

**Public FERC correspondence & comments received re Docket PF14-22 (Kinder-Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline proposed Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline)**

**VOLUME 3 (r1): Comments from June & July, 2015**

*{rev 1: updated Feb 8, 2016, to correct 2 document references; bookmarks added}*

**The most recent Volume will always be at: [http://www.Mason-NH.org/FERC\\_COMMENTS.pdf](http://www.Mason-NH.org/FERC_COMMENTS.pdf)  
and will contain links to any earlier volumes**

**Volume 2 (r2) (pages 580...1,139, 2.1 MB) covers from March 1, 2015 through May 31, 2015, it can be downloaded from**

**[http://www.Mason-NH.org/FERC\\_COMMENTS\\_vol\\_2.pdf](http://www.Mason-NH.org/FERC_COMMENTS_vol_2.pdf)**

**Volume 1 (r3) (pages 1...579, 2.2 MB) covers from the beginning in September, 2014, through February 28, 2015, it can be downloaded from**

**[http://www.Mason-NH.org/FERC\\_COMMENTS\\_vol\\_1.pdf](http://www.Mason-NH.org/FERC_COMMENTS_vol_1.pdf)**

*Editor's note:*

*The comments sent to FERC by citizens, local governments and organizations are meant to provide important information to FERC for use in its review of a proposed project. In this role the information flows essentially in only one direction: to FERC.*

***A less well known function is to encourage the exchange of information between citizens, groups and local governments. In my view this exchange is as important as informing FERC, perhaps more important.** Unfortunately, while the comments sent to FERC are made part of the public record and are placed on-line, they can be rather hard to access through FERC's somewhat opaque eLibrary interface. In practice they essentially disappear from the public eye.*

*As a consequence, much of the value of the comments is lost. While some comments are simple "I'm all for it" or "don't allow it" expressions of opinion, many others contain thoughtful discussions of costs and benefits, suggestions for studies which would be important, considerations of alternative solutions, and other valuable contributions to the public discussion. **It is a terrible waste of human effort and knowledge to allow these comments to disappear from the public discussion.***

*The intent of this document was to collect and make easily accessible the comments sent to FERC by citizens, organizations and local governments along with FERC's replies. I wanted to make the comments available as a collection in a small number of PDF files of manageable size - this meant that the comments would have to be in text form rather than as large image scans.*

*Most of the documents were scanned at FERC and then converted into text via OCR (Optical Character Recognition). While modern OCR can do a decent job, there always will be errors. The errors were compounded by the tendency of some FERC clerks to stamp the documents near to, often on top of, the text - which greatly confused the OCR and made it time-consuming to select and copy the remaining legible parts. **Hand-written documents are not OCR compatible and could not be converted to text.** They are listed in*

sequence below but without text; where possible a note is made as to author and support or opposition.

**Maps and similar graphical material are also not included.**

Also excluded are the very large document collections provided by Kinder Morgan in their application. Each update of their proposal includes almost 1,000 MB of files containing thousands of pages. These files are listed in sequence below and can be downloaded from FERC's eLibrary if you want them.

Much of the OCR'd text resulted in lines which did not match the page width of this collection; simply copying these short lines this would have at least tripled the length of this already very long document. Instead, after selecting the text I reformatted the paragraphs so that they would fill out the width. I did not attempt to also recreate indentations or tabular formats.

This project has been complicated by several factors:

I found it surprising that many documents which were fully OCR compatible were never converted, including a number which came from governmental bodies, tribes, or influential NGOs. These were either stored as (large) image scans in the PDF files or simply noted as not being convertible with no clue as to content. Some which had "SENT BY EMAIL" in their header, indicating they had been sent to FERC in digital text form were apparently converted into the much less useful scan image format. Processing at FERC seems somewhat inconsistent. Where possible I have applied my own OCR when only scans are provided.

Finally, there is pilot fatigue and error. Long and late hours provided ample occasion for errors and I'm sure I must have made some. I suspect the most likely would be deletions of parts of paragraphs (the Delete key being all too close to other keys I used). Please report any that you discover to [Garth@JacqCAD.com](mailto:Garth@JacqCAD.com) and I will repair them.

In short, expect some errors. When in doubt you can consult images of the originals in FERC's eLibrary. The bolded numbers, such as "**20140917-4001(29789308).pdf**", are the FERC document file names in which the first numbers, e.g., **20140917-4001**, are the document's "Accession Number" while the numbers in ( ) are the specific file number (there may be several files, for example a scan Image file and also a PDF version, possibly OCR'd, or not...).

You can search FERC's eLibrary at <http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/elibrary.asp> where you can use "advanced search" to find all files under a specific Accession Number.

G.Fletcher.

The files are listed in numerical order - which should correspond to date, beginning with the earliest.

Comments received in Sep 2014	(2014 <b>09</b> ...) begin on page	Volume 1: 3
Comments received in Oct 2014	(2014 <b>10</b> ...) begin on page	Volume 1: 41
Comments received in Nov 2014	(2014 <b>11</b> ...) begin on page	Volume 1: 106
Comments received in Dec 2014	(2014 <b>12</b> ...) begin on page	Volume 1: 200
Comments received in Jan 2015	(2015 <b>01</b> ...) begin on page	Volume 1: 281
<u>Comments received in Feb 2015</u>	<u>(2015<b>02</b>...) begin on page</u>	<u>Volume 1: 424</u>
Comments received in Mar 2015	(2015 <b>03</b> ...) begin on page	Volume 2: 582
Comments received in Apr 2015	(2015 <b>04</b> ...) begin on page	Volume 2: 778
<u>Comments received in May 2015</u>	<u>(2015<b>05</b>...) begin on page</u>	<u>Volume 2: 965</u>
Comments received in Jun 2015	(2015 <b>06</b> ...) begin on page	Volume 3: 1142
<u>Comments received in Jul 2015</u>	<u>(2015<b>07</b>...) begin on page</u>	<u>Volume 3: 1440</u>
Comments received in Aug 2015	(2015 <b>08</b> ...) begin on page	Volume 4: 1887

**20150601-5009(30620123).txt**

Stephen and Carol Dolan, Dracut, MA.  
Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, N.E.  
Washington, D.C. 20426

May 29, 2015

RE: The Northeast Energy Direct, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Project, Docket # PF 14-22

Dear Ms. Bose:

We have been residents of 9 Colonial Drive, Dracut, Massachusetts for over thirty-three years. We are opposed to any additional gas pipelines and/or compressor stations terminating or passing through our town. Dracut has many gas pipelines, our town already assists the United States with the delivery of gas throughout the northeast. The current pipelines do not run at capacity. The proposed project (Docket # PF 14-22) calls for an immense 36" high-pressure pipeline, other pipelines ranging from 20-30", and a compressor station occupying several acres. Why the need for such a huge project?

**Safety:** According to the Federal Pipeline & Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA), there has been an average of more than one "significant incident" a week along high pressure gas transmission lines nationwide since 2000. This project also means the proposed location of the compressor station places our family and hundred others within the incineration zone. We will have fifty-six seconds to find safety in the event of an explosion. If you and your family lived for over three decades in a beautiful community would you want to be affected by such a project? Kinder Morgan is the company orchestrating this project. Understandably any company like Kinder Morgan would want to develop an efficient project at the least cost. We believe Kinder Morgan does not care about the safety of the residents. Why would they consider, never mind be allowed, to develop a compressor station so close to an established neighborhood? Besides the safety concerns of a compressor station, the increased flow of commercial traffic in our neighborhood would be unacceptable.

**Environment:** We understand a pipeline of this size will mean a 100 ft. land clearing and maintenance with pesticides. We also understand the proposed pipeline would cross several former toxic waste sites. What will be the impact to our water and wildlife? Will underground water flows be disrupted? We fear Dracut will no longer be a place to raise a family, thus property values will undoubtedly drop. Ms. Bose, would you want to be faced with this scenario for you and your family?

**Alternative Energy:** We understand that Kinder Morgan and similar companies exist for profit and that's OK, but don't fool us into believing The Northeast Energy Direct, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Project, Docket # PF 14-22 is to handle the "growing U.S. demand". This project is for one reason, export. Exports deplete domestic supply and raise prices. Invoking eminent domain for the benefit of a private corporation would be wrong. America is using and will continue to successfully utilize renewable energy alternatives. Please consider local, not global.

Respectfully,

Stephen and Carol Dolan

**20150601-5012(30620129).txt**

deborah pomerleau, parker, CO.

Scoping meetings for each town in NH that could get this pipeline are necessary. Please provide these meetings to each town.

**20150601-5036(30620180).txt**

Patricia Sahr, East Nassau, NY.

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the NED pipeline project. I am a resident of the town of

Nassau. While my home is not in close proximity to the proposed route of the pipeline, I am nevertheless very concerned that my family and I would be adversely affected by toxic gas emissions and could potentially be harmed by a break in the line or by an explosion. I am also concerned about friends and colleagues who DO live on or very near the route. Not only would their health and safety be jeopardized, they would also see a great loss in the value of their property.

Another great source of worry is the fact that the route of the pipeline will go dangerously close to both the Dewey Loeffel toxic waste site on Mead Road and the proposed site for a hard rock mine near the intersection of Rtes. 66 and 43. It seems as if Kinder Morgan is not addressing the very real danger possible if the pipeline is put in the vicinity of these two situations.

For the welfare of the residents of Nassau, please do not approve the NED pipeline project!

**20150601-5037(30620182).txt**

Guy Steucek, Dracut, MA.

Gentlefolk:

Reference is made to Docket #PF14-22 for the gas pipeline from New York to Dracut, MA with a current pathway through western Massachusetts, southern New Hampshire and eastern Massachusetts.

I am opposed to the construction of this natural gas pipeline for a number of reasons. From a global perspective, cheap natural gas to the Northeast will only impede the development of green, renewable sources of energy for at least 20 years in this area. Many think we could be approaching the tipping point of global warming/climate change. To promote the development of fossil fuel natural gas reserves is reckless.

The demand for natural gas in the Northeast can be met with the development and improvement of existing natural gas pipelines.

On the local level, we plan to cut our use of natural gas in half this year with the installation of insulation in a house originally constructed in 1770. Moreover, my neighbors have installed solar collectors on their houses and we are exploring the construction of a solar collection system on our farm. As a nation we should promote the development of these energy generating systems.

Not only will the proposed pipeline by Kinder Morgan companies leave a scar on the natural areas it transects, it will be a hazard and annoyance to the citizens that live in the immediate vicinity of the pipeline. This is a high price to pay for a little gas that could be used in the Northeast while the majority will be shipped overseas.

It would seem that gas shipped over seas with an elevated price would mean that the citizens of the Northeast would have to compete with high priced markets for gas and henceforth pay higher prices for gas.

There are many specific questions that can be brought to the project. For example, is the compressor station proposed in Dracut sufficient to meet the capacity of gas proposed for transport? Will additional facilities need to be constructed? Will baseline noise levels be done during the winter when noise travels unimpeded by vegetation? Neighbors complain about the noise from the current metering system in Dracut, installed in 2008, especially in winter. Will FERC employ stronger restrictions on noise with any new construction?

Thank you for entertaining these comments.

Guy Steucek  
430 Marsh Hill Road  
Dracut, MA 01826

**20150601-5046(30620200).txt**

Garth Fletcher, Mason, NH.

**SUMMARY OF DENIALS OF SURVEY ACCESS**

A non-exhaustive review of FERC's Docket PF14-22 submissions through May 30, 2015, reveals 176 sub-

missions containing letters denying (or rescinding) survey access permission to Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company (KM/TGP).

That list of submissions, listed by FERC eLibrary “accession number”, is appended below.

In some cases FERC staff had bundled several separate denials into a single file, the most extreme case being 20150414-0055 which combined the letters of denial from 30 different landowners into a single submission. The total number of letters from individual landowners exceeds 200.

The number of properties to which access has been denied is difficult to judge. While every letter denied access to at least on property, others listed several separate properties and some, such as the Towns of Fitzwilliam, Rindge and Winchester denied access to “all town property” while the town of Richmond denied access to a list of 50 specific properties.

This summary may include some over-counts as I did not cross-reference the denials by addresses or lot numbers. Some may have appeared twice, for example once in the original denial and a second time in a letter complaining to FERC about that denial having been ignored by KM/TGP surveyors (unfortunately reports suggest this may not be a rare occurrence).

On the other hand, assuming local conditions are representative, the count is much more likely to be a significant under-count. Only a sub-set of landowners take the extra step of notifying FERC about letters of denial they have sent to KM/TGP.

Consequently only KM/TGP is able to determine the actual number of property access denials that have been sent. I strongly recommend that FERC request this information from KM/TGP in order to have a better understanding of the frequency and geographic distribution of access denials.

FERC PF14-22 Docket eLibrary accession numbers for submissions referencing refusals of access for surveys:

20141024-5001	20141105-5139	20141215-0009	20141216-5012
20141222-5129	20141222-5129	20141223-5014	20141223-5285
20141224-5003	20141229-0012	20150113-0086	20150114-0006
20150116-0020	20150116-0021	20150116-0022	20150120-0006
20150120-5265	20150122-0006	20150122-0007	20150122-0016
20150123-0022	20150123-0024	20150123-0027	20150126-0028
20150127-0058	20150128-0025	20150128-0034	20150128-0035
20150129-0032	20150129-0033	20150129-0034	20150129-0035
20150130-0021	20150202-0068	20150202-0103	20150202-5035
20150203-0021	20150203-0022	20150203-0030	20150204-0006
20150206-0018	20150206-0019	20150206-0020	20150209-0007
20150209-0066	20150209-0081	20150209-0082	20150209-0083
20150209-5065	20150209-5074	20150209-5086	20150209-5132
20150210-0040	20150212-0044	20150212-5028	20150213-0019
20150218-0046	20150218-0048	20150218-0088	20150219-0075
20150220-0008	20150223-0008	20150223-0009	20150223-0021
20150223-0022	20150223-0023	20150223-0032	20150223-0033
20150223-5000	20150224-0042	20150225-0030	20150225-0031
20150226-0011	20150226-0056	20150302-0032	20150302-0047
20150302-0050	20150302-0051	20150309-0111	20150309-0116
20150309-0119	20150309-0121	20150309-0125	20150309-0157
20150310-0057	20150310-0058	20150310-0059	20150311-0011
20150311-0023	20150312-0016	20150313-0026	20150313-0027
20150316-0028	20150316-0060	20150316-0066	20150317-0040
20150317-0043	20150318-0027	20150323-0025	20150323-0026
20150323-0030	20150323-0032	20150323-0034	20150323-0046

20150323-0060	20150323-5023	20150326-5004	20150327-0009
20150330-0043	20150330-0051	20150330-5008	20150331-0009
20150331-0010	20150331-0028	20150331-0029	20150403-0023
20150403-0032	20150406-0101	20150407-0030	20150407-0031
20150409-0017	20150409-0025	20150413-0050	20150413-0070
20150413-0073	20150414-0055	20150414-0056	20150414-0057
20150420-0137	20150427-0119	20150427-0138	20150427-0396
20150427-0397	20150428-0008	20150428-0009	20150430-0029
20150501-0028	20150501-0044	20150501-0045	20150501-0046
20150501-0048	20150504-0312	20150504-0313	20150504-0320
20150504-0328	20150504-0336	20150504-0337	20150504-0340
20150504-0350	20150504-0360	20150504-0364	20150505-0259
20150505-0275	20150506-0013	20150506-0014	20150508-0028
20150508-0031	20150508-0032	20150511-0022	20150511-0024
20150511-0035	20150511-0036	20150511-0037	20150511-0079
20150513-0019	20150515-0030	20150515-0031	20150515-0032
20150515-0033	20150515-0034	20150518-0030	20150518-0032
20150518-0058	20150519-0047	20150519-5021	20150521-0023

**20150601-5052(30620212).txt**

deborah pomerleau, parker, CO.

We need scoping meetings in every town along the pipeline route. Even towns adjacent to towns that might have the pipeline. The aquifer system in NH is critical not just to NH but also to MA. We have water that needs saving and protecting. Please have a scoping meeting in every town in NH and MA.

**20150601-5085(30620489).pdf**

May 31, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
 888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
 Washington, DC 20426 !

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Expansion Project  
 Northeast Energy Direct, PF14-22-000

Dear Secretary Bose, !

We are writing to express our concern with and opposition to the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline North-east Expansion project.

As residents of Tewksbury for 23 years, our family is directly affected by its potential consequences including the risk of gas leak-related explosion and contamination, as well as a decline in property values and an increase in insurance costs. Furthermore, as currently planned, this project will cross thru our property which has a pool and an eco-system with rare species that would be forced out of their habitats. Also, there is underground piping that connects to the perimeter/ french drains of our home and two others. If this drain piping is disturbed or damaged, it will result in water backing-up into our homes.

According to a Town of Tewksbury Zoning Map (February 2015), our property is on a Groundwater Protection District. The purpose of this Groundwater Protection District is to:

- a. promote the health, safety, and general welfare of the community by ensuring and adequate quality and quantity of drinking water for the residents, institutions, and businesses of the Town of Tewksbury
- b. preserve and protect existing and potential sources of drinking water supplies

- c. conserve the natural resources of the town; and
- d. prevent temporary and permanent contamination of the environment.

The effort to meet Massachusetts' ongoing energy needs should not adversely impact residents' quality of life, nor come at the expense of open space benefitting the public good. The proposed pipeline merely perpetuates reliance on non-renewable resources for short-term gain while ignoring the long-term benefits of renewable solutions that are safer, less invasive and potentially less costly. Massachusetts has a strong track record promoting renewable energy and energy efficiency programs. I urge you to fully prioritize further investment in and deployment of these solutions, and to take any actions as are necessary to disallow the Tennessee Pipeline Expansion project.

Sincerely,

David & Connie Roy  
36 Dunvegan Road  
Tewksbury, MA 0187

**20150601-5148(30621007).txt**

deborah pomerleau, parker, CO.

No pipeline in NH. Scoping meetings for every town in NH on the proposed pipeline.

**20150601-5150(30621009).txt**

kenneth c. scallon, nassau, NY.

Re: NED Pipeline, Docket # PF14-22.

We oppose this project after much review, including attending the KM Forum held in Schodack NY.

1. We are currently less than 2 miles from the existing pipelines and based on information we have, the potential for these to leak due to age has increased.
2. The new proposed pipeline route is north of our village of Nassau and would transect both residential and natural areas which we feel is a negative impact overall and contains unacceptable risk to all near it.
3. The proposal to use the Rennesslaer Aquifer for storage of the Gas is also of great concern to us. Current information gives no indication that this is a safe practice given future need of the aquifer.
4. Much of the information disseminated by Kinder Morgan, even in person, is conflicting with other information distributed.
5. The fact that this product is from fracking in Pennsylvania is even more disturbing, coupled with that according to SOME Kinder Morgan sources it will be used for export.

We could cite many other reasons but imagine that many of these would be redundant based on comments we know have already been provided to FERC on this subject.

Therefore we cannot, in good faith, agree to this pipeline being built through our town and county.

Sincerely,

Kenneth C. Scallon  
Mary A. Scallon  
369 Malden Bridge Rd.  
Nassau, NY 12123  
kmscallon@yaho

**20150601-5185(30621254).pdf**

May 31, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426 !

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Expansion Project  
Northeast Energy Direct, PF14-22-000

Dear Secretary Bose, !

We are writing to express our concern with and opposition to the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline North-east Expansion project.

As residents of Tewksbury for 23 years, our family is directly affected by its potential consequences including the risk of gas leak-related explosion and contamination, as well as a decline in property values and an increase in insurance costs. Furthermore, as currently planned, this project will cross thru our property which has a pool and an eco-system with rare species that would be forced out of their habitats. Also, there is underground piping that connects to the perimeter/ french drains of our home and two others. If this drain piping is disturbed or damaged, it will result in water backing-up into our homes.

According to a Town of Tewksbury Zoning Map (February 2015), our property is on a Groundwater Protection District. The purpose of this Groundwater Protection District is to:

- a. promote the health, safety, and general welfare of the community by ensuring and adequate quality and quantity of drinking water for the residents, institutions, and businesses of the Town of Tewksbury
- b. preserve and protect existing and potential sources of drinking water supplies
- c. conserve the natural resources of the town; and
- d. prevent temporary and permanent contamination of the environment.

The effort to meet Massachusetts' ongoing energy needs should not adversely impact residents' quality of life, nor come at the expense of open space benefitting the public good. The proposed pipeline merely perpetuates reliance on non-renewable resources for short-term gain while ignoring the long-term benefits of renewable solutions that are safer, less invasive and potentially less costly.

Massachusetts has a strong track record promoting renewable energy and energy efficiency programs. I urge you to fully prioritize further investment in and deployment of these solutions, and to take any actions as are necessary to disallow the Tennessee Pipeline Expansion project.

Sincerely,

David & Connie Roy  
36 Dunvegan Road  
Tewksbury, MA 01876

**20150601-5227(30621392).txt**

jim carr, dracut, MA.

Dear Ferc members,

I moved to Dracut in 1976 with my wife because of all the open land, protected forest land and it's beautiful, rolling , open farmlands. I joined the conservation commission in 1983 and served as chairman for several years. Later I was chairman of the Dracut open space committee as well as the Dracut Community Preservation committee. I have been involved in preserving and protecting many Dracut land parcels with agricultural and conservation restrictions. I also served on The Dracut Land Trust where we helped to preserve significant acreage in our town.

This proposed pipeline coming through our town-crossing wetlands, wildlife habitat and farmland is very disturbing to me and our town. Dracut has spent millions of dollars to preserve many of these parcels, including the Smith-Healey farm, Saja farm, the Leczinski/Dumeresque farm, and other conservation restricted areas.

We built the first Catholic Church (St. Francis) in our diocese in 30 years on 15 acres of beautiful, rolling hills surrounded by 4 farms - The Berube farm, The Ogonowski farm, The Saja farm and The Leczinski/Dumeresque farm.

A our church ,Saint Francis we have a beautiful prayer area , with a nice brook and an statue of Mary. Yes you guessed it . Kinder Morgan wants to put a 36 inch pressurized pipeline under the brook and adjacent to the Statue of Mary! So our reward for carefully preserving all this beautiful environmentally spectacular land is this? What must we do to have someone with a sense for the environment look at this , and make a well thought out decision on what is good for Dracut and our protected lands. What must we do to protect our 15 acre church parcel that some parishioners envisioned a Catholic school, or a home for the elderly? Like you folks I have served on many committees in our town and have always tried to do the right thing. I implore you to do the right thing and deny Kinder Morgan the right to take by “Eminent Domain” protected and holy lands in Dracut to enrich their stockholders .It is not their unalienable right to invade our beautiful town and do what they desire to it.

Thank You for your attention!

Sincerely - Jim Carr  
136 Fox Avenue Dracut Ma. 01826  
978-453-0882

**20150601-5363(30622219).pdf**

**Tennessee Gas Pipeline  
Company, L.L.C.**  
a Kinder Morgan company

INFORMATION HAS BEEN REMOVED FROM THIS DOCUMENT FOR  
PRIVILEGED TREATMENT (18 C.F.R. § 388.112)

June 1, 2015

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

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, Docket No. PF14-22-000  
Northeast Energy Direct Project

Supplemental Filing -- Compressor Station Locations

Dear Ms. Bose:

On September 15, 2014, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. (“Tennessee”) filed a request to use the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission’s (“Commission”) pre-filing procedures for the proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project (“Project”). By notice issued October 2, 2014, the Commission approved Tennessee’s request to use the pre-filing procedures for the Project. As part of the pre-filing process, Tennessee submitted drafts of Resource Reports 1 and 10 for the Project on November 5, 2014, with an updated Resource Report 1 filed on December 8, 2014. On March 13, 2015, Tennessee filed a first draft of Environmental Resource Reports 1 through 13 (collectively, “Environmental Report”) for the Project.

In the March 13, 2015 draft Environmental Report, Tennessee noted that it would file updated information with the Commission regarding the locations of the nine new compressor stations proposed for the Project. With this filing, Tennessee is now providing the following information regarding the specific locations for the nine proposed compressor stations:

### **Proposed Compressor Station Locations**

Station Name	Location (Town, County, State)	Facilities to be Installed (anticipated)	Estimated Acreage of Compressor Station Site	Total Property Acreage to be Acquired (approximate)	Property Acquisition Status
Supply Path Head Station	Town of New Milford, Susquehanna County, Pennsylvania	Two compressor units Compressor building Ancillary facilities	10 acres	86 acres	Option to Purchase Agreement executed
Supply Path Mid Station	Town of Franklin, Delaware County, New York*	One compressor unit Compressor building Office building for Tennessee personnel Ancillary facilities	10 acres	117 acres	Option to Purchase Agreement in negotiation
Supply Path Tail Station	Town of Schoharie, Schoharie County, New York	One compressor unit Compressor building Ancillary facilities	10 acres	91 acres	Option to Purchase Agreement executed
Market Path Head Station	Town of Schoharie, Schoharie County, New York	Two compressor units Compressor building Ancillary facilities Metering facilities	10 acres	64 acres**	Option to Purchase Agreement executed
Market Path Mid Station 1	Town of Nassau, Rensselaer County, New York	Three compressor units Compressor buildings Ancillary facilities	10 acres	142 acres	Option to Purchase Agreement executed
Market Path Mid Station 2	Town of Windsor, Berkshire County, Massachusetts	Three compressor units Compressor buildings Ancillary facilities	10 acres	89 acres	Option to Purchase Agreement executed
Market Path Mid Station 3	Town of Northfield, Franklin County, Massachusetts	Three compressor units Compressor buildings Ancillary facilities	10 acres	242 acres	Option to Purchase Agreement executed
Market Path Tail Station	Town of Dracut, Middlesex	One compressor unit Compressor building Ancillary facilities	10 acres	29 acres	Option to Purchase Agreement executed

County, Metering facilities  
Massachusetts

Market Path Mid Station 4	Town of New Ipswich, New Hampshire	Two Titan 250 turbines; one Titan 130 turbine Compressor building Office building for Tennessee personnel Ancillary facilities	10 acres	165 acres	Option to Purchase Agreement executed
---------------------------	------------------------------------	---	----------	-----------	---------------------------------------

\* The proposed Supply Path Mid Station will be located on property to be acquired in the Town of Franklin, Delaware County, New York. Tennessee will also be acquiring an adjacent property in the Town of Otsego, Otsego County, New York to serve as a buffer area. The site of the proposed Supply Path Mid Station will not be located on the property located in the Town of Otsego.  
\*\* In addition to the property (47 acres) for which an Option to Purchase Agreement has been executed for the Market Path Head Station, Tennessee is in negotiations to purchase an adjacent property (17 acres) to serve as a buffer area.

Aerial maps depicting the exact locations of the proposed nine new compressor stations to be constructed as part of the Project are attached to this filing. These aerial maps show a one-half mile radius around the total property boundary where the compressor stations are proposed to be located.

With the specific locations of the compressor stations selected, Tennessee is continuing the detailed design of the compressor stations and specific facilities to be installed at each new compressor station location. More detailed information about these proposed compressor stations, including preliminary plot plans for each new compressor station, will be included in the next draft Environmental Report, which Tennessee will submit in July 2015.

Also attached are lists of those landowners that are located within the one-half mile radius of each of the property boundaries where the new compressor stations are proposed to be located. Tennessee respectfully requests that the landowner lists be accorded privileged and confidential treatment, pursuant to Section 388.112 of the Commission’s regulations, 18 C.F.R. § 388.112 (2014). Accordingly, the landowner lists have been marked “Contains Privileged Information - Do Not Release.” Copies of this filing, except for the privileged information, will be provided to the identified landowners.

In accordance with the Commission’s filing requirements, Tennessee is submitting the original of this filing to the Commission’s Secretary. Tennessee is also providing two complete copies of this filing to the Office of Energy Projects (“OEP”).

Respectfully submitted,

TENNESSEE GAS PIPELINE COMPANY, L.L.C.

By: /s/ J. Curtis Moffatt

J. Curtis Moffatt

Deputy General Counsel and Vice President

Gas Group Legal

Enclosures

cc: Mr. Rich McGuire; Mr. Michael McGehee; Mr. Eric Tomasi (Federal Energy Regulatory Commission)

**20150602-0012(30628527).pdf**

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Date: May 16, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access

As the owner of the property located at:

150 Stowell Rd

Ray Short Jr. Ray Short Sr.

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, subcontractors, or associates to enter my land to perform surveys, or for any other purpose. Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Ray Short Jr. Ray Short Sr.

**20150602-0014(30628483).pdf**

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, NE

Room 1A

Washington, DC 20426

Date: 5/16/15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access

As the owner of the property located at:

157 Stowell Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, subcontractors, or associates to enter my land to perform surveys, or for any other purpose. Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Priscilla E. Casey

**20150602-0015(30628713).pdf**

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, NE

Room 1A

Washington, DC 20426

Date: 5-16-15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access

As the owner of the property located at:

165 Boynton Hill Rd

New Ipswich, NH 03071

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, subcontractors, or associates to enter my land to perform surveys, or for any other purpose. Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Gloria Foster

**20150602-0023(30629504).pdf**

**Montague Conservation Commission**

Secretary Kimberly D. Bose  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
88 First Street NE Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline, L.L.C., Docket No. PF14-22-000

Dear Secretary Bose:

The Montague Conservation Commission understands that the proposed route for the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline will run for 4.7 miles through the Town of Montague. The Montague Conservation Commission urges FERC to protect the interests identified in the following laws of the Commonwealth:

Mass Wetlands Protection Act (MGL Ch 131 s40) -The proposed route will directly impact several jurisdictional wetland resource areas.

Mass Riverfront Protection Act (MGL Ch258, Acts of 1996)-The proposed route will cross the Connecticut and Millers Rivers.

Mass Endangered Species Act (MGL Ch 131A Sec 4)- The proposed route will affect 2,366 acres of NHESP Priority Habitat for rare species within 1/8 mile buffer.

Permanently Protected Open Space (Article 97 of the Constitution of the Commonwealth)- The proposed route bisects the Montague Plains Wildlife Management Area- affecting 97 acres of permanently protected land within 300 feet.

The Zoning Act (MGL. Ch 40A)- The proposed route bisects the Turners Falls Water District's public water supply protection district for the Hannegan Brook Well Zone II.

The Commission also urges FERC to avoid segmentation in reviewing projects across the region. Thus we ask you to evaluate the cumulative impacts of the five major pipeline projects planned for New England.

Foremost, The Montague Comprehensive Plan and Open Space Plan calls for preserving the Montague Plains, a precious ecological and recreation resource of statewide benefit. The pipeline bisects this 20,000+ acre area that is primarily protected by the Mass Department of Fisheries and Wildlife. We are concerned that the proposed pipeline will conflict with the obligation that the land used for outdoor recreation and natural habitat. Thank you for considering our local concerns.

Sincerely,

Mark Fairbrother, Chairman      Donna Francis      Alex Peterkin      Sean F. Werle, PhD  
Justin Fermann, PhD      Addie Rose Holland      Deborah J. Picking, PhD

CC: Montague Legislative and Congressional Representatives, Governor Baker, Commissioner of Mass Fish and Game

**20150602-0047(30630592).pdf**

**TOWN OF PELHAM**  
Office of the Selectmen  
6 Village Green  
Pelham, NH 03076

May 14, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC, Docket No. PF14-22-000 (Reg. No. 18301  
FERC ID 1 F291489)

Dear Ms. Bose:

The Town of Pelham, New Hampshire (Town), a municipality as defined by 15 USC 717a (3), will be crossed by the Alternative Route as proposed in the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC, (Company) December 8, 2014, Supplemental Filing-Adoption of Alternative Route as Part of Proposed Route (Wright, New York to Dracut, Massachusetts Pipeline Segment, (the Project) and, as a result, will be directly, substantially and adversely impacted by the construction, operation and maintenance of the pipeline.

The Town of Pelham opposes the Project.

The Draft Environmental Report, submitted November 2014, by the Company at 10.3.1.8, page 10.3.1.8, New Hampshire Power line Alternative and the accompanying Tables and Maps do not adequately detail the precise route and impacts on the Town of Pelham nor does the Draft Environmental Report adequately address the following threats to the Town:

1. The construction, operation and maintenance of the Project will include drilling, blasting, rock crushing and excavation using heavy equipment and trucks, causing the contamination of surface and ground water from blasting emulsions and compounds; air contamination from dust and debris; and air contamination from diesel exhaust from crushers, heavy equipment and trucks; and,
2. The operation and maintenance of the Project threatens injury and damage to wildlife and indigenous plants and trees because of the use of herbicides and poisons in the pipeline right of way both from air born transmission and from leaching into surface and ground waters; and,
3. The construction, operation and maintenance of the Project threatens adverse impacts on Town lakes, rivers, streams, brooks, estuaries, wetlands, surface and ground waters; and the impact of blasting, drilling, pumping and releasing of contaminated waste water on Pelham's large stratified drift aquifer is of particular concern.
4. The construction, operation and maintenance of the project threatens adverse impacts to Town forest lands, recreational and conservation areas; and,
5. The construction, operation and maintenance of the Project will require the involuntary taking of Town property by the pipeline company, including precious conservation and recreation property, by eminent domain in violation of Article 12- a of the New Hampshire Constitution, the provision that property cannot be taken for private use; and,
6. The construction, operation and maintenance of the Project threaten the economic well-being and aggregate tax base of the Town.
7. Town of Pelham will be exposed to the expansion of transmission lines in relation to the Merrimack Valley Reliability Project (MVRP). The proposed pipeline is slated to "coexist" in the same right of way or alongside of this transmission line expansion. The construction, operation and maintenance of the Project threatens injury and damage to the health and safety of Town residents and their property because of the proximity of a large high pressure gas pipeline carrying flammable liquid natural gas to high voltage (345-kV) power transmission lines.

The Town of Pelham, New Hampshire, requests that:

1. The Company provides a full and comprehensive analysis of the impacts of the project on the Town;
2. The Company provides a precise description of the route of the pipeline through the Town;
3. The Company precisely identifies each environmental impact the project will have on the Town;
4. The Company addresses the threats to the Town identified at items 1-7 above.
5. A time certain be entered that will permit the Town and each citizen and property owner of the Town of Pelham to have full opportunity to express concerns about the adverse impacts of the Project upon

them and their property but in no event earlier than 90 days after the filing of this letter.

6. Or in the latter, schedule a Scoping Meeting for Pelham and the Eastern NH towns to address our concerns and to be held in Pelham, New Hampshire.

Lastly, please address any filings, communications and correspondence regarding this project to: The Pelham Board of Selectmen, 6 Village Green Pelham, New Hampshire 03076.

Respectfully submitted,

Brian McCarthy, Town Administrator  
bmccarthy@pelhamweb.com

cc: Board of Selectmen  
File

**20150602-0086(30625638).pdf**

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Date: May 15, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access

As the owner of the property located at:

215 Timbertop Rd  
New Ipswich, NH 03071

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, subcontractors, or associates to enter my land to perform surveys, or for any other purpose. Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Robert Bailey

**20150602-0088(30626817).pdf**

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Date: 19 May, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access

As the owner of the property located at:

102 Old Wilton Rd  
New Ipswich, NH 03071

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, subcontractors, or associates to enter my land to perform surveys, or for any other purpose. Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Darren F. Cepple

**20150602-0114(30630527).pdf**

Hand written 2 page letter, ?, Dracut, MA, opposing

**20150602-0203(30634400).pdf**

May 21, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Subject: Northeast Energy Direct, PF14-22-000

Dear Secretary Bose,

I would like to voice my concern over the proposed Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Pipeline and compressor station for the town in which I live, Dracut, Massachusetts. Please reject the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. (TGP) Pre-Filing submission to FERC of the NED pipeline project as planned, specifically for the all facilities in the project terminus town of Dracut, Massachusetts. TGC needs to reassess the plans. They have provided incomplete, inaccurate, and poorly planned information for the pipeline and associated facilities for Dracut.

Specifically:

Destruction of Property Values due to “Co-Location with Existing Utilities

TGC has presented that they are planning to “co-locate” with existing utilities throughout the project. Their Project Manager, Mark Hamarich, and other TGC representatives “clarified” what this means at a public presentation in Andover on Feb. 17, 2015. “Co-location” actually means “alongside” existing utilities. As an example, TGC plans to place their Lynnfield Connector pipeline 5’ beyond the existing electric easement on the properties located on the street on which I live, Heather Road in Dracut. While I am not a direct abutter to this project, my home faces the properties that do abut the proposed pipeline. TGC wants to have a 50’ permanent easement for the new pipeline, which will infringe on the abutter’s properties on Heather Rd. The company also needs additional temporary easements for the installation. Compounding this poorly thought-out decision is the fact that this will require clear-cutting of a mature forest of trees that currently provides a visual buffer between the homes and the electric line. The NED project will require removal of the tree line that is visible from my property and abuts all of my Heather Rd neighbors and which cannot be replaced. The landscape of, the Heather Rd properties will be permanently altered and this, along with the end result of living across the street from a massive gas pipeline, will negatively affect the property values of every home on the street.

Although TGC’s pre-filing information and other presentations have claimed that this is “just preliminary” and “we are still engineering it” it was very clear that they had put quite a bit of thought into the execution of the project and have treated abutting and affected property owners with contempt. TGC representatives said that they anticipated difficulty in negotiating with the current electric transmission line easement holder. Apparently they feel they can use the FERC and the Eminent Domain process to bully their way into significant property impacts to all of the homeowners, who like myself, have owned homes on this street for over 30 years.

My wife and I bought our home in Dracut 34 years ago to provide an investment for our future and our retirement. Like my neighbors, we have maintained and improved our homes greatly over those years, thereby significantly increasing their value. That value is now clearly threatened by this project. Despite assurances to the contrary and TGC providing outdated and non-New England property reports, the project as planned will devalue most properties in our vicinity solely to the benefit of Kinder Morgan, TGC and their shareholders. The project, as proposed, requires permanent destruction and disruption to our neighborhood and will destroy the property value of every home in the vicinity. As if this were not disturbing enough, the

gas produced by this 'Northeast pipeline in no way appears to benefit residents of the Northeastern United States, as the gas is intended solely for export outside of the US.

Are there alternatives for the location of this lateral gas line? Yes. There are nonresidential areas of Dracut where this line could be routed, if the pipeline is actually needed. We could also be looking to upgrade existing infrastructure as well as continue to study other energy efficiency measures.

### Overall Destruction of the Fabric of a Community

Dracut, Massachusetts is "ground zero for the NED project. The primary "Market Line" is dubbed; Wright, NY York to Dracut, Mass. Pipeline Segment. Dracut sits at the confluence of two existing and two proposed gas lines in addition to the NED proposed Market Line.

The NED project has simply not provided FERC with the total, cumulative, and extensive impacts to the town of Dracut. They have "cherry-picked" FERC's filing requirements and provided only minimal, or "to be provided later" information that is required by FERC's rules and regulations.

The project as-planned will site a major, 23,000HP compressor station, connections to five (5) gas lines, new lines that slice through existing well-established neighborhoods, near schools, adjacent to churches, and through farmland. This project will undermine the character of the town and destroy the value of the hundreds of homes throughout East Dracut where both the pipeline and compressor station are due to be built.

There are grave concerns regarding the construction and operation of a compressor station that will run 24 x 7. A facility that will be a large structure near several neighborhoods with substantial night lighting and noise levels that range from 50-90 decibels at a distance and which will exhaust gas and other chemical residues into the environment. This facility will be located less than 1/2 mile from my home further eroding the value of the many properties in this neighborhood.

### Safety Concerns

Kinder Morgan's safety record presents another reason to worry about the routing of this 30 - 36" gas pipeline within feet of homes, schools and churches. They have had more than 20 accidents since 2003 that were serious enough to be reported to the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration. Their oversight and maintenance have been cited as lacking and in some cases has been reported as being intentionally lacking. Unfortunately ail of the disks associated with Kinder Morgan's lack of maintenance fall squarely on those whose homes and properties will be endangered by a leak or an explosion. It is no consolation that my home falls within the 'incineration zone that would be created by such an event. What ability is there to respond and contain a catastrophic event such as an explosion when residents live in such dose proximity'

There are apparently additional maintenance risks that will result from the co-location of the pipeline along electric transmission lines as increased electrical interference from the transmission lines can lead to increased corrosion of the pipeline; creating another maintenance issue. How are these additional risks being assessed and how can anyone be sure that Kinder Morgan will provide the oversight and maintenance activities associated with co-location.

### Gas to Benefit Whom?

There is no benefit to anyone in the Northeastern United States from the Northeast Direct Pipeline. The only beneficiaries are Kinder Morgan, TGC and their shareholders who will reap the benefits of exporting the gas to other countries. The disruption that the placement and construction of this pipeline will create, will destroy the fabric of the many small rural towns along its route but will do it's most serious damage in the town where I have made my home for over 30 years.

### In Summary

As a resident and property owner affected by the designated route of the pipeline as well as the compressor station, I ask you to stop the pre-filing process of the project now and send TGC "back to the drawing board". There needs to be far greater due diligence of the impacts of this pipeline to Dracut and the other communities who will be impacted by this proposed route. TGC needs to get their facts straight and consider pacts other than simple engineering 5 construction concerns.

Paul Zapert  
64 Heather Rd  
Dracut, MA 01826

**20150602-0276(30632983).pdf**

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: May 26, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access

As the owner of the property located at:

Glenna M Shaloum  
Pintoosre Lake Condominium, Bldg #4 - Apt #4  
580 South Main Street  
Lanesborough, Massachusetts 01237-0395

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its employees, contractors, subcontractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter will be considered an intrusion and treated as trespass.

Glenna M Shaloum

**20150602-0283(30631714).pdf**

*{was "File 30625625\_1.tif cannot be converted to PDF. " The .tif file was OCR was converted here}  
{CONTAINS 28 SEPARATE HAND-WRITTEN CARDS BUNDLED INTO A SINGLE FILE}*

Hand written card, Roberta H. Whitney, 35 Argilla Rd, Andover, MA 01810, opposing

Hand written card, S. Mason, 5 Meadow Oak Lane, S. Deerfield, MA 01373, opposing

Hand written card, Jen Lee, 26 Governor St, Plainfield, MA 01070, opposing

Hand written card, Mary Bickenstaffe, 196 Trout Brook Rd, Dracut, MA 01826, opposing

Hand written card, Paul (Sandy) Laughner, 186 Old Turnpike Road, Richmond, NH 03470, opposing

Hand written card, Byrne, 40 Pelczar Rd, Dracut, MA 01826, opposing

Hand written card, Risa Andre, Michael Andre, ? Trout Brook Rd, Dracut, MA 01826, opposing

Hand written card, Joyce A. Kulig, 81 Heather Rd, Dracut, MA 01826, opposing

Hand written card, Linda & Ray Carolla, 21 Chetnut Rd, Dracut, MA 01826, opposing

Hand written card, Christina C?well, 651 A River Rd, Weare, NH 03281 opposing

Hand written card, Shawna Cashman, 515 Parker Rd, Dracut, MA 01826, opposing

Hand written card, Dorothy L. Zanna, 74 Leo Ave, Dracut, MA 01826, opposing

Hand written card, Martin Kulig, 81 Heather Rd, Dracut, MA 01826, opposing

Hand written card, Sandra Wilkens, 426 Lowell St, Lawrence, MA 01891, opposing

Hand written card, Nancy Katin, 59 Mill St unit 207, Dracut, MA 01826, opposing

Hand written card, Arthur Kostoulakos, 971 Lakeview Ave apt 11D, Dracut, MA 01826, opposing

Hand written card, Heikkila, 20 Greenbriar Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, opposing

Hand written card, Tracy Wagoner, 83 Sandhill Rd, Peterborough, NH 03458, opposing

Hand written card, Marily Griska, 18 Atlantic Dr, Rindge, NH 03461, opposing

Hand written card, Lisa Derby Oden, 6 Upper Pratt Pond Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, requesting scoping meeting in New Ipswich

Hand written card, Julie Reekie, 315 South St, Troy, NH 03465, opposing

Hand written card, Kathy Bateman, 150 Kenwood Rd, Dracut, MA 01826, opposing

Hand written card, Karen Miller, 161 Ashburnham Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, opposing

Hand written card, Mary Thomann, 39 Colonial Drive, Dracut, MA 01826, opposing

Hand written card, Gary R. Thomann, 39 Colonial Drive, Dracut, MA 01826, opposing

Hand written card, Betty Ann Aubrey, 25 Arbor Dr, Dracut, MA 01826, opposing

Hand written card, Jake Wise, 252 Prospect St, Plainfield, MA 01070, opposing

Hand written card, Marily Griska, 18 Atlantic Dr, Rindge, NH 03461, requesting meeting with FERC

**20150602-0292(30631394).pdf**

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Date: 5/14/2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access

As the owner of the property located at:

292 Chesham Rd  
Harrisville NH 03450

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land to perform surveys, or for any other purpose. Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Cheryl L. Barlow

**20150602-0309(30630832).pdf**

May 19, 2015

To all recipients listed below

I live in New Ipswich, NH. This package is to present the many questions and concerns I have about the proposed route of the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline through Southern New Hampshire. Servicing energy supplies around the globe has an ongoing legacy of reckless destruction of ecosystems and of causing illness and death in Zzypuit of profits. The industry is in denial of its inability to control the hazards of its ways. We do, after all, build nuclear power plants along active fault lines.

This is not to say there aren't risks to life, but it is to say our energy wants may be exceeding our energy needs and the energy models are hurling the planet to the brink of instability, filling the air and land and seas and our bodies with a toxic slush.

Consider this:

- ~ Coal energy has poisoned ecosystems and caused illness and death.
- ~ Drilling for oil has poisoned ecosystems and caused illness and death.
- ~ Nuclear power has poisoned ecosystems and caused illness and death.

~ Fracking has poisoned ecosystems and caused illness and death.

Blasting and burrowing through the fragile watersheds, wetlands, aquifers, fields, forests, rivers, and rocky hillsides of New Hampshire for a combustible gas pipeline will not preserve or improve our life sustaining ecosystems or our health and can also cause illness and death.

We know this.

The decision about this pipeline is very, very important.

- a) The decision will determine if we must sacrifice our earned enjoyment of life in New Hampshire.
- b) The decision will determine whether we lose our home and in some cases, also our livelihood.
- c) The decision will determine whether we must bear the noise and pollution from an 80,000+ hp compressor station interrupting our sleep, elevating stress and degrading our health. Restful sleep and a clean environment are essential to life and good health.
- d) The decision will determine if we suffer financial hardship brought upon us from a pipeline.
- e) The decision will determine if we are forced to allow intentional destruction of clean and healthy ecosystems.
- f) The decision will determine if we are forced to accept and absorb contaminants into our environment and our bodies to cause us harm for what may be the rest of our lives and for generations thereafter.
- g) The decision will determine if we are forced off our rightful U.S. properties for the profit of a few to send prime, limited non-renewable U.S. energy supplies to foreign lands.

Is this the United States: land of the free and home of the brave?

Only until someone who wants what we have is given permission to come and take it away.

Eminent domain for the purpose of profit is reminiscent of what was done to Native Americans. Someone wanted their favored lands so they pushed the rightful owners off and took possession for their own personal gain.

Didn't we since judge those practices to have been wrong? No compensation or program since offered to Native Americans has returned or restored what was taken away and no compensation or program will return or restore what this pipeline will take away from us.

We are easily persuaded to trade health and wellness for money; to blur right from wrong. We seem to be far more motivated by a fist full of dollar bills than a fistful of soil even though the soil grows our sustenance and holds the cures for our disease.

Money is money; dirt is dirt. That's a 'no brainer', right'? Or is it no brain?

We have come to believe that money is the quintessential measure of success. How sad. But on occasion we trust our instincts and become true to our souls, and when we do, we discover we are capable of doing bigger and better things.

Starbucks introduced a free college education opportunity to employees. What could be more beneficial to a person and the world than the promise of an education?

CVS stopped selling cigarettes. Smoking kills. CVS did the right thing

Rachael Carson rescued us all from the darkness of Silent Spring with not a moment to spare from what almost became catastrophic destruction of Earth's life supporting systems from the irresponsible widespread use of severely toxic pesticides.

Rachael Carson taught us science and courage. Rachael Carson proved it is sometimes essential to say, "No" and demand from ourselves to find a better way.

FERC must become a better protector and we must find a better way.

Sincerely,

Evelyn Taylor

213 Old Wilton Road  
New Ipswich, NH 03071

#### Recipient List

Steven J. Kean, President, Chief Operating Officer and Director, Kinder Morgan, Inc., 1001 Louisiana Street, Houston, Texas 77002

Jim Hartman, Kinder Morgan, 8 Anngina Drive, Enfield, Connecticut 06082

Mark Hamarich, Kinder Morgan, 8 Anngina Drive, Enfield, Connecticut 06082

Allen Fore, Kinder Morgan, 8 Anngina Drive, Enfield, Connecticut 06082

Curtis Cole, Kinder Morgan, 8 Anngina Drive, Enfield, Connecticut 06082

Lucas Meyer, 9 Park St. Suite 200, Boston, Massachusetts 02108

Governor Maggie Hassan, Office of the Governor, State House, 107 North Main Street, Concord, NH 03301

NH Dept of Environmental Services, Tom Burack, Commissioner, PO Box 95, Concord, NH 03302-0095

New Hampshire chapter of The Nature Conservancy, Dr. Thomas D. Lee, Chair-New Hampshire's Chapter Board of Trustees, New Hampshire Field Office, 22 Bridge Street, 4th Floor, Concord, New Hampshire 03301

J. William Degnan, State Fire Marshall, Division of Fire Safety, NH Department of Safety, 33 Hazen Drive, Concord, NH 03305

Senator Kelly Ayotte, 144 Main Street, Nashua, NH 03060

U.S.Department of Transportation, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, East Building, 2nd Floor, 1200 New Jersey Ave., SE, Washington, DC 20590

New Hampshire chapter of The Nature Conservancy, Dr. David Patrick, Director of Conservation, New Hampshire Field Office, 22 Bridge Street, 4th Floor, Concord, New Hampshire 03301

Deborah Pendergast, Director, Division of Fire Standards & Emergency Medical Services, NH Dept. of Safety, Division of Forest and Lands, PO Box 1856, Concord, NH 03301

Senator Jeanne Shaheen, 60 Main Street, Nashua, NH 03060

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE, Room 1A, Washington, DC 20426

Commissioner Tony Clark, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE, Washington, DC 20426

Commissioner Cheryl A. LaFleur, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE, Washington, DC 20426

Chairman Norman C. Bay, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE, Washington, DC 20426

William F. Condra, Commissioner, Wilton Water Commission, 42 Main Street, P.O. Box 83, Wilton, NH 03086

Commissioner Philip D. Moeller, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE, Washington, DC 20426

Brendon Kemen, New Hampshire Dept. of Environmental Services, Drinking Water Source Protection Program, PO Box 95, Concord, NH 03302-0095

Commissioner Colette D. Honorable, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE, Washington, DC 20426

Cynthia McGuire, CEO, Monadnock Community Hospital, 452 Old Street Road, Peterborough, NH 03458

## LNG PIPELINE CONCERNS and QUESTIONS

Are you aware of the impact of the ice storm that hit the U.S. Northeast in December, 2008?

That storm crippled parts of Pennsylvania, New York, Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire and Maine. Thousands of miles of roads were obstructed or inaccessible by downed trees and utility lines. Utility response crews were unable to effectively mobilize. Local emergency response teams were also crippled. The impact to New Hampshire was summarized as follows. (Similar summaries were written for other states.)

“Up to an inch of ice across the southern half of New Hampshire downed trees and wires and left 440,000 Public Service of NH, Unitil, NH Electric Coop, and National Grid customers without power; largest outage in NH history; 175 National Guard soldiers deployed to help clear debris and evacuate residents; outages down to 300,000 (December 13), 138,000 (December 15), 44,000 (December 18); unprecedented storm damage for PSNH, with many central power lines damaged, and entire systems needing to be rebuilt; Mo-nadnock, Nashua, and Derry regions hard hit; PSNH crews had strung 55 miles of wire by December 18; PSNH doubled its spending on tree trimming to 513 million last year.”\*

A major problem during and after the ice storm was that repair crews were unable to survey, locate and quantify the extent of damage and thus were unable to determine or communicate accurate timelines to regain control. If the southern NH pipeline route is allowed, imagine how much more difficult assessment, control and recovery will be when strong storms hit the region.

- ~ How could response crews reach one or more failed pipeline zones?
- ~ How effective could containment and suppression efforts be when hindered by inaccessible roadways?
- ~ How far might contamination and burn zones spread before being controlled?
- ~ How could people escape or be rescued from these additional threats with broken transportation and communication systems?

Storms are common to the Northeast. Erosion and soil movements are continuously at play throughout the rugged terrain. These forces have toppled and moved houses, cars, trees, boulders and soils weighing tons. Roads, utility lines, bridges and our homesteads are in constant motion and in need of repair from these actions. Thousands of potentially harmful natural events occur throughout the northeast every year. Assuming none will ever affect the pipeline is being blind to what surrounds you.

This is not Texas. New Hampshire roads are remote, narrow and winding and often without rapid access to alternate routes and directions. There are many long driveways and dead end streets dispersed within the forests. Quick and effective mobilization of emergency response teams and equipment and execution of evacuations from a pipeline or compressor station blast-induced forest fire will be extremely difficult to contain and extinguish. Our fire trucks, police vehicles and ambulances are not designed to travel through the power line landscapes or into the forests.

The pipeline does not come with a self-extinguishing fire control mechanism.

Adding another fire risk to New Hampshire is irresponsible and not in the interest of the public good.

The rugged rocky woodlands and rural neighborhoods of New Hampshire are no place for a combustible pipeline.

\*Reference: Appendix D

The December 2008 ice Storm in New Hampshire

Kathleen F. Jones

Cold Regions Research and Engineering Laboratory

Hanover, New Hampshire 03755

-----

## PIPELINE CONCERNS AND QUESTIONS

### **1. Does this pipeline serve the public good'?**

a. People don't want to live near a combustible pipeline nor tolerate the noise and safety risks of a compressor station. Property values have already fallen solely from the intent of the pipeline. The proposal has violated our peace as it threatens our quiet and clean rural existence. We have surveyors creeping around our neighborhoods. WE STILL OWN THESE PROPERTIES!

This domineering corporate approach with premature intrusion and intimidation is disrespectful of the suffering already imposed upon residents in the path of the pipeline. Falling market values mean less payback to homeowners and more money to Kinder Morgan during eminent domain. The pipeline will be a permanent property depreciation constraint. All residents who remain will be burdened to absorb the losses. Kinder Morgan offers no individual compensation for depressing property values.

This approach does not serve the public good.

b. People will lose their home to eminent domain. The expectation of the energy industry is that when they want something, they can have it. Despite the destruction energy companies cause, approvals and permits continue to be issued and the cycle of harm continues.

This approach does not serve the public good.

Kinder Morgan agreed the New Hampshire towns along the proposed pipeline route are not getting any of this gas. Kinder Morgan stated they do not know where the gas is going after reaching Dracut.

i. Is this to say this corporate venture has no sales plan?

ii. Is this to say there is no expectation for overseas shipment?

iii. Is this to say Kinder Morgan approved the project without an overseas market as a calculated and necessary component of success toward return on investment'?

iv. Is this gas going overseas?

Are Americans poised to lose their homes through reckless depletion of limited non-renewable U.S. energy supplies by profit seekers who heed no boundaries in pursuit of greed'

This approach does not serve the public good.

There are no large cities in New Hampshire. (Manchester is the largest with 110,000 people.) The high quality of life the people of New Hampshire enjoy exists from shared responsibilities mutually negotiated between local, state and federal governments.

Managing new short and long-term financial burdens brought on from the pipeline will cripple the existing governance models and require an extensive overhaul by local, state and federal officials to restore financial balance to the state.

Every taxpayer in every town in New Hampshire will be affected by this pipeline. We are, in essence, all on its route. Financial hardships and endangerments will be dispersed throughout the State.

This approach does not serve the public good.

### **2. What are the financial hardships and endangerments to the local, state and federal levels'?**

a. Each exiting tax payer places an additional tax burden on those remaining. How will we sustain our town with lost revenues from eminent domain and further exodus to get away from the pipeline?

b. How will we maintain services, schools and community medical services and facilities? We already have heavy local debts that are difficult to manage.

c. What restrictions and costs does the pipeline bring to future growth near pipeline sites? Who will pick up the cost each time we need to seek approval for growth'?

d. Who will pay for the cost of pipeline supervisory control?

- e. Small towns don't have the staff, training, equipment, access roads, money or infrastructure to tackle pipeline disasters. What training and support services are available and who pays for them?
- f. Our towns don't have a full network of fire hydrants nor the finances to attempt to install them and even if we did, we may not have the water supplies to make them useful. Pristine but fragile watersheds are not reservoirs; they filter and release the water to a continuous downhill travel.
- g. What is the cost to local health care facilities (hospitals, clinics, health care centers, test labs, backup facilities, etc.) to become prepared and knowledgeable about diagnosis and treatment of pipeline specific/compressor station incidents? (burns, toxins, treatments, remedies, special supplies, etc.)
- h. What is the cost for local health care providers (nurses, doctors, technicians, EMTs, etc.) to become prepared for these same incidents?
- i. Who pays the immediate costs of training, purchasing new supplies and creating accommodations required for towns to integrate the risks associated to a pipeline?
- j. Who pays the ongoing costs?
- k. What additional reporting is required for pipeline incidents? Who will guide us to know what's required?
- l. Who pays the cost for towns to research and calculate these costs and others?
- m. How extensive do these preparations flow to bordering towns and neighborhoods beyond those hosting a pipeline? Southern NH borders northern MA. Surely these two states would be wise to coordinate emergency response efforts with one another, but how is that done? Who will backfill positions while resources are attending training sessions and drills'? Who pays for these preparations when more than one state is involved?
- n. Pipelines have increased insurance costs and in some places, homeowners have had their insurance cancelled due to the increased risk. Buyers have had difficulties getting mortgages. How will these constraints affect our towns?

### **3. The pipeline will follow alongside the power lines which will add fuel to a fire.**

- a. Many of the power lines have wooden support posts. Our telephone and electric lines are also supported by wooden poles.
- b. A pipeline fire will be further fueled by the wooden poles and encourage rapid failure of the power grid.
- c. This fuel supply will also encourage rapid spread of fire. The spread could sever communication lines on the telephone poles.
- d. Simultaneous loss of both power and communication grids would exacerbate emergency efforts, particularly during night time darkness and below freezing temperatures.
- e. Stripping a wider swath to bury the pipeline will increase evaporation and erosion. Evaporation promotes drought, drying up essential wetlands and aquifers and destroying the life systems that rely upon them.
- f. New Hampshire relies heavily on watersheds and aquifers for drinking water supplies. We have no Quabbin Reservoir as a backup. Thousands could be left with no running water in their homes. How can that be remedied and who must pay?
- g. Drought turns a landscape into a tinderbox that can explode into an uncontrolled burn covering thousands of acres with losses to homes and lives.
- h. Large burn zones could cross over state lines into Massachusetts.
- i. Drought and burned landscapes promote erosion, causing further environmental damage and dispersing contaminants over wide areas.
- j. Who owns the responsibility for causing these conditions'?
- k. Who pays for our losses?

l. Who pays to restore the environment?

**4. Cutoff valves are generally miles apart so a failure could be more catastrophic than from an accident by a tanker truck.**

- a. What would be the maximum distance between cutoff valves for this project?
- b. How easily and quickly could cutoff valves be reached? Are they remotely controlled or must they be accessed directly at each location?
- c. Are they placed along roadsides? Are they accessible in winter through deep snow?
- d. Who would be allowed to close these? Can local emergency response personnel do that or must a pipeline support person do so?
- e. What is the availability of pipeline support personnel?
- f. How are valves protected from mischief or intentional harm?
- g. Would ice prevent a cut-off valve from operating?
- h. How are exposed pipelines protected from mischief or intentional harm?
- i. There are many hunters in New Hampshire. Are pipelines bullet proof?
- j. Off road vehicles, hikers, and cross country skiers use the power line route for recreational activities. Will those activities be allowed to continue?
- k. How is the pipeline monitored and how often?
- l. Are inspection results documented and available to the public?
- m. Is there a set of standards governing the inspections?

**5. The sloping terrain is prone to landslides, falling trees and rocks and washouts.** You can see this as you travel along New Hampshire waterways or hike through the hills and mountains. The pipeline is expected to travel through the watersheds, follow steep slopes and cross rivers.

- a. What is the maximum slope a pipeline through such terrain can endure?
- b. Can a pipeline withstand the severe forces within our rivers during high water events? Such forces can easily topple and move houses and wash away roads. What will they do to the pipeline?
- c. If a landslide falls atop the pipeline route, how is the integrity of the pipeline below confirmed, or is it? Is the landslide removed or left to remain?
- d. Would the pipeline have survived the landslide on route 101 in Wilton between mile marker 33-4 and 33-6? Similar steep terrain exists where the power lines cross Route 31 in Greenville, NH. Is the pipeline expected to make that climb?
- e. Would the pipeline have survived the collapse on High Street in Greenville?
- f. The Northeast is an earthquake zone. Leaks following earthquakes often result in fires. Is the pipeline rated for earthquakes?

Power lines can openly span across difficult terrains; pipelines cannot.

**6. Environmental destruction is inevitable.**

- a. Our wetlands, rivers, watershed and aquifers will be stripped and blasted, offering exposure to drought and forest fires. Opening the topsoil layer, introduces pathways for contaminants, carcinogens, and disease causing organisms to enter and proliferate through the soils and drinking water supplies.
- b. The compressor station and other pipeline activities will spew harsh chemicals that will also make their way into the environment and our bodies.

- c. The existing water flow that nourishes all life will be disrupted and altered. you can't blast through balanced ecosystems that have taken thousands of years to evolve and expect improvement.
- d. Our wells are often fragile, depending on rainfall and conservation. Many homes have no alternative fresh water options if wells are damaged and go dry.
- e. We have no full networks of water, sewer or gas lines as the terrain and water supplies prohibit cost effective installations.

The terrain hasn't changed, so what makes this pipeline proposal suddenly logical?

## **7. Materials and methods**

- a. Kinder Morgan suggested a lesser quality pipe along this route. Hills and water have combined forces that can move a house so why would Kinder Morgan choose a lesser quality pipe? Is it to save costs over saving lives'? Are we expendable pawns in the way of a pursuit of financial gain to but a few?
- b. What are the minimum and maximum depths for the trenches and the pipe, including the depths required for fillers beneath and on top of the pipe? Kinder Morgan suggested the pipe would be buried six feet but how does that translate in relation to a 36 inch diameter pipe?
- c. What are the burial depths and techniques for crossing waterways such as rivers and streams? Will the normal freeze/thaw cycles in New Hampshire damage the pipeline? breached?
- e. Other aquifers have rapid movements and underground changes.
- f. What additional construction techniques and controls are used if a high pressure confined aquifer or artesian system is exposed? Are studies done before construction to identify probable areas where these conditions exist? How would loss of water be controlled if suddenly released during construction of the pipeline? How would damage be controlled at and around the site?
- g. How is the preservation of the quality of the water ensured? Are water tests done before, during and after construction?
- h. What chemicals and toxins are in this gas, the compressor station, and the pipeline?
- i. What deposits are expected to accumulate in the pipeline? How do they affect the function of the pipeline?
- j. How is the pipeline cleaned or cleared? How often? What substance is used to do that and what happens that substance once removed from the pipeline?
- k. How is the outside condition of the pipeline monitored? What is the threshold for movement before the pipeline is deemed threatened?
- l. If a breach is suspected to be imminent, is the pipeline shut down?
- m. Are these events reported to a governing agency? Are the records made public?
- n. What's involved in stopping and restarting the flow of gas through a pipeline?
- o. What testing is done to confirm performance of the pipeline?
- p. What happens if the compressor station shuts down?
- q. Does that pose a risk to the contents of the pipeline or elevate the risk of an explosion?
- r. Is the compressor station staffed? If so, what is the coverage?
- s. If not, how is the state of the pipeline and compressor station monitored?
- t. How vulnerable are compressor stations to intentional harm'
- u. How soon would one know if someone was trying to cause intentional harm'

## **8. Response and Responsibility**

- a. Road washouts are common. If a car, truck, tree crashes onto exposed pipeline will it burst?

- b. Who needs to respond to an exposed pipeline. Local authorities, Kinder Morgan an appointed 3rd party, EPA, other agencies?
- c. How long would it take Kinder Morgan or designated alternate resource to respond’
- d. Who decides how to safely divert traffic and persons through or from a roadway affected area?
- e. How is the integrity of an exposed pipe determined’?
- f. What is the protocol for evacuations?
- g. How is a safe distance from the destruction zone calculated?
- h. How should you or I respond if we come upon an exposed or broken pipeline?
- i. New Hampshire is a tourist state with people drawn from all over the world to our vistas and waterways. How is these world travelers notified of the existence of a pipeline?
- j. Whose jurisdiction is it to fix a damaged road after initial the initial pipeline installation?
- k. Whose jurisdiction is it to fix damaged landscape from a landslide area, a wetlands area, or other nonroadway location’
- l. Who assesses the cost of repairs?
- m. Who certifies the repairs’
- n. Who pays for the repairs to the pipeline?
- o. Who pays for to repair the roadway?
- p. Who pays for the repairs to the peripheral area affected’?
- q. Who pays for damages to any surrounding personal property - homes, cars, etc.?
- r. Who assesses and tracks environmental impacts and damages in the event of a pipeline or compressor station failure event?
- s. How long would environmental impacts be monitored and reported?
- t. What is the expected time lapse from the event date to restoration complete date?
- u. Who is responsible to set up and maintain long term detours?
- v. Are towns and citizens compensated for the cost and inconvenience of long term detours?

## **9. What is thermal radiation?**

The rupture of a high-pressure gas pipeline can lead to outcomes that can pose a significant threat to people and property in the immediate vicinity of the failure location. The dominant hazard is thermal radiation from a sustained fire and an estimate of the ground area affected by a credible worst-case event can be obtained from a model that characterizes the heat intensity associated with rupture failure of the pipe where the escaping gas is assumed to feed a fire that ignites very soon after line failure.\*

Reference: <http://nogaspipeline.org/2010-08-19/the-blast-radius>

- a. Since a pipeline can fail with explosion and/or fire anywhere along its route, is the Thermal Radiation area calculated along the entire route taking into consideration the changing terrain’
- b. Given the likely event of rapid spread of fire due to wooden support posts on power and utility lines and New Hampshire forest land, how does Kinder Morgan define “credible worst-case” along the pipeline route through Southern New Hampshire?
- c. What is the expected Thermal Radiation zone for the 80K+ hp compressor station at each of the locations under consideration?
- d. Who calculates the Thermal Radiation zone estimate(s)?
- e. Is the calculation performed and/or certified by an outside independent party?

- f. What controls does Kinder Morgan have in place to ensure accurate measures?
- g. How is a Thermal Radiation zone identified and labeled? Is the zone allowed to intrude upon areas open to public access such as roads, schools, businesses and residential properties?
- h. Are those included in the thermal radiation zone offered safety training or instruction?

### **10. What is “blast radius” or “burn radius”?**

The blast radius is the distance that the fire from an explosion consumes, measured in feet from the epicenter to the outer edge of the burned area.

The Burn Radius has often been underestimated:

An incident involving a 30” pipe near Jackson, Louisiana (1984 NTSB-PAR-86-1) burned an area 1450 feet long by 360 feet wide (furthest fire extent 950 feet) while operating at 1016 PSI which claimed 5 lives within 65 feet (0 foot offset) and 23 injuries within 800 feet (180 foot offset).

The actual burn radius for this incident is 45.5256 greater than the 660 foot burn radius hypothesized.~

“Reference: <http://noeasoioeline.org/2010-08-19/the-blast-radius>

- a. Since a pipeline can fail with explosion and/or fire anywhere along its route, is a blast radius calculated along the entire route taking into consideration the changing terrain?
- b. What is the expected Blast Radius for the 80K+ hp compressor station at each of the locations under consideration?
- c. Who calculates Blast Radius and Burn Radius? Is each estimated against actual on-site installation location conditions? For instance, a compressor station located in a large paved area would have a smaller Burn Radius of one located in grassy area or forested area or forested area with higher tinder content, etc.
- d. Is the calculation for Blast Radius and Burn Radius performed and/or certified by an outside independent party?
- e. Given an industry history of underestimating the Blast Radius, what controls does Kinder Morgan have in place to ensure accurate measures’?
- f. How is a Burn Radius identified and labeled?
- g. Can Blast Radius and Burn Radius intrude upon areas open to public access such as roads, schools, businesses, established recreational paths and residential properties?
- h. Are those included in the blast radius offered safety training or instruction’?

### **11. Entrapment**

- a. There are many dead-end streets and long driveways in our neighborhoods and homes are nestled deep within the woodlands. The rapid spread of fire from a pipeline or compressor station failure can block such locations where escape routes are limited and prevent rescue crews from reaching those in need.
- b. Existing roads can offer few options to change direction. They may lead someone around and back into a disaster zone rather than away from it.
- c. Emergency vehicles could be blocked from assisting those in need.

Since these conditions are known to exist throughout the state, who would be held accountable, then, for intentionally putting people in harm’s way?

People can’t move their existing homes to relocate away from dead-end streets, long driveways or out of the forest.

### **12. Unimaginable and unpredictable loss.**

- a. How quickly can a fire spread?
- b. How far reaching could a disaster go'?
- c. How helpless would our small response teams be?
- d. What other services and towns might be drawn into a disaster zone?
- e. How long will it take for pipeline support personnel to reach a disaster zone through the remote New Hampshire terrain'?
- f. What type of equipment and resources would pipeline support personnel use to control and end a failure event?
- g. How soon could they dispatch what would be needed?
- h. What additional services would local towns need to provide to accommodate a large response and recovery team'?
- i. Who would fund those accommodations?
- j. Can the disaster zone even be defined?
- k. Would it include assistance to Massachusetts or other states if they were also impacted?
- l. With such risk inherent to the pipeline, the entire region is at risk.
- m. How long would it take to control and end a destructive event?
- n. How is the resulting damage and loss of life assessed'?
- o. Who pays for damages and loss of life?
- p. Who is responsible for cleanup and restoration?
- q. How long would it take for cleanup and restoration? Have events been calculated out to an assumed maximum and if so, what are the maximum and all ranges below it?
- r. If municipal water supplies are destroyed, is there a workable ongoing distribution plan to provide an alternate source and how long would it take to fully implement'?
- s. What does a burn or chemical release do to potable water supplies?
- t. Can tainted water supplies be restored to prior condition'?
- u. Who is held accountable if we begin to have negative health affects not observed prior to the pipeline?
- v. What processes are in place to address health complaints and maladies?
- w. Does Kinder Morgan pay for unbiased studies, medical bills, pain and suffering?
- x. Energy companies typically seem to refuse responsibility for accidents. What agency is responsible to determine accountability?
- y. Kinder Morgan uses 3''' party contractors. Who is responsible to monitor the quality of the work done by contractors?
- z. There is a shortage of workers skilled in pipeline construction. How does this shortage affect the quality and timeline of the proposed pipeline project? Will mistakes be made that result in accidents?

**13. Clean air and pure potable water is essential to life. LNG is not.**

- a. The Monadnock Mountain Spring Water Company in Wilton sits a short distance from the pipeline route at the junction of routes 31 and 101. This company relies on the purity of the aquifers and the reliability of the Souhegan River watershed to supply thousands of people with high quality drinking water.
- b. Can Kinder Morgan promise no degradation of the water quality or suoolv in New Hampshire due to the construction or operation of the pipeline?
- c. Air pollution and water polluting contaminants from construction and operation of the pipeline will be dispersed upon our woodlands, our gardens, our forests, our streams and our rivers and into the air we breathe. We will eat and drink these toxins as they make their way into our bodies and cause undue harm.

- d. The rivers of Southern New Hampshire continue to flow and feed into larger rivers as they make their way to the Atlantic Ocean. How far will the destruction from a devastating event reach?
- e. What destruction will be done to the balance of nature? The planet is already bordering on catastrophic collapse of sustainability.
- f. People in California and other west coast areas are without running water in their homes due to poor choices and projects of greed. Are we going to let that happen to New Hampshire?

#### **14. Do you have a well?**

- a. There is no guarantee your well will not be affected during construction or sometime after the pipeline is in service.
- b. What happens if we lose running water from inside our homes?
- c. How can we prove the loss is linked to the pipeline? What recourse will we have?
- d. Will Kinder Morgan assume responsibility and pay fair market value to homeowners so they can relocate?
- e. Or, will we be left on our own with lost property value, high taxes, and no options other than to secure a large tanked water supply delivered and refilled as needed?
- f. How would such a tank be cleaned and maintained'? At whose cost?
- g. Where would we store such a tank? Unlike warmer states facing water issues, New England has a long, freezing winter to contend with.
- h. If you have a well you probably have no alternative water supply and have learned to respect and conserve water. Once that's gone, it's gone for good. How long will Kinder Morgan stick around or help?

#### **15. The Clean Water Act Section 303(d) Program is applicable to protect our aquifers and watershed.**

Our existing clean fresh water supplies are essential to our existence. We have no other fresh water sources available to our rural neighborhoods.

The Clean Water Act Section 303(d) Program includes a 'Protection Goal'. The intent of the Protection Goal is to encourage a more systematic consideration of management actions to "prevent impairments in healthy waters (i.e., unimpaired waters) in order to maintain water quality or protect existing uses or high quality waters."

State officials are supposed to uphold the goals of the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) Program and thus reject the pipeline.

If the Clean Water Act is upheld, the pipeline **MUST BE REJECTED** as it cannot be constructed or used without causing harm to the environment and our health and wellness.

#### **16. Is the pipeline "forever"?**

- a. What happens when the pipeline is retired from use? Does it remain in place or is it removed?
- b. If it remains in place, what is the long term environmental impact associated to the deterioration of the pipeline? Who monitors and reports on the ongoing environmental impacts as the pipeline deteriorates? Who pays for that?
- c. If it is removed, what is the process to monitor and restore the environment? Who monitors and reports on the restoration? Who pays for that?
- d. What is the process if a section of a retired pipeline needs to be removed?
- e. What controls are in place to monitor vandalism or destruction of an active or retired pipeline?
- f. Who is held accountable if negative environmental impacts are discovered after the pipeline is retired?

from use?

g. Who is held accountable if we begin to have negative health impacts after the pipeline is no longer in service?

h. What happens to the installation if the quality or quantity of the product has no continuing market and operations are ceased for this or any other reason? Who is held accountable to shut down operations and what does a shut down mean?

**20150602-5146(30622864).docx**

**Tennessee Gas Pipeline  
Company, L.L.C.**  
a Kinder Morgan company

June 2, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., Docket No. PF14-22-000  
Northeast Energy Direct Project  
Project Scope Update

Dear Ms. Bose:

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. (“Tennessee”) submits this letter to inform the Federal Energy Regulatory (“Commission”) and stakeholders of a change in the scope of the proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project (“NED Project” or “Project”) facilities. As discussed in more detail below, Tennessee is removing two pipeline laterals and modifications at three existing meter stations from the scope of the Project. This revised scope, which will be reflected in Tennessee’s next draft Environmental Report filing, will allow Tennessee to meet the needs for all the shippers that have executed binding precedent agreements for the Project.

As background, on September 15, 2014, Tennessee filed a request to use the Commission’s pre-filing procedures for the proposed NED Project, and the Commission approved Tennessee’s request to use the pre-filing procedures for the Project on October 2, 2014. As part of the pre-filing process, Tennessee submitted drafts of Resource Reports 1 and 10 for the Project on November 5, 2014. On December 8, 2014, Tennessee filed a revised draft of Resource Report 1, which reflected the adoption of two major route alternatives for the Wright, New York to Dracut, Massachusetts Pipeline Segment of the Project (referred to as the “market path component”). On March 13, 2015, Tennessee submitted the first draft of the Environmental Report to the Commission, which included Resource Reports 1 through 13.

Tennessee is providing notice that it has revised the scope of the NED Project since the March 13, 2015 draft Environmental Report filing. The facilities to be removed from the NED Project scope include (i) approximately 15.6 miles of pipeline associated with the North Worcester Lateral in Massachusetts and the Stamford Loop in Connecticut, (ii) the proposed new North Worcester meter station in Massachusetts, and (iii) the proposed modifications at three (3) existing meter stations in Connecticut (Long Ridge Meter Station, Stamford Meter Station, and New Britain Meter Station).

In Massachusetts, removing the proposed North Worcester Lateral from the Project scope reduces the mileage of proposed pipeline that would impact Article 97 lands by approximately 1.25 miles. This reduction in impacted lands results in approximately 86% co-location for the proposed laterals and in 100% co-location for the proposed mainline pipeline through Article 97 lands. Through the removal of the facilities listed

above, the Project's total proposed co-location percentage is now approximately 82%, up from 80% previously. The Project's increase in co-location percentage and decrease in proposed Project facilities directly minimizes environmental and landowner impacts. As Tennessee explained in the draft Environmental Report submitted on March 13, 2015, the current route of the proposed Project is generally located parallel and adjacent to, and, in certain cases, overlaps existing utility easements (pipeline or electric utility). This paralleling/overlapping of easements is referred to as "co-location". The current pipeline alignment along existing utility corridors is proposed to be generally located five (5) feet outside the existing utility easement, with the permanent easement generally centered on the proposed pipeline. Refinements to the proposed Project route will occur as the Project continues to be developed during this pre-filing process and the anticipated certificate application process, which will incorporate information gained from field surveys and landowner and other stakeholder input.

This revision to the Project scope represents the result of Tennessee's complete engagement in the Commission's pre-filing process, which is meant to provide a forum to refine a potential project prior to the filing of a formal certificate application with the Commission. The removal of the impacts associated with the two pipeline laterals, a new meter station, and meter station modifications from the scope of the Project will be reflected in the upcoming submittal of the second draft of the Environmental Report to the Commission, now targeted for July 2015. Following the filing of the second draft of the Environmental Report and after the conclusion of the Commission's scoping period for the Project, Tennessee intends to file the certificate application for the Project in October 2015.

In accordance with the Commission's filing requirements, Tennessee is submitting this filing with the Commission's Secretary through the eFiling system. Tennessee is also providing complete copies of this filing to the Office of Energy Projects. Any questions concerning the enclosed filing should be addressed to Ms. Jacquelyne Rocan at (713) 420-4544 or to Ms. Shannon Miller at (713) 420-4038.

Respectfully submitted,

TENNESSEE GAS PIPELINE COMPANY, L.L.C.

By: J. Curtis Moffatt

Deputy General Counsel and Vice President Gas Group Legal

cc: Mr. Michael McGehee

Mr. Rich McGuire

Mr. Eric Tomasi

**20150603-0011(30630613).pdf**

*{Appears to be a duplicate of 20150602-0309 above}*

**20150603-0074(30624302).tif**

Hand written card, Tewein Gyalpo, SJ Cothey, PS Cothey, RT Dye, Thinley Dhargely, Jill Valentina, 15 Dodge Brand, Hawley, 01337, opposing

**20150603-0079(30632020).pdf**

**Town of Dracut**  
TOWN HALL  
62 ARLINGTON STREET  
DRACUT, MASSACHUSETTS 01826

May 11, 2015

Mr. Alan Fore

Kinder Morgan

9 Park Street, Suite 200

Boston, MA 02108

Dear Mr. Fore,

The Dracut Board of Selectmen voted unanimously on April 28, 2015 to authorize its Chairman to sign a letter expressing the following:

That no Private Company or Corporation shall be allowed to conduct surveying activity on any public way within the Town of Dracut or on any Town property for the purpose of a natural gas pipeline project, without the express written consent of the Board of Selectmen, until such time as a Public Interest Determination has been made in accordance with the applicable Federal Energy Regulatory Commission application process for such project.

You are asked to adhere to this decision of the Board of Selectmen.

Sincerely,

Joseph DiRocco, Jr., Chairman  
Board of Selectmen

**20150603-0084(30634223).pdf**

Golden Skep Farm  
264 Linden Street, Berlin, MA 01503  
978-838-2471  
www.goldenskepfarm.com

Selected as one of the  
“1000Great Places to Visit” in Massachusetts

May 19,2015

Honorable Governor Charles D. Baker, Jr.  
Massachusetts State House  
24 Beacon Street  
Office of the Governor — Room 280  
Boston, Massachusetts 02133

Subject: Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Governor Baker:

My name is Carl Wickstiom and my wife Elaine and I have lived in the bucolic town of Berlin, Massachusetts for over forty years and for the past thirty years have owned a small 6+ acre farm which has a Circa 1740 farmhouse on it. When we purchased the farm, the house and barn were in significant disrepair and the land had been neglected and overgrown. As a result of our hard work and significant “sweat equity”, we revitalized the farm and we with the help of a hired farmhand, have also been operating a productive honey and perennial flower farm. Many first time customers to the farm remark that our farm reminds them of settings at historic Sturbridge Village. I turned 72 in April of this year and Elaine will be 70 in July and our goal for some time has been to retire once I reach the age of 75.

Until the past year or so, all was well on track - until a Kinder Morgan representative came knocking on our door and advised that as part of their massive project to run a gas pipeline across the northern section of the state from the New York border to Dracut, Massachusetts that a lateral gas line will go through Berlin and through our farm for the purpose of supplying Worcester, Massachusetts with gas. As of this date, Kinder Morgan has indicated that the line may not go on our property ...just a 50’o 100’ right-of-way. But where the pipeline, if installed, will go seems to change from day to day. Needless to say, such a proposed gas line has created a great deal of stress, frustration and anxiety for us. For us, like many other hardworking Americans who own real estate, our farm is our largest asset. Having a pipeline on our property or a large right-of-way will greatly reduce the value of our property and put our financial future into jeopardy. To protect us from loss, as well as that of our neighbors and to protect the town conservation land, Kinder Morgan’s proposed

project needs to be stopped!

Here are just a few of the compelling reasons why this massive project is bad for the community of Berlin and the Commonwealth:

~ The main pipeline and the lateral line in Berlin will deeply scar our beautiful rural landscape and once installed, will be utilized in years to come as established rights-of-way for other utilities. Many of the existing pipelines in our state have over the years been expanded to include multiple gas lines and high tension power lines. For example, in the 1950's, a gas pipeline was installed through the town of Millville, Massachusetts. Since then, a second gas line was installed and high tensions have also been installed. As a result, the path of the pipeline, etc. is now over 100' wide and an UGLY scar on the town lands.

~ Kinder Morgan claims the pipelines are a must to meet the demands for natural gas. The main pipeline will have the capacity to carry 1.2 to 2.2 billion cubic feet of gas per day. National Grid of MA, Liberty Utilities, Columbia Gas of MA, Connecticut Natural Gas Corp and other anchor shippers will only require 500 million cubic feet of natural gas a day according to a March 8, 2015 Worcester Telegram and Gazette (WT&G) article. The Wall Street Journal recently cited the owners of a gas-fueled power plant in New England with saying that proposing a massive pipeline building program for our region is like "trying to kill a cockroach with a sledgehammer". (Quoted from Massachusetts Representative Naughton's letter dated October 14, 2014 to Kimberly D. Bose, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission)

~ At various public meetings, Kinder Morgan has acknowledged that in addition to serving local utilities, the pipeline will also be used to export gas to Asia and Europe. So, as we see it, our state our towns and the landowners have to pay the price of having our conservation land, farmland and individual properties ravaged forever so that the exporter of that gas can get higher prices for the gas in Asia and Europe. Is this country trying to be energy independent?? If so, why are we planning to export such a natural resource ??? To add insult to injury, none of the gas to be transported by the pipeline will be available to Berlin residents.

~ Kinder Morgan's plan for the lateral line is to run it through farmland and conservation land in Berlin and other surrounding communities. This is the most cost-effective approach for Kinder Morgan because there are fewer structures for them to deal with on open farm and conservation land. If they think there is a need to get gas to Worcester, Massachusetts, why not use the existing right-of-way along Route 290 which is a straight shot into Worcester. Using Conservation land for their project will also violate Article 97 of the Commonwealth's Constitution which provides in part that once conservation land is in place, it is not to be used for other purposes unless there is a two-thirds vote by each branch of the general court.

To the credit of Berlin's Conservation Commission, our small town of Berlin has over 1,300 beautiful acres of conservation land and now a pipeline may be constructed on a good portion of it? Where is the logic???

~ Then there is the safety issue. According to a January 28, 2015 WTKG article, the National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) harshly criticized the pipeline industry and state governments for lack of proper inspection where pipelines have been installed.

The NTSB's report was issued due to three accidents since 2009 that illustrated systemic problems. The accidents were:

~ May 4, 2009, a pipeline near Palm City, Florida exploded and 106 feet of buried pipeline was tossed into the air landing between two major highways.

~ On September 9, 2010, a massive section of pipeline blew out of the ground in San Bruno, California. Nine people were killed and 70 homes destroyed.

~ On December 11, 2012, near Sessonville, West Virginia, three homes were destroyed as the result of an explosion. The pipeline hadn't been inspected in 24 years!

Will Kinder Morgan be vigilant in inspecting the pipelines if installed or will they follow the historical

industry standard and not do appropriate inspections’

According to a September 19, 2013 Sightline Daily article, “Wall Street Worries About Kinder Morgan’s Safety Record”, it states “In our review, Kinder Morgan, cuts defers and eventually finances the (Limited Partnership’s) maintenance spending.”

~ It is no secret that the winter of 2014/2015 was one of the coldest and most brutal in recent memory. One can presume therefore, that the demand for natural gas must have been at an all-time extremely high level. Despite such a high demand for natural gas, there was a February 2015 WTAG article and a March, 2015 article that gas companies had reduced the gas price to homeowners. Under such horrifically cold weather conditions, logic dictates that this can mean only one thing and that is despite a very high demand for natural gas, the supply must have exceeded such a demand if gas suppliers are dropping prices under such conditions. If supplies are this adequate, why do we need the Kinder Morgan project?

~ In another WTAG article on January 23, 2015, Frank Katulak, president and CEO of Distrigas of MA, LLC noted that a better solution to Kinder Morgan’s massive pipeline project is to “continue to supplement gas with LNG to satisfy the demand peaks that occur 30 to 40 days of the year instead of another pipeline.

~ The Commonwealth has been aggressively moving forward as far as we can tell with promoting clean renewable energy sources but much more needs to be done in order to avoid such massive and disruptive projects that Kinder Morgan is proposing.

New Hampshire purchases renewable hydro-electric power from Canada and New Hampshire has a high-tension line that runs the length of their state and stops at the northern Massachusetts border. Why can’t the Commonwealth tap into that clean source of energy?

~ The total cost of the proposed pipeline will be paid for by the public by way of an added charge to utility bills! Utilities would rather have the pipeline than more solar power. Why? In a March 7, 2015 Washington Post article, utility CEO’s at a “summit” in Colorado were told that if demand for residential solar continues to soar, traditional utilities could see a decline in retail sales and loss of customers and some utilities could go out of business. So now utilities are lobbying state legislators to pass a tax on home owners who sell surplus electricity from their solar systems back to the utilities known as net metering. Such a tax then makes it uneconomical for the homeowner to sell the surplus electricity. Some utilities are also charging a \$50 a month surcharge for homeowners that would achieve net metering with their home solar systems. “The utilities are fighting tooth and nail to minimize the impact of net metering on their businesses.” said Scott Peters, director of the Checks and Balances Project, a Virginia nonprofit that investigates lobbyists.

According to a WTB’cG article of April 12, 2015, even our state legislature has imposed net metering caps on large commercial projects. “Solar companies have asked the state Legislature to raise the caps which help make solar systems more affordable. Industry advocates say the caps should be raised at least to a level that would allow the state to reach its goal of 1,600 megawatts of solar power installed by 2020. The current caps bring the state to 1,000 megawatts.

For the Wickstroms, our neighbors, the Town of Berlin and the Commonwealth, we respectfully request that you and your administration take appropriate steps to stop Kinder Morgan’ proposed pipeline projects. The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Office of Energy Projects has the authority to approve or reject their project. I would like to request that the Commonwealth, as the birthplace of our nation’s democracy, inform the FERC that States Rights are important to the citizens of the Commonwealth and that the FERC reject the Kinder Morgan pipeline projects.

Thank you for your time in considering this request.

