

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

* * * * *

RE:

ALGONQUIN GAS TRANSMISSION

PF07-15-000

LLC

EAST TO WEST HUBLINE EXPANSION

PROJECT

* * * * *

HEARING

Location: Knights of Columbus Hall

505 Sutton Street

North Andover, MA

Date: Wednesday, November 7, 2007

Time: 7:00 p.m.

1

2

3 APPEARANCES:

4

5 PANEL:

6 SHANNON JONES Federal Regulatory Energy Commission

7 SELMA URMAN Massachusetts Energy Facilities

8 Siting Board

9 ALEX DANKANICH US Department of Transportation

10 Pipeline and Hazardous Safety

11 Administration

12 LARRY BROWN Natural Resource Group

13

14 ALGONQUIN GAS TRANSMISSION REPRESENTATIVES:

15 Gene Muhlherr

16 James Luskay

17 Terry Doyle

18 Frank Gessner

19 Joseph Andrade

20 Micheal Lychwala

21

22 Members of the Audience

23

24

1

2

3

P R O C E E D I N G S

4

MS. JONES: My name is Shannon Jones and

5

I work for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission,

6

also referred to as FERC. Selma Urman, seated to my

7

right, is here from the Massachusetts Energy

8

Facilities Siting Board. This is a joint FERC siting

9

board public scoping meeting to receive your comments

10

and concerns about Algonquin Gas Transmission East to

11

West Hubline Expansion Project.

12

Also here tonight is Alex Dankanich

13

from the US Department of Transportation Pipeline and

14

Hazardous Safety Administration. He will be seated

15

to the far right when he returns in a moment. Up

16

here to my left is Larry Brown with Natural Resource

17

Group. Also with is Natural Resource Group is Amy

18

and Steve that you met at the sign-in table. NRG is

19

a consultant firm and in this project review they are

20

acting as an extension of the FERC staff.

21

So Amy and Steve at the back, please

22

feel free to see them if you have any questions

23

during the course of the meeting. They will be happy

24

to help you. We will be here afterwards as well.

1 I want to give you a little background
2 on FERC if you are not familiar with our agency. We
3 are an independent federal agency. We regulate the
4 interstate transmission of electricity, natural gas
5 and oil. We are located in Washington, DC, headed by
6 presidentially-appointed commissioners with about
7 1200 staff. The FERC is the agency ultimately
8 responsible for approving or denying this project.
9 But before that happens, we have to conduct an
10 extensive environmental review process that complies
11 with the National Environmental Policy Act. During
12 that review, we compile information from a variety of
13 sources, including Algonquin, the public, other
14 federal and state and local agencies and we also
15 conduct our own independent review analysis and field
16 work.

17 In Massachusetts, the project will also
18 undergo a review pursuant to the Massachusetts
19 Environmental Policy Act, also referred to as MEPA.
20 We plan to conduct a coordinated review with the MEPA
21 office. In addition, we will compile all agency and
22 public comments, analyze the potential resource
23 impact on everything from wildlife to residences,
24 safety and archeology and present our findings and

1 recommendations in a formal report called an
2 Environmental Impact Statement or EIS.

3 All interested parties will be given an
4 opportunity to comment on a draft version of that EIS
5 once it's issued and we will hold another round of
6 comment meetings very similar to this one, where you
7 will have an opportunity to comment on that document.
8 The final EIS will address any comments we have
9 received and will be used by our commissioners in
10 determining whether or not to authorize the project.

11 So tonight we're here to ask for your
12 concerns that you think we should address in that
13 EIS. If you wish to speak tonight, we would ask that
14 you sign the speakers list. But if you do not wish
15 to speak and still comment, you can provide those in
16 written format. Oral or written comments hold equal
17 weight and will be considered. Instructions were
18 provided in the notice that announced these meetings
19 on how to provide written comments and we have also
20 some green handouts that were at the sign-in table
21 that run down how to send in those written comments
22 to the FERC. We would like to receive those written
23 comments before November 21st. You may also send
24 written comments to the Massachusetts Energy

1 Facilities Siting Board, and Selma will address that
2 further in a moment.

3 If you did not receive a notice from
4 the FERC that announced these meetings -- it was
5 called a Notice of Intent -- if you did not receive
6 that, you are not on our mailing list. And being on
7 our mailing list assures you will receive a copy of
8 the draft and final Environmental Impact Statement
9 when it's issued. So if you want to be on our
10 mailing list and receive those documents, either a
11 paper or CD copy of that, there are three ways to let
12 us know.

13 You can send a written comment to the
14 FERC. You can sign up at the sign-in table to be on
15 the mailing list tonight or you can return the mail
16 list retention form on the back page of that notice
17 of intent that we sent out that announced these
18 meetings. You have to do one of those three things
19 to make sure you stay on our mailing list.

20 So at this point I will turn it over to
21 Selma who can give a little background on the Siting
22 Board's role. Thank you.

23 MS. URMAN: As Shannon stated, my name
24 is Thelma Urman and I'm here on behalf of the

1 Massachusetts Energy Facilities Siting Board which I
2 will refer to as the Siting Board to hear public
3 comments regarding Algonquin's filing with the FERC.

4 First, let me briefly describe the
5 Siting Board and its role in this matter. The Siting
6 Board is an independent board of the Commonwealth of
7 Massachusetts within the Department of Public
8 Utilities. The Siting Board's nonmembers include the
9 Secretary of Energy and Environmental Affairs who
10 serves as its chairman; the Secretary of Housing and
11 Economic Development, the commissioner of the
12 Department of Environmental Protection, the
13 commissioner of the Division of Energy Resources, two
14 commissioners of the Department of Public Utilities
15 and three public members appointed by the governor.
16 One of the principal functions of the Siting Board is
17 to review proposals for construction of new energy
18 facilities in Massachusetts, including power plants,
19 electric transmission lines, natural gas pipelines
20 and natural gas storage tanks.

21 The Siting Board does not, however,
22 have the authority to approve or disapprove
23 interstate natural gas facilities, such as the one
24 proposed by Algonquin in this case. Instead that

1 authority rests with the FERC.

2 When an interstate natural gas pipeline
3 company such as Algonquin applies to the FERC to
4 construct facilities within Massachusetts, the Siting
5 Board is required by its regulations to preserve the
6 rights of interested citizens of the Commonwealth by
7 intervening in the FERC proceedings in any such
8 application. The Siting Board is also required to
9 hold a public informational hearing in the area where
10 the proposed facility would be located. The
11 interstate pipeline company must attend the public
12 hearings and they are present today.

13 After the conclusion of the public
14 hearing and an additional comment period, the Siting
15 Board files written comments regarding the proposed
16 project with the FERC. The Siting Board comments are
17 intended to identify difficulties and problems with
18 the project associated with the environmental issues
19 as required by the Siting Board's regulations.

20 The Siting Board's comments will be
21 based in part upon review of pre-filing documents
22 with the FERC, a site visit the Siting Board has
23 conducted along with the proposed pipeline use and
24 upon the public comments and questions received by

1 the Siting Board. The Siting Board encourages those
2 attending the hearing tonight to comment upon the
3 potential environmental impact of the Algonquin
4 proposal. We are particularly interested in hearing
5 your concerns about specific locations along the
6 proposed routes and specific proposals you may have
7 for eliminating or mitigating impacts.

8 You are welcome to send comments to
9 either the FERC or the Siting Board. All comments
10 received by the Siting Board before November 21st
11 will be included in our submission to the FERC for
12 its consideration and the Siting Board's address
13 appears at the bottom of the legal notice for
14 tonight's hearing. I have placed that notice on the
15 table outside this room. That concludes my remarks
16 and I will turn the floor over to the Department of
17 Transportation.

18 MR. DANKANICH: Good evening. My name
19 is Alex Dankanich, and I work for the US DOT Pipeline
20 Hazardous Material Safety Administration. Our
21 administration has five regional offices. I work out
22 of the Washington DC office. And we also have
23 engineers and inspectors that work throughout the
24 Northeast region.

1 We have an inspector in Lynn,
2 Massachusetts. We have an inspector in Pittsburgh.
3 We have three engineers and inspectors in Trenton,
4 New Jersey, and the remainder of us are in the DC
5 office. I'm here to explain to you what PHMSA or
6 Pipeline and Hazardous Material Safety Administration
7 does. We maintain a regulatory watch over the
8 pipeline and in this case also the compressor station
9 throughout the design, the construction and the
10 entire operational life of the compressor station,
11 the pipeline and all other appurtenances.

12 There are over 350,000 miles of
13 interstate gas transmission pipeline in this country.
14 Transmission pipelines are the larger diameter
15 pipelines that crisscross the states, okay. They may
16 start -- in the case of Maritimes, they may start in
17 Canada, come down through Maine, through Vermont,
18 Connecticut, Massachusetts, and bring gas in a
19 southerly direction. The bulk of the pipelines bring
20 gas up out of the Gulf in a northerly direction.
21 Capacity coming out of the Gulf, our demand is
22 exceeding capacity, thus the need for more pipelines,
23 more compression of the gas to transmit the natural
24 gas through the pipelines.

1 I can address questions, but there are
2 safety devices that will be built into the gas
3 compression station. There are over -- I don't have
4 an exact number -- but over 1,600 gas compression
5 stations in this country. And I understand there are
6 three existing gas compression stations in
7 Massachusetts: Tennessee Gas which is El Paso Energy
8 has three compressor stations currently, one in
9 Ludlow, one in Charlton and one in Mendon,
10 Massachusetts.

11 Currently gas compression stations are
12 state-of-the-art. The compressors themselves are
13 very efficient. The design is the latest design.
14 The newer compression stations as well as most of the
15 existing ones have alarms, automatic shut-down
16 devices, gas sensors, relief valves, among other
17 safety components that are built right into the gas
18 compression station itself. The station if you look
19 at some of the pictures in the back, the building
20 materials are made of noncombustible building
21 materials. They are sound-proof and they are really
22 state-of-the-art.

23 And those are my opening remarks and I
24 will be here to answer questions after the meeting

1 adjourns if you have some specific questions you
2 would like for me to address. Thank you.

3 MS. JONES: Thank you, Al. Algonquin
4 will provide you a project overview before we get
5 into your comments.

6 MR. BONSALL: Thank you very much and
7 good evening, everyone. My name is John Bonsall and
8 I'm going to provide a very brief overview of the
9 East to West Expansion Project as proposed by
10 Algonquin Gas Transmission. There are a number of
11 members of the Algonquin project team this evening
12 that I will briefly introduce. I also mention at the
13 request of FERC and the Siting Board, we have a
14 number of display items at the back of the room. At
15 the conclusion of this evening's hearing, we intend
16 to stay and answer additional questions people may
17 have or walk you through some of the alignment
18 drawings and project drawings at the back of the
19 room.

20 The Algonquin team tonight that's
21 sitting up here at the front with me includes Gene
22 Muhlherr who is the project manager, Jim Luskay,
23 project director with Algonquin, Terry Doyle who is
24 the environmental manager on this project, Frank

1 Gessner, who is the right-of-way manager for the
2 project, Joe Andrade who is with our construction
3 group and Mike Lychwala with TSE Environmental,
4 providing environmental consulting services to the
5 project team.

6 Briefly, this project goes through
7 several states in addition to Massachusetts. There
8 is work that would be involved in states such as New
9 York, Connecticut and Rhode Island, in addition to
10 Massachusetts. Algonquin is an interstate gas
11 pipeline company headquartered here in Waltham,
12 Massachusetts and has been operating in the region
13 since the early 1950s. This project stems from an
14 open study Algonquin conducted early in the spring
15 and is clearly market-driven. One of the benefits
16 will be to enhance the overall operational
17 flexibility of Algonquin's existing system in the New
18 England area and in Massachusetts specifically.

19 With regard to the Massachusetts
20 portion of this project, there are really three
21 different components. There are 32 miles of pipeline
22 work that would occur between Medway, Massachusetts
23 and Weymouth, Massachusetts, between Medway and
24 Canton, Massachusetts that includes what's called

1 lift and replace, an existing pipeline that is
2 presently operated by Algonquin and it will be taken
3 out of service and replaced with a larger diameter
4 pipe.

