 100 feet in width, however there will be variations across the alignment where there are needs for additional temporary workspace and other areas where there will be a reduction in workspace (i.e. at wetland crossings). Kasia added that the permanent easement is planned to be 50 feet in width. Adele follows up indicating that the extent of these areas is often dictated by FERC. Adele then presents information regarding environmental considerations (page two from meeting handout fully covered).
- Matt Carpenter (NH F&G Fisheries Biologist) inquires how streams are crossed. Kasia indicates that for most stream crossings the subject reach of stream bed would be isolated from the rest of the waterbody utilizing either a dam and pump or flume technique, and that the stream bed and banks would be returned to pre-construction condition following placement of the pipe. Tim O'Sullivan indicates that for some of the larger crossings, a horizontal directional drill (HDD) option may also be utilized. Kasia added that use of HDD crossings will be limited (only three HDDs are currently planned for the NH portion of the project) as there are significant workspace requirements and conditions must be suitable to such crossing methods. Kasia noted that the Souhegan River and Merrimack River are currently planned to be crossed by HDD, and that geotechnical analysis is required to further assess this crossing method at specific locations.
- Adele leads discussion on aerial photograph interpretations, noting that this activity is ongoing to begin to address no access areas. Adele further notes that the high resolution aerial photographs are being used in

conjunction with LiDAR generated topography data for desktop habitat studies and other considerations and that data gaps resulting from no access will be filled in at a later date.

- Mike Marchand and Carol Henderson inquire how Tennessee will deal with data gaps in the permit applications. Carol indicates she is aware that some agencies have approved the aerial photograph interpretation method but that there is a need to ground truth the aerial photograph interpretation in some areas. Tim O'Sullivan responds that some surveys may have to be done after FERC issues the certificate. Kasia follows up indicating that access permissions continue to be acquired and that the expectation is that the aerial photography will be used to begin the permit application process where access has not been granted, however Tennessee understands that the permits will not be issued before necessary on-the-ground surveys are completed. Adele notes this will be a multi-year process.
- Mike Marchand notes he will need to understand the construction methods before he can provide recommendations on impact avoidance and minimization. Mike further notes that after seeing the picture of the cleared ROW included in the handout, his perspective on the level of impact has been changed. Kasia responds by indicating the picture is an accurate representation of upland pipeline construction. Kasia then proceeds to give an overview of the general construction sequencing for a pipeline as well as a general overview of the differences between upland construction and wetland construction where additional BMPs are utilized.
- Kim asks how big the pipe is. Kasia responds by indicating it is currently proposed as 36" (clarification: there is also a 30" option).
- Carol inquired regarding the width of the existing Eversource ROW. Kasia indicates she is unsure of the extent of the existing easement (clarification: as is Eversource) and that Tennessee is continuing to have discussions with the utility company to obtain additional information regarding their easement.
- Tim O'Sullivan indicates trees may be felled in the winter by hand/chainsaws and left in place for removal in the spring to comply with tree clearing restrictions. Mike questions why the trees would not be felled and removed at the same time. Kim agrees. Kasia indicated there is often a need to fell trees to meet restriction windows (migratory birds and bats), so the trees must be felled in the winter, however there are concerns with winter construction (largely safety as well as environmental impact), which usually necessitates felling the trees and returning in the spring to remove them. Tim indicates Tennessee will provide NH F&G with the full strategy for tree clearing and provide reasons why it is done this way as these details are further developed. Mike expressed concern that the felled timber may be desirable as potential cover or habitat for certain species and that could pose an issue if felled timber is left for removal until the spring.
- Matt Carpenter questions how leaks are detected. Kasia explains that the pressure in the system is monitored 24 hours a day and that Tennessee also conducts periodic aerial surveys and ground patrols to look for signs of encroachment or potential issues, as well as conducting periodic internal inspection of the pipeline to identify potential corrosion or defects. Additionally, isolation valves can be closed remotely in less than 60 seconds.
- Mike Marchand states he needs to see the layout of the workspace in relation to the existing habitat to determine how much forest is to be cleared as opposed to scrub/shrub or other habitats. Adele indicates that land cover types are being interpreted from the high resolution aerial photography for the entire 400' survey corridor. Carol interjects seeking confirmation that the 400' corridor is just for survey and not for construction. Adele and Kasia indicate that is correct and the 400' corridor is being looked at in case the pipeline needs to be shifted one way or another. Kasia further notes that feedback from state and federal agencies, landowners and communities that suggest reroutes will be looked at.
- Tim O'Sullivan notes that while impacts to various habitat types will be quantified as part of the Project's permit applications and that mitigation will be discussed in the future in the context of impacts, one of the main goals for the meeting was to review the species list provided by the NH NHB and to come to an understanding with NH F&G regarding which species would require survey and what exactly that may entail. Mike Marchand states that while the EO information is important, in most cases NH F&G has not done any

site specific surveys. Mike added that the area west of the Merrimack in particular has not been well studied by F&G. Tim indicates that during the course of other field survey work (wetlands/vernal pools) Tennessee's consultants will document and report all state-listed species observations to NH F&G. Matt Carpenter states Tennessee should add wild brook trout to the list and that if Tennessee provides NH F&G with a list of streams crossed by the NED Project, NH F&G could provide them with an indication of which streams hold wild brook trout. Rick Simmons and Matt Carpenter will coordinate this effort.

- Discussion then turns to the overall T&E list provided at the meeting. Sarah Barnum discusses grassland birds (Grasshopper and Vesper Sparrow) indicating these species are documented at the Anheuser-Busch site and unlikely to occur elsewhere along the ROW. Sarah further indicates Tennessee's approach will be to assume presence given the well-documented occurrence, and abide by a time of year restriction (May 25-July 31). Sarah also raised removal of vegetation (mowing) as a potential avoidance measure, in conjunction with monitors, as needed, to allow construction to proceed into the restricted time period. Kasia added that Tennessee will need to take into consideration potential timing restrictions across the Project, as there may be areas where multiple timing restrictions are suggested that would severely limit construction. In those cases we would like to find suitable mitigation that would still meet the requirement goals, but would also allow the construction schedule to be met. Tim O'Sullivan notes this area is along the Merrimack River, which has been identified as a likely HDD site and therefore, the aboveground impacts may be lessened.
- Kim asks if Tennessee gets data regarding bird species from New Hampshire Audubon. Tim replies that we can but we usually take direction on species locations from state and federal agencies. Tim further indicates that generally speaking grassland birds receive a net benefit from natural gas pipeline ROWs.
- Sarah continues the species list discussion by indicating that since Marsh Wrens are on the list from NH F&G but do not have any legal status in NH that surveys for this species are not planned. Sarah follows this by indicating the same is true for all of the odonates on the list.
- Matt Carpenter indicates that he is less worried about the construction phase of the Project and is much more concerned about how the streams are put back together after the pipe has been put in place, further indicating that his concern also applies to the regular maintenance activities that occur. Matt goes on to state his concerns pertaining to stream restoration by indicating that too much sediment left or placed in the stream could lead to subsurface flow at times of low water, and that if the stream bed and banks are not put back together properly, it could lead to erosion. Matt concluded his remarks by stating a preference for providing as much shade as possible within 50' of the streams to better maintain cooler water temperatures. Mike Marchand asks Matt if any considerations are different for streams that contain brook trout. Matt replies Tennessee should treat all perennial streams the same.
- Matt Carpenter inquires if there are any post-construction monitoring requirements. Kasia responds that FERC requires post-construction re-vegetation monitoring that includes looking for potential issues such as erosion, subsidence and overall vegetative cover to make sure the areas are stable. Tennessee will also continue monitoring the ROW for any other detrimental issues. Kasia also added that there are additional postconstruction monitoring requirements for wetland and waterbody crossings, and that the period of monitoring will be determined through the permitting process with USACE and the state agencies.
- Mike Marchand asks Matt Carpenter if there was a need for baseline stream surveys. Matt responds in the negative, reiterating his main concern is how the streams will be reconstructed and further stating there may be some opportunities to improve habitat in the impacted riparian zones. Kim Tuttle asks Matt if there are records for bridles shiner in the Project area. Matt responds in the negative, stating records for the species are historic.
- Carol Henderson asks if as part of the stream restoration, Tennessee could add additional "structure" to the stream channels to provide cover for aquatic species, such as logs or woody debris. Kasia responds that Tennessee would be required to adhere to the USACE, state permits, as well as FERC requirements, and that we are required to restore the stream crossing to pre-construction condition. Kasia added that certain types of habitat enhancement may be possible, however that would have to be discussed and reviewed further. Harry

Stewart notes this could be part of the overall mitigation for the Project.

- Heidi Holman (NH F&G) notes there are updated records for the New England cottontail (NEC) in Hudson and Londonderry. Tim O’Sullivan inquires how we can obtain this information and asks if Heidi and Sarah can coordinate on that. Heidi and Sarah agree to coordinate on this. Sarah indicates the approach for NEC will be preliminary habitat assessments and then if it is determined that suitable habitat exists, pellet survey would be performed. Tim notes that Normandeau would use Dr. Adrienne Kovach’s laboratory at the University of New Hampshire for DNA analysis of the pellets. Heidi requests that surveys be implemented early in the winter season (as soon as the snow flies), noting increased detection probability in the early winter season. Mike Marchand states Tennessee should use standard NEC pellet survey protocols.
- Rick Simmons leads discussion on freshwater mussels, indicating it is Tennessee’s intent to perform surveys for the brook floater and that the location of all mussel species would be mapped out as part of the surveys. Rick notes that we will need further data from the NH NHB and NH F&G regarding the potential locations of the Eastern pond mussel. Mike Marchand and Rick Simmons agree to coordinate on NH F&G providing location data for Eastern pond mussel to the Project. Mike indicates NH may list Eastern pond mussel as either T or E in the future. Tim O’Sullivan inquires about an overall list of survey sites for mussels. Mike responds by saying if a particular waterbody has a record(s) for these two species, NH F&G would want it surveyed, unless previous surveys have indicated the waterbody is unsuitable for these species. Rick and Mike will coordinate on generating a list of freshwater mussel survey sites. Rick indicates he can draft the list and send to Mike for confirmation. Mike indicates relocation of listed mussel species is a possibility if they are determined to be present, potentially coupled with monitoring.
- Tim O’Sullivan inquires about NH F&G’s concerns regarding banded sunfish and American eel. Matt Carpenter indicates the stream crossings are short-term impacts and these species can move out of the crossing areas and then return to restored habitats and re-colonize post construction.
- Carol Henderson asks if Tennessee has concentrated its HDD efforts on the larger rivers. Kasia Ingram responds in the affirmative, further indicating the Souhegan and Merrimack Rivers as planned for HDD.
- Discussion then turns to snakes and turtles with Sarah Barnum inquiring if NH F&G is assuming presence where the element occurrences occur and further inquires what type of additional surveys may be required. Mike Marchand responds by indicating he will need to look into it further. Mike notes he is interested in what can be done regarding BMPs to protect these species during and after construction. Mike goes on to say F&G has not done much survey work west of the Merrimack River and that Tennessee needs to reduce the likelihood of a “take”. Mike indicates short term and long term impacts need to be evaluated for snakes and turtles. Regarding turtles, Mike indicates Tennessee should work to identify nesting areas and wetlands that can support Blanding’s and spotted, further indicating that no winter work should be done in these latter areas. Tim O’Sullivan states the Project team needs to identify overall survey areas prior to finalizing work plans/protocols and implementing surveys. Mike responds by indicating Blanding’s turtle is more prevalent east of the Merrimack River but they are also present, in fewer numbers, west of the river. Mike indicates he is more concerned about the direct construction related impacts, particularly as they relate to direct mortality of turtles and snakes. Mike goes on to say if permanent wetland fills are proposed, these impact areas may need a more intensive survey effort. Kasia responds by indicating there are no permanent fills currently proposed along the pipeline alignment, and that the wetlands will be restored with the exception of cover-type conversion within the permanent easement. Mike indicates if Tennessee will be excavating in suitable Blanding’s and/or spotted turtle habitat, including vernal pools, then Tennessee needs to figure out how to handle that. Tim O’Sullivan indicates that what Mike is describing are protection plans, which have been generated for these species in other states on other projects.
- Discussion then turns specifically to wood turtles (WT), with Mike Marchand indicating this species is a species of regional conservation concern and there is a new WT project in NH designed to protect this species and its habitat. Mike indicates WT is likely present in many of the streams crossed by the Project, especially in the southwestern portion of the state. Mike cites a recent study which determined approxi-

mately 95% of WT activity occurs within 250 meters (820 feet) of an occupied stream/river. Mike indicates winter work in uplands would be beneficial to this species because they over winter in-water. Mike adds that if summer work is planned, then biological monitors would be needed to perform sweeps in front of the equipment to reduce the likelihood of a “take”. Mike goes on to state that post-construction management of the ROW will be important for the long term survival of the species and notes direct mortality due to WTs getting hit on roads and killed during vegetation management. Kim Tuttle asks Mike if surveying for WT overwintering habitat would be beneficial. Mike responds by indicating it would be good for Tennessee to know where WTs are overwintering. Mike indicates Tennessee should implement presence/absence surveys in areas where digging will occur in riparian zones known to support WTs. Mike goes on to say that construction impacts are his biggest concern with habitat restoration also a concern, but a lesser concern. Sarah Barnum takes action to generate WT survey area list and coordinate with Mike. Lastly, Mike notes that spring and fall are the best survey times for WTs.

- Discussion then turns to the snake species, with Mike Marchand indicating this species group is likely the most difficult on the list to survey for and to avoid with time of year (TOY) restrictions. The snake species are underground on land in the winter, with no way to identify the den sites. Mike indicates there are many den sites on utility corridors, even under some OH transmission line structures and in chipmunk borrows. Mike indicates most of the survey activity for these species has occurred from Concord to the east. Mike states that the Northern black racer (NBR) spends a significant amount of time in the vicinity of dens sites in the spring and fall and that by looking at dates and locations for specific EOs, it may be possible to locate the dens using spring and fall surveys. In summer, Mike indicates the NBR may travel a mile or more from the den site. Mike notes that many of the NBR observations NH F&G has occurred under OH electric transmission lines and that if this habitat was wiped out during construction of the NED Project, it is unlikely that the animals would persist. Tim O’Sullivan notes that only a portion of the habitat associated with the OH transmission lines would be impacted during the construction of the NED Project and that much of it will likely remain untouched.
- Tim O’Sullivan inquires if the Eastern hognose snake shows a close correlation with sandy/outwash soils in NH or if they have been observed on till as well. Mike Marchand responds by indicating while many observations do occur on the sandy soils, this species has been observed on other soil types as well. Mike goes on to say Tennessee needs to come up with a comprehensive survey area for Eastern hognose snake as well.
- Carol Henderson asks if access to the NED Project area will be limited after construction, noting that if a person’s land is not posted in NH it is open to public hunting and fishing. Kasia Ingram responds by indicating Tennessee will have an easement over the land but the land would still be in private ownership (and therefore will be up to the landowner to post).
- Adele Fiorillo asks Mike Marchand to ID areas where we can avoid WTs. Mike responds by suggesting surveys to identify the better WT habitat areas associated with the Project. Mike indicates he will be looking for reports which say how we are going to avoid impacting the state-listed species and that if we determine some impacts are unavoidable, the reports should identify what Tennessee is going to do to mitigate said impacts. Mike reiterates the position that construction related impacts are NH F&G’s biggest concern regarding reptiles, with habitat restoration and long term management important but slightly less significant considerations.
- Mike Marchand inquires if there are any issues with pavement on top of the pipeline. Kasia responds by indicating Tennessee will have an easement over the land, so future development will need to address the pipeline presence. Clarification: pavement would not be an issue, however, structures and trees are prohibited within the easement.
- Matt Carpenter inquires where the end of the line is and what the use of the gas will be. Kasia responds by indicating that Dracut, MA is the end of the mainline and the gas would be utilized by local distribution companies for various uses including residential and electricity generation by power plants.
- Carol Henderson inquires how Tennessee will address the Northern long-eared bat. Adele Fiorillo responds

by indicating a Project wide acoustic survey is currently underway to address this species.

- Carol Henderson inquires about the possibility of compressor stations in NH. Kasia Ingram responds by indicating that there is a compressor station planned for the NH portion of the project and Tennessee is reviewing potential sites for the siting of that compressor station. Kim Tuttle inquires how large the compressor station sites are. Barry Duff responds by saying there is a separate team looking at compressor stations and that typically Tennessee likes to secure a site that is large enough to support the necessary infrastructure and that also can provide buffers for visual and noise concerns. Barry further indicates that Tennessee is looking for compressor stations sites in NH that are at least 50 acres. Barry goes on to say that a site of this size would house a compressor that would be approximately 120'x150' and would also include an area approximately 35'x100' for support buildings and associated infrastructure. Barry notes that currently there are three sites under consideration and that the one that best avoids and minimizes impacts to the environment will be selected. Update: a site in New Ipswich has been chosen as the primary site for the compressor station in NH.
- Mike Marchand asks if Bald Eagle surveys have been done. Sarah Barnum responds by providing a summary of what has been done to date for Bald Eagles (desktop and aerial nest site surveys) and what will be done in the future (winter roost site surveys). Mike notes there is a known roost site on the Merrimack River that will need to be looked at in the context of the Project location.
- Matt Carpenter inquires what would happen if there was a leak under the Merrimack River. Tim O'Sullivan responds that Tennessee would isolate that section of pipeline and then perform follow up technical investigations to determine the best path forward. Kasia follows up by providing a discussion about routine pipeline inspection, including the use of internal inspection devices to monitor for corrosion/erosion, as well as periodic aerial and ground patrols. Depending on the issue, repairs may be addressed by isolating the affected portion of pipe, excavating the pipe, and repairing or replacing the section of pipe.
- Mike Marchand asks if there has been any consideration on the part of Tennessee regarding the more common wildlife species such as migratory birds. Sarah Barnum responds by indicating Tennessee will be doing a separate analysis of migratory birds for the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Kasia follows up by stating that once operational, FERC has requirements regarding time of year restrictions for vegetation management activities to reduce impacts during the nesting season and that routine vegetation clearing generally does not occur more frequently than every 3 years.
- Matt Carpenter inquired if Tennessee could provide pictures showing the condition of waterbody crossings before and after construction. Kasia responds by indicating that is a possibility. Kasia added that this has been a USACE permit requirement on other projects, and we have utilized environmental inspection staff to obtain photos since they are on the ground observing construction activities. Adele notes that survey crews are photographing these resources while obtaining field survey information.
- Mike Marchand and Kim Tuttle inquire regarding what type of materials would be used in restoration, noting a preference for no materials that would entrap smaller animal species, indicating nylon netting for erosion control noted as especially harmful. Kasia responds by indicating that Tennessee takes the entrapment concerns into consideration and has avoided use of specific matting materials (certain types of curlex for instance) on past projects for this reason.
- Tim O'Sullivan inquires regarding NH F&G's concerns regarding the smooth green snake. Mike Marchand responds by indicating they are present in the proposed Project area and that some impacts to this species are expected. Tim asks if Mike's concerns for the NBR and Eastern hognose snake would transfer to this species. Mike responds in the affirmative.
- Carol Henderson inquires if there are any deer yards in the Project area and notes Tennessee should obtain this information from Dan Bergeron.
- Carol Henderson inquires if Tennessee needs to write an EIS. Kasia replies by indicating that as part of the FERC application, Tennessee will file an Environmental Report (ER), which consists of Resource Reports 1 through 13 and addresses environmental, cultural, socio-economic issues, alternatives and other top-

ics as they relate to the Project. Kasia indicates that we are currently in the pre-filing process with FERC and that the first draft set of the resource reports were filed with FERC in March, and that a second draft is planned to be filed in July (link to the filed reports: http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/file_list.asp?accession_num=20150313-5090). Kasia then provides a summary of what has been filed with FERC to date and what is anticipated in the future. Kasia also explained FERC's actions, which will include a scoping period allowing for public comment, and preparation of an EIS, in which the public and agencies will have opportunities for comment. Adele stated that FERC will also have a third-party contractor to help with the Resource Report review and preparation of the EIS. Kasia confirmed that Cardno Entrix is working with the FERC as the third-party contractor designated for the Project. The FERC application and review process will run in parallel with the SEC application and review process. Harry Stewart notes it is not uncommon for this to occur.

- A closing discussion on what the next steps are in relation to state listed species then ensues. The Project team notes that work plans/survey protocols, which include desktop data collection and defined survey areas need to be developed for all subject species and that said plans would then need subsequent approval by NH F&G, prior to implementation. Only after results of the surveys are compiled can an evaluation of impact assessment take place.
- Kim Tuttle asked if any other subcontractors would be working on the NED Project in NH. Kasia answered by indicating that HMM, AECOM Normandeau, and Louis Berger are the main subcontractors currently involved with NH, but that other subcontractors would also be working on the Project in other states.

{end of 20150904-4008}

20150904-5009

Michael Nork, Pittsfield, NH.

As a resident of the state of New Hampshire, I would like to express my disapproval of the NED project. Given the fact that this pipeline's primary purpose would be to transport natural gas for export, NED would have minimal benefit for the state of New Hampshire or its residents. Furthermore, I believe that investment in fossil fuel infrastructure like NED is a waste of money and time. We would be better off to plan for the future and bolster renewable energy infrastructure.

20150904-5021

Kara Seager, Hampton, NH.

Northfield is my hometown and where I attended high school at Northfield Mount Hermon School (preparatory school). I am adamantly opposed to the Kindermorgan project, which plans to put in a compressor station that is louder than a locomotive and will vent gasses from the process that will waft over the whole valley. They also plan to install a gas pipe line through Northfield, Deerfield, under the CT River, and the Deerfield River. Along this proposed pipeline they are clearing a 100' easement that will be treated with something like Roundup in perpetuity. This line is going through conservation land, through areas near Old Deerfield that have Indian relics that they are just being allowed to dig up, through existing working farms (Clarkdale and others). Once the line is in, people within 200' of the line will not be able to get insurance, thereby unable to sell their homes. All around, this sounds like a negative impact for the local residents and environment. I hope that a project like this will never be completed. But if it ends up in effect, what compensation will be made to the local towns and cities that are disrupted, polluted and potentially destroyed by this project, especially if an accident happens? Northfield only has volunteer fire fighters, so if there ever were an accident, the town would not be equipped to handle it.

This does not sound like a company or project that is taking into consideration the human and environmental impact. I sincerely hope it will be stopped.

20150904-5113

FERC NED EIS Scoping Comments

Plainfield Agricultural Commission

The Agricultural Commission focused on issues posed by construction and operation of the proposed pipeline that could impact the viability of current or future agricultural activities. It was noted that Plainfield is entirely zoned for mixed agricultural - residential use and that agriculture, including timber production, crop, livestock including dairy, beef, lamb and poultry, and some specialty crops such as Christmas trees and fruit production is an important aspect of Plainfield's current economic base and will likely grow in importance in the future given trends in climate if not impeded.

The following specific issues were identified which warrant careful attention in the EIS if Plainfield's agricultural assets are to be safeguarded:

1. Impact of blasting on livestock: It is likely that construction of the pipeline will require very significant amount of blasting given the prevalence of subsoil ledge in the area. The effect of ongoing blasting on livestock productivity - dairy, egg production, breeding - should be examined and likely losses and compensation estimated.
2. Impact of draft from hydrostatic testing: It appears that procedures for testing of the pipe will require discharge of water potentially including contaminants. The contaminants should be identified and the possibility of their dispersion through the air or runoff assessed to determine if they will impact agricultural production, including certified organic products.
3. Segregation and replacement of topsoil: Plainfield's topsoil is limited and delicate. Mixing of subsoil's with top soils can render an area incapable of supporting crops, pasture and forest products indefinitely without significantly and costly remediation. Any disturbance of topsoil will require careful assessment of the subsoil layer depths and segregation of layers so it can be replaced without mixing.
4. Crop land: Plainfield has limited cropland and the proposed route of the pipeline traverses several of the largest parcels. The effect of this disruption on the economic viability of future agricultural operations should be assessed on these parcels, and given the interdependence of agricultural operations, Plainfield's agricultural viability overall.
5. Timber production: Plainfield's largest agricultural product is timber and other forest products. Pipeline construction will destroy significant timber stands and the corridor to be maintained permanently will reduce timber potential for the life of the pipeline and most likely beyond due to issues cited above. Fragmentation of timber stands reduces the economic viability of cuttings.

20150904-5189

James D St Jean, Frankestown, NH.

Dear FERC Commissioners:

Subject: Comment on Docket No. PF14-22-000

I urge the FERC Commission to reject the proposal by Kinder-Morgan to construct the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline (NED). This pipeline is not in the interest of New Hampshire, the residents, or the communities involved. The proposed path of this pipeline will impact many conserved land areas and threaten critical aquifers in southern New Hampshire. We do not need this unnecessary infrastructure, and should not impact local residents and communities in such a significant way purely to allow a commercial company to increase profits. This project is not in the public interest as additional gas supplies are not needed in New Hampshire and this project will overall provide no benefit to New Hampshire or its residents. New Hampshire has plenty of energy available and with the increasing prevalence of solar, wind, and alternative energy sources this infrastructure is simply not consistent with protecting the residents and the local environment from unnecessary destruction and pollution risks. I urge you on behalf of many local residents of New Hampshire to refuse to allow the Kinder-Morgan project to move forward.

20150904-5262

New Hampshire Fish and Game Department

11 Hazen Drive, Concord, NH 03301-6500

Headquarters: (603)271-3421

Web site: www.WildNH.com

{note: same letter as 20150904-4008 above}

20150904-5279

TOWN OF MERRIMACK, NH

6 BABOOSIC LAKE ROAD · MERRIMACK, NH 03054 • WWW.MERRIMACKNH.GOV

September 4, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC)

888 First Street, N.E.

Washington, DC 20426

RE: Access by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC to property in the Town of Merrimack, New Hampshire for environmental surveys for the Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Secretary Bose:

The Town of Merrimack (“Town”) has now spent eight months, innumerable hours, and thousands of dollars in a futile attempt to finalize an access agreement with the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (“TGP”) in order to allow TGP to access multiple Town properties for environmental and other surveys associated with the Northeast Energy Direct Project (“NED”). There are four properties, plus Town roads covered by the draft access agreement and the majority of the properties at issue are conservation lands with sensitive resources.

In February, 2015, the Town prepared an access agreement setting forth the terms by which the Town will allow such access and sent it to the pertinent TGP contact on March 25, 2015 (“TGP Access Agreement”). At the end of March, TGP sent back a markup of the TGP Access Agreement with only a few outstanding issues. Since then, the Town has gone back and forth with TGP personnel with no clear and final resolution of all of those few outstanding issues. For example, in the May 10, 2015 version of the agreement which TGP sent to the Town noting that it had been reviewed by the TGP legal team, TGP agreed to language requiring that Town personnel be present when TGP personnel undertake surveys of Town property. However, more recent TGP versions of the draft agreement have eliminated this requirement without any explanation. Further, TGP has repeatedly rejected the Town’s request for a limit of four TGP personnel accessing Town properties at any given time. Despite the relatively minor nature of these changes and their importance to the Town, TGP has made no mention of any concern that these limits would impact their ability to complete the necessary field surveys, but, instead, simply circulates redline after redline refusing to integrate these changes. In short, TGP has thrown up a stone wall to execution of the TGP Access Agreement. A more detailed chronology of the TGP and Town negotiations is enclosed.

As noted to the Commission in May, 2015, the Town has achieved so little traction regarding the TGP Access Agreement that it can only conclude that TGP is not interested in actually executing an agreement. Lending credence to this conclusion from the Town’s perspective is the fact that, in late June 2015, TGP personnel unlawfully accessed Town property, requiring the Town to take action to notify TGP of the applicable permits and/or approvals required under the Town’s ordinances for their survey work, and that, barring an executed TGP Access Agreement, access to Town property was unacceptable.

As a public entity, the Town bears responsibility for managing and protecting Town resources. The Town decided early in this process that the best way to protect those resources was to cooperate with TGP in order to provide access to assess NED impacts. Unfortunately, TGP’s intransigence has proven exhausting. At this

point the Town has finalized and executed the enclosed access agreement, with reasonable terms discussed in good faith with TGP. Thank you for any assistance you can provide in incentivizing TGP to execute this agreement such that impacts to Town property from the NED can properly be assessed and mitigated.

Sincerely,

Eileen Cabanel
Town Manager

cc: Merrimack Town Council

Maggie Hassan, Governor of New Hampshire
Joseph Foster, Attorney General of New Hampshire
Shawn Jasper, Speaker of the New Hampshire House of Representatives
Chuck Morse, President of the New Hampshire State Senate
Kelly Ayotte, U. S. Senator
Jeanne Shaheen, U. S. Senator
Frank Guinta, U. S. House of Representatives
Ann McLane Kuster, U. S. House of Representatives
Allen Fore, Kinder Morgan

Field Survey Access Agreement Chronology

Town of Merrimack / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Negotiations through 8/20/2015

- 1/20/2015 Patty Quinn, Field Survey Agent with Kinder Morgan, dropped off survey permission agreements to survey (4) Town owned parcels
- 2/11/2015 Town Attorney Joanna Tourangeau met with Chair & Vice Chair of Town Council, Town Manager, several department heads, Conservation Commission Chair Tim Tenhave & representatives from the Merrimack Village District to discuss environmental impacts associated with the proposed pipeline project
- 2/23/2015 Joanna prepared and circulated draft Field Survey Access Agreement for Kinder Morgan access to all four Town owned parcels
- 2/26/2015 Town Council discussed, revised and approved the Field Survey Access Agreement and authorized TM to sign during public meeting
- 3/5/2015 Revised Access Agreement sent to Joanna for review and recommendations. Joanna reviewed and agreed with changes
- 3/25/2015 Town emailed Access Agreement to Patty Quinn for consideration and signature
- 3/31/2015 Received KM revised agreement from Patty Quinn via email
- 4/1/2015 Sent to Town Attorney Joanna Tourangeau for review. KM refused to agree to Town requests that Town personnel be present for access or to permit Town review of data obtained regarding Town properties in advance of filing with FERC
- 4/2,6,8,10,14,16,18/2015 Joanna calls Patty Quinn leaving messages requesting time to discuss outstanding issues regarding Access Agreement
- 4/23/2015 Town Council amended agreement during their public meeting
- 4/29/2015 Emailed revised agreement to Joanna
- 4/30/2015 Received clean redline from Joanna showing the Council's primary changes
- 5/7/2015 Sent to Patty Quinn revised agreement for signature
- 5/8,11,12/2015 Joanna calls Patty Quinn and leaves messages requesting discussion of outstanding issues with Access Agreement
- 5/12/2015 Received modified agreement from Patty Quinn via email. Modified agreement continues to delete Town requests for Town personnel to be present when KM personnel on Town property and for review of acquired data prior to submission to FERC. No explanation of this refusal to

change Access Agreement is provided

- 5/13/2015 Forwarded agreement on to Joanna for opinion and received recommendations
- 5/28/2015 Town Council discussed access agreement during public meeting
- 6/1,3,5/2015 Joanna leaves messages for Patty Quinn regarding outstanding issues with Access Agreement
- 6/24/2015 KM field surveyors commence sampling in Town roadways without approval from Town of access agreement or of Public Works Department for road opening and other required permits
- 6/25/2015 Town provides Patty Quinn with copy of local ordinances and cease and desist request. Patty Quinn contacts Joanna Tourangeau for the first time
- 6/26/2015 Conference call between Patty Quinn and Joanna regarding outstanding issues with access agreement. Patty confirms that she cannot address those issues but will forward to KM
- 6/29/2015 File correspondence with FERC discussing lack of progress on access agreement and KM unauthorized access
- 6/30/2015 KM representative (Jim Hartman) reaches out to Town Manager and indicates that the Town must be working with the 2 wrong people on the Access Agreement. Asks the Town to contact him
- 7/1/2015 Joanna emailed red lined access agreement to Patty Quinn
- 7/6-10/2015 Joanna and Kinder Morgan contact (Jim Hartman) trade calls regarding the Access Agreement
- 7/12/2015 Joanna and Jim discuss Access Agreement. KM indicates unwillingness to provide data from property in advance of filing with FERC and prefers not to condition access on attendance by Town personnel
- 7/16/2015 Discussion of Town position regarding Access Agreement with Town
- 7/17/2015 Joanna left a message for KM discussion Town position on access only with Town personnel available for sensitive properties and so long as KM provides data gathered during survey to Town in advance of filing with FERC or in an otherwise public manner
- 8/12/2015 Joanna receives voicemail message from Jim Hartman indicating that KM legal is actively reviewing the Access Agreement and will send a revised document the following week
- 8/20/2015 KM sends a revised Access Agreement with provisions which do not reflect the discussions regarding outstanding issues important to the Town

ACCESS AGREEMENT RE FIELD SURVEYS

The Town of Merrimack (“Town”) received four requests for access by Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LLC or its designated contractors (hereinafter referred to as “TGP”) to access the following properties:

- (1) Horse Hill Nature Preserve (Map/Block/Lot 3B-164) deeded from NasTam Associates to the Town of Merrimack by deed dated July 19,2002 and recorded in the Hillsborough County Registry of Deeds in Book 6670, Page 2730;
- (2) Gilmore Woods Memorial Forest (Map/Block/Lot 3C-73) deeded from Constance M. Heath to the Town of Merrimack by deed dated December 30, 1997 and recorded in the Hillsborough County Registry of Deeds in Book 5892, Page 0204;
- (3) 10 Green’s Pond (Map/Block/Lot 3C-41) deeded from Digital Equipment Corporation to the Town of Merrimack by deed dated January 26, 1978 and recorded in the Hillsborough County Registry of Deeds in Book 2608, Page 637;
- (4) Sewer Buffer (Map/Block/Lot 3C-40-2); and
- (5) All Public Roads and Ways, provided applicable permit requirements are met

(these five properties are referred to herein together as the “Property”) in order for TGP or its designated contractors to perform field surveys necessary for the above captioned FERC Docket No. PF14-22 environmental screening. The surveys to be conducted on the property of the Town are described as follows: civil and environmental surveys and studies that include, but are not limited to, project routing, characterization

of land as to property ownership, topographic features, descriptions, cultural resources, wetland delineation and archeology.

The Town consents to these requests for access on the following terms:

The Town will permit, at any given time, no more than a total of four (4) employees and/or consultants of TGP the right, but not the obligation, of ingress to, egress from, and access under, above, and through, the Property by foot and limited vehicular access for the purpose of allowing TGP to conduct nonintrusive field surveys. With regard to the Public Roads and Ways (described above in numbered Paragraph 5), the Town does not grant TGP access rights to areas beyond the visible road or way (whether paved or gravel). The Town expressly withholds consent to TGP access which includes passage beyond a fence or other barrier or onto a lawn or beyond any other visible demarcation of the road or way even where the area is within the Property.

The Town reserves the right to prevent activity that, in its reasonable judgment, could result in damage or injury or threaten interference with activities of the Town. TGP shall have no access to buildings on the Property.

Before undertaking any activity on the Property, TGP shall give the Town reasonable advance notice no less than forty-eight (48) hours in advance, by telephone conversation with Eileen Cabanel at (603) 424-2331, or in writing, of planned activity, including notice of the areas of the Property that are expected to be accessed. TGP shall also provide the Town with reasonable advance notice of the name and contact information for each and every individual exercising rights under this Agreement. The Town shall make every reasonable effort to provide a representative to accompany TGP during any surveying activities conducted on the Property. Notwithstanding this Town obligation, TGP's rights to access the Property described in Paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 above is expressly conditioned upon the presence of a Town representative. Access shall occur between the dates of September 1, 2015 and December 31, 2015. This Agreement shall automatically terminate on December 31, 2015 unless an extension is approved in writing by the Town and TGP.

TGP shall reasonably cooperate with the Town regarding all activities that are conducted on the Property. TGP shall bear the responsibility of determining the location of any utilities. In conducting all activities TGP shall exercise due care and shall ensure that each and every individual accessing the Property under this Agreement behaves in a professional manner.

After completing the activities contemplated by this contract, TGP shall ensure removal of their equipment and shall restore any part of the Property that was affected by its activities to a condition that is substantially similar to the condition of the Property at the time immediately preceding the commencement of said activities.

As part of the public process and upon collection of any field survey data that suggests any of the Property is impacted by significant resources, hereinafter referred to as the "Data", TGP shall provide the Data to Eileen Cabanel. The Town shall use its best reasonable efforts to maintain the confidentiality of any Data identified by TGP as confidential consistent with New Hampshire's Right to Know Law .. Consistent with federal law and regulations, in the event that any cultural resources and/or endangered species Data is collected as a result of TGP's activities on the Property under this Agreement, TGP shall file the field survey reports concerning the Data as confidential with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). The Town may also request the information directly from the FERC through a Freedom of Information Act request.

TGP shall indemnify and hold harmless the Town from (a) any damage to the Property, (b) damage to any property of any person not a party to this Agreement, or for bodily injury to any person or third party that is caused by TGP as a result of the activities of TGP related to activities contemplated by this Agreement. The Town shall promptly notify TGP in writing of any damage to the Property that has allegedly been caused by any TGP pursuant to any activity of TGP on the Property. Before it will be liable to provide any monetary payment to the Town for any indemnified damage to the Property, TGP shall have the right to restore or repair the damage to its prior condition, using contractors and consultants selected by them and reasonably satisfactory to the Town. TGP shall indemnify the Town for TGP noncompliance with this Agreement and

this indemnification shall survive termination of the Agreement.

EXECUTED: September 4, 2015.

TOWN OF MERRIMACK:

By: Eileen Cabanel

Town Manager, Merrimack, NH

TENNESSEE GAS PIPELINE COMPANY, LLC:

By: _____

Print Name: _____

Title: _____

20150904-5296

TOWN OF MERRIMACK, NH

6 BABOOSIC LAKE ROAD · MERRIMACK, NH 03054 • WWW.MERRIMACKNH.GOV

September 4, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC)

888 First Street, N.E.

Washington, DC 20426

RE: FERC Docket No. PF14-22 - July 2015 Resource Reports

Dear Secretary Bose:

In its July, 2015 Resource Report 10, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (“TGP”) presented three alternative routes through the Towns of Amherst and Merrimack, New Hampshire which avoid a significant bog in Amherst but which will impact the Town of Merrimack (“Amherst Alternatives”) (July 2015 Resource Report 10 at §10.3.2.4.).

While the Amherst Alternative Route 1 may mitigate impacts to sensitive receptors in Amherst, they have significant additional impacts to the Town of Merrimack not disclosed in the July 2015 Resource Report.

Specifically, the Town is aware of the following impacts associated with the Amherst Alternative Route 1:

1. The Amherst Alternative Route 1 runs within 650 feet of the Thomtons Ferry Elementary School.
2. The Amherst Alternative Route 1 runs within 200-300 feet of several large residential neighborhoods known as Whittier Place, Camp Sargent Acres and the Cambridge Drive/Wethersfield neighborhoods, as well as the Castleton Ridge neighborhood. These neighborhoods will be significantly impacted by the Amherst Alternative Route 1.
3. A hospice facility off Continental Boulevard is within a few hundred feet of the Amherst Alternative Route 1.
4. Impacts to commercial properties associated with the construction phase of the Amherst Alternative Route 1 are increased. Further, the Amherst Alternative Route 1 travels along Rt. 101-A such that, in the event there is an incident, these properties will all be isolated as there is no alternative means of egress. These impacts are likely to negatively impact valuable commercial properties in Town thereby decreasing employment opportunities and tax revenue to the Town.
5. The Amherst Alternative Route 1 relocates the NED Project directly across the Town of Merrimack Conservation Commission’s property (Town of Merrimack Tax Map 2B-358- 1). The deed for this parcel expressly prohibits this activity.
6. Habitat impacts in the Town of Merrimack (wet meadow, shrub wetland, and Appalachian oak/pine) as listed in Section 2.3 for the Amherst Alternative Route 1. These Habitat types are listed from NH

Wildlife Action Plan dated 2010 (<http://www.wildlife.state.nh.us/maps/wap.html>) and score as part of the Highest Ranked Habitat in New Hampshire. This high scoring covers the Amherst Alternative Route 1 from its entry into Merrimack from Hollis up to Industrial Drive.

7. In general, the entire path of the Amherst Alternative Route 1 along Continental Boulevard is either a vernal pool, a wetland, or is the immediately adjacent upland to a wetland or vernal pool. Uplands adjacent to wetlands are significant to many different species and are where the Town has documented the majority of the rare, threatened, and endangered species in Town. These lands require significant surveying to ensure all potential plant, insect, and animal species of concern are noted. The July, 2015 Resource Reports contain no documentation whatsoever regarding such impacts.
8. Most of the land impacted by Amherst Alternative Route I is part of a wetland system and the Naticook Brook Aquifer that serves to provide water for the Town of Merrimack's Merrimack Village District ("MVD") wells. This same system originates North in the Town of Merrimack and includes Stump Pond and the brooks/streams that feed it and outflow from it. Over 8000 MVD customers receive their drinking water from this source. Just as the original Project Route does, the Amherst Alternative Route 1 impacts two overlapping wellhead protection areas along Rt. 101-A as discussed in Section 2.1.1.4.1 of the July, 2015 Resource Report 2. However, the Amherst Alternative Route 1 impacts an additional third wellhead protection area, MVD well and water treatment facility planned for near term construction. In short, the Amherst Alternative Route 1 jeopardizes the entirety of the Town's public water supply. **(See Attachment from the MVD)**
9. The proposed path puts the pipeline directly across numerous properties owned by Pennichuck Water Works. Some of these parcels have a conservation easement on them running to the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests. These parcels include: 2C-66, 2B-324, 2B-324-1, 2C-49, 2B-12, and 2B-13. The conservation easement is recorded in the New Hampshire, Hillsborough County Registry at Book/Page: 8584-1669. This easement prohibits activity such as the NED Project. A copy of the easement is enclosed for the Commission's review and reference.

The Town respectfully requests that the Commission require TOP to consider and address these, and all other issues associated with the Amherst Alternative Route 1 as part of its next data request in order to ensure a full and fair consideration of alternatives in the Commission's scoping process.

The Town will continue to actively participate in this process in order to ensure that its residents are accorded all appropriate consideration and necessary process.

Thank you for your assistance with this matter.

Sincerely,

Eileen Cabanel Town Manager

cc: Merrimack Town Council

Maggie Hassan, Governor of New Hampshire
Joseph Foster, Attorney General of New Hampshire
Shawn Jasper, Speaker of the New Hampshire House of Representatives
Chuck Morse, President of the New Hampshire State Senate
Kelly Ayotte, U. S. Senator
Jeanne Shaheen, U. S. Senator
Frank Guinta, U. S. House of Representatives
Ann McLane Kuster, U. S. House of Representatives
Allen Fore, Kinder Morgan

Emery & Garrett Groundwater Investigations, LLC

P.O. Box 1578-56 Main Street
Meredith, New Hampshire 03253

September 2, 2015

The Merrimack Village District (MVD) is responsible for providing potable water to 25,000 residents in the Town of Merrimack, New Hampshire. All of their water resources are derived exclusively from groundwater that is pumped from a series of high-yielding wells sited in three shallow stratified drift Aquifers. On an annual basis, they provide approximately 800,000,000 gallons of high quality, potable water to their customers. Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC is in the pre-filing process of siting a high pressure natural gas pipeline route (identified as the NED Project) through the Town of Merrimack.

The “original” proposed route of the NED gas pipeline crossed through the center of one of the principal aquifers utilized by the MVD, known locally as the Naticook Brook Aquifer. The MVD currently operates two Production Wells (MVD-2 and MVD-3) that pump groundwater from this Aquifer, which provides approximately 50% of the MVD’s water supply capacity. This Aquifer is protected by the Town of Merrimack through an Aquifer Protection Overlay District and the contributing area for the two Production Wells is a registered Wellhead Protection Area (WHPA) with the State of New Hampshire.

On behalf of the MVD, Emery & Garrett Groundwater Investigations (EGGI) submitted a professional technical opinion on February 18, 2015 (which was later forwarded to FERC on March 3, 2015 by the MVD). This professional document described why blasting, pipeline construction, and the installation of a high pressure gas pipeline are not considered reasonable or acceptable along this proposed route.

The most recent pipeline route (Option #1) that is currently proposed would further increase the potential for causing adverse, and possibly irreparable, impacts to Merrimack’s public groundwater supply. This route not only crosses over the Naticook Brook Aquifer, but also now goes directly through the Witches Brook Aquifer; an Aquifer that provides 33% of the MVD’s public water capacity. Therefore, the new pipeline route will be installed directly on top of both critical Aquifers and through both designated “sensitive groundwater recharge areas.”

Loss of use of any portion of these potable water supply resources could have devastating and catastrophic consequences to the Town of Merrimack and on their ability to provide a reliable source of water to the residents and businesses in the Town of Merrimack. The Town finds it unacceptable to route a petroleum product pipeline (as identified as “Option 1”) in such close proximity to its Production Wells, high yield Aquifers, and their designated “sensitive groundwater recharge areas.”

Respectfully submitted,

James M. Emery, P.G.

President/Senior Hydrogeologist

20150908-0007

Hand written letter, Barbara Ferullo, 50 Stowell Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071: opposing

20150908-0008

From: Alea Ashline

To: Philip Moeller

Subject: 362 signers: STOP PROPOSED GAS COMPRESSOR STATION IN NASSAU, NY petition

Date: Monday, August 03, 2015 10:20:29 PM

Dear Commissioner Philip D. Moeller,

I started a petition to you titled STOP PROPOSED GAS COMPRESSOR STATION IN NASSAU, NY. So far, the petition has 362 total signers.

You can post a response for us to pass along to all petition signers by clicking here:

http://petitions.moveon.org/target_talkback.html?tt=tt-97460-custom-60837-20250803-TTE3Cn

The petition states:

“PETITION FOR TOWN, COUNTY, AND STATE OFFICIALS TO TAKE ACTION TO STOP ANY CONSTRUCTION OF A GAS COMPRESSION STATION IN RENSSELAER COUNTY.”

To download a PDF file of all your constituents who have signed the petition, including their addresses, click this link:

http://petitions.moveon.org/deliver_pdf.html?job_id=1591718&target_type=custom&target_id=60837

To download a CSV file of all of your constituents who have signed the petition, including their addresses, click this link:

http://petitions.moveon.org/deliver_pdf.html?job_id=1591718&target_type=custom&targetid=60837&csv=1

Thank you.

--Alea Ashline

If you have any other questions, please email petitions@moveon.org.

The links to download the petition as a PDF and to respond to all of your constituents will remain available for the next 14 days.

This email was sent through MoveOn's petition website, a free service that allows anyone to set up their own online petition and share it with friends. MoveOn does not endorse the contents of petitions posted on our public petition website. If you don't want to receive further emails updating you on how many people have signed this petition, click here:

http://petitions.moveon.org/delivery_unsub.html?e=.5oFwmTFmxJJ4Akq4MJdpnBoaWxpcC5tb2VsbGVyQGZlcmMuZ292&petition_id=97460.

{2nd copy addressed to Commissioner Moeller}

20150908-0009

Congress of the United States
Washington, DC 20515

August 28, 2015

The Honorable Norman C. Bay
Chairman
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, DC 20426

Dear Chairman Bay:

We are writing to formally request an extension to the comment phase of the current scoping period for the North East Energy Direct Pipeline (Docket No. PF14-22-000) project proposed by the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, a subsidiary of Kinder Morgan.

The current scoping period is scheduled to close on August 31, 2015. On July 24, Kinder Morgan released over one gigabyte of data, amounting to six thousand pages of information, after the scoping meetings were held. Our constituents did not have an opportunity to review these documents before expressing their concerns to FERC. After speaking with many of the people we represent, and their local elected officials, we do not believe that there is a sufficient amount of time to review, analyze, and respond to the new information before the August 31 deadline.

It is critical that the public, especially those directly impacted by this proposed pipeline and its infrastructure, have a reasonable amount of time to access these reports, and have an opportunity to ask questions of FERC and Kinder Morgan regarding this project. At present, the public will not have a reasonable amount of time to comment on this report prior to when the draft Environmental Impact Statement is issued by FERC.

Because public input comment is critical to this process, we request that FERC extend the current scoping period to November 30, 2015.

Sincerely,

Charles E. Schumer
United States Senator

Kirsten Gillibrand
United States Senator

Chris Gibson
Member of Congress

20150908-0010

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

PAUL TONKO
20th DISTRICT, NEW YORK

August 31, 2015

The Honorable Nonnan C. Bay Chainnan
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Docket No. PF14-22-000; Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Project

Dear Chainnan Bay:

I am writing to request an extension of the seoping period for the Nonh East Energy Direct Pipeline project proposed by the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, a subsidiary of Kinder Morgan, Inc.

The scoping period closes today. It is my understanding that Kinder Morgan, Inc. released a significant amount of new information at the end of July, after the last of lthe scoping meetings were held in New York. As I am certain you are aware, these large infrastructure projects often are unwelcome to individual property owners and to the communities that are impacted directly by the pipeline itself or by its associated infrastructure (e.g. compressor stations). While an extension of the seoping period may not resolve all citizen concerns, I believe it is very important to allow the public an opportunity to understand fully all the dimensions of these projects and to enable the residents of the area to offer constructive suggestions about how the negative impacts of the project might be reduced or eliminated. I am concerned that closing the scoping period now does not provide sufficient time for the public or local governments to review, analyze and respond to the new information released by Kinder Morgan last month.

I am aware that other members of the New York delegation recently wrote to you to request an extension of the scoping period to November 30, 2015. I support their request, and I also urge you to extend the scoping period for this project to the end of November. Thank you for your consideration and attention to this request.

Sincerely,

Paul D. Tonko
Member of Congress

20150908-0011

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives

September 2, 2015

The Honorable Norman Bay
Chairman
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426

Dear Chairman Bay:

Over the last several months, I have written to you on behalf of my constituents regarding Kinder Morgan's proposed Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline project. Since this project was first proposed, I have had the opportunity to listen to the concerns and questions of my constituents and locally elected officials in towns affected by the pipeline route. Additionally, I have travelled to many of these towns in southern New Hampshire to survey the land where the pipeline route would lay and meet with families to discuss the NED project. I am writing today to ensure that you and your staff are informed of the practical concerns that my constituents and I share regarding the NED project.

One of the primary issues that has been brought forth by my constituents is the potential impact that the NED project will have on conservation lands and environmentally sensitive areas. New Hampshire has a rich tradition of protecting our land and preserving it for future generations to enjoy. The ecological vitality of Granite State conservation lands is critical to ensuring that wildlife species continue to live safely within their existing habitats. In particular, citizens of the town of Amherst have raised concerns about the pipeline's potential effect on the Ponemah Bog and Scott Conservation land that are within close proximity of the pipeline route. The biodiversity of these areas and their role as local wildlife sanctuaries requires a thorough and judicious review by FERC to ensure that there are no negative environmental impacts posed by the NED project.

Citizens of the towns of Pelham and Mason have also expressed uncertainty about the NED project disrupting recreational areas. The Peabody Town Forest in Pelham is a highly valued parcel of land under the town's jurisdiction that is frequented by hikers, nature observers and sportsmen throughout the year. The people of Pelham treasure their public-use lands and are worried that the NED project, which is routed through the Peabody Town Forest, will negatively affect their ability to enjoy this land. Similarly, the Fifield conservation land located in the town of Mason is designated as a habitat of high priority by the state of New Hampshire. Mason has established this conservancy area to preserve wildlife habitats, fisheries and other important natural resources, and citizens have expressed concerns that the NED project would impact the town's ability to responsibly manage this conservation land. I also share the concerns expressed by many towns including Mason, Pelham, and Temple that the route crosses over crucial aquifers that provide drinking water to thousands of residents along the route. These towns deserve thorough analysis about how the NED project would influence properties like the Peabody Town Forest, Fifield conservation land, and town aquifers.

Furthermore, the proposed location of the pipeline between the Amherst Middle School and Elementary School, and the location of a compressor station in New Ipswich near the local elementary school has raised questions about emergency preparedness and safety. The Temple Elementary School is located approximately 1,300 feet from the location of a compressor station and the pipeline route in Amherst crosses directly through two adjacent schools. Many local residents whose children attend the schools in both towns have concerns about safety and disruption. The compressor station in particular raises concerns about noise pollution and the ability of volunteer emergency responders in surrounding rural communities to manage potential incidents. This is an issue of high concern for many small, rural towns along the route; I share my constituents concerns regarding the ability of volunteer emergency responders to properly manage any incidents that could occur along the pipeline or near the compressor station and ask that this issue be addressed before the NED project moves forward.

