



**THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS  
ENERGY FACILITIES SITING BOARD**

ONE SOUTH STATION  
BOSTON, MA 02110  
(617) 305-3525

**CHARLES D. BAKER**  
GOVERNOR

**KARYN E. POLITO**  
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

June 18, 2015

BY ELECTRONIC FILING

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

Re: Algonquin Gas Transmission, L.L.C., PF15-12-000

Dear Ms. Bose:

The Massachusetts Energy Facilities Siting Board (“Siting Board”) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the filings relating to the Algonquin Gas Transmission, L.L.C.’s (“Algonquin” or “Company”) Atlantic Bridge Project (“Project”), FERC proceeding PF15-12-000. The Siting Board is submitting these comments in advance of FERC’s preparation of an Environmental Assessment (“EA”). This letter conveys some of the key issues voiced at the May 27, 2015 public hearing held by the Siting Board in Weymouth, Massachusetts, as well as concerns expressed in written comments received by the Siting Board. In addition, we summarize below some of the important issues identified by Siting Board staff. The Siting Board staff respectfully requests that the Company address the issues and concerns articulated below in the Application that it will file to commence the certificate proceeding, and that FERC also address these issues and concerns in its drafting of the EA – or, if FERC so determines, an Environmental Impact Study (“EIS”) – for the Project.

I. INTRODUCTION

This proceeding began with Algonquin’s January 30, 2015 filing with FERC requesting the use of the pre-filing review process for the Project. On February 20, 2015, FERC approved Algonquin’s request to use pre-filing review. The Project would enable Algonquin to expand its existing pipeline system in New York, Connecticut, and Massachusetts. On April 27, 2015, FERC issued a “Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Assessment for the Planned Atlantic Bridge Project, Request for Comments on Environmental Issues, and Notice of Public Scoping Meetings” (“Notice”), announcing the opening of the public scoping process used to

gather input from the public and interested agencies on the Project. FERC is reviewing the Atlantic Bridge Project under its regulations in compliance with the Natural Gas Act (“NGA”) and the National Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”) using its pre-filing review process. Upon completion of the pre-filing review process, the Company will file an application with FERC for authorization to construct the Project under Section 7(c) of the NGA.

The Siting Board is an independent board of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts with a statutory mission to ensure a “reliable energy supply for the Commonwealth with a minimum impact on the environment at the lowest possible cost.” G.L. c. 164, § 69H. The Siting Board is required by regulation at 980 C.M.R. § 7.07(9)(a) to conduct public information hearings and intervene at FERC to preserve the rights of interested citizens of the Commonwealth when an interstate natural gas pipeline company applies to FERC to construct or modify pipeline facilities within Massachusetts. The Siting Board participates in the pre-filing phase of FERC proceedings in order fulfill this regulatory obligation.

Siting Board staff has monitored filings and public comments posted on the FERC website for the Project and have attended a number of Project-related meetings. These meetings included public scoping meetings held by FERC in Weymouth on May 13, 2015, and in Franklin on May 14, 2015; a site visit guided by Algonquin employees in Weymouth on May 27, 2015; a public comment hearing held by the Siting Board in Weymouth on May 27, 2015<sup>1,2</sup>; and on-going bi-weekly phone calls with the Company, federal and state officials, and other interested parties. The Siting Board staff also have solicited and received written comments from Massachusetts residents.

## II. PROPOSAL

The Project involves the expansion of the Company’s existing natural gas pipeline system in New York, Connecticut, and Massachusetts. Currently, in Massachusetts, the Company would construct a new 10,915 horsepower (“hp”) gas-fired compressor station in Weymouth. The compressor station would be located on 4.3 acres within a 10.2 acre parcel, bounded by Route 3A to the south, the Fore River to the north and west, and Kings Cove to the east. The Company would also modify a regulator station in Needham, and rebuild two existing metering and regulating (“M&R”) stations in Plymouth. The Company has changed the scope of the

---

<sup>1</sup> On May 26, 2015, the Siting Board was notified by the Company that the scope of the Project in Massachusetts had been changed to eliminate the installation of 3.5 miles of new 30-inch diameter pipeline in Medway, Bellingham, and Franklin. The Siting Board subsequently canceled a site visit and public hearing proposed scheduled for Thursday, May 28 in Franklin. The Siting Board was notified of a change in compressor station horsepower on June 2, 2015.