Yours very truly,

Carl R. Wickstrom

Elaine C. Wickstrom

CC: Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
Matthew B. Beaton, Secretary  
Energy and Environmental Affairs  
Karyn Polito, Lt. Governor  
Commissioner John Lebeaux  
Department of Agricultural Resources  
Senator Elizabeth Warren  
Senator Edward Markey  
Representative Nicola Tsongas  
Senator Jennifer L. Flanagan  
Representative Harold P. Naughton, Jr

**220150603-0085(30634607).pdf**

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Date: May 20, 2017

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re Denying property access

As the owner of the property located at:

110 Curtis Rd  
Winchester NH 03470

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, subcontractors, or associates to enter my land to perform surveys, or for any other purpose. Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized and treated as trespass.

Theodore M Miller

**0150603-0087(30628501).pdf**

**Office of the Schodack Town Clerk**

265 Schuurman Rd.

Castleton, NY 12033

TELEPHONE (518) 477-7590

FAX (518)477-2439

DONNA L CONLIN  
TOWN CLERK

May 18, 2015

Norman C. Bay, Chairman  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC)  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20126

KAREN A. VECCHIONE, DEPUTY  
LOIS M. CICCOLELLA, DEPUTY

Dear Mr. Bay:

Enclosed you will find a certified resolution adopted by the Town Board of the Town of Schodack on May 14, 2015 opposing the Kinder Morgan (NED) pipeline that is proposed to go through the Town of Schodack.

Many residents of our community have voiced their concerns at Town Board meetings and other public venues in opposition to this line. The Town Board assessed all the information presented by Kinder Morgan and others before making their decision to join with the towns of Nassau and Stephentown as well as Rensselaer County in opposition to the pipeline. The enclosed resolution outlines the justifications for why we oppose the pipeline.

Sincerely,

Donna L. Conlin/CMC/RMC  
Schodack Town Clerk

Enc: (1)

**Office of the Schodack Town Clerk**

265 Schuurman Rd.  
Castteton, NY 12033  
TELEPHONE (518) 477-7590  
FAX (518)477-2439

DONNA L CONLIN  
TOWN CLERK

KAREN A. VECCHIONE, DEPUTY  
LOIS M. CICCOLELLA, DEPUTY

STATE OF NEW YORK )  
COUNTY OF RENSSELAER )SS.:  
TOWN OF SCHODACK )

I, the undersigned Clerk of the Town of Schodack, do hereby certify as follows:

1. A Special Meeting of the Town Board of the Town of Schodack, State of New York, was duly held on 05/14/2015, and Minutes of said meeting have been duly recorded in the Minute Book kept by me in accordance with law for the purpose of recording the Minutes of meetings of said Board. I have compared the attached Extract with said Minutes so recorded and said Extract is a true copy of said Minutes and of the whole thereof insofar as said Minutes relate to matters referred to in said Extract.
2. Said Minutes correctly state the time when said Meeting was convened and the place where such Meeting was held and the members of said Board who attended said Meeting.
3. Public Notice of the time and place of the said Meeting was duly given to the public and the news media in accordance with the Open Meetings Law, constituting Chapter 511 of the Laws of 1976 of the State of New York, and that the members of said Board had due notice of said Meeting and the Meeting was in all respects duly held and a quorum was present and acted throughout.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and have hereunto affixed the corporate seal of the Town of Schodack this 15 day of May 2015.

Donna L. Conlin  
Schodack Town Clerk/RMC

At a Regular Meeting of the Town Board of the Town of Schodack, Rensselaer County, New York, held at 265 Schuurman Road, in said Town on the 14<sup>th</sup> of May, 2015 at 7:05 P.M.

The meeting was called to order by Dennis Dowds, Supervisor, and upon roll being called, the following

	PRESENT	ABSENT
DENNIS E. DOWDS	X	
FRANCIS H. CURTIS	X	
JAMES N. BULT	X	

MICHAEL KENNEY X  
SCOTT SWARTZ X

The following resolution was offered by Councilperson Swartz who moved its adoption and was seconded by Supervisor Dowds:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE TOWN BOARD OF THE TOWN OF SCHODACK DOES HEREBY:

2015-145) WHEREAS, Kinder Morgan, by its subsidiary Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LLC, is proposing a large natural gas pipeline to run through southern Rensselaer County, including the Town of Schodack, referenced as the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline project; and

WHEREAS, Kinder Morgan is seeking approval from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) for federal eminent domain status, to allow the project to proceed; and

WHEREAS, the citizens of the Town of Schodack have expressed strong opposition to this project, based upon a series of concerns:

1. The proposed NED pipeline would be large (36 inches in diameter) with a high pressure (1460 psi), which in turn would result in major public safety issues in the Town of Schodack;
2. The public safety issues will result in strains to fire departments and other emergency responders in the Town;
3. The public safety concerns will reduce property values in the Town of Schodack along the route of the proposed pipeline;
4. The project would create the risk of substantial damage to the health, safety, and environment of the Town of Schodack including damage to the aquifer;
5. The compensation, if any, paid to property owners by the pipeline operator would not come close to compensating for the major economic and environmental damages to the Town;
6. The project includes the siting of a compressor station, reportedly in the Town of Schodack. The industrial size of this proposed compressor station would result in significant noise and other environmental impacts to residents near the compressor site; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board of the Town of Schodack shares the concerns expressed by many residents, and wishes to give formal expression of this opposition to Kinder Morgan, FERC, and more particularly to our federal representatives in Congress;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Town Board of the Town of Schodack hereby goes on record to express its strong opposition to the siting of this pipeline and the compressor station anywhere within the Town of Schodack; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Schodack Town Clerk is hereby directed to send a certified copy of this resolution to the representatives of the Town in Congress, to wit, Hon. Charles Schumer, Hon. Kirsten Gillibrand, and Hon. Chris Gibson and Hon. Paul Tonko.

Upon the vote being cast, the members voted as follows:

	AYE	NAY	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
DENNIS E. DOWDS	X			
FRANCIS CURTIS	X			
JAMES N. BULT	X			
MICHAEL KENNEY	X			
SCOTT SWARTZ	X			

The Resolution, having received a majority vote of the members of the Town Board was declared by the Supervisor to be adopted.

**TOWN OF MILFORD, NEW HAMPSHIRE  
BOARD OF SELECTMEN**

Norman Bay, Chairman  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

Dear Chairman Bay,

We write to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission regarding Kinder Morgan's proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project, Docket N. PF-14-22-000. We, the Selectmen of the Town of Milford, NH formally request that you schedule a pre-filing scoping meeting in Milford, NH to allow our residents ample opportunity to express their views on this proposed natural gas pipeline. Our Town Hall auditorium would be an excellent location and we will work with you to find a mutually convenient date and time for the meeting.

We believe it is imperative that our residents be afforded the opportunity to engage in open and transparent dialog with FERC about the pipeline and the proposed route before any final decision is made.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this request and we look forward to seeing you in Milford, NH.

Sincerely,

Mark Fougere, Chairman  
Gary Daniels, Selectman  
Mike Putnam, Selectman

Kevin Federico, Vice-Chairman  
Kathy Bauer, Selectman

Town Hall — 1 Union Square — Milford, NH 03055-4240- (603) 249-0600- FAX (610) 673 2273  
TDD Access: Relay NH 1-800-735-2964  
website: [www.milford.nh.aov](http://www.milford.nh.aov)

Lisa Lipomi, Dracut, MA.  
RE: Docket PF14-22

Dear Federal Energy Regulatory Commission:

As a long-time resident of Dracut, Massachusetts, I am not convinced that a 36-inch compressed natural gas pipeline with a compression and metering station proposed by Kinder-Morgan/Tennessee Gas Corporation pumping (bi- directionly) 2.2 billion cubic feet of gas per day through the town of Dracut is necessary and that the benefits (if any to us) outweigh the huge risks and impacts to Dracut and its surrounding areas.

The location of the proposed pipeline compression station, metering station and large gas pipelines are proposed to be constructed in a High Consequence Areas (HCA) with a Potential Impact Radius of 900-2000 feet. This megaplex is near places of assembly such as the Campbell School, St. Francis Church and adjacent to prime farm land, conservation land, electrical utility lines as well as a quarry where blasting happens daily.

Residents will have to deal with construction, blasting, losing land (resulting in non-conforming lots), closed streets and possibly no access, lots of noise, stadium lighting, air pollution (methane and other carcinogenic chemicals), global warming, pigging, diminishing property values, increased insurance costs, potential well water pollution/contamination, and the some, the anxiety of being in the "incinerator zone" – never knowing if you were going to lose your life and that of your family in 59 seconds.

The colonial town of Dracut with its active farms and open space/conservation areas are doomed if this pipeline becomes reality, not to even guess at the potential health impacts for future generations. Note, I have been told that someone will be monitoring this compression station from Texas if anything should hap-

pen – that really sets off alarms to me.

On a personal note, I am saddened that Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Pipeline would even consider impacting the Ogonowski Farm. Hasn't this family lost enough with their son being the first victim of 9/11? All this so Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Pipeline can export the natural gas to other countries? (see page 2 for a KM Presentation Oct 2015) Before issuing any certification to this company, please examine all the impacts thoroughly and think about what the permanent losses and impacts are to our town and New England too.

Lisa Lipomi  
34 Gilbert Street  
Dracut, MA 01826  
(mailing will follow)

**20150603-5056(30624268).txt**

Lisa Lipomi, Dracut, MA.  
Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Expansion Project

RE: Northeast Energy Direct, PF14-22-000

Dear Secretary Bose,

The NEW map of area of the NED pipeline was published from Kinder Morgan that reflects the 1/2 mile radius around the proposed compressor station. Did anyone look at the map and realize that the Fire Department at the corner of Jones Avenue is within the radius and the Police Department is just on the edge of that radius?

Dracut has more affected homes than any other community with a compressor/metering stations, can't we have an Environmental Scoping Meeting here in Dracut? We wanted an open house but never got that.

Compressor Stations push out heat from multiple generators. This heat is exhausted 24x7 at an avg. temperature of 950 degrees! Climate change! If station is unoccupied, managed via "remote control" from Texas, who locally in Dracut will know how or if valves are properly shut if there is a catastrophic "event". Random spewing of toxic gases will rise rapidly into the air we breathe as we race to take cover when you hear the "jet engine noises" called a "blow down". Blown downs can happen anytime. Not much is known yet about how long you need to remain indoors with windows and doors shut until it is safe to re-emerge. Where will you be if a warning siren sounds? Jogging? Pushing your baby's carriage? Walking your pet? What are we (including our animals) going to eat or breathe if the wells are contaminated so our crops and animals do not have potable water and clean air? Bad news of Dracut!

Lisa Lipomi  
34 Gilbert Street  
Dracut, MA 01826

**20150603-5057(30624282).txt**

Kaela Law, Pelham, NH.

A comment of opposition regarding the compressor station siting in the town of Dracut, Massachusetts and hopefully you will be able to provide me an answer to a question I have regarding that?

I live in Pelham, NH and Dracut is our very near neighbor. This compressor station looks to be just over a mile away from our town border. Dracut is a highly populated area and I find the siting of this station to be largely negligent to the lives and well-being of all of those little yellow dots that fall within the "1/2 mile buffer" circling the proposed facility. My questions is simply this, what is the point of that buffer? I am re-

ally hoping someone from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission will provide me an answer, rather than just filing my eComment. If this so-called buffer encompasses a large number of residences I was just curious about why the imaginary line is drawn?

Thank you,

Kaela Law

Pelham/Windham Pipeline Awareness

**20150603-5085(30624391).txt**

Brandon Cardinal, New Ipswich, NH.

My reason for writing to you is to appose Kinder Morgan's plan to build a pipeline and install a compressor station in New Ipswich. I was informed of the location they intend to install the compressor station and it is simply unacceptable to allow devices which emit toxic gas and high levels of noise as close to our rural based homes. I and we as a community expect to be able to live in a safe hazardous free environment, but installing such a system off Old Wilton Rd. and Route 45 is far from achieving this. I understand the need to supply gas will continue to grow in the years to come, but as a business Tennessee Gas/Kinder Morgan must make better decisions on located such projects of this magnitude. I will do everything within my ability to reach everyone about denying the approval to erect this proposed project in the center of my community.

Regards,

Brandon Cardinal

**20150603-5103(30624556).txt**

Susan M Keegan, Nassau, NY.

To FERC,

I am concerned about the impact that the Kinder Morgan pipeline will have on the Rensselaer Plateau. The plateau covers a large part of Rensselaer County and has streams and ponds that you can fish in, habitat for birds and wild mammals. Wen the Tennessee Valley Pipeline went through northern Columbia County some of the ponds never recovered, there are no fish or frogs in the habitat. Please do not let this happen in Rensselaer County.

What can you do to prevent this from happening? Do we really need another pipeline in our immediate area? I don't think so. Please explain your reasoning if you indeed allow the Kinder Morgan Pipeline to go through Stephentown, Nassau and Schodack in Rensselaer County.

Thank you,

Susan M. Keegan

5 Elm Street

Nassau, NY 12123

**20150603-5140(30624946).pdf**

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., Docket No. PF14-22-000

As FERC considers Kinder Morgan's Northeast Energy Direct proposal, I ask that you also consider the following from a concerned citizen.

Compressor Station Blues (and Yellows and Purples)

On June 2, 2015, Tennessee Gas Pipeline (TGP), a subsidiary of Kinder Morgan, filed a document with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) in the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) docket disclosing

the locations of the nine compressor stations that it proposes to build as part of the NED project. This filing included aerial maps of each of the proposed locations, complete with yellow dots depicting residences within one half-mile of the borders of the compressor station properties and purple dots depicting “other structures” located within that same distance.

Why one half-mile? Because even FERC, a “regulatory” agency that seems not particularly interested in regulating much of anything to do with the natural gas pipelines that it so readily approves – even FERC recognizes the disruptive power of compressor stations. These industrial complexes can produce prodigious amounts of pollution of all sorts: light pollution, noise pollution, air pollution – you name it.

Compressor stations are built at intervals along a natural gas pipeline to compress the gas in order to keep it flowing through the pipe. The NED market line is a 36-inch pipe that is proposed to operate at a pressure of nearly 1500 psi. Compressor stations come in a variety of different types and sizes. They can be powered by electricity, diesel or natural gas. A number of compressors can be installed at a given site – the more compressors, the more sound and air pollution produced. Some of the proposed NED stations are monsters – up to 90,000 HP, powered by large, noisy gas turbine compressors.

How many residences and other buildings are shown on the nine proposed compressor station maps? This is a table based on the TGP filing:

**Buildings Within One Half Mile of Proposed NED Compressor Station Boundaries**

Map	Location	Residences	Other Structures
1 of 9	New Milford, PA	27	23
2 of 9	Franklin, NY	20	16
3 of 9	Schoharie, NY	60	44
4 of 9	Schoharie, NY	35	34
5 of 9	Nassau, NY	64	41
6 of 9	Windsor, MA	6	8
7 of 9	Northfield, MA	11	6
8 of 9	New Ipswich, NH	78	21
9 of 9	Dracut, MA	262	46
<b>Totals:</b>		<b>563</b>	<b>239</b>

563 residences - who knows how many residents live in those homes? And of course, the pollution that would be created by these compressor stations does not conveniently stop at the half-mile boundary – that is just an arbitrary distance chosen by FERC. Many other residences exist a bit further out. And many of the 239 “other” structures are occupied, at least during portions of the day.

Back to those dots. As stated above, each yellow dot on the aerial maps represents a residence within one half-mile of the boundary of one of the proposed compressor stations. Purple dots represent other structures. New Ipswich is a gorgeous, rural town in southern New Hampshire – the type of town you might choose to live in to enjoy a quieter, simpler, cleaner way of life. Here is a portion of the map depicting the proposed compressor station in New Ipswich, NH:

*{map not included here}*

The brown stain in the middle of the map represents two parcels that TGP proposes to purchase for the compressor station. The blue line is the proposed NED pipeline. The lighter shaded area represents the one half-mile boundary from the edge of the compressor station boundary. There are 78 yellow dots (residences) and 21 purple dots (other buildings) within the half-mile boundary of the proposed compressor station.

I suggest that everyone take a moment and consider how it would feel to discover a yellow dot representing your own home on such a map. The home that you scrimped and saved to buy and fix up. The home where

you raised or are raising your family. The home that you had planned to age in. Your peace of mind and your plans are now in tatters. Your finances may also be negatively impacted (despite Kinder Morgan's hollow claim that "pipelines don't affect property values"). All because of a huge energy company's plans to build a pipeline that would deliver much more natural gas than even gas proponents believe New England can consume. But along with the unnecessary volume of gas, this pipeline will deliver pollution and misery to many of those in close proximity to their proposed compressor stations. The dots tell the story.

Nick Miller Groton, MA

**20150604-0037(30632032).pdf**

Hand written card, Tom Bickerstaffe, 196 Trout Brook Rd, Dracut, MA 01826, refusing access

**20150604-0038(30632033).pdf**

Hand written card, Karen Guadagni, 76 Greenbriar, New Ipswich, NH 03071, opposing

**20150604-0039(30632040).pdf**

Hand written card, Olive A. Haky, 31 Pasquale St, Dracut, MA 01826, opposing

**20150604-0040(30632054).pdf**

Hand written card, Gail Stamp, 91 Derby St, Dracut, MA 01826, opposing

**20150604-0041(30632055).pdf**

Hand written card, Robert, Parker Village, East Dracut, MA, opposing

**20150604-0042(30632053).pdf**

Hand written card, James Camera, 196 Perry Rd, Rindge, NH, opposing

**20150604-0043(30634609).pdf**

Hand written card, Deborah Kondig, 47 Scott Rd, Ashby, MA 01431, opposing

**20150604-0056(30630833).pdf**

Lakeview Orchard  
94 Old Cheshire Road Lanesborough, MA 01237  
www.lakevieworchard.com

May 28, 2015

Attn.: Commission Members

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to you today to ask for your support with regard to the Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline (Northeast Direct Project) that, as of December 8, 2014, has a new route passing through Lanesborough, Massachusetts.

The route of this 36 "High Pressure gas line passes right through my orchard, Lakeview Orchard..I started this orchard in 1995.It has taken 20 years of hard work and my personal finances to turn acres of pastureland into a viable agricultural business. My orchard has over 5,000 fruit trees, several acres of assorted berries, and a variety of vegetable crops. I have a very busy farm store with a bakery and a cider mill. Lakeview

Orchard has become a destination for fresh picked and pick your own Fruits and is well known for its “from scratch” bakery, honey, fresh local produce, and other farm made and local products We are dedicated to providing these fresh fruits, vegetables, and assorted products to local consumers and to being a vital part of the Town of Lanesborough.

Family farms are the backbone of American agriculture. These farms are on the decline as many next generation family members are not interested in continuing the family farming business. Lakeview Orchard is very fortunate to have an adult son who loves the orchard and is now taking over part of the farm operation and will be the next generation at Lakeview Orchard. Our grandson, also, has an interest in the orchard and could be a third generation orchardist.

Our family orchard is now being threatened! by the behemoth for profit company, Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas. The proposed gas line route goes right through a portion of my apple orchard, most of my cherry orchard, an cathe section of raspberries, and a planting of pear trees. If this proposed route becomes reality my orchard could well be put out of business.

I will never be able to replant fruit trees in the area of the pipeline. Yes, I can replant raspberries, but there will be a loss of revenue from our pick your own raspberry operation for at least 3 years. Additionally, there is no guarantee that our customers will return once they have located another pick your own farm to meet their need for tree fruits and berries.

Furthermore, there are many people who now firmly believe that the food grown on farms near the pipeline will be contaminated and unfit to eat. These people will no longer patronize Lakeview Orchard. Such a loss of business would cause such a loss of revenue that we would be unable to continue operating any phase of our business.

Please say NO to the Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Northeast Direct Project.

Sincerely,

David Jurczak  
Lakeview Orchard  
Owner  
upick@verizon.net  
413-441-0844

**20150604-0062(30634214).pdf**

Hand written card, Brenda Dube, opposing

**20150604-0095(30634238).pdf**

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street  
Washington, D.C. 20426  
RE: Northeast Energy Direct Project  
90,000 hp Compressor Station  
Nassau, NY  
Rensselaer County

I am writing to you today to express my objection the proposed Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Pipeline NED project. Specifically the proposed 90,000hp compressor station proposed for the Nassau/Schodack area in Rensselaer county NY. Last week I witnessed surveyors performing a wetland survey on my neighbors property. Upon talking to other people I found out that he is willing to sell his property to Kinder Morgan so they can build this huge compressor station. Below I have listed several reason as to why I object to this structure being built in our small, quiet community.

- ~ The pipeline and compressor station would be within 1.25 miles of the Dewey Loeffel Superfund site which was just cleaned up and contained at a cost of millions of dollars. Is big business going to be allowed to just come in and create another source of environmental contamination just so they can continue to make record profits? How would any explosions of the station or pipeline effect this site?
- ~ If constructed on Tom Hansen's property the compressor station would be within a few hundred feet of National Grids high tension power lines. So they want to put a pipeline and compressor station which would contain highly flammable gas under high pressure very close to high voltage power lines? Not a good combination!
- ~ The pipeline would cross the Valatie Kill which was also just cleaned up as part of the Dewey Loeffel project. How would fracking chemicals leaking from the station and pipeline effect this feeder stream the connects to Nassau Lake, Kinderhook Creek and eventually makes its way to the Hudson River in Columbia County. Any chemicals in the water would affect all residents along the water path. Chemicals released during the "blowdown" could reach Burden Lake which is about 1/3 mile away. This is a clean lake that is stocked by NYSDEC and used for year round recreation.
- ~ Governor Cuomo has banned the fracking of the Marcellous shale formation in New York. The gas that is to be transported through this proposed pipeline and compressor stations contains the same chemicals that caused the DOH to recommend that the governor ban lacking. These same chemicals will be released into the NY environment if this project is allowed to go forward.
- ~ The pipeline is proposed to be 36" in diameter. When the company performs maintenance on the pipeline or compressor station they must do a "blowdown" to release the pressure from the pipeline. The releasing of pressure, gas and chemicals from a 36" pipeline is an incredibly loud and disruptive event. It would be heard for miles around in our quiet community.
- ~ The potential site of the compressor station on Clarke Chapel Rd. is in an area surrounded by residences, many of which have small children. These children would grow up inhaling the fracking and other chemicals dispersed into the air by routine "blowdowns" at the compressor station. Some of these chemicals include benzene, toluene, sulfuric oxide and formaldehyde. Known carcinogens and neurotoxins. As well as lead and radioactive polonium. These two chemicals are deposited on the ground surrounding the compressor site.
- ~ The proposed compressor station at Clerks Chapel Rd would be located in a valley. This valley would help to contain the methane smog created by the compressor station "blowdown" In other parts of the country the ozone level has increased dramatically over gas drilling sites that release methane into the atmosphere. We like our clean country air.
- ~ The gas and oil industry does not have a very good safety record. Especially lately with the oil spill in California, oil train cars exploding and gas pipelines exploding. Accidents are unavoidable. Since 2011 there have been at least ten compressor station explosions. If this proposed 90,000hp compressor station ever exploded, Nassau would be making the national news in a very bad way, with many casualties.
- ~ The noise survey that was performed on the 21"-22nd of May to determine how close the compressor station can be located to residences was a flawed survey. The device placed on Clarke Chapel Rd. was located just off the edge of the road. Tom Hansen, the owner of the land that is being surveyed for a potential site of the compressor station was driving his large ten wheeled dump trucks and water truck up and down the road several days. This is not normal and would only be done to bring the average decibel readings of an otherwise quiet rural area up. Thus allowing Tennessee Pipeline to locate the station close to the surrounding residences.
- ~ We chose to live in a rural area because we like peace and quiet and clean air. If the proposed 90,000hp compressor station (would be the largest in the state) is built, in Nassau, it would destroy this entire area. The station would create noise and air pollution day and night, and light pollution at night. This is an area that is normally very dark at night. All of this pollution would be year round as these stations run constantly 24-7, 365 days.

~ There is no public water supply in our area. Everyone uses well water for all of their needs. The presence of a compressor station with all of the chemicals they disperse would be a very great cause for concern with regards to our drinking water.

~ Everyone who lives around the proposed compressor station site would have their property values decrease dramatically. They would never be able to sell their property to get away from all of the dangerous chemicals and potential explosion. Who would want to buy property in an area like that? No one!

Please do not let Kinder Morgan/ Tennessee Pipeline build this 90,000hp compressor station on Clerks Chapel Rd in Nassau, NY. If the station is allowed to be built at all we find out down the road that the health and safety of the surrounding residents will be in jeopardy for the duration of the station's operation, it will be too late. Don't make the same mistakes other states are making by allowing this type of infrastructure to spider web across their land.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Colin M. Murphy

Concerned resident at 160 Clerks Chapel Rd.

Nassau, NY

**20150604-5000(30625036).txt**

Timothy Weaver, New Ipswich, NH.

We do not need, nor do we want this pipeline or compressor station in our town of New Ipswich, NH. There is no significant need for more natural gas in our state, and it is obvious that the intent of this pipeline is to export NG to Canada to be sold on the global market. It is ridiculous to expect all of the affected towns on the proposed pipeline route to deal with the disruption of the pipeline construction as well as the air, sound and light pollution emitted from the compressor stations and the danger of pipeline ruptures - all for the financial benefit of a corporation, with no benefit to the town or state.

This pipeline is absolutely not welcome here in New Hampshire.

**20150604-5005(30625069).txt**

Susan M Keegan, Nassau, NY.

6/3/2015

To FERC,

For Kinder Morgan to even consider ruining the lives and property of people who live in this area just to make money is a sin. Our lives and peace of mind would be ruined. Would you want anyone you love or care about to be in jeopardy of being killed at any time? There would only be 1" between us and death. Kinder Morgan facilities have blown up many times. Kinder Morgan has had leaks many many times. They keep their mistakes quiet and secret. They want to put an extremely dangerous, extremely noisy operation in our back yard. We will live in constant fear of death and destruction.

With that mess in our backyard, our property will be worthless. We will still be expected to pay taxes on it but we would never be able to sell it and, obviously, it will be worthless to our daughters in the future as any inheritance.

Please help us. People should not be harmed just for a company to make money.

William Hastings

32 Pine Drive S.

Nassau, NY 12123

wackywilly731@gmail.com

**20150604-5007(30625075).txt**

S, Nassau, NY.

Dear FERC,

Please do not allow Kinder Morgan to desecrate our property and our lives just for them to make a profit. Kinder Morgan is responsible for making their profits. We do not care if they make a profit. We are responsible for keeping ourselves safe and keeping our property liveable.

Kinder Morgan is known to not be that responsible with their facilities. We bought a house where we bought to have a very quite bucolic neighborhood. No noise. No pollution. No bright lights. The pipe is 36" but only 1" thick for protection. We live directly behind Lape Road. When it explodes, it will blow us up. Even if it does not explode, the noise, the pollution and prison-like lights will make our lives miserable.

The stress of living with that dangerous, loud, prison atmosphere right behind us could possibly kill us.

Please do not kill us. Please do not ruin our lives. Please do not ruin the value of our property.

Linda Hastings

32 Pine Drive S.

Nassau, NY 12123

Lindahastings1@aol.com

**20150604-5037(30625300).pdf**

Gerald Kutcher  
210 Cardigan Rd  
Tewksbury MA 01876  
jerrykutch@verizon.net

May 28, 2015

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

RE: PF14-22 Northeast Direct Pipeline Project - LYNNFIELD LATERAL

Dear Commissioners;

I am a long time resident of Tewksbury (over 40 years). I moved here because of the town's natural beauty. I am now writing to express my concern about the Kinder Morgan/ Tennessee Gas Pipeline, and the Company's current proposed path for the Lynnfield Lateral. Specifically impacting me is the current path of the Lynnfield Lateral pipeline, which is lain out across the body of land running between the single family homes on Cardigan Road, Tewksbury and those on Deca Circle and Brown Streets, Andover MA. This area is shown on Map TE-SEG\_N-007, which was filed in March 2015.

There has to be a better alternate route.

This strip of land is a forested slope with large shady trees. It is a Residential subdivision of single family homes on 1-2 acre lots. It has numerous perennial streams running through it in multiple locations. It also has several swampy areas. It is mid way between two major rivers and several NHESP Habitats. This area is a natural home, and breeding ground for a variety of wild life, including many birds, reptiles, amphibians, foxes, coyotes, rabbits and deer. It serves as a wildlife corridor as the animals and birds migrate between the Merrimack and Shawsheen Rivers, between our numerous certified wild life habitats, and as they otherwise travel north to south and back again throughout the state. This area has been preserved in its natural state because it is wetlands and supporting uplands, both of which are recognized by Federal, State and Town law as important wildlife habitats and a source of contribution to plentiful, clean water. It also has historic, cultural and archeological significance, dating back to the 1600's. It is also part of an area which was originally

inhabited by the Wamesit Indians.

As many residents have already written, this pipeline project will destroy this habitat, consequently destroying forever wildlife in the area. The alterations will be detrimental to the replenishment of the clean water that so many people down river depend on. Because of the close proximity of the homes and high population along this path, installing the pipeline in this location creates an unnecessary risk to the health, safety and welfare of many families. It will also destroy significant historical, cultural, archeological and geological resources located here. To see the portion of the proposed path I am referring to herein, please see the segment of the Map TGP filed in March, attached as Exhibit A, on which I have noted my property as 210 Cardigan in yellow highlight.

Specifically, I wish to point out the following with respect to the March, 2015 Map and Resource reports:

- **STEEP SLOPE:** The Elevation of my home at 210 Cardigan Road, Tewksbury, is elevation 110 while the homes behind me on Brown Street and Deca Circle, Andover are at elevations 210-220. This is a steep slope but the maps that TGP has filed to date do not show this. They are outdated and deceiving. The homes are much closer together than as shown on the Map. I believe this is because the slope is extremely steep but the maps are only two dimensional. To cut into that slope as proposed on the maps and explained in the Resource Reports will for sure result in damage to the homes here. Such work endangers the long term stability of the slope. It will be impossible to re-compact the soils to support the weight of those homes at the higher elevation, causing long term risk to homes at both elevations, not only during construction, but also as they settle over time. Please note that the roots of the mature trees here, through which, according to their maps, TGP proposes to clear cut a 90-170 foot wide swath and keep a 50 foot easement, play a big part in keeping the slope stable and preventing erosion. The existence of this slope does not seem to be recognized in any of their resource reports. See Topo at Exhibit B.
- **CLOSE PROXIMITY OF HOMES:** As I explained above, the homes on Cardigan Road, Tewksbury and Brown Street/Deca Circle, Andover, are much closer to each other than they appear on the map. According to the March filing, KM/TGP is intending to create a clear cut work area between the homes of up to 160 feet in many locations through Tewksbury, and to keep a 50 foot clear cut easement, all the while also representing to homeowners they will stay 25 feet away from homes. Such distances do not exist here and the representations that KM/TGP have been making that they will clear cut 90 feet, while their maps show 160-170 feet, and that they will stay 25 feet away from a home, when such a distance does not exist, are disingenuous, unfair and deceptive with respect to the Lynnfield Lateral. I note their resource reports are peppered with qualifying phrases like “when possible”. Well, that is a phrase that they have inserted by need because they know that the exception to the 25 foot set back from homes will apply along the entirety of the Lynnfield Lateral. It is not possible to maintain such a set back along most of the Lynnfield Lateral, especially not here in Tewksbury, given the slope I disclosed above. See section of their map at Exhibit A. See also photo at Exhibit C.
- **NUMEROUS STREAMS:** Behind my home at 210 Cardigan (the rear yard of which is shown as 3915 on the map), there is a natural stream that flows down the slope behind my home. It starts up behind 5 Deca Circle, Andover (shown as 4222) and flows down toward my home. This stream, plus any surface run off storm water by the nature of the topography, next continues on past my home to an even lower elevation to recharge the Certified Zone II Well Head protection area that my home borders, and Tewksbury Ground Water Protection Zone that my home sits in. The proposed path of the pipeline will traverse the stream on the perpendicular, and cut off/disrupt the flow of that natural stream. It will also traverse on the perpendicular the swale which allows “downhill water” run off from Andover’s Brown St /Deca Circle to flow into a 12 pipe in a drain culvert that I had installed on my property at the bottom of the swale. Engineers recommended and installed this pipe and drain culvert to divert surface water flood waters away from my house. Prior to installing this pipe (at the end of the swale) water from the higher Andover land would come flowing down the hill and flood my basement. Allowing the pipeline to cut the swale would bring a return to the flooding problem for me. Please see Exhibit D.

- **MASSACHUSETTS PRIORITY RESOURCE AREA , MA CERTIFIED ZONE II PROTECTION AREA AND TEWKSBURY GROUND WATER PROTECTION ZONE:** This area behind my home, as well as almost the entire path along the Tewksbury-Andover Border, is a Massachusetts priority resource area and a Tewksbury Ground Water Protection Zone. According to the MA DEP Maps, this area has the following valuable attributes: freshwater wetlands, approved wellhead protection area Zone 2, Certified Vernal Pools, Potential Vernal Pools, Perennial Streams, Intermittent streams, Shawsheen River NHESP protected wildlife habitat, Riverine Habitats, Potentially Productive High Yield Aquifers, Potentially productive medium yield aquifers. According to the DEP Maps, it also is primarily Wood land wetlands, specifically including the S1, S2, S3, SS wetlands as is indicated on the DEP maps.
- **NHESP RARE SPECIES HABITAT AND VERNAL POOLS:** To date KM/TGP has not disclosed the fact that the Tewksbury- Andover path they have chosen has numerous NHESP rare species habitats and other certified and potential vernal pools, all the way from the Merrimack River to Lynnfield. This omission is despite the fact that some of the information is readily available on the MA websites. There is no excuse for this. While some of these items must be detected by ground surveys, permission for which has, to date not been granted by a majority of the homeowners, others are readily revealed on the Commonwealth's public maps.
- **CULTURAL, ARECHOLIGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCE AREA:** There are numerous historical stone walls running down the stretch of land between Cardigan Road, Tewksbury and Brown Street. These are at least 200-400 years old. There is a major one, substantially still intact, which I believe to have been erected in colonial times, which runs along the length of the border of my Property, which I believe is the perimeter of the Original Genera Ames Estate. ( See below) It runs through all the back yards here, exactly where this Lynnfield Lateral is proposed to go. Because my land extends over both sides of the Tewksbury/ Andover Town line, a major section of this stone wall exists, intact, at the edge of my yard, precisely where the maps show KM wants it permanent easement to exist. These walls are recognized in Massachusetts as cultural, historic, archeological, and geologically significant Landscape structures. These stone walls are unique to New England and without argument, have significant cultural, historical, geological and archeological value. The proposed Lynnfield lateral will traverse them, run over them, and otherwise permanently destroy them. Please see Exhibit E. See also booklet published by MA DCR entitled, "Terra Firma, Putting Historic Landscape on Solid Ground, "Stones that Speak".
- **AREA HAS ADDITIONAL HIGH HISTORICAL, CULTURAL, ARCHEOLOGICAL AND GEOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE:** In general, this area of Andover/Tewksbury is historically, culturally, and archeologically significant in ways additional to those mentioned above. Specifically, Tewksbury is a suburb of the Lowell National and State Historic Parks, both of which have been wisely restored and preserved Lowell as an accurate Mill City, at great taxpayer expense under Federal and State Preservation Acts. Ames Pond and the land around it, on both sides of the Town line, was originally owned by General Adelbert Ames, who, along with his father-in-law General Franklin Benjamin Butler, played an important role making Lowell a leader in the Industrial Revolution. He was born in 1835 and who died in 1933. After settling in Massachusetts, Ames built a seventeen-room estate in Tewksbury known locally as "the Castle" on Prospect Hill, now called Ames Hill, in 1906. He built a dam on Meadow Brook to create a forested hunting preserve of hundreds of Acres of wetlands and forests. This dam created Ames Pond, as shown on the map. It drew much wildlife to the area and served recreational purposes like hunting, fishing, canoeing, swimming and ice skating. It still does that to this day. Adelbert Ames was a decorated general of the American Civil War, receiving the Medal of Honor. He was also a Senator and Governor of Mississippi during Reconstruction. He moved to Tewksbury in the early 1900's as an executive in a flour Mill, and he held other investment interests in Lowell promoting Lowell's recognized role in the Industrial Revolution. General Ames married Blanche Butler Ames, who was born in Lowell and the daughter of Benjamin Franklin Butler, another Civil war General, and a Lowell attorney and politician who fought improve the conditions of labor and who helped established the City of Lowell and its

Textile Mills. General Ames and Blanche Butler were married in the Saint Anne's Episcopal Church in Lowell, MA, as stated above, now a national and state historic Park. His daughter, Blanche, Ames Ames, became a suffragist, inventor, artist, and writer. These people are very important contributors to the history of Massachusetts. This area is closely tied to the history of the Lowell Historic National Park and the Lowell Historic State Park. It should properly remain preserved as it is. The Town of Tewksbury has attained a good balance between allowing homes to be built and maintaining the historical environment created by General Ames. This area reveals the lifestyle of the leaders of Lowell's Industrial Revolution.

The Lynnfield lateral as proposed from the Merrimack to Lynnfield is not a viable route. It is also not a wise route. There are too many residences, too many rare habitats, streams, rivers and wetlands; too many historical, cultural, ecological and geological resources here. There are many other paths that this can take which will not destroy habitats, threaten clean water, endanger human lives, and otherwise deprive private, hardworking citizens of their hard earned peace and enjoyment of their private real property in the name of shareholder profit. I think it is clear from the news reports that this proposal has nothing to do with public convenience and necessity. It is not about bringing gas to the citizens of Massachusetts. We already have sufficient easements in place across the Commonwealth to accomplish that goal. It's about a multi-billion dollar publicly traded company attempting to misuse the Natural Gas act to acquire the power of eminent domain so they can take whatever private property they want from whomever US Citizens they want as cheaply as possible, to acquire additional easements, with the ultimate goal of building unnecessary pipeline so that they can generate profit by leasing out the line to fossil fuel producers who will ultimately enter profitable, long term contracts to sell US natural resources to foreign countries. This fact is all over the news, so please make note of it.

Massachusetts already has sufficient utility easements in place which can be easily upgraded should it be deemed necessary to deliver additional amounts of gas to this region. We also have two LNG import facilities in Everett, which have been "good to go", but which have apparently been allowed to sit idle. There is no reason why the same Fracked gas which we are being told will be sent through this proposed pipeline from the Marcellus shale to Massachusetts cannot be shipped here as LNG over water from those mid Atlantic states which support fracking, and at a reasonable cost.

Both Tewksbury and Andover pride themselves on being Green communities. Both communities have taken serious steps and made successful efforts to get away from Fossil fuels. Alternative routes have been suggested after obviously well studied astute analyses of this path by the both the Tewksbury and Andover Boards of Selectmen. A number of the suggested alternate routes run on publicly owned land, or along pre-existing rights of way, without newly disrupting neighborhoods, communities and wildlife habitats and corridors. Tewksbury lies in the watersheds of 4 different Rivers. It is a very complex and valuable water resource area. The current proposed path may be the cheapest route for Kinder Morgan, but it's not the best alternative for the general public, nor for our endangered species, nor for our clean drinking water supply. Please either deny this project or choose one of those other pre-existing routes and rights of way. Do not allow another taking for another utility right of way through this Commonwealth. We, as a state, have enough of those. We, as a Commonwealth, have already sacrificed sufficient amounts of our valuable land to provide the necessary rights of way for utility delivery well into the future. Please require this project to follow exiting pipeline/ utility routes or the path of publicly owned ways. See Exhibit F

I hereby furthermore notify everyone that I refuse permission to allow the Kinder Morgan- Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, its agents servants and employees to enter my land. Any such entry will be deemed a trespass and I will seek all legal and equitable remedies in response to any attempt by them to enter my property.

Sincerely,

/s/ Gerald Kutcher

*{maps and photographs, Exhibits A-E omitted here}*

OFFICE OF THE TOWN MANAGER  
**TOWN OF TEWKSBURY**  
TOWN HALL  
1009 MAIN ST  
TEWKSBURY, MASSACHUSETTS 01876

RICHARD A. MONTUORI  
TOWN MANAGER

(978) 640-4300  
FAX (978) 640-4302

April 6, 2015

Steve Keady  
Kinder Morgan, Inc.  
9 Park Street, Suite 200  
Boston, MA 02108

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LLC-Docket No. PF14-22-000

Proposed Alternative Routes for Lynnfield Lateral

Dear Mr. Keady:

The Board of Selectmen and the administrative staff of the Town of Tewksbury continue to have significant concerns related to the proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project by Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Gas Pipeline. In particular, the proposed pathway that crosses through dense residential neighborhoods along the Tewksbury and Andover town lines would present a significant hardship to the residents there. In response to those concerns, we would ask that you consider modifications to the current proposed pathway that would minimize residential impact in both communities.

To that end, we are proposing three potential modifications to lessen the impact on residential neighborhoods.

Alternative 1- Haverhill Lateral Co-localization

As currently proposed, there are several segments of the proposed pipeline that will emerge from the Dracut hub. This includes the Lynnfield Lateral, as well as the Haverhill Lateral. Much of the Haverhill Lateral will be constructed along a current right-of-way, presenting less impact to the communities it travels through. Our proposed adjustment would be to co-locate the Lynnfield Lateral with the Haverhill Lateral until it reaches the crossing of Forest Street in Methuen (42.719679, -71.228610). At that point, the Haverhill Lateral turns north parallel to Temple Drive, while the new Lynnfield Lateral could continue east and south-east until it connects with Interstate 93. There appears to be an electric utility easement that travels due east across wetlands to Interstate 93 in the area of Danton Drive (42.724219, -71.210950). Once it reaches Interstate 93, the Lynnfield Lateral could then run alongside the interstate until it rejoins the current proposed path at MP 7.8.

Alternative 2 - High Plain Crossing

Given the proposed pipeline will have a significant impact on the dense residential areas along the Tewksbury and Andover line, this proposed alternative would shift the pipeline to a less densely populated location near High Plain Road in Andover. The proposed shift would occur near Methuen Street at approximately MP 2.0. Instead of crossing the Merrimack River at the current proposed location, the pipeline would cross somewhere between Hillside Drive (42.668512, -71.240757) and Wheeler Street (42.676069, -71.233319). Once across the river, the pipeline would be placed to minimize impact to homes in this sparsely populated area to reach the electric utility easement that crosses High Plain Street {42.661847, -71.210397}. From there, the pipeline could be located in that electric utility until it intersects with Interstate 93, or it could travel along High Plain Road until it intersects first Interstate 495 and then 93. At that point, it would run along Interstate 93 until it reaches the current proposed path at MP7.8 as above.

### Alternative 3 - 495 Co-localization

As described above for the other proposed alternatives, the goal of these proposals is to minimize impact on residential areas. Should Alternatives 1 & 2 proposed here be impossible, the last alternative proposed would co-localize the pipeline with Interstate 495. This would leave the Lynnfield Lateral as proposed until the crossing of Interstate 495 near Exit 39 {42.645591, -71.227608}. At that point, it would travel north-east along the northern side of 495 until it intersects with High Plain Road (42.658875, -71.202022). At that point the pipeline could travel along High Plain Road until it intersects with Interstate 93, and then run alongside the interstate until it rejoins the current proposed path at MP 7.8.

Thank you for your time and consideration of these proposals, and please feel free to contact us with any questions or clarifications that are required in reference to these route modifications. We have attached a pdf indicating the general paths of each proposed alternative. We look forward to working with you to limit the impact of this project on the residents of Tewksbury and the Merrimack Valley.

Richard A. Montuori

RAM/jrnt

*{map omitted here}*

**TOWN OF TEWKSBURY**  
999 WHIPPLE RD  
TEWKSBURY, MASSACHUSETTS 01876

KYLE BOYD  
PLANNER / CONSERVATION ADMINISTRATOR

khoyd@tcwksbury-ma.gov

April 6, 2015

Steve Keady  
Kinder Morgan, Inc.  
9 Park Street, Suite 200  
Boston, MA 02108

Re: Comments of Tewksbury Conservation Commission

Dear Mr. Keady:

Thank you for meeting with me last week to discuss the latest proposed plans for Tennessee Gas Pipeline's Lynnfield Lateral. The Tewksbury Conservation Commission is deeply concerned with the proposed route due to the impact the project will have on the Open Space parcel located behind 40 Bonnie Street in which the Conservation Commission and Town of Tewksbury specifically protected in 2004 as a result of investigating its unique ecological value.

This 18 acre forested parcel was surveyed in 2004 when residents from Bligh Street approached the Conservation Commission having observed the presence of vernal pool species. As a result of the survey, egg masses of obligate vernal pool species were observed in both locations and both were then certified as vernal pools. Additionally, the landscape intersecting the two vernal pools is as an ecologically thriving Red Maple Swamp with the rare sighting of a fisher cat further confirming this parcel to be an extremely important healthy forest ecosystem and asset to the Town of Tewksbury.

In maintaining a healthy vernal pool it is not only the pool itself that needs protection. The species that rely on the pool only spend a small percentage of the year within the pool for breeding purposes and then return to their neighboring upland habitat. Furthermore, this parcel was protected with the intent of preserving the entire 18 acre forest to allow the associated species to thrive. The proposed route appears to cut between these two vernal pools which would cause devastating damage to the ecosystem displacing many of the protected species.

Altering lands subject to Article 97 requires a two-thirds vote by legislature to undo the restriction. Additionally, the conversion of Open Space land to non-Open Space land space requires mitigating for this Open Space land somewhere else. The Tewksbury Conservation Commission strongly believes that it would be nearly impossible to mitigate for this parcel of land which offers rare ecological value and that the Tewksbury Conservation Commission has worked so hard to protect. Furthermore, the Commission has significant concerns with the proposed Lynnfield Lateral and would like to see an alternative proposed.

Kyle Boyd  
Town Planner/Conservation Administrator

**20150604-5058(30625710).txt**

Richard Horton, Winchester, NH.

Our town was informed of this project somewhere in the beginning of December 2014. Approximately six months later Kinder Morgan has continued to answer questions with vague responses and mis-truths.

In February the big show came to town. A sea of Blue shirts and even a lit up billboard in the center of our peaceful town. The evening was filled with fan fair and food. One might say the circus came to town.

After several hours of asking questions to newly contracted employees it was obvious that many were just quickly hired temporary help to read a script. Many times we were told go ask the other guy in the blue shirt he knows better than I. This evening that was designed to inform the people of what the actual scope of this project was, it turned into a frustrating evening of listening to a sales pitch over and over.

Over the last six months I have attend many of these meetings and spent hours researching this project. I feel strongly in saying I have done my homework! This project has many flaws in it plan. It seems to have been driven from a business plan and not from considering the environmental impact and the impact on the citizens of the towns in its path.

The project is proposed to enter the State of New Hampshire in Winchester. The entry point is a property that is Conservation land and is protected. This property is the home for many species of plants and animals. It also has a clean water stream running through it with a natural waterfall. It is name Pulpit Falls and this project will destroy it if approved.

Protecting sacred land is something of a moral commitment to the inhabitants of this land. Protecting fresh clean drinking water is a commitment of survival for the human race.

With that being said the project is then proposed to run downhill into a valley that is home to the largest aquifer in the area. It supplies clean drinking water to our town and it is connected to the aquifers throughout the region. This aquifer is not only wide but deep and is surrounded by steep hills. It is nestled in a valley that has been farmland for decades and possibly centuries.

In closing I would ask that you deny this application due to not only the lack of need but the destruction and damage it will do to the land. We as a town will see no direct benefit from this project. There is promise of tax revenue and it is an empty promise. We are already fighting for promised tax revenue with a utility. This town cannot afford another lawsuit. We are working hard to build a town to raise children and encourage families to move to our town. If you approve this project you will be setting us back years in our progress to build a beautiful border town that is one of the gateways to New Hampshire.

Take a long hard look. Is this a project of NEED or GREED?

**20150604-5069(30625757).pdf**

June 3, 2015

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

Re: Docket No. PF14-22

Tennessee Gas Pipeline North East Direct - Lynnfield Lateral

Dear Commissioners:

This letter is to inform you of our overwhelming opposition to the proposal for the Lynnfield Lateral 20 inch 1400 psi high pressure pipeline that Kinder Morgan and TGP are requesting to build in our backyards! We object for the following reasons:

1. This area is densely populated. TGP will denude and desecrate what little land we have behind our houses. They will bury a highly volatile methane gas pipeline within a few feet of swing sets, backyard pools and outdoor decks with propane grills! We have a large vegetable garden and a historical old stone wall that will be directly impacted! When there is a natural gas explosion, fiery debris gets thrown up to 1,000 feet! Even just a small leak or small electric spark can set off an explosion!!! It would be unconscionable to allow this hazard to run through populated areas and wetlands that contribute to clean drinking water.
2. Clean drinking water to 1,000,000 residences are supplied by the Merrimack, Shawsheen, and Ipswich River watersheds. If 30-50 feet of trees and vegetation are cleared with ongoing herbicide maintenance then their natural filtering of pollutants will be forfeited. They may remove up to 160 feet of our backyard for their heavy equipment vehicles! Our home in Tewksbury, MA is designated by parcel number 7861 on the Lynnfield Lateral Pipeline Map/ Sheet Number TE-SEG-N-007
3. Our country does not need this major connector pipeline! There is already in existence a viable route through the southern part of Massachusetts that supplies adequate natural gas to our area. We do not need a second route through the northern part of the state. Neither our community and surrounding cities, nor any US citizen will benefit directly from this pipeline. This pipe is such a large volume, that in the future it is intended to deliver gas elsewhere. Kinder Morgan is looking for the least expensive route.. We hope and pray, that as a govt. agency, you would not condone or allow “profits over people”! Our wonderful democratic government “of the people, by the people, for the people” should not be held hostage to corporate greed!
4. Natural gas, that results from the fracking process with chemicals and know carcinogens, is now considered to be just a “bridge fuel”, buying us time to perfect how to power the earth with sun or wind. Our hard earned tax dollars and higher fees should be focused on renewable energy, not damaging fossil fuels. Eventually, thousands of miles of dangerous underground pipelines will become obsolete. Most homeowners would prefer to pay higher gas prices then to invest in an energy source that scientists warn is leading to catastrophe! If the cost of natural gas reflected the environmental harm caused, then higher prices would reduce usage and subsequent greenhouse gas emissions, while also rendering cleaner energy choices more cost competitive.

In closing, we believe this controversial issue is a “Wake up Call” for all of us to protect the environment for our families and future generations. If Kinder Morgan is allowed to invade our privacy and jeopardize our health and safety then we will undergo extreme psychological stress and anxiety. It would be a travesty for us ordinary, taxpaying citizens to be subjected to such a disruption in our lives when it cannot be proven that this pipeline is for the greater good of our communities!

After weighing all the issues, if your agency decides to allow Kinder Morgan to proceed, we landowners beg you to insist that the pipeline be re-routed around this heavily populated area!

Sincerely,

John and Elaine Iannuzzi  
Tewksbury, MA

**20150604-5094(30626290).txt**

Sheila DS Foraker, Nassau, NY.

Please do not allow or give a permit to Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas for their proposed Fracked Gas Pipeline. If this company is allowed to build this gas pipeline, it will be a travesty and our whole way of life will

be changed forever. It will be devastating to humans, animals, nature, the environment. There is absolutely no reason for this to happen except to make this company richer. We HAVE done our research on this proposed pipeline. We OPPOSE it.

We found out that Kinder Morgan found people in our area willing to sell their land for the 9 compressor stations along the Northeast Energy Direct. The compressor stations will destroy our environment, with poisonous air and water pollution and noise pollution. One of the compressor stations will be on County Route 15 and Clarks Chapel Road, right in my backyard. Also the National Grid utility poles are behind my house, under which they propose to lay their pipeline. [It has been found to be dangerous to put gas pipes under utility poles because the electric emissions will eventually corrode the pipes.]

The Town of Nassau Town Board wrote a beautiful resolution stating why this Kinder Morgan should not get the permit to lay this pipeline in our land. All the facts of our destruction were addressed in it. Also any type of this building is not permitted by our local government.

I hope that you know the facts of the dangers of this proposed pipeline. Below are some of the facts that we have found in our research:

1. The fracked gas will be shipped outside the US. [Fracking is illegal in New York State. It should be illegal to pipe fracked gas through our state as well. All the fracked gas will be sent abroad. We get NOTHING from this, but destruction of our peaceful way of life, our pure air and water, and of our wildlife.]
2. Pipelines can explode, leveling everything within a mile on both sides. [My family, friends, neighbors and I will be killed.]
3. All pipelines leak and they are not well monitored. [My pure spring water would be polluted.]
4. The shut-off valves are far apart, one every 21 miles in a rural area. [This is very dangerous to us.]
5. Fire departments would not be prepared to handle a catastrophe such as a pipeline explosion.
6. This will be one of the biggest pipeline projects in the US and the proposed compressor that moves the gas through the pipeline will be 90,000 horsepower. [Yes, ninety thousand. This is not a typo. It produces noise so great as to vibrate the land around it besides all the pollution going into the air and in the ground and the dangers of equipment failure.]
7. To save money the pipeline is made thinner where it passes through rural areas. [We live in the country and the danger is great.]
8. Almost no jobs would be created and those that are would be temporary. [They have their own crew from out of state, who have no loyalty to the people and environment of our area. They do their job with no one to monitor them. Quality control is nil because the pipes are buried without being checked.]

Please do not let this dangerous project happen. Do not approve the permit to build this pipeline.

#### **20150604-5106(30626323).txt**

karen miller, new ipswich, NH.

i am a resident of new ipswich, nh, my name is karen miller, and i am a very concerned citizen. on tuesday we learned the ned pipeline compressor station is sited for our town. we have private wells and no backup municipal water in case of an emergency situation. if that is not enough reason for opposition to this project, protection of our water, the proposed buffer zone includes our neighbors greenville, nh, water supply and the temple,nh elementary school, which is also temples emergency shelter. we were also informed that anybody living with in 1/2

mile of the proposed compressor station should have received notification at the same time pipeline abutters were notified about this project. that did not happen! home owners saw their property in a compressor station "buffer" zone on a map, tuesday, june 2nd.

this is a bad idea for new ipswich, and a bad idea for new hampshire!

i would also like to note that new ipswich does not have infrastructure that would support gas distribution, if

it were a distribution line. we shouldnt wear the footprint of gas pipeline headed through our town and the rest of southern new hampshire for export sales.

thank you.

**20150604-5148(30627140).pdf**

LAW OFFICES OF CAROLYN ELEFANT PLLC

2200 Pennsylvania Avenue N.W. 4th Flr. E. Washington D.C. 20037 I 202-297-6100

Carolyn@carolynelefant.com I LawOfficesofCarolynElefant.com I licensed in MD, DC, NY

Ms. Kimberly Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, NE

Washington D.C.20426

June 4, 2015

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline  
Northeast Energy Direct Project No. PF14-22

Dear Ms. Bose,

Iam writing this letter on behalf of my client, the **Henry S.Kernan Trust** which owns a 924-acre tract of land, Parcel NY-DE-226known as the Charlotte Forest, located in the Town of Harpersfield, Delaware County, New York and which is in the path of the above-captioned Northeast Energy Direct (NED) project. Two months ago, Icontacted Tennessee Gas Pipeline on behalf of my clients to alert the company to conditions imposed as part of the Commission's order in Constitution Pipeline, Order Granting Certificate, 149 FERC 161,199 (December 2,2014) that would preclude Tennessee Gas from siting its pipeline within the Constitution Pipeline right-of-way or otherwise across my clients' land. Because we have not received a response from Tennessee Gas either acknowledging my correspondence or proposing to re-route the project to avoid the Charlotte Forest, Iwish to bring this issue to the Commission's attention.

I. Background

As the Commission may recall, my clients were active participants in the Constitution Pipeline certificate proceeding. As originally proposed, the Constitution Pipeline would have cut through a swath through the Charlotte Forest, disrupting an approximately one-mile stretch of unfragmented,productive forest and pristine wetlands. Although the Commission ultimately issued a certificate to Constitution, it incorporated several conditions from the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) to protect the Charlotte Forest. These conditions require that Constitution (1) utilize trenchless direct pipe construction between MP 90.67 and 90.89; (b) reduce the 100-foot temporary construction to 75 feet and (c) reduce the permanent right-of-way from 50 feet to 30 feet. See Attachment 1. Moreover, since the issuance of the Commission Order, Constitution has been exploring alternatives that would avoid Charlotte Forest entirely.

II. The NED Project

On December 14, 2014, just two weeks after the Commission granted a certificate for the Constitution Pipeline, my clients received a letter from Tennessee Gas (Attachment 2) informing them that the NED Project would cross their property. Given that the Commission has already acknowledged the need to protect the unique ecological characteristics of the Charlotte Forest through the conditions described above, my clients believed that similar conditions would likewise apply to Tennessee Gas and preclude it from crossing through the Charlotte Forest.

My clients sought to bring this matter to Tennessee Gas' attention. Tennessee Gas' December 14 letter invited impacted landowners to contact Tennessee Gas with concerns and included contact information for a land agent named James Hartman. Accordingly, on March 31,2015, I wrote Tennessee Gas to advise that it could not cross my clients' property.

To date, neither my clients nor I have received a response from Tennessee Gas. Thus, we seek to bring this

matter to the Commission's attention during the pre-filing phase to provide Tennessee Gas with sufficient opportunity to re-route the pipeline around the Charlotte Forest. Should Tennessee Gas fail to do so, we ask the Commission to direct Tennessee Gas to adopt an alternative route that would avoid the Charlotte Forest. Please contact me at 202-297-6100 if you have any further questions regarding this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

Carolyn Elefant

ATTACHMENT 1:  
LETTER TO TGL  
FROM HSK TRUST

LAW OFFICES OF CAROLYN ELEFANT PLLC  
2200 Pennsylvania Avenue N.W. 4th Flr. E. Washington D.C. 20037 I 202-297-6100  
Carolyn@carolynelefant.com I LawOfficesofCarolynElefant.com I licensed in MD, DC, NY  
BYEMAIL

Mr. James Hartman  
Tennessee Gas Pipeline LLC  
nedinfo@kindermorgan.com  
cc: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

March 31,2015

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline LLC  
Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline PF14-22

Dear Mr. Hartman,

I represent the Henry S. Kernan Trust The Kernan Family Trust which owns a 924-acre tract of land, Parcel NY-DE-226 known as the Charlotte Forest, located in the Town of Harpersfield, Delaware County, New York.

On behalf of my clients, I write to advise that Tennessee Gas Pipeline's (TFP) proposed location for the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline (NED) in the Charlotte Forest -parallel to the right-of-way for the recently approved Constitution Pipeline as currently proposed, or anywhere else on the property - is prohibited by the terms of the certificate issued by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) for the Constitution Pipeline.' Moreover, contrary to TGP's Draft Environmental Resource Report 1, submitted March 13, 2015, the NED pipeline route does not take into account information in the Final Explanation follows.

#### I. Background

The Charlotte Forest has been managed for public benefit by the Kernan family for more than sixty-five years, the Charlotte Forest has served as a model of exemplary forest management by the New York Department of Environmental Conservation in six feature articles published in the NYSDEC's own "The Conservationist" magazine between 1956 and 2006.

In June 2013, the Constitution Pipeline filed an application at FERC for a certificate for a 124-mile pipeline extending from Susquehanna County, Pennsylvania, to a proposed interconnection with Iroquois Gas Transmission System, L.P. (Iroquois) in Schoharie County, New York. The Constitution Pipeline would cut through a swath through the Charlotte Forest, and irreparably disrupt an approximately one-mile stretch of unfragmented, productive forest and pristine wetlands. Throughout the certificate proceeding, the Trust filed numerous comments documenting the damage to the Charlotte Forest, including reports by a renowned invasive species expert and several environmental consultants.

II. The Commission FEIS and Certificate FERC's Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the project, although deficient in many respects} took additional steps to avoid impacts to sensitive forested

wetlands. Specifically, the FEIS directed Constitution to (a) utilize trenchless direct pipe construction between MP 90.67 and 90.89; (b) reduce the 100-foot temporary construction to 75 feet and (c) reduce the permanent right-of-way from 50 feet to 30 feet.” The Commission certificate for the Constitution Pipeline, issued December 2,2014, subsequently incorporated the construction requirements of the FEIS, Table 3.4.3-1 in Condition 11,

Appendix:

Constitution shall adopt the minor route variations and/or modifications of construction methods for the tracts specified in table 3.4.3-1 and as depicted in Appendix H-2A of the EIS (except for TRK# 478.0 as identified in Constitution’s October 31,2014 filing). As part of its Implementation Plan, Constitution shall file with the Secretary updated alignment sheets incorporating these minor route variations and modifications of construction methods prior to the start of construction. (section 3.4.3.2)5

In addition to the FERC Certificate, the New York Department of Environment and Conservation (NYDEC) is still reviewing Constitution’s application for a Section 401 water quality certificate. As part of that process, NYDEC asked Constitution to evaluate the possibility of using HDD to cross under the entire property - a condition that the Trust endorsed during the Section 401 proceedings.

### III. TGP’s NED Proposal Is Precluded By the Terms of the FERC Certificate

Although NED has been touted as co-located, review of TGP’s Draft Environmental Resource Report 1 (March 2015) shows that co-location does not mean location within an existing right-of-way, but rather, adjacent or parallel to an existing right-of-way. Resource Report 1, n. 2. The alignment sheets accompanying the Environmental Reports confirm that the TGP-s 36-inch pipeline will run alongside the Constitution Pipeline easement. The alignment sheets also show that in addition, the TGP will need anywhere between 25 and 50 feet on either side of the 50foot easement as temporary workspace.

All told, the NED pipeline will disturb anywhere between 75 and 125 feet of property - on top of what is already impacted by the Constitution Pipeline because TGP does not expect any overlap. The TGP alignment sheets substantially downplay these impacts since they do not depict the easement area to be used by the Constitution Pipeline.

TGP represents that it developed its route consistent with the terms of the FEIS for the Constitution Pipeline. Resource Report at n.3. But the terms of the FEIS and the FERC Certificate for the Constitution Pipeline clearly prohibit TGP’s proposed route across the Charlotte Forest. As described above, the FEIS makes clear that Constitution must limit the width of its temporary construction easement to 75 feet, and its permanent right-of-way to 30 feet to further minimize damage to forest and wetlands. Moreover, FERC deemed the portions of the property between MP 90.67 and 90.89 so sensitive that it required Constitution to use trenchless direct pipe method rather than traditional construction techniques.

The FERC order makes clear that any expansion or use of property in the Charlotte Forest other than the limited 30-foot permanent easement approved in the Certificate is, quite simply, off limits. TGP’s proposed route for the NED pipeline across the Charlotte Forest is thus prohibited by the terms of the FERC order. The same is true in the event that Constitution is required to use HDD to cross under the Charlotte Forest, either as a result of the Trust’s pending rehearing request or through conditions requested as part of other permit proceedings.

Accordingly, the Trust asks TGP to reroute its proposed NED pipeline off the Trust property consistent with the requirements of the FERC certificate for the Constitution Pipeline. We have also filed a copy of this letter at FERC.

Respectfully submitted,

Carolyn Elefant

Counsel to Kernan Family Trust

-----  
1 Constitution Pipeline, Order Granting Certificate, 149 FERC 161,199 (December 2,2014) (“Certificate

Order”) online at [http:// www.ferc.gov / CalendarFiles/20141202171918-CP13-499-000.pdf](http://www.ferc.gov/CalendarFiles/20141202171918-CP13-499-000.pdf). Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the Constitution Pipeline.’

2 TGP Draft Environmental Resource Report (March 2015) at n. 2 and n.3.

3 Among other things, the FEIS failed to fully consider viable alternatives for the Constitution Pipeline that would have avoided the Charlotte Forest, such as alternative routes off the property, or a full horizontal direct drill (HDD) alternative that would cross underneath the property, leaving the forest and wetlands intact. The Trust has raised these issues in its request for rehearing of the Certificate Order, filed on January 2, 2015.

4 FEIS for Constitution Pipeline, Docket No. 13-499, Table 3.4.3-1, attached as Exhibit 1.

5 Certificate Order, Appendix, Condition 11, online at [http:// www.ferc.gov / CalendarFiles / 20141202171918-CP13-499-000.pdf](http://www.ferc.gov/CalendarFiles/20141202171918-CP13-499-000.pdf) (emphasis added).

ATTACHMENT 2:  
LETTER FROM TGL  
TO HSK TRUSTEES

Tennessee Gas Pipeline  
Company, L.L.C.  
a Kinder Morgan company

December 11, 2014

Henry S Kernan Land Trust  
317 County Highway 40  
So. Worcester, NY 12197

*{contents too blurry for OCR}*

James Hartman  
Agent-Right of Way SR  
Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC

**20150604-5206(30628039).pdf**

Patricia Martin  
17 Farrar Road  
Rindge, NH 03461

June 1, 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. As a consumer and active member of the Town of Rindge Energy Commission, I appreciate the chance to weigh in on this important discussion regarding our economic and energy future.

My comments are my own opinion. I represent no organization, company, lobbying group, party or special interest. While I belong to many energy related volunteer organizations and may reference published materials from such organizations; I do so without their endorsement.

I have strong ties to New Hampshire as I served in the USAF at Pease AFB and then the NH Air National Guard while I earned a BSEE from UNH in 1978. While an undergraduate at UNH, I organized a summer long project which employed 12 fellow engineering students doing energy audits at 12 colleges in New Hampshire. As a young engineer, I helped innovate the first portable computers; drawing heavily on my studies of energy management and control techniques learned in building efficiency.

I do not claim to be an expert, but I believe my background demonstrates my long term interest in what our energy future will look like and how we can make it not only affordable, but a force that fuels New Hampshire's economic resurgence. While the recent emphasis on increasing pipeline capacity for fracked gas from the Marcellus Shale has certainly amplified my interest and involvement in energy policy in New Hampshire, I have been an active participant in workshops, conferences, etc. on this subject for many years.

1.) Identification of the root cause of high winter wholesale/and or retail electricity prices. I have studied electricity pricing in New England, New York and across the country through the ISO-NE and eia.gov websites. Although all the media focus seems to be on the actual rate paid per KWh, the EIA also tracks average monthly bills across the country. Until recently, New Hampshire has been somewhere in the middle. Tennessee which has among the lowest electricity rates, still winds up in the top ten for average monthly bills because of usage rate. The latest such study for the eia is from 2013.

<http://www.eia.gov/electricity/monthly/update/archive/march2015/>

On April 19, 2015, Maureen Callahan, from USource Energy appeared on WMUR to talk about the April 1 letter from the Business Industry Association to the New England Governors, asking them to support pipeline expansion. Ms. Callahan showed a graphic which depicted pipelines in NY and NE and had flags showing the price of gas at the city gate on February 24, 2015 at the peak of winter demand. In NY the city gate price was less than \$4.00, while in New England; the price was over \$30 per dekatherm. <http://www.wmur.com/money/regional-business-leaderspush-governors-on-energy-crisis/32399874#comment-1977523569>

What Ms. Callahan did not show was the residential rate for electricity that New Yorkers pay is equal to what we pay in New Hampshire according to the latest eia.gov website, [http://www.eia.gov/electricity/monthly/epm\\_table\\_grapher.cfm?t=epmt\\_5\\_6\\_b](http://www.eia.gov/electricity/monthly/epm_table_grapher.cfm?t=epmt_5_6_b)

So are we to conclude that all those pipelines and cheaper gas have not resulted in significantly lower electricity prices for the consumer? Granted there may be a penny or two savings over CT, but what really stands out are the relatively low rates paid in VT and ME which take advantage of significant amounts of renewable energy and energy efficiency.

While the cost of fuel is an important factor in electricity pricing, the Northeast must acknowledge that prevailing wages, rental prices, real estate values and environmental regulations are also important contributors. Expensive infrastructure projects add to higher prices in New England: the scrubber at the Merrimack Coal Plant being the most recent example.

Also worth consideration is the graph from the ISO-NE website which shows the 10 year history of wholesale electricity pricing. Notice that wholesale prices between 2004 and 2009 were, on average, higher than between 2010 and 2015. Even if the narrow spikes in the winters of 2013 and 2014 are taken into account, the average price appears to be approximately equivalent or even slightly less than prices paid in the years between 2004 and 2009.

*{graph omitted here}*

So, what caused the price spikes in 2013 and 2014?

2013 and 2014 were severe winters. I enter the data for our town's energy consumption through the EPA's Portfolio Manager and so keep track of degree day information as well as consumption. 2012 was an unusually mild winter with below average heating degree days. The winters of 2013 and 2014 certainly highlighted the fact that the relationship between fuel consumption and degree day data is not linear. In most cases, a 9% increase in heating degree days resulted in a 30% increase in fuel consumption.

In preparation for the winter of 2013, electricity suppliers were allowed to stockpile oil for the dual use generators, in the event of a gas shortage. ISO-NE Chair Gordon Van Weylie did not support stockpiling of LNG because it would, “send the wrong market signals.”

As an attendee at the 2013 and 2014 NH Energy Summit conferences, I can only conclude that Gordon Van Weylie was responding to the conference message that New England needs pipelines. And, there was a clear preference expressed that those pipelines be constructed/subscribed at ratepayer expense in the form of a tariff on utility bills.

Stockpiling oil was an expensive proposition in 2013 since oil prices were still very high. PSNH did well in the winter of 2013 because it was able to run its more expensive coal and oil burning facilities when other utilities were scrambling for capacity on the open market with natural gas prices soaring. The burden of maintaining the generating infrastructure of PSNH seemed a small price to pay compared with the prices the other utilities had to pay to buy predominantly natural gas fired electricity. This demonstrates the importance of power generation diversity and argues against committing New England to even more dependence on natural gas generated electricity.

In 2014, unfortunate timing in going out to purchase default electric capacity and anticipated shortages of natural gas led to record high electricity rates. Shortly after the NH utilities went out to bid, oil prices fell dramatically, bringing gas and LNG prices with them.

In 2014-2015, the Winter Reliability Program included oil AND LNG stockpiling which led to wholesale electricity prices stabilizing significantly compared with 2013-2014.

There is little doubt that electricity pricing tracks natural gas prices. Since ISO-NE generates over 50% of its electricity with natural gas, this is unsurprising.

Is the root cause of high electricity pricing during 2013-2014 a result of a lack of pipeline capacity? The answer should be, no. Given that PSNH was able to weather the worst of the winter of 2013-2014 due to having diverse fuel sources for generation and the generally lower prices of electricity in States like Washington, Maine and Vermont due to hydro and renewable generation, the root cause of high prices should be tied to a decrease in fuel diversity and an over reliance on a single fuel source.

2.) How the preferred solution results in lower wholesale and/or retail electricity prices for New Hampshire consumers. For example, if the preferred solution requires one or more New Hampshire EDCs to purchase firm pipeline capacity, explain in detail how that purchase translates into lower Load Marginal Prices (LMPs) for wholesale electricity customers and eventually lower electric energy rates for retail customers. Identify all steps in the process and specify all assumptions. New England pipeline capacity currently totals 3.4 bcf/day. A little over 1 bcf/day is used to generate electricity. The problems with pipeline capacity occur during the winter months when non-electric generation usage of natural gas for heating homes and businesses peaks. During those four months, pipeline capacity would have to nearly double to accommodate demand. This leaves nearly 8 months during which an expanded pipeline would only be filled to 25% or less of capacity for electricity generation.

Based on approval of an export license for Pieridae Energy by the Department of Energy in May, up to .8 bcf/day may be headed for export to Canada for conversion to LNG for the international market. Reversal of the flow of the Maritimes pipeline system will allow a path from New England north to Canada. This will also cut off the source of natural gas supplies flowing from Canada to New England. It is difficult to see how encouraging export of natural gas to the world market and cutting off imports from the north will help pricing in New England.

If we were to assume that the problem of a decline in fuel diversity is the root cause of high electricity prices, we might want to look at attacking the problem of peak demand from a number of angles. Begin by attempting to shave the natural gas demand peak in the winter:

A.) Create a regional project/focus on weatherization of buildings which use natural gas for heating. (20% improvement is typical)

B.) Expand opportunities for natural gas consumers to convert from non-condensing to condensing furnaces by providing incentives. (10 to 15% improvement in efficiency is typical) <http://www.eia.gov/today-in-energy/detail.cfm?id=14051>

A 20% reduction in demand during the winter months or approximately 0.68 bcf/day, would obviate the need for additional pipeline capacity and increased reliance on fossil fuels.

Every KWh is not created equal.

The ITRON meters currently being deployed to Eversource customers do not have Demand Response capability. This is unfortunate and serves as yet another example of wasted opportunity for which ratepayers will pick up the tab. Demand Response via Smart Metering is working very well for customers in other parts of the country and even among some of New Hampshire's other utilities. Rewarding customers for load reduction during periods of peak demand is an effective way to avoid overbuilding infrastructure. <http://www.nashuatelegraph.com/news/1037346-469/psnh-meter-readers-wont-have-toleave.html>

Establish a Carbon Tax

In 2011, I learned that the NH Legislature had set a maximum of \$55 per Renewable Energy Credit. I called Jack Ruderman of the PUC to ask how this could possibly work. He explained that if a utility or generator could not purchase RECs for \$55 or less, they paid a fine or Alternative Compliance Payment (ACP) of \$55. This system has made it very difficult for renewable energy suppliers to justify investing in the New Hampshire market. Although that price has worked for some biomass and wind suppliers, it is not competitive for rooftop solar installs.

What happened to letting the "market" determine economic outcomes? NH utilities and electric suppliers have little incentive to purchase renewable energy since the ACP is usually cheaper than picking up RECs on the open market. The evidence of this can be seen in the Earth Day report from ISO-NE, <http://isone-wswire.com/updates/2015/4/22/iso-ne-marks-earth-day-with-an-update-on-energy-efficiency-s.html>

The chart below from the ISO-NE report shows solar installed capacity in New England. Out of 908 MW installed capacity, NH has only 12.7 MW.

*{graph omitted here}*

Although Maine has very little solar, this map from the same ISO-NE report shows that Maine dominates the installed capacity for wind. Again, NH has the least installed capacity with a little over 1% of the total for New England.

*{graph omitted here}*

It is time to develop legislation to allow true virtual net metering in New Hampshire

Although the Group Net Metering legislation championed by Senator Molly Kelly helped open the door to more cost effective, larger solar projects, it is still being worked out and interpreted by the utilities in ways that are frequently unfavorable to participants.

Group Net Metering is not an effective tool for other types of renewable generation such as wind or conventional hydro. The reason for this is that there must be a host meter on a building which serves as the first interconnect or host point. Wind, in particular, does not lend itself well to this restriction.

Utilities need to invest in more Research & Development

The decision by ISO-NE to award the grid reliability project to Eversource for an ac backbone on above ground towers is disappointing. Burying cables and providing dc interconnects such as described in the SeaLink proposal makes much more sense as we experience more severe weather events and attempt to integrate renewable resources into the grid.

The Northern Pass project should bury all cables, not only to preserve views, but to reduce vulnerability to weather events.

As mentioned earlier, the deployment of the ITRON meters to Eversource customers is also extremely dis-

appointing and a missed opportunity to manage peak demand.

Allowing Cape Wind to wither and die is a mistake and I hope ISO-NE and the utilities will do something about bringing it back to life.

With the recent announcement from Tesla and Solar City, our utilities ought to be motivated to study ways that they can add value instead of merely obstructing progress and defending the past.

Again...Every KWh is not created equal

Currently, customers get a reduction in rates for the KWhs consumed above 650 KWh/month. Utilities make more money when they sell more power. The time has come to recognize these two facts drive us in the wrong direction when it comes to bringing down electricity prices and rewarding efficiency.

Customers who consume electricity for non-heating purposes during peak demand or who consume above the monthly average should pay a premium for that electricity.

Utilities should expand their CORE weatherization and energy efficiency programs and consider partnering with solar companies to help low income homeowners finance rooftop or community solar installations with financing and administration.

Currently, NH ranks 21st among the States in terms of Energy Efficiency while ME ranks 16th and the other NE States are all in the top ten. The PUC is to be commended for IR 15-073 which studied the establishment of an EERS for New Hampshire.

{graphic omitted here}

As Governor Hassan said at the 2013 and 2014 NH Energy Summits, “The cheapest KWh is the one you don’t use.” This should be our first plan of attack. Our other New England neighbors should cooperate by helping the LDCs reduce their natural gas demand during the heating season with weatherization and energy efficiency programs.

Conclusion

I won’t attempt to answer questions 3 through 8, except to say that the results of the PUC Docket, IR 15-073, seem reasonable to me in support of energy efficiency improvements. My one suggestion would be to target natural gas heated buildings and make it a regional effort so that the natural gas shortage is addressed first. On the other hand, building pipelines when fuel prices are so volatile and which will further erode fuel diversity when other options such as energy efficiency and demand response exist, seems very shortsighted. Reducing demand for natural gas during the heating season would constructively address the problem with a clear advantage to the consumer through lower bills.

Demand Response rewards on customer electric bills during the summer season would also help reduce peak demand and prevent building an unnecessarily complex and over capacity system. Our investments should be spent on making electricity more affordable by following the example of States that are investing in locally sourced renewable energy and energy efficiency. The states with the lowest energy costs have local sources of fuel and/or hydro. I applaud all the efforts by the PUC, Legislature and ISO-NE to integrate renewable resources into the grid and the market, but think more effort needs to be spent on R&D to solve the problems of storage and intermittency.

There is also the risk that fracking will be banned or, more likely, prices will soar as the yields begin to drop. Then what? Will we be facing another Seabrook, Merrimack Scrubber, or ITRON meter solution?

As a participant in the New Hampshire Leadership Series, I learned how Don Shumway and Richard Crocker were able to close the Laconia State School. It seemed such an overwhelming problem to solve. They used a technique they called “Incremental Opportunism.” By that they meant that you start with each small decision and ask yourself which answer will take you closer to your goal. Over a few years they were able to help create the area agencies by discharging clients to them with their funding as each review came up. They did not attempt to “fix” the Laconia State School, which was a restrictive and inhumane environment for people with disabilities; they emptied it.

I see this pricing issue and the proposed pipeline solution in a similar light to Laconia State School. New Hampshire was the first State in the nation to close its state school. As a citizen of New Hampshire, I am very proud of that. We know that sustainable pricing and climate change are overwhelming problems for us; perhaps applying the principal of incremental opportunism will help us reach another proud moment?

I know you will be scheduling interviews with stakeholders in this process and do not want to add to your burden, but if you think it would be in anyway helpful, I would be happy to appear to speak as a consumer.

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

Sincerely,  
Pat Martin

**20150605-0012(30636933).pdf**

Barbara Zabriskie  
Greg Lovett  
305 Abel Road  
Rindge, NH 03461  
NO PIPELINE!!

May 22, 2015

Governor Margaret Wood Hassan  
Office of the Governor, State House  
107 North Main Street  
Concord, NH 03301

RE: Proposed Pipeline Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Pipeline PLEASE STOP!

BILL: HB208

Dear Governor Hassan:

AGAIN. Thank you for your response to my letter. Although I appreciate your responses, you do not address the issue of the pipeline going THROUGH OUR HOMES AND NEIGHBORHOOD AND RUINING OUR ENVIRONMENT AND LIVES!!

I am disgusted with the fact that you are allowing Kinder Morgan, Tennessee Pipeline and their surveyors to be able to survey land that has no trespassing signs and they can do whatever they want even though they DO NOT HAVE PERMITS FROM FEREC.

I am also disgusted that our OWN GOVERNMENT in New Hampshire is allowing a private company to TAKE AWAY OUR LAND AND HOMES AND DESTROY OUR ENVIRONMENT AND WILDLIFE. If this pipeline is allowed it will destroy our homes, families and will no longer be able to live on our street. WE NEED TO STOP THE PIPELINE AND WE NEED TO PROTECT OUR FAMILIES AND PROPERTIES.

I AM URGING YOU AGAIN TO MAKE STATEMENTS TO FEREC TO STOP THIS PIPELINE AS I WILL CONTINUE TO DO THK SAME.

IF YOU DO NOT STOP THIS I WILL DO EVERTHING NECESSARY TO BESURE YOU DO NOT GET RE-ELECTED INTO OFFICE AND TELL EVERYONE SAME.

Thank you.

Very truly our,  
Barbara Zabriskie

Barbara Zabriskie

305 Abel Road  
Rindge, NH 03461  
NO PIPELINE!

May 22, 2015

President Barack Obama  
Pennsylvania Avenue  
Washington, D.C. 20426

RE: PLEASE STOP THE Proposed Pipeline Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Pipeline in  
RINDGE, NEW HAMPSHIRE

Dear President Obama:

Please be advised that I am an owner of property at 305 Abel Road in Rindge.

I have been urging my senators, Governor, representative and anyone else who will listen to STOP A PIPE-  
LINE PROPOSAL that will destroy our environment, families, homes and wildlife.

I am only send this message to you as I have not been able to get our Representatives in New Hampshire  
to see what is going on in our small town. We do not have any underground anything. We don't even have  
cable and this Pipeline proposal from a PRIVATE company wants to put a very large pipeline right through  
our homes and properties and say they have the right to do it through FERC. I am disgusted with the fact  
that our NH Representatives and our Government is allowing this to happen. I have been sending letters and  
you are my last resort.

This is a major concern and I have been sending letters to no end and I am urging you or anyone on your  
behalf to PLEASE STOP THIS PIPELINE FROM GOING INTO THESE SMALL TOWNS AND RUIN-  
ING OUR LIVES. WE HAVE NO USE FOR IT, WE WILL NOT BENEFIT FROM IT AND IT WILL  
DESTROY EVERYTHING AROUND US.

PLEASE HELP US STOP THE PIPELINE!

Thank you.

Very truly yours

Barbara Zabriskie

FERC: Docket No. PF14-22

**20150605-0016(30636934).pdf**

Hand written card, Jacqueline Geffue, 145 Kenwood Rd, Dracut, MA 01826, opposing

**20150605-0017(30636066).pdf**

Hand written card, Laurel Cameron, 196 Perry Rd, Rindge, NH, opposing

**20150605-0018(30636937).pdf**

Hand written card, Elizabeth P. Stell, 33 Stormview Rd, Lanesboro, MA 01237, opposing

**20150605-0019(30636932).pdf**

Hand written card, William W. Matthiesen, 33 Stormview Rd, Lanesboro, MA 01237, opposing

**20150605-0020(30636941).pdf**

Hand written card, Roberta Clare Carroll, 187 Thornbrush Rd, Dracut, MA 01826, opposing

**Winchester Conservation Commission**

Flora — Fauna — Air — Soil — Water — Recreation

1 Richmond Road — Town Hall — Winchester — Hew Hampshire

May 22, 2015

Mark Gardella  
AECOM Project Manager  
AECOM  
10 Orms Street, Suite 405  
Providence, RI 02904

In response to your information request of Jan. 26, 2015, we are providing information that we have been able to assemble related to the Northeast Energy Direct Project, FERC Docket No. PF14-22. Your request was forwarded to the Winchester Conservation Commission for action by Dean Beaman, chair of the Winchester Planning Board, on May 18, 2015.

This information may be relevant to preparation of revised Resource Reports as requested by the FERC on May 15, 2015.

We have provided an invoice for costs associated with assembling this information along with receipts where appropriate.

Most of the requested information is contained in a map labeled “Pipeline Map Final” that was assembled using GIS and other databases held by the Cheshire County Regional Planning Commission in Keene, NH. We have provided you with an electronic version on the enclosed disc. The most recent route map for the projected pipeline includes about 5.8 miles within the borders of Winchester, NH. We have also provided you with another digital map that shows the steep slopes in Winchester, NH.

The “Pipeline Map Final” has several layers that should provide some of the information you have requested. The map has been drawn to scale, so distances can be measured. We believe your 0.25 mile range of the pipeline route is not sufficient for separation from the pipeline, especially as it pertains to the town aquifer and our drinking water supplies.

The Pipeline Map Final includes:

- ~ the most recently proposed route of the NED pipeline through Winchester;
- ~ the location of the town aquifer;
- ~ aquifer transmissivity rates in feet squared per day for the areas of the town aquifer that have been mapped;
- ~ aquifer protection areas;
- ~ wellhead protection districts, potential wellhead protection areas, and drinking well protection areas (private wells are not included in this map because of privacy concerns in the databases);
- ~ location of public drinking water wells;
- ~ locations of swamps, lakes, wetlands, and reservoirs;
- ~ the locations of parks (Pisgah State Park);
- ~ topography lines to indicate steep slopes;
- ~ the location of rivers and streams with significant aesthetic or conservation features, including the Ashuelot River, Mirey Brook, Roaring Brook, and Snow Brook;
- ~ location of conservation lands, protected parcels, town forests, and lands with conservation easements;

~ routes of existing major power lines through Winchester.

In addition, we have provided copies of the Winchester Aquifer Protection ordinance, our Steep Slopes ordinance, and our Erosion Control ordinance, all of which may be relevant to your route planning.

As requested, we note the following issues with the current route of the pipeline:

~ the route enters Winchester through town-owned land that contains a conservation restriction on the scenic Pauchaug Brook area along with Pulpit Falls and Pulpit Rock and associated trails. The pipeline should avoid such properties.

~ the current route crosses the town aquifer, which is a very sensitive area. This stratified drift aquifer has a high transmissivity rate wherein disturbances on the surface are reflected at depth.

~ the route crosses far too close to the main existing town drinking well, and goes right through the protection area for a planned future well.

~ the route traverses steep slopes that can be seen on the two maps. The excavation may create erosional issues in the town aquifer, as well as other problems.

~ the route crosses some significant prime farmland soils, and locally significant scenic areas, including Pulpit Falls and Snow Brook.

~ the route crosses significant streams feeding into the aquifer and the town drinking water supply, including Roaring Brook and Mirey Brook.

~ the route comes very close to significant trails, particularly in the Pulpit Falls area, and in the Stone Mountain area.

The current route is more than a quarter mile from the town school and its ball field. There are currently no planned residential subdivision developments or planned commercial or industrial developments within a half mile of the proposed route.

Yours,

Gus Ruth, Chair

Winchester Conservation Commission

1 Richmond Road

Winchester, NH 03470

Phone (603) 239-4951 to leave a message.

Email: [iruth97@aol.com](mailto:iruth97@aol.com)

ccs: Michael Lennon, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

**20150605-0035(30631469).pdf**

PROPERTY ACCESS DENIED

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC

1615 Suffield Street

Agawam, MA 01001

Date: 6/1/15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

RE: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

Street Address: 64 Hemlock Drive

Fitzwilliam, NH 03447

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any

other purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Michael Swartz

CC:

FERC

Kimberly D, Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, NE, Room 1A

Washington, DC 20426

**20150605-4013(30630515).pdf**

## **TOWN OF WINCHESTER**

### **NEW HAMPSHIRE**

#### **AQUIFER PROTECTION DISTRICT**

##### **SECTION 1. PURPOSE AND AUTHORITY**

Pursuant to the authority granted under RSA 674:21, the Town of Winchester hereby adopts the following regulation. The purpose of this ordinance is in the interest of public health, safety and general welfare, to protect, preserve and maintain existing and potential groundwater supply and groundwater recharge areas within the known aquifer from adverse development, land use practices or depletion. This is to be accomplished by regulating the uses of land over certain known aquifers and their recharge areas so as to protect them from contamination caused by adverse or incompatible land use practices or developments. The Aquifer Protection District Ordinance is intended to limit the uses of land so designated to those which will not adversely affect water quality by contamination or water quantity by preventing recharge of the aquifer.

##### **SECTION 2. DISTRICT BOUNDARIES**

The boundaries of the Aquifer Protection District shall be the outermost edge of the surficial extent of all aquifer deposits presently designated as stratified drift as supported by information included in the United States Geological survey and shown on the Winchester Aquifer Map titled "Saturated thickness and transmissivity of stratified drift aquifers in the lower Connecticut River Basin, Southwestern New Hampshire". The Aquifer Protection District is a zoning overlay district, which imposes additional requirements and restrictions to those of the underlying base district zoning. In all cases, the more restrictive requirement(s) and permitted uses shall apply. The Aquifer Protection Overlay does not apply to central business district.