5 From Canton to Weymouth there would be
6 a new 32-inch pipe put in that would follow an
7 existing NSTAR pipeline corridor that is also part of
8 this project. We have also proposed a compressor
9 station in the Rehoboth area and here in the North
10 Shore. We proposed a North Shore compressor station,
11 with a preferred site being located in Boxford and an
12 alternative site that we have under consideration
13 located in Danvers, Massachusetts. However, the
14 Boxford site is at this point in time our preferred
15 site.

16 Back on October 10th, we filed draft
17 resource reports one and ten with the FERC and
18 included in that is additional information concerning
19 the project as well as the proposed compressor
20 station here in the North Shore. Copies of that
21 filing have been made with the public libraries in
22 each of the communities of this area: Haverhill,
23 North Andover as well as Boxford. Copies have been
24 filed with the Conservation Commissions and have been

1 provided either to a town administrator or board of
2 selectmen or mayor and city council president within
3 each of the communities and also provided a copy to
4 the town clerk or city clerk in the communities all
5 along the pipeline project.

6 There is also the ability, as Shannon
7 will talk about later, to access information off of
8 the FERC Web site. As many of you know, we have had
9 a pretty extensive public outreach effort that
10 extends to the spring. We started our survey
11 activities. We mailed letters initially to land
12 owners requesting survey permission, conducted survey
13 activities, used that data as part of the resource
14 reports we filed in mid-October. And part of that
15 process we have had two rounds of Open Houses, the
16 first group back in June and more recently another
17 series of Open Houses late September and early
18 October.

19 In addition we have supplemented with a
20 number of presentations to Boards of Selectmen or
21 other municipal bodies along the entire project area.
22 Most recently we have been before the Board of
23 Selectmen in North Andover and prior to that the
24 Board of Selectmen in Boxford in terms of this

1 particular part of the project overview.

2 A moment ago I said 32-inch pipeline.
3 It's actually 36-inch diameter pipe that will go in
4 on Medway to Weymouth. Again, we appreciate everyone
5 being here this evening. We have a number of our
6 right of way agents present that some of you have
7 interacted with in the past. The balance of the
8 project team will stay, as I said earlier, at the end
9 of the evening to address any additional questions
10 people have and respond to specific questions
11 relating to the materials at the back of the room.
12 Thank you.

13 MS. JONES: Thank you. We will now get
14 to the most important part of the meeting and our
15 primary purpose for being here tonight and that is to
16 receive your comments. We will call speakers up in
17 the general order they are listed here on our sign-in
18 list. When it is your turn, I will ask that you
19 please come to the microphone here in the center
20 aisle and state and spell your name for the benefit
21 of the transcriber, identifying the organization you
22 may represent and indicate if you are a landowner
23 near part of the pipeline or any other compressor
24 station or project facilities.

1 Your comments should focus tonight on
2 environmental issues and concerns. When you provide
3 your comments, questions that anyone here at this
4 panel can readily answer, we will try to do so.
5 Otherwise, your concerns will be addressed in our
6 project review and conclusions presented in the
7 Environmental Impact Statement. The transcripts are
8 being prepared tonight to insure that we get an
9 accurate record of your comments so that we can be
10 sure to address them. The transcripts will be placed
11 in the public record at FERC which can be freely
12 accessed through the Internet and there are some
13 pamphlets at the sign-in table that provide some good
14 instructions on how to access the electronic
15 information through our FERC Web site.

16 So I'll start with the first name on
17 the list here, William Martineau.

18 MR. MARTINEAU: Thank you for taking
19 the time this evening to come into North Andover and
20 hear the concerns of the neighbors. My name is Bill
21 Martineau and I represent Town Manager Mark Rees who
22 could not make it here this evening. Mark has some
23 concerns that the residents have brought to him about
24 this location of the compressor.

1 Overall, I just have to make a comment
2 that the crews of Algonquin that put in the original
3 pipeline did a great job. And we were all concerned
4 about problems. And I think they showed us that they
5 can come in and do something without much problem.

6 The Town Manager would like to know:
7 Have you looked into other options of placement of
8 the compressor other than Danvers?

9 MS. JONES: There are a number of
10 alternatives and some others are provided in the
11 mapping at the back. There is -- well, there is the
12 Boxford station is the preferred site at this point
13 and the Danvers compressor location is the alternate.

14 MR. MARTINEAU: He was just wondering
15 why other sites in that area weren't looked at at
16 that time. Under the Environmental Impact Statement
17 study, we have some concerns about the impact on
18 groundwater supplies in the evaluation of temporary
19 and permanent impact on wetlands, restoration of
20 wetlands, and development of appropriate wetland
21 mitigation options. The Boxford site is actually in
22 the watershed of Lake Cochichewick, the Town of North
23 Andover's water supply. Lake Cochichewick is North
24 Andover's greatest resource, and we are very

1 concerned about any contamination to that drinking
2 water supply.

3 Also, the air quality and noise,
4 effects of the local air quality and noise at the
5 proposed facility. There will be an impact on the
6 residents somehow. It may be a minor impact but
7 there will be an impact. We need more study of that.

8 And the reliability and safety. How do
9 we guarantee the safety of that site? No commercial
10 site can be risk-free and hazard-free. And another
11 concern is that the site requires 8.2 acres and
12 Algonquin has proposed and has mentioned in their
13 statements that they are looking at purchasing 157
14 acres around this site. Would there be a
15 conservation trust enacted so that that land would
16 stay conservation land as opposed to future
17 expansion. If we look around, the price of oil goes
18 up every day. And we are already dealing with a
19 proposed peak-shaving generator station along the
20 pipeline at the other end of North Andover,
21 Middleton. With this 157 acres, would this also be a
22 nice site for not only the compressor station but
23 also a peak generating site, where you already have
24 the 157 acres.

1 Also the Town Manager is concerned
2 about the ownership of the paper road known as Barker
3 Street that the Algonquin company intends to use to
4 access this site. You know, there is a question of
5 ownership, it's a public road or if it's a private
6 way. And that is an issue that needs to be
7 addressed. Thank you for allowing me to make my
8 comments.

9 MS. JONES: Thank you. Would anyone at
10 Algonquin want to expand on some of the alternative
11 work that you have done with regard to the
12 compression site locations?

13 MR. DOYLE: Terry Doyle with Algonquin
14 Gas. In our resource report, Ken, we looked at
15 multiple sites for compressor station locations up
16 here. I believe in the resource report we have got
17 six other sites identified besides the two that we
18 are currently focused on, our primary site and our
19 first alternate site. They are in the general area
20 between Boxford and Danvers and Littleton.

21 So we have looked at, I think, a lot of
22 sites before that and now we are down to those and
23 now we have narrowed it down a little further.

24 MS. JONES: Thank you. Our next

1 speaker is James Winn.

2 MR. WINN: Good evening. Thank you for
3 the opportunity to speak to you tonight. Again, for
4 the record, my name is Jim Winn, W-I-N-N. I live at
5 260 Bradford Street, North Andover. As a direct
6 abutter to the proposed compressor station located in
7 Boxford, I do have significant concerns with respect
8 to quality of life, the environment and safety
9 impacts of the proposed project. In addition, I
10 purchased my home, knowing that the land surrounding
11 my property was zoned residential and that it would
12 be protected for commercial and industrial uses such
13 as are proposed.

14 In addition to the assessment already
15 spoken of by FERC, I believe the following impact
16 should also be assessed in determining the
17 appropriate site for this project. I further
18 recommend these impacts not only be compared between
19 the current proposed sites but also compared to those
20 sites suggested by the North Andover Board of
21 Selectmen as well as sites previously looked at in
22 the cities of Haverhill and Methuen which were found
23 to be unsuitable for the project. So the impact be
24 compared to the current proposal locations, as well

1 as those locations that were found to be unsuitable.

2 Additional impacts include: Number

3 one, the proximity of the project to a protection

4 area for public water drinking supply; number two,

5 the property zoning and variances required if not

6 federally regulated for development; the proximity to

7 an airport landing and take-off path; number four,

8 the availability of emergency services in which the

9 town or city facilities proposed both fire and

10 police, the distance and road condition emergency

11 service vehicles would need to travel to reach the

12 site; number six, the length and maximum grade of the

13 access road to reach the site; number seven, the

14 safety of the driveway intersection, including the

15 approach grades as well as site distance; number

16 eight, the roadway width, the availability of

17 sidewalks, site lines and roadway grades of traveler

18 routes for workers and construction vehicles; number

19 nine, the proximity location of wetlands and ground

20 pools; number ten, the elevation of the site with

21 respect to surrounding area; number twelve,

22 consideration of recreational uses as well as homes;

23 13, the proximity to wildlife and the impact of noise

24 and land disturbance and, of course, finally 14: The

1 existing noise, life and air quality conditions of
2 the site.

3 If the Boxford site which is located as
4 I mentioned in an environmentally sensitive and
5 residentially-zoned area is found to be suitable for
6 industrial use, the following measures should be
7 implemented to protect the surrounding neighborhoods
8 and the environment.

9 Number one: The applicant should
10 provide funds to the towns of North Andover and
11 Boxford to hire a third-party reviewer to perform
12 independent pre- and post-analysis of project
13 impacts, particularly with respect to safety, noise
14 and air and water quality, the use of multiple
15 smaller electric compressors rather than one large
16 natural gas turbine.

17 Number three: Construction of a
18 heavily insulated concrete building to house the
19 compressors, number four: Construction of an earth
20 sound barrier on all sides of the site based on
21 residential homes in Boxford; number five, to locate
22 the site of the Northeast Valley of the site between
23 Mount Hayman and Maiden Hill as far from the
24 residential homes as possible; create a deeded

1 conservation area that includes the watershed area
2 for North Andover's drinking water supply area as
3 well as the land to the southwest of the existing gas
4 and power line abutting residential homes.

5 Number seven: To commit to provide
6 full environmental study to insure that future
7 changes to the facility will not further impact
8 environment. Number eight: Enforce a more stringent
9 requirement than the 55-decibel level of the closest
10 receptors due to the current land use zoning and
11 environmental impacts; number nine: Create an access
12 driveway that construction and emergency vehicles
13 would not need to travel through the narrow roadway
14 from an abutting residential community to access the
15 site as well as traverse a long steep access
16 driveway. Ten: Only the facilities that need to be
17 located on the site should be allowed to bypass
18 current local zoning requirements.

19 All accessory uses such as office
20 space, storage areas, et cetera, should be located
21 off site in a location zoned for such uses. Finally
22 as part of the impact assessment study, the
23 distribution list for the previous mailing sent to
24 residents and property owners located within a half

1 mile of the site should be provided for review. The
2 land in which the current board controls is much
3 greater than the 30 acres described for use for this
4 facility. The parcel as a whole should have been
5 considered and all property owners within half mile
6 of this boundary should have been previously notified
7 of the project.

8 Since this project is to be jointly
9 filed with MEPA, Massachusetts Environmental Policy
10 review indicates that a property cannot separate or
11 segment the property in the assessment of a project
12 environmental impact. That's 301 CMR 11.01(c).
13 Thank you again for the opportunity to speak tonight.
14 I hope my comments and suggestions are taken into
15 consideration for the impact of the project. Thank
16 you.

17 MS. JONES: Cristos Xerras. I
18 apologize if I mispronounce.

19 MR. XERRAS: Good evening. My name is
20 Cristos Xerras. I am a property owner living at 1
21 Helman Drive in Peabody. My concerns were very
22 thoroughly addressed by the previous speaker. But I
23 would like to reiterate the question of the noise.
24 Can anyone tell me exactly how loud this facility, a

1 fairly substantially industrial facility, would be?

2 MS. JONES: I can tell you how the FERC
3 analyzes noise impacts from compressor stations.
4 Noise is actually one of the big concerns for
5 compressor stations. We adopt the EPA standard of 55
6 DBA for most nuisance level noises. We often require
7 companies to do modellings to determine what the
8 noise would be from their proposed design at the
9 nearest noise sensitive area.