The Temple Elementary school also serves as the local community's shelter in the event of an emergency. If an emergency were to occur with the pipeline or compressor station, there would not be a safe shelter for area residents. The safety and well-being of my constituents is a top priority of mine in Congress, and it is important that FERC reviews all emergency preparedness plans and safety concerns while drafting an environmental impact statement. Small, rural towns have a narrow range of options for designating emergency shelters, and the placement of the NED project near the Temple Elementary school could require town planners to significantly alter emergency preparedness plans. In addition, I request that FERC review possible alternative locations for the compressor station that are not located within a close proximity to education facilities and buildings that are designated as emergency shelters.

New Hampshire is a quiet, rural state and thus there are considerations that must be taken into account in order for my constituents to maintain the peaceful quality of life that attracts them to the Granite State. I appreciate FERC's attention to the concerns that my constituents and I share, and understand the complicated process of reviewing a large energy proposal like the NED project. Many of my constituents have raised questions about the NED project's impact on environmentally sensitive areas, public health and emergency preparedness plans, and I request that FERC fully analyzes the specific concerns outlined in this letter during the decision making process. Thank you for your attention to these requests.

Sincerely,

Ann McLane Kuster
Member of Congress

20150908-0025

Hand written letter, 2 pages, Seth Hopkins, Member of Brokenshire Trust, 335 Green St, Northborough, MA 01532: opposing. Also denying access:

PROPERTY ACCESS DENIED

To: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC
1615 Suffield Street
Agawam, MA 01001

30 August 2015

RE: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

119 Sandy Pond Rd
Richmond, NH 03470
Brokenshire Trust

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Sincerely,

Seth Hopkins

20150908-0027

Hand written letter, 2 pages, Joanne Ostrowski, 401A Smith Rd, Ashfield, MA 01330: opposing

20150908-0028

{duplicate copy of 20150901-5069 (66 pages)}

20150908-0033

Marjorie Feathers
P. O. Box 1042
Hancock, Massachusetts 01237

August 31, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street NE, Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's Northeast Direct Project proposed by Kinder Morgan During careful, ongoing study of the Northeast Direct Pipeline from Kinder Morgan's first proposed route in New York State and Massachusetts through the current proposed route that also includes New Hampshire, it has been very obvious that this gas pipeline would be of benefit primarily to Kinder Morgan and that these northeastern states and towns are expected to accept Kinder Morgan's plan; should trust the company's "studies"; not worry about potential destruction of individual and public water supplies and leaks or the fact that rural towns would have diminished safety regulations involving pipeline gauge or distance between shut-off gates; and not even question the need for the gas. Regarding need, recently Kinder Morgan has been forced to realize that they have not been able to receive commitments and enough users in these states to support the type and size of pipeline they had originally proposed. Exportation of the gas would be their savior, as was probably planned to begin with. There are other routes and which they can export.

Opposition to this pipeline is not a nimby event. Across all three states, a large number of federal senators and representatives, state senators and representatives, and whole towns, all of whom have studied the proposal in its vague presentation and/or have met with Kinder Morgan representatives, have stood in strong opposition to this pipeline; Representatives have requested extension of scoping meetings for time to study the very recently changed proposal. Northeast Energy Solutions and others have challenged the financial model of the project. ISO's original forecast of New England's electricity load for 2015 was so inaccurate that New England Power Pool voted not to support it. New Jersey-based Northeast Energy Solutions recently rightfully questions why UIL Holdings Corp., parent company of Berkshire Gas Company, is enforcing a moratorium on adding new natural gas customers in parts of its coverage area while pledging to lift the moratorium if the gas pipeline is built, without disclosing their own financial investment in the pipeline. This certainly is cause for concern about public interest and public trust of a utility subject to regulation. Will the expense of building this project be passed on to National Grid customers, keeping energy costs high? Is National Grid's parent company also making financial investment in the pipeline or have they made secretive deals?

A look at settlement in the rural town of Hancock, MA, using the U. S. Geological Survey map, reveals that within 1/2 mile (mostly within 1/4 mile) of the proposed route lies the closest concentration of homes in the town — the whole village: 72 dwellings, the town library and the town's only church. Three of the town's earliest, stately homes, eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Properties, would be within yards of the rural-regulation thinner-gauge pipeline. Safety concerns about destroyed individual water wells and springs from possible gas leaks, and possible explosions from a weaker pipeline than is required in cities are of high priority. In fact, Hancock is only one of the many small towns expressing these worries.

Wide-spread safety and possible drinking water contamination concerns across all the involved states must be weighed heavily against the supposed but questioned need for gas from this proposed pipeline. It is these utmost concerns that have united a whole region that seldom agrees as strongly as this on any topic or project. Yes, the northeast is a more expensive place to live and do business when it comes to the cost of energy. Has it not always been? Are individuals, towns, and representatives clamoring to create short-term jobs and to get the energy cost down with a pipeline? No. Are renewable energy projects blossoming? Yes. The excuse for building this pipeline came from elsewhere, not from these affected states. For the sake of the people living in New York, Massachusetts and New Hampshire and not for the pockets of Kinder Morgan and its investors, please reject this pipeline proposal.

Marjorie Feathers

20150908-0034

3621 Hancock Road
Hancock, Massachusetts 01237
August 31, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street NE, Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426

Docket Number PF14-22-000

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's Northeast Energy Direct Project proposed by Kinder Morgan

As a volunteer fireman, having fought an inferno caused by a gas explosion that leveled a whole section of my hometown, killed best friends and maimed others, I am acutely aware of the dangers of explosion from gas.

I have studied as much as seems to be available and not elusive about the Northeast Energy Direct Project and have reached the conclusion that this pipeline would be more detrimental than beneficial to the people and the states through which it is proposed to pass. Less-than-strongest gauge pipe through rural areas and allowed small leaks do not belong near where people live, no matter what size the population. FERC needs to be aware that in the three northeastern states involved in this project there are no lengthy areas of unpopulated, inconsequential open land, as in the west. Towns and villages are contiguous, and many people live very near the power-line that Kinder Morgan plans to follow in laying their pipeline.

Corrected studies show that the need for directly-piped gas to this area is far less than Kinder Morgan has presented, leaving one to conclude that its construction is certainly not in the best interest of these states and would unnecessarily expose many towns and thousands of people to drinking-water and fire-safety risks. Requiring that all leaks be fixed in the current gas infrastructure would go a long way toward making available the extra gas needed during the few days cold snaps in the middle of winter when there may be shortfall in this area. For the safety of the people in the towns in which this proposed pipeline is planned, I ask that FERC not allow this project to proceed.

Yours truly,

Melvin Feathers

20150908-0035

{duplicate copy of 20150908-0034 }

20150908-0036

{duplicate copy of 20150831-5144 }

20150908-0040

Hand written card, Sullivan Family, 155 Old Wilton Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071: opposing

20150908-0041

Hand written card, William J. Finlayson, 167 Heald Rd, Wilton, NH 03086: opposing

20150908-0042

Hand written card, Jackie Skidmore, 358 Poor Farm Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071: opposing

20150908-0043

Hand written card, Jackie Skidmore, 358 Poor Farm Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071: opposing

20150908-0044

Hand written card, Jackie Skidmore, 358 Poor Farm Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071: opposing

20150908-0045

Hand written card, Jackie Skidmore, 358 Poor Farm Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071: opposing

20150908-0046

Hand written card, Andrew Finlayson, 167 Heald Rd, Wilton, NH 03086: opposing

20150908-0047

Hand written card, K. Sullivan, 155 Old Wilton Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071: opposing

20150908-0048

Hand written card, Jackie Skidmore, 358 Poor Farm Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071: opposing

20150908-0049

Hand written card, Jackie Skidmore, 358 Poor Farm Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071: opposing

20150908-0050

Hand written card, Sullivan family, 155 Old Wilton Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071: opposing

20150908-0051

Hand written card, John Leoutsacos, 79 Mountainview Drive, Temple, NH 03084: opposing

20150908-0052

Hand written card, Virginia Sullivan, 9 Pleasant St, Conway, MA 01341: opposing

20150908-0053

Hand written card, Virginia Sullivan, 9 Pleasant St, Conway, MA 01341: opposing

20150908-0054

Hand written card, Brown Williams, 9 Pleasant St, Conway, MA 01341: opposing

20150908-0055

Hand written card, Brown Williams, 9 Pleasant St, Conway, MA 01341: opposing

20150908-0056

Hand written card, Virginia Sullivan, 9 Pleasant St, Conway, MA 01341: opposing

20150908-0057

Hand written card, John Harrison, PO Box 396, 21 B? Hill Rd, Conway, MA 01341: opposing

20150908-0061

Hand written card, Barbara Ferullo, 50 Stowell Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071: opposing

20150908-0062

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE

Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426

Date: 8/27/2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access

As the owner of the property located at:
Map 3 Lot 5, Warwick Rd, Winchester NH
AND Map 3 Lot 6, 340 Warwick Rd, Winchester, NH

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose. Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.
Hugh ? McGovern

20150908-0072

Hand written letter, Hugh McGovern & George R. McGovern, Trustees of H & G Realty Trust, 82 Kemp St, Dunstable, MA 01827: opposing

20150908-0159

Hand written FERC Comment form, ? Hernandez, 4762 Palacio Rd, Brownsville, TX: opposing

20150908-0160

Hand written FERC Comment form: Joan Coryat, 109 Nash Hill Rd, Haydenville, MA 01039: opposing

20150908-0161

Hand written FERC Comment form: Benjamin Kohn, 74 Hinsdale Rd, Windosr, MA 01270: opposing

20150908-0162

Hand written FERC Comment form: Arthur G. Silver, 190 Nash Hill Road, Haydenville, MA 01039: opposing

20150908-0171

Hand written FERC Comment form: Bobbie Anne Fachini, 74 Hinsdale Rd, Windosr, MA 01270: opposing

20150908-0172

Hand written FERC Comment form: Benjamin Kohn, 74 Hinsdale Rd, Windosr, MA 01270: opposing

20150908-0173

Hand written FERC Comment form: Arthur G. Silver, 190 Nash Hill Road, Haydenville, MA 01039: opposing

20150908-0174

Hand written FERC Comment form: Joan Coryat, 109 Nash Hill Rd, Haydenville, MA 01039: opposing

20150908-0175

Hand written FERC Comment form: Ethan Kohn, 522 Hight St. Hill, Windosr, MA 01270: opposing

20150908-0188

8-30-2015 Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426

Project Docket Number: PF14-22

Scoping

Dear Kimberly D. Bose and FERC Commissioners:

Please do a study of earth quakes in my area that could affect gas pipe lines. How many G forces does it take to shock a pipe to crack on diameters such as 10” 12”20” 30”and 36”pipes with its flange at each connection. Would it break a flange seal? How much flexibility is there on each pipe diameter?

Some gas pipe lines are above ground and there are other areas of gas pipe lines that are under ground. From the center of the gas pipe line depth though is only three feet deep. What would happen if lightning strikes the gas pipes line’? Can you please do a study of lightning storms in my area? What affects could take place that might hurt the environment of a public area and the habitat’?

How often does Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas inspect pipe lines for leaks? How come one company, Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas that has a track record of bad events able to continue adding more gas pipe lines without correcting the older leaky gas pipe lines first? Would the leaky gas pipe line contaminate our drinking water? What health illnesses are to be expected to humans and habitat over our lifetime’

Affected land owner

John F. Orthmann
37 Comstock Drive
Milford NH 03055

20150908-0211

County of Cheshire
12 Court Street, Keene, NH 03431
www.co.cheshire.nh.us

August 31, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Kinder-Morgan Pipeline - Anticipatory Preparations

Dear Secretary Bose,

I am enclosing with this letter a copy of a letter that I have submitted to Lori Ferry ofAECOM in response to her letter ofJuly 2g, 2015 requesting that the County submit answers to stated concerns and that the remarks relate specifically to milepost markers on a US Geodetic Survey map that they enclosed.

As you probably know, Cheshire County Government does not maintain specific records ofthe nature requested. Cheshire County Government also lacks the ability to enact ordinances to protect citizens and their property. All such statutes and ofdinsnces must be enacted by the NH Legislature or by the towns themselves.

In the course of answering the AECOM letter I tried to identify all of the sensitive areas in the towns through which this pipeline is to pass.

The Cheshire County Commissioners wish to file the attached letter with the FERC as record of our concern about the pipeline. It would appear to be more appropriate for the applicants to replace and upgrade an undersized and deteriorating pipeline in Massachusetts rather than to create the damage that is inevitable in New Hampshire.

Sincerely,

Stillman Rogers, Chairman
Cheshire County Board of Commissioners

County of Cheshire

12 Court Street, Keene, NH 03431
www.co.cheshire.nh.us

August 17, 2015

Ms. Lori Ferry

AECOM Project Manager

10 Orms Street, Suite 405

Providence, R.I 02904

Subject: Your letter of July 28, 2015: Information Request

Northeast Energy Direct Project Docket 1 PF14-22

Dear Ms. Ferry,

I have previously responded to your letter of January 26, 2015 relative to this project. As indicated in my response to that letter, the government of Cheshire County does not maintain the type of information requested. I am, therefore, forwarding your letter to the Southwest Regional Planning Commission which may have more detailed information that is available to Cheshire County government.

I appreciate your attaching to your letter the maps of the proposed route of the pipeline. I have examined them and would make the following observations based upon my personal familiarity with the areas that will be impacted by the project. You have requested milepost references and I shall attempt to comply with that request but, you should note, many of the responses apply generally to the entire route.

Known aquifers exist, as I understand it, under the entire route from Milepost (MP) 0 in Winchester to MP 29 at the New Ipswich border. It is my understanding that several towns, e.g. Richmond, have ordinances protecting the aquifer. It is my understanding that the aquifer under Richmond also services the towns of Swanzey and Winchester.

The valley through which Route 32 passes is, I have been informed, a geological plate zone related to the plate tectonics that differentiate Vermont and New Hampshire. It is related to the plate actions that created the Connecticut River Valley. There have been several small earthquakes in this valley over the past several years. I have personally experienced them.

Geodetic Survey Map Observations:

From observation of the map that you have supplied, I note that from MPO to MP 1 the Pipeline (PL) crosses several hills that transmit water flow down to ponds, streams and marshy wetlands at their base and feed the streams and wetlands of Sunny Valley (which the pipeline passes through between MP 2.5 and MP 3.4. At MP 2 it passes between a small pond and its outflow brook. The passage on either side of MP 3 through sensitive wetlands presents serious threats to these wetlands and the aquifers that they feed. From conversations that I have had with Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company (TGPC) personnel it is my belief that the plan is to excavate through these areas and not to drill horizontal shafts under them. This presents a major threat to

the environment.

From MP4 to MP8, mostly in Richmond, the pipeline crosses a valley with a stream called Roaring Brook, then rising over a steep hillside and then crossing another valley with intermittent and vernal streams and turning east at the base of Scott Mountain along a valley floor, crossing yet another intermittent and vernal stream (MP6) before climbing over and down another hill and crossing Brickyard Brook at about MP6.7. It then climbs over the shoulders of Attleboro Mountain, descending to cross Taylor Road to MP8. The territory that it passes from MP7 to MP9 is a substantial part of the watershed for Sandy Pond which falls within the Buffer Zone. Sandy Pond is a popular swimming pond for townspeople as well as the location of Camp Wiyaka (www.camowivaka.org) a residential summer camp for children. This camp falls within your buffer zone. The pipeline, therefore, presents a threat to the water supply of the pond, to the camp and to the residences that fall within the runoff and buffer zone of the pipeline.

Between MP8 and MP9 at Route 92 the pipeline, and your proposed service road run over the tops of and up and down the steep sides of parts of the Franconia Mountain Range through territory which is composed of solid granite overlain by a thin layer of soil, a situation that is true of most of the route of this pipeline.

At about MP9 the PL crosses Route 32 and descends into a broad valley. The PL buffer zone at this point includes several private homes and, in the case of one home, virtually owns it. The PL will destroy the well of this one home and affect several other close by.

The valley between MP9 and MP9.5 contains Rice Brook (also locally referred to as Martin Brook), a feeder stream for the Ashuelot River. This stream flows northward through a sensitive ecological area of wetlands through Richmond and into Swanzey, passing close by Monadnock Regional High School before emptying into the Ashuelot River at the Cresson Covered Bridge. Any pollution or degradation of this stream would have significant impact upon a substantial sensitive ecosystem that extends from a point south of MP9.5 to the juncture of Rice Brook and the Ashuelot several miles north of MP9.5, then extending by way of the Ashuelot south through the town of Winchester to the Connecticut River at Hinsdale.

From MP 9.5 the PL and your service road rise up the flanks of another small mountain providing danger of runoff and pollution of Rice Brook. Then runs across another range of small granitic mountains to the area of MP12.3 where it crosses another valley that is the natural runoff route for an entire valley system and which is the water supply for a series of ponds and Nester Brook and providing the water supply for West Hill Reservoir in Troy. The rise of the PL from MP12.3 to MP12.65 likewise present the same danger to that ecosystem.

From MP13 the PL descends a mountainside, crosses a valley and rises to a point at MP14.3 during the course of which it crosses low marshy wetlands and Rockwood Brook, which in turn flows into brooks in Troy and thence into rivers. The course of the PL from MP14 to MP15 poses threats of ecological damage to Rockwood Pond and Boulder Pond, both in Fitzwilliam. It also poses danger to the private water supply of homes north of Rockwood Pond. Boulder Pond actually faces danger of pollution from two points of the PL. The area from MP14.3 to MP15 and the area from MP 15.2 to MP 16.2 both provide the probability of extensive runoff pollution of the marshes, streams and pond that make up this sensitive ecosystem.

The entire area from MP14 to MP16 also presents severe danger to the welfare and water supplies of a number of private residences in Troy and Fitzwilliam. All of these homes are served by private wells. That water comes from the surrounding hillsides which feed the underlying aquifer. From MP16 the PL descends into a large undeveloped marshland that almost to MP16. At about MP 17.5 it crosses the end of Scott Pond, a shallow pond surrounded by marshlands and known for its fish life, especially bass and perch. I have been informed by TGPC personnel that Scott Pond and Scott Brook would be trenched, rather than being traversed by horizontal drilling. That approach to crossing of any body of water or stream would be immensely destructive of a wildlife system that is highly valued in this region. The passage of the pipeline through this region also endangers the water supply wells of a number of cottages and homes in, and around Scott Pond. The PL also threatens the wells and homes of residences from MP18.8 to MP 20.1

From MP 19.5 to MP22.2 the PL crosses several additional marshy wetlands and ponds, the potential of pol-

lution of which endangers Perley Pond and the Damon Reservoirs. At MP 21 the PL again crosses another pond the trenching of which would be extremely damaging to the surrounding ecosystem. From MP 21 to MP29.2, at the border of Hillsborough County, the PL follows a path that passes through a constant series of waterways that provide water to a number of brooks and streams and provide for seasonal drainage the pollution or destruction of which would be disastrous for stream and bodies of water and the people who rely upon them for recreation and for their water supply. The sectors between MP 24 and MP 27 appear to be particularly troublesome because of the potential effect on Lake Monomonac and Cxocxoft and Emerson Ponds.

I believe that most of the area covered by this proposed pipeline are over aquifer areas and I know that at least a part of it is subject to municipal aquifer protection ordinances. Almost all of the area qualifies as surface waters for public drinking water supply. The water supply for just about every home and business within the area covered by the proposed pipeline is provided by drinking water wells, private reservoirs or springs and all such homes and businesses within 300 feet would be affected.

Almost the entire proposed pipeline zone is within open space and natural areas. The pipeline significantly affects local roads, scenic areas and streams and ponds. It would also have an adverse effect on wildlife, wildlife seasonal movement, migration nesting and grazing patterns. Much of this area is wilderness. The project would affect local hiking and walking trails and would create a massive and unsightly half mile wide swath through all of the affected towns. You have also asked about roads. Many of the roads that you will be using to move your equipment and the pipes are paved country roads, not designed to bear the burden of the heavy equipment that you will be putting over these roads. I notice that you have only one contractor yard, and that in Marlboro, a town not directly affected by this pipeline. The means that all of the equipment, pipeline and associated material, trucks, earthmoving equipment, etc., will be moving to the site over local highways. We need assurance that the damages you cause will be rectified and the highways made whole.

The pipeline would also create a massive problem for local safety officials in the event of a rupture of the pipeline. None of the towns, including the City of Keene, has a fire suppression capability that could cope with a massive fire caused by a rupture. While these are not frequent, they do occur and this region does not have the capability to handle them. In discussions with Kinder-Morgan personnel I have been told that no local fire department could deal with such an event yet there has been no mention of any proposal to handle such an event. We cannot wait hours for some qualified personnel and equipment to come to this region when needed.

Another major concern is that historically when these pipelines have outlived their usefulness they are abandoned in place. That is not an acceptable alternative in this region. The populace here should not be forced to bear the burden of removal and pollution clearance created by the pipeline.

I hope that you find these comments and observations useful as this matter progresses. I look forward to your statements and comments in reply.

Sincerely;

Stiiiman Rogers, Chairman
Board of Commissioners
County of Cheshire, New Hampshire

20150908-0212

August 27 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street NE, Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426

RE: Project Docket 1PF14-22-000

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co. Proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Ms. Bose:

This letter is to notify you of my family's opposition to the proposed pipeline in the vicinity of Sandy Pond, Richmond, New Hampshire.

For nearly 100 years, our family has owned property with a cottage directly on the shores of Sandy Pond—a peaceful, tranquil place with pristine, clean water. Not only do we enjoy our summers swimming in the lake, but fall and winter seasons—hunting, hiking, and enjoying Thanksgiving dinner, as well. So given our close proximity to this proposed pipeline, we have very many health and environmental concerns.

First, the proposed route through Richmond places our land within site of the pipeline and its right of way easements and places our pond in the incinerator zone. Our pond is fed solely by the runoff from along the hillside of the route and the brook that runs through it. Possible leakage of the pipeline not to mention the changes to the underground aquifers due to blasting are a threat to our water. Most importantly, there is a major threat to our dwelling's shallow well, our only source of drinking water. Of equal concern, would be any pesticides for controlling the vegetation in the pipeline area making for contamination of our water, as well.

Furthermore, one of the six property owners surrounding us at the pond is Camp Wiyaka, which is affiliated with the Athol Area YMCA. This camp has been in existence since 1921, when its founder Johnny Johnstone dreamed that boys and girls be offered the “Wiyaka Spirit” experience of “tenting with nature and learning the ways of the wood and wind.” As a parent, I know that I share the same sentiment as others as well, I would not send my child to this camp knowing it is within site of the pipeline and in the incinerator zone.

Additionally, the pipeline will affect property values and access roads will destroy the landscape. There will be bedrock blasting along the 100-foot ledges—this being a dangerous process. If there were an explosion or leakage, which cannot be guaranteed could occur, our whole area would be wiped out. Richmond is a very small town, and its fire and emergency personnel are all volunteers and not equipped to handle a disaster of this type.

This pipeline would be of no benefit to us. It is very interesting to note that according to a recent report commissioned by GDF Suez, a multinational energy company based in France that owns and operates a variety of liquefied natural gas import facilities in New England, which was conducted by Energyzt Advisors LLC concludes that proposed new natural gas pipeline construction is unnecessary and lays out a series of alternatives to meet the regions shortfalls of natural gas.

In closing, it does not seem fair that we be put at risk so that a private company can benefit and make millions in profits on our misfortune. Please do not allow this pipeline project to proceed and destroy an area we all hold dear to us and our future generations.

Sincerely,

Dorene Hayden McCobb and Family

20150908-0213

Hand written letter, 2 pages: Martha Freedman, 55 Quarry Road, Box 242, Lanesborough, MA 01237: opposing

20150908-0219

Hand written letter, Sawyer Hopkins: opposing

20150908-0220

Hand written FERC Comment form, 2 pages: M. Wenz, 17 Farmer Rd, Merrimack, NH 03054: opposing

August 28, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street NE, 1A

Washington, DC 20426-0001

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LLC., Northeast Energy Direct Project; Docket No. PF14-22-000 Scoping Comments

Dear Ms. Bose;

Thank you for the opportunity to submit the following comments on the Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the Planned Northeast Energy Direct Project (NED). I was provided a copy of "The Trustees", comments and concur entirely with their assessment of the negative impacts of the current siting proposal. The Trustees carefully lay out exactly why a project such as this, in the year 2015, should never be sited in virgin or green locations with so many other alternatives. They carefully document the externalities but it is up to FERC to make sure they are properly monetized and included in the analysis of alternatives. There are sufficient gray and black corridors that eliminate the preponderance of these externalities which are not adequately presented in the current application. Some of these alternatives that do not appear to be under consideration would be superior and could surely meet:

- The public necessity
- Needs of the applicant
- Needs of the public
- Need of private companies

and minimize the:

- Externalities:
- Public takings
- Wildlife impacts
- Water shed impacts
- View shed impacts
- Ecosystem impacts
- Wetland impacts
- River system impacts

Given existing gray corridors such as Route 2, the Massachusetts Turnpike, and other thoroughly and previously excavated and constructed corridors, there are available siting opportunities that eliminate most of the negative impacts, reduce cost to the applicant, reduce cost to society, and produce a superior, win-win outcome for the public. And importantly, forcing the externalities on New Hampshire - when the greatest benefit accrues to Massachusetts — is unfair and irresponsible.

As FERC is well aware, Massachusetts needs expanded natural gas supplies for potentially repowering:

1. Pilgrim (this plant will retire and location lacks sufficient natural gas),
2. Canal (mothballed due to lack of gas supply among other reasons),
3. Salem (mothballed lack of natural gas to switch from coal),
4. Fall River, Somerset and New Bedford (forced coal retirements with lack of sufficient natural gas supply for repowering),

FERC should prioritize providing access for these plants to use the large Marcellus and possible future

domestic gas reserves as both prudent and environmentally responsible. Massachusetts is the predominant gas consumer that will benefit from this supply expansion. While significant fuel switching plans have been investigated by the various utilities over the decades, a routing of the Kinder Morgan pipeline - further north away from these consumers - makes it more difficult and expensive to get large volumes of gas to the major gas consuming centers. It could also delay for decades additional access to natural gas for large numbers of residential consumers in the region for home heating as a cheaper and cleaner alternative to oil ie. increases competition for consumers and environmental benefits. FERC is aware of expansion constraints in densely populated areas of Eastern Massachusetts, Cape Cod and the Islands and there is a current moratorium on new gas hook-ups on Cape Cod due to a lack of capacity, notwithstanding ongoing upgrades and current attempts to improve capacity. A major policy re-think is critical for both FERC and Massachusetts involving the following topics:

Metro Boston is the gas sink. (The Nova Scotia/New Brunswick proposals were to help relieve winter extreme conditions and those low pressure/peak problems continue to persist) Power plant sites are likely to, and should, remain the focus for power production since they are already bmnw sites and were constructed because they have a unique collection of critical attributes such as access to cooling water, transmission, interconnections, existing brownfield sites, distance fmm residential locations, fuel supply access to the facilities, fuel storage, electrical grid support, etc.

Repowering with domestic natural gas is a win-win-win.

A NED pipeline route on the Massachusetts Turnpike or Route 2 has huge advantages for Massachusetts, FERC and the Applicant, including:

- Revenue for right of way access; and
- Better locations for high pressure supply to
- power plant sites,
- Eastern Massachusetts
- Boston and
- Cape Cod.

Using the Mass Pike or Route 2 has large advantages for NED:

- Known, previously excavated soil types and structures along existing gray corridor;
- Far fewer entities for right of way negotiations and eminent domain takings; and
- Use of existing gray land rather than proposed NH siting in very difficult and virgin soil structures including extensive:
 - o granite,
 - o wetlands,
 - o river crossing,
 - o heavy rock formations

Use of this type of terrain carries enormous local opposition and will require a large number of unnecessary public land takings by eminent domain. FERC should reject the proposed Northern route due to its inherently large negative externalities, eminent domain requirements, hugely negative private property impacts, negative watershed, riverine, wild life and ecosystem impacts and request the Applicant to pursue siting proposals that provide more benefits and less extemalities.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts and NED have a once in a lifetime opportunity for significant environmental and economic progress for the benefit of the parties. The public deserves this and sensible planning and decision making is quite prudent at this stage of the process.

In conclusion, the current proposal is a substandard infrastructure placement which will likely have substantially negative economic and environmental impacts for the US compared with alternatives. It will likely force the applicant to resort to export markets for the gas due to less access for domestic consumption and

superior nature of trade opportunities as a result of the proposed siting. In my view and in the view of many, this would be a terrible domestic energy and environmental policy outcome for FERC, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and the country as a whole.

Please reject NED's current proposal and inspire an enlightened outcome.

Sincerely,

Curt Felix

CC:

The Honorable Ed Markey, Senator, Chairman US Senate Energy Committee
The Honorable Niki Tsongas, Representative
The Honorable Seth Moulton, Representative
The Honorable Bill Keating, Representative
The Honorable Joseph P. Kennedy III, Representative
The Honorable Charlie Baker, Governor of Massachusetts
The Honorable Matthew Benton, MA Secretary Energy and Environmental Affairs
The Honorable Richard Davey, MA Secretary of Transportation
The Honorable Angela O'onnor, Chair, MA Department of Public Utilities
The Honorable Robert Hayden, Commissioner, MA Department of Public Utilities
The Honorable Jolette Westbrook, Commissioner, MA Department of Public Utilities
The Honorable Andreas Thanos, Commissioner, MA Department of Public Utilities
The Honorable Dan Wolfe, State Senator, Commonwealth of MA
The Honorable Sara Peake, State Representative, Commonwealth of MA
The Honorable Maggie Hasson, Governor of New Hampshire
The Honorable Rick Minard, NH Deputy Director Energy and Planning
The Honorable Martin P. Honigberg, NHC~Department of Public Utilities
Rick Minard, NH Deputy Director Energy and Planning
Debra A. Howland, NH Executive Director, Department of Public Utilities

20150908-0224

TOWN OF NORTHFIELD

www.northfield.ma.us

69 MAIN STREET

NORTHFIELD, MASSACHUSETTS 01360-1017

August 27, 2015

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 1st St NE Rm 1a
Washington, DC 20426-0002

RE: ADDENDUM TO THE FERC COMMENTS (PREVIOUSLY FILED) OF THE TOWN

Dear Ms. Bose:

Please accept the following comments as additions to our previously filed comments regarding the Northeast Energy Direct Project as proposed by Kinder Morgan (Docket No. PF14-22-000).

Thank you.

Sincerely,

BRIAN S. NOBLE
Town Administrator

enclosures

The Concern: Berkshire gas is now a 2 /12% owner of the NED pipeline project. It is highly likely that they knew this at the time they issued a moratorium on new customers. Their refusing to take on new customers must be viewed as a ploy to convince FERCC and other regulators of a need when in fact the need for a moratorium is questionable at best.

The Requirement: That any moratorium that was called by Berkshire gas be considered a marketing ploy and not a true assessment of need. That others who followed their lead must also be considered as an invalid response and should be ignored.

The Concern: The calculation of need needs to be limited to the Northeast and not Canada.

The Requirement:: That need be based on US need only and if there was a shortfall of gas then we must first consider that all gas goes first to US based customers. That any shortfall estimates be reduced by the amount of gas shipped to Canada or off shore.

The Concern: That calculation of need consider small scale solar and other energy generation.

The Requirement:: That we consider individual generators of solar or wind power in estimates of need and consider that these forms of energy will increase over time.

The Concern: That conservation measures can be used to provide an alternative to increased energy production.

The Requirement:: That when calculating energy projections and need we give full consideration to an energy conservation initiative that could be sponsored by the state or the Northeastern states. With a strong campaign, focusing on simple solutions we can reduce use across Massachusetts and the northeast.

The Concern: That the issue of public convenience and necessity must take into account the necessity of production of food, the need for clean water and the need for trees and forests to produce oxygen.

The Requirement:: That we give value of the necessity of rural New England to maintain the ability to produce crops at the current rate, to prevent water pollution and to have enough green land to generate oxygen. While it is true that no one pipeline will destroy the global production, the water pollution can destroy a town. The overall trend, of which this pipeline would be a part is to destroy the environment on favor of energy. This trend must stop to guarantee adequate resources for future generations.

Rosenberg FERC Hearing:

There needs to be a clear need for FERC to approve the taking of land by eminent domain. The land in question is private land, town lands state lands and federally funded protected lands. I want to address the question of need.

Let me start with the definition of need. Need is something that is required, a necessity a condition marked by the lack of something requisite. Need is distinguished from desire by the necessity and requirement rather than something that one would like to have.

There is no need for more gas. There are no peer reviewed studies that support the need for gas as proposed by Kinder Morgan. There are many alternative solutions available.

Stop the leaks.

- o From to WBUR radio “According to Senator Edward Markey’s 2013 study, the state’s gas customers paid between 640 million dollars and 1.5 billion dollars for gas that never even reach their home or business.” If this gas was not leaking then it would help solve any problem that might exist.
- o From the Boston Globe “Detailed maps of the leaks became available this week as a result of a new state law requiring utility companies to report the location and age of all their known gas leaks, which according to one estimate have cost ratepayers more than \$1 billion.” If the gas companies stop these leaks we will have more gas and cleaner air with less toxic pollutants.

There must be a requirement that gas leaks be fixed before we add ore infrastructure. The solution is to clean up the problems before thinking about creating new ones.

The cheapest way to deal with the issue of a perceived shortage of energy is conservation.

o As we did during WWII, conserving gasoline we need to have a “war” on energy waste.

- There needs to be a statewide campaign to be “cool” in the winter having everyone lower their thermostats to under 70 degrees. Let all politicians and public figures lead this effort and be shown wearing sweaters in all public appearances during the cold months.
- There should be an “I Save Energy” sweatshirt campaign that has everyone in Massachusetts getting a free sweatshirt with that slogan when they commit to reducing household or office temperatures in the winter.
- Be “hot” in the summer. All people must be encouraged to raise the temperatures in air conditioned places to a minimum of 72 degrees.
- Promote the statewide energy audit program. Have grants for low income people and interest free or low interest loans to others for energy savings efforts on homes and offices. Expand that program so that everyone in the state is aware of it and uses it.
- Provide loans for solar, wind and small scale hydro energy generation.

FERC needs to demand an explanation from Kinder Morgan on their projected increase of need when federal studies show a decline in the use of gas and the use of energy.

Last year the fears of an energy shortage did not materialize. LNG ports were able to help meet any needs. According to a study commissioned by GDF Suez any gas shortages can be remedied by the use of a combination of dual-fuel power plants and more efficient LNG gas contracting.

There are 2 LNG terminals in Everett that are currently operating at only 50% of capacity. This is an underutilized resource that should be used to help resolve any potential shortages.

There are two pipelines under construction or in the planning phase. One is along an existing pipeline route and the other is a short pipeline that will help feed the Connecticut area, part of our region.

There are also proposed High capacity electric lines from Canada that will be providing additional energy to the region lessening the need for gas generated electricity.

There is no way that need for more gas can be proven. As for a desire, I think the main desire we are trying to accommodate here is the desire for Kinder Morgan to increase revenue.

Do people need to have their houses heated above 70 degrees. NO. Do they need to cool them below 72 degrees, NO. They may want to, but that is desire, not need. Do we need more fossil fuel energy generation, NO. It is desired by some but not needed by anyone.

As a country we are facing a dilemma.

Do we continue to increase our demands (not needs) for more fossil fuel energy generation or do we look towards alternative.

Do we aggressively move towards a green solution that is sustainable over time or do we continue to keep our heads in the sand and rely on fossil fuel as though it has no down sides and will last forever.

Do we accept the destruction of our environment for short term corporate profit or do we value the land, air, water, forests and farms that are needed for life itself.

While I will be the first to admit that one pipeline in itself will not be the destruction of rural America, the ongoing trend of Fracking and distribution of gas through a leaking and poorly maintained infrastructure added to the oil pipelines that have wreaked havoc across the nation must be stopped. Stop it here, stop it now. Say NO to NED

Town of Conway, Massachusetts
BOARD OF HEALTH
5 Academy Hill Rd.
P. O. Box 240
Conway, Ma 01341

Phone: (413) 369-4235 Ext. 8
Fax: (413) 369-4237

Email: boardofhealth@townofconway.com

August 24, 2015

Kimberly Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street NE
Washington, DC 20426
RE: Docket #PF14-22

Dear Secretary Bose,

The Board of Health of the Town of Conway, Massachusetts hereby submits this letter as part of the proceedings under this docket.

The following taken from the Massachusetts Association of Health Boards website, provides a brief description of the responsibilities of local Boards of Health in Massachusetts which includes “disease prevention and control, health and environmental protection, and promoting a healthy community”.

The Conway Board of Health has grave concerns about the health, safety, and environmental impacts of the Northeast Direct natural gas pipeline and appurtenances proposed to bisect our town. The Conway Board of Health unanimously supports the submission to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission &om the Conway Ad Hoc Pipeline Task Force.

Specifically and within the jurisdiction of this Board we a’re concerned abo’ut the following:

- integrity of drinking water;
- integrity of air quality;
- noise;
- safety; and
- the direct and indirect health effects related to natural gas infrastructure, specifically around the planned and unplanned releases of natural gas.

The current scientific literature indicates that direct and indirect environmental impacts related to unconventional natural gas development have potential adverse effects on public health. Given the increasing questions about the need for the proposed Northeast Direct natural gas infrastructure expansion, the Conway Board of Health strongly urges FERC to deny the application of Tennessee Gas Pipeline / Kinder Morgan for the NED Pipeline.

Further, given the concerns of the Conway Board of Health related to the short and long term health effects, the Board has issued a cease and desist order prohibiting all activities related to the proposed Northeast Direct Pipeline &om continuing in the Town of Conway.

Respectfully submitted,

{signatures of 5 members/commissioners}

cc Allen Fore

John Fitz-Gibbon

Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Fisheries and Wildlife Board
251 Causeway Street, Suite 400
Boston, Massachusetts 02114

George L. Darey, Chairman

Bonnie Booth

John F. Creedon

Joseph Larson, PhD.

Michael Roche

Brandi Van Roo, PhD.

Frederic Winthrop

August 27, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street NE, Room IA
Washington, DC 20426

RE: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC, Docket No. PF14-22-000, Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Secretary Bose,

I am writing on behalf of the Massachusetts Fisheries and Wildlife Board (Board) regarding the Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Northeast Energy Direct Project (NED) issued by the staff of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) on June 30, 2015, in the above-referenced docket.

The Board has the statutory control and supervision of the Massachusetts Division of Fisheries and Wildlife (DFW). This includes the acquisition and management of land, wetlands, and waters (in fee or lesser interests) as wildlife habitat for outdoor passive recreation. DFW has acquired these lands and waters using funds from a variety of public and private sources. These sources include (1) license fees paid by the public for hunting, fishing, and trapping licenses; (2) federal aid funds; (3) state open space bonds; and (4) private donations from individuals, charities, and land trusts.

As a matter of law, DFW is entrusted with the care of these lands and waters. They are protected by the Massachusetts Constitution, Massachusetts statutes, DFW regulations, and the common law. All of these lands carry fiscal obligations of oversight, maintenance, and management. Many also entail obligations negotiated with public and private entities.

In particular, Article 97 of the Amendments to the Massachusetts Constitution extends the DFW's public obligations beyond management of wildlife and their habitats. This provision expressly requires that lands or easements that DFW acquires for public conservation purposes may not be used for other purposes without a two-thirds vote of each branch of the legislature. In addition, lands that DFW acquires with funds from the state's environmental-bond bills are legally required to be open to the general public for a wide variety of year-round outdoor passive recreation activities. The Board expects FERC to ensure that the proponents of the NED meet these requirements of Massachusetts law.

If permitted, the NED could have substantial environmental impact on the lands and waters of the Commonwealth, portions of which are owned and protected by DFW. In order for the EIS to be fully informed and appropriately comprehensive, adequate time is essential for entities such as DFW to digest and provide comments on this large project. This is especially the case given (1) the recent and significant changes proposed in the route, extent, and location of the NED and (2) the truly massive and overwhelming quantity of material recently generated for review contained in the Resource Reports filed just last month (almost 7,000 pages of text, maps, and exhibits).

On behalf of DFW, the Board respectfully submits that it is per se unreasonable and contrary to the pub-

lic interest for DFW to be required to review and consider these thousands of pages of submissions and to provide meaningful comments to FERC staff by August 31, 2015, the current deadline. Accordingly, the Board joins others — individuals, municipalities, state agencies, nonprofit organizations, members of state legislatures, and members of Congress — in urging FERC to extend the time for submitting comments on the proposed scope of the EIS. A reasonable extension of time would have many positive effects. It would enable affected landowners like DFW to assess the materials very recently submitted on the NED. It would also allow FERC to require the project proponents to present enhanced information on project need and alternatives and the economic and environmental costs and benefits of the project (and any alternatives), all of which many individuals and organizations have suggested would be prudent. FERC needs to ensure that the environmental data on the alternative routes be as detailed and complete as the data supplied for the preferred route. Your analysis should also address the longterm effects on the Division's (and other similar public and private entities') future ability to acquire and hold land in trust. The reputational cost to those entities charged with protecting public lands is significant and needs to be understood and evaluated.

It would further allow the NED project to be more fully evaluated in light of the efforts of the Massachusetts Attorney General, who recently commissioned a study of regional electricity reliability needs, which is expected in October 2015 and could provide a much-needed objective assessment of whether the NED project is necessary or advisable.

This Board and DFW will vigorously fulfill the obligations assigned to us by the legislature and the citizens of Massachusetts. At the same time, we are prepared to cooperate fully with the project proponents in identifying a pipeline route that maximizes the use of existing transportation and utility corridors and minimizes adverse impacts to lands and waters indentified as valuable for wildlife habitat and public passive recreation, if such a pipeline is proven to be in the public interest

Respectfully submitted,

George Darey, Chairman

20150908-0227

{duplicate copy of 20150908-0220 }

20150908-5025

Timothy Somero, New Ipswich, NH.

A national news outlet, ABC, published a report that a Kinder Morgan (Tennessee Gas) subsidiary El Paso Pipeline (purchased in November 2014) recently had an explosion in New Mexico that killed numerous American citizens.

<http://abcnews.go.com/US/story?id=96090&page=1>

When will these fatalities be included in the safety reports in the EIS filed by KM that reflect the full scope of KM, TGP, and all related subsidiaries across our nation?

My concern is that reporting a safety record for only a subsidiary, pick one - KM, TGP, EPP, etc. - makes data obscure to the American public on 5-, 10-, 15-, and beyond safety impacts for natural gas infrastructure across the entire business domain for KM + TGP + EPP, etc.

When is KM required to provide, in simple language, a comprehensive record of all pipeline accidents, fatalities, etc. for their entire infrastructure across America?

20150908-5029

Timothy Somero, New Ipswich, NH.

From a socio-economic perspective, what is the total cost per capita for my family to invest in the compressor station that is proposed to be a mile from my home.

I'm asking for a plain English number that accounts for any property taxes paid by the company, increase in

my property taxes, decrease in my property value, and the medical problems that I anticipate for the town residents and children.

What is the total cost?

Whatever the number, I prefer having this money available in cash to invest in renewable energy such as wind, solar, geothermal. I learned about this on the TV ads from the natural gas industry that tell me that the natural gas industry is supporting all of this.

Could you tell me my personal, lifetime cost of the project? When will I get financial incentive from the company to offset the cost of their project in support of the renewable alternative for my family?

20150908-5034

Valerie A Rossetti, Bloomfield, CT.

I am writing as a very concerned citizen of Bloomfield, CT against the approval of the proposed Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Pipeline Company gas pipeline along Metropolitan-District-Commission (MDC) lands in Bloomfield, CT. The current route crosses highly-protected drinking-water lands and should in no way be endangered by construction and maintenance of a large gas pipeline. Per CT law, these are Class I and Class II restricted lands and cannot be legally disturbed other than through limited, permitted actions necessary to maintain operations. Disturbing the hydrology by construction of a 30-36" pipeline and exposing the watershed to potential leakage or contamination is patently unwise. Until or unless alternatives to traversing this section are investigated and approved, this pipeline should NOT be given approval.

20150908-5061

Dear FERC,

This week President Obama travelled to Alaska and called for urgent and aggressive action to tackle climate change. How are your actions helping reduce climate change?

Research by the EPA indicates that the energy sector is currently the largest source of carbon dioxide in the U.S., accounting for 97% of emissions in 2012.

(<http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/ghgemissions/usinventoryreport.html>).

In 2014, the Berkeley School of Law study, "Addressing Climate Change Without Legislation," indicated ways that the FERC could reduce greenhouse gas and promote clean energy use.

(https://www.law.berkeley.edu/files/CLEE/FERC_Report_FINAL.pdf)

This Berkeley study had 6 bullet point conclusions:

- "Promote increased use of clean energy sources. FERC can reduce fossil fuel generation by including a carbon adder, reflecting the cost of climate and other environmental damage caused by electricity generation's carbon dioxide emissions, in wholesale electricity rates.
- "Encourage increased development of renewable power systems. FERC can encourage more renewable generation by facilitating the development and use of feedin tariffs that guarantee renewable generators a specified price for their power.
- "Support the use of hydrokinetic resources, particularly ocean energy resources. FERC can encourage the development of offshore hydrokinetic projects by simplifying the approvals process for such projects.
- "Encourage expansion of the transmission grid to connect areas with high renewable energy potential to load centers. FERC can require electric utilities to expand their transmission capacity to serve renewable power systems. Additionally, FERC can encourage utilities to voluntarily invest in such expansions by changing its transmission cost recovery rules to allow for broader allocation of investment costs.
- "Promote integrated resource planning that considers both supply and demand side options for meeting future electricity requirements. By encouraging utilities to consider all possible resource options, integrated resource planning may lead to greater use of renewable generation, energy efficiency, and other

environmentally friendly resources. Recognizing this, FERC may require utilities to adopt a fully integrated approach when preparing regional transmission plans. Additionally, FERC can also foster greater cooperation and information sharing between utilities during the planning process.

- “Reduce the natural gas industry’s climate impacts. FERC can mitigate greenhouse gas emissions from natural gas production, transportation, and use by requiring natural gas companies to report on the climate impacts of their operations and to take appropriate steps to minimize those impacts.”

The fifth bullet above states the FERC could encourage utilities make better use of the exponential growth of “behind the meter” solar resources growing here in New England.

A springtime 2015 prediction of grid performance by the ISONE stated “ The exponential growth of solar photovoltaic resources in the region is adding to the complexity of operating the grid, especially during the summer months. More than 900 MW (nameplate capacity) of “behindthemeteter” solar facilities are currently installed throughout New England, but because they are not connected to the highvoltage power system, ISO New England can’t “see” how much power they produce, or where and when it is being produced. At the ISO level, power output from these resources shows up as a reduction in overall demand on the high-voltage power system. ”

(http://www.isone.com/staticassets/documents/2015/04/2015_summer_outlook_release_final.pdf) .

According to ISONE, consumers are making this happen through “exponential growth.” This is a good thing for the region, the USA, and is inline with the President’s agenda. FERC can better serve the public need for energy by improving grid integration with behind the meter solar facilities (as just one action).

As our Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, please show leadership and guidance to transform our energy grid into a decentralized model. The Berkeley study demonstrates the FERC can do this without legislation. Politically speaking, it is better to be a leader in this area rather than to have the president and/or congress tell you to do it later. Please don’t be the last department in the government to realize that a decentralized solar grid is the future.

Many other eCommenters have demonstrated the NED natural gas pipeline is not needed or necessary. I will not restate their conclusions here. Please stop the NED Pipeline as it is unnecessary will lead to greatly increased greenhouse gas. There is no benefit to doubling down on natural gas now.

Instead of adding needless pipeline, transform the grid to better utilize the energy being pushed on to grid by we the people behind the meters.

{submitted by Sean Radcliffe}

20150908-5075

September 7, 2015

Mr. Eric Tomasi, Project Manager for PF14-22
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, N.E., Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426

CC:Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

RE: Is the FERC Docket a complete record?

Dear Mr. Tomasi,

I am writing to express a concern about the FERC Docket. I had thought that it was intended to contain a complete record of the Applicant’s interactions with government agencies. However, it appears that may have been a naive assumption on my part. I would appreciate clarification.

Docket accession number 20150904-4008, posted 9/4/2015, contains 2 items:

1. a letter to FERC from Carol Henderson, Environmental Review Coordinator, NH Fish and Game Department

2. the minutes (on Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company stationery) of a 3-hour meeting on 5/19/15 between NH Fish and Game and personnel from Kinder Morgan, AECOM, HMM and Normandeau.

The topic of the meeting was the NED project and its Minutes were referenced in, and appended to, the NH Fish and Game letter. Thus it appears that minutes recorded by the Applicant concerning a project-related conference with a governmental agency was not documented in the Docket, except months later and as an afterthought.

My questions are:

1. if there is any requirement that minutes of such meetings be entered into the FERC Docket:
 - 1a. which party or parties to such meetings are required to submit the minutes to FERC?
 - 1b. is there a log of such meetings which would support cross-checking for minutes?
2. if there is no such a requirement, then what is required to be in the FERC Docket, versus what can be excluded? For example, are only meetings attended by FERC staff required to be minuted in the Docket?
3. I can foresee a large number of meetings between the Applicant's staff or agents and a wide range of governmental agencies - Federal, state or local. Important issues could be discussed and significant decisions made.
 - 3a. Is FERC kept informed of such meetings, or are they effectively *sub-rosa* despite involving public agencies and quite likely discussions of issues or decisions of great import to the application?
 - 3b. If FERC is kept informed, how do the "stakeholders" find out about such meetings?

I hope that there are more transparent and efficient solutions than requiring "stakeholders" to broadcast FOIA requests to every potentially involved Federal, State and local agency!

Cordially,

Garth Fletcher
288 Marcel Rd
Mason, NH 03048

20150908-5115

Four Mile Brook Flash Flooding Concerns

The Concern

The Four Mile Brook watershed is relatively small but with very steep slopes. Consequently, it is susceptible to flash flooding dangers. In 1999 the intense rainfall from Hurricane Floyd resulted in a flash flood that washed out hundreds of feet of roadway to a depth of up to 6 – 8 feet. This damage isolated many residents for days. The proposed pipeline is to extend over 2.5 miles along this watershed. This route will result in the clear cutting of over 3.5 acres in the watershed for the construction of the pipeline. The construction will also greatly compact local soils due to the heavy equipment used for construction. This clear cutting and soil compaction will significantly increase the runoff and time of concentration of peak runoff.

The Requirement

Mitigation must be provided that there will be zero increase in runoff during and after the construction of the pipeline.

20150909-0006

{duplicate copy of 20150908-0008 }

20150909-0010

Town of Berne, New York

August 31, 2015

Norman C. Bay, Chairman
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street NE
Washington, DC 20426

RE: Docket No. PF14-22-000

Dear Chairman Bay,

The Town of Berne writes this letter concerning the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project (Docket No. PF14-22-000) proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. (TGP), a subsidiary of Kinder Morgan. The Town has many residents who are concerned about the proposed pipeline expansion and we request these concerns be adequately addressed.

1. FERC failed to schedule scoping hearings in our county, placing the undue burden of travel to a neighboring county or farther to meet with your representatives.

Will future FERC scoping sessions and hearings be held in Albany County

The Town of Berne requests that an Albany County location be included in all future FERC scoping sessions and hearings.

2. The scoping session location closest to Berne was held on July 16. The latest Draft Environmental Report and project Scope Update from TGP was due in June, but was not filed until July 24, cutting our residents out of the opportunity to question FERC representatives in person regarding it

Will any additional scoping sessions be scheduled?

The Town of Berne requests that an additional scoping session be scheduled in Albany County to address this inconsistency.

3. The Environmental Report mentioned above consists of over 1GB of data — more than 6,700 pages of text, maps, tables and technical information. Given the amount and complexity of the material, the 38 days between the filing and the end of the comment period is absurdly inadequate for residents and officials of a small town with limited engineering and environmental resources to properly examine and analyze it, and to submit responses. On August 28, Senators Charles E. Schumer and Kirstin Gillibrand along with Representative Chris Gibson wrote a letter requesting FERC extend the current comment period to November 30, 2015.

Will the current comment period be extended? If not, why?