Where the bounds, as delineated, are in doubt or in dispute, the burden of proof shall be upon the owner(s) of the land in question to show where they should properly be located. At the request of the owner(s), the Planning Board may engage a professional geologist, hydrologist, or soil scientist to determine more accurately the location and extent of an aquifer area, and may charge the owner(s) for all or part of the cost of the investigation. The delineation can be modified by the Planning Board upon receipt of findings of the detailed on-site survey techniques.

##### **SECTION 3. PROHIBITED USES**

The following uses shall not be permitted in the Aquifer Protection District:

- a. Disposal of solid waste other than brush or stumps.
- b. Outside, unenclosed storage of road salt.
- c. Automotive service and repair shops and car washes, unless they are operated in accordance with New Hampshire State Statutes, rules and regulations governing such uses.
- d. Junk and salvage yards.
- e. Subsurface storage of petroleum and other hazardous materials.
- f. Dumping of snow containing de-icing chemicals brought from outside the Aquifer Protection District.

- g. All on site handling, disposal of liquid or leachable non-human wastes, storage, processing or recycling of hazardous, toxic materials or wastes.
- h. Land uses that will render over 15% of the parcel covered with pavement, roofing or other material impervious to surface water.
- i. Industrial uses which discharge contact, type process waters or other wastes on site.
- j. On site disposal, bulk storage, processing or recycling of toxic or hazardous materials or wastes.
- k. Dry cleaning establishment.
- l. Bulk fuel storage yards.

**SECTION 4: PERMITTED USES**

The following uses will be permitted in this district:

- a. Industrial or commercial uses, in the appropriate District, which discharge no nonhuman wastes on site and human wastes only in an approved septic system.
- b. Industrial uses that discharge only non-contact cooling water.
- c. Activities designed for conservation of soil, water, plants and wildlife.
- d. Recreation- Aquifer areas may be used for recreation purposes such as biking, hunting, cross country skiing, tennis courts, recreation fields, parks and motorized and non-motorized activities which pose no threat of contamination or pollution of the ground water.
- e. Development- low-density, single-family residential development is permitted, subject to special conditions listed under “conditional uses” after detailed on-site investigation determines that sewage disposal systems and access roads can be constructed and maintained without contamination of the ground water nor diminishing the recharge capability of the aquifer.
- f. Maintenance and repair of any existing structure.
- g. Farming, gardening, nursery, forestry, harvesting and grazing provided that fertilizers, herbicides, pesticides, manure, and other leachables are used appropriately and not stored outdoors and are in accordance with the following:
  - 1. The cultivation and harvesting of crops shall be performed in accordance with the recognized soil conservation practices of the Cheshire County Conservation District and agricultural practices as may be regulated by the New Hampshire Department of Agriculture, the Division of Public Health Services of the Department of Health and Human services, and the New Hampshire Water Supply and Pollution Control Division or as recommended by the Cheshire County Extension Service.
  - 2. Forestry or tree farming shall be performed in accordance with recognized management practices in order to protect the aquifer from contamination or damage as may be regulated by the Division of Forests and Lands of the New Hampshire Department of Resources and Economic Development or recommended by the Cheshire County Soil Conservation District.

**SECTION 5: CONDITIONAL USES**

- a. SPECIAL CONDITIONS- The minimum lot size in the aquifer Protection District is five (5) acres, or six (6) acres for a two family dwelling. If serviced by town water and sewer, lot size is as permitted in the underlying district.
- b. PERMIT REQUIRED- All subdivision proposals and other development proposal located within the Aquifer Protection District shall be reviewed by the Planning Board and shall conform to the provisions of this ordinance. No conditional uses shall be conducted within an Aquifer Protection District unless a Permit has been issued by the Planning Board. The Planning Board is hereby authorized to attach any reasonable conditions to such permit regarding construction and operation.

Conditional uses shall include but are not limited to:

- 1. Industrial, commercial, institutional and governmental uses not otherwise prohibited in Section 3

of this Ordinance.

2. Multi-family residential development. Minimum lot size is two acres per unit. If serviced by town water and sewer, lot size is as permitted in the underlying district.
3. Sand and gravel excavation carried out in compliance with the Town of Winchester's Regulations Governing Earth Excavations including any subsequent amendments, provided that such excavation is not carried out within 6 (six) vertical feet of the seasonal high water table and that periodic inspections are made by the Planning Board or its agent to determine compliance.
4. Replacement of underground petroleum product storage tanks.
5. Animal feedlots and manure storage facilities provided the applicant consults and complies with the Cheshire County Conservation District guidelines before such uses are established, and follows their recommendations.

## **SECTION 6: STANDARDS**

All subdivision proposals, proposed new developments and conditional uses within the Aquifer Protection District shall be reviewed by the Planning Board and shall conform to the provisions of this ordinance, the Subdivision Regulations of the Town of Winchester and the following:

- a. All such proposals are consistent with the need to protect the groundwater of the Town of Winchester and adjacent communities.
- b. All surface storm water generated by development is kept on-site and handled in such a manner as to allow the water to infiltrate into the ground before leaving the site.
- c. Streets, roads and parking areas are constructed so that the need for direct application of road salt is minimized for winter safety, and so that run-off from such uses is channeled to avoid or minimize groundwater contamination.
- d. Written approval of the State of New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services, Water Supply and Pollution Control for subdivision and septic systems has been obtained.
- e. The use will not detrimentally affect groundwater quality, nor cause a significant long-term reduction in the volume of water contained in the aquifer or in the storage capacity of the aquifer.
- f. Best Management Practices (BMPs) for Groundwater Protection should be adhered to according to adopted NH Code of Administrative Rules Env-Ws 421, which apply to all contamination sources.

## **SECTION 7: NON-CONFORMING USES**

Non-conforming uses may continue in this district in the form in which they existed prior to the date on which this section was posted and published in this Town, unless they pose a direct hazard to the aquifer or are actually introducing some foreign substances (oils, salts, chemicals, etc.) into the aquifer. In the latter case, the Selectmen shall issue an immediate cease and desist order to stop the offending activity or process from continuing in this district.

## **SECTION 8: SPECIAL EXCEPTION FOR LOTS OF RECORD**

Upon application to the Board of Adjustment, a special exception shall be granted to permit the erection of a structure within the Aquifer Protection District on a nonconforming lot provided that all of the following conditions are found to exist:

- a. The lot upon which an exception is sought was an official lot of record, as recorded with the Cheshire County Registry of Deeds, prior to the date on which this section was posted and published in the Town.
- b. The use for which the exception is sought cannot feasibly be carried out on a portion or portions of the lot which are outside of the aquifer Protection District.
- c. No reasonable and economically viable use of the lot can be made without the exception.
- d. The design and construction of the proposed use will be consistent with the purpose and intent of this section.

## **SECTION 9: APPEALS**

Any person who is aggrieved of an administrative decision made under the provisions of this ordinance may appeal to the Board of Adjustment, under the provisions of RSA 674:33. The Board of Adjustment shall also have the power to authorize such variance from the terms of the ordinance as will not be contrary to the public interest. The Board of Adjustment shall request from the Planning Board and the Conservation Commission an advisory decision before rendering any decision on a request for a variance under this section.

## **SECTION 10: DEFINITION OF TERMS**

a. Animal feedlot: A commercial agricultural establishment consisting of confined feeding areas and related structures for the raising and maintenance of livestock.\*

\*Dictionary definition: feedlot- a large plot of land where livestock, esp. beef cattle, are fed and fattened prior to slaughter

b. Aquifer: A geologic formation, group of formations or part of a formation or deposits of layered sand and gravel capable of yielding quantities of groundwater usable for municipal or private water supplies.

c. Aquifer Protection District: The direct discharge areas of designated aquifer. The aquifer Protection District is shown on the Aquifer Overlay Map derived from the Map titled "Saturated thickness and transmissivity of stratified draft aquifers in the lower Connecticut River Basin Area, Southwestern New Hampshire"

d. Direct Recharge Area: The area immediately overlying the stratified drift aquifer. The boundary of the direct recharge area is the contact between the stratified drift and adjacent till or rockbed.

e. Groundwater: Water in the subsurface zone at or below the water table in which all pore spaces are filled with water.

f. Groundwater Recharge Area: That area from which water is added to the saturated zone by: 1) natural processes such as infiltration or precipitation, or by 2) artificial processes such as induced infiltration.

g. Bulk Fuel Storage Yard: Any location where there are ten thousand (10, 000) gallons or more of fuel intended for storage, transfer or distribution.

h. Hazardous or Toxic materials and waste: Solid, semisolid, liquid or contained gaseous wastes or any combination of these wastes which, because of either quantity, concentration or physical, chemical or infectious characteristics, may cause or contribute to an increase in irreversible or incapacitating reversible illness or pose a present or potential threat to human health or the environment when improperly treated, stored, disposed of or otherwise mismanaged, or that which has been identified as a "toxic or hazardous waste" under federal or state law or administrative rule. Such wastes include, but are not limited to, those which are toxic, corrosive, ignitable, reactive irritants, strong sensitizers, or which generate pressure through decomposition, heat or other means.

i. Leachable Wastes: Waste material, including solid wastes, sludge and agricultural wastes that are capable of releasing contaminants to the surrounding environment.

j. Non-contact Cooling Water: Water which flows through a heat exchanger providing a physical barrier between the water and the process being cooled.

k. Potential High Yield Aquifers: Areas inferred to be underlain by relatively thin saturated sections of medium to very coarse sand or sand and gravel that have medium potential to yield water.

l. Process Water: Wastewater from an industrial process.

m. Saturated Zone: The zone beneath the land surface in which all open spaces are filled with water.

n. Sludge: Residual materials produced by water and sewage treatment processes and domestic septic tanks.

o. Solid Waste: Any discarded or abandoned material including refuse, putrescible material, septage, or sludge, as defined by New Hampshire Solid Waste Rules He-P 1901.03\* Solid waste includes solid, liq-

uid, semi-solid, or contained gaseous waste material resulting from residential, industrial, commercial, mining, and agricultural operations and from community activities.

p. Stratified Drift: Unconsolidated, sorted sediment composed of layers of silt, sand and gravel deposited by meltwater from glaciers.

-----

Town of Winchester

REGULATIONS GOVERNING SEDIMENT AND EROSION CONTROL  
AND STORMWATER MANAGEMENT

**SECTION I: Authority**

These regulations are adopted pursuant to RSA 674:16, Grant of Power, RSA 674:17, Purposes of Zoning Ordinance, and RSA 674:21, Innovative Land Use Controls, Environmental Characteristics.

**SECTION II: Purpose**

The purpose of these regulations is to protect and maintain public health, safety, welfare, and the environment by developing and implementing minimum standards and procedures to control the adverse affects of stormwater runoff during construction or land disturbance and the management of stormwater after construction or land disturbance.

**SECTION III: Applicability**

A. The requirements of these regulations shall apply to all land disturbance, development, or exterior construction activities in any zoning district where one or more of the following conditions are proposed:

- a subdivision of more than three lots,
- an activity that is within a critical area as hereby defined by these regulations,
- the activity involves the construction or reconstruction of a road,

B. Land clearing, grading or other site disturbance involving the removal of vegetation or grading of land that is greater than 20,000 square feet or more of cumulative site activity shall require the use of Best Management Practices for Sediment and Erosion Control (refer to Section X).

**SECTION IV: Definitions**

Best Management Practice (BMP): A proven or accepted practice used to prevent or reduce increases in stormwater volumes or flow; to reduce erosion, sediment, peak storm discharge, and point-source and non-point-source pollution; and to improve stormwater quality.

Critical Areas: Disturbed areas of any size within 75 feet of a stream, intermittent stream, bog, water body, or poorly or very poorly drained soils; disturbed areas of any size within 50 feet of a property line; disturbed areas exceeding 2,000 square feet in highly erodible soils; or disturbed areas containing slope lengths exceeding 25 feet on slopes greater than 15 percent.

Disturbed Area: An area where the natural vegetation has been destroyed or removed leaving the land subject to accelerated erosion.

Drainage Area: A geographic area within which stormwater, sediments, or dissolved materials drain to a particular receiving waterbody or to a particular point along a receiving waterbody.

Erosion: The detachment and movement of soil and rock fragments by water, wind, ice, or gravity.

Grading: Any excavating, grubbing, filling, or stockpiling of earthen material.

**Hay Bale Barrier:** A temporary sediment filter consisting of a row of entrenched and anchored bales of hay or straw used to intercept or detain small amounts of sediment from disturbed areas.

**Impervious Surface:** Land surface with a low capacity for soil infiltration, including but not limited to pavement, roadways, structures, and densely compacted soils.

**Land Disturbance:** Any exposed soil resulting from activities such as clearing of trees or vegetation, grading, blasting, and excavation.

**Low Impact Development:** Alternative designs for the treatment and management of stormwater that minimize disturbance to the natural drainage patterns. They require high standards for water quality discharge and recharge.

**Recharge:** The amount of water from precipitation that infiltrates into the ground.

**Sediment:** Solid material, either mineral or organic, that is in suspension, is transported, or has been moved from its site of origin.

**Sensitive Area:** For the purposes of these regulations, these areas include lakes, ponds, streams, vernal pools, wetlands, floodplains, floodways, intermittent streams, and areas with highly erodible soils.

**Sheet flow:** The natural flow of runoff from a site.

**Stabilization:** The condition in which all soil-disturbing activities at a site have been completed and a uniform, perennial vegetative cover with a density of 85 percent has been established or equivalent stabilization measures (such as mulch) have been utilized on all unpaved areas and areas not covered by permanent structures.

**Stormwater:** Water resulting from precipitation that runs off the land's surface, is transmitted to the subsurface, or is captured by separate storm sewers or other man-made or natural drainage facilities.

**Stormwater runoff:** The water from precipitation that is not absorbed, evaporated, or otherwise stored within the contributing drainage area.

**Swale:** A type of drainage way consisting of a shallow longitudinal depression that carries stormwater. It is commonly heavily vegetated and is normally without flowing water.

**Temporary Seeding:** Establishment of temporary groundcover by seeding and mulching soils that will be exposed for a period greater than one month but less than one year.

**Vegetation:** Live plant material including grass, trees, shrubs, vines, or other forms of plant or fungal growth.

**Water Supply Intake Protection Area:** A designated protection area for a surface water intake used as a source by a public water system.

## **SECTION V: Design Standards**

Adequate provisions must be made to provide for proper site surface drainage so that removal of surface waters will not adversely affect neighboring properties or the public storm drainage system. The following standards and requirements shall be applied for erosion control and stormwater management:

1. A Sediment and Erosion Control Plan must be submitted for all construction activities that meet the applicability requirement as stated in Section III above.
2. Appropriate methods of erosion control and stormwater management shall be selected to accommodate the unique conditions of the site and the surrounding area. Additional protection from stormwater runoff and construction activity is required in critical areas.
3. The area of disturbance shall be limited to 20,000 square feet of contiguous area unless it is associated with the installation of a road. Larger areas of disturbance shall be separated by at least 20 feet of area maintained at natural grade and retaining existing, mature vegetative cover that is at least 20 feet wide at its narrowest point.

4. Stockpile areas shall be protected from stormwater runoff using temporary barriers and stormwater run-on using diversion methods. Stockpile locations and control methods shall be included in the Sediment and Erosion Control Plan.
5. Best management practices set forth in Section X of this regulation and in the N.H. Stormwater Management Manual shall be used in all plans. The use of innovative stormwater management techniques shall be used wherever possible. These include site selection and design, infiltration methods, minimizing site disturbance, maintaining natural flow paths, and disconnecting impervious surfaces.
6. Erosion control measures and stormwater management systems shall be designed and installed to control the post-development peak rate of runoff so that it does not exceed the predevelopment runoff for the 2-year, 10-year, and 25-year/24-hour storm event and for additional storm frequencies. Emergency spillways and down slope drainage facilities shall have capacity to accommodate a 100-year/24-hour storm.
7. Stormwater management systems shall not discharge to surface waters, ground surface, subsurface, or groundwater within the wellhead protection area.
8. The Sediment and Erosion Control Plan and the Stormwater Management Plan shall include the use of low impact development techniques to intercept, treat, and infiltrate runoff from developed areas distributed throughout the site or shall demonstrate why on-site infiltration methods are not possible or adequate for the proposal. Acceptable methods include but are not limited to: bioretention areas, rain gardens, infiltration trenches, dry wells, vegetated swales, vegetated strips, etc.
9. Stream crossings for roads and driveways shall meet the following minimum standards or the New Hampshire Stream Crossing Guidelines as amended, whichever is more restrictive:
  - a. sized for 1.2 times bank-full stream width (i.e. the width of the stream during the 1.5-year flow event),
  - b. open bottom culvert or natural covering bottom,
  - c. round culverts must be imbedded at least 25 percent,
  - d. culverts must have a narrow channel in the bottom running the length of the culvert to support fish and aquatic amphibian passage during-low flow periods,
  - e. culverts and bridges shall be designed to have an openness ratio that is greater than or equal to .25 (calculated in meters) for perennial storms,
  - f. culverts and bridges shall be designed to maintain water velocity at a variety of flows that are comparable to upstream and downstream flows.
10. Erosion control and stormwater management designs shall not conflict with the minimum requirements set forth by the N.H. Department of Environmental Services (NH DES) for Alteration of Terrain or any other environmental permits required.

## **SECTION VI: Application Requirements**

The Sediment and Erosion Control Plan shall contain proper provisions to adequately control accelerated erosion and sedimentation and reduce the danger from stormwater runoff on the proposed site based on the best available technology. The following information shall be submitted with all applications to the Planning Board that include activities as previously defined in Section III, Applicability:

1. Pre-Construction and During-Construction Plan
  - a. Topographic map showing contours at two (2) foot intervals to the property boundaries with surveyors seal and signature.
  - b. Title block including at a minimum; property location, owner, applicant, scale, date of survey, and all revisions

- c. Critical areas relating to natural resources, including wildlife habitat areas if referenced in a natural resource inventory or other natural resource plan
- d. All wetlands, watershed areas, vernal pools, flood plain areas, drainage patterns, or other water bodies
- e. Grading Plan
- f. All structures, roads, utilities, and easements
- g. Stockpiles, materials storage areas, and equipment storage
- h. Stump disposal areas
- i. Areas of soil disturbance and remediation areas
- j. A soil survey of the areas of disturbance
- k. Notes should include:
  - 1. Construction Schedule
  - 2. Inspection Schedule- including responsible party and contact information for emergency repairs
  - 3. Operations and Maintenance Plan

In addition to the Plan, a written report shall be submitted containing the following information:

- a. Drainage report-volume, peak discharge, pre- and post-construction runoff rates
  - b. Construction Sequence, including land disturbance
  - c. Description of all structural and non-structural control methods with detailed drawings
  - d. Description of all vegetative erosion control methods, including seeding specifications
  - e. Inspection Schedule
  - f. Maintenance plan for temporary and permanent erosion control measures, including the contact information of the responsible party for emergency repairs
2. Post-Construction Plan
- a. Drainage Plan
  - b. Detail sheet with drainage specifications
  - c. Engineers seal and signature
  - d. Title block including at a minimum; property location, owner, applicant, scale, date of plan preparation, and all revisions
  - e. Drainage Report with calculations to support Drainage Plan
  - f. Spill Prevention Plan and Emergency Management Plan for spills of potentially hazardous materials
  - g. Maintenance Plan for stormwater management including a note stating that the Maintenance Plan shall be recorded in the Registry of Deeds as a Maintenance Covenant

## **SECTION VII: Plan Review**

1. The Winchester Conservation Commission shall review the Sediment and Erosion Control Plan and supporting documentation within 30 days of receipt of the plan. They shall send a recommendation to the Planning Board including information such as findings, compliance, concerns, etc.
2. Upon completion of the review by the Conservation Commission, the Planning Board shall approve the Sediment and Erosion Control Plan if it complies with these regulations or shall deny it if it is found that it does not comply. Any denial shall contain reasons for such action.

3. The Planning Board may seek technical review of the Sediment and Erosion Control Plan and supporting documentation by a qualified professional consultant if it is determined that additional assistance is necessary. Any fee associated with a technical review shall be at the applicant's expense.

### **SECTION VIII: Prior to site clearing and other activity**

1. The applicant shall supply information to the Planning Board regarding the pre-development and the proposed post-development stormwater runoff rates.
2. All clearing activity that has occurred within the past five years shall be considered in the precleared state for the purpose of these regulations.

### **SECTION IX: On-Site Plan Implementation (Pre- and During Construction)**

It is the responsibility of the applicant/owner to ensure that the work is carried out in compliance with these regulations and the approved plan, including any supporting documentation.

1. It is a requirement of these regulations to conduct a pre-construction meeting between the applicant/owner, site engineer, and site contractor along with appropriate town personnel as deemed necessary to discuss the approved plans, phasing, permitting, bonding and other relevant information regarding the development. This meeting shall be initiated by the applicant and must occur prior to site work.
2. The installation of erosion and sedimentation control devices shall be properly installed in accordance with current installation requirements prior to the commencement of site disturbance, including tree removal.
3. Building Permits shall not be issued until certification has been submitted to the building inspector that the erosion and sedimentation control devices have been properly installed in accordance with the approved plan for the section, or phase that may be affected by construction activity.
4. Critical areas must be clearly flagged and have appropriate construction barriers to ensure protection of these areas. Additional erosion control measures may be required.
5. Inspections shall be made on a weekly basis and within 24 hours of a storm with one-half an inch of rainfall or greater. Inspections should include all silt fences, hay bales, and other erosion control methods as well as stormwater management controls. A record of all inspections, installations, modifications required, storm events, and erosion observed shall be maintained by the site operator or designee. This record shall be available to the town's inspector upon request.
6. Dust shall be kept to a minimum through the use of water and other dust inhibiting agents as approved by the NH DES when necessary.
7. Storm drain inlets and culverts must be protected from sediment during site work and construction. Regular inspections and cleaning are necessary during construction and upon project completion.
8. Measures shall be taken to prepare the site for the winter season. A pre-winter meeting with the applicant, site contractor, site engineer, and town staff shall be held no later than September 15 of each year to discuss the appropriate measures needed to secure the site for winter weather.

### **SECTION X: Best Management Practices (BMP's)**

Best management practices for temporary and permanent erosion control include both structural and non-structural methods. In general, it is a "common sense" approach to maintaining control of the stormwater runoff of a site in order to protect water quality, public safety, and personal property. The use of BMP's through all stages of land development can control and minimize the negative impacts caused by construction activities. The Sediment and Erosion Control Plan should include the use of best management practices to the greatest extent possible.

1. The existing terrain of the land and drainage patterns should be considered during the site selection and design of a project. Alternative design and location of structures should be explored to minimize the effects of site runoff.
2. Site disturbance should be limited to those areas that are necessary and consistent with the plan. Maintain native vegetative cover to the maximum extent possible.
3. Phasing of larger projects should be considered in an effort to keep areas of site disturbance to a minimum.
4. Stock piles should be temporarily seeded if they will not be used within 14 days. Areas where soil disturbance has occurred should also be seeded and mulched within 14 days after disturbance in that area has ended.
5. Structural erosion control measures should be used to prevent stormwater from entering the site and reaching disturbed soils. Methods to consider include but are not limited to: stone check dams, swales, filter socks, rip rap, mulch berms, etc.
6. Prevent sedimentation from being carried off site by using methods such as silt fences, hay bales, erosion control blankets, swales, vegetated strips, sediment traps and basins, etc.
7. Additional erosion control supplies should be stored on the site and accessible in the event of an emergency.
8. Steep slopes must be stabilized during construction and may require terracing. Stormwater should be diverted around these areas or otherwise dispersed if it is not possible to divert due to the site constraints.
9. Construction site entrances should have an adequate tracking pad to prevent mud from being tracked onto roads and catch basins or other roadway drainage areas.
10. Impervious surfaces shall be kept to a minimum to allow for groundwater recharge. Large impervious surfaces should be separated by vegetative strips.
11. Winter stabilization should be completed no later than September 15. All exposed soils, including stock piles, should be seeded and mulched or protected by erosion control blankets. Areas should remain stabilized until permanent measures are put into place.
12. Remove temporary erosion controls structures when area is stabilized by revegetation and permanent stormwater management methods are implemented to allow the stormwater management plan to function properly.

## **SECTION XI: Surety**

A bond may be required to cover the cost of repair or replacement of temporary and permanent erosion control methods. The applicant may submit a written request for a bond reduction upon completion of an area or phase of the development. The request will be considered after an inspection is performed by the town's representative. A total of up to 85% of the original bond may be released upon completion of construction. The remaining 15% will be held in escrow for a period of two years after completion of construction as surety that the stormwater management controls are functioning as intended and have been properly maintained. All temporary erosion control measures shall be removed prior to the release of the final bond.

## **SECTION XII: Responsibility**

The applicant shall bear full responsibility for the installation, construction, and maintenance of erosion control and stormwater management methods contained in the approved plan. He/she shall also notify the Planning Board of any modifications, temporary or permanent, necessary to provide adequate erosion control and stormwater protection and the reason(s) for the change.

**SECTION XIII: Inspections**

The applicant is responsible for conducting weekly inspections of the erosion controls and stormwater management controls and providing a copy of the reports to the Winchester Building Inspector/Code Enforcement Officer and the Land Use Assistant by the 1st day of every month. Inspections must also be conducted within 24 hours after every storm event that produces onehalf an inch or greater of rainfall.

**SECTION XIV: Waivers**

Any portion of these regulations may be waived where, in the opinion of the Planning Board, strict conformity would pose an unnecessary hardship to the applicant, and such waiver would not be contrary to the spirit and intent of the regulations. The applicant shall submit any waiver request in writing and shall include the specific part of these regulations they are seeking to waive and the reason for the request.

**SECTION XV: Administration and Enforcement**

These regulations shall be administered by the Planning Board. The enforcement of these is vested with the Selectmen or the Building Inspector/Code Enforcement Official.

**SECTION XVI: Appeals**

Decisions of the Planning Board are appealable to Superior Court as set forth in RSA 677:15.

**SECTION XVII: Validity**

If any section or part of a section or paragraph of these regulations shall be declared invalid or unconstitutional, it shall not be held to invalidate or impair the validity, force or effect of any other section or part of a section or paragraph of these regulations.

**SECTION XVIII: Amendments**

These regulations may be amended by a majority vote of the Planning Board after at least one public hearing following proper notification.

**SECTION XIX: Effective Date**

These regulations shall take effect on 6-21-10.

-----  
**Steep Slopes Ordinance**

A) Authority, Purpose and Intent

By the authority granted in NH RSA 674:16-17 and RSA 674: 20-21, and in the interest of public health, safety and welfare of individual land owners and the Town of Winchester, and to encourage proper use of natural resources, this ordinance shall guide the use of lands with a slope of 15% or greater.

The intent of this ordinance is to:

Prevent soil erosion and protect the town and abutting property owners from unnecessary expense caused by such erosion.

- 1) Prevent damage to surface waters from erosion, runoff of storm water or effluent from septic systems.
- 2) Preserve tree cover and other vegetative cover.
- 3) Protect wildlife habitat.

- 4) Preserve scenic views.
- 5) Protect unique or unusual natural areas.
- 6) Maintain ecological balance.
- 7) Control dwelling density in sensitive areas of town.

#### B) Definition and Determination

A steep slope is any area with a dominant slope of 15% or greater over horizontal distances of one hundred feet. Slope is determined by dividing vertical distance (rise) by horizontal distance (run). Any dispute over the determination of slope will be resolved at the expense of the applicant by a surveyed plan prepared by a New Hampshire licensed surveyor, septic designer or engineer.

#### C) Development Requirements

Any construction other than for farming or agricultural uses shall meet the following criteria:

- 1) The determination of minimum lot size for creating new lots or new construction on areas with slopes of 15 to 24 % shall exclude 65% of such land.
- 2) The determination of minimum lot size for creating new lots or new construction on areas with slopes of 25% or more shall exclude 80% (75%) of such land. (I don't think wetlands, ponds and vernal pools should be part of the land area.)
- 3) The maximum amount of land required for new construction or the creation of new lots shall not exceed five acres. (Do we need this?)

#### D) Special Exemptions

The Planning Board may exempt existing lots and proposed lots ( this would be a subdivision) from some or all of the above Development Requirements by a majority vote based on the following situations:

- 1) Creation of an easement to protect forest land for sustainable forestry, or conservation of special places, or conservation of land for the benefit of the public good, or protection of prime farmland soil, established agricultural areas such as hay fields or fields for other crops, or preservation of scenic areas, or preservation of views either from or of other areas, or protection of surface waters, or protection of unique places or other similar situation of benefit to the public good. Lot size averaging is permitted at the discretion of the Planning Board. The determination of the appropriateness of such easements and the extent of the elimination of the Development Requirements listed in C) above and /or the extent of lot size averaging shall be at the discretion of the Planning Board. (If the applicant is not satisfied with the Planning Board's determination, the Development Requirements will apply in full or the applicant may seek to develop or build under the terms of the Planned Residential Development Ordinance, even if the request is to construct only one building.)

This might be used as a loophole to the steep slopes ordinance

- 2) The location of any structure to preserve ridge lines or views either from or of other areas, or to preserve views from abutting properties.
- 3) The placement or location of any structure or road to enhance the natural features of the area and/or benefit the public or the neighborhood.

#### E) Special Conditions

If a structure, road or septic system is to be located on a slope of 15% or more, engineering data shall be submitted to show that the proposed construction is of sound engineering design. This engineering data shall show proof of favorable development conditions and a sound erosion control plan both during and following construction. This proof shall be prepared by a surveyor, septic designer, or engineer licensed in New Hampshire. If there is a dispute over the adequacy of construction plans, the Planning Board may require another opinion at the expense of the applicant. The Code Enforcement Officer or Planning Board may request a plan for the reclamation of vegetative cover or restoration of terrain or other natural conditions either

during and/or following construction.

#### F) Enforcement and Penalties

The Town of Winchester or its agents have the right to inspect the premises or construction site at any time during construction to ensure the construction is being carried out according to the approved plans. If construction does not proceed according to those plans, the owner will be liable for a fine up to \$100 per day of the violation, as per RSA 676:17. Minor adjustments are allowed to accommodate previously unknown conditions if the overall effect is the same or an improvement. In the event a violation or deviation from the approved plan is found, a cease and desist order will be issued until the violation is corrected.

#### G) Separability

If any section, clause, provision or portion of these regulations is held to be invalid by any court, such holding shall not invalidate any other section, clause, provision or portion of this article.

#### H) Town Liability

In any case where changes in topography alter the course of water flow, normal or excessive, so as to cause damage to neighboring properties, or those downstream, the owner shall assume all liability for such damage. The town shall be held harmless from any claims for damage resulting from actions of the applicant or applicant's agent regardless of any approvals granted by the town.

How about....

- Access from class 1, class 2, or class 5 public highways
- B,3 steep slope map
- B4, ( as a reference for developers and the Planning Board )
- Do we need D 6 a III 3 ( drainage ways)

-----  
Winchester Conservation Commission  
Flora - Fauna - Air:- Soil- Water - Recreation  
1 Richmond Road - Town Hall- Winchester - New Hampshire

May 22,2015

Mark Gardella  
AECOM Project Manager  
AECOM  
10 Orms Street, Suite 405  
Providence, RI 02904

In response to your information request of Jan. 26, 2015, we are providing information that we have been able to assemble related to the Northeast Energy Direct Project, FERC Docket No. PFI4-22. Your request was forwarded to the Winchester Conservation Commission for action by Dean Beaman, chair of the Winchester Planning Board, on May 18,2015.

This information may be relevant to preparation of revised Resource Reports as requested by the FERC on May 15,2015.

We have provided an invoice for costs associated with assembling this information along with receipts where appropriate.

Most of the requested information is contained in a map labeled "Pipeline Map Final" that was assembled using GIS and other databases held by the Cheshire County Regional Planning Commission in Keene, NH. We have provided you with an electronic version on the enclosed disc. The most recent route map for the projected pipeline includes about 5.8 miles within the borders of Winchester, NH.

We have also provided you with another digital map that shows the steep slopes in Winchester, NH.

The "Pipeline Map Final" has several layers that should provide some of the information you have requested. The map has been drawn to scale, so distances can be measured. We believe your 0.25 mile range of the pipeline route is not sufficient for separation from the pipeline, especially as it pertains to the town aquifer and our drinking water supplies.

The Pipeline Map Final includes:

- the most recently proposed route of the NED pipeline through Winchester;
- the location of the town aquifer;
- aquifer transmissivity rates in feet squared per day for the areas of the town aquifer that have been mapped;
- aquifer protection areas;
- wellhead protection districts, potential wellhead protection areas, and drinking well protection areas (private wells are not included in this map because of privacy concerns in the databases);
- location of public drinking water wells;
- locations of swamps, lakes, wetlands, and reservoirs;
- the locations of parks (Pisgah State Park);
- topography lines to indicate steep slopes;
- the location of rivers and streams with significant aesthetic or conservation features, including the Ashuelot River, Mirey Brook, Roaring Brook, and Snow Brook;
- location of conservation lands, protected parcels, town forests, and lands with conservation easements;
- routes of existing major power lines through Winchester.

In addition, we have provided copies of the Winchester Aquifer Protection ordinance, our Steep Slopes ordinance, and our Erosion Control ordinance, all of which may be relevant to your route planning.

As requested, we note the following issues with the current route of the pipeline:

- the route enters Winchester through town-owned land that contains a conservation restriction on the scenic Pauchaug Brook area along with Pulpit Falls and Pulpit Rock and associated trails. The pipeline should avoid such properties.
- the current route crosses the town aquifer, which is a very sensitive area. This stratified drift aquifer has a high transmissivity rate wherein disturbances on the surface are reflected at depth.
- the route crosses far too close to the main existing town drinking well, and goes right through the protection area for a planned future well.
- the route traverses steep slopes that can be seen on the two maps. The excavation may create erosional issues in the town aquifer, as well as other problems.
- the route crosses some significant prime farmland soils, and locally significant scenic areas, including Pulpit Falls and Snow Brook.
- the route crosses significant streams feeding into the aquifer and the town drinking water supply, including Roaring Brook and Mirey Brook.
- the route comes very close to significant trails, particularly in the Pulpit Falls area, and in the Stone Mountain area.

The current route is more than a quarter mile from the town school and its ball field. There are currently no planned residential subdivision developments or planned commercial or industrial developments within a half mile of the proposed route.

Yours,

Gus Ruth, Chair  
Winchester Conservation Commission

1 Richmond Road  
Winchester, NH 03470  
Phone (603) 239-4951 to leave a message.  
Email: iruth97@aol.com

ccs: Michael Lennon, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

*{maps, not included here}*

**20150605-5064(30628219).pdf**

**Tennessee Gas Pipeline  
Company, L.L.C.**  
a Kinder Morgan company

June 5, 2015

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

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., Docket No. PF14-22-000  
Northeast Energy Direct Project

Supplement to June 1, 2015 Compressor Station Location Filing

Dear Ms. Bose:

On September 15, 2014, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. (“Tennessee”) filed a request to use the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission’s (“Commission” or “FERC”) pre-filing procedures for the proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project (“Project”). By notice issued October 2, 2014, the Commission approved Tennessee’s request to use the pre-filing procedures for the Project. On March 13, 2015, Tennessee filed a first draft of Environmental Resource Reports 1 through 13 (collectively, “Environmental Report”) for the Project. In the March 13, 2015 draft Environmental Report, Tennessee noted that it would file updated information with the Commission regarding the locations of the nine new compressor stations proposed for the Project.

Tennessee filed updated information regarding the specific locations for the nine proposed compressor stations with the Commission on June 1, 2015. Subsequent to the filing on June 1, 2015, Tennessee discovered a typographical error in the letter included with the filing pertaining to the location of the Supply Path Mid Station. A footnote to the compressor station location table in the letter included in the June 1, 2015 filing incorrectly stated that Tennessee would be acquiring an adjacent property for the Supply Path Mid Station in the Town of Otsego, Otsego County, New York. Tennessee clarifies that the adjacent property to be acquired for the Supply Path Mid Station (which will serve as a buffer property for the new station) is located in the Town of Otego, Otsego County, New York, as reflected on the aerial map that was included with Tennessee’s June 1, 2015 filing. The Supply Path Mid Station will be constructed on property to be acquired in the Town of Franklin, Delaware County, New York.

Tennessee also provides with this filing updated aerial mapping for the nine new compressor station locations that includes the corresponding pipeline segment letter and milepost information for these compressor station locations. A discussion of Tennessee’s use of pipeline segment letters and mileposts for the proposed Project facilities may be found in Section 1.1.2 of the draft Resource Report 1 included as part of the March 13, 2015 draft Environmental Report. Tennessee notes that the aerial mapping submitted with the June 1, 2015 filing included a line circling each proposed compressor station location (designated as a “half mile buffer”). For clarification purposes, Tennessee has revised the legend on the attached aerial mapping to indicate that this line represents the “1/2 Mile FERC Identification Boundary”. Tennessee has identified

landowners within 1/2 mile of the properties where the new compressor stations will be located, per the Commission's landowner notification regulations, and is providing those identified landowners with notice of this filing, as well as the June 1, 2015 filing. Those landowners have been included in the landowner list that was submitted with the June 1, 2015 filing (filed as privileged and confidential).

In accordance with the Commission's filing requirements, Tennessee is submitting the original of this filing to the Commission's Secretary. Tennessee is also providing two complete copies of this filing to the Office of Energy Projects ("OEP").

Respectfully submitted,

TENNESSEE GAS PIPELINE COMPANY, L.L.C.

By: /s/ J. Curtis Moffatt

J. Curtis Moffatt

Deputy General Counsel and Vice President Gas

Group Legal

Enclosures

cc: Mr. Rich McGuire; Mr. Michael McGehee; Mr. Eric Tomasi (Commission)

**20150608-0035(30636938).pdf**

May 30, 2015

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, NE, R

Washington, DC 20426

To Whom It May Concern:

I am contacting you to communicate my concerns about the proposed compressor station site to be built by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company on a 70 acre at 7550 Whites Creek Pike between Norgan Road and Greenbrier Road In Joelton TN.

I am very concerned about the effects of toxic emission on my family. There are three people in my family. My son is 17. He has asthma and has always had allergy problems. My wife has sinus problems and allergy problems as well. Neither of them have a good Immune system. My son has dyslexia and already struggles. I have heard that the effects of sound and vibration of noise pollution can interfere with his daily activities. We already have him in weekly counseling. This would not be beneficial to us.

We live only a mile or so from the proposed site. We are very concerned about any type of explosion. We have seen this happen before and have seen casualties. It would also disrupt the water sources and put toxins in our land...potentially hurting our crops and animals and then hurting the people in our community.

This compressor station does NOT need to be built here in Joelton.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey L. Fitts

7520 Gerald Drive

Joelton, TN 37050

515435-3120

Jefflts3@comcast.net

**20150608-0054(30636909).pdf**

Mr. & Mrs. Donald W. Dodd

477 Falls Bridge Road

P.O. Box 477

Blue Hill, Maine 04614

Attn: Kimberly D. Bose  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A  
Re: Docket 1PF14-22

June 3, 2015

Dear Ms. Bose,

In 2008 we purchased a piece of land in Warwick, Massachusetts in hopes of building our last home. It was to be built with the future in mind, using solar, geothermal and energy smart infrastructure. We chose Warwick because of location and rural character. We began preparations for the sale of our current home when economic disaster struck in the form of a major recession. While we waited for a return to normalcy, the second disaster struck in the form of an impending pipeline that would essentially change the face of Massachusetts for the foreseeable future.

We began looking into the problem of a pipeline and found maps describing gas and oil infrastructure in the nation. We also found news articles and videos of environmental disasters, explosions, fires, toxic waste, and water laced with deadly chemicals being forced into the bowels of the earth to extract yet more poison. Current aging pipelines waste large volumes of fuel from leaks and breaks not repaired or monitored. We were traumatized by the scope and magnitude of harm already done.

This area of Massachusetts, Berkshire, Hampshire and Franklin Counties, is some of the last pristine environment left in Massachusetts. The good people of these counties do not deserve to be asked to tolerate a project that will depress property values, endanger their water and pollute the air they breath, not to mention noise and light pollution from 80,000 h.p. compressors running 24/7/365 and releasing gas from time to time. There is also the danger of fire, explosions and possible arson, all for the economic benefit of a few out of state investors who will pump this gas to Canada to sell on the world market. The ratepayers will be asked to pay for the construction of the project and disasters when they occur

Two facts stand out in all of this. One is that if we continue promoting fossil fuel consumption there will be no future for this nation or the world. The second is the only choice, if we put our entire effort into clean, renewable energy, we might have a future for ourselves and those who inherit this earth.

The choice that you will have to make is to either approve the construction of the new pipeline, or to deny approval. If it is approved, we will not build that wonderful house of the future. We will end our days watching the degradation of a once profoundly beautiful and bountiful place. Which legacy will you choose?

Most sincerely,

Donald and Beverly Dodd

Cc

**20150608-0058(30636939).pdf**

270 Thomas Road  
Rindge, New Hampshire 03461  
(603) 899 - 5445

The Honorable Kimberly D. Bosse,  
Secretary,  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street —Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

May 25, 2015

RE:Kinder-Morgan “Northeast Energy Direct Project Pipeline”

Docket PF 14-22

Dear Secretary Bosse:

I write in opposition to the proposed “Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline” Project, Docket PF 14-22, sought by Kinder-Morgan Corporation. This letter addresses the destruction of a valuable historical site here in Rindge, New Hampshire which would be lost if Kinder-Morgan pipeline is granted eminent domain to construct an unfeasible pipeline here in New Hampshire.

I am speaking about the historical “Rindge Smallpox Cemetery” which is directly in the pipeline’s path, and which would be plowed up and destroyed. New Hampshire is a small, densely-populated state with a rich Pre-Revolutionary history, and we cherish our role and place in New England history and the founding of this country. The goal of F.E.R.C. must be to encourage necessary energy infrastructure while protecting and preserving the affected communities and their historical sites. This balance would not be met if Kinder-Morgan is allowed to proceed.

The Kinder-Morgan pipeline is only a transmission pipeline which will have no economic or energy benefit to communities such as Rindge, NH whose lands, historical artifacts and sites will be destroyed iff E.R.C. grants permission in Docket PF 14-22.

Please deny the proposal of Kinder-Morgan Energy, Docket PF 14-22, because granting permission will result in senseless destruction of historical sites and private property without any showing of national economic or energy need.

Sincerely yours,

Mark E. Wolterbeek

**20150608-0061(30636940).pdf**

**TOWN OF LITCHFIELD  
PLANNING BOARD  
2 LIBERTYWAY SUITE 1  
LITCHFIELD, NH 03052-2345**

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

May 19, 2015

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C, Docket ffPF14-22-000

Dear Secretary Bose:

We, the Litchfield Planning Board, are writing to share concerns our board has with Kinder Morgan’s North-east Energy Direct (NED) project which is proposed to pass through our town. The New Hampshire portion of this route includes approximately 2.68 miles in Litchfield. passing west to east through the entire width of town.

The current route passes through some of our town’s most densely populated residential neighborhoods, which are comprised of several subdivisions with numerous cul-de-sacs which would be isolated in the event of any emergency with the proposed pipeline during construction or operation. In total, approximately 46 residential properties within 300 feet, or 202 with 1/4 mile, would be affected. Prior to the proposed pipeline, the Planning Board has allowed for the development of additional residential lots in the immediate area of the proposed pipeline route. While some of these developments are incomplete, there has been active and substantial development and building taking place. When these subdivisions are complete, they will have created additional cul-de-sacs which would be isolated in the event of any emergency with the proposed pipeline during construction or operation.

The proposed pipeline route will cross both of the north – south thoroughfares in our town, The Charles Bancroft Highway (NH Rt, 3A) and Albuquerque Ave essentially cutting our town in half in the event of any emergency with the pipeline; isolating residents in the south half of town from the fire and police services which are located to the north of the proposed pipeline route. The costs associated with developing

additional public safety capacity to service areas south of the pipeline would be significant and would need to be factored into any consideration of the proposed cost for the project.

Other portions of town through which the pipeline is proposed to run include areas protected by conservation easements and environmental protection zoning. Specifically, the areas along the Wren Street corridor are within a stratified drift aquifer area which is protected from development by Uitchfield Zoning Ordinance 51250, 'Aquifer Protection District, as are parcels owned by the Town of Litchfield in the neighboring vicinity. Wells from this aquifer are used by the Pennichuck Water Works, Inc. to provide municipal drinking water to the communities of Litchfield and Hudson, NH. Several private residential wells also draw from this aquifer. The entire proposed pipeline route runs through the Nesenkeag Brook Watershed. Further, the town has looked at potential impacts to properties within a quarter mile of the proposed pipeline. As proposed, the pipeline may further impact four properties with conservation significance, seven Natural Heritage sites, the Nesenkeag Archeological site, and the Brickyard Recreational Park. The New Hampshire Fish and Game Department, in their 2010 Wildlife Action Plan, identified large areas through which the proposed pipeline would run as "Highest Ranked Habitat in NH for protection and preservation.

In the Planning Board's efforts to make public utilities more widely available, we find that no meaningful commitment has been made to expand residential and commercial natural gas service as a result of this pipeline. While our local provider, Liberty Utilities, has committed to use a small portion of the massive capacity of the Kinder Morgan project, their actual agreement does not appear to represent any expansion of capacity in our community. Small portions of Litchfield have natural gas service from Liberty Utilities and others have sought our Board's assistance to expand that service. However, Liberty's lack of commitment on this, tied to the new capacity of this proposed pipeline, does not demonstrate any benefit of the Kinder Morgan pipeline to Litchfield. Further, we have heard testimony at a recent hearing that a major commercial/industrial user in town has had requests from Liberty to reduce usage during peak demand periods. Yet, no specific guaranty has been made that the enhanced regional capacity proposed by the Kinder Morgan pipeline will address this business disruption.

Based on the concerns stated above, we believe this project is not appropriate for our community, and further would be detrimental to the goals and objectives stated within the Master Plan of our Town. At our meeting of April 21, 2015, the Planning Board voted to oppose this project.

This project has generated a significant amount of interest and concern in our community. We urge careful consideration of these issues and further request that one of the required scoping meetings be held in Litchfield so that our residents' concerns can be heard directly.

Tom Young, Chair

Michael Caprioglio, Vice Chair

Russell Blanchette

Michael Croteau

Jason Guerrette

Matthew Shoemaker

Steven Perry, Ex-Officio

cc:

Senator Jeanne Shaheen

Senator Kelly Ayotte

Representative Ann Kuster

Governor Maggie Hassan

State Senator Donna Soucy

State Representative Frank Byron

State Representative Ralph Boehm

State Representative Andre Martel

State Representative Mark Proulx

**20150608-0122(30644724).pdf**

Hand written card, no name, asking about moving pipeline location in Dracut, MA

**20150608-0123(30644800).pdf**

Hand written card, James M. & Patricia W. Hamilton, 101 Heather Rd, Dracut, MA, 01826, denying access to their property

**20150608-0124(30644830).pdf**

Hand written card, Amande Moulton, 25 Greemont Ave, Dracut, MA, 01826, opposing

**20150608-0126(30644832).pdf**

Hand written card, Mark E. Wolterbeek, Rindge Historical Society, 270 Thomas Road, Rindge, NH 03461, opposing

**20150608-0127(30644833).pdf**

Hand written card, Karen Miller, 161 Ashburnham Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, opposing

**20150608-0129(30644835).pdf**

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: May 1, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access

As the owner of the property located at:

270 Thomas Road, , Rindge, NH 03461

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Georgia J. Wolterbeek, Owner

**20150608-5006(30628917).txt**

Jim Parison, New Ipswich, NH.

Re: Docket for Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. Northeast Energy Direct Project under PF14-22

Pre-filing dated Sept. 15, 2014

I am writing to oppose the Northeast Energy Direct Project (NED) under PF14-22 as currently proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. Division of Kinder Morgan (KM).

There is no argument that a gas supply bottle neck is causing high energy costs in New England. The region needs additional capacity if only to replace generation from retiring coal, oil and nuclear facilities.

That said, the region does not need all the proposed projects to meet our capacity shortfall. My simple calculations from ISO-NE projections show that we need to replace about 4,000 MW in the next 3-4 years. That could be met with 1B cu-ft/day of additional gas pipeline capacity.

In reviewing all the various project proposals to expand gas pipeline capacity the KM NED project as proposed is the most disruptive. Furthermore, by the time the KM supply comes on line, the Spectra Access Northeast expansion will already have met the 1B cu-ft/day need.

For that reason, KM should not be allowed to take property by eminent domain because the project will not be needed for the public good by the time it is built. KM should instead bargain with property owners for

this merchant project.

If, however, the FERC finds the KM NED project is needed, I ask that you approve the original route through Massachusetts. This MA direct route was abandoned by KM because it was opposed by powerful political lobbies who complained about green field development and Article 97 violations. The FERC has the power and authority to overrule State law. The NH detour (current plan of record) is longer, disrupts more green space, goes through more difficult terrain with more elevation change, and will create far greater environmental damage and negative visual impacts to local residents. Because the KM NED project has no shared rights of way with PSNH, it must clear a wide swath of trees that now serve as a hedge along the electric transmission corridor. Property owners will now suddenly have in their front and back yards power lines that were hidden from view for generations. "Collocation" with power lines as proposed by KM is really a ruse to avoid political opposition to green field development in MA when this is, in fact, green field development in NH.

Please reject the NH alternative route as proposed in the KM NED pre-filing. In your investigations I am available to discuss the many negative impacts this project will impose on my constituents.

Thank-you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Jim Parison - NH State Representative  
House Science, Technology and Energy Committee  
40 Old Rindge Road  
New Ipswich, NH 03071  
603-878-5001  
508-468-8431(c)

**20150608-5007(30628919).txt**

deborah pomerleau, parker, CO.

Please do not approve this project. New Ipswich should not have a compressor station. Mason should not have 2 pipelines. Every town should have a scoping meeting. This is wrong in so many ways. Please do not approve this docket.

**20150608-5020(30628945).txt**

John Boccalini, Richmond, NH.

The Voluntary Energy and Environmental Committee strongly discourages the current proposed pipeline or any other proposal, that encourages the transport of any product that is reliant on high pressure fracking or has need for high volume compression stations, because it supports:

1. the creation of extreme amount of toxic contamination and emissions at the extraction sites and compression stations put the health and well being of our fellow citizens at risk.
2. the fracking of the earth shows the possibility of a link to increased seismic activity.
3. the extraction and use of fossil fuels perpetuate the production of greenhouse gasses and stifle the expansion of the development of cleaner and greener energy production.
4. the true cost of the product is cloaked with tariffs, usage fees that are not regulated and therefore the cost is ultimately unknown.

This resolution statement was added to the warrant and was overwhelmingly accepted at the Richmond NH, Town Meeting 2015 so that can be used for guidance on any pipeline actions or decisions of any Municipal Boards or Committees.

**20150608-5033(30628971).txt**

John Belliveau, New Ipswich, NH.

I am requesting that a scoping meeting for this project be held for the Town of New Ipswich, NH.

Also, it's my understand that Kinder Morgan has an obligation to notify everyone within a 1/2 mile of the proposed compressor station. This has not been done.

**20150608-5079(30629355).txt**

Patricia S Bailey, Nassau, NY.

TO: FERC;

I am opposed to the gas pipeline and compressor station proposed by The Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company (a subsidiary of Kinder Morgan) for the Towns of Schodack and Nassau in New York State, and I ask that you deny any additional permits for the construction of either. This 36" pipe and compressor station are ill-conceived and a threat to the people living in the area of the Towns of Schodack and Nassau in New York State.

The pipeline is not needed in the US now nor will it be in the future as any fuel "shortfall" has occurred only during the coldest winters and fixing leaks in current pipes would eliminate future possible shortages.

Also:

- It represents a danger to the people living nearby (at least 50 homes in the immediate area) as safety standards are lower in rural areas and Kinder Morgan has a poor safety record.
- Our first responders are not equipped to handle any possible explosions and/or fires.
- It will have a detrimental effect on property values.
- It is not for the benefit of residents of Schodack, Nassau, New York or even the Northeast – but is intended for sale overseas.
- No private company should be able to use the power of Eminent Domain for private benefit and with no benefit to US citizens.
- This may damage our environment, both air and ground water (drinking water), not only as a result of construction, but also due to likely leaks and/or explosions and resulting fires. We all rely on wells for our safe drinking water.
- This is a rural community of retired people and middle class homes and this will damage the peaceful nature of the area.
- This fossil fuel is already being replaced by solar and wind and soon even more efficient power generating cells.
- Once built the pipe will forever be in the ground as they do not plan to remove it even when it is no longer needed – probably within 15 years.

Thank you for your attention.

Patricia S. Bailey

**20150608-5118(30629727).txt**

Howard and Glenna Henderson, Nassau, NY.

FERC:

We are strongly opposed to the construction of the gas pipeline and compressor station proposed by Kinder Morgan and its subsidiary Tennessee Gas in the residential, rural towns of Schodack and Nassau in New York State. Please deny any further permits for this project to protect our family's lives, health, and security. The risks of this project far outweigh the benefits. Going further with this proposal will be disastrous to our environment and residential properties.

- There is a dangerous threat of catastrophic explosions and serious injury.
- Our community's emergency response facilities are not equipped to deal with such catastrophes.
- There is a high risk of serious health issues due to leaching of noxious chemicals into our air and drinking water through intentional venting at the compressor stations, leaks in the pipeline, and during blasting and construction.
- This project poses a negative impact on our property values, eligibility for mortgages, and insurance requirements due to proximity.
- Contamination of our residential wells, soil, and our precious aquifer is likely.
- Drying up of our wells is also likely due to blasting and construction.
- There are inadequate federal and state regulations and resources to ensure pipeline safety and maintenance.
- Since the gas is being sold to foreign markets; the pipeline is of no benefit to our town, state, or even country.
- The power of Eminent Domain should not be used for the profits of a private company and with no benefit to US citizens.
- There is a concerted effort to move towards green energy.

Thank you for your attention.

Howard and Glenna Henderson

**20150608-5210(30630459).txt**

Sebastian E Barthelmess, New Ipswich, NH.

We are land owners at 424 Temple Road New Ipswich, NH. We were just notified at our town Selectman's meeting last week that Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company LLC (Kinder Morgan) has proposed a compressor station on land abutting ours and directly across the street and uphill from us in the watershed district of New Ipswich. As of today we have received no formal communication from our town, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, or Kinder Morgan regarding this. We ask you deny this application and pre-filing as it presents a serious health risk and property devaluation to our home and surrounding community. We need more time to research and understand our rights and implications of this proposed pipeline and compressor station. Thank you.

**20150608-5224(30630510).txt**

Dawn Elliott, New Ipswich, NH.

I live in the town of New Ipswich and it was just made public last week as to the location of the compressor station being located in New Ipswich at the Skinny Cat site. This site had been used extensively in the past for target shooting and the land is contaminated with lead, with in the 1/2 mile buffer zone there are 2 tributaries that feed the local drinking water reservoir and there is an elementary school located within this zone. I am deeply concerned over the repercussions of this plan and implore you to provide the people of New Ipswich more time to look into these new issues more thoroughly. 3 months is not enough time to research the potential impacts of this site choice.

Thank you.

Dawn Elliott

**20150609-0008(30630819).pdf**

Dear Chairman Bay,

Kinder Morgan and its subsidiary, Tennessee Gas, propose to build and operate a 36-inch pipeline to daily transport up to 2.2 billion cubic feet of hydro-~ gas at a pressure of up to 1,460 pounds per square inch from

Pennsylvania, through New York to Dracula Massachusetts. The proposal is called the Northeast Energy Duct pipeline project (NED).

Please stop the NED in order to protect my family and community. I oppose this project for the following reasons:

- No New York resident or business will receive any of the gas and almost all it will be exported to foreign markets.
- Pipeline safety standards in rural areas are much lower than in urban areas effectively treating constituents who live in the rural communities along the proposed route as ????
- The governing federal and state regulations and the resources used to ensure pipeline safety during construction, operation and decommissioning phases are woefully inadequate
- Only landowners whose lands abut the pipeline route may receive compensation. All other residents along the pipeline corridor, even those within the “incineration zone,” involuntarily assume the risk of death, personal injury and property damage in the event of a rupture, but receive no compensation for their risk and diminished quality of life.
- Property values along the pipeline will decline and reduce assessed valuations. This in turn will increase the tax burden on properties further away from the pipeline.
- The federal process for approving and constructing gas pipelines violates the requirement of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) to minimize cumulative negative impacts that federal agency decisions may have on public safety, health and the environment.
- No single federal entity oversees the NED project as a whole. For example, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission decides whether and where the NED is built. The Department of State decides whether the gas may be exported. The Pipeline and Hazardous Material Safety Administration governs pipeline safety. Each agency pleads lack of jurisdiction to review or do anything that could be seen as meddling within the jurisdiction of another agency. Oversight of the project is therefore segmented, hindering the public’s ability to effectively review and voice concerns about the NED.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Nancy A. Brandt  
16 Pikes Pond Rd, Averill Park, NY 12018

**20150609-0037(30636936).pdf**

Hand written card, E. Susan Taylor, 25 Greenmont Ave, Dracut, MA 01826, opposing

**20150609-0038(30636931).pdf**

Hand written card, Jackie Carr, 135 Fox Ave, Dracut, MA 01826, opposing

**20150609-0039(30636946).pdf**

Hand written card, David Hayes, 366 River Rd, Deerfield, MA 01342, opposing

**20150609-0040(30636942).pdf**

Hand written card, John Cohen, 86 Island Rd, Northampton, MA 01060, opposing

**20150609-0041(30636930).pdf**

Hand written card, Craig L. Cahill, 214 Shufelt Road, Nassau, New York, 12123, opposing

**20150609-0042(30636944).pdf**

WOOLMAN HILL

Quaker Retreat Center  
Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Docket No. PF 14-22-000  
Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LL.C.(TGP),  
Proposed Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project

June 3, 2015

Dear Kimberly D. Bose,

Please see the enclosed statement from the Woolman Hill board and executive director, expressing our concern about and opposition to the proposed Tennessee Gas pipeline.

Thank you for engaging on this critical issue.

Sincerely,

Margaret Cooley  
Executive Director, Woodman Hill  
(margaret@woolmanhill.org)

cc: Kinder Morgan

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company  
Department of Public Utilities  
Department of Environmental Protection  
Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs  
Attorney General Maura Healey  
Governor Charlie Baker  
Senator Stan Rosenberg  
Senator Ed Markey  
Senator Hixabeth Warren  
Congressman Jim McGovern  
Representative Stephen Kulik  
Town of Deerfield Board of Selectmen and Board of Health  
Franklin Regional Council of Governments  
Local media

107 Keets Road Deerfield MA 01342 + 413-774-3431 + info@woolmanhill.org  
www.woolmanhill.org

WOOLMAN HILL Quaker Retreat Center  
107 Keets Road Deerfield MA 01342 + 413 774 3431 + info@woolmanhill.or + www.woolmanhill.org

#### PUBLIC STATEMENT REGARDING THE PROPOSED TENNESSEE GAS PIPELINE

Woolman Hill Quaker Retreat Center joins with other communities, organizations and individuals in opposing the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline through Massachusetts and New Hampshire, and in calling for sustainable solutions to energy needs.

In addition to significant concerns about the danger, environmental destruction and economic disturbance posed to Woolman Hill by the pipeline's proposed route across our land, we carry equal concern for the broader implications of the pipeline's regional and global impact. We have found no convincing demonstration that New England needs more natural gas pipelines for its residences, businesses, or power plants. Tennessee Gas has not denied that a large portion of the gas to be transported through the pipeline is for export

to foreign countries. Exporting fossil fuels depletes a finite resource, increases dependence on non-renewable energy elsewhere in the world, and contributes to greenhouse gas emission levels that further damage the earth's ability to support humans and other animal and plant species.

Situated on the beautiful Pocumtuck ridge in Deerfield, our retreat center emphasizes the importance of reflection, spiritual engagement, and connection with nature. We provide simple, comfortable facilities for individual retreats, group gatherings and programs that nurture spiritual growth and foster peace-making, simplicity, integrity, social responsibility, and stewardship of the earth.

Beginning with Antoinette Spruyt's original Intent to further the causes of peace and brotherhood in the world" when she donated the land to Quakers in the 1950s, Woolman Hill has a long history of advocacy and witness in western Massachusetts and beyond. It has served as the locus of peace conferences, international youth work camps, an alternative school, the birthplace of Traprock Peace Center, the home of war tax resisters Juanita and Wally Nelson, and innumerable spiritual and social justice events.

Consistent with Woolman Hill's purpose and its Quaker values, we encourage lifestyles that reduce dependence on non-renewable energy and minimize negative impact on the earth. We acknowledge that fossil fuel and climate change issues are very complex, and that at this point in time we ourselves are often complicit with unsustainable environmental, economic, political and social systems. We grieve the destruction of the natural environment and of vulnerable communities due to human disregard for finite resources and for the sanctity of all life. We support the development of renewable and responsible energy systems which will allow us all to live sustainably on the earth.

We call on our local, state, and federal officials to promote sustainable energy use, to protect public conservation land and private landowners' rights, and to make decisions that prioritize the well-being of our natural environment and of future generations. We call on them to prevent the construction of the Tennessee Gas pipeline. May we all work towards furthering the causes of peace and kinship in the world.

Woolman Hill Board of Directors:

Virginia Barker, Boscswen NH  
Peter Bishop, Leeds MA  
Ksthryn Cranford, Lsconia NH  
Maureen Flannery, Northsmp-ton MA  
Patricia Higgins, Hanover NH  
Dan Hoskins, Brattleboro VT  
Tom Hoskins, Patsey VT

Mary Link, Ashfield MA  
Greg Melville, Cheshire CT  
Suzette Snow-Cobb, Turners Falls MA  
Pat Wallace, Contoocook NH  
Honor Woodrow, Jamaica Plain MA  
Woolmsn Hill Executive Director  
Margaret Cooley, Greenfield MA

May 2015

**20150609-0045(30636951).pdf**

June 1, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20216

Re: Docket No. PF14-22 TGP Northeast Energy Direct

I am a farmer's daughter and rent our family's land along the Connecticut River in Franklin County in Massachusetts to potato farmers. I have a great respect for land here because it is some of the most fertile in the country. It must be preserved for agricultural use only. For this reason I am writing to urge the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to review equally all the aspects of the proposed Tennessee Gas Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline.

It is being promoted by Kinder Morgan as vitally necessary to satisfy the growing need for energy in the Northeast and without it there will be shortages and rising gas prices. But the reality is that the proposed 2.2

billion cubic feet of natural gas per day flowing through the pipeline is more than twice what can be used by all 6 New England states during non-peak requirements in the winter. The pipeline is being built so that natural gas can be exported to make huge profits for a private company. And in the process pristine land under state conservation protection will be destroyed forever.

I wish you would come to this area and see for yourself its beauty and agricultural prosperity. I'd like you to see the number of houses with roof top solar panels. We are a leading area for renewable energy. With more efforts in conservation and energy efficiency improvements in homes and businesses and repairing leaks in existing pipelines, our energy needs will be amply satisfied. 'There is no need for a new 36" gas pipeline.

There is no need to destroy countless acres of land and contaminate millions and millions of gallons of potable water to extract natural gas by fracking in the Marcellus Shales. There is no need to increase the infrastructure to promote more burning of fossil fuels which is exponentially adding to global warming. There is no need for ordinary, hard working people to bear the threat to their health and safety and destruction of their environment just to allow a multi-billion dollar corporation to make more profits.

It is not in the public interest to approve the Northeast Direct Pipeline. It is not in the public interest to approve this project solely because it will enhance the Gross Domestic Product. The public does not need it; the public does not want it. Our public interest will be better served when big business ends its obsession with profits over people and their planet.

Respectfully yours,

Irene Grybko Clancy  
5 Meadow Wood Drive  
South Deerfield, MA 01373

**20150609-0050(30636943).pdf**

PROPERTY ACCESS DENIED

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: June 5, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

RE: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:  
Street Address: 100 Granite Hill Road  
Town & Zip: Richmond, NH 03470  
Map & Lot Number(s) (if known): 408/57

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Elizabeth W. McCarthy  
Richard McCarthy

cc:

FERC

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

**20150609-0064(30636918).pdf**

PROPERTY ACCESS DENIED

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: 6/3/15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

RE: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:  
Street Address: 230 Bullock Road  
Town & Zip: Richmond, NH  
Map & Lot Number(s) (if known):

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Paul S. ?

Kathleen D. Kilventon

cc:

FERC

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

**20150609-0065(30636947).pdf**

PROPERTY ACCESS DENIED

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: June 4, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

RE: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:  
Street Address: 22 Fatima Way  
Town & Zip: Richmond, NH 03470  
Map & Lot Number(s) (if known):

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Eleonore D. Villarrubia

cc:

FERC

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

**20150609-0066(30636935).pdf**

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Date: 6/3/15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access

As the owner of the property located at:

Rockwood Pond Rd, Fitzwilliam, NH 03447  
Map 38, Lot 01

i am aenyng permission to the Rennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land to perform surveys, or for any other purpose. Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Mark Irvings

Society for the Preservation of Rockwood Pond  
617-734-3278

**20150609-5008(30630656).txt**

Donna Butler, Pelham, NH.  
89 Deer Hill Circle  
Pelham, NH 03076

June 8, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LLC Docket #PF14-22-000  
Northeast Energy Direct (NED)

Dear Ms. Bose,

We are Pelham, NH residents writing to express our strong opposition to Docket #PF14-22-000.

Pelham, NH is a family-oriented community of just over 13,000 residents and rich in natural resources and wildlife. Our home is located within the Potential Impact Radius, the 1000' on either side of the pipeline at risk of incineration in the event of a malfunction. Given the frequency with which pipeline errors occur combined with Kinder Morgan's poor safety record, NED poses safety and security issues for residents living in close proximity to it. The proposed route would directly and adversely impact 338 of Pelham, NH's properties:

- \* Number of Properties with Proposed Pipeline Easements - 57
- \* Number of Properties within 400' Temporary Easement/Construction Zone - 61
- \* Number of Total Properties in Potential Impact Radius (PIR) - 338

As a whole, the State of New Hampshire is predominantly rural with little infrastructure for gas distribution.

Pelham, NH has hosted two natural gas pipelines for decades and does not benefit from the distribution of natural gas. Pelham, NH does not need a third pipeline.

We respectfully urge FERC to consider our concerns with regard to NED and its direct impact on our sense of safety and community. Our request is twofold. Please consider:

- (1) Holding a Scoping Session in Pelham, NH
- (2) Denying Kinder Morgan's permit for NED

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Timothy & Donna Butler

**20150609-5012(30630684).pdf**

As you may be aware, Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas identified compressor station sites for the NED. The site in Rensselaer County is in the Town of Nassau on Clarks Chapel Road. The parcel of land that is under contract for the compressor station is 142 acres. This parcel of land is across the street from my home. The compressor station itself will have 90,000 horsepower to transmit the fracked gas along the pipeline route. This facility will be operating 24/7, with around-the-clock lighting and noise and routine venting of methane along with the toxins associated with fracking. Many residents in the area, including myself, are concerned about the combined poisons in the environment from the superfund site and the proposed pipeline and compressor station's emissions. About 35 children live close to this site. We are devastated by this news.

My husband and I built our home on 5 acres of his family's property on Nassau Averill Park Road. His parents still live in their home they built on their 45 acres. This land has been in the family for 75+ years. My sister-in-law built her home on the property as well. She currently lives there with her husband and three children, and we have two children we are raising in our home directly across the street from the proposed site. We built our home on this property as we wanted to raise our children in a rural area, not thinking we would ever be subjected to something like this. Not only will our property value diminish, the toxins that will be in the air are enough to cause grave concern. Recently, we decided to start raising chickens and had also planned on starting a small farm. Those plans are now on hold.

I have enclosed pictures of our home that we built and our children we are raising directly across the street from this proposed toxic site. We need you to help us stop the NED. New York State needs to step up and help protect its citizens. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Jenny Shoemaker  
1216 Nassau Averill Park Road  
Nassau, NY 12123

*{Photos, not included here}*

**20150609-5026(30630860).txt**

Donna Butler, Pelham, NH.  
89 Deer Hill Circle  
Pelham, NH 03076  
June 9, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LLC Docket #PF-14-22-000  
Northeast Energy Direct (NED)

Dear Ms. Bose,

After months of reviewing the NED project, attending meetings and speaking with experts in their respective fields, we firmly believe that NED is not needed for NH or New England. We are Pelham, NH residents writing to express our strong opposition to Docket #PF-14-22.

Kinder Morgan falsely and repeatedly claims that NED will reduce the cost of electricity to New Hampshire residents. Yet NED has not secured a single contract with any gas-fired power plants that generate electricity to NH. Until and unless a gas-fired power plant signs a contract with NED, Kinder Morgan's claim that NED will bring cheaper electricity to our area is false and misleading.

We respectfully urge FERC to consider our concerns with regard to NED and its direct impact on our sense of safety and community. Our request is twofold. Please consider:

- (1) Holding a scoping session in Pelham, NH
- (2) Denying Kinder Morgan's permit for NED

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Timothy & Donna Butler

**20150609-5028(30630868).txt**

Kaela Law, Pelham, NH.

Writing to request a scoping hearing in the town of Pelham, NH.

Pelham has two existing Tennessee Gas Pipelines running roughly 5 miles through town. A third and much larger pipeline through a new 5 mile long corridor through town is not "low impact" or "minimal impact." (there are zero residential or commercial natural gas customers here)

Pelham has a Compressor Station near the Pelham / Windham town line on the north side of town. A second compressor station near the Pelham / Dracut town line on the south side is not "low impact" or "minimal impact" to Pelham. Furthermore regarding compressor stations, we were told during Kinder Morgan's brief presentation to our Board of Selectmen that the pre-existing compressor station is rarely in use. Please evaluate whether or not the existing Tennessee Gas Pipeline or Kinder Morgan (previously owned by El Paso Corp) natural gas infrastructure is under-utilized. Because that compressor station 270B in Pelham already exists, we would like you to ensure it is being fully utilized to compress the gas to get the appropriate volume up the Concord Lateral transmission into New Hampshire before you consider giving approval to an expensive project for new pipeline infrastructure in our state.

We request that a scoping hearing or scoping meeting is scheduled in the town of Pelham, NH to assess the total impact in our town that new and existing infrastructure would amount to when they are looked at as a whole.

Thank you,

Kaela Law  
Pelham, NH

**20150609-5045(30631258).txt**

Frank Barrus, New Ipswich, NH.

We in New Ipswich have only just received official word about the placement of the compressor station in New Ipswich in June, 2015. Many people are just now finding out about this for the first time, and are just now receiving notices that they are within the 1/2 mile "buffer zone". More time is needed for our town and those in the affected region to understand and evaluate the impacts of this, but from my understanding, the schedule is still the same as when the pipeline was routed through Mass instead of NH. The schedule needs to be extended.

**20150609-5046(30631262).txt**

Frank Barrus, New Ipswich, NH.

We have been told that the noise from the compressor station will be reduced to 55 decibels by the fence-line. However this sound level is far too loud for the rural area of New Ipswich, where there is no highway or other constant background noise, and on winter nights the background sound level outside is often no more than 20 decibels. 55 decibels of compressor station noise will ruin the peace and quiet of this region. There is already a noise ordinance that was used previously to stop windmills that required the sound to be less than 28 decibels. How will the compressor station comply with keeping its sound level low enough to meet the 28 decibel requirement? Will the company invest in extensive soundproofing around the building? Simply using distance and trees to reduce the noise will not suffice, since there is an unobstructed view of the compressor station from various mountaintop hiking trails where many people currently enjoy the peace and quiet.

**20150609-5069(30631359).pdf**

**Town of Amherst, New Hampshire**  
P.O. Box 960, 2 Main Street  
Amherst, NH 03031  
1.(603).673.6041 | www.amherstnh.gov

June 8, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Comments of the Town of Amherst, NH

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. (“TGP”)  
Docket No. PF14-22-000: Proposed Northeast Energy Direct (“NED”)

Dear Ms. Bose:

The Board of Selectmen of the Town of Amherst, as the duly elected officials responsible for directing the municipal government of the Town of Amherst in line with the wishes of its residents, and as specifically empowered by Warrant Article of the voters to intervene on behalf of the Town and residents in all issues pertaining to the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) natural gas transmission pipeline project (FERC Docket No. PF14-22) proposed by Kinder Morgan (KM), continue to have strong reservations about the project. We have already documented some of the sources of our concern in previous letters to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC).

An additional area of concern stems from the widespread citation of “regional energy needs” as the main justification for the pipeline under the FERC process. We believe discussion has reached a critical point where confusion over the true status of the State of New Hampshire’s energy needs — or rather, the lack thereof — requires clarification to our residents before this process continues any further under such justification, especially since Amherst homeowners are already concerned about negative economic impacts on property values as speculation about the proposed pipeline increases.

Clarifying whether any New Hampshire energy needs will be served by the pipeline is not only common courtesy to the people of the State of New Hampshire, but a legal requirement, since the authority under which the FERC is allowed to permit companies like KM to potentially seize private land through the exercise of eminent domain rests on a determination of “public necessity” for the energy under discussion<sup>1</sup>. In light of this, we the representatives of the residents of Amherst call on the FERC, our elected state leaders and federal representatives to conduct an objective and transparent, data-based analysis of the real power needs of the residents of New Hampshire. To put it simply, we do not believe that the proposed NED pipe-

line serves the energy needs of either New Hampshire or of the Town of Amherst. In support of this assertion we present the following information gathered by our Pipeline Task Force.

### **I. The Phony Problem: New Hampshire's Power Generation Need**

One of the most disconcerting factors that this proposed pipeline project has brought to light is that New Hampshire's power needs and related issues are rarely, if ever, discussed directly or taken into consideration. There is much talk in the media and from KM about "New England's power needs"<sup>2 3</sup>, and how the NED gas pipeline will meet those power needs if adequately subscribed<sup>4</sup>. These assertions stem from the comments of a "non-governmental organization" created in 2008 - the New England State Committee on Electricity (NESCOE) - that actually has taken quasi-governmental authority (while rejecting any form of governmental accountability to the people) in making regional power decisions<sup>5</sup>. In the NESCOE context, there is much talk about Massachusetts'<sup>6</sup> and Maine's power needs<sup>7</sup>; however, New Hampshire's own power situation is little discussed.

Even though New Hampshire is a smaller state, the Constitution does not distinguish between small states' rights and large states' rights. New Hampshire is a distinct entity with its own economy, not simply a convenient pass through corridor for power demands from other states. And in fact, New Hampshire has a very different power situation than its neighbors. Specifically:

1. New Hampshire is a net exporter of power<sup>8</sup>. New Hampshire's net generation of power in 2012 (the most recent EIA data available) was 19,264 thousand megawatthours, while direct use was only 10,870 thousand megawatthours. This means that New Hampshire had one of the highest ratios of power generation versus consumption in the country in 2012<sup>9</sup> (tied for 5th with Alabama).

{table, not included here}

2. New Hampshire already has 63 operating power plants. This means that we as a state host the noise, byproducts, safety risk, and road traffic that goes into maintaining these plants' generation capacity. We as a citizenry absorb the many impacts of their location in our state<sup>10</sup>.

While we understand that power needs in the region cannot be completely separated from New Hampshire, and that those regional needs may impact power prices within New Hampshire, we think it important to note that New Hampshire itself does not have the same power dynamic as its neighboring power customers. We are, in fact, more than self-sufficient in power production to the point where we export a substantial share of the power we produce to other economies.

This distinction is important because the issue of power generation — from whatever source the power is generated — gets conflated and confused with power consumption as part of the justification for this pipeline. There are many, many steps between the laying of a natural gas transmission pipeline and the consumption of, and payment for, electricity by ratepayers, and each step has its own impact on retail electricity prices. Yet the justification for this project never includes a realistic look at New Hampshire's power needs, or lack thereof.

The simplistic view is that if there is more gas available in New Hampshire, more power will be produced here, thereby driving down costs. This view is refuted by New Hampshire's current status as a major power exporter, one which (somehow) also has very high electric rates. In New Hampshire, there is no need for even more power generation, nor is there any proof — which is required by FERC from an applicant — that this pipeline will result in reduced retail power prices, as has been claimed.

### **II. The Real Problem: New Hampshire's Power Distribution Needs**

As most New Hampshire residents know first-hand, while New Hampshire supplies sufficient power and transmission for its own citizenry and then some, it does have a distribution problem for all power types — including electrical and natural gas. Older power lines, heavily forested land, high winds, ice storms, and heavy snow totals make distribution a challenging issue for electrical power. The environmental conditions are also part of why so few natural gas laterals feed off current transmission pipelines in New Hampshire.

As New Hampshire seeks to grow its industry and business environment, expanded and reliable distribution

systems for electricity and for natural gas will be critical. Thus, the immediate public need for energy infrastructure improvement in New Hampshire lies in improved power distribution not in greater regional power generation. The proposed NED Pipeline is therefore a distraction from the capital improvements we need in our state to improve the reliability of energy supply for our residents and industries.

Addressing the state's actual need, the New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission's recent (17-April-2015) Order of Notice (IR 15-124) "Investigation into Approaches to Ameliorate Adverse Wholesale Electricity Market Conditions in New Hampshire"<sup>11</sup> is a welcome analysis. It reflects a reasoned recognition of the fact that regulatory and financial practices have as much impact on price as supply and demand metrics.

When the point about the need for better power distribution rather than more generation is raised with KM, as it has been in many town meetings throughout New Hampshire, their answer is that any distribution (be it electrical or natural gas) is the problem and responsibility of the private utilities that own those lines or laterals, or the citizens using that power. However, their answer is directly undercut by the fact that the KM natural gas transmission pipeline proposal would potentially be funded using a tariff proposed by NESCOE as an addition to New Hampshire (and other states') residents' power bills to meet part of their demonstration of financial backing for this pipeline project<sup>12</sup>.

We want to emphasize this point again: a quasi-governmental interstate organization has proposed to tax electric rate payers in six states to demonstrate to the federal government part of the proof of financial backing for the private enterprise that is the NED gas transmission pipeline in order to justify the potential seizure of private property.

We understand that the status of this proposed tariff is still uncertain, but that fact in and of itself is part of the problem. The FERC Statement of Policy, issued September 15, 1999 (Docket No. PL99-3-000) makes clear that pipeline expansions — which this one appears to be — are not to be subsidized by existing customers to ensure that there is a market need for the project. We

realize that electric ratepayers are not direct customers of transmission pipeline companies — they are more like customers of the customers of the customers of transmission pipeline companies. However, quoting the FERC Statement of Policy referenced above: "If one of the benefits of a proposed project would be to lower gas or electric rates for consumers, then the applicant's market study would need to explain the basis for that projection. Vague assertions of public benefits will not be sufficient."

FERC's policy is that existing customers can have their rates increased if the pipeline can demonstrate that the expansion will improve service to existing customers. As we noted, the distribution service problem faced by New Hampshire retail electric customers is clearly not addressed. A NESCOE tariff<sup>13</sup> — proposed or confirmed — undermines the whole purpose of the pre-filing and need determination phase of the NED project by giving New Hampshire residents the impression that even if needs analysis falls through later in the NED pipeline review process, an ex-post-facto tariff hangs out there ready to 'rescue' it.

Any method of raising the cost of electricity to retail customers in order to subsidize the proposed NED pipeline — whether through a tariff or through some even more creative and less transparent scheme — in hypothetical service to the goal of "lower gas or electric rates for customers" would appear to be a direct violation of the FERC's Statement of Policy.

### **III. The Cost / Benefit Analysis is Unclear — At Best**

To summarize: New Hampshire's primary public need is for enhanced electric power and natural gas distribution, not added power generation or gas transmission. Yet the FERC is seriously considering a proposal championed by NESCOE to not only ask New Hampshire residents to potentially fund through tariffs / taxes a private enterprise that provides little to no demonstrated New Hampshire public power benefit, but also to give up portions of their town conservation lands, private property, and chosen life styles to build it. How is this project — in any way — either a public benefit or public necessity for New Hampshire and the residents of the Town of Amherst?

This latter question is not rhetorical. The Town of Amherst would like to better understand from the FERC

how it will calculate the direct benefits to be provided by this project and offset them against the direct costs to individuals in its path. We need this information so that we can educate our elected state officials and federal representatives on whether this pipeline — and specifically its recently proposed rerouting through 71 miles of New Hampshire — is truly justifiable, especially when we know that there are multiple pipeline proposals for the region (not just New Hampshire) under consideration<sup>14</sup>. If there are a number of different proposed pipelines for the New England region before the FERC right now, and the benefits of those lines accrue primarily to Massachusetts, shouldn't

those pipelines be built in Massachusetts — as was originally proposed for the NED Pipeline project? Under what conceivable justification might the FERC and the United States Government impose burdens and taxation on the residents of New Hampshire for the ease, benefit, and convenience of residents of Massachusetts?

We ask these questions on behalf of our residents in order to allow people to make informed decisions, and to provide accurate and useful feedback to the FERC. We appreciate that the FERC process takes into account many different impacts from pipeline construction — and seeks to mitigate those impacts. However, as pipeline proposals are approved and scoped, we are concerned that the initial, fundamental question of public need and public benefit is not being addressed in a way that recognizes quantifiable and qualitative differences within and between the New England member states and how those differences align — or do not — with the many pipeline proposals for the New England region.

Before the proposals you are asked to approve result in disrupting homes, potentially seizing hard-earned property, and fundamentally altering people's lives, we ask you to engage with us and our elected state and federal representatives in an open and honest analysis about the real benefits, the real costs, and how the recipients of the benefits align with those being asked to bear the burden of the costs, from these proposals.

#### **IV. Conclusion: New Hampshire is Not a Utility Conduit for New England**

The information gathered by the Town of Amherst and cited in this letter strongly suggests that the State of New Hampshire's true needs are not accounted for in the NED pipeline proposal. What this data does indicate is that KM, using NESCOE regional data as a cover, proposes to subject New Hampshire property owners to potential losses in value, use, and enjoyment due to easements "negotiated" under the background threat of seizure by eminent domain.

The proposed NED project's original route through Massachusetts — only entering New Hampshire with a lateral pipeline to supply the sole confirmed customer in New Hampshire — was a much better attempt to assign the burdens caused by the project onto the residents of the state that would receive the majority of the benefits of the NED pipeline. The decision to reroute this proposed pipeline through 71 miles of New Hampshire, to the detriment, harm and potential taxation of New Hampshire residents, and for the ease, comfort, and convenience of residents of Massachusetts would, if approved by the FERC, potentially represent an unconstitutional taking from residents of New Hampshire for the benefit of residents of another state. Should FERC condone, encourage, and permit such an abuse of power to take place, we, the governing body of the Town of Amherst, either alone or in

combination with the other New Hampshire towns whose residents would be similarly exploited for the benefit of residents in other states, would feel compelled to seek full constitutional redress, including injunctive relief, to ensure that the U.S. Constitution's provisions related to takings, equal protection, and state's rights (federalism) are properly followed.

We understand that as of yet there has been no formal filing by KM with the FERC for the NED project, and that in the pre-filing phase the route proposed by KM may change. Indeed, it already has. However, if the FERC finds the issues we have raised in this letter to be substantive, then it would seem that the FERC has an obligation to inform KM that its recently proposed route change for the NED pipeline — through 71 miles of New Hampshire — may be neither justifiable, nor legally supportable. In which case, the sooner KM is made aware of this, the sooner it can revise its plans and, when it actually files the application for the NED pipeline, KM can propose a route that more accurately matches the burdens imposed with the potential

benefits to be received.

Respectfully

Dwight Brew, Chairman

John D'Angelo, Vice Chairman

Tom Grella, Selectman

Nate Jensen, Selectman

Reed Panasiti, Selectman

cc: Allen Fore, Kinder Morgan

Lucas Meyer, Kinder Morgan

Maggie Hassan, Governor of New Hampshire

Joseph Foster, Attorney General of New Hampshire

Shawn Jasper, Speaker of the New Hampshire House of Representatives

Chuck Morse, President of the New Hampshire State Senate

Kelly Ayotte, U. S. Senator

Jeanne Shaheen, U. S. Senator

Frank Guinta, U. S. House of Representatives

Ann McLane Custer, U. S. House of Representatives

Amherst Citizen, Manchester Union Leader, Nashua Telegraph

-----

1 The Natural Gas Act of 1938, [http://www.eia.gov/oil\\_gas/natural\\_gas/analysis\\_publications/ngmajorleg/ngact1938.html](http://www.eia.gov/oil_gas/natural_gas/analysis_publications/ngmajorleg/ngact1938.html)

2 Kinder Morgan, January 2015 presentation to the town of Milford, NH; discussion of need begins on slide 13; <http://www.milford.nh.gov/documents/ned-nh-project-presentation>

3 "New England's Energy Brokers Must Look Beyond Natural Gas." The Boston Globe. April 9, 2015. <http://www.bostonglobe.com/opinion/editorials/2015/04/09/new-england-energy-brokers-must-look-beyond-natural-gas/axqBhIpyv0yDBxii0GKoJO/story.html>

4 "Energy Project Finding Support." Bakken. April 19, 2015. <http://bakken.com/news/id/237238/energy-project-finding-support/>

5 New England States Committee on Electricity, [http://www.nescoe.com/uploads/WhatisNESCOE\\_Sept2014.pdf](http://www.nescoe.com/uploads/WhatisNESCOE_Sept2014.pdf)

6 "Anatomy of a Pipeline Decision: A Scheme of Dubious Legality." By Mary Douglas, The Berkshire Edge, October 20, 2014. <http://theberkshireedge.com/anatomy-pipeline-decision-scheme-dubious-legality/>

7 "Eye on Augusta: Legislature Goes Big for Natural Gas." By Andy O'Brien, Maine Free Press, August 1, 2013. <http://www.freepressonline.com/main.asp?Search=1&ArticleID=27545&SectionID=96&SubSectionID=541&S=1>

8 "New Hampshire State Energy Profile." U.S. Energy Information Administration. <http://www.eia.gov/state/print.cfm?sid=NH>

9 "New Hampshire Electricity Profile 2012." U.S. Energy Information Administration. <http://www.eia.gov/electricity/state/NewHampshire/>

10 "New Hampshire Power Plants." <http://www.powerplantjobs.com/ppj.nsf/powerplants1?openform&cat=nh&Count=500> and the Global Energy Observatory Power Plant list at <http://globalenergyobservatory.org/constructNetworkIndex.php>

11 The State of New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission, IR 15-124, April 17, 2015 <http://www.puc.nh.gov/Regulatory/Orders%20of%20Notice/041715onIR15-124%20Elec%20Distribution%20Utils.PDF>

12 "Anatomy of a Pipeline Decision: A Scheme of Dubious Legality." By Mary Douglas, The Berkshire Edge, October 20, 2014. <http://theberkshireedge.com/anatomy-pipeline-decision-scheme-dubious-legality/>

13 <http://www.clf.org/blog/clean-energy-climate-change/breaking-news-nescoe-suspends-vote-tariff-proposals/>

14 "Pipeline Expansion Projects." Northeast Gas Association. March 2015. [http://www.northeastgas.org/pipeline\\_expansion.php](http://www.northeastgas.org/pipeline_expansion.php)

**20150609-5099(30631509).pdf**

**Town of New Ipswich**

661 Turnpike Rd New Ipswich NH 03071  
Board of Selectmen

June 9, 2015

Norman Ray, Chairman  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

Dear Chairman Ray,

We write to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission regarding Kinder Morgan's proposed Northeast Energy Director Project, Docket N. PF-14-22-000. We, the Selectmen of the Town of New Ipswich, NH formally request that you schedule a pre-filing scoping meeting in New Ipswich, NH to allow our residents ample opportunity to express their views on this proposed natural gas pipeline. We recently learned that the siting of the compressor for the project will be located in New Ipswich and it is, therefore, extremely important that our citizens have a chance to ask questions and receive information. Our high school auditorium would be an excellent location to hold a meeting and we will work with you to find a mutually convenient date and time for the meeting.

We believe it is imperative that our residents be afforded the opportunity to engage in open and transparent dialog with FERC about the pipeline, the compressor and proposed route before any final decision is made. Thank you for your prompt attention to this request and we look forward to seeing you in New Ipswich, NH.