<sup>2</sup> Public comments letters received by the Siting Board are attached as Attachment A; and a transcript of the May 27, 2015 Siting Board public hearing is attached as Attachment B.

Project in Massachusetts (as well as other states) on several occasions.<sup>3</sup> The Siting Board was informed of these Project changes on April 2, May 26, and June 2, 2015.<sup>4</sup>

As of June 2, 2015,<sup>5</sup> the New York portion of the Project would involve the replacement of 4.0 miles of existing 26-inch diameter pipeline with 42-inch diameter pipeline in Rockland and Westchester Counties and modifications to an existing M&R station in the Town of Yorktown. The Connecticut portion of the Project would involve the replacement of 2.3 miles of existing 26-inch diameter pipeline with 42-inch diameter pipeline in Danbury, modifications to two existing compressor stations in Oxford and Chaplin, construction of a new M&R station in Norwich, and modifications to an existing M&R station in Danbury.

As of June 2, 2015, the Project would increase the Company's natural gas delivery by approximately 132,000 dekatherms per day ("Dth/d"). In draft resource report 1, which has not been updated to reflect the Project's new scope, Algonquin asserts that there is need for this additional capacity for the transportation of natural gas supplies from a receipt point in Mahwah, New Jersey to the Project shippers' delivery points in Massachusetts, Maine, and at the United States-Canada border. Also in draft resource report 1, Algonquin states that it has signed binding precedent agreements with five local gas distribution companies, three manufacturing companies, and a municipal utility. The Company expects that the Project would be in service by November 1, 2017.

---

<sup>3</sup> Algonquin submitted draft resource reports 1 and 10 to FERC on March 23, 2015. The draft resource reports described the Project as consisting of a total of 36.6 miles, with 10.2 miles of pipeline in Massachusetts, and a 10,915 hp compressor station in Weymouth. Subsequently, in April 2015, Algonquin revised the Project to consist of 18.1 miles, with 3.5 miles of pipeline in Massachusetts and a 7,700 hp compressor station in Weymouth. The draft resource reports do not reflect the revisions. In early June 2015, Algonquin announced that the proposed Weymouth compressor station horsepower would, once again, be 10,915 hp.

<sup>4</sup> The Siting Board was informed of the changes in scope through the Company's Monthly Progress report submitted to FERC on April 2, a phone conversation with counsel for the Company on May 26, and a bi-weekly FERC conference call on June 2.

<sup>5</sup> The Siting Board received an email on June 2, 2015 from Algonquin's environmental consultant detailing the new Project scope, which included the change in natural gas delivery from approximately 153,000 Dth/d to 132,000 Dth/d and the accompanying changes in distance and compression.

### III. PUBLIC COMMENTS

#### A. Summary of Public Comments

At the Siting Board public hearing on May 27, 2015 in Weymouth, members of the public had an opportunity to comment on the proposed Project. At this hearing, approximately 200 people were in attendance, with 46 individuals providing oral comments, including those of eight elected officials. A copy of the complete transcript from the public hearings is attached as Attachment B.

In addition, by written notice, the Siting Board staff invited members of the public to submit written comments by June 5, 2015. The Siting Board received 138 written comments, which are attached as Attachment A. In some cases, the written comments provided to the Siting Board were also submitted directly to FERC through its public hearing process.

