

July 16, 2015
Paul Stevens
156 Timbertop Rd
New Ipswich, NH 03071

Debra Howland
Executive Director and Secretary
NH Public Utilities Commission
21 S. Fruit Street
Suite 10
Concord, NH 03301

RE: Docket 14-380

It might interest you to know that the proposed Tennessee Gas / Kinder Morgan, New England Energy Direct (NED) pipe may not be so good for New Hampshire after all and here's why.

It was never intended for New Hampshire. It was intended for Massachusetts, but due to opposition, KM moved it north. So if it was not good for Massachusetts, why should it be good for New Hampshire?

We were told it will bring jobs. True, a pipeline will bring jobs to the region, but KM's claim of 3,000 jobs is a bit exaggerated. It's 3,000 jobs during peak construction, approx. 18-24 months. However, a good portion of them will go to specialized workers, like pipeline welding crews from Oklahoma. Alternatively, dollar for dollar, jobs in efficiency and clean energy could provide 36,000 jobs for the same investment. LiUNA union workers are trained for clean energy and weatherization jobs as well. Some have stated they would rather work in these fields if more of them were available.

We were told the gas is for New Hampshire, but if that were true, why was the pipe planned for Massachusetts? KM states that they have 0.5 Bcf/day in contracts, but the pipeline capacity is 2.2 Bcf/day, leaving 1.7 Bcf/day extra. So where is all that extra going? They do NOT deny that they will take export contracts and new export terminals are coming online in Canada. Yet Kinder Morgan continues to deny the gas is intended for export. Furthermore, the only stated contracts in New Hampshire are with Liberty, a KM subsidiary and even those contracts are in dispute. So is it right for KM to use eminent domain to take New Hampshire residents' land away (when most New Hampshire residents do not use gas) just so one company can sell that gas to foreign powers?

We are told that the pipe will lower domestic gas prices. However, the European market pays 2-4 times as much as US customers, and the Asian market pays 3-5 times as much. This can only drive up domestic prices.

We are told that new pipelines and gas-fired electricity plants are needed to replace the 8,300 MW of electric generation capacity that is being retired in the next few years. Ending the reign of nuclear, coal, and oil plants is a positive step, but replacing them with natural gas perpetuates dependency on fossil fuels and only gets in the way of renewables. Also, not all of the capacity retiring needs to be replaced with power plants. The cost of utility-scale solar has dropped 78% in the past five years, and renewables are now becoming economically competitive with gas. And why should so much of our energy needs be met with gas? Is it fair that one form of energy get that much of a market share?

Thank you for your consideration

Paul Stevens

July 16, 2015
Paul Stevens
156 Timbertop Rd
New Ipswich, NH 03071

Debra Howland
Executive Director and Secretary
NH Public Utilities Commission
21 S. Fruit Street
Suite 10
Concord, NH 03301

Most people would agree that war-mongering and war profiteering are bad things. Well, that's just what Kinder-Morgan wants to do. They claim the gas from NED is for New Hampshire, but such enormous capacity is only useful here a few days a year. So where is the bulk of it really going?

David Goldwyn* of the Brookings Institution told the US Senate in March 2014, "This bounty (referring to the Marcellus fracked oil and gas fields) could enhance our national power by positioning our nation as a reliable supplier of natural gas to regions of the world that suffer from intimidation from their suppliers. The question before us is not whether we have this geopolitical potential, but whether we will realize it in time to help our friends and allies." Of course Goldwyn is talking about Putin riding roughshod over the Ukraine, and how leaders of Western Europe have done little to stop him because they are worried Putin will turn off the gas and oil. But think about it, we are not helping Europe by selling them more expensive gas. Rather, if they get an alternate source of gas, they may be emboldened to take a stand against Putin. And if Putin's ratings slip he may be tempted to take a few pot shots. And then we'll have to come to NATO's aid. And if you thought chasing terrorists around in the desert for years was expensive, wait 'till we start losing a few stealth bombers. Remember Malaysian Airlines flight 17? And don't forget that the New York Times reported on Sept. 6 2014, that the Brookings Institution receives millions in foreign funding so Goldwyn may not have American interests at heart.

Please don't let Kinder-Morgan (or anyone else) become an American war enabler. Please say no to NED and Docket 14-380.

