Patricia Martin
17 Farrar Road
Rindge, NH 03461
August 21, 2015

Alexander F. Speidel, Esq.
Staff Attorney/Hearings Examiner
New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission
21 S. Fruit Street, Suite 10
Concord, NH 03301

Dear Attorney Speidel,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on IR15-124. I wish I had been able to meet with you in person last week. If I had, I would have made the following points in addition to my initial comments emphasizing the need for fuel diversity as the most important factor in offering ratepayers price protection.

1.) The statements/promotional ads touting the energy savings due to natural gas pipelines are at least partially based on oil prices of over $70/barrel from 2013/2014 studies. This link is not clearly drawn because it would not offer a favorable argument for the pipeline proposals. Instead, while the cost of LNG is specified, the cost of oil or other alternatives are only reflected in LMP prices. Since oil prices are now less than $40/barrel, consumers are unlikely to see significant savings from the additional natural gas infrastructure. Of course, oil prices could skyrocket again, but so could natural gas!
   An example of what this might look like can be found in the data from the gas utility energy efficiency programs that returned such disappointing results last year. I suspect that instead of helping current gas customers to weatherize buildings, a significant portion of the "energy efficiency" projects involved converting oil heated homes to natural gas equipment. When natural gas was ½ the price per BTU of oil, those conversions looked good. With oil prices dropping, the program savings disappeared. I am concerned that a major natural gas pipeline infrastructure build may mirror these disappointing results.
   NEPGA testified that its members are bringing dual fuel (oil/gas) generating plants online as one way to address the winter demand crisis.
2.) The environmental benefit of switching to natural gas fired electricity generation because of lower carbon emissions than coal or oil is offset by the negative impact of methane leakage in the production, transmission, and distribution of natural gas. The dangers of methane as a contributor to climate change are just beginning to be publicized and regulations are changing to reflect this reality. Remember "Clean Coal?" There is even a small possibility that fracking could be banned or become so expensive that stranded costs will come even sooner for ratepayers.

3.) Ten years ago when the legislature supported the scrubber for the coal plant, they were assured that the scrubber would extend the life of the plant by 20 years. The project cost twice as much as the original estimate, retirement of the underutilized plant seems likely, and the ratepayers are stuck with the stranded cost of that scrubber. Why would we do that to ratepayers again with these pipeline projects when there are much less expensive alternatives like energy efficiency and LNG to act as a bridge while we work on integrating more renewable energy resources and storage solutions into a smarter grid?

Finally, I am linking some folk songs from around the country showing the resistance to the rush to export and the taking of private property for corporate gain.
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=77V_X00XwVU this was sent by my cousin in North Carolina.
This from a popular folk group in Western Mass:
http://www.soundclick.com/player/single_player.cfm?songid=13163536&q=hi&newref=1
This is from a "young" sound, "Melodeego": https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=39_b1yEy0sM
I'm just waiting for the rap song…

Thank you again to the Commission for welcoming me as a consumer at these proceedings and for allowing me to comment.

Sincerely,

Pat Martin