All but one of the oral and written comments received by the Siting Board is in opposition to the siting of the proposed compressor station in Weymouth.<sup>6</sup> The following concerns were cited frequently by elected officials and members of the public in their opposition:

- Cumulative environmental, public health, and safety impacts of the construction of a compressor station at the North Weymouth location due to the existence of extensive industrial infrastructure in what many asserted is an already “overburdened” Fore River Basin (which includes the towns of Weymouth, Braintree, and Quincy). This infrastructure consists of:
  1. Algonquin’s existing underground natural gas transmission pipeline and meter station (Weymouth);
  2. Calpine’s 731 megawatt (“MW”) combined-cycle Fore River Energy Center power plant (Weymouth);
  3. Massachusetts Water Resources Authority’s (“MWRA”) Braintree-Weymouth Relief Facilities (Weymouth);
  4. Fore River Bridge and the Fore River Bridge Replacement Project (Weymouth, Quincy),
  5. New England Fertilizer Company/MWRA’s sludge-to-fertilizer pelletizing plant (Quincy);
  6. Twin River Technologies’ fatty acid and USP glycerin production site and distribution center (Quincy);
  7. CITGO’s petroleum product (ultra low sulfur diesel, heating oil, reformulated gasoline) terminal (Braintree);

---

<sup>6</sup> The one comment received in support of the Project was submitted by a Company employee residing in Weymouth.

8. Braintree Electric Light Department's 96 MW Potter and 116 MW Thomas A. Watson Generation Stations; and
  9. Clean Harbors' waste treatment, storage, and disposal facilities (Braintree).
- Cumulative impacts of the proposed compressor station and existing industrial infrastructure on noise levels;
  - Cumulative impacts of the proposed compressor station and existing industrial infrastructure on air quality;
  - Close proximity of residences, environmental justice communities<sup>7</sup>, businesses, schools, wetlands and water bodies, and other sensitive receptors to the proposed site; there are approximately 1,000 residences within a ½ mile radius of the site;
  - Noise impacts and air emissions of the compressor station during maintenance, 24/7 operations, and the venting of natural gas (blowdowns);
  - Volume of traffic utilizing the Fore River Bridge as the main route to commute and travel from the South Shore of Massachusetts into Boston;
  - Siting of a compressor station on a small site (10 acres) in a densely populated area, in comparison to the larger acreage and lower residential density of surrounding compressor stations in the Company's portfolio;
  - Lack of the assessment of site alternatives to the Weymouth compressor station location;
  - Negative land use impacts of the Project on wetlands, wildlife, water bodies, and other environmentally sensitive areas during construction and operations; and
  - Safety impacts, emergency response preparedness, and inadequate egress due to high density of nearby businesses and residences.

Additional comments received during the public comment hearing and the written comment period in regards to other aspects of the Project are summarized below.

- Concerns with the need for the Project;
- Concerns on the thoroughness of the assessment of alternatives to the Project, such as energy efficiency and renewable energy; and

---

<sup>7</sup>

The neighborhoods of Germantown and Quincy Point in the City of Quincy are designated as Environmental Justice communities by the Massachusetts Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs based on minority population and income criteria. For more information, please visit: <http://www.mass.gov/eea/grants-and-tech-assistance/environmental-justice-policy.html>.

- FERC should consider, together, the Project, Algonquin's future planned Access Northeast Project, and Algonquin's recently FERC certificated Algonquin Incremental Market Project (FERC Docket No. CP14-96) in order to assess cumulative impacts.

B. Comments from Elected Officials

At the public comment hearing, eight elected state and local officials provided comments:

- State Senator Robert Hedlund, Plymouth and Norfolk District
- State Representative James Murphy, Fourth Norfolk District
- Mayor Susan Kay, Town of Weymouth
- Town Council President and Councilor at Large Patrick O'Connor, Town of Weymouth
- Councilor at Large Jane Hackett, Town of Weymouth
- Councilor at Large Brian McDonald, Town of Weymouth
- District One Town Councilor Rebecca Haugh, Town of Weymouth
- Ward 1 City Councilor Margaret Laforest, City of Quincy

In addition, six elected public officials provided written comments:

- State Representative James Murphy, Fourth Norfolk District
- State Representative Ronald Mariano, Third Norfolk District
- Mayor Susan Kay, Town of Weymouth
- District One Town Councilor Rebecca Haugh, Town of Weymouth
- Councilor at Large Jane Hackett, Town of Weymouth
- Ward 2 City Councilor Brad Croall, City of Quincy

All of the elected officials, in both oral and written comments, are in opposition to the proposed compressor station and their comments reflected the above concerns. Councilor Haugh has requested an additional FERC scoping session to reflect the revised Project scope, specifically the change in horsepower at the Weymouth compressor station, which occurred after the May 13, 2015 FERC scoping session and the May 27, 2015 Siting Board public hearing. Councilor Haugh has also requested additional receptor locations for noise and air analyses.