10 They have to install the appropriate
11 building materials and silencers and mufflers to try
12 to meet that level. After construction, that's
13 verified with another noise survey. And the FERC
14 requires the company to do this post-construction
15 verifications as a standard condition of our
16 approvals.

17 MR. XERRAS: My second question is:
18 Can you tell me what the duty cycle or how many hours
19 a day would this facility run?

20 MS. JONES: I couldn't answer that. Is
21 that something that Algonquin is prepared to answer
22 tonight or is this something we would need to come
23 back with at a later date?

24 MR. DOYLE: Again, Terry Doyle of

1 Algonquin Gas. Normally our compression stations run
2 somewhere in the neighborhood of three to 4,000 hours
3 a year, usually in the winter months when gas demand
4 is high, you know, and very little in the summertime.
5 So it's not all year. It's not 24 hours a day. It's
6 really depending on demand of the natural gas.

7 Typically in the wintertime our
8 compressor stations operate in the early morning
9 hours when the load is greatest when people are
10 showering and getting ready to go to work; also in
11 the evening hours when they are home cooking dinner
12 and things like that. So it's kind of early morning
13 late afternoon, mostly in the winter but it's not
14 year-round and it's not 24 hours a day.

15 MR. XERRAS: My final question is:
16 Have any studies been done on the health and welfare
17 of abutters at other facilities as to how such a
18 facility would affect their health and welfare?

19 MS. JONES: I can say that the FERC
20 does an analysis of air impacts, of area emissions,
21 noise impacts and safety standards. Whether there
22 has been a specific health study done, that I cannot
23 answer. I'm not aware of that.

24 MR. XERRAS: Thank you.

1 MS. JONES: Next speaker is Anthony
2 Bille.

3 MR. BILLE: Hi. Good evening. My name
4 is Anthony Bille, B-I-L-L-E. I'm an abutter at the
5 Danvers proposed or alternate site. The first
6 question I have is for Alex. You spoke about the
7 safety or the state of the art of these new
8 buildings. You can't guarantee the safety of any
9 building, whether there is relief valves or anything
10 else. Is that true? Nobody can guarantee us any
11 kind of safety concerns, they are going to be 100
12 percent.

13 MR. DANKANICH: There is risk involved
14 with any mechanical device, with your car, washing
15 machine, with any kind of device. What we, the
16 government is trying -- has been trying to do is
17 minimize those risks through the safety devices,
18 through mandatory safety devices and a number of
19 safety devices built within the compressor station of
20 a building, some of the devices I mentioned earlier.

21 So absolutely you are correct. There
22 is risk involved in pretty near everything we do on a
23 day-to-day basis.

24 MR. BILLE: And that's my utmost

1 concern, the safety of the residents. If you look at
2 the two overviews here -- and I don't mean to dump
3 anything on the Boxford neighbors here -- if you look
4 at the overviews, Peabody: We have a residential
5 area which is probably 200 yards that abuts this
6 land. And the rest -- you know, one of the things
7 that bothers me about the FERC proposal is: It's an
8 environmental impact study. It sounds like that you
9 base everything on.

10 And what concerns me is there is nine
11 bullets here and it's not till the sixth bullet that
12 you talk about the impact on the residents. We come
13 after vegetation and birds. And I find that really
14 pretty sad. Okay. I don't know if that was the
15 intent. But I know the safety of my children and my
16 family and my neighbors are more important than
17 vegetation and birds.

18 The other question I have is: We have
19 environmental concerns too. When we bought in this
20 area, we were told these were conservation lands and
21 nothing could be built up there. All of a sudden now
22 we are told: A little bit farther down the road
23 here, that's not part of the conservation land. And
24 we will be taking part of this road to service this

1 plant. And I don't think the neighbors knew that and
2 I think it's very unfair that this proposal, even
3 though it's an alternate site, is being cast upon us
4 in this way.

5 The other question I have is Algonquin
6 the way the process is developed. We in Peabody in
7 this area we receive no natural gas benefits. A lot
8 of the neighbors and abutters that receive
9 information -- this is something I wish FERC would
10 address -- there has to be a better way to deliver
11 this mailing to the neighbors. People see that and
12 look at it as solicitation when they get something
13 from the gas company as a way to convert from oil to
14 gas. A lot of them are unaware of what's going on
15 here.

16 In fairness, I think what should be put
17 on this is something that -- a building site or
18 something to let us know in all fairness what's going
19 on here. We are not -- I'm not afraid of, you know,
20 what's best for society. I want to make sure the
21 public safety of my family and my neighbors are
22 heard. Thank you.

23 MS. JONES: Thank you. The next
24 speaker is Bob Flynn.

1 MR. FLYNN: Bob Flynn, F-L-Y-N-N. I own
2 the Far Corner Golf Course which is probably the
3 closest part of this project. It's funny because I
4 also, as does my whole family, live in Danvers so I
5 am kind of right in the middle. My concerns have
6 been addressed by the other speakers with just one
7 thing. The Lawrence Airport flyway also goes right
8 over that Mt. Hayman and I don't think that's been
9 mentioned tonight. Anything else I will submit in
10 writing. Thank you.

11 MS. JONES: Thank you. Janette Cohen.

12 MS. COHEN: My name is Janette Cohen.
13 I'm an abutter in Peabody to the Danvers station.
14 The gentleman that was quite accurate a few minutes
15 ago came to us with quite a nice list. I think he
16 covered almost everything.

17 My big issue is safety. After what
18 happened in Danvers that I saw from my family room
19 window -- I'm quite a distance from Danvers -- the
20 area it happened in -- we're very concerned in our
21 area. If an explosion should occur, how big of an
22 area would it cover and what kind of safety measures
23 are there for this compressed gas that the station is
24 being built for?

1 MS. JONES: I believe Alex touched
2 earlier on some of the general safety requirements by
3 DOT. Is there anything you care to add to that,
4 Alex?

5 MS. COHEN: I would like you to be
6 specific.

7 MR. DANKANICH: Give me a second -- I'm
8 looking here in our Code of Federal Regulations. We
9 have federal regulations that cover compressor
10 station construction, the devices that need to be
11 built into them and then the maintenance of these
12 devices. Let me turn to the page and if you don't
13 mind, I will read one or two paragraphs. Maybe that
14 will give you a gist of the some of the regulations.

15 MS. JONES: I believe Algonquin might
16 add something to this discussion.

17 MR. LUSKAY: My name is Jim Luskay with
18 Algonquin Gas. While Alex is looking up the
19 regulations, I will give you a brief overview of some
20 of the safety devices that are built into the
21 compressor station. There are gas detectors, smoke
22 detectors and infrared detectors inside the stations
23 as well as pressure detectors. If there is an
24 indication of a problem, the station would

1 automatically shut down and the gas would be
2 evacuated from the station, all the way to from where
3 it ties into the pipeline through the entire station.
4 That's in the event of some sort of catastrophic
5 failure or a fire at the facility. That's what the
6 codes that Alex is going to talk about leads to in
7 the practical sense as far as what's installed at the
8 facility.

9 MS. JONES: Thank you. I know there
10 are established performance standards DOT has that
11 are implemented by the companies and the safety of
12 the stations and pipeline safety is an area of
13 analysis that will be fully developed, analyzed and
14 reported on in our Environmental Impact Statement.
15 So there will be a lot of information and data and
16 analysis to be provided. We may not have it all
17 right here now but that is a concern of ours that
18 will be fully addressed.

19 MR. DANKANICH: I can add one or two
20 comments. Compressor stations must have
21 pressure-relieving devices put on the outlet of the
22 compressor station on the piping that's coming out to
23 maintain adequate maximum pressure so that the
24 maximum -- all pipeline is designed for a maximum

1 allowable operating pressure -- we call it NAOP --
2 tested at one and a half times prior to putting in
3 services -- at one and a half times what that NAOP
4 would be. So let's say if it's 100 pounds, it's
5 tested to 150 pounds. This will be operating a
6 little over 1,000 pounds, so tested at one and a half
7 times the operating pressure.

8 Some of the safety devices are: On the
9 compressor itself, they are going to have an
10 automatic device to detect the driver, the speed of
11 the driver or the RPM so that it doesn't overspeed
12 itself and cause it to burn up the compressor. So
13 there is a speed device on the compressor itself.
14 There is an automatic shut-down device. If it gets
15 to exceed that speed or that RPM, it automatically
16 shuts down.

17 Some of the alarms, the gas detectors
18 throughout the building, are tied into the automatic
19 shut-down device that shuts the compressor down. The
20 muffler on the engine of the device is vented, has
21 bafflers to prevent gas build-up. In short, the
22 design has been reviewed from a national standard
23 agency. And we, the federal government, adopt
24 national standards from ASTM and API and other

1 organizations like that and incorporate those
2 national standards into the design of the compressor
3 building itself.

4 I can go into other devices after the
5 meeting more specifically if you would like. Thank
6 you.

7 MS. JONES: Okay. Thank you. Our next
8 speaker is Murray Bob.

9 MS. BOB: Hi. Murray Bob, B-O-B, is
10 the last name, 4 Bald Hill Lane in Peabody. I'm an
11 abutter on the Peabody side. I'm not sure exactly
12 where -- this is what, near the Heather Drive by the
13 landfill? Is that where the proposed alternate site
14 is?

15 MR. DANKANICH: Yes, it is.

16 MR. BOB: By the way, I must comment in
17 the previous notices when I looked at it, you know,
18 it said you were going to put in the pipeline. It
19 didn't say anything about the compressor system or
20 building being put in potentially in our backyards.
21 So I think that you might have gotten a lot more
22 people at previous meetings to attend if they were
23 aware of this.

24 Somebody just came around today and

1 said: You know this is happening? I said: Holy
2 smokes. I want to get up here. One of my main
3 concerns is that everybody else mentioned is the
4 noise as well as the particulates. If it's close to
5 the Danvers dump, I don't know what has been buried
6 over there. And I don't know during the construction
7 phase as well as the operating phase, what type of
8 air it's going to -- what type of things it will kick
9 up into the air; if there is any carcinogens or any
10 other things that might be problematic for people
11 living very close to the proposed site.

12 Just like everybody else mentioned,
13 that we -- this was supposed to be residential
14 zoning. And our house and our development is closely
15 zoned where we have conservation land all around,
16 except this is not going to be conservation land.

17 One of the things you have mentioned a
18 lot about the safety of the facility. Now, is this
19 going to be a manned facility or remotely operated
20 and with remote security or how is this going to be
21 handled?

22 MR. DANKANICH: Most of the -- do you
23 want me to answer that?

24 MS. JONES: Yes.

1 MR. DANKANICH: Most of the
2 construction that I see on the compressor stations
3 are not manned. Now, I'm not sure about this one but
4 that's what we are seeing here. They have automatic
5 -- some of the automatic devices that I spoke about
6 earlier that would shut the system down that monitor
7 the system and automatically shut it down. Is this
8 facility going to be manned? Would you like to
9 address that question? Did I get -- go ahead.

10 MR. MUHLHERR: Gene Muhlherr. This
11 will be a manned facility. You will have people
12 there during daylight hours. It won't be manned in
13 the evening. But as far as being able to be started
14 remotely, it can be. It can be operated and turned
15 on, turned off from a remote location. We have a gas
16 control system located in Houston, Texas, that
17 operates -- operates and maintains the integrity of
18 the gas pipeline system all up and down throughout
19 New England. So...

20 MR. BOB: That answers parts of it.
21 Now, one of the things that we have seen is that we
22 have had the security breach at, I think, in Lynn at
23 some gas facility. And we also are, I think, are
24 building an offshore gas facility because nobody

1 wants it in the port of Boston. And why should we
2 have this within a couple of hundred yards or feet of
3 our people?

4 MS. JONES: Thank you. Next speaker is
5 Stanley B-A-I-L-E-Y.

6 MR. BAILEY: This thing is planned, all
7 the things are tested for, let's say, unusual
8 circumstances that are not intentional. But since
9 9/11, we are always worried about security. And that
10 should be a primary concern, especially after seeing
11 what a little accident caused at the Danvers port.
12 If we will have lots of compressed gas coming
13 through, who knows? Seems to me like a prime target.