The Town of Berne joins our Congressional representatives in this request

4. The residents of the Town of Berne rely solely on private water wells and lakes for drinking water. The proposed pipeline route traverses numerous ponds, wetlands and aquifer recharge areas.

Has an inventory of potential impacts specific to private drinking water sources been conducted? If not, why? If not, will it be required?

The Town of Berne requests that FERC require a complete inventory of potential impacts that NED Project development might have on Berne's drinking water supply and quality and submit this to the Town.

5. The Town of Berne relies on volunteer fire and ambulance emergency services. Pipelines can, and do, leak and explode. The proposed pipeline route travels under numerous roads, overhead power lines, and near residences. The expansion project calls for the proposed pipeline to carry gas from unconventional gas wells which have higher levels of toxic chemicals and radioactivity than from conventional gas wells, and at higher pressures than the existing pipelines currently carry, creating a greater hazard to residents and emergency workers.

What scope of training and equipment is necessary, how will it be provided to our emergency workers and our town, and who will pay for it?

The Town of Berne requests specific information on the emergency services training and equipment necessary to adequately protect our residents, and who is expected to pay for this training and equipment

6. In April 2015, the Medical Society of the State of New York (MSSNY) passed a resolution calling for “governmental assessment of the health and environmental risks that are associated with natural gas pipelines.” In June, the American Medical Association (AMA) followed with a resolution stating, in part, that our AMA recognize the potential impact on human health associated with natural gas infrastructure and be it further resolved, that our AMA support legislation that would require a Comprehensive Health Impact Assessment regarding the health risks that may be associated with natural gas pipelines.” In July Dr. David O. Carpenter, Director of the Institute for Health and Environment, University at Albany released a memorandum stating that the AMA quite clearly concluded that “current regulatory procedures do not adequately protect public health and safety and summarized several of the many deficiencies of FERC’s current regulatory review process.

Why does FERC not currently require a Comprehensive Health Impact Assessment? Will FERC review its regulatory review process?

The Town of Berne acknowledges the expertise of MSSNY, AMA, and Dr. Carpenter, and requests that FERC require a Comprehensive Health Impact Assessment as outlined by the Centers of Disease Control and Prevention and by the National Academy of Sciences for the NED Project.

In addition, there are concerns that this gas is not needed and will mostly be exported to consumers outside the U.S. None of it will benefit the residents of Berne who are impacted by this project. It is unclear that any benefits to the New England region will outweigh the impacts on the communities that lie on the proposed route. TGP has already decreased the diameter of some sections of the proposed pipeline and decreased the size of a number of proposed compressor stations, presumably because of a decrease in expected need. Petroleum prices are at a six-year low, likely further reducing the need for more natural gas, and recent studies of New England energy markets, which include energy use data from the brutal winter of 2014-2015, call in to question the statistics used to show the necessity for this project.

FERC issues a certificate for “public convenience and necessity.” What steps will FERC take to ensure that the NED Project is, indeed, a necessity and that its benefits to the New England energy market will outweigh the impacts to residents and communities along its path?

No doubt more questions and concerns from our community and others like it will be brought to the forefront upon further review of the latest Draft Environmental Report. It is our sincere hope that FERC responds to the above listed concerns, and honors the intent of public inclusion by extending the current comment period to allow a reasonable time for review of the latest published documents.

Thank you for your consideration.

On behalf of the Town Council,

Dawn G. Jordan
Councilman

CC: Senator Charles E. Schumer
Senator Kristin Gillibrand

20150909-0011

Hand written FERC Comment form: Barbara Ferullo, 50 Stowell Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071: opposing

20150909-0012

Steven and Niki McGettigan
PO Box 101
Temple, New Hampshire 03084
August 30, 2015

Norman C. Bay, Chairman
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street NE, Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Project Docket Number PF14-22-000

Dear Chairman Bay:

We are writing to add our voices to that of New Hampshire's Governor Maggie Hassan in her August 14, 2015 letter to you regarding the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline that is being proposed by Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline.

Governor Hassan is requesting that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission require Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company to provide detailed responses to the questions and concerns of New Hampshire residents related to the Northeast Energy Direct project as part of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement process. Those of us who live near this proposed pipeline are extremely concerned about the protection of our drinking water. We live in a rural area where almost everyone has a private well; there are no public water supplies in most of these towns. Without clean wells our families could no longer live here and our homes and properties that we've worked so hard for would become virtually worthless.

We are extremely concerned about the noise and health hazards that the proposed 40,000 to 80,000 horsepower compressor station would bring to our area. It would regularly blow off poisonous gas and toxic carcinogens in close proximity to our elementary school, hazardous emissions that never have to be disclosed to the public by the company.

We are frustrated that a private company could be permitted to take our property using the eminent domain process that was once reserved strictly for truly public projects, not extended to for-profit companies.

We are concerned that almost all the gas this pipeline would carry would not be used in New Hampshire, but would be exported to Canada where it would be then converted into Liquid Natural Gas and sold to European and Asian buyers at higher profits.

We respectfully ask that you read Governor Hassan's letter very carefully and that FERC require Tennessee Gas Pipeline to provide detailed responses to the questions and concerns of New Hampshire residents.

Respectfully,

Steven and Niki McGettigan

20150909-0016

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426

Date: August 30, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access

As the owner of the property located at:

18 Ryan Farm Road
Windham, NH 03087

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose. Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Bira S. Cherian

20150909-0017

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426

Date: September 1, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access: PF14-22-000

As the owner of the property located at:

Green Farm Village Cluster Association (Green Farm Road house numbers 93-139 and Jacqueline Dr house numbers 40-51) which abut common land at New Ipswich tax lot 10-6.

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose. Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Carolyn Cormier, President
Green Farm Village Cluster Association

20150909-0018

Hand written FERC Comment form: John & Darlene Palmer, 124 Timbertop Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071:
opposing

20150909-0029

Carol A. Regan
88 Hazel St.
Methuen, MA

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE Room 1A

August 27, 2018

Refer to Docket 8 PF14-22-000

Dear Ms. Bose;

I am a member of the Methuen Pipeline Awareness. The Haverhill lateral is slated to run for several miles through Methuen. The Methuen City Council recently unanimously approved a resolution opposing the pipeline. This project causes hundreds of residents in Methuen as well as in many other communities in its path to be disrupted with the construction. This disruption is not warranted by either the supposed need or the delivery of the natural gas to the affected residents. Moreover there is a serious threat to residents and first responders in the event of a failure. Kinder Morgan's past poor record on safety and the maintenance of their current pipelines is abundant. This pipeline project presents numerous, disturbing concerns and promises NO benefits. Many questions exist. Where are the answers'?

Why was the lateral increased to 20" with no new customer commitments'?

Am there any documented customer commitments for this lateral'

Where does the Haverhill lateral really end'?

Why does this project make Methuen residents accept the burden to benefit Kinder Morgan?

Why does the route pass through Methuen impacting densely populated neighborhoods, wetlands, conservation land, and groundwater?

Options exist that must be examined including repair to existing infrastructure before adding new pipelines. I and many of my fellow citizens are opposed to this intrusion into our community for a private company's benefit. It is common knowledge that this pipeline is primarily focused on foreign markets through New England and Canadian ports. Please listen to our concerns and refuse to grant whatever approvals are necessary for this project to move forward.

Yours truly,

Carol A Regan Ed. D.

20150909-0030

August 25, 2015

Dear Ms. Bose,

We are writing to give our comments regarding NED Pipeline — Project docket number PF14-22-000.

We oppose the pipeline proposed by Kinder Morgan as the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline will bring no benefit to the people of NH. I will try to list as many reasons that I can think of with a personal commentary at the end.

- This is all about greed not need.
 - o Kinder Morgan, a \$125 billion Texas energy company, will profit at NH's expense
 - o Capacity exceeds estimated regional demand
 - o Pipeline connects PA fracking fields to the MA coastal region for export — not our use
 - o This depletes our resources making us more dependent on foreign energy
- Pipelines and compression stations are destructive to families and communities
 - o All pipelines leak!
 - o Pipelines require compressor stations and stations are ginormous polluters
 - o Compression station emissions do not have to be disclosed — they have routine blow-downs or accidental releases of VOCs and NOx
 - o Noise — blow-downs can last for two hours (40 or more a year)
 - o The sound of regular compressor station has been compared to four diesel locomotive engines running 24/7
 - o Compression stations do not have to be monitored or managed
 - o Are exempt from regulations
 - o Studies show that populations in the vicinity of compressor stations show increases in all manner of health issues, from bloody noses, cancers to still births
 - o People who already live above the Marcellus shale fields have already had their air and water and livestock poisoned and have had to walk away from their now worthless properties—just like we would have to do!
 - o Property values will be adversely affected
 - o Safety precautions will cost towns money
 - o Environmental damage, disruption of wildlife habitats, effects on wells and aquifers
- Not the New Hampshire Way

- o Private property may be seized by eminent domain, with inadequate compensation
- o No compensation for those living in the “burn zone” of the compressor station
- o Pipeline construction cost may be paid for in part by a proposed tariff on electric bills
- o Threatens rural town character for corporate profit
- o It’s not for NH —not in our public interest
- o Diverted through NH because MA citizens and elected officials strongly opposed ita pipeline already exists —why aren’t we using that’?

We have been home owners here in the Town of Temple for 30 years. We are not opposed to the United States advancing in technology and being strong as a nation. We do oppose corporations for the sake of greed destroying people’s way of life for no other purpose than material gain of a private corporation, which is what this is all about!

We are being asked to live near a compressor station that will be noisy, affect our health and could possibly cause severe injuries if it blows up!

If that isn’t bad enough the other structure in the enclosed map is a Temple Elementary School. We were told we could prevent the compressor station going in if we could find endangered species of animals living there —well isn’t this endangering our children of New Hampshire who will be exposed to the harmful effects of this compressor station! What if it blows up? I ask you, are children no longer valuable in the eyes of the American government?

If you want this to go through we highly recommend that in your agreement with Kinder Morgan they must offer to buy out the Temple School and the homes in the “burn zone” for fair market value if the owner wishes to sell!

If you don’t do this all homes will become worthless, we will not be able to sell for fair market value and many people, including us, will have to walk away with nothing —because home owners in the bum zone will not be able to live in the type of safe, clean environment that everyone in the United States is entitled to

I hope that after doing the research needed you will be convinced that the pipeline will pollute our air, contaminate our aquifers, wells and other water resources. This will destroy conservation lands, harm our tourist industry and rural character of New Hampshire.

Kinder Morgan hires locals to speak positively about the pipeline in our communities. We who oppose it are said to be overreacting. WE ARE NOT OVERREACTING -these are our lives that are involuntarily being changed.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely

Roger and Joan Crooker
 PO Box 60
 Temple, NH 03084

{map omitted}

20150909-0078

September 3, 2015

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
 888 First Street NE: Room 1A
 Washington, DC 20426

Dear FERC,

I live in Franklin County Massachusetts, and I am very concerned about the proposed NED PIPELINE that

is planned to go through this beautiful, agricultural land, with many areas that are environmentally protected.

I am not a resident of the towns in which the pipeline would be constructed, but two of our children have homes in Ashfield, our son, our daughter, their families, our grandchildren live there. How can this be safe? How can it be with vents that release fumes and chemicals along the pipeline, not to mention if there was, God forbid, an accident.

We have many areas that are protected that we, as residents in this rich conservation area have to respect, I am grateful for that. Conservation Commissions work all across the state to make sure that these places are protected. But yet, a large company can plan to come through these sensitive areas, take Massachusetts residents' property (their homes), go through historical areas, construct a pipeline under our highways and our rivers, possibly contaminate our well water and put our families in danger and what's going to happen to the value of our properties?? I keep saying, how can this be right??

And again, Our families put in danger, how can this be right??

Franklin County not only has homes for people, but homes for all types of wildlife in the woods and wetland areas and beautiful pollinators that work to help us grow food. How can these fumes and chemicals not affect our agriculture, wells and wildlife and ultimately, our lives?

Please don't let our beautiful area or any area become a land that is desolate and undesirable to live because of this pipeline project.

Please do not let it happen, there are other solutions.

Esther Boyer
P.O. Box 121
33 Webber Road
Whately, MA 01093

Cc: State Senator Stan Rosenberg

20150909-0085

Commonwealth of Massachusetts
House of Representatives
State House, Boston, 02133-1054

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426

Dear Secretary Bose:

Please accept this letter as a statement of concern regarding the FERC scoping process as it relates to the Kinder Morgan proposed Northeast Extension Pipeline project (Project Docket Number PF14-22-000).

It has been stated by the members of the FERC scoping commission, in their recent public hearings, that it is their intention to take a "hard look" at the proposed pipeline extension. We are asking that this "hard look" be directed, not only as to the scope and siting of the proposed natural gas pipeline, but as to the necessity of the pipeline extension in its entirety.

Massachusetts Governor Charlie Baker has issued the following general statement:

*"Governor Baker is committed to diversifying the Commonwealth's energy portfolio to reduce costs and ensure reliability for Massachusetts ratepayers through a balanced approach of renewable energy investments, increasing energy efficiency and expanding natural gas capacity **along existing routes**. (emphasis added)"*

— Billy Pitman, Deputy Communications Director

We stand with Governor Baker in this position. Massachusetts has existing pipeline infrastructure that we

believe can be expanded to adequately provide for the existing need for natural gas energy in the northeast region. However, it is our hope that reliance on natural gas moving forward shall diminish as newer sources of clean renewable energy become more prevalent. Governor Baker recently introduced a hydropower initiative to this end, as well as a solar energy bill that would raise the public and private net metering caps and provide a revenue stream for solar projects to help the state reach its goal of 1,600 megawatts of solar development by 2020. We, along with our fellow legislators, are committed to reducing our dependency on natural gas in favor of other types of renewable energy sources like hydropower and solar energy, and will work to see that more initiatives toward this end are sought. The proposed pipelines are intended to support our needs for up to 100 years, but we can say, without reservation, that it is our commitment to work towards making natural gas a minor player in the energy arena of the future. As a state that has been a leader in advancements in energy technology research, we feel confident that this goal can be realized.

In addition, we have grave concerns about the siting process. As presently proposed the expanded pipeline will affect both private land and land we have sought to protect by amending our state constitution. Article 97 of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts states:

“The people shall have the right to clean air and water, freedom from excessive and unnecessary noise, and the natural, scenic, historic, and esthetic qualities of their environment; and the protection of the people in their right to the conservation, development and utilization of the agricultural, mineral, forest, water, air and other natural resources is hereby declared to be a public purpose. The general court shall have the power to enact legislation necessary or expedient to protect such rights. In the furtherance of the foregoing powers, the general court shall have the power to provide for the taking, upon payment of just compensation therefor, or for the acquisition by purchase or otherwise, of lands and easements or such other interests therein as may be deemed necessary to accomplish these purposes. Lands and easements taken or acquired for such purposes shall not be used for other purposes or otherwise disposed of except by laws enacted by a two thirds vote, taken by yeas and nays, of each branch of the general court.”

In initial meetings with legislators in 2014, Kinder Morgan expressed its commitment to comply with all state and local laws and regulations. We are asking that FERC hold Kinder Morgan to this commitment. We also ask that FERC recognize how important the protection of our natural resources is to the people of this Commonwealth. Disruption to the quality of our environment, when other less disruptive alternatives are available, is something that should certainly be subject to the scrutiny of the Massachusetts legislative body, as prescribed by Article 97. We ask that you respect this process.

We also have serious concerns about the environmental, health and safety risks associated with gas line leaks in the Commonwealth’s existing natural gas pipeline infrastructure, and how those risks would be exacerbated by a project of the magnitude Kinder Morgan is proposing. In 2014, the Massachusetts Legislature enacted legislation requiring utility companies to report the location and age of all natural gas leaks in their pipelines, and to work towards repairing these leaks. According to a new report by the Cambridge-based Home Energy Efficiency Team, utility companies have identified approximately 20,000 “potentially dangerous and environmentally damaging leaks” within the existing distribution system in Massachusetts. It is our belief that this problem must be addressed before we commit to adding new pipelines.

Please feel free to contact us if you have any further questions regarding our position as it is outlined in this letter. Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,

Bradley H. Jones, Jr.
Minority Leader

Sheila C. Harrington
State Representative

James Lyons
State Representative

Susannah Whipps Lee
State Representative

Leah Cole
State Representative

20150909-0100

Hand written card, Earle Robinson, PO Box 145, Greenville, NH 03048: opposing.

20150909-0101

Hand written card, Lesley Finlayson, 167 Heald Road, Wilton, NH: opposing

20150909-0102

Hand written card, Michele Bernier, 121 Old Wilton Rd, New Ipswich, NH: opposing

20150909-0103

Hand written card, Michele Bernier, 121 Old Wilton Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071: opposing

20150909-0104

Hand written card, Gary Moorman, 50 Appleton Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071: opposing, should be routed along Rte 2 in Mass.

20150909-0105

Hand written card, Gretchen Smith, Fairbanks Rd, New Ipswich, NH: opposing

20150909-0106

Hand written card, Michele Bernier, 121 Old Wilton Rd, New Ipswich, NH: opposing

20150909-0107

Hand written card, Earle Robinson, PO Box 145, Greenville, NH 03048: opposing

20150909-0108

Hand written card, Seth Bernier, 121 Old Wilton Rd, New Ipswich, NH: opposing

20150909-0109

Hand written card, Meghan Bernier, 121 Old Wilton Rd, New Ipswich, NH: opposing

20150909-0110

Hand written card, Mark Shemet, 255 Turnpike Rd, Jaffrey, NH 03452: concerned about lack of evacuation plan for Temple School & proximity to the compressor station. Narrow roads, deep snow in Winter...

20150909-5002

Evelyn Taylor, New Ipswich, NH.

Evelyn Taylor, New Ipswich, NH.

There is no incentive for pipeline companies to fix leaks because the cost of the lost gas is passed to customers. FERC needs to demand this practice stops. this is intentional damage to the environment that makes people sick. This is according to a recent article, "Methane Emissions from United States Natural Gas Gathering and Processing"

Credits: Anthony J. Marchese* 1, Timothy L. Vaughn 1, Daniel J. Zimmerle 2, David M. Martinez 1, Laurie L. Williams 3, Allen L. Robinson 4, Austin L. Mitchell 4, R. Subramanian 4, Daniel S. Tkacik 4, Joseph R. Roscioli 5, and Scott C. Herndon 5

1 Department of Mechanical Engineering, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado 80523, United States

2 The Energy Institute, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado 80523, United States

3 Fort Lewis College, Durango, Colorado 81301, United States

4 Department of Mechanical Engineering, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213, United States

5 Aerodyne Research Inc., Billerica, Massachusetts 01821, United States

Environ. Sci. Technol., 2015, 49 (17), pp 10718–10727

DOI: 10.1021/acs.est.5b02275

Publication Date (Web): August 18, 2015

The article says many gathering facilities use puffs of natural gas in valves that open and close to regulate gas or liquid flow, releasing a bit of methane into the air with every cycle. Anthony J. Marchese, a professor of mechanical engineering at Colorado State and the lead author of the new study, said that this practice surprised him. “I was: ‘Really? That’s what they do?’ ” he said.

Professor Marchese said that the amount of gas that escapes from gathering facilities each year could heat 3.2 million homes. Wasting a potentially valuable resource, not to mention harming the environment, he said, mystified him. “Why would you ever vent it when you can use it to generate electricity?” he added.

Does Kinder Morgan know where pipelines are leaking? Satellite imagery looked at Boston and the leaks are everywhere, but since customers pay for the gas that leaks, there is no incentive to stop them. Leaks are windfall profits, and dangerous ones at that. The internet is filled with explosions from leaking pipelines. This also adds to the methane greenhouse affect and puts toxins into the air, water and soils. These practices prove Kinder Morgan and other companies do not do what’s needed to ensure our safety. Kinder Morgan’s claim to work to keep us safe is not true. They work to keep their profits.

20150909-5006

Evelyn Taylor, New Ipswich, NH.

Accidents have occurred due to deterioration of a pipeline at a point where a pig could not access the pipe to clean it. How are these points identified and what does Kinder Morgan do to keep these points clean and avoid further accidents?

20150909-5007

Evelyn Taylor, New Ipswich, NH.

The NED pipeline is mapped out to travel through many sloping hillsides and waterways. How will Kinder Morgan prevent landslides once they disturb the soils on slopes and steep inclines? We have had many landslides where tons of soil, rocks and trees have slid and damaged and blocked roads, destabilized roads and buildings, and put other soils at risk of slippage. How will Kinder Morgan address this increased risk to the landscape as they cut through the pipeline path? Will they take affected adjacent properties beyond the targeted pipeline path by eminent domain? Will they take voluntary, responsible action to stabilize these areas? Will they voluntarily compensate property owners for loss of use and lost value or will they leave the problem to someone else and wait for legal action before making remediation or compensation? Stories on the internet indicate it is extremely difficult and costly to get Kinder Morgan to address damage and loss, i.e., initiation or pursuit of a lawsuit seems to be required. I expect this is true as people like me that are close (within 1/2 mile) to the path but not in the path are left with extreme financial loss and the threat of illness with no compensation whatsoever.

20150909-5008

Evelyn Taylor, New Ipswich, NH.

Kinder Morgan recently put up pipeline markers in Longmeadow, MA. People who have lived there for 20 years are asking why now and why without notice? Kinder Morgan said they tried going door to door. That seems to be a very feeble attempt. Why didn’t they send people a letter? I don’t answer my door to strangers, especially trespassers. Strangers at our door in today’s world is frightening. It is a common practice for

thieves to get people to answer a call at their door. It seems Kinder Morgan goes out of their way to cause trouble and frighten people every chance they get. Kinder Morgan said it is all part of federal safety requirements to put up these large markers and that they have every right to do so without notice. They said the pipelines are close enough that if someone were to put a shovel in the ground, they could erupt a line and the markers are there denote the presence of the pipelines. How close to the surface are these pipelines and obviously, Kinder Morgan didn't worry about protecting these people before. This is another example of Kinder Morgan not being concerned about keeping us safe. Their written policies and frequent statements to us in person to the media are not true. As the installation of these markers show, Kinder Morgan does not make safety a priority and they do not take even minimal and reasonable means to make contact with those affected by their shortfalls. FERC needs to take note of how brutal and uncaring Kinder Morgan has demonstrate to be and protect us from sloppy safety enforcement. Kinder Morgan's safety record shows they cannot be trusted to be diligent or concerning about environments or people. We do not need this pipeline. It is a path for export that is being desparately labeled as necessary and good for New England as a whole. There is no supporting evidence that this is essential and supportive of the public good, therefore, this pipeline is in violation of the laws and must be rejected by FERC. FERC must start doing its job. To not do so is also unlawful. This pipeline must be REJECTED and to delay that action is futher harassment and torture to the people being abused by this insanity. It is costing me money and lost sleep and ill health to be continuously bothered by these unconscionable actions.

20150909-5009

Evelyn Taylor, New Ipswich, NH.

A recent accident this month (September) killed a Kinder Morgan worker when the bulldozer he was using to push petroleum coke toppled and sank into the pit filled with 200-degree byproduct wastewater. According to news reports, the bulldozer was being used because other equipment typically used was out of service for an extended period of time. It seems obvious to me that allowing a person on a bulldozer to do a job in a 200 degree wastewater pit is a violent violation of common sense and safety procedure. Doesn't Kinder Morgan properly train workers to not take such risks? Doesn't Kinder Morgan demand their workers say, "NO" to uncommon circumstances that can become catastrophic? Another unfortunate death was to a person unloading a barge. The freight slid to one side of the barge, tumbling the man into the river. The man died. Again, doesn't Kinder Morgan sufficiently train worker to recognize unsafe opeartional procedure and insist that they refust to continue work operations under uncommone circumstances? Five people were killed at the Walnut Creek accident in 2005 when a pipeline was hit and exploded. Kinder Morgan had failed to install markers, similar to what just occurred in Longmeadow, Ma. It is these and many other failures to keep people safe that are objectionable and unacceptable for a company to continue to operate to install large diameter high compression explosive gas pipelines and compressor stations. FERC must look at the record. FERC is responsible to also ensure our safety. These accidents show that the public is not safe because Kinder Morgan is not taking reasonable measures to ensure safety. FERC must stop this pipeline as to approve it puts many more thousands of people at risk of harm. FERC must REJECT this pipeline.

20150909-5147

Jan A. Griska, Rindge, NH.

Kinder Morgan NED Project Scoping Response part 2

Docket number PF 14-22

Resource Report 11

11.1 RELIABILITY AND SAFETY OF THE PROJECT

Please Note:I did some math based on TGP's data found in section 11.1. It appears that they have one public safety incident a year across their system. That isn't insignificant to the people experiencing the incident, especially if they didn't want the pipeline in the first place.

A. Please study the impact of a public safety incident (pipeline explosion/fire) in Rindge. My primary concern is fire fighting and evacuation.

B. Please document the study's findings and present them to the Rindge Board Of Selectmen.

11.2 SPECIFIC MEASURES TO PROTECT THE PUBLIC

Please Note: TGP only mentions Methane in section 11.2. What about Benzene, Toluene, Ethylbenzene and Xylene? All of which are found in blow down at compressor stations, MLVs etc.

Anybody who has taken science classes, never mind chemistry in high school knows that all you have to do is add air (oxygen) to a fuel to make it a combustible mix. Methane is hardly an inert gas, if it was, TGP wouldn't be pushing it down this proposed pipeline.

A. Please study the effects of the above components of natural gas that are released to the atmosphere via blow downs and leaks in the proposed pipeline. Benzene is a known carcinogen.

B. Please document the study's findings and present them to the Rindge Board Of Selectmen.

C. Please have TGP remove the second paragraph of section 11.2. as natural gas, its other components and those introduced in the fracking process aren't friendly to humans and the environment.

11.2.1 Pipeline Design Specifications

Please Note: The crack initiation approach relies on close attention to the workmanship and quality control during welding. However, it can be difficult to guarantee that no areas of local brittle zones exist. It is also difficult to know the exact stress distribution around a crack tip that experiences contributions from residual stresses and local stress concentration. For these reasons the crack arrest approach may be considered a viable alternative. The crack arrest concept is simple in principle, if not always in application: arrest of fast running brittle cracks, that have initiated in a region of low toughness, will occur if the applied crack driving force is smaller than the resistance to crack propagation. By looking at conditions of crack arrest, the focus can be taken away from localised stress concentration or brittle zones and back to the bulk properties of the parent plate, weld metal or heat affected zone and the nominal applied stress. The conditions for crack arrest to occur can be expressed using one of the following approaches:

1. Fracture mechanics comparison, where the applied stress intensity factor (KI) is less than the crack arrest fracture toughness (KIa).

2. Ensuring that the temperature at the crack tip is above the crack arrest.

3. An energy balance so that the available energy for crack propagation is less than the energy absorbed by the material during crack propagation.

4. Local approach, such that the crack driving force (cdf) is less than the local arrest property. The cdf is determined from mechanical models, and the local arrest is determined from mechanistic models of the crack arrest processes.

A. This is metallurgy that can only be reproduced in a controlled environment. Please have TGP explain how they are going to make the pipe they use and the welding done in the field "crack Proof."

B. Please have TGP explain how, that while X-raying welds shows that the welds are complete (good penetration etc.). That they will not detect stresses caused in the pipe manufacturing process. Who are these people trying to fool. This pipe is a crap shoot given the pressures involved and the manufacture and construction processes.

C. Hydrostatic testing helps to the extent it finds leaks, but it doesn't predict seasonal, seismic etc. induced stresses etc. Please have TGP explain and document how they plan to deal with these problems.

D. Rural lives matter, while TGP has identified us as a pipeline class location 2. So for the sake of reducing pipeline construction cost, we get thinner wall pipe. Please ask TGP for class location 3 pipe in Rindge.

11.2.5 System Monitoring Equipment

A. Please insure KM/TGP's Emergency Response Procedure, that has been updated to include Rindge specific information, is made available to Rindge's Police and Fire departments.

B. Please insure KM/TGP provides Rindge's Fire and police departments with examples of an annual communications packages and a schedule of when the packages will be made available along with any necessary meetings.

C. Please insure KM/TGP shares with Rindge's Fire and Police departments, how KM/TGP plans to use the Incident Command System ("ICS").

11.2.10 Emergency Plan

A. Please insure KM/TGP's Emergency Plan is made available to Rindge's Fire and Police departments for review and that the department's feedback is included in the final version of the plan.

11.2.11 Construction Safety

A. Please insure the Contractor's safety plan is made available (prior to construction) to Rindge's Fire and Police departments for review and that the department's feedback is included in the final version of the plan.

Jan A. Griska
Rindge, NH.

20150910-5053

LEGACY ENVIRONMENTAL GROUP
Michael Hootstein, Principal Hydrogeologist
PO Box 158
Shutesbury, MA 01072

Chairman Norman Bay
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC")
888 First Street NE, Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline ("TGP") Co., L.L.C. (Docket No. PF14-22-000)

September 10, 2015

Dear Chairman Bay,

Upon reading your biography, that you were previously the FERC Director of the Office of Enforcement (OE) who was charged with investigating wrongdoing, I respectfully ask you to please investigate possible wrongdoing at FERC.

This Western Massachusetts hydrogeologist (and former Board of Health member) submitted my original scoping comments on August 10, 2015 with the hope that FERC's Environmental Impact Statement ("EIS") would fairly and impartially incorporate comprehensive scientific assessment of foreseeable (direct, indirect and cumulative) TGP pipeline and compressor station impacts to drinking water, human health and the environment. Upon review of FERC's Keystone Pipeline EIS as directed by FERC's Guidance Manual for Environmental Report Preparation (www.ferc.gov/industries/gas/enviro/erpman.pdf), I no longer have that hope.

FERC's Guidance Manual for Environmental Report Preparation encourages pipeline applicants to conceal essential hydrogeologic data so as to evade fair and impartial scientific assessment of foreseeable (direct, indirect and cumulative) pipeline and compressor station impacts to drinking water, human health and the environment. Either FERC doesn't employ any hydrogeologists who know how to perform the most basic Phase I hydrogeologic site assessment. Or, FERC is controlled by unscrupulous industry insiders who are engaged in a conspiracy to circumvent, and violate, the National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA").

The TGP proposal to dredge, horizontally drill, and blast a west-east trending tunnel (large enough to

contain a 30" diameter pipe), would perforate and hydraulically connect sixty-four (64) miles of north-south trending Massachusetts sand aquifers, aquitards, streams, wetlands and water-yielding bedrock strata.

Based on my review of available Massachusetts GIS and USGS data, the dredging/drilling/blasting of such an extremely large manmade preferential groundwater pathway for contaminant transport will cause devastating foreseeable harmful impacts to drinking water, human health and "Damage to the Environment" as defined by Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act ("MEPA") regulations (310 CMR 11:02).

Please investigate possible wrongdoing at FERC. Supreme Court Justice Douglas spoke most eloquently to the issue at hand in 1973, as memorialized in his *Life of the Land v. Brinegar*, 414 U.S. 1052, 94 S.Ct. 558, 38 L.Ed.2d 341, 1054-1057 (1973) dissent:

"It seems to me a total frustration of the entire purpose of NEPA to entrust evaluation of the environmental factors to a firm with a multimillion dollar stake in the approval of this project. NEPA embodies the belated national recognition that we have been 'brought to the brink' by myopic pursuit of technological progress and by a decision-making mechanism resting largely on the advice of vested interest groups. [Footnote 3: 'There may be controversy over how close to the brink we stand, but there is none that we are in serious trouble.' H.R. Rep. No. 91-378, 91st Cong., 1st Sess., 4 (1969), U.S. Code Cong. & Admin. News 1969, p. 2753: 'By land, sea, and air, the enemies of man's survival relentlessly press their attack. The most dangerous of all these enemies is man's own undirected technology. The radioactive poisons from nuclear tests, the runoff into rivers of nitrogen fertilizers, the smog from automobiles, the pesticides in the food chains...are examples of the failure to foresee and control the untoward consequences of modern technology.']"

"A long standing policy of listening only to those with enough money to be heard has left our country scarred with a continuum of environmental abscesses... The same oil interests which argued the advisability of off-shore drilling at Santa Barbara pressed for a trans-Alaska pipeline and obtained a concession in the Act that in effect exempted the pipeline from NEPA to the extent that it curtailed judicial review. Other interests, notably those waiting for the great killing in nuclear fission, got temporary relief from NEPA. Our congested land and fouled air bear grim testimony to the success of Detroit in making fortunes out of the destruction of elemental parts of our biosphere."

"We have listened as the manufacturing-industrial complex advised us on the desirability of fueling 'progress' by stripping our land and using our rivers, lakes, and atmosphere as technological sewers... NEPA was designed to correct in part the information void underlying our national decision-making mechanism. Congress knew what happens when we heed the counsel only of those who measure national advancement by GNP and the Dow Jones industrial average... They are not advocates of the interests of mountains, forests, streams, rivers, oceans, and coral beds, or of the wildlife that inhabit them or the people who enjoy them. They are not useful when it comes to appraising the values of an unspoiled meadow or glacier or reef, for they think only in terms of dollars. They lack the sensitivity to be entrusted with evaluating what effect dredging will have on our estuaries... Dredging makes these estuaries biological deserts for years to come. Congress knew that the final say on these environmental matters should not be under the direct or indirect control of those who plan to make millions out of their destruction."

Thanks for your consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Michael B. Hootstein

20150910-5055

Laura Lynch, Temple, NH.

I have a big problem with the Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline NED project. I asked a question last night at the open house in New Ipswich NH. I wanted to see a picture of a 41,000 HP compressor station and my answer was "We have never built one before". I am not very happy with this comment. Please take this into consideration. How can a company come in and destroy a beautiful rural farm town and have this type of a response. You can take your pretty pictures and explanations and stuff them. We do not need this

pipeline and we do not want one. All it is going to do is destroy our land, water, air, health and wildlife.

20150910-5064

September 10, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street NE Room 1 A
Washington, DC 20426

re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., Docket No. PF14-22-000

Dear Secretary Bose:

New England is at a crossroads. Federal and state policies are calling for drastically reducing the use of fossil fuels while five different projects are proposing to almost double the amount of natural gas coming to our region. We know we face some tough energy choices. At the same time many of us face a crisis in trust. Processes that we believed were supposed to ensure that federal actions protected the public end up appearing only as check boxes on a long road toward pre-determined approval of a litany of projects. FERC knows about multiple independent proposals all claiming to meet what they claim is a natural gas capacity constriction. These projects may well be redundant with each other and with existing projects that FERC determined were necessary but now sit underutilized.

One way FERC could re-gain the public's trust is to combine the various proposals from Kinder Morgan, Spectra Energy, Portland Natural Gas, and their various partners into one regional Environmental Impact Statement and one coordinated FERC process. Indeed, National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) review requires nothing less. Added together, these proposals could almost double the gas supply to New England at a time when the federal Clean Power Plan (CPP) and the MA Global Warming Solutions Act (GWSA) are demanding that we greatly reduce our consumption of fossil fuels.

Kinder Morgan admits that other projects could meet the same needs as their proposed NED project:

"...without the proposed Project, other natural gas transmission companies will be required to increase their capacity and construct new facilities to meet the existing and growing demand for the additional transportation capacity. Such action will only result in the transference of environmental impacts from one project to another but will not eliminate such impacts in their entirety." (Resource Report 10 - Alternatives, July 2015, p. 10-2)

Since Kinder Morgan acknowledges that the alleged need met by NED could be met by the competing projects, it makes sense that all the projects be analyzed together to see which one, if any, or which combinations of projects, would satisfy any demand with least impact to the environment and affected land owners.

A consolidated New England pipeline project analysis is precisely the situation that calls for a comprehensive National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) review. On December 18, 2014, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) issued guidance on the effective use of "programmatic" NEPA reviews. The guidance recommends agencies consider a programmatic review when ***"making decisions on common elements or aspects of a series or suite of closely related projects;"*** and, as a way to ***"avoid 'segmenting' the overall program from subsequent individual actions and thereby avoid unreasonably constricting the scope of environmental review."*** (December 2014 CEQ Guidance, p.15-16, emphasis added)

Specific actions listed in the December guidance as appropriate for a programmatic NEPA review include those that FERC and other Federal Agencies are now considering for several pipeline projects in New England:

Approving Multiple Actions. *Decision to proceed with multiple projects that are temporally or spatially connected and that will have a series of associated concurrent or subsequent decisions. Programmatic examples include:*

o Several similar actions or projects in a region or nationwide (e.g., a large scale utility corridor

project); or

o A suite of ongoing, proposed or reasonably foreseeable actions that share a common geography or timing, such as multiple activities within a defined boundary (i.e., Federal land or facility). (December 2014 CEQ Guidance, p.14)

The Northeast Gas Association (http://www.northeastgas.org/pdf/system_enhance0715.pdf) provides a list of planned pipeline projects in the northeast including the FERC status of each project:

- Tennessee Gas/Kinder Morgan CT Expansion – Application filed with FERC
- Spectra Atlantic Bridge – In FERC pre-filing
- Tennessee Gas/Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct – In FERC pre-filing
- Spectra Access Northeast – Open Season 2015
- Portland Natural Gas “C2C” Project – Open Season 2015

The above pipeline proposals share a common geography and timing. All have potential impacts on a range of resources and involve many local, state and regional stakeholders. Together these projects total 2.66 Bcf/d of increased natural gas capacity. Adding the recently (March 2015) approved Spectra AIM project, the total reaches close to 3 Bcf/d of additional gas capacity into New England. If Kinder Morgan chooses to go back to the 2.2 Bcf/d NED project as originally proposed, it will be close to 4 Bcf/d additional capacity. Clearly the capacity of all these projects taken together far exceeds any potential shortfall in even the most aggressive demand scenario. They are redundant and cannot cite the same “need” or be considered independently. **These projects constitute alternative solutions to the same potential need and must be reviewed as such under NEPA.**

A combined programmatic review would allow the various agencies an opportunity to “*propose standard mitigation protocols and/or operating procedures in a programmatic NEPA review and thereby provide a framework and scope for the subsequent tiered analysis of environmental impacts.*” (December 2014 CEQ Guidance, p.23) As the December 2014 guidance document states:

Programmatic NEPA reviews provide an opportunity for agencies to incorporate comprehensive mitigation planning, best management practices, and standard operating procedures, as well as monitoring strategies into the Federal policymaking process at a broad or strategic level. These analyses can promote sustainability and allow Federal agencies to advance the nation’s environmental policy as articulated in Section 101 of NEPA. (December 2014 CEQ Guidance, p. 35)

Combining the projects in a programmatic review would foster an open and transparent process, not just for the potential environmental impacts, alternatives and mitigation measures but also for the needs analysis critical to understanding and quantifying both the No Build alternative as well as various alternatives by different gas transmission companies.

The FERC NEPA review for these combined projects needs to determine:

1. What amount of gas, if any, is needed to meet the threshold of public convenience and necessity which would most certainly result in takings of hundreds of private properties by eminent domain? Please keep in mind that two offshore LNG “energy bridge” terminals that FERC recently determined were absolutely “necessary” for New England, now sit essentially idle after the costs and environmental impacts associated with their construction have already occurred.
2. What is the best way to meet any gas need while minimizing project impacts? This could be by choosing one particular project or perhaps it is parts of several different proposals that best meets the needs with the least impact.
3. In assessing the needs of the electric generation market, the NEPA review should include the results of the study MA Attorney General Maura Healey is undertaking to determine electric reliability needs including what gas capacity we need for electricity generation through 2030. The results of that study, expected in October, will provide answers to whether or not new pipeline capacity is really needed to serve the electric generation market and if so, will properly define and dimension that

need.

4. In assessing the amount of the gas contracted through the various LDC proposals, the review should include an analysis of how much of the LDC demand is currently replacing expiring volumes already under contract? How much is for future demand? How much is to arbitrage?
5. The No Action Alternative should consider whether further investments by LDC's in repairing widespread and long-standing leaks in the distribution systems and providing increased incentives for people with older gas furnaces and appliances to upgrade to more efficient ones would negate the need for any new pipeline, while at the same time help meet the state's obligation under the GWSA.
6. The No Action alternative should address the feasibility of increased use of already constructed on-shore and offshore LNG facilities to cover any limited shortfalls, which appear to be limited to a few days per year. FERC must contrast the relative environmental impacts of construction of pipelines to this alternative, given that the construction impacts associated with the LNG terminals have already occurred.
7. The EIS for a regional gas transmission study should acknowledge the specific projects proposed in response to the New England Clean Energy Plan RFP (<http://cleanenergyrfp.com/>) and fully consider their timing and future presence in assessing the need for increased natural gas in evaluating the No Action Alternative. The No Action Alternative must also evaluate whether the import of 2400 MW of additional hydroelectric power by 2020 as proposed by Governor Baker fully meets or greatly reduces the need for the project in the No Action Alternative.
8. The role of export in any proposed pipeline capacity expansion needs to be explicitly explained. People bearing the impacts and loss of property need to know where the gas is going. If export is identified as a "need" for increasing pipeline capacity to and through New England, an alternative that needs to be considered is serving the export market by sending gas on existing pipelines south to existing export facilities on the Gulf and Mid Atlantic Coasts.
9. In comparing and contrasting the NED project and other natural gas transmission projects, the relative impacts of increased natural gas use on greenhouse gas emissions must be considered. The EIS should specifically address consistency with the federal CPP and MA GWSA. It should compare and contrast the proposed projects with increased reliance on renewable energy sources, increased efficiency incentives, gas savings from leak repairs, and other ways which may be more consistent with CPP and GWSA.
10. If increased natural gas is primarily a bridge fuel as many of the project proponents are claiming, then these projects should be considered only a potential temporary solution. The temporary nature of increased need, if in fact additional pipeline capacity is needed at all, must be taken into account in comparing the permanent loss of critical forested habitat associated with the projects to other short-term solutions, such as increased use of our currently underutilized LNG terminals using existing infrastructure.

FERC needs to look at the larger picture of natural gas capacity in New England by combining the various proposals into a single, comprehensive NEPA review as suggested. This consolidated review is required for FERC to fulfill its obligation to *"use all practicable means and measures, including financial and technical assistance, in a manner calculated to foster and promote the general welfare, to create and maintain conditions under which man and nature can exist in productive harmony, and fulfill the social, economic, and other requirements of present and future generations of Americans"* as specified in Section 101 of the National Environmental Policy Act.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment. I would be pleased to answer any questions or provide any clarification.

Most sincerely,
Carolyn Sellars

Townsend, MA
casellers@gmail.com

cc: Senator Warren
Senator Markey
Representative Tsongas
Representative McGovern
Governor Baker
Lt. Governor Polito
Attorney General Healy
MA Senate President Rosenberg
MA State Rep. Harrington
MA State Sen. Flanagan
Christy Goldfuss, Managing Director, Council on Environmental Quality
Matthew Beaton, MA Secretary of Energy and Environmental Affairs
Townsend Board of Selectmen

20150910-5090

Adam Mileikowsky, Barrington, RI.

I would like to let the FERC commissioners know that I support the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline 100% of the way. If they needed to go through my backyard to build it I would certainly let them even though I would not necessarily like having a gas pipeline on my property. It's simple a lot more companies, electric generation plants, and homes use natural gas for heat and electric. Yet supply has not expanded nearly enough as the use of natural gas has so New Englanders and myself included pay exorbitant prices for natural gas and electricity during the winter. I hate having to pay more than I should due to irrational people protesting and holding up a valuable pipeline that will increase capacity and decrease prices year round for a commodity that is in ample supply yet some people hate any idea of expanding natural gas's supply just to artificially make solar and wind energy more affordable. We need more natural gas to help get us through this transition period to use more renewable energy sources especially since none of them help people heat their homes unless you use electric which I believe few people do. The vast majority of people should not have to pay increased electric and gas rates just because a few vocal people hate anything to do with fossil fuels. I urge the commission to approve the Northeast Energy Direct natural gas line as it will help the Northeast remain competitive to live and work as well as create well paying jobs.

20150910-5114

Joyce Kulig, Dracut, MA.

I have posted my testimony from the FERC scoping session in Dracut, MA on Aug. 11, 2015. I noticed some errors in the transcription of my testimony so I want to be sure the correct information is received. Thank you.

Good Evening

My name is Joyce Kulig K-U-L-I-G, a 32 year resident at 81 Heather Rd in Dracut, Massachusetts

As a retired 35 year public school teacher, this is a civics lesson I never imagined I would have to learn.

Clearly you've heard a lot about the environmental impacts of this proposed project. But the most egregious impact is what this project, as proposed, would do to the neighborhoods of Dracut MA that are in its path.

I'd like to speak specifically about the construction and maintenance of the pipeline that is proposed to run in our backyards. Currently behind my home as well as others in my neighborhood, there's a 200' electric utility easement which has been in place since we all bought our homes, some of us 30+ years ago. The electric lines, themselves, only encompass about 50 feet of that easement. Kinder Morgan has proposed that it is co-locating with that utility but that is not true. Kinder Morgan wants their own easement. Therefore,

they are really co-locating with our backyards. This co-locating will require the destruction and clear cutting of at least a 100 foot swath of mature trees and vegetative buffer on our properties. Kinder Morgan would then need to maintain this land without tree cover forever. This would also require Kinder Morgan to obtain this land through eminent domain proceedings because, I, for one, would not be a willing seller of my property for the proposed pipeline.

Some aspects of this environmental destruction are the reduction in noise mitigation and the actual reduction in mature woodland trees. I would ask the FERC to review how many abutters will lose their shielding from the power line easements after the destruction of the woodland privacy barriers on private property are confiscated by eminent domain. This current wooded buffer between the power lines and our homes is where our children and grandchildren play and enjoy the woods. The environmental impacts may possibly result in impacts to our health, physical and stress related, as well as have a negative impact to our property values. In your letter to me dated June 30, 2015, you indicated our comments should focus on these effects and provide reasonable alternatives to avoid or lesson the environmental impacts. The way to do this is to not locate this pipeline in my neighborhood or any other neighborhood in Dracut, Massachusetts.

Kinder Morgan's pre-application says that the proposed pipeline is being co-located with existing utility easements, but the truth is the proposed pipeline is co-locating with our homes, properties and families.

Should Ferc allow Kinder Morgan to use the eminent domain law to violate our property when there are reasonable alternatives including a no- build alternative? Certainly not! Thank you for listening.

20150910-5122

k sullivan, New Ipswich, NH.

I am within the 1/2 mile incineration blast zone from the proposed New Ipswich Compressor Station.

I am very concerned about a lot of things with this pipeline & compressor station.

This comment is about my well water.

The proposed compressor station in New Ipswich is going to be placed in/on one of the water aqua filters for our well water.

There is an official state sign notifying the public or anyone coming into the area that this is a water shed area. There is a phone number to report hazard spills. This is with feet of the proposed compressor station. I consider the proposed compressor station a hazard condition.

I want to know if Kinder Morgan/Tn Gas Pipeline Company/NED people are going to be paying to have my well water tested on a quarterly routine at the water testing company of my choice.

I want to know what Kinder Morgan/TN Gas Pipeline Company/NED is going to do when my water goes bad. I want to know what Kinder Morgan/TN Gas Pipeline Company/NED is going to do when my well goes dry.

Is Kinder Morgan/TN Gas Pipeline Company/NED going to supply me & my family, my heirs, my descendants or anyone who may buy my properties with clean potable water to the end of time or until this planet we now call earth & home is no longer in existence?

Just what is Kinder Morgan/TN Gas Pipeline Company/NED responsibility to keep my home supplied with clean, non contaminated water as I have now? Is Kinder Morgan/TN Gas Pipeline Company/NED going to give me a base water report from the water testing company of my choice before they start the construction to put in the pipeline & proposed compressor station and disrupting the aqua filter, water shed areas of the whole of New Ipswich?

Without clean, non contaminated water there is no life.

I have a right to know. The people of the towns along the route of the pipeline, the people of New Ipswich have the right to know what is, who is responsible to keep our water clean & non contaminated & what happens when our water goes bad or dries up.

New Hampshire will not benefit from this Kinder Morgan/TN Gas Pipeline Company/NED project. New Ipswich will not benefit from this pipeline nor the compressor station. It is not wanted. It is not needed. FERC, please just say NO to the Kinder Morgan/TN Gas Pipeline Company/NED project and just SAY YES to the people of New Ipswich & deny this application.

20150911-0006

Hand written FERC Comment form: Barbara Ferullo, 50 Stowell Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071: opposing

20150911-0007

{duplicate copy of 20150908-0008}

20150911-5001

Evelyn Taylor, New Ipswich, NH.

I have just heard Kinder Morgan/TGP has changed the pipeline route to go under the football field at Souhgan High School in Mount Vernon, NH. I am sick and tired of this madness. How are we supposed to assess this project when it is constantly changing? We have spend thousands of dollars and days to try to get a grip on the truth and impacts to no avail. Our homes, our lielihoods, our families, our health and our lives are at risk from this project. Kinder Morgan/TGP obviously has no idea what they are doing, where they are doing it, or when they are doing it yet they threaten us with notice of eminent domain and claim this is needed in NH and for the public good. This is not needed and not for the public good. It is a rush to reap private profit before the opportunity is lost. I propose that the FERC call for a competency hearing and I want to be compensated for my time and money and lost sleep and suffering from being badgered with constant indecision and illusion. In my opinion, a company with such poor execution as we are seeing is not qualified to be trusted with a large volume high pressure hazardous material pipeline cutting through our ecosystems and neighborhoods. It seems to me that they view their profits as far more important than our existence.

20150911-5031

Gwen Palmer, Amherst, NH.

I am writing to you about Kinder Morgan's proposal to build the NED pipeline thru southern NH. We live in Amherst, NH. We are adamantly opposed to this project and the damage it would do to our town. We are also opposed to continuing to prop up the fossil fuel industry when we should be putting our energy into renewable energy. But here are our biggest concerns:

- 1) Kinder Morgan's safety record, including the recent explosions in Texas and Canada. It feels like they will be burying bombs, end to end for 70+ miles through our state....
- 2) For no benefit to NH. This is primarily for use in Masssachusetts and for export, though now there are questions about the foreing market not being so robust. As one friend said, "We are not Massachusett's basement—they don't get to store their unsightly, dangerous stuff in our state while they get all the benefits!"
- 3) Our property values will plummet, even if our property is not directly affected. And there's nothing we could do—even if we moved right now, we'd take a hit in the price.
- 4) The installation alone will be horribly damaging and disruptive, esp. to our natural conservancy areas.
- 5) I have not heard a single friend or neighbor say they support this. And if we did, we'd suspect that they'd been paid off, because that's what Kinder Morgan does—they recruit people, pay them to chat this project up. Just the beginning of the shadiness we've already experienced from this company. Including their making deals with unions for proposed work, because who doesn't like the idea of more jobs and supporting the unions? So they create positive buzz, they assume this is going forward despite the huge uproar in our state.

I'm sure you see a very different playing field of energy needs and options, but know that the fear here is very deep and very real. We feel so powerless against this big company, but we will not get a vote on this. We know there are plans in place to fight this in court, etc. especially if Kinder Morgan tries to seize property thru eminent domain. But I hope you as an agency of our government, will also be looking out for our best interests, short and long term. There is a lot of speculation that you will just "rubber stamp" this, but I'm trusting that you are intelligent people who will really hear these comments from me and our neighbors. Thank you for your time. Sincerely, Gwen Palmer

20150914-0007

Congress of the United States
Washington, DC 20515
The Honorable Norman C. Bay
Chairman
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, DC 20426

Dear Chairman Bay:

We write regarding concerns with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (FERC's) permitting process for natural gas pipelines. In meetings across New Hampshire, our constituents continue to raise questions and concerns with the Commission's permitting process. We respectfully request explanations to the following concerns as posed by our constituents:

- Do you agree that FERC should make the threshold determination for "public need" before siting a proposed pipeline? Has FERC made that threshold determination in the case of Kinder Morgan's proposed Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline? If so, please share with us your detailed analysis regarding the determination.
- Do you agree that in determining the "public need" for a proposed pipeline in a particular region, FERC should evaluate the potential impact of other proposed projects in the region, which may collectively provide unneeded excess capacity? Has it done so for the proposed NED project?
- Do you agree that FERC should give strong consideration during its "public need" review to a project's economic and environmental impact on communities? Has it done so for the proposed NED project?
- The public comment system is receiving a very high volume of comments. What steps do the Commissioners take to directly review information on "public need" submitted via that system? Does FERC staff review, analyze, and brief Commissioners on those submissions?
- How do stakeholders with information relevant to the determination of "public need" ensure Commissioners will directly review that information?
- Do you agree that the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) should have a role in FERC's determination of whether to permit a proposed pipeline? Has PHMSA provided FERC with safety analysis for the proposed NED project?