IV. ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS

Based on the public comments directed to the Siting Board, the Siting Board's analysis of the materials filed to date, and the site visits; the Siting Board requests that the following environmental and procedural concerns be addressed in preparation of the scope for the EA for the Project and the environmental resource reports.

A. Detailed Alignment Sheets and Maps, Updated Environmental Resource Reports, and Timing of Comments

On March 23, 2015, the Company submitted draft resource reports 1 and 10. On April 2, 2015, the Company submitted a monthly progress report for the Project for the period ending on March 31, 2015. In that filing, the Company indicated that the scope of the Project had been reduced to 153,000 Dth/d from 222,000 Dth/d. On May 26, 2015, the Siting Board was informed that the pipeline portion of the Project in Massachusetts had been removed from the scope of the Project. On June 2, 2015, the Company announced further changes to the Project scope during the bi-weekly pre-filing call with FERC, the Company, and other agencies, which included an increase from 7,700 hp to 10,915 hp at the Weymouth compressor station. On this call, the Company stated the complete set of resource reports, including revisions to the reports submitted in March, would be filed in mid-June 2015 to reflect all changes in Project scope.

In the draft resource reports filed on March 23, the Company did not provide alignment sheets of a scale larger than 1:24,000 (1 inch = 2,000 feet). The Company did not provide plot/site plans of the compressor stations showing the location of the nearest noise-sensitive areas or the layout of the new compressor stations on the proposed sites. For the Weymouth compressor station, the qualitative description consisted of one paragraph and a USGS 7.5-minute series topographic map (scale of 1:24,000).

In the Notice issued April 27, 2015, FERC stated that comments on the potential environmental effects, reasonable alternatives, and measures to avoid or lessen environmental impacts for the Project would assist FERC in determining what issues need to be evaluated in the EA, and were due to FERC by June 11, 2015. The Notice referenced the then-proposed 7,700 hp size of the Weymouth compressor station, which the Company subsequently increased to 10,915 hp on June 2, 2015.

Given the following list of omissions and very recent revisions, the Siting Board is concerned that the Company has not provided adequate information to facilitate the filing of fully informed comments by the public or interested agencies during the scoping period. These include:

- Omission of detailed maps and alignments sheets in the draft environmental resource reports submitted in March;
- Resource reports 1 and 10 have been the subject of announced changes, but have not been formally updated; a complete set of environmental resource reports will not be provided by Algonquin until after the close of the scoping period;
- An increase in the horsepower of the Weymouth compressor station was announced after both the FERC scoping meeting on May 13, 2015 and the Siting Board public comment hearing on May 27, 2015 (however, the Company did notify elected officials by email on June 2, 2015 of the horsepower increase);

- Public notice of the proposed changes to the Weymouth compressor station was not revealed to the Siting Board and other state agencies until June 2, 2015, and published June 10, 2015.

Following the close of the comment period, FERC will ask the Company to respond to questions and comments gathered during the scoping period. The Siting Board recognizes that the public will continue to be able to submit comments through the FERC website and comment on the draft EA when it is issued as part of the pre-filing process. However, the scoping period timeframe should be sufficient to enable the public to comment on a complete and accurate draft set of resource reports. The resource reports filed in March do not reflect the current configuration impact of the Project, and are lacking in detailed maps, site plans, and descriptions of compressor station impacts.