Sincerely,

BOARD OF SELECTMEN  
George H. Lawrence, Chairman  
Rebecca M Doyle  
Woody Meiszner

**20150609-5111(30631696).txt**

Christopher Lane D Addegio, Downsville, NY.

I am a 50year Union member who has traveled 1 1/2 2 hours to work for years. We have raised 3 great children. All of whom are all grown u with college diplomas that were built from the sweat of a union laborer. Thank Gog for my union! All of my kids have moved away from this area because there are no good paying jobs.

I've done it, I've seen it.. if you bring energy to our area you will bring local jobs.

Please see this project trough. I APPROVE

**20150609-5112(30631699).txt**

Thomas A Davis, Pinebush, NY.

We need the work. We have trained men ready to work.

**20150609-5113(30631709).txt**

Alan Lee Covart, Calliwory, NY.

We live locally and this will provide great paying jobs for our union members.

I approve this project

**20150609-5115(30631716).txt**

Betty Davis, Pine Bush, NY.

Live local and we need good paying jobs.

**20150609-5126(30631743).txt**

John Finkle, Wurtgboro, NY.  
Live Locally  
Cheaper Energy  
Vital to area economy

**20150609-5165(30632202).docx**

**Tennessee Gas Pipeline**  
Company, L.L.C.  
a Kinder Morgan company

June 9, 2015

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

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., Docket No. PF14-22-000  
Northeast Energy Direct Project  
Monthly Status Report -- May 2015

Dear Ms. Bose:

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. (“Tennessee”) is filing with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (“Commission”) in Docket No. PF14-22-000 its monthly pre-filing status report for the above-referenced project. The enclosed status report covers the period May 1 through May 31, 2015.

In accordance with the Commission’s filing requirements, Tennessee is submitting this filing with the Commission’s Secretary through the eFiling system. Tennessee is also providing complete copies of this filing to the Office of Energy Projects (“OEP”). Any questions concerning the enclosed filing should be addressed to Ms. Jacquelyne Rocan at (713) 420-4544 or to Ms. Shannon Miller at (713) 420-4038.

Respectfully submitted,  
TENNESSEE GAS PIPELINE COMPANY, L.L.C.  
By: /s/ J. Curtis Moffatt  
J. Curtis Moffatt  
Deputy General Counsel and Vice President  
Gas Group Legal

Enclosure

cc: Mr. Michael McGehee  
Mr. Rich McGuire  
Mr. Eric Tomasi

-----  
Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. (“Tennessee”)  
Northeast Energy Direct (“NED”) Project, Docket No. PF14-22-000  
Pre-Filing Monthly Activity Report  
(Reporting Period: May 1, 2015 through May 31, 2015)

Public Outreach

As part of its public outreach process, Tennessee continued to engage in meetings with governmental officials and other groups in the Project area to provide information and respond to questions about the

proposed Project during the reporting period.

Tennessee did not distribute any Project notifications to affected stakeholders or hold town presentations during the reporting period.

## Environmental

Tennessee continued to work toward the preparation of the second draft of Resource Reports 1 through 13 for the anticipated filing of these reports in July 2015.

Tennessee continued field surveys during the reporting period, including cultural, environmental, and threatened and endangered species surveys. Threatened and endangered species protocols continue to be developed, and agency consultations are ongoing.

As of May 31, 2015, biological surveys have taken place over approximately 40.4 miles, or 24 percent, of the NED Project Supply Path component route, and approximately 45.7 miles, or 18 percent, of the NED Project Market Path component route. In addition, cultural resource surveys have taken place over approximately 58.8 miles, or 36 percent, of the NED Project Supply Path component route, and approximately 32.2 miles, or 13 percent, of the NED Project Market Path component route. Table 1 below summarizes the completion status of environmental and cultural surveys.

Table 1: Civil, Biological, and Cultural Surveys Performed

Segment	Survey Area* (miles)	Survey Completed (miles)		
		Civil	Environmental	Cultural
NED Project (Supply Path)	165	C=100.12 D=87.51	40.4	58.8
NED Project (Market Path)	247	C=60.21 D=53.76 C=38.91%	45.7	32.2
% Complete		D=34.28%	21%	22%

\*The total survey area in Table 1 does not correlate precisely to proposed total length of pipeline for the NED Project. This number represents the survey area for the proposed pipeline and for evaluation of route alternatives.

\*\* "C" represents center line staking. "D" represents completed civil detail survey.

## Project Meetings

Tennessee met with the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation on May 13, 2015.

Tennessee met with the New Hampshire Fish and Game Department on May 19, 2015.

Tennessee held a meeting with the Massachusetts Natural Heritage & Endangered Species Program on May 21, 2015.

## Right-of-Way

Tennessee has obtained survey permission for approximately 38% of the NED Project Market Path component area, and approximately 53% of the NED Project Supply Path component area.

Title work is approximately 79% completed for the NED Project Market Path component area and approximately 93% completed for the NED Supply Path component area.

Tennessee has received 191 calls as of the date of this report on the toll-free phone number established for the Project.

Tennessee has continued survey requests in order to conduct bat surveys and access road surveys throughout the Project area.

Tennessee has secured purchase option agreements for 8 of the 9 proposed compressor station locations and is actively working on obtaining the purchase option agreement for the remaining site.

Tennessee continues to work with landowners through the survey permission process to identify concerns and investigate minor deviations and alternative routing.

## Engineering

Tennessee continues to evaluate the proposed route for the Project. Deviations to the proposed route are being reviewed to accommodate construction constraints, and requests from landowners and applicable regulatory agencies. Some examples include requests for routing deviations submitted by Amherst, New Hampshire and Haverhill, Massachusetts.

Tennessee continues to evaluate the proposed major river crossings. Permits for geotechnical cores in the Hudson River (New York) to support the proposed horizontal directional drill (“HDD”) crossing method have been received. The in-water borings were completed at the end of the reporting period. In addition, Tennessee continues to evaluate other potential HDD locations. Once these locations are identified, Tennessee will seek appropriate permits for the geotechnical investigations.

Tennessee has contracted for aerial photography of the proposed primary route for the Project and for several alternative routes discussed in the draft Resource Report 10 submitted on March 13, 2015. Winter weather delayed completion of this work until spring 2015. The primary route was flown to a one-mile corridor during the reporting period, and the imagery is currently being processed. LiDAR information as well as high resolution photography has been acquired and is currently being processed.

Tennessee continued to evaluate locations for proposed compressor stations and meter stations along the proposed route, and continued to schedule site visits. Tennessee intends to provide locations of the proposed compressor station sites in a supplemental filing to the Commission in early June 2015.

Tennessee field engineers continue to identify available access roads, pipe/construction yards, and other areas proposed for use during construction.

Survey activities identifying and staking the centerline along all routes on accessible land resumed during the reporting period. Work being performed includes staking and detail survey along pipeline route and surveys of supporting sites such as contractor yards and compressor stations.

Tennessee continued discussions with the electric utility companies regarding the co-location of proposed Project facilities with existing utility corridors.

Tennessee has conducted an initial analysis based on public imagery to review class locations to allow for siting of mainline valves. Main line valve sites continue to be field-reviewed. Locations will be reevaluated following the final imagery and class determination.

Public hydraulic information has been collected for all stream and river crossings. This information will be utilized to help identify and design the proposed crossing methods, and is also being utilized for proposed hydrostatic test water withdrawal locations.

Tennessee is continuing to develop residential site-specific drawings.

### **20150610-0008(30633033).pdf**

*{appears to belong to a different docket as the situation discussed is in Kentucky}*

*{the issue concerns noise from a Kinder Morgan compressor station and the homeowner’s difficulties in getting sound level measurements taken at his residence rather than behind a shieldin hill. This file, which may be of interest in communities near compressor stations, can be downloaded from FERC’s eLibrary...}*

### **20150610-0009(30633032).pdf**

Re: Opposition to the Fmchxl Gas Pipeline pmposed for Rensselaer County

Dear Commissioner Honorable:

I am a resident of Rensselaer County aad oppose the high-pressme &ached-gas pipeline (known as “the Northeast Energy Direct PmjecP) that Kiuder Morgan Energy and Tennessee Gas are proposing to build along National Grid’s power lines. I hope that you me also opposed to locating the pipeline in our area and will say so publicly. As your constitueat, I urge you to use the power ofyow office to fight against it

My opposition to the hydro-&ached pipeline comes from many concerns, some ofwhich I have listed below:

- 1.) Frecked gss contains many toxic chemicals. Over time, even the soundest of pipes develop leaks.
- 2.) In rural areas such as ours, pipeline safety standards are less stringent than in more densely populated places.
- 3.) The fmst line here is 48 inches. The proposed pipe will be only 36”below ground and is vulnerable to frost heave.
- 4.) The National Transportation and Safety Administration found PHMSA (the agency responsible for pipe-line safety regulation compliance) to be under-funded and under-manned.
- 5.) Ifa~hic event takes place, local fue departments may not be equipped to respond adequately. Insuring their~would require additional training and equipment Small towns don’t have the money for the kind of upgrade requinxk
- 6.) Homeowners who don’t favor the project may be legally forced to grant a right ofway. Adding insult to injury, they will still have to pay taxes on the land where the pipe they opposed lies buried.
- 7.) Being in the so-called “incineration zone,” our insunmm premiums would smely go up.
- 8.) Ifdamage to our infastructmu and beautiful landscape occurs during onstruction, repair (if even possible) will cost.
- 9.) The economic vitality ofour town is at stake. In a degraded, high-risk area, buying a home, business or farm would be unappealing. Property values would ertainly go down.
- 10.) It is my understanding that most ofthe gas carried by the pipeline is to be eqmhd overseas. It will not be used by Americans and will profit only Kinder Morganffennessee Gas and their stuueholders. Why would we cede our hmd, risk our health, sufibr envirommental degradation, or risk catastrophe just to improve the bottom line of an already very rich entity?

If you join us in the fight against the Northeast Energy Dhect Project, it will not go unncgtced.

Nancy A. Brandt  
 16 Pikes Pond  
 Averill Park, NY 12018

**220150610-0021(30636945).pdf**

**PROPERTY ACCESS DENIED**

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
 1615 Suffield Street  
 Agawam, MA 01001

Date: June 3, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

RE: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

Street Address: 265 Morgan Road  
 Town & Zip: Richmond, NH 03470  
 Map & Lot Number(s) (if known):

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Diane M. Wood

cc:  
 FERC

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

**20150610-5005(30632061).txt**

Emily White, East Nassau, NY.

As a property owner in Nassau, I am opposed to the NED pipeline. I have huge concerns for our environment and for the safety of all Nassau residents and for the residents of neighboring towns. The pipeline will particularly impact the Nassau Veterinary Clinic, the Sportsman's Club, the Sufi Retreat Center on China Hill Dr., the Dewey Loeffel Toxic Waste Site on Mead Rd. and the site of the proposed hard rock mine near the intersection of Rtes. 66 and 43. My family and I live close enough to the compressor station that will be built to be affected by the noise and air pollution.

**20150610-5008(30632084).txt**

Anthony Louis Giratore, Dracut, MA.

Due to the environmental and safety concerns associated with the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's proposal I am urging you to strongly consider denying this project to move forward. Their proposed plans have compressor stations located dangerously close to populated neighborhoods, farms, and conservation land, especially in Dracut, MA. These compressor stations emit harmful air and noise pollution as well as have the potential to negatively impact the town water supply. The FERC should be focused on renewable energy projects rather than those projects that deplete our natural resources which we will need to find an alternate solution to in the future anyway.

I moved to Dracut as it is a beautiful community of hard working people that has not been over-commercialized. This compressor station in Dracut, MA per the last page of their FERC filing is being situated in the middle of more than 200 homes in our quiet town, mine being one of them, that would be directly impacted as we are within a half mile radius of the station. I am vehemently opposed to this placement due to the harm it will cause once it is constructed. If the project must move on I urge you to have the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company revisit the selection of the Dracut, MA compressor station site. You will notice it is the most densely populated location out of all of the other proposed locations for compressor stations within their plan. I truly hope this message is read and acted upon as it will be a shame to see the community I live in destroyed by this project.

**20150610-5011(30632090).txt**

deborah pomerleau, Londonderry, NH.

I just moved from Colorado back to my home state of NH. I now live in Londonderry NH and am from Mason NH originally. This pipeline is sooooo very wrong on so many levels. Everyone knows this. Please don't let it happen. At the very least, every town deserves a scoping meeting. Please provide scoping meetings for every town. Please don't let this pipeline happen.

**20150610-5016(30632130).docx**

I am deeply opposed to the Kinder Morgan pipeline they want to run through 17 towns in NH claiming there is an energy crisis. From all my independent and other independent individuals have found is that there is a shortage in MA.

So why is NH spending so much time and energy and personal money to fight this. Because this is wrong. FERC, please don't rubber stamp this. Please come to the NH towns affected and find out for yourself the affect it would have on the towns, not just those who would have it in their backyard.

KM has given incorrect facts, avoided answers. They miscounted a whole neighborhood as one abutter be-

cause they have common land but that neighborhood has 64 houses.

They left out the Outlet malls on their maps. They are filing with inaccurate information and just want this pipeline. They don't care if they run it through town water supply, through a town preserve.

Much of NH is opposed to this and you need to find out why.

Thank you,

Carol DiPirro

**20150610-5054(30632379).txt**

Damn O'Banks, Maybrook, NY.

As a resident of Maybrook NY I support any project that is built union. As a citizen I am highly in support of projects. lessening our foreign dependence on energy sources is paramount to boost our economy as well as providing good paying jobs to Americans.

**20150610-5055(30632389).txt**

David G Gryton Sr, port Cruin, NY.

When hiring union people you hire the best. Trained people in the state especially local 17, they are trained at our training academy.

**20150610-5056(30632398).txt**

Dean Mullings, new burgh, NY.

I support the NED project 100%. This project will be very helpful for our community, creating hundreds of jobs for working families like myself.

Thanks

**20150610-5059(30632413).txt**

Michael E Garrity, New Paltz, NY.

Expanding and upgrading our energy infrastructure is the reason gas is under \$3.00 and work is easier to find in areas that use this logic. The northeast is in need of both the expansion and the upgrade since most of this project will use existing energy corridors.

Good paying jobs for local families and reasonable energy prices are needed and welcomed by those who live in these areas.

**20150610-5064(30632437).txt**

George Wood, white lake, NY.

This is a very worthwhile project. Our area is severely depressed and I'm in great need of a job. Everyone is having a hard time meeting expenses. This would be a good opportunity for good jobs and would help with meeting energy demands.

**20150610-5066(30632441).txt**

Joseph M. Leechow Jr., New Windsor, NY.

I totally support the NED project. The Union will be totally welcomed to all our brothers throughout the Northeast.

**20150610-5067(30632444).txt**

Michael P. Tamburri, Marlboro, NY.

It is very important to local communities to have good paying jobs with trained union help. The local worker gives back to there community with taxes.

**20150610-5068(30632446).txt**

Frank Scaturro, Marlboro, NY.

I am in favor of any project that will enhance the production of domestic energy for our area and at the same time provide much needed job opportunities for our region. The project also will assist with tax revenue that is so important to our area tax base.

**20150610-5070(30632503).txt**

Robert j Dubois, Marlboro, NY.

I'm in favor of this project because it will provide good paying jobs to local labor. It will provide revenue to area businesses. Are union is a highly skilled motivated work force and our economy needs this boost.

**20150610-5081(30632522).txt**

Patrick Galiotta, Newburgh, NY.

I support the NED project, this project will help local people working. Helping our energy demand without foreign oil from the middle east, and using skilled workers spending in our local economy.

**20150610-5084(30632533).txt**

TJ Smith, newburgh, NY.

This will provide good paying jobs to people of who live locally. As a member of local 17 I can attest that you will get highly skilled and trained employees to complete this job.

**20150610-5085(30632536).txt**

Joseph Mastro, Tillson, NY.

This area needs to upgrade our sources of domestic energy and local 17 workers need to be put to work.

**20150610-5086(30632540).txt**

Joseph Jazwinski, Newburgh, NY.

A job like this will help the while region in many ways.

**20150610-5087(30632543).txt**

harry Dannis, Montgomery, NY.

Our union needs the work to keep men working. The men working keep our funds secure for our retired members and it will help the economy and jobs all around.

**20150610-5088(30632545).txt**

Donna Butler, Pelham, NH.

June 10, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street NE, Room 1A

Washington, DC 20426

RE: Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LLC Docket #PF-14-22-000

Northeast Energy Direct (NED)

Dear Ms. Bose,

We are Pelham, NH residents writing to express our strong opposition to Docket #PF-14-22 based on an

absence of need.

Proponents of NED tout the project as a solution to the supposed “energy crisis” plaguing New England. This inaccurate message is being marketed by the industry to garner support. In fact, there is no energy crisis in New England. The New England Power Generators Association report from October, 2014 concludes: “New England is not facing a near-term energy infrastructure crisis. As shown this past winter and through the analyses summarized in this report, New England has adequate energy infrastructure to meet its winter reliability objectives now and into the near future. To the extent any centralized effort is required, it would be to ensure adequate planning and commercial arrangements so as to optimize use of existing infrastructure. Optimizing what New England already has will ensure reliability for the region and provide time for private investors to make long-term infrastructure investment.”

The full report may be viewed here:

[https://www.epsa.org/forms/uploadFiles/2CB910000000A.filename.Energyzt\\_NEPGA\\_Final\\_Report.pdf](https://www.epsa.org/forms/uploadFiles/2CB910000000A.filename.Energyzt_NEPGA_Final_Report.pdf)

We respectfully urge FERC to thoroughly investigate the validity of an “energy crisis” in New England and its corresponding level of need.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Timothy & Donna Butler

#### **20150610-5089(30632548).txt**

Jan A. Griska, Rindge, NH.

NED Pipeline Rock Blasting and its Impact on Water Quality:

An interesting thing happened to me at a ground water seminar given by the American Ground Water Trust. I attended a panel discussion given by the NHDES (New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services). The discussion concerned protecting private well drinking water quality.

The bulk of the panel discussion dealt with the usual suspects entering our ground water and contaminating our wells and how to protect our wells from those contaminants.

A question and answer session followed. I felt compelled to ask about detecting blasting contaminants in well water because as a Rindge resident, I’m faced with the possibility of the NED pipeline crossing my property. The panel wasn’t prepared to deal with the water quality issues I was concerned about. They didn’t dismiss my concerns, they said they would get back to me.

As I left the conference, I was thinking, that due to the lack of funding, staff etc., that I’d never hear from them. To my surprise I got an email response from a DES staff member that deals with blasting impact on water quality!

He sent me a paper a paper he published for the NHDES:

<http://des.nh.gov/organization/commissioner/pip/publications/wd/documents/wd-10-12.pdf>

It is an eye opener, it isn’t a large document, including the cover page, it is 8 pages long. The document explains how blasting can impact our wells and the second section Attachment A: describes the language local municipalities should use to create local regulations, that Kinder- Morgan via FERC can be held to. Please note: During a town’s Scoping session with FERC, these are the kinds of issues that need to be addressed.

A municipality can ask FERC to require Kinder Morgan to fund local efforts to manage the blasting Best Management Practices oversight in their locality, at their Scoping session.

My request of local towns, is, develop a deep understanding of the Scoping process, get their ducks in a row and make sure that they protect their drinking water. If any of you have seen the documentary “Gas Land” remember how the gas companies addressed the fixing the contaminated well problems in Pennsylvania. They gave the people with contaminated wells, multi hundred gallon plastic containers (some people re-

ferred to them as “pigs”), that the gas companies periodically refilled from water tankers. Please note that they didn’t replace their contaminated wells.

Note: at a Kinder Morgan “show and tell” here in Rindge, Kinder Morgan said to the concerned abutters that they would replace their wells.

Just picture how a multi hundred gallon “pig” would help you sell your house and or improve your landscaping.

Let’s not let Kinder Morgan turn New Hampshire into Pennsylvania.

Thank you,

Jan A. Griska (abutter)  
Rindge, N.H.

**20150610-5090(30632549).txt**

Chambers Eptraim, Newburgh, NY.

I’m from the area and has been a local 17 member for the pass 27 years with jobs like this coming to our area it will provide stability as well as economic value to many of our members.

**20150610-5091(30632560).txt**

Andrew F. Cannella, Rockhill lake rd, NY.

It is most important that FERC allow the NED project to move forward with this project. I am in favor of this project it will be great for our local union, economy and meet gas demands.

**20150610-5103(30632583).txt**

John Guido, New Windsor, NY.

I love in the proposed area and support the NED. It will give a much needed boost to our local economy by providing jobs to our union members.

**20150610-5117(30632613).txt**

Richard Whitney, new Paltz, NY.

I support the NED Project because it will create jobs that pay a great wage while helping to meet our current and future energy demands.

**20150610-5122(30632630).txt**

John Deskevich, Cortland, NY.

I Approve.

**20150610-5123(30632641).txt**

Gregory J. Kimiecik, Florida, NY.

Our area needs the jobs. I approve NED and long live the Union.

**20150610-5125(30632656).txt**

Bradley B Van Zile, Jefferson, NY.

To whom it may concern,

I live in Schoharie county, I have a home and land, Ive had to travel hundreds of miles away from home for work. This pipeline would benefit me greatly. I could be home with my family and make a very good income, also I believe we should look in our own backyard for energy not depending on foreign suppliers as we have done.

**20150610-5126(30632666).txt**

William Hatton Jr, Swan Lake, NY.

Will bring good paying jobs and much needed revenues, tax money in the area. Plus energy from our home land.

**20150610-5128(30632676).txt**

William Wygant, Warwick, NY.

I fully support the NED project. It is important to our future to have these upgrades on our energy system. The use of highly skilled and train laborers from our union will make this project go smooth with great paying jobs.

**20150610-5129(30632751).txt**

Peter Di Silvestre, Hawley, PA.

I believe that this project will boost our economy and create great paying jobs

**20150610-5133(30632761).txt**

Steven Kaleita, Middletown, NY.

I am support of the NED project, this project will supply good paying jobs to many local highly skilled trades people. Also it will help meet energy demands domestically and it is good for the community due to tax revenues it will generate.

**20150610-5134(30632764).txt**

John lasher, Kingston, NY.

I think this project will help emery demands and also put a lot of union members to work.

**20150610-5135(30632799).txt**

Edward J Pellam Sr, Malden, NY.

I think its about time for energy saving to the people and union members. It will bring money to the towns around it and other unions will be able to get to work.

**20150610-5136(30632815).txt**

Peter C Mertz, mill ript, NY.

I have been a laborer out of local 17 for eighteen years. I have done very well financially up until 4 years ago.. when work in my area became sparse and I haven't earned a full credit since. Although available for work always, I sit home and get soft and fat. We need jobs in this area and this pipeline project will help TREMENDOUSLY!

**20150610-5209(30633074).txt**

Glenn Roy, Windsor, MA.

Date June 10,2015

RE: Docket #PF14-22 - Northeast Energy Direct

Dear .....

I am writing as a concerned citizen of Windsor, Massachusetts. The proposed Kinder Morgan pipeline presents great risks to the health and safety of this community. It will pollute clean air, clean water and in general our natural environment – what the Berkshires are known for.

The residents of the Town Of Windsor voted and approved a referendum last year stating that we did not want a pipeline through our land – much of which is conserved or protected wetlands. Furthermore, these

lands are protected in Massachusetts under Article 97.

The pipeline itself presents major environmental risks. Methane, a greenhouse gas 20 times more potent than carbon dioxide, has been shown to leak as it moves through the pipeline. Methane leakage is a significant contributor to climate change, which threatens our communities, natural resources, and way of life.

In addition to the pipeline, Windsor is being asked to host an 80,000 horsepower compressor station as well. The revised proposal is four times larger than the initial proposed 20,000 horsepower station. The compressor station presents known health risks including methane emissions, as well as emissions of harmful NOx and VOC's which not only affect the climate, but cause local air quality and health problems. The noise and light pollution will greatly affect every living thing, person, plant and animal on this mountain in a very negative way!

On January 14, 2015, President Obama announced major executive action to reduce the release of methane into the environment by 40% below 2012 levels by 2025. Given that reducing methane pollution is a major goal of the administration, FERC should reject permits for the construction of new facilities that are known to leak methane including the Kinder Morgan pipeline and its appurtenant infrastructure.

I encourage you to do everything in your power to stop this project.

Please note my vote AGAINST this pipeline and compressor station in Massachusetts.

Sincerely,

Glenn Roy 1495 East Windsor Rd. Windsor, Ma. 01270

Email : roys1495@verizon.net

**20150610-5257(30633247).pdf**

Gallagher, Callahan & Gartrell

ARI B. POLLACK  
President  
214 N. Main Street  
Concord, NH 03301  
Direct Dial: (603) 545.3630  
General: (603) 228-1181  
Fax: (603) 228-8396  
pollack@gcglaw.com

Via E-File and US Mail

June 10, 2015

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

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co., LLC, subsidiary of Kinder Morgan Energy Partners, L.P., proponent of the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Energy Direct Project, FERC Docket No. PF14-22-000

Dear Secretary Bose:

This firm represents 52 lot owners within Whittier Place, a 64-lot residential subdivision in Merrimack, New Hampshire, who are opposed to the proposed route through Whittier Place Common Land and the Town of Merrimack, NH.

**I. Introduction.**

The Whittier Place subdivision was approved by the Town of Merrimack on October 8, 1996 and consists of 77.121 acres, with approximately 41.14 acres of unimproved common land. See Plan of Whittier Place (the "Subdivision Plan"), recorded Hillsborough County Registry of Deeds on October 23, 1996 as Plan No.

28286 (Sheet 1 attached as Exhibit 1).

Whittier Place Association, Inc. (the “Association”), the original homeowners association for Whittier Place, was formed in 1997 as a New Hampshire non-profit corporation.<sup>1</sup> See Records of the New Hampshire Secretary of State, Corporation Division re Whittier Place Association, Inc., printed Feb. 20, 2015 (Exhibit 2). Title to the Whittier Place common lands, as the same are shown on the Subdivision Plan, however, was never deeded to the Association. Instead, undivided interests were conveyed to each residential lot owner. See e.g., Warranty Deed for 54 Whittier Road, Lot 27-44, recorded Hillsborough Registry of Deeds on Feb. 3, 2011, Book 8290, Page 1101 (Exhibit 3).

The Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Energy Direct Project proposes to construct, operate and maintain a 36” natural gas pipeline (the “Pipeline”) under and across portions of the common land of Whittier Place. In addition to the physical placement of the Pipeline upon the common land, public filings by Kinder Morgan Energy Partners, L.P. (“KM”) indicate that permanent and temporary easements and temporary workspace easements are being proposed for the Whittier Place common land.

Our clients strongly oppose the proposed routing and location of the Pipeline. The proposed routing and location of the Pipeline burdens our clients’ safety, as well as their safe use and enjoyment of their neighborhood common land. In addition, the proposed location of the Pipeline impairs their safe enjoyment, resale value, and ability to obtain insurance relative to their surrounding residential lots in Whittier Place. This letter is intended to document our clients’ concerns such that you can include their position in your future consideration of the Pipeline project. Kindly insert this communication into the permanent record relating to FERC Docket No. PF14-22-000.

## **II. Expert Engineering Analysis.**

To better understand the impacts of the proposed Pipeline, our clients retained Hayner/Swanson, Inc. (HSI), a civil engineering and land surveying firm based in Nashua, New Hampshire. HSI was retained to identify and study potential project impacts from the Pipeline upon the Whittier Place subdivision and its common lands. HSI was also asked to identify sensitive areas to avoid, that, if considered by KM, would eliminate or substantially reduce impacts of the Pipeline upon the Town of Merrimack, New Hampshire and the residents of its Whittier Place.

HSI’s entire report, with exhibits, is enclosed for your consideration at Exhibit 4. HSI’s conclusions can be summarized as follows:

- A. The proposed Pipeline threatens the integrity of certain municipal wells for the Merrimack Village District, a water system that supplies public drinking water to the residents of the Town of Merrimack, including the Whittier Place residents. Due to the presence of a geologic fault line, seismic events in the area are not out of the question. Such events could have irreversible impacts upon the wells and safety of the water supply. To address this potential impact, HSI proposes shifting the alignment of the Pipeline to increase the distance to and separation from the line to the subject wells and the aquifer. See also, Letter from Ronald Miner, Jr., Superintendent, Merrimack Village District dated Mar. 3, 2015 (Exhibit 5).
- B. Blasting for the proposed Pipeline places nearby residential structures at increased risk of vibration, foundation damage, and fly rock damage, and exposes residents to construction noise, dust and construction vehicles. [During construction of the adjacent Merrimack Premium Outlets (“the Mall”), similar blasting concerns were expressed and some residents experienced actual foundation and structural damage. Blasting associated with the Pipeline would be significantly closer to Whittier Place.]
- C. Clearing the proposed easements and temporary easements/workspace would permanently impair important landscaping and screening buffers now existing between Whittier Place and the Mall, which are posted as conservation areas. The Mall is a newly-constructed retail shopping facility that was approved with certain screening and buffering requirements to help mitigate the impact of traffic, noise and lighting upon the adjacent neighborhood (Whittier Place).
- D. Construction impacts and permanent clearing of the proposed easement areas would impair and reduce

the availability of wildlife habitat for certain endangered and threatened species. These species are known to populate the general vicinity according to databases maintained by New Hampshire Fish and Game.

E. The “Potential Impact Radius” or “Incineration Zone”, which has been downplayed publicly by KM, is not well delineated but is extremely concerning to the public. Without some better or more helpful context, the term generates inescapable images of catastrophic fire and explosive events with inherently unsafe conditions for anyone living in proximity to the Pipeline. Such areas include Whittier Place, and its residents.

F. Whittier Place is considered a “high consequence area” (HCA), which will require additional precautions for a densely populated area.

G. In the event the Pipeline proceeds as proposed, substantial mitigation measures, including installation/construction, operations and maintenance plans sensitive to the needs of immediately adjacent residential abutters, such as Whittier Place and its proximity to and screening from the Mall, will be necessary.

### **III. Legal Title to Lot 27-69.**

The common land surrounding the Whittier Place residential lot is identified on the subdivision plan as Lot 27-69. Title to Lot 27-69 was conveyed in groups by Surfson Properties, Inc., the original developer, to different block builders. Ultimately, title to the common land was conveyed in sixty-fourths to each residential lot owner within Whittier Place. See Exhibit 3. For example, each deed contains language in substantially the same form as the following: “Said lot conveyed herein is conveyed together with an undivided 1/64th interest in the whole of the common property”.

The Whittier Place common lands, including title to Lot 27-69, is effectively held by each of the sixty-four (64) individual residential lot owners. Thus, each owner retains an equal and undivided interest in the ownership of the development common land.

To obtain necessary land rights for the permanent and temporary easements and temporary workspace proposed for the Pipeline, KM will be required to negotiate in good faith with, and otherwise obtain land rights from, each and every lot owner within Whittier Place.

### **IV. Interference with the Public Service Company of New Hampshire Easement.**

Lot 27-69, the Whittier Place common land, is presently encumbered by an existing overhead electric transmission line owned and operated by Eversource Vida Public Service Company of New Hampshire (“Eversource”). The transmission line easement was granted to Eversource by easement deed dated January 27, 1970. See Easement Deed to Public Service Company of New Hampshire, recorded in the Hillsborough County Registry of Deeds on June 24, 1970 at Book 2083, Page 100 (Exhibit 6).

The easement deed provides Eversource with the right to construct and operate “overhead and underground lines ... for transmitting electric current”. While the easement deed does not transfer any rights to install a gas pipeline, and while only an overhead electric transmission line presently exists, the easement language makes clear that subterranean rights were conferred. Consequently, a transfer from the fee simple landowners to KM of the contemplated easements for the Pipeline would likely interfere with land rights previously granted to Eversource. In this regard, the Association, or its successors-in-interest, may not have the full legal authority to convey to KM all of the desired land and easement rights.

Moreover, as discussed above and in HSI’s enclosed engineering review, the existing electric transmission right-of-way now includes reestablished vegetation that is conducive to wildlife habitat for certain endangered and threatened species. This habitat would be destroyed, at least temporarily, by clearing and trenching for the Pipeline.

### **V. Conclusion.**

For the reasons stated above, the Whittier Place residents respectfully request that KM be ordered to relocate the Pipeline away from their high consequence area such that neither Whittier Place, nor its common lands, nor the municipal water supply wells of the Merrimack Village District, nor the Town of Merrimack, are impacted. Thank you for your consideration.

Very truly yours,  
Ari B. Pollack  
FERC ID #F300997

Enclosures

cc: Joanna B. Tourangeau, Esq., legal counsel to the Town of Merrimack, NH  
Whittier Place Clients  
Hayner/Swanson, Inc.

1 The Association was later dissolved by action of the New Hampshire Secretary of State on February 1, 2001. The Association has not been reformed. See Exhibit 2.

*{73 pages of exhibits not included here}*

**20150610-5258(30633248).pdf**

To: "The Telegraph," Other Newspapers, etc.:

NED Pipeline: Another NOT for New Hampshire Letter for the Pile

The so-called "NED" (short for "Northeast Energy Direct") high-pressure gas pipeline project is opening eyes and raising brows. Unfortunately, not enough fast enough. Proposed by the Kinder Morgan Company (\*KM) and Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company (collectively, \*KIV{/TGPC'), the project is being rammed through and expected to be considered for certification by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC") in just three to four months. Yet, a recent IINH poll found that only 16% of New Hampshire citizens polled believed that they were "very familiar" with it. This is the number most favorable to proponents of the NED pipeline-not any of the numbers pertaining to all of the advertised "benefits" the project is actually committing to New Hampshire (those numbers would all be zeroes). The 84% of New Hampshire citizens who are not yet up to speed on what is going on.

If certified by FERC, KIW/TGPC will have the ability to begin taking land by federal eminent domain for clear-cutting a generally 110-135 foot-wide path, for a three-foot in diameter transmission pipe, through more than 70 miles of southern New Hampshire, impacting 18 towns, hundreds of residences, thousands of lives, sensitive conservation areas and water resources without hooking up to a single home or business: contrary to a common misconception, the pipeline is not a local delivery line. Before exiting New Hampshire with the vast bulk of gas for use outside of the state, it will substantially deprive homeowners of the use, enjoyment and value of their properties, lower town tax bases, create town response costs and problems, disturb and damage the environment (including, potentially, the water aquifers for at least five towns, Hudson among them) but leave no energy benefits for the state we could not obtain far less painfully elsewhere. We are only watching this approaching train wreck because Massachusetts wisely and loudly said: "We don't want it!"

Hudson, you need to join the growing NH Municipal Pipeline Coalition of towns who have already turned thumbs to the NED project and do the same. KIW{/TGPC is bringing its dog-and-pottery\* of NED "attractions" to Hudson, to try and convince you that the NED pipeline is right for your town. Ask the tough questions, and listen closely to the answers. "Opportunity" is a word NED pipeline proponents throw around a lot. It provides the "opportunity" for additional gas availability, jobs, businesses and municipal tax revenues; and for decreased energy costs. It offers, say the salesmen, an "opportunity" for a glorious new life. So doesn't a goose that lays golden eggs.

Don't buy this one, Hudson. Ask the tough questions. When asked some by Brookline, New Hampshire citizens, KM was openly noncommittal and evasive:

- In response to the question whether gas will be exported, KM was blunt: "Kinder Morgan cannot discriminate among customers based on the ultimate destination or use of the gas, such as the Northeast versus Canada or another foreign country ... The ultimate destination of the gas and volumes associated are within the sole control of the project customers." In other words: the gas will follow the money, whatever kind, wherever from.

- In response to the jointly posed questions “Can you site [sic] a study showing there is a demand for this gas in New England? Will any of the gas that moves through the pipeline be used by residents of New Hampshire?,” KM completely ignored the first and only identified Liberty Utilities as a state natural gas provider with a tentative agreement (subject to approval by the state’s Public Utilities Commission, i.e., the “PUC”) for gas from the NED project. However KM did not note that Liberty Utilities would receive less than 20% of the gas transmitted through the pipeline and is already meeting its needs elsewhere-and could receive more gas from other pipelines less damaging to New Hampshire.
- In response to the question “Does KM have a policy or plan to seek [tax] abatements for the pipeline after it is built,” KM slipped away with “KM does not plan to seek tax abatements at this time.” Of course not “at this time”: KM has not been taxed yet-then it will file for abatements.

Why do I get the feeling that, when all of the “fee-fi-fo-fum”ing is done, if the NED pipeline approved, only an energy giant is going to be holding the gold, and New Hampshire just goose eggs?

If it were the best alternative to meet actual New Hampshire energy needs, the NED pipeline project would be understandable. But this is clearly not the case. Three experts in the PUC proceeding considering approval of the tentative agreement between Liberty Utilities and KM (including the PUC Staffs own expert, Melissa Whitten-have cited numerous flaws in the arguments behind the NED pipeline, with one or more finding that the pipeline’s capacity is excessive for the actual need and/or not cost-effective.

In a May 15, 2015 letter commenting on draft reports provided in support of the NED pipeline, FERC itself suggested, on page 37, that the project is excessive. Noting that the pipeline will provide 2.2 billion cubic feet of constant transmission capacity, whereas it has been projected that New England needs only 1.1 to 1.6 billion cubic feet of additional capacity to meet its needs-and then only on about 40 cold winter days a year-FERC went on to note that two pipelines by the Spectra group already in the works will transport a total of about .56 billion cubic feet of gas per day toward New England’s needs, and another 1 billion cubic feet per day can be “funneled” from another source, Access NorthEast. Between Access NorthEast and Spectra then, over 1.5 billion cubic feet of additional capacity is available without resort to the NED pipeline-and there are other proposed pipelines in the works.

Spectra and Access Northeast are partnering to meet New Hampshire and New England’s energy needs, and are already ahead of the NED project in key areas. Spectra is not proposing a 70-mile pipeline through New Hampshire, will rely on established pipeline routes and will have far less impact on property owners and sensitive conservation and environmental areas than the NED pipeline. The only thing the excess NED pipeline capacity will supply is a disincentive to invest in the renewable sources of energy that New Hampshire and the rest of New England need to focus on. There is no need for NED. Sniff the sugar you’re fed, New Hampshire.

Sincerely,  
Richard Husband  
Town of Litchfield

Transmitted to:

The Telegraph  
Keene Sentinel  
New Hampshire Union Leader  
Foster’s Daily Democrat  
The Honorable Governor Margaret Hassan  
Senator Kelly Ayotte

Hudson-Litchfield News  
Concord Monitor  
Portsmouth Herald  
FERC  
Senator Jeanne Shaheen  
Representative Ann McLane Kuster

**20150610-5265(30633310).txt**

deborah pomerleau, Londonderry, NH.

Please do not approve this pipeline that crosses through NH. I live in an effected town, and grew up in another effected town. This is just so wrong for NH. NH can’t handle having their water damaged. NH’s

roads can't handle the damage done to them by heavy trucks. Please don't approve this project. It isn't fair to the homeowners who will have lower property values.

**20150610-5284(30633816).txt**

Donna Butler, Pelham, NH.

Letter to the Editor from NH State Representative, Eric Estevez - Page 1

“More Energy Yes, but Keep it Safe” by State Representative Eric Estevez

The Northeast Energy Direct pipeline proposed by Kinder Morgan provides no benefit to New Hampshire yet it is proposed to cut through seventeen communities across our state and close to 1,000 homeowners and property owners across the state are in the direct path of the pipeline which, by any measure, appears to offer the residents of New Hampshire no significant benefit but instead a litany of adverse consequences. Allow me to illustrate.

For example, at the present time, in my hometown of Pelham, NH, we are home to a portion of the Concord Lateral transmission line from Dracut, Massachusetts up to Concord as well as Compressor Station 270B on the same pipeline system. The Concord Lateral began fifty years ago as two 8-inch pipelines side by side. In the 1980s one of these 8-inch pipelines was dug out and replaced with a 12-inch pipeline. In 2000 the other 8-inch pipeline was dug out and replaced with a 20-inch pipeline. In 2008, Pelham, NH became the site for a compressor station. Over the years, Pelham has sacrificed and endured disruption within our community to benefit other communities. For example, the Concord Lateral runs right beneath Muldoon Park, a children's playing field complex, as well as beneath the parking lot between our Elementary and Middle Schools. I mention this to allow readers to understand the word “NIMBY” does not apply to the Pelham community. We have allowed our backyard to be used for pipeline infrastructure un-regrettably for a number of years. We understand and contribute every day to the public good of the region, while Pelham itself does not enjoy the same benefits from natural gas that other municipalities do. Despite having two existing natural gas pipelines and a compressor station here in town, Pelham does not have any distribution of natural gas for home heating, commercial use in our business district or for our school buildings and town offices.

To ask this community of hard-working citizens to give up their properties and conserved outdoor spaces for yet a third and much more extravagant pipeline is an unfair request.

Pelham is not the only New Hampshire town that will suffer as a result of the controversial Kinder Morgan's Northeast Energy Direct. Seventeen more communities and close to 1,000 homeowners and property owners across the state will too. Allow me to illustrate a number of adverse consequences.

The first of these consequences is the bargaining away of New Hampshire property rights. In making this deal with Kinder Morgan, the state of New Hampshire will allow the use of eminent domain for a private company. The value of homes and the environmental impact on pristine forested land will be diminished. My constituents worry over the market value of their homes, and since this is the first project of this over-large size in the state, there is no basis for comparison between similar properties.

Another consequence is the introduction of major health and safety risks in these communities across the state. There is a ‘Potential Impact Radius’ which is defined by the US Government as the radius of a circle within which the potential failure of a pipeline could have significant impact on people or property. ‘Significant Impact’ in cases of pipeline failure, which are largely caused by third parties, have shown up all over the news as mass devastation caused by fire. This pipeline project really does not stop with the directly affected property owners, but extends further to those properties that fall within the Potential Impact Radius parameters. It is a risk that no homeowner should live with and furthermore no homeowner should have a forced property loss by the use of eminent domain to incur this risk.

There are points along a pipeline route where systematic gas is released into the atmosphere. Valve Stations are spaced every ten or twenty miles depending on population density. They perform a function known as a “Blow Down” where noxious gas, containing as much as six hundred volatile organic compounds and radioactive isotopes from the drilling processes, is purposely released into the air to regulate pressure

within the pipes. Similar “Blow Downs” occur at the Compressor Station locations as well. There have been heightened instances of nose bleeds in individuals living near these stations, as well as asphyxiation causing nearby residents to actually pass out during a blow down from the compressor, and preliminary studies are being examined by the CDC about the rise in cancer, and in childhood asthma for the youth who become neighbors to compressor stations. The compressor station in my hometown of Pelham is just over 6,000 horsepower and sits on an 11 acre parcel of land. According to Kinder Morgan, it is rarely in use. Comparatively, the stations proposed to be built along the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline system are 80,000 horsepower and would rest on about 50 acres of land. The compressor station slated for an undisclosed location in Hillsborough County is one of the largest compressor stations ever planned in the United States, so large that neighboring communities who reap no tax benefits will also be burdened with the health risks associated with this potentially disastrous project.

We must also examine why is this proposed pipeline so big? . . . (See Next Comment for Page 2)

**20150610-5285(30633817).txt**

Donna Butler, Pelham, NH.

(Continuation of Previous Comment)

“More Energy Yes, but Keep it Safe” by State Representative Eric Estevez - Page 2

We must also examine why is this proposed pipeline so big?

Kinder Morgan wants us to believe that the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline will contribute to lower energy costs. The fact is, none of the gas Kinder Morgan is proposing to deliver has been contracted for power plants. What’s more there are several other pipeline projects in the queue that propose to do just that, all of which would have much less impact to New Hampshire since they are sited on existing rights of way. When study after study proves that our so-called “energy constraints” are limited to a few weeks in winter, there is no reason to build a new and massive 175 mile pipeline that does not even connect to the power generators. Additionally, rural New Hampshire towns beg the question if build-out of distribution for natural gas home heating is economically feasible here.

Not all pipeline propositions are equal. The problem with the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline proposal is that it does nothing to reduce New England’s electricity prices.

The Northeast Energy Direct is a pipeline that will root us to and maximize the inefficiencies of the high-electricity cost status quo cycle in New England. We need to look away from this proposal by Kinder Morgan if we seriously want to change the environmentally unfriendly course and lessen our energy prices in the northeast. We need to focus our attentions on projects that keep the energy flowing in-state in New Hampshire. Currently, NH is a large contributor to the New England power grid. NH uses only about half of the electricity we generate and the rest is exported out to the power grid to benefit our neighboring states. In an effort to help stimulate our economy, many jobs can be created in state if New Hampshire starts establishing strong energy efficiency programs and works on projects that aim to generate electricity within the state of New Hampshire for the use of New Hampshire citizens. We must start taking a pro-active look to our energy future and working on a solution to benefit New Hampshire. The loss of NH land for the Northeast Energy Direct project that will largely export natural gas, over 95%, to destinations out of our state is a step in the wrong direction for us. If we do not look out for NH, than who will?

In the final analysis, in the classic book Dante’s Inferno, Dante said, “The hottest places in hell are reserved for those who maintain their neutrality in times of moral crisis.” This issue is a moral crisis. As a state representative, I remain committed to fighting for what is morally right. The Northeast Energy Direct pipeline proposed by Kinder Morgan would pass through the great state of New Hampshire but would bring no direct benefit to our state. I encourage that we all take a much closer look at this proposal to see that it is not a good deal for New Hampshire.

Thank you,

State Representative Eric Estevez

Eric P. Estevez (R) is a member of the New Hampshire House of Representatives. He serves on the Judiciary Committee and represents the towns of Pelham and Hudson.

**20150610-5343(30634110).txt**

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
Regarding Docket PF 14-22

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

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

Paul Stevens  
Southern New Hampshire

**20150611-0046(30636493).pdf**

Hand written card, Patricia M. Cahill, 214 Shufelt Road, Nassau, New York, 12123, opposing

**20150611-0049(30636948).pdf**

Hand written card, Jeffrey Cahill, 214 Shufelt Road, Nassau, New York, 12123, opposing

**20150611-0059(30636949).pdf**

PROPERTY ACCESS DENIED

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: June 3, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

RE: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

Street Address: 320 Whipple Hill Road  
Town & Zip: Richmond, NH 03470  
Map & Lot Number(s) (if known): 410 027

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Teresa O'Rorke

cc:

FERC

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

**20150611-0062(30636950).pdf**

**TOWN OF DRACUT  
BOARD OF SELECTMEN  
TOWN HALL  
62 ARLINGTON STREET  
DRACUT, MA. 01826**

Phone 978-452- t 908—Fax 978-452-7924

June 1, 2015

Mr. Norman Bay, Chairman  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC, Docket No. PF14-22-000  
Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Mr. Bay,

At the Dracut Board of Selectmen's May 26, 2015 meeting, after receiving requests Sum residents, it was voted to send a letter to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) requesting that a scoping session be held in Dracut, MA.

Due to the impact on Dracut, the Board would appreciate FERC providing our citizens the most convenient location possible to learn more about the Commission's review process, and to verbally comment on their concerns regarding the Project. When Kinder Morgan hosted their public session, they did so in the City of Methuen, MA, which is a community that is not even impacted by the project.

We appreciate your consideration of this request and look forward to the opportunity to participate in a scoping session.

Sincerely,

Tony Archinski, Chairman  
Dracut Board of Selectmen

cc: Alan Fore, Vice President, Public Affairs

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co. LLC  
Docket Number PF 14-22-000  
Northeast Energy Direct Project

June 5, 2015

No Pipeline

Please say no to the Kinder Morgan pipeline. It is a bad idea for Northfield and for Western Massachusetts. In Northfield, the proposed pipeline is planned to run through the M & M hiking trail. It is part of the historical scenic trail system. We frequent the trails in this area, as well as others, since our town highlights these recreational attractions. There are beautiful vistas along the trail system. The vista of Mt Monadnock is one of Northfield's special places. The area will be changed forever if an 80,000 horse-power compressor station is built on 10 acres of cleared land in Northfield. It will destroy our forest and the peace and quiet that prevails. It will destroy our recreational environment. It is not environmentally friendly. It's ironic that we go to all this trouble to preserve land, only to destroy it in the name of the "almighty dollar/ big business/Kinder Morgan". The citizens of Northfield do not want this pipeline and many of the citizens along the pipeline route do not want this pipeline.

We should not be spending enormous amounts of money on infrastructures that have limited lifetimes and costly repairs. We should be spending our money on renewable energy sources, especially on ones that do not destroy our environment, in the process of building them.

We live near Northfield State Forest, and near the area of the proposed pipeline. The area behind our house and behind all my neighbor's houses is conservation land. We are not allowed to cut trees or build in that area. Yet a company can come in and clear cut trees and dig trenches to install pipelines, with no concern for public opinion. The vernal pools will be destroyed, and the land tract that encourages our wildlife will be impacted. Our recreation area will be destroyed.

If the pipeline is built, there is a chance that our groundwater can be contaminated, and our air polluted with caustic carcinogenic chemicals. I am concerned about our wells becoming contaminated if there are leaks in the pipeline. We depend on well water for our water. If the wells are contaminated, we have no resource but to dig another well, in the hopes that it is not contaminated. Who will be responsible for the digging of new wells and who will be responsible for cleaning up the leaks?

Water, a valuable resource, should not be wasted on the process of obtaining the gas. We should be preserving and protecting our water resources. I am concerned about the noise that an 80,000 horse-power compressor station will make. It will be the largest one that they plan to build in the Northeast, and it will be located in Northfield State Forest, a little over 1 mile from our neighborhood. I am concerned about the effect it will have on our health. Stress symptoms can develop due to the constant noise, and disrupts sleep patterns. We moved here because we need and desire to live in a quiet environment. We do not want to live next to a loud 80,000 horse-power compressor station. The noise and the chance of an explosion will make living here unbearable. We have a volunteer fire department. They do not have the man-power or the equipment to fight a gas explosion. PLEASE .

Preserve our forest, our environment, our water, and our health. We do not want this pipeline, we do not want our land, our state forest, and our land destroyed. We want the gas companies to fix the leaks that exist now, rather than build more pipelines. We do not want to pay for this pipeline, and we do not support gas exports to other countries. We support renewable energy.

Please say NO to Kinder Morgan Pipeline, it's not the right decision for Northfield or Massachusetts

Respectfully,

A concerned citizen of Northfield, MA, a wife and mother of 2 children,  
Cindy Dickerman

MEMORANDUM TO: Office of the Secretary  
FROM: Paul Friedman, FERC staff  
SUBJECT: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company LLC  
Northeast Energy Direct Project  
Docket No. PF14-22

DATE: June 11, 2015

Please place the attached document in the public files for the project proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company LLC (TGP) in Docket No. PF14-22-000:

Notes from an April 27, 2015 meeting between TGP, FERC staff, and representatives of various Indian tribes, held at the Omni Hotel in Providence, Rhode Island.

The notes were taken by Cardno, the FERC's environmental contractor for the Northeast Energy Direct Project. The document is NOT confidential.

**TENNESSEE GAS PIPELINE (TGP)  
NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT (NED) PROJECT  
FERC Docket No. PF 14-22  
(Pennsylvania, New York, Connecticut, New Hampshire, Massachusetts)  
MEETING WITH INDIAN TRIBES  
AND THE FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION (FERC)  
Monday, April 27, 2015 (8am-11am)  
Omni Hotel, 1 West Exchange St., Providence, Rhode Island  
Narragansett Ballroom  
Meeting Minutes**

Attendees:

Rebecca Brodeur, Louis Berger Group  
Dell Gould, Louis Berger Group  
Jim Hartman, Tennessee Gas Pipeline  
Mark Hamarich, Tennessee Gas Pipeline  
Jacqueline Rocan, Tennessee Gas Pipeline  
Paul Friedman, FERG  
Mark Gardella, AECOM  
Hope Luhman, Louis Berger Group  
Mike Letson, Kinder Morgan  
Christine Abrams, Tonawanda Seneca Nation  
Steve Brann, Cardno  
Bonney Hartley, Stockbridge — Munsee  
Mark Andrews, Wampanoag Tribe  
James Quinn, Mohegan Tribe  
Ramona Peters, Mashpee Wampanoag  
David Weeden, Mashpee Wampanoag  
Ed Gehres, Van Ness Feldman/Kinder Morgan  
Jim Flynn, Tennessee Gas Pipeline  
Eric Tomasi, FERC  
Kyle Andrews, Wampanoag Tribe  
Doug Harris, Narragansett

Jay Levy, Mohegan Tribe  
Bettina Washington, Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head  
Elaine Thomas, Mohegan Tribe

Summary:

8 am- Registration and Breakfast

8:15am —Introductions and Invocation

Br45 am —Recap March 18 meeting

FERC- intro —Have followed up with some of to do list from first meeting.

- o Draft Unanticipated Discovery Plan and Cultural Resources Predictive Models in blue folder
- o Berger has started right-of-way (ROW) safety training classes for tribal representatives

FERC would like opinions on items in blue folder and ideas of getting tribes on the ground with crews.

9:00am - Discussions

Tennessee Gas Pipeline (TGP)/Kinder Morgan (KM)—project update

- ~ On March 13TGP/KM completed first FERC filing of draft research reports.
- ~ have begun agency consultations such as SHPO, US ACOE, state environmental agencies, etc.
- ~ started surveys again -wetlands, CR, and enviro. On areas with land owner permission
  - o done with spring eagle survey
  - o bat survey in progress
- ~ second round of filings scheduled for June
- ~ have begun aerial photography of route to speed up enviro. permits
- ~ engineering —route changes in progress
  - o route mainly set but will change going forward
  - o have recently finished public meetings and open houses

Louis Berger Group- Cultural Resources fieldwork update

- ~ Started in PA and NY and will be starting in NH + MA in coming weeks.
- ~ Berger having safety meetings in Hartford, CT and Binghamton, NY

1030am - Question and Answer

Tribes- Where are surveys starting?

AECOM -started in PA, NY- where collocated and have land owner permission -start surveys at NY/PA border and move north this summer -75 -80 miles in all 5 states- start now to complete by July

Tribes - Where is North East Direct (NED) pipeline collocated with Constitution’

AECOM —Not established yet. Will use approved Constitution EIS to determine where to collocate w/Constitution

Tribes - What if Constitution not built’

TGP/KM - Then will have ROW just for NED pipeline.

General discussion about getting Constitution pipeline Cultural Resources info for tribes concerned about NED pipeline. Questions about if it could be made available and if there would be any problems with confidentiality/trade secrets. FERC offered to contact Constitution archaeologist and TGP/KM offered to sign confidentiality agreement.

Tribes- TGP/KM has started well —need to continue meetings and frequent communications.

FERC—scoping meetings will be a good opportunity for next meetings —when scoping meetings are scheduled, FERC and tribes can arrange another meeting.

~ will create list of scoping meeting sites and send to tribes to determine where will be best site for next meeting

General discussion of ceremonial stone landscapes, ROW survey methods, tribal input, identification, involvement in surveys for landscapes

General discussion of predictive models —how does Berger determine sensitivities?

~ Berger - Combine data such as soils, topo, previous surveys, LIDAR, and aerial photography.

~ Tribes ask to be included in creating predictive models so pipeline surveys and construction can better avoid sites and buffials.

~ Predictive models are always changing due to field conditions and other input.

General discussion of property ownership and easements.

~ TGP/KM doesn't own ROW, only maintain. Compressor Stations usually owned by TGP/KM

Unanticipated Discovery (UD) Plan —TGP/KM ask for input from tribes on UD plans —suggest state-by-state addendums to be consulted according to tribal area of concern where UD occurs.

~ Tribes - How are tribal concerns with UD plan addressed before fieldwork because fieldwork is already underway? What is timeframe for finalizing UD plan?

~ TGP/KM and Berger - Plan is developed up until beginning of construction. Concerns are incorporated into predictive models.

~ Tribes have concerns about photography of remains-tribes want no photos before THPO notified and on site.

~ UD plan needs to include notification of tribes as early as possible and at same time as notification of sheriff/SHPO.

General discussion of LIDAR —TGP/KM and AECOM not sure about formats and access to LIDAR data but will arrange visit with company that is interpreting LIDAR data for TGP/KM and Berger (Normandean Associates, Inc., Bedford, NH).

General discussion of insurance requirements.

~ Do tribes need same insurance as CRM/environmental contractors to go into field?

~ Berger —need to research

~ TGP/KM —has department to determine insurance needs and can change requirements based on roles/activities

General discussion of making arrangements for tribes to use natural resources and tribally sensitive plants that may be impacted by construction. TGP/KM and AECOM provide natural resource reports to tribes to determine if plants/NR can be used —TGP/KM and AECOM ask for list or description of plants/environments and to make arrangements ASAP so can coordinate. TGP/KM concerned that windows for when plants/NR can be gathered may interfere with survey/construction schedules.

#### **20150611-5000(30633967).txt**

Richard Sahr, East Nassau, NY.

June 10, 2015

To Whom It May Concern:

I'm am a resident of the Town of Nassau, N.Y. and am writing to express my strong oppsition to the NED pipeline which will pass close to the the Dewey Loeffel Toxic Waste Site, (one of the most toxic in the U.S.) and the proposed Clemente hard rock mine. Blasting near these two sites is a prescription for disaster. In addition, we live close enough to be affected by discharges and noise from the compressor station.

Lastly all pipelines leak, eventually poisoning the ground water and land. It also releases toxins into the air

and creates herrendous noise. Fracking and the pipeline is enviromentally repulsive and would destroy our home in rural America. In addition, harming the enviroenment is on of the most unpatriotic thing anyone can do.

Sincerely,

Richard A. Sahr

**20150611-5052(30634220).txt**

Elizabeth Florsur, Saugerties, NY.

As a women, I am of course in favor of this project. It well bring needed jobs and revenue to our area, and surrounding areas.

**20150611-5053(30634235).txt**

Ian Petry, Cochton, NY.

Great paying jobs for are union members

**20150611-5058(30634277).txt**

Pete Ackerson, parksville, NY.

Pipeline will create great jobs for our skilled labor union. Keep the money in the USA. At the same time we are supporting our infrastructure.

**20150611-5060(30634279).txt**

Bob Garland, accord, NY.

I am a local man that is trying to make a living, this would be a great job that would help me support my family in hard times. It would bring much need tax money that would be a big relief.

**20150611-5068(30634287).txt**

Carlos B Thirin, Ossining, NY.

I agree with this project. This will be a big help for our union members.

**20150611-5075(30634302).txt**

Ignatius Kosior Jr., locust Grove, NY.

This project would lesson our needs for outside fuel. And Great paying jobs

**20150612-0009(30636180).tif**

Hand written card, Thomas Kelley, 26 Governor St, Plainfield, MA 01070, opposing

**20150612-4007(30636527).docx**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
**FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION**  
INTERAGENCY PRE-FILING CONFERENCE CALL

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC

Docket No: PF14-22-000

NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT PROJECT

May 14, 2015

Agencies in Attendance (list of attendees is attached):

- Federak Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC)

- Cardno (Consultants for FERC)
- U.S. Army Corp of Engineers (USACE)
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
- PA Department of Environmental Protection (PA DEP)
- PA Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (PA DCNR)
- PA Historical and Museum Commission (PHMC)
- NY Department of Agriculture
- NY State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC)
- NY State Parks and Recreation
- NY State Department of Public Health
- MA Department of Environmental Protection (MA DEP)
- MA Department of Fish and Game (MA DFG)
- MA Department of Conservation and Recreation (MA DCR)
- MA Department of Public Utilities (MA DPU)
- NH Department of Environmental Services (NH DES)
- NH State Historic Preservation Office (NH SHPO)
- CT Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (CT DEEP)
- Berkshire Regional Planning Commission
- Nashua Regional Planning Commission
- Tennessee Gas Pipeline (Tennessee Gas)
- AECOM (Tennessee Gas contractor)
- Hatch Mott (Tennessee Gas contractor)
- Louis Berger (Tennessee Gas contractor)

#### Meeting Summary

The conference call was conducted to provide an overview of the FERC's role for the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project as well as to review the general status of the schedule, field surveys, landowner coordination, and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process. Topics discussed included:

- Resource Report Review and NOI Status
  - o Open Houses completed in April.
  - o FERC reviewing Resource Reports. Will be issuing the Data Request soon.
  - o Notice of Intent (NOI) will be issued in the next few weeks. FERC is waiting for compressor station locations from Tennessee Gas prior to issuing the NOI, opening the scoping comment period, and identifying scoping meeting locations.
  - o FERC identifying locations for scoping meetings. May reach out to regional groups to assist identifying venue locations.
  - o FERC is requesting feedback from agencies on cumulative impacts.
- Tennessee Gas Status update
  - o Tennessee indicated that the next set of draft Resource Reports has been delayed and will now be filed in July, 2015.
  - o Surveys
    - Approximately 79 miles of environmental surveys and 84 miles of cultural resources surveys have been completed
    - Vernal pool surveys completed in CT. Surveys ongoing in NH and MA.
    - Bat surveys completed in NY. Additional Bat Surveys will be initiated May 16 across project area.

- Threatened and Endangered (T & E) plant surveys will begin May 18th on NED West.
- Preparing for Phase 1 Bog Turtle surveys will begin mid- to late-June in NY.
- Developing T & E consultation letters to be sent to agencies based on access roads, compressor station sites, and route modifications.
- o Meetings
  - Met with NYSDEC on May 13.
  - Meetings upcoming on May 19 with NH Fish and Game and May 21 with MA Natural Heritage.
  - Tentative meeting scheduled on June 1st with MA DEP
- o Aerial Flyovers
  - Aerial flyovers completed on NED East as of May 10th.
  - Flyovers of CT Loop and remaining laterals should be complete by May 18th
- o Tribes
  - Tennessee Gas is providing tribes with weekly updates – All tribes are invited to join the walk-throughs as long as they have taken the appropriate Tennessee Gas safety training.
  - Tribes are currently reviewing survey data from Tennessee Gas.

#### Discussion

- FERC will send out cumulative impact question to all of the agencies to get feedback on appropriate Region of Influences for each resource.
- FERC indicated that it looking at major route alternatives, specifically the I-88 NY route, the Mass Pike Alternative, and the existing Line 200 alternative.

#### Next Call

- Agency call will be held every 2 weeks
- Next call is May 28th, 2015.

#### List of Attendees

Organization	Name
FERC	Eric Tomasi
FERC	Elaine Baum
FERC	Rafael Montag
FERC	Xiah (Shelia) Kragie
Cardno	Jackie Layton
Cardno	Jennifer Harris
USACE	Mike Dombrowskie
USACE	Kevin Kotelly
USEPA	Tim Timmerman
USEPA	Thomas Uybarreta
USEPA	Lingard Knutson
USFWS	Tim Sullivan
USFWS	Maria Tur
PADEP	Jim Kuncelman
PA DCNR	David Mong
PA SHPO - PHMC	Steven McDougal
NY Dept. of Agriculture	Matthew Brower
NYSDEC	Stephen Tomasik
NYSDEC	Bill Little
NYSDEC	Mark Wythall

NYSDEC	Patty Denoyer
NYS Parks and Recreation	Diana Carter
NYS Dept. Public Health	Jane Thapa
MA DEP	Michael Stroman
MA DFG	Tay Evans
MA DCR	Jennifer Howard
MA DPU	Stephen August
NH DES	Timothy Drew
NH SHPO	Edna Feigner
CT DEEP	Fred Riese
Berkshire Regional Planning Commission	Tom Matuszko
Nashua Regional Planning Commission	Sara Siskavich
Tennessee Gas	Howdy McCracken
Tennessee Gas	Mark Hamarich
Tennessee Gas	Jacquelyne Rocan
Tennessee Gas	Kasia Ingram
Hatch Mott	John M. Quinlisk
Hatch Mott	Theresa Albanese
Louis Berger	Hope Luhman
AECOM	Eileen Banach

**20150612-4008(30636556).docx**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
**FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION**  
INTERAGENCY PRE-FILING CONFERENCE CALL

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC

Docket No: PF14-22-000

NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT PROJECT

May 28, 2015

Agencies in Attendance (list of attendees is attached):

- FERC
- Cardno (FERC 3rd party contractor)
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
- PA Department of Natural Resources (PA DCNR)
- PA Historical and Museum Commission (PHMC)
- NY Department of Agriculture
- NY State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC)
- NY State Parks and Recreation
- NY Department of Transportation
- NY State Department of Public Health
- MA Attorney General's Office
- MA Department of Fish and Game (MA DFG)
- MA Department of Conservation and Recreation (MA DCR)
- MA Department of Public Utilities (MA DPU)
- NH Fish and Game Department (NH FGD)
- NH State Historic Preservation Office (NH SHPO)
- CT Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (CT DEEP)
- Southwest Region Planning Commission

- Berkshire Regional Planning Commission
- Nashua Regional Planning Commission
- Delaware River Basin Commission
- Tennessee Gas Pipeline (Tennessee Gas)
- AECOM (Contractor for Tennessee Gas)
- Hatch Mott (Contractor for Tennessee Gas)
- Louis Berger (Contractor for Tennessee Gas)
- Normandeau Associates (Contractor for Tennessee Gas)

## Meeting Summary

The conference call was conducted to provide an overview of the FERC's role for the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project as well as to review the general status of the schedule, field surveys, landowner coordination, and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process. Topics discussed included:

- Resource Report Review and NOI Status
  - o Environmental Comments on the draft resource reports issued on Friday, May 15th. Tennessee Gas is required to incorporate responses into its next set of draft resource reports.
  - o Cumulative impacts request sent to agencies on May 15th.
  - o Tennessee Gas will send next set of Resource Reports in July.
  - o Notice of Intent (NOI) will be issued in the next few weeks. Waiting for compressor station locations from Tennessee Gas.
  - o FERC identifying locations for up to 15 scoping meetings.
  - o At this point in our planning, we are looking for 2 scoping meetings held in PA, 4 in NY state (2 in Albany area), 1 meeting in CT, 3 in New Hampshire, and 5 meetings in MA. These may change slightly based upon an anticipated Tennessee Gas filing.
  - o The comment period will likely be 60 days or longer due to the number of scoping meetings.
- Tennessee Gas Status update
  - o Surveys
    - Environmental surveys have been focused on the compressor station sites. Surveys will shift to pipeline route and will include additional survey teams.
    - As of the week ending May 22nd, approximately 84 miles of environmental surveys and 88 miles of cultural resources surveys have been completed
    - Bat acoustic surveys are continuing. Tennessee Gas to provide additional information regarding bat surveys on next call.
    - Threatened and Endangered (T & E) plant surveys have finished in NY and PA. T & E plant surveys will continue in CT, MA and NH through the summer.
  - o Meetings
    - Tennessee Gas is preparing additional agency consultation letters based on access roads, compressor station sites, and route modifications.
    - Tennessee Gas met with NH Fish and Game on May 19 and MA Natural Heritage on May 21. Both meetings were to discuss T & E protocols.
    - Meeting scheduled on June 10 with MA DEP

## Next Call

- Agency call will be held every 2 weeks
- Next call is June 11th, 2015.

## List of Attendees

Organization	Name
FERC	Eric Tomasi
FERC	Elaine Baum
FERC	Rafael Montag
Cardno	Jennifer Harris
USEPA	Thomas Uybarreta
USEPA	Lingard Knutson
USFWS	Tim Sullivan
USFWS	Maria Tur
PA DCNR	David Mong
PA SHPO - PHMC	Steven McDougal
PA SHPO - PHMC	Cheryl Nagle
NY Dept. of Agriculture	Matthew Brower
NYSDEC	Stephen Tomasik
NYS Parks and Recreation	Diana Carter
NYS Dept. Public Health	Jane Thapa
NY DOT	Marvin Federman
MA Attorney General's Office	Matt Ireland
MA DFG	Christy Edwards
MA DCR	Jennifer Howard
MA DPU	Stephen August
NH FGD	Carol Henderson
NH SHPO	Edna Feighner
CT DEEP	Fred Riese
Berkshire Regional Planning Commission	Tom Matuszko
Southwest Region Planning Commission	Henry Underwood
Nashua Regional Planning Commission	Sara Siskavich
Delaware River Basin Commission	David Kovitch
Tennessee Gas	Deborah McCartney
Tennessee Gas	Kasia Ingram
Hatch Mott	John M. Quinlisk
Hatch Mott	Theresa Albanese
Louis Berger	Hope Luhman
AECOM	Eileen Banach
Normandeau Associates	Harry Stewart

**20150612-5007(30634958).txt**

Donna Butler, Pelham, NH.  
June 11, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LLC Docket #PF-14-22-000  
Northeast Energy Direct (NED)

Dear Ms. Bose,

We are Pelham, NH residents writing to oppose Docket #PF-14-22-000.

In addition to NED, Pelham simultaneously faces another major infrastructure project planned for the same

location. The Merrimack Valley Reliability Project (MVRP) is an electric grid reliability update by National Grid and Eversource. The MVRP updates the existing 3-row electrical tower system to a higher capacity 4-row tower system. The existing middle row of towers will be removed and relocated to the outer edge of the Eversource-owned easement and replaced by a larger row of towers and a 345,000 volt transmission line.

Both MVRP and NED intend to occupy the same space within the existing 350-foot wide utility easement owned by Eversource. When questioned on how they intend to coordinate projects, Kinder Morgan representatives indicated they were in discussions with Eversource while Eversource representatives denied any communications with Kinder Morgan.

Many unanswered questions remain regarding how these two large-scale projects will proceed simultaneously and within the same easement owned by Eversource.

We respectfully request FERC hold a scoping meeting in Pelham, NH to evaluate the feasibility of the proposed NED route as it relates to the MVRP. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Timothy & Donna Butler

**20150612-5011(30634967).txt**

deborah pomerleau, Londonderry, NH.

I live in Londonderry, NH and am from Mason NH.

- 1) Please don't let this pipeline happen!
- 2) damage to wells, water, rivers
- 3) damage to forests and roads
- 4) not enough firemen and policemen for future problems
- 5) air pollution from compressor station
- 6) no need demonstrated. only "want" from KM so that they can export gas.
- 7) tourism is key to NH's livelihood. damage to that.
- 8) scoping meeting for every town effected.
- 9) scoping meeting especially for :  
merrimack - as pipeline goes under merrimack river  
mason - as there are 2 pipelines proposed.  
new ipswich - as the compressor station could go there.  
but really all towns need one. many individual needs.  
please don't approve this pipeline.

I am a voter.

**20150612-5014(30634973).txt**

Amy Glowacki, Mason, NH.

I oppose the construction of the NED pipeline in NH. KM has not provided any facts and data to support the need of this pipeline in NH. NH citizens do not benefit. I am writing in support of the recent letter sent to FERC by the Selectmen of Amherst, NH. In June 2015 the Selectmen sent a letter to the FERC questioning the need for the NED pipeline — especially the need in New Hampshire — they also question the legality of relocating ~71 miles of the proposed route for this pipeline from Massachusetts, which may need the gas to be supplied by this pipeline, to New Hampshire, which does not appear to need it. Where is the proof that NH needs this gas and it will be used in NH to benefit NH residents.

The Amherst Selectmen present a comprehensive argument based in facts that NH does not have a red for

this gas and that KM has not presented the facts to prove NH needs it.

20150612-5030(30635024).pdf

## Updated Summary Of Denials Of Property Access Recorded In FERC Docket PF14-22

current as of June 8, 2015, replacing my earlier preliminary summary, filed under 20150601-5046

A closer review of FERC's Docket PF14-22 submissions through June 8, 2015, reveals 201 submissions referencing the denial (or rescission) of property access permission to Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company (KM/TGP)'s NED project staff, contractors or agents.

In some cases FERC contractors had bundled several separate denials into a single file, the most extreme case being 20150414-0055 which combined the letters of denial from 30 different landowners into a single submission. The total number of letters is at least 237, ***approximately 10% of the comments in the Docket.***

That list of such submissions, listed by FERC eLibrary "accession number", is appended below.

The number of properties to which access has been denied is difficult to judge. While every letter denied access to at least on property, others listed several separate properties and some, such as the New Hampshire Towns of Fitzwilliam, Rindge and Winchester denied access to "all town property" while the town of Richmond denied access to a list of 51 specific town properties (presumably all town properties).

If one counts Richmond as "denying access to all town properties", then it adds up to 263 lots + 5 Towns listing "All town property" without specific lot numbers

If one instead includes the 51 enumerated Richmond lots then the total is 314 lots + 4 other Towns listing "All town property".

This summary may include some over-counts as I did not cross-reference the denials by addresses or lot numbers. Some may have appeared twice, for example once in the original denial and a second time in a letter complaining to FERC about that denial having been ignored by KM/TGP surveyors (unfortunately reports suggest this may not be a rare occurrence).

On the other hand, assuming local conditions are representative, the count is much more likely to be a very significant under-count. Only a rather limited sub-set of landowners seem to take the extra step of notifying FERC about letters of denial that they have sent to KM/TGP, its contractors or its agents.

**Consequently only KM/TGP is able to determine the actual number of property access denials or rescissions that have been sent. I strongly recommend that FERC require this information from KM/TGP in order to have a better understanding of the frequency and geographic distribution of access denials.**

### FERC PF14-22 Docket eLibrary accession numbers for submissions referencing denials (or rescission) of access permission to KM/TGP staff, contractors or agents:

20141024-5001 R-1	20141105-5139 D-1	20141124-5231 R-1
20141215-0009 D-1	20141216-5012 D-1	20141222-5008 D-1
20141222-5129 D-1	20141223-5014 D-1	20141223-5285 D-1
20141224-5003 D-1	20141229-0012 D-1	20150113-0086 D-* (T)
20150114-0006 D-1	20150116-0020 D-5	20150116-0021 D-1
20150116-0022 D-5	20150120-0006 D-1	20150120-0132 D-1
20150120-0133 D-1	20150120-0134 D-1	20150120-5265 D-1
20150122-0006 D-1	20150122-0007 D-1	20150122-0016 D-1
20150123-0022 D-1	20150123-0024 D-1	20150123-0027 D-1
20150126-0023 D-1	20150126-0028 D-1	20150126-0030 D-1
20150127-0058 D-1	20150128-0025 D-1	20150128-0034 D-1
20150128-0035 D-1	20150129-0032 D-1	20150129-0033 D-1
20150129-0034 D-1	20150129-0035 D-1	20150130-0021 D-1
20150202-0068 D-1	20150202-0103 D-2	20150202-5035 D-1

20150203-0021 D-1	20150203-0022 D-1	20150203-0030 D-1
20150204-0006 D-1	20150206-0018 D-1	20150206-0019 D-1
20150206-0020 D-1	20150209-0007 D-1	20150209-0066 D-1
20150209-0081 D-1	20150209-0082 D-1	20150209-0083 D-1
20150209-5065 D-1	20150209-5074 D-1	20150209-5086 D-1
20150209-5132 D-1	20150210-0040 D-1	20150212-0044 D-1
20150212-5028 D-1	20150213-0019 D-1	20150218-0046 D-1
20150218-0048 D-1	20150218-0088 D-1	20150218-0110 D-1
20150219-0075 D-1	20150220-0008 D-1	20150223-0008 D-1
20150223-0009 D-3/3	20150223-0021 D-2	20150223-0022 D-1
20150223-0023 D-2	20150223-0032 D-1	20150223-0033 D-1
20150223-5000 D-1	20150224-0025 D-1	20150224-0026 D-1
20150224-0028 D-1	20150224-0042 D-1	20150225-0030 D-5/5
20150225-0031 D-1	20150226-0011 D-1	20150226-0056 D-1
20150302-0032 D-1	20150302-0047 D-1	20150302-0050 D-1
20150302-0051 D-1	20150309-0111 D-1	20150309-0116 D-3
20150309-0119 D-1	20150309-0121 D-1	20150309-0125 D-1
20150309-0157 D-1	20150310-0057 D-1	20150310-0058 D-1
20150310-0059 D-1	20150311-0023 D-1	20150312-0016 D-5
20150313-0026 D-1	20150313-0027 D-1	20150313-0042 D-1
20150315-4000 D-1	20150316-0028 D-2	20150316-0033 D-1
20150316-0060 D-1	20150316-0066 D-1	20150317-0040 D-1
20150317-0043 D-1	20150318-0027 D-1	20150323-0025 D-1
20150323-0026 D-1	20150323-0030 D-1	20150323-0032 D-1
20150323-0034 D-1	20150323-0046 D-4	20150323-0060 D-1
20150326-5004 D-1	20150327-0009 D-1	20150330-0043 D-1
20150330-0051 D-1	20150330-5008 D-1	20150331-0009 D-1
20150331-0010 D-1	20150331-0028 D-1	20150331-0029 R-1
20150403-0023 D-1	20150403-0032 D-1	20150406-0101 D-1
20150407-0030 D-51 (T)	20150407-0031 D-1	20150408-0026 D-1
20150409-0017 D-2	20150409-0025 D-1	20150413-0050 D-1
20150413-0070 D-1	20150413-0073 D-*	20150414-0031 D-*(T)
20150414-0055 D-28,R-2/30	20150414-0056 D-1	20150414-0057 D-1
20150420-0137 D-1	20150427-0119 D-1	20150427-0138 D-1
20150427-0396 D-1	20150427-0397 D-1	20150428-0008 D-1
20150428-0009 R-1	20150428-0084 D-*(T)	20150430-0029 D-1
20150501-0028 D-*	20150501-0044 D-1	20150501-0045 D-2
20150501-0046 R-1	20150501-0048 D-1	20150504-0312 D-1
20150504-0313 R-1	20150504-0320 D-1	20150504-0328 D-1
20150504-0336 D-1	20150504-0337 D-1	20150504-0340 D-1
20150504-0350 R-1	20150504-0360 D-1	20150504-0364 D-1
20150505-0259 D-3	20150505-0275 D-1	20150506-0013 D-4
20150506-0014 D-1	20150508-0028 D-1	20150508-0031 D-1
20150508-0032 D-1	20150511-0022 D-1	20150511-0024 D-1
20150511-0035 D-1	20150511-0036 D-1	20150511-0037 D-2
20150511-0079 D-1	20150513-0019 D-1	20150515-0030 D-1
20150515-0031 D-1	20150515-0032 D-1	20150515-0033 D-1
20150515-0034 D-1	20150518-0030 D-1	20150518-0032 D-1
20150518-0058 R-1	20150519-0047 R-1	20150519-5021 D-1
20150521-0023 D-1	20150602-0012 D-1	20150602-0014 D-1
20150602-0015 D-1	20150602-0086 D-1	20150602-0088 D-1
20150602-0276 D-1	20150602-0292 D-1	20150603-0079 D-*(T)
20150604-0037 D-1	20150604-5037 D-1	20150605-0035 D-1

Table annotations: “**D-1**” = Denial for 1 lot, “**R-1**” = Rescission of permission for 1 lot

“/3” = bundles 3 separate landowners into the submission, “\*” = “all”, e.g., “all town properties”

“(T)” = Denial by a Town Meeting or town Board or Commission

for example: “**D-28,R-2/30**” indicates 28 Denials + 2 Rescissions, involving 30 separate owners  
Garth Fletcher, Mason, NH 03048

**20150612-5039(30635144).txt**

Donald Cornish, Parkville, NY.

We need some local work. Have one of the highest unemployment rates in area.

GO UNION, I APPROVE!

**20150612-5040(30635148).txt**

Robert B harder III, Unadilla, NY.

I am tired of high heating bills and high gas prices. We need to start using are natural fuel sources. This line is a good start. We have well trained men and women to do the job right. Lets get it done.

**20150612-5041(30635151).txt**

James LeVeille, Otego, NY.

I've been working in the pipeline industry for over 20 years. Most of my work is out of town, PA, Ohio, NJ. It would be nice to sleep in my own bed every night and be around my family in stead of living out of a suitcase. It will be nice to have local work. Also it would bring a lot of revenue to a much needed area and would help the much needed area and would help the much needed energy demands. Theses are more positives than negatives in this field. HELP us work locally and introduce this to NYS.

Thank you

James LeVeille

**20150612-5043(30635158).txt**

Joshua Brinh, Lake Karie, NY.

Good paying jobs and tax breaks. Also helping our infrastructure and schools. These are the projects needed to help us become energy independent as a nation. I approve the NED project.

**20150612-5044(30635165).txt**

William Swartz, Marlboro, NY.

Having worked on some ferc jobs..(minisink compressor station, millennium pipeline) The planning and the care to the environment are second to none. Good paying jobs for workers who live locally and who will spend it locally. Also very professional workmanship and care for the workers put into the job. The wild life seems to flourish on the refurbished right aways.

**20150612-5045(30635168).txt**

Jeffery longfield, Pine Bush, NY.

Hopefully will bring long term jobs to all the Unions in the atrea. The project will have skilled men and women. it will also help out the economy and our schools. I approve this project.

**20150612-5047(30635176).txt**

George Hofbauer, Hagurennot, NY.

Good paying jobs for are union local.

**20150612-5048(30635180).txt**

Joe Kern, Ellenville, NY.

We need Union work. Lets not talk about it.....DO IT!!

**20150612-5049(30635184).txt**

Charles W Mills, Huguenot, NY.

Makes for good jobs and keeps it local. I approve this project.

**20150612-5050(30635188).txt**

James Addley, Fishs Eddy, NY.

Thank God for jobs like this that will go union, built with local workers.

I approve this pipeline> YES I live here and want to work here!

**20150612-5052(30635193).txt**

Joseph Sarka, Newburgh, NY.

I have 38 years with local 17. You will not find a better work force.

I approve this project

**20150612-5057(30635225).txt**

Mark C Colandrea, La Grorgeville, NY.

Great opportunity to keep the skilled workforce working locally with good paying jobs. I approve this project and go Union

Thanks

**20150612-5069(30635246).pdf**

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC

1615 Suffield Street

Agawam, MA 01001

Date: 2/5/2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access

\*Common Land 27-67, 27-68, 27-69

And all addresses listed below.

As the Whittier Place Association, Merrimack, Inc., owners of the common land property located as part of Whittier Place Association, Merrimack, NH 03054

We are denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land to perform survey, or for any other purpose. Any physical entry onto my land will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Bruce B ?, 54 Whittier Rd  
Susanna Henzley, 46 Whittier Rd  
Anne Morrilly, 45 Whittier Rd  
Amy Niezrecki, 33 Whittier Rd  
Dennis Conn?, 42 Whittier Rd  
James Manfield, 44 Whittier Rd  
Allen Somerville, 41 Whittier Rd  
Lauren Burke, 40 Whittier Rd  
Rachel Horton, 39 Whittier Rd  
Egan Degtrar?, 32 Whittier Rd  
Kimberley Silva, 31 Whittier Rd  
Michael Tabbes, 26 Whittier Rd

Petra ?, 2 Cranstone Cir  
Michele Watson, 21 Whittier Rd  
Heather Gerrard, 5 Danville Circle  
Kyle Maye, 17 Whittier Rd  
Krista Prymak, 48 Whittier Rd  
Sheila Soucy, 37 Whittier Rd  
Jane Firrell, 24 Whittier Rd  
Joseph Ch?, 4 Findlay Way  
Vizdyd? Wainppa, 8 Englewood Dr  
Timothy Liu, 3 Danville Cir  
Karen Kadney, 2 Danville Cir  
Claire M Lester, 4 Cranston Cir

Greg H?, 29 Whittier Rd  
Perry Ke?, 3 Englewood Dr  
Gerrard Beraz?, 1 Findlay Way  
Jane B. Hoover, 35 Whittier Rd  
Lindsay D. Toomey, 43 Whittier Rd  
Pamila K Ogden, 47 Whittier Rd  
Kim Dinsmore, 4 Whittier Rd  
Kevin Heath, 8 Whittier Rd  
Michael Goodwin, 3 Cranstone Cir  
Lee? G Bowen, 1 Cranstone Cir

Katherine Johnston, 5 Cranston Cir  
Megan Pelletier, 9 Warr? Rd  
David Moss, ? Whittier Rd  
John Mason, 3 Whittier Rd  
Nathan Lacroix, 5 Whittier Rd  
Christian Bu?, ? Findlay Way  
Tim Carlan, 27 Whittier Rd  
?, 25 Whittier Rd  
?, 28 Whittier Rd  
?, 34 Whittier Rd

*{the editor apologizes for his difficulties in decyphering many of the hand-written names}*

#### **20150612-5110(30635947).txt**

deborah pomerleau, Londonderry, NH.

This pipeline project is wrong for NH. Please do not approve this.

- 1) Above all, we need safe water to drink. This would jeopardize the whole water table of southern NH.
- 2) Kinder Morgan has a debt load of \$40+ billion. Too much risk of the company collapsing.
- 3) The “Need” for more gas is not there. KM has a “want” for profit for exporting.

#### **20150612-5131(30636026).doc**

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed pipeline project by Kinder Morgan through 71 miles of NH – with a proposed Compression Station on the border of my town, Temple. I have many concerns and will outline some below. Expect to hear from me again.

- NH, as a net exporter of power, does not need a new source.
- We already have 63 operating power plants, and we absorb many impacts of these plants. We do not need another. The addition of this pipeline would not lead to further generation of power in our state.
- This pipeline would also not address power distribution needs in NH, and in fact could redirect funds that should be aimed at that need.
- NH is a distinct entity with its own economy and not just a convenient pass through for other states that wish to obtain power. Our needs are not the same as our neighboring states, and our rights are no less important just because our state is small.
- The Temple Elementary School lies within one half mile of this proposed Compression Station. This building also serves our community as our emergency shelter. I find it hard to imagine a more likely emergency than an incident at such a station. If an evacuation of our school was required by such an incident, buses would be traveling from Peterborough to pick up our children – not a speedy rescue.
- I am concerned about the environmental impacts of this station: air, light and noise pollution.
- I am concerned about the safety record of Kinder Morgan and it seems way too easy to find evidence of their shortcomings on the internet.
- My town is a quintessential New England town – the kind of town tourists love to see. But if this project moves forward and living conditions are negatively impacted, if residents see their home values plummet, if they are forced to flee the pollution and risk, I do not see Temple as a viable tourist destination in the future.

I would also like to quote from a recent letter written by the Amherst Board of Selectmen:

“The proposed NED project’s original route through Massachusetts — only entering New Hampshire with a lateral pipeline to supply the sole confirmed customer in New Hampshire — was a much better attempt to

assign the burdens caused by the project onto the residents of the state that would receive the majority of the benefits of the NED pipeline. The decision to reroute this proposed pipeline through 71 miles of New Hampshire, to the detriment, harm and potential taxation of New Hampshire residents, and for the ease, comfort, and convenience of residents of Massachusetts would, if approved by the FERC, potentially represent an unconstitutional taking from residents of New Hampshire for the benefit of residents of another state.”

I strongly urge you to add your voice and wherever possible your vote to the opposition of this project.

Sincerely,

Elena L. Fiske  
332 General Miller Highway  
Temple, NH 03084

**20150612-5153(30636131).txt**

Tyler W Seppala, Rindge, NH.

We need a scoping session held in Rindge, NH. Our first Open House date that Kinder Morgan had set-up was canceled due to the weather. The revised date was set-up during a school vacation week when many people were away and Kinder Morgan would not change the date even after being informed of this.

As of today residents on our Private Drive that have the pipeline going right their properties still have not received any sort of written notice from Kinder Morgan that they plan on coming through. If this process is an example of transparency like they claim then I guess the definition of transparency needs to be redefined.

**20150612-5156(30636220).txt**

Mary McEntee, Greenfield, MA.

I am saddened that I live in a country where people have minimal say over property they own. This Business is using eminent domain to take property to build a compressor station next to a home that will make my friend's house (Holly Lovelace) unsellable, uninsurable and worthless. They will be unable to pay their mortgage, their house will be worthless and they will go into financial ruin. They're not being compensated by this business that stands to make money from this pipeline, nor do I see any revenue coming to this community. I only see a company coming in and stealing property and to take 100% of the profit that they make and export natural gas. Why should I go to work every day if this can happen to anyone? How will they compensate people and the state for the losses that will come from this project that they will make money from? A percentage of profit should be given to those people who lost their life savings on all exports of natural gas.

**20150615-0023(30639686).tif**

William And Donna Goode  
46 Dunvegan Rd  
Tewksbury, MA 01876

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First St NE  
Washington, DC 20426

Subject: Proposed Kinder Morgan Pipeline through Tewksbury

We, Donna & William Goode have lived In Tewksbury for over 30 years now raised our children here and now have grandchildren. We are urging you to stop the proposed gas pipeline by Kinder Morgan In New England to run through our backyard.