14 MR. BIALI: My name is Stan Biali, a
15 concerned citizen from Boxford that would be living
16 somewhere adjacent to the facility and would have
17 some concerns. Also, I want to mention that my
18 background basically is 20 years of design experience
19 in the power generation business in terms of the
20 design of steam turbines, 20 years with the design of
21 gas turbine aircraft engines. I put together some
22 charts that I would like to run through briefly to
23 point out the concerns that have not been mentioned
24 so far and also some specific concerns I would like

1 to highlight on.

2 If you look at page two, the general
3 concerns of this facility are the site and equipment,
4 the noise concerns that have been mentioned, a
5 category for omissions pollution, wetlands and
6 conservation, odor, lighting, visual, public safety
7 and essentially economics.

8 If you look at the specifics relative
9 to site equipment, one of the concerns is the site of
10 the facility was mentioned at one of the earlier
11 meetings with the pipeline people. There would be
12 several buildings there, not just the compressor
13 building itself. I guess our selectmen mentioned
14 they would almost be like a little campus at the far
15 corner of our particular town. The other concern is
16 relative to the compressor hardware itself.
17 Essentially it's a 50,000 horsepower compressor. If
18 you are to look at that in terms of a turbine
19 generator providing electricity to the town, that's
20 enough electricity for 16,000 homes using an average
21 of 500 kilowatt hours per month. So that would be a
22 pretty good size, and basically driven by a gas
23 turbine which is a form of a jet engine that we hear
24 several times a day here passing through the airport

1 in Lawrence.

2 So relative to the environmental
3 impact, this would be the first industrial-type
4 facility that would impact the rural pastoral setting
5 that we now enjoy in Boxford. I guess tonight was
6 the first time I heard this wasn't run 24/7.
7 Certainly if it was, that would increase the noise of
8 exhaust emissions into this quiet community.
9 Certainly alternatives would be looking to locate the
10 facility on a site that's more industrial-related
11 other than rural Boxford.

12 Relative to noise, the concern, the key
13 one that I see, is that there are 35 Boxford
14 residents that live south of this facility within
15 about a mile or so. If you look at the elevation of
16 their particular homes, their elevation is higher
17 than probably what the exhaust stacks would be. We
18 all know that you can insulate around the building
19 and take care of noise at ground level. These folks
20 will be up above the particular stack which is an
21 opening for the exhaust of the turbine. They can
22 hear this noise and that's a concern that should be
23 considered by FERC.

24 Some of the alternatives to lessen that

1 would be considering that particular situation the
2 noise impact studies by adding silencers to the
3 exhaust system, raising the stack higher than these
4 particular residents that are high on the hill south
5 of the facility. If this facility does get
6 installed, I guess you mentioned that these kinds of
7 things would be measured and considered while it's
8 running to be sure if it's an issue, not 55 DBs, that
9 some type of abatement action would take place to
10 satisfy the regulatory requirements.

11 Relative to the emissions, the concerns
12 are NOX, sulfur dioxides and DOCs. I read in the
13 paper the other day, read the letter from the gas
14 people that talked about the emissions and what the
15 percentages were. They indicated these emissions are
16 actually trace allowance and I wanted to talk a
17 little bit about that.

18 We all know that NOX is a contributor
19 to smog, and studies have shown that in the Lawrence
20 area here, there is a high incidence of asthma. And
21 if this facility was located here, this would be
22 adding another stack to the one that is already here
23 for the power plant in Haverhill and also the one in
24 North Andover.

1 And another comment is that NOX when
2 it's combined with sulfur dioxide is a contributor to
3 acid rain and that could have an impact on the
4 wetlands and also the reservoir that a provides water
5 to the community of North Andover. The comment on
6 emissions, the Algonquin letter, mentioned that the
7 emissions would consist of 74 percent nitrogen, 15
8 percent oxygen, 7 percent water vapor, 3 percent
9 carbon, 1 percent argon and the trace allowance of
10 the NOX and sulphuratae dioxide, if you will.

11 One thing I took a look at was the gas
12 line people again mentioned that the gas turbine
13 would be probably solar equipment. I looked at an
14 equivalent GE gas turbine of the same size rating
15 which happened to be 16,000 horsepower. The
16 specifications for that turbine indicate that the
17 exhaust flow was about 103 pounds per second. They
18 indicate that for that particular design, the NOX is
19 25 parts per million, which is point 0029 percent
20 which we agree is a trace amount of NOX that would be
21 passing through this particular piece of equipment.

22 And the interesting thing is: Yeah.
23 It's a trace amount but if you look at it on a yearly
24 basis and admittedly it is not going to be running

1 24/7 but less than that; the exhaust flow for a
2 machine of this size would be about 9 million pounds
3 per day of exhaust flow or actually 3.3 billion
4 pounds of exhaust flow that would pass through this
5 machine in one year; again, on a 24-7 basis, that
6 could be ratioed down.

7 So if you took the trace amount of the
8 NOX, that could be equivalent to about 81,000 pounds
9 of NOX that would be passing into the particular
10 environment in this area. And it's kind of -- if you
11 look at Bill Gates, a millionaire and take a small
12 amount of his money, that still could be a huge
13 amount. So NOX is a concern and certainly should be
14 considered.

15 The other concern is with respect to
16 odor. And carbon monoxide is a concern. Sulfur
17 dioxide and additives and any that would be added to
18 the natural gas fuel, this odor from the emissions
19 could impact the health and quality of life of the
20 nearby residents. And we certainly hope stringent
21 emissions controls would be added to the particular
22 hardware to try to control that.

23 Lighting and visual is a concern. The
24 industrial look of the facility would consist of

1 probably six buildings, fencing, exhaust piping and
2 storage tanks. At night, if these are all
3 well-lighted, you would see a glow in the distance
4 and that's a concern. Obviously, abating that would
5 be to minimize the lighting, maybe shut it off at
6 times during the evening so that you wouldn't see
7 that.

8 Relative to public safety concerns
9 there is that Boxford is a volunteer fire department
10 nearest the station is somewhat remote from the
11 facility. So if there was a malfunction of a gas
12 turbine compressor, there could be a reaction time
13 relative to this volunteer department responding. I
14 understand it's going to be monitored with all kinds
15 of devices that could mention the safety relief
16 valve.

17 There was an incident at the power
18 plant in North Andover and it lost its tie into the
19 grid. It was producing steam and the steam had
20 nowhere to go because the stop valve to the turbine
21 shut down. So it went through the relief valve which
22 really was sonic velocity.

23 This occurred at about 2:00 in the
24 morning. And the citizens of the area were

1 concerned. They called the police department to find
2 out what it was. It was actually this power plant
3 releasing the steam from the boiler. It was pretty
4 noisy. The thing ran for half hour, 45 minutes.
5 There are safety devices when they are running you
6 will probably hear them also. That's a possibility.

7 So the last concern is relative to
8 economics and the concerns are property values and
9 taxes. You know, certainly property values could
10 decrease for nearby residents due to the first
11 industrial facility in a residential, rural, quiet
12 community. Taxes could increase for the entire town.
13 If the fire department had to add staffing, maybe run
14 24/7 or add a volunteer department, possibly adding
15 more equipment to handling a particular issue that
16 may occur at the facility. Those are concerns also
17 we feel should be considered in the impact statement.
18 So basically those were the comments I had and the
19 concerns we think should be considered and hopefully
20 solve these kind of concerns. Thank you.

21 MS. JONES: Thank you. Tom
22 Glendinning.

23 MR. GLENDINNING: My name is Tim
24 Glendinning. Maybe I am looking for a little

1 clarification here. I think from the onset of the
2 meeting, you mentioned environmental was your key
3 concern. Is that correct?

4 MS. JONES: This is an environmental
5 review, yes. It includes -- it includes not only the
6 birds and the bees and critters but impact to
7 residences, safety, air and noise emissions. It's a
8 wide range of potential impacts that we consider as
9 part of the environmental review.

10 MR. GLENDINNING: I don't know if there
11 is anybody else on the list after me here tonight.
12 But I think the comments were really good from Jim
13 who started at the beginning of the night, then
14 Stanley who came up later here so I will not go back
15 over them. We are talking about the environmental
16 issues, the watershed in North Andover.

17 In Boxford where we are now, we value
18 the environment quite a bit. So I mean, looking at
19 the environment in Boxford, I think there is a
20 comment about an alternative site. And I hope we
21 hear more of that. But I think we have until the
22 21st of November to make comments. Is that correct.

23 MS. JONES: That is -- that is the time
24 frame to receive comments. After that we will still

1 consider them.

2 MR. GLENDINNING: Okay. I don't want
3 to go on here. But I'm just looking at -- I'm
4 curious with the crowd that you have here tonight.
5 How many are from Boxford (indicating)? How many
6 from North Andover? And I heard a few Peabody people
7 here tonight and Danvers also, right? We have a
8 pretty good showing here. I'm just curious. Is this
9 the only meeting? I know you had one in Boxford on
10 the 12th. Was there a scoping meeting in Boxford?

11 MS. JONES: We had a meeting in
12 Randolph on Monday and we have another meeting
13 tomorrow night in Norwich, Connecticut.

14 MR. GLENDINNING: So I am really
15 getting at the point where I think in Boxford,
16 probably the communities here, as far as getting
17 notification out, talking to the people, finding out
18 their thoughts, what extremes did FERC go to to get
19 people notified?

20 MS. JONES: Our regulations dictate who
21 needs to be notified of the project and that are --
22 generally it's land abutters to pipeline routes.
23 There is a radius for proposed compressor stations
24 that's point five miles. So those are the general

1 land owners that we try to put on our mailing list in
2 addition to abutters to any alternative pipeline
3 facilities or above-ground facility locations. We
4 also include local, state and federal officials,
5 towns, conservation groups, NGOs. We try to cast the
6 net as wide as we can.

7 MR. GLENDINNING: I'm just again
8 getting at the point that I think notification could
9 have been improved a little better. And no fault of
10 anybody here on the panel. I'm just talking as a
11 citizen in Boxford. And we are relatively close to
12 the site. And I think the bottom line comment is the
13 environment where we live is highly valued. And
14 talking about specifics of watershed safety, all have
15 been mentioned tonight from Jim to Stanley.

16 I know you are making notification.
17 You are recording all of this. But I think, you
18 know, looking at an alternative site -- again, you
19 folks will do your job in regards to that. But I
20 think coming into these communities is just -- I'm
21 sure many of us here tonight just kind of shake our
22 heads and wonder: Why is it happening? I know you
23 folks deal with this every day. You have 1600 pump
24 stations across America.

1 So I think maybe my 15 minutes of fame
2 here is looking at an alternative site. Not to point
3 fingers at Danvers but whether or not that
4 opportunity should be fully pursued. Again, you have
5 heard all the environmental issues. So I think the
6 take-away message is, you know, Boxford is only at
7 three percent industrialized out of all its area.
8 The community, whether or not the property that they
9 will purchase of 157 to 200-plus acres -- eight acres
10 is the footprint and you will do your job to operate
11 a safe pump station.

12 But looking at the rest of the
13 community, the effect on Boxford, North Andover and
14 Haverhill, I just hope in your report you summarize
15 the comments here tonight that, you know, there is a
16 lot of people here. There could have been more. I
17 think if the message got out in the future, I think
18 notification could have been improved. But I think
19 the people here tonight are here for one reason only,
20 is to protect what we have. So I think that's all I
21 wanted to get out and we will wait to hear your
22 response. Thank you.

23 MS. JONES: That is the last of our
24 speakers that have signed up. Do we have some more

1 speakers?

2 MR. MACMILLAN: Francis MacMillan.

3 Thank you for letting me speak. My name is Francis
4 MacMillan, Jr., M-A-C-M-I-L-L-A-N. I am a physician
5 in town in North Andover. I'm also a member of the
6 Board of Health but I'm speaking as an abutter.