The Siting Board requests that the public scoping period be extended for at least 30 days after the complete draft set of environmental resource reports are filed at FERC to allow the public to review and comment on complete and accurate information. With such information, the public can best assist FERC in identifying all environmental impacts and Project alternatives prior to the development of the final environmental resource reports and draft EA.

#### B. Aboveground Facility Alternatives

Many commenters raised concerns about the location of the proposed Weymouth compressor station in the proximity of existing infrastructure, such as a 731 MW combined-cycle natural gas/oil power plant, MWRA water and sewage facilities, and the Fore River Bridge. Additionally, commenters raised concerns about the siting of the compressor station in a densely populated residential community, with specific concerns about emergency response, noise, and public health impacts.

The Siting Board requests that the EA and Application include a detailed analysis and consideration of alternative locations for the proposed Weymouth compressor station. The EA and Application should specifically address why the proposed Weymouth compressor station location is preferred, based on detailed engineering information, to other locations along the Algonquin I-10 System pipeline, with specific consideration of safety, land use, and residential impacts. The analysis should include an updated need for the compressor station based on the revised configuration of the Project, as well as any updates regarding precedent agreements with Project shippers.

#### C. Noise Impacts

Many comments were received that expressed concern about the noise impacts of the compressor station during construction and operation. The Siting Board is concerned that the proposed compressor station would further increase the ambient noise level, which already reflects the contribution of the existing infrastructure. Algonquin has asserted that the project would comply with federal noise standards, as required by FERC. However, there is no analysis

in the resource reports to support this assertion. In addition, Massachusetts has a statewide noise policy implemented by the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (“MassDEP”); however, there is no indication in the Company’s filing that the Weymouth compressor would, at a minimum, comply with this policy. Therefore, the Siting Board requests a detailed noise analysis in the EA and Application that addresses both the federal and Massachusetts noise standards.<sup>8</sup>

Specifically, the Siting Board requests that the noise analysis model the potential noise impacts at a number of residential receptors near the proposed route. These receptors should include: (1) Kings Cove Way, Weymouth; (2) Kings Cove Beach Road (near Hunt Hills Point), Weymouth; (3) Monatiquot Street/Vaness Road, Weymouth; (4) Germantown, Quincy; (5) Dee Road area, Quincy; (6) Weybosset Street/Fore River Avenue, Weymouth; (7) Roslind Road/Evans Road, Weymouth and; (8) the Johnson School, 70 Pearl Street Weymouth.<sup>9</sup> The noise analysis should model the anticipated noise increases for both nighttime and daytime levels at each receptor, based on ambient levels ( $L_{90}$  measurements). The noise analysis should reflect ambient nighttime levels without the Fore River Bridge construction, which is scheduled to be completed in 2016/2017. The noise analysis should also include the impacts of noise dispersion over water and the attendant impacts on receptors across the Weymouth Fore River in the Germantown neighborhood of Quincy and Kings Cove in Weymouth.

The noise analysis should also discuss options for noise mitigation at these receptors including time of day restrictions and noise barriers. The noise analysis should include a description of mitigation practices employed by Algonquin in similar situations and the effectiveness of such practices.

Furthermore, the Siting Board notes that the noise from the Fore River Bridge Replacement Project has contributed to the background ambient level. But this project will end. Therefore, inclusion of such noise in the data introduces bias into the measured ambient level. The Siting Board notes that in 2000, Sithe Energy (the prior owner of the Fore River Energy Center) was before the Siting Board and a Final Decision was issued February 11, 2000. The Final Decision states that the nighttime ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the Fore River Energy Center, which is directly south of the proposed compressor station and included some receptors listed above, ranged from 35 to 42 dBA (see Sithe Edgar Development, LLC, EFSB 98-10, at 77 (“Final Decision”).<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> The noise analysis should include a table that consists of at least the following columns; receptor; measured ambient sound level; modeled facility-only noise level; combined ambient and facility noise level; and increase above ambient.

<sup>9</sup> The last three receptors were suggested by Councilor Haugh.

<sup>10</sup> The Siting Board decision, EFSB 98-10, can be accessed at: <http://www.mass.gov/eea/energy-utilities-clean-tech/energy-facilities-siting-board/efsb-decisions/power-plants.html>.

