

From: Stephen Tirrell [<mailto:st1957589@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, January 10, 2016 5:10 PM
To: Monroe, Pamela
Subject: docket 2015-08

Now that the docket is opened I looked for comments I has made about it previously that were to have been added after the docket opened but they had apparently been lost. I do have an issue with the NED pipeline that I believe needs to be added to the list of items to be examined. I have seen no mention of this in other postings on the docket. Tennessee Gas Pipelines has no maintenance strategy for this installation that New Hampshire residents will be able to live with. In their other installations in other states they depend on a program that involves spraying products to retard the growth of vegetation to enable inspection by air. There are two problems with this strategy that stand out. The first is the terrain involved. They have laid out a course that does not lend itself to spraying from tracked vehicles. There will be problems with access because of grades and problems with runoff. The second is the inherent nature of the products involved and the safety issues involved. PSNH tried this back in the sixties or seventies on my parents land in Goffstown, on the site of the DC powerline that runs through there. At the time my father kept honey bees on the property and objected to the use of the chemicals involved, as well as the application method. They relented and returned to a cutoff strategy. Eversource currently uses tracked excavators with cutoff heads mounted to control the brush on the easement near Nesenkeag Dr. where I live. That won't work over a gas line easement, because of the chance of sparks and over the proposed course there is terrain where they can't operate. This issue is going to go unresolved and lead to this 30inch 1400psi monstrosity getting minimal inspection. If you look at the line going to the powerplant in Londonderry you will see the same overgrown situation, there is no meaningful inspection going on for that line. They might be complying with the federal agency involved, but that is only because they are complying on paper. That line is thoroughly overgrown in a few areas, and inspection by air at this point is impossible.

Since NED is destined to be a safety hazard and a substantial property issue in it's path through New Hampshire I believe the Site Evaluation Committee needs to deny the application.

Government needs to handle bad proposals the same way business does. In business when a vendor comes in with a bad proposal you decline it, someone else will fill the void later if there is such a void. As a state we need to do the same. If there is in fact substantial demand then someone else will come in with an acceptable proposal.

New Hampshire residents near the site of the proposed NED pipeline know that the demand is phantom, the pipeline is for export, and that co-location is a farce. Your position as a government agency needs to reflect this.

Thanks for the opportunity to state this concern

Steve Tirrell
Litchfield, NH