After attending several meetings and analyzing the arguments, We have come to the conclusion that the risks far outweigh rewards as follows:

High Risks:

Leaks and herbicides: The standard operating procedures could lead to leaks and spraying herbicides around the pipeline will damage our conserved land, including our drinking water supply.

Accidental leaks. Disasters do happen, despite precautions. We don't want Tewksbury MA to become another infamous location of a gas leak or an explosion from one of the highest-pressure pipeline in our backyard.

Housing prices: The gas pipeline will make our town less attractive for new home-buyers in Tewksbury, reducing prices, and hence, affecting local economy.

Please consider existing routes that already have easements and approvals if you decide to continue with this pipeline project.

Donna & William Goode

**20150615-5001(30636996).txt**

Sherri Williams, Methuen, MA.

Dear Federal Energy Regulatory Commission,

I am deeply concerned over the proposal for the installation of the TGP Northeast Energy Direct high-pressure natural gas pipeline by the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. This pipeline will run in close proximity to land owned by my close family members in North Ipswich, New Hampshire. The following are the reasons why I and my family members are opposed to this pipeline:

1. Safety concerns:

- Fires and explosions due to leaks in the natural gas infrastructure are being reported with increasing frequency.

(Source 1: <http://www.csmonitor.com/Environment/2012/1212/West-Virginia-gas-pipeline-explosion-just-a-drop-in-the-disaster-bucket>)

(Source 2: <http://www.cbc.ca/news/pipeline-safety-incident-rate-doubled-in-past-decade-1.2251771>)

- Pipeline infrastructure may also be at risk of sabotage and terrorism.

(Source 1: <http://www.pipelineandgasjournal.com/pipeline-security-new-technology-today's-demanding-environment>)

(Source 2: <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2014-06-13/uglygorilla-hack-of-u-s-utility-exposes-cyberwar-threat.html>)

- Gas in interstate pipelines generally does not have an odorant added, so you cannot smell a leak; an odorant is only required in high-population-density areas.

(Source: [http://phmsa.dot.gov/staticfiles/PHMSA/DownloadableFiles/Files/buzz\\_fant.pdf](http://phmsa.dot.gov/staticfiles/PHMSA/DownloadableFiles/Files/buzz_fant.pdf))

- A shareholder suit recently filed against Kinder Morgan alleges that money that should be used to maintain its pipelines is being funneled into profits for the company.

(Source: <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2014-02-06/kinder-morgan-sued-by-investor-over-pipeline-distributions-1-.html>)

2. Increased costs and no benefit to residents

- It appears likely that the pipeline would decrease individual property values and the value of surrounding properties.

(Source 1: [http://www.forensic-appraisal.com/gas\\_pipelines\\_q\\_a](http://www.forensic-appraisal.com/gas_pipelines_q_a))

(Source 2: <http://www.abc12.com/story/25056405/texas-landowners-win-21-million-judgment-against-pipeline-company-over-lower-property-value>.)

- There could be an additional charge on electric bills to pay for construction of the pipeline.

(Source: [http://www.nescoe.com/uploads/ISO\\_assistance\\_Trans\\_\\_\\_Gas\\_1\\_21\\_14\\_final.pdf](http://www.nescoe.com/uploads/ISO_assistance_Trans___Gas_1_21_14_final.pdf))

- The new pipeline will not bring new jobs to our state. Most of the jobs associated with the pipeline

would be temporary jobs and possibly for out-of-state employees of the company.

In the case of the Keystone XL Pipeline, of the 42,100 jobs that might result, only fifty are predicted to be in place after the one- to two-year construction period.

(Source: <http://keystonepipeline-xl.state.gov/documents/organization/221135.pdf>, p. ES-19, 4.3.1 – Economic Activity Overview)

3. The pipeline is unnecessary

- The main stated reason for the pipeline is “The ‘energy crisis’ is overblown”, according to the President of the NE Power Generators, in a March 4, 2015 article by the Power Plant Owners. “This winter, not only is there still the same amount of pipeline (as there was in ‘13/’14), but also a major nuclear plant and a big coal plant have been retired....and electricity prices (wholesale) dropped 60% from Jan. 2014 to January 2015”.
- NH exports half of the electricity it makes, so NH doesn’t need the gas for electricity generation. There already is a gas main running along southern MA. KM doesn’t have any gas customers lined up except for Liberty, which is owned by KM through Algonquin. Few people in NH use gas anyway, mains exist only in a few cities.

I sincerely hope that you will reconsider the proposal and not allow this pipeline to be installed and affect the lives and welfare of the affected region’s citizens. Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Sherrri Williams

**20150615-5004(30636999).txt**

Donna Butler, Pelham, NH.

89 Deer Hill Circle

Pelham, NH 03076

June 13, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street NE, Room 1A

Washington, DC 20426

RE: Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LLC Docket #PF-14-22-000

Dear Ms. Bose,

We are Pelham, NH residents writing to express our strong opposition to Docket #PF-14-22. We request FERC deny a permit to Kinder Morgan for the NED project given its close proximity to a 4-row high voltage electrical transmission line and Kinder Morgan’s failure to address the risk.

NED is proposed to co-locate with the Merrimack Valley Reliability Project (MVRP). In addition to the existing three rows of high voltage lines, MVRP adds of a fourth more powerful line operating at 345,000 volts.

Pipelines and high voltage power lines don’t mix. Scientific studies confirm that pipelines in close proximity to high-voltage power lines are at risk of corrosion as a result of electrical interference. Electromagnetic radiation (EMR) from power lines interfere with the integrity of pipelines and lead to corrosion. In order to properly mitigate risk, induction-of-current studies are required. Induction-of-current studies are on-site field studies conducted along the installed power lines prior to the installation of gas lines.

Kinder Morgan has failed to address a protection plan against EMR corrosion from the high voltage 4-row electrical transmission lines. Given the fact that the majority of power lines and pipeline will exist in residential areas directly affecting a minimum of 338 properties, this lack of attention is crucial. When Kinder Morgan came to Pelham on March 26, 2015, representatives were unaware of the amperage of the power

lines and had not determined a plan to protect its pipelines from corrosion.

We urge FERC to thoroughly investigate the safety of placing a large pipeline carrying fracked natural gas at a pressure of 1460 psi alongside 4 rows of high voltage power lines in family neighborhoods. We request that FERC hold a scoping session in Pelham, NH.

Without appropriate safety measures in place to prevent corrosion, we request that FERC deny Kinder Morgan's permit for NED.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Timothy & Donna Butler

**20150615-5008(30637003).txt**

Jennifer Hixon, East Greenbush, NY.

I oppose the Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's Northeast Energy Direct (NED) project because of the danger it presents to my local community, in which I was born and am raising my children. Building the pipeline and its compressor stations will disturb the natural beauty, endanger the environment and population, and change the character of the rural communities in Rensselaer County through which it will be routed. The pipeline will bring no measurable benefit to these communities nor to our country. Rather, it will line the pockets of the gas company at the expense of not only present but also future residents of the area. We should be stopping the leaks in the existing natural gas infrastructure and investing in alternative energies rather than building an expensive and dangerous pipeline for fracked gas, which damages the communities where it is obtained and, in the case of this project, is most likely intended for sale overseas.

The area through which the pipeline will be routed is one of rare beauty. It includes the Rensselaer Plateau, "one of the largest and most ecologically intact native habitats in New York State," according to the Rensselaer Plateau Alliance ([rensselaerplateau.org](http://rensselaerplateau.org)). "The forests of the Rensselaer Plateau provide: enough clean water for thousands of families; scenic beauty; hunting and fishing; locally grown forest products; healthy family activities and recreation; habitat for wildlife." We should not endanger these priceless treasures for the convenience and enrichment of a private company. Eminent domain should be used to benefit the public interest, not to harm it.

**20150615-5021(30637016).txt**

Michael Madden, Temple, NH.

Dear FERC Commissioners, I am writing to you to express my opinion AGAINST the proposed NED project and the resulting pipeline that is proposed to be constructed thru southern NH< an area of natural beauty. I have been studying the documents supplied by Kinder-Morgan and as your office has indicated in their response to Kinder Morgan, the documents are at best void of critical information regarding the economic need of such an invasive project. I have copied the FERC Mission statement and Guiding Principles and if you continue to follow those principles and continue to live by your mission statement you will make the correct decision and DENY approval of this project since it is clear from the macro economic standpoint that the region and local consumers will not benefit and only the ability of Kinder Morgan to export the excess capacity out of the region.

I look forward to hearing back from you,

Sincerely,

Michael Madden

Mission: Reliable, Efficient and Sustainable Energy for Customers.

Assist consumers in obtaining reliable, efficient and sustainable energy services at a reasonable cost through appropriate regulatory and market means.

## Guiding Principles:

**Organizational Excellence:** The Commission strives to use its resources efficiently and effectively to achieve its strategic priorities.

**Due Process and Transparency:** Paramount in all of its proceedings is the Commission's determination to be open and fair to all participants.

**Regulatory Certainty:** In each of the thousands of orders, opinions and reports issued by the Commission each year, the Commission strives to provide regulatory certainty through consistent approaches and actions.

**Stakeholder Involvement:** The Commission conducts regular outreach to ensure that interested parties have an appropriate opportunity to contribute to the performance of the Commission's responsibilities.

**Timeliness:** The Commission's goal is to reach an appropriate resolution of each proceeding in an expeditious manner.

### **20150615-5031(30637026).txt**

karen guadagni, new ipswich, NH.

The compressor station location in New Ipswich NH 03071 is unacceptable. This land is a Brownfield Site. It is filled with lead. Any land disturbance will put lead into the ground water. All homes in New Ipswich NH / Temple NH have private water wells. These water wells will become contaminated.

### **20150615-5032(30637027).txt**

karen guadagni, new ipswich, NH.

The New Ipswich New Hampshire 03071 Compressor Station will be the Largest Compressor Station in a Residential Neighborhood. Many homes will be poisoned with air, water, noise and light pollution. All other large stations are in open agricultural land. This is in the middle of a residential area

### **20150615-5051(30637185).doc**

June 14, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose

Secretary Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street NE

Room 1 A

Washington, DC 20426

re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., Docket No. PF14-22-000

Dear Secretary Bose;

Common Sense.

Integrity.

Logic.

Please do not insult the intelligence of New Englanders by ignoring these principles and values as you evaluate the Northeast Direct Pipeline project proposed by Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Pipeline Co. Hundreds of New Englanders are investing thousands of hours in researching and learning about natural gas pipelines and their impacts. We know whereof we speak.

- There is nothing direct about the proposed pipeline. The direct line between two points is a straight line. A pipeline entering western MA and ending in Dracut, MA does not traverse a straight line with a seventy mile loop north through New Hampshire. All those extra miles result in huge additional impacts to families, properties, waterways, wetlands, etc. Co-location with existing power line rights-of-way is a farce in that a pipeline must, in fact, run beside, existing power lines and thus still requires substantial taking of properties. Close proximity to power lines also raises the risk of increased corrosion in

any pipeline, to say nothing of an accident also knocking out the power grid as well as incinerating all nearby people and properties. The huge loop through New Hampshire also results in a proposed lateral pipeline back to Fitchburg Massachusetts which would be completely avoidable with a DIRECT route along existing rights of way such as the Mass Turnpike or Route 2.

- All the gas will flow to Massachusetts either via the main pipeline or via laterals. New Hampshire does not benefit directly from a single cubic foot of gas proposed to flow through this pipeline.
- New Hampshire is a net exporter of energy. This proposed pipeline offers us nothing we need.
- No homeowner in their right mind would hire a contractor who lied, dissembled and refused to answer questions about a project during the bidding process. Letter after letter to FERC has detailed the abysmally dishonest record of Kinder Morgan in public meetings. Respect to individuals is apparently not in the Kinder Morgan vocabulary. Their arrogance and dismissal of impacted citizens speaks clearly of their values. One KM rep at the Milford NH Open House stated, “All our projects are approved.” They believe they are ‘too big to be denied’. That being said they see no reason to expend effort in communicating honestly and fairly with potentially impacted landowners. How dare you force such a contractor on New England homeowners.
- Kinder Morgan can afford to pay employees to lie and dissemble for them at will. Many are willing to do so for a paycheck. Yet people impacted by this potential pipeline must find time outside of their jobs and families to fight this onslaught to their health and wellbeing, property rights, etc.
- Kinder Morgan’s arrogance extends to submitting environmental impact reports to FERC with literally thousands of parameters “To be Determined”. Such reports should be returned until such time as all details are known and reported.
- Existing pipelines, expansion of existing pipelines and repair of leaking pipelines are known to provide significantly more than the quantity of natural gas needed by New England now and in the future. The few New England contracts Kinder Morgan has made known are questionable as insider deals with artificially inflated numbers. No contracts have been announced for the proposed Fitchburg lateral. Export overseas is NOT for American ‘Public Good’. American citizens are being asked to shoulder the burden of lost property values, lost dreams, toxic and trashed environments, poisoned or lost water for private profits of a private corporation and it’s stockholders. The dollar is NOT almighty.
- ISO New England has admitted that shortages during the winter of 2013/2014 were caused by poor planning which has been corrected.
- No one can promise or guarantee the future price of fossil fuels yet we are told over and over by KM that the pipeline will lower prices. This is highly unlikely since KM is seeking overseas markets where natural gas is valued 3 – 5 times higher than in the United States. If Kinder Morgan makes long term overseas contracts and the long term supply of natural gas is less than supposed (see below) then the US could be in the situation of having to buy back natural gas at hugely inflated prices. If US natural gas is supposed to assure a long term energy future for the US then it needs to remain in this country and right now there is NO NEED for it in New Hampshire or even all of New England.
- More than 70% of landowners along the proposed route have refused access to Tennessee Pipeline and more are doing so every day. Some such properties have been surveyed anyway, when owners were not home, exhibiting complete disrespect for individuals and the legal system. Is eminent domain on that scale even remotely appropriate for a pipeline we all KNOW is not necessary or needed for the public good of New England?
- Kinder Morgan’s safety record is abysmal and getting worse with every passing day, month and year.
- Every American life is of equal value although apparently Kinder Morgan doesn’t agree. Their rural pipelines are always of minimal thickness, increasing the risk of accidents and in places with emergency resources completely unable to deal with industrial scale accidents.
- The fracked gas proposed to flow thru the pipeline is a source a vast environmental degradation,

contaminating aquifers and triggering mid west earthquakes. Fracked gas has been analyzed to contain many, many toxic chemicals which venting and leaks will release to contaminate the environment, to say nothing of the massive greenhouse gas impact of natural gas itself. The gas and toxins WILL be leaked and vented all along the pipeline route. That is the KM modus operandi.

- The proposed pipeline will mostly pass through areas served by private wells, pristine aquifers, lakes and rivers. Construction and blasting through granite outcrops (NH is the Granite State for a reason) will result in detrimental impacts far further than the proposed 150 feet. Blasting can completely change the flow of an aquifer. At the very least towns and property owners, directly affected, abutting and nearby must be guaranteed recourse if water resources are contaminated or destroyed.
- Many acres of land along the proposed route have been legally donated and preserved in perpetuity for future generations. No private, for profit enterprise should ever trump such protections.
- Virtually all towns through which this pipeline is proposed to pass have denied access for surveying and committed themselves to oppose the pipeline which will drastically diminish the rural lifestyles and values of the citizens who have deliberately chosen to live in such pristine environments.
- Tax revenues will fall in every town due to loss of property values and many properties will become unsaleable. At the very least KM must guarantee full financial compensation to property owners directly or indirectly impacted in value by the pipeline.
- KM tries to appease/bribe towns with large estimated tax payments but historically as soon as a pipeline is in place they will deploy legions of lawyers to wrangle their way out of paying promised taxes.
- Our country would do well to study the renewable energy programs of such countries as Germany and Denmark rather than focusing blindly on sucking every last drop of fossilized fuel from the ground before facing the disastrous long term impacts.
- Fracked gas resources are increasingly being discovered to be far more limited than originally thought or declared. No massive pipeline should be built for a resource with rapidly diminishing supply. According to the Post Carbon Institute, Drilling Deeper report, “Shale gas production from the top seven plays will also likely peak before 2020. Barring major new discoveries on the scale of the Marcellus, production will be far below the EIA’s forecast by 2040. Shale gas production from the top seven plays will underperform the EIA’s reference case forecast by 39% from 2014 to 2040, and more of this production will be front-loaded than the EIA estimates. By 2040, production rates from these plays will be about one-third that of the EIA forecast. Production from shale gas plays other than the top seven will need to be four times that estimated by the EIA in order to meet its reference case forecast.”

<http://www.postcarbon.org/publications/drillingdeeper/>

<http://resourceinsights.blogspot.com/2015/02/alternate-opinions-worlds-energy.html>

I further urge you to review the Declaration of Independence, partially reproduced below with a few highlights for your added attention. Please note that corporations are not part of this founding document of our country.

“We hold these truths to be self-evident, that **all men are created equal**, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, **deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed**, --That **whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government**, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness.”

And, as Lincoln so aptly stated in his 1864 Gettysburg Address, ours is a “*government of the people, by the people, for the people*”.

We, the people, have been intensely busy with diligent and detailed research about this proposed pipeline and find it to be a destructive project proposed by an arrogant, deceitful corporation with no known benefits

to the impacted region.

We are also VOTERS and we have had enough of corporations buying politicians to advance their profits over and above health, well being, environment, climate, and sustainability.

We urge, nay we insist, respectfully, that you deny this project. Please prove that Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline is NOT too big to deny.

Respectfully,

Alison Jaskiewicz

Mason NH

cc:

NH Governor, Maggie Hassan

NH US Senator, Jeanne Shaheen

NH US Senator, Kelly Ayotte

NH US Representative, Ann Kuster

NH Senator, Christopher Adams

NH Senator, Jack Flanagan

NH Executive Councilor, David Wheeler

**20150615-5064(30637219).txt**

deborah pomerleau, Londonderry, NH.

Please don't approve this project. There are too many ways that the pipeline could cause environmental issues. It isn't right for NH. Water table damage is too risky. New Ipswich should not have the compressor station. NH is called the "Granite State" because there is a lot --- a lot of granite rock. Is KM going to blast through all that granite to put a pipe in below ground? No.

**20150615-5070(30637663).pdf**

Drummond Woodsum

Attorneys at Law

Joanna B. Tourangeau  
207.253.0567 Direct  
tourangeau@dwmlaw.com  
84 Marginal Way, Suite 600  
Portland, ME 04101-2480  
207.772.1941 Man  
207.772.3627 Fax

June 15, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC)

888 First Street, N.E.

Washington, DC 20426

RE: Identification of **Town of Merrimack** Property Owners  
Impacted by NED Project in FERC Docket No. PF14-22

Dear Secretary Bose:

On March 13, 2015 the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.O (-TGP") filed with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("Commission") its Draft Resource Reports and Appendices. This filing included Appendix AA, the List of Affected Landowners which is privileged and not available for review. Since this filing, the Town of Merrimack ("Town") has had interactions with TGP in which TGP has indicated that there are sixty-one (61) impacted residents along the proposed 4.49 miles of the Northeast Energy Direct

Project (“NED Project”) in Town. The Town’s research regarding impacted property owners differs dramatically from that which TGP provided the Town. The Town tax maps indicate that there are seventy-seven (77) landowners along the NED Project route through Town including three parcels of common area with rights in those three common parcels flowing to an additional seventy-six (76) landowners. Together, the total number of those whose property rights will be directly impacted by the route crossing over their land in Town is one hundred and fifty three (153).

Given that the Town is unable to review and verify that TGP has correctly identified these property owners in its March 13, 2015 filings or otherwise, and the inaccurate number of impacted property owners recently cited by TGP, the Town respectfully requests that the Commission carefully review and address this issue in TGP’s next iteration of the Resource Reports in the above captioned docket. The NED Project is generating an extreme level of concern regarding impacts to property valuation, health and safety and environmental issues and it is of vital importance to the Town that each and every one of its residents whose property TGP may be surveying or otherwise accessing receive proper notice such that they may participate in the current pre-filing process in an informed way and all necessary requests for permission to access.

The Town will continue to actively participate in this process in order to ensure that its residents are accorded all appropriate consideration and necessary process.

Thank you for your assistance with this matter.

Sincerely,

Joanna B. Tourangeau

**20150615-5077(30637767).txt**

Alison Jaskiewicz, Mason, NH.

PART ONE

June 14, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose

Secretary Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street NE

Room 1 A

Washington, DC 20426

re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., Docket No. PF14-22-000

Dear Secretary Bose;

Common Sense.

Integrity.

Logic.

Please do not insult the intelligence of New Englanders by ignoring these principles and values as you evaluate the Northeast Direct Pipeline project proposed by Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Pipeline Co. Hundreds of New Englanders are investing thousands of hours in researching and learning about natural gas pipelines and their impacts. We know whereof we speak.

\*There is nothing direct about the proposed pipeline. The direct line between two points is a straight line. A pipeline entering western MA and ending in Dracut, MA does not traverse a straight line with a seventy mile loop north through New Hampshire. All those extra miles result in huge additional impacts to families, properties, waterways, wetlands, etc. Co-location with existing power line rights-of-way is a farce in that a pipeline must, in fact, run beside, existing power lines and thus still requires substantial taking of properties. Close proximity to power lines also raises the risk of increased corrosion in any pipeline, to say nothing of an accident also knocking out the power grid as well as incinerating all nearby people and properties. The huge loop through New Hampshire also results in a proposed lateral pipeline back to Fitchburg Massachu-

setts which would be completely avoidable with a DIRECT route along existing rights of way such as the Mass Turnpike or Route 2.

\*All the gas will flow to Massachusetts either via the main pipeline or via laterals. New Hampshire does not benefit directly from a single cubic foot of gas proposed to flow through this pipeline.

\*New Hampshire is a net exporter of energy. This proposed pipeline offers us nothing we need.

\*No homeowner in their right mind would hire a contractor who lied, dissembled and refused to answer questions about a project during the bidding process. Letter after letter to FERC has detailed the abysmally dishonest record of Kinder Morgan in public meetings. Respect to individuals is apparently not in the Kinder Morgan vocabulary. Their arrogance and dismissal of impacted citizens speaks clearly of their values. One KM rep at the Milford NH Open House stated, "All our projects are approved." They believe they are 'too big to be denied'. That being said they see no reason to expend effort in communicating honestly and fairly with potentially impacted landowners. How dare you force such a contractor on New England homeowners.

\*Kinder Morgan can afford to pay employees to lie and dissemble for them at will. Many are willing to do so for a paycheck. Yet people impacted by this potential pipeline must find time outside of their jobs and families to fight this onslaught to their health and wellbeing, property rights, etc.

Kinder Morgan's arrogance extends to submitting environmental impact reports to FERC with literally thousands of parameters "To be Determined". Such reports should be returned until such time as all details are known and reported.

\*Existing pipelines, expansion of existing pipelines and repair of leaking pipelines are known to provide significantly more than the quantity of natural gas needed by New England now and in the future. The few New England contracts Kinder Morgan has made known are questionable as insider deals with artificially inflated numbers. No contracts have been announced for the proposed Fitchburg lateral. Export overseas is NOT for American 'Public Good'. American citizens are being asked to shoulder the burden of lost property values, lost dreams, toxic and trashed environments, poisoned or lost water for private profits of a private corporation and its stockholders. The dollar is NOT almighty.

\*ISO New England has admitted that shortages during the winter of 2013/2014 were caused by poor planning which has been corrected.

\*No one can promise or guarantee the future price of fossil fuels yet we are told over and over by KM that the pipeline will lower prices. This is highly unlikely since KM is seeking overseas markets where natural gas is valued 3 – 5 times higher than in the United States. If Kinder Morgan makes long term overseas contracts and the long term supply of natural gas is less than supposed (see below) then the US could be in the situation of having to buy back natural gas at hugely inflated prices. If US natural gas is supposed to assure a long term energy future for the US then it needs to remain in this country and right now there is NO NEED for it in New Hampshire or even all of New England.

\*More than 70% of landowners along the proposed route have refused access to Tennessee Pipeline and more are doing so every day. Some such properties have been surveyed anyway, when owners were not home, exhibiting complete disrespect for individuals and the legal system. Is eminent domain on that scale even remotely appropriate for a pipeline we all KNOW is not necessary or needed for the public good of New England?

\*Kinder Morgan's safety record is abysmal and getting worse with every passing day, month and year.

\*Every American life is of equal value although apparently Kinder Morgan doesn't agree. Their rural pipelines are always of minimal thickness, increasing the risk of accidents and in places with emergency resources completely unable to deal with industrial scale accidents.

**20150615-5078(30637769).txt**

Michael R Senchak, Binghamton, NY.

This will be the best that we can hope for. Cant wait for it to happen. I support this project while heartily.

**20150615-5079(30637781).txt**

Alison Jaskiewicz, Mason, NH.

**PART TWO**

\*The fracked gas proposed to flow thru the pipeline is a source a vast environmental degradation, contaminating aquifers and triggering mid west earthquakes. Fracked gas has been analyzed to contain many, many toxic chemicals which venting and leaks will release to contaminate the environment, to say nothing of the massive greenhouse gas impact of natural gas itself. The gas and toxins WILL be leaked and vented all along the pipeline route. That is the KM modus operandi.

\*The proposed pipeline will mostly pass through areas served by private wells, pristine aquifers, lakes and rivers. Construction and blasting through granite outcrops (NH is the Granite State for a reason) will result in detrimental impacts far further than the proposed 150 feet. Blasting can completely change the flow of an aquifer. At the very least towns and property owners, directly affected, abutting and nearby must be guaranteed recourse if water resources are contaminated or destroyed.

\*Many acres of land along the proposed route have been legally donated and preserved in perpetuity for future generations. No private, for profit enterprise should ever trump such protections.

\*Virtually all towns through which this pipeline is proposed to pass have denied access for surveying and committed themselves to oppose the pipeline which will drastically diminish the rural lifestyles and values of the citizens who have deliberately chosen to live in such pristine environments.

\*Tax revenues will fall in every town due to loss of property values and many properties will become unsaleable. At the very least KM must guarantee full financial compensation to property owners directly or indirectly impacted in value by the pipeline.

\*KM tries to appease/bribe towns with large estimated tax payments but historically as soon as a pipeline is in place they will deploy legions of lawyers to wrangle their way out of paying promised taxes.

\*Our country would do well to study the renewable energy programs of such countries as Germany and Denmark rather than focusing blindly on sucking every last drop of fossilized fuel from the ground before facing the disastrous long term impacts.

\*Fracked gas resources are increasingly being discovered to be far more limited than originally thought or declared. No massive pipeline should be built for a resource with rapidly diminishing supply. According to the Post Carbon Institute, Drilling Deeper report, "Shale gas production from the top seven plays will also likely peak before 2020. Barring major new discoveries on the scale of the Marcellus, production will be far below the EIA's forecast by 2040. Shale gas production from the top seven plays will underperform the EIA's reference case forecast by 39% from 2014 to 2040, and more of this production will be front-loaded than the EIA estimates. By 2040, production rates from these plays will be about one-third that of the EIA forecast. Production from shale gas plays other than the top seven will need to be four times that estimated by the EIA in order to meet its reference case forecast."

<http://www.postcarbon.org/publications/drillingdeeper/>

<http://resourceinsights.blogspot.com/2015/02/alternate-opinions-worlds-energy.html>

I further urge you to review the Declaration of Independence, partially reproduced below with a few highlights for your added attention. Please note that corporations are not part of this founding document of our country.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of

Happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, --That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness.

And, as Lincoln so aptly stated in his 1864 Gettysburg Address, ours is a “government of the people, by the people, for the people”.

We, the people, have been intensely busy with diligent and detailed research about this proposed pipeline and find it to be a destructive project proposed by an arrogant, deceitful corporation with no known benefits to the impacted region.

We are also VOTERS and we have had enough of corporations buying politicians to advance their profits over and above health, well being, environment, climate, and sustainability.

We urge, nay we insist, respectfully, that you deny this project. Please prove that Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline is NOT too big to deny.

Respectfully,

Alison Jaskiewicz  
576 Jackson Rd  
Mason NH 03048  
603-878-2590  
alison@jaskiewicz.us

cc:

NH Governor, Maggie Hassan  
NH US Senator, Jeanne Shaheen  
NH US Senator, Kelly Ayotte  
NH US Representative, Ann Kuster  
NH Senator, Christopher Adams  
NH Senator, Jack Flanagan  
NH Executive Councilor, David Wheeler

**20150615-5080(30637782).txt**

Jesse Gifford, Sidney, NY.

I live in the area and we need good paying jobs. Traveled to PA for work last three years. It would be nice to have good work in my backyard.

**20150615-5082(30637846).txt**

Jeffrey Glasner, Walton, NY.

I live locally and would love to work on this project, especially that it would be in my back yard. It will provide jobs and help our country become more energy independent. All area communities would profit from the revenues

**20150615-5083(30637852).txt**

Daniel S. Delezel, Otego, NY.

The NED project will have a positive impact on the local community in many ways, Jobs and mostly local energy. This area has a highly skilled workforce with pipeline experience. Lets pull together and do good for the community.

**20150615-5088(30637981).txt**

william G. Buddenhagen, Jeffersonville, NY.

Our area is depressed, there is a lack of good work and good paying jobs. This will help to lower our taxes and help our schools.

It would also help our skilled union workers to have more work which we need in our area.

**20150615-5130(30638603).txt**

Douglas Smith, Cameson Mills, NY.

Do to the fact fracking was banned in our area, which was a huge loss, this project would be a great asset. Our area is a very depressed economy due to the poor choices made by local government. Brining this multi-billion dollar project to our area would be great for my family. Thank you

**20150615-5135(30638615).txt**

Steven Panek, Venice Center, NY.

We need to meet energy demands now. Gas is the further. Less impact on the environment makes good sence. We have a highly trained work force to get this done safely. Build Union and we will meet tomorrows energy demands. Thanks

**20150615-5151(30638649).txt**

Charles H. Gammow, PO Box 538, NY.

I feel this NED project- will being good paying jobs. Much needed at this time. Thanks

**20150615-5160(30638662).txt**

Robert W. Bump, Gillett, PA.

Please allow this project it is very important to the economy and economic progress of our communities. Also for the progress of economic and employment of our nation wide growth. Thank you!

**20150615-5165(30638671).txt**

Leon Graves, Middleburg CTR, PA.

I am in favor of the pipeline jobs for our Union people. It would bring these whom are unemployed some greatly needed work. It would also be profitable for new energy. The job would be best suited for the skilled workers which are Union Workers.

**20150615-5168(30638682).txt**

Angel M VazQuez Rivera, Binghampton, NY.

I live in Binghampton and this project is going to be good for the community. Brining more oppotunities of work not only for the union members but for everybody. I hope these projects open as soon as possible for the good for the community.

**20150615-5171(30638689).txt**

Jared Wormuth, Hancock, NY.

I live locally, the project is vital to our areas economy and it has minimal impact on the government. If the pproject goes through our areas local union members should be hired instead of outside members. This way a lot of us do not have to travel out of state so much for work and we can still be with our families. Thank you.

**20150615-5174(30638702).txt**

Holly P Lovelace, Northfield, MA.

As a landowner who was notified that my home is in the buffer zone of the largest proposed compressor station east of Montana, I am extremely concerned that my quality of life and my property values will be severely negatively impacted.

Since this is such a massive compressor station, I believe that 1/2 mile buffer zone may not be nearly large enough to protect my rights.

I would prefer that the pipeline use the already approved southern route near the border of Mass and Connecticut or at minimum move the station up the utility right of way another mile where there would be no abutting landowners.

**20150615-5198(30638781).txt**

Cindy Cassavaugh, Averill Park, NY.

I am writing to you concerning the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) project proposed by Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Gas -- docket number PF14-22. I am extremely concerned about this. If this is allowed to be done it will be hazardous to our air, water, health, the noise factor and more. I live in the country because I want clean air, clean water, a quiet atmosphere, and no hazards from industrial or other types of things such as this. The other important thing to note is that it will not even benefit this community in any way or even this state for that matter. This would also detract from the possibilities of selling my home if I ever needed to. I am gravely concerned that this country community is being taken advantage of due to profit gain by large companies that are not concerned about "the little guy" or the hazards and destruction that are left in the path of this plan. PLEASE DO NOT LET THIS HAPPEN IN OUR COMMUNITY. Thank you.

**20150615-5199(30638783).txt**

Thomas A. Brown, Dundee, NY.

I live locally and support the NEA project. Our local has many high skilled and trained workers, and I feel that this project can be completed with minimal environmental impact. We need these good paying jobs and our communities will benefit through revenues that help infrastructure and schools. I feel this project is very vital to our areas economy!

**20150615-5206(30638977).txt**

Raymond F. Updike JR, Elmira, NY.

What exactly can add to what is said above. But thinking of my brothers in the union. We need these jobs badly. Helping our schools and the economy is real. We are skilled and trained to do this work and need these jobs badly. Thank you!

**20150615-5213(30639012).txt**

Francis G Horton, Penn Yan, NY.

If it keeps the Union workers on the job, I feel it is a good idea. Please help us get these great paying jobs.

**20150615-5227(30639043).txt**

Douglas Parker, Clifton Park, NY.

I am a 49 year resident of New York State. I believe the NED project will benefit all New Yorkers by meeting energy demands with domestic energy. Also with minimal environmental impact. Our community benefits with good paying jobs and tax revenues.

**20150615-5228(30639067).txt**

Joe Dylar, Addison, NY.

I am excited to hear about the upcoming pipeline work. This is my livelihood and how I pay my taxes. So lets plan the work and work the plan. Thanks

**20150615-5250(30639211).txt**

Mary M. Roy, Windsor, MA.

Date: June 15, 2015

RE: Docket #PF14 – 22 – Northeast Energy Direct

To FERC:

As a resident of Windsor, Massachusetts, I am writing to state my opposition to the Kinder Morgan pipeline and to the 80,000 hp compressor station which would be built here.

This project would be devastating to our small town of less than 1000, completely changing the quality of life of its citizens. We have already voted upon and approved a referendum stating our opposition to this project.

I am particularly concerned about: the emission of methane and fracking compounds from the compressor, operating 24/7 and with periodic, intentional “ blow down “ events; the risk of leaks from the proposed 36” diameter pipeline, carrying as much as 2.2 billion cubic feet of gas per day through Windsor, and sections of which would be under bodies of water; the safety of the people living in this town, served by volunteer fire and emergency responders, in the case of a pipeline or compressor rupture and explosion; the irreparable environmental damage to a pristine place of forests, fields, and unspoiled rivers.

In addition, many questions have been raised about the real objective of this project. Is its ultimate purpose NOT to meet claimed energy needs in New England, but instead, to export gas from a port in Dracut, MA to higher-priced foreign markets ? Shouldn’t steps such as fixing leaks in existing pipelines, investment in renewable resources such as solar power, and incentives for increased efficiency be taken first ?

Respectfully, I request that FERC deny all permits for the NED pipeline.

Sincerely,

Mary M. Roy  
1495 East Windsor Rd.  
Windsor, MA 01270

**20150616-0027(30646239).pdf**

**Town of Sharon, New Hampshire**

432 NH Route 123 • Sharon, NH 03458

603-924-9250 • FAX: 603-924-3103 • www.sharonnh.org

June 10, 2015

FERC (Federal Energy Regulatory Commission)

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 1st St NE Washington, DC 20426-0001

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., Docket No. PF14-22-000 Proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project

To whom it may concern;

The Conservation Commission of the Town of Sharon, New Hampshire is in opposition to construction of the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct pipeline through southwestern New Hampshire. The Town of Sharon borders the Town of New Ipswich, and residents would be less than 2 miles from the proposed route

of the pipeline. While the pipeline won't run through Sharon, we are concerned with the disruption to the forests, wetlands, geology, wildlife habitat, general rural character and way of life of all towns in this region. Sharon is a heavily forested town, the rural nature of which is of utmost importance to its residents. Of the Town's 9956 acres, various conservation holdings account for 4991 acres, or approximately 50% of the town's land area. The residents of Sharon have always been outspoken about the importance of the rural character of our Town, and this is strongly reflected in our Master Plan, Town Ordinances, our Forest Management Plan for the Town Forest and in our Natural Resources Management Plan

A Natural Resource Assessment and Management Plan was completed for the Town of Sharon in 1996, which revealed the valuable biological resources of our town. The Conservation Commissions of towns adjacent to Sharon have undertaken similar Natural Resource and Wildlife Assessments, working hard to protect large parcels of land for recreation, wildlife habitat and wildlife corridors. Included in this is the implementation of conservation easements with local landowners.

As stewards of the Town's natural resources, the Sharon Conservation Commission upholds Sharon's Zoning Ordinances that support land use patterns that preserve and protect our water and woodlands, our outstanding natural topography, and open space for both recreation and wildlife habitat. A notable resource in Sharon is the Gridley River, which has its headwaters in Sharon before running south into New Ipswich, (very close to the proposed pipeline route) and then turns north to become one of the main sources of the Contoocook River, that flows through many towns on its way to the Merrimack River. The portion of the Gridley River in Sharon was overwhelmingly identified by Sharon residents as one of the most important wildlife resources in this town.

The rural character of this region depends on land undisturbed by large scale commercial enterprises that will have long-term impacts on both the wildlife and the residents of southwestern New Hampshire. Even after the construction of the pipeline is completed, the placement of a large compressor plant in this very rural area would permanently alter the lives of the residents and wildlife, with noise, light and emission pollution becoming an unwelcome and permanent part of these lives.

Construction of the pipeline will negatively impact many unique wildlife habitats and wetlands, much of which are on conservation lands in the region. It will disrupt and disturb geologic features, likely causing permanent change to aquifers and wetlands. Sharon, like other towns in our region, does not have municipal water and wastewater systems, but relies on the natural infrastructure. As stated in Sharon's Master Plan, adopted in 2003, "Our natural 'infrastructure', every bit as important and complex as those man-made systems found in more urban areas, is essential to the safety, health and very sustainable future of the Town." During construction, noise from blasting and heavy equipment will be heard in Sharon and adjacent towns. During operation, noise from the compressor station will be heard in Sharon day and night, for years to come. In the event of an explosion or fire, large blocks of forest, wildlife habitat and important wetlands, our valued natural environment and the rural life of this area would be forever altered.

We can only speak for the Town of Sharon: While we may withstand the disruption to our quality of life during the construction of the proposed pipeline, we are much less certain of the ability to maintain this quality in the future during constant operation, considering the impact the project will have on the natural environment, the loss of tourism resulting from it, and the diminishment of the quality of life that we foresee for Sharon and all the other towns with or near this project. It is an unreasonable sacrifice for little benefit to the State of New Hampshire.

Sincerely yours,

Ken Callahan, Chairman  
Conservation Commission  
Town of Sharon

20150616-0046

PROPERTY ACCESS ~~DENIED~~ GRANTED

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: June 5, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

RE: ~~Denying~~ **Giving** Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

Street Address: 22 Barrus Road

Town & Zip: Richmond, NH 03470

Map & Lot Number(s) (if known):

I am ~~denying~~ **Giving** permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward ~~will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.~~

William Petrowski

CC:

FERC

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, NE, Room 1A

Washington, DC 20426

**20150616-0047(30645780).pdf**

PROPERTY ACCESS DENIED

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: 6/5/15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

RE: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

Street Address: 149 Fish Hatchery Road

Town & Zip: Richmond, NH 03470

Map & Lot Number(s) (if known):

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Marcia A. Clark

CC:

FERC

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, NE, Room 1A

Washington, DC 20426

**20150616-0048(30645941).pdf**

PROPERTY ACCESS DENIED

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: June 8, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

RE: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

Street Address: 413 Athol Rd, also 421 Athol Rd

Town & Zip: Richmond, NH 03470

Map & Lot Number(s) (if known): Map 000414 Lot 000030 also Lot 000029

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Daniel J. Carey, Mary Jane Carey

CC:

FERC

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, NE, Room 1A

Washington, DC 20426

**20150616-0049(30645212).pdf**

PROPERTY ACCESS DENIED

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: 6 June 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

RE: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

Street Address: 154 Winchester Rd

Town & Zip: Richmond, NH 03470

Map & Lot Number(s) (if known):

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Gregory H. Butko

CC:

FERC

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

**20150616-0050(30646156).pdf**

PROPERTY ACCESS DENIED

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: 6/8/15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

RE: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

Street Address: 292 Morgan Rd

Town & Zip: Richmond, NH 03470

Map & Lot Number(s) (if known):

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Dan Greenspan

CC:

FERC

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, NE, Room 1A

Washington, DC 20426

**20150616-0051(30646040).pdf**

**Town of Troy**

16 Central Square - PO Box

June 4, 2015

Regarding Docket No. PFI4-22-000

On March 11, 2015, the town of Troy, New Hampshire held its annual town meeting. A total of 97 citizens attended and voted Yes unanimously on the following articles to oppose the proposed NED Kinder Morgan-Tennessee Gas Pipeline proposal. Docket No. PFI4-22-000.

Article 33 - By Petition

To see if the town will vote to oppose installation of a natural gas pipeline by Kinder Morgan because the proposal is inconsistent with Individual property rights. because if approved. KM would have the power to force private property owners to give up easement under Eminent Domain proceedings for installation of the pipeline.

Article 34 - By Petition

To see if the town will vote to oppose installation of a natural gas pipeline by Kinder Morgan because the proposal is inconsistent with protecting the Town's groundwater. residential wells. other bodies of water. local vegetation. wildlife and threatened species.

Article 35 - By Petition

To see if the town will vote to oppose installation of a natural gas pipeline by Kinder Morgan because the proposal is inconsistent with preserving the Town's rural character. scenic roads. roadside trees. stone walls, forests.

#### Article 36 - By Petition

To see if the town will vote to oppose installation of a natural gas pipeline by Kinder Morgan because the proposal would adversely affect health and safety by causing construction materials, soil, dust and potential contaminants to enter the air, wetland areas. and/or groundwater. aquifers, drinking water, along with residential wells and any run-off or seasonal melts.

#### Article 37 - By Petition

To see if the town will vote to oppose installation of a natural gas pipeline by Kinder Morgan because the Town lacks the required equipment or personnel for emergency services to adequately address potential health and safety risks of a pipeline explosion, leak, or other installation.

#### Article 38 - By Petition

To see if the town will vote to oppose installation of a natural gas pipeline by Kinder Morgan because the proposal is inconsistent with the Town's goal keeping Troy Mills Landfill Superfund site environmentally secure regarding surface water, monitoring wells, wetlands, air and soil.

Sincerely,

Marianne Salcetti, Ph.D.

Chair - Troy Conservation Commission

*{page 2: misaligned scan, approx 15° tilt, not OCR compatible. Editor's summary of relevant content:}*

"Select Board Meeting Minutes, Town of Troy, Monday April 27, 2015, 5:00 PM }

....

6:02 - Conservation Committee - Marianne Salcetti, Sheila Ames, Warren Davis and Darlene Harris present - Pipeline information. Selectman Matson MOVED to endorse the NH Coalition letter, SECOND Selectman Nadeau. VOTE unanimous. Amend the motion so Mr. Davis can sign the letter on behalf of the Selectmen. The committee presented the Gas Pipeline Resolution to the Select board. Selectman Matson MOVED to support it, SECOND Selectman Nadeau, VOTE unanimous.

...

*{page 3}*

### **Resolution concerning the proposed Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Natural Gas Pipeline**

Unanimously passed by the Troy Conservation Commission, Troy, NH March 20, 2015

#### Gas Pipeline Resolution

The mission of the Troy Conservation Commission is to protect the natural resources of the town of Troy, NH. In regards to this mission, the Troy Conservation Commission is in opposition to the proposed Kinder Morgan I Tennessee Natural Gas pipeline proposal for the following reasons:

1. The proposed route will require at least an additional 125- foot right of way (ROW) through privately owned land and forests under eminent domain, ultimately not in the public's interest, but for private gain.
2. The burying and placement of the pipeline will require extensive drilling and blasting that could adversely affect residential wells. Water tables could shift during blasting thus rerouting the water away from the wells. Water quality, along with radon releases (a known carcinogen) could be affected during and after construction. Blasting could disturb sediment, causing it to flow to the home rather than resting safely at the bottom of the well\_
3. The pipeline is intended to transport natural gas to distribution facilities primarily for export, and would not bring fuel directly to homes for residential use therefore it will not benefit the citizens of Troy or the

majority of the citizens of the state of New Hampshire.

4. Construction of the pipeline would leave permanent degradation of our landscape, private properties, wildlife, forests, agricultural land, and aquifers. It will also undermine past and future efforts to maintain the town's rural, open space character.

5\_ The proposed route will traverse Rhododendron State Park in which 762 acres resides in the town of Troy. This affected land has been intended for conservation and public use only. The permanent scarring of the land is not in the public's best interest. The Park is designated as a National Natural Landmark by the U.S. National Park Service as part of Title XIX Public Recreation Chapter 227-0:6, which states that the Monadnock Advisory Commission and department of resources and economic development is to ensure the integrity of that designation in its management policies and plans.

6. The construction of this pipeline will further extend New Hampshire's dependence on fossil fuels. The methane that leaks from well drilling, flaring, transmission, and distribution is a far more potent greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide and negates any gains over burning other fossil fuels.

7. Building a permanent infrastructure for this natural gas pipeline is contrary to the goals of reduced carbon emissions outlined in the "New Hampshire Climate Action Plan" (NHCAP).

8. The possible use of herbicides as a means of vegetation control has the potential to adversely affect fish, wildlife, water quality, and human health through the contamination of ground and surface water sources.

9. The proposed route is within approximately 500 feet of restrictive covenants surrounding the Troy Mills Superfund Site. The Site responsibility falls under the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, (EPA). Storm water runoff from the construction site can impact surface water quality and sediment, and interfere with ongoing testing at the Site's sensitive monitoring wells. Drilling, blasting, or digging could interfere with groundwater flow, impacting the Site's contaminants. Construction debris likely could get into an already stressed wetlands area by the Superfund Site. The primary remedy for this Site is "Monitored Natural Attenuation", which is a very slow process, over a period of years, in which contaminants degrade naturally and are continuously tested and measured. Nearby construction, drilling and digging could alter these results and interfere with this process. The potential for pipeline leaks of natural gas near the Superfund Site presents risks. Explosions present a risk of Significant and catastrophic damage. The South end of the Troy Mills Superfund Site is within the 1,000-foot blast/incineration zone of the proposed pipeline. In the event of an explosion or fire, buried waste carpet and fabric scraps could ignite and burn, emitting toxic fumes creating an extremely hazardous and dangerous environment for firefighters, first responders and nearby residents.

Signed: Sheila Ames

Warren Davis

Darline Harris

LeeAnn Lafosse

Melvin Pierce

Julie Reekie

Marianne Salcetti

**20150616-0052(30645173).pdf**

PROPERTY ACCESS DENIED

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC

1615 Suffield Street

Agawam, MA 01001

Date: 6/8/15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

RE: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

Street Address: 11 Monument Rd  
Town & Zip: Richmond, NH 03470  
Map & Lot Number(s) (if known): 407/89

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Debra Coll

CC:  
FERC  
Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

**20150616-0053(30645221).pdf**

PROPERTY ACCESS DENIED

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: June 8, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

RE: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

Street Address: 11 Monument Rd  
Town & Zip: Richmond, NH 03470  
Map & Lot Number(s) (if known): 407/89

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

William Coll, Jr.

CC:  
FERC  
Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

**20150616-0055(30645731).pdf**

Handwritten card, Susan Collins, 68 Turnpike Rd, Ashby, MA 01431, opposing

**20150616-0056(30645948).pdf**

Handwritten card, Fred Walsh, 68 Turnpike Rd, Ashby, MA 01431, opposing

**20150616-0057(30646130).pdf**

Handwritten card, Marilyn Griska, 18 Atlantic Dr, Rindge, NH 03461, opposing

**20150616-0058(30645213).pdf**

Handwritten card, Wendy Juchnevics-Freeman, 18 Rumrill Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, opposing

**20150616-0059(30646150).pdf**

Handwritten card, Sally ? Lawton, 12 Stage Rd, Westhampton, MA 01027, opposing

**20150616-0082(30647036).pdf**

Handwritten card, Susan Riley, 1445 North St, Windsor, MA 01270, opposing

**20150616-0083(30646199).pdf**

Handwritten card, Tom Peragallo, PO Box 590, NH 03461, opposing

**20150616-0084(30643716).pdf**

Hand written card, Tyrone C. Perrault, 915 High St. Hill Road, Windsor, MA 01270, opposing

**20150616-0085(30646197).pdf**

Hand written card, Gary & Janet Booky, 394 Peru Rd, Windsor, MA 06270, opposing

**20150616-0086(30646201).pdf**

Hand written card, Gloria Carpenter, 163 Haverihill St, Dracut, MA 01862, opposing

**20150616-0108(30645178).pdf**

Handwritten card, Charles A. Riley, 1445 North St, Windsor, MA 01270, opposing

**20150616-0117(30644840).pdf**

6/8/20015

Attn: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

Reference: Docket1PF14-22

As a Dracut resident and a investor I cannot find any reason that it is necessary for Kinder Morgan- Tennessee Gas Corporation to destroy one of Dracut's beautiful neighborhoods. The proposed location for the pipeline consists of valuable farm lands, beautiful conservation land, and homes owned by hard working people with pride that shows in their properties. As an investor I dedicate a lot of my time researching energy and technology markets. With the advancements in renewable resources and energy storage in years to come, the volume of natural gas needed will most certainly diminish. The impact of this proposal will not. The town of Dracut and the proposed site for the pipeline will not recover from this. We cannot create new farm lands and conservation land in this area, when they are gone they are gone forever.

Before issuing a certificate to a corporation of this type, please think long and hard about the impact and the future need for this volume of natural gas. Compare that to the damage inflicted on our properties, our farm lands, our lifelong investments, our children's futures and this town.

Sincerely,

Brandon Graham

22 Kevin Road

Dracut, MA 01826

**TOWN OF NORTHFIELD  
OFFICE OF THE SELECTBOARD  
69 MAIN STREET  
NORTHFIELD, MASSACHUSETTS 01360-1017**

June 9, 2015

Mr. Norman Bay, Chairman  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: Northeast Energy Direct Project, Docket No. PF-14-22-000

Dear Chairman Bay,

On behalf of the community of Northfield, we respectfully request consideration be given to holding a scoping session within our town as we are one of two communities being proposed to host an 80,000 hp compressor station.

If these sessions are held in Boston, that means a 180 mile round trip for Northfield residents to participate. This translates to a full day off of work. With the exception of Dracut, Massachusetts, all of the other Massachusetts towns affected by the NED Project are located to the west of Northfield and Warwick.

We believe it is imperative that our residents be afforded the opportunity to engage in open and transparent dialog with FERC regarding the pipeline and the proposed route, impacts, and mitigation requirements before any final decision is made.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this request and we look forward to welcoming you in Northfield.

Sincerely,

THE SELECTBOARD OF NORTHFIELD, MASSACHUSETTS

Tracy Rogers  
Selectman

cc: Allen Fore, Kinder Morgan  
Peggy Sloan, Franklin Regional Council of Governments

20150616-5015(30639433).txt

Donna Butler, Pelham, NH.  
June 15, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LLC Docket #PF-14-22-000  
Northeast Energy Direct (NED)

Dear Ms. Bose,

We are Pelham, NH residents writing to express our strong opposition to Docket #PF-14-22 and together request that FERC deny the permit of the NED project.

Accidents happen. Pipelines rupture. Just yesterday, the rupture of a natural gas pipeline in rural Cuero, TX occurred, prompting this response from Sheriff Joel Zavesky:

“If we were going to have a fire from a ruptured pipeline, I don’t think we could have picked a better location, as there were so few homes around there.” He added the Sheriff’s Office doesn’t have any idea what

caused the blaze.

NED doesn't belong in populated neighborhoods. The risks associated with gas pressurized at 1,460 pounds per square inch travelling at more than 400 miles per hour in a 36" pipeline are significant, unnecessarily placing innocent citizens in harms way. Buried to a depth of only 3' below the surface, and 2' where rock is present (granite is a predominant occurrence in NH, "The Granite State"), pipelines can be easily compromised. NED has no place in neighborhoods yet that is exactly where Kinder Morgan proposes to place this line.

[http://www.nofrackedgasinmass.org/notgp/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/12\\_NED-VolIII-App-F-Mark\\_Align-Sheet\\_Seg-J-0313152of2.PDF-.pdf](http://www.nofrackedgasinmass.org/notgp/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/12_NED-VolIII-App-F-Mark_Align-Sheet_Seg-J-0313152of2.PDF-.pdf)

It is important to note that the maps Kinder Morgan filed to FERC in early March and those they distributed to Pelham residents on March 26th were different. Kinder Morgan distributed maps that failed to show entire neighborhoods within proximity to NED.

Our request is twofold: (1) Please consider holding a FERC scoping session in Pelham, NH to review its proximity to neighborhoods and (2) Please deny Kinder Morgan's permit for NED.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Timothy & Donna Butler

**20150616-5047(30639465).txt**

Susan, Nassau, NY.

Dear FERC,

**PLEASE STOP KINDER MORGAN!!!**

It is my understanding that Kinder Morgan is planning on building a compression station on Lape Road which is right behind my house. There are a lot of houses all over this area. Can they not find an area which is not as built up to do their building? There are a lot of beautiful homes, families, children here. We do not want to be killed. We do not want to be scared. We do not want to hear their noise and see their lights.

Why would Kinder Morgan's convenience and profits be more important than our lives and our welfare?

Please make them find a deserted area where no one will be in danger.

Thank you.

William F. Hastings

32 Pine Drive South

Nassau, NY 12123

wackywilly731@gmail.com

**20150616-5052(30639470).txt**

Susan Keegan, Nassau, NY.

Dear FERC:

I am writing you with extreme concern. We understand that there is a danger of a compressor station being built right below our house. There are a lot of families living on our street and on the streets surrounding us. We are hard working, tax-paying, voting families. We paid a lot for our homes and should be allowed to enjoy them without the fear of some profiteering company wanting to make money on our suffering.

There would be an unbearable noise coming from a compressor station, noise pollution, light pollution and air pollution. Kinder Morgan is known to be lax in their care of their stations. We do not want to be blown up so that they can make more money for something of absolutely NO BENEFIT to us.

Please let me hear what you will do about it.

Thank you.

Linda Hastings

32 Pine Drive South

Nassau, NY 12123

lindahastings1@aol.com

**20150616-5080(30639652).pdf**

*{editor's note: I submitted the following copy of this letter from the Mason, NH, Board of Selectmen which had been mailed April 29, 2015, to FERC, when it became apparent that the original had not made its way into the FERC Docket despite a delay exceeding 5 weeks. In my cover note to my submission I expressed concern about official letters from local governments to FERC not being made part of FERC's official Docket. I hope this is a rare instance}*

**Office of the Board of Selectmen  
Town of Mason**

16 Darling Hill Road - Mann House  
Mason, New Hampshire 03048  
(603) 878-2070 (603) 878-4892 Fax

April 28, 2015

Norman C. Bay, Chairman  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Docket: PF-14-22-000

Lead Applicant: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC

Dear Chairman Bay and Commissioners:

The Town of Mason is located in Hillsborough County, New Hampshire, along the route of the applicant's proposed Northeast Energy Direct high pressure gas pipeline. Tennessee proposes running 3.9 miles of 36" of pipe (main line), and 5.08 miles of 12" pipe (Fitchburg lateral) through Mason. I With a total 8.98 miles of pipeline, Mason is one of the New Hampshire towns most heavily impacted by the proposed line.

We are writing to advise you that at the annual Mason Town Meeting on March 14, 2015, the voters voiced unanimous opposition to the NED project by approving the following two warrant articles:

Article 12. To see if the town will authorize the Board of Selectmen to take all reasonable and prudent actions to oppose the proposed Northeast Energy Direct high pressure gas pipeline, lateral line, and appurtenances, and all reasonable and prudent actions necessary to mitigate the impact thereof on the land and people of the Town of Mason. Such actions may include but are not limited to participating directly in all Federal and State regulatory processes related to such pipeline project, joining in coalition with the selectmen of other affected New Hampshire towns in opposing or mitigating the effects of the proposed project, and hiring legal professionals and consultants to advise and appear on behalf of the Town of Mason in regulatory and/or judicial proceedings related thereto. This authorization shall remain in effect until rescinded by a vote of the town meeting.

Article 13: To see if the town will raise and appropriate the sum of \$80,000.00 to be expended at the discretion of the Board of Selectmen in opposition to the proposed Northeast Energy Direct high pressure gas pipeline, lateral line, and appurtenances, and/or to minimize the impact thereof on the land and people of the Town of Mason, including but not limited to expenditures for legal representation and

consultants, land use planning and zoning consultation, public information purposes, administrative and court filing fees, participation in multi-town coalitions, and any and all other expenses reasonably related to opposing said pipeline project and/or mitigating the effects thereof. This will be a non-lapsing appropriation per RSA 32-7, VI and will not lapse until December 31, 2018.

In accordance with the foregoing, the Board of Selectmen notifies you, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, that the people of the Town of Mason, overwhelmingly oppose the NED project.

Respectfully submitted,

TOWN OF MASON, NH

By its Selectmen:

Bernard O'Grady, Selectman

Louise M. Lavoie, Selectman

Charles V. Moser, Selectman

cc: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LTD

Kinder Morgan

Gov. Hassan

Sen. Shaheen

Sen. Ayotte

Sen. Avar

Rep. Flanagan

Rep. Adams

**20150616-5130(30640468).txt**

Brandon Cardinal, New Ipswich, NH.

DATE: 6-16-2015

RE: Opposition to the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline natural gas pipeline and compressor installation in New Ipswich

As the owner of property located at:

208 Old Wilton Rd. New Ipswich, New Hampshire

By now many of my coalition partners have met with you and discussed the many concerns they have about the NED project. I like them share these same concerns and deem it necessary to share with you how they personally impact me as a citizen of our town, and father of 4.

Quality of life

I moved to New Ipswich New Hampshire 10 years ago with my family and built a home. One which I had no intention of ever leaving, but that could change. I chose to move here from the city to offer my children a cleaner, more peaceful, and safer environment to grow up in. Up until this point all these things have been a part of our daily lives, as well as numerous other families in this town. These very specific characteristics of living in New Ipswich will be lost if the pipeline and compressor station are built in our town.

Allow me to share a real situation that occurred last week. I laid my head down on my pillow the other night, I looked over at my wife and said do you hear that? She replied hear what? I said exactly nothing you could hear a pin drop, which wouldn't be the case if the 80K HP compressor station was erected within the 1/2 mile it's supposed to be from my home. So would we lose sleep, YES! Would we be worried about if our well was contaminated when we turned on our facets, YES! Am I worried about the quality of the air I'll be breathing, YES! I've read reports and watched numerous videos on homes that are located near a compressor station and after it went up folks began complaining about constant headaches, bloody noses, vertigo, and a constant rumble of their homes as well as sleep deprivation. Is this the environment I want to subject my family to in the future, NO and I assure you I won't!

## Safety

It's 3AM and I'm awoken out of a sound sleep to blaring sirens. 10 minutes later my door bell rings and someone is at my door telling me I need to evacuate. So I run and wake everyone up, get in the car and drive somewhere. This isn't a grim story I carved out of a book, but a very real scenario I would be subjected to if this project was approved by the FERC. I have no interest in putting my family in harm's way like this. I also feel that we're putting many folks in additional danger because if a fire or explosion occurs the local emergency response team will be asked to stand down until the gas companies support crew can arrive. These projects DON'T belong in an area where homes, schools, and business are located much less 1/2 mile from them. NOTHING about this is right! Lastly let us not forgot we're considered a sacrifice zone because we're rural community. Having the power to choose the strength of material used for a project is equal the power to choose whose life and environment is more valuable than another. That control shouldn't fall under KM.

## Financial

There is as you know much discussion and concern surrounding the devaluation of our homes and property. How would this affect our ability to sell or obtain insurance for our homes, or keep the policies we have without an increase to our premiums? These are all very real questions we all have. We need to be honest with ourselves, would you ever buy a home exposed to the real dangers I've described above? We all know the answer is an unequivocal no. This will also be an expensive decision for town as tax burdens will be placed on the remaining residents that decide to remain in town. That coupled with the very real possibility of increased utility costs due to tariffs imposed on us to pay for NED will put a strain on this community. All this when we stand no financial gain, or ability to use the gas we are creating a super highway for.

I hope you can see this project is BAD news for the future of New Ipswich and New Hampshire. I look forward to fighting this battle alongside you united with the folks who want a safe and prosperous future for our town and State.

Thank you,

Brandon Cardinal

### **20150616-5133(30640511).txt**

Robert DaBerigno, Highland Mills, NY.

I approve the project. This is great for the area and will be great for our union member of local 17. Local jobs with a highly skilled workforce, that will meet energy demands. Also help with our local economy and infrastructure.

### **20150616-5135(30640513).txt**

Andrew P. Carr Jr, Middletown, NY.

I approve this project because it will help meet energy demands with domestic energy, and minimal environmental impact. This will great for the community with tax revenues.

### **20150616-5136(30640514).txt**

Stephen W Stolecki, Middletown, NY.

This will help our local economy. by providing great paying jobs and put our union members to work who are skilled and highly trained in this area of work.

### **20150616-5142(30640531).txt**

Mary Kelliher, Kingston, NY.

I just became aware of the proposal for the 344 mile pipeline. which will extend through our area. THE NED CAN NOT BE OPPOSED. As a New Yorker I know how important it is to bring good paying jobs to

our area. A large multibillion dollar project is needed here in the Northeast. This could add so much to local revenue. I am asking that FERC to allow this project to develop.

**20150616-5143(30640572).txt**

Vincent Wodenski, Catskill, NY.  
WE NEED WORK IN THE AREA. THE AREA IS DEAD.

**20150616-5147(30640579).txt**

John Lassley, Beach Lake, NY.  
I am in full support of the NED project. I think that this is a great thing. It will bring good paying jobs to our area and this is what we need. It will be very good for the community.

**20150616-5149(30640587).docx**

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Docket No. PF14-22-000 Northeast Energy Direct Project, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.

Dear Ms. Bose:

I am writing on behalf of the **New Hampshire Sierra Club (NHSC)** regarding the above referenced project, Northeast Energy Direct (NED) of Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, a Kinder Morgan company.

Started in 1892 and with over two million members and supporters, the Sierra Club is the nation's oldest and largest grassroots environmental organization. Its statement of purpose starts: "To explore, enjoy, and protect the wild places of the Earth."

NHSC has over 10,000 members and supporters in New Hampshire. We have a number of questions related to the project's economic and environmental impact on our communities, local economy, public health and environment.

**How does the NED pipeline contribute to the goal of energy diversity for New England?**

New England is already generating over half of its electricity with natural gas .[1]

**Electric generating capacity and energy production by fuel type:**

New England Generators by Fuel Type	% of Total Capacity 2012	% of Electric Energy 2012
Natural gas	43%	52%
Oil	22%	<1%
Nuclear	14%	31%
Coal	8%	3%
Hydro	5%	6%
Pumped Storage	5%	1%
Other renewables	3%	7%

Over the years, the argument for fuel diversity has been used to keep "the worst of the worst" coal burning facilities operational in New Hampshire. Now it seems the experts want to ignore fuel diversity as a goal and crown natural gas as the dominant fuel in the region.

- "The energy problems confronting New England....largely stem from a growing regional dependency

on natural gas that has displaced many other fuels”, said Gordon van Welie, president and CEO of ISO-New England” during the July 2 Energy Meeting of public officials St Anselm College.

- “The initiative’s goal is to diversify the region’s fuel supply, stabilize the energy economy and above all, benefit ratepayers,” said Robert Scott, commissioner of the NHPUC at the same meeting. “The overriding criteria will be cost-effectiveness.”

In examining the distribution of fuel types shown in the chart, it is obvious that increasing fuel diversity efforts should focus on energy efficiency measures, hydro, pumped (or other) storage, and other renewables. A major increase of pipeline infrastructure will only encourage increased reliance on natural gas and reduced fuel diversity. Also, a high level of dependency will likely lead to ongoing price volatility, as well as a flattening of job growth within the clean energy sector.

### **How does the NED pipeline support the federal, regional and state policy?**

In 2007 US Supreme Court decision confirmed that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) does have the jurisdiction to set safety standards for carbon emissions from power plants as part of the Clean Air Act. Then in 2014, the EPA introduced the Clean Power Plan (CPP), a commonsense standard that encourages the states to create and implement an innovative and flexible plan to lower carbon with a variety of tools. Currently, New Hampshire also participates in state and regional efforts to reduce climate pollution, like the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (RGGI). The State released a 10 Year Energy Strategy in 2014 to create a vision of the energy future best suited to the state’s resources, economy, communities, businesses, and character [2]. RGGI, renewable energy goals, energy efficiency programs and procurement priorities are all designed to help promote cleaner energy and thus cleaner air, as well as, new job creation and investment. Specifically, the CPP’s Building Blocks Three and Four are particularly suited for New Hampshire’s state and regional goals. From the EPA website, these two sections are:

**Building Block Three** aims to encourage use of zero emitting sources by expanding the use of renewable sources, like wind and solar; and low emitting sources like nuclear power.

**Building Block Four** aims to “use electricity more efficiently” by “reducing demand on power plants is a proven, low-cost way to reduce emissions, which will save consumers and businesses money and mean less carbon pollution.”

New England does not face the same challenges at other regions [3]. For example, the Mid-West region of the United States generates only 7% of its electricity from natural gas fired plants while over 60% of its electricity is generated by coal-fired power plants.

In comparison, the entire Northeast (which includes more than the New England states) consumes only half the electricity of the Midwest region. Plus, ISO-NE forecasted demand at less than 2% by for the next ten years.

According to state and regional policy, the priority for New Hampshire is to shore up efficiency and conservation measures within its building inventory. The New Hampshire Office of Energy and Planning commissioned a study that estimated the potential for energy savings in the residential sector to be about 4,800 BBtu and in the commercial sector [4] to be over 4,000 BBtu. We are not a large state and savings of this magnitude are significant.

FERC should and must consider federal, regional, or state policy, such as the Clean Power Plan, Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative, or the NH 10 Year Energy Strategy, as part of the thoughtful planning and calculation for future projects in New England. While it may be true that New England’s natural gas fired generating plants are occasionally constrained by price and supply, operating all of New England’s natural gas fired plants at 70% of capacity may not be even necessary since the states, individually and regionally, have planned renewable energy goals for air pollution standards, renewable energy and demand-side reductions. More natural gas capacity is not appropriate for New England.

Further, FERC should and must consider the costs for projects that are not part of the policy developed in a state or region. Given the state, regional, and federal priorities, the pipeline proposal in this docket would in-

crease regional financial investment on the fossil fuel infrastructure which would potentially divert time and money away from renewable energy projects that are prioritized by the federal, regional, and state policy.

### **The NED pipeline proposal increases demand for fracked gas.**

NHSC has concerns that the construction of the NED pipeline will not only create increased regional demand for natural gas, but will also lead to international export at unprecedented rates, based on the projected capacity of the NED pipeline of 2.2 bcf/day, and application to the Department of Energy (DOE filing number, FE Docket No. 14-179-LNG) for LNG export licenses of .8 bcf/day by Pieridae Energy of Canada.

In a May 8, 2014 letter to the White House signed by 22 US Senators, including New Hampshire's Senior Senator Jeanne Shaheen, states,

“Recently, the Department of Energy approved exports of liquefied natural gas from a sixth export facility. This means that total approved exports, combined with existing and approved export pipelines, now exceeds the total amount of gas that is currently used in every single American home and commercial business. This level of exports well exceeds the “high export scenario” referenced by a Department of Energy study in 2012 that indicated prices could increase by up to 54 percent. Price increases of this scale could translate into more than \$60 billion a year in higher energy costs for American consumers and businesses.”

Increased costs to consumers are not the only impacts; our communities, health, and our environment are at risk, too. A fact sheet from the Sierra Club states, “Fracking for natural gas damages landscapes, pollutes water and air sources, and can have serious health consequences for local communities [5].” Additionally, “the many problems associated with inadequate safeguards in natural gas development are the harmful air emissions that pollute communities surrounding drilling operations, compressor stations and pipelines, and a lack of environmental assessments, monitoring and regulatory enforcement to gauge damages to landscapes and wildlife”.

The Sierra Club opposes hydraulic fracturing for methane gas [6]. By extension, building pipelines designed to dramatically increase consumption of fracked gas is also opposed by the Sierra Club [7].

### **The NED pipeline proposal will put our communities at risk.**

The Monadnock Conservancy noted that the current proposal would cross 40 conservation areas in the Granite State, 155 wetlands, and 116 bodies of water, including 18 rivers and about 8 miles of state forest or parks, according to filings with FERC [8]. The Granite State is our home and our most precious sanctuary. This is where we trust that we are safe, our families are protected and our future is on a trajectory towards the better. Our homes and communities should be protected.

Focusing on the impact our New Hampshire communities, the miles of pipe and compressor stations will cause significant harm to our neighborhoods and landscapes. Mina Hamilton, a past Research Associate at Radioactive Waste Management Associates and former leader in the Sierra Club, states has reported

“Compressor Stations (the large structures which pressurize and pump the gas along the pipelines) are significant contributors to global warming. During a venting, known as a “blow-down”, large quantities of methane are released to the atmosphere. In the first two decades after methane is released it is 79 to 105 times more powerful than CO2 at destabilizing the climate.” [9]

While leaks and spills are always a risk with pipelines, the transporting of fracked gas through pipelines increase climate change causing emissions rather than reduce them

**CONCLUSION: The NED pipeline proposal would make New Hampshire and New England more vulnerable to price spikes and other unintended consequences of an unbalanced system by making the region more dependent on a single fuel type. The NED pipeline proposal will not comply with state or federal policy to reduce climate change causing pollution or protect our public health. The NED pipeline proposal puts our communities at undue health and safety risks. The NED pipeline proposal will increase fracking gas in other regions of the United States putting our neighbors far and near at risk.**

**The NED pipeline proposal ignores the fastest, cheapest and most effective way to address our state's energy demands: energy efficiency, weatherization and conservation. Therefore, NHSC does not support the pipeline proposal.**

The mission of the Sierra Club is to explore, enjoy and protect the earth. The proposed pipeline creates unacceptable risks to the affected communities and the overall environment. The risks include climate change causing emissions, air pollution, water waste related to fracking, and the destruction of our communities, schools, homes and businesses. Thus, NHSC opposes the NED pipeline proposal.

As an alternative to investments for the fossil fuel power and infrastructure, NHSC supports renewable energy, conservation, weatherization, and energy efficiency measures. The buildings in New Hampshire and the Northeast are ripe for applying innovative and newer technologies that are low to zero emitting, renewable, and sustainable. NHSC supports smart solutions that will shift away from fossil fuel build out and incentivize these safer energy saving technologies to help lower people's bills, not raise them.

We urge the FERC to support that shift too by approving projects that are in line with the local, state, and federal energy policies because these policies expand upon the idea to build strong communities that invest in the local energy sources, infrastructure, the local economy and protect public health. Please support projects that advance truly clean energy like wind, solar, and energy efficiency.

-----  
[1] From the February 2013, ISO-NE report, "New England Regional Profile 2012-2013," found at [http://www.iso-ne.com/aboutiso/fin/annl\\_reports/2000/2014\\_reo.pdf](http://www.iso-ne.com/aboutiso/fin/annl_reports/2000/2014_reo.pdf)

[2] The entire state strategy can be found here: <http://www.nh.gov/oep/energy/programs/documents/energy-strategy.pdf>

[3] According to data from the US Energy Information Administration (EIA), March 10, 2015 report #on "Short-Term Energy Outlook, Table 7d: U.S. Regional Electricity Generation, All Sectors (Thousand Megawatt hours per Day),"

[4] Presentation of the Revised Energy Vision and Resource Potential Study to the: State Energy Advisory Council, March 7, 2014; <http://www.nh.gov/oep/energy/programs/documents/sb191-2014-3-7-revised-energy-vision-and-resource-potential-study.pdf>

[5] See fact sheet here, <https://content.sierraclub.org/sites/content.sierraclub.org.naturalgas/files/documents/natural-gas-campaign-factsheet.pdf>.

[6] See entire policy here, <http://www.sierraclub.org/policy/energy/fracking>

[7] A Sierra Club and NRDC joint statement in a November 2014 press release, "The most effective way to solve the climate crisis is to keep all dirty fossil fuels, like fracked gas, in the ground, because even the most rigorous methane controls will fail to do what is needed to fight climate disruption," said Deb Nardone, director of the Sierra Club's Beyond Natural Gas campaign. "Fracking threatens to transform our most beautiful wild places, our communities, and our backyards into dirty fuel industrial sites." Full press release here, <http://www.nrdc.org/media/2014/141120.asp>

[8] Monadnock Conservancy E-News March 15th 2015 edition, <http://archive.constantcontact.com/fs182/1102444951262/archive/1120146079115.html>

[9] "More Than a Pipeline: It's a Toxic Industrial Infrastructure"

**20150616-5150(30640589).txt**

Ronald W FRost Jr, Poughkeepsie, NY.

I support this project, for it not only employs Union Labor, it creates more domestic energy to employ others as well. The job will be built by a highly skilled labor force who take pride in their work and will be mindful of the impact on the environment. This will also create tax revenues for the entire communities.

**20150616-5176(30642233).txt**

deborah pomerleau, Londonderry, NH.

"The NED pipeline proposal would make New Hampshire and New England more vulnerable to price spikes and other unintended consequences of an unbalanced system by making the region more dependent on a single fuel type. The NED pipeline proposal will not comply with state or federal policy to reduce climate change causing pollution or protect our public health. The NED pipeline proposal puts our com-

munities at undue health and safety risks. The NED pipeline proposal will increase fracking gas in other regions of the United States putting our neighbors far and near at risk. The NED pipeline proposal ignores the fastest, cheapest and most effective way to address our state's energy demands: energy efficiency, weatherization and conservation. Therefore, NHSC does not support the pipeline proposal.”

This is from a letter to FERC from the Sierra Club, and I 100% agree with it.

**20150616-5308(30643026).txt**

Susan P Ross, Northfield, MA.

I am concerned that the Compressor Station planned for Northfield, MA and the pipeline to and from this station could contaminate the water supply for the Town of Northfield.

Many people in Northfield living on the outlying roads in town have their own wells, but there are two water sources that in the hills near the compressor/pipeline that serve a great many families in town: Grandin Reservoir operated by East Northfield Water Company, a spring-fed open body of water serves about 200 users and an entire campus when that campus is occupied. Northfield Reservoir/Well serves many homes on Main Street and central Northfield village and this is just off Warwick Brook. In both cases, it is assumed that water has traveled through the soil and rocks on the very mountains on which the compressor and pipeline are to be built. This is a dangerous situation and contamination would force an emergency evacuation of our beautiful, historic town first settled by the English in 1673 on land occupied by the Squakheag Indians for centuries before that!

Another concern I have is that the Town of Northfield has just finished a multi-year project that has resulted in a Master Plan for the town. There was consensus that the town wanted to capitalize on its historic resources and its river and forest resources for recreation. This pipeline project with a compressor right along the New England Trail ruins this plan that was to be a big deal for economic development of the Town of Northfield as a destination for historic travel and eco-tourism. No one will want to hike in our hills with a compressor in our midst.

Finally, there will be no benefits to the town from a natural gas pipeline. Certainly the pipeline owner will pay taxes, but the cost of community services that this behemoth will demand (police, fire protection, road restoration etc.) will create a net zero benefit.

**20150617-0006(30644571).tif**

**PROPERTY ACCESS DENIED**

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC

1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: June 5, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

RE: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

Street Address: 190 Fitzwilliam Road

Town & Zip: Richmond, NH 03470

Map & Lot Number(s) (if known): 000408 Lot 000089

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Arthur & Barbara Taillon

cc:

FERC  
Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

*{4 pages of printed material, not included here}*

**20150617-0011(30645733).pdf**

PROPERTY ACCESS DENIED

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: June 9, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

RE: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

Street Address: 186 Old Turnpike Road

Town & Zip: Richmond, NH 03470

Map & Lot Number(s) (if known): 000409 / 000049

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Paul A. Laughner, Jr.

CC:

FERC

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, NE, Room 1A

Washington, DC 20426

**20150617-0012(30644839).pdf**

PROPERTY ACCESS DENIED

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: 9 June 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

RE: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

Street Address: 320 Bullock Rd

Town & Zip: Richmond, NH 03470

Map & Lot Number(s) (if known): 000405 Lot 000024

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property

from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.  
Arthur & Barbara Taillon

cc:  
FERC  
Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

**20150617-0017(30646226).pdf**

Hand written card, Jennifer Daler, 177 Colburn Rd, Temple, NH 03084, opposing

**20150617-0018(30646218).pdf**

Hand written card, Carol Mamczak, 23 Cutter Rd, Temple, NH 03084, opposing

**20150617-0019(30648822).pdf**

Hand written card, Amy Cabana, 7 Laurel Wood Dr, Temple, NH 03084, opposing

**20150617-0020(30645737).pdf**

Hand written card, Holly McTague, 213 Howard Hill Rd, Temple, NH 03084, opposing

**20150617-0021(30645741).pdf**

Hand written card, Debbie & Dennis Drumm, 1005 High St. Hill, Windsor, MA 01270, opposing

**20150617-0022(30648669).pdf**

Hand written card, Deborah Eve Kodiak, 33 Foster Rd, Temple, NH 03084, opposing

**20150617-0023(30650213).pdf**

**PROPERTY ACCESS DENIED**

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: 6-12-15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

RE: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

Street Address: 460 Whipple Hill Road

Town & Zip: Richmond, NH 03470

Map & Lot Number(s) (if known): 000410/000042 - 000410/000042

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Kevin R. Marcotte

CC:  
FERC

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

**20150617-0024(30652664).pdf**

PROPERTY ACCESS DENIED

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: 6-10-15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

RE: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

Street Address: 440 Fitzwilliam Rd

Town & Zip: Richmond, NH 03470

Map & Lot Number(s) (if known):

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Deborah A. MacNeil

CC:

FERC

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

**20150617-0025(30650211).pdf**

PROPERTY ACCESS DENIED

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: 6/20/15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

RE: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

Street Address: 211 + 215 Taylor Hill Rd

Town & Zip: Richmond, NH 85716

Map & Lot Number(s) (if known): 000404/000045

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Brian Keith Burns

CC:  
FERC  
Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

**20150617-0027(30650212).pdf**

PROPERTY ACCESS DENIED

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: 6-9-15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

RE: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

Street Address: 36 Bullock Rd

Town & Zip: Richmond, NH 03470

Map & Lot Number(s) (if known):

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Roxanne Hubert

CC:  
FERC  
Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

**20150617-0031(30648825).pdf**

Monadnock Ledger-Transcript

Published on the Ledger Transcript (<http://www.ledgertranscript.com>)

The time to act is now

By Amy Cabana

Friday, April 24, 2015

(Published in print: Tuesday, May 5, 2015)

I love this town of Temple, this area, this place I have called home for decades. I love the rural character, the peace, the night sky, the conservation land, the farms, the hills and the mountains, the ponds, lakes, streams and rivers.

This is a natural playground for peace-seeking, nature-loving people. We live here for a reason. We drive farther for services, we choose to enjoy what the Monadnock region has to offer, and accept the "commercial" limitations of being "country folk." We can support our local farmers by buying humanely raised, grass-fed meat and locally grown organic fruit and vegetables, empowering us to make better choices than those the commercial food industry offers.

I attended the recent informational meeting at the Temple Town Hall in regard to Kinder Morgan's proposed pipeline. I don't pretend to be an expert, and I have a great deal more to learn, and I apologize in advance if I have any of my information wrong. This piece is my perception of what I have heard and read,

Once I step away from the horror of the proposal and what it could mean to our communities, I realize that we need to be part of the solution. The conversation started between the government and Kinder Morgan because of a perceived need for energy for the future. As long as there is a need, the conversation is not going to go away. So step one—turn off your lights, your electronics, unplug your chargers, replace your appliances (if you can) with more energy efficient models. This is a small thing we can all do, young and old, rich or poor. If you can afford to convert to a renewable source of energy like solar or wind, now is the time to start that process.

This is a train speeding down the track, and the only way to stop it is by getting in front of it. Literally throwing ourselves in front of it. The proposed site for the enormous compressor station (which I gathered is much larger than anywhere else, and seems to far exceed any energy needs we have), is near my home, and more importantly, near the elementary school my children went to. It is near organic farms, it is near a public drinking water supply, it is near conservation lands and aquifers. It is in our neighborhoods. Not out in the middle of nowhere where no one will be bothered by it, but in our neighborhoods. Compressor stations are noisy, they create many kinds of pollution, and they blow up. Not all the time, but it happens. Whatever would we do in the event of an emergency? Would all our volunteer fire departments be able to handle a disaster of the magnitude that a compressor station fire or explosion could create? I think not. And where would we go? Our elementary school is our emergency shelter, but that would be in the evacuation zone.

This proposal defies common sense. As Kinder Morgan dangles the "look at all the taxes we'll pay" carrot, the long-term implications of this kind of intrusion into our chosen way of life will leave our towns desperate and undesirable. We won't be able to give our homes away. It is probable that our wells will be adversely affected, thus increasing the likelihood of diseases. The light and noise pollution alone have a whole host of adverse symptoms that will be visited upon us. Rumor has it their proposed site also has lead contamination—let's go mucking around in that! Also, the federal government does not have to comply with our local and state easements for conservation land, watersheds, aquifers and the like. The list of negatives goes on and on....and the list of positives for our communities, New Hampshire and even New England, is very, very short—and perhaps non-existent. I assume so, anyway, I imagine there must be something about this that is positive, I just haven't been able to ferret out what it might be.

So step two—be part of the solution. Go to meetings in your town, ask questions, voice your concerns, tell your elected representatives what you want. Ask them to draft zoning ordinances that would make it very difficult and cost prohibitive for Kinder Morgan to proceed. Write to our state representatives, senators, and the governor, a lot, more than once, become a nuisance to them, make yourself heard, email them and call them. Talk to your neighbors, start and sign petitions, make some noise. Learn about other possible solutions to the perceived need for additional energy, like expanding existing pipelines, wind and solar energy. In short, throw yourself in front of the train, and let Kinder Morgan and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission know what it means to live free or die. And turn off your lights.

"Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world; indeed, it's the only thing that ever has." —Margaret Mead

Amy Cabana lives in Temple.

7 Laurel Wood Dr, Temple, NH 03084

**20150617-0038(30647063).pdf**

**Schoharie County Soil and Water Conservation**

173 South Grand St. Suite #3

Cobleskill, NY 12043

518-823-4535

June 10, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: Docket PF 14-22-000

To whom it may concern,

I am writing this letter in regards to the installation of the proposed Kinder Morgan pipeline in Schoharie County. As the Stanton Family Farm LLCs certified nutrient management planner, I have concerns of the location of the proposed pipeline installation.

The Stanton Family Farm LLC is located in the Town of Middleburgh. Its operation is the largest in Schoharie County. It contributes greatly to our local economy by providing jobs, revenue and milk products to our community and New York State. This family farm milks 450 cows in addition to having calves and heifers totaling 925 animals. The farm's land base spans 1500 acres and is within a 10 mile radius of the farm. This land base is not only used to produce feed for the animals but to also spread their manure on an almost daily basis. Every acre of this land base is essential to the farm's ability to feed their animals and manage their manure in a sustainable way. Construction of this pipeline on their prime farmland will hinder the production of feed for their animals and utilization of the manure. Over application of manure on other fields will only inhibit future manure spreading. Crop rotations will be over extended making them out of compliance with their certified nutrient management plan (CNMP).

Working with the farm on an almost daily basis, we've had multiple discussions of proposed expansions, current farmstead management and cropping plans. They are at their max in their current location and are finishing up multiple best management practices that need to be installed in accordance with their certified nutrient management plan. Their land base currently supports their farming practices but any significant changes will be detrimental to the whole plan. They strive to keep up to date. They are very proactive and progressive as they work towards being completely implemented which is imperative to stay in compliance with their concentrated animal feeding operation (CAFO) permit.

The farm operates under the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation's (NYS DEC) CAFP permit (GP-0-9-001). This permit requires them to spread their manure agronomically correct in accordance with their certified nutrient management plan (CNMP). The CNMP is based on standards set forth by the Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) standard 1 NY 312. In order to comply with the permit they are under penalty of law to follow the CNMP. The permit states that it is the farm's duty to comply (part VII, section A) with all conditions of the general permit. Any noncompliance constitutes a violation of the Environmental Conservation Law and is grounds for: an enforcement action (up to \$37,500 per day); loss of authorization under the general permit and/or denial of a permit renewal application. They file this permit yearly allowing them to farm legally in New York State. They are subject to yearly and can also have unannounced spot checks.

If and or when this pipeline goes in, it will cause a serious issue with the Stanton farm's crop rotation and manure spreading. About 130 acres of their farm will be disrupted and with the constitution pipeline installation delayed, it will be at the very least 2 growing seasons. With the addition of your pipeline, that could mean an additional 2-3 growing years. The farm has to follow their yearly updated plan or else they will be deemed out of compliance, not only with DEC but with the Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) as well. Fines can also occur through NRCS for not following a crop rotation in accordance with their conservation plan. If fields aren't available because of the pipeline construction it will ruin not only the crop plans for that year but subsequent years as well. It will create a domino effect on all the other fields used by the Stanton's farm.

As you have read, installing this pipeline can be very costly in both noncompliance and having to purchase extra feed. There is also the issue of manure spreading, where will they be able to store or spread that ma-

nure during the time of installation? This farm provides a lot business to the area in terms of jobs, tax base, and of reinvestment into the community. The pipeline needs to be installed in the least restricting manner as possible for this farm to insure its viability for its family and the community.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions you have on his nutrient management plan.

Thank you,

Lisa Kuehnle, CCA  
Certified Nutrient Management Planner

## **20150617-0039(30647201).pdf**

June 6, 2015

Re: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Docket No. PF 14-22  
Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Project of Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Gas Company

Honorable Senators, Members of the Assembly, and Public Officials:

As of June 1, 2015, Kinder Morgan Energy Partners, Inc. filed a proposal to FERC regarding a proposed expansion of the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline including modifications and construction compressor stations and meter stations along the proposed route, including nine new compressor stations. One of these stations is proposed to be built on Clerks Chapel road in the Town of Nassau in rural Rensselaer County. The proposal is for a 36" pipeline that would transmit up to 2.2 billion cubic feet of gas at a pressure of up to 1460 psi and located in a residential, farming community. The property itself is less than a mile away from pique Burden Lake that is known to be nesting site for Bald Eagles and is a popular summer haven for the communities of Averill Park, Nassau, Schodack and Stephentown. This particular portion of Nassau also known to be home for various other types of wild life including bears, owls, foxes, various types of woodpeckers, coyotes, moose and so much more.

Families that live in this area tend to be multigenerational settlers. My home which directly borders the proposed compressor station site belonged originally to my grandparents who purchased the property on October 10, 1947. They raised three children in that home. My father purchased the property on October 6, 1993 to protect the house and land that he grew up on. I moved onto the property of 166 Clerks Chapel Road in July of 2000. I currently reside there with my husband and two year old son. Our property houses two horses, six chickens, and two large dogs. Our plan has always been to raise our son within the rich culture of the farm so that he can know respect for the land and animals that provide our food.

The proposed site for the compressor station was the same site that my husband and I chose to exchange our vows when we were married on June 19, 2010. The private ceremony including our family and a select group of friends who agreed to stand by us and bless our union. There is a pond with a dock and gazebo that overlooks rolling fields, towering maples and surrounding farms where families such as ours have hoped to live the simple dream that my family holds. We made off that land in a horse drawn carriage that brought us down to the Nassau Sportsmen's Club for a reception and pig roast. Only in communities such as brought would this type of celebration be possible.