7 I think that a lot of the points have
8 been made but I have a few points that I wanted to
9 just reiterate. First of all, this proposed station
10 is surrounded by not only residents but conservation
11 areas. North Andover has purposefully purchased many
12 acres of land around the proposed area in North
13 Andover, not in Boxford but the very local vicinity
14 because Lake Cochichewick a surface water source and
15 the sole source of water to 30,000 residents in the
16 Town of North Andover.

17 The lake is largely fed by a large
18 swamp which is within the watershed of the proposed
19 location. The construction of the facility will not
20 only open up a road that has been closed for the past
21 several years by the land owners but it would allow
22 permanent access to that road. That road is
23 currently on paper but not open to the public.

24 It is completely unimproved and I have

1 been a resident of North Andover since 1968. When
2 that road was open, it was a source of dumping of
3 automobiles, used appliances. Opening this road
4 would be an environmental disaster to the potential
5 water supply that supplies 30,000 residents. That's
6 my first point.

7 The second thing is that public safety:
8 If you consider that this facility is proposed to be
9 located in the Town of Boxford, there is actually no
10 roadway access from the Town of Boxford to this
11 facility. So this facility is located in the town
12 that their public facilities cannot access via their
13 own roads. I have clocked the mileage on Route 133
14 from the Boxford line to the site of Bradford and
15 Barker Street in North Andover. It is 1.5 miles.
16 From the site on Bradford and Barker to the proposed
17 location on Mt. Hayman is an additional zero point
18 five miles. That is two miles from the Boxford
19 border. So you are going to site a facility two
20 miles from the border of the town that's supposed to
21 provide public safety services. That puts a big
22 burden on our facilities in North Andover.

23 As I think Mr. Martineau had mentioned
24 earlier, these public safety facilities are volunteer

1 after hours. So the Boxford Fire Department is an
2 additional mile into Boxford is over three miles,
3 almost two miles of which is through the Town of
4 North Andover. That makes absolutely no sense, not
5 from a public safety standpoint. I don't care how
6 safe these things are, accidents do happen. These
7 are remote risks, but real risks.

8 The Town of Boxford cannot service this
9 facility. I think that is very clear. This location
10 has been proposed for the top of what is described on
11 the map as Mt. Hayman. It is one of the highest
12 sites in the area. As Mr. Winn had suggested
13 earlier, it's in the flight path of the Lawrence
14 airport.

15 One of the concerns that I have is that
16 the reason they are proposing this site on the top of
17 Mt. Hayman is because there is all wetlands and
18 things that nature. And there is actually no other
19 suitable site within this acreage. And putting this
20 place at the highest point absolutely makes no sense:
21 With the noise, emissions and with the light
22 pollution that it's going to provide a completely
23 residential makes no sense to me.

24 The second and the next point I would

1 like to make just briefly: Is the impact of noxious
2 public facilities. The State Court in Massachusetts
3 has recognized that North Andover is overburdened
4 with noxious public facilities. We have the
5 Wheelabrator energy generation trash-burning plant.
6 We have a new trash transfer station with the
7 Thompson Brothers in North Andover, approximately a
8 half a mile away. We have the Greater Lawrence
9 Sanitary District Water Treatment Plant which
10 provides noxious odors 24 hours a day 365 days a
11 year. North Andover is clearly overburdened with
12 noxious public facilities. We don't need yet another
13 noxious public facility within 2,000 feet of our
14 border.

15 There are many houses, residential
16 facilities. This is a facility that should be an
17 industrial-zoned area. There is no excuse for
18 putting this in a residential area or conservation
19 land. Thank you for your time.

20 MS. JONES: Thank you. Next speaker is
21 David Torrisi.

22 MR. TORRISI: David T-O-R-R-I-S-I,
23 State representative from North Andover. And I also
24 want to acknowledge my colleagues Barbara L'Italien

1 who is a State representative in North Andover and
2 Boxford and I think Senator Bruce Tarr who is a State
3 Senator for many towns, too numerous for me to
4 mention. Also to make full disclosure, I reside at
5 67 Settlers Route Road.

6 I have been briefed by the Algonquin
7 people and they have made a very thorough
8 presentation and I appreciate their time and efforts.
9 I appreciate your time and efforts for coming here
10 tonight. I missed your introduction so I don't know
11 if this question has already been expressed or it's
12 beyond your scope. Is this facility definitely going
13 to be built along this corridor from, you know,
14 Methuen down to Danvers. That's the first question I
15 have.

16 MS. JONES: Are you speaking about the
17 compressor station?

18 MR. TORRISI: Yes, the one that --
19 obviously whether it's in Peabody, Danvers, Boxford.
20 That's what, I think, the people are mostly here to
21 talk about tonight. Is that definitely to be built
22 somewhere along that line?

23 MS. JONES: That's the proposal.

24 MR. TORRISI: Now, what's your

1 authority or what's your jurisdiction as far as
2 looking at financial implications of such a facility?

3 MS. JONES: We look -- one of our areas
4 of analysis is in the socio-economic and
5 physio-economic impact of construction of certain
6 facilities. I'm not sure if I can answer your
7 question.

8 MR. TORRISI: I think the fire chief
9 made an excellent point and Dr. MacMillan made an
10 excellent point, where the proposed primary site they
11 are proposing right now is the Boxford site. And,
12 you know, objectively looking at it, it probably does
13 touch the least amount of residents. What I am
14 trying to get is at is my belief and I think an
15 objective layman's view the impact is going to be
16 dramatic. Mr. Winn from Bradford Street opined
17 numerous environmental reasons why this shouldn't be
18 built. Not -- I don't want to throw Danvers at
19 Peabody here. No one wants this in their backyard.
20 You travel the country and you hear that day in and
21 day out: They don't want these kind of facilities
22 built in their backyard. They have to be built.
23 They do serve a purpose.

24 If they have to be built, obviously the

1 community that bears the burden is often compensated.
2 I know when the pipeline came through, Bob --
3 Algonquin -- were you called Algonquin then --
4 Maritime. They were very helpful in trying to move
5 the pipeline around a couple of different sites.
6 There was some monetary compensation to help train
7 firefighters, for example. If this is built in
8 Boxford, North Andover is going to bear most of the
9 burden. Is there anything FERC can mandate to make
10 sure North Andover is compensated for bearing such
11 burdens? That is what I meant by financial burden.

12 MS. JONES: That isn't an answer I have
13 right now. And whether that is typically part of our
14 analysis, that's something I couldn't answer. I
15 would have to look into and get back to you about.

16 MR. TORRISI: Please. Another point,
17 the study with Dr. MacMillan, I believe this is a
18 point of access. I know Mr. Flynn doesn't want to
19 hear this. But you can get to the site probably
20 through the golf course. What kind of jurisdiction
21 you have to mandate that, this building is being
22 constructed, that if Boxford again is bearing -- and
23 I know a lot of residents don't want it but if it
24 does come, they will get the financial rewards for

1 having it. It is going to be close to half a million
2 dollars a year in property taxes. So they will get
3 that as compensation. What kind of mandates can you
4 put on to make sure they use Boxford roads, for
5 example?

6 MS. JONES: I believe in general, the
7 FERC is not in a practice of mandating financial
8 compensation. I could be wrong but in my
9 recollection that isn't an area that we get into.
10 But I will note your concern and look into it
11 further. But it isn't an answer I have for you right
12 now.

13 MR. TORRISI: I would seem to think in
14 your history, there may be instances where a site is
15 built on the outskirts of a town that the boundary
16 may not be near any homes but may be close to other
17 homes in other communities. So obviously, again,
18 it's a very parochial interest -- and I apologize to
19 my neighbors in Boxford. But I think we need to look
20 at this in those terms. I hope you do some research
21 to find out if you have authority to insist or
22 mandate if this proposed site, proposed primary site,
23 is approved by you folks, that North Andover is
24 justly compensated. Thank you.

1 MS. JONES: Thank you. Sandy Lieto.

2 MS. LIETO: Hi. I'm Sandy Lieto. I
3 live on Lily Pond Road in Boxford, Massachusetts. I
4 was not planning on speaking tonight. I'm not very
5 well-informed. I found out about this a short while
6 ago. I live literally right around the corner from
7 Far Corner Golf Course. Needless to say, I am not
8 very happy about this coming in. I just scribbled a
9 few quick notes so maybe you can take it home and get
10 back to us.

11 First of all, a lot of us did not
12 receive notice of the meeting for this coming in. I
13 think you could make more of an effort in that
14 department. The gentleman who stated that a lot more
15 people would show up is right. Let's see. I'm
16 curious if you have ever done a study on property
17 values on one of your plans and how they have been
18 affected by this. I'm curious if you do regular
19 water testing for PCBs. I read an article in the
20 "New York Times" there were extensive cases of cancer
21 in New Jersey near one of these plants.

22 I'm curious -- I heard a question about
23 noise earlier. I didn't really hear an answer. I am
24 just up the road from it and I still am not clear

1 about what I will be hearing. I'm curious why you
2 are building in Boxford with a volunteer fire
3 department. I still didn't hear an answer about what
4 the circumference of what an explosion would be. I'm
5 wondering why you don't go to a municipal area where
6 number one, the noise would be less invasive; number
7 two, they have a nonvolunteer fire department.
8 Number three, they have public water supplies instead
9 of relying on the groundwater which could be easily
10 contaminated.

11 I'm curious about whether any of what
12 we say is going to have impact. I'm feeling sort of
13 bull-dozed in this. I'm feeling pretty helpless
14 right now. My husband and I sacrificed a lot to get
15 here. We came here because we loved the rural nature
16 of the town. I feel like you are taking our peace of
17 mind. We have two young children. I'm very worried
18 about their health. It all sounds like emotional
19 knee jerk but it's very real to me. And I am
20 wondering if any of you have kids and any of you live
21 near one of these plants.

22 MS. JONES: Ms. Lieto, I appreciate all
23 of your concerns and for you coming out tonight to
24 give them to us. The transcripts are being made so

1 that we can get an accurate record of everything that
2 is being said here tonight so that we are sure to
3 address all of those concerns.

4 That was the last person I had on the
5 speakers list. If there is anyone additional who
6 would like to speak, please feel free to in turn come
7 to the microphone. Please state your name and spell
8 it as it would help our transcriber.

9 MR. PEARL: My name is Jack Pearl,
10 P-E-A-R-L. I own abutting land. I live in Boxford.
11 And I'm concerned with the safety issue here. And
12 it's been dodged. We have all kinds of mechanical
13 devices but if we have a leak in this system or in
14 this pipe or station, the potential for catastrophe
15 is real. These safety vales and measures you are
16 talking about take time to trip out. In the meantime
17 you are creating a plume of gas. If you have
18 ignition, you have a fireball. And as far as the
19 diameter, we are talking hundreds of feet depending
20 on the volume of gas.

21 This has happened. We lost three
22 people yesterday or the day before at Salem Harbor
23 because of some kind of mechanical rupture or
24 failure. So these things do happen. We are talking

1 about a gas that is odorless and colorless. You
2 don't know that you are being enveloped with this
3 gas. You don't know that. You can actually breathe
4 in this gas. But once you have ignition, you are in
5 a fireball. That's one point.

6 The other point is I don't like FERC
7 dodging the property damages that you are causing
8 with this issue. There are property evaluations that
9 occur with your installations. It bothers me you sit
10 there and say: Oh, we haven't even looked at that.

11 These people who about this plant are
12 entitled to severance damages. And this should be
13 mandated by FERC. FERC should not dodge it and
14 ignore it. Severance damages. There is a property
15 devaluation with what you are doing. There is no
16 question. Thank you.

17 MS. JONES: Thank you.

18 MR. HANSON: Hi. My name is Bill
19 Hanson. I live on Bradford Street in North Andover,
20 a stone's throw away from Dave. Two things: One is
21 I only heard about this meeting from a Web site
22 called stopboxfordgascompressor.com. Nobody else
23 notified me at all. I will add my voice to the
24 people complaining about this before.

