TOWN OF ACUSHNET FIRE & EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT

FIRE & RESCUE DIVISION

24 Russell Street, Acushnet, MA 02743 Tel: (508) 998-0250 Fax: (508) 998-5889



EMS DIVISION

60 Middle Road, Acushnet, MA 02743 Tel: (508) 998-0235 Fax: (508) 998-0206

Kevin A. Gallagher Chief of Department

RE:

Algonquin Gas Transmission, LLC's, Access Northeast Project

Docket # PF16-1-000

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

June 8, 2016, 2016

Dear Secretary Bose:

I have attached, for your review, a letter sent to Access Northeast officials by both the Acushnet Police Chief and the Acushnet Fire Chief. The letter is self-explanatory.

Please know that both Chief Alves and I are opposed to any plans that would allow Access Northeast to distribute LNG from the proposed Acushnet facility beyond that needed during an emergency and to the existing peak shaving facility. We ask that you reject the language cited at 13.5.15 of the recently submitted Draft Resource Report #13 (Engineering and Design Material) relative to distribution in the Northeast in the event they enter into contracts for their product.

Please feel free to contact us is you have any questions or concerns.

Kevin A. Gallagher Chief of Department

TOWN OF ACUSHNET FIRE & EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT

FIRE & RESCUE DIVISION

24 Russell Street, Acushnet, MA 02743 Tel: (508) 998-0250 Fax: (508) 998-5889



EMS DIVISION

60 Middle Road, Acushnet, MA 02743 Tel: (508) 998-0235 Fax: (508) 998-0206

Mr. Jeffrey R. Martin Director, Project Planning and Siting Eversource Energy 56 Prospect Street, 56P-1 Hartford, CT 06103

June 7, 2016

Dear Mr. Martin:

As you know, we have been closely following the Access Northeast project and the issues of interest to the residents of the town of Acushnet. We write today to seek your immediate intervention on an issue we have identified to be of great importance and concern.

It has been stated directly to both of us, and the public at large, by representatives of Access Northeast that a direct benefit of operating the proposed new LNG storage facility would be a dramatic decrease -- if not outright elimination -- in the need to truck LNG to the present peak shaving facility located on Peckham Road. On average, LNG transport vehicles make three hundred trips to Acushnet each year. While Access Northeast officials have been careful to not commit to ending the practice of trucks hauling LNG into Acushnet, it was understood by us multiple times that every effort would be made to work toward that goal.

Imagine our surprise and concern when we read in Draft Resource Report #13 (Engineering and Design Material) the following:

"13.5.15 LNG Product Loading Trucking: The LNG facility will include support facilities for trucking. The trucking facilities are designed to load LNG onto trucks in the event of a mutual aid request from other LNG facilities in the Northeast or to otherwise support emergency loading/unloading operations. The trucking facilities will also be

capable of supporting LNG loading and delivery for distribution in the Northeast, should commercial arrangement for such deliveries be entered into at a future point. The trucking facilities are also designed to support operational, maintenance, and material delivery requirements (including liquid nitrogen for purging and refrigerant makeup)."

If this language is meant to seek approval from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) to allow the transfer, via truck, of LNG from the proposed new Acushnet facility to the existing Acushnet facility then that would be consistent with past statements and artists renditions of the proposed facility which show a paved loop roadway between the two plants. Remember, the goal is the great reduction, if not elimination, of LNG transport vehicles on our residential streets.

If this language is meant to seek approval from FERC to allow the distribution of LNG to customers outside of Acushnet, then that runs contrary to stated goals and a primary safety benefit to this community. It is inconceivable to us that Access Northeast would state that the truck loading operation would facilitate "delivery for distribution in the Northeast, should commercial arrangement for such deliveries be entered into at a future point." Hopefully, we are simply pointing out a typographical error in Resource Report #13.

If the plan is to shuttle <u>LNG between</u> the proposed and existing tanks in Acushnet, we request that the word "Northeast" 'be removed and the word "Acushnet" be added. We strongly recommend that if this is indeed the case that FERC be contacted immediately.

If the plan is to allow the possible future distribution of LNG to locations outside Acushnet then the stated goal of reducing LNG transport through our community is negated. Increased LNG transport traffic through Acushnet is not something that we, as the lead public safety officials of this community, will accept.

We request your immediate attention to this issue.

Sincerely,

Kevin A. Ganagher

Fire Chie

Michael G. Alves Police Chief