The pipeline would run through privately owner farms and residential properties that would have little to no choice in the placement of the pipes through likely used of eminent domain standards that Kinder Morgan has used on the past to run its line through communities. The Nassau Sportsman's Club is also directly in its path and its members also oppose this pipeline. We as a community are concerned about the environmental impacts of what can only be described as an industrial site placed within the borders of our farming community. The compressor station itself will have 90,000 horsepower to transmit its product (fracked gas) through the pipeline. An industrial facility that operates 24/7 and the associated around the clock lighting and noise would have immediate detrimental effects of the peaceful, rural community in which it is placed. As residents we are concerned about the effects on the environment of routine and emergency venting of methane and the associated gas toxins that are components of the fracked gas that will be pumped through this

pipeline.

The Town of Nassau is already home to the Dewey Loeffel Superfund site which is located about 4 miles northeast of the village of Nassau and approximately 1 mile from the site of the new compressor station. The 16-acre unlined dump contains about 46,000 pounds of PCBs, solvents and other toxic chemicals that were illegally dumped from GE, the former Schenectady International and Bendix from 1952 to 1970, when the dump was closed by court order. The battle to clean this site has spanned decades and is still regularly tested to ensure that additional toxins do not continue to enter the ground water and the wells that supply drinking water to the homes of residents who live in this area. Residences surrounding the pipeline and compressor site also rely on wells to supply water to our homes. A repeat of this disaster is the very thing that residents affected by this pipeline and compressor station are concerned with. There is no guarantee that the NED pipeline will not pose a similar threat to the townships that it cuts through.

Our children's futures within this community are at stake, and the families that live in the path of this pipeline are heartbroken at the thought of its destruction. We await a decision by FERC, a federal agency with a history of offering little to no opportunity for opinions and concerns of the American citizens that are directly affected to influence its decision in regards to projects such as this one. We ask for change in regard to this policy; would its representatives be comfortable with this type of compressor station in their back yard?

My family and my neighbors need your help to stop the Northeast Energy Direct project. Help us protect our homes, the environment, and the legacy of the lands we call home for our children. We understand that the federal government has jurisdiction over interstate pipelines and it is our fear that our concerns will be overlooked in this matter. We need to speak with one voice and protect the land and its vital resources for ourselves and future generations.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Michelle Curtis-McMahon  
Clarks Chapel Road, Nassau, N.Y.  
(518)477-2673

**20150617-5010(30643506).txt**

Donna Butler, Pelham, NH.  
89 Deer Hill Circle  
Pelham, NH 03076

June 16, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LLC Docket #PF-14-22-000  
Northeast Energy Direct (NED)

Dear Ms. Bose,

We are Pelham, NH residents writing to express our strong opposition to Docket #PF-14-22 and together request FERC deny a permit to Kinder Morgan for the NED project.

Pentachlorophenol (PCP) is an organochlorine wood preservative commonly used in the treatment of utility poles in the US. Officials confirm exposure to this chemical is linked to short- and long-term health effects, including skin and respiratory irritations, liver, kidney and central nervous system damage and cancer. The Environmental Protection Agency found that PCP is a "probable cancer-causing agent" while the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services found the chemical can cause fevers, difficulty breathing and organ damage.

Since NED will be buried along an existing 3-row power line corridor, hazardous PCPs lodged in the soil could be released into nearby wells. In addition, the Merrimack Valley Reliability Project proposed for the same space will add additional risk of PCP contamination. PCPs can be absorbed through inhalation and/or physical contact. By the time the chemical is detectable by smell, the risk to exposure is already 900 times the limit considered safe by federal environmental regulators.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3558766/>

We respectfully urge FERC to thoroughly investigate the impact of constructing NED in the powerline right-of-way with regard to water safety and PCPs in private wells and aquifers. As part of that process, we request that FERC hold a scoping session in Pelham, NH, perform soil testing along the proposed route for detection of PCP and facilitate the formation of a working group to develop best management practices to prevent future contamination.

Respectfully,

Timothy & Donna Butler

**20150617-5031(30643750).txt**

Eliabeth Reilly, Nassau, NY.

I am writing to you today to express my objection to the proposed Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Pipeline NED project. Specifically the proposed 90,000hp compressor station for the Town of Nassau in Rensselaer county NY. Below I have listed several reasons as to why I object to this structure being built next to my organic farm, home and business, that is located in a RURAL RESIDENTIAL hamlet.

- I have two land parcels, the farm homestead and the other is agriculture farm land located next to the homestead, equaling 100 acres of organic farm land being actively used for organic farming practices. It is located ACROSS THE STREET FROM THE proposed 90,000 hp compressor station in the Town of Nassau NY. My house, land and business will be worthless. The compressor station will be visible from my farm's roadway as well as my fields, since the elevation is much higher than the location proposed for the compressor station. That does not fit into the whole historic farmstead.

-My customers come to the farm for the quiet rural historic country setting. My business will suffer greatly. We also will not be able to classify our meat as all natural or organic if there is a toxic compressor station located across the street. I also am concerned when there is a "blow down" where my cows will end up. The noise will be intense at the farm spooking the cows and they will ultimately end up out of the fence. How are we going to get them back? I will ultimately suffer great economic loss.

- This is a zoned RURAL RESIDENTIAL neighborhood. From our zoning laws adopted by the town on 9/8/2011 reads: The rural residential district is established to maintain and PROTECT the rural character, environmental quality and natural habitat of these parts of the Town while allowing for a mixture of housing types, opportunities and home occupations, and to provide for current and future residents the opportunities for a wide range of activities including rural living, agriculture, forestry, recreation and the enjoyment of wildlife. We live here because we thought we were protected from industrialization.

Another Town Law reads: The emission of dust, dirt, smoke, fly ash, odor or Noxious gases, which creates a nuisance or could damage to the health of persons, animals, plant life or other forms of property, is prohibited.

- My Son and I both suffer from a gene disorder that does not allow us to process toxins properly. My son's is greater than mine. I also suffer from chronic Lyme disease and bartonella which have both greatly affected my central nervous system. The toxins documented that are released from these compressor station sites also hinder the nervous system. I have structured my life in a zoned rural residential neighborhood to never have to be faced with this issue. I currently produce my own meat, vegetables, eggs and honey ORGANICALLY on this farm. If emissions and toxins are now located across the street how can I consume the food I produce, let alone sell it to others?

- The toxins generated from the compressor station are known to be Ethyl-benene , n-butane, n-hexane, MTBE, CO,pyridine, dimethyl pyridine and many more... Would you let your kids breath this air in?
- The above listed toxins will be released in greater volumes during a “blow down” event, leaving the toxins to settle on the land surround the site, which consists of family’s and farms that produce food for human and animal consumption. How is this good?
- There are 40-50 kids located within the 1/2 mile “buffer” zone with many more within close proximity. These kids will be subject to a lifetime of short term and long term health effects due to the emissions and toxins that are released on a daily basis. Another reason why we have all located our children in a rural residential neighborhood and not industrial, to protect them from carcinogens in the air and water we take in.
- The proposed compressor station at Clarks Chapel Rd would be located in a valley. This valley would help to contain the methane smog created by the compressor station. In other parts of the country the ozone level has increased dramatically over gas drilling sites that release methane into the atmosphere. We like our clean country air.
- The noise survey that was performed on the 21st-22nd of May to determine how close the compressor station can be located to residences was a flawed survey. The device placed on Clarks Chapel Rd. was located just off the edge of the road. Tom Hansen, the owner of the land that is currently proposed for the compressor station was driving his large ten wheeled dump trucks and water truck up and down the road all day. This is not normal and would only be done to bring the average decibel up for the neighborhood that is normally extremely quiet.
- There is no public water supply in our area. Everyone uses well water for all of their needs. The presence of a compressor station with all of the chemicals they disperse would be a very great cause for concern with regards to our drinking water.
- A Bald Eagle also inhabits the area where the compressor station is to be located.It is there often and we have the pictures of it on the land.

Please do not let Kinder Morgan build a 90,000hp compressor station in a heavily populated Rural residential neighborhood. Our health will be in great jeopardy and our house values will depreciate drastically. Those located with the pipeline right out there back door will be in danger 24/7. My Historic farm’s business will suffer. In this event I will pursue a class action lawsuit for damages to my business and my sons health. I will not stand for a profit company to come to my neighborhood and rip up family’s lives, this is unacceptable.

**20150617-5087(30644110).pdf**

**Mason Conservation Commission**

June 18, 2015

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

RE: PF 14-22-000

Dear Ms. Bose,

Mason Conservation Commission respectfully requests that FERC hold a Scoping Session in Mason, NH for the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project proposed by Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co., FERC Docket # PF 14-22-000. The Mason Conservation Commission believes that Mason merits a Scoping Session for the following reasons:

- \* Both the main high-pressure pipeline and the Fitchburg lateral are proposed to cut across Mason in two

directions, adding up to 8.9 miles of pipeline, more than any other NH town.

- \* The NED project would have major impacts on Mason and its natural resources. Yet the NED Resource Reports omit from consideration many of these resources.
- \* The protection of Mason's water supplies deserves detailed scoping. Mason residents depend entirely on individual wells drilled into bedrock or stratified drift aquifers. With a significant portion of pipeline routed across shallow-to-bedrock soils, the blasting involved in pipeline construction risks contaminating these aquifers and altering their flow.
- \* The pipelines cross Mason's largest stratified drift aquifer. What are the foreseeable and potential effects on this aquifer of the withdrawal and discharge of hydrostatic testing water?
- \* Mason's wetlands and streams have been seriously under-counted and mis-represented in NED Resource Reports and maps. Resource Report 2 on Water documents no wetlands for the lateral in Mason. This cannot be true, since it crosses the Mason Brook valley.
- \* State and town conservation lands and conservation easements in Mason are threatened with taking for the pipelines, risking violation of the public trust. These lands include some of NH's Highest Ranked Wildlife Habitat as documented in NH Wildlife Action Plan.
- \* Mason citizens are very concerned about the impacts of NED on our rural town, on the state, and on the whole region. They have formed a pipeline committee which hosts weekly meetings where people from all towns are welcome to hear experts speak on the issues.
- \* Mason's Elementary School has a large auditorium suitable for a Scoping Session. Our town would welcome FERC staff for this purpose. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Robert B. Larochelle, Chairman, Mason Conservation Commission  
Mann House, 16 Darling Hill Road, Mason, NH 03048

Cc: Governor Maggie Hassan

Attorney General Joseph A. Foster  
Dijit Taylor, Director, NH Land and Community Heritage Investment Program (LCHIP)  
Tracey Boisvert, Director, NH Conservation Land Stewardship Program (LCIP)  
Senator Kelly Ayotte  
Senator Jeanne Shaheen  
Representative Annie Kuster  
State Senator Kevin Avar  
State Representative Jack Flanagan  
State Representative Christopher Adams  
Mason Board of Selectmen  
Craig Fifield  
William Doonan

**20150617-5100(30644416).txt**

Maria, New Ipswich, NH.

I am writing to comment that the amount of time between notification of stakeholders in New Ipswich, NH regarding the compressor station to be located there, and scoping meetings expected to be announced this week, to be scheduled for later in July IS NOT SUFFICIENT OR ACCEPTABLE.

Kinder Morgan only notified about 80 stakeholders, mostly in New Ipswich, NH a few in Temple, NH of their intentions to place the largest compressor station 1/2 mile or less from their homes a week to a week and a half ago. This does not give those homeowners, businesses, or schools time to assess, research, or adequately prepare for a scoping meeting taking place in 4 - 6 weeks. Is that enough time for anyone working full time as well to research and prepare to defend and protect their home, family, lifestyle, and probably

largest lifetime investment. Massachusetts has had a SIGNIFICANTLY longer time. New Ipswich,NH should be afforded the same amount of time.

These are people with full time jobs and families. They cannot “put staff” on the tasks needed to be completed before scoping the way a billion dollar energy company (which also has done this same job many times before) can. The entire FERC process in general puts unfair burdens on ordinary citizens, who can only investigate the impacts to them while conducting their ordinary lives. It gives the extreme advantage to companies who propose pipelines and file with you, as they can devote all the money,time, and manpower necessary to achieve whatever they choose.

The FERC also should put very low caps on the amount of money these large corporations donate to non-profits, or use to “sponsor” area events. (or limit them to only repeat contributions to specific organizations they supported BEFORE filing ) This system gives them an unfair advantage this way as well, and is tantamount to allowing them to BUY popular and at times local official approval for a proposed project. Companies filing in your system also should be disallowed from making campaign contributions to potential candidates in the areas of proposed projects.

This system is unfair and smacks of corruption! Maria Szmauz

**20150617-5101(30644496).txt**

Christopher heckman, Montgomery, NY.

As a union member I am all for the NED project. Union members take pride in building America and are professionals at their industrial trade with much training and years of experience. Infrastructure is vital to our society now and in the future.

**20150617-5102(30644510).txt**

Eugene A Kolbe, Callicoon, NY.

Our union is in need of good paying jobs for our trained workforce. Tax revenue will be great for our community.

**20150617-5104(30644599).txt**

William L Meade, Oneonta, NY.

I lived on the farm for 32 years with two gas lines underground in Owego NY. We plowed and planted crops over the pipeline. We logged over the pipeline in the wooded area. With an open right away animals that could not feed in wooded area flourished in the grass and brush. We never had problems. We fished in the Owego creek and no problems existed over the pipeline.

**20150617-5107(30644608).txt**

Donald E Carney, Cornwall on Hudson, NY.

Any project that has to do with energy should be implemented. This country and state needs all the economy it can get. The project will help the economy and put people back to work. Everybody will benefit from this project, Jobs, tax revenue, everything will trickle down and be seen in the economic progress that it produces.

**20150617-5109(30644622).txt**

Marc Solomon, new windsor, NY.

We need these local projects to support our families, our school taxes are so high that we don't want to be forced out of the area. Good paying jobs will help subsidize this.

**20150617-5110(30644625).txt**

John Peters, Roxbury, NY.

We need more paying good jobs in our area. This will turn, reduce the number of families and people collecting assistance.

**20150617-5111(30644628).txt**

Louis S Jennings, cornwall, NY.

Its a good paying job and we need the work for our union members

**20150617-5112(30644631).txt**

Stephen K Ertchsen, Highland, NY.

we need good paying jobs and the tax breaks that this project will create. I approve the NED

**20150617-5113(30644634).txt**

Robyn Amadon, Jaffrey, NH.

I am opposition to this project as the current route stands. The pipeline is slated to cut through sensitive ecosystems including 155 wetlands, and 116 bodies of water, including 18 rivers and about 8 miles of state forest or parks in New Hampshire alone. Several local Conservation Commissions have written to FERC and Kinder Morgan regarding impacts to wetlands and aquifers with regards to impacts to drinking water - most of the residents of the communities surrounding the pipeline ROW have drinking water wells that would be impacted by pollutants as a result of this project.

Pentachlorophenol (PCP) is an organochlorine wood preservative commonly used in the treatment of utility poles in the US. Officials confirm exposure to this chemical is linked to short- and long-term health effects, including skin and respiratory irritations, liver, kidney and central nervous system damage and cancer. The Environmental Protection Agency found that PCP is a "probable cancer-causing agent" while the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services found the chemical can cause fevers, difficulty breathing and organ damage. Since NED will be buried along an existing 3-row power line corridor, hazardous PCPs lodged in the soil could be released into nearby wells. In addition, the Merrimack Valley Reliability Project proposed for the same space will add additional risk of PCP contamination. PCPs can be absorbed through inhalation and/or physical contact. By the time the chemical is detectable by smell, the risk to exposure is already 900 times the limit considered safe by federal environmental regulators. FERC needs to thoroughly investigate the impact of constructing NED in the powerline right-of-way with regard to water safety and PCPs in private wells and aquifers.

The compressor station proposed in Temple, NH would jeopardize the children who attend school there by the pollutants that are a byproduct of a compressor station, and there are inadequate fire, safety, emergency personnel in the surrounding communities to respond to any emergency situations that could occur with a compressor station located there.

While I support the unions and local jobs, this project needs further evaluation and exploration. The impacts to our communities and environment, and the lack of demand for natural gas in New England do not justify the need for this project at this time.

Sincerely,

Robyn Amadon

**20150617-5114(30644637).txt**

Devrim Gurbuz, Newburgh, NY.

I think the NED project will have a positive impact on the whole region. It will provide good paying jobs while helping meet energy demands.

Robyn Amadon  
9 Carriage Hill Dr.  
Jaffrey, NH 03452

June 17, 2015

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Docket No. PF14-22-000 Northeast Energy Direct Project, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.

To whom it may concern:

I am in agreement and support of NH Sierra Club in opposition of the NED pipeline project. NH Sierra Club wrote in their letter to FERC dated June 16, 2015:

The NED pipeline proposal would make New Hampshire and New England more vulnerable to price spikes and other unintended consequences of an unbalanced system by making the region more dependent on a single fuel type. The NED pipeline proposal will not comply with state or federal policy to reduce climate change causing pollution or protect our public health. The NED pipeline proposal puts our communities at undue health and safety risks. The NED pipeline proposal will increase fracking gas in other regions of the United States putting our neighbors far and near at risk. The NED pipeline proposal ignores the fastest, cheapest and most effective way to address our state's energy demands: energy efficiency, weatherization and conservation. Therefore, NHSC does not support the pipeline proposal.

Sincerely,

Robyn Amadon

**20150617-5124(30644657).txt**

Dan Childs, Wallkill, NY.

I approve this NED project. Union work great paying work.

**20150617-5137(30644684).txt**

Joseph A Kittle, Jr, Nichols, NY.

The Northeast Energy Direct will provide good Union construction jobs locally and enable the consumption of us. Domestic energy reducing our reliance on foreign sources.

**20150617-5138(30644685).pdf**

June 17, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE Room 1 A  
Washington, DC 20426

re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., Docket No. PF14-22-000

Dear Secretary Bose:

Thank you to your staff for providing the notes on the Interagency Pre-filing Conference Calls. Those of us in the impacted communities, struggling to understand the potential impacts of the proposed pipeline, appreciate the opportunity to learn what is being discussed during these calls.

The May 28, 2015 Conference Call notes state, "Environmental Comments on the draft resource reports issued on Friday, May 15th. Tennessee Gas is required to incorporate responses into its next set of draft

resource reports.” I look forward to seeing those reports. It is hard to understand the potential impacts of the proposed project with all these unanswered questions and the multitude of TBD’s in the current Resource Reports. I would urge FERC to delay the beginning of scoping until after the Resource Reports addressing these comments are filed and the public and our local town officials (many who are volunteers with other jobs and commitments) have an opportunity to review them.

Another issue needing further discussion is the need for the “Fitchburg Lateral.” Kinder Morgan has not given a straight answer on the need for this particular lateral.

- They call it the “Fitchburg Lateral” even though it doesn’t go to Fitchburg – it goes through Mason, NH, Townsend and ends in Lunenburg at a Tennessee Gas pipeline. Unitil which serves Fitchburg has NOT signed on for capacity and has said they do not need the capacity.
- At the Open House, Curtis Cole from Kinder Morgan told us the lateral was to serve National Grid. I reviewed and commented on the National Grid Capacity Agreement MA DPU Docket (15-34). No where did it mention this lateral. National Grid’s request was all about an “Everett Lateral” and getting gas into the Greater Boston area.
- Kinder Morgan told our local State Representative that someone in Townsend requested this lateral. This is not a distribution pipeline that someone can tap into. There is no large user of gas anywhere near the proposed lateral. Townsend does not want this project. It runs through the Squannassit Area of Critical Environmental Concern, Willard Brook and Pearl Hill State Parks.
- Many of us thought this Mason-Townsend-Lunenburg Lateral would be to get the gas down to the proposed North Worcester Lateral. We were quite surprised that this lateral was not dropped when the North Worcester Lateral was a few weeks back.

I appreciate the May 15th comments asking for more information about the 200 line alternative. Rather than overbuild pipeline capacity through greenfield areas (including greenfields next to powerlines), Kinder Morgan should be investing in upgrades to their 200 line in Southern MA.

- This is a piece of aging infrastructure that serves much of Massachusetts including existing power plants. Here is an opportunity to pro-actively address the associated reliability and safety concerns of some old infrastructure.
- Kinder Morgan’s ulterior motive seems to be to overbuild pipeline capacity to serve an export market. This only helps Kinder Morgan. Increasing exports of natural gas will drive costs up for all consumers. Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Carolyn Sellars  
Townsend, MA

**20150617-5143(30644720).txt**

William D Figgolari, Squires Apartment 112a, NY.

I hope the tax payers of Cortland County vote for this it means jobs for more members of our local. We really need this work. Thank you!

**20150617-5147(30644792).txt**

Jeff Konchar, Hancock, NY.

Need to have decent paying jobs in upstate NY. We really need this to uplift our economy! Thankjs

**20150617-5153(30644847).txt**

David Bango, Endicott, NY.

Its about jobs, Its always about jobs. Projects like these become more important now that the Governor chickened out by banning fracking and there wont be any new casinos in the southern tier!

**20150617-5154(30644850).txt**

Paul L Jayne, Millerton, NY.

This will bring lots of good Paying Jobs and help with the demand for clean energy. Thank you very much for this opportunity to express our opinions.

**20150617-5159(30644866).txt**

James A Beaver, Hornell, NY.

How could anyone not want this project to move forward quickly? It will provide our struggling middle to low class with many new well needed high paying jobs. Please help us to pass this legislation forward so that we may be able to provide for our families.

**20150617-5170(30644888).txt**

Raymond Hoyt, Ithaca, NY.

I am a Union worker and member and we need good paying construction jobs in the Southern Tier of New York. Please help us to get these jobs.

**20150617-5174(30644902).txt**

Ronnie Torres, Binghamton, NY.

Local Jobs Local people, skilled Laborers w/experience- Environmentally safe.

**20150617-5176(30644972).txt**

James William Lockwood Jr, Groton, NY.

I think this is a well needed project for all trades. This will be good for our Unions. We are a skilled trained workforce for the job. You want to get r done so lets do it Union.

**20150617-5180(30645020).txt**

Derek Spencer, Endicott, NY.

I live locally, this job would be good for the community through tax revenues that help infrastructures and our schools. Thank you!

**20150617-5183(30645035).txt**

Frank L Crawford SR, Wellsville, NY.

This is and could be a great job. The Southern Tier area is a rural farm Community. It will be beneficial for every one. Cheaper fuel costs for NY State residents. This will help energy demands for thousand of people. It will also help schools churches and communities.

**20150617-5184(30645050).txt**

Dennis Holt, Horseheads, NY.

Area Jobs make \$\$\$\$\$. We need these jobs big time.

**20150617-5185(30645069).txt**

Thomas McMahan, Vestal, NY.

I am looking forward to good paying jobs and still be able to live locally for work and not travel out of state. Thanks.

**20150617-5186(30645078).txt**

Franklin John Gordon, Endwell, NY.  
Need work! Good paying Union Jobs. Please help us.

**20150617-5190(30645100).txt**

Britney L Fraser, State Hwy 23, NY.  
I live locally. I also need good jobs in the area. Need to improve the environmental impact and skilled workforce. The infrastructure of our schools etc.

**20150617-5194(30645116).txt**

Charles Fraser, Davenport Ctr, NY.  
I live locally. It will provide good paying jobs close to home and be very good for the economy and schools. It will also help bring in new taxes and help with the energy demands. It will also put some of our highly skilled labor workforce out in the field doing what it is that they do best.

**20150617-5197(30645122).txt**

Richard Davy, Endicott, NY.  
With the project being funded by private money I think it will be a win for everyone involved also employment to many people in the State involved in this kind of construction.

**20150617-5200(30645147).txt**

deborah pomerleau, Londonderry, NH.  
Last night, I attended Hudson Open House Meeting with selectmen and Kinder Morgan. They are still showing small and old compressor stations, instead of one close to the size of the proposed New Ipswich. Scoping meetings need to be held in every effected town.  
Many expressed concerns about the co-location of pipes near powerlines. I agree. It is a huge risk. The “need” is not demonstrated. Kinder Morgan “wants” to make more money through exporting gas to other countries.  
New concern expressed about earthquakes in NH. This is legitimate. What if one happens near granite that has been blasted to form a trench for the pipe? Explosion.  
Homeowners’ insurance, mortgages, Fannie Mac, Fannie Mae, house values and the ability to sell homes will be effected.  
A potential homeowner can’t get a mortgage if an insurance company won’t provide homeowner’s insurance on a property that has a pipeline.

**20150617-5201(30645162).txt**

Ralph Taylor, Lisle, NY.  
With the prices and taxes what they are in upstate NYS. The unemployment rate ETC it would be good to have some economic development here. Maybe it would slow down the exodus of our population somewhat.

**20150617-5206(30645189).txt**

Maryann Harper, Rindge, NH.  
June 17, 2015  
Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE

Washington, DC 20426  
RE: Docket PF-14-22-000

Dear Secretary Bose:

I am writing to you to express my concerns regarding the manner in which Kinder Morgan is operating in New Hampshire. Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company have stressed in their correspondence that they want to be “good neighbors” and part of a “thorough and transparent process.” Mr. Allen Fore, of Kinder Morgan, actually spoke these words publicly during a special report on the project aired by New Hampshire Television Channel WMUR.

I would like to take just a few minutes of your time to share our experiences to date.

#### NUMBER OF AFFECTED PROPERTY OWNERS IS NOT CORRECT

Kinder Morgan states that in Rindge, NH, there are 73 affected properties which is part of a total of the 822 affected properties in the State of New Hampshire. As a resident of Rindge, I know of several directly affected properties in town, that to date, have received no notification from the developer. In using the term “directly affected” I am referring to properties that will have the land altered by either the pipeline easement or the construction corridor or both. As an example, on the maps filed on March 13, 2015, one of these properties is shown with a pipeline easement along the property and a construction corridor which eliminates all the trees on the property between the home and the existing Eversource R.O.W. I think we can all agree that this is an affected property, yet the owners have not received a single piece of correspondence from the project developer, Kinder Morgan. Rindge Conservation Commission estimated the “affected properties” in Rindge to more realistically be a much higher number than the 73 stated by Kinder Morgan.

I own four parcels near the proposed route although only one has an Eversource easement. In December of 2014 I received notification from Kinder Morgan informing me that they were embarking upon a project that was a “Federal Undertaking.” I denied access to my land. A month later I received a request to survey the parcel that had the Eversource Easement and an additional parcel. When the Maps were released in March, I noted that Kinder Morgan showed the construction corridor now on three of my parcels! So I would like to know – what is the actual number of properties directly affected by this project? I doubt this is an experience unique to Rindge, NH and it appears the project developer, Kinder Morgan, is intentionally under-estimating the number of affected properties to lower the perceived impact of the project before the Regulatory Agencies and our elected officials.

#### TRESPASSING SURVEYORS

On Saturday, May 16, 2015 I noticed a burgundy Toyota Tundra pickup truck with Mississippi License Plates parked by the Eversource R.O.W. I pulled over behind the vehicle and got out. Two men got out of the truck and identified themselves as Kinder Morgan Surveyors. I asked if they had checked in with the Police Department as Martha Hudzinski, Kinder Morgan Land Agent, had assured our Police Chief that they would before beginning work in our Town. They responded that the “Lady Land Agent” told them they were all set and did not need to do anything with the Police Department. (I immediately contacted the Police Chief who was unaware of their presence in Town.)

I informed them that almost everyone in Rindge had denied access. They said that they were aware of the 90% rate of denial of access in New Hampshire. They assured me they were only doing “GPS” surveying within the road R.O.W. and would not enter posted property. Later as I returned I saw the truck but no surveyors. I finally spotted them coming out of the woods. They assured me again they were staying within the R.O.W. (I contacted our Department of Public Works who informed me the R.O.W. is typically stone wall to stone wall and where walls do not exist it extends 25’ in either direction from the paved or gravel cartway centerline.) On the following Monday as I left for work, I saw them again, one in the Road R.O.W. the other walking out of the wooded area approximately 15 feet into the property- well outside of the road R.O.W. I contacted the property owner who immediately went there but they were gone. This property, by the way, is a large parcel completely posted “No Trespassing” and under a Conservation Easement. The next week the property owner was walking the property with the Conservancy Group and came across a

brand new orange post with a white “survey marker” sleeve -approximately 100’ into the property. This is not the only such marker that has been found.

For three weeks, residents of Rindge spotted surveyors and called owners only to have the surveyors pack up and move immediately. I could recount several more stories, such as the experience of an owner who posted her land and verbally told the surveyors not to enter before leaving for work, only to return after work to find flagging on her property. I hope you now understand that the mode of operation utilized is to move around town when noticed only to return and enter the property when the opportunity presents itself.

Kinder Morgan stated that there would be 520 temporary jobs related to the pipeline project. Certainly there are qualified surveyors in New Hampshire and I could not understand why they were not being utilized. Now I understand. No decent, licensed New Hampshire surveyor would use such underhanded and unethical tactics. This is the good neighbor, Kinder Morgan, doing a thorough and transparent job.

Very truly yours,

Maryann B. Harper

**20150617-5215(30645208).txt**

Devorah Hanson, TEMPLE, NH.

June 17, 2015

From: Devorah Hanson, Temple NH

RE: Proposed Pipeline/Kinder Morgan Project

I am a concerned citizen of New Hampshire who is also concerned for the planet at large. The type of project being proposed by Kinder Morgan is only taking us down the destructive path that we have been on for generations in the name of energy consumption. The proposed project across Massachusetts and New Hampshire will create a myriad of environmental and health problems and forever destroy the peaceful life-style for hundreds, if not thousands of residents/land owners.

This type of energy source (fracked gas) and delivery (massive pipelines and compressor stations) has no place in the New England countryside. The visible scar across the landscape, the invisible health hazards along with invasive noise and light pollution are the ingredients that will have negative impacts on us for generations to come. Is this what anyone has in mind when we think of ending our destructive path for our planet? Not only would we be allowing the destruction and pollution of our own lands and waterways but we would be passively supporting the continuation of fracking which is in itself a destructive and invasive method of retrieving resources from our planet.

At the very least it is shameful that Kinder Morgan has proposed to locate their 80,000 horse power compressor station just a 1/2 mile from Temple’s Elementary School, which also doubles as the town’s emergency shelter. This is but one example of the disregard for the safety and sanctity of the people who live here. All across the proposed pipeline there will be dozens of stories of how our lives are affected – none of them for the better.

Stop this project in its 125 foot wide tracks. It is not the direction we should be going in environmentally, economically or ethically.

Best regards,

Devorah Hanson

**20150617-5243(30646114).txt**

Christine Robidoux, Temple, NH.

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed pipeline project by Kinder Morgan through 71 miles of NH with a proposed Compression Station on the border of my town, Temple. I share the same concerns as my neighbors and will outline some below.

\*NH, as a net exporter of power, does not need a new source.

\*We already have 63 operating power plants, and we absorb many impacts of these plants. We do not need another. The addition of this pipeline would not lead to further generation of power in our state.

\*This pipeline would also not address power distribution needs in NH, and in fact could redirect funds that should be aimed at that need.

\*NH is a distinct entity with its own economy and not just a convenient pass through for other states that wish to obtain power. Our needs are not the same as our neighboring states, and our rights are no less important just because our state is small.

\*The Temple Elementary School lies within one half mile of this proposed Compression Station. This building also serves our community as our emergency shelter. I find it hard to imagine a more likely emergency than an incident at such a station. If an evacuation of our school was required by such an incident, buses would be traveling from Peterborough to pick up our children, not a speedy rescue.

\*I am concerned about the environmental impacts of this station: air, light and noise pollution.

\*Our town has a vibrant and commercially successful farming community. Who will by produce, meat, and dairy from farmers operating near a facility that sends toxins into our air and water? The compressor station would devastate their livelihood.

\*I am concerned about the safety record of Kinder Morgan and it seems way too easy to find evidence of their shortcomings on the internet.

\*My town is a quintessential New England town, the kind of town tourists love to visit. But if this project moves forward and our environment is negatively impacted, if residents see their home values plummet, if they are forced to flee the pollution and risk, I do not see Temple as a viable tourist destination in the future. Our quaint village will disappear.

Our community, though small, does not support this project. Not one person. If you don't believe me, come and see for yourself.

#### **20150618-0015(30650188).pdf**

Hand written card, Leonard Price, PO Box 121, 134 Crane Road, Windsor, MA 01270, opposing

#### **20150618-5004(30646255).txt**

Michelle Cross, Nassau, NY.

I am compelled to write this to express my adamant opposition to the NED gas pipeline and compressor station. As one of the residents and affected homeowners and farmers I can not express strongly enough what a detriment this would be to our small, rural, residential community.

The responses that we repeatedly receive are ... just wait. We CAN'T wait. Waiting will be too late! We need attention NOW, BEFORE ITS TOO LATE. We need to tell EVERYONE that OUR rights, OUR livelihoods, our standards of living are worth defending. We MUST defend them now... we must shine the spotlight on what will be the destruction of our residential area BEFORE it's too late!

There are currently several properties under contract for compressor stations. There is a parcel of land on Clarks Chapel Road in Nassau, NY which will house a proposed 90,000 HP compressor station. This compressor station, which will run 24 hours a day, 365 days a year is DIRECTLY across the street from Reilly's Farm - a family run farm which in itself is historical to the community.

The 1/2 mile ----- 1/2 mile!!!!!!!!!! FERC established radius from the compressor station is home to upwards of 40 children!! This radius also includes the homes of residents that have lived in this community for generations. We are also home to farms raising organic beef, free-range chickens, goats, and pesticide-free vegetables.

Placing a 90,000 HP compressor station in the heart of this area will jeopardize ALL OF THIS! It will

introduce into our fresh-air community more toxins than we will ever be able to account for or correct in our lifetime, or our children's lifetime or even their children's lifetime.

We, as a community have what seems to us a very serious list of concerns, concerns that do not seem to be taken seriously by the people that can speak out against this proposal. SOMEONE has to take notice! We are fighting to find SOMEONE to take notice and stand with us. Nassau is already battling the effects of the Dewey Loffell superfund dumpsite. Do we learn NOTHING from history?

Nassau and it's residents are not EXPENDABLE!

Some of our collective concerns are:

- Industrial equipment, trucks and construction vehicles on our rural area roads which are not constructed for Industrial traffic and will be damaged during construction/maintenance.
- The cost to local taxpayers to fix road damage caused by construction of said natural gas pump station.
- Untrained, under-equipped volunteer first responders will be unable to handle a large scale natural disaster with the special needs of a natural gas pump station.
- In the event of a disaster, taxpayers will incur the cost of repair to personal property as many property owners do not have insurance for such conditions.
- Pump station will be located at a dangerous and inappropriate distance from "Dewey Loffal" superfund site (approx. 8,000 ft.), as well as Valatie kill water pathway (as close as 3,000 ft.).
- Pump station will not be in a jurisdiction with close localized police, with the nearest police station of said jurisdiction of proposed location being NY State Police on Rte. 9 in Schodack or NY State Police on Rte. 66 in Averill Park.
- Pump station location is NOT close to first responders therefore increasing the risk of becoming a target for local domestic terrorism.
- Noise, unintentional/intentional by-product waste release, causing pollution of rural area home to people and livestock.
- Corruption at state and federal levels of government due to loss of rights of local governments. Eminent domain is not being used to ensure public interest, but is being used to force the local general public to comply with unwanted federal involvement.
- The value and quality of the people living in the local community, property values and the local economy, as well as the value of living in New York State altogether and the overall health of the region will suffer. People will not want to stay, live or invest in this area.

We need a voice to magnify our own. To shine the spotlight on exactly what is happening in our RURAL, RESIDENTIAL town.

**20150618-5025(30646771).txt**

Robyn Amadon, Jaffrey, NH.

I am in accordance with Town of Sharon Conservation Commission's letter to FERC dated June 10, 2015 in which they write:

"Even after the construction of the pipeline is completed, the placement of a large compressor plant in this very rural area would permanently alter the lives of the residents and wildlife, with noise, light and emission pollution becoming an unwelcome and permanent part of these lives.

Construction of the pipeline will negatively impact many unique wildlife habitats and wetlands, much of which are on conservation lands in the region. It will disrupt and disturb geologic features, likely causing permanent change to aquifers and wetlands."

I oppose this project.

**20150618-5031(30646813).txt**

Sara Schuman, Nassau, NY.

Dear FERC:

Kinder Morgan announced that the hamlet of Clarks Chapel/Miller's Corners is a proposed site for a massive multi-turbine gas compressor station. The construction and operation of such an industrial gas compressor station in a rural residential zone is contrary to Town laws as well as the Town of Nassau Comprehensive Plan as developed and approved by the community in July 2011.

Unlike other locations, you are proposing this project in a hamlet community which, while not only contrary to town laws, is an affront to our residents that have invested in the rural residential character of this community.

The Town of Nassau has formally and unanimously opposed this proposal. As home owners on Clarks Chapel Rd., we are firmly against the proposal to build a compressor station on our street. Our property will not only lose its value, but emissions will destroy our air quality and pose a considerable health risk to us.

Please choose another location that is NOT in a residential location.

Thank you very much,

Sara and Bob Schuman

**20150618-5038(30647027).txt**

Krista Locci, Nassau, NY.

I am writing to oppose the Northeast Direct Pipeline 90,000 HP Compressor station located on Clarks Chapel Rd. In New York. I reside on CR-15 and I am in the "buffer zone" for this compressor. Our house would be across the street from the proposed compressor station site. Our land has been in our family for 75+ years. My parents own the majority of the land now. My brother and I have built our homes on this land. I am raising my three daughters the way I was raised, in a quiet, country setting with lots of wooded areas and room to run. To hear that this compressor station could be across the street from us is absolutely devastating to say the least. We live in a quiet neighborhood and want to keep it that way!

The compressor station would release toxins into the air on a daily basis. I did not build my house to subject my children to these toxins. We built in a rural residential zoned neighborhood.

Our property values would be lowered and we will not benefit from this pipeline at all.

I would ask that you take the time to reconsider this project. Please put yourself in our shoes. Would you want to subject yourself or your family to the dangers of this pipeline??

A very distraught and concerned citizen.

Krista Locci

**20150618-5080(30648455).txt**

deborah pomerleau, Londonderry, NH.

The "need" for more gas has not been demonstrated. This pipeline is for profit for Kinder Morgan and will not benefit the state of NH in any way. This will damage the environment permanently. The risk is too high. Please do not approve this pipeline.

**20150619-0019(30652677).pdf**

MY OPEN LETTER TO NH GOVERNOR, MAGGIE HASSAN, AND JEANNE SHAHEEN, KELLY AYOTTE, AND ANNIE KUSTER, MEMBERS OF CONGRESS:

June 12, 2015

It is past midnight and I can't sleep after attending a powerful Pipeline Forum organized and presented by the Town of Temple, NH. Tonight I learned the deeper truth about the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline

(NED) and the 80,000 horsepower compressor station that Kinder Morgan wants to build one-half mile from my home and that truth is, WE DON'T NEED THEM!

No, really, the pipeline and the compressor station, we don't need them.

New Hampshire: does not need, and will not be the beneficiary of, the copious amounts of natural gas that will flow through the miles and miles of 36" pipe to spaa our beautiful New Hampshire. My land, my neighbor's land, my town's land, my state's land are merely a thoroughfare for Kinder Morgan to transport their toxic elixir for export to Europe and Asia. The natural gas was never for us in New Hampshire. But I suspect you knew that.

Fourteen affected towns in Southern New Hampshire have banded together to form a Municipal Coalition and will bear the enormous burden of fighting Kinder Morgan's pipeline romp through our precious landscape.

It is OUR property values that will decrease.

It is OUR health that will be affected by the tons of noxious poisons Kinder Morgan will expel into our air each time they do a routine blow down.

It is OUR wells, OUR drinking water that will be in danger of contamination. And it is OUR citizens who will be required to test and re-test, and monitor their own wells to make sure that Kinder Morgan hasn't poisoned them yet...all at the citizen's expense.

It is OUR parents who will fear letting their children get on a bus to Temple Elementary School each day because, IF a pipeline explosion occurs at the 80,000 horsepower compression station located a half mile from this school, the first responders of Temple and the surrounding towns have been instructed by Kinder Morgan to, "step down". Apparently the two days of emergency training Kinder Morgan proposes to give our emergency teams is not adequate to equip them to manage such catastrophes and safely evacuate the children.

It is this, all of this, that has me awake past midnight, typing in the dark on my laptop.

And so I ask myself, are my town and the other 13 affected towns, that expendable?

You know, my town of New Ipswich is zoned as rural, which means that Kinder Morgan is not required to use the highest and safest grade steel in the pipes they want to bury in our soil. So someone, somewhere decided that if a town does not have a particular number of residents, then that town does not get the same level of protection from potential natural gas pipeline accidents as another town with ONE more resident. What is that magic number that makes a town's children worth protecting, I wonder? What is that tipping point?

At each pipeline-information meeting I attend I am told over and over again to write to you. I am told that you just need to hear enough times from enough people that we KNOW this pipeline project is not good for our state's environment and economics. Apparently it takes the right number of people shouting and pleading and typing the same core message to you over and over and over again before you will agree that you must oppose Kinder Morgan's pipeline and compressor station. Agree that opposition is the only right thing to do for your state. What is that magic number, I wonder? What is that tipping point?

But why do we have to write you pleading letters to tell you what you already know? Each of you got to your political stations in life because you are smart, capable women. When you each took office, you were charged with looking out for us, for our state, first and foremost in all matters. That is your mandate.

So let's cut to the chase, Maggie, Jeanne, Kelly, and Annie. Please show YOUR constituents of Southern New Hampshire the respect we deserve by being honest as to why you refuse to oppose this monster of a pipeline and its compressor station? Are we expendable? Are these 14 towns the sacrificial lambs to some "higher" corporate agenda?

On behalf of Southern New Hampshire, I DEMAND you be honest and tell us why you will not oppose this pipeline and compressor station.

And telling me that you do not have the power to stop this is not a good enough answer.

Massachusetts had the support of their Governor and Representatives in Congress and Kinder Morgan withdrew its proposal and moved on to New Hampshire. It CAN be done. It is your JOB to oppose this. Why are you leaving us to fight this without you? We choose to live pipeline-free or die tryin! We are New Hampshire!

MAGGIE, JEANNE, KELLY AND ANNIE, WHERE ARE YOU?!!!!

Sincerely,

Patricia Canaday  
New Hampshire Constituent  
New Ipswich, NH

**20150619-0025(30652682).pdf**

**FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION**  
WASHINGTON, DC 40426

June 18, 2015

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

The Honorable Kathleen Marchione  
United States Senator  
State of New York  
Albany, NY 12247

Dear Senator Marchione:

Thank you for your April 29, 2015, letter concerning Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.'s (Tennessee Gas) planned Northeast Energy Direct Project (Docket No. PF14-22-000). The Commission approved Tennessee Gas' request to enter into our pre-filing process for the planned project on October 2, 2014. The pre-filing process allows FERC staff to actively participate with landowners, interested parties, other federal and state agencies, elected officials, and the applicant in order to identify environmental or other issues, and discuss potential solutions and route modifications before an application is filed. By engaging the public early in the process, we believe that we can conduct a comprehensive and meaningful review of the project as part of our obligation under the National Environmental Policy Act.

This planned project is still early in our environmental review process and staff has not opened the formal public scoping period. As always, the Commission will accept and consider comments from any interested stakeholder at any time during the pre-filing and application review process. When we have completed our scoping process, we will include an analysis of issues raised in a draft environmental impact statement (EIS). Our EIS will include a review of the design and construction requirements established by the United States Department of Transportation pipeline safety regulations, as well as a socioeconomic analysis addressing any impacts to property values and community financial effects. During the EIS process, the public will have numerous opportunities to comment on the project and the adequacy of the EIS.

Please be assured as in any Commission matter, we strive to make our review of energy proposals both accessible and transparent to the public. If I can be of further assistance in this or any other Commission matter, I hope you will not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely,

Norman C. Bay  
Chairman

**20150619-0032(30652681).pdf**

**FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION**  
WASHINGTON, DC 40426

June 18, 2015

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

The Honorable James P. McGovern  
U.S. House of Representatives  
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Congressman McGovern:

Thank you for your April 29, 2015, letter regarding Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.'s (Tennessee Gas) planned Northeast Energy Direct Project (Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Docket No. PF14-22-000).

Commission staff approved Tennessee Gas' request to enter into the pre-filing process for the planned project on October 2, 2014. The pre-filing process is intended to provide an early forum for the applicant to seek input from agencies and landowners on the planned location of facilities. Use of the Commission's process allows early opportunity for public disclosure of the applicant's project planning activities.

The pre-filing process often starts with facility locations undetermined and is intended to identify issues and adjust those locations on an iterative basis, as appropriate. As a result, some landowners who may be affected by a proposed project may not be notified prior to the initial open houses because the project location is not yet firmly determined. However, all affected landowners must be contacted later in the process, when the project is set. The requirement you reference as contained in 18 C.F.Rg 157.21(fX3) is intended to ensure that notification occurs. In addition, Commission staff verifies that affected landowners are added to the Commission's project mailing list.

As your letter indicated, the planned project is still early in our environmental review process, and Commission staff has not opened the formal public scoping period. The scoping process is intended to solicit input from agencies, affected landowners, and the public on the environmental impacts associated with the installation of the planned equipment at the identified locations. This period does not begin until the company gives the Commission specific location information on major facilities, including compressor stations, and staff issues the Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (NOI). Moreover, scoping will be re-opened if the proposed location of a major project component is changed and affects new landowners.

Commission staff anticipates that Tennessee Gas will file the selected locations of the compressor stations shortly. Once Tennessee Gas submits the compressor station location information, staff will add to the project mailing list all landowners whose property is located within 1/4 mile of the planned locations. Commission staff is aware of concerns that all potentially-affected landowners in the Town of Northfield may not yet have received individual notification about the project, and will ensure all such people are notified of the scoping period and environmental review. I want to assure you that all landowners around the planned compressor stations will have a full formal scoping period, whether they have already received formal notification or are notified in the future, and that Commission staff will hold scoping meetings in locations convenient to residents near the compressor stations. As always, the Commission will accept and consider comments from any interested stakeholder at any time during the pre-filing and application review process.

The Commission has also received the letters that you forwarded from the Town of Northfield, Massachusetts, and the Northfield Pipeline Awareness organization. When the scoping process is complete, staff will include an analysis of issues raised in a draft environmental impact statement (EIS) that will be issued for public comment. The EIS will include a safety, environmental, and socioeconomic analysis that will cover the issues identified by the Town of Northfield and the Northfield Pipeline Awareness organization.

As in any Commission matter, please be assured that we strive to make our review of energy proposals both accessible and transparent to the public. If I can be of further assistance in this or any other Commission matter, I hope you will not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely,

Norman C. Bay  
Chairman

**20150619-0035(30652686).pdf**

*{“File 30652454\_1.tif cannot be converted to PDF” NOTE: is largely OCR compatible scan, typed letter}*

LAW OFFICES OF CRISTOBAL BONIFAZ  
180 Maple Street P.O. Box 180 Conway, Massachusetts  
Telephone 413-369-4263  
Fax 413-369-0076  
Electronic Mail: cbonifaz@comcast.net

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL, RETURN RECEIPT

June 9, 2015

Honorable Cheryl A. LaFleur  
Chairperson  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street,  
Washington, DC 20426

Honorable Ernest Moniz  
Secretary  
US Department of Justice  
1000 Independence Ave., SW  
Washington, DC 20585

Honorable Eric H. Holder  
US Attorney General  
US Department of Justice  
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Honorable Karen LGoodwin  
US Attorney’s Office  
District of Massachusetts  
300 State Street, Suite 230  
Springfield, MA, 01105

**In RE: Deerfield et al., v United States**

Dear Honorable Cheryl A. LaFleur, Honorable Ernest Moniz, Honorable Eric H. Holder, Honorable Karen LGoodwin:

HSB Solomon Associates LLC • One Lincoln Centre> 5400 LBJ Freeway> Suite 1400 • Dallas, TX 75240 • Phone: + 1.972.739.1700 (“HSB”), an energy consulting firm, sent this office, via e-mail on June 8, 2015 a demand for retraction of material incorporated by independent researcher David Keith into his report, filed by this office in support of the afore referred Federal Torts Claim filed against the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, the Department of Energy and the United States. The demand of HSB is that some material in the accompanying expert report filed with the tort claim is copyrighted.

Specifically HSB has requested that this office removes from Mr. Keith’s report all references and or copyrighted materials regarding Ziff Energy regarding the Pieridae LNG export project as noted on page 2 of the Ziff Energy/Solomon report. The demand of HSB is that independent researcher, Mr. David Gilbert Keith (address 41 Old Main St. (Box 304), Deerfield, MA 01342), and a member of the Deerfield Energy Resources Committee, extracted valuable and restricted Intellectual Property from an LNG export application copyrighted by Ziff Energy regarding the Pieridae LNG export application.

This Law Office complies and hereby retracts all references and materials requested by HSB Solomon Associates from Mr. Keith's report and requests that the attached version of the redacted David Keith report be substituted for the prior version accompanying the Deerfield claim. The redacted version of Mr. Keith's report is attached.

This retraction does not add or take away any element of proof to the fact that most of the natural gas projected to be transported through the proposed Kinder Morgan pipeline is for export, a factual issue to be decided by the trial court,

Respectfully submitted,

By Attorney by Attorney Cristobal Bonifaz

Cc: HBS Solomon Associated and others copied by HBS: Bill Gwozd [bill.gwozd@solomononline.com], Jason Hillman - HBSolomon (jason\_hillman@hsb.com), Udokang, Essien, Thorn.dawsomgipieridaenergy.com, Mike J. Hileman, Bill Winnick, (via electronic mail with attachments). Clients of this Law Office in this matter and all other previous recipients of the FTCA claim, (via electronic mail with attachments which was the way they received the original copies of the FTCA claim).

David Gilbert Keith  
41 Old Main St. (Box 304)  
Deerfield, MA 01342

February 3, 2015

Attorney Cristobal Bonifaz  
Law Office of Cristobal Bonifaz  
180 Maple Street  
P.O. Box 180  
Conway, Massachusetts 01341

Dear Attorney Bonifaz:

Thank you for asking me to study the Kinder Morgan proposed project of constructing a gas pipeline through certain towns in Massachusetts, including especially Deerfield, and to reach an opinion as to whether A.) the New England states can use the 2.2 billion cubic feet of natural gas per day the pipeline will be capable of transporting or, B.) the amount exceeds what New England states can use in the foreseeable future, and C.) a large portion of the delivered natural gas will be exported from New England.

As an independent researcher I have provided environmental analysis for over 20 years in a number of legal cases involving oil spills as well as noise, air, and water pollution related to aircraft. I am co-author of "The Hidden Cost of Oil: New Orleans to Indonesia" and "After the Gold Rush." I am currently a member of the Deerfield Energy Resources Committee.

As per the facts delineated below it is my expert opinion that a great portion of this gas will not find use in New England and will be exported from the United States.

Marcellus and Utica production has already overwhelmed demand in the US Northeast area and has begun to push outward. -- Pieridae Energy (Canada) Ltd., Application to import natural gas.  
Nov. 6, 2013

### **1: Natural Gas Consumption & Demand in New England**

Kinder Morgan, Inc. is proposing to build a pipeline from New York State capable of delivering 2.2 billion cubic feet [bcf] per day to Dracut, Massachusetts. For the reasons delineated below, I conclude that New England simply cannot use this much additional energy and a very large portion of this gas will instead find its demand as Liquefied Natural Gas shipped to markets overseas.

To understand why 2.2bcf/day of natural gas exceeds demand in New England, it is important to look at the difference between supply and delivery rate.

Recent studies have concluded that New England has had to pay more for fuel during peak demand days because of constraints in the supply of natural gas. i On peak days the inflow of gas comes close to the maximum inflow capacity, triggering higher costs as the reserve threshold is approached and alternate fuels and generation (such as Hydrn-Quebec) must be used. This constraint has two components. The first is regulatory disincentive for electric power generating facilities to buy forward contracts. ii The second is more a shortage of flow than of gas itself. The household equivalent would be turning on all the water taps and then flushing the toilets. The tanks would take longer to refill and the shower would be unsatisfying-ebut that is different from running out of water.[1] New England does not need more gas. It may need marginally faster delivery of gas. According to the US Energy Information Agency [EIA), existing net inflow capacity (inflow less outflow) to New England is almost two thirds more gas than the region consumes.

The six New England states consumed 889 billion cubic feet [bcf) of natural gas in 2013. For the six years ending in 2013, net inflow capacity constant at 1,441bcf/yr. The capacity is already in place to deliver more gas than the region uses.

Delivery rate-a separate issue-will be improved by completion of two projects expected to be completed in 2016. Spectra Energy's Algonquin Incremental Market Project will deliver .33bcf/day and Kinder Morgan's Tennessee Gas Pipeline [TGP) Northeast Connecticut Expansion 0.07bcf!day. These improvements will likely ease price volatility in New England, but the larger question is whether New England has sufficient demand to use the gas being delivered. Given these expansions and Kinder Morgan's proposed 2.2bcf/day Northeast Direct Pipeline, the answer is no.

*{chart, not included here}*

Gas for heating and industrial use, so-called "firm" demand, is not expected to increase beyond supply, but it does get a sort of first refusal-by contract=on the total supply, leaving the remainder to electrical power generators." Yet the power sector has not provided sufficient demand for pipeline expansions:

In 2011, Spectra Energy (operator of the Algonquin pipeline) proposed the Algonquin Incremental Market (AIM) Project to expand its citygate capacity by a nonbinding nomination of J Bcjlday. In December 2013, the proposed capacity expansion was 0.33 Bcfiday, with the target completion in November 2016,5 The size of the pipeline capacity expansion was reduced 65% from the original proposal because of lack of interest in signing up for long-term firm transport capacity contracts. iii

Most of new demand and price volatility comes from increasing use of natural gas to power electrical generation. ICF International, LtC. has projected that the only shortage of capacity would occur on "design days" when demand would approach inflow capacity, Even for these days, ICF reports: "The projected deficits in gas supply apply only to the power sector; gas supply capabilitie are adequate to meet non-power, firm gas demand,,iv

*{chart, not included here}*

The consulting firm Black & Veatch determined that overall gas consumption in New England is not expected to increase much over the next fifteen years despite the repowcring of electrical power plants, as shown in the chart above: V

Repowering cannot create demand to match the 803bcf/year Kindel' Morgan proposes to deliver. For financial as well as environmental reasons, the only power plants it would make sense to convert to natural gas are coal, petroleum, and nuclear. RIA data shows that by 2012 (the most recent year for which data is available) coal use was already down by roughly 80%, from generating 17% of the total power supply in 1990 to 3% in 2012, Petroleum is already all but phased out in 2012, dropping from 27% of power generation in 1990 to 0.4% in 2012.

Repowering all remaining coal, petroleum, and nuclear power plants in New England to natural gas would increase consumption of natural gas by 363bcf/yr. Even this extremely unlikely demand scenario leaves 440bcf---wllsiderably more than half-v-of the Kinder Morgan pipeline capacity unused.

It is argued that New England could benefit from additional pipeline capacity to avoid peak demand hour

cost spikes, But the difference between flow capacity and supply is most relevant to the question of how the gas itself will be used.

By definition peak days are not average days. Even on the coldest of days, when residential heating is a larger percentage of use, demand for gas is not constant. The U.S. Energy Information Agency notes that the ratio between peaks and average consumption of electricity has been rising, especially in New England. The ratio increases as the difference between the peak and the average becomes greater. In 2012 the peak hour demand ratio was 1.78, meaning peak demand was 78% greater than the hourly average.” Since the main use of new gas supplies is to be power generation, the few demand spikes of the year will be increasingly removed from overall demand, While incremental pipeline capacity growth might prevent price increases during the few peak hours of the year, there is no need for the fuel new pipelines will deliver for the thousands of other hours of the year or even the other hours of that peak day,

*{chart, not included here}*

Figure 3: (Synapse Energy Economics, Inc. 1/7/2015) Note here that even within a demand day, the peak hour demand is roughly 20% higher than the same day’s average demand.”

Imagining a highest demand scenario, with an unprecedented 1.6% per year growth in firm (heating and industrial) demand and with all nuclear, coal and petroleum power plants in New England converting to gas next year, the firm demand for natural gas throughout New England would increase by 242bcf/yr by 2030 with the new generation demand adding another 363bcf/yr for a total of 606bc/yr. Even this all-but impossible scenario leaves a quarter of the capacity of Kinder Morgan’s proposed pipeline unused.

far more likely would be a slight decline in firm demand (as alternative energy and conservation projects take effect) and remaining coal plants repowering to natural gas or being replaced altogether. Coal and petroleum powered generation in New England produced about 4,500,000 MegaWatt-hours [MWh] in 2012, The now-closed Vermont Yankee nuclear plant produced another 5,000,000 MWh, Using the EIA’s conversion factor (which includes power plant efficiency ratings), generating 9,500,000MWh would consume about 75bcf of gas. So what will happen to the rest of the 803bcf/yr Kinder Morgan’s Northeast Energy Direct pipeline could deliver’?

## **Part 2: Destination**

The only evident Shortage in New England is in delivery capacity-rate of flow and concurrent cost constraints-not actual gas, Since the gas transported through Kinder Morgan’s pipeline far exceeds New England’s demand, where will it go? Regarding increased production in general, the U.S. Energy Information Agency concludes, “Increased natural gas production would meet most demand from added LNG exports ... , In the export scenarios that EIA was asked to analyze, LNG exports from the Lower 48 states start in 2015 and increase at a rate of 2 billion cubic feet (Bcf) per day per year, ultimately reaching 12, 16 or 20 Bcf/d, “v;;;

Figure 4:

Change in natural gas “supply and delivered end-use consumption in four added export scenarios relative to the Reference case baseline (2015-40) billion cubic feet per day

*{chart, not included here}*

Indeed, such considerations are already well under way. The Canadian Broadcast Corporation reports: “The company that owns majority interest in the Maritimes and Northeast Pipeline has announced plans to reverse its flow from south to north, putting pressure on New Brunswick’s Saint John’s Canaport liquefied natural gas terminal to convert into an export facility.” The same report notes that another LNG export facility is also proposed for Guysborough County in Nova Scotia and adds: “The Saint John’s terminal is idle for extended periods each year. For the most part, it sends gas into the United States during peak winter demand periods.”” The Maritimes & Northeast pipeline was built to bring Canadian gas south, ending in Dracut, Massachusetts, but demand is already proving insufficient and Canadian production is diminishing. The far greater flood of gas Kinder Morgan proposes to deliver will not “sit idle.” The natural gas transported

through Kinder Morgan's NED pipeline will likely find much of its demand in exports as liquefied natural gas.

**Conclusion:**

- New England may have a capacity shortage that constrains delivery of available natural gas to power generators during comparatively few peak demand hours per year.
- New England does not have any evident shortage of natural gas itself. Additional gas, therefore, is not needed even if incremental growth of pipelines to deliver gas more quickly might be helpful.
- New England cannot use another 803bcf/yr of natural gas. At least a large portion of this gas will be exported.

Thank you again for giving me this opportunity to examine this important issue.

Sincerely,

David Gilbert Keith

-----

[1] "The interstate pipelines have a combined capacity of approximately 3,500 MMcf/d to serve New England's residential, commercial, municipal, and industrial customers, as well as the demands of the region's natural-gas-fired power plants. During the peak winter period for natural gas demand, natural gas consumption can easily reach the capacity limits of the pipelines." ISO NE, Inc. "2013 Annual Markets Report," p. 13, May 6, 2013 [http://www.iso-ne.com/staticassets/documents/markets/mkt\\_anly' \[PULino\) mkt\\_rpts/ZQ13/2Q13\\_amr\\_final\\_050614.pdf](http://www.iso-ne.com/staticassets/documents/markets/mkt_anly' [PULino) mkt_rpts/ZQ13/2Q13_amr_final_050614.pdf) (Accessed 1/25/2015)

[2] "Therefore, in the context of this report, a gas supply 'deficiency' suggests that the firm shippers are at or near their full contract limits and there is insufficient interruptible pipeline capacity remaining to meet the overall needs of the electric generators. A potential deficit of supplies available to electric generators does not mean that the pipelines serving New England are under-designed or otherwise incapable of meeting their contractual firm shipper obligations; rather it raises a number of questions about how to address potential supply shortages for electric generators." ICF International, LLC, "Assessment of New England's Natural Gas Pipeline Capacity to Satisfy Short and Near Term Electric Generation Needs: Phase II," p. L Nov. 20, 2014 [http://www.iso-ne.com/staticassets/documents/2014/final\\_icf\\_phil\\_gas\\_study\\_report\\_with\\_appendices\\_112014.pdf](http://www.iso-ne.com/staticassets/documents/2014/final_icf_phil_gas_study_report_with_appendices_112014.pdf) (Accessed 11/26/2015)

E.g.:

- "2013 Annual Markets Report," ISO NE, Inc. May 6, 2013 [http://www.iso-ne.com/markets/mkt\\_anly\\_rpts/2Q13/2013\\_mmr\\_nal\\_050614.pdf](http://www.iso-ne.com/markets/mkt_anly_rpts/2Q13/2013_mmr_nal_050614.pdf) (Accessed 11/25/2015),

- "Assessment of New England's Natural Gas Pipeline Capacity to Satisfy Short and Near Term Electric Generation Needs: Phase II," ICF International, LLC., 11/20/2014 [http://www.iso-ne.com/markets/mkt\\_anly\\_rpts/2Q13/2013\\_mmr\\_nal\\_050614.pdf](http://www.iso-ne.com/markets/mkt_anly_rpts/2Q13/2013_mmr_nal_050614.pdf) (Accessed 11/25/2015)

- "Natural Gas Infrastructure and Electric Generation: Proposed Solutions for New England," B&V Project No. 178511, Prepared for: The New England States Committee on Electricity, Black & Veatch, 8/26/2013 [http://www.iso-ne.com/markets/mkt\\_anly\\_rpts/2Q13/2013\\_mmr\\_nal\\_050614.pdf](http://www.iso-ne.com/markets/mkt_anly_rpts/2Q13/2013_mmr_nal_050614.pdf) (Accessed 1/24/2015)

i; "In the case of natural gas, part of the problem results from the predominance of market-driven electricity generation investment within the New England region. Merchant generators in search of the lowest cost fuels have gravitated toward natural gas as a default, and no single generator has an incentive to invest in the forward contracts, firm gas transportation service, fuel diversification or storage that would be necessary to increase reliability and reduce price volatility." --Quadrennial Energy Review Task Force Secretariat and Energy Policy and Systems Analysis Staff, U.S. Dept of Energy, Letter Re: "Infrastructure Constraints in New England," 4/15/2014 [http://www.energy.gov/sites/prod/files/2014/04/f15/BriefingMemo InfrastDicture-ConstaintsinNewEngand April21 .pdf](http://www.energy.gov/sites/prod/files/2014/04/f15/BriefingMemo%20Infrastructure%20Constraints%20in%20New%20England%20April%20121.pdf) (Accessed 1/26/2015)

; U.S. EIA, “High prices show stresses in New England natural gas delivery system,” Feb. 7, 2014 <http://www.eia.gov/naturalgas/review/deliverysystem2013/> (Accessed 2/21/2015)

; “Assessment of New England’s Natural Gas Pipeline Capacity to Satisfy Short and Near-Term Power Generation Needs: Phase I.” ICF International, u.c, p. 34, 612412012 Public Version ‘Black & Veatch, “Natural Gas Infrastructure and Electric Generation: Proposed Solutions for New England, B&V Project No. 178511, Prepared for: The New England States Committee on Electricity, 8/26/2013 [http://www.nes-coe.com/uploads/Phase III Gas-Elec Report Sept 2013.pdf](http://www.nes-coe.com/uploads/Phase%III%Gas-Elec%Report%Sept%2013.pdf) (Accessed 1/24/2015)

; U.S. EIA: “Peak-to-average electricity demand ratio rising in New England and many other U.S. regions” <http://www.eia.gov/tpdayinenergy/detail.cfm?id=15051>; “Massachusetts Low Gas demand Analysis: Final Report,” Synapse Energy Economics, Inc., p.25 Jan. 7, 2015 <http://www.mass.gov/eeldocs/doer/fuelsdoer-low-demand-report-final.pdf> (Accessed 11/25/15)

viii U.S. Energy Information Agency, “Today in Energy: Increased natural gas production would meet most demand from added LNG exports,” 11/12/14 <http://www.eia.gov/todayinenergy/detail.cfm?id=181> (Accessed 11/25/15)

See also: U.S. EIA “Annual Energy Outlook with projections to 2040,” Marcellus natural gas exceeds 100% of the demand projected for the New England and Mid-Atlantic Census Divisions from 2016 through 2040 in the Reference case, requiring transportation of some Marcellus gas to other markets. During the expected peak production period for the Marcellus shale, from 2022 through 2025, its total production exceeds natural gas consumption in the New England and Middle Atlantic regions by more than 1.0 Tcf over the period. <http://www.eia.gov/forecasts/aeo/tables/naturalgas> (Accessed 2/3/2015)

; Ibid. ‘CBC News: “New uses sought for Saint John’s Canaport LNG terminal,” 1/23/2015 <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/new-brunswick/new-uses-soyght-for-saint-john-s-canaport-lng-terminal-1.2538819> (Accessed 11/25/2015)

### **20150619-0038(30652697).pdf**

From: Corinne Sharkey, 126 Cole Street / PO Box 147, Cummington, MA 01026

To: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC, 1615 Suffield Street, Agawam, MA 01001

Date: June 11, 2015

Via Certified Mail. Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access [NED - Northeast Energy Direct. docket number PF14-22]

As the owner of the property located at: 126 Cole Street, Cummington, Massachusetts I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass. Following are some of the reasons for not allowing access:

- A natural gas transmission pipeline is considered storage of hazardous material and could violate provisions in my mortgage, put me in default and expose me to foreclosure.
- Natural gas transmission pipelines pose a very serious risk due to possible explosion and fire with potential injury and loss of life.
- A natural gas transmission pipeline is considered storage of hazardous materials and could violate the terms of my homeowner’s insurance agreement and expose me to litigation risks due to the previously mentioned fire hazard.
- The existence of a natural gas transmission pipeline on my property, based on real estate value assessments from similar properties with similar easements, poses a demonstrable loss of property value, which would be unrecoverable.

- The existence of a natural gas transmission pipeline on my property could prevent sale or sub-division of the property due to the potential inability of the buyer to obtain a mortgage.
- Burning additional fossil fuel is harmful to the environment, and not needed. Efficiency, conservation, and renewable energy are safe, reliable sources to meet our energy needs.

cc: FERC chairman; Governor Baker; US Senators Warren, Markey; US Representative Neal; Massachusetts Senator Ben Downing

**20150619-0039(30652696).pdf**

**Office of the Board of Selectmen  
Town of Mason**  
16 Darling Hill Road —Mann House  
Mason, New Hampshire 03048  
(603) 878-2070 (603) 878-4892 Fax

June 9, 2015

Norman C. Bay, Chairman  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Request for scoping meeting

Docket No. PF-14-22, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co., Northeast Energy Direct proposal

Dear Mr. Bay:

The Select Board of the Town of Mason, New Hampshire, respectfully requests that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission hold a pre-filing scoping meeting in our town. We believe it is important that you hear directly from the selectmen, the planning board, the conservation commission, and the citizens of this community. We are a small, pristine, rural town with a wide range of concerns about the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's Northeast Energy Direct pipeline project.

Mason is one of the New Hampshire towns most intensely impacted by the proposed pipeline, as Tennessee is proposing to locate both the main line and the "Fitchburg lateral" here, effectively trisecting the town with approximately 9 miles of pipeline.

Please contact Jeannine, Administrative Assistant to the selectmen, to discuss a time and location for a scoping meeting in Mason, New Hampshire.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this request.

Sincerely,

BOARD OF SELECTMEN  
Bernard O'Grady, Chairman  
Duly Authorized

**20150619-5001(30650193).txt**

Brian bulan, Nassau, NY.

I OPPOSE the application of Tennessee Gas Pipeline! I own roughly 100 acres and would also be in the buffer zone. This land has been in my family for a very long time and was going to be passed down to my children in the future and also be part of my retirement. I will lose property value that I can't get back. Will not be able to sell d/t mortgage companies not allowing mortgage loans on property within the buffer zone. Not to mention raising my children in an unsafe environment physically and chemically. Landowners should have rights when it comes to eminent domain! What does NYS gain from this pipeline? Please do research and don't allow them to take our freedom away.

**20150619-5003(30650216).txt**

Alice Pearman, Manchester, NH.

The overall plan ignores formalized goals for fuel diversity in New England. The pipeline would not fit regional and state energy policies. The pipeline would increase demand for fracked gas. Our communities, including important conversation land in the Monadnock area, would be at risk.

We do not want this pipeline in New Hampshire, or anywhere! Support renewable energy -- stop doing things the way they've always been done. It doesn't work. Reject this project.

**20150619-5004(30650218).txt**

MARTE, NORTHFIELD, MA.

I live in Northfield Ma where a proposed compressor station will be built. On a map distributed to the local paper I noticed my house in the affected area 1/2 mile from the site. I haven't been notified of this or its consequences. Typical behavior from this Kinder Morgan Company. There is a lot of land following the ROW that the pipeline will travel to build this compressor station that would not impact stakeholders that hasn't been explored. As for public need, I have no access to this gas. The local public has no need for poisonous effluent or loud machinery in the rural countryside that this pipeline will travel. My neighbors contacted their lenders and insurance companies for consultations and were told that their insurance would be cancelled if they were in the FERC 1/2 mile zone from this compressor. As you know the reputation and safety record of Kinder Morgan is abhorant.

**Kinder Morgan Accidents & Safety Violations**

In 2009, the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) cited Kinder Morgan for violating safety standards regarding the distance between a natural gas pipeline and a "high consequence area" such as a school or hospital; the pipeline was too close for safe operation in case of a leak. [22]

In 2011, PHMSA cited Kinder Morgan for these safety violations:

- failing to maintain update maps showing pipeline locations,
- failing to test pipeline safety devices,
- failing to maintain proper firefighting equipment,
- failing to inspect its pipelines as required, and
- failing to adequately monitor pipes' corrosion levels. [23]

In 2013, the headline "Wall Street Worries About Kinder Morgan's Safety Record: BC pipeline operator slashes and defers maintenance spending" was a concern to anyone who lived or worked near a Kinder Morgan pipeline. [24]

The Wall Street Journal asked, "Is Kinder Morgan Scrimping on its Pipelines?" after an investment analyst charged the company with starving its pipelines of routine maintenance spending in order to return more cash to investors. [25]

Deferred maintenance may account for the high number of Kinder Morgan pipeline accidents in the last decade.

Close examination of PHMSA's incident reports for Kinder Morgan's onshore gas transmission pipelines shows that faulty infrastructure causes 45% of onshore gas transmission pipeline significant leaks. Failure of the pipe, a cracked weld, and faulty pipeline equipment together account for 28.3% of pipeline leaks, and corrosion of the pipe causes 16.8%. [26]

Accidents In Texas from 2003 to 2014, Kinder Morgan experienced 36 "significant incidents", resulting in fatalities or hospitalization, fires, explosions, or spills. [27]

Throughout the U.S. since 2003, Kinder Morgan and its subsidiaries' pipe lines have been responsible for at least 180 spills, evacuations, explosions, fires, and fatalities in 24 states. [28]

Some notable examples (including spills in Canada):

- 2003 In August 2003, in Caddo County, Oklahoma, a Kinder Morgan Natural Gas Pipeline of America failed in a rural farming area about just east of the town of Stecker. A 26” diameter pipe exploded, throwing a 54 - foot long section of pipe 30 feet from the ditch. The cause was environmental cracking along the length of the failed section parallel to the longitudinal weld seam. [29]
- 2004 On April 27, 2004, an underground Kinder Morgan 14” pipeline ruptured at Suisun Marsh in Solano County, California, spilling over 120,000 gallons of diesel fuel directly into the marsh. The cause was pipe corrosion. The company failed to notify authorities about the spill for 18 hours, another safety violation for which it was later cited. Kinder Morgan was fined \$5.3 million for the spill, and agreed to enhance spill prevention, response and reporting practices. The company had 44 spills in 31 months, indicating “widespread failure to adequately detect and address the effects of outside force damage and corrosion,” according to an order issued in August 2005 by the U.S. Department of Transportation’s Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA). [30] [31]

On November 9, 2004, a Kinder Morgan pipeline in Walnut Creek, California was struck by a backhoe, causing a gasoline spill that ignited in an explosive fireball that incinerated five workers and severely injured four others. CalOSHA (California Occupational Safety and Health Administration) cited Kinder Morgan for failure to accurately mark or map the pipeline location. [32]

In 2005, the California Fire Marshal fined Kinder Morgan \$500,000 for its role in the “completely preventable” tragedy. Kinder Morgan agreed to upgrade pipeline inspection methods and improve corrosion control. [33]

- 2005 A Kinder Morgan Energy Partners petroleum products pipeline was found to be leaking gasoline into Summit Creek, near Truckee, California, on April 1. Gasoline spread into Donner Lake. About 300 gallons were spilled. [34] [35]

In May 2005, a Kinder Morgan Natural Gas Pipeline of America 30” diameter pipe exploded near Marshall, Texas, sending a giant fireball into the sky and hurling a 160 - foot section of pipe onto the grounds of an electric power generating plant. Two people were hurt, 40 evacuated. The cause was stress corrosion cracking. [36]

- 2006 On July 22, 2006, near Campbellsville, Kentucky, a Kinder Morgan Tennessee Gas Pipeline exploded. A 25 - foot chunk of pipe blew out of the ground and landed 200 feet away, the pipe twisted and mangled, its external coating burned off. The 24” pipeline ruptured due to external corrosion more than two feet long at the bottom of a valley in an area of wet shale, known to cause corrosion on buried pipelines in this part of Kentucky. [37] The list goes on and on and on. How is it possible that FERC maintains that pipelines are safe and regulated. How can the public ever trust this.

#### **20150619-5123(30651846).txt**

deborah pomerleau, Londonderry, NH.

I went to the Londonderry Open House with Kinder Morgan last night. Strangely, this had not been advertised much and many said that only found out about it shortly before 7pm.

There was mention of a possible alternative route along the Mass Pike. Though not ideal, this would be better than through southern NH.

- 1) wetlands, rivers, streams, ponds, aquifers, wells, septic tanks - would all be effected if this pipeline went through southern NH.
- 2) property values will drop, as people will not buy a house near a pipeline.
- 3) insurance companies will not want the responsibility or liability and will not provide new policies to new mortgage requests.
- 4) noise and air pollution

- 5) deceptive presentation of smaller compressor stations during these open houses, instead of a realistic drawing of what the large 80,000 hp compressor station will look like.
  - 6) incineration zone.
  - 7) schools and hospitals near pipeline
  - 8) lack of ability for police and fire departments to respond in an emergency.
  - 9) damage to our roads from the large trucks
  - 10) extra damage along the pipeline due to temporary construction sites.
- please do not approve this project.

**20150619-5205(30652621).txt**

Gentlemen, we need to get away from fossil fuels, not add more. All that extra volume will enable war in Europe. The Pope has already called the conflict in Ukraine the seeds of WW III. Another company, Portland, has offered to use their existing capacity to feed New Hampshire's future growth needs over another route. If KM gets this pipe their market share will grow past 25% and edge them towards monopoly, de-stabilizing the industry, allowing KM to fix prices.

**20150622-0013(30655098).pdf**

**Office of Board of Selectmen**  
**Town of Mason**  
16 Darling Hill Road — Mann House  
Mason, New Hampshire 03048  
(603) 878-2070 (603) 878-4892 Fax

June 16, 2015

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

Re: Docket: PF-14-22-000

Letter to Norman C. Bay, Chairman

Dear Ms. Bose,

The Board of Selectmen sent a letter to Norman C. Bay, Chairman, on April 28, 2015. We have not seen the letter listed on the docket as of today. I have enclosed signed copy of the letter addressed to you certified mail.

We appreciate your attention to this letter.

Sincerely,

Jeannine Phalon  
Administrative Assistant

*{referenced enclosed letter not included in FERC PDF file, but see my submission 20150616-5080 above}*

**20150622-0014**

*{note: Feb 8, 2016: document referenced above in 20150622-0013 added to Docket per my request, but see 20150616-5080 above anyway}*

THE SENATE  
STATE OF NEW YORK

• 430 CAPITOL  
ALBANY, NEW YORK 12247  
(518) 455-3131

• 41 S MAIN STREET  
ONEONTA, NEW YORK 13820  
(507)432-5524

EMAIL  
SEWARD@NYSENATE.GOV  
WEBSITE  
SEWARD.NYSENATE.GOV

ASSISTANT REPUBLICAN CONFERENCE LEADER  
ON CONFERENCE OPERATIONS  
CHAIRMAN  
INSURANCE COMMITTEE  
COMMITTEES  
RULES  
FINANCE  
EDUCATION  
HIGHER EDUCATION  
AGRICULTURE  
HEALTH  
MENTAL HEALTH

JAMES L. SEWARD  
SENATOR, 51ST DISTRICT

June 17, 2015

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, N.E., Room I A  
Washington, D.C. 20426

RE: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.

Docket No. PF14-22-000

Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Secretary Bose,

I write to express concerns about the proposed route and plan of the Tennessee Gas Pipeline (Kinder-Morgan) through portions of my district and to ask that it be held to highest level of scrutiny possible. In fact, given what my constituents along the proposed route are facing with other energy projects, I would urge FERC to decline approval of this one. "Pipeline Fatigue" might be an apt description of the outlook of my constituents.

My concern is simply this: the area through which the pipe will be routed is already under FERC approval for one pipeline. The Constitution Pipeline will supply much needed natural gas to certain areas it is crossing, but no such plan seems in view from Kinder Morgan. If that is the case, then areas I represent are simply being asked to host a pipeline 'highway' with no additional benefits.

The cumulative effect of multiple pipelines through portions of Delaware and Schoharie Counties should be reviewed by FERC. It is not unreasonable to project that multiple pipelines would place arithmetically higher pressure on public infrastructure and public services, land values and the environment. This 'multiplier' factor should be evaluated carefully.

In light of additional pressure by a second line, I would ask that FERC insist on an agreement that localities' costs attributable to pipeline construction be funded by the company in the event that the pipeline is approved. In New York, our local governments operate under a property tax cap, and due to an economic climate of high business regulation and state taxation, we are not experiencing massive new business growth to offset higher municipal costs. Thus, municipal resources to address the side-effects of industrial construction are limited.

The Delaware County Board of Supervisors has identified several specific concerns, communicated them to Kinder Morgan, and outlined them in a letter to you dated April 23, 2015 (copy enclosed). I would ask that FERC review the county's concerns and ensure that they are respected and enacted.

Please review the Tennessee Gas Pipeline plans very carefully to assess whether a second pipeline through my district is genuinely in the best interests of the public and whether it is necessary to meet an identified

need for additional energy.

One, it seems to me, is enough. I hope that FERC agrees and rejects the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline (Kinder-Morgan), Docket No. PF14-22-000.

With best wishes, I remain

Sincerely yours,

JAMES L. SEWARD

State Senator

JLS:ddjt

Cc: Congressman Gibson

Sens. Schumer, Gillibrand

Delaware County Board of Supervisors

Schoharie County Board of Supervisors

**20150622-0016**

**Delaware County Board of Supervisors**

*{ note: Feb 8, 2016: this missing document added to Docket per my request }  
{ is duplicate copy of 20150428-0010 (in Vol 2) }*

**20150622-0020(30655075).pdf**

PROPERTY ACCESS DENIED

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC

1615 Suffield Street

Agawam, MA 01001

Date: 6/15/15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

RE: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

Street Address: 30 Fish Hatchery Road

Town & Zip: Richmond, NH 03470

Map & Lot Number(s) (if known): 405, LOT 84-04

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Yvon Pierre Brulot

CC:

FERC

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, NE, Room 1A

Washington, DC 20426

**20150622-0021(30655074).pdf**

PROPERTY ACCESS DENIED

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC

1615 Suffield Street

Agawam, MA 01001

Date: June 10, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

RE: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

Street Address: 112 Tully Brook Road

Town & Zip: Richmond, NH 03470

Map & Lot Number(s) (if known): 000412 000026

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Mrs. Janet Montgomery

CC:

FERC

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, NE, Room 1A

Washington, DC 20426

**20150622-0022(30655072).pdf**

PROPERTY ACCESS DENIED

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC

1615 Suffield Street

Agawam, MA 01001

Date: 6/15/2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

RE: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

Street Address: 683 Old Homestead Hwy

Town & Zip: Richmond, NH 03470

Map & Lot Number(s) (if known): Map # 000402, LOT # 000080

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Dennis J. Castor

CC:

FERC

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, NE, Room 1A

Washington, DC 20426

PROPERTY ACCESS DENIED

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: 6-1-15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

RE: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

Street Address: 11 Athol Rd

Town & Zip: Richmond, NH 03470

Map & Lot Number(s) (if known):MAP # 000201, LOT # 000034

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Sharon Hause

CC:

FERC

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, NE, Room 1A

Washington, DC 20426

**20150622-5006(30652709).txt**

Robert Meagher, Greenfield, NH.

I am a citizen of southern New Hampshire and want to go on record that I oppose this project on the basis that:

- 1) The project is not targeted at making natural gas available to the areas through which the pipeline will pass in New Hampshire.
- 2) The project is unnecessary for meeting the energy needs of New Hampshire and New England.
- 3) The project will impose an unfair tax upon the electricity ratepayers of New Hampshire, who will not even benefit from the project.
- 4) The project will impose hardships on the citizens of southern New Hampshire because of destruction of environment, danger to citizens from toxic fumes, danger to life because of potential pipeline ruptures and explosions near homes and schools.

The project serves no one in the state of New Hampshire, and only has value (monetary) to Kinder Morgan and its affiliates. Please deny approval for this project.

**20150622-5009(30652715).txt**

Kaela Law, Pelham, NH.

First I am including a picture of a map. The link and picture are here: <http://www.bing.com/images/search?q=tennessee+gas+pipeline&view=detailv2&&id=449337A6989D841466112A658197DC86794B427E&selectedIndex=0&ccid=j5sGmM21&simid=607994042026296422&thid=JN.z3UYtcTzX91hkNP9UflLbQ&ajaxhist=0>

From Kinder Morgan's website, the blurb describing the Tennessee Gas Pipeline is as follows: Kinder Morgan's Tennessee Gas Pipeline is an approximately 11,900-mile pipeline system that transports natural gas from Louisiana, the Gulf of Mexico and south Texas to the northeast section of the United States, including New York City and Boston.

Does this system seem a bit antiquated and uneconomical to anyone else? I am asking honest questions here, and would like to start a correspondence with someone from the FERC offices regarding them, if such a thing is possible. Was the TGP pipeline system developed before the marcellus shale was fully recognized? I ask, because those pipes, the red line on the link above and the pink lines shown to us during Kinder Morgan's town hall presentation maps, show that this pipeline travels right through the Pennsylvania marcellus shale region. Kinder Morgan likes to point out that our gas prices are very expensive in New England to push their NED project. (On the flip side I've seen graphs and statements from both ISO-NE and EIA that indicate our electricity prices are below the national average and that our electricity use or demand is forecasted to grow only 1% annually over the next decade. With energy-efficiency factored in, that number drops to 0.1%.) Either way, for the sake of argument, is the reason we see higher gas prices in New England because our gas is being traveled all the way up from the southern and supposedly more expensive shale plays, across the country to get here? The transport price on that pipeline system must factor in pretty heavily to the costs up here, am I correct in thinking that? Curtis Cole of Kinder Morgan told the town of Pelham that the purpose of the NED project was to bring New England cheap marcellus shale gas. If that is the case, why isn't this company looking to consider repurposing the existing Tennessee Gas Pipeline system to do just that? It is already in the ground, it is already traversing the marcellus shale in Pennsylvania. Why isn't Kinder Morgan proposing a much smaller piece of natural gas infrastructure in PA that would start plugging existing TGP lines with marcellus shale gas. The "cheaper" gas from PA would travel much less distance to reach New England and I assume New England gas prices would then drop? They could file to reverse flow on their line from PA heading south to the gulf coast as well and give marcellus shale gas another avenue out of PA that way. If marcellus shale gas is supposedly "abundant" and "cheap" wouldn't a good business model be to use existing assets to cash in? Kinder Morgan took over the Tennessee Gas Pipeline system in 2012/2013, thus taking over the means to operate this pipeline and if they want to seriously bring New England's energy prices down they can file to repurpose this pipeline. This is an option that must be explored before a brand new pipeline with a \$5 billion dollar price tag is even considered. If anyone from FERC has any questions about what I am trying to explain here, please don't hesitate to email me kaelademetra@gmail.com.

Options to maximize existing pipeline systems must be considered before the use of eminent domain against New Hampshire citizens to build a brand new greenfield easement corridor is considered.

New Hampshire needs to see some serious energy efficiency policies put into place before we just rip up the landscape and use up natural resources almost recklessly. Investments for home insulation and newer windows, and to continue technology on lightbulbs and appliances to increase efficiency should be the first order of business. Too many people don't take these measures upon themselves, but expect homeowners such as my family to take a property loss for a pipeline easement because they are too lazy to maximize the efficiency of running their own households? It just doesn't make any sense to me. There should be an order to things, and number 1 item should include energy efficiency. If New Hampshire gets it in gear and initiates policies for better energy efficiency, has a few years to see a positive drop in energy prices and usage as a result, and afterwards still talks to me about "needing gas" maybe then I would consider giving my property away to a gas easement for the better good or whatever, but not a minute before that time. I am not sacrificing to help people who won't help themselves first. The same applies to any large business with an open flat roof ripe for a few solar panels.

Until our energy policies are straightened out we should put this Northeast Energy Direct pipeline proposition on the shelf. Period.

**20150622-5012(30652721).txt**

deborah pomerleau, Londonderry, NH.

I live in Londonderry NH 1/2 mile from the proposed pipeline, 1/4 mile from the incineration zone. Please don't approve this pipeline. Please allow scoping meetings for each and every town effected by this proposed pipeline.

**20150622-5016(30652729).txt**

Kaela Law, Pelham, NH.

Theoretical Co-Location

Regarding Co-Location, the Merrimack Valley Reliability Project, and zero reason this gas pipeline should cut through the town of Pelham, NH.

At the recent Londonderry Town Hall meeting with Kinder Morgan 6/18/2015, a KM rep told us: "It is a different dynamic here than what we are proposing for the theoretical co-location piece in other areas." Although the overall goal of this "theoretical co-location piece," is to have an overlap of permanent easement with the powerline utility ROW, Kinder Morgan's proposition was probably not banking on a simultaneous energy project that saw an upgrade to the overhead powerlines.

The Merrimack Valley Reliability Project for the towns of Londonderry, Hudson, Windham, Pelham, and Dracut is pretty much guaranteeing that there will be no such overlap. This presents an actual and definite brand new greenfield corridor for a very new gas pipeline easement through the towns of Londonderry, Hudson, Windham, Pelham and Dracut in particular. We in New Hampshire have been told the reason behind the jump up into our state by this proposed pipeline path was to essentially piggyback on the existing overhead electric transmission line easement. We have also been told the jump up was to lessen the greenfield corridor through Massachusetts. If piggybacking onto the powerline ROW is not a possibility, and a greenfield corridor will be constructed anyways, this proposed pipeline has zero business in NH towns such as Pelham and others.

Questions: Would the gas pipeline limit future growth for the electric transmission companies? Is that why National Grid / Eversource and Kinder Morgan have not yet come to conclusive terms about easement use? Additionally the easements in many cases are still the private property held by NH citizens. Can someone from the FERC offices please reply to my comment and point me in the direction that I might research the liability of an easement over a piece of property that is essentially divided three ways – landowner, electric utility, and private company? Can someone from the FERC offices please explain to me why a gas pipeline needs a permanent 50 foot easement? I am wondering if it is for safety reasons, or if it is for the pipeline companies protected potential for future growth and expansion within the easement, or both?

If FERC does not deny Kinder Morgan's application, this proposed pipeline has zero reason to follow the existing utility easement once it hits the town of Londonderry. As far as I am concerned it can skip right across the entire town of Londonderry to pick up route 93 and follow the highway down into Massachusetts that way. There is zero reason the town of Pelham, NH should be traversed by this proposed pipeline. Being home to a ROW of powerlines should not be a reason to walk around with a bullseye strapped to our backs, and that applies to all of the NH towns along this route.