Additionally, enclosed is a copy of a letter from our congressional delegation to the Inspector General of the Department of Energy (DOE) dated July 15, 2015, regarding the proposed Northeast Energy Direct project. The letter requested that the Inspector General address and answer five questions related to FERC's permitting process. We are separately writing the Inspector General and asking for immediate answers to the questions raised in our previous letter.

New Hampshire residents deserve a fully transparent process and should be guaranteed that the Commissioners will consider and respond to their concerns. To date, FERC's interactions with the public have been unsuccessful in answering these relevant and important questions. We strongly urge FERC to provide dear

and complete answers to these questions by September 18, 2015.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter. We look forward to your timely response.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Shaheen
U.S. Senator

Ann McLane Kuster
Member of Congress

Kelly A. Ayotte
U.S. Senator

Frank Guinta
Member of Congress

20150914-0009

{duplicate copy of 20150904-5296 }

20150914-0010

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426

Date: Sept. 4, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access:

As the owner of the property located at:

Lot #2-33 F Tipping Rock Road, Winchester, NH 03470

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose. Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Daniel Hayes Kennedy

20150914-0020

{duplicate copy of 20150904-5279 }

20150914-0021

Massachusetts A.T. Committee
Berkshire Chapter — Appalachian Mountain Club
Post Office Box 2281, Pittsfield, MA 01202-2281

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426

August 30, 2015

Dear Ms. Bose:

After examining Resource Reports filed on 7/24/15, the Appalachian Trail Management Committee of the Appalachian Mountain Club Berkshire Chapter (the "AT Committee", a stewardship partner for the Appalachian Trail (A.T.) in Massachusetts) submits the following comments.

Resource Report 8 Land Use, Recreation and Aesthetics, created by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company in July 2015, in paragraph 8.4.1.6 references the crossing of the Appalachian Trail in Dalton Mass. The proposed pipeline is co-located on an existing cleared ROW containing an electrical transmission line. The

paragraph says (in part): “Any changes to the existing landscape will be minor and confined to minimal widening of the existing cleared ROW as necessary for safe construction and operation of the pipeline. Any physical and visual obstruction to the view shed will be temporary in nature and limited to the period of the construction.”

1. Map TE-SEG G-011 indicates that near MP9.5 up to 95 feet of disturbance will occur along the existing ROW in the area of the Appalachian Trail and the nearby Crystal Mountain Campsite (Lat 42.515203314, Lon -73.159891385). Additionally in some areas as much as 50 ft more width may be required on the north side of the proposed route. This will bring the worksite and associated destruction of existing vegetation very close to (if not impinging upon) this campsite.

The Appalachian Trail Conservancy (ATC), a nonprofit organization, works closely with Appalachian Trail clubs and public and private partners to ensure the protection and stewardship of the natural, cultural, and experiential resources of the Appalachian National Scenic Trail (ANST). The Conservancy has developed policies that describe important management values shared by all Trail management partners including the National Park Service, USDA Forest Service and cooperating state agencies (in this case, Mass Department of Conservation and Recreation). Excerpts from relevant policies include:

- The experience for Appalachian Trail visitors should include the means *to interact with the wild, scenic, pastoral, cultural, and natural elements of the Appalachian Trail environment, unfettered and unimpeded by competing sights or sounds and in as direct and intimate a manner as possible* (from the 1997 ATC Policy on the A.T. Experience and Non-Hiking Recreational Uses of Trail Lands).
- *Proposed pipeline does not cross an area unsuitable for such development, including:*
 - o *Trail Related facilities, such as shelters and campsites.*
- *Pipeline authorizations include mitigation for any loss of the natural, cultural, scenic, and recreational values of the A.T. ATC’s goal is to ensure that there is no net loss of these values. The Conservancy will encourage land-managing agencies to set permit requirements that achieve this outcome.* (from the 2015 ATC Policy on Pipeline Crossings of the Appalachian Trail)

Because the intended work is adjacent, and may be within, the campsite mentioned above, ATC and the AT Committee finds that the values described above will be significantly impacted by both construction activity and the resultant removal of existing vegetation. It is likely that this important campsite will need to be closed during construction. After construction the area is unlikely to be suitable for use as an overnight site on the A.T. In addition to environmental degradation of the area, the safety of overnight users in the unlikely event of a leak or explosion is also a concern. Estimated use of the campsite averages 4-6 visitors nightly between May and September, with peaks as high as 15 on summer weekends.

2. The wetland (NWI-tr4) area east of MP9.5 serves as a recharge zone for the stream that serves as the water source for Crystal Mountain Campsite. Contamination or disruption of flow of this stream will render the campsite unusable.
3. Illegal ATV access is already troublesome in this area on both the Appalachian Trail Corridor lands and the adjacent Chalet Wildlife Management Area. This traffic will be enhanced when the existing deeded area is widened, particularly where it crosses roads to the east and west of the Appalachian Trail. Mitigation of these effects has not been addressed.
4. The “viewshed” referenced in the Resource Report will be permanently altered by the additional widening required for construction, increasing the impact to the hiking experience.
5. The Appalachian Trail is a significant national and international icon. Millions of visitors, seeking many different varieties of passive recreation visit the Trail every year. Some stay for a day, others spend weeks or months traveling this unique resource. The Proposed New England Direct pipeline is one of more than a dozen similar proposals along the length of the A.T. While one line may affect a relatively small section of the Trail, the cumulative impact of a significant number of utility crossings should also be a consideration in any decision to approve this project.

Given the above concerns, the Massachusetts AT Management Committee opposes the current proposed route. Alternative routes that cross the Appalachian Trail at existing road crossings are preferred locations. Such locations will eliminate negative impacts to the Trail environment, and are far from designated overnight sites.

Respectfully Submitted:

Jim Pelletier, Massachusetts Appalachian Trail Management Committee, Chair

20150914-0022

September 3, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

FERC

888 First Street NE

Washington, DC 20426

RE: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Comp. LLC

DOC# PF14-22-000

Northeast Energy Direct project

Dear Secretary Bose,

The co-location of this proposed gas pipe line with an existing power line that crossed Berkshire and Franklin Counties sounded like a good idea, especially if it was placed within the current cleared easement. But I quickly learned that the gas pipe line easement would not be within the power line easement but outside and requiring a new easement. Furthermore after walking and viewing much of the power line route between the MA/NY and MA/NH state lines I soon realized this is not a responsible route for a gas pipe line for the following reasons. But first, I will give you some background information on my credentials. I was a professional forester for 40 plus years, working in forested mountain terrain and familiar with logging operations in Franklin County. We operated under strict management practices to prevent erosion and not allowed to skid logs on steep mountain slopes. The reasons for not using the proposed co-location route are the following.

- 1) The power line chosen for this co-location easily crosses the mountainous terrain of Berkshire and Franklin County. All rivers, highways, railroads, gorges, wetlands, reservoirs, and steep mountain slopes are easily spanned with little ground disturbance following tree removal. A pipeline following this same route is a major land disturbance when a 6' x 8' trench is dug or blasted in the ground.
- 2) Soon after entering Hancock, Massachusetts the proposed route encounters Potter Mountain (Jiminy Peak) which is part of the Pittsfield State Forest (Article 97 land) designated a Forest Reserve. The proposed pipe line enters the State Forest at a tributary to Kinderhook Stream and then ascends steeply up Potter Mountain on 60% slopes and near vertical at the top. The line then descends steeply down the east slope crossing three tributaries of Hollow Brook. Digging and blasting a trench straight up and down these steep slopes cannot be done without uncontrolled erosion, which would clog all tributaries crossed. Massachusetts Department of Environmental Quality would have to suspend their erosion control regulations for this pipe line to be constructed. And these steep mountain slopes are only one of many to cross in Berkshire and Franklin County. For example, across from Potter Mountain to the east is North Mountain where the power line climbs 1000' in elevation through the Chalet State Wildlife Management Area also Article 97 lands. After crossing Route 9 this power line crosses through rough steep forest that comprises the Pittsfield Watershed, also Article 97 lands and passes between Windsor Reservoir and Cleveland Brook Reservoir and over a connecting aqueduct. This is not a suitable area to dig and blast a trench.
- 3) Throughout this mountainous terrain access roads will be needed on both private and public lands. These roads will require upgrading to allow large construction equipment and pipe line supplies.

Tree cutting and road rebuilding will be required sometimes not agreeable to the owners. The extent and location of these access roads are not known.

- 4) In Dalton, MA and perhaps other towns the power line easement has only been partially cleared. In this town the proposed gas pipe line is located on the uncleared side of the power line easement. This means an uncleared strip of trees will be left between the pipe line clearing and the power line clearing and likely cause wind throw of the trees in this strip.

In conclusion, this proposed route is not a responsible location for a pipe line, unless the proponents care little for our forest, soils, and water resources of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Sincerely,

Bruce Spencer
6 Cooleyville Road Ext.
New Salem, MA 01355

20150914-0025

**UNITED STATES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

September 10, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street NE, Room A1
Washington, DC 20426

Dear Secretary Bose,

I am writing to request that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) provide residents of the Sixth District of Massachusetts with the opportunity to express their concerns regarding the proposed Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct project. While FERC has held four scoping meetings in Massachusetts, none of the scoping meetings have been easily accessible to residents affected by the proposed Lynnfield Lateral pipeline.

I therefore request that FERC include a scoping meeting for Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Docket No. PF14-22-000 in the Sixth Congressional District of Massachusetts. The proposed project would upgrade infrastructure in Pennsylvania, New York, New Hampshire, Connecticut, and Massachusetts. While it has the potential to improve reliability of access to energy during peak demand, my constituents have serious concerns about the impact of the proposed Lynnfield Lateral pipeline.

Finally, I want to express my appreciation that the Agency extended the period for public comment through October 16, 2015. It is my aim to serve as an advocate for my constituents to ensure that their concerns are properly addressed, and it is my belief the extension should include an opportunity for the communities affected by the Lynnfield Lateral proposal to share their concerns.

Sincerely,

SETH MOULTON
Member of Congress

20150914-0030

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC
1615 Suffield Street
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: August 27, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

6, 8, 10, 17, 19 South Shore Dr
Pelham, NH 03076

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Julia Steed Mawson

20150914-0037

Hand written card, Alice Bury, 7 Patricia Ln, Amherst, NH 03031: opposing

20150914-0041

Hand written card, Benjamin Sylvia, 123 Montague Rd, Wendell, MA 01379: opposing

20150914-0042

Hand written card, Aimee Gelinias, 1516 Savoy Hollow Rd, Windosr, MA 01270: opposing

20150914-0043

Hand written card, Daniel Cohen, 1516 Savoy Hollow Rd, Windosr, MA 01270: opposing

20150914-0044

Hand written card, Daniel Cournayer, 19 Main Street, Temple, NH 03084: opposing

20150914-0045

Hand written card, Margaret "Peggy" Cournayer, 19 Main Street, Temple, NH 03084: opposing

20150914-0046

Hand written card, John Leoutsacos, 79 Mountainview Drive, Temple, NH 03084: opposing

20150914-0047

Hand written card, Lesley Finlayson, 167 Heald Road, Wilton, NH: opposing

20150914-0048

Hand written card, David Taylor, 64 Hudson Rd, Temple, NH 03084: opposing

20150914-0049

Hand written card, Andrew Finlayson, 167 Heald Road, Wilton, NH: opposing

20150914-0050

Hand written card, William Finlayson, 167 Heald Road, Wilton, NH: opposing

20150914-0051

Hand written card, Lesley Finlayson, 167 Heald Road, Wilton, NH: opposing

20150914-0057

{FERC Comment form, 2 pages: }

Christine Vitale
56 West Meadow Road
West Townsend, MA 01474

The proposed NED pipeline appears to be on track for installation on my property, literally, in my back yard. As you know the pipeline will be carrying gas at a rate of about 1400 psi, an incredibly high rate of pressure. A normal air pressure hose is 100 psi. Although the pipeline will be seated about five feet down in stone ledge, it will be situated approximately 200 linear ft. from our house. We will be welcoming a new infant to our home of 4 adults, 2 of whom are in their early twenties. In the event of an explosion, the ledge will act as shrapnel, destroying property and inflicting devastating injury for anyone unfortunate enough to be in its wake.

Regarding the pipeline structure, over time connection seals on any junction loosen and the materials deteriorate which can cause a rupture, especially with a constant flow of material at a high rate of pressure. Echoing what others have said before: "It's not a matter of if the pipeline will explode, it's a matter of when". A system failure will happen somewhere along the line at some point in the future, causing massive destruction.

From a home owner's standpoint, another hardship we will be faced with is a deep decline in property value. Quite frankly, nobody wants to buy a house with a high pressure gas pipeline running through it.

What is disturbing about the location of the intended pipeline is that there are 124 acres of agricultural land across the street from us where impact to people would have been minimal. The proposed pipeline was originally planned to go through this area of farmland and wildlife management. One can only guess why the Wildlife Division gave opposition to the pipeline crossing its land and that was why it was pushed back across the street onto private property. Otherwise, why wouldn't the government use its own land, where installation would be much easier in regularly tilled soil?

Aren't all good Americans trying to get away from oil dependency by looking at and using other energy alternatives? Our collective goal is to use cleaner, alternative, sources of energy such as wind and solar. The utility companies at each end of the Northeast lateral reportedly say they have no contracts with Tennessee Gas and no need for any. It certainly doesn't seem necessary and is definitely not convenient to have a pipeline destroying habitat and protected ecosystems for Tennessee Gas's financial gain. Or, maybe the federal government just wants to be a world superpower when it comes to fossil fuels and that's why it wants to push the NED lateral through, and off to the European market they go.

Maybe FERC is unfamiliar with Massachusetts and stubborn New Englanders, so I must ask this. If every affected town in Massachusetts, New Hampshire that the pipeline is intended to cross, vehemently opposes the Northeast Direct branch, why would the FERC take on this political nightmare that will surely unfold for your agency? One woman at the Aug. 12, 2015 Leominster public meeting said it best: "FERC; make history. Say NO to big business and the oil industry."

Christine Vitale
56 West Meadow Road
West Townsend, MA 01474

20150914-0058

{was "File 30876327_1.tif cannot be converted to PDF." - OCR converted here}

pennsylvania
DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION
AND NATURAL RESOURCES
BUREAU OF RECREATION AND CONSERVATION

September 3, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street NE, Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426

RE: Project Docket Number PF14-22-000

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Ms. Bose:

The Pennsylvania, Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, Bureau of Recreation and Conservation (BRC) has reviewed the proposed pipeline location for potential conflicts with BRC-funded park and recreation properties. This review identified two BRC-funded recreational properties (both in Susquehanna County) that have the potential to be impacted by the proposed pipeline construction (see the attached file). The first of these BRC-funded resources is the Elk Lake School Park owned by the Elk Lake School District in Dimock Township. Both Land and Water Conservation Fund and Keystone grant monies were used to assist in the recreational development of this school park. If the proposed pipeline construction is to impact this public recreational facility in any way, further coordination with the BRC is required.

The second BRC-funded property is the Rail Trail of Northeastern Pennsylvania owned by the Trails Conservation Corporation (now the Rail-Trail of Northeast Pennsylvania) in Harmony Township. Acquisition of this linear corridor was partially funded by BRC using Keystone Recreational Trails money. Construction of the proposed pipeline appears to cross this rail trail. If the pipeline cannot be installed under the active rail trail by way of a trenchless method, or if there would be any surface disturbance to the trail in any manner by any method of crossing then further coordination is needed with the BRC. There is an expectation that any surface impacts to the trail shall be fully mitigated by Tennessee upon completion of the pipeline construction. Mitigation would consist of reconstructing the active rail trail to the same grade and using similar materials to that which existed prior to the start of pipeline construction. In summary, there shall be no post-construction impacts to the functional surface of the active rail trail as a result of the activities associated with the proposed project. If the surface of the rail trail is to be impacted in any manner, further coordination with the BRC is required.

Sincerely,

Ashley D. Rebert
Chief, Land Conservation & Stewardship Section
Community Parks & Conservation Division

20150914-0089

Hand written card, Julia Steed Mawson, 17 South Shore Dr, Pelham, NH 03076: opposing

20150914-5005

Jan A. Griska, Rindge, NH.

Compressor Stations, MLVs etc.

In the process of responding to Tennessee Gas Pipeline's (TGP) 6,751 page Resource Reports, I did some research on the impact that Compressor Stations, MLVs and pipeline leaks have on air quality.

What I found out was both horrifying and fascinating, I'll let you decide which is which as the letter unfolds. What follows is data from my research, personal observations and feedback from the Kinder Morgan's Compressor Station Guru, that was present at the Fitzwilliam open house on 9/10/15.

The first thing, I'll ask you to remember is the following gases/chemicals that get released into the atmosphere with a blowdown: Methane, Benzene, Toluene, Ethylbenzene and Xylene. I'm not a chemist, but I know that Methane, is a Green House that is worst than CO2 and I also know Benzene is a well documented

carcinogen. So one (Methane) will accelerate climate change and the other (Benzene) will kill you in insidious ways if you are exposed to it long enough.

My research told me that Compressor Stations don't need to do blowdowns. Given they change operating procedures and make relatively straight forward changes to the plumbing in Compressor Stations. Please use the following URLs to get access to some of my research data:

http://www.epa.gov/gasstar/documents/ll_compressoroffline.pdf

<https://sites.google.com/site/metropolitanenvironmental/the-lowdown-on-gas-compressor-blowdown-the-dirty-truth-of-unreportable-emissions>

For those of you that want to know how much gas gets released into the atmosphere from a blowdown (taking a compressor offline) it is about 15,000 cubic feet of gas. Given an emergency compressor station shut down, as much as 1.5 million cubic feet of gas can be vented in the atmosphere. Given a pipeline failure, the figure gets expediential. The NED project spacing of the MLVs (Main Line Valves) varies with population density. I believe the MLV's are 7.5 miles apart in section I (Cheshire County). So picture a cylinder that is 30 inches in diameter that is 7.5 miles long and the gas stored in that cylinder is compressed to a pressure of 800 pounds per square inch to as much 1,460 pounds per square inch, that is a lot more than 1.5 million cubic feet of gas!

Now for my conversation with Kinder Morgan's Compressor Station Guru: He told me that not blowing down the compressors, that they are taking offline, will shorten the life of the seals on the compressor shafts. The EPA etc. (see the URLs I've included) have identified a solution to that problem. Another suggested solution (venting the blowdown gases into the suction of an in service compressor) was dismissed by the Kinder Morgan Compressor Station Guru because they would have to add a pump to the compressor stations plumbing!

They are looking at the cheapest most cost effective solution. They state in the Resource Reports that they meet the minimum regulatory safety requirements.

Now, I hope the people of New Ipswich, and the rest of the impacted towns are reading this.

The above tells me four things:

1. No Pipeline, No Problem.
2. A large negative side to living with a compressor station could be remedied if KM wanted to.
3. Our animals, crops, and wildlife are just collateral damage.
4. The cost of building a compressor stations is more important to KM, than human life.

Jan A. Griska
Rindge, N.H.

20150914-5012

Jean Nigro, ARLINGTON, MA.
September 12, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Docket PF 14-22

Dear Secretary Bose,

I had the pleasure, a term I use loosely, of attending a Tennessee Gas/Kinder Morgan open house in New Ipswich, New Hampshire on September 9th. I was quite perturbed that the company representatives who were ostensibly present to provide facts with regard to the NED project instead provided misinformation, evasive

responses, and a complete failure to respond to concerns.

Specifically, two separate representatives of Tennessee Gas repeated to me several times that in their combined 50 years of experience working for Kinder Morgan, they were aware of no pipeline accidents, leaks or fires. Their information is contrary to fact as documented by this article based on data from the National Association of Pipeline Safety Representatives and the National Transportation Safety Board. <https://www.sn1.com/InteractiveX/Article.aspx?cdid=A-33791090-11060> which states that the failure rate of new gas lines has spiked dramatically in the past five years. Another TGP representative repeatedly insisted that there was nothing dangerous or toxic emitted at compressor station sites. However, the Southwest Pennsylvania Environmental Health Impact Project has published a well researched paper on the myriad of toxic chemicals that are emitted in the vicinity of gas compressor stations, and the negative health effects associated with those emissions. <http://www.newipswichpipeline.info/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/SWPA-Compressor-Stations-and-Health-Impacts.pdf>

And finally, a representative who greeted me near the entrance entertained me with a soliloquy on the dire energy crisis in New Hampshire and the resulting high cost of electricity and gas, by far the highest in the nation. Not true! Based on data from the U.S. Energy Information Administration, the Federal Highway Administration, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and AAA's Daily Fuel Gauge Report, New Hampshire electricity prices rank 24th out of the 50 states and the natural gas prices in New Hampshire are lower than 46 other states. <http://wallethub.com/edu/most-least-energy-expensive-states/4833/>

My conclusion can only be that these representatives are either completely ignorant of the industry in which they are employed and have been employed for many years, OR, they are lying. They are lying to New Hampshire property owners like me who will receive absolutely no benefit from this pipeline project and will suffer greatly if it goes forward. There ARE accidents, leaks and fires. There ARE toxic unmitigated toxic emissions at compressor station sites. There IS NOT any need in New Hampshire for this pipeline.

You must not allow a company that is either, extremely ill equipped to build such a project or so deceptive and dishonest that they would lie to people's faces, to go forward. Deny their permit!

Jean Nigro

20150914-5013

Carol M DiPirro, Merrimack, NH.

To Chairman Norman C Bay and the FERC Commissioners:

I am writing in opposition to the NED pipeline proposed for NH and MA.

At the point of writing this, only one distributor has expressed interest in using the LNG on the NED 30" pipeline. This is roughly about 4% of what Kinder Morgan proposes to transmit through my state.

I ask FERC to find out what will happen to the rest of the LNG??

Please do not destroy our pristine state for the greed of a company. If NH needs additional energy, which I have read it does not. From all of my research it sounds like the state of Massachusetts is in need.

At this time, it is not intended to go thru my back yard. But I am concerned of the risks it poses in general to my home town. It seems Kinder Morgan is now eyeing my town of Merrimack, NH for a metering station. My understanding is that a metering station is to "know how much gas is in the system at all times....To accomplish this, pipeline companies use metering stations to measure all natural gas entering or exiting the pipeline system. "

I do not want more LNG being transported through my state, town, especially not a metering station due to the following reasons I found at <http://www.ingaa.org/Topics/ClimateChange.aspx>

"Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions management and reporting have emerged as leading environmental policy issue at the state, provincial, regional and federal levels in the United States and Canada. Several new initiatives have been launched or are currently under development in the U.S. and Canada that establish rules to report and track these emissions. In addition, the 110th Congress will begin to focus more intently

on the merits and the possible form of a mandatory Federal GHG control program.

The primary GHG emissions attributable to the natural gas transmission industry include Carbon Dioxide (CO₂) from combustion sources and methane (CH₄) from fugitive emissions (leaks) and venting. Methane emissions are especially important due to the global warming potential (GWP) of methane.”

I have also read about functions of metering stations and how they have vent stacks and may create noise or a whine as I’ve hear. These vent stacks release methane in the air which has clearly been defined as a MAJOR contributor to climate change. I’ve heard of these releases being called blowdowns or planned depressurization.”

Source: Pacific Carbon Trust <http://www.pacificcarbontrust.com/our-projects/offset-showcase/natural-gas-pipeline-venting-reduction-spectra-energy-northeastern-bc/>

On several websites I’ve read about “fugitive emissions which are “leakage from the sealed surfaces of valves, connections, pressure relief valves, and open ended lines.” “..devices can bleed gas to the atmosphere continuously”

I find this very frightening in light of climate change but it brings up the subject of if there are bleeds or leaks in other pipelines, I believe it would be more cost effective, more environmentally friendly and avoid disruption in NH if these leaks were not only identified but FIXED!!!!

Thousands of natural gas pipeline leaks have been identified in Boston and across Massachusetts that not only cost consumers millions of dollars in lost fuel, but also can pose a threat to public safety and the environment.

Now, using public records, a local environmental advocacy group has begun mapping such leaks and publishing the results online at www.clf.org/map.

Working with Boston University, the Conservation Law Foundation has located more than 4,000 leaks reported during several years by National Grid and a smaller utility that serves Fall River, North Attleboro, Plainville, Somerset, Swansea, and Westport. The leaks — some of which may have been fixed — are graded by severity.

Source: <http://www.boston.com/news/local/massachusetts/2014/03/20/environmental-group-mapping-natural-gas-leaks/v0F2h0ocwps4PEdyn8zkL/story.html>

Source: <http://www.ingaa.org/cms/131.aspx>

A spike occurred in 2013-2014 winter season which did not occur in 2014-2015 without building a humungous pipeline. It was better planning

At a FERC meeting it was said that we export energy to other states. The need has yet to be demonstrated. Isn’t that FERC’s charter, to find reasonable need. There is not the need. Alternative energy can be used to fill any gaps if we invest in it instead of depending more on fossil fuel.

Don’t risk our water supply, our trees, our safety, just because KM sees a financial opportunity.

Prove the people wrong that say you are a rubber stamp machine.

Thank you,

Carol DiPirro
Merrimack NH

20150914-5020

W. Martin Senrick, Nassau, NY.

535 Hoags Corners Road
Nassau, NY 12123

10 Sep 2015

FERC Docket No. PF14-22-000

I am strongly opposed to the NED pipeline for the following reasons:

- Damage to the environment (water and air) caused by fracking chemicals in the gas and construction of the pipeline and compressor station
- Noise and light pollution caused by an up to 90,000 HP compressor station less than 1 mile away
- Danger of incineration from a gas leak
- Global Warming from fossil fuels - I have solar panels (105% of usage), bought a 100% electric car, and heat only with wood pellets (nearly carbon neutral) and believe global warming IS happening
- Fracking is illegal in NY and transporting of fracked natural gas should be illegal too
- The Dewey Loeffel Waste Oil Dump (an EPA cleanup site) is close to the pipeline route - haven't we been polluted enough already?
- Homeowner's insurance rates will increase if pipeline is completed
- None of the gas transported will be used locally - MOST of it will be exported (just as crude oil from the Alaska pipeline was)
- Local governments will have to increase fire fighting equipment at their own cost and will receive no benefits from the pipeline operation
- Property values will decrease
- The rich (Kinder Morgan) will get richer and the common people (us) will get nothing

W. Martin Senrick

20150914-5021

David W James, Meriden, CT.

Dear Secretary Bose,

I am writing in regards to Docket number PF14-22, Kinder Morgan's Northeast Energy Direct (NED) project.

In the environmental impact statement, FERC needs to take into account the increased amount of methane emissions that this large project will pour into our atmosphere. Earlier this month the EPA proposed new standards to reduce methane emissions by 45% over the next 10 years. The EPA recognizes that methane is a potent global greenhouse gas, far worse than carbon dioxide at trapping heat in the atmosphere. The NED project will make those reductions in methane emissions impossible, and will cause irreparable harm to our climate.

Furthermore, these shale gas expansion projects are segmented into two, the Connecticut Expansion and NED. FERC must acknowledge that this is the case, and admit that the environmental harm caused by these two projects is cumulative. They are not separate projects, and FERC has been guilty of illegal segmentation in the recent past.

The potential harm to water has been raised by the Hartford MDC, the municipal corporation responsible for providing clean water to 400,000 people in the Hartford area. In a June 26 letter to FERC, MDC Chief Executive Officer Scott Jellison wrote "to express some concern that the proposed pipeline could potentially impact MDC's public drinking water supplies in West Hartford and Bloomfield, CT." FERC must address the concerns of MDC and the public about the impact of pipeline construction and operation on drinking water.

FERC should take into account the frequency of pipeline leaks and explosions, and factor in the costs to local communities, who bear a burden when environmental harm from pipeline accidents occur. According to the Pipeline Hazardous and Safety Material Administration, leaks and explosions are not uncommon and have increased in frequency in recent years.

Yours,

20150914-5022

Scott Ezell, South San Francisco, CA.

I'm here visiting the Monadnock Region of NH, where I grew up. This is a beautiful and tranquil place and I find it shocking that this could all change to benefit a company that has no interest in this area. Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company are being selfish about their profit, but have no idea of the impact they are already having on this area. Real estate values are already significantly diminished in the nearby towns and many houses on the market already have no chance of selling as long as this threat hangs over the region.

20150914-5074

Docket No. PF14-22-000

The Pipeline is currently planned to go through my property behind my home on Slivko Rd in Nassau(12123), NY. Myself, my wife and my 2 young children live at this address. We worked very hard towards buying this property and building this house 5 years ago.

We have several concerns with the effects of this pipeline and compressor stations current placement. This pipelines placement would be very close to our home within 100 feet. I feel my home and family of 2 young boys will be in danger from the pipeline. Based on the close proximity of our home In the case of an explosion, leak or blow off. My home is downhill from the pipeline and in the case of an explosion the pipes energy would point at my home and family. We are in the incineration zone. An additional concern is the high tension power lines in the incineration zone acting as an ignition source in the case of a leak. Cumulatively putting our family at high risk with no warning. Kindermorgans track record of maintenance on these systems does not provide comfort that we would have any notice of a potential incident.

With the continuous threats to our country we also feel this is a target for attacks. By those who may want to hurt our country, having 2 of our countries energy sources running parallel makes this a vulnerable situation not to mention the compressor station being right in the power line corridor.

During heavy rain or snow runoff water comes down the hill behind my home like a river. We fixed this with drainage that would be located on the right of way of the pipeline. I would not be able to maintain or expanded this drainage as needed. What is the risk of contamination to my well which is also on this right away? Shouldn't there be mandatory testing of local wells if this pipeline is within a certain distance of drinking wells. My shed is also on the right of way.

I believe the pipeline should follow the I-90 Corridor where they already have an existing right of way and compressor station in place. It could be upgraded to handle the new pipeline by using what is already in place. The concept of recycling and would overall do less harm to the environment.

Knowing our land and terrain a plan for the current pipeline to be located on the north side of the power lines would create more challenges for Kindermorgans situation and harm for the environment. The most severe grades and wet lands are located on the north side of the power lines. Putting the pipeline on the Southside of the power lines would distance the pipelines from the homes on Slivko Rd. and would offer minimum distribution to the sportsman club(only effecting their parking lot).

I have included a map from national grids right of way that is about a third of Slivko roads length. On the map you will see the severity of the terrain. Proving one more reason the pipeline should follow the I-90 corridor. This corridor already inhabits pipelines, this terrain has open fields and a level terrain making it a better place for this plan. The maps kindermorgan supplied of the power line are inaccurate and are off by 50 or more feet on all the property lines adjoining purposed pipeline route, the homes are much closer to the pipeline then it appears. They know this! The power line on the right of way is not centered as they show on the maps. They are also not using current aerial maps of the properties, they do not show my shed and the clearing around it. For a reference I have included Kindermorgans

aerial map this shows all of the property lines shifted south, the actual utility right of way is 50 feet or more to the north of what is shown on these maps. National grid has cleared the right of way to their property line. After discussions with kindermorgan representatives they are aware of this and have done nothing to update this information. Again being deceptive in their tactics. If Kindermorgan is granted the right to build on the north side of the power lines does this mean the remainder of national grids right of way is now unusable and needed as a buffer zone!

We need your help:

Help us protect our water and air - mandate biannual testing on our drinking water and air quality.

Help us protect our investment - A law needs to be put in place to protect people like us who have worked very hard for their homes. are we forced to stay but live in fear of the long term effects of living near a compressor station and within a 100 feet of an explosive pipeline. Or do we leave? Who do we sell to? Who would want to live here? Now we have lost all of our equity with no chance to recover our loss. Why aren't there laws to protect taxpaying citizens. We want to live in our home and feel safe. If this goes to eminent domain and is necessary for the good of all, then we should be compensated for our property value so we can leave and be left to live in peace. A home is supposed to be a safe place for a family and your are stripping this from us. You will move this pipeline to protect animals, wetlands or for other environmental impact but what about the people who live on this land. This is when the government needs to step in a protect its people.

Sincerely,

Fedorowicz Family
80 Slivko Rd. Nassau, NY

20150914-5087

Roger and Ann Sweet, Sullivan, NH.

We oppose the proposed Kinder Morgan pipeline in NH for the following reasons:

1. Violation of conservation properties.
2. Thread to water supplies of residents.
3. Danger of spills, given K_M's reputations for maintenance.
4. No benefits to NH residents.

20150914-5116

David M Mann, Bloomfield, CT.

To the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

I am writing on behalf of the Conservation Energy and Environment Committee for the Town of Bloomfield, CT to express our opposition to the proposed Kinder Morgan/Tennessee gas pipeline project. We understand that the pipeline route is planned to pass through Metropolitan District Commission (MDC) and other lands in Bloomfield and neighboring West Hartford. Portions of this route cross highly-protected drinking water sources that should in no way be compromised by the construction of a large gas pipeline. CT law further identifies these lands as Class I and Class II restricted lands that cannot be legally disturbed other than through limited, permitted actions necessary to maintain operations. Disturbing the hydrology by constructing a 30-36" pipeline and exposing the watershed to potential leakage or contamination is patently unwise and unworthy of public support.

We have not seen or heard of any viable alternatives to the proposed alignment. Nor have we seen a detailed description of the ROW alignment to determine more clearly how the project would affect our natural resources, or understand how physical and economic disruptions to property will be remedied. Furthermore, we question why additional ROW is needed when the existing ROW seems adequate. Also, does the advent of a new pipeline imply the existing one is nearing the end of its useful life? If so, what further actions are

under consideration?

Our committee is engaged in actively promoting residential and commercial energy conservation and motivating renewable energy investments. Therefore, our secondary concern about the Kinder Morgan /Tennessee gas pipeline has to do with the continuation and expansion of non-sustainable, fossil fuel usage. We may never transition to renewable energy, as long as fossil fuels are made less expensive; and are available at great risk to our environment, our wetlands and water supply, and woodland destruction.

Sincerely,

Marie Mac Donald, Chairman, and membership of the
Conservation Energy and Environment Committee
Town of Bloomfield, CT

20150914-5117

Mark A. Burton
365 Beldingville Road
Shelburne Falls, MA 01370

September 12, 2015

Mr. James D. Hartman
Kinder Morgan
1615 Suffield Street
Agawam, MA 01001

RE: FERC Docket No. PF14-22-000 and LL# MA WD 229,231

Dear Mr Hartman:

In response to your letter of September 9, 2015 requesting permission to survey my two parcels of land, please be advised that my answer to you remains essentially the same as the verbal indication I provided in February/March of last year: Kinder Morgan, its subsidiaries, and any and all contractors (including Hatch MacDonald) that are directly or indirectly affiliated with, engaged by, contracted by, or are otherwise collaborating with or assisting Kinder Morgan in its attempt have permitted the project supervised by the above reference docket, are expressly denied permission to be present on my property for any and all reasons. Any physical presence of such representation on my property, whether as persons or equipment, will be considered Trespassing and will be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

Most Sincerely,

Mark A. Burton

CC:

Attorney General Maura Healey
Commonwealth of Massachusetts
One Ashburton Place
Boston, MA 02108-1518

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street NE, Room 1A
Washington, D.C. 20426

20150915-0007

{same text as 20150902-0020, except signed by: }

Eleanor P. Lesser, 239 River Mead Road, Peterborough, NH 03458

20150915-0015

18-2 America Way
Salem, MA 01970

September 7, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Docket PF14-22-000

Dear Madam Secretary:

I write to register my very strong opposition to the above docketed pipeline presently proposed to travel through very densely populated sections of Essex County, Massachusetts carrying fracked gas from western Pennsylvania. Essex County is historically one of the oldest counties in the United States having been created by the General Court of the Massachusetts Bay Colony on May 10, 1643, one hundred and forty four years older than the Constitution of the United States of America. The county is also one of the most densely populated counties in the country having a population density of 1508.8 people per square mile.

Consequently, any gas pipeline run in or through one square mile of Essex County, Massachusetts exposes over 1500 people per square mile to the risks and hazards of this venture. Your agency is charged with federal review and approval of this project and I strongly urge that this project be rejected as dangerous and inappropriate for this densely populated area.

Very truly yours,

Eleanor M. LYnn, Esq.

20150915-4002

{copy of 20150908-0008}

20150915-5001

Evelyn Taylor, New Ipswich, NH.

Mr. Wheatley from Kinder Morgan has said: "In response to your question relating to gas quality, the methane natural gas that Tennessee Gas Pipeline (TGP) transports on its existing pipeline system, and would transport via the proposed NED pipeline, must be fully processed, with impurities removed, before it enters our pipeline system for subsequent compression and transport to end-use markets for our customers and shippers.

As I noted, this natural gas has already been treated and/or processed prior to its entry (i.e., via custody transfer into the interstate pipeline network) to remove impurities and any hazardous air pollutants that may be present."

But studies have showed health problems do exist. In Dish, Texas, where there are numerous pipelines and Compressor Stations there has been a die-off of trees, livestock dying of mysterious causes, and humans developing a range of unusual medical problems. Extremely high levels of carcinogenic and neurotoxic air pollutants have been recorded near one of the town's 11 compressor stations. Health care professionals report that a large number of children who attend schools near compressor stations suffer periodic nosebleeds. Suspected in these nosebleeds is formaldehyde, a byproduct of the combustion engines used in the compressor stations that pump gas through transmission lines.

I think the FERC needs to secure evidence from Kinder Morgan that their emissions have had impurities and hazardous air pollutants removed and that formaldehyde is not a concern for the children and people near the proposed compressor station site in New Ipswich, NH. The Temple Elementary school is the only

elementary school. Will all the children of temple be made to suffer? Are we getting correct information from Kinder Morgan?

Another problem reported from Compressor stations:

Natural Gas Compressors emit LFN continuously. LFN causes the body to secrete adrenaline, which in turn causes blood vessels to constrict. The smallest blood vessels are in the brain and eyes. In some cases, visual acuity is severely affected. Some exposed folks have died of brain aneurisms in our county [Dew, Texas]. Age doesn't matter. Some people are affected more than others. A key sign of VAD is a thickening of the pericardium (sack) around the heart. Only an echocardiogram test will reveal it.

Does Kinder Morgan do studies of it's own to determine if their compressor stations are also causing harm? I don't think the NED pipeline should be approved until Kinder Morgan can show their operations are unlike others and that they do remove impurities and any hazardous air pollutants that may be present.

Can we please see the data from similar-sized compressor stations that prove the common health impacts being reported over and over again in various places will not exist in New Ipswich?

20150915-5004

Mark Duckworth, Merrimack, NH.

I oppose the NED pipeline project through New Hampshire. It is not needed, it is dangerous, it would steal private land from citizens, it will adversely affect our groundwater and ecosystems. Please consider safer more sustainable ways to provide energy for the region.

20150915-5041

Anne Perkins, Amherst, MA.

I oppose approval of this NED pipeline. There is no proven need for more gas in Western Massachusetts, yet this pipeline would destroy hundreds of acres of pristine land, conservation land, forest, and home sites. It is time we depend on renewable energy sources, not fossil fuels.

20150915-5043

Connecticut Fund for the Environment and Save the Sound

142 Temple Street • New Haven, Connecticut 06510 • (203) 787-0646

www.ctenvironment.org • www.savethesound.org

September 15, 2015

Secretary Kimberly D. Bose

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, NE, Room 1A

Washington, DC 20426

Re: Proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project, Tennessee Gas Pipeline L.L.C/Kinder Morgan (FERC Docket No. PF14-22-000)

Dear Secretary Bose,

Connecticut Fund for the Environment (CFE) writes to express deep concern over the potential impact of the Northeast Energy Direct Project, a section of which could significantly impact important protected lands within one of Connecticut's drinking-water watersheds.

CFE is a non-profit environmental organization with over 5,500 members in Connecticut and New York. The mission of CFE, and its bi-state program Save the Sound, is to protect and improve the land, air, and water of Connecticut and Long Island Sound. We use legal and scientific expertise and bring people together to achieve results that benefit our environment for current and future generations.

CFE has a longstanding interest in ensuring that all Connecticut residents have a safe and clean source of

drinking water. In 2002, CFE helped form the Endangered Lands Coalition (ELC), a statewide network of members dedicated to protecting Connecticut's drinking water through organizing local support and legislative action. By 2006, approximately 170 members and over 80 state and local elected officials had joined the coalition.

CFE and the ELC have succeeded in permanently protecting approximately 500 acres of electric utility lands, Fairfield County's 800-acre Trout Brook Valley property, 15,500 acres of reservoir lands formerly owned by the Kelda Group, and a beautiful 25-acre reservoir in New Milford, which is surrounded by 150 acres of pristine forest and is now a nature park. In addition to these land conservation efforts, we achieved statutory protection for 25,000 acres of Class II water company-owned lands by requiring that their sale be subject to a permanent conservation easement.

CFE is concerned that the proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project may negatively impact Connecticut's drinking water and natural resources. The proposed siting route would result in the pipeline traversing Class I and Class II protected lands. These lands belong to the Metropolitan District, which provides drinking water to hundreds of thousands of Connecticut residents in the greater Hartford area. State law provides special protections for Class I and II lands to ensure that the state's drinking water resources are not threatened.

At this time, the initial environmental review process appears deficient. In addition to inadequately addressing potential impact to critical natural resources, CFE has not seen any alternatives analysis for the proposed pipeline. We urge the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) to require the project applicants to conduct a rigorous environmental review and alternatives analysis that fully considers siting options that would avoid Class I and Class II protected lands in Connecticut. Alternative pipeline routes that would not imperil Connecticut's drinking water should be carefully analyzed before the currently proposed route receives any further consideration.

Finally, numerous Connecticut residents and organizations have expressed concern that they are being left out of the decision-making process. CFE urges FERC to require the applicants to engage in substantial stakeholder outreach to ensure that all interested citizens can provide input on the proposed project. The applicants should provide ample public notice and hold a series of public meetings so citizens have adequate opportunity to provide comment.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

Shannon Smyth Laun

Energy & Environment Attorney

Connecticut Fund for the Environment

slaun@ctenvironment.org Tel: (203) 787-0646 ext. 122

Fax: (203) 787-0246

20150915-5072

Margaret Viglione, Greenville, NH.

The Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas/NED Pipeline is:

- Owned by a multi-billion dollar, private, FOR PROFIT company with deplorable safety, maintenance and transparency records.
- Headed by former Enron executives.
- Promoted through a morally bankrupt shell game of misinformation and deliberate deception.
- Offering the promise of non-existent permanent jobs and the false lure of lower energy costs to consumers.
- Fostering public fear of an "energy crisis" and the belief that New England needs their gas to meet energy needs, and they tout their pipeline as "the solution" - patently untrue.
- Proposing a mammoth, unnecessary infrastructure required to be paid for by the very consumers harmed

by its construction and operation.

- Utilizing illegal power of eminent domain to seize land for private corporate profit.
- Ignoring state and local laws, conservation land protections and massive public resistance.
- Designed to export our country's limited supply of fracked gas as quickly as possible overseas for the highest profit for their shareholders.
- Threatening the health, safety and welfare of people, animals, agriculture and the environment through toxic and radioactive pollution, explosions and leaks.
- To transport "natural" gas containing hundreds of toxic and radioactive chemicals that are known or possible human carcinogens usually regulated under the Safe Drinking Water Act, or listed as hazardous air pollutants, but the pipeline is EXEMPT from the Safe Drinking Water Act, the Clean Air and Clean Water Acts.
- A short sighted investment of huge taxpayer dollars in non-renewable, fossil fuel energy strategies - a poor vision for future energy solutions for New Hampshire and the globe.
- Overseen by FERC, an agency charged to APPROVE pipelines and paid by the same pipelines they approve, which operates without presidential or congressional oversight, a clear conflict of interest.

20150915-5120

Louis W. Burch, Hamden, CT.

September 15, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, NE

Washington, DC 20426

RE: Application to open a pre-filing proceeding of Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. under New Docket for Tennessee's Northeast Energy Direct Project (Docket #PF14-22).

Dear Secretary Bose:

Citizens Campaign for the Environment (CCE) is an 80,000 member, non-profit, non-partisan advocacy organization that works to empower communities and advocate solutions that protect public health and the natural environment. CCE appreciates the opportunity to provide the following comments on Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co.'s Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline expansion proposal.

CCE is opposed to any and all sections of the aforementioned application that would run through Metropolitan District Commission (MDC) lands in Connecticut. These lands are designated Class 1 and Class 2 drinking water protection areas under Connecticut state law, and are critical for the preservation of clean drinking water for over 400,000 residents statewide.

Connecticut's drinking water resources enjoy some of the strongest protections in the nation. These protections include the prohibition of wastewater discharges into public drinking water supply areas, and the requirement to maintain lands that feed drinking watershed areas as open space. CT Public Health Statutes Sec. 25-37c-1 and 25-37c-2 clearly establish criteria and performance standards for classification of water company lands.

- Class I water company lands are defined in the public health statutes as "any land situated within 250 feet of the high water line of a drinking water reservoir, areas along water courses which are covered by any of the critical components of a stream belt or are within 200 feet of ground water wells, or any recharge area of an aquifer that is currently in use or available for future use.
- Class II lands are defined as "all land owned by a water company which is either: (1) on a public drinking supply watershed which is not included in Class I or (2) completely off a public drinking supply watershed but within one hundred and fifty feet of a distribution reservoir or a first-order stream tributary to a distribution reservoir".

According to Connecticut State Law (CGS Sec. 25-32), any transfer or change of use of Class I or Class II water company lands requires permit approval by the CT Department of Public Health (DPH). This section significantly limits transactions involving Class I lands and favors the preservation of open space. Under these statutes, a water company may not lease or transfer Class I lands and may only sell them to the state, a municipality, or another water company. Additionally, any prospective buyer of Class I lands must agree to maintain them in accordance to the restrictions of the DPH permit and corresponding statutes.

In addition, any company in possession of Class I lands may only change their permitted use if it can demonstrate that the change (1) will not harm the quality of the water supply, and (2) is consistent with a DPH approved water supply plan filed by that company. The proposed project ignores Connecticut's process for protecting drinking water.

These Class I and II lands, as defined by the CT Public Health Statutes, have the highest priority in Connecticut's state water policy. Approval of this pipeline expansion through Class I and II water company lands would jeopardize Connecticut's pristine drinking water resources, and it would set a bad precedent regarding our state's (and others') rights and autonomy over protecting their precious and limited natural resources. CCE strongly urges FERC to deny Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas' proposal to construct its Northeast Energy Direct pipeline expansion project through these protected and vital drinking water supply lands.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this important issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Louis W. Burch
Government Relations

cc: Gov. Dannel P. Malloy
cc: CT DEEP Commissioner
cc: CT DOH Commissioner

20150915-5125

Sheryl Poole, Andover, MA.
September 15, 2015

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Northeast Energy Direct Project Docket PF 14-22

Scoping Comments re: Lynnfield Lateral

Members of the Commission:

I would like to enter the following comments into the public record regarding the scope of the Northeast Energy Direct Project/Lynnfield Lateral:

Please include in the scope of your consideration the potential impacts of activity by Brox Industries on the stability of the lateral gas line and the Dracut compressor station. I reside approximately one mile from the Brox site, across the Merrimack River. Dozens of times each year blasting at the Brox plant shakes my home strongly enough to knock out window grilles. As the gas line itself, as well as the compressor station, would be much more proximate to the blasting location, I believe a thorough analysis of impacts would necessarily have to include scientific assessments of the seismic activity regularly generated in the region.

In addition, Brox Industries emits silica dust, a known carcinogen, so to the extent that there is any analysis of the potential impacts of a line or compressor incident (leak, explosion etc.), adverse health effects of the widespread dispersal of silica dust should also be assessed.

Thank you for your time and consideration of these important issues.

Sincerely,

Sheryl L. Poole
1 Stoneybrook Circle
Andover, MA 01810
978-681-6444
sherylpoole@comcast.net

20150916-0014

Hand written card, Tara Greenblatt, 91 Temple Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071: opposing

20150916-0015

Hand written card, Karen Green, 68 Conway St, Shelburne Falls, MA 01370, opposing

20150916-5036

NH Municipal Pipeline Coalition

Amherst Brookline Fitzwilliam Greenville
Litchfield Mason Merrimack Milford New Ipswich
Pelham Richmond Rindge Temple Troy

September 14, 2015

The Honorable Gregory H. Friedman Inspector General
U.S. Department of Energy
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, D.C. 20585

Re: Oversight of FERC and Approval of Gas Pipelines

Dear Mr. Friedman,

We write to you regarding the interstate gas permitting process administered by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) pursuant to the Natural Gas Act of 1938 (NGA). As the New Hampshire Municipal Pipeline Coalition, we represent 14 towns and thousands of residents with concerns about the FERC process in general and specifically regarding the Kinder Morgan (KM) Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project - Docket No. PF14-22-000.

Our intent here is not to debate this proposed pipeline, but rather share our concerns about FERC's handling of the interstate natural gas permitting process for Kinder Morgan's application. Indeed, our concerns echo those previously sent to you July 15, 2015 by the bi-partisan New Hampshire Congressional Delegation. In that letter, they asked you for specific explanations about citizen access to accurate information and that citizen participation be considered a credible part of this proposed pipeline's Scoping process.

For several months, our experiences with FERC officials have left us and many New Hampshire residents confused and frustrated about the integrity of the permitting process and, by extension, whether citizen voices will be heard and considered. As examples, during meetings with our Coalition, the Nashua Regional Planning Commission (NRPC) and at the local Scoping Meetings, Eric Tomasi, FERC Project Manager stated:

- FERC does not report to the President or Congress. FERC "reports to the courts."
- FERC staff does not review the "need" for a pipeline. The Commissioners make a determination of "need" in their final review.
- FERC could simply approve all pipelines proposed for New England and let the market decide what actually gets built.

We request that you and your office respond to the following requests:

- 1.) Please clarify the lines of authority and oversight of FERC. What provides the regulatory oversight for FERC to protect the constitutional rights of citizens and landowners? FERC has broad powers to approve interstate pipelines, preempt state and local authority, exercise eminent domain and restrict state rights for oversight. Is this consistent with the intent of the Natural Gas Act?

The threat of eminent domain to implement this project raises serious apprehensions as expressed by the Congressional delegation in their letter to you. We share these concerns given the New Hampshire Constitution specifies protections in: Article 12-a. - Power to Take Property Limited: No part of a person's property shall be taken by eminent domain and transferred, directly or indirectly, to another person if the taking is for the purpose of private development or other private use of the property.

- 2.) How are we assured by your office that this eminent domain power, protected by the New Hampshire Constitution, is not abused?

We are deeply concerned about the true "need" for the NED Project as noted in the second bullet point from Mr. Tomasi. Need should be addressed very early in the process, in a highly public and transparent way, before Environmental Impact Studies are even started. There are at least three competing pipelines proposed for New England with Kinder Morgan's NED as the only "greenfield" project, while the other two (Spectra and Portland Natural Gas) utilize existing pipeline rights-of-way and would be completed at much lower cost and environmental impact.

- 3.) We request a fully transparent analysis be required of FERC that evaluates the true "need" of the three new pipeline projects in the region: Kinder Morgan's NED, Spectra's Access Northeast, and a pipeline expansion by Portland Natural Gas.

We believe that if FERC simply approves all three pipeline projects, as suggested in Mr. Tomasi's third bullet, it is ignoring its regulatory responsibility. Further, it would result in a significant overbuild of pipeline infrastructure that would unnecessarily impact our environment, pose threats to our water supply, and leave rate payers paying the unneeded cost for years to come.

We ask that you utilize the full authority of your office to investigate the scope of FERC's authority to ensure that landowner rights are preserved; consumer safeguards are in place to prevent predatory practices as detailed in the NGA; comparative low cost/low impact analyses are conducted on all competing pipeline proposals and that there is adequate oversight of FERC by our duly elected federal officials.

Thank you for your attention to our request and we look forward to your prompt response.

