

Pamela G. Monroe

Administrator

New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee

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, after that - five jobs. 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 re 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.

Thank you
Paul Stevens