- 1) FERC – do not give this Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline the approval it seeks.
- 2) FERC – hold a scoping meeting in the town of Pelham, NH to better understand why the "theoretical co-location piece" is just a theory and cannot be realized.

Has anyone from National Grid or Eversource weighed in with your regulatory proceedings to shed some light on the "theoretical co-location" of this project?

**20150622-5019(30652735).txt**

Amy Glowacki, Mason, NH.

I oppose this project in NH. There is still no evidence showing the true need for this project or that it will be beneficial to the people of NH to warrant eminent domain. co-location is not innocuous. There has not been any accurate information showing the true impact of co-location.

Mason, NH is targeted for the 36" Amin line and the Fitchburg lateral line. NH residents will receive no benefits from this lateral that bisects our town.

Mason is 100% dependent on well water. This pipeline cuts through aquifers, near wells and through conservation land. There is no information on how this issue of well water will be addressed and protected. What about wells that run dry from blasting and disturbing aquifers? What about contamination during blasting? Where are the answers and assurances?

Mason roads are not built to handle the construction equipment? Will our roads be rebuilt? And how will they be maintained if equipment is brought in throughout the life of huge pipeline?

We have no fire hydrants. How will we fight a fire? A pipeline rupture in the heavily forested areas with cause a conflagration that will not be easily controlled especially without hydrants and adequate water.

How are conservation issues being addressed to protect the wildlife?

The Selectmen of the Town of Mason have requested a scoping session. It is imperative that a scoping session be held in Mason for the residents to share their concerns with FERC. This process must ensure that the residents have a fair voice in this process. So far this process has been one of intimidation and little information.

What about social injustice? Our town is rural. Information sharing is difficult at best. Some people are just learning about this project. Seriously, communication is not easily facilitated here in NH.

How is it acceptable that the overwhelming majority of land owners refused survey access yet KM continues to file information? They cannot have accurate information about impacts on the land, water and conservation issues. Helicopter flights are not going to provide that level of information. This project has too many lasting life-changing consequences to not consider the health and property rights of people involved - especially without showing the public necessity of this project for the people of NH.

Mason must have a scoping session. A scoping session must be more open and fair with equal opportunities to participate with accurate, fair information than a information meeting. Those KM information meetings lack any substantive information.

Scoping session in Mason, NH is critical for the town to have a voice in supporting the case of the devastating impacts of the pipelines in Mason especially in light of no benefit to the public. It does not benefit NH.

**20150622-5024(30652745).txt**

deborah pomerleau, Londonderry, NH.

Please don't approve this pipeline for southern NH. You all know this is wrong. You know this can hurt water, wells, rivers, ponds, aquifers, and wetlands. You know this can lower property values, make mortgages difficult to get and keep. You know that ultimately homeowners' insurance will be difficult to get. You know that compressor stations pollute the air. You know that compressor stations have light pollution issues at night. You know that compressor stations cause noise pollution. You know this forever changes the environment around them. You know that children will be impacted and forever fearful of explosions and changes to their world. You know that police and fire departments can not handle catastrophes that can and will happen along pipelines. You know that Kinder Morgan is happy when accidents happen because they have subsidiaries that clean up accidental spills.

why. why can't you just say no to pipelines.

**“Precedent Agreements” for KM/TGP NED Project - in New Hampshire**

In order to issue a “Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity“ FERC requires binding “*Precedent Agreements*” between the pipeline applicant and “*Project Shippers*”. These long-term agreements to ship specific quantities of gas are used as evidence of a “need” for a pipeline.

Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline has listed Liberty Utilities in New Hampshire as one of the “Project Shippers” for its NED project.

Public utilities require approval of their state Public Utilities Commissions before they can sign such binding Precedent Agreements. The state PUC determines whether such an agreement would be in the best interests of the consumers.

In the case of Liberty Utilities, the New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission (NH PUC) is the relevant commission.

On December 31, 2014, Liberty Utilities filed a “Petition for Approval of a Firm Transportation Agreement With Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC” with the NH PUC, thus opening Docket No. DG 14-380.

The entire NH PUC docket for this application (DG 14-380) is publicly accessible at:

**<http://www.puc.nh.gov/Regulatory/Docketbk/2014/14-380.html>**

In addition to the applicants there are 3 interested parties:

**NH PUC Staff**

**OCA** (Office of Consumer Advocate) established by NH RSA 363:28 as “...*an independent agency administratively attached to the public utilities commission...*” which “...*shall have the power and duty to petition for, initiate, appear or intervene in any proceeding concerning rates, charges, tariffs, and consumer services before any board, commission, agency, court, or regulatory body in which the interests of residential utility consumers are involved and to represent the interests of such residential utility consumers...*”

**PLAN-NE** (Pipeline Awareness Network for the North East) which was granted standing as an intervenor based on some of its members being customers of Liberty Utilities.

Each party assigned its own expert to study and submit a report about the application. These experts were:

**NH PUC Staff:** Melissa Whitten (consultant)

**OCA:** Dr. Pradip K. Chattopadhyay (Assistant Consumer Advocate/Rate and Market Policy Director)

**PLAN-NE:** John A. Rosenkranz (consultant)

The experts submitted their reports on May 8, 2015. Their “direct testimony” adds up to 108 pages, not including supplementary data - too much to include here. Instead I have only included each report’s title-page and its final summary / conclusions / recommendations sections. Links to the complete reports are included in each title page.

Each of the three experts recommended **against** approval of the application.

Hearings before the Massachusetts Utility Commissions concerning public utilities in Massachusetts wishing to sign Precedent Agreements with NED were scheduled to take place after the NH PUC hearing.

-----  
BEFORE THE  
NEW HAMPSHIRE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
LIBERTY UTILITIES (ENERGYNORTH : Docket No. DG 14-380

NATURAL GAS) CORP. D/B/A LIBERTY :  
UTILITIES :  
Petition for Approval of a Firm Transportation  
Agreement With Tennessee Gas Pipeline  
Company, LLC

REDACTED  
DIRECT TESTIMONY  
OF  
MELISSA WHITTEN  
ON BEHALF OF THE  
THE STAFF OF THE NEW HAMPSHIRE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
May 8, 2015

Full testimony (56 pages) available at:

<http://www.puc.nh.gov/Regulatory/Docketbk/2014/14-380/TESTIMONY/14-380%202015-05-08%20STAFF%20DTESTIMONY%20M%20WHITTEN.PDF>

REDACTED  
Docket No. DG 14-380  
Testimony of Melissa Whitten  
May 8, 2015  
Page 53 of 56

### VIII. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Q. Please summarize your conclusions and recommendations for the Commission?

A. I have identified several concerns with the Company's Filing. These are:

- a) The Company indicates that it can continue to obtain firm citygate deliveries to meet design day deficits in the near term and does not indicate that it cannot continue to do so at least to cover a portion of the forecasted demand deficit;
- b) The PA assumes 115,000 Dth/d of capacity only 50,000 of which will replace existing capacity under the TGP Dracut contract, leaving 65,000 Dth/d of incremental capacity that results in excess capacity of as much as 55,000 Dth/d in the first year of the FT-NED agreement;
- c) The Company's very aggressive and speculative forecast of growth in Design Day Demand reduces this excess capacity slowly over time but some remains even after 20 years;
- d) As a result, in order to make sure that the PA represents the least-cost, or even just the best-cost alternative, the Company would have to be certain that it could recoup a significant percentage of the total costs of the excess capacity through cost-mitigation measures. However, this would require an even more speculative assumption about the future value of excess pipeline capacity in the secondary market;
- e) The Company's argument that the reliability benefit from having a second high-pressure interconnect on the west side of its system is a sufficient reason to impose the cost of the FT-NED contract on all firm ratepayers, even though it will retain all of its needle peaking capacity including the four propane air plants, whose cost is also borne by ratepayers, has not been demonstrated to support a conclusion that the contract is the least cost alternative;
- f) Additionally, the Company argues that the high-pressure interconnect will allow for cost-effective distribution system expansion to add new customers to the system, without providing any details about its

growth expectations or a fully-developed plan estimating the cost to obtain targeted levels of new customer growth and the required investment in distribution system expansion to serve these customers.

Based on these observations, and considering the findings summarized above, it is clear that the Company's stated need for 65,000 Dth/d of incremental capacity is not supported. Instead of providing an analysis based on industry best practices rooted in the IRP process, the company has effectively presented a procurement effort in lieu of a plan.

Further, the justification for the PA is based on an aggressive single-scenario demand forecast that would leave the Company with substantial excess capacity that it would not completely absorb or grow into over the life of the contract. As a result, in order to make sure that the PA represents the least-cost or even just the best-cost alternative, the Company would have to be certain – and the Commission would have to be assured - that the Company could recoup a significant percentage of the total costs of the excess capacity through cost mitigation measures. However, this certainty is not attainable, as any mitigation expectations require an even more speculative assumption about the future value of excess pipeline capacity in the secondary market, in order to be considered offset by the what the Company views as substantial benefits to customers over time, if the Company's demand forecasts come to pass.

Therefore, I respectfully recommend that the Commission deny the Company's petition as-filed, or in the alternative require the Company to prepare an amended filing that includes:

- 1) A fully-developed range of demand forecasts that are based on appropriate long-term drivers of customer count and use-per-customer by rate class,
- 2) An adequate and viable plan that quantifies the costs and the benefits of pursuing market growth, including the cost of extending the Company's distribution system;
- 3) A fully-developed range of supply-side portfolio configurations, including varying levels of capacity for the NED project while retaining the vintage Dracut capacity;
- 4) A proposal to mothball the propane air plants that will not be required to meet design peak day requirements once the FT NED capacity becomes available, except for any plants that the Company needs for distribution system pressure support; and
- 5) A revised PA that maintains as much flexibility as possible to minimize risk to ratepayers should the deadline for notification to TGP change.

Q. Does this conclude your testimony?

A. At this time, yes it does. I reserve the right to amend or expand this testimony if additional information becomes available.

---

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE  
BEFORE THE  
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

In the matter of

Liberty Utilities (EnergyNorth Natural Gas) Corp. d/b/a Liberty Utilities  
Docket No. DG 14-380  
Petition for Approval of Firm Transportation Agreement

DIRECT TESTIMONY  
OF  
Dr. Pradip K. Chattopadhyay

May 1, 2015

Full testimony (24 pages) available at:

<http://www.puc.nh.gov/Regulatory/Docketbk/2014/14-380/TESTIMONY/14-380%202015-05-08%20OCA%20DTESTIMONY%20P%20CHATTOPADHYAY.PDF>

Page 22...

Q. Please summarize your position with respect to the Company's petition requesting the approval of the PA agreement.

A. Contrary to what the Company has stated, I do not believe it has met the burden of proof in determining that 115,000 Dth per day (while eliminating existing Concord Lateral contracts) is an appropriate capacity level to contract with NED. Given my analysis above, it is extremely important that Liberty Utilities is directed by the Commission to analyze different levels of capacities, in decrements of 5,000 Dth/day, relative to the PA's proposed level of 115,000 Dth/day. It is my recommendation that capacity levels as low as 80,000 Dth per day should be examined. I also urge the Commission to properly account for economic efficiency considerations in analyzing the appropriateness of a contract to ensure that current ratepayers are not unfairly burdened. Any consideration of non-cost factors should be properly explained and viewed in conjunction with the cost analysis that the OCA is urging the Commission to direct Liberty Utilities to conduct.

Q. Do you want to bring to attention any other point?

A. I am cognizant, based on Attachment PKC-3, that " ... the Precedent Agreement filed for approval in this docket does not contemplate any volumes below 100,000 Dth and would require renegotiated terms and conditions to address any lower volume." Dafonte, page 3 of 3. Whether or not the appropriate contract level requires renegotiated terms should not drive the Commission's decision. I strongly urge the Commission to require the Company to properly meet the burden of proof in determining the appropriate level of contract by providing additional analysis requested above.

Q. Does this conclude your testimony?

A. Yes.

---

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE  
BEFORE THE  
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Liberty Utilities (EnergyNorth Natural Gas) Corp. d/b/a Liberty Utilities  
Approval of Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LLC Precedent Agreement  
Docket No. DG 14-380

TESTIMONY OF JOHN A. ROSENKRANZ ON BEHALF OF PIPE LINE AWARENESS NETWORK  
FOR THE NORTHEAST, INC.

May 8, 2015

REDACTED VERSION

Full testimony (28 pages) available at:

<http://www.puc.nh.gov/Regulatory/Docketbk/2014/14-380/TESTIMONY/14-380%202015-05-08%20PLAN%20TESTIMONY%20J%20ROSENKRANZ.PDF>

Page 25

Q. Given your analysis, what are your recommendations?

A. EnergyNorth's proposal to contract for 115,000 Dth/day of capacity in Tennessee's NED expansion project is not in the interests of EnergyNorth's customers and should not be approved. The additional fixed pipeline charges associated with extending the transportation path for 50,000 Dth/day of existing transportation service from Dracut, MA to Wright, NY is likely to be exceed the potential savings in gas commodity costs. The proposed addition of 65,000 Dth/day of firm transportation service from Wright is more than two times the quantity of incremental firm gas supply resources that EnergyNorth needs to meet design day requirements over a 10 year planning horizon and should be rejected as well.

Q. Does that conclude your testimony?

A. Yes, it does.

**20150622-5046(30653339).rtf**

I will begin by stating that I am in opposition of the proposed Northeast Energy Direct (NED) project. My family has owned the land that the National Grid corridor travels through since the early 1900's. When right of way was given to Niagara Mohawk for the existing power lines, I am sure they never imagined a project like NED affecting future generations in this way.

The electric that travels the corridor is used by everyone in the region. It would have been hard to argue the need for that utility corridor when it provided so much to the surrounding areas, while the land could still be farmed as it always had been. I do not see the need for the NED project in the same way. None of the gas traveling the proposed line will be accessible by the surrounding region, yet my family will be forced to surrender more land with restrictions on use of that land because of a burried gas line.

The proposed gas line uses the existing Tennessee Gas pipeline for certain lengths of the corridor, and National Grid for other lengths. Why not follow the Tennessee pipeline all the way to Dracut MA? There are concerns of accelerated metal corrosion when placed near high tension lines, yet the idea of piggy backing the National Grid corridor is convenient for Kinder Morgan. Why do middle class families have to be inconvenienced so a multi-billion dollar corporation can make millions more in profit?

Steven Truss

**20150622-5047(30653345).pdf**

Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr., Deputy Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

Date: 6/21/15

RE: Denying property access

FERCPF 14-22 Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Project

As the owner of the property located at  
44 Slivko Rd Nassau N.Y. 12123

I am denying permission to Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company LLC( a Kinder Morgan Cornpanv), its representatives, contractors! sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land to perform surveys, or for any other purpose.

Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Steven M. Truss

**20150622-5066(30653441).txt**

Sherri Williams, Methuen, MA.

Outgoing presidents like to leave a legacy for the history books. Help Mr. Obama do something more than simply being the first black president. After all, that was not really his achievement, it was the voters'. Give him something we can be proud of, give him a swath of New England free of petro chemical development. Stop NED.

**20150622-5067(30653445).txt**

Sherri Williams, Methuen, MA.

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 rather than sell it to foreigners for a fast buck. Don't facilitate this foolishness. Look to the future and stop NED.

**20150622-5068(30653448).txt**

Sherri Williams, Methuen, MA.

The vast majority of the people living along the pipe route have rejected the pipe. It is morally wrong to forcibly take their land and ruin the landscape just so that a few people can get richer selling gas overseas. New Hampshire does not need or want this gas, not at this price.

**20150622-5070(30653452).txt**

Sherri Williams, Methuen, MA.

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.

**20150622-5079(30653816).docx**

Gentlemen,

Studies commissioned by NESCOE showed that if current levels of state energy efficiency programs continue, there is no need for additional natural gas infrastructure even with economic growth taken into account, yet ISO New England and NESCOE are calling for more pipeline capacity. The fact that the "Low Demand Scenario" created by current efficiency programs was never analyzed and the study in general were termed "flawed" during our meeting with the Governor and Sec. of Energy and Environmental Affairs. The Dept. of Energy Resources has undertaken a new study of cost benefits and risks of following the current trend of efficiency that currently keeping demand for electricity flat. Results of this new study may be available as early as the beginning of next year.

Concerned citizen against gas pipeline expansion in NH.

**20150622-5093(30653995).docx**

Gentlemen,

The need for more capacity has been cited as peak demand during cold weather when gas for heating and gas for electric generation compete for existing pipeline capacity. These conditions only happen for a few hours a day, about 10-27 days a year, and it has never led to a dip into our electric generation buffer (the extra electric capacity ISO-NE likes to keep on hand), let alone actual electric demand.

Concerned citizen against gas pipeline expansion in NH.

**20150622-5094(30653997).docx**

Gentlemen,

One of our pipeline-watchers has also just discovered that ISO New England has been issuing “Minimum Generation Emergency Warnings.” These are times when consumers were using so little electricity that the grid operator had to ask power plants to NOT generate electricity. As we understand it, this happens far, far more often than the times ISO-NE comes close to dipping into the buffer of electric generation during the 10-27 peak usage days per year that occur in winter. A quick look at the ISO-NE calendar shows that this “Minimum Generation Emergency Warning” happens about 10-20 a MONTH – about 12 times more often than the supposed “capacity constraint” that led to the request for more pipelines.

Concerned citizen against gas pipeline expansion in NH.

**20150622-5095(30654000).docx**

Gentlemen,

Even if there were an actual need, there are currently enough leaks in the existing infrastructure to provide another 400 MW of power. The two most dangerous classes of these leaks are now slated to be fixed under new legislation that has passed, but repairing Class 3 leaks (considered non-dangerous) is not mandatory. We think it should be.

There are also existing pipelines that are standing at least partially unused. Using these to capacity to store gas during non-peak times can keep enough reserve to cover the few days every winter when peak demand drives up prices. This project is not being driven by a shortage of gas supply, just a shortage of cheap gas available to electric generation plants during extremely cold weather when people use more of the gas supply for heat.

Concerned citizen against gas pipeline expansion in NH

**20150622-5101(30654062).docx**

Gentlemen,

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 rather than sell it to foreigners for a fast buck. Don't facilitate this foolishness. Look to the future and stop NED.

Concerned citizen against gas pipeline expansion in NH.

**20150622-5102(30654065).docx**

Gentlemen,

The vast majority of the people living along the pipe route have rejected the pipe. It is morally wrong to forcibly take their land and ruin the landscape just so that a few people can get richer selling gas overseas. New Hampshire does not need or want this gas, not at this price.

Concerned citizen against gas pipeline expansion in NH.

**20150622-5103(30654067).docx**

Gentlemen,

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.

Concerned citizen against gas pipeline expansion in NH.

**20150622-5104(30654068).docx**

Gentlemen,

We can't have this in our neighborhood. I have some good friends whose lives will be decimated by the compressor station. This monster will emit "regulated" toxins and noise 24/7. Right now there are beautiful, quiet woods. We can't let that be mowed down in favor of some horrible industrial complex. Property values will be cut dramatically. No one will want to buy our homes. I never thought I could campaign for a cause, but when the cause is my way of life...

Concerned citizen against gas pipeline expansion in NH.

**20150622-5124(30654113).docx**

Gentlemen,

Outgoing presidents like to leave a legacy for the history books. Help Mr. Obama do something more than simply being the first black president. After all, that was not really his achievement, it was the voters'. Give him something we can be proud of, give him a swath of New England free of petro chemical development. Stop NED.

Concerned citizen against gas pipeline expansion

**20150622-5167(30654776).pdf**

Dear FERC.

My Name is Thomas Kinchla. I live on Dunvegan Road in Tewksbury Massachusetts. I am writing to you to relay my objection and concerns about a major natural gas pipeline that Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Natural Gas wants to build through Tewksbury in general and directly through my back yard in particular.

I object to the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Expansion routing through our neighborhood for several reasons;

I am concerned about the decrease in property value of the affected houses. I have lived in this house since it was built over 22 years ago. I, like others, purchased houses on our street because we own the land behind our houses as well, which typically means it cannot be built upon.

I am also concerned about how close the proposed pipeline is to my house. It runs right through a part of my yard that I use nearly every day of the non-winter months. The proposed pipeline is a high pressure 20" line that I would not feel safe having underneath me at all times. I take pride in my yard and enjoy entertaining in the backyard, which includes sitting around a fire pit with friends and family. I don't think we would ever enjoy that anymore knowing that such an enormous gas line was underfoot.

My neighborhood also has an underground drainage system that runs under our foundations and into the wetlands behind our properties so when the water table rises, we don't get water in the basement. Any disruption to this system could be very damaging.

Also, I do not believe that the new pipelines will decrease utility prices in the north east as the builders are claiming. Representatives from Kinder Morgan would not comment on how the purchasers of the natural gas would use their gas at the town meeting that I attended.

I also happen to know that there are already other Natural Gas lines that run along the power lines about a

quarter mile from our neighborhood. This seems like a much more desirable approach, if indeed the pipeline even needs to be built.

Thanks and best regards,

Thomas Kinchla  
26 Dunvegan Road  
Tewksbury, MA 01876  
978-640-9144  
t-g.kinchla@comcast.net

## **20150623-0007(30658186).pdf**

Hand written letter, Ray & Susan Duhamel, 83 Greenbriar Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, opposing.

Followed by printed:

**WHY STOP THIS PIPELINE?**

**IF IT'S APPROVED**

They will strip all the trees from a 150 ft. wide swath of land through 71 miles of southern NH near the power lines. They will drill down 6 ft. through solid granite to lay the 36" pipes. It will go through 17 towns, across 40 conservation lands, through 155 wetlands, and under 116 bodies of water, including 18 rivers, about 8 miles of state forest or parks, and the property of 822 NH households. And from beginning to end it will leak methane - worse than CO2 - from valves, pipes, and compressor stations.

**FOR TEMPLE**

The pipeline will go right over Temple's largest aquifer and be about a half mile from our elementary school. That puts it in what they call the "bum zone" and just a shave off the "incineration zone" of the pipeline and within the 2-mile "buffer zone" of the compressor station, if there's ever an accident. .

**THE COMPRESSOR STATION - the worst of the worst**

An 80,000 HP high pressure power plant which from all indications is planned for 50-75 acres of the SCAT land in New Ipswich. One of the largest in the US, emissions experts say it will have a 2 mile radius of toxic emissions ...• also too close for comfort to our school, several farms, the reservoir, residential neighborhoods and woods. And Kinder Morgan's safety record for its compressor stations is abysmal - a serious concern for fires & explosions.

**ALL RISKS AND NO BENEFITS FOR NH!**

1. NH does NOT need more energy. We have an excess, which we export to MA.
2. We wouldn't get any gas from it anyway. Only 25% may go to MA. The project is designed for export to Asia and Europe where prices are higher.
3. It will NOT lower prices for natural gas. It will raise them as we have to compete with export prices and cover its construction costs of \$5-6 Billion!
4. Jobs? 1 yr. - for union workers only. Mostly they bring their own trained crews.

**WHY WERE ELECTRIC RATES SO HIGH?**

The rates were set at peak price last fall. A month later they fell. By January they fell by 60% wholesale. Eversource is giving rebates to its heating customers. If regulations allowed, they would rebate electric customers, too.

**WHAT CAN YOU DO?**

1. Join the opposition noon hike up Mt Monadnock with signs - June 27
2. Learn more & SIGN the petition to Hassan - 'Nww.NHPiQelir!'a.Awareness.on~
3. Write or call: Gov. Hassan -- govemorhassan(OOnh.gov 603-271-2121

4. Questions? Contact Bev - -t\_” .!!.~desha(-t~!;m.-s.-n.-cc-m

## SAFETY

From Mina Hamilton’s research for NY State

Since 2011, there have been at 11 accidents - explosions and fires - at compressor stations in the following towns:

Lathrop, PA, Brooklyn Township, PA,

Branchville, NJ, Langton, OK

Windsor, NY, Pinedale, WY,

Marengo County, AL, Oaktown, IN and others .... “

Montrose, PA,

Clinton, AK

Nine Mile Canyon, UT

## KINDER MORGAN PIPELINE SAFETY VIOLATIONS

“In 2009, the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) cited Kinder Morgan for violating safety standards regarding the distance between a natural gas pipeline and a “high consequence area” such as a school or hospital; the pipeline was too close for safe operation in case of a leak.

In 2011, PHMSA cited Kinder Morgan for these safety violations:

Failing to test pipeline safety devices,

Failing to maintain proper firefighting equipment,

Failing to inspect its pipelines as required,

and Failing to adequately monitor pipes’ corrosion levels.

In 2013, the headline “Wall Street Worries About Kinder Morgan’s Safety Record”: pipeline operator slashes and defers maintenance spending- was a concern to anyone who lived or worked near a Kinder Morgan pipeline.

The Wall Street Journal asked, “Is Kinder Morgan Scrimping on its Pipelines?” Deferred maintenance may account for the high number of Kinder Morgan pipeline accidents in the last decade.

PHMSA’s incident reports for Kinder Morgan’s onshore gas transmission pipelines shows that faulty infrastructure causes 45% of onshore gas transmission pipeline significant leaks. Failure of the pipe, a cracked weld, and faulty pipeline equipment together account for 28.3% of pipeline leaks, and corrosion of the pipe causes 16.8%.

## Accidents

In U.S. since 2003, Kinder Morgan and its subsidiaries’ pipelines have been responsible for at least 180 spills, evacuations, explosions, fires, and fatalities in 24 states.” - PHMSA

Pipeline Integrity and Releases from Kinder Morgan’s SEC 10-K filing:

“From time to time, despite our best efforts, our pipelines experience leaks and ruptures. These leaks and ruptures may cause explosions, fire, and damage to the environment, damage to property and/or personal injury or death.” From references & footnotes #25 - #35 <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/KinderMorgan>, an

## COMPRESSOR STATION HAZARDS

The possibilities for health, safety or environmental harm resulting from natural gas compressor stations are many and serious.

Some of these include: Explosions, fires, leaks and spills .....

plus fugitive emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and nitrogen oxides (NOx), as well as other potential exposure threats, such as radon, lead, and mercury.

## EMISSIONS

While all of these hazards have been well documented nationwide the most prevalent, by far, is the intentional (routine) "blow-downs". Accidental releases of VOCs and NOx also occur. But, all possible threats 'need to be considered when allowing compressor stations to operate .... especially in close proximity to: homes, work places, playgrounds, schools, water resources & farms

The two of VOCs and NOX commonly emitted include:

Formaldehyde, benzene, toluene, ethyl benzene,

xylene, hydrogen disulfide, carbon monoxide (CO),

carbon dioxide (CO2), sulfur dioxide (SO2), methane (CH4) ....

and other compounds or elements that are toxic, carcinogenic or neurotoxic, and which are prone to causing major adverse health effects in humans and animals.

## NOISE

Compressor stations are loud. "Blow-downs" can last from 20 minutes to 2-3 hours, from 12 to 40 x yr. The noise is comparable to a commercial jet taking off. They often occur in the middle of the night.

The sound of regular compressor station operation has been compared to four diesel locomotive engines running 24hr. Residents as far as a mile away can hear the racket.

This humming can cause hearing impairment and cardiovascular problems.

From Mina Hamilton's research in Madison County, NY- Research Associate at Radioactive Waste Management Associates.

## HEALTH IMPACTS

Reported by People Living 50 feet to 2 miles from Compressor Stations and Metering Stations.

Wilma Subra- ex-Vice-chair of EPA National Advisory Council for Environmental Policy and Technology

[http://www.earthbyvoice.org/publications/SU8PJ3\\_b\\_voice\\_Gas\\_Pi](http://www.earthbyvoice.org/publications/SU8PJ3_b_voice_Gas_Pi):

Health Impacts: SJSMLQf

Frequent Nausea\* Throat Irritation\* Eyes Burning\* Nasal Irritation\*

Sinus Problems\* Bronchitis\* Persistent Cough Weakness\*

Tiredness\* Chronic Eye Irritation\* Shortness of Breath Muscle Aches"

Dizziness\* Ringing in Ears Sores & Ulcers in Mouth Urinary Infections

Depression\* Decreased Motor Skills\* Falling, Staggering\* Frequent Irritation\*

Brain disorders"" Severe Headaches" Frequent Nose Bleeds Sleep Disturbances

Difficulty Concentrating Joint Pain Nervous System Impacts Forgetfulness

Irregular/Rapid Heart Beat Strokes Allergies Easy Bruising

Severe Anxiety"" Excessive Sweating Abnormal EEG\* Spleen

Lump in Breast Pre-Cancerous Lesions" Amnesia Thyroid Problems

\*61% of Health Impacts Associated with Chemicals present in Excess of Short and Long Term Effects Screening Levels in the air

Additional Resources with extensive reports:

[http://www.environmentalhealthupdate.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/Compressor\\_Health\\_Impacts.pdf](http://www.environmentalhealthupdate.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/Compressor_Health_Impacts.pdf)

[http://www.earthbyvoice.org/publications/SU8PJ3\\_b\\_voice\\_Gas\\_Pi](http://www.earthbyvoice.org/publications/SU8PJ3_b_voice_Gas_Pi)

[http://www.earthbyvoice.org/publications/SU8PJ3\\_b\\_voice\\_Gas\\_Pi](http://www.earthbyvoice.org/publications/SU8PJ3_b_voice_Gas_Pi)

[http://www.earthbyvoice.org/publications/SU8PJ3\\_b\\_voice\\_Gas\\_Pi](http://www.earthbyvoice.org/publications/SU8PJ3_b_voice_Gas_Pi)

**20150623-0008(30658183).pdf**

I'm a resident of Reusselaer County and oppose the proposed high-pressure fracked gas Northeast Bnetgy Direct pipeline that Kinder Morgan and T\_\_ au Co. want to Oleo-locate" with Natioaal Grid's power lines in our County. I hope that you, also, oppose this pipeline IIIIIthat ~ will publicly state your opposition IIIII actively work apiDst it.

The pipeline will leak fracked gas Icontaining toxic chemicals that threaten our health 8IId that of our families, neighbor, and CODIIIUilities. DIIIUIp to the enviJonment (soil, air 8IId water) will R8III from pipeline CODSIruCtioD. apd lalring gas, IIIJd our forests, sIreIIms, rivers, groIIIdwater, IIIJd aquifers .. at risk of being pollutIId. ADd wbat about the c:ontamiDation of our weUs, gardeas, IIIJd filrms? In addition, the gas is I1I8tbau, a dam.ging grecmhouse gas. Surely expanding fossil fuel infastructures is a step bacht-wanl &om nationallIIJd state goals of developing III!IOWIble CIIII!Y resources.

In rural areas, such as OIII'I, pipelille safety staacWds are 1\_ stringent lhan in deIIsely popuIaed ueas so that here the thinnest pipes permitted are used, IIIJd shut-off' valves to seal off sectio.os of pipe in the event of an emergency are placed tea miles apart. In additioD, the tops of the pipes .. buried only 36" deep even though the fiost line iithese parII is 48" deep, aDd pipes have ruptured &om fiost heave. These companies have very poor safety recorCI, and we have \_ in the \_ that pipelines cawICI c:atastrophic explosions IIIJd finis. Our local fire depalmeats .. IIIIIbly to be able to adequately respond to such an event. Accordina to Public Employees fur Eovinnmmeal R.esponsibility, the Pipeline and HaDrdous Material Safety Administration (PHMSA). which is cbarpd with the "safri' IIIJd "enYirommentally sound operation" of gas pipelines, has oaIy 135 m.pectus to oversee 2.6 million miles of pipeline and only a fiifh of that pipeline system has been iDspectecl by PHMSA or ita state partnm since 2006. The National TI'IIISJ)Ortation and Safety AdmiDislnltion \_tIy issued a report fiDding that PHMSA bas .inadequate 1'C8OUICeI.

Local homeowners' may be filC'Cell to give the companies a right of way, but will remain ~ible for taxes O11 the property. Their property valucs reduced, many will be sentenced to live with a pipeliua as a aighbor and woncilll' daily about its danger. Bluting IIIJd the heavy DIICbinery requiml to build the pipeline will damage our towDa' infi'asIruecture and who will pay for that'l The cc:onomic vitality of our towns is at stab, for who would want to bUy a house, or locate • business, or invest in • tiam in a town at risk of such dangers?

I believe that most of the gas will likely be for export IIIJd sale on the intaDationallDIllket where gas prices .. higher than they .. here. WOII't that drive up our own cost of gas? We" your COJJStituenU, are assuming the risk of dangers \_iated with the pipelille while these companies collect profits at OId' expense. Are we truly inconsequealial 8IId expendahle in the eyes of those who have the authority to stop the pipeline? How many assaults O11 O111' bealth, bow many dlldbs, and how much enviromncmtal degradation should we toIemte? I have beard rumors of political leeders melring deals to get somethiDg for their coDStitucmts in return fur acceptiDg the pipeline. Please" I don't want this pipeline • any cin:umstances. Do not make any deals on my behalf. Iust fight it as bard as you can.

Phyllis J. Ellefsen  
63 N. Schodack Rd  
E. Greenbush, NY 12061

**20150623-0013(30658193).pdf**

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulation Commission

Date: 6-15-2015

RE: Opposition to the proposed Tennessee Gas pipeline natural gas pipeline and compressor installation in New Hampshire

As the owner of the property located at:

208 Old Wilton Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071

First and foremost thank you for your time. I am a concerned resident residing in New Ipswich New Hampshire. I received a letter of intent by Kinder Morgan on Tuesday June 9<sup>th</sup> indicating their intention to install a pipeline and compressor station 5 mile from my home. There are numerous health, ecological, and financial concerns at hand which I need to bring to your attention.

First and foremost our coalition needs additional time to perform the necessary studies and research necessary regarding this project. Disturbing such a large ecosystem has numerous negative effects such as pollution, and elimination of numerous natural landscapes which makes New Hampshire unique and special. Just digging alone will disturb numerous aquifers, and if the pipeline is installed I along with many others will have to stop and question ourselves when leaning that glass of water back to drink, is it safe any longer? We should not have to worry about that! I have read numerous reports on towns that have fallen prey to these compressor stations and they live with sleep deprivation, bloody noses, headaches, and vertigo. What kind of quality of life is that! More than 16 different cancer causing carcinogens have been found in numerous backyards of homes post the installation of compressor stations.

On June 11<sup>th</sup> of 2015 the first public notification of intent was released to the public by Kinder Morgan. On June 22<sup>nd</sup> our town officials agreed to oppose the pipeline and compressor station, and on June 6<sup>th</sup> they requested a scoping meeting. All this is happening at too fast of a rate to give the community sufficient time to prepare their research.

I know that if NED goes into New Hampshire numerous folks including myself will be forced to leave our homes which we had built within the last 10 years to search for a new safe environments to continue bringing up our families. The impact to the towns we leave behind will be additional tax burdens for the residents that are left, which are already up in arms about high taxes, and more expensive utility bills as tariffs are being suggested as ways to help pay for this project. As if we're already stretched enough this environment will push folks even further. I pray that the very real concerns and pictures I have painted above are considered when it comes time to review the NED project for approval.

Brandon Cardinal

**20150623-0015(30658184).pdf**

PROPERTY ACCESS DENIED

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: June 15, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

RE: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

Street Address: 240 Activity Rd  
Town & Zip: Richmond, NH 03470  
Map & Lot Number(s) (if known)

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Falls Brook Trust - Gilbert Goodell

CC:  
FERC

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

**20150623-0031(30660452).pdf**

June 17, 2015

16 Clarks Chapel Rd.

Nassau, NY 12123

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street NE

Room IA

Washington, D.C. 20246

Re: Fedeml Energy Regulatory Commission Docket No. PF 14-22

Dear Secretary Bose,

Pending before FERC is a pipeline project referred to as the Northeast Energy Dbect (NED). This pmposed pipeline is being built by Kinder Morgan Energy Partners, Inc.. I believe that you may be aware of the scope of this project and have received communications from residents a6'ected by this. The details of the specific constniction aspects of the project I need not repeat. However, there are personal concerns neighboring residents and I of the Town of Nassau living on Clarks Chapel Rd. and Rensselaer County Rte. 15 have concern- ing this project:

1. The overall daily safety and health of the residents concerning every aspect of physical construchon and on going daily 24/7 operation of these facilities in the proximity to each of us. We sre aware of facility opera- tions and failures of these fiicilities in the psst.
2. The 24/7 constant decibel level from the 90,000 horsepower gas fired turbines and the number of unknown instances of purging cycles. I am aware of this from working as an employee at Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation generating facilities. I am also aware of the current Tenneco Compressor station on Rte 66, Maiden Bridge, Columbia Co. at 10,000 horsepower and its noise level.
3. The loss of natural quiet rural character in this area we have lived with for many years.
4. The loss of home and property values for us. The raising of taxes for others in town.
5. If you review a NYS utility company power bill such as National Grid, NYSEG, etc., there is a particular item of concern we should notice. Under terms and definitions is listed SBC, System Benefits Charge. The SBC is a state-mandated charge for all electricity and natural gas custotnets. The electricity SBC is used to fund energy efficiency programs to meet [state energy use reduction targets], provide assistance for low-in- come customers and oonduct energy ~. The natural gas SBC is used to fund initiatives focused on [reducing natural gas use in the state] as part of the Energy Efficiency Portfolio Standard. These charges were required by the Public Service Commission of the State of NY. Here is my point. The State of New York is mandating that we as utility cussomers pay this SBC for the above mentioned programs, particularly energy use reduc- tion and reducing natural gas use. Now we have a proposed project going to transport a pmduct through the State of NY that the State is making us pay a charge to reduce the use of this product here. FERC may ap- prove this project and will be able to enact eminent domain rights against people who are paying to reduce the use of this product here and are not going to benefit from the product going through NY. This is a double slap in the face!

Therefore, it would be greatly appreciated if you would oppose this project because there is not one single benefit to almost all of the residents of New York State, Rcnsselaer County aud the Town of Nassau. The

health, safety and lifestyle we enjoy and value now and hopefully in the future, outweighs any economic value of this project. Thank you for your time and I look forward to your response to my concerns.

Sincerely,

Wesley D. Petrone

**20150623-0033(30660372).pdf**

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulation Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Date: 6-15-2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access: PF 14-22-000

As the owner of the property located at:

208 Old Wilton Rd  
New Ipswich, NH 03071

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose. Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Brandon Cardinal

**20150623-0036(30660430).pdf**

Kimberly D. Bose  
Secretary Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426 June 15, 2015

re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., Docket No. PF14-22-000

Dear Secretary Bose;

The Commission's written policy states:

In considering the impact of new construction projects on existing pipelines, the Commission's goal is to appropriately consider the enhancement of competitive transportation alternatives, the possibility of over-building, the avoidance of unnecessary disruption of the environment, and the unneeded exercise of eminent domain. 'houldn't proposals for new pipelines receive the very same scrutiny'?

Existing pipelines are known to provide significantly more than the quantity of natural gas needed by New England, now and in the future. Export overseas of the bulk of it is NOT for any American 'Public Good'.

The proposed 400 miles of pipeline and nine new compressor stations in four states will cause massive habitat destruction. The fracked gas proposed to flow thru the pipeline is a source of vast environmental degradation, contaminating aquifers and triggering midwest earthquakes. Fracked gas has been analyzed to contain many toxic chemicals which venting and leaks will release to further contaminate the environment.

The gas and toxins WILL be leaked and vented all along the new pipeline route; the company's many recorded leak-incidents attest to this. Kinder-Morgan's rural pipelines are always of minimal thickness, increasing the risk of accidents and in places where emergency resources are completely unable to deal with industrial scale accidents.

More than 70% of landowners along the proposed route have refused access to Tennessee Pipeline and more are doing so every day. Some such properties have been surveyed anyway, when owners were not home, exhibiting complete disrespect for individuals and the legal system. Is eminent domain on that scale even remotely appropriate for a pipeline we all KNOW is not necessary or needed for the public good of New England?

Sincerely,

Kenneth M. Kipen and Ethel R. Kipen, P.O. Box 183, Ashfield MA USA

### **20150623-0041(30660455).pdf**

To: "The Telepreph," Other Nswrspapers, etc.:

NED Pipeline Another NOT for New Hamnshlre Letter for the Pile

The so called "NED" (short for "Northeast Energy Direct") high-pressure gas pipeline project is opening eyes and raising bmws. Unfortunately, not enough fiist enough. Proposed by the Kinder Morgan Company ("KM") and Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company (collectively, "KM'PC"), the project is being rammed though and expected to be considemd for certification by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC") in just three to four months. Yet, a recent UNH poll found that only 16/o of New Hampshhe citizens polled believed that they were "very fianiliar" with it. This is the number most favorable to pmponents of the NED pipeline—not any of the numbers pertaining to all of the advertised "benefits" the project is actually committing to New Hampshire (those numbers would all be zeroes)—the \$4'Yo of New Hampshire citizens who are not yet up to speed on what is going on.

If certified by FERC, KM/TGPC will have the ability to begin taking land by federal eminent domain for clearceing a generally 110-135feet-wide path, for a three-foot m diameter rranrnitrsion pipe, though more than 70 miles of southern New Hampshire, impacting 18 towns, hundreds of residences, thousands of lives, sensitive conservation areas and water resources — without hooking up to a single home or business: contrary to a common misconception, the pipeline is not a local delivery line. Before exiting New Hampshire with the vast bulk of gas for use outside of the state, it will substantially deprive homeowners of the use, enjoyment and value of their pmpties, lower town tax bases, create town response costs and pmblems, disturb and damage the envhomnent (including, potentially, the water aquifers for at least five towns, Hudson among them)—but leave no energy benefits for the state we could not obtain Su less painfully elsewhere. We are only watching this approaching train wreck because Massachusetts wisely and loudly said: "We don't want it!"

Hudson, you need to join the growing NH Municipal Pipeline Coalition oftowns who have already turned thumbs to the NED project and do the same. KM/TGPC is bringing its dog~dpony show of NED "attractions" to Hudson, to try and convince you that the NED pipeline is right for your town. Ask the tough questions, and listen closely to the answers. "Opportunity" is a word NED pipeline pmponents thmw amund a lot. It provides the "opportunity" for additional gas availability, jobs, businesses and municipal tax revenues; and for decreased energy costs. It offers, say the salesmen, an "opportunity" for a glorious new life.

So doesn't a goose that lays golden eggs.

New Hampshire citizens, KM was openly noncommittal and evasive:

- In response to the question whether gas will be exported, KM was blunt: "Kinder Morgan cannot disemminate among customers based on the ultimate destination or use of the gas, such as the Northeast versus Canada or another fomign country ...The ultimate destination of the gss and volumes associated are within Sie sole control of the project customers." In other words: the gas will follow the money, whatever kind, wherever from.
- In response to the jointly posed questions "Can you site [sic] a study showing there is a demand for this gas in New England? Will any of the gas that moves through the pipeline be used by residents of New Hampshire'i," KM completely ignored the first and only identified Liberty Utilities as a shte natural

gas provider with a tentative agreement (subject to approval by the state’s Public Utilities Commission, i.e., the “PUC”) for gas & the NED project. However, KM did not note that Liberty Utilities would receive less than 2% of the gas transmitted through the pipeline and is already meeting its needs elsewhere — and could receive more gas from other pipelines less damaging to New Hampshire.

- In response to the question “Does KM have a policy or plan to seek [tax] abatements for the pipeline after it is built,” KM slipped away with “KM does not plan to seek tax abatements at this time.” Of course not “at this time”: KM has not been taxed yet—then it will file for abatements.

Why do I get the feeling that, when all of the “fee-fi-fo-fum”ing is done, if the NED pipeline approved, only an energy giant is going to be holding the gold, and New Hampshire just goose eggs?

If it were the best alternative to meet actual New Hampshire energy needs, the NED pipeline project would be understandable. But this is clearly not the case. Three experts in the PUC proceeding considering approval of the tentative agreement between Liberty Utilities and KM TGPC—including the PUC Staff’s own expert, Melissa Whitten—have cited numerous flaws in the arguments behind the NED pipeline, with one or more finding that the pipeline’s capacity is excessive for the actual need and/or not cost-effective.

In a May 15, 2015 letter commenting on draft reports provided in support of the NED pipeline, FERC itself suggested, on page 37, that the project is excessive. Noting that the pipeline will provide 2.2 billion cubic feet of constant transmission capacity, whereas it has been projected that New England needs only 1.1 to 1.6 billion cubic feet of additional capacity to meet its needs—and then only on about 40 cold winter days a year—FERC went on to note that two pipelines by the Spectra group already in the works will transport a total of about .56 billion cubic feet of gas per day toward New England’s needs, and another 1 billion cubic feet per day can be “funneled” from another source, Access Northeast. Between Access Northeast and Spectra, then, over 1.5 billion cubic feet of additional capacity is available without resort to the NED pipeline—and there are other proposed pipelines in the works.

Spectra and Access Northeast are partnering to meet New Hampshire and New England’s energy needs, and are already ahead of the NED project in key areas. Spectra is not proposing a 70-mile pipeline through New Hampshire, will rely on established pipeline routes and will have far less impact on property owners and sensitive conservation and environmental areas than the NED pipeline. The only thing the excess NED pipeline capacity will supply is a disincentive to invest in the real sources of energy that New Hampshire and the rest of New England need to focus on. There is no need for NED. Sniff the sugar you’ve fed, New Hampshire.

Sincerely,

Richard Husband  
Town of Litchfield

Transmitted to:

The Telegraph  
([news.nashuatelegraph.com](http://news.nashuatelegraph.com))

Keene Sentinel  
([news.keenesc Sentinel.com](http://news.keenesc Sentinel.com))

New Hampshire Union Leader  
([oufisherunionleader.com](http://oufisherunionleader.com))

Foster’s Daily Democrat  
([news&fosters.com](http://news&fosters.com))

The Honorable Governor Hassan  
c/o [infol@maahassan.com](mailto:infol@maahassan.com)

Senator Kelly Ayotte

Hudson-Litchfield News  
([news/Rareanews.com](http://news/Rareanews.com))

Concord Monitor  
([news.Scmonitor.com](http://news.Scmonitor.com))

Portsmouth Herald  
([newscitizen.com](http://newscitizen.com))

FERC

Senator Jeanne Shebeen

Representative Ann McLane Kuster

**20150623-0055(30660502).pdf**

Hand written card, Wayne Kelling, 384 Hadley Hwy, Temple, NH, opposing.

**20150623-0057(30660433).pdf**

Hand written card, Susan B. Lantz, 74 Lyman Road, Northampton, MA 01060, opposing.

**20150623-0061(30660494).pdf**

Hand written card, Ray Duhamel, 86 Greenbriar Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, opposing.

**20150623-0068(30660503).pdf**

Hand written card, Marilyn Griska, 18 Atlantic Dr, Rindge, NH 03461, opposing.

**20150623-0069(30660508).pdf**

Hand written card, Irene Sherburda, 73 Livingston Rd, Greenville, NH 03048, opposing.

**20150623-0070(30660505).pdf**

Hand written card, Timothy E. Somero, 52 Old Tenney Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, opposing.

**20150623-0071(30660513).pdf**

Hand written card, Rick Davo, 46 Maplewood Dr, Temple, NH 03084, opposing.

**20150623-0072(30660507).pdf**

Hand written card, Timothy E. Somero, 52 Old Tenney Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, opposing.

**20150623-0073(30660506).pdf**

Hand written card, Heather Hollenback, 65 Cutter Rd, Temple, NH 03084, opposing.

**20150623-0074(30660514).pdf**

Hand written card, Susan Duhamel, 86 Greenbriar Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, opposing.

**20150623-5000(30655951).txt**

Dennis Gauvin, New Ipswich, NH.

My home lies less than 2 miles from the proposed compression station and less from the pipeline itself. From all I've read and meetings I've attended I cannot see the need for this pipeline at all. There is no need in NH and it seems the excess need for Mass. can be supplied elsewhere, like Portland Gas. I cannot imagine the noise from this compression station as we could always here the shooting when the site was a skeet range! The unregulated gases released on a regular basis would easily be blown right towards town on the very often south westerly winds. I live in the center of town, right near the town pool, ball fields etc. An explosion which is very common per the DOT, would ignite a forest fire spreading out of control long before local volunteer fire crew could respond. No, I and my wife are 100% against this pipeline being authorized to travel through our town

**20150623-5003(30656083).txt**

deborah pomerleau, Londonderry, NH.

I watch the news, I read the news, and I fear for the future of our country. Please help take a stand against KM and block this pipeline from approval. The dangers are too high. There is no "need" only a "want" by KM to export the gas. The whole southern part of NH is a gigantic aquifer that not only supplies water to

NH but also to Massachusetts. Please don't approve this pipeline. We need clean water to survive. This can't be much more basic a need than this.

**20150623-5006(30656089).txt**

Kaela Law, Pelham, NH.

Allen Fore and Jim Hartman of Kinder Morgan met with the Londonderry town council on January 5, 2015. (Meeting minutes can be found on the Londonderry NH town website. Please look them up) It was stated then, 39 Londonderry homes would be directly impacted. Londonderry was also the location for one of Kinder Morgan's Open House trade shows on February 17, 2015. Why then, did the Chairman of the town council at the most recent Q&A with Kinder Morgan June 18, 2015 in the town of Londonderry, NH try to explain to residents that the pipeline could not go on private properties?

It was a slightly comical, though not really funny at all, moment when the KM reps themselves had to correct the Chairman. Perhaps the chairman was not in attendance at either of the first two encounters with Kinder Morgan in that town? Perhaps the level of information Kinder Morgan is sharing with the NH towns along the "preferred route" at these gatherings is not held up to any sort of factual standards? These NH towns NEED more time, more substantial information and real answers regarding this project.

Please do not authorize Kinder Morgan's request to use eminent domain against homeowners in the state of NH in order to build an export pipeline. There is no public necessity or convenience being proposed with this project. It is not convenient for so many NH landowners to give up the rights to their own properties. At the very least, do not make that decision until you have met with all of the towns along this proposed route. We would like a scoping meeting for every town in NH along this proposed route. We would like you to meet with us face to face, and we would like to get our statements recorded for the record.

**20150623-5011(30656120).txt**

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Gary R Elsworth under PF14-22-000. MOTION TO INTERVENE OF GARY R ELSWORTH & SHARON A ELSWORTH. Directly effected by this proposed pipeline.

Submission Date: 6/23/2015 12:06:32 AM

Filed Date: 6/23/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

-----

PF14-22-000 Application to open a pre-filing proceeding of Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. under New Docket for Tennessee's Northeast Energy Direct Project under PF14-22.

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party	Signer (Representative)	Other Contact (Principal)
--------------	-------------------------	---------------------------

-----

Individual	Traderhill101@gmail.com
------------	-------------------------

Basis for Intervening:

MOTION TO INTERVENE OF GARY R ELSWORTH AND SHARON A ELSWORTH

Both of the above named are residents/owners at 840 Starch Mill Rd, Mason, Hillsborough County NH. This proposed right of way for Tennessee Pipeline Company NED project will run through their property approx 50' from their residence. As a result of this proposal the Elsworth's property is subject to condemnation if a certificate is granted. Pursuant to Commission Rules 385.214(b) and 157.10 the Elsworth's move to INTERVENE in the above mentioned pipeline proceeding. This INTERVENTION is timely filed.

The Elsworth's property/home will be dramatically effected if this pipeline proceeds. The residence is within 100' of the Eversource ROW. Kinder Morgan has stated that they will use the same ROW. Ever-

source has said NO for any use. Eversource's ROW is only for power line Transmission Lines. If this pipeline is permitted the new ROW will require more land clearing touching Eversources ROW. This means the proposed pipeline will be within 50' of their home. This will also mean that the Elsworth's will now have a 250' wide by approx up to 500' long piece of their property that they will not be able to use as they wish, AND must pay the TAXES on this land. WE have ALREADY "PAID" our fair share of "helping the greater Community" by having Eversource's ROW for their Transmission Lines going through our property. ANY blasting to install this pipeline will cause irreparable damage to their homes' foundation, their only source of water, their well, and the wells water source will most likely be effected. Being approx 40' from a pipeline places the home and owners in absolute danger of the incineration zone. Having this gas pipeline go through their property, and so very close to their home will also devalue the value of the property.

The Elsworth's are ABSOLUTELY OPPOSED to this proposed project. Mason will NOT receive ANY benefit at all. Kinder Morgan says they will help "TRAIN" our First Responders. Mason ONLY has a volunteer Fire Dept. Most everyone works out of town. Response time to an accident will be in the hours time frame. This is not what Mason, a very small town can handle nor afford. We wish to add more info as events occur. We wish to be duly notified of any events relating to this pipeline proposal occur.

Thank you, Gary R Elsworth & Sharon A Elsworth

**20150623-5053(30656763).txt**

Jan A. Griska, Rindge, NH.

The Economics of NED Related Energy:

I've been watching and participating in the "go round" between Kinder Morgan and the involved citizens of New Hampshire. First I should state, I'm against the pipeline, I developed this position after considering what Kinder Morgan had to say. On the other hand most of the pipeline proponents believe what Kinder Morgan tells them. If this gets approved there is no going back. I hope to walk you through some of the economic realities related to the natural gas the proposed pipeline will be transporting through our back yards.

I assume everybody has heard the term "Urban Myths," well Kinder Morgan is propagating "Rural Myths." The first of which is: The North East Direct (NED) pipeline will lower your electricity costs. Few people realize that not one New Hampshire power generating company has signed a contract with Kinder Morgan; it appears that they, the power generators, will be going elsewhere; perhaps with the with the Access NE project. The next "Rural Myth" is that the pipeline will provide the people of Cheshire County with gas, which we can use to heat our homes. Kinder Morgan's response to questions about how it is going to happen is, "it isn't in our business model." That means they get paid for building and pushing gas down a pipeline, not building local gas distribution infrastructure. Let's look at the size of the impacted towns. None of the small rural towns can afford to run gas pipelines down the roads of their towns. Heaven knows what utility will do it given each town's low density housing.

Now, let's look at what is going to happen with the 2.2 billion cubic feet of gas which will move down the pipeline every day. As things currently stand, an Algonquian (Canadian firm) subsidiary is the only contract Kinder Morgan has (home heating for 65,000 homes East of the Merrimack River). Believe me the gas those homes will use for heating is a drop in the 2.2 Billion cubic foot bucket.

Now for a quick switch from dollars and cents to geography. Why do you think the pipeline is going from Pennsylvania to Dracut, MA. ? Dracut is a gas distribution center (my term). From Dracut, pipelines go up the coast of Maine into Canada. Guess where they are building plants to compress the gas into liquid form (LNG)? Next guess, where the LNG is going? The smart money is betting on Europe.

Now enters the law of "Supply and Demand"; I've been told a 2.2 Billion cubic foot a day pipeline will consume all of the gas that is contained in the Marcellus shale in 30 years by their estimation. If we keep the gas in the U.S., the source's life span will increase, moderating costs (supply and demand). On the other hand, shipping LNG to Europe will accelerate demand (our gas is cheaper). As the supply dwindles, the price will

increase worldwide, meaning we will be paying more for our gas here in the U.S. where it was produced. I'm not proposing that we don't ship LNG to Europe, but I would seriously like us to look at the impact of cheap fossil fuels has on our migration to sustainable energy sources. Fossil fuels are finite!

Jan Griska  
Rindge, NH

**20150623-5070(30657323).txt**

deborah pomerleau, Londonderry, NH.  
Kinder Morgan should not put this gas pipeline through southern NH. The aquifer in southern NH is critical for the whole state. Please do not allow this pipeline to happen. The damage to NH roads is a huge risk too. Blasting will be needed to cut a path through granite in order to place pipelines. That blasting can damage the underground structure and cause wells and aquifers to disappear. Please do not approve this pipeline.

**20150624-0011(30662080).pdf**

Hand written card, Roger & Joan Crooker, 811 NH Route 45, Temple, NH 03084, opposing.

**20150624-0012(30664840).pdf**

PROPERTY ACCESS DENIED

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: June 8, 2015

~~Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested~~

RE: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

Street Address: 782 Old Homestead Hwy

Town & Zip: Richmond, NH

Map & Lot Number(s) (if known)

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Elaine M. Moriarty

CC:

FERC

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, NE, Room 1A

Washington, DC 20426

**20150624-0013(30664843).pdf**

PROPERTY ACCESS DENIED

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: 6-15-15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

RE: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

Street Address: 35 Birch Brook Crossing

Town & Zip: Richmond, NH 03470

Map & Lot Number(s) (if known)

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Burt G. Hollenbeck, Jr. PhD

M. Elizabeth Hollengeck, PhD

CC:

FERC

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, NE, Room 1A

Washington, DC 20426

**20150624-0015(30664837).pdf**

June 15, 2015

Dear Governor Hassan,

We are writing to ask that you, *{overlain by FERC stamp}* Kinder. Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England. We believe it will harm the communities in southern NH.

The construction process alone will pollute our air, contaminate our aquifers, wells, and other water resources. It will destroy large swaths of conservation land and the private property of over 800 NH families, taken through eminent domain. It will crush the rural character of our towns and reduce our property values. It will harm the tourist industry in the Monadnock region, the real estate business in southern NH, and devastate the local energy efficiency and renewable energy businesses in NH with its excessive investment in more fracked gas and massive infrastructure.

Temple, as an abutter, has requested intervener status with FERC and the NH SEC. If the pipeline and its Hillsborough County Compressor Station are built next to the ROW and transmissions lines bordering Temple, as proposed, they will bring safety, health, and environmental hazards to our community and our elementary school. The noise pollution of the 80,000 compressor station proposed near all those homes will make it an unlivable environment.

This level of invasive disruption, the taking of private property, and degradation of our rural quality of life is harmful enough. To think this pipeline will end up raising our energy rates as the vast majority of gas gets exported, defies common sense. This is detrimental in every way for our communities and a terrible proposition for NH. NH does not need this much fracked gas or this overbuild of permanent infrastructure.

Governor Hassan, we need you to oppose this pipeline and we are also requesting that you work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

Cc: FERC

**20150624-0017(30664841).pdf**

June 15, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose  
Secretary Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Expansion Project Northeast Energy Direct, PF14-22-000

Dear Secretary Bose

I am writing to you to request a scoping meeting be held in the Town of Mason, NH for the Kinder-Morgan / TGP NED Pipeline project. There are several reasons why a scoping meeting should be held in Mason. They are, and are not limited to:

1. We are the only town along the proposed pipeline route that is tri-sected by the main pipeline and the lateral. This will have a MAJOR impact on our community.
2. The lateral section is not associated with any co-location —damaging a huge swath of “greenfield” area.
3. Because we’e a small tovm, an exceptionally high percentage of properties in town are Impacted.
4. Mason has a high proportion of known shallow-to-bedrock soils requiring extensive blasting in combination with total dependence of homes and businesses on private, drilled wells; most of which are drilled in bedrock and of low capacity.
5. The “Lateral” runs through the Town of Mason’s primary aquifer.
6. This pipeline is planned to pass through several conservations lands, some with complex deed restrictions, etc.
7. The heavily forested Town of Mason’s volunteer Fire department is simply not equipped to handle consequences of a large fire. In 1927 a fire burned 16,000 acres in the area, including many in Mason.
8. The Town of Mason is a town of many dirt roads and low capacity roads. A pipeline construction project of this size will take a heavy toll on our roads.
9. The Town of Mason has a sparse road system —originally developed over 250 years ago. There is very little redundancy to provide alternate escape routes during a period of crisis.
10. Mason is a Town of very steep terrain (640’ elevation changes along pipeline pathway) making access for wildfire suppression diIEcult.

For these reasons as well as others we strongly request FERC hold a scoping Mason in and specifically for the Town of Mason, NH.

Sincerely,

Mr. Kirk Farrell  
683 Brookline Rd  
Mason, NH 03048

**20150624-0020(30664931).pdf**

Grassroots Capital Management

June 15, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Northeast Energy Direct Docket #PF14-22

Dear Ms. Bose,

I am writing today to reiterate my strong opposition to the North East Direct natural gas pipeline project, and urge FERC to deny permits for the project to proceed.

On June 11, the Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities (DPU) held a hearing in Greenfield on the pipeline. Virtually all of the overflow crowd of over 700 expressed strong opposition to the pipeline. Among the reasons:

- ~ The pipeline will degrade and destroy protected and conserved land that represents a prime and irreplaceable asset of the State.
- ~ The lands at risk include many areas acquired with public and private funds under the express understanding that such lands would enjoy permanent protection under Article 97 of the State Constitution.
- ~ The pipeline promoters are pursuing a "public benefit" finding under the false assertion that it is necessary to meet regional energy requirements, when the bulk of capacity will be devoted to export, providing no benefit to Massachusetts or U.S. citizens other than profit to the promoters.
- ~ The pipeline represents a major new investment in fossil fuel infrastructure at a time when an increasingly diverse range of global leaders, including President Obama, Pope Francis and the Norwegian sovereign wealth fund, are recognizing the necessity and moral imperative of transforming the global energy system to eliminate fossil fuel consumption.
- ~ The pipeline is being deliberately routed through rural parts of the State where lower safety standards, such as pipe wall thickness, are permitted, implicitly laying a lower value on the lives of rural residents.

In the face of these arguments, the Massachusetts DPU appears to have already made up its mind to support the NED project.

- ~ DPU seems determined to limit participation in the comment and review process, excluding full participation by elected representatives and citizens' organizations.
- ~ DPU seems eager to accept at face value the highly inflated claims of local utilities that they will purchase gas delivered by the pipeline, rather than undertake the conservation, repair and renewables development work that would ensure lower rates and more reliable and safer supply.
- ~ DPU seems determined to move the approval process as rapidly and sloppily as possible, preventing a full consideration of alternatives including moderate upgrade and expansion of existing pipelines and a more genuine commitment to a more efficient and less damaging energy system.
- ~ DPU is all too ready to condone the utilities' outrageous behavior in halting new gas hookups and in some cases, like Berkshire Gas, explicitly conditioning new hook ups on the approval of the NED, without questioning how the utilities could have planned so poorly and irresponsibly as to be unable to meet the current energy demands of their service areas.

DPU's approach is less appropriate to that of a regulator acting in the public interest than of a partner and collaborator in this private project for private gain. Fortunately, it appears that Massachusetts Attorney General Coskley also takes a dim view of the NED project and process and hopefully can be depended on to reveal and prosecute the collusion and corruption that lies beneath the surface.

I hope FERC can be depended on to undertake a more rigorous and transparent review of the North East Direct Pipeline, and speak out against the manipulation of the review process, the blatant favoring of private profit over public benefit and safety, and the shortsighted and destructive energy policy it represents.

Sincerely,

Paul DiLeo

President

Grassroots Capital Management, PBC

POB 70  
Plainfield, MA 01070

**20150624-0021(30664941).pdf**

Kimberly D. Bose  
Secretary Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Expansion Project Northeast Energy Direct, PF14-22-000

Dear Secretary Bose

I am writing to you to request a scoping meeting be held in the Town of Mason, NH for the Kinder-Morgan / TGP NED Pipeline project. There are several reasons why a scoping meeting should be held in Mason. They are, and are not limited to:

1. We are the only town along the proposed pipeline route that is tri-sected by the main pipeline and the lateral. This will have a MAJOR impact on our community.
2. The lateral section is not associated with any co-location —damaging a huge swath of “greenfield” area.
3. Because we’re a small town, an exceptionally high percentage of properties in town are impacted.
4. Mason has a high proportion of known shallow-to-bedrock soils requiring extensive blasting in combination with total dependence of homes and businesses on private, drilled wells; most of which are drilled in bedrock and of low capacity.
5. The “Lateral” runs through the Town of Mason’s primary aquifer.
6. This pipeline is planned to pass through several conservations lands, some with complex deed restrictions, etc.
7. The heavily forested Town of Mason’s volunteer Fire department is simply not equipped to handle consequences of a large fire. In 1927 a fire burned 16,000 acres in the area, including many in Mason.
8. The Town of Mason is a town of many dirt roads and low capacity roads. A pipeline construction project of this size will take a heavy toll on our roads.
9. The Town of Mason has a sparse road system - originally developed over 250 years ago. There is very little redundancy to provide alternate escape routes during a period of crisis.
10. Mason is a Town of very steep terrain (640’ elevation changes along pipeline pathway) making access for wildfire suppression difficult.

For these reasons as well as others we strongly request FERC hold a scoping Mason in and specifically for the Town of Mason, NH.

Sincerely,  
Judith A. Forty  
293 Pullman Rd  
Mason, NH 03048

**20150624-0022(30665218).pdf**

*{“File 30660994\_1.tif cannot be converted to PDF”, Editor’s note: BUT FILE WAS OCR-compatible}*

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Chairman Howard C. Bay  
Office of the Chairman  
888 First Street NE, Room II A  
Washington, DC 20426

June 10,2015

Re: Docket #PF 14-22

Dear Chairman Bay,

This letter follows on the heels of an article in the Times Union newspaper regarding a proposed fracked gas pipeline and compressor stations belonging to Kinder Morgan in Rensselaer, Schoharie and Albany counties. I have enclosed/attached this article.

Reporter Brian Nearing states Kinder Morgan proposes nine new compressor stations, four in New York State, one being on Clark's Chapel Road in Nassau, Rensselaer County and that 60 families are within 1/2 mile of the proposed site. I believe there will be many more affected. My home is located within 1/2 mile of the proposed pipeline and within one mile of the proposed compressor station. Also included in the article was a health study authored by Dr. David Carpenter, Director of the Institute for Health & The Environment, at the University of Albany. Results reveal higher "formaldehyde levels that carry increased lifetime cancer risks" in air samples near compressor stations in Pennsylvania.

Those risks to the health and safety of our children and families are unacceptable to us, and should be to you. What also concerns me is the loss of property values around the four compressor stations, the economic stability of the families affected, and the tax consequences of devaluing their property. Certainly any home and property near these compressor stations will not be worth as much as they were in the past. Personally, I would not have bought in this area had I known this pipeline and compressor station were going to be built.

I believe we homeowners have made a contract with our municipality and the State of New York to buy, maintain and pay taxes in a safe residential zone. If Kinder Morgan's plans are approved these contracts would be broken. Our property would need to be reassessed at a lower value and residents in opposition are already speaking of withholding property and school taxes in the affected areas and municipalities. For example, the properties within approximately one mile of the Clark's Chapel Road compressor station are valued at over \$9,000,000.00. Town officials I've spoken to believe property within several miles will be affected. Multiply that by four compressor stations and there will be a huge amount of real estate in New York State that will be devalued.

Our rights are being violated and that should also be unacceptable. There is no one that can tell me New York State residents are being exposed to a higher risk of cancer, having their most valuable asset devalued and a huge tax base being negatively affected is for the greater good. The fact that all of this is being visited upon us because a multi-million dollar company wants to make more millions and out-of-state communities don't want to purchase foreign oil in addition to the amount of gas received from the existing pipeline. This is not only disgraceful, it's un-American. This country was founded upon the

The federal government is not infallible or invincible. New York sounded the battle cry against imperialism 239 years ago during our War of Independence and it is time to do so again. New York's elected and appointed representatives must protect the health, safety and interests of their constituents and say "NO!", even if that means fighting a battle against FERC and the federal government. We entrusted you with the well-being and safety of our families when we put you in office.

We beseech you not to abuse the trust we placed in you. We beg you to protect our families. These rural residential communities about to be affected are the backbone of New York. We are the pride and future of this State. Make us proud to be New Yorkers.

Very respectfully yours,

Shelley M. Bennett      474 Burden Lake Road  
518-366-9594            Nassau, New York 12123

Plus 12 other signatories

*{Article referred to in paragraph 1 is not included in the TIFF file}*

**CITY OF PEABODY**

24 LOWELL STREET  
PEABODY, MA 01960

P.978-538-5700  
F.978-638-5980

**OFFICE OF THE MAYOR**  
EDWARD A. BETTENCOURT, JR

June 12, 2015

Sandra Waldstein, Director  
The State, International and Public Affairs Division  
FERC  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: Docket No. PF14-22

Dear Ms. Waldstein:

The Tennessee Gas Pipeline, L.L.C. has submitted to FERC an Application to open a pre-filing proceeding of Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. under New Docket for Tennessee's Northeast Energy Direct Project under PF14-22.

As part of this project, Tennessee Gas has proposed building a spur of subsurface pipeline in an area of Peabody, Massachusetts wholly unsuited for such a utility. As Mayor of Peabody, I feel it is my duty to convey to FERC the concerns and fears of so many in our community.

First, the area proposed for pipeline construction runs adjacent to one of our city's most beloved and tight knit neighborhoods. Families who live here are justly concerned about a disruptive construction project which could forever alter the landscape of their homes. Homeowners have also expressed to me their concerns relative to public safety and protection of property.

Also, the area proposed for pipeline construction runs along the Peabody Independence Greenway. Known locally as simply 'the Bikepath,' the Greenway is a favorite destination for thousands of walkers, joggers, cyclists and wildlife enthusiasts. Many of these individuals have expressed their dismay over this pipeline proposal and I share their concern for preservation of this vital community resource.

Finally, the area proposed for pipeline construction is home to a number of natural resources which could be jeopardized by such a large scale and disruptive project. Thanks to its vicinity to the Ipswich River, the area is rife with wetlands, plants, trees, and other types of vegetation. While Peabody is renowned as a center of industry and technology, we treasure our open space and natural resources.

I join my fellow elected officials on the City Council as well as hundreds of Peabody residents who have united to oppose this project. The Tennessee Gas proposal will disrupt Peabody neighborhoods, jeopardize public safety, decimate a treasured recreational amenity and wipe out precious natural resources. Thank you for your consideration of this public comment.

Warmest regards,

Edward A. Bettencourt, Jr.  
Mayor, City of Peabody

Cc—Kimberly D. Bose

Kimberly D. Bose  
Secretary Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Expansion Project Northeast Energy Direct, PF14-22-000

Dear Secretary Bose

I am writing to you to request a scoping meeting be held in the Town of Mason, NH for the Kinder-Morgan / TGP NED Pipeline project. There are several reasons why a scoping meeting should be held in Mason. They are, and are not limited to:

1. We are the only town along the proposed pipeline route that is tri-sected by the main pipeline and the lateral. This will have a MAJOR impact on our community.
2. The lateral section is not associated with any co-location —damaging a huge swath of “greenfield” area.
3. Because we’e a small tovm, an exceptionally high percentage of properties in town are impacted.
4. Mason has a high proportion of known shallow-to-bedrock soils requiring extensive blasting in combination with total dependence of homes and businesses on private, drilled wells; most of which are drilled in bedrock and of low capacity.
5. The “Lateral” runs through the Town of Mason’s primary aquifer.
6. This pipeline is planned to pass through several conservations lands, some with complex deed restrictions, etc.
7. The heavily forested Town of Mason’s volunteer Fire department is simply not equipped to handle consequences of a large fire. In 1927 a fire burned 16,000 acres in the area, including many in Mason.
8. The Town of Mason is a town of many dirt roads and low capacity roads. A pipeline construction project of this size will take a heavy toll on our roads.
9. The Town of Mason has a sparse road system - originally developed over 250 years ago. There is very little redundancy to provide alternate escape routes during a period of crisis.
10. Mason is a Town of very steep terrain (640’ elevation changes along pipeline pathway) making access for wildfire suppression difficult.

For these reasons as well as others we strongly request FERC hold a scoping meeting in and specifically for the Town of Mason, NH.

Sincerely,

Carol J. Iodice  
304 Old County Road  
Mason, NH 03048

**20150624-0026(30665229).pdf**

Kimberly D. Bose  
Secretary Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Expansion Project Northeast Energy Direct, PF14-22-000

Dear Secretary Bose

I am writing to you to request a scoping meeting be held in the Town of Mason, NH for the Kinder-Morgan / TGP NED Pipeline project. There are several reasons why a scoping meeting should be held in Mason. They are, and are not limited to:

1. We are the only town along the proposed pipeline route that is tri-sected by the main pipeline and the lateral. This will have a MAJOR impact on our community.
2. The lateral section is not associated with any co-location —damaging a huge swath of “greenfield” area.

3. Because we're a small town, an exceptionally high percentage of properties in town are impacted.
4. Mason has a high proportion of known shallow-to-bedrock soils requiring extensive blasting in combination with total dependence of homes and businesses on private, drilled wells; most of which are drilled in bedrock and of low capacity.
5. The "Lateral" runs through the Town of Mason's primary aquifer.
6. This pipeline is planned to pass through several conservation lands, some with complex deed restrictions, etc.
7. The heavily forested Town of Mason's volunteer Fire department is simply not equipped to handle consequences of a large fire. In 1927 a fire burned 16,000 acres in the area, including many in Mason.
8. The Town of Mason is a town of many dirt roads and low capacity roads. A pipeline construction project of this size will take a heavy toll on our roads.
9. The Town of Mason has a sparse road system - originally developed over 250 years ago. There is very little redundancy to provide alternate escape routes during a period of crisis.
10. Mason is a Town of very steep terrain (640' elevation changes along pipeline pathway) making access for wildfire suppression difficult.

For these reasons as well as others we strongly request FERC hold a scoping hearing in and specifically for the Town of Mason, NH.

Sincerely,

Robert B. Larochelle  
Dianna Larochelle  
958 Starch Mill Rd  
Mason, NH 03048

**20150624-0027(30665230).pdf**

June 15, 2015

Dear Governor Hassan,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Governor, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England. We believe it will harm the communities in southern NH.

The construction process alone will pollute our air, contaminate our aquifers, wells, and other water resources. It will destroy large swaths of conservation land and the private property of over 800 NH families, taken through eminent domain. It will crush the rural character of our towns and reduce our property values. It will harm the tourist industry in the Monadnock region, the real estate business in southern NH, and devastate the local energy efficiency and renewable energy businesses in NH with its excessive investment in more fracked gas and massive infrastructure.

Temple, as an abutter, has requested intervenor status with FERC and the NH SEC. If the pipeline and its Hillsborough County Compressor Station are built next to the ROW and transmission lines bordering Temple, as proposed, they will bring safety, health, and environmental hazards to our community and our elementary school. The noise pollution of the 80,000 compressor station proposed near all those homes will make it an unlivable environment.

This level of invasive disruption, the taking of private property, and degradation of our rural quality of life is harmful enough. To think this pipeline will end up raising our energy rates as the vast majority of gas gets exported, defies common sense! This is detrimental in every way for our communities and a terrible proposition for NH. NH does not need this much fracked gas or this overbuild of permanent infrastructure.

Governor Hassan, we need you to oppose this pipeline and we are also requesting that you work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

Roger & Joan Crooker

We live in the “burn zone” and would have to leave our home which we have loved for 30 years because of my health issues. Please help us fight this!

Cc: FERC

-----  
June 15, 2015

Dear Congressman Guinta,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Senator, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This pmroect will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England. We believe it will harm the communities in southern NH.

The construction process alone will pollute our air, contaminate our aquifer, wells, and other water resources. It will destroy large swaths of conservation land and the private property of over 800 NH families, taken through eminent domain. It will crush the rural character of our towns and reduce our property values. It will harm the tourist industry in the Monadnock region, the real estate business in southern NH, and devastate the local energy efficiency and renewable energy businesses in NH with its excessive investment in more fracked gas and massive infrastructure.

Temple, as an abutter, has requested intervener status with FERC and the NH SEC. If the pipeline and its Hillsborough County Compressor Station are built next to the ROW and transmissions lines bordering Temple, as proposed, they will bring safety, health, and environmental hazards to our community and our elementary school. The noise pollution of the 80,000 compressor station proposed near all our homes will make it an unlivable environment.

This level of invasive disruption, the taking of private property, and degradation of our rural quality of life is harmful enough. To think this pipeline will end up raising our energy rates as the vast majority of gas gets exported, defies common sense! This is detrimental in every way for our communities and a terrible proposition for NH. NE does not need this much fracked gas or this overbuild of permanent infrastructure.

Please, oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project!

Most Sincerely,

Roger & Joan Crooker

Temple, NH

-----  
June 15, 2015

Dear Congresswoman Kuster,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Senator, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This pmroect will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England. We believe it will harm the communities in southern NH.

The construction process alone will pollute our air, contaminate our aquifer, wells, and other water resources. It will destroy large swaths of conservation land and the private property of over 800 NH families, taken through eminent domain. It will crush the rural character of our towns and reduce our property values. It will harm the tourist industry in the Monadnock region, the real estate business in southern NH, and devastate the local energy efficiency and renewable energy businesses in NH with its excessive investment in more fracked gas and massive infrastructure.

Temple, as an abutter, has requested intervener status with FERC and the NH SEC. If the pipeline and its Hillsborough County Compressor Station are built next to the ROW and transmissions lines bordering Temple, as proposed, they will bring safety, health, and environmental hazards to our community and our

elementary school. The noise pollution of the 80,000 compressor station proposed near all our homes will make it an unlivable environment.

This level of invasive disruption, the taking of private property, and degradation of our rural quality of life is harmful enough. To think this pipeline will end up raising our energy rates as the vast majority of gas gets exported, defies common sense! This is detrimental in every way for our communities and a terrible proposition for NH. NE does not need this much fracked gas or this overbuild of permanent infrastructure.

Please, oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project!

Most Sincerely,

Roger & Joan Crooker  
Temple, NH

-----  
June 15, 2015

Dear Senator Ayotte,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Senator, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England. We believe it will harm the communities in southern NH.

The construction process alone will pollute our air, contaminate our aquifer, wells, and other water resources. It will destroy large swaths of conservation land and the private property of over 800 NH families, taken through eminent domain. It will crush the rural character of our towns and reduce our property values. It will harm the tourist industry in the Monadnock region, the real estate business in southern NH, and devastate the local energy efficiency and renewable energy businesses in NH with its excessive investment in more fracked gas and massive infrastructure.

Temple, as an abutter, has requested intervenor status with FERC and the NH SEC. If the pipeline and its Hillsborough County Compressor Station are built next to the ROW and transmission lines bordering Temple, as proposed, they will bring safety, health, and environmental hazards to our community and our elementary school. The noise pollution of the 80,000 compressor station proposed near all our homes will make it an unlivable environment.

This level of invasive disruption, the taking of private property, and degradation of our rural quality of life is harmful enough. To think this pipeline will end up raising our energy rates as the vast majority of gas gets exported, defies common sense! This is detrimental in every way for our communities and a terrible proposition for NH. NE does not need this much fracked gas or this overbuild of permanent infrastructure.

Please, oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project!

Most Sincerely,

Roger & Joan Crooker  
Temple, NH

-----  
June 15, 2015

Dear Senator Shaheen,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Senator, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England. We believe it will harm the communities in southern NH.

The construction process alone will pollute our air, contaminate our aquifer, wells, and other water resources. It will destroy large swaths of conservation land and the private property of over 800 NH families, taken through eminent domain. It will crush the rural character of our towns and reduce our property values. It will harm the tourist industry in the Monadnock region, the real estate business in southern NH, and dev-

astate the local energy efficiency and renewable energy businesses in NH with its excessive investment in more fracked gas and massive infrastructure.

Temple, as an abutter, has requested intervener status with FERC and the NH SEC. If the pipeline and its Hillsborough County Compressor Station are built next to the ROW and transmissions lines bordering Temple, as proposed, they will bring safety, health, and environmental hazards to our community and our elementary school. The noise pollution of the 80,000 compressor station proposed near all our homes will make it an unlivable environment.

This level of invasive disruption, the taking of private property, and degradation of our rural quality of life is harmful enough. To think this pipeline will end up raising our energy rates as the vast majority of gas gets exported, defies common sense! This is detrimental in every way for our communities and a terrible proposition for NH. NE does not need this much fracked gas or this overbuild of permanent infrastructure.

Please, oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project!

Most Sincerely,

Roger & Joan Crooker  
Temple, NH

**20150624-0029(30665310).pdf**

Hand written card, Denise Augusto, 97 Orange Rd, Northfield, MA 01360, opposing.

**20150624-0030(30665307).pdf**

Hand written card, Marte Augusto, 97 Orange Rd, Northfield, MA 01360, opposing.

**20150624-0032(30665308).pdf**

Hand written card, Marilyn Griska, 18 Atlantic Dr, Rindge, NH 03461, opposing.

**20150624-0035(30661875).pdf**

Hand written card, Karen M. Miller, 161 Ashburnham Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, requesting Scoping meeting in New Ipswich.

**20150624-0036(30662122).pdf**

Hand written card, Gary Nielsen, 185 Colburn Rd, Temple, NH 03084, opposing.

**20150624-0037(30661869).pdf**

Hand written card, Mary Ann Kelling, 384 Hadley Hwy, Temple, NH 03084, opposing.

**20150624-0038(30661868).pdf**

Hand written card, Timothy Somero, 42 Old Tenney Road, New Ipswich, NH 03071, opposing.

**20150624-0039(30666355).pdf**

Hand written card, Timothy E. Somero, 42 Old Tenney Road, New Ipswich, NH 03071, requesting more time before Scoping session.

**20150624-5076(30660643).txt**

deborah pomerleau, Londonderry, NH.

I live in the town of Londonderry and am located 1/2 mile from the proposed pipeline. Every town needs a scoping meeting to completely discuss all important environmental issues unique to each town. Please al-

low this to happen. The potential for water pollution, air pollution, noise pollution, and damage to our town is too great to risk.

**20150625-0021(30667635).pdf**

**TOWN OF ANDOVER**

Town Offices  
36 Bartlet Street  
Andover, MA 01810  
(978) 623-8200  
www.town.andover.ma.us

June 12, 2015

Mr. Phillip D. Moeller, Commissioner  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20146

Re: Gas Pipeline Resolution

Dear Mr. Moeller:

Please be advised that the following resolution was passed at the May, 2015 Andover Annual Town Meeting. ARTICLE 59. To see if the Town will vote to approve the following Resolution to ban the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline project and to Support Sustainable Energy in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the citizens of the Town of Andover, Massachusetts:

1. Hereby commend our Town Manager and Selectmen for their efforts to re-route the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline company's high-pressured pipeline through Andover.
2. Believe that the proposed pipeline goes against current Commonwealth of Massachusetts and Andover commitments to renewable energy technologies and combating global climate change; and
3. Call upon businesses and residents to maximize energy conservation to reduce demand; call upon utilities and the state to actively reduce peak demand shortfalls through pricing and backup storage options; and call upon the state to continue to aggressively promote adoption of renewable energy technologies.
4. Demand that the Commonwealth require and oversee the repair to all existing gas pipelines prior to and as a condition of allowing expansion of gas supply pipelines, and give preference to incremental expansion of existing pipelines and to short-term solutions such as liquefied natural gas prior to any consideration of building new pipeline infrastructure in the State.
5. Hereby request our State and Federal Legislators and our Executive Branch Officials to enact legislation, and take such other and further actions, as is necessary to disallow such projects that go against our commitments to life, the environment, our economic well-being and our personal health and safety; and, instead, to legislate more stringent energy efficiency and further exploration of, and subsidies for, renewable energy sources; and also:

BE IT RESOLVED that the following individuals receive an Official Copy of This RESOLUTION:

President Barack Obama  
United States Senator Elizabeth Warren  
United States Senator Edward Markey  
United States Representative Seth Moulton  
United States Representative Ni ki Tsongas  
Governor Charlie Baker  
Massachusetts Senator Barbara L 'Italien

Massachusetts Representative James Lyons  
Massachusetts Representative Frank Moran  
All five Commissioners of the Federal Regulatory Commission

Very truly yours,

ANDOVER BOARD OF SELECTMEN

Mary T. O'Donoghue, Chair  
Alexander J. Vispoli, Vice-Chair  
Paul J. Salafia, Secretary  
Daniel H. Kowalski  
Robert A. Landry

**20150625-5002(30662128).txt**

Wenjun Chen, Dracut, MA.

Dear Federal Energy Regulatory Commission:

As a resident of the town of Dracut, Massachusetts, I have yet to be shown evidence of a domestic need for gas that justifies need for gas that justifies a new 36 inch natural gas pipeline with its accompanying 23,000 HP compressor station proposed by the Kinder Morgan-Tennessee Gas Corporation pumping what we are told will push 2.2 billion cubic feet of gas per day through the Town of Dracut.

The location of said proposed pipeline mega-plex slated to traverse existing heavily populated neighborhood, prime farm land, conservation land, a golf course and to be co-located near places of assembly (St. Francis Church, Campbell School) has resulted in much uproar throughout East Dracut. Among many impacted areas, Meadow Creek community is a newly developed residency area consisting of more than 170 houses.

As a home owner of a Meadow Creek community, I am concerned about effects of a compressor station which is expected to introduce a blast impact radius (some call an "incineration corridor"), noise, air pollution, and stadium type industrial lighting guaranteed to impact our health, lifestyle, and well-being along with diminished property values. The last impact radius includes a reservation land, and a gold course.

In additions, I am concerned that industrializing Dracut to this level as we are a town gifted with active farms including our own family farm (Saja Farm) which produces each season, thousands of pounds of produce for local markets and beyond.

Would you please hasten your efforts to address per and post install concerns of such a pipeline project, why the need, how we expect to live amongst the displacement, this permanent industrial expanse, including further encroachment of power line easements, with the feeling that we have destroyed a colonial town motif and forever disrupted preserved lands that were to benefit future generations?

Before issuing any certificate to a corporation of this type, please think long and hard. Please do not ruin our lives, our properties, our farm lands, our homes, our long term lifelong investments, our livelihood, our children's futures, and our town.

We can't handle this type of impact. Please help us.

Sincerely,

Wenjun Chen  
63 Regency Drive,  
Dracut, MA 01826  
Email: wenjunchen88@gmail.com

**20150625-5008(30662554).txt**

Donald F Briggs, Windsor, MA.

Please Stop the Pipeline.

Our children and future generations will thank you for taking action now to protect our land, air, and water and to build our clean energy economy.

We, the undersigned citizens of the Commonwealth, call upon your leadership to enact legislation and take such other actions as are necessary:

1. To disallow in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts the construction of any and all new pipelines carrying natural gas obtained through hydraulic fracturing.
2. To fully fund and comply with the Massachusetts Global Warming Solutions Act .
3. To create and enforce more stringent energy efficiency standards and effective subsidies for energy efficiency.
4. To promote further exploration of renewable energy sources, creating effective subsidies for such sources, in order to move us away from large power plants (including big wind) to smaller, more resilient, efficient, and ecologically sound locally produced energy.

Fracked gas travels at high pressure, increasing the likelihood of leaks, ruptures and explosions causing damage to property and lives. Pipelines bisect family farms, protected wooded areas, wetlands, and wildlife habitat and negatively affect property values and aesthetics for countless parcels of land.

On a global scale, fracking and natural gas contributes to pollution at drilling sites and worldwide climate change. While natural gas has lower carbon dioxide emissions than other fossil fuels, leaks in extraction and transmission emit methane, which is a far more potent greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide.

More natural gas is not needed to meet our heating fuel needs, nor our electricity needs. In a study projecting out to 2022, ISO-New England has projected that we already have enough infrastructure in place to meet future annual energy needs. Improvements in energy efficiency will help us to meet future needs. Increasing rooftop wind and solar is a more ecologically sound solution than expanding the natural gas infrastructure. Small scale projects would also create more long-term local jobs.

That's why I signed a petition to Richard K. Sullivan, Jr., Secretary, Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs, The Massachusetts State House, The Massachusetts State Senate, and Governor Charlie Baker, which says:

“Massachusetts: Let us devote our resources to creating a comprehensive renewable energy infrastructure rather than fortifying our reliance on fossil fuels. Ban the construction of new “fracked gas” pipelines and support sustainable energy efforts.”

Sincerely,

Sharon and Donald Briggs

**20150625-5018(30662929).txt**

Xing S Gu, Dracut, MA.

As a resident of the town of Dracut, Massachusetts, I have yet to be shown evidence of a domestic need for gas that justifies need for gas that justifies a new 36 inch natural gas pipeline with its accompanying 23,000 HP compressor station proposed by the Kinder Morgan-Tennessee Gas Corporation pumping what we are told will push 2.2 billion cubic feet of gas per day through the Town of Dracut.

The location of said proposed pipeline mega-plex slated to traverse existing heavily populated neighborhood, prime farm land, conservation land, a golf course and to be co-located near places of assembly (St. Francis Church, Campbell School) has resulted in much uproar throughout East Dracut. Among many impacted areas, Meadow Creek community is a newly developed residency area consisting of more than 170 houses.