Sincerely,

James O'Mara
Town Administrator
Amherst

Kelley Collins
Town Administrator
Greenville

John Boccalini
Pipeline Task Force
Richmond

Nancy Harrington
Town Council
Merrimack

Tad Putney
Town Administrator
Brookline

Wendy Juchnevics-Freeman
Pipeline Task Force
New Ipswich

Roberta Oeser
Board of Selectmen
Rindge

Tom Matson
Board of Selectmen
Troy

Susan Silverman
Board of Selectmen
Fitzwilliam

Mark Bender
Town Administrator
Milford

John Kieley
Pipeline Task Force
Temple

Charlie Moser
Board of Selectmen
Mason

cc: Chairman Norman Bay, FERC
Governor Maggie Hassan
Senator Jeanne Shaheen
Senator Kelly Ayotte

Representative Ann McLane Kuster
Representative Frank Guinta

20150916-5086

Meredith Cody, Andover, MA.

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project. I do not want Tennessee Gas/Kinder-Morgan to build this pipeline. I do not trust that they will keep health and environmental concerns above their concerns for their profits. I reside in Andover, MA and I do not want this pipeline to be built here or elsewhere. It is too much of a risk.

Thank you,

Meredith A. Cody

20150917-0018

Hand written card, Tara Greenblatt, 91 Temple Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071: opposing

20150917-0023

Paul and Veronica Garabedian
&
Construction Industries Trust
352 S.Broadway
Salem, NH 03079

September 11,2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street NE, Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426
Phone: 202-502-8258
www. fere.gov
E-mail: efilinfere.gov

Project Docket Number: PF14-22-000

Dear Ms. Bose,

I am the trustee of land adjacent to Garabedian Drive in Salem, New Hampshire. The existing Tennessee Gas pipeline traverses across the land on the westerly side of Garabedisn Drive. Referring to the Town of Salem NH tax map 6 Garabedian Drive, Map 143, Parcel 9470 & S. Broadway, Map 143, Parcel 9478 the land is unbuildable and very difficult to develop in this prime retail area. When the land was purchase many years ago it was used for cattle grazing and it was never thought this would be prime commercial real estate with town water, sewer and natural gas.

We are not receiving any subsistence from the Granite State Electric Company or Tennessee Gas for the use of this land and would like the gas company to relocate locate their easement to the edge of our property line as I have sketched on the tax map enclosed. This would make our land marketable and we would be able recoup the investment we have made throughout the years not to mention the taxes to the town and the use of natural gas by the new buildings constructed on this land.

I appreciate the opportunity to express my concerns and hope this agency is able to give me relief on this property so we can utilize this parcel to its fullest and best use.

20150918-5001

Annamarie Cameron, North Reading, MA.

To Whom It May Concern,

My name is Annmarie Cameron and I live in North Reading, Massachusetts on the proposed Lynnfield Lateral. I am an affected land owner of the Kinder Morgan Pipeline if it would get approved. I am writing to let you know about my experience with Kinder Morgan. At the beginning of this whole process, Kinder Morgan representatives harassed me trying to get permission to survey my land. I was outside playing with my children and I would often see the representative parked outside my house. I received several phone calls also. During the visits and phone calls, Kinder Morgan tried to have me believe that this gas pipeline would be a gas pipeline that would allow me to have gas to my home and they told me other misleading information.

In addition, I am very much concerned about my property value of my home and the impact of conservation land across my beautiful state of Massachusetts. Kinder Morgan, the Texas-based gas pipeline company who has proposed both the Northeast Energy Direct and Connecticut Expansion gas pipeline in Massachusetts, wants to dispose of protected status on public lands to construct their pipelines, access roads, work areas, and on-the-ground infrastructure. They hope to clear-cut, blast and trench their way to construct a pipeline that would damage over 100 conservation parcels for their private profit. Eighty five of those parcels, including State Forests and Parks, are protected by Article 97 of the Massachusetts Constitution. I cannot believe that this is happening!

We need to protect affected hardworking landowners like myself who day in and out work hard to have a home free of worry about potential gas leaks and environmental issues. We need to protect Massachusetts conservation lands and the animals who inhabit those lands.

Please consider my concerns when you think about whether or not this gas pipeline should be approved.

Respectfully,

Annamarie & John Cameron
North Reading, MA

20150918-5002

Victor Herson, Bloomfield, CT.

The proposed expansion of the existing Tennessee Gas Pipeline is an unnecessary and risky project that will result in disruption of natural resources and cause significant hardship to public and private landowners. In our region of Connecticut, there are also significant concerns about the project's risk of contaminating our water supply.

This project is a step backwards. Rather than investing our resources into expanding use of fossil fuels we should be focusing on alternative energy sources (wind and solar).

I urge the FERC to reject this propoosal.

20150918-5006

Jane Crosby, Cummington, MA.

Dear FERC

Please consider the environmental impact of the water that is used to clean the pipe, and then discharged back into the environment. Our area is a clean and unruined area of Massachusetts, with intact ecosystems of water sheds, animal habitats and clean air. Please consider why we would choose to put a pipeline, with all its dangers, through such an unspoiled area, so rare in Massachusetts. Our area's water sheds provide clean water to many towns in Western Massachusetts. Studies have shown that the compressor stations emit carcinogenic gases. Please look into the impact of these gas emissions on the long term health of the people living near the stations.

Jane Crosby

20150918-5008

Eli Schotz, Cummington, MA.

Dear FERC

As a physician I request that you do further research into the long term health impacts of compressor stations and their dangerous gas emissions on human beings and other animals. Our water is clean, our air is relatively clean and we have much unspoiled land in which wild animals can live.

Rather than increasing gas pipeline capacity, please understand that the people want clean and renewable energy, and that this is not happening fast enough.

We want to wait until the independent study being spearheaded by Attorney General Maura Healey is completed to let us know the best and safest way to meet our energy needs. Kinder Morgan's motivation is profit, at the expense of this beautiful pristine area and the people and animals who live here.

Please research the size of our roads which are not of a size to be able to handle the huge trucks involved. Our area does not have the infrastructure to handle such a large construction project. Our people do not have the capacity to respond to a pipeline disaster. Our first responders are volunteers. Please look carefully at this outsized project that does not fit into the scale and capacity of our towns.

Eli Schotz

20150918-5145

William Miller, ESQ, Lynnfield, MA.

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street NE, Room 1A

Washington, DC 20426

RE: Project Docket Number: PF14-22

Dear Secretary Bose:

Our homestead farm is in the pathway of the pipeline as proposed by Kinder Morgan and, as proposed, it will bisect our property. I calculate the easement will permanently and substantially damage at least six acres of our home. Our property is a sanctuary for honey bees, bats, monarch butterflies, New England cottontail rabbits, woodcock, blue-eyed grass, asters, rushes, goldenrod, wild cranberries and other threatened and ecologically stressed species. Although your office has received many thoughtful comments opposing this high-pressure gas pipeline, I offer the following comments to oppose it as well.

I urge the commission to diligently follow its own regulations and procedures governing its review of this project. A finding of "public convenience and necessity" should be granted only after an applicant meets an exceedingly high standard, as you will be empowering a large private corporation to lawfully and forcibly take property from individuals. Very significantly in this instance, those who will benefit from such a taking are not American consumers of natural gas or electricity. The evidence is overwhelming that the pipeline is not needed by New Hampshire or New England consumers. There is not one distribution terminal planned for New Hampshire. The last time I checked, domestic buyers are only interested in purchasing ten percent (10%) of the proposed pipeline's capacity. Those who will benefit from such a pipeline are ultimately the shareholders of Kinder Morgan and those foreign interests to whom it will sell most of the gas. Such a result is inherently unfair even if so-called "fair market value" is paid to the landowners for the easements because private property will be forcibly relinquished to Kinder Morgan over the objections of the landowners. The forced taking of private property by Kinder Morgan will be a form of coercion that would be a criminal offense if not sanctioned by a (dare I say, unjust) government. "[A] law that takes property from A. and gives it to B.: ...is against all reason and justice," *Calder v. Bull*, 3 Dall. 386, 388, 1 L.Ed. 648 (1798)

cited by Justice O'Connor in *Kelo v. City of New London*, 545 U.S. 469 (2005). As with Pfizer Corporation in *Kelo*, "any boon for [Kinder Morgan] is difficult to disaggregate from the promised public gains in taxes and jobs [and free flowing natural gas]" *Kelo* at page 502. The facts of this case overwhelmingly support the conclusion that the boon to Kinder Morgan by forcibly taking private property to enable it to export gas (even to potential adversaries of our nation) far exceeds any imagined public benefit.

In addition, I earnestly request your commission require the plan submitted by Kinder Morgan include provisions Kinder Morgan must have and evidence it will have resources necessary to clean up the easement area after there is no longer any financial incentive to pump gas through this pipeline. Fracked gas is a finite resource and given rapidly advancing clean technologies, it may become uneconomical sooner than currently is predicted. The moment it is no longer profitable for Kinder Morgan (or any successor) to pump gas through the pipeline, Kinder Morgan will either abandon it by going bankrupt (lawful) or by spending as little as possible to extricate itself from a losing endeavor (again, lawful). There definitely will be a time when it is uneconomical to use such a pipeline as is proposed and it obviously is wrong to allow Kinder Morgan to use federal power to burden another's private property with easements that can only be used for a finite time. When that time is up, the individual property owners ultimately will be left with the liability and burden of cleaning up what Kinder Morgan abandons or lacks sufficient incentive to commit resources to adequately clean up. Kinder Morgan will not have sufficient incentive when it knows it only faces individual landowners who lack the resources or the political connections to force Kinder Morgan to fully meet its obligations. Without you ensuring substantial incentives are in place to protect us, if Kinder Morgan is faced with overwhelming liabilities (which, in my opinion, it would eminently face if all costs of the project were appropriately attributed to it), it can simply go bankrupt or inadequately address any clean up. Whatever toxic waste is left in the pipeline as well as the pipeline itself with all of its attachments will remain, substantially burdening the land owned by individual property owners. Eminent domain never was sanctioned or conceived to so burden a servient property yet this will be the reality if Kinder Morgan is granted permission to proceed with this project without you requiring adequate safeguards to prevent such inevitable and possibly catastrophic harm.

My wife and I will be several victims among many if your commission sanctions this proposed pipeline. To paraphrase Justice O'Connor, in *Kelo*, you have been given the power to grant a license to transfer property from those with fewer resources (me and my wife and other property owners) to those with more (Kinder Morgan). The Founders of our great country could not have intended such a perverse result to occur with the power of eminent domain. "That alone is a just government which impartially secures to every man, whatever is his own." (Emphasis in original) James Madison, for the *National Gazette*, Property, (March 27, 1792), reprinted in *14 Papers of James Madison* 266 (R. Rutland et al. eds. 1983).

Very truly yours,
William H. Miller

20150921-0007

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, DC 20426

September 17, 2015

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

The Honorable Niki Tsongas
U. S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Congresswoman Tsongas:

Thank you for your July 20, 2015, letter regarding Tennessee Gas's proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project (Docket No. PF14-22-000) and requesting that the Commission postpone the public scoping meetings.

On June 30, 2015, Commission staff issued the Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the Planned Northeast Energy Direct Project, Request for Comments on Environmental Issues, and Notice of Public Scoping Meetings, which initiated the formal public scoping period and indicated the locations, dates, and times for the public scoping meetings. The meeting locations were selected to be convenient for the greatest number of people who might be interested in the project while recognizing the available resources of the Commission to conduct such meetings. On September 3, 2015, Commission staff announced that the formal comment period has been extended until October 16, 2015.

The pre-filing process is intended to result in a complete application for the Commission's review. An important part of that development is stakeholder input and so the Commission's scoping process remains open throughout the pre-filing process to inform Commission staff and the applicant of the issues needed to be addressed in the application and in the environmental review document. As a consequence, it is necessary to hold meetings while the draft resource reports are still in development. The public scoping meeting dates are in no way intended to limit any future review or comments by stakeholders.

While scoping meetings are a valuable tool for us to receive comments from the public, they are only one of several ways for interested parties to bring their concerns to the attention of the Commission. Stakeholders may also file written comments with the Commission. Those comments will receive the same attention and scrutiny as comments received at the public meetings. As a matter of policy, Commission staff continues to fully evaluate any comment received after the close of the comment period, making any formal extension of the comment period unnecessary. I encourage you and your constituents to continue to participate in the review of the project, and to file any comments that you believe will help the Commission consider this matter.

As in any Commission matter, please be assured that we strive to make our review of energy proposals both accessible and transparent to the public. If I can be of further assistance in this or any other Commission matter, I hope you will not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely,

Norman C. Bay
Chairman

20150921-0016

September 14, 2015

Dear Governor Hassan,

We are writing to oppose the pipeline proposed by Kinder Morgan. The Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline will bring no benefit to New Hampshire.

It feels like the negative effects of this pipeline do not matter to elected officials. Well it matters to all of us who are being asked to live near a compressor station's hub of noise, light pollution, toxic chemicals and frequent "blow downs."

Not only are homes affected, but the compressor station is proposed to go near Temple School where children are. We can prevent the compressor station going in New Ipswich if we find endangered species of animals living there — well isn't this endangering our children of New Hampshire who will be exposed to the harmful effects of this compression station! What if it blows up? I ask you, are children no longer valuable in the eyes of the American government?

If you want this to to throuah we hiahly recommend that in vour agreement with Kinder Moraan they must offer to buy out the Temple School and the homes in the "burn zone" for fair market value if the owner wishes to sell! If you don't do this all homes will become worthless, it won't sell for fair market value and many people will eventually have to walk away with nothing— because home owners in the burn zone will not be able to live in the type of safe, clean environment that everyone in New Hampshire is entitled to!

After doing the research I am convinced the pipeline construction process will pollute our air, contaminate

our aquifers, wells and other water resources. Over 800 NH families will lose their homes and it will destroy conservation lands. It will harm the tourist industry and rural character of New Hampshire. Stand up and stop the greed of Kinder Morgan from ruining our way of life!

Thank you for your consideration.

Most Sincerely,

{signature illegible}

cc: FERC docket number PF14-22

20150921-0021

{same text as 20150921-0016, except signed: }

Nat & Holly Crooker

20150921-0023

Hand written letter, 2 pages, Margerie? L. Smith, 31 Elwood Rd, Londonderry, NH: opposing

20150921-0024

Secretary Bose,

Re: Project Docket Number PF 14-22-000

I want to register my disapproval of the proposed Kinder-Morgan pipeline through the Ashfield area. This pipeline will do irreparable damage old growth woods and ancestral farms that my ancestors settled. The on-going maintenance and repair of the pipeline will undoubtedly result in damage to the land and potential run-off pollution in the Bear River. The blasting that will be necessary for the installation will damage aquifers and contribute substantial damage to the foundations of the older farms and homes of the area.

The need for the pipeline has not been documented in any form or convincing manner and is apparently not needed for the greater New England area. Additionally, many of the installation and on-going care plans for it are label "TBD".

This pipeline is both ill conceived and unnecessary. It places ancestral lands and farms and pristine local ecology in unnecessary danger all with no demonstrable need for the product. I urge the commission to stop this project now.

Steve Ellis

54609 Whispering Oak Dr.

Mishawaka, IN 46545

20150921-0026

Sidney Hall Jr.

17-A Old Milford Road

Brookline, New Hampshire 03033

603-801-1995

e-mail:sidhall@charter.net

Office Ph/FAX 603-672-4317

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

F88 First Street, NE, Room IA

Washington, DC 20426

Dear Federal Energy Regulatory Commission,

I urge you to take a very strong stand against any plan by Kinder-Morgan to put a natural gas pipeline

through southern New Hampshire.

If the pipeline were projected to go through your own house and property, how would you feel?

Perhaps you would feel that eminent domain should only be used for the most extreme cases, when the public value truly rises to the level that your individual right should be sacrificed. Perhaps you would also feel that this project does not rise nearly to that level.

The rural and historical character of the towns in southern New Hampshire are not served in any way by this proposal and neither is their economic interest.

Please take an unequivocal stand against the pipeline. and help keep New Hampshire the wonderful and beautiful state that it is.

Thank you

Sid Hall, Jr.

Brookline, New Hampshire

20150921-0029

Herbert W. Reilly, Jr.
Albany County Legislator. 33rd District
Phone (518) 765-2538

22 Voorheesvle Ave
Voorheesville, NY 12186
September 15, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First St. NE, Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Docket 1 PF 14-22-000

I am sending for your review a copy of Albany County, NY Local Law J that was approved by the Albany County Legislature on September 14, 2015.

Kindly attach to the previous file received by your office on August 31, 2015.

The only change to the previous draft of Local Law J is outlined in red.

Respectfully,

Herbert W. Reilly, Jr.

ALBANY COUNTY LEGISLATURE
HAROLD L. JOYCE OFFICE BUILDING
118 STATE STREET, ROOM 710
ALBANY, NEW YORK 12207
(618) 447-7168 - FAX (618) 447-5695
WWW.ALBANYCOUNTY.COM

AGENDA

CONSERVATION AND IMPROVEMENT COMMITTEE

SEPTEMBER 14, 2016

PREVIOUS BUSINESS:

1. LOCAL LAW NO. "J" FOR 2015: A LOCAL LAW OF THE COUNTY OF ALBANY, NEW YORK, TO BE KNOWN AS THE PUBLIC DRINKING WATER PROTECTION LAW

{full original text in 20150831-0104, only outlined text included below: }

Section 4. Notification

Responsibility of Blaster:

.b

2nd paragraph

Persuant to Section 6 of this local law, The Albany County Department of Health is permitted to promulgate regulations that supplement this list and the requirements of this Section. If after such investigation the Blaster chooses not to proceed with blasting within two miles of the contaminated area, then it will not be required to remediate the same.

20150921-0054

Hand written card, Martina Dooley-Carvalito, 814 Wendell Rd, Shutesbury, MA 01072: opposing

20150921-0057

Hand written card, Jeanne Weintraub, 2 Noah St, Montague, MA 01351: opposing

20150921-0060

Hand written card, Meagan Sylvia, 123 Montague Rd, Wendell, MA 01379: opposing

20150921-0061

Hand written card, Nicholas Boulanger, 24 Fox Cir, Keene, NH 03431: opposing

20150921-0062

Hand written card, Donna Mackey, 20 Middletown Rd, Roxbury, NH 03431: opposing

20150921-0063

Hand written card, Erin Williams, 64 Beaver St, Keene, NH 03431: opposing

20150921-0064

Hand written card, Carolyn Allen, Harrisville, NH 03450: opposing

20150921-0065

Hand written card, Andi Johnson, 88 S. Lincoln St, Keene, NH 03431: opposing

20150921-0066

Hand written card, Ron White, PO B 21, Peterborough, NH 03458: opposing

20150921-0068

Hand written card, Susan Walthour, 13 Westview Ave, Keene, NH 03431: opposing

20150921-0069

Hand written card, Sarah Fernald, 225 Willard St, Dracut, MA 01826: opposing

20150921-0070

Hand written card, Susan Duhamel, 83 Greenbriar Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071: opposing

20150921-0071

Hand written card, Jessie Lund, ? Turnpike Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071: need Scoping meeting

20150921-0072

Hand written card, Marilyn Jean Simons, 22 Stratton Rd, #3, Jaffrey, NH 03452: opposing

20150921-0073

Hand written card, Peter Salera, 65 Glen Farm Road, Temple, NH : opposing

20150921-0074

Hand written card, Peter Salera, 65 Glen Farm Road, Temple, NH : opposing

20150921-0075

Hand written card, Peter Salera, 65 Glen Farm Road, Temple, NH : opposing

20150921-0076

Hand written card, Louise A. Merrill, 8 Laurel St, New Ipswich, NH 03071: opposing

20150921-0077

Hand written card, Peter Salera, 65 Glen Farm Road, Temple, NH : opposing

20150921-0078

Hand written card, Peter Salera, 65 Glen Farm Road, Temple, NH : opposing

20150921-0079

Hand written card, Jennifer Gregg, 3 Main Street, Greenville, NH 03048 : opposing

20150921-0080

Hand written card, Susan Duhamel, 83 Greenbriar Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071: opposing

20150921-0081

Hand written card, Susan Duhamel, 83 Greenbriar Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071: opposing

20150921-0082

Hand written card, Susan Duhamel, 83 Greenbriar Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071: opposing

20150921-0083

Hand written card, Susan Duhamel, 83 Greenbriar Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071: opposing

20150921-0084

Hand written card, Ray Duhamel, 83 Greenbriar Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071: opposing

20150921-0085

Hand written card, Ray Duhamel, 83 Greenbriar Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071: opposing

20150921-0086

Hand written card, Jane Hershey, 19 Blakeville Rd, Rindge, NH 030461: opposing

20150921-0087

Hand written card, Susan Duhamel, 83 Greenbriar Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071: opposing

20150921-0088

Hand written card, Lesley Finlayson, 167 Heald Road, Wilton, NH: opposing

20150921-0089

Hand written card, Susan Duhamel, 83 Greenbriar Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071: opposing

20150921-0201

Hand written card, Marilyn Griska, 18 Atlantic Dr, Rindge, NH 030461: opposing

20150921-0202

Hand written card, Hershey + van Lennep, 19 Blakeville Rd, Rindge, NH 030461: opposing

20150921-0203

Hand written card, Susan Duhamel, 83 Greenbriar Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071: opposing

20150921-0204

Hand written card, Susan Duhamel, 83 Greenbriar Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071: will blueberries we pick be safe to eat?

20150921-0205

Hand written card, Susan Duhamel, 83 Greenbriar Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071: blasting will ruin wells

20150921-0206

Hand written card, Susan Duhamel, 83 Greenbriar Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071: opposing

20150921-0207

Hand written card, Susan Duhamel, 83 Greenbriar Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071: opposing

20150921-0208

Hand written card, Susan Duhamel, 83 Greenbriar Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071: opposing

20150921-0209

Hand written card, Jackie Skidmore, 358 Poor Farm Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071: opposing

20150921-5007

Maureen Flannery, Northampton, MA.

I write in opposition to the Northeast Energy Direct Project of the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company.

Although I do not reside along the proposed route, I am familiar with the area that would be affected. In addition to many concerns about environmental effects and dangers during construction and use, I have equal concern for the broader implications of the pipeline's regional and global impact. I am aware of no convincing demonstration that New England needs more natural gas pipelines for its residences, businesses, or power plants. I understand that a large portion of the gas to be transported through the pipeline is for export to foreign countries. Exporting fossil fuels depletes a finite resource, increases dependence on non-renewable energy elsewhere in the world, and contributes to greenhouse gas emission levels that further damage the earth's ability to support humans and other animal and plant species.

As a person of faith with a belief in the sanctity of creation and a grandmother with a concern for the world that future generations will inherit, I ask that you deny the permit which would allow this project to proceed. Thank you for your attention to this important issue.

20150921-5015

Mary Wyse, Amherst, MA.

I want to adamantly oppose the Tennessee Gas Pipeline for the following reasons: We do not need additional gas supplies in this area; it creates very few permanent jobs; and there are numerous environmental concerns. The environmental concerns include the fact that much of the gas will be fracked (which has devastating effects on the environment) and it will disrupt sensitive ecosystems along the way.

Thank you for receiving my comment.

20150921-5019

Ron Grosslein, Amherst, MA.

We now know that burning fossil fuels drives climate change. It's critical that we stop, and a key step is to stop building new infrastructure for that purpose. On that ground alone, the pipeline fails, and the FERC should deny permission to build it. Can the FERC summon the backbone to take this stand? Do we have to wait until all of Manhattan Island is awash before we stop making things worse? Failing to act now is akin to standing on the bridge of the Titanic after the iceberg has been sighted dead ahead, and refusing to take action to try and save the ship.

If that isn't enough, there are other, lesser, environmental impacts. Don't cut any more trees, or damage any more wetlands, or drive heavy equipment through any more conservation areas, for the purpose of burning more fossil fuel.

Alternatives exist for short term gas supply issues, including patching leaks in the existing distribution system, building LNG storage facilities for times of peak demand, and aggressive conservation efforts to reduce usage. Surely we'd be wise to do all of those things instead of building another major pipeline. The only thing these measures would not accomplish is getting large amounts of fracked gas to international markets, and that we should not do due to climate change. Some people will not make the money they might have made, but that's OK. Money is not the most important thing; preserving climate stability on our only planet is hugely more important.

Clearly the burning of fossil fuels on a vast scale is not sustainable. I hope the FERC will do its part to drive a rapid phase out of fossil fuels and a rapid transition to renewables, and deny this permit.

20150921-5021

Beth Burns, Merrimack, NH.

Dear FERC - The deep concerns over the Kinder Morgan pipeline passing through the town of Merrimack have become an even deeper concern due to their change in route. The current proposed route will travel across the area behind the houses on Spruce Street, travel upward near the outlets and other buildings, and travel through Whittier Place where people live in homes. This proposed route Kinder Morgan members want is beyond dangerous. The pipeline would be of a danger to those of us living off of Spruce Street, the

outlet areas, our aquifer area, it would be less than 1,000 feet from the children's playground at Thornton's Ferry Elementary school, which proves to be far too close to those mentioned. Our water supply and quality is of utmost importance, as is the safety of our school children, our homes, our forests, and our families. We have worked very hard for our homes and to have Kinder Morgan people waltzing into OUR town for the pipeline THEY want is ludicrous. They have had over twenty accidents since 2003. The record the company has is endless. Please show your support and dignity for the state you are representing and protect us by not approving the pipeline through our town. Our water, forests, children, our homes and our families should be viewed as higher and more important than the false words and big money Kinder Morgan is waving.

Truly,

Beth Burns

20150921-5033

September 19, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street NE Room 1 A
Washington, DC 20426

re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., Docket No. PF14-22-000

Dear Secretary Bose:

Five different pipeline projects are proposing to nearly double the amount of natural gas coming into New England. By dealing with each project in isolation, FERC risks violating its own rules against segmentation and over-building, causing excessive and unnecessary environmental and socio-economic impacts for redundant infrastructure.

Pipeline over-building contravenes the goals of NH's 2014 Ten Year Energy Strategy, which calls for energy efficiency as the cheapest, cleanest, most plentiful energy source. (2014 Ten Year Energy Strategy , p. 23) NH Public Utilities Commission (PUC) is now implementing this goal as it works to establish an Energy Efficiency Resource Standard (EERS, NHPUC Docket DE15-137).

By doubling the gas supply to New England, all these pipeline projects will add up to a significant increase in greenhouse gas emissions at a time when the federal Clean Power Plan (CPP) and the Northeast Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (RGGI) have set goals to greatly reduce our consumption of fossil fuels. Recent research by Harvard University, the Environmental Defense Fund and others, has revealed that natural gas infrastructure is a significant source of methane emissions, a very potent greenhouse gas.

There is a way FERC can address this situation. Please combine the pipeline proposals from Kinder Morgan, Spectra Energy, Portland Natural Gas, and their various partners into a single regional Environmental Impact Statement and one coordinated FERC process.

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) review requires nothing less, as stated in the Council on Environmental Quality's (CEQ) guidance on programmatic NEPA reviews, issued December 18, 2014. A combined analysis of all proposed New England pipeline projects would meet the requirement for a comprehensive National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) review.

Kinder Morgan admits that other projects could meet the same needs as their proposed NED project: "... *without the proposed Project, other natural gas transmission companies will be required to increase their capacity and construct new facilities to meet the existing and growing demand for the additional transportation capacity. Such action will only result in the transference of environmental impacts from one project to another but will not eliminate such impacts in their entirety.*" (Resource Report 10 - Alternatives, July 2015, p. 10-2)

Since Kinder Morgan acknowledges that the alleged need met by NED could be met by the competing projects, it makes sense that all the projects be analyzed together to see which one, if any, or which combination

of projects, would satisfy demand with the least impact to the environment and affected land owners.

Carolyn Sellars of Townsend, MA, has done excellent research on this CEQ guidance on the effective use of programmatic NEPA reviews. The attached information is from Ms. Sellars September 10, 2015 letter to FERC about combined NEPA review for all gas pipeline projects coming into New England.

Please prevent New England from being engulfed in a “pipeline bubble” of over-building, by combining all regional pipeline projects together into a single comprehensive NEPA review to determine which, if any, can fit the need with the least environmental and socio-economic impacts. Thank you very much for the opportunity to comment on this important issue.

Sincerely,

Liz Fletcher

Mason, NH 03048

lizfletcher@jacqcad.com

** The following paragraphs are from Carolyn Sellars 9/10/15 letter to FERC recommending combined NEPA review for all gas pipeline projects coming into New England: **

The guidance recommends agencies consider a programmatic review when “*making decisions on common elements or aspects of a series or suite of closely related projects;*” and, as a way to “*avoid ‘segmenting’ the overall program from subsequent individual actions and thereby avoid unreasonably constricting the scope of environmental review.*” (December 2014 CEQ Guidance, p.15-16, emphasis added)

Specific actions listed in the December guidance as appropriate for a programmatic NEPA review include those that FERC and other Federal Agencies are now considering for several pipeline projects in New England:

Approving Multiple Actions. Decision to proceed with multiple projects that are temporally or spatially connected and that will have a series of associated concurrent or subsequent decisions.

Programmatic examples include:

- o Several similar actions or projects in a region or nationwide (e.g., a large scale utility corridor project);
or
- o A suite of ongoing, proposed or reasonably foreseeable actions that share a common geography or timing, such as multiple activities within a defined boundary (i.e., Federal land or facility). (December 2014 CEQ Guidance, p.14)

The Northeast Gas Association (http://www.northeastgas.org/pdf/system_enhance0715.pdf) provides a list of planned pipeline projects in the northeast including the FERC status of each project:

- * Tennessee Gas/Kinder Morgan CT Expansion – Application filed with FERC
- * Spectra Atlantic Bridge – In FERC pre-filing
- * Tennessee Gas/Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct – In FERC pre-filing
- * Spectra Access Northeast – Open Season 2015
- * Portland Natural Gas “C2C” Project – Open Season 2015

These pipeline proposals share a common geography and timing. All have potential impacts on a range of resources and involve many local, state and regional stakeholders. Together these projects total 2.66 Bcf/d of increased natural gas capacity. Adding the recently (March 2015) approved Spectra AIM project, the total reaches close to 3 Bcf/d of additional gas capacity into New England. If Kinder Morgan chooses to go back to the 2.2 Bcf/d NED project as originally proposed, it will be close to 4 Bcf/d additional capacity. Clearly the capacity of all these projects taken together far exceeds any potential shortfall in even the most aggressive demand scenario. They are redundant and cannot cite the same “need” or be considered independently.

These projects constitute alternative solutions to the same potential need and must be reviewed as such under NEPA.

A combined programmatic review would allow the various agencies to “*propose standard mitigation protocols and/or operating procedures in a programmatic NEPA review and thereby provide a framework and scope for the subsequent tiered analysis of environmental impacts.*” (December 2014 CEQ Guidance, p.23)

As the December 2014 guidance document states:

Programmatic NEPA reviews provide an opportunity for agencies to incorporate comprehensive mitigation planning, best management practices, and standard operating procedures, as well as monitoring strategies into the Federal policymaking process at a broad or strategic level. These analyses can promote sustainability and allow Federal agencies to advance the nation’s environmental policy as articulated in Section 101 of NEPA. (December 2014 CEQ Guidance, p. 35)

Combining the projects in a programmatic review would foster an open and transparent process, not just for the potential environmental impacts, alternatives and mitigation measures but also for the needs analysis critical to understanding and quantifying both the No Build alternative as well as various alternatives by different gas transmission companies.

The FERC NEPA review for these combined projects needs to determine:

1. What amount of gas, if any, is needed to meet the threshold of public convenience and necessity which would most certainly result in takings of hundreds of private properties by eminent domain? Please keep in mind that two offshore LNG “energy bridge” terminals that FERC recently determined were absolutely “necessary” for New England, now sit essentially idle after the costs and environmental impacts associated with their construction have already occurred.
2. What is the best way to meet any gas need while minimizing project impacts? This could be by choosing one particular project or perhaps it is parts of several different proposals that best meets the needs with the least impact.
3. In assessing the needs of the electric generation market, the NEPA review should include the results of the study MA Attorney General Maura Healey is undertaking to determine electric reliability needs including what gas capacity we need for electricity generation through 2030. The results of that study, expected in October, will provide answers to whether or not new pipeline capacity is really needed to serve the electric generation market and if so, will properly define and dimension that need.
4. In assessing the amount of the gas contracted through the various LDC proposals, the review should include an analysis of how much of the LDC demand is currently replacing expiring volumes already under contract? How much is for future demand? How much is to arbitrage?
5. The No Action Alternative should consider whether further investments by LDC’s in repairing widespread and long-standing leaks in the distribution systems and providing increased incentives for people with older gas furnaces and appliances to upgrade to more efficient ones would negate the need for any new pipeline, while at the same time help met the state’s obligation under the GWSA.
6. The No Action alternative should address the feasibility of increased use of already constructed onshore and offshore LNG facilities to cover any limited shortfalls, which appear to be limited to a few days per year. FERC must contrast the relative environmental impacts of construction of pipelines to this alternative, given that the construction impacts associated with the LNG terminals have already occurred.
7. The EIS for a regional gas transmission study should acknowledge the specific projects proposed in response to the New England Clean Energy Plan RFP (<http://cleanenergyrfp.com/>) and fully consider their timing and future presence in assessing the need for increased natural gas in evaluating the No Action Alternative. The No Action Alternative must also evaluate whether the import of 2400 MW of additional hydroelectric power by 2020 as proposed by Governor Baker fully meets or greatly reduces the need for the project in the No Action Alternative.
8. The role of export in any proposed pipeline capacity expansion needs to explicitly explained. People bearing the impacts and loss of property need to know where the gas is going. If export is identified as a “need” for increasing pipeline capacity to and through New England, an alternative that needs to be considered is

servicing the export market by sending gas on existing pipelines south to existing export facilities on the Gulf and Mid Atlantic Coasts.

9. In comparing and contrasting the NED project and other natural gas transmission projects, the relative impacts of increased natural gas use on greenhouse gas emissions must be considered. The EIS should specifically address consistency with the federal CPP and MA GWSA. It should compare and contrast the proposed projects with increased reliance on renewable energy sources, increased efficiency incentives, gas savings from leak repairs, and other ways which may be more consistent with CPP and GWSA.

10. If increased natural gas is primarily a bridge fuel as many of the project proponents are claiming, then these projects should be considered only a potential temporary solution. The temporary nature of increased need, if in fact additional pipeline capacity is needed at all, must be taken into account in comparing the permanent loss of critical forested habitat associated with the projects to other short-term solutions, such as increased use of our currently underutilized LNG terminals using existing infrastructure.

FERC needs to look at the larger picture of natural gas capacity in New England by combining the various proposals into a single, comprehensive NEPA review as suggested. This consolidated review is required for FERC to fulfill its obligation to “use all practicable means and measures, including financial and technical assistance, in a manner calculated to foster and promote the general welfare, to create and maintain conditions under which man and nature can exist in productive harmony, and fulfill the social, economic, and other requirements of present and future generations of Americans” as specified in Section 101 of the National Environmental Policy Act.

End of paragraphs from Carolyn Sellars’ 9/10/15 letter to FERC. *{original at 20150910-5064 }*

cc: Senator Jeanne Shaheen
Senator Kelly Ayotte
Representative Annie Kuster
Representative Frank Guinta
Governor Maggie Hassan
Attorney General Joseph Foster
NH Senate President Jeb Bradley
NH State Senator Kevin Avar
NH State Rep. Jack Flanagan
NH State Rep. Chris Adams
Tom Burack, Commissioner, NH Dept. of Environmental Services
Mason Board of Selectmen Mason Conservation Commission

20150921-5067

audrey m greene, Windsor, MA.

At what point is FERC required to consider the big picture of all proposed pipelines going through one state? I wonder if FERC isn't going to be happy until Massachusetts has enough pipelines to blow our state off the map..

20150921-5081

Maureen McLatchy, Greenville, NH.

Dear FERC,

As a property owner within 1/2 mile of the proposed compressor station in New Ipswich NH , I am completely against the NED pipeline project. First, we all live here because of what this area is like, clean air, clean water, quiet forested landscape with abundant wildlife. If this project were to proceed, this area would no longer be quiet nor clean nor safe. Our homes will be worth nearly nothing, who will want to live here? How will you address the issue of property value decline? Every home that surrounds this property in Temple and New Ipswich has it's own water wells. How will you protect our water well systems when the

blasting of construction happens? This will upset the local aquifers for sure. The town of Greenville has a public water supply and it is located within 1/2 mile of this proposed compressor site. How will you protect their water supply?

The town of Temple's elementary school which is also the town's emergency shelter is also within 1/2 mile of this site. How will you protect the children and residents there?

The towns of Temple and Greenville share a police department stationed in Greenville. The road between the two towns is Rt. 45, the site of the compressor station. In the event of an emergency, the police would be cut off from the people they serve and protect. How will you address this?

Given the above facts, I cannot imagine that this is a viable site for such an environmentally destructive project.

Please do not grant permission for this project.

Sincerely,

Maureen McLatchy

20150921-5104

**TOWN OF SHELBURNE
Office of the Selectboard**

{REPLACED DUE TO CLERICAL ERROR (missing page) with 20150922-5014 below}

20150921-5194

**THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
ONE ASHBURTON PLACE
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02108**

MAURA HEALEY
ATTORNEY GENERAL

(617) 727-2200
(617) 727-4765 TTY
www.mass.gov/ago

September 21, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, DC 02426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., Docket No. PF 14-22-000
Northeast Energy Direct Project; Consideration of AGO study prior to advancement of pipeline project

Dear Secretary Bose:

I write to provide the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("Commission") with a status update on the Massachusetts regulatory review of the precedent agreements between Boston Gas Company d/b/a National Grid; Bay State Gas Company d/b/a Columbia Gas of Massachusetts; and The Berkshire Gas Company (collectively the "Companies") and Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company ("Tennessee") for transportation service on Tennessee's Northeast Energy Direct ("NED") project—a 188 mile, 30-inch pipeline designed to provide up to 1.3 billion cubic feet per day ("Bcf/day") of transportation service from Wright, New York, to Dracut, Massachusetts.

As you are aware, in April 2015, the Companies filed petitions with the Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities ("Department") seeking approval of their precedent agreements. Since the beginning of these cases, the Attorney General's Office ("AGO") has urged the Department not to make decisions without knowing all the facts. We asked for a transparent process and a procedural schedule that would have allowed time

for the parties and the public to meaningfully consider, analyze, and testify about the Companies' petitions. Instead, the Department expedited the procedural schedule in a manner that did not reflect the precedent agreement's lasting consequences for Massachusetts ratepayers.² The Department also limited the evidence presented in the case by denying full intervention status to two entities whose members include legislators, municipalities and landowners.

The AGO urged the Department, in these proceedings and other related Department proceedings, to consider the interrelationship of gas and electric markets in Massachusetts and to conduct a factual analysis of future demand and cost-effective energy and efficiency resources before making any decisions regarding additional gas capacity investments. Consistent with this request, the AGO asked the Department for a stay in the proceedings to allow the Department the opportunity to consider evidence presented in related Department proceedings concerning gas capacity. The Department rejected the AGO's stay request and continued its accelerated schedule.

As you are also aware, in July, the AGO commissioned a regional study by The Analysis Group. That study is underway and will be completed by October 31, 2015. A key focus of the study is whether more natural gas capacity is needed to maintain electric reliability. In light of the pending study and its relevancy to the precedent agreements, the AGO asked the Department to reconsider and stay the precedent agreement proceedings to allow consideration of the study results. The Department denied this request.

On August 31, 2015, over the AGO's objection, the Department approved all three precedent agreements. The AGO believes the Department and Massachusetts ratepayers would have benefited from a more thorough process and we are considering how to best participate in the state court appeals of the Department's approvals filed by the Conservation Law Foundation and Pipe Line Awareness Network for the Northeast.

As the state's Ratepayer Advocate, the AGO believes the Department's decision makes it more important than ever that the Commission conduct a comprehensive and meaningful examination of the need for and alternatives to the NED project. It is imperative that the Commission consider these issues, as well as the results of our study, before allowing the project to move forward. This letter provides notice to the Commission that the AGO will continue to actively participate in Docket No. PF 14-22-000, including filing detailed scoping comments by the October 16, 2015 deadline, and will file the AGO's study when released, together with commentary on the study's implications for the Commission's decision.

The Office of the Attorney General thanks the Commission for its efforts thus far to listen to the concerns of Massachusetts residents and we urge the Commission to continue to reach out to the public and Massachusetts stakeholders. It is vitally important that any decision about the NED project be the product of a thorough and transparent process and be based on accurate data and a realistic assessment of need.

Respectfully submitted.

Rebecca Tepper
Chief, Energy and Telecommunications Division
Office of Massachusetts Attorney General

¹ On July 16, 2015, Tennessee's parent company, Kinder Morgan, announced that the NED project would be scaled back to provide up to 1.3 BcMay, rather than the 2.2 Bcf/day originally proposed and presented to the Department.

² For example, in D.P.U. 15-48, the Department approved the Attorney General's request to hire an expert on May 26, but required the Attorney General to file expert testimony on June 5, only eight business days later. Eight days simply was not sufficient for the Attorney General to comply with reasonable procurement practices and have the selected expert review case materials and draft testimony. The Department provided other intervenors with even less time to file testimony. Indeed, one intervenor was required to submit testimony before receiving a confidential copy of the full petition or answers to its discovery. Despite two requests to extend the deadline from June 5 to June 12, the Department declined to amend the schedule.

September 22, 2015

Hon. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20426

**Re: Matter of Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co., Northeast Direct Project
FERC Docket PF14-22**

Dear Secretary Bose:

It has been more than a month since my correspondence to you describing the urgent need for access to information relative to the above-referenced project. Now, with less than a month left in the extended comment period, impacted municipalities remain in the dark relative to critical information needed to gauge the actual impact of this pipeline and associated compressor stations. This lack of transparency and any response from your agency is preventing thoughtful comment on this massive industrial scheme proposed for residential areas.

I'm writing to solicit a response from FERC immediately to provide the necessary access to information for public comment.

Specifically, and of urgent need, Nassau requested the following:

REQUEST FOR IMMEDIATE ACCESS TO CRITICAL ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE INFORMATION

Pursuant to FERC's Critical Energy Infrastructure Information (CEII) regulations at 18 CFR § 388.113(d)(4) the Town of Nassau, New York, has requested access to certain information submitted by TGPL on July 24, 2015, regarding the Northeast Direct Market Path Pipeline and Market Mid-station I Compressor Station proposed to be located within the Town of Nassau, Rensselaer County, New York. We requested that Town of Nassau officials should be provided access to the confidential files submitted by Tennessee Gas Pipeline (TGPL) on July 24, 2015, without reservation and on an expedited basis. Thus far, this request appears to have been completely ignored.

The details of the proposed facilities currently hidden from public view are critical to the Town understanding the TGPL proposal within the Town of Nassau, and in developing reasoned comments and consideration of potential impacts on natural and cultural resources, land uses and most importantly on the health, safety and lives of residents within the impact zone around the proposed compressor station site. The Town asserts that this request is a legitimate request for access to information essential to the Town's review of the NED Project proposal and development of Scoping Comments for FERC's pending development of a final Scope of Studies for the Environmental Impact Statement. As previously outlined, the Town willingly will assent to execution of a non-disclosure agreement and take reasonable precautions to maintain security and integrity of any CEII information provided pursuant to this request.

Additionally, we have also stated that the information provided in the TGPL July 24, 2015 submittal to FERC is an update to previous submittals, but is incomplete pending further updates.

There are significant amounts of additional information either not yet provided, or inaccessible for public review, which include information essential for understanding the TGPL proposal for a major compressor station at Clarks Chapel Road in the Town of Nassau, New York. Furthermore, the matrix of "Responses" is replete with indications of information that will be "provided in the October, 2015 filing" or "TBP in Final ER." Examples of this information include: locations of HDD installations; specification of communication system and whether communication towers will be proposed to be sited and proposed locations of these towers; sensitive groundwater resources in relation to compressor station sites; fisheries resource protections and mitigation proposals; wetland delineations; groundwater aquifer information and details; sites of

contaminated sediments; project operational effects on surface waters; interior forest ecological impacts; environmental justice information for aboveground facilities locations; seismic fault information; NYS § 480-a forest lands affected by the proposed facilities; visual resources information (including regarding any as-of-yet unidentified communications towers); emissions data from compressor stations, including methane and exhaust from compressor facility operations; and acoustical analysis of compressor station operations, including sound emissions and mitigation measures necessary.

In closing, the Town respectfully requests that the FERC immediately grant the responses requested herein. I have attached a copy of our August 12, 2015 correspondence for your renewed consideration.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,
David F. Fleming, Jr.
Nassau Town Supervisor

Attachment

cc: Hon. Chuck Schumer, United States Senate
Hon. Kirsten Gillibrand, United States Senate
Hon. Chris Gibson, United States House of Representatives
Hon. Kathy Marchione, New York State Senate
Hon. Steve McLaughlin, New York State Assembly
Hon. Dennis Dowds, Schodack Town Supervisor
Hon. Larry Eckhardt, Stephentown Town Supervisor
Nassau Town Board
Nassau Natural Resources Committee

Nassau Town Hall
29 Church Street, Post Office Box 587
Nassau, New York 12123
518.766.3559 • supervisor@townofnassau.org

TOWN OF NASSAU, N.Y.

OFFICE OF THE TOWN SUPERVISOR

David F. Fleming, Jr.

August 12, 2015

Hon. Kimberly O. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street NE
Washington, DC 20426

**Re: Matter of Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co., Northeast Direct Project
FERC Docket PF14-22
Filing by TGPL dated July 24, 2015**

Dear Secretary Bose:

On July 24, 2015, Tennessee Gas Pipeline (TGPL) filed a massive update to the earlier draft Resource Reports and mapping files for the NED project, constituting thousands of pages of information and map sheets providing seemingly significant updates to previous submittals. The submitted files amount to over one gigabyte of electronic files that are publicly accessible, as well as hundreds of pages of text and maps that are not accessible due to TGPL claims of their containing "Critical Energy Infrastructure Information" not to be disclosed for public review. This information is of vital interest to and may have a dramatic impact on the community that I represent.

INFORMATION PROVIDED IN THE TGPL JULY 24, 2015 SUBMITTAL TO FERC IS AN UPDATE TO PREVIOUS SUBMITTALS, BUT IS INCOMPLETE PENDING FURTHER UPDATES

While the July 24, 2015 publicly accessible filing includes a large amount of new information, there are significant amounts of additional information either not yet provided, or inaccessible for public review, which include information essential for understanding the TGPL proposal for a major compressor station at Clarks Chapel Road in the Town of Nassau, New York. Information such as: a compressor station site layout plan; an indication of the location of the 30-inch pipeline to and from the station site from the mainline route; an indication of the proposed vehicular access route to the compressor station from public roadways; location, external dimensions and finish materials of compressor station enclosure building, fence-line, emergency blow-down vent facility; location and extent of buffer areas around proposed compressor station facilities; and the location and extent of non-Jurisdictional infrastructure that may be subject to siting and site plan review by the Town of Nassau. Without access to much of this information, some of which is indicated on the 73 pages of “Responses to Comments” and “Responses to Letters” on Draft Resource Reports, dated May 15, 2015, the Town of Nassau cannot fully comment on the appropriate scope of studies appropriate for studying the proposed project, its impacts, alternatives and potential mitigation measures that should be evaluated in the Environmental Impact Statement.

Furthermore, the matrix of “Responses” is replete with indications of information that will be “provided in the October, 2015 filing” or “TBP in Final ER.” Examples of this information include: locations of HOD installations; specification of communication system and whether communication towers will be proposed to be sited and proposed locations of these towers; sensitive groundwater resources in relation to compressor station sites; fisheries resource protections and mitigation proposals; wetland delineations; groundwater aquifer information and details; sites of contaminated sediments; project operational effects on surface waters; interior forest ecological impacts; environmental justice information for aboveground facilities locations; seismic fault information; NYS § 480-a forest lands affected by the proposed facilities; visual resources information (including regarding any as-of-yet unidentified communications towers); emissions data from compressor stations, including methane and exhaust from compressor facility operations; and acoustical analysis of compressor station operations, including sound emissions and mitigation measures necessary.

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF THE SCOPING PHASE COMMENT PERIOD

The deadline for submitting comments on the Scope of Studies for preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement should be extended until after the CEU Information Is made available to Town of Nassau officials, and information to be provided by TGPL in the forecasted October environmental report Is available for consideration.

Town officials and committee members are making great efforts to review the Resource Reports and associated information submitted at a late date in July, only a few weeks prior to the close of the Scoping Period. This is a huge undertaking for these officials, given the large amount of information that was provided. However, the large amounts of information not yet provided or only provided under protected status, make it infeasible for the Town of Nassau to provide a full evaluation of the information necessary to develop relevant Scoping Comments by the August 31 deadline. The listed incomplete or “to be provided” information includes many topics of specific concern to the Town of Nassau, given the proposal to site the large, 41,000 horsepower compressor station in a Rural Residential area, far from any similar industrial or major utility station use; and the pipeline traversing the rural landscape of northern Nassau. Additional time should be added to the Scoping Period schedule to provide a realistic opportunity for review of the Resource Reports, including information submitted by TOPL as Critical Energy Infrastructure Information, and for development of reasoned comments on the Scope of Studies appropriate to evaluate the proposed major transmission facility project.

Additional time will not represent a burden to the applicant, given that the Resource Reports as filed do not fully provide the requested baseline information as specified in many sections of the FERC GUIDANCE MANUAL FOR ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT PREPARATION, dated August 2002.

REQUEST FOR IMMEDIATE ACCESS TO CRITICAL ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE INFORMATION

Pursuant to FERC's Critical Energy Infrastructure Information (CEII) regulations at 18 CFR § 388.13(d)(4) the Town of Nassau, New York, requests access to certain information submitted by TGPL on July 24, 2015, regarding the Northeast Direct Market Path Pipeline and Market Mid-station 1 Compressor Station proposed to be located within the Town of Nassau, Rensselaer County, New York. Town of Nassau officials should be provided access to the confidential files submitted BY TGPL on July 24, 2015, without reservation and on an expedited basis.

CEII submittals regarding details proposed for the Compressor Station site should be provided on a confidential basis for review and development of Scoping Comments by the Town and its representatives. The requested information includes:

- the Compressor Station site plan;
- compressor station facilities arrangement plans;
- 'non-jurisdictional facilities' to be located at the Compressor Station property.

The individuals to be granted access to this information would include the following:

David Fleming, Nassau Town Supervisor

Fred Nuffer, Chairman, Town of Nassau Natural Resources Committee

Lani Rafferty, Councilperson, Nassau Town Board

As identified above, the details of the proposed facilities currently hidden from public view are critical to the Town understanding the TGPL proposal within the Town of Nassau, and in developing reasoned comments and consideration of potential impacts on natural and cultural resources, land uses and most importantly on the health, safety and lives of residents within the impact zone around the proposed compressor station site. The Town asserts that this request is a legitimate request for access to information essential to the Town's review of the NED Project proposal and development of Scoping Comments for FERC's pending development of a final Scope of Studies for the Environmental Impact Statement. The Town willingly will assent to execution of a non-disclosure agreement and take reasonable precautions to maintain security and integrity of any CEII information provided pursuant to this request.

In closing, the Town respectfully requests that the FERC immediately grant the relief requested herein.

Thank you in advance for your assistance in this matter.

Very truly yours,

David F. Fleming, Jr.

Nassau Town Supervisor

cc: Hon. Chuck Schumer, United States Senate
Hon. Kirsten Gillibrand, United States Senate
Hon. Chris Gibson, United State House of Representatives
Hon. Kathy Jimino, Rensselaer County Executive
Hon. Kathy Marchione, New York State Senate
Hon. Steve McLaughlin, New York State Assembly
Hon. Dennis Dowds, Schodack Town Supervisor
Hon. Larry Eckhardt, Stephentown Town Supervisor
Nassau Town Board
Nassau Natural Resources Committee

20150922-5014

TOWN OF SHELBURNE
Shelburne Board of Selectmen

51 Bridge Street
Shelburne Falls, MA 01370

September 21, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street NE, Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.
Northeast Energy Direct Project - Docket No. PF14-22-000

Dear Secretary Bose:

The attached Scoping Comments on the proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project Docket No. PF14-22-000, replaces initial comments dated September 10th, 2015 that were filed by Shelburne Board of Selectmen. The initial comments had a clerical error, consisting of a missing page, and should be disregarded.

