From: Jeanne Dietsch [mailto:jeanne.a.dietsch@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 09, 2015 11:52 AM
To: Monroe, Pamela
Subject: Re: Comments on Docket No. 2015-08

Pamela, thank you for accepting by email the following comments for NH Site Evaluation Committee, Docket 2015-08. I was present at the meeting in Rindge on 12/2/15.

1) The ICF Report cited by Kinder Morgan for most energy predictions in FERC filing, pp 64, 68, 77, 86 and 99, is based on historical data rather than future projections. Future energy demand and supply will not resemble the past because of:

a) OVERALL EMISSIONS, including methane and other emissions released during the fracking process plus emissions from the burning of the fuel, make fracked gas "dirtier" than oil and possibly as bad as coal. KM is careful to state that the "gas from its pipeline" is cleaner than oil, excluding emissions during the fracking process before the gas reaches the pipeline.

b) PROBABLE REGULATION of fracking that will inhibit supply. Regulation of fracking is likely because of water pollution and seismic issues in fracking areas. In addition, in June, the G7 agreed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 40-70% by 2050; that goal will probably be increased at the Paris Climate talks taking place now.

c) INCREASING AVAILABILITY OF RENEWABLE SOURCES of energy at lessening costs. For example, the Town of Peterborough is now relying 100% on renewable sources, including the largest solar array in the state, saving $50,000 per year. Millipore, in Jaffrey, has cut its energy costs by $400,000 per year with its new biomass plant. Such savings, and continuing lower costs of solar systems will encourage even quicker adoption of non-fossil fuels.

d) NEW STORAGE TECHNOLOGIES that are making previously intermittent energy sources, such as solar and wind, to be available 24/7. These technologies include not only Tesla's batteries, but also the salt towers that are being used out west in grid-based solutions. Note that Kinder Morgan's filing on this topic is inaccurate:
(P 93, FERC filing Nov 2015: "Solar and wind are intermittent resources, only available when the sun is shining or the wind is blowing.")

2) Please note that Kinder Morgan cites some of these risks, due to low demand, poor financing, lack of supply and changes in regulation, in their own corporate annual 10K filing to the Securities and Exchange Commission, beginning on page 29. These risks could result in stranded assets, impairing KM's abiilty to finance its debt. KM admits in the same 10K filing that that ability is already in jeopardy. If the pipeline were to be unfinished or unused, for whatever reason, would NH receive the promised $19 million per year in taxes? Would owners even be paid for the damage to their properties?

3) Finally, KM promotes its pipeline as a means to insure a greater supply of energy to the region, yet during the Rindge meeting, one of the KM presenters stated that, "once this pipeline is approved, oil-fired plants will shut down." If oil fired plants shut down, how will the pipeline be improving redundancy? What will the region do if terrorists target a pipeline, Pennsylvania halts fracking or something else interferes with the gas supply? We would be no better off and perhaps worse off than with oil.

Thank you for your consideration of these issues.

Looking out for Humankind SAPIENS PLURUM Jeanne Dietsch
43 Pine Street, Peterborough, NH 03458
603-924-6720, jdietsch@sapiensplurum.org