As a home owner of a Meadow Creek community, I am concerned about effects of a compressor station which is expected to introduce a blast impact radius (some call an “incineration corridor”), noise, air pollution, and stadium type industrial lighting guaranteed to impact our health, lifestyle, and well-being along with diminished property values. The last impact radius includes a reservation land, and a golf course.

In additions, I am concerned that industrializing Dracut to this level as we are a town gifted with active farms including our own family farm (Saja Farm) which produces each season, thousands of pounds of produce for local markets and beyond.

Would you please help us to voice our concerns of such a pipeline project that we do not need:

- (1) Property devaluation
- (2) Disruption of current landscaping
- (3) Foundation structural damage due to blasting
- (4) Use of pesticides for pipeline maintenance
- (5) Noise and light pollution from compressor station and/or metering station(s)
- (6) Probable loss of life in the case of catastrophic failure of the pipeline structures
- (7) Air pollution from the compressor station
- (8) Potential contamination of water wells
- (9) The lack of independent information about ecological impact.

How we expect to live amongst the displacement, this permanent industrial expanse, including further encroachment of power line easements, with the feeling that we have destroyed a colonial town motif and forever disrupted preserved lands that were to benefit future generations?

Please help us to protect our lives, our properties, our farm lands, our homes, our long term lifelong investments, our livelihood, our children, our futures, and our town.

Sincerely

Xing Sheena Gu  
11 Brentwood Drive  
Dracut MA 01826

**20150625-5051(30664552).txt**

Pixie Holbrook, Conway, MA.

As one of the organizers of the Pipeline Opposition in the small rural town of Conway, MA, I am questioning deeply the ethics of a company like Kinder Morgan. From the onset, we all questioned the values of a company whose chairman is the former COO of ENRON. From there, it has only become far worse. The lies and deceptions are unfolding before our eyes.

Kinder Morgan makes public statements about their plan to hire 3,000 local employees for its installation. From past practice, we know this not to be true. Their own crews travel from state to state, hiring only a few dozen local workers. Their crews are predominantly from the southern states. KM is giving false hopes to our local unions who believe that this pipeline is an asset to them.

Case in point, surveyors have arrived in our rural neighborhoods since last fall and now this spring. We have taken their photos and spoken with several at length. Some have revealed details with a caveat (“Don’t tell anyone who told you this, but...”). Not a trusting relationship from the start, agreed? They converse openly and politely with their strong and obvious southern accents. Clearly they are not local employees. A lie.

Further evidence...they drive their personal vehicles with a temporary sign telling us that they are working for a local company. “Hatch, Mott and MacDonald” is written clearly on their logo, with the address Holyoke, MA, a small city nearby. This company is a multi-state surveying business, with an office in Holyoke. This helps to give the appearance of local surveyors, but it is another obvious and unethical deception.

Looking closely, the license plates of their pickup trucks reveal the truth. These surveyors are from Texas, Louisiana and Arkansas. Not local hires. Proof.

They are on to us, and when we approach for a photo, they stand and block the license plates of their truck. Really? It's come to this? But I have those photos and have released them to our local press. No local hires. KM lies and deceives. This is an unethical company.

And let's not forget the lie about this fracked gas not going for export, they say. The 36" pipe will contain 10 times what New England could need. Where's it going? It's heading to Europe for huge profits. The flow of gas from Canada to the US is being reversed. Why, you ask? Now the gas can make its way from Pennsylvania all the way to Nova Scotia where a new LNG terminal is in process for export to Europe. Lies.

Our local gas distributor (Berkshire Gas) wants the gas, they say, and have placed an unnecessary moratorium on new gas customers, trying to give the impression of the need for more gas. They have gone before our DPU asking to be included. Their approval will help justify your approval. Now we learn that Berkshire Gas is being purchased by a multi-national from Spain, who...guess what?...is opening an LNG terminal to RECEIVE our fracked gas from Pennsylvania. Kinder Morgan breeds lies. This industry breeds lies.

Now for one of our favorites... At their Open House last year, they proudly showed us the photograph of a compressor station, noting the white "X" on the door, suggesting a quaint country barn, not unlike others in our town. They made a point of remarking that this would add to the rural character of Conway. This highly insulting comment was duly-noted by all. Besides the suggestion that that simple and foolish detail would make a difference to us, it was soon noted that they were showing a compressor station that was only a quarter of the size that would be built for their purpose. The one proposed for our town (and now moved to our neighboring town) is an enormous 80,000hp station. They had showed us a 20,000hp station. More lies and deception.

So, what is next? What other lies will they tell us? Will we hear that they will honor our local ordinances for construction? Will they say they will protect our aquifers? Will they promise to compensate us for land and our loss of natural habitats and the purity of silence? Will they train our emergency people and supply the foam trucks to put out the explosion that is burning down that farmer's home, barn and livelihood? Will they agree to objectively inspect the countless leaks years from now? Will they promise to cure my grandchildren, who live a half-mile away, when they are diagnosed with a cancer or a respiratory disease?

We don't believe Kinder Morgan, and we want them out of our town, out of our county, out of our state...out of ALL states. This toxic pipeline is not needed, and will serve only to gain profit for a disreputable company. Please strongly consider the denial of this pipeline through our homes, our lands and our lives.

Pixie J. Holbrook  
Conway, MA

#### **20150625-5063(30664804).txt**

Tara Wiese, Nassau, NY.

I am writing to share my thoughts with you on the proposed site for the Kinder Morgan Compressor Station located on Clarks Chapel Road, Nassau, NY. I am strongly opposed to this station for too many reasons to list in this form, but will share the one closest to my heart. My family has lived in this area my whole life. We have spent years building our home and farm. We choose to eat organic, we don't use products littered with chemicals and we try our best to minimize toxins in our life. This compressor station would have a profoundly negative impact on the life we have worked so hard to build. I urge you to strongly consider another site for this station. Place yourselves in our shoes.....would you want this for your family?

A few points to consider:

- This is a zoned RURAL RESIDENTIAL neighborhood. From our zoning laws adopted by the town on 9/8/2011 reads: The rural residential district is established to maintain and PROTECT the rural character, environmental quality and natural habitat of these parts of the Town while allowing for a mixture of housing

types, opportunities and home occupations, and to provide for current and future residents the opportunities for a wide range of activities including rural living, agriculture, forestry, recreation and the enjoyment of wildlife. We live here because we thought we were protected from industrialization.

- Another Town Law reads: The emission of dust, dirt, smoke, fly ash, odor or Noxious gases, which creates a nuisance or could damage to the health of persons, animals, plant life or other forms of property, is prohibited.

The toxins generated from the compressor station are known to be Ethyl-benene , n-butane, n-hexane, MTBE, CO, iso-Butane, methyl mercaptan, n-octane, nitrogen dioxide, nitrous-acidstyrene, 2-methyl butane, 2 methyl pentane, 3 methyl pentane, ethyl benene, benene, ethane, propane, methanol, naphthalene, dimethyl disulfide, methyl ethyl disulphide, ethyl-methylethyl disulfide, trimethyl benene, methyl-methylethyl benene, tetramethyl benene, naphthalene 1,2,4-trimethyl benene, m&P xylenes, carconyl sulfide, carbon disulfide, methyl pyridine, dimethyl pyridine and many more... Would you let your kids breath this air in?

- The above listed toxins will be released in greater volumes during a “blow down” event, leaving the toxins to settle on the land surround the site, which consists of family’s and farms that produce food for human and animal consumption. How is this good?

- There are 40-50 kids located within the 1/2 mile “buffer” zone with many more within close proximity. These kids will be subject to a lifetime of short term and long term health effects due to the emissions and toxins that are released on a daily basis. Another reason why we have all located our children in a rural residential neighborhood and not industrial, to protect them from carcinogens in the air and water we take in.

#### **20150625-5123(30666383).txt**

Michael McTague, Voorheesville, NY.

I am a current member of the Warner Lake Association in East Berne, NY. I was recently informed that the Kinder Morgan Corporation is proposing it install a 12 inch gas pipeline directly through a beaver pond that is located across the street from and above the northwest corner of Warner Lake. This beaver dam ruptured during Hurricane Irene and did considerable damage to many residents homes around the lake as well as dumping hundreds of thousands of gallons of heavily silted water in our lake which we are still recovering from.

We have heard through a number of sources that Kinder Morgan, as part of their Northeast Direct (NED) project, proposes to install a 12 inch gas pipeline that will run directly through this beaver pond. They are proposing to build a coffer dam to contain the water from the dam while the pipe is being installed. This information was verified by executive members of the Warner Lake Association who met with and discussed this proposed activity with Kinder Morgan staff at an open house that Kinder Morgan participated in on February 12th of the year at the Colonie Country Club in Voorheesville, NY.

Myself and other Warner Lake residents have concerns when this pipe is installed through the beaver pond. We want to make sure it is done safely and correctly in a manner that will prevent any silt, bacteria, or nuisance vegetation like pond weeds from finding its way into Warner Lake waters. As you may or may not know, the water in Warner Lake has been tested by Albany County and deemed potable. Almost all residents around the lake use this water for cooking and washing and many use it directly for their drinking water.

We are asking you to ensure that this activity is closely monitored when it is scheduled to occur sometime in the spring of 2016. We are asking that an environmental assessment be conducted to address these concerns prior to any environmental permits being approved for this pipeline installation above our lake through this beaver pond.

Sincerely,

Michael J. McTague

41 Severson Hill Road  
Voorheesville, NY 12186  
mickmctague@yahoo.com

**20150626-5000(30666388).txt**

deborah pomerleau, Londonderry, NH.  
NO PIPELINE

**20150626-5074(30667077).txt**

Robyn Amadon, Jaffrey, NH.

The toxins generated from the compressor station are known to be Ethyl-benene , n-butane, n-hexane, MTBE, CO, iso-Butane, methyl mercaptan, n-octane, nitrogen dioxide, nitrous-acidstyrene, 2-methyl butane, 2 methyl pentane, 3 methyl pentane, ethyl benene, benene, ethane, propane, methanol, naphthelene, dimethyl disulfide, methyl ethyl disulphide, ethyl-methylethyl disulfide, trimethyl benene, methyl-methylethyl benene, tetramethyl benene, naphthalene 1,2,4-trimethyl benene, m&P xylenes, carconyl sulfide, carbon disulfide, methyl pyridine, dimethyl pyridine and many more.

All of which will be released during a blow down from a compressor station a mere 0.5 mile from the Temple, NH elementary school. I do not approve of subjecting kids to these toxins. Please do not approve this project.

**20150626-5211(30671747).pdf**

**New England States  
Committee on Electricity**

June 26, 2015

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

Re: Limited Comments in Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.  
Docket No. PF14-22-000

Dear Ms. Bose:

The New England States Committee on Electricity (“NESCOE”) respectfully submits these limited comments to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (“FERC”) to clarify the record concerning NESCOE activities and positions that are contained in above captioned docket regarding Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.’s proposed Northeast Energy Direct (“NED”) project. In particular, NESCOE seeks to clarify a series of unfortunate mischaracterizations in a letter dated June 8, 2015 from the Town of Amherst, New Hampshire (“June 8 Letter”) regarding this project.<sup>1</sup>

NESCOE is the Regional State Committee for the New England region and is governed by a board of managers appointed by the Governors of Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont. NESCOE’s mission is to represent the interests of the citizens of the New England region by advancing policies that will provide electricity at the lowest reasonable cost over the long term, consistent with maintaining reliable service and environmental quality. NESCOE has not provided any earlier comments in this docket and does not take any substantive position on the merits of this proceeding, including issues raised in the June 8 Letter.

**I. NESCOE Has Never Supported or Endorsed any Pipeline Proposal**

At several places, the June 8 Letter suggests or implies that NESCOE has been or is a proponent of the NED project.<sup>2</sup> Such an assertion is simply incorrect as a matter of fact. NESCOE has never indicated support or

endorsement for any specific pipeline project. This includes any proceeding before FERC, where NESCOE is an active and frequent advocate on behalf of the New England states and their electricity consumers. It is additionally important for the record to reflect that NESCOE has no authority to approve the implementation or funding of any proposed pipeline project.

## **II. There Is no Active Tariff Proposal Under Consideration**

The June 8 Letter references a “NESCOE tariff” and states that “FERC is seriously considering a proposal championed by NESCOE” regarding the NED project.<sup>3</sup> These points warrant clarification.

First, regarding reference to a “tariff,” NESCOE understands that to mean a proposed generic cost recovery mechanism for energy infrastructure through the ISO New England (“ISONE”) tariff that was proposed in 2014, but never executed.

At the direction of the six New England states, NESCOE worked in early 2014 to develop such a proposal for consideration by and discussion with ISO-NE and stakeholders through the New England Power Pool (NEPOOL). Like any other proposed ISO-NE tariff, had the region wished to advance this particular proposal further, it would need to be filed with FERC for review in its open and public process.

However, this tariff approach has not been substantively discussed with stakeholders in almost a year, and NESCOE is unaware of any such tariff before FERC for its consideration and has not made any filing in that regard.<sup>4</sup> Indeed, the New England states’ April 2015 articulation of current actions in furtherance of cleaner and more reliable and affordable energy does not include the tariff proposal in question.<sup>5</sup>

It is also important to clarify that the proposed tariff advanced for discussion purposes never included the selection of any particular project, such as NED; would only have been executed after public processes at both the state and federal levels; and would have created a new charge for ratepayers only after a competitive solicitation process conducted by appropriate state authorities to ensure that consumer benefits outweighed consumer costs.

## **III. Conclusion**

NESCOE appreciates the opportunity to provide these limited comments.

Respectfully submitted,

Heather Hunt  
Executive Director  
New England States Committee  
on Electricity  
655 Longmeadow Street  
Longmeadow, MA 01106  
heatherhunt@nescoe.com

-----  
1 NESCOE does not address here the characterizations about NESCOE organizationally, which are unsubstantiated, inaccurate, and exceedingly beyond the scope of this proceeding.

2 June 8 Letter at 2, 4-5.

3 Id. at 4-5.

4 NESCOE understands that some information on its website dates back to 2014 postings. NESCOE is in process of reworking its website, which should help avoid any confusion as to current and prior activities.

5 See [www.nescoe.com/uploads/6\\_State\\_Action\\_Plan\\_FINAL\\_4-22-15\\_1-5.40\\_pf.pdf](http://www.nescoe.com/uploads/6_State_Action_Plan_FINAL_4-22-15_1-5.40_pf.pdf). The six New England Governors concurrently issued a joint statement on “Regional Cooperation on Energy Infrastructure,” available at <http://governor.nh.gov/media/news/2015/documents/pr-2015-04-23-new-england-governors-statement.pdf>.

**20150629-0023(30691221).pdf**

Hand written FERC Comment form, Charles & Denise Mayrer, PO Box 101, 397 Burden Lane Road, East Schodack, NY 12063, Opposing

**20150629-0027(30682140).pdf**

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: 6/15/2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

840 Starch Mill Rd, Mason, NH

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Gary R. Elsworth

**20150629-0028(30682522).pdf**

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: 6/15/2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

455 Jackson Rd, Mason, NH 03048

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Anna M. Faiello

**20150629-0029(30682377).pdf**

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: June 15, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

Lot D-23 Starch Mill Rd and

Sand Pit Road Mason, NH 03048

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Darrell J. Scott

**20150629-0030(30682397).pdf**

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: June 15, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

304 Old County Rd, Mason, NH 03048

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Carol J. Iodice

**20150629-0031(30682398).pdf**

PROPERTY ACCESS DENIED

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: 6/22/15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

RE: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

Street Address: 260 Athol Rd  
Town & Zip: Richmons, NH 03470  
Map & Lot Number(s) (if known)

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Lynn M. Mason

CC:

FERC

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

**20150629-0032(30682476).pdf**

Kinder Morgan /Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, Ma 01001  
Re: Rescinding Prnproperty Access

June 19, 2015

As the owners of property located at:

214 Shufelt Road  
Nassau, New York 12123  
Map/Block/Lot 210.-4-8.2

We are rescinding permission previously granted to TGP/Kinder Morgan, and its subsidiaries and affiliated entities, including without limitation Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company and its subsidiaries and related entities, as well as NYSEG, National Grid or other electric utility company with whom any of them co-locate or propose to co-locate any pipeline, and their representatives and contractors, to enter my property identified above, to perform surveys or for any other purpose (other than for access by my utility company directly related to the supply of electricity to my property) without prior written notice specifying the purpose of such access and my express consent.

Any physical entry onto our property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Craig Cahill      Patricia M. Cahill

CC:

General Counsel National Grid  
General Counsel NYSEG  
Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary FERC

**20150629-0033(30682521).pdf**

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: 6-15-2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

958 Starch Mill Rd  
Mason, NH 03048

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter fonvard will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Robert B. Larochele  
Dianna Larochele

**20150629-0034(30682606).pdf**

1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: 6-15-15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

339 Nutting Hill Rd  
Mason, NH 03048

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Joseph W. McGuire

**20150629-0035(30682618).pdf**

Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield St  
Agwam, MA 01001

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr., Deputy Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

Date: 6/22/2015

RE: Denying property access

FERC PF 14-22 Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Project

As the owner of the property located at

198 Poyneer Rd, Nassau, NY 12123

I am denying permission to Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land to perform surveys, or for any other purpose.

Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Brenda M. Jenkins & Mark E Jenkins

**20150629-0036(30683827).pdf**

Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield St  
Agwam, MA 01001

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr., Deputy Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

Date: 6/21/2015

RE: Denying property access

FERC PF 14-22 Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Project

As the owner of the property located at

121 Slivico Rd, Nassau, NY 12123

I am denying permission to Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land to perform surveys, or for any other purpose.

Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Bryan Bulan

**20150629-0037(30682131).pdf**

Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield St  
Agwam, MA 01001

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr., Deputy Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

Date: 6-22-2015

RE: Denying property access

FERC PF 14-22 Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Project

As the owner of the property located at  
193 Radley Rd, Averill Park, NY

I am denying permission to Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land to perform surveys, or for any other purpose.

Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Raymond S. Gamache / Kathryn E. Gamache

**20150629-0039(30682342).pdf**

Dear Ms. Bose:

I am writing this letter as a concerned resident of New Hampshire. The more I look into the facts surrounding the pipeline the more afraid I become for our great state so many accidents, and violations on other projects by Kidder Morgan. So many people against them from places where they have already been gas leaks, fires. Compression stations on utube who would want that near their home. Plus more important we will not get the benefit of this gas they will just go through our state destroy land bring down value of homes, add carbon monoxide into atmosphere global warming. Health issues infertility, birth defects, cancer, to name a few. This is not good for us we have many tourists who come to our state they don't want to come and see a compression station with a blow down in progress with the loud noises and lights going off. We are going to lose money from that plus people will lose the value on their homes. Please don't let Kidder Morgan win they will ruin this state pollute the water nd in many towns that have wells do the research this is not a good thing. Please help us save this beautiful state from the likes of kidder Morgan.

Thank you,

Michele Napolitano

**20150629-0045(30682488).pdf**

June 15, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose

Secretary Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room IA  
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas pipeline Northeast Expansion project Northeast Energy Direct, pF14-22-000

Dear Secretary Bose

I am writing to you to request a scoping meeting be held in the Town of Mason, NH for the Kinder-Morgan / TGP NED pipeline project. There are several reasons why a scoping meeting should be held in Mason. They are, and are not limited to:

1. We are the only town along the proposed pipeline route that is tri-sected by the main pipeline and the lateral. This will have a MAJOR impact on our community.
2. The lateral section is not associated with any co-location —damaging a huge swath of “greenfield” area.
3. Because we’re a small town, an exceptionally high percentage of properties in town are impacted.
4. Mason has a high proportion of known shallow-to-bedrock soils requiring extensive blasting in combination with total dependence of homes and businesses on private, drilled wells; most of which are drilled in bedrock and of low capacity.
5. The “Lateral” runs through the Town of Mason’s primary aquifer.
6. This pipeline is planned to pass through several conservations lands, some with complex deed restrictions, etc.
7. The heavily forested Town of Mason’s volunteer fire department is simply not equipped to handle consequences of a large fire. In 1927 a fire burned 16,000 acres in the area, including many in Mason.
8. The Town of Mason is a town of many dirt roads and low capacity roads. A pipeline construction project of this size will take a heavy toll on our roads.
9. The Town of Mason has a sparse road system —originally developed over 250 years ago. There is very little redundancy to provide alternate escape routes during a period of crisis.
10. Mason is a Town of very steep terrain (640’ elevation changes along pipeline pathway) making access for wildfire suppression difficult.

For these reasons as well as others we strongly request FERC hold a scoping Mason in and specifically for the Town of Mason, NH.

Joseph W. McGuire  
339 Nutting Hill Rd  
Mason, NH 03048

**20150629-0046(30682519).pdf**

June 15, 2015

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

Re: Tennessee Gas pipeline Northeast Expansion project Northeast Energy Direct, pF14-22-000

Dear Secretary Bose

I am writing to you to request a scoping meeting be held in the Town of Mason, NH for the Kinder-Morgan / TGP NED pipeline project. There are several reasons why a scoping meeting should be held in Mason. They are, and are not limited to:

1. We are the only town along the proposed pipeline route that is tri-sected by the main pipeline and the lateral. This will have a MAJOR impact on our community.

2. The lateral section is not associated with any co-location —damaging a huge swath of “greenfield” area.
3. Because we’re a small town, an exceptionally high percentage of properties in town are impacted.
4. Mason has a high proportion of known shallow-to-bedrock soils requiring extensive blasting in combination with total dependence of homes and businesses on private, drilled wells; most of which are drilled in bedrock and of low capacity.
5. The “Lateral” runs through the Town of Mason’s primary aquifer.
6. This pipeline is planned to pass through several conservations lands, some with complex deed restrictions, etc.
7. The heavily forested Town of Mason’s volunteer fire department is simply not equipped to handle consequences of a large fire. In 1927 a fire burned 16,000 acres in the area, including many in Mason.
8. The Town of Mason is a town of many dirt roads and low capacity roads. A pipeline construction project of this size will take a heavy toll on our roads.
9. The Town of Mason has a sparse road system —originally developed over 250 years ago. There is very little redundancy to provide alternate escape routes during a period of crisis.
10. Mason is a Town of very steep terrain (640’ elevation changes along pipeline pathway) making access for wildfire suppression difficult.

For these reasons as well as others we strongly request FERC hold a scoping Mason in and specifically for the Town of Mason, NH.

William G. Fritz  
 304 Old County Rd  
 Mason, NH

**20150629-0047(30683869).pdf**

June 15, 2015

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

Re: Tennessee Gas pipeline Northeast Expansion project Northeast Energy Direct, pF14-22-000

Dear Secretary Bose

I am writing to you to request a scoping meeting be held in the Town of Mason, NH for the Kinder-Morgan / TGP NED pipeline project. There are several reasons why a scoping meeting should be held in Mason. They are, and are not limited to:

1. We are the only town along the proposed pipeline route that is tri-sected by the main pipeline and the lateral. This will have a MAJOR impact on our community.
2. The lateral section is not associated with any co-location —damaging a huge swath of “greenfield” area.
3. Because we’re a small town, an exceptionally high percentage of properties in town are impacted.
4. Mason has a high proportion of known shallow-to-bedrock soils requiring extensive blasting in combination with total dependence of homes and businesses on private, drilled wells; most of which are drilled in bedrock and of low capacity.
5. The “Lateral” runs through the Town of Mason’s primary aquifer.
6. This pipeline is planned to pass through several conservations lands, some with complex deed restrictions, etc.
7. The heavily forested Town of Mason’s volunteer fire department is simply not equipped to handle conse-

quences of a large fire. In 1927 a fire burned 16,000 acres in the area, including many in Mason.

8. The Town of Mason is a town of many dirt roads and low capacity roads. A pipeline construction project of this size will take a heavy toll on our roads.

9. The Town of Mason has a sparse road system — originally developed over 250 years ago. There is very little redundancy to provide alternate escape routes during a period of crisis.

10. Mason is a Town of very steep terrain (640' elevation changes along pipeline pathway) making access for wildfire suppression difficult.

For these reasons as well as others we strongly request FERC hold a scoping Mason in and specifically for the Town of Mason, NH.

John Lewicke  
928 Starch Mill Rd  
Mason, NH 03048

**20150629-0048(30682288).pdf**

134 Clarks Chapel Rd.  
Nassau, NY 12123

June 18, 2015

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
888 First Street NE RM1A  
Washington, D.C. 20426

RE: FERC Docket Number: PF14-22

Dear Kimberly D. Bose:

Kinder Morgan announced that the hamlet of Clarks Chapel/Miller's Corners is a proposed site for a massive multi-turbine gas compressor station. The construction and operation of such an industrial gas compressor station in a rural residential zone is contrary to Town laws as well as the Town of Nassau Comprehensive Plan as developed and approved by the community in July 2011.

Unlike other locations, this project is being proposed in a hamlet community which, while not only contrary to town laws, is an affront to residents that have invested in the rural residential character of this community.

The Town of Nassau has formally and unanimously opposed this proposal. As home owners on Clarks Chapel Rd., we are firmly against the proposal to build a compressor station on our street. Our property will not only lose its value, but emissions will destroy our air quality and pose a considerable health risk to us.

Please help force Kinder Morgan to choose another location that is NOT in a residential location.

Thank you very much,  
Sara and Bob Schuman

**20150629-0049(30683864).pdf**

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

June 19, 2015

Re: Northeast Energy Direct Docket 1PF14-22

I am opposed to the construction of this new pipeline. My wife and I have lived here for 21 years and love the town and the people who live here. However, I feel that I have to make the following comments regarding Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company (TGPC) / Kinder Morgan and how it will affect my family.

I have experienced TGPC) / Kinder Morgan's ineptitude and lack of honesty first hand.

On May 1, 2014 I was approached by a representative TGPC/ Kinder Morgan for permission to enter my premises (land) for the purpose of a survey. The Land Agent a James B Considine said that the TGPC needed to survey to determine where the new pipe would be placed along the existing pipeline. He said that I was not on his list of property owners who abut the existing pipeline ROW. He only stopped because as he was driving by he saw my house next to the pipeline. He never said that this new pipe would be a 36 inch pipe (verses the 2-24 inch pipes that were already in the ground). He also didn't say that the new (larger) pipe would be transporting over 2.2 Billion cubic feet of hydro-fractured gas at a tremendously higher pressure of 1,460 PSI from Pennsylvania thru New York to Dracut, Mass. Had he told me that the new gas being transmitted thru my land was hydro-fractured gas I would never signed the permission paper. I have written Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company / Kinder Morgan rescinding my permission to enter my property.

I know from watching the news and reading news articles about Hydro-fractured gas that it is more volatile than the current gas being transmitted thru the current pipes in the pipeline and the gas will be under much more pressure (1,460PSI) than the current gas being transmitted. The current plan to run these new deadlier gas pipes thru my property has me SCARED. I am scared that my family and I could be incinerated at any time. There is a high possibility that the new pipe could rupture and the current protocol from the TGPC / Kinder Morgan is not to have local or any other fire department respond if there is a rupture, explosion or fire. Their theory is to just let the gas burn itself out. The current pipeline standards are a lot less stringent in rural areas than in urban areas. I guess United States citizens who reside in suburban or rural areas are somehow second class citizens when it comes to safety and highly volatile gas transmission s.

Scared, because I saw my house as an investment in my wife's and my future retirement plans. However, if you allow this pipe to be run alongside the existing pipeline our house will be worthless. The other residents in the town will have to pay more than their fair share of property & school taxes and our town would not continue to grow. Will TGPC / Kinder Morgan pay me for the current value of my home? I feel that TGPC / Kinder Morgan are violating my 5<sup>th</sup> amendment rights:

“Amendment V

No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation.”

If pipeline project is approved I will be deprived life, liberty, and property, without due process. Is FERC my due process? I don't think so! I don't believe our founding Fathers saw FERC as providing any citizen of the United States due process. If project is approved my property will be worthless which means I won't receive just compensation. Which is another violation of my 5<sup>th</sup> amendment rights “nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation.” It should be noted that my property would not be taken for public use but for Corporate use. There is no case that this pipeline is for the public good. It most certainly is not for residents in New York, Massachusetts or New Hampshire. It is only good if you are Kinder Morgan or citizens of other countries they will export the gas to. I don't believe the 5<sup>th</sup> amendment protects Corporations or citizen of other countries.

Scared because of chemicals that are used during hydraulic fracturing and chemicals used at the compressor stations to clean the insides of the new deadly pipe, will be disposed of onsite and since the pipeline and potentially the compressor station is located over the town aquifer. Scared that our wells will become polluted and poisoned and therefore we would become poisoned by the cleaning chemicals. Even the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is not aware of what the chemicals TGPC / Kinder Morgan are using. In 2005, the Bush/Cheney Energy Bill (among the many dubious provisions in the energy bill was one dubbed the Halliburton loophole, which was inserted at the behest of then-Vice President Dick Cheney, a former

chief executive of Halliburton) exempted natural gas drilling from the Safe Drinking Water Act. It exempts companies from disclosing the chemicals used during hydraulic fracturing. Essentially, the provision took the EPA off the job.

I always thought that elected officials were supposed to look out for the common man but I guess profit over protection wins out.

Scared because there is no recourse from federal governmental agencies who should be protecting citizens from unsafe pipelines lack the jurisdiction to stop such from being constructed in the first place.

Introduced on May 9, 2013, the Fracturing Responsibility and Awareness of Chemicals Act of 2013, was sponsored by Diana DeGette (D-Co) and S9 other co-sponsors one of whom is Congressman Chris Gibson (R-NY). (To see what representative were a co-sponsor go to link <http://www.opensecrets.org/lobby/bills/soons.oh?id=hr1921-113>.) It would close the loophole and restore the E.P.A.'s rightful authority to regulate hydraulic fracturing. It would also require the oil and gas industry to disclose the chemicals they use. The industry argues that the chemicals are proprietary secrets and that disclosing them would hurt their competitiveness. It also argues that the process is basically safe and that regulating it would deter domestic production. But if hydraulic fracturing is as safe as the industry says it is, why should it fear regulation?

To see Lobbyist for and against the bill and how much they spent go to this link:

<http://www.opensecrets.org/lobby/billlob.oh?id=hr1921-113>.

Some organizations listed were Independent Petroleum Assn of America, Chesapeake Energy, Marathon OII, Sempra Energy, Sierra Club, Environmental Working Group, Food & Water Watch, National Ground Water Assn, League of Conservation Voters, Southern Environmental Law Center, Earth justice Legal Defense Fund to name a few.

According to [www.govtrack.us](http://www.govtrack.us) (link <https://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/113/hr1921>), there have been no votes related to this bill.

I implore you not to violate my rights and please do not allow the construction of this pipeline literally through my backyard.

I thank you for your attention into this matter.

Sincerely,

Craig Cahill  
214 Shufelt Road  
Nassau, New York 12123

CC:

United State Senator Charles E. Schumer  
United States Senator Kirsten E. Gillibrand  
Congressman Chris Gibson  
NYS Senator Kathleen A. Marchione  
NYS Assemblyman Steven McLaughlin

**20150629-0056(30681293).pdf**

June 22, 2015

Dear Congresswoman Kuster,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Congresswoman, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England. We believe it will harm the communities in southern NH.

Though the pipeline will not be going through Temple, about 200 houses in Temple, including our family home, will be within a two-mile radius of the compressor station on the SKAT land in New Ipswich.

While the pipeline is a large issue, the compressor station is an even larger one. The proposed compressor

station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent “blow downs” where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline.

These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station —again my family’s house —along with many others including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby!

The property values near this compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit including my home in New Ipswich!

Congresswoman Kuster, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

*signature not legible*

cc: FERC

**20150629-0057(30681854).pdf**

June 22, 2015

Dear Congressman Guinta,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Congressman, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England. We believe it will harm the communities in southern NH.

Though the pipeline will not be going through Temple, about 200 houses in Temple, including our family home, will be within a two-mile radius of the compressor station on the SKAT land in New Ipswich.

While the pipeline is a large issue, the compressor station is an even larger one. The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent “blow downs” where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline.

These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station —again my family’s house —along with many others including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby!

The property values near this compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit including my home in New Ipswich!

Congressman Guinta, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

*signature not legible*

cc: FERC

**20150629-0058(30681577).pdf**

June 22, 2015

Dear Senator Ayotte,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Senator, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England. We believe it will harm the communities in southern NH.

Though the pipeline will not be going through Temple, about 200 houses in Temple, including our family home, will be within a two-mile radius of the compressor station on the SKAT land in New Ipswich.

While the pipeline is a large issue, the compressor station is an even larger one. The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent “blow downs” where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline.

These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station —again my house —along with many others including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby!

The property values near this compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit including my home in New Ipswich!

I personally because of noise pollution and health issues would lose everything!

Senator Ayotte, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

*signature not legible*

cc: FERC

**20150629-0059(30684134).pdf**

June 22, 2015

Dear Governor Hassan,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Governor, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England. We believe it will harm the communities in southern NH.

Though the pipeline will not be going through Temple, about 200 houses in Temple, including our family home, will be within a two-mile radius of the compressor station on the SKAT land in New Ipswich.

While the pipeline is a large issue, the compressor station is an even larger one. The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent “blow downs” where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline.

These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station —again my house —along with many others including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby!

The property values near this compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit including my home in New Ipswich!

I personally because of noise pollution and health issues would lose everything!

Governor Hassan, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,  
*signature not legible*  
cc: FERC

**20150629-0060(30681565).pdf**

June 22, 2015

Dear Congresswoman Kuster,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Congresswoman, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England. We believe it will harm the communities in southern NH.

Though the pipeline will not be going through Temple, about 200 houses in Temple, including our family home, will be within a two-mile radius of the compressor station on the SKAT land in New Ipswich.

While the pipeline is a large issue, the compressor station is an even larger one. The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent “blow downs” where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline.

These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station —again my family’s house —along with many others including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby!

The property values near this compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit including my home in New Ipswich!

Congresswoman Kuster, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,  
*signature not legible*  
cc: FERC

**20150629-0061(30681591).pdf**

June 22, 2015

Dear Congressman Guinta,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Congressman, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England. We believe it will harm the communities in southern NH.

Though the pipeline will not be going through Temple, about 200 houses in Temple, including our family home, will be within a two-mile radius of the compressor station on the SKAT land in New Ipswich.

While the pipeline is a large issue, the compressor station is an even larger one. The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent “blow downs” where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline.

These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station —again my house —along with many others including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the

ground along with anyone nearby!

The property values near this compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit including my home in New Ipswich!

I personally because of noise pollution and health issues w'ould lose everything!

Congressman Guinta, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

*signature not legible*

cc: FERC

**20150629-0062(30681850).pdf**

June 22, 2015

Dear Senator Ayotte,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Senator, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England. We believe it will harm the communities in southern NH.

Though the pipeline will not be going through Temple, about 200 houses in Temple, including our family home, will be within a two-mile radius of the compressor station on the SKAT land in New Ipswich.

While the pipeline is a large issue, the compressor station is an even larger one. The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent "blow downs" where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline.

These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station —again my family's house —along with many others including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby!

The property values near this compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit including my home in New Ipswich!

Senator Ayotte, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

Nat & Holly Crook

cc: FERC

**20150629-0063(30681843).pdf**

June 22, 2015

Dear Senator Shaheen,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Senator, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England. We believe it will harm the communities in southern NH.

Though the pipeline will not be going through Temple, about 200 houses in Temple, including our family home, will be within a two-mile radius of the compressor station on the SKAT land in New Ipswich.

While the pipeline is a large issue, the compressor station is an even larger one. The proposed compressor

station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent “blow downs” where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline.

These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station —again my family’s house —along with many others including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby!

The property values near this compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit including my home in New Ipswich!

Senator Shaheen, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

Nat & Holly Crook

cc: FERC

**20150629-0064(30680146).pdf**

June 22, 2015

Dear Congressman Guinta,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Congressman, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England. We believe it will harm the communities in southern NH.

Though the pipeline will not be going through Temple, about 200 houses in Temple, including our family home, will be within a two-mile radius of the compressor station on the SKAT land in New Ipswich.

While the pipeline is a large issue, the compressor station is an even larger one. The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent “blow downs” where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline.

These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station —again my family’s house —along with many others including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby!

The property values near this compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit including my home in New Ipswich!

Congressman Guinta, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

Nat & Holly Crook

cc: FERC

**20150629-0065(30680147).pdf**

June 22, 2015

Dear Congresswoman Kuster,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Congresswoman, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England. We believe it will harm the communities in southern NH.

Though the pipeline will not be going through Temple, about 200 houses in Temple, including our family home, will be within a two-mile radius of the compressor station on the SKAT land in New Ipswich.

While the pipeline is a large issue, the compressor station is an even larger one. The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent “blow downs” where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline.

These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station —again my family’s house —along with many others including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby!

The property values near this compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit including my home in New Ipswich!

Congresswoman Kuster, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

Nat & Holly Crook

cc: FERC

**20150629-0066(30681852).pdf**

June 22, 2015

Dear Governor Hassan,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Governor, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England. We believe it will harm the communities in southern NH.

Though the pipeline will not be going through Temple, about 200 houses in Temple, including our family home, will be within a two-mile radius of the compressor station on the SKAT land in New Ipswich.

While the pipeline is a large issue, the compressor station is an even larger one. The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent “blow downs” where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline.

These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station —again my family’s house —along with many others including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby!

The property values near this compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit including my home in New Ipswich!

Governor Hassan, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

Nat & Holly Crook

cc: FERC

**20150629-0067(30681856).pdf**

June 22, 2015

Dear Senator Shaheen,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Senator, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England. We believe it will harm the communities in southern NH.

Though the pipeline will not be going through Temple, about 200 houses in Temple, including our family home, will be within a two-mile radius of the compressor station on the SKAT land in New Ipswich.

While the pipeline is a large issue, the compressor station is an even larger one. The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent “blow downs” where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline.

These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station —again my house —along with many others including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby!

The property values near this compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit including my home in New Ipswich!

I personally because of noise pollution and health issues would lose everything!

Senator Shaheen, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

*signature not legible*

cc: FERC

**20150629-0069(30681938).pdf**

Hand written card, Michele Bernier, 121 Old Wilton Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, opposing

**20150629-0070(30681936).pdf**

Hand written card, Timothy Somero, 42 Old Tenney Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, opposing

**20150629-0071(30681893).pdf**

Hand written card, David A. Durocher, 556 NH Rt 101, Temple, NH 03084, opposing.

**20150629-0072(30681915).pdf**

Hand written card, A llan Oxman, 288 Fish Rd, Temple, NH 03084, opposing.

**20150629-0073(30682040).pdf**

Hand written card, Jean Thibodeau, 30 Fisk Hill Rd, Temple, NH 03084, opposing.

**20150629-0074(30681866).pdf**

Hand written card, Paul Stevens, 156 Timbertop Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, opposing

**20150629-0075(30682129).pdf**

Hand written card, Paul Stevens, 156 Timbertop Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, opposing

**20150629-0076(30682127).pdf**

Hand written card, Priscilla A. Weston, 79 Colburn Rd, Apt A, Temple, NH 03084, opposing.

**20150629-0077(30682128).pdf**

Hand written card, Paul Stevens, 156 Timbertop Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, opposing

**20150629-0080(30682132).pdf**

Hand written card, Paul Stevens, 156 Timbertop Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, opposing

**20150629-5004(30674475).txt**

hua zhao, Dracut, MA.

Dear Federal Energy Regulatory Commission:

As a new resident of the town of Dracut, Massachusetts, I have yet to be shown evidence of a domestic need for gas that justifies need for gas that justifies a new 36 inch natural gas pipeline with its accompanying 23,000 HP compressor station proposed by the Kinder Morgan-Tennessee Gas Corporation pumping what we are told will push 2.2 billion cubic feet of gas per day through the Town of Dracut.

The location of said proposed pipeline mega-plex slated to traverse existing heavily populated neighborhood, prime farm land, conservation land, a golf course and to be co-located near places of assembly (St. Francis Church, Campbell School) has resulted in much uproar throughout East Dracut. Among many impacted areas, Meadow Creek community is a newly developed residency area consisting of more than 170 houses.

As a new home owner of a Meadow Creek community, I am very concerned about effects of a compressor station which is expected to introduce a blast impact radius (some call an "incineration corridor"), noise, air pollution, and stadium type industrial lighting guaranteed to impact our health, lifestyle, and well-being along with diminished property values. The last impact radius includes a reservation land, and a gold course. In additions, I am concerned that industrializing Dracut to this level as we are a town gifted with active farms including our own family farm (Saja Farm) which produces each season, thousands of pounds of produce for local markets and beyond.

Would you please hasten your efforts to address per and post install concerns of such a pipeline project, why the need, how we expect to live amongst the displacement, this permanent industrial expanse, including further encroachment of power line easements, with the feeling that we have destroyed a colonial town motif and forever disrupted preserved lands that were to benefit future generations?

This pipeline compressure station is just located in our community over 170 homes with high residential property density.

Before issuing any certificate to a corporation of this type, please think long and hard. Please do not ruin our lives, our properties, our farm lands, our homes, our long term lifelong investments, our livelihood, our children's futures, and our town.

We can't handle this type of impact.

Sincerely,

Hua Zhao

**20150629-5017(30674501).txt**

deborah pomerleau, Londonderry, NH.

I was sad to hear that FERC has only approved scoping meetings for individual counties rather than for individual towns. Mason has the 2 pipelines to consider. New Ipswich has the compressor station to consider. Compare them to Londonderry's soccer fields and apple orchards, these large meetings will be ok, but not ideal. Really every town should have their own scoping meeting. I am from Mason, went to high school in New Ipswich, have friends who live in Greenville, and now live in Londonderry. This all saddens me so much. I really wish this pipeline wasn't happening.

The NEED for the pipeline just doesn't exist. KM WANTS it for profit. We just don't HAVE THE NEED for this much extra gas. What is also strange is that the gas will come up into NH then down into Dracut, and then back up into NH for delivery? Most towns don't have the street to street gas pipes ready for individual house delivery. Only Nashua does in some parts, I believe. This whole thing doesn't make sense for NH citizens.

I am concerned about property values, tourism, water, air pollution, etc. The list of concerns is endless. Please don't approve this pipeline.

**20150629-5030(30674527).txt**

Katharine Gregg, Mason, NH.

I came away from my latest Kinder Morgan open house the other evening with a decidedly sinking feeling. One of the Kinder Morgan reps answering questions was clearly intelligent and well-informed. His answers were thoughtful and complete. He was no liar, nor con man. The conclusion I was left with is a simple one: The company he represents wants one thing, and the citizens of the towns along the southern New Hampshire border want another. The trouble is, in a society and with a government where capital and profit reign supreme Kinder Morgan holds the trump cards, and we citizens haven't much to fight with.

Unless we can show that the need and the profit might not be there. Here we may have some ammunition.

I asked the rep why Kinder Morgan had decided to abandon the proposed lateral pipeline in central Massachusetts. The answer was that the need expected from an industrial complex near Worcester hadn't materialized. Then I said, How about the Fitchburg lateral? That one's still "a go," he said, unless the need proves insufficient there too.

The primary energy utility in the Fitchburg area is the Fitchburg Gas and Electric Light Company, which merged in 1992 with Unitil. They buy their natural gas from Kinder Morgan. But where is the great and increasing need in an area that isn't growing either in industry or residential customers? At this time Fitchburg is under contract with Kinder Morgan to buy something like 0.02 billion cubic feet of gas a day and apparently isn't interested in buying a larger quantity.

I also learned at that meeting that Kinder Morgan needs a total sign on from companies of between 1.5 and 2 bcf a day in order to file for their certificate of need and convenience with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) next September—and begin construction. The KM rep acknowledged that as of now they have only signed on .5 bcf.

So maybe there is hope: Lack of need could be a trump card for us.

And what about New Hampshire citizens, their need and profit? Well, the vast majority of southern New Hampshire is rural and therefore uses propane, not natural gas. Count out increased need for these folks—to say nothing of profit!

But the governor and lawmakers talk about need and profit for the state as a whole. New business will be attracted to the state by a greater availability of natural gas. Make gas available: Business will come. But be careful! That's not what's happening in central Massachusetts.

Construction jobs will be created. But the jobs will only last as long as the construction. Maintenance of the

pipeline will need specialized professionals.

Electric utility rates will be lowered. H'm. Many New Hampshire residents remember the promises of Seabrook, but rates went up from construction costs and maintenance problems. Ratepayers can already see their rates going up to pay for pipeline construction and maintenance costs.

Profits we can count on? We don't see them.

Oh, one more thing. An ad is running on WMUR: a soft-spoken woman, voice over soothing music, showing iconic New Hampshire landscape, congratulating us on getting rid of ugly smokestacks, working in her lovely garden—but wait! Where's the clear cutting, the bulldozers, the gigantic rounds of steel pipe? Not in this lady's backyard! (Paid for by the Coalition to Lower Energy Costs.)

The profits being offering are only potential not guaranteed, but the losses to the people impacted by this project are guaranteed to be profoundly real and lasting.

### **20150629-5044(30674555).txt**

Timothy Somero, New Ipswich, NH.

We need a scoping meeting in New Ipswich, Temple, Greenville, and Mason NH as participants in an equal, adequate, and comprehensive process established by the FERC.

The planned compressor station site poses numerous and complicated aspects that require time and attention to develop a comprehensive, planned response.

Briefly, the site is:

- Within a half-mile of the Temple NH elementary school
- Adjacent to a thriving organic beef business
- On the same parcel containing a brownfield site (lead shot, old shooting range)
- On the watershed for the Greenville NH reservoir (their primary source of domestic water)
- Dividing the primary path (Route 45) for joint Temple-Greenville police and emergency services
- A half-mile from a convalescent home for nuns.
- in the path of prevailing winds that affect New Ipswich, Temple, Greenville, and Mason

We're doing our best to communicate with FERC to get a level playing field in this process. Our affected land-owners were notified on June 2nd by Kinder Morgan of the compressor station site and we are scrambling to get in touch with affected land owners and focus our efforts to inform our friends and family.

We hope that our fellow Americans at FERC appreciate that we citizens are volunteering in this effort in addition to the personal demands of work, family, volunteerism, and typical community activities.

On the other hand KM appears to have vast economic resources and political influence. We have nothing but our personal earnings, wits, guts, courage, and love for ourselves, our families, and community.

We owe it to every resident in these four towns to follow a comprehensive and adequate FERC process so we get enough information to make personal, community, and town-wide decisions to plan for the worst while we hope for the best.

From researching other American cities and towns who were plagued by the surprise of a similar unwelcome guest, we see that alternative sites are welcomed.

That is reasonable.

However, neither of these four towns has a need nor provides a reasonable market for natural gas providers to deliver this natural resource to our homes and business.

Would you agree that our communities have no reasonable prior knowledge or experience with natural gas?

If it is a requirement that a huge conglomerate has to capitalize on our wits, guts, and courage for a suggested site alternative, I will participate in that (although the very concept seems silly).

In the meantime, we need to plan for the worst and need more time and dialog to consider at a minimum the following for each of our towns:

- environmental impact
- economic impact
- health impact (do we need to baseline the health of all residents?)
- tax base changes due to deflation in local housing market
- potential litigation expenses against KM who has not been forthright nor respectable in its business practices (no glimmer of hope, in other words, for reasonable business dealings, do we escrow legal funds to be at the ready? I thought that this happened at the end of a marriage, not in courtship...)
- accuracy in bonding for potential road damage or other damage from construction and operation
- the 5-, 10-, 15-, and 20-year costs of a drastic change in our community
- local tax code changes so that we have a remote opportunity for accurate taxation to offset expenses
- many, many, many more...

I am surely rehashing known issues to FERC and Kinder Morgan. We however, are collectively reeling.

My hope is that this message is heard and there is a response to a simple question with due respect of FERC and the hope of consistent, nationwide American ideals.

When will New Ipswich, Temple, Greenville, and Mason each have a scoping meeting?

We need time and opportunity to respond.

Sincerely,

Timothy Somero  
New Ipswich, NH

**20150629-5046(30674559).txt**

Sean Radcliffe, Temple, NH.

Date 6/28/2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr., Deputy Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

RE:Docket No. PF14-22-000

I received a letter from Kinder Morgan detailing the location of the Compressor station slated for the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline in New Ipswich, NH. My house will be within 1000 feet of the compressor station.

I have several concerns due to this compressor station.

There will be ongoing effects to living within 1000 feet of a 80,000 HP compressor station:

Well water. Like several residents living within close proximity to the proposed New Ipswich compressor station, I have a dug (not drilled) well. Dug wells are more sensitive to and are recharged by local surface wetlands. My well is only 25 feet deep. My neighbors well is even shallower. In our experience these wells have never gone dry and have extremely clean water. The compressor station is uphill from our homes and wells. Water tends to run north from wooded land where the compressor station is proposed across Mountain View Road, through our properties towards tributaries to the Greenville Reservoir. The compressor station could affect the quality and flow of our wells due to it's presence uphill from our wells.

Sound pollution. Compressor stations can be very loud. There will be only a thin strip of woods separating

the compressor station from my house (within the 1000 feet). Unless the compressor station is extremely sound proofed, the sound of the compressor station will make living on Mountain View Road extremely unpleasant. We typically enjoy hearing owls, tree frogs, coyotes, veeries and wood thrushes in these areas. We don't want the noise of a compressor station to drown the natural sounds we enjoy today. As well, the health effects of noise pollution is well documented. I don't want to learn how to cope with the dangers of noise pollution because of this compressor station.

Air pollution, exhaust. The New Ipswich compressor station is slated to be 80,000 HP, fueled by natural gas. We can only estimate what this would be by comparing to locomotive engines. 80,000 HP is equivalent to 15 to 20 locomotive engines. The air pollution from the exhaust from 20 locomotive engines would be something that would be noticeable within 1000 feet. This compressor station should have scrubbers for the exhaust.

Air pollution, blowdowns. The blowdowns for an 80K HP compressor station/36" 1400 PSI pipeline will be large and concentrated. Blowdowns will be mostly methane and methane should rise, not stay at ground level but there are other gases and substances in the fracked natural gas. For example, Radon is heavy and will drop to the ground. The radon gas could be travel downhill to our residences via air or water. There are many toxic chemicals that will be discharged in great quantities during a blowdown event. I don't understand why the blow downs are not captured in low pressure tanks rather than simply vented into the air.

Light pollution. I understand the compressor station will be have lights on 24x7. My neighbors and I have used telescopes to examine the night sky on clear nights. The light pollution due to the compressor station could completely destroy any nighttime viewing. I don't understand why a non-manned facility could not have motion and heat activated lights. Compressor stations shouldn't need to have lights on 24x7.

Vibration. The 80,000 HP compressors will be sitting on top of granite ledge. If the ledge vibrates, those vibrations could travel farther than anticipated, certainly vibrations could travel over 1000 feet. Continuous vibrations on a residence is both unhealthy and dangerous to the structure.

There will be short term effects of living near the construction of an 80,000 HP compressor station: The New Ipswich compressor station is slated to located between Rt 45 and Temple Rd in New Ipswich. Mountain View Road is the shortest public road connecting each side of the compressor station site. To travel on Mountain View road during the construction phase of the pipeline and compressor station will be increased and could affect day to day living. This could lead to more dust, noise and vibrations. All the homes on Mountain View Road have driveways with low visibility but there is relatively little traffic on Mountain View Road. With increased number of vehicles due to construction, dangerous traffic events are more likely.

There will be potential catastrophic event while living near an 80,000 HP compressor station: It appears there are explosions or events at compressor stations somewhere in USA at least once per year since year 2000. If there is any catastrophic event at the compressor station, our homes within 1000 feet will likely be affected. I understand the FERC will expect the compressor station to be built to safe standards. As this compressor station will be much larger than the average, any catastrophic event is likely to be larger as well. Lastly, if we have to evacuate our home, the Town of Temple's emergency shelter is also within the half mile radius of the compressor station. The town's emergency shelter may not be useable during any catastrophic event.

These concerns are real and potential. There are no reasons why new compressor stations could not be built to be quiet, clean and dark and safe.

Sincerely,

Sean Radcliffe

Colleen Pascu

45 Mountain View Road

Temple, NH 03084

**20150629-5056**

deborah pomerleau, Londonderry, NH.

Yes, it is me again. I just feel so passionate about this pipeline. I grew up in Mason. Quiet town. Lots of dirt roads. My dad even built a second house, after our first house burned down. I feel so lucky to have been raised there. Idealistic yes, realistic yes. Pros and cons of everywhere. Yet, this town with its history, forests, granite and streams is my home. I haven't lived there for 30+ years, but my dad is buried 3 miles down the road from where we lived. I love cities, like Boston, Denver, and San Francisco. BUT, I also value the importance of such small towns like Mason and Londonderry NH where I live now. These fragile tiny towns need protecting. We can grow out from Boston or Denver and even San Francisco into neighboring towns and cities. Tiny towns like Mason, New Ipswich (where I graduated from high school), Londonderry and Greenville, play an important role in the culture of our country. Our young country of 200+ years compared to the old countries of Europe. Mason has not changed one bit in 50+ years, except to make the public school grow larger, with slow additions to the complex. How rare is that? How truly wonderful that is. I remember Labor Day and Memorial Day parades with everyone being in the parade. No one watched. We all participated. I grew up thinking this was how a parade was supposed to be. We all joined in together. These pipelines will splinter these towns. There is no question about it. These pipelines will ruin the countryside. There is no question about it. These pipelines will jeopardize wells, rivers, streams, ponds, and lakes. There is no question about it. These pipelines will forever change the culture of these towns. There is no question about it.

Please don't approve this pipeline. Please don't approve the lateral pipeline for the north to south route in Mason. Please think of the future. Please think of children who could walk in a parade with the rest of the town. Please think beyond the "need" and "want" of a large corporation. Please. Don't approve this pipeline.

**20150629-5061(30674705).txt**

Robert J DeSimone, Dracut, MA.

June 29, 2015

Robert and Denise DeSimone

Dracut, MA.

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, N.E.  
Washington, D.C. 20426

RE: The Northeast Energy Direct, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Project, Docket # PF 14-22

Dear Ms. Bose:

We have been residents of 40 Blacksmith, Dracut, Massachusetts for over twenty years. We are opposed to any additional gas pipelines and/or compressor stations terminating or passing through our town. Dracut already has numerous gas pipelines meaning we are already actively contributing to the United States with the delivery of gas throughout the northeast. These current pipelines do not run at capacity. The proposed project (Docket # PF 14-22) calls for an immense 36" high-pressure pipeline, other pipelines ranging from 20-30", and a compressor station occupying several acres. We question the need for such a huge.

According to the Federal Pipeline & Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA), there has been an average of more than one "significant incident" a week along high pressure gas transmission lines nationwide since 2000. While the underground pipeline comes with these proven risks, the proposed compressor station locating in this heavily residential neighborhood with hundreds of people living within the incineration zone is deeply concerning. We will have fifty-six seconds to find safety in the event of an explosion. If you and your family lived for over twenty years in a beautiful community would you want to be affected

by such a project? Kinder Morgan is the company orchestrating this project. Understandably any company like Kinder Morgan would want to develop an efficient project at the least cost. We believe Kinder Morgan does not care about the safety of the residents. By siting a compressor station within a half mile of over 260 homes, three times the number of homes of any other compressor station planned for the project. This half-mile radius also includes one of our fire stations (located at the corner of Jones Ave and Broadway Road) and abuts our Police station. In the event of a catastrophic accident, how could our safety professionals respond if they too are in the midst of the incineration zone?

A pipeline of this size means a 100ft. land clearing and maintenance with pesticides drastically impacting Dracut farming and open space heritage. How will these changes impact our water and wildlife? Will underground water flows be disrupted? We have raised our four children in this town and chose it because of the character that comes with an intimate small town. This project will change the character of Dracut overnight, dramatically affecting quality of life and property values. We wonder if this project was proposed in the town you live, would you want to be faced with these challenges that come with this pipeline?

Kinder Morgan and similar companies exist for profit and that's the foundation of our capitalistic system but make us think that the Northeast Energy Direct, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Project, Docket # PF 14-22 is to handle the "growing U.S. demand". This project is for one reason, export. Exports deplete domestic supply and raise prices. Allowing a project of this kind to go forward basically sentences 262 families in Dracut to a future of living in mortal danger and we implore you to deny its approval not only for these families but for all of the families and communities this pipeline would impact.

Respectfully,

Robert and Denise DeSimone

**20150629-5097(30676456).pdf**

VILLI PONI FARM, NEWFOUNDLAND PONY PRESERVE

603-291-0424

[viliponifarm@me.com](mailto:viliponifarm@me.com)

171 Greenville Rd

PO Box 371

New Ipswich, NH

03071

[www.viliponifarm.org](http://www.viliponifarm.org)

June 29, 2015

FERC

888 First Street, NE, Room 1A

Washington, DC 20426

To whom it may concern:

Villi Poni Farm is a qualified charitable organization #46-1756998, established in January of 2103. Our mission is to protect and preserve the critically endangered Newfoundland Pony, a protected native species of which only 250 crucially important breeding ponies remain in the WORLD. This landrace animal was born of and created by the environment over 400 years, and as such is the LAST remaining native pony breed in the world that has not had its nature-made genetics altered. It is a walking time capsule of precious healthy genetics vital to the survival of the Species Equine in the event of a biological or environmental crisis.

In the 1980's, due to Government instituted fencing laws, lack of pasture, lack of knowledge and just plain greed, thousands of these ponies were slaughtered off nearly to extinction, many of their owners fooled into thinking they were going to good homes. Instead they went to European dinner plates.

Because this is a vital breed, one that nature created via survival of the fittest reproduction, it is significant. They are healthy, smart, sane, and willing. We know of no man-created horse breed that can even compare.

An effort was started in the late 1980's to revive the breed through conservation practices. Efforts have been difficult, once again due to lack of knowledge.

Villi Poni Farm has been evolving over the last 5 years. Currently 1/3 of the US Newfoundland Pony population resides here. In our herd, we carry one complete, very important and very rare bloodline. Sadly, of our many mares only two have any offspring to leave behind. Mares are in short order and breeding is mandatory to save the breed. We also took in a Stallion who was severely injured. He is permanently disabled, however pain free and able to breed. He has had only 1 foal, ever, and it is crucial he father more foals to leave behind. As you can see our herd is fragile and our mission is urgent.

A conservation approach is also mandatory to retain their survival traits and not alter the breed with numbers so low. It is genetically diverse and can recover however it seems everywhere we turn a new danger steps into our path to the future.

Enter Kinder Morgan. The preserve is located less than 1 mile from the site of the proposed Compressor. The preserve is also downwind from that site. We have done our homework and have found documented case studies of livestock within a 5 mile range of compressor stations suffering illness, sterilization and death from the airborne Toxins emitted on a regular basis from the Compressor.

We use a dug well to water the ponies. We have learned that dug wells are the most susceptible to toxins, generally from emissions.

The ponies graze here. We have learned that these toxins are found in forage.

The ponies breathe the air here. Obviously airborne toxic emissions will enter their lungs.

Kinder Morgan since 2011 has had 11 Compressor explosion/fire accidents! It's not news that they have a shoddy record. In the event of a leak, explosion, accident of any sort, we are unable to evacuate an entire herd. We are also unable to evacuate our damaged stallion as he requires a specially equipped animal ambulance to be transported.

This area is heavily forested and with the prevailing winds, our preserve and these protected native species landrace Ponies lives are in grave danger from this Compressor! This is simply UNACCEPTABLE.

We truly need to breed this year. We never know if our disabled stallion will survive another winter and our mares are aging, getting closer to being too old to breed. Gestation for a pony is almost one year. Because the sanctuary, the ponies and the surrounding area where we had hoped to find new homes is facing an environmental threat, we have had to put our entire breeding program ON HOLD! We simply cannot knowingly place pregnant mares and foals in danger. Clearly, halting our breeding program, and interfering with our documented mission to save this breed is beyond UNACCEPTABLE!

On top of the danger to the ponies, Villi Poni Farm has just started to make headway as a charity, just started to be recognized in the community and internationally. Two months ago we launched a conservation breeding program to cultivate conservation-knowledgeable homes in the area for the foals we will be creating.

We also are kicking off an Equine Assisted Learning program this August, using all Newfoundland Ponies as part of our educational portion of our mission, making it the only one of its kind in the entire world. Our goal is to promote the breed while providing key programs that focus on Leadership Skills, Anti-bullying, Anti-drug as well as others, for children and adults as part of our community outreach. Those programs cannot be held under the threat of toxin-spewing volatile compressor.

Five solid years of hard work, dedication, perseverance, and financial investment to get to where we are, and in the blink of an eye the sanctuary's ponies will be sterilized and/or killed. Our charitable organization will suffer financial ruin, and perhaps be forced to dissolve. All of this is simply because a compressor station for a pipeline that is not for local benefit and not necessary, is being forced into our area.

We want you to know that the loss of even ONE of our important ponies out of 250 will have a very serious impact on the future of this last remaining landrace breed. That is completely unforgivable. Canadian pony owners and authorities involved with rare breeds are watching this story unfold very carefully, and very upset.

We are trapped here now, much like the ponies were when they were hauled off the island of Newfoundland by the truckload to their deaths, driven by liars and greed. We don't have the finances to move and yet we can't stay or the ponies will be in grave danger.

Honestly we feel as is we waiting for the Kinder Morgan meat truck to pull up, driven by liars and greed, to exterminate what remains of this precious vitally important breed.

Is nothing sacred?

We have a saying here at Villi Poni Farm: "the Earth and Animals can survive just fine without People, but it is not the other way around."

Nature is the wisest of all, Nature always wins. In the end, as humans continue to cause death and destruction of this earth, Nature will step in and remove us, the noxious weeds, from her garden. This fracked gas assault on every living thing may be just what brings that about.

Emily Chetkowski, President

Villi Poni Farm,

Newfoundland Pony Preserve

New Ipswich, NH 03071

#### **20150629-5119(30676514).txt**

Debra Huffman, Merrimack, NH.

FERC has been made abundantly aware of the number of NH residents who wish to express concerns about the NED pipeline during your upcoming scoping meetings. I'm sure that you intend to provide ample opportunity for all residents' concerns to be heard, and therefore I assume you will be scheduling scoping meetings in all affected towns. To avoid a stampede at the Milford, NH scoping meeting, please announce the dates and locations for other scoping meetings. Thank you.

#### **20150629-5121(30676519).pdf**

Drummond & Woodsum  
Attorneys at Law

Joanna B. Tourangeau  
Admitted in ME, NH and MA  
207.253.0567 Direct  
jtourangeau@dwmlaw.com  
84 Marginal Way, Suite 600  
Portland, ME 04101-2480  
207.772.1941 Main  
207.772.3627 Fax

June 26, 2015

Patty Quinn, SR/WA, R/W-NAC

VIA Email: patty.quinn@kindermorgan.com

RE: Access by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC to property in The Town of Merrimack New Hampshire for the Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Ms. Quinn:

The **Town of Merrimack** has received the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC ("TGP") request for access to Town of Merrimack, New Hampshire ("Town") property for environmental and other surveys associated with the Northeast Energy Direct Project ("NED"). The town has prepared an access agreement setting forth the terms by which the town will allow such access. However, as discussed below that agreement is not yet final.

The Town also has multiple ordinance provisions applicable to TGP personnel access to town property including but not limited to opening of public ways. Such provisions must be complied with by all TGP

personnel regardless of the status of any access agreement entered into by the Town and TGP.

At this point in time, despite multiple attempts to contact you, the Town has received no response regarding the relatively minor outstanding issues in the draft access agreement. Until such time as the access agreement is final and TGP personnel have received any and all other applicable permits and/or approvals required under the Towns ordinances for their survey work, TGP personnel shall not undertake unauthorized access. Should TGP personnel ignore these requirements, their unauthorized access shall be prosecuted by the Town to the fullest extent of the law including involvement by the Town police.

We are aware and have clearly stated to you that such unauthorized access is denied and will be further reconsidered once the access agreement is finalized.

For your convenience some of the relevant ordinance provisions regarding access to public ways in Town are enclosed. Of course TGP personnel are responsible for reviewing and ensuring compliance with all applicable ordinance provisions.

Thank you for your assistance with this matter.

Sincerely,

Joanna B. Tourangeau

JBT/as

cc• Lori Ferry, Project Manager

#### Town of Merrimack road opening

##### § 169-1 Permit Required.

No person shall break or excavate the ground in any street, road, sidewalk, Town-owned land or common in the Town or construct/reconstruct/pave/repave any driveway connecting to a public street or erect any staging for building or deposit any building materials thereon or remove any building through any street or public place without first having received a written permit from the Director of Public Works or designee and complying in all respects with the conditions of said permit.

##### § 169-2 Authority to grant permit.

The Director of Public Works or his designated representative may grant a permit, in writing, to any person for building or removing any building or for any other lawful purpose to excavate, obstruct or encumber so much of any street, road, sidewalk or other public place in the Town as may be necessary for such purpose and on such terms as the Director or his designated representatives shall deem safe and proper.

##### § 169-3 Protection of public; restoration of property.

Whenever any street, road, sidewalk or other public place in the Town shall, under permit granted in the previous section, be excavated, obstructed, encumbered or otherwise rendered unsafe or inconvenient for travelers, the permittee shall erect and at all times maintain a suitable railing around the sections or parts of said area so excavated and shall keep two or more lighted fixtures attached thereto or in some proper manner. Within such reasonable time as the Director of Public Works or his designated representative shall direct, said permittee shall amend and repair such street, road, sidewalk or other public place to the acceptance of the Director or his designated representative.

##### § 169-7 Violations and penalties.

If any person shall violate the terms of this chapter, he shall be fined \$100. Each calendar day of violation shall be considered a separate offense.

**20150629-5130(30677266).txt**

gerry avitable, nassau, NY.

My family has lived on Clarks Chapel Rd in Nassau, NY for 36 yrs and have gladly accepted the inherent

inconvenience and cost because of the quiet , tranquility and natural environment.

Suddenly, ourselves and those in our neighborhood are faced with severe degradation of our environment and our investment for the economic convenience of Kinder Morgan , a company that proposes to pipe fracked natural gas from Pennsylvania through our rural countryside into Massachusetts.

Locating a 90,000 HP Compressor station in the middle of the neighborhood will go beyond the extensive disruption of the construction phase and result in a constant and endless source of air and noise pollution.

Ironically, our neighborhood has no access to natural gas for heating and is in a state where the Governor has taken a stand, foregoing the economic benefits of fracking in the interest of a better environment for families and children.

If the Nassau compressor station is allowed on the proposed site our property values will be significantly reduced, effectively stealing retirement savings from many of us.

The environmental quality many of us wanted for our children will be a memory, especially during the loud “blow offs” and the associated localized release of pollutants.

I’m not asking FERC to block this project, there is a suitable industrial zoned compressor site nearby with the only drawback seeming to be that it is not optimum for Kinder Morgan.

Not being able to enjoy the evening quiet that we have all worked for with <25 dba ambient replaced by a 24/7/365 55 dba whine would be a constant reminder of what our federal government didn’t do for individual taxpayers , preferring instead the incremental financial gain of a corporation.

**20150629-5132(30677974).txt**

gerry avitable, nassau, NY.

Kinder Morgan surprised us in Nassau with the new proposed route in January 2015, less than 6 months ago.

The most egregious part of the proposal. location of a 90000HP compressor station in a rural residential area was only made public on June 1.

Public review scheduled only 6 weeks later.

KMI has provided no information on noise or chemical pollution, impact on property values, degradation of the neighborhood during construction or maintenance to the citizens impacted.

KMI appears to be trying to rush the process to the detriment of the citizens of Nassau.

**20150629-5153(30678566).txt**

Jessica Cormier, New Ipswich, NH.

My husband Eric and I live slightly over 1/2 mile from the proposed compressor station to be built in New Ipswich. We also live thousands of feet from the path of the pipeline, but ARE NOT CONSIDERED AFFECTED LANDOWNERS, yet in a catastrophe our land and animals could be devastated.

WE NEED MORE THAN 4 TO 6 WEEKS FROM ALO NOTIFICATION TO SCOPING. THIS IS UNTHINKABLE. Especially because other people in our same circumstance MAY NOT EVEN YET KNOW this 80,000 HP giant is coming near them as KM does not even have to tell them.

All of our real estate values will go down. THIS IS A DIRT ROAD, IMPASSABLE AT TIMES, and cannot withstand the vehicles that will travel it incessantly during construction, DISRUPTING OUR LIVES FOR NO GAIN.

WE DEMAND A SCOPING MEETING IN NEW IPSWICH. Our town will get no gas from this pipeline. We will get little to no jobs from this pipeline. We do not want the tax revenue as it will not even offset newly incurred costs.

We oppose NED  
EMINENT DOMAIN FOR CORPORATE GAIN..

**20150629-5204(30679127).txt**

Alison Jaskiewicz, Mason, NH.

Many, many hundreds of individuals in New Hampshire are potentially impacted in a myriad of ways by the Kinder Morgan Northeast Direct pipeline proposal. Every one of these individuals deserves the right to hear and be heard at FERC scoping meetings. It is imperative that enough scoping meetings be held to assure that no one is shut out or turned away, otherwise FERC cannot possibly carry out its job of assessing the true impact of such a pipeline.

Please, please, PLEASE, schedule a scoping meeting in every impacted NH town, each of which will work with you to offer a suitable time and location for its own citizens. Every impacted citizen MUST have the opportunity to speak directly to FERC at a scoping meeting.

**20150630-0208**

6-22-15

287 West Street  
Cummington, MA 01026

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

Dear Norman C. Bay and FERC Commissioners,

As it is your responsibility to research and pass judgement upon new proposed pipeline projects throughout the United States, I write to call your attention to an article published by Commonwealth, A Journal of Politics, Ideas, and Civic Life in Massachusetts. This essay titled, "We're Not Facing an Energy Crisis in New England" written by depth journalists Peter Shattuck, Jamie Howland, and Varun Kamur provides significant statistical evidence that the proposed Kinder Morgan Northeast Expansion Pipeline Project is invalid and an unnecessary multi-billion redefinition of pristine wetlands, rivers and streams, state parks, wildlife sanctuaries, and personal property throughout Northern Massachusetts and Southern New Hampshire.

Among the many studies cited, the following is particularly germane. The authors write,

"This past winter a more diverse fuel supply mix reduced price volatility despite harsher weather. Those who suffered through it probably do not need to be reminded how cold this winter was, but by every meaningful metric December 2014-February 2015 was colder on average than December 2013-February 2014. In addition, both winters were colder than the prior 10 year average. This past February was in fact the coldest on record in the region, with an average daily temperature of 16.9 degrees Fahrenheit.... Unsurprisingly, this colder weather led to greater demand for heating (tallied up as "heating days", a measure of the daily difference between outside temperature and 65 degrees, which is a good predictor of the energy needed for heating buildings).

The particularly cold weather in the middle of February and the corresponding higher heating load led to three of the five highest gas-demand days ever for the Northeast. While noteworthy, the higher gas demand is not surprising. What did surprise many observers is that, despite the colder weather and record gas demand, wholesale electricity prices were 43% lower on average from December 2014-February 2015, in comparison to December 2013-February 2014. "

In the succeeding paragraphs, the writers detail the fast developing mix of fuel sources which contributed to lower prices in Jan. 2014-Feb. 2015, and which will continue to develop and expand thereby gradually lessening demand and reliance on natural gas and oil.

Running parallel to the Commonwealth essay, the New Hampshire Public Utilities Commissions found

after conducting due diligence, that "...thePublic Utilities Commission recently ruled in the Liberty Utilities precedent agreement proceeding that assessment of the environmental impacts of the NED pipeline is relevant to, or likely to lead to the discovery of relevant information about, the justness, reasonableness, and/or prudence of the cost of the new pipeline capacity. Our expert testimony, along with the testimony submitted by the Office of Consumer Advocate and the testimony submitted by the staff of the PUC, concluded that Liberty Utilities' contract with Kinder Morgan should be derried. "This would be a denial of approximately one-fourth of the capacity that Kinder Morgan has announced that it needs to make its project financially viable.

There are other powerful environmental and aesthetic reasons for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to deny Kinder Morgan this project, among them the veritable despoliation of thus far untrammelled natural beauty. It is impossible for Kinder Morgan to exercise the brute force necessary to bury pipe underground with its concomitant methane spewing relay stations without destroying innumerable heretofore state protected wetlands and conservation sanctuaries, not to mention the thousands of acres of pristine old growth forests, some of the few remaining in the Unites States.

This, as opposed to the following U.S. Census Bureau statistic: since the year 2000 to the present, the Northeast Region of our country has represented from 19%in the year 2000 to 17.6%in the year 2014 of the entire United States population, which itself is experiencing its slowest population growth since 1937. That is, population growth in the Northeast region of the U.S. is essentially stagnant. How does this fact comport with Kinder Morgan's stated assessment that there exists a natural gas shortage in the Northeast and that new pipeline capacity is critical?

Please permit me to express, finally, this personal and admittedly unsubstantiated observation. Rumors are awash in this region that the overwhelming majority of natural gas to be pumped through this pipe is headed overseas, from Dracut, MA to Europe via Canada, that Massachusetts residents wiH receive incidental product as it gushes primarily toward overseas markets. If true, then issues like taking personal property by eminent domain (which is legal only when said property is taken "for public use"), and the alteration of state protected ecosystems (such as wetlands and state forests) becomes terrifically problematic, and I should say, legally actionable. The truthfulness of this rumor will surface eventually and should it prove accurate I believe FERC and Kinder Morgan will experience a regrettable and costly statewide public outcry.

I speak for all concerned citizens when I ask you to rule against Kinder Morgan' proposed Northeast Expansion Pipeline Project.

Sincerely,

Gordon Massman

PS. Here is the internet address for the Commonwealth Magazine article.

<http://commonwealthmagazine.org/environment/were-not-facing-an-energy-crisis-in-new-england/>

CC. Charlie Baker, Governor of Massachusetts; Senator Elizabeth Warren; Representative Stephen Kulik; The Hampshire Gazette

#### **20150630-0230**

Hand written card, Robert L. Dickerman, 32 Alexander Hill Road, Northfield, MA 03360, opposing

#### **20150630-0231**

Hand written card, Timothy Somero, 42 Old Tenney Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, opposing

#### **20150630-0232**

Hand written card, Laura Clayton, 369 West Rd, Temple, NH 03084, opposing.

**20150630-0233**

Hand written card, Marilyn Griska, 18 Atlantic Dr, Rindge, NH 03461, opposing

**20150630-0253**

Hand written card, Tina Hansen, 800 Route 119, Rindge, NH 03461, opposing

**20150630-0254**

Hand written card, Maureen Petro, PO Box 32, 307 Hadley Hwy, Temple, NH 03084, opposing.

**20150630-0255**

Hand written card, Charles Page, 181 Tobey Hwy, Greenville, NH 03048, opposing.

**20150630-0256**

Hand written card, Chris Bradler, 269 East Rd, Temple, NH 03084, opposing.

**20150630-0257**

Hand written card, Donald Briggs, 505 Bates Road, Windsor, MA 01270, opposing

**20150630-0258**

Hand written card, Sasha Chudacoff, PO Box 3444, 322 1/2 Gothic Ave, Crested Butte, CO, 81224, opposing

**20150630-0260**

Hand written card, David Barisano, 65 Contoocook Lane, Peterborough, NH 03458, supporting

**20150630-0262**

Hand written card, Timothy Earl Somero, 42 Old Tenney Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, suggesting escrow account for environmental remediation

**20150630-0263**

Hand written card, Charles Page, 181 Tobey Hwy, Greenville, NH 03048, opposing.

**20150630-0267**

**State of New Jersey**  
Mail Code 501-04B  
**Department of Environmental Protection**  
**Natural & Historic Resources**  
Historic Preservation Office  
P.O.Box 420  
Trenton, NJ 08625-0578

June 22, 2015  
Gina B.Doisey  
Director ofEHS Project Permitting Group  
Kinder Morgan inc.  
1001 Louisiana Street, Suite 1000  
Houston, Texas 77002

RE: Request for Categorical Exclusion Agreements for Kinder Morgan Inc. [Tennessee Gas Pipeline, L.L.C]

Dear Ms. Dorsey,

The New Jersey Historic Preservation Office (HPO) is currently reviewing our participation in Categorical Exclusion Agreements with natural gas providers. The HPO has a report on file (GLO C 44 ln) in which archaeological resources may have been adversely affected by actions that may have been classified as Categorical Exclusions. The HPO is concerned that new construction in previously undisturbed soils is being incorrectly applied as maintenance work under Categorical Exclusion Agreements. Additionally, the summary reports required at the end of the agreement period only describe a small number of projects, suggesting that there may be no need for categorical exclusions due to the small number of reviews. In consequence, the HPO will not be renewing the Categorical Exclusion Agreements at this time, but will continue to review undertakings requiring formal regulatory review. Please note that the HPO has yet to receive a copy of your summary reporting for the 2008-2013 period.

Additional Comments

Thank you again for providing the opportunity to review and comment on the potential for Kinder Morgan projects to affect historic properties. The HPO looks forward to the requested reports. Please reference the HPO project number 14-0693 in any future calls, emails, submission or written correspondence to help expedite your review and response. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Vincent Maresca of my staff at (609) 633-2395 with questions regarding archaeology or Michele Craren at (609)292-0032 with questions regarding historic architecture.

Sincerely,

Daniel D. Saunders  
Deputy State Historic  
Preservation Officer

Cc. Kimberly Bose, FERC  
DDS/KJM/VM/ks

**20150630-0270**

Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield St  
Agawam, MA 01001

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr., Deputy Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

Date: 6/24/15

RE: Denying property access

FERC PF 14-22 Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Project

As the owner of the property located at  
213 and 215 Radley Rd, Averill Park, N.Y. 12018

I am denying permission to Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land to perform surveys, or for any other purpose.

Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Robert D. Hale

*{was "File 30683344\_1.tif cannot be converted to PDF.", but easily OCR processed here}*

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulation Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Date: June 23, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access: PF 14-22-000

As the owner of the property located at:

Greenville and New Ipswich NH

and for the reasons listed we are denying access

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose. Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Jeremy Bradler  
-----

June 23, 2015

Patty Quinn  
Percheron Field Services  
Land Agent for  
Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
RE: Northeast Expansion Project  
LL# NH WD 244 Track #1 Block /Lot 03-08  
Survey Permission

Dear Ms. Patty Quinn,

Thank you for your interest in surveying my property for a possible right of way (ROW) easement to install a natural gas transmission pipeline. After careful consideration of information that is publicly available on this subject, I regret to inform you that I must decline your request for the following reasons.

- A natural gas transmission pipeline and or pumping station under a High Voltage Power Line could pose a potential terrorist threat as a target .
- Natural gas transmission pipelines pose a very serious risk due to possible explosion and fire with potential injury and loss of life .
- A natural gas transmission pipeline is considered storage of hazardous materials and could violate the terms of my homeowners insurance agreement and expose me to litigation risks due to the previously mentioned fire hazard .
- The existence of a natural gas transmission pipeline on my property, based on real estate value assessments from similar properties with similar easements, poses a demonstrable loss of property value, which would be unrecoverable .
- The existence of a natural gas transmission pipeline on my property could prevent sale or sub-division of the property due to the potential inability of the buyer to obtain a mortgage.

Based on my inability to grant a ROW easement for the above stated reasons it would be inconsistent to allow you access to my property for surveying or for any other purpose.

Regards,  
Jeremy Bradler  
PO Box 1230  
Wilton, NH 03086

cc

Greenville Select Board -

State and Federal Representatives - Maggie Hassan, Jean Shaheen, Kelly Ayotte, Ann Kuster and Frank Guinta

June 23, 2015

Patty Quinn  
Percheron Field Services  
Land Agent for  
Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC

RE: Northeast Expansion Project

LL# NH WD 243 Track #1 Block /Lot 03-040

Survey Permission

Dear Ms. Patty Quinn,

Thank you for your interest in surveying my property for a possible right of way (ROW) easement to install a natural gas transmission pipeline. After careful consideration of information that is publicly available on this subject, I regret to inform you that I must decline your request for the following reasons .

- A natural gas transmission pipeline and or pumping station under a High Voltage Power Line could pose a potential terrorist threat as a target.
- Natural gas transmission pipelines pose a very serious risk due to possible explosion and fire with potential injury and loss of life .
- A natural gas transmission pipeline is considered storage of hazardous materials and could violate the terms of my homeowners insurance agreement and expose me to litigation risks due to the previously mentioned fire hazard .
- The existence of a natural gas transmission pipeline on my property, based on real estate value assessments from similar properties with similar easements, poses a demonstrable loss of property value, which would be unrecoverable .
- The existence of a natural gas transmission pipeline on my property could prevent sale or sub-division of the property due to the potential inability of the buyer to obtain a mortgage.

Based on my inability to grant a ROW easement for the above stated reasons it would be inconsistent to allow you access to my property for surveying or for any other purpose.

Regards,

Howard Bradler  
PO Box 1230  
Wilton, NH 03086

cc

Greenville Select Board-

State and Federal Representatives - Maggie Hassan, Jean Shaheen, Kelly Ayotte, Ann Kuster and Frank Guinta

**20150630-0275**

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulation Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Date: 6/26/2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access: PF 14-22-000

As the owner of the property located at:

17 Farrar Road  
Rindge, NH 03461

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose. Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Patricia A. Martin

**20150630-3044(30683245).doc**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
**FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.

Docket No. PF14-22-000

NOTICE OF INTENT TO PREPARE AN  
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR THE PLANNED  
NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT PROJECT,  
REQUEST FOR COMMENTS ON ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES, AND NOTICE OF PUBLIC SCOPING  
MEETINGS

(June 30, 2015)

The staff of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC or Commission) will prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) that will discuss the environmental impacts of the Northeast Energy Direct Project (Project) involving construction and operation of facilities by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. (Tennessee Gas) in Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Connecticut. The Commission will use this EIS in its decision-making process to determine whether the Project is in the public convenience and necessity.

This notice announces the opening of the scoping process the Commission will use to gather input from the public and interested agencies on the Project. You can make a difference by providing us with your specific comments or concerns about the Project. Your comments should focus on the potential environmental effects, reasonable alternatives, and measures to avoid or lessen environmental impacts. Your input will help the Commission staff determine what issues they need to evaluate in the EIS. To ensure that your comments are timely and properly recorded, please send your comments so that the Commission receives them in Washington, DC on or before August 31, 2015.

If you sent comments on this project to the Commission before the opening of this docket on September 15, 2014, you will need to file those comments in Docket No. PF14-22-000 to ensure they are considered as part of this proceeding.

This notice is being sent to the Commission’s current environmental mailing list for this Project. State and local government representatives should notify their constituents of this planned Project and encourage them to comment on their areas of concern.

If you are a landowner receiving this notice, a Tennessee Gas representative may contact you about the acquisition of an easement to construct, operate, and maintain the planned facilities. The company would seek to negotiate a mutually acceptable agreement. However, if the Commission approves the Project, that approval conveys with it the right of eminent domain. Therefore, if easement negotiations fail to produce an agreement, the pipeline company could initiate condemnation proceedings where compensation would be determined in accordance with state law.

A fact sheet prepared by the FERC entitled “An Interstate Natural Gas Facility On My Land? What Do I Need To Know?” is available for viewing on the FERC website for Citizen’s Guides (<http://www.ferc.gov/for-citizens/citizen-guides.asp>). This fact sheet addresses a number of typically asked questions, including the use of eminent domain and how to participate in the Commission’s proceedings.

### **Public Participation**

For your convenience, there are four methods you can use to submit your comments to the Commission. The Commission will provide equal consideration to all comments received, whether filed in written form or provided verbally. The Commission encourages electronic filing of comments and has expert staff available to assist you at (202) 502-8258 or [efiling@ferc.gov](mailto:efiling@ferc.gov). Please carefully follow these instructions so that your comments are properly recorded.

- 1) You can file your comments electronically using the eComment feature on the Commission’s website ([www.ferc.gov](http://www.ferc.gov)) under the link to Documents and Filings. This is an easy method for interested persons to submit brief, text-only comments on a project;
- 2) You can file your comments electronically by using the eFiling feature on the Commission’s website ([www.ferc.gov](http://www.ferc.gov)) under the link to Documents and Filings. With eFiling, you can provide comments in a variety of formats by attaching them as a file with your submission. New eFiling users must first create an account by clicking on “eRegister.” If you are filing a comment on a particular project, please select “Comment on a Filing” as the filing type;
- 3) You can file a paper copy of your comments by mailing them to the following address:

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Be sure to reference the Project docket number PF14-22-000 with your submission; or

- 4) In lieu of sending written or electronic comments, the Commission invites you to attend one of the public scoping meetings its staff will conduct in the Project area, scheduled as follows.

### **FERC Public Scoping Meetings**

<b><u>Date and Time</u></b>	<b><u>Location</u></b>	<b><u>Location</u></b>
Tuesday, July 14, 2015 7:00 pm	Towanda Jr./Sr. High School 1 High School Drive Towanda, PA 18848 (570) 265-2101	Birch Hill Catering 1 Celebration Way Castleton-on-Hudson, NY 12033 (518) 732-4444

Wednesday, July 15, 2015 6:30 pm	VFW 386 Main St. Great Bend, PA 18848 (570) 879-4420	Birch Hill Catering 1 Celebration Way Castleton-on-Hudson, NY 12033 (518) 732-4444
Thursday, July 16, 2015 7:00 pm	Foothills Performing Arts Center 24 Market St. Oneonta, NY 13820 (607) 431-2080	Days Inn 160 Holiday Way Schoharie, NY 12157 (518) 295-6088
Tuesday, July 28, 2015 7:00 pm	Taconic High School 96 Valentine Rd Pittsfield, MA 01201 (413) 448-9600	
Wednesday, July 29, 2015 6:30 pm	Nashua Radisson 11 Tara Blvd Nashua, NH 03062 (603) 888-9970	Greenfield Middle School 141 Davis St. Greenfield, MA 01301 (413) 772-1360
Thursday, July 30, 2015 6:30 pm	Milford Town Hall Town Hall, One Union Square Milford, NH 03055 (603) 249-0600	Central Connecticut State University 1615 Stanley St. New Britain, CT 06050 (860) 832-3200
Tuesday, August 11, 2015 7:00 pm	Dracut Senior High School 1540 Lakeview Ave. Dracut, MA 01826 (978)-957-1500	
Wednesday, August 12, 2015 7:00 pm	Lunenburg High School 1079 Massachusetts Ave. Lunenburg, MA 01462 (978) 582-4115	

Please note that on five nights (July 14-16 and July 29-30), meetings will be held concurrently in two different locations. The same information will be presented at all of the meetings.

**We are planning on holding one additional scoping meeting near Winchester, New Hampshire, during the week of July 27-31, 2015. We will announce this meeting with a future notice once the location is finalized.**

We will begin our sign up of speakers one hour prior to the start of each meeting. The scoping meetings will begin with a description of our environmental review process by Commission staff, after which speakers will be called. Each meeting will end once all speakers have provided their comments or when our contracted time for the facility closes. Please note that there may be a time limit to present comments (no less than 3 minutes), and speakers should structure their comments accordingly. If time limits are implemented, they will be strictly enforced to ensure that as many individuals as possible are given an opportunity to comment. The meetings will be recorded by a stenographer to ensure comments are accurately recorded. Transcripts will be entered into the formal record of the Commission proceeding.

Please note that this is not your only public input opportunity; please refer to the review process flow chart in appendix 1.

## **Summary of the Planned Project**

Tennessee Gas plans to construct and operate approximately 412 miles of new natural gas transmission pipeline and associated facilities in Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Connecticut. This Project would also involve modifications at existing compressor and meter stations and construction of 9 new compressor stations, 14 new meter stations, and various appurtenant facilities. These facilities would be capable of providing 2.2 billion cubic feet per day of capacity to transport natural gas to markets in the northeastern United States and Canada.

The pipeline planned for construction includes supply path and market path components. The Supply Path component would deliver gas from the existing Tennessee Gas 300 Line to its existing 200 Line near Wright, New York. The Supply Path would include approximately 135 miles in Pennsylvania and New York, as well as 32 miles of pipeline loop along the 300 Line in Pennsylvania.

The Market Path would include approximately 188 miles of pipeline extending from Wright, New York, into Massachusetts and New Hampshire and then ending in Dracut, Massachusetts. The Market Path would generally be collocated with existing linear infrastructure.

In addition, the Project would include construction of nine pipeline laterals, loops