Sincerely
Town Clerk

TOWN OF SHELBURNE
Office of the Selectboard
51 Bridge Street
Shelburne Falls, MA 01370

September 21, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street NE, Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.
Northeast Energy Direct Project - Docket No. PF14-22-000

Dear Secretary Bose:

The Shelburne Selectboard unanimously voted on August 24 to oppose the Tennessee Gas Pipeline as not being a suitable project for the Town of Shelburne and the region we live in. To explain why we took this vote after careful deliberation, we submit the attached concerns, questions, and requests specific to the Town of Shelburne, as part of our participation in the Scoping Process that will determine the final version of the EIS to be responded to by Tennessee Gas Pipeline (TGP) and Kinder Morgan (KM).

Before getting to the Shelburne-specific scoping comments, we want to make FERC aware that the Shelburne Selectboard-- and its other committees and boards-- like many others in rural areas that will be traversed by the proposed pipeline, is almost entirely made up of part-time volunteers. We do not have professional staff, and we generally meet just twice a month: our staff and financial resources are limited. Given the short notice and woeful lack of information in TGP's July 24th release of its 2nd Draft Environmental Report, we applaud FERC's decision to extend the comment deadline. We urge FERC to call a moratorium to the entire review process until TGP issues a final Environmental Report with more substance and also no "To Be Determined" blanks.

There are several other more universal concerns that we hope FERC will take into account when reviewing this project:

--Climate change is perhaps the most pressing energy-related issue facing both this nation and the entire world. Methane has been very convincingly identified as one of the most significant contributors to climate

change: Is it really prudent to even consider building a huge destructive and intrusive infrastructure project, which will, if current pipeline reality holds, leak methane into the atmosphere? Is this the 50-year future we want for our nation's energy policy, when everywhere there is call for -and success with-sustainable energy R&D and installation? We urge FERC to factor this reality into its deliberations.

--Is there even a need for this pipeline project? We are not alone in thinking that KM has given inadequate attention to alternate routes and has failed to justify the need for the project or for the use of eminent domain to force it upon unwilling landowners.

KM says its proposed pipeline is necessary to address shortages in natural gas experienced at eastern Massachusetts electricity generating plants, especially during last winter's frigidity. Yet there are conflicting reports from other energy-related companies, from objective scientists, from public officials-telling us that the pipeline is not necessary, nor will it ease whatever congestion, storage or distribution problems caused last year's "spikes." There have been many proposed solutions to whatever may have caused them: none require a 100+mile, intrusive, expensive, and destructive industrial pipeline project through the heart of rural, agricultural landscapes, towns, farms and communities.

We urge FERC to require KM to scrupulously document their case that this pipeline is absolutely crucial to meet New England's energy needs" and to require KM to respond to and convincingly refute those studies, etc., that say otherwise.

--Importantly, Massachusetts' Attorney General has commissioned an objective study to assess near-future energy needs in eastern New England: it's target date for completion is this coming October. Rather than relying on KM's assertions of need and supply, we urge FERC to delay any further action on this project until the results of this study are made public, thoroughly examined and assessed.

--In addition, we urge FERC to require KM to employ objective, third-party, transparent analysis, by having KM and the towns traversed by the pipeline jointly approve the organizations and resources that will conduct the analyses.

The Shelburne-specific concerns we would like to see included in the EIS that FERC will be sending to KMITGP appear in the attachment to this letter. While we have not been given sufficient time to fully review the 2nd Draft Environmental Report filed by KMITGP, we have identified many issues and lack of information that we ask be fully addressed by KM in its response to FERC's EIS.

In closing, the Shelburne Selectboard wishes to state its endorsement of the more comprehensive scoping comments submitted by the Franklin Regional Council of Governments, as well as the input of our neighboring towns which have sent their own scoping documents to FERC. Although each town has specific characteristics that will be negatively impacted by the construction of the proposed pipeline, we are a region with shared heritage, values, way of life, connections to the land, and economy. Not only is it "a hurt to one is a hurt to all" situation: the proposed pipeline represents a threat to the character and integrity of the entire region. We intend to participate actively in the oversight and monitoring of the construction and maintenance of the Northeast Energy Direct Project, should it be approved by FERC.

Therefore we urge FERC to grant "intervenor" status to all the affected towns that request it.

On behalf of the Shelburne Selectboard

Robert Manners, Chair, Shelburne Selectboard

Attached: Scoping Comments

cc: Members, State Legislative Delegation

Franklin Regional Council of Governments

Hon Charlie Baker, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts

TOWN OF SHELBURNE
Scoping Comments on FERC Project No. PF14-22-000

Approval and the consequent construction of the NED pipeline would amount to the industrialization of a rural area that includes a number of historically significant farms with large tracts of land that have been maintained by the same families for a century or more. Additionally, the impact on the overall environment, economy and quality of life for all Shelburne residents and visitors would be significant. The following questions/concerns need to be addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Economic Impacts

- Will homeowners have difficulty in obtaining insurance if located in the “Incineration Zone?”
- Will there be devaluation of property in or near the incineration zone?
- Will there be a reduction of the town’s tax revenue caused by the presence of a major natural gas pipeline?
- Assess the potential for loss of essential tourism and recreation related income due to the presence of a major gas pipeline in the area.

Water Resources

- Assess whether there will be damage to wetlands essential to maintaining water bodies and supply, and detail any wetlands restoration that will be needed.
- Assess the impacts of directional drilling to take the proposed pipeline under the Deerfield River.
- Assess possible flooding as a result of any alteration of surface water drainage patterns.
- Assess the possibility of contamination of water supplies affecting farming, food security, essential water use caused by the proposed gas pipeline.
- Assess the reduction of well capacities from bedrock wells as a result of blasting.
- Assess the disruption of the flow of Shingle Brook and several small currently unnamed brooks as a result of pipeline construction.
- What will be the source of water used for pressure testing of the proposed pipeline and where will it be disposed of after the test?

Air quality

- Detail any venting of gases hazardous to humans, animals and vegetation into the Town’s airshed.
- Discuss measures to insure against leaks of methane gas during the life of the pipeline.

Geology

- Assess whether blasting would alter or diminish groundwater flow.
- Assess whether boring under Deerfield River would affect the integrity of the river bed.
- Assess the impact of underground fissures created by drilling and blasting on drinking water quality and quantity, human health, and the environment.
- Assess the potential for creation of new preferential pathways for contaminant transport through inter-connecting aquifers as a result of blasting and drilling.

Public Safety

- Detail how TGP would detect a natural gas other hazardous gas leak, and how it would alert the public in a timely way.
- Detail the support TGP will provide to local first responders, including funding, training and equipment over the life of the proposed pipeline.
- Assess the adequacy of regional response preparedness to deal with emergencies that may arise during and after construction of the proposed pipeline.
- Assess the safety of locating the proposed pipeline close to high tension transmission lines.

- Will proximity to the power lines increase electrolysis on the pipes, causing acceleration of corrosion that would increase safety risk?
- Define the zone of combustion/incineration of the proposed pipeline corridor, and present an evacuation plan to be followed by town residents in the event of accidents.

Open Space and Recreation

- Identify wildlife corridors and habitat that would be impacted by the proposed pipeline.
- Assess potential disruption of migration patterns by pipeline construction and ongoing maintenance and how that would affect native wildlife.
- Discuss the impacts of the proposed pipeline on current and potential recreation (e.g., hiking, hunting, x-c skiing, snowmobiling) in the proposed pipeline corridor and the surrounding area.

Historical, Cultural and Archeological Resource~

- Identify impacts on designated scenic roads (i.e., Taylor and Bardwells Ferry roads), and on stone walls and cellar holes that would be disturbed or partially, even fully removed. Once gone, they are irreplaceable.
- Assess the impacts on historic properties in the project area, such as the Herron's house which is designated an historic structure by the MA Historical Commission.
- Identify the specific roads that would be utilized for access during construction.
- Present a plan of action, including stop work orders, to be followed in the event archeological sites are encountered during construction.

Conserved and Preserved Lands

- Assess the impact on the status, value, and taxes of lands that are currently in the Chapter 61 tax abatement program and through which the proposed pipeline will pass.
- Assess the possible loss to the landowner if pipeline development affected the qualification for reduced taxable status.

Agriculture & Forestry

Discuss the impact of the proposed pipeline and its construction and ongoing maintenance on the following:

- Loss of crop production and resulting reduction of farm income
- Reduction of grazing during construction and resulting reduction of income
- Disturbance, compaction and loss of topsoil, mixing topsoil with subsoil, and a decline in general stability in soil structure
- Contamination of soil/land areas
- Disturbance of drainage, natural and manmade
- Long-term land use changes
- Impact on trees and their roots
- A plan for both the removal and disposition of trees that are cleared for the proposed pipeline
- Loss of timber in right of way
- Loss of timber as a result of damage during construction
- Control & elimination of invasive species introduced during of construction
- A plan for controlling vegetation in the proposed pipeline corridor over the life of the project
- Impact of herbicides on existing bee population affecting both existing bee keeping operations and the overall need to maintain pollination by bees
- Impact on other natural pollinators

- A plan for restoration of crop production affected by pipeline construction
- Any limits on crossing the proposed pipeline with farming and forestry equipment
- Any limits on farming, forestry and recreational use of the land in the project corridor

Construction

- Identify local roads that will bear heavy vehicle traffic during construction, and give the location and dimensions of all equipment and supplies staging areas in Shelburne.
- Present a construction plan to avoid construction traffic from late February to May, the so-called “mud season,” when the risk of damage to rural roads is the greatest.’
- Detail how town roads damaged by heavy equipment traffic during construction will be repaired. Such repairs should be completed prior to the pipeline going into operation, should it be approved.
- Detail the location and process of horizontal directional drilling to take the proposed pipeline under the Deerfield River.
- Assess possible interference and danger to PanAm Railroad train traffic during project construction.
- Detail the location of the proposed pipeline in the right-of-way of existing power line corridors, and assess the threat to power line integrity due to blasting next to the lines.
- Present a plan to insure that outside fill and material does not introduce invasive plant species into the area and ultimately the region.
- Address whether directional drilling and pipe installation under the Deerfield River would compromise integrity of the pipe by causing leakage and corrosion, and what measures would be taken to insure pipe integrity.
- Detail proper bedding of the pipeline to insure pipe integrity through the Town of Shelburne.
- Detail installation of pipe in the frost zone to insure pipe integrity.
- Detail how and where boring spoils will be captured and disposed of.
- Discuss the benefits of an independent 3rd party construction monitor, funded by the applicant and retained by the towns and familiar with local and regional concerns and certifications.

Long-term Maintenance of the Right-Of-Way and Pipeline

Discuss the following issues pertaining to long-term maintenance of the proposed pipeline and its right-of-way:

- Abandonment when the pipeline comes the end of its useful life
- Reclamation and restoration of any land that has been impacted by the pipeline
- Impacts of herbicides, if used to suppress woody vegetation, and their impacts on water quality, agricultural land, farm and domestic animals, and wildlife
- Inherent dangers due to inaccessibility of the proposed pipeline during and after construction, e.g., under the Deerfield River and in remote areas
- Long-term control and eradication of invasive species in the pipeline corridor

Bonding

To insure there are financial resources available after construction and during the lifetime of the proposed pipeline to cover pipeline impacts, the Town of Shelburne requests that FERC require bonding for the following activities:

- Restoration of wetlands affected by pipeline construction.
- Providing potable water supplies for residents and livestock to replace sources contaminated or significantly reduced as a result of project construction.

- Compensation for loss of soil productivity as a result of project construction and ongoing maintenance.
- Control and elimination of invasive species introduced by project construction.
- Repair of roads damaged by construction traffic.
- Removal of the pipeline and restoration of the corridor upon abandonment of the pipeline.

The amount and type of bonding should be detailed by FERC in the DEIS and memorialized in project conditions, should the project be approved. The proposed pipeline should be constructed and maintained at the least possible or no cost to the Town of Shelburne, its residents, and the environment.

1 Most roads to and through the project area are narrow and unpaved. They are particularly susceptible to damage from heavy vehicle traffic.

August 28, 2015

20150922-5038

Cynthia Bourgault, Greenville, NH.

Dear FERC Members,

I'm writing to voice my concern over, and opposition to, the proposed NED Pipeline project. My home is located in Greenville, NH, near the New Ipswich, NH border which puts it less than a mile from the proposed natural gas pipeline and compressor station. This issue directly affects me. When considering whether or not to approve this project, I ask that you take the following into consideration.

1. The proposed site for the natural gas pipeline and compressor station in New Ipswich, NH is approximately 1/2 mile from the town of Temple, NH's elementary school. This puts it within the incineration zone and within an area affected by the pollution generated by the pipeline and compressor station. This school also serves as that town's evacuation center making it impossible to use if there is an evacuation due to an accident or emergency at the pipeline or compressor station.
2. The proposed site for this natural gas pipeline and compressor station is located next to Temple Mountain Beef. The cows on that farm are pastured raised and graze in the fields next to the proposed compressor station. Pollution from the pipeline and compressor station along with the noise and light will be a problem for this farmer.
3. The water supply for the town of Greenville, NH is located next to the elementary school in Temple, NH putting it only about 1/2 mile from the pipeline and compressor station. Pollution from the pipeline and compressor station can easily enter the town's water supply. An accident at either location could cut off the supply of water to our town (the pipeline and compressor station would be located between the town reservoir and the town). For those people with wells in the area, the blasting needed to complete this project can cause numerous issues. It will also necessitate expensive water quality monitoring for everyone.
4. The towns in this area have very small, volunteer fire departments that don't have the resources, equipment or training to handle any of the emergencies that might arise from this pipeline and compressor station leaving us extremely vulnerable.
5. Activity at the proposed compressor station in New Ipswich, NH will be handled remotely which means that in the case of an emergency we'll be evacuated until someone can come in from another state to handle the situation. This leaves us without anywhere to stay and makes our homes vulnerable to looting.
6. The proposed route for the pipeline and the pollution from both the pipeline and the compressor station will have a very negative effect on the conservation land, waterways and wildlife in the area.
7. There are a lot of homes that are in close proximity to the pipeline and compressor station and pollution and its negative health consequences are a big concern for us.
8. The loss of property value if this project is approved will cause many of us to be forced into a situation where we have to decide between having to walk away from our worthless homes or having to stay in an area that's likely to cause numerous, potentially life-threatening illnesses.

9. I'm also concerned with the use of eminent domain. The idea that land can be taken away from my neighbors for this project is unfathomable. We've worked hard to build lives here and to see them destroyed this way would be devastating.

I am strongly opposed to this project. I feel that Kinder Morgan's recent reduction in the size of this project proves that this pipeline isn't necessary. Their horrible safety record speaks for itself. This project creates more problems than it solves. I believe we should look at other ways to meet any need we might have for more fuel. Projects that have already been approved and projects that improve and utilize existing infrastructure should be explored before resorting to a new pipeline and the devastation and cost that brings with it.

I've chosen to be a resident of the Monadnock Region because it offers the way of life that I was looking for. I grew up here, moved away and then came back. I love the quiet and the beauty of the area. I love all of the waterfalls, ponds, hiking trails and wildlife. The people who live here aren't here because they are uneducated or backward. We live here because we value a quieter, simpler way of life and we feel that our lives, the lives of our children and the preservation of our way of life should matter.

Thank-you for your time and consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Bourgault

20150922-5169

Gina Weaver, New Ipswich, NH.

Please do not approve the NED project by Tennessee Gas Pipeline - Kinder Morgan. It is not needed as NH has a surplus of electricity. As for natural gas Spectra which already has an established pipeline in NH and has an existing ROW in NH has said that they can increase their pipeline to fulfill the need for natural gas in New England and they can achieve this with putting down as little pipe as possible. Since they already have an existing ROW homes will not be lost and properties ruined like they would be by Kinder Morgan. Spectra has also partnered with EverSource which is the main electrical company in New England. Eversource services over 70% of the electrical customers in New England. That means that Spectra has over 70% of the electrical customers in New England. Kinder Morgan only has one customer which is Liberty Utilities. They do not have many electrical customers at all. It really does not make sense for Kinder Morgan to be building a pipeline in NH since it will not be needed and Spectra will be able to provide more natural gas especially since they have been in NH for many years which Kinder Morgan has not. They may say they have operated here for 60 years but that is only the company they have acquired. As I said before Please do not approve the application of the NED project in NH. Thank you!

20150923-0016

{ "The Latest in NED NEWS Northeast Direct / New England Destruction?" }
{Edition Number One, 5 pages, multi-column printed, not OCR convertible, omitted}

20150923-0017

Hand written card, Susy Carnevale, 44 Fanning Ave, Dracut, MA, 01826: opposing

20150923-0019

Hand written card, Peter Salera, 65 Glen Farm Road, Temple, NH : opposing

20150923-0021

Hand written card, Vickie Shanahan, 16 Lands End Rd, Tyngsborough, MA 01879: opposing

20150923-4006

The proposed NED pipeline, PF14-22, runs through the western part of Windham, New Hampshire. Although the pipeline route in Windham is short, it runs perilously close to over twenty homes - so close that in some cases, it must be routed around the actual homes.

Kinder Morgan, in its latest alignment sheets, has shown the pipeline to be moved fifteen feet into the current National Grid electrical right of way. This does move the pipeline somewhat further from the affected homes, however, there is no confirmation from National Grid that this permanent placement of the pipeline within the existing electrical right of way will be allowed.

This placement of the pipeline represents a safety concern, a property value problem and an aesthetic issue for the impacted property owners. As a representative of the owners involved, I would like to invite you to our neighborhood to view these properties and see the issues that the NED pipeline creates. All of the homes concerned are within a one mile radius and can be easily viewed.

Please let me know if you would be available for a tour of the area and I will make arrangements for your visit.

Thank you.

Homer Shannon
15 Autumns Street
Windham NH 03087

Chairman, Windham Residents Against the Pipeline

20150923-5022

Fred Black, Fitzwilliam, NH.

I believe gas derived from the fracking process is Liquid Natural Gas (LNG). All of the gas used in rural areas is Liquid Petroleum Gas (LPG).

Please explain how this massive destructive infrastructure project will help to lessen the cost of energy anywhere in the area of the proposed pipeline?

20150923-5036

Elizabeth Loughran, Belchertown, MA.

Please refuse to authorize this pipeline. The gas it is projected to carry will primarily be exported overseas. The government should not be supporting a private firm's making money when the proposed pipeline will destroy a wide swath of land through the beautiful rural areas of western New England. It should not support a company using potentially dangerous extraction techniques such as fracking. It should not support a form of energy usage that will increase damage to our climate when alternatives will fill our needs at much less cost. The government's job is to protect and serve the people, not to support a private company's need for higher profits.

20150923-5140

Tennessee Pipeline
Company, LLC.
a Kinder Morgan company

September 18, 2015

The Honorable Jeanne Shaheen
United States Senate
508 Hart SOB, Washington, DC 20510

The Honorable Kelly Ayotte

United States Senate
144 Russell SOB, Washington, DC 20510

The Honorable Ann McLane Kuster
United States House of Representatives
137 Cannon HOB, Washington, DC 20515

The Honorable Frank Guinta
United States House of Representatives
326 Cannon HOB, Washington, DC 20515

To the Honorable New Hampshire Congressional Delegation,

I am writing in response to your letter to Allen Fore dated September 11, 2015 regarding the routing for Kinder Morgan's proposed Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline project. As the President of Tennessee Gas Pipeline (TGP) and the individual in charge of this project, I am pleased to respond. We have been proudly serving New England for 60 years and are looking forward to helping lower your constituents' natural gas and electric bills through this important project.

As you aware, TGP, a Kinder Morgan subsidiary, requested and received approval to use the pre-filing process of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) in October 2014. As part of the pre-filing process, we are required to develop and submit draft environmental resource reports identifying the proposed project, anticipated impacts, and proposals to minimize and mitigate those impacts, to assist with the FERC's responsibility to review the project pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act. Among these resource reports is Resource Report 10, which focuses on alternatives to the routing and proposed project facilities. Given the importance of the development and analysis of project alternatives, a draft of Resource Report 10 (along with a draft of Resource Report 1, which provides an overall project description) is required to be filed 30 days after the pre-filing proceeding is opened.

TGP filed drafts of Resource Reports 1 and 10 with the FERC on November 5, 2014. In that filing, we identified and discussed several route alternatives for various portions of the project in draft Resource Report 10. Among the route alternatives discussed for the Wright, New York to Dracut, Massachusetts Pipeline Segment (referred to as the Market Path Component of the project) were the New York Powerline Alternative and the New Hampshire Powerline Alternative (see Sections 10.3.1.2 and 10.3.1.8 of draft Resource Report 10). These identified alternatives involved collocating the pipeline along an existing electric transmission line corridor in eastern New York, western Massachusetts, and southern New Hampshire.

As part of our ongoing outreach efforts, the route for the NED project and proposed alternatives were reviewed and refined in response to concerns and comments from local community members, elected officials, and non-governmental agencies in order to identify a route that would allow TGP to supply much needed gas to customers in New England with the least impact to the region as possible. Throughout the development of the project, TGP conducted an extensive needs and alternative routing analysis for the Project. The primary objective in performing this analysis was to develop a project that will accomplish TGP's objective to provide up to 1.3 billion cubic feet per day ("Bcfj d") of additional natural gas transportation capacity to meet the growing energy needs in the Northeast U.S., particularly in New England, while working to avoid or minimize potential adverse environmental impacts to the greatest extent practicable. TGP evaluated pipeline routing options based on regional topography, environmental considerations, population density, existing land usage, construction safety, and feasibility considerations. As a result of the extensive outreach efforts, as well as TGP's own review of the initial proposed route and the two alternatives that were identified above, it became clear that adopting these alternatives, which included a greater amount of co-location with existing utility corridors than the initial proposed route was the preferred option, primarily from an environmental siting perspective, as discussed in more detail below.

On December 8, 2014, TGP submitted a filing to the FERC in which it stated its determination that it would adopt both the New York Powerline Alternative and the New Hampshire Powerline Alternative as its proposed route. The Market Path Component of the project was thus revised to include the two alternatives,

which included routing the proposed pipeline through southern New Hampshire.

This decision to adopt the two alternatives, which included the routing of the proposed pipeline through southern New Hampshire (referred to as the “NH route”) rather than the originally proposed route through Massachusetts (referred to as the “MA route”) was based on several reasons, including increased co-location with existing utility rights-of-way, reduced environmental impacts, and improved access to an interstate pipeline in New Hampshire:

- 1. Increased co-location with existing powerline rights-of-way:** One of the primary reasons that led to TGP’s decision to adopt the current route through New Hampshire is that the route allows TGP to take advantage of a greater degree of pipeline construction and operation that is located adjacent to, and parallel with, existing utility corridors in the state of New Hampshire (as well as the states of New York and Massachusetts). When evaluating routing options for the Project, TGP has attempted to co-locate with existing utility rights-of-way, to the extent practicable and feasible, consistent with Section 380.15(d) of the FERC’s regulations (18 CFR § 380.15(d)), which requires applicants for natural gas pipeline projects to consider the use, widening or extension of existing rights-of-ways when possible.’ These regulations also require applicants to avoid, to the extent practicable, historic sites, national landmarks and parks, wetlands, recreational and wildlife areas. Approximately 87% of current 71-mile pipeline route through New Hampshire is co-located with existing utility line rights-of-way. In contrast, the previous MA route for the NED pipeline included approximately 65.64 miles of new pipeline in Massachusetts, primarily through “greenfield” or new construction areas, with just 16.20 miles co-located with existing utility corridors (approximately 24.6% co-located).
- 2. Reduced environmental impacts:** By increasing the percentage of co-location, as discussed above, the current route located through southern New Hampshire will minimize disruption of undeveloped land, thus reducing disruption to the environment, including habitat fragmentation. As noted in detail in the updated Resource Report 10 submitted on July 24, 2015 to FERC, the current proposed NH route crosses a smaller amount of wetland footage, fewer rivers, and the same amount of perennial waterbodies as the previous MA route. Additionally, the NH route crosses fewer miles of state forests and parks (1.55 miles for the NH route versus 9.22 miles for the MA route) and fewer national and state trails (4 for the NH route versus 23 for the MA route).
- 3. Improved access to an interstate pipeline in New Hampshire:** The current NED project route through New Hampshire allows increased access to natural gas for New Hampshire power and gas utilities that have signed precedent agreements as customers for the NED Project, including Liberty Utilities. Currently, the southern New Hampshire region lacks an interstate natural gas pipeline. The current proposed NH route will provide economic gas transport service to several geographic areas in southern New Hampshire (as well as northern Massachusetts) that are not currently served by an interstate natural gas pipeline. Because of its close proximity, the NED pipeline in New Hampshire would provide the opportunity for local distribution companies (LDCs) to expand natural gas service in the future to towns along the NED route, such as Keene, Swanzey, Rindge, Jaffrey, Amherst, and New Ipswich, among others, as well as provided gas to clean burning gas-fired power generation facilities. The availability of low cost, domestic and abundant natural gas will allow New Hampshire to retain existing industries, attract new industries, lower electricity rates (gas-fired generation sets the pricing for electricity 70% of the time in New England), and replace fuel oil and coal with a cleaner burning fuel, while enabling the further growth of renewables and enabling the region meet its climate change objectives. Since fuel oil is currently one of the primary fuels used to heat New Hampshire homes, residents would greatly benefit from the cost advantage of natural gas, if it was available for them.

As part of this ongoing outreach effort, TGP appreciates this opportunity to provide responses to these important questions regarding the NED project. TGP remains committed to maintaining fluid lines of communications with the towns along the proposed route as well as local, state and federal elected officials and will continue to work constructively with these entities. Please do not hesitate to contact us with additional questions or comments.

1 In a recent Draft Environmental Impact Statement (“DEIS”) issued by the FERC on September 4, 2015 for the Southeast Market Pipelines Project, Docket Nos. CPI4-SS4-000, CPIS-16-000, and CPIS-17 -000, the FERC, in its environmental analysis of resources, discussed co-location of new pipeline facilities with existing linear infrastructure as generally reducing environmental impacts by using existing disturbed areas during construction and incrementally expanding existing rights-of-way for operation. See p. 3-68. The DEIS further noted that co-location of natural gas pipeline facilities is a common and encouraged industry practice. See p. 3-27S.

Sincerely,

Kimberly S. Watson
President
Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.
1001 Louisiana Street Houston, TX 77002

20150923-5149

Tennessee Gas Pipeline
Company, LLC
a Kinder Morgan company

September 23, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, N.E.
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., Docket No. PF14-22-000
Northeast Energy Direct Project

Monthly Status Report --August 2015

Dear Ms. Bose:

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. (“Tennessee”) is filing with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (“Commission”) in Docket No. PF14-22-000 its monthly pre-filing status report for the above-referenced project. The enclosed status report covers the period August 1 through August 31, 2015.

In accordance with the Commission’s filing requirements, Tennessee is submitting this filing with the Commission’s Secretary through the eFiling system. Tennessee is also providing complete copies of this filing to the Office of Energy Projects (“OEP”). Any questions concerning the enclosed filing should be addressed to Ms. Jacquelyne Rocan at (713) 420-4544 or to Ms. Shannon Miller at (713) 420-4038.

Respectfully submitted,

TENNESSEE GAS PIPELINE COMPANY, L.L.C.

By: /s/ J. Curtis Moffatt
Deputy General Counsel and Vice President
Gas Group Legal

Enclosure

cc: Mr. Michael McGehee
Mr. Rich McGuire
Mr. Eric Tomasi

Northeast Energy Direct (“NED”) Project, Docket No. PF14-22-000
Pre-Filing Monthly Activity Report
(Reporting Period: August 1, 2015 through August 31, 2015)

Public Outreach

- Tennessee provided the following NED Project notifications:
 - On August 6, 2015, Tennessee provided applicable elected officials with a schedule of the five open houses to be held in September 2015 in New Hampshire.

Environmental

- Tennessee continued to work on revising Resource Reports 1 through 13 for the final Environmental Report, to be included with the certificate application filing.
- Tennessee continued field surveys during the reporting period, including cultural, environmental, and threatened and endangered species surveys. Tennessee continues to develop survey protocols and prepare for additional threatened and endangered species surveys throughout the Project area as survey protocols are finalized.
- As of August 31, 2015, biological surveys have taken place over approximately 97.90 miles, or 57 percent, of the NED Project Supply Path component route, and approximately 88.51 miles, or 36 percent, of the NED Project Market Path component route. In addition, cultural resource surveys have taken place over approximately 97.81 miles, or 57 percent, of the NED Project Supply Path component route, and approximately 50.35 miles, or 20 percent, of the NED Project Market Path component route. Table 1 below summarizes the completion status of environmental and cultural surveys.

Table 1: Civil, Biological, and Cultural Surveys Performed

Segment	Survey Area* (miles)	Survey Completed (miles)		
		Civil**	Environmental	Cultural
NED West (Supply Path)	171	C: 95.9 D: 86.8	97.90	97.81
NED East (Market Path)	248	C: 75.9 D: 70.3	88.51	50.35
% Complete		C: 41% D: 37%	44%	35%

*The total survey area in Table 1 does not correlate precisely to proposed total length of pipeline for the NED Project. This number represents the survey area for the proposed pipeline and for evaluation of route alternatives.

** “C” represents center line staking. “D” represents completed civil detail survey.

*The total survey area in Table 1 does not correlate precisely to proposed total length of pipeline for the NED Project. This number represents the survey area for the proposed pipeline and for evaluation of route alternatives.

** “C” represents center line staking. “D” represents completed civil detail survey.

Project Meetings

- Tennessee met with the New York Department of Environmental Conservation on August 21, 2015.
- Tennessee conducted field visits to review agricultural lands in New York proposed for Project use as a contractor yard or compressor station (Market Path Head Station) with the New York State Department of Agriculture and Markets on August 27, 2015.
- The Commission conducted the following scoping meetings during the reporting period:
 - Dracut, Massachusetts -- August 11, 2015
 - ^a Lunenburg, Massachusetts -- August 12, 2015

Right-of-Way

- Tennessee has obtained survey permission for approximately 39% of the NED Project Market Path component area, and approximately 55% of the NED Project Supply Path component area.
- Title work is approximately 95% completed for the NED Project Market Path component area and approximately 97% completed for the NED Supply Path component area.
- Tennessee has received 237 calls as of the date of this report on the toll-free phone number established for the Project.
- Tennessee is starting to assemble permit application criteria for Federal, State, County and Town road permit applications.
- Tennessee is continuing to communicate with and seek survey permission from affected landowners.

Engineering

- Tennessee continues to evaluate the proposed route for the Project. Deviations to the proposed route are being reviewed to accommodate construction constraints, and requests from landowners, towns, and applicable regulatory agencies. Some examples include requests for routing deviations submitted by Amherst, New Hampshire and the NYSDEC.
- Tennessee continues to evaluate the proposed major river crossings, including potential Horizontal Directional Drill (“HDD”) locations. Tennessee is conducting environmental surveys where access is available at these potential locations, and will seek appropriate permits, as needed, for geotechnical investigations.
- Tennessee contracted for aerial photography of the proposed primary route for the Project and for several alternative routes that were discussed in the draft Resource Report 10 submitted on March 13, 2015. The primary route was flown to a one-mile corridor and the imagery continues to be processed. LiDAR information as well as high resolution photography has been acquired and is currently being processed, and will be included in the final Environmental Report to be submitted with the certificate application filing. It is anticipated that additional areas where re-routes have occurred, as identified in the July 24, 2015 second draft Environmental Report, will be flown in the fall 2015 after the leaves are off the trees.
- Tennessee provided preliminary layouts for some of the proposed compressor stations as part of the July 24, 2015 second draft Environmental Report. Surveys of these locations were conducted at most of the proposed sites during the previous reporting period. Tennessee is currently working on scheduling geotechnical investigations for structural and permeability analysis.
 - Tennessee field engineers continue to identify available access roads, contractor yards, and other areas proposed for use during construction. An updated list will be provided in the certificate application filing.
 - Survey activities, including identifying and staking the centerline along all routes on accessible land, continued during the reporting period. Work being performed includes staking and detailed survey along the pipeline route and surveys of supporting sites such as contractor yards and compressor stations. Tennessee is nearing completion of survey activities for the total available areas where survey access has been granted.
 - Tennessee continued discussions with electric utility companies regarding the co-location of proposed Project facilities with existing utility corridors. Eversource provided Tennessee with property information for their facilities and has entered into an agreement with Tennessee to allow for surveys to be conducted on their property. These surveys are anticipated to begin in mid-September 2015.
 - Tennessee has conducted an analysis based on the Project imagery to review class locations to allow for siting of mainline valves. Mainline valve site locations and an updated class location list will be provided in the certificate application filing.
 - Preliminary construction spreads have been determined.

- A preliminary hydrostatic test plan has been developed, including depicting potential water supplies and discharge locations. Tennessee will be meeting with jurisdictional agencies to review areas and gain feedback.
- Residential figures were provided based on public information for residences within 50 feet of the proposed workspace with the July 24, 2015 second draft Environmental Report. These drawings are being updated, utilizing the flown imagery for structure locations, and will be included with the final Environmental Report to be included with the certificate application filing.
- Based on discussions with the NYSDEC, an updated template used for a waterbody crossing analysis is being developed. An initial routing has been developed with high level workspace and access road locations for the I-88 alternative. Tennessee agreed to review the I-88 route and provide a follow-up report on its conclusions directly to the NYSDEC within the scoping comment period. The Resource Report 10 included in the final Environmental Report will contain a summary of the report findings.
- Compressor station layouts are being developed and will be provided in the certificate application filing.
- Aboveground appurtenance drawings are being developed for metering, main line valve, and launcher/receiver sites.

20150924-0006

September 14, 2015

Dear Senator Shaheen,

We are writing to oppose the pipeline proposed by Kinder Morgan. The Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline will bring no benefit to New Hampshire.

It feels like the negative effects of this pipeline do not matter to elected officials. Well it matters to all of us who are being asked to live near a compressor station's hub of noise, light pollution, toxic chemicals and frequent "blow downs."

Not only are homes affected, but the compressor station is proposed to go near Temple School where children are. We can prevent the compressor station going in New Ipswich if we find endangered species of animals living there — well isn't this endangering our children of New Hampshire who will be exposed to the harmful effects of this compression station! What if it blows up? I ask you, are children no longer valuable in the eyes of the American government?

If you want this to go through we highly recommend that in your agreement with Kinder Morgan they must offer to buy out the Temple School and the homes in the "burn zone" for fair market value if the owner wishes to sell! If you don't do this all homes will become worthless, it won't sell for fair market value and many people will eventually have to walk away with nothing— because home owners in the burn zone will not be able to live in the type of safe, clean environment that everyone in New Hampshire is entitled to!

After doing the research I am convinced the pipeline construction process will pollute our air, contaminate our aquifers, wells and other water resources. Over 800 NH families will lose their homes and it will destroy conservation lands. It will harm the tourist industry and rural character of New Hampshire. Stand up and stop the greed of Kinder Morgan from ruining our way of life!

Thank you for your consideration.

Most Sincerely,

Roger & Jan Crooker

cc: FERC docket number PF14-22

20150924-0007

{same text as 20150924-0006, except addressed to: }

Dear Governor Hassan,

20150924-0008

{same text as 20150924-0006, except addressed to: }

Dear Senator Ayotte,

20150924-5002

Beverly Black, Fitzwilliam, NH.

The proposed route of the pipeline project goes through rural areas where the only source of potable water are private wells. There must be thousands of them along the route - my street alone has over 20 wells. Kinder-Morgan is showing a staging area for their equipment off of Rockwood Pond Road in Fitzwilliam, NH. This same area is an EPA Super Fund site, contaminated by the now defunct Troy Mills.

Specifically, please address how Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company will prevent contamination of the aquifers that supply drinking water to the residents along the route, especially in areas where toxic chemicals may be introduced by the activities of digging and installing the pipeline. If wells are made unsafe to drink by the installation of the pipeline, how will Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company mitigate the damage? How will potable water be supplied to the residents along the proposed routes should contamination occur? What liability will the gas pipeline company assume to make appropriate restitution should contamination of wells result from their activities?

Thank you,

20150924-5006

Erin Black, Boonton, NJ.

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LLC. , Northeast Energy Direct Project; Docket No. PF14-22-000 Scoping Comments

Stop the Pipeline!

I've been visiting New Hampshire since I was just a few months old, and lived there for a time as a child; now my parents have moved back to the state, and my own family and I visit as often as we can. New Hampshire is a very special place to myself and my family, from the hikes in the mountains and canoe rides through the lakes that made up my childhood, to the small, safe town that my parents now call home. So it should come as no surprise that I am vehemently opposed to the pipeline coming through any part of the state. As a rational human being, I can't find any good explanation for why the pipeline would have to travel north from PA to NH, east through NH, and then back south, especially given that no one along that route would benefit from that gas, which will all be exported. That benefits the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, not the state of New Hampshire or anyone in New England.

But as a person with deep family roots and personal ties to the state of New Hampshire, I feel very strongly that nothing could be worth the risks the pipeline would pose to the natural beauty and resources of the state, or the dangers it poses to drinking water, both from chemicals that would leak with any disturbance, and from the disturbance to the wells that constructing such a pipeline would result in, endangering all residents along the pipeline who rely on well water. This is not to mention the huge disturbance the pipeline would cause to forested areas and protected land. The pipeline also has a huge negative impact on the private property it would be building near and over, from increasing insurance rates to having a devastating effect on property values around the pipeline.

The pipeline would benefit exactly zero New Hampshire residents in any way, nor is it in any way desirable for those of us who come to the state as tourists and visitors every year. There are already precious few

places on earth that have the peaceful atmosphere, natural beauty, and much-visited lakes and mountains that New Hampshire does, and it would be a shame for everyone who's ever set foot in the state for the pipeline to be allowed. My family and I are all completely against the pipeline, for personal, environmental, and moral reasons.

Regards,
Erin Black

20150924-5012

Nathalie Watson, Milford, NH.
Dear Ms. Kimberly Bose,

I am writing about this proposed pipeline. I am a New Hampshire resident.

I am staunchly against this pipeline for three main reasons. First, there is no true need for the people of NH; NH already exports energy elsewhere, so there is no lack of supply, especially with only 4% demand for natural gas and environmentally-friendly alternatives increasing in NH. Secondly, Kinder Morgan does not have a strong history of safety with their pipelines and maintenance; from 2003-2014, this company had 36 "significant incidents" which resulted in deaths and damage. That's about 3 hazardous incidents per year! By the way, this excludes their two citations from the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration. Lastly, NH is known for its beautiful nature year round, which invites tourists and boosts our economy; the pipeline will break through 40 conservation lands, including state forests/parks.

This pipeline, created by this questionably safe company, is not meeting the needs of the people. It merely meets the profit-driven wants of the company, which is not an acceptable reason to allow this project.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Nathalie Watson

20150924-5078

Chris Modzelewski, Boonton, NJ.

My wife's family lives in New Hampshire, within a few miles of the proposed pipeline route. My wife and I have been visiting NH there for years, and are currently considering buying property there. The factors driving these plans include NH's natural beauty, the pristine quality of its environment, and the opportunity for property value appreciation in the area. However, the proposed pipeline would significantly damage all of these features: Not only will it be an eyesore, it also risks polluting groundwater, exposes the danger of industrial accidents, the infrastructure required to build the pipeline will put further strain on NH's already-strained public infrastructure. The pipeline will decrease property values in its vicinity, and degrade the attractiveness of the area for NH's vital tourism industry - which is heavily shaped by NH's natural beauty and pristine environment. These are very real costs that the pipeline will impose on NH's current and future residents (which my wife and I hope to be soon).

Yet despite imposing these significant costs, the pipeline offers no tangible benefits in return: The gas that will flow through the pipeline is destined for export which will only benefit a company that is not domiciled in NH and which will have minimal employment in NH (if any). The only reason why the pipeline is proposed to run through NH is because MA was wise enough to recognize that it only offers costs and risks with no off-setting rewards. NH should not be so foolish as to think that's a good deal: It is only going to be bad for NH's residents (by decreasing property taxes), for southern NH's tourism industry, and for NH's environment overall. It is not worth it, and a bad idea.

20150924-5176

Kathleen Gauvin, New Ipswich, NH.

I am writing as a concerned citizen of New Ipswich, NH. I may quite possibly be living in a town where Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas will build the largest compressor station in the Northeast as part of the NED pipeline project. I write this comment as I have been closely following the correspondence that our NH Delegation as well as our Governor Maggie Hassan have sent to FERC, Kinder Morgan, and the U. S. Dept. of Energy. These letters request answers to questions both they and their constituents have. These letters and the questions therein go unanswered. How is it that this lack of respect can be demonstrated by all three recipients of correspondence? Your lack of respect for our elected officials is appalling. What must be done to get straight forward answers from you, the FERC, Kinder Morgan, and the Dept. of Energy?

My second concern is that if you don't handle their requests, how would I even imagine that you would even consider my requests and concerns? The promise of FERC to be transparent is clearly an empty one. I have extreme doubts that this process has any merits at all. I'd like to be proven wrong.

20150925-0007

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC
1615 Suffield Street
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: 9/21/15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying Property Access, PF14-22

As the owner of the property located at:

20 North Hill Dr
Lynnfield, MA 01940

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Joy E. Stevens

20150925-4018

From: Alea Ashline

To: Philip Moeller

Subject: 1,804 signers: Stop the proposed gas compressor station in Nassau, NY petition

Date: Friday, September 25, 2015 7:40:17 AM

Dear Commissioner Philip D. Moeller,

I started a petition to you titled Stop the proposed gas compressor station in Nassau, NY. So far, the petition has 1,804 total signers.

You can post a response for us to pass along to all petition signers by clicking here:

http://petitions.moveon.org/target_talkback.html?tt=tt-97460-custom-60837-20250925-pT6Oa2

The petition states:

“We’re petitioning the town, county, and state officials to take action to stop any construction of a gas compression station in Rensselaer County.”

To download a PDF file of all your constituents who have signed the petition, including their addresses, click this link: http://petitions.moveon.org/deliver_pdf.html?job_id=1629816&target_type=custom&target_

id=60837

To download a CSV file of all of your constituents who have signed the petition, including their addresses, click this link: http://petitions.moveon.org/deliver_pdf.html?job_id=1629816&target_type=custom&target_id=60837&csv=1

Thank you.

--Alea Ashline

If you have any other questions, please email petitions@moveon.org.

The links to download the petition as a PDF and to respond to all of your constituents will remain available for the next 14 days.

This email was sent through MoveOn's petition website, a free service that allows anyone to set up their own online petition and share it with friends. MoveOn does not endorse the contents of petitions posted on our public petition website. If you don't want to receive further emails updating you on how many people have signed this petition, click here: http://petitions.moveon.org/delivery_unsub.html?e=.5oFwmTFmxJJ4Akq4MJdpnBoaWxpcC5tb2VsbGVyQGZlcmMuZ292&petition_id=97460

20150925-5068

Anne C O'Connor, Williamstown, MA.

I am a member of the Board of Selectmen of Williamstown, Mass. A Resolution opposing the proposed Tennessee Gas "Northeast Energy Direct" pipeline, Docket PF14-22-000, was passed unanimously at Town Meeting on May 19, 2015, and endorsed unanimously by the Select Board.

I ask FERC to consider a number of general concerns addressed in that Resolution.

Please study the environmental impacts of the installation and operation of the pipeline with respect to the health of residents in affected communities, as well as nearby communities such as Williamstown.

Please examine whether fumes from blow-down valves could be carried by the wind as far as Williamstown or, in certain weather patterns, settle in large quantities in the Hancock & Williamstown valley floor.

Please also consider whether health risks and property value losses associated with the pipeline will impact our regional tourism economy, which is reliant on attractions like Jiminy Peak, Ramblewild, Ashuwillticock Rail Trail, Mt. Greylock, and Notchview, to bring tourists and second-home dwellers to our area.

Please thoroughly study how the pipeline will impact the quality of the water, air and soil for local farms, including the organic CSAs Caretaker Farm and Mighty Food Farms, and Lakeview Orchards, all of which are significant suppliers to our local food economy and food resiliency.

Please examine how the Williamstown economy would be impacted by a decline in health quality — as well as property values — in our neighboring communities, whose residents work in and own businesses in our town. Please consider the impact on our regional school district if children from Hancock and Lanesborough move away or are sickened or die due to the effects of the pipeline.

Please consider the costs to the Town of Williamstown if our emergency responders are called upon for disaster response and mitigation due to a pipeline incident.

Please also clarify whether we as ratepayers will be required to pay for the construction of the pipeline via a utility tariff. The need for the pipeline is still not clear, and FERC should suspend the scoping process until the state Attorney General has finished participating in Mass DPU dockets 15-37 and 15-48 regarding gas capacity needs and Berkshire Gas's proposed contract with Tennessee Gas.

Please also examine whether our state's increased dependency upon natural gas due to the increased supply provided by the pipeline would damage the state's solar power industry, and prevent Massachusetts from meeting its statutory obligations under the Global Warming Solutions act.

Finally, in light of the many concerns raised in the scoping process, we ask you to consider the potential benefit of NOT building the pipeline, particularly in the face of the extreme challenges presented by the

climate crisis.

20150925-5130

Thomas Choquette, Averill Park, NY.

I have been informed that there is a Compressor Station proposed for construction within a mile of my business. The study is PF14-22, a 41,000 horsepower Compressor Station located off Clarks Chapel Road. I have owned Burden Lake Country Club for 33 years and have put my whole life into making my business better. The Golf Course was purchased in 1983 for \$120,000 and has a value of 2.75 million now. During the past 30 plus years I have watched the number of houses on the lake increase and my business has grown from \$120,000 to 1.4 million annually. Golf is not an easy business, but I have maintained growth every year. The serenity of being a part of nature will be strongly affected by the noise the Compressor station will make as well as the health risks that will incur. Golfers are healthy people and they will not take the chance of being affected by the toxic waste that will be generated. Golf is also at the mercy of the weather. When we experience extremely dry weather we need to be able to water the golf course. The blasting that will take place during construction may affect the natural aquifer in the surrounding area.

I am afraid that this Compressor Station will put my business at risk and therefore destroy the family business that have built over the past 30 years. I hope that there will be a study done to protect myself and the other local citizens from any health risks that may come from the Compressor Station. I have over 6,000 customers each year and 50 employees that may be affected if this Compressor Station is built in this location. I would think there are a lot of other areas that an industrial Station could be built that wouldn't affect so many Citizens.

20150925-5132

To Whom It May Concern;

I am writing in regards to my concern about the planned route of the Kinder Morgan Pipeline through Merrimack, NH. I feel the proposed route is too close to some of my community's most vulnerable people and resources. We should not have our children at school, terminally ill hospice residents and our water supply put into jeopardy over this. This needs to come to a stop. The people of Merrimack, NH have voiced that they are against this project and its proposed route. It's unfortunate that the voices of the people who make our community strong and truly care for it are remaining unheard.

My children are scheduled to attend the school that will be closest to the pipeline. I will not allow my children to do so. I will not put their lives at risk so that people in other communities can have a lower priced commodity available to him. This whole concept just is absurd.

I hope that my concerns voiced in this letter are recognized and taken into consideration.

Thank you,

Christine Nazaka
9 Danforth Rd.
Merrimack, NH 03054
603.420.8970

20150925-5265

Town of Amherst, New Hampshire
P.O. Box 960, 2 Main Street
Amherst, NH 03031
1.(603).673.6041 | www.amherstnh.gov

September 24, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. (“TGP”)
Docket No. PF14-22-000: Proposed Northeast Energy Direct (“NED”)

Dear Ms. Bose:

On Wednesday, September 16, 2015, the Town of Amherst Pipeline Taskforce held a meeting with representatives of the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company/Kinder Morgan. This served as a follow up to earlier meetings during which sensitive areas were identified by the Amherst Pipeline Taskforce as priority areas to be avoided. Kinder Morgan agreed to propose alternate routes for the pipeline through Amherst, and brought an alternative route proposal (Option 1) to the last meeting. At that time, the Town still had concerns regarding the proposed Option 1 route between the Milford town line and Bon Terrain. At the meeting on September 16, Kinder Morgan presented an amended alternate route that was shifted south in this area in order to avoid an existing residential cul-de-sac and a workforce housing development under construction.

The Town appreciates the efforts of Kinder Morgan to meet the Amherst Pipeline Task Force’s criteria for avoiding sensitive environmental resources, schools, senior and workforce housing developments, and residential cul-de-sacs. Attached please find minutes of the September 16, 2015 taskforce meeting, and the alternate route map provided by Kinder Morgan at that meeting.

While the Town of Amherst does not endorse the NED pipeline, and does not believe this pipeline belongs in New Hampshire, the route as currently proposed represents a significant reduction in overall adverse impact to the Town from the route proposed in the project’s initial pre-filing. The Town of Amherst continues to review the latest proposed route and will notify Kinder Morgan and the FERC of additional concerns.

It should be noted that the project is located within an aquifer protection area and, should the project be approved by the FERC, appropriate best management practices should be used to minimize the potential for construction impacts in the aquifer.

I respectfully ask that this letter and the accompanying documents be included as part of the public record. Thank you for your consideration of this information.

Sincerely,

James M. O’Mara, Jr.
Town Administrator

cc: File w/ attachments

Amherst Pipeline 1 Task Force Meeting
Wednesday, September 16, 2015 – 2:00PM

ATTENDEES:

Task Force Members: David Beach, Tiani Coleman, Colin Lonsdale, Reed Panasiti – Selectman, John D’Angelo – Selectman, Paul Indeglia – ACC Liaison, Colleen Mailloux – Community Development Director

Also in attendance, Lucas Meyer – Kinder Morgan, Barry Duff – Kinder Morgan, Mark Hamarich – Kinder Morgan, Jim Hartman – Tennessee Gas

Approximately 30 interested residents were in attendance.

The meeting began at 2:04pm. C. Mailloux stated that this is a follow up to previous meetings held between the Amherst Pipeline Task Force and Kinder Morgan to discuss alternate routes for the pipeline through Amherst. This is a public meeting, and the public are welcome to attend and observe but there will be no public comment. Members of the Task Force and Kinder Morgan representatives introduced themselves.

L. Meyer thanked the Task Force for agreeing to meet. Maps showing a revised proposed route were provided to members of the Task Force and the audience. L. Meyer stated that, during previous meetings in April and June, the Task Force presented Kinder Morgan with areas of concern with the proposed pipeline route through Amherst. Kinder Morgan has studied alternatives that avoid the sensitive areas identified by the Task Force and feel confident that they have identified a route that they can move forward with. B. Duff reviewed the alternate route plan. Since the last meeting, they have changed the route between the Milford border and Bon Terrain. They are able to move the proposed route south to avoid the Patricia Lane neighborhood, the approved workforce housing development, and the church at the corner of Rt. 122 and Patricia Lane. Pennichuck also requested that the pipeline be moved further from their storage tanks in the Bon Terrain area, and that request was accommodated. Pipeline will now be 742 feet from tank. The pipeline will run parallel to the railroad track, through Hollis, into Merrimack and then will cross 101A and Continental Boulevard and follow a route on the southerly side of Continental Boulevard. B. Duff indicated that a construction contractor has done preliminary analysis and determined that the pipeline route as proposed is buildable. Estimate 55 weeks of construction to complete the Amherst-Merrimack segment of the pipeline – a longer construction time table than the preliminary route. Route 101A and Continental Boulevard crossings would be done through borings to avoid construction impacts/road closures. The proposed route includes 1,400 feet in Hollis, along the railroad track. The southerly shift puts the proposed route between 300-700 feet south of Patricia Lane and 242 feet south of the church.

J. D'Angelo asked if the revised route avoids residential cul-de-sacs? B. Duff – yes. Does it avoid the workforce housing development and the church? Yes. B. Duff stated that the railroad is being followed into Merrimack. The route crosses near Home Depot and continues south of Continental, 1,100 feet from Thornton Ferry School.

J. Hartman stated that property owners along 47 the newly proposed route have not yet been identified. The next step is contacting property owners (including railroad), getting survey permission. J. D'Angelo stated that this plan represents an improved route through Amherst. The Task Force will review the plans and provide comment.

B. Duff indicated that this proposed route is the one that will be submitted when Kinder Morgan files with FERC. They are expected to file in the fourth quarter of this year. D. Beach stated that the resource reports are included in the filing. B. Duff stated that resource report 10, which will be included in the filing, will include all of the alternatives that have been reviewed to get to this preferred route. FERC has the ultimate decision; they could say that there is a better route. FERC chooses the pipeline route.

T. Coleman asked if the public would be notified of the alternate route before the draft resource report is filed. B. Duff – the next filing will be the final filing with FERC with this revised route. This meeting is the first public release of the revised route. J. Hartman stated that Kinder Morgan must do its due diligence, identify property owners, etc. This will begin soon.