1 The other one is: I watched the North
2 Andover Selectmen's meeting where Algonquin made a
3 presentation about this plant and the noise level.
4 And correct me if I am wrong -- the way they defined
5 the noise level is it was 55 decibels at 500 feet
6 away from the plant. My question is: Do they have a
7 noise footprint so we can look at it and say: If
8 it's 55 DB at 500 feet, it's a lot louder than that.
9 And the other question is: How long does it take for
10 the tail to go away? So I would like to see a noise
11 footprint for what this thing will do. Thank you.

12 MS. JONES: Thank you.

13 MR. PETROSINO: My name is Kevin
14 P-E-T-R-O-S-I-N-O. I live on 9 Helen Drive in
15 Peabody. I'm an abutter for the alternate location.
16 I have a couple of questions. I think the gentleman
17 from Algonquin spoke. He said that the station would
18 run three to 4,000 hours a year. If I do the math,
19 that's about 60 to 80 hours a week, not 24/7 but that
20 is more than a full-time job. That's a full-time job
21 of a couple of people. It's not just a couple of
22 hours in the morning and a couple of hours in the
23 night. It can happen that way if it's going to be 60
24 to 80 hours a week. That's my first question.

1 My second observational question is:
2 Is that all the people here whether from North
3 Andover, Peabody, Danvers, Boxford; we are looking
4 for specific answers and for the most part we have
5 heard general comments being made. I don't know --
6 I'm not an engineer. I don't know what 55 DBs
7 translates to. I have no idea. And talking about
8 whether the station is going to be manned or
9 unmanned: Why don't you guys know that? What's it
10 going to be specifically?

11 You know, we are all concerned. We
12 want to know specifically. I'm not -- I don't live
13 around a proposed area. I'm not a quarter of a mile
14 or half a mile away. I'm less than a pinch away.

15 And me and my family, the residents of
16 Peabody around that area, are very concerned. And we
17 -- we would like to hear specifics, not generalities.
18 Thank you.

19 MS. JONES: I just want to respond
20 briefly. There is a trade-off in the FERC coming to
21 conduct these meetings during what we call this
22 pre-filing process. Algonquin has not yet filed a
23 formal application with us. Their project is still
24 in the early planning stages. So on the one hand, we

1 don't have all of the specifics at hand because it is
2 still in the planning stages.

3 But we are out here early to try to
4 identify any major issues so as the planning directs
5 us forward, those things can be considered and
6 integrated into the proposal instead of just getting
7 a package landed on us that has a whole lot of major
8 problems with it.

9 So there is a trade-off and I
10 apologize. It may seem we don't have a lot of
11 specifics but it's because of the early stage we are
12 in and the fact that we are trying to come out early
13 and get some issues brought to light so we can
14 resolve them throughout the planning phase.

15 MS. HARTRICK: Hi. I'm Barbara
16 Hartrick and I'm from Boxford. And this feels very
17 familiar because about five or six years ago Maritime
18 built a pipeline pretty near our property. At that
19 time I was wondering what would be the next one.
20 Once the pipeline went, was that the end of it or was
21 there going to be some other thing being built?

22 So now we are back again and there is,
23 you know, Boxford is the primary site for a
24 compressor. And what I am wondering is five or six

1 years from now, what is going to be the next step in
2 this process? And is that something you consider
3 when you approve step one? Do you think ahead of
4 what's likely to come in six years or ten years.

5 And I would like to know: Suppose the
6 compressor is spilled in whatever site it's spilled;
7 what does that mean for the next six years in terms
8 of development of this energy pipeline?

9 Is there going to be another compressor
10 site built in between or near the first one? Are the
11 pipes going to have to be dug up and larger pipes put
12 in eventually? What are you approving in this --
13 when you go through this approval process, can you
14 give us an idea of what the likely timeline is for
15 the next big construction, energy construction, along
16 this corridor?

17 MR. BOB: I'm Murray Bob from Peabody.
18 I have something that ties into what she just
19 mentioned on page 7 of your handout here. It talks
20 about compressor stations in storage fields and --
21 typically you find that after you put -- sometime
22 after you put a compressor station in, do you put
23 storage fields? And that seemed to take up a fair
24 amount of space. And there's 8.2 acres that you are

1 looking at in Boxford but 50 acres in Danvers. So
2 does that mean that you are looking at possibly
3 putting in a storage field which would be much more
4 destructive and have much more environmental impact.

5 MS. JONES: Pipelines require
6 compressor stations. And storage fields also require
7 compressor stations. So that's probably the reason
8 why they were discussed in the same portion of our
9 informational pamphlet. However, storage of natural
10 gas is very much dictated by geology. It's often
11 found in structural, underground structural tracks in
12 the geography and in salt caverns that are vying for
13 natural gas storage. It's a completely different
14 application. The compressor stations that are being
15 proposed for this pipeline are entirely unrelated to
16 natural gas storage.

17 MS. SLADE: Phila Slade, 21 Bradford
18 Street. I had a couple of questions. Just off the
19 top of your head, does anybody have a guess what the
20 DB level of sound that's coming up from downstairs?

21 MS. JONES: I took a noise meter back
22 to my house one night when the crickets were pretty
23 loud and it was about 65 on my porch. I don't know
24 if that helps or not. 55 is a pretty tough standard.

1 MS. SLADE: The next question is:
2 Representative Tourissi asked about the road's
3 access. The street currently is closed off between
4 the water tower down toward Far Corner Golf Course.
5 And it will have to be improved for the construction.
6 Will it continue to be locked and closed off or will
7 it become an open public way? And if so, who will
8 hold the key? I think this was addressed at the
9 selectmen's meeting but I don't remember just how it
10 came out.

11 MR. GESSNER: My name is Frank Gessner.
12 I am the right-of-way manager. The answer to the
13 question is yes. The gate will be replaced with
14 another gate. Likely the keys that are currently --
15 that open that gate will be similar keys and most of
16 the land owners that have access to that road right
17 now will maintain access. As to getting into the
18 actual compressor station site, there will be a
19 second gate that will be keyed only for the Algonquin
20 facility.

21 MS. JONES: I assume that the police
22 and fire departments will also have keys?

23 MR. GESSNER: To the road; yes. That
24 is correct. They will but not to the station.

1 MS. JONES: So the fire department
2 can't get to the station?

3 MR. GESSNER: They can get to the gate
4 of the station but they can't get into the station.

5 MS. SLADE: I am also a member of the
6 Friends from the North Andover Trail. We are
7 somewhat concerned about the impact on the animal and
8 plant environment. I know that there is some
9 conservation land that crosses the street there. And
10 the trail committee wasn't particularly aware of this
11 meeting. But I presume we can send in written
12 comments, then?

13 MS. JONES: Yes. You may.

14 MS. SLADE: Thank you.

15 MS. SILESKUS: Hi. My name is Sandra
16 Sileskus. I'm a West Boxford resident, and my home
17 is just a stone's throw away from the Far Corners
18 Golf Course as well. And I wanted to make two points
19 that haven't been made this evening regarding
20 construction of this gas compressor plant on the
21 Boxford site.

22 One of the points that I would like to
23 make this evening is that this Boxford site may
24 potentially be located on a deep earthquake fault

1 line. Based on research I have done on the Internet,
2 this may apparently be the case. Last month we had
3 seismic activity which was centered in Amesbury,
4 Massachusetts, which is maybe ten, 15 miles away from
5 Boxford. It measured 1.8 on the Richter scale but
6 there were also a number of measures taken as well.

7 According to the Internet, experts are
8 speculating that this area, Merrimack Valley,
9 including Boxford, is well overdue for further
10 earthquake activity. I don't know how that will
11 impact this gas compressor station. But if it's
12 during construction or after the fact? If there has
13 been other studies, other locations which gas
14 compressor stations have been in areas of earthquake
15 activity, how does that affect the environment and
16 the communities? It would be something I think that
17 should be in the report.

18 Secondly, I would like to just inform
19 you that the Boxford site, this 150 acres, is
20 adjacent to the largest blue heron rookery in the
21 State of Massachusetts. I'm not sure if you know
22 this fact. I have been told this by a
23 representatives of the Oxford Trail Association.
24 It's been here for a number of years. And we are

1 hoping it remains here for a number of years to come.

2 Based on where I live in West Boxford,
3 I can observe these birds on a daily basis. These
4 large, timid birds migrate here every March. It's an
5 impressive rookery. You should all observe it. They
6 come here to nest and hatch their young. On a daily
7 basis, they go from their nest in search of food in
8 other surrounding ponds in the area.

9 They are very timid. If they see any
10 noise -- if they hear any noise or see any activity
11 on the ground below, they divert from their flight
12 path. So it's something that we need to be very
13 aware of, especially since the Boxford Trail
14 Association worked very, very hard to establish a
15 trail on private property which happens to be my
16 husband's and mine. And they have an easement for
17 this trail so that residents of all ages can come
18 down the trail and observe this massive blue heron
19 rookery which is adjacent to this Boxford site.

20 Now, should this gas compressor station
21 be constructed, it will have an impact on this site.
22 And I just want you to realize that. And not only do
23 blue herons live here, but it's been confirmed there
24 is owl nests on this property. Bald eagles migrate

1 here and other unusual wildlife do habitate in this
2 general surrounding area.

3 In fact, it's so popular there is even
4 a children's book that's been published which cites
5 the blue heron rookery. They do mention the fact
6 that once you approach the gas pipeline, you are not
7 -- you are restricted and you can't go any further.
8 So the trail ends at the gas pipeline. And you can
9 observe the blue heron rookery from there.

10 And if we ruin it for our future
11 generations that are not able to observe these
12 beautiful birds and all the other wildlife that come
13 here, then we have ruined it forever. So I just want
14 to point this out so that in your environmental
15 investigation, you can take this into account and
16 hopefully keep it in consideration and not build a
17 gas compressor station in our very small town, very
18 rural town of Boxford. Thank you very much.

19 MS. JONES: Thank you.

20 MR. PERRY: My name is a Stephen Perry.
21 I live at 7 Helen Drive in Peabody and I pay taxes in
22 Danvers because half of my backyard, like my
23 neighbors, falls in Danvers. Okay. In preparing for
24 tonight's meeting, I wanted to take a different point

1 of view. I went to the compressor station today. I
2 would like to congratulate you on where you located
3 it.

4 Driving up on Route 100, I'm looking
5 for it. I know it's going to be a left-hand turn
6 someplace. I see this nice gated long driveway going
7 up into the woods, beautiful wooded lane probably 600
8 yards long, very nice three lanes going down it. I
9 am thinking maybe I am going to a corporate office.
10 I know it's supposed to be a compressor station
11 because that's what it says in the booklet.

12 I turn the corner at the end. And I'm
13 facing a very industrial plant, maybe 400 feet of
14 barbed fencing on all sides; three buildings on the
15 site, one and a half storage -- first building is all
16 gray, silver color. It houses the facility's
17 equipment: The boiler, the electrical substation,
18 what it takes to run the facility.

19 Across the way is the turbines and the
20 reciprocating engines. Between them that building
21 would be about two and a half stories, the same
22 design. Between them I have five stacks, 40 feet up
23 in the air, I guess. Between those I have five
24 storage tanks maybe 25 feet up in the air. Separated

1 from that is the general office area.

2 The staff is very, very cordial. I
3 went down there unannounced. I didn't expect much.
4 They let me into the gate. They answered a couple of
5 questions and that was it. Other than visual, what I
6 am really seeing is the noise. I wanted to get a
7 real grasp of what we are talking about here but you
8 will say a slight buzz. We really don't know until
9 the plant is up and operational and by then it's too
10 late.

11 And standing at the gate, all I can
12 think of is a small jet engine on a runway waiting to
13 take off. Idling. It's not roaring down the runway,
14 it's not that loud. But it's just idling. It's a
15 roaring, constant. And this is the turbine,
16 depending on duty cycle.

17 The gentleman that I spoke to said it's
18 not 24/7 but it does increase in frequency depending
19 upon the demand. And we know we are coming into the
20 wintertime. Okay. It did decrease as I left the
21 plant as I got into the trees going back closer to
22 Route 100. By the time, I got back to Route 1 --
23 again, I'm guessing at about 600 yards, it was barely
24 noticeable. It was sheltered. It's an ideal

1 location. It's not a residential area.