#### D. Air Emissions

Many commenters were concerned with air emissions during Project construction, operation, and maintenance, as well as unanticipated fugitive emissions. The commenters pointed to the location of the site beneath the Fore River Bridge and the possibility of inversion effects. The Siting Board recommends that the EA and the Application include a robust air analysis of the existing air quality and estimated air quality impacts of the proposed compressor station, including emissions of nitrogen dioxide, volatile organic compounds, carbon monoxide, particulate matter, sulfur dioxide, identified criteria pollutants, greenhouse gases, and any other significant emissions associated with the compressor.

Algonquin should mitigate the Project's construction-related air emissions. The Siting Board recommends that the EA and the Application include a discussion of the potential use of USEPA-verified (or equivalent) emission control devices, such as oxidation catalysts or other comparable technologies (to the extent that they are commercially available), on the exhaust system side of the diesel combustion engine of diesel-powered non-road construction equipment with engine horsepower ratings of 50 and above to be used for 30 or more days over the course of Project construction. Mitigation measures of this type would be consistent with Siting Board practices.

#### E. Safety Concerns

Safety concerns were expressed by many of the commenters based on the close proximity of the compressor station to existing infrastructure and residential neighborhoods and the limited egress and ingress due to the location of the Fore River Bridge. Commenters also expressed concerns regarding the limitations of Town of Weymouth resources available to respond to potential emergencies associated with the compressor station. The resource reports and the EA should include a detailed description of all the federal, state, and local safety regulations and inspections that pertain to the Project, as well as any additional Company safety protocols. Algonquin should, in addition, consult at its earliest convenience with health, safety, and security personnel in the vicinity of the compressor station and along the Project route to address public safety issues; identify emergency egress for emergency vehicles, residences, and businesses; and address concerns related to the Town of Weymouth emergency response resources.

Many commenters expressed concern with the safety record of pipeline and aboveground facilities owned and operated by the Company. The Siting Board requests that the Company provide a detailed history of its safety record, which would include failures, incidents, and accidents on both pipelines and compressor stations within the Company's portfolio. The information should include the cause of the incident, the quantity of leaked gas and other environmental impacts, and any related injuries or fatalities. Additionally, the Siting Board requests that the Company provide information on incidents and accidents at any compressor station across the United States in the past ten years, and the potential relevance to the Weymouth site.

F. Coastal Zone Land Use Impacts

Some commenters raised concerns about portions of the parcel proposed for the compressor station being within a Federal Emergency Management Agency 100-year flood zone. The Siting Board requests that the EA and the Application include an analysis of the total acres of the property within a flood zone, mitigation to reduce the impact of a flood event, and safety measures and guidelines in place to respond to a flood event.

G. Cumulative Health Impacts

Commenters expressed concern about the cumulative impact of an additional industrial facility on the health of residents in the Fore River area related to noise and air emissions. The Siting Board recommends that the EA and the Application include a public health study which would evaluate existing noise measurements and air emissions, and address the cumulative effect of the compressor station. This study should include the long-term impacts of the Project on these factors and the general public.

H. Cumulative Impact Analysis

The Siting Board recommends that the Company identify past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the Weymouth area that could be affected by the Project, such as the Fore River Bridge Replacement Project and pipeline construction that may occur along the I-9 or I-10 pipelines. The Company should include a description of cumulative and/or overlapping impacts these projects and the Atlantic Bridge Project would have on environmental resources such as air quality, noise, and surface water. The Company should identify measures that would be implemented to minimize these impacts and include a map showing the identified projects in relation to the Project. In addition, this cumulative discussion should include any available information on regional predictive climate change effects and the cumulative impact on resources and the Project.

I. Land Use Characteristics of Compressor Stations within the Company's Portfolio

Commenters expressed concern about the land use characteristics of the proposed Weymouth compressor site in comparison to other compressor station sites in the Company's portfolio. The Siting Board would like the Company to provide information about compressor stations it owns and operates that meet any of the following characteristics: within a residential community, within an industrial area, or in close proximity to a heavily trafficked bridge.