Naturally, since the bulk of the gas is going overseas, there is little benefit to the people of New Hampshire, therefore, taking property by eminent domain is not justified. There is no greater good, only personal enrichment for gas companies and Kinder-Morgan.

*Quoted from Fortune Magazine, June 16, 2014

Thank you for helping the cause of peace in the world

Paul Stevens

July 16, 2015
Paul Stevens
156 Timbertop Rd
New Ipswich, NH 03071

Debra Howland
Executive Director and Secretary
NH Public Utilities Commission
21 S. Fruit Street
Suite 10
Concord, NH 03301

We must conserve the precious gas and oil of Pennsylvania for future generations of Americans. Conservation now will make the transition from fossil to renewable more orderly and predictable. We should keep this resource for our children and applications where gas is the most effective energy source rather than sell it to foreigners for a fast buck. Don't facilitate this foolishness. Look to the future and stop NED and Docket 14-380.

Thank you

Paul Stevens

July 16, 2015

Paul Stevens
156 Timbertop Rd
New Ipswich, NH 03071

Debra Howland
Executive Director and Secretary
NH Public Utilities Commission
21 S. Fruit Street
Suite 10
Concord, NH 03301

In regards to Docket 14-380. I am concerned about the impact of this agreement on Southern New Hampshire and the implications for the state's energy future. Please reject the late-filed settlement agreement as ill advised based on the following facts.

The PUC's staff own expert consultant, Melissa Whitten, recommended against approval of the original proposed Liberty agreement, citing it as "speculative" and not "least cost". Also, it leaves the Company (and ratepayers) with substantial excess capacity over the life of the contract.

The NH Office of Consumer Advocate likewise recommended against approval of the petition stating the "the Company's analysis is not thorough."

The capacity adjustment made for the settlement agreement is token and ignores the defects associated with the original position, including the OCA's assessment of cost allocation to consumers, stating that "it is fundamentally unreasonable to require ratepayers now to unnecessarily bear significantly greater burden compared to ratepayers in the future."

A major investment such as this for our ratepayers should be appropriate for what is actually needed in New England and should follow the NH Office of Energy and Planning (OEP) 10-year strategy.

The NH OEP's 10 year strategy strongly promotes "Diversity of Supply" as one of its principal components for a sound and stable energy policy. 50% of New England's energy already comes from natural gas. This contract and the massive NED project nearly eliminates alternatives and renewables. You do not have to be reminded that natural gas produces greenhouse gases.

Such major investments in infrastructure in NH should be cost-effective and not speculative.

Thank you

Paul Stevens

July 14, 2015
Paul Stevens
156 Timbertop Rd
New Ipswich, NH 03071

Debra Howland
Executive Director and Secretary
NH Public Utilities Commission
21 S. Fruit Street
Suite 10
Concord, NH 03301

New Hampshire exports almost half of the electricity it generates. So obviously there is no need for more natural gas to generate electricity in New Hampshire. Most people will agree that we need to wean ourselves off of fossil fuels. Why don't we start weaning right here, right now. Stop NED.

Thank you for your consideration of Docket 14-380

Paul Stevens

July 16, 2015
Paul Stevens
156 Timbertop Rd
New Ipswich, NH 03071

Debra Howland
Executive Director and Secretary
NH Public Utilities Commission
21 S. Fruit Street
Suite 10
Concord, NH 03301

In December 2014, Kinder Morgan chose to relocate a significant portion of the proposed 36-inch, 1460 PSI natural gas pipeline segment running from Hancock Township Massachusetts to Dracut Massachusetts out of Massachusetts and north into New Hampshire. They did this due to political pressure from the Massachusetts Governor and the Massachusetts Congressional Delegation. Consequently, the Boards of Selectmen of most towns along this new route established Task Force groups to determine the impact and need for this project. None of those groups have been able to demonstrate any significant benefit to the citizens of these towns that outweigh the detriments.

In addition, these groups generally feel that significantly extending this pipe out of Massachusetts and back into Massachusetts is gratuitous, and the taking of land for this purpose is unconstitutional especially when you consider how little of the gas will be consumed in New Hampshire, and indeed, how the majority will be exported to foreign nationals.

Thank you for your consideration in reference to Docket 14-380.

Paul Stevens