2 I'm not here to polarize the crowd to
3 say: Should it be in Boxford? Should it be in
4 Danvers? It shouldn't be in any residential area,
5 especially in homes within that. Okay.

6 Speaking of the Danvers site because
7 naturally, that's my primary concern here, I thought
8 I was close. When I saw the map back there, there
9 are some residents up in Goodale Farms where it's
10 their backyard and you are looking at the plant and
11 there is one row of trees.

12 Now, the problem is: In Burrillville
13 (ph) where you have a forest that surrounds us; back
14 there in the landfill, my understanding is once it's
15 capped you, you couldn't break the cap. You can't
16 get through the landfill. You can't penetrate that
17 cap. So how will you plant trees at the end of that?

18 Another thing is the area where the
19 plant is shown to go in, it's depressed. It's the
20 lowest point. Goodale Farms is higher. You have a
21 valley where you put in the plant. You have the
22 landfill. Okay so if you have to get your vents so
23 that they exhaust away from the homes, you could have
24 them put that up higher. And that's going to expose

1 and give terrible site lines.

2 So we are talking about environmental
3 impact. We have a noise to deal with and also your
4 site lines. Right now when you look out there, there
5 is a landfill. We knew that going in. We also know
6 it was closed off, capped off. It's grassed over.
7 We get the occasional wildlife out there.

8 The kids -- we have some of our kids
9 here tonight. And they can tell you when they are
10 out their playing, it's a very nice area to live.
11 It's very quiet. But now we will be dealing with jet
12 engines, with the vents. It's just not right. Not
13 in a residential area.

14 Like Janette said earlier, again, you
15 can't give an exact footprint on an explosion because
16 you don't know certain parameters. That's
17 understandable. I also was woken up the night of the
18 explosion in Danvers and I live all the way on the
19 other side of town. My windows were rattling. How
20 would you like it? Thank you.

21 MR. ANDRIOLO: Hi. My name is Joseph
22 A-N-D-R-I-O-L-O. And I'm an abutter on White Birch
23 Lane in North Andover, Mass. I don't want to
24 reiterate what everyone else has been saying. Just a

1 few points that I want to kind of touch on. I'm glad
2 the earthquake point was made because I was going to
3 bring that up as well. There is a lot of fault line
4 and a lot of conjecture as to what could come out of
5 that at some point in the future.

6 I have felt a couple of small tremors.
7 You know, it's something you ought to look into. As
8 far as my own perspective -- and again, I'm not here
9 to polarize the crowd but just to try to speak of our
10 own interest here. As an abutter where we live, we
11 are getting it from all angles now because we have
12 several smoke stacks, one in Haverhill directly to
13 the northwest of us. Then we have an incinerator in
14 North Andover, which is directly west of us.

15 Then we have another stack. I'm not
16 quite sure what it's for and then we have the trash
17 transfer station. Then we have that airport where we
18 are hearing the constant noise. And whenever the
19 wind is coming west or northwest or southwest, it
20 always smells like we are smelling burnt -- like a
21 forest fire.

22 We constantly smell those incinerators.
23 Now when the wind shifts to the east, we will have
24 the pleasure of smelling this. And we are getting it

1 from all angles. And like a couple of other folks in
2 this group, we have worked very hard to get out of an
3 urban area to live here. We came in here with an
4 understanding of conservation lands, watersheds and a
5 rural community. And to have something like this
6 just thrown in there, it doesn't add up for me. I
7 don't quite understand why it wouldn't be in more of
8 an urbanized area.

9 It's just like they don't want to put a
10 liquid natural gas terminal in Boston, for obvious
11 reasons. They are worried about terrorist attacks or
12 if there is an explosion. I'm extremely horrified
13 that this is on the flight line to the airport.
14 These planes come right over our houses. And you
15 just get one whacko. That's a pretty soft target.
16 That's a pretty easy thing to hit and it's unmanned.
17 What happens if someone does decide to take a dive
18 into that compressor station?

19 I don't know if anyone has any idea.
20 To me, you are putting it right in the direct flight
21 path of an airport. And it's not just a little
22 airport where you occasionally get these prop jets.
23 It is becoming a pretty busy regional airport. You
24 got a lot of these small jets going in there now, and

1 you hear those engines spooling. If this plant is
2 going to sound like an idling, spooling engine,
3 that's very problematic and troubling to me.

4 You got a lot more traffic and they are
5 talking about upgrading that airport. You ought to
6 do a little research on the plans they have for that
7 airport and potential things: They might want to do
8 a runway. I don't know exactly what they are talking
9 with the Turtle. My understanding they are looking
10 to replace it and really make it a nice executive
11 airport.

12 And the more traffic, the more
13 capabilities you have to get the wrong people flying
14 the planes and decide to do something there. I'm
15 very concerned as well: During construction living
16 off of Bradford Street -- I don't know if you have
17 ever driven down there. Before you leave, you might
18 want to take a ride up there. That road is about as
19 wide as this area (indicating). When you have two
20 cars coming on that street, I don't know how you can
21 get tractor trailers and dump trucks, you know, up
22 and down that road.

23 And not only is the road in rather poor
24 condition, and the shoulders have been washed out,

1 you try to pull over and I have had a couple of
2 situations where I am lucky to have a truck because
3 if I was in a car, I would have hang nailed myself.

4 You know, I'm not being facetious.

5 Take a ride down the road and take a look. That is
6 the access for the time being. You have heard about
7 Barker Road. That road can't even handle two-way
8 traffic without having to slow down and really kind
9 of change your bearings.

10 Noise is a common theme. Property
11 values is a common theme. On my end you have to look
12 at the whole picture and find a different
13 alternative. That's pretty much all I have to say.
14 Thank you.

15 MR. MALLEY: My name is Victor Malley.
16 I live at 5 Helen Drive in Peabody. I'm probably one
17 of the oldest residents on the street. And years ago
18 when they had voided the area that you're looking at,
19 it was owned by some friends of mine. They had taken
20 the land out and made the runways at Logan Airport
21 and created voids around the area, along with
22 creating these voids, created pockets of water they
23 had told me were part of some river that runs down
24 through Salem.

1 So when they had capped off the
2 landfill behind us, Hybrid Company had come in and
3 they had done all the ash and the gravel and done a
4 great job. They came to me and said: Would you like
5 us to fill this void? It was a small pond which was
6 really kind of a puddle, you know. It's adjacent --
7 a part of my property and one of my neighbors who
8 spoke here tonight.

9 I said: I'd love to because it would
10 make my yard grade off a little better. It's about a
11 35, 40-foot drop to it. I said: I would love to.
12 All of a sudden out of nowhere a big meeting arose in
13 my backyard with the conservation from Danvers came
14 in, some State representative from the conservation
15 committee and said: I'm sorry. You can't fill this.
16 Hybrid was looking to do it at their own expense,
17 extended drainage pipe that came off of the run-off
18 from the street.

19 And you know no one -- I mean, this
20 area here is kind of in the middle of nowhere. And
21 they said: No, we can't do it. So my point is that
22 if you can't fill an old tire-filled pond, just an
23 old dump site, how can you build something like this
24 there? It's just a point that I wanted to bring up.

1 Thank you.

2 MR. TARR: Good evening. I'm State
3 Senator Bruce Tarr and I have the privilege of
4 representing half of North Andover along with my
5 colleague Senator Steve Baddour who could not be with
6 us tonight but also wanted to express his interest in
7 this issue. I also represent all of Boxford.
8 Together with my two colleagues who are here tonight,
9 Representative L'Italien and Representative Tourissi,
10 I think it's fair to say that the entire legislative
11 delegation considers the concerns that have been
12 expressed tonight very seriously.

13 I actually have been sitting about
14 halfway back in the room and listening to those
15 comments. I am very pleased that you are here
16 tonight to be able to receive them, as are the
17 project proponents all sitting to my left. I hope
18 that both will take all of the comments into serious
19 consideration.

20 I'm glad we are at the outset of the
21 process. I think there is an opportunity to guide
22 this process in an informed way based on the comments
23 made here tonight. Without reiterating all of them,
24 just to recap a couple that I have heard tonight and

1 I think are particularly important is that one: You
2 should require and the proponents should provide a
3 full safety analysis of the capacities and response
4 times of the entities that would be required to
5 respond if there is an incident at the plant.

6 Number two, there should be a full
7 environmental analysis that takes into account the
8 air quality issues and the sound issues, the
9 potential for mitigation, if there is potential to
10 mitigate the sound issues, as well as the impact on
11 drinking water supply and biodiversity. In addition
12 to that, I think there should be an overarching
13 analysis done here and there should be a full
14 consideration of alternatives for the best site for
15 this proposal.

16 By that, I mean that we are looking at
17 areas that are largely bounded by residential areas.
18 And I wonder, as I think many people in the room
19 wonder, if it's not possible to look at more
20 industrial alternatives that might be more consistent
21 with the local zoning of the communities and existing
22 land uses of those communities where a proposal could
23 be cited. I hope you will require that. I hope that
24 the proponents will deliver that to you in the

1 interest of doing a circumspect analysis of what is
2 to happen with this plant.

3 Last but not least, I also hope that
4 you will require and the proponents will provide a
5 delineation of why this is needed. I do want to give
6 credit where it is due. I appreciate the customary
7 informed approach that the project proponents have
8 taken with the legislative delegation and we had a
9 chance to discuss this.

10 But I would hope that you would require
11 a forthright explanation of why additional
12 compression is necessary, given the fact that the
13 pipeline is currently not running at either designed
14 volume or pressure. Yet we are introducing
15 additional gas and requiring additional compression.
16 I hope that will be addressed from an engineering
17 standpoint.

18 Last but not least, there seems to be a
19 lot of unanswered questions here tonight. I know
20 that is not the panel's initiative tonight to be able
21 to answer those things or prerogative. But I would
22 hope in the interest of moving forward in an informed
23 way, that the project proponents would make
24 themselves available. And I know that the

1 legislative delegation would be happy to work with
2 them to have a night of informational exchange so
3 that any unanswered questions could be answered by
4 the folks actually intended to build this project. I
5 know they are very knowledgeable and very
6 professional. And I think this entire group and
7 others who were not able to be here tonight would
8 benefit from that kind of informational exchange.

9 So I hope that you will look at all of
10 those things as elements at the outset of this
11 process to be included as it moves forward in any
12 potential certification. And I do appreciate the
13 fact that you were willing to come and listen. I
14 think that is critically important and you are here
15 at the outset of the process. I think that's a fact
16 that should be noted and duly noted. And I hope that
17 we can continue to work together to try to find the
18 optimal location for this plant, if it needs to be
19 built. Thank you.

20 MS. JONES: Thank you.

21 MR. BOB: Murray Bob from Peabody.
22 Does this pipeline pass through Boston effectively?

23 MS. JONES: I don't know the answer to
24 that question.

1 MR. BOB: The reason I am asking isn't
2 natural gas the same thing that what is being
3 proposed to be off-loaded three miles out in the
4 harbor. And if so, wouldn't it make sense to say:
5 Let's have a compression facility that takes care of
6 everything? Possibly the gas that's coming in from
7 the barges as well as the gas that is being pushed
8 from wherever we are all the way to wherever --
9 Connecticut or wherever the next state is.

10 I don't know if that's technically
11 feasible. But that would solve everybody's problems.

12 MS. JONES: I was just trying to
13 determine what facility you are referring to.

14 MR. BOB: Well, somebody else mentioned
15 and I mentioned earlier that I believe Boston does
16 not want a liquid natural gas facility. Now, I don't
17 know the difference between your gas or your gas over
18 there and the liquid natural gas. But I would think
19 gas is gas. It would be interchangeable.

20 If that's the case, then why not be
21 able to have it compressed in some sort of offshore
22 facility. This way nobody gets -- nobody is in
23 danger and it would do dual duty because I'm sure the
24 barges that will be off-loaded in Boston Harbor with

1 the underground lines, that would also need
2 compression.