P. Indeglia asked about wetland impacts in the area of Route 122. B. Duff indicated the route in that area is on a side slope and not expected to be wetland. J. Hartman stated that the route will be surveyed, wetland scientists will delineate wetlands. P. Indeglia indicated likely to be some wetland near the FW Webb warehouse in Bon Terrain.

J. Hartman pointed out that the plans provided show the pipeline route and a 200' survey corridor on either side of the route. The area on the plan is not indicative of the construction corridor.

M. Bender, Milford Town Administrator, stated that this looks to be a much more direct route with less mileage. Kinder Morgan estimates that total mileage through Amherst and Merrimack will be reduced by approximately 3 miles.

A resident of Merrimack expressed concern with the proximity to the Thornton Ferry School and a hospice house, impacts to residential areas in Merrimack.

K. McGhee, a resident of Hollis and member of the Hollis Pipeline Task Force asked if there was any plan for facilities, plants in Bon Terrain. Pennichuck has plans to build a plant to remove manganese from water

from the wells in that area to make it useable, but Kinder Morgan has no plans for any facilities relating to the pipeline in Bon Terrain.

J. D'Angelo summarized, this is an improved route through Amherst. This is the best of a bad deal- far better than the original proposal which would have impacted Ponemah Bog, Souhegan River, Amherst schools. This reduces the impact on residential neighborhoods in Amherst. This avoids Merrimack conservation land and reduces mileage through Amherst and Merrimack. The newly proposed route is a less disruptive route through Amherst. The pipeline Task Force will review the plans. L. Meyer indicated that electronic plans will be sent to C. Mailloux and NRPC. The Amherst Task Force will review the revised route and will notify Kinder Morgan of any issues.

J. Hartmann asked if the Task Force will convey to FERC its opinion of the alternate route. J. D'Angelo, there is no way to make everyone happy. Would like to see pipeline pushed 20 miles to the south, but the efforts of Kinder Morgan in addressing the concerns of the Amherst pipeline Task Force are appreciated. Minutes of the meeting will be submitted to FERC.

The meeting adjourned at 2:30pm.

{7 pages of maps omitted}

20150928-0012

{same text as 20150902-0020, except signed by: }

Elaine ?, 80 Main St, Peterborough, NH 03458

20150928-0013

{copy of 20150916-5036 above}

*{September 14, 2015, NH Municipal Pipeline Coalition to The Honorable Gregory H. Friedman
Inspector General , U.S. Department of Energy, Re: Oversight of FERC and Approval of Gas Pipelines}*

20150928-0018

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426

Date: 9-21-2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access

As the owner of the property located at:

440 Temple Rd
New Ipswich, NH 03071

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose. Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Thomas J. Peters

20150928-0019

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street NE, Room 1A

Washington, DC 20426
Docket No. PF14-22-000
September 17, 2015

Dear Ms. Bose,

After reviewing literature and attending meetings, I would like to be recorded as firmly opposed to the proposed Northeast Energy Direct project.

I ask that FERC reject the project on several grounds:

- (1) This pipeline is unnecessary. In terms of natural gas needs for western Massachusetts— indeed, for the entire state —gas companies should instead be instructed to fix the abundant gas leaks that strongly contribute to waste, and to store LNG for peak times at already-existing, but currently unused, storage facilities, such as the one off Long Plain Road in Whately. Daily, the state is seeing more and more usage of renewable energy, and more and more residents have been signing a form that instructs their electric company to use renewable energy sources.
- (2) This pipeline is slated to allow for drilling that could easily contaminate the waters of the Deerfield and Connecticut Rivers and some of their tributaries, and there are sensitive wetlands, woodlands, and meadows that will be irrevocably altered if the plan is pursued.
- (3) It is time for more federal and state initiatives that will increase the use of renewable energy. It would be heartening to see Eminent Domain used to push forward stalled solar and wind projects. Every new pipeline —and particularly those that, like this one, will convey “fracked” gas —drags ordinary US citizens back environmentally and economically, instead of propelling us forward. Hydraulic fracturing releases not only carbon, but deadly methane gas —and a host of additional chemicals that add to pollution and climate change —not our collective wellbeing.
- (4) If this project is approved, residents of Massachusetts will be paying for something that will solely benefit Kinder Morgan, as it will sell most of the natural gas overseas. That means that FERC would be serving a corporation’s owners/shareholders, instead of “we the people.”

Thank you for registering my concerns.

Sincerely yours,

Laurel Gardner
13 Plain Street
Easthampton, MA 01027

20150928-0021

**NEW HAMPSHIRE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
SCHOOL ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT #1
CONTOOCOOK VALLEY SCHOOL DISTRICT
OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS
106 Hancock Road, Peterborough, NH, 03456-1197**

September 21, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street NE, IA
Washington, DC 20426-0001

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LLC
Northeast Energy Direct Project (NED);
Docket No. PF14-22-000

Dear Secretary Bose:

We are the Board of the Contoocook Valley School District (ConVal). Our district is comprised of nine towns including the Town of Temple. We are responsible for the operation of the Temple Elementary School.

The proposed 41,000 HP Hillsborough County NED compressor station would be approximately one-quarter mile from this school. The ConVal School Board requests that Tennessee Gas Pipeline's (TGP) FERC application be denied.

We are making this request for the following reasons:

- ~ Compressor stations regularly emit toxins known to have serious effects on human health. These health effects are known to be particularly acute when people spend significant time in close proximity to a compressor station. These emissions will affect all areas of the school and playgrounds, and be drawn into the school HVAC system further exposing our children and staff.
- ~ In the event of a serious incident at the compressor station, we have no means to evacuate the students and staff in a timely manner.
- ~ The local police, fire and ambulance resources are not adequate to protect our children and staff in the event of an incident at the compressor station.

If FERC is considering approving the Tennessee Gas application, we request that FERC require the following:

- ~ A thorough independent evaluation of the particular vulnerability of children to the harmful effects of toxic pollutants regularly emitted from compressor stations of the size and design proposed for Hillsborough County.
- ~ A pre-construction baseline health survey of the students and staff at TES conducted by professional public health practitioners and paid for by Kinder Morgan, with a commitment to have the health profiles professionally monitored annually for 10 years.
- ~ An air quality monitoring facility located at TES with round the clock reporting to a qualified independent agency charged with timely evaluation of the results.
- ~ The development of a safety plan for TES students and staff

We hope that you will appreciate our concerns and take action to eliminate the health and safety risks that this project would bring to our students and staff.

Thank you for your consideration,

ConVal School Board

20150928-0051

Hand written card, Susan Duhamel, 83 Greenbriar Rd, New Ipswich, NH: opposing

20150928-0052

Hand written card, Arnold Thibodeau, 30 Fisk Hill Rd, Temple, NH: opposing

20150928-0053

Hand written card, Jackie Skidmore, 358 Poor Farm Rd, New Ipswich, NH: Portland Gas company is a better solution to a temporary peak.

20150928-0054

Hand written card, Timothy Somero, 42 Old Tenney Rd, New Ipswich, NH: what steps will be taken to monitor compressor emissions 24x7x365 to prevent health problems in children?

20150928-0055

Hand written card, Jackie Skidmore, 358 Poor Farm Rd, New Ipswich, NH: opposing.

20150928-0056

Hand written card, Jackie Skidmore, 358 Poor Farm Rd, New Ipswich, NH: opposing.

20150928-0057

Hand written card, Jackie Skidmore, 358 Poor Farm Rd, New Ipswich, NH: opposing.

20150928-0058

Hand written card, Jackie Skidmore, 358 Poor Farm Rd, New Ipswich, NH: Halliburton Loophole must be closed.

20150928-0059

Hand written card, Jackie Skidmore, 358 Poor Farm Rd, New Ipswich, NH: opposing.

20150928-0060

Hand written card, Jackie Skidmore, 358 Poor Farm Rd, New Ipswich, NH: opposing.

20150928-0061

Hand written card, Frank Skidmore, 358 Poor Farm Rd, New Ipswich, NH: no need, opposing.

20150928-0062

Hand written card, Jackie Skidmore, 358 Poor Farm Rd, New Ipswich, NH: opposing. Other projects are better solutions.

20150928-0063

Hand written card, Jackie Skidmore, 358 Poor Farm Rd, New Ipswich, NH: opposing.

20150928-0064

Hand written card, Jackie Skidmore, 358 Poor Farm Rd, New Ipswich, NH: opposing.

20150928-0065

Hand written card, Frank Skidmore, 358 Poor Farm Rd, New Ipswich, NH: why thinner pipes, are our lives less important?

20150928-0066

Hand written card, Eileen Palumbon, 30 Center Rd, Gill, MA 01354: opposing

20150928-0067

Hand written card, Jackie Skidmore, 358 Poor Farm Rd, New Ipswich, NH: Portland Gas is best NH choice.

20150928-0068

Hand written card, Jackie Skidmore, 358 Poor Farm Rd, New Ipswich, NH: opposing.

20150928-0069

Hand written card, Mary Jane Speyrer, 154 Foley Road, Sheffield, MA 01257: opposing

20150928-0070

Hand written card, Fred Speyrer, 154 Foley Road, Sheffield, MA 01257: opposing

20150928-0071

Hand written card, Susan Duhamel, 83 Greenbriar Rd, New Ipswich, NH: FERC, visit what your are going to ruin, opposing

20150928-0072

Hello,

I am a proud resident of New Hampshire. I have until recently remained open minded to the proposed NED Kinder Morgan Pipeline Project. After much research, both pros and cons, I have come to the only possible conclusion. This project brings zero value to the state of New Hampshire.

In fact I firmly believe it will have devastatingly negative impacts on many aspects. This pipeline is intended for export, it does not benefit New Hampshire home owners. We will actually be burdened with a tariff on our electric rates to fund the cost to build this pipeline. Allowing Kinder Morgan, a privately owned company, zero costs and accountability.

I am extremely concerned for the environmental damage, effects on wells and aquifers, disruption and elimination of wildlife (falcons in particular) loss of property/adverse property value with no compensation or accountability for VOC pollutants, excessive noise levels, elimination of “night sky”, and most importantly our health and safety. Kinder Morgan historically has a poor safety record. This project would also take away from important National and State goals for renewable energy. Let’s not take a step backwards I

I am also very concerned that Eminent Domain is being considered. Without a need from New Hampshire residents how can this process be legally acceptable?

All towns affected would be forced to bare the added burden of funding addition safety needs, fire, police, safety, and evacuation requirements that need to be implemented for accident preparations. This will be an enormous financial burden for all our New Hampshire residents.

After taking all things into consideration I strongly feel this is greed, not a need.

I oppose the NED Kinder Morgan Pipeline Project!

Regards,

Lou Murphy

20150928-0073

TOWN OF DANVERS

Town Hall, Sylvan Street
Danvers, Mass. 01923
Telephone (978) 777-0001
Fax (978) 777-1025
sbartha@mail.danvers-ma.org

Steve Bartha, Town Manager

September 2, 2015

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street NE
Washington, D.C. 20426

To Whom It May Concern:

On behalf of the Town of Danvers, the following are comments and areas of concern with respect to the proposed "Lynnfield Lateral" by Kinder Morgan (K/M), shown in the Pre- Application FERC Filing of September 14, 2014 and updated on June 2, 2015:

- ~ The proposed pipeline alignment in Danvers, as presented by K/M, follows along, within, or adjacent to the existing Tenneco Gas Easement, New England power Utility corridor and the Merrimack North-east Pipeline easement. The termination point of the Lynnfield Lateral is adjacent to the former Town of Danvers Sanitary Landfill Site and connects to the existing Tenneco Gas Pipeline that serves Cape Ann to the north and Danvers, Beverly, Salem, through the NGRID System; to the east; and Peabody, etc., to the south.
- ~ The Town of Danvers does not object to the proposed alignment and terminating point of the Danvers section, but does reserve the right to object, should any changes be made within the Town of Danvers. We note for the record this alignment will be subject to a Notice of Intent finding with Danvers Conservation Commission and Order of Conditions.
- ~ The Town is concerned that the Lynnfield Lateral may be the first phase of a larger project that would extend the lateral or replace existing Tenneco facilities (pipelines). Since, the original installation of the pipeline many decades ago, there has been significant residential and commercial development within the Town of Danvers, and a larger project would have significant impact on residential neighborhoods and commercial businesses.
- ~ The Town supports the efforts of both State and Federal elected officials to coordinate and facilitate negotiations with FERC to ensure that there is a unified effort by the communities throughout the process. We understand that the impact to Danvers is far less than in other communities, where larger diameter transmission mains will be constructed. To that end, the Town will support efforts by the surrounding communities impacted by the proposed pipeline to mitigate those impacts.
- ~ The Town will review and provide written comments during the Environmental Review process as well as the FERC Regulatory Process.

Please accept this letter as our formal request to become an "Intervenor," once the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company files its formal application with the Commission. As such, we reserve the right to file a motion to intervene at some point in the process.

We appreciate your consideration of our request.

Sincerely,

Steve Bartha
Town Manager
SB:af

20150928-0074

Morton Borzykowski
35 Blue Heron Drive
Averill Park, New York 12018

Wednesday, September 23, 2015

In regards to FERC Docket Number PF14-22:

After the Pennsylvania and New York Scoping Meetings for the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline, and four days before the Massachusetts and New Hampshire Scoping Meetings, Kinder Morgan dropped a brand new, 6,571 page set of Resource Reports for a different sized project, making comments from Pennsylvania and New York irrelevant and leaving no one time to evaluate them. This renders the current Scoping Period null and void. Please issue a new Notice of Intent, schedule new Scoping Meetings and allow a new full 60-day comment period.

I live on Burden Lake in Averill Park, New York. I am concerned about the effects of the 41,000 horsepower scalable to 90,000 horsepower compressor station slated to be built on Clark's Chapel Road in Nassau,

New York, less than 3,000 feet away from Burden Lake, as well as the Northeast Energy Direct project as a whole as proposed by Kinder Morgan's subsidiary Tennessee Gas Pipeline.

Aside from the adverse health effects, the noise and light pollution, as well as the negative effects to the lake's ecosystem, I am worried about declining property values. As a new homeowner in this area, I was dismayed to learn that a compressor station, a major industrial complex, was going to be built so close to my residence. The blasting, which will be necessary for construction, will be a nuisance and a hazard to well water and building foundations. Furthermore, once construction is complete, leaks from the pipe or the compressor station could compromise the safety and health of the lake as well as my well water.

The EIS must consider the economic consequences of declining property values, the impact on mortgage agreements and the ability to secure reverse mortgages for seniors in the community. In other pipeline applications, FERC has found that there is no peer-reviewed literature supporting the proposition that pipelines reduce property values in any significant way. However, a review of the existing literature shows that no such study even mentions compressor stations. Unlike pipelines, compressor stations can be seen, heard and smelled. Compressors of the size contemplated for Nassau are in fact indistinguishable from heavy industrial uses. There is a significant body of peer-reviewed literature that demonstrates large reductions in property values of residences located near such uses. FERC is relying, therefore, on the wrong body of literature with respect to compressors. (See, *Undesirable Facilities And Property Values: A Summary Of Empirical Studies*, Stephen Farber, Graduate School of Public and International Affairs, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15260, UZA Received 10 September 1996; accepted 13 March 1997.) A complete economic analysis would consider this among other negative externalities such as increased health costs and environmental costs.

The natural gas transported by the NED would add to total carbon emissions loads in direct contravention of the EPA's Energy Plan. It is unnecessary to relieve constraints on electric capacity since existing shortfalls are easily met with LNG purchases. These shortfalls could be eliminated entirely by repairing leaks in the current system, adding renewable sources of energy such as wind, water and solar and increasing energy efficiencies in general. Electric use has been flat since 2008 and the world is adding more capacity for renewables each year than coal, natural gas, and oil combined. The NED and other northeast pipelines are likely to be obsolete and unused before they reach the end of their useful lives, leaving ratepayers to pick up the bill and leaving a trail of environmental destruction. Thus, I implore you to consider a No Action Alternative.

Sincerely,

Morton Borzykowski

20150928-0076

September 21, 2015

Dear Kimberly D. Bose

This letter is in response to Docket P.F. 14-22 (Northeast Energy Direct)

My husband and I, (Leonard dt Carol Lilley) have many concerns with the proposed Tennessee Pipeline installation in our backyard.

First, the safety of our family. All of our children and their seven children, our grandchildren, use our yard every day. We all live up the same driveway. They especially use our backyard for the pool and walks through the woods, etc.

Lynnfield has already had a gas line explosion in the past and that is also a major concern for us. That could wipe us all out!

Depreciation of our property due to this would be a hardship to our property value and for any resale or home equity value.

There is no compensation or benefit to us or any one else effected by this project. It is totally unfair.

We do not give anyone permission to go on our property for any reason, surveying, etc, Including Tennessee

Gas Pipeline Commission or Kinder-Morgan.

Please stop this project from happening immediately !

Thank-you,

Carol & Leonard Lilley, Jr.
22A Rear North Hill Dr
Lynnfield, Ma. 01940

20150928-0084

Hand written FERC Comment form: Debby Connolly, 88 Vaillancourt Drive, New Ipswich, NH 03071: opposing

20150928-0089

September 20, 2015

United States of America
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20426

To whom it may concern,

Re: Docket 1 PF14-22-000

I am in receipt of your "Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the Planned Northeast Energy Direct Project."

It states that, The Commission will use this EIS in its decisionmaking process to determine whether the Project is in the public convenience and necessity."

Please know that this is NOT in the public convenience of our neighborhood, and is NOT a necessity, as it will NOT be providing natural gas here. Many of us moved here from cities across America to sum our land. We have already experienced big business — we don't want it coming to us. Excavating will disturb our wildlife and underground springs, as well as our peace of mind.

Tennessee Gas has stated to me that they hope to install their pipeline NEXT TO the upcoming Constitution pipeline in our neighborhood ~Coyote Drive, Summit, New York&. It is certainly not convenient for our neighborhood to have TWO natural gas pipelines right next to each other. This only doubles the risk factors.

Have the people NO rights of land ownership?

Another concern is that the natural gas companies provide the landowner with a one-time" fee to use their land for the rest of their lives. Why are they not "Ceasing" land from the property owner on a yearly basis? Why shouldn't the landowner be receiving yearly or even monthly remuneration for lifetime" use of their land? They pay their taxes, yet you can GIVE their land away while others benefit from its use. What about a monthly "dividend" from part of the huge earnings received from the natural gas?

Also, our ground shifts and heaves during winter weather, and then settles when spring arrives. It is common that many homes shift. Many homes do not have foundations here. My concern is that our underground springs will be disturbed and possibly be redirected to interfere with our wells that supply our drinking water.

Another concern is our trees and stone walls. My neighbor was told to remove twelve of his full-grown pine trees before Constitution pipeline comes through, or they would have to cut them down. The pipeline company will also be removing stone walls, and an additional amount of full-grown pine trees.

The pipeline company does not replace the trees or the stone walls, they simply give money to the landowner who would rather have their landscape in tact.

We do not want our underground springs, wells, agricultural, wildlife, and peace of mind jeopardized by

heavy equipment excavating and natural gas pipe installation. The structure of our ground leads me to believe that it would be high risk with the shifting of the earth during the seasons here, and the large amount of underground rock and water and caverns in this area.

You have already approved one natural gas pipeline to come through our neighborhood. TWO is just TOO much. I'm sure you wouldn't want TWO gas pipelines in &out of your home. Can Tennessee Gas find another route? Is your conscience alive? Please! TWO gas pipelines next to each other!

Respectfully,

Patricia A. Fowler
P.O. Box 276
144 Coyote Drive
Summit, New York 12175

20150928-5003

Allison Gwinn, Merrimack, NH.

Merrimack NH is not the right place for a pipeline. Yesterday, in his address to the US Congress, Pope Francis said that any threat to the environment is a threat to humanity. The gas pipeline through southern NH is a threat to the environment.

I have lived my entire life in this town and it would be devastating to the community to have the pipeline running through it. It puts our schools, employers, water supply and air quality in danger. It makes me extremely sad to think of my three children and extended family (all whom live in Merrimack) put at risk due to the pipeline. Please keep it out of NH!

Allison Wood Gwinn

20150928-5005

Rosemary Wessel, Cummington, MA.

This request / comment on filing procedure and structure is applicable to all pipeline applications, not just #PF14-22.

The current method of pipeline project application submittal is outdated and cumbersome. Since many projects involve small communities with limited or all-volunteer staff, the amount of time needed by town officials to extract all information is proving to be a burden, if not a barrier to meaningfully understand or comment on the proposals' impacts.

Technologies and methods currently used for filing date back at to 1993, when the first PDF files and technologies for reading / searching them became available. Although a great leap forward from paper document searches at the time, further online technologies have evolved, including multi-layered, interactive maps that can contain hyperlinks back to multiple forms of documents, and online file formats that can connect them all through a publicly accessible online user interface. For areas where confidentiality is a concern, there are adequate security shells to protect such content, allowing everything to be stored in one, cohesively structured server account.

To be fair to communities, which become obligated to take on the substantially time-consuming burden of evaluating these proposals through no fault of their own, pipeline proposal applications, especially those for pipelines of hundreds of miles in length, should be filed in a modern, accessible and searchable manner.

On a central, publicly available map file, there should be:

- A single interactive map file, accessible online via Google Maps or other commonly used interfaces, that contain the entire pipeline route, including all laterals and appurtenant components and facilities
- Separate, selectable layers for different elements of the pipeline system
 - Compressor stations

- Pigging Launchers & Receivers

- Meter stations

- MLVs

- Contractor yards

- HDD sites, including full staging areas

- Wet-trench and other water-crossing sites

- The ability to overlay the route over CURRENT satellite and environmental boundary maps available in local, state and federal databases

— Active hyperlinks to areas in text and tables in written parts of the application, which will open those specific anchored elements in the the application's PDF files.

— Information should be tagged in a matter that all fields of data may be pulled up in individual searches, with all applicable classes of subsequent data tagged for review.

i.e. People should be able to search for:

— a specific location, and all data points that pertain to it

— a specific class of infrastructure (i.e. pipeline segment designation, pipeline Class, MLV, compressor station, remote blowdown valve, etc.) and see all data points that pertain to it

— a specific zones of pipeline construction activity needing specific construction methods (i.e. blasting zones, HDD, wet-trench, wetlands crossing, agricultural land crossing, high-vibration zones like quarries, train tracks, high volume highways, seismically active zones.)

— uncompleted data points, TBDs and required data fields left blank

Having spent several weeks picking apart the 6,571 pages of the Resource Reports filed by Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company for the Northeast Energy Direct, the cumbersome method of extracting information as it pertains to locales, construction methods or particular technologies has been astounding. While the section of the Resource Report titled and purportedly pertaining to Horizontal Directional Drilling is literally once sentence saying to expect information later, I have found schedules for intended locations and lengths of HDD sites in another appendix but only as they pertain to Massachusetts. With major rivers to cross in NY and NH, I'm sure there are other intended HDD sites, including the Hudson and Merrimack Rivers, but there is no obvious location for that information anywhere near the mention of MA sites in Appendix L and, again NOTHING at all in Appendix O which is supposed to address the topic specifically. A hyperlinked, datapoint-based method of filing would avoid this type of obfuscatory effect. In the 21st century, it is not only technically possible but common among some professional sectors.

Rosemary Wessel

No Fracked Gas in Mass, Cummington, MA

20150928-5006

Dave Anderson, Merrimack, NH.

It is my understanding that in order for a project to gain approval from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) for the pipeline and the tariff to pay for it, the project must be shown to provide public benefits that outweigh adverse impacts and meet an environmental review that explores all reasonable alternative.

Hera are some "reasonable alternatives"

- Utility Companies should be fixing their current infrastructure. Repairing the aging structure already in place will help reduce or eliminate the need for any additional resources. <https://www.edf.org/climate/methanemaps/city-snapshots/boston>
- Renewable energy should be fully explored to identify what it can offer to supplement growing energy

demands.

- There are also currently approved lateral lines planned for the area. We need to understand what the contribution will be.

Any of these, never mind a combination of, would have the potential to produce/recapture adequate capacity to offset peak winter demands.

The NED currently proposed by Kinder Morgan does not provide “”. Those of us in the path of this proposed pipeline are not interested in bearing the environmental, aesthetic and personal risks associated with this project. The proposed capacity far exceeds the amount needed to cover any shortages seen during “peak” winter usage. Where does the excess go? From what I can see, it gets exported. We are put at risk and they get the reward. Where’s the “public benefit” in that?

As a US Army Veteran, I find it appalling that the government could be manipulated to the point of allowing a private company land taken by eminent domain take land from property owners (at their expense). The ONLY way for this project not have any impact is to DECLINE the project.

20150928-5016

Alison Ezell, Ridgefield, CT.

I’m in NH, visiting my parents in Temple, NH. This is not a place where you go to go shopping or go to the movies or hang out at the mall. You come here because it’s beautiful and tranquil. We buried our beloved dog in the backyard this weekend and I want to think she will rest peacefully here forever. But if the compressor station that TGP wants to build in New Ipswich goes in, this place will never be the refuge that it has been. I’m afraid the whole town of Temple will become a ghost town. People in this part of town will start abandoning their houses because they will not be able to sell them. No families will ever move here and the Temple Elementary School will close down for lack of children. With the school gone, the lifeblood of the town will be gone. The whole 9 town school district will be paying for an empty building, increasing school costs and local property taxes. Soon, people won’t want to move to any of the towns in the district. I suppose the whole area that used to be a gem could turn into a blighted region of the state. Please don’t let this happen to this beautiful place.

20150928-5017

Julie Penney, Merrimack, NH.

NH is NOT in energy crisis. We export excess energy to MA and are not intended to be the end-user; reaping no real benefits that outweigh the numerous costs. The pipeline is a conveyance of gas to another state for industry profit; sacrificing the better good of the people and the environment. The recently changed route goes through our aquifer, Pennichuck Water Works conservation land, town wetlands and comes dangerously close to an elementary school. It is obvious the pipeline is routed through NH merely as a path of least resistance and not due to public or energy needs. We can’t let big business destroy our resources and sense of security. Please do the right and responsible thing for New Hampshire.

Julie Penney

20150928-5031

Michelle LeClair, Rensselaer, NY.

I am writing to you regarding the Tennessee gas pipeline and compression station that is being proposed for Rensselaer County. FERC docket PF14-22

I am shocked and disgusted that this project of this nature is being considered for the proposed area. My reasons are as follows:

- The project contributes absolutely nothing positive to the area it is impacting and will have a significant negative effect on property values and quality of life for a very large area around the project.

- No one who lives in this area is in favor of this project (with the exception of Mr. Hanson who I presume is benefitting from the sale of his land for the proposed compressor station)
- This is a rural area with no industrial facilities which is why the current residents live there. Why should the current residents be forced to completely alter their living environment in a negative way in order to benefit a private enterprise.
- Most of the local residents rely on wells or lakes for their drinking water and there is a huge potential for contamination of these waters either by leakage from the pipeline itself or from off gassing
- This being a rural area, there are limited emergency services. Therefore, in the event of an emergency at the compressor station or the pipeline, the response time of emergency personnel would be inadequate to protect the population
- The residents of the area moved there because of the beautiful and quiet rural environment. To force a project like this down their throats is both dishonest and treacherous.
- I feel that Kinder Morgan and the regulatory authorities have not been honest or forthcoming regarding this project. Any information that has been released about the project has been incomplete and misleading. The surrounding municipalities have been begging for full disclosure on the project and they are still waiting.

In summary, I feel this proposed project violates the basic human rights of the residents affected because it is forcing them to lose all they have invested in their properties and it is putting their health at risk.

For these reasons and in the spirit of fairness, I urge you to not approve this project. I look forward to hearing your response.

Thank you,

Michelle LeClair

20150928-5032

Shawn M Logan, Andover, MA.

Dear Sirs or Madams,

I am classified as an abutter to the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct Project and have previously voice my serious concerns with the need for this pipeline, its invasive nature to our local environment, and the inability of our local public safety systems to accommodate any pipeline related emergency.

In addition, I would like to express my frustration with Kinder Morgan as a company. Kinder Morgan sent a representative to my home sometime after the we were notified about the project in late 2014 (December). The representative wanted to obtain my permission to survey my property. I refused to provide permission and signed a form they provided indicating that I did not want to have my property surveyed by Kinder Morgan representatives.

Since that time, I have received through US Mail between two and three additional mailings from Kinder Morgan requesting permission to survey my property - despite the fact that I refused their request in writing.

Last week, I received a notice in my mailbox that I received a piece of certified mail from Kinder Morgan and needed to pick it up at the Andover Post Office. I was frustrated that Kinder Morgan both expects me to pick up their certified mail - and suspected that this was an additional request to survey my property. As a result, I refused the piece of certified mail using the appropriate check box on the certified mail notification as well on the on-line form.

My neighbor, who is also an abutter, received a similar certified mail notification. Hence, I suspect Kinder Morgan has sent thousands of other abutters similar mail. I did contact Massachusetts Representative Nicki Tsongus regarding these mailings and her office suggested I submit a FERC filing.

I feel as if I am being harassed by Kinder Morgan as I have already clearly indicated that I do not want them to survey my property and they continue to contact me to obtain permission.

This is not the type of company I want to rely on to build, maintain, and take action in any pipeline emergency in Massachusetts.

Sincerely,

Shawn Logan

20150928-5113

Amy Glowacki, Mason, NH.

I just read that the scoping session on 9/29 for NED NH will be cutoff at 10 pm as the venue is only reserved until 10 pm. If this is true, why was this decision made? This is not enough time for all impacted citizens to speak. This is just one more example of the deck being stacked against the citizens of NH making it more difficult to participate. A fair and open session would not be limited to 10pm-especially in light of the large turnouts at all the other NH scoping sessions. Everyone deserves to be heard in the forum. While it is stated that written comments to FERC carry the same value -this truncated scoping session is one more example of NH citizens not having an opportunity for full participation in a fair and open process. If this project is approved and eminent domain is used to gain access to NH private and publicly protected lands we need to have trust that all voices are heard. Please allow for a fair scoping session that allocates all the time needed for everyone who wishes to participate. Too much is at stake.

20150928-5132

Donna Dailey, Merrimack, NH.

I am writing to express my concern & dismay regarding the proposed pipeline in my neighborhood of Merrimack, NH. I strongly oppose the pipeline because it will directly impact the safety of our children, our school, and our home values. NED has not been forthright in identifying the value of this project to the NH constituents. I believe we have not exhausted all other alternatives to meet the demand for natural gas in NH.

The project ends in MA & should not be routed through NH.

Thank you for your consideration,

Tom & Donna Dailey

20150928-5135

Fred Teeboom, Nashua, NH.

To: FERC

Subject: Docket No. PF14-22-000

The Northeast Energy Direct Project is sorely needed in New England, as our per-term gas costs are very high, especially in the winter when our consumption is high. When our consumption is low, in the summer-time, the per-term cost is much lower. Here is a summary of my last two year's natural gas bills:

DATE		# terms	cost/term	gas bill	
from	to				
15-Aug-13	12-Sep-13	9		\$24.94	
12-Sep-13	11-Oct-13	15		\$31.30	
11-Oct-13	8-Nov-13	64		\$81.37	
8-Nov-13	11-Dec-13	148		\$194.00	high
11-Dec-13	13-Jan-14	213		\$279.91	high
13-Jan-14	11-Feb-14	180		\$257.41	high
11-Feb-14	13-Mar-14	186		\$290.95	high
13-Mar-14	11-Apr-14	126		\$216.53	high
11-Apr-14	13-May-14	65	\$1.09	\$108.42	high

13-May-14	13-Jun-14	14	\$0.54	\$29.86	
13-Jun-14	14-Jul-14	10	\$0.54	\$28.82	
14-Jul-14	12-Aug-14	10	\$0.54	\$25.44	
12-Aug-14	11-Sep-14	8	\$0.49	\$23.84	
11-Sep-14	13-Oct-14	28	\$0.39	\$40.13	
13-Oct-14	11-Nov-14	70	\$0.78	\$93.75	
11-Nov-14	11-Dec-14	135	\$1.16	\$223.40	high
11-Dec-14	13-Jan-15	186	\$1.12	\$298.44	high
13-Jan-15	11-Feb-15	215	\$1.01	\$314.12	high
12-Feb-15	12-Mar-15	195	\$0.91	\$265.95	high
13-Mar-15	14-Apr-15	145	\$0.80	\$192.50	high
14-Apr-15	12-May-15	47	\$0.57	\$63.61	high
12-May-15	12-Jun-15	13	\$0.31	\$29.68	
12-Jun-15	14-Jul-15	11	\$0.33	\$30.32	
14-Jul-15	12-Aug-15	10	\$0.34	\$29.18	
12-Aug-15	14-Sep-15	10	\$0.34	\$32.11	

This needs to be fixed. Hopefully, this project will help.

Fred Teeboom
Nashua, NH
(603) 889-2316
fredtee@comcast.net

20150928-5172

Ming Wei, Deerfield, MA.

I was recently a B & B guest at one of the Deerfield residents' houses. I learned from our host about the pipeline project and the difficult process they have been going through in the past 1.5 years as well as the negative impact on the local people's lives because of this project I appreciate very much the beautiful and clean environment that is offered by Deerfield as well as the towns around this region. The purity this beautiful land provides is definitely a gem that everyone should treasure and protect. If someday in the future I learn that the pipelines are installed in this region, I will feel extremely sorry and not want to come back to visit as I will feel unsafe and the land is contaminated. I am sure you do not want to see that the revenue of tourisms in this region is damaged. Yet with your approval of this pipeline project, it is for sure a big loss of tourist revenue will occur. I am saying this from a tourist perspective and I am saying this because I loved this land the first time I saw it. With the pipeline, this land is no longer the one I fell in love. I strongly urge you to consider the voices from the local people as well as the tourists. Please DO help the locals to protect the purity and sustainability of this land! Thank you very much!

20150928-5237

Denise Greenleaf, Merrimack, NH.

Kinder Morgan is a for profit organization trying to get a 30" fracked gas pipeline into Southern NH for transporting gas to its real destination, overseas. It is not needed in NH. However, this fracked gas pipeline will be going over farmland, water aquifers, protected areas of wildlife, etc.

If FERC allows this abomination to pass, KM will be able to take privately owned property by eminent domain for private greed. THIS IS ILLEGAL. KM has absolutely not proven the "need" for this pipeline. NH has more than enough energy to heat our homes during the winters, and actually sells some to other states!

If a lay person, like me, can accrue enough information to understand what's going on here, FERC MUST be aware of the wool that is being pulled over its eyes. Wake up and smell the gas, BEFORE IT EX-

PLODES!!

Kinder Morgan's safety records are atrocious! How dare you even consider allowing this company to put our citizens' lives and health at risk just to line their wallets, and don't think the public isn't aware who pays your salaries, (that's a scandal by itself). Fracked gas is a filthy, polluting, yesterday energy. Clean energy is needed now, not after the damage is done.

NO KINDER MORGAN FRACKED GAS PIPELINE IN SOUTHERN NH.

NO EMINENT DOMAIN FOR PRIVATE GAIN.

KINDER MORGAN HAS NOT PROVEN A NEED!!!

20150928-5254

Bruce Hawkins, Northampton, MA.

I do not believe this project is in the interests of the citizens of Massachusetts. Its primary purpose appears to be to export gas to other countries, although there has been much deception surrounding its capacity and the needs of the state. There is a claim that more peak capacity is needed, but much cheaper planned facilities to meet that demand with storage have not been built. We need more conservation and renewables, not a pipeline that will doily our landscape.

20150928-5309

Laurel Facey, Millers Falls, MA.

The Wendell Agricultural Commission, of which I am Secretary, encouraged me to go on record in opposition to the proposed gas pipeline which would run through hundreds of private properties and some of our region's most sensitive ecosystems, including valuable agricultural resources. At our last meeting, we were all in support of promoting the expansion of programs that would increase efficiencies and sustainable, renewable sources of clean energy and opposed to the hydrofracking that has become the main method of extracting natural gas. Fracked gas is not the answer to our energy needs, and it is one of the worst sources of toxics in the soil, our water and the air. We must consider the environment upon which we depend for our very lives.

In particular, may I point to Article 97 of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and remind you that the citizens of this state do not take our common wealth lightly. The benefits of a healthy environment to our people must take precedence over the narrow interests of a private corporation, even when that corporation purports to provide its customers with a needed commodity.

Wasteful leaks should be repaired and conservation efforts encouraged. Ratepayers must not be required to fund a pipeline that would not directly benefit them and which would be offset by so much harm that the cost-benefit analysis would indicate that such a project must not be pursued. The farming community would be irreparably harmed by the construction of a gas pipeline and so I respectfully request that this project be dropped.

Yours truly,

Laurel Facey

20150929-0009

Hand written card, Amanda Saye, 1 Walton Circ, Londonderry, NH: opposing

20150929-0015

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, DC 20426

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

September 25, 2015

Governor Margaret Wood Hassan
107 North Main Street
Room 208
Concord, NH 03301

Dear Governor Hassan:

Thank you for your August 14, 2015, letter regarding Tennessee Gas's proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project (Docket No. PF14-22-000).

During the pre-filing process, numerous environmental surveys and studies are being performed concurrently by the applicant. Additionally, FERC staff is reviewing that information and requesting additional information from Tennessee Gas. The purpose of the pre-filing process is to increase the applicant's and staff's understanding of the issues that should be addressed in the formal application and in the subsequent environmental impact statement (EIS) for the project. Accordingly, the EIS will analyze the environmental issues you raise, such as impacts on drinking water, noise impacts, impacts on local and regional air quality, public safety, and alternative pipeline routes. I assure you that the EIS will not be issued without the Commission having all of the information necessary to determine the potential impacts associated with constructing and operating the project.

With regard to your suggestion that other pipelines could be used to meet the same demand as the project, the EIS will include a discussion of system alternatives. The Commission will consider your concerns regarding the need for the project as well as potential export of natural gas.

As in any Commission matter, please be assured that we strive to make our review of proposals both accessible and transparent to the public. If I can be of any further assistance in this or any other Commission matter, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Norman C. Bay
Chairman

20150929-0016

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, DC 20426

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

September 25, 2015

The Honorable James W. McConnell
New Hampshire House of Representatives
107 North Main Street
Concord, NH 03301

Dear Representative McConnell:

Thank you for your August 17, 2015, letter regarding Tennessee Gas's proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project (Docket No. PF 14-22-000).

During the pre-filing process, numerous environmental surveys and studies are being performed concurrently by the applicant. Route modifications and realignments are also occurring. As a result, draft resource reports will not be completed before an application is filed with the Commission. The purpose of the pre-filing scoping process is to increase the applicant's and Commission staff's understanding of the issues that should be addressed in the formal application and in the subsequent environmental impact statement (EIS) for the project.

Commission staff is aware of the issues identified in the route alignment in the Town of Richmond. Staff's

review of the project will address the applicant's proposed route and alternatives. The EIS will not be issued before the Commission has all of the information necessary to determine the potential impacts associated with constructing and operating the project.

Pursuant to the Commission's September 3, 2015, Supplemental Notice, the comment period has been extended until October 16, 2015. Commission staff will continue to accept comments on the project even after the end of the formal comment period and these comments will be considered within the EIS.

As in any Commission matter, please be assured that we strive to make our review of proposals both accessible and transparent to the public. If I can be of any further assistance in this or any other Commission matter, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Norman C. Bay
Chairman

20150929-0017

NORTH SHORE COALITION
a local initiative facilitated by METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING ?

September 10, 2015

Norman C. Bay, Chairman
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street NE
Washington, DC 20426

RE: Request for Public Hearing on Docket No. PF 14-22

Dear Chairman Bay:

On behalf of the North Shore Coalition, I am writing to request a public hearing and scoping session be held in the City of Peabody regarding the gas pipeline being proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline, u.c (Docket No. PF 14-22). This letter serves as support for the same request made by Peabody Mayor Edward Bettencourt in his later dated August 27, 2015.

The North Shore Coalition is an organization of eighteen (18) cities and towns on the North Shore of metropolitan Boston facilitated by the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC). The Coalition is a voluntary forum where municipal CEOs exchange information and create solutions to common problems, addressing issues unique to our cities and towns and those that would benefit from a regional perspective. The municipal officials comprising this group represent nearly 400,000 residents from Beverly, Danvers, Essex, Gloucester, Hamilton, Ipswich, Lynn, Manchester-by-the-sea, Marblehead, Middleton, Nahant, Peabody, Rockport, Salem, Saugus, Swampscott, Topsfield, and Wenham.

While the proposed pipeline would not pass through every municipality in our region, we recognize that building infrastructure of this magnitude will have impacts across our region, and indeed across the entire metropolitan region and beyond. Holding at least one public hearing in Peabody as requested by Mayor Bettencourt would afford municipal officials and residents from all of our cities and towns the opportunity to express our opinions on this project. Our residents deserve an opportunity to comment on infrastructure projects such as this that will affect their region not only for months or years, but decades.

Thank you for your consideration of this request. If you or your staff have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Nicholas Downing, MAPC's Government Affairs Specialist at 617-933-0711 or [ndowning@mapc.org](mailto:n-downing@mapc.org).

Sincerely,

Mayor Kimberly Driscoll, Salem
Chair

20150929-0019

Hand written letter, Barbara Ferullo, 50 Stowell Road, New Ipswich, NH 03071: opposing

20150929-0041

Hand written FERC Comment form: Sandy Gates: opposing

20150929-0042

Hand written FERC Comment form: Donna Kenison, 98 Rhododendron Rd, Fitzwilliam, NH 03447: opposing

20150929-0043

Hand written FERC Comment form: Cathleen A. McGurk, 223 West Lake Rd, Fitzwilliam, NH 03447: opposing

20150929-0044

Hand written FERC Comment form: Charles Kenison, 98 Rhododendron Rd, Fitzwilliam, NH 03447: opposing

20150929-0045

Hand written letter, Marilyn Griska, 18 Atlantic Dr, Rindge, NH 03461: opposing

20150929-0046

Hand written letter, Marilyn Griska, 18 Atlantic Dr, Rindge, NH 03461: opposing

20150929-0047

Hand written card, Gabe Toubia, 61 Marblehead Rd, Windham, NH 03087: opposing

20150929-0048

Hand written card, Kim Webster, 77 Simpson Rd, Pelham, NH 03076: opposing

20150929-0049

Hand written card, Marcus Webster, 77 Simpson Rd, Pelham, NH 03076: opposing

20150929-0051

To: Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary - Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

From: Lynn Quade - Property owner of 12 Atlantic Drive, Rindge, NH

Subject: Concerns Surrounding Docket# PFI4-22

Date: September 25, 2015

Dear Ms. Bose,

I am writing to you concerning the Kinder Morgan's proposal to construct a compressed natural gas pipeline through New Hampshire (Docket# PF14-22-000, Northeast Energy Direct Project, "NED"). As a home owner who is directly impacted by this project, my purpose in writing this letter is to first and foremost express my opposition to the project, as well as to highlight concerns surrounding this project. I am extremely concerned about the overall impact on safety, socio-economic status, ecology, and health of not only my own town of Rindge, NH, but also on the state of NH as a whole.

As far as my personal property is concerned, it is one of the properties in Rindge that is most impacted by

this project. If the proposed pipeline is approved, approximately one third of my property could be taken by eminent domain. The property that I retain after the project is complete will most certainly drop in property value as the new industrial corridor will remove the entire buffer of the trees that currently separates my property from the transmission lines. In addition to the change to my backyard, the project will also remove the trees that separate the side of my property from the highway. I also see that there is now a “safety fence” that will be installed along my back yard which will further decrease the property value. In addition to the economic impact to my property, I am extremely concerned about the effect the construction of the pipeline will have on the structural integrity of my well and my homes’ foundation due to potential blasting. My property has a great deal of granite that will need to be disturbed or removed during construction. I am concerned that if the integrity of my well is compromised I will be left with no source water as Rindge does not have a town water source. I am also very concerned that due to the proximity of the pipeline to my well (approximately 25 ft.) that my well could become contaminated. If blasting has to occur during construction, it is possible the structural integrity of my homes’ foundation could be compromised where placement of this pipeline is only 29 ft. from my home. Has anyone studied the economic impact this will have on me? The area is already being impacted economically because area real estate agents have stated homes that are along the proposed route are not selling. What efforts will be undertaken to avoid or mitigate any potential impacts to my well, water supply and water quality? What short-term and long-term water quality monitoring will TOP conduct to ensure my well has not been compromised? What efforts will be undertaken to avoid or mitigate any potential impacts to my homes’ foundation? I am requesting something that addresses these concerns.

On a larger scale, the protection of drinking water is critically important to not only my town but to the state of NH as many of our towns rely solely on well water. If our water were to become contaminated due to a leak in the pipeline it would be detrimental not only to NH residents, but to area businesses as well. I am concerned that should there be a contamination of the aquifers in this area the business I am currently employed at (EMD Millipore Inc.) would have to cease operations as it too has a well that feeds the plant. Any disruptions in operations could be catastrophic, both from an economic standpoint (it currently employs 850+ employees) and from a healthcare standpoint. Because EMD Millipore is a single source supplier for many major drug manufacturers, any supply disruption caused by a contaminated water supply could result in a disruption to many life saving drugs and vaccines. Has Tennessee Gas (TOP) compiled a complete inventory of potential impacts to water supplies and water quality from the proposed NED Project? If not, I request that FERC require such an inventory.

What efforts will be undertaken to avoid or mitigate any potential impacts to water supplies and water quality? What short-term and long-term water quality monitoring will TOP conduct?

Another concern I have is that towns like mine that are along the proposed route are rural in nature and have very limited emergency response resources. Will TOP work with our communities to enhance emergency response capabilities? How will TOP monitor the pipeline for potential safety issues?

Another concern I have is whether there are plans for this natural gas to be exported to other nations. Considering this pipeline is being built and personal property being taken on the premise this gas is needed for New England I ask that the TOP provide a detailed response to this concern, and to commit to using these supplies only in New England. TOP should not be allowed to profit by international sales at the expense of US citizens homes and personal property.

Given the fact that the current proposal traverses primarily through communities where neither residents nor businesses have access to natural gas, I urge FERC to give serious consideration to alternative routes that would place the pipeline closer to those communities that will actually benefit from this gas.

In addition to requiring the Company to address the question/concerns above, I ask that FERC staff look closely at the proposed route and consider all potential viable alternatives. The locations of energy transmission projects must strike a balance between potential benefits in reduced energy costs and potential negative impacts. As a representative of the people, you must work to ensure that the potential negative impacts of

the proposed NED Project don't disproportionately outweigh the benefits, particularly for those of us in NH that are bearing the burden of hosting this project.

Respectfully,

Lynn Quade

20150929-4005

Transcript of Scoping Meeting, September 29, 2015, Rindge, NH, see separate file:

Transcripts of Scoping Meetings at: http://www.Mason-NH.org/FERC_Scoping_Transcripts.pdf

20150929-5008

Dear FERC Commissioners:

Subject: Comment on Docket # PF14-22

I am writing you to voice my concerns in regards to the proposal by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.c. to construct the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline and 90,000 horsepower compressor station in the rural community of Nassau NY.

The construction of a 90,000 horsepower compressor station with three huge Titan 250 turbines will result in the destruction of our community. Noise pollution, light pollution, harmful emissions, ground water contamination and the potential for explosions and fires are among the major concerns I have about the planned compressor station.

- The normal operating sound in close proximity of a single Titan 130 turbine running at less than full capacity is 113 decibels. That's as loud as the loudest rock concert in history. A blowdown is intentional venting to release pressure. This can last up to 2 hours, and at close proximity, can be as loud as a 747 airplane. Half a mile away it would sound like standing near a lawn mower (60- 90 decibels). Three Titan 250 turbines would be much louder.
- Stadium-style lights will illuminate the industrial complex and the night sky. Xx acres of land was recently purchased on Clarks Chapel road in Nassau, NY for the construction of a proposed compressor station.
- Air pollution through intentional venting, leaks, and accidental releases will release 324,000 tons of CO₂, 121 tons of carbon monoxide, 106 tons nitrogen oxide and 26 tons of volatile organic compounds per year per Titan 250 turbine. Between 100 and 3,000 pounds per year each of benzene, toluene, xylene, and formaldehyde per Titan 250 turbine. Emissions can lead to serious health issues for citizens who live close by.
- The potential for groundwater contamination is twofold. Blasting from the construction of a pipeline could jeopardize the local aquafer. It is also well documented that pipelines leak, making groundwater contamination inevitable. The majority of households in Nassau get their water from wells. If the ground water is contaminated it will further reduce the value of our homes and businesses.
- Explosions & Fires at compressor stations are documented throughout the Northeast and the country. The Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Administration (PHMSA) only has 135 inspectors to oversee 2.6 million miles of pipeline. PHMSA or its state partners have inspected only one fifth of that pipeline system since 2006. In the past ten years, gas transmission lines average 117 incidents a year, according to PHMSA. In the past twenty years there have been 41 deaths, 195 injuries, and \$1.6 billion in property damage as a result.

Instead of investing in long term infrastructure for more fossil fuels, we need to consider investing in solar, wind, demand response and energy efficiency alternatives that do not threaten the environment and our public health.

I urge you to refuse to allow the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.c. Project to move forward.

Sincerely,

20150929-5084

Susan Wessels, Rindge, NH.

The home we built in 1994 sits on 3 acres of wooded land in Rindge, NH. Almost the entire 3 acres is within the study zone on Kinder Morgan maps indicating the route of the NED pipeline. I have these questions:

(1) If our well is destroyed by excavation, is KM required to build us a new well? Are we expected to drink and use water from “pigs” the rest of our lives in this home?

(2) Are they required to provide us with a safe source of potable water on our land, will they pay to have a new well dug or would that be at our expense?

(3) How much time do they have to restore a safe source of water (e.g. a new well) on our land?

(4) If they clear all the area within the study zone, except for the house itself, do they have any responsibility to restore the 2 acres of planned gardens we spent years cultivating?

(5) I am a professional photographer and have taken and sold many photos of the gardens surrounding our house. What am I expected to do without this subject matter available throughout spring, summer and fall for my photos?

(6) Whose responsibility is it to restore the land NOT in the actual easement that is destroyed to some aesthetically pleasing state or is that our responsibility? Would this be allowed under the requirements of the pipeline maintenance?

(7) There are many all-terrain vehicles, including snow mobiles, that now use the Eversource ROW in the back of our house for recreational riding. They enter onto the ROW from many different places. If the pipeline is buried above the frost line, this recreational use seems very dangerous inasmuch as a snow mobile or other vehicle could hit a pipeline that becomes exposed due to frost heaves, etc. How would the power line ROW be monitored and its use for recreation be prevented given the danger such use would pose? Is the town responsible? At whose cost?

(8) Who is responsible to keep snow mobiles and other off-road vehicles from using the ROW for recreation?

(9) Who is responsible for policing these ROWs for people who do not obey the law? If it is the town, do the taxpayers have to pay for police to monitor ROWs to make sure they are not breached?

And

(10) With all the destruction and danger this pipeline would bring to our home and our lives over the short and long term, where are we supposed to go to get our peace of mind back?

And these questions about FERC itself:

In a conversation between Mr. Ted Glick and FERC Chairman, Norman Bay, the following was reported by Mr. Ted Glick:

“He told me that he respected what we were doing with the fast and the commitment it showed as far as our beliefs. He said he felt this type of action was a good type of action. However, he went on to say that he really had problems with us disrupting their monthly meetings and asked if we would stop doing that. I responded: how can we do that when there’s no change at FERC as far as permitting gas pipelines and fracking infrastructure, one after the other, with virtually no exceptions.

His response: these are just pipelines. We’re a regulatory agency. Blaming us is like blaming the steel companies that make pipes. It’s the production of the gas that you need to deal with.”

Why does Mr. Bay, et al think there are scoping hearings at all? Are they really just a mechanism through which KM learns of location issues? Is this their only purpose? Is this the only purpose of all the comments? Of the entire FERC public process? That there will be a pipeline, it’s just a question of which town/neighborhood gets it? Is this what the entire process is geared to answer or is KM obliged to justify the entire

project as in “needed,” “in the public good.” etc.? Does FERC understand that while the Gas Act applies, it does not cover every possible pipeline proposed? or does it? Is there a minimum threshold of appropriateness that still must be met? If so, what is that minimum threshold? What about the questions asked by our Reps to which they have not been offered responses? Are those questions, too, moot and/or irrelevant? Does Mr Bay think he and FERC have any responsibility at all for protecting homeowners from the greed of corporations? What, in fact, is FERC charged with “regulating?”