The Siting Board requests more information about the compressor stations in Morristown and Linden, New Jersey cited in the presentation given the Company at the Siting Board's public hearing in Weymouth on May 27. Specifically, the Siting Board would like information about the number of residents, businesses, or industrial facilities within a half-mile radius of each facility; the horsepower of the compressor stations; the acreage that the compressor stations are located on; the square footage of the compressor stations; the ambient noise measurements

recorded pre- and post-construction; and the air quality analysis completed pre- and post-construction.

## V. OTHER ISSUES

It appears that the proposed site of the compressor station is located in a Designated Port Area (“DPA”) and is subject to Chapter 91 waterways regulations.<sup>11</sup> The DPA designation is designed to protect and enhance water dependent industrial uses in the coastal zone. These regulations require that all structures located in DPAs must be either water-dependent industrial uses, accessory uses, or a limited category of supporting uses. The resource reports and the EA should provide a description of how the proposed compressor station would comport with the DPA and Chapter 91 regulations in terms of water-dependent uses and public access associated with such regulations.

As noted above in Section VI.C, the Fore River Energy Center was approved by the Siting Board on February 11, 2000. The Fore River Energy Center site is bisected by the Fore River Bridge (or Route 3A Bridge) into two sections: (1) a 16-acre section north of the bridge (“North Parcel”); and (2) a 41-acre area to the south of the bridge, where the Fore River Energy Facility is located (Final Decision, EFSB 98-7 at 12). The compressor station is proposed to be located on the North Parcel, currently owned by Calpine. The Final Decision approval included two conditions (that remain in effect) and are still outstanding due to the extended construction of the Fore River Bridge.<sup>12</sup> The resource reports and the EA should include a discussion on the current ownership and availability of the North Parcel, as well as the status of Algonquin’s purchase of the North Parcel, or its option to do so.

---

<sup>11</sup> There are ten DPAs in Massachusetts. The DPA designation (see 301 CMR 25.00) works in conjunction with Chapter 91 regulations (see 301 CMR 9.00)

<sup>12</sup> Condition F states: “In order to minimize visual impacts, the Siting Board requires the Company to provide landscaping that will provide vegetative screening and shoreline improvements along the northwestern shoreline of the northern portion of the proposed site which would serve as a continuation of the proposed King’s Cove area.” Condition L states “In order to minimize land use impacts, the Siting Board requires the Company to work with Weymouth, Fore River Watershed Association and appropriate state agencies to develop and coordinate plans for providing additional public access, if and where appropriate, in the area of the northern portion of the site that Sithe will improve as conditioned in Section III.F.2., and in other parts of the site as may be agreed.”

VI. CLOSING COMMENTS

In summary, the Massachusetts Siting Board staff appreciates the opportunity to file comments on the scope of the EA and available resource reports, as well as filings relating to the Atlantic Bridge Project, FERC proceeding number PF15-12-000.

Sincerely yours,



Robert J. Shea  
Presiding Officer

Enclosures

cc: Senate President Stanley Rosenberg (w/o enclosures)  
Senator Robert Hedlund (w/o enclosures)  
Senator John Keenan (w/o enclosures)  
Speaker Robert DeLeo (w/o enclosures)  
Representative Ronald Mariano (w/o enclosures)  
Representative James Murphy (w/o enclosures)  
Representative Bruce Ayers (w/o enclosures)  
Representative Tackey Chan (w/o enclosures)  
Mayor Susan Kay (w/o enclosures)  
Weymouth Town Councilor Patrick O'Connor (w/o enclosures)  
Weymouth Town Councilor Rebecca Haugh (w/o enclosures)  
Weymouth Town Councilor Brian McDonald (w/o enclosures)  
Weymouth Town Councilor Jane Hackett (w/o enclosures)  
Quincy City Councilor Margaret Laforest (w/o enclosures)  
Quincy City Councilor Brad Croall (w/o enclosures)