3 MS. JONES: I believe the two offshore
4 facilities you are referring to -- there is two that
5 have been recently approved, Northeast Gateway and
6 the Neptune L&G facility. Those are both --
7 Northeast Gateway Center is under construction. And
8 their facility is to receive L&G vessels with natural
9 gas liquid form, which would then be transferred to
10 natural gas and put into the pipeline grid.

11 There are engineering constraints that
12 determine and flow dynamic modelling that goes into
13 determining where the pipeline system compression is
14 needed to make sure that it can flow from point A to
15 point B. And those -- I'm not an engineer.

16 But there is flow mechanics and the
17 engineering constraints somewhat dictate where along
18 the system you need additional compression. So it's
19 not possible generally to just take a point on the
20 map that would be a good spot and say that would
21 serve the purpose. It has to meet the engineering
22 specifications to make sure the gas can flow. I'm
23 sure one of you can describe that more eloquently as
24 far as what engineering and flow considerations go

1 into deciding where along the line compression is
2 required.

3 MR. BOB: I just wanted to bring this
4 up. They don't want it. We don't want it and I
5 don't think anybody who is residential wants it. We
6 know Boston didn't want similar -- other type of
7 technology. And they have come up with a different
8 way of doing things. So maybe somebody has to think
9 outside the box to be able to satisfy residential
10 requirements.

11 MR. ANDRIOLO: I just need ten seconds.
12 But thank you very much for letting me speak. One
13 thing I just wanted to mention that is just on the
14 ironic side. And I'm Joe Andriolo again, White Birch
15 Lane, North Andover. It's just kind of irony but we
16 know we don't have natural gas on our street. It's
17 all oil heat. And my understanding is the
18 development in Danvers also does not have natural
19 gas. I don't know if anyone can verify that.

20 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: We have lived
21 there 17 years, and nobody on the street has natural
22 gas.

23 MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: We don't have
24 it either for what it's worth. Thank you.

1 MR. GHIKAS: My name is a David
2 G-H-I-K-A-S. I live at 186 Bradford Street so I am an
3 abutter. From what I understand there is two sites
4 that are in consideration. When you consider to
5 reach the site that you took into consideration, did
6 the financial, you know, cost come into play as a
7 factor? I'm wondering if there is any other perhaps
8 alternative settings which are less residential which
9 might be more expensive but might provide a better
10 quality of life for, you know, everybody concerned.
11 And this cost associated with establishing these
12 facilities -- maybe it's a little more expensive to
13 put it not in the most optimal spot. This cost
14 should eventually be passed onto the consumer, I
15 would think. I was wondering if that was -- I guess
16 in short: Why these two sites? Are there any other
17 sites that would be better situated for the community
18 as a whole? Anyone want to answer?

19 MS. JONES: Alternatives -- the two
20 first pieces of information that FERC receives when
21 we start reviewing these projects, an overall project
22 description which describes purpose and need:
23 General, you know what the project would entail and
24 then alternatives. And we try to look at those

1 things up front because we realize it is one of the
2 paramount issues, that siting of both the facilities
3 and routing pipelines is a very difficult process.
4 There is a lot of concerns everybody has.

5 We attempt to try to find a balance of
6 all those issues. We look at the alternatives at the
7 proposed site for the facilities and the alternatives
8 the applicant provides. We look at all the
9 rationales and reasons for choosing particular sites.
10 We conduct also an independent review. If there are
11 other sites that weren't put on the table in the
12 initial application, it doesn't mean they are
13 completely off the table. FERC does an independent
14 review and if there are other alternatives we should
15 be looking at, we will do so.

16 MR. FLYNN: When do those alternatives
17 come into play?

18 MS. JONES: It's all part of the review
19 process.

20 MR. FLYNN: Where in the review process
21 do you start looking at alternatives?

22 MS. JONES: As early as possible:

23 MR. FLYNN: Would that be now?

24 MS. JONES: Correct.

1 MR. FLYNN: So are you considering any
2 alternative place besides Danvers?

3 MS. JONES: At this point we are
4 actively reviewing the resource report ten, which
5 describes all of the alternatives that have been
6 provided in the proposal and the listing and the
7 description of those alternatives is available on our
8 Internet site. You can be looking at the same
9 analysis and listing of alternatives that we are
10 looking at.

11 So I encourage you to pick up some of
12 the materials to describe how to get information from
13 the FERC Web site that you can be looking at the same
14 information that we are and to provide your comments
15 if you think there are other areas we should be
16 looking at.

17 MR. FLYNN: Thank you.

18 MR. BOB: Looking at your map again.
19 Murray Bob of Peabody. If my map reading is correct,
20 I see the Boxford proposed site. I see the Danvers
21 proposed site and then I see the line going through
22 water down to Randolph.

23 So that seems to me that we are dealing
24 with something that -- an area that is water-based

1 and not surrounded by people. So I'm wondering:
2 Have any, even an offshore which is -- which would
3 not effectively be way out of the way, you are
4 effectively in the stream of your pipeline. If you
5 look at the map over here (indicating).

6 MS. JONES: I would be happy to discuss
7 this further with you. I know you have a lot of
8 questions tonight. In the interest of time to give
9 everybody a chance, I ask that maybe we speak
10 afterwards.

11 MR. POLIGNONE: Hi. My name is Robert
12 Polignone. I'm at 27 Emily Lane. The concerns that
13 I have: Where is FERC going to be when we sell our
14 homes? We all pay a premium for living here. The
15 reason why a lot of us moved into these areas is to
16 give our children and ourselves a better life.

17 I know that years ago, looking at the
18 Everett area, there are the gas tanks there. That
19 was one of the main reasons for moving out of Everett
20 to this rural area here in Peabody and to move
21 further north. The other thing is: The consensus
22 here is that it is wildlife, whether it's in Boxford,
23 Peabody or Danvers.

24 Right now -- yesterday -- we see six or

1 seven deer over the weekend in my backyard out of my
2 window. Now the site that's proposed in the Danvers
3 area is probably one of the most populated areas of
4 people. And all the houses and so forth and
5 communities, it's like taking a bomb and dropping it
6 in the middle of the neighborhood with cul-de-sacs,
7 you know, big large communities on both sides. It's
8 not something that sticking a facility for that size
9 and that amount of noise and air pollution, all these
10 environmental concerns, it belongs in an industrial
11 area. That's -- you know, I'm speaking for Boxford,
12 Danvers and Peabody. It does not belong in a rural
13 area, especially in the area populated with a lot of
14 people.

15 Right now I go all over the US, in the
16 UK and China. This fact about being able to monitor
17 and to activate systems: Our systems go down and we
18 have to send people on site to actually kick if those
19 safety factors fail. If it's mechanical, it will
20 fail. You can have all the safety factors you want;
21 when this thing blows up, how big of a disaster area
22 is it going to be? It will wipe out our whole
23 neighborhood and who is going to be around? Our
24 children? Nobody is going to be around.

1 You can tell us that the plant is good.
2 It's great. Do you people live near there? If you
3 lived near that plant, can you tell me all the noise
4 pollution, I would listen to you. But living near a
5 plant like that belongs in an industrial area. If I
6 want industrial, I would move back to the city.

7 That's the whole reason why we are out
8 here. And to have it on a golf course, wildlife, I
9 mean, this is something that we all preserve and live
10 for, the kids, children, the future. Sticking
11 something like that in my backyard is like putting a
12 bomb in my backyard. I'm sorry. I'm dead against
13 it. I really think they need to look at the area.
14 There is no benefit. I have not heard tonight once
15 from the company -- what are we benefitting from?
16 What are they giving back to the community? In
17 Peabody, we don't get any benefit from it. Danvers
18 gets the benefit.

19 So what are they doing for the people?
20 I have not heard one thing in this meeting saying
21 there is something they are doing for the people. I
22 think, you know, we are all looking for some comfort
23 zone. We are trying to let you in, deal with you.
24 But you haven't really given us any choices. Do we

1 put it in Boxford? Do we put it in Danvers? I think
2 the sites you have right now, they should be
3 different sites.

4 It's affecting all areas, whether it's
5 two acres of land or eight acres of land. In this
6 place, I don't think there is enough studies done on
7 it, you know, especially the noise pollution. I
8 worked on the airport for ten years. A jet engine,
9 that thing idling, you will hear it a quarter of a
10 mile away. Right now, at night when I sit on my
11 porch, I would rather listen to a thousand crickets
12 than listen to a jet engine. That's all I have to
13 say.

14 MS. COHEN: Janette Cohen, Peabody. I
15 have lived on the site for 50 years when it was an
16 asparagus patch. My great concern is also the
17 safety. Is this plant that you're going to be
18 building original? Or are you going to copy, one of
19 the other plants that have already been built. I see
20 there are a number of plants that are coming up
21 through New York and Connecticut that are already
22 built; is that correct? Are you going to reinvent
23 the wheel with a new plant that you are going to
24 build or copy one of the other ones?

1 MR. MUHLHERR: This plant is going to
2 be modeled after one of the ones or several of the
3 ones that we have already built in Maine. So it's --
4 we already have similar units such as this all up and
5 down our pipeline. So it's not anything brand-new.
6 It's nothing that we haven't seen or used before.
7 It's very reliable equipment. That is why we are
8 going with it again.

9 MS. COHEN: If that's the case, why
10 can't you be more specific as to what it's going to
11 do as far as sound? You spoke some about safety but
12 it's sound and the other issues these people have
13 brought up.

14 Another thing: When I first became
15 aware of this, I called someone from your office -- I
16 didn't bring the paperwork with me from your office.
17 I learned something that maybe these people know but
18 I didn't. You people are like the truckers. You
19 don't own the gas; is that correct? You are the
20 truckers.

21 Someone else owns the gas that is going
22 to be fed through the lines that you're going to put
23 in and compress; is that correct? And we are not mad
24 at all of you. Is this golf course that everybody is

1 talking about, is that the proposed site for the
2 compressor station? Or is it just near it?

3 MS. JONES: I believe it is near it.

4 MR. FLYNN: It directly abuts it.

5 MS. JONES: That's at the Boxford site?

6 MR. FLYNN: Correct.

7 MS. JONES: Is there anyone else who
8 has comments this evening?

9 MR. WINN: Jim Winn from North Andover.
10 I do have the written comments that I spoke about
11 earlier I would like to submit. I was wondering if
12 this is an opportunity for the people in this group
13 that may not want to come up to speak but may have
14 written comments they could submit now instead of
15 going through mailing.

16 MS. JONES: Yes, you can do that.

17 Is there anybody else who would like to
18 provide some comments tonight? It does not look as
19 though we have any more speakers so we will conclude
20 the formal portion of this meeting. On behalf of
21 FERC and the Massachusetts Energy Facility Siting
22 Board, I would like to thank you all for coming
23 tonight and providing your comments and concerns.
24 We will all be here a bit longer. If you have

1 additional questions and would like to speak with us,
2 please feel free. Thank you.

3 (Hearing concluded at 9:24 p.m.)

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 C E R T I F I C A T E

2 I, Lynda Vetter, a Certified Shorthand
3 Reporter and Notary Public of the State of
4 Massachusetts, do hereby certify that the foregoing
5 is a true and accurate transcript of my stenographic
6 notes of the above-referenced proceeding, taken at
7 the place and on the date hereinbefore set forth.

8 I further certify that I am neither attorney
9 nor counsel for, nor related to or employed by any of
10 the parties to the action in which this proceeding
11 was taken, and further that I am not a relative or
12 employee of any attorney or counsel employed in this
13 case, nor am I financially interested in this action.

14 THE FOREGOING CERTIFICATION OF THIS TRANSCRIPT
15 DOES NOT APPLY TO ANY REPRODUCTION OF THE SAME BY ANY
16 MEANS UNLESS UNDER THE DIRECT CONTROL AND/OR
17 DIRECTION OF THE CERTIFYING REPORTER.

18

19 Lynda C. Vetter, RPR, CCR

20

21

22

23

24