20150929-5088

Alan Shulman, New London, NH.

Dear FERC:

I am writing in response to the news of a public hearing at Franklin Pierce University, which I am unable to attend, regarding the above docket proposed gas pipeline from Pennsylvania and ultimately through New Hampshire. I am opposed to the construction of this proposed pipeline. First, the gas being piped will be produced by fracking, a dangerous practice at best which has been proven harmful to the environment, most notably to ground and drinking water. If we do not provide an outlet for this dangerously extracted gas, chances are the extraction will soon be terminated. Second, I am opposed to pipelines in general because their construction invariably results in leaks and spills despite claims by companies that build them that they are safe and will not disrupt or damage communities through which they pass. Third, at a time when we as a nation should be disinvesting in fossil fuel production and consumption, this pipeline would be counter to the needed effort to move toward renewable energy sources. Fourth, I suspect that most of this fuel will not even benefit the local economies of the states through which it passes nor will it help states adjacent, and that most of this product will be exported, thus putting corporate profits over prudent energy policies and creating markets for a product best left in the ground.

I hope you will reject this pipeline proposal.

Respectfully,

Alan Shulman shulmandesign

20150929-5160

James L Giddings, Greenville, NH.

Many of us whose towns and homes are affected by the plans for the NED pipeline have filed comments calling for the rejection of it, on this docket. It is rumored that an Australia-based corporation named Cardno has been engaged by FERC to categorize, filter and summarize our comments. I would like FERC to respond, telling us if this is true, or if some other contractor is filtering our comments before they reach the Commissioners. I would like to hear exactly how much of the material we, our town governments, etc. have submitted will actually be seen by the Commissioners. While many of our comments may seem redundant, some of them are extremely important human reactions that should be seen individually. FERC should elucidate the role of Cardno and other contractors, assuring us that our comments are not going into some sort of black hole, to be summarized as ignorant, irrelevant ranting. I read that a FERC commissioner said something dismissive to the effect of “It’s only a pipeline” when asked about the devastation this pipeline (and others) will cause in our communities. You might as well have said “It’s only an atomic bomb.” We are infuriated that you seem to see our lives as unimportant and the building of such multi-billion-dollar weapons of mass destruction as this pipeline as routine and unworthy of comment or protest.

20150929-5272

I am writing to urge the FERC to approve the Northeast Energy Direct natural gas pipeline as proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C..

There is clearly a need for additional natural gas capacity throughout Massachusetts. Synapse Energy Economics, Inc. was commissioned by the Massachusetts Department of Energy Resources to utilize current

forecasts of natural gas and electric power under a range of scenarios, taking into consideration environmental, reliability and cost to answer two key questions:

- 1) What is the current demand for and capacity to supply natural gas in Massachusetts?
- 2) If all technologically and economically feasible alternative energy resources are utilized, is any additional natural gas infrastructure needed, and if so, how much?

The final report was released on January 7, 2015. Synapse analyzed the demand for natural gas under eight different scenarios and concluded the state would face a shortfall of between 600 to 800 million cubic feet of gas on a winter day in 2020 when demand for the fuel is at its peak. By 2030, the shortfall could range from 600 million to 900 million cubic feet of gas per day. For comparison purposes, Massachusetts used an average of 1.8 billion cubic feet of gas per day during January 2014.

I expect that this increased demand will persist as Massachusetts continues to convert electric generation facilities from oil and coal to cleaner natural gas. The Salem Harbor Plant which had burned coal and perennially listed as one of the “filthy five” has been taken off line and demolished. A new, state-of-the-art, 674 MW, combined cycle natural gas turbine is currently under construction to replace it. The 604-megawatt Vermont Yankee nuclear plant shut down in December 2014. Brayton Point, the largest coal-fired plant in New England is scheduled to close in 2017. To meet the energy needs of Massachusetts and New England, we will need to replace this electrical generating capacity with new power plants which are expected to be fueled by natural gas. While we have an abundance of natural gas in the United States we currently lack the infrastructure to transmit it to electrical generating plants, businesses and residential users. The Massachusetts Building Trades Council and its affiliated local unions endorse and support increasing the use of renewable energy such as solar, wind, and geothermal but the current technology and capacity is grossly insufficient to meet our current energy needs.

Other indicators also highlight the need for additional natural gas capacity. New England and Massachusetts in particular, have among the highest energy costs in the nation. The Massachusetts Taxpayers Foundation released a report on business costs in Massachusetts in September of 2015. Among the findings was that electricity prices for industrial customers in Massachusetts were the third highest in the nation. This not only indicates a supply problem but an economic problem for our entire region.

Building the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline will increase natural gas capacity necessary to allow existing Massachusetts businesses to expand, encourage new businesses to locate here, and lower residential energy costs, thus freeing up disposable income to be spent in the local economy.

All of these components will generate good jobs in Massachusetts. The pipeline project itself will generate 3,000 union construction jobs for area residents. These are jobs that pay family sustaining wages with top quality health insurance, defined benefit pensions and other benefits. The union workers who will perform this work are the best trained, most highly skilled, most productive and safest workforce available. This is the product of the investment of more than \$33 million per year by Massachusetts’ Building Trades unions in our comprehensive apprenticeship and journeyman upgrade training programs.

The added capacity and reduced energy costs will generate additional jobs in Massachusetts from the companies that expand or locate here. These jobs will cut across various sectors including: manufacturing, high-tech, bio-tech, office, construction and others industries.

The proposed NED pipeline is also the safest, most cost effective, and most environmentally sound method of transporting natural gas. The current method of shipping liquefied natural gas into Boston Harbor is clearly none of the above.

I urge you to approve the Northeast Energy Direct natural gas pipeline project as proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C..

Sincerely,

Francis X. Callahan, Jr.
President

Massachusetts Building Trades Council
35 Highland Avenue
Malden, MA 02145

20150930-0007

{from: The People of Burden Lake and Nassau, NY, 167 page FAX containing petition and signatures}

Stop the proposed gas compressor station in Nassau, NY

Petition by Alea Ashline

To be delivered to Howard A. Zucker, M.D., J.D., DOH Commissioner, Commissioner Marc Gerstman, Commissioner for the NYS Dept. of Environmental Conservation, Keith Goertz, Regional Director for the NYS Dept. of Environmental Conservation, Commissioner Tony Clark, Commissioner for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Commissioner Cheryl A. LaFleur, Commissioner for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and 10 other targets ([click here to see more](#))

We're petitioning the town, county, and state officials to take action to stop any construction of a gas compression station in Rensselaer County.

There are currently 1,866 signatures.

Petition Background

Kinder Morgan is proposing a new high pressure natural gas pipeline from Wright, NY to Dracut, MA. This pipeline will create the risk of chemical leaks and explosions that would contaminate our soil, water, air, damage our properties, and create hazards in our communities. Chemical off-gassing of known carcinogens, neurotoxins, and endocrine disrupters happens at compressor stations and drilling sites, wherever pipelines are leaking. In 2011 the US Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration cited Kinder Morgan for a number of safety violations.

The gas that will go through this pipeline will be extracted using hydraulic fracturing (commonly known as fracking) which is irrefutably linked to health problems because of the chemicals involved and the contamination to underground water supplies. In terms of natural gas and pollution, methane leaks from fracking, compressor stations, and transmission lines create more pollution than coal or oil.

We are specifically concerned about the proposed gas compressor station that would be located in the Town of Nassau, NY. It would cover 40 acres and add light and noise pollution comparable to a commercial jet taking off all hours of the day and night.

Although Kinder Morgan has stated this pipeline is necessary to keep prices down and provide a bridge between older fossil fuels and future renewables, mounting evidence strongly suggests this is not true. Both the Kinder Morgan website and their project pre-application letter state that some of the gas from this pipeline will be exported. Exporting can raise our fuel prices, as was observed in winter 2014 when propane was sold overseas and U.S prices soared.

We the undersigned citizens call upon your leadership to enact legislation and take such necessary actions to stop the Northeast Energy Direct Project (NED) because:

1. We do not feel that constituent concerns raised in regard to the NED are being answered honestly, fully, and accurately.
2. The profits of Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company LLC are taking precedence over the immediate and long-term safety, security, and well-being of people living along the proposed pipeline route in the following ways:
 - a. There is no benefit of the project to New Yorkers or New York State.
 - b. We assume health and safety risks so the NED can generate profits for their companies.
 - c. The federal agency responsible for pipeline safety has inadequate resources to do its job. A report

from the Transportation Department's Office of the Inspector General indicates "The Federal Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, or PHMSA, isn't ensuring key state inspectors are properly trained, inspections are being conducted frequently enough and inspections target the most risky pipelines".

d. Our property rights will be taken by eminent domain so that the companies can profit while we remain responsible for property tax payments.

e. Our public safety officers will be unable to adequately respond to pipeline explosions.

f. Our property values are likely to drastically fall.

g. Our areas economic viability is likely to drastically suffer.

h. We will not consume the gas, most of which is likely to be exported for the company's profit, which in turn will drive up the cost of gas for us.

3. The NED will transmit up to 2.2 billion cubic feet of fracked gas daily, through a 30" pipeline, at a pressure of up to 1,460 pounds per square inch, and has the potential to leak toxins, carcinogens, and other hazardous chemicals that may contaminate our water wells, air, and soil. These include:

a. Methane – a greenhouse gas that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has found contributes to global warming. Affected Organ Systems: Dermal, Pulmonary, and Cardiovascular.

b. Benzene – a colorless, sweet smelling, highly flammable chemical. It evaporates into the air very quickly and floats on top of water. Affected Organ Systems: Hematological, Immunological, and Neurological.

c. Toluene – a clear, colorless liquid with a distinctive smell. It is used in making paints, paint thinners, fingernail polish, lacquers, adhesives, and rubber. Affected Organ Systems: Cardiovascular and Neurological.

d. Sulfur Dioxide – a colorless gas with a pungent odor. It is a liquid when under pressure and dissolves in water very easily. Affected Organ Systems: Immunological and Respiratory.

e. Formaldehyde – a colorless flammable gas that has a distinct, pungent smell. It is used in the production of fertilizer, paper, plywood and urea-formaldehyde resins. Affected Organ Systems: Dermal, Gastrointestinal, Immunological, and Respiratory.

f. Nitrous Oxide – a colorless, non-flammable gas with a slightly sweet odor and taste. Commonly used in surgery or dentistry for its anesthetic and analgesic effects. Affected Organ Systems: Pulmonary and Cardiovascular.

4. Local elected officials of the Rensselaer County Legislature oppose the project, opposing use of eminent domain and requesting intervention by federal officials.

Therefore, we the undersigned, realizing the risks and costs to our families, our property values, our safety, our drinking water, our clean air, our roads, and the potential costs and stresses to our towns that will be created by the Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Project – which will be using fracked shale gas – do hereby state that it is our desire for our federal, state, county, and town leaders to immediately and permanently declare on our behalf that no gas compressor stations or new or additional high pressure gas pipelines of any kind shall be placed within the boundaries of our towns. Although NYS has banned fracking, allowing the pipeline and compressor stations to be built will result in the same amount of damage the legislation was designed to prevent.

{full list of signatories can be viewed at <http://petitions.moveon.org/sign/stop-proposed-gas-compressor>}

20150930-0017

Docket PF14-22

September 25, 2015

Tyler Seppala
37 Delton Drive
Rindge, NH 03461

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC
1615 Suffield Street
Agawam, MA 01001

Dear Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company/Kinder Morgan,

We are respectfully asking that the proposed route be shifted from where it's currently proposed. We have already asked on a couple of occasions only to be completely ignored each time. I constantly see on 1V and other media sources how you claim this is a transparent process and how you listen to landowner concerns. We haven't experienced anything transparent about this process and have been ignored time and time again which is pretty aggravating. I know it makes for good sound bites but sadly it's not the truth. You have sent trespassing surveyors on our property on more than one occasion and how someone could trust a company that continually treats landowners like this is baffling. We know landowners that have the pipe proposed to come right through their properties that have not received one piece of correspondence from your company. The current route has devastating consequences to the affected property owners. I have attached 3 separate maps. These are suggestions on moving the current pipeline location in the areas of Abel Road, Delton Drive and SInridge Road in Rindge, NH. The maps are located in Cheshire County NH and the route suggestions takes place between MP 20.2 & MP 22.2. I have included Option # 1 (Pink Colored), Option # 2 (Green Colored) & Option # 3 (Red Colored) which shows the suggested pipe location in the select colors listed. Option # 1 would have the least impact on homes, wells (blasting), septic systems etc. The current route through these areas directly affects 10 homes compared to the 2 homes on the opposite side of the utility corridors. Moving the pipe to where it directly affects the least amount of people should be the best option which is why the suggested option route changes should be considered.

We have a unique situation in our area of Rindge in which we have two sets of utility corridors. There is approx. 170'-180' of distance in between the two sets of lines leaving a large area which the pipeline could be sited instead of having a construction zone that goes through our yards and in one case even having an easement through an entire side yard on one of these properties. It looks like you are trying to site the pipe the closest you could to the homes in this area. Not only that your current route is sited though the largest and widest area of the Tarbell Brook and wetland complex. The wetland serves as a Stratified Drift Aquifer and also has additional value as a floodplain and why the pipeline would even be allowed to go through it is beyond me. To site a pipe through an area that provides drinking water to many homes should be avoided at all costs and I doubt that any plans to avoid it have even been discussed amongst your company. The maps submitted to FERC as part of the pre-filing stage are outdated and do not even show my home or my neighbors. It incorrectly has our road listed as Whicker

Drive when it's actually Delton Drive. It hasn't been Whicker drive in over 8 years. I'm not going to list all of the concerns in this letter as we have previously listed them in prior letters. Your current route does cut our private road off with no secondary mean of egress in the case of emergency. We also will not be allowing any of the tractor trailers and construction vehicles to use our cul-de-sac to loop around as it's a private road and will not be for your use. This pipe and the construction equipment will destroy our soon to be paved road which will involve another host of issues and legalities.

This project has turned our lives upside down and has caused great mental anguish and stress. This project shouldn't even be allowed to go through as it serves no true benefit to NH or the residents whose land you are trying to steal. We know the sound bites about potential gas in our towns in the future are empty promises to justify coming from MA, through NH and back down into Massachusetts. From clear cutting every tree we own behind our homes which hurts the maple syrup business our road is INVOLVED in, construction vehicles driving over our lawns, construction vehicles driving over our septic systems and foundation drainage the list of destruction goes on and on. Three quarters of our properties are already under easement but

you want to take the last bit and confine us to our lawns. The usability of our properties will become useless. In our case you actually have a chance to co-locate the pipe in the existing utility corridor or using a portion of the opposite side instead of slashing a whole new corridor right through our yards. Please make one of these route adjustments as none of us will be signing any right of way agreements if this destructive project that has no benefit to us gets approved per the current the plan.

Sincerely,

Tyler Seppala

Cc: Maggie Hassan (NH Governor)
Jeanne Shaheen (NH US Senator)
Kelly Ayotte (NH US Senator)
Ann Kuster (US Rep 2nd District)

{6 pages of maps omitted}

20150930-0018

Jennie L. Hill
32 Cross Road
Richmond, NH 03470

September 24, 2015

Docket 1PF14-22
(Northeast Energy Direct)

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A
Washington DC 20426

Dear Secretary Bose,

First, I would like to thank you for extending the Public Comment period. Kinder Morgan' proposed route has been a moving target. It wasn't until August that the route went from being several miles away, to going through my neighbors' ards. I had submitted comments earlier in which I estimated additional miles and cost of construction to route the NED pipeline through New Hampshire. (20150828-0024). I have had more time to look into this (thank you again for the extension) and see that the 30" Market Path line would increase the total length by about 10 miles; the 12" Fitchburg Lateral would result in an additional 7 or 8 miles construction. This still adds up to a significant sum, over \$75 million by some estimating formulae. And it still begs the question: What benefit for Kinder Morgan dictates that additional expenditure and at what cost to the property owners and the environment, above and beyond the shorter route directly through Massachusetts?

Sincerely,

Jennie L Hill

Energy Future Holdings

September 22, 2015

The chapter 11 process requires the distribution of certain documents and notices that provide information about the restructuring of Energy Future Holdings'nd certain of its subsidiaries (together with such subsidiaries that are subsidiaries in these chapter 11 proceedings, "EFH").

Enclosed with this letter is one such notice informing you that the court has scheduled a hearing to consider confirmation of EFH's plan of reorganization (as may be amended or modified from time to time, the "Plan") for November 3, 2015, at 11a.m. Eastern. As stated in the notice enclosed with this letter, any objections to EFH's Plan must be filed and served by October 23, 2015, at 4 p.m. Eastern.

Before the hearing to consider confirmation of the Plan, EFH will solicit creditors' support for the plan of reorganization. If you are entitled to vote, you will receive an additional mailing with a copy of EFH's disclosure statement and Plan, as well as instructions for voting.

If you have any questions, please call the EFH's restructuring hotline at 877-276-7311 or email ethvoteepiqsy@stems.com.

IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

In re:

ENERGY FUTURE HOLDINGS CORP., et
al., Debtors.

Chapter 11

Case No. 14-10979(CSS)

(Jointly Administered)

NOTICE OF HEARING TO CONSIDER
CONFIRMATION OF THE CHAPTER 11 PLAN FILED BY THE
DEBTORS AND RELATED VOTING AND OBJECTION DEADLINES

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT, on September 22, 2015, the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware (the "Court") entered an order [D.I. 6131] (the "Disclosure Statement Order"): (a) authorizing Energy Future Holdings Corp. and its affiliated debtors and debtors in possession (collectively, the "Debtors") to solicit acceptances for the Fifth Amended Joint Plan of Reorganization of Energy Future Holdings Corp., et al., Pursuant to Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code [D.I.6122] (as may be modified, amended or supplemented from time to time, the "Plan"); (b) approving the Disclosure Statement for the Fifth Amended Joint Plan of Reorganization of Energy Future Holdings Corp., et al., Pursuant to Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code, including all exhibits and schedules thereto [D.I. 6124] (as may be modified, amended or supplemented from time to time, the "Disclosure Statement") as containing "adequate information" pursuant to section 1125 of the Bankruptcy Code; (c) approving the solicitation materials and documents to be included in the solicitation packages; and (d) approving procedures for soliciting, receiving and tabulating votes on the Plan and for filing objections to the Plan.

PLEASE TAKE FURTHER NOTICE THAT, on August 27, 2015, the Court entered an Amended Order (A) Revising Certain Hearing Dates and Deadlines, and (B) Establishing Certain Protocols in Connection with the Confirmation of Debtors' Plan of Reorganization [D.I.5771] revising that order entered by the Court on July 2, 2015 [D.I. 4916] and (a) scheduling dates and deadlines in connection with the approval of the Disclosure Statement and the confirmation of the Plan and (b) establishing certain protocols in connection with those

1 The last four digits of Energy Future Holdings Corp.'s tax identification number are 8810. The location of the debtors' service address is 1601 Bryan Street, Dallas, Texas 75201. Due to the large number of debtors in these chapter 11 cases, which are being jointly administered, a complete list of the debtors and the last four digits of their federal tax identification numbers is not provided herein. A complete list of such information may be obtained on the website of the debtors' claims and noticing agent at <http://www.eihcaseinfo.com>.

2 Capitalized terms not otherwise defined herein shall have the same meanings set forth in the Plan

KIRKLAND dt ELLIS LLP

Attn: Edward O. Sassower, P.C.

Attn: Stephen E. Hessler, Esq.

Attn: Brian E. Schartz, Esq.

601 Lexington Avenue

New York, NY 10022
Attn: James H.M. Sprayregen, P.C.
Attn: Merc Kieselstein, P.C.
Attn: Chad J. Husnick, Esq.
Attn: Steven N. Serajeddini, Esq.
300 North LaSalle
Chicago, IL 60654
RICHARDSr LAYTON R FINGER, P.A.
Atm: Mark D. Collins, Esq.
Attn: Daniel J. Depranceschi, Esq.
Attn: Jason M. Madmn, fsq.
920 North King Street
Wilmington, DE 19801
Cu-Cooosetnr the Jtebtsts
PROSKAUKR ROSE LLP.
Ann: Jeff J. Marwil, Esq.
Atm: Mark K Thomas, Esq.
Attn: Peter J. Young. Esq.
Three First National Plaza
70 W. Madison ST STE 3800
Chicago, IL 60602
O'KELLY, KRNST dr BIKLLI LLP
Attn: David M. Klauder, Esq.
Attn: Shannon Dougherty, Esq.
901 N Market St STE 100
Wilmington, DE 19801
C aConnset to Energy Fstnrr Holdings Coryx
MUNGKR, TOLLKS 4 OLSON LLP
Attn: Thomas B. Walper, Esq.
Attn: Todd J Rosen, Esq.
Attn: Seth Goldman, Esq.
Attn: John W. Spiegel, Esq.
355 S. Grand Ave 35th FL
Los Angeles, CA 90071
MCKLROV,DKUTSCH,MUVANKY,R
CARPENTER,LLP
Attn: Davtd P. Pnmack, Esq.
300 Delaware Ste 770
Wflmingmn. DE 19801
Co-Connect to the TCEH Debtors
CRAVATH, SWAIN, R MOORE LLP
Attn; Michael A Paskin, Esq.
Worldwide Plaza
825 Fighth Ave
New York. NY 10019-7475
STEVENS tk LEE PC
Attn: Joseph H. Hutson Jr, Esq.
1105 N. Market St STE 700
Wilmington, DE 19801
JKNNKR dt BLOCK LLP

Attn: Richard Levin Esq.
919 Third Ave
New York, NY 10022-3908
Co-Counsel to Energy Fntnm Intetssdiare Heldng Company LLC
THK OFFICE OF THE U!qITKD STATES TRUSTEE FOR THK DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

Attn: Richard L. Schepacarter, Esq.

Attn: Andrea B. Schwartz, Esq.

844 King Street, Suite 2207

Lockbox 35

Wilmington, DE 19801

RI.FI

Dated: September 22, 2015

Wilmington, Delaware Is/ Jason M. Madron

RICHARDS, LAYTON & FINGER, P.A.

Mark D. Collins (No. 2981)

Daniel J. DeFranceschi (No. 2732)

Jason M. Madron (No. 4431)

920 North King Street

Wilmington, Delaware 19801

Email: collinsirlf.com

defranceschiirlf.com

madronlrlf.com

-and-

KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP

KIRKLAND & ELLIS INTERNATIONAL LLP

Edward O. Sassower, P.C. (admitted pro hac vice)

Stephen E. Hessler (admitted pro hac vice)

Brian E. Schartz (admitted pro hac vice)

601 Lexington Avenue

New York, New York 10022-4611

Email: edward.sassowerkirkland.com

stephen.hesslerkirkland.com

brian.schartzkirkland.com

-and-

James H.M. Sprayregen, P.C. (admitted pro hac vice)

Mare Kieselstein, P.C. (admitted pro hac vice)

Chad J. Husnick (admitted pro hac vice)

Steven N. Serajeddini (admitted pro hac vice)

300 North LaSalle

Chicago, Illinois 60654

Email: james.sprayregenkirkland.com

mare.kieselsteinkirkland.com

chad.husnickkirkland.com

steven.serajeddini@kirkland.com

Co-Counsel to the Debtors and Debtors in Possession

20150930-0023

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
MASSACHUSETTS SENATE
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

SENATOR STAN ROSENBERG
PRESIDENT
Hampshire, Franklin and Worcester District
September 30, 2015

STATE HOUSE, ROOM 332
BOSTON, MA 02133-1053
Tel (617) 722-1500
FAX (617) 248-3840

Commissioner Cheryl A. LaFleur
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, DC 20426
(202) 502-8000

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., Docket No. PF 14-22-000
Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Chairman Bay:

Thank you for meeting with me to discuss the myriad concerns raised by many in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts who are impacted by the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company/Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline project Docket No. PF 14-22-000. Although the NED project is in the pre-filing stage, people throughout the Commonwealth are deeply engaged in the analysis and comment process. And, while I understand that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) evaluates projects such as NED pursuant to its statutory obligation and established regulatory requirements, it is my fervent hope that as part of the evaluation process you will give serious consideration to the concerns and objections raised by those in Massachusetts and other states along the proposed route who will have to live with the effects of this project for many decades if it is approved.

The purpose of my visit is threefold: 1) to present you with a copy of the testimony from the September 10th Greenfield, Massachusetts comment session; 2) to summarize the comments from the perspective of people on the ground; and 3) to gain greater understanding of FERC's decision-making process and to discuss a decision-making framework from the point of view of those constituents and many state legislators.

COMMENT SESSION, SEPTEMBER 10, 2015

On September 10, 2015, over 250 people attended a comment session in Greenfield, Massachusetts that was organized to provide additional information and testimony to FERC regarding the proposed NED project. The format of the comment session was similar to the previous scoping session held by FERC staff in both the format and subject matter. I requested that the comments address the same issues as a FERC environmental impact scoping session. Of those 250 people, 73 people testified orally over a four-hour time period and many submitted written testimony as well. The package presented to you today includes a transcript of both the oral and written testimony at the Greenfield session. Nearly everyone who testified, with very few exceptions, objects to the proposed NED project, arguing that it is not in the public interest and requests that FERC deny issuance of a certificate of public convenience and necessity when officially requested or withhold issuance until such time as Kinder Morgan and the NED project addresses the identified concerns and problems.

In general, the comments address issues regarding the impact on water resources, wetlands, wildlife, air quality, cultural resources, land use, socioeconomics and quality of life, public safety, alternatives to the project and to fossil fuels, and the size and scope of the project relative to the current and projected need for gas in the region. Although the detailed comments on these matters are included in the attached transcript, this letter discusses several key points that were identified by many of the commenters.

COMMENTS AND CONCERNS

ENVIRONMENTAL

Many commenters are concerned about the deleterious and harmful environmental effects of the pipeline and object to the project in its entirety due to the impact of project on the lands and waterways along the

selected route. Noting the abundance of groundwater - wells, rivers, fractured bedrock aquifers - some opponents request that FERC require a detailed hydro-geologic survey of the public and private wells along the entire route to adequately evaluate the potential impacts. Many are also concerned about the effect of horizontal drilling as method to install the pipeline during the construction phase. Others expressed concern about the effect of the toxic chemicals that would be emitted by the pipeline components and that would pollute surrounding properties, as well as the harmful health effects of such emissions on people who live near a pipeline. There is also concern that the pipeline would cross some of the most pristine land in western Massachusetts and in addition to the negative environmental impact, would have a harmful economic effect on the surrounding communities by virtue of its existence. And, they are also concerned that the pipeline would take protected conservation land by private eminent domain.

NEED AND ALTERNATIVES, COST

Many commenters question the need for the pipeline and argue that a pipeline of this size and scope is inconsistent with efforts to reduce our dependence on fossil fuels and increase the amount of clean and renewable energy in the system. And, most people commented that, as proposed, the project will be overbuilt and that the true undisclosed objective of Kinder Morgan is to export the pipeline gas into world markets. They are

also concerned that ratepayers will be required to pay for this pipeline for decades to come, regardless of whether there is any direct local benefit and even if the pipeline becomes uneconomic in the future.

PUBLIC SAFETY

Many municipal officials were troubled by the public safety aspects of the pipeline and by the fact that the size of the project is substantially larger than the identified need for gas in the region. In addition to the pipes, many feel that the compressors and blow off valves present a clear and present danger to people and property proximate to the sites.

DECISIONMAKING PARADIGM

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts is in the process of transitioning from a fossil fuel based energy framework to a new energy paradigm that reduces our dependence on legacy fuels and incorporates 'cleaner and renewable sources of energy. Nearly a decade ago, we established aggressive and groundbreaking emission reduction targets pursuant to the state Global Warming Solutions Act and the Green Communities Act, and we are well on our way to meeting those benchmarks. The legislative and regulatory framework we established to guide the transition recognized the need to assist the development of clean and renewable energy technology, energy efficiency and conservation, smart grid and distributed technology and demand reduction by changing the market structure for energy supply and by establishing financial incentives and mechanisms to encourage clean and renewable energy to be competitive with fossil fuels. The Massachusetts Senate, House of Representatives and Governor are in the process of examining that legislative framework, and we anticipate there will be new legislation this session that we hope will speed up development of new green energy market entrants and new technology solutions and expanded energy conservation efforts.

Over the past two winters, Massachusetts experienced both supply shortages and cost increases that had a significant impact on ratepayers throughout the Commonwealth. And, while we will make every effort to address cost issues, we are also concerned about capacity and reliability of in the system both today and into the future. To date, we have seen conflicting studies about the New England gas market and whether the system needs new pipelines or whether the winter needs can be addressed through other means, such as LNG. The Attorney General of the Commonwealth is currently conducting a regional reliability study, which we anticipate will respond to the question of how much supply and infrastructure is needed through 2030.

If approved, the NED project will be a huge intrusion for a long time regardless of whether we ultimately need the pipeline and use the gas, creating the potential for stranded costs in the future that will be borne by ratepayers. And, in addition to the NED project, there are other pipeline, transmission and hydroelectric projects either proposed or under consideration and the proponents of each of these projects assert that they will address the problem of constrained resources in the New England Markets. And, in my district, which is

served by The Berkshire Gas Company, even if the NED project is approved, it does not address the current economic distress faced by gas customers due to a moratorium imposed by the Company on adding new customers or expansion for existing customers.

As FERC moves forward in evaluating the NED project, it will be crucial to consider the plan within the overall context of what is happening in the New England region and take into account our substantial efforts to address cost, capacity and reliability while moving aggressively to meet the established and anticipated climate reduction targets. It is important to make a decision that is fair, right and reasonable and in the public interest as we transition to a new energy future. Massachusetts now leads the nation in energy efficiency, and is among the top five states in overall solar energy production. Furthermore, our green energy industry is one of the fastest growing sectors of our economy. These are just a few examples of the progress we have made, progress that has helped make Massachusetts a nationally-recognized pioneer in addressing climate change.

On behalf of those of us who will be substantially and specifically affected by this project for decades to come, I request that as part of your review, you consider this project within the context of the overall regional needs and alternatives; consider all other peak demand solutions; consider state-level priorities on renewable energy and conservation and their ability to meet both our peak and long term needs in the coming years; consider all proposed pipeline proposals and all proposed energy infrastructure concurrently; consider long term demand in Massachusetts and New England only, not potential exports and that you consider infrastructure improvements and pipeline integrity, including fixing leaks across the distribution system before allowing a project of the size and scope of NED to be built I would also request that the FERC process be extended to accommodate each of these considerations and that you provide time for the public to respond as new information becomes available. Finally, consistent with the FERC pipeline review process, I request that FERC refrain from issuing a certificate for the NED pipeline until such time as the potential adverse consequences have been adequately addressed.

Thank you again for meeting with me on this important matter. I stand ready to provide any additional information and assistance that I can as the process moves forward.

Sincerely,

STAN ROSENBERG

President of the Senate

Hampshire, Franklin and Worcester District

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
MASSACHUSETTS SENATE
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

SENATOR STAN ROSENBERG

PRESIDENT

Hampshire, Franklin and Worcester District

September 30, 2015

STATE HOUSE, ROOM 332

BOSTON, MA 02133-1053

Tel (617) 722-1500

FAX (617) 248-3840

REQUESTS FOR CONSIDERATION BY FERC PRIOR TO CERTIFICATE DECISION

1. Consider pending studies regarding long term, regional demand for gas, including the Regional Electric Reliability Options Study being done by Massachusetts Attorney General Maura Healey which will be released at the end of October 2015.
2. Consider all other peak demand solutions, including transported and stored LNG.
3. Consider state-level priorities on renewable energy.
4. Consider all regional pipeline proposals concurrently and in the context of long term demand in Massa-

achusetts and New England only, not as potential export capability.

S. Consider all regional energy infrastructure proposals concurrently and in context of need, cost and consistency with state-level priorities on environment and renewable energy and innovation in areas such as grid modernization and energy storage.

6. Consider cohesive federal review of new energy projects proposed in New England.

7. Consider infrastructure improvements and pipeline integrity first, including requiring gas leak fixes across the distribution system.

8. Consistent with the FERC pipeline review process, FERC should refrain from authorizing the construction of the Kinder Morgan NED pipeline until such time as the potential adverse consequences have been adequately addressed.

9. Prior to making the final decision, ensure adequate time for the public to respond as new information is made available.

10. Require, and consider the results of, comprehensive studies relating to potential hydrological and geological impacts, as well as those on culturally sensitive sites, including those of concern to Native Americans.

11. Consider the impact on protected lands purchased with federal and state funds.

20150930-5011

Starrs, Sea Girt, NJ.

Please reconsider your plans for the pipeline through the Worcester property. This land is pristine and is providing income for the resident. The well water, which supplies this home, if contaminated would be deadly. We all know what happens when large corporations raped the land... You win, we lose.

20150930-5071

Kathleen Gauvin, New Ipswich, NH.

FERC SCOPING STATEMENTS Docket PF14-22 Northeast Energy Direct

9/29/2015 Rindge Scoping Session

My name is Kathleen Gauvin. I live in New Ipswich, NH.

To the FERC Commissioners, you should be here listening to our voices, you should be here seeing our faces. We are the next sacrificial lambs that will be offered up, all in the name of big corporations and their profit making schemes. It is time that you take notice! When does the issue of what is morally right supersede the issue of passively permitting these contaminating monsters that are ravaging through our country like a cancer in its final stage?

When will you consider the people?

“We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.”

Where in this process does FERC consider We the People? or In order to form a more perfect Union? or Promote the general welfare? or Secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity?

As I read the research into the disastrous effects of a compressor station's emissions in Minisink, NY, I knew that WE THE PEOPLE was not a consideration in the permitting process. Minisink is a difficult article to read; we are now potentially the next Minisink populace. Minisink is a town inhabited by people just like us, who were not given the justice that they deserved, their general welfare was not protected, and most certainly, the blessings of liberty were not preserved for themselves and their posterity.

When the permitting of the Minisink, NY pipeline and compressor station was discussed by the FERC Com-

missioners in 2012, two Commissioners dissented. These Commissioners expressed similar opinions noting that the construction of the Wagoner Alternative would provide numerous benefits beyond those provided by the Minisink proposal with significantly fewer emissions, thus reducing the effects on the local air quality. The other three Commissioners voted in favor and the permit was granted. The Minisink, NY residents living near the compressor station are now plagued with numerous health ailments and research shows that they are the direct result of the emissions.

So to you, the FERC Commissioners I ask, “Will you pay attention to the dissenters’ concerns in your midst? Will you look at less harmful alternative routes? Will you make a morally right decision?”

20150930-5072

TOWN OF MERRIMACK, NH

6 BABOOSIC LAKE ROAD 8 MERRIMACK, NH 03054 • WWW.MERRIMACKNH.GOV

September 28, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street NE, Room IA
Washington, DC 20426

RE: Docket No. PFI4-22-000- Additional Scoping Comments from the Town of Merrimack specific to a Meter Station sited in the Town

Dear Secretary Bose,

The Town of Merrimack (Town) has been identified as the likely site for a new meter station on the North-east Energy Direct (NED) pipeline route. The potential for locating this facility in our town raises many questions and we respectfully request that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) ensure that all potential impacts of the proposed meter station be thoroughly evaluated and addressed in the Commission’s Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

Tennessee Gas Pipeline’s (TGP) June, 2015 Draft Resource Report 9, Air and Noise Quality, leaves many questions unanswered, most importantly the type of equipment to be installed at the West Nashua meter station (Section 9.2.3.24). When this information becomes available, the Town may have additional questions. Based on the information provided to date, we request that the Commission require TGP to address the following.

NOISE IMPACTS

1. Identify all equipment, operations, and procedures, both ongoing and occasional, that may produce noise audible outside of the meter station building and the maximum noise level that may be emitted individually or cumulatively based on normal and any foreseeable abnormal or emergency operations.
2. Identify all noise-sensitive areas within a one-mile radius of the proposed meter station where a quiet setting is a reasonably expected attribute, including, but not limited to residential, educational, health, and religious structures and sites, and parks, recreational areas (including areas with wilderness characteristics), wildlife refuges, and cultural and historical sites.
3. Conduct pre-construction noise surveys to accurately identify baseline noise. These surveys should be conducted over a period of weeks during the winter months, when seasonal noise is not introduced as a factor influencing background noise levels. All areas identified under item #2 above must be included in the study.
4. Include in the noise impact study data specific to Anheuser-Busch (INBEV), specifically to their horse and other livestock housed near the proposed meter station site.
5. Specifically address noise impact study data with regard to wildlife in and adjacent to the Merrimack

River corridor.

6. Using the data compiled, provide a detailed noise assessment outlining how noise disturbances will be addressed.
7. Conduct after-construction noise surveys within one month of the in-service date to assure compliance with all noise regulations and continue surveys on an ongoing basis, including during winter months.
8. Install additional engineering controls and/or noise mitigation as needed after construction to insure that residents and businesses are not negatively impacted.
9. Include in the cost analysis the reduction in property value adjacent to the meter station due to noise and other factors.

The town is also concerned about air and water quality issues related to leaks. In a written response to questions from the Town, TGP stated that:

“All compressor and meter station [sic] along the pipeline routes are monitored from the 24-hour control center], .. J If a leak is detected that does not represent a safety concern and is classified as a non-hazardous leak an appropriate repair plan would be developed. An example of a non-hazardous leak that would not require a system shut down could be a valve packing that can be tightened to stop the leak. “

TGP’s statement that leaks may happen and may be allowed to continue while a repair plan is developed is unacceptable given that the proposed site is located in close proximity to the Merrimack River as well as numerous residences, schools, medical facilities, and businesses. The Town respectfully requests that the Commission require as part of the EIS process that TGP set forth specific proposals for evaluation of the air, water, and soil surrounding the proposed meter station before, during and after construction and during the operational life of the station.

Specifically, the Town requests that TGP:

1. Quantify in detail all emissions that could be produced by the proposed facility including all emissions from reasonably anticipated future leaks of the system, and intentional and unintentional venting of natural gas.
2. Quantify the effects to human health and welfare in terms of number of people exposed to the emissions, and the number of people who would develop adverse health effects from the exposure. Identify all potential adverse health effects.
3. Quantify the effects to human health and welfare to sensitive populations, including, but not limited to: children; people with lung disease, such as asthma, emphysema, or chronic bronchitis; and older adults.
4. Quantify the indirect costs associated with the effects to human health and welfare, including health care costs, insurance cost, loss of wages, unemployment insurance, and reduction in productivity.
5. Include a separate evaluation of all of the above with regard to domestic animals and livestock, including but not limited to the Anheuser-Busch (INBEV) Clydesdales, pets, and wildlife.
6. Detail compliance with the National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) and the New Source Performance Standards.
7. Detail and evaluate all emission control alternatives for the proposed facility.
8. Include specific health-based and epidemiological criteria to determine the significance to air quality.
9. Describe reductions-by-design, emission controls, emission offsets, and other mitigation that would be implemented to reduce air quality impacts.

The Town also believes that locating a meter station in close proximity to the Merrimack River and other conservation lands within the Town presents unique concerns which require additional studies, including but not limited to:

1. Impact of all noise and emissions on aquatic life, including impacts during spawning and all lifecycle stages.
2. Identification of all federally listed essential fish habitat (EFH) that potentially occurs in the vicinity of the project. Provide information on all EFH, as identified by the pertinent Federal fishery management plans, which may be adversely affected by the project.
3. Provision for site-specific mitigation measures to minimize impacts on fisheries, wildlife, and vegetation including data on impacts on amphibians.
4. Production of a stormwater management plan that shows how the Merrimack River and all surrounding areas will be potentially impacted during construction and operation of the facility, and methods that will be used to minimize that impact.
5. Include copies of correspondence containing recommendations from appropriate Federal and state fish and wildlife agencies to avoid or limit impact on wildlife, fisheries, and vegetation, and the applicant's response to the recommendations.

The Town also has several concerns for the design, operation, and ongoing maintenance of the facility, including but not limited to:

1. Detailed analysis of the construction and maintenance of the meter station building, including details on consideration for visual impact on surrounding properties.
2. Detailed analysis of lighting and the impact of light on the surrounding area.
3. Detailed analysis of emergency planning and response plans.
4. Detailed analysis of safety measures, such as installation of a fast-acting emergency shutdown valve upstream to cut the station off in the case of a leak, and a check valve downstream to prevent back-flow of gas during a leak.
5. Provision of a wetlands survey for the site and all surrounding areas.
6. Provision of a comprehensive soils survey.
7. Detailed analysis of impacts to cultural and archaeological resources.
8. Impacts to endangered and/or threatened species.
9. Detailed analysis of the construction and maintenance of the fence surrounding the facility, including visual impact on surrounding properties.
10. Detailed analysis of the access road, including how it will be maintained (e.g., plowing in winter, unauthorized access) and gated. Will local officials have the keys to the gate?
 - o Specific information on the use of ice melt chemicals and ice and snow removal best management practices on access roads and parking areas.
11. Detailed analysis of the impact of temperature on the pipeline and the meter station specific to New Hampshire, such as extremes of temperature, expected maximum depth of frost, impact of frost heaves on all equipment, the access road, the pipeline, the meter station, case studies of pipelines and meter stations in a similar topography and climate.
12. Specific information on the use of non-mechanical means of vegetation control (e.g., chemical defoliant and herbicides), around the equipment and meter station including responsibility for monitoring for chemical use and corrective action that will be taken if agreements with property owners are not adhered to.
13. Specific information about all substances to be stored at the facility, such as mercaptan.

We appreciate the Commission's assistance with obtaining from TGP information regarding these anticipated impacts to the Town.

Thank you.

Eileen Cabanel
Town Manager
Merrimack, NH

cc: Merrimack Town Council

Maggie Hassan, Governor of New Hampshire
Joseph Foster, Attorney General of New Hampshire
Shawn Jasper, Speaker of the New Hampshire House of Representatives
Chuck Morse, President of the New Hampshire State Senate
Kelly Ayotte, U. S. Senator
Jeanne Shaheen, U. S. Senator
Frank Guinta, U. S. House of Representatives
Ann McLane Kuster, U. S. House of Representatives
David K. Wheeler, Executive Council
Gary Daniels, New Hampshire State Senate
John L. Balcom, New Hampshire House of Representatives
Richard W. Barry, New Hampshire House of Representatives
Chris Christensen, New Hampshire House of Representatives
Richard W. Hinch, New Hampshire House of Representatives
Josh Moore, New Hampshire House of Representatives
Jeanine M. Notter, New Hampshire House of Representatives
Anthony J. Pellegrino, New Hampshire House of Representatives
Phillip N. Straight, New Hampshire House of Representatives
Allen Fore, Kinder Morgan

20150930-5105

Kimberly Galipeau, Hollis, NH.
A Resolution by the Board of Selectmen
Regarding the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's
Northeast Energy Direct Project

Whereas, the Voters at the September 20, 2014 Special Town Meeting ("the Meeting") passed Warrant Articles 1 through 14; and

Whereas, through the passage of those Warrant Articles, the Voters of the Town of Hollis directed the Board of Selectmen to oppose any proposed Petition for Certificate of Site and Facility of the Tennessee Gas Pipeline before the Energy Facility Site Evaluation Committee ("EFSEC") for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Northeast Energy Direct Project for the following reasons:

- The proposal is inconsistent with the Town's goal of preserving the Town's rural character;
- The proposal is inconsistent with the Town's goal of protecting and preserving the water quality in the Town's lakes, rivers, streams, brooks, estuaries, groundwater, and other bodies of water;
- The proposal is inconsistent with the Town's goal of preserving and protecting local wildlife, including, but not limited to, the endangered and rare marbled salamander, hognose snake, hog-peanut, Sickle-pod, butterfly-weed, Wiegand's sedge, Houghton's umbrella sedge, ram's head lady's slipper, burweed, goat's rue, and trailing arbutus;
- The proposal is inconsistent with the Town's goal of preserving its rural character because of the potential will have adverse effects upon scenic roads, roadside trees, and stonewalls;
- The proposal is inconsistent with the Town's goal of preserving and protecting forests, woodlands, wetlands, and open-space areas for recreational purposes;
- The proposal would have an adverse impact upon the property values within the Town, thereby reduc-

ing tax revenues and impairing the tax base of the Town, net of any positive tax impact from the proposed pipeline;

- The proposal would adversely affect aesthetics within the Town by disturbing pristine or recreational forests, trails, woodlands, and wetlands and by clear cutting a fifty-foot wide path for the construction of said pipeline;
- The proposal would adversely affect aesthetics within the Town by altering or disturbing scenic roads, roadside trees, and stone walls and by clear-cutting a fifty foot wide path for the construction of said pipeline;
- The proposal would adversely affect aesthetics within the Town by altering or disturbing historic sites and areas;
- The proposal would adversely affect health and safety within the region by causing construction materials, soil, dust, and potential contaminants to enter the water shed that supplies water to the greater Nashua area;
- The proposal would adversely affect health and safety within the Town and in the greater Nashua area due to the continuous presence of a natural gas pipeline proximate to groundwater, aquifers, water sheds and surface water, which supply water to the greater Nashua area;
- The proposal would adversely affect health and safety within the Town by causing construction materials, soil, dust, and potential contaminants to enter wetlands and/or groundwater;
- The proposal would traverse large tracts of conservation land property and would involve economic uses that are inconsistent with other economic uses within said areas, such as silviculture and agriculture; and
- The Town lacks the required equipment or personnel for emergency services to adequately address potential health and safety risks that the proposal presents;

WHEREAS, the proposal of the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company will result in the clear-cutting of trees and vegetation across a distance of up to 100 feet at all sites during construction and a permanent, clear-cut, easement of fifty feet post-construction;

WHEREAS, the Board of Selectmen has received preliminary analysis, indicating that the proposal of the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company will result in a reduction of the overall tax base within the Town;

WHEREAS, the site proposed by the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company provides vital environmental services to the Town and the surrounding region through maintenance and/or provision of high quality natural resources, water recharge of aquifers servicing various adjacent municipalities, and wildlife habitats and corridors;

WHEREAS, the taxpayers of the Town have paid an additional \$11 million dollars in taxes to maintain the Town's rural character and to preserve conservation lands, including but not limited to, the lands upon which the proposed pipeline will disturb;

WHEREAS, voters at the Meeting voiced concerns regarding the presence of a high-pressure gas pipeline near residential and conservation properties, particularly with regard to the possibility of gas leaks or eruption of natural gas;

WHEREAS, the taxpayers of the Town have stated that a reason for living in the Town of Hollis is the abundance of clean water and have further voiced concern that blasting of granite necessary to construct the proposed pipeline will lead to an arsenic contamination in an irreplaceable watershed;

WHEREAS, the maps of the proposed project submitted to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission by the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company do not reflect the current condition of the proposal site and do not reflect residential properties and structures;

WHEREAS, the proposed pipeline site shall pass through historic sites in the Town, including traversing under or very near to, the Woodmont Orchard and the Gambrel Barn;

WHEREAS, voters at the Meeting voiced concern regarding the reduction of private property values, the

loss of standard insurance coverage resulting in the increased expenses to property owners of high risk insurance coverage as a result of the construction and maintenance of the proposed pipeline.

NOW THEREFORE be it resolved by the Board of Selectmen of the Town of Hollis as follows:

1. In recognition of the expressed will of the Voters of the Town of Hollis, New Hampshire at the Town Meeting held on September 20, 2014, and c

{file ends here...}

20150930-5134

Marilyn Learner, Hollis, NH.

I attended the scoping meeting in Rindge; my number was so high that I was unable to deliver my comments to Mr. Tomasi. While they were read to a separate transcriber, I am posting them in ecomments in the hope that they will be read by more than "engineering staff."

I would like to know why KM has not explored upgrading their Concord Lateral and/or other TGP existing pipelines, like the 200 Line, as alternate options to NED. In their attempts to make NED palatable in NH, KM touts the "advantage" of "co-location" and using an existing ROW. Why not use their OWN existing ROW to end up in Dracut? NED, and the greenfield destruction it causes, makes absolutely no sense.

Additionally, I would like to comment on this process. At the last scoping meeting I had a pleasant conversation with a FERC engineer who mentioned being very impressed with the caliber of comments coming from NH residents. We have clearly done our homework. I asked what else we could do to make our case. I was told, "Tell people to get a lawyer. Read the fine print." REALLY???

Alan Fore, Vice President for Public Affairs for Kinder Morgan, has said that KM never files for pipeline approval unless they know with certainty beforehand that they will receive a Certificate of Public Necessity and Convenience. The record shows that to be true; KM's approval record is 100%. So I ask obvious questions for the public record.

I'd like to know how KM KNOWS, before filing, and with minimal participation in the process as it is designed, that approval will be granted? Other than providing information about WHERE the pipeline can or should not go, does public input mean anything? Has industry thoroughly manipulated and completely co-opted the process? Are pre-filing, Scoping and EIS reports just a "check off the box" sham? Are we all actors going thru the motions in a superficial democratic process charade? Bottom line: Does this process have the depth and integrity that the public demands and has a right to expect or is this a perfunctory compliance exercise?

How can KM be so certain of outcomes if this process is 1) truly open and transparent, and 2) if FERC's commissioners look at real need, at ALL real costs, upstream and downstream, including environmental, public health, and economic ramifications, and consider all monetized and non-monetized impacts as part of the long term public good? Scoping should be about more than engineering concerns!!!

Kinder Morgan representatives have stated that they intend to file their formal application sometime around Oct 24, soon after the comment period for this Scoping period ends. That suggests that they will pay little to no attention to concerns raised here. And, route changes, once again, are so recent, that impacted property owners are just receiving notifications and coming to terms with how NED will potentially impact their lives.

The Department of Energy Inspector General has been asked to review the gas pipeline approval process. I would suggest that until that review is completed and the approval process has been revised to reflect 21st century goals, realities, and technologies that there should be a moratorium on new pipeline filings.

Contrary to the statements of several FERC commissioners, this is NOT "just" a pipeline. For property owners NED is an emotional life changer that creates financial hardships, and for all NH residents it establishes dangerous precedents, creates risks, and creates a permanent visual scar across the southern tier. It also commits NH to 20th Century fossil fuel technology for decades; the only beneficiary of this boondoggle

is its advocate and builder.

Many issues have been raised and documented in Scoping comments which should cause FERC Commissioners to very seriously consider the arguments against approving this massive, fossil fuel infrastructure which, when described in a nutshell is Kinder Morgan's export project masquerading as KM's public service "gift" to New Hampshire. (The "gift" is required to justify approval; I suspect they would trench straight up to Canada from PA if they were allowed to). The reality is that this project was born in backrooms to benefit boardrooms, not the people of New Hampshire. It creates many more harms than benefits, and should be denied, even KM complies, however perfunctorily and disingenuously, with your checklist.

20150930-5203

Philip F. Tomlinson Jr., Greenfield, MA.

Dear FERC Commissioners,

As a resident of Greenfield, Massachusetts, I am writing to oppose the Northeast Energy Direct Project ("NED Project") proposed by Kinder Morgan, a subsidiary of Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. Conservation land (even that which is protected under Massachusetts Article 97), organic and conventional farms, wetlands, aquifers, private properties, businesses, historical archeological digs, tourist attractions, private schools, rivers, and other water resources are all threatened by this 5-billion-dollar proposal. The health and welfare of local and regional citizens would be negatively impacted. I am convinced that the project must be terminated and a better solution found to meet energy needs.

Thank you for your consideration.

20150930-5287

Horace Briggs, Los Angeles, CA. RE: The Northeast Energy Direct Project (NED Project).

FERC Docket #PF14-22

This pipeline project is an obscene act of corporate destruction of private lives and well-being, and it should not be approved. My sister owns a lovely home and BnB on a hill in Deerfield, MA, with a gorgeous view of the Berkshires. She writes: "After a year and a half of fighting the construction of a natural gas pipeline that Kinder Morgan threatens to traverse through eight towns in my immediate locality (including across my yard, contaminating my well and my now valueless (that is, unsellable) property, which is well within their proclaimed incineration zone of 900 feet (I am less than 300 feet)), I just heard (when I was writing this a few days ago) from a concerned neighbor, that yet another house has exploded (yesterday) due to a natural gas incident.... [T]here have been 358 natural gas pipeline incidents since 2000. We really need to s

{intentionally blank page}

{intentionally blank page}

{intentionally blank page}

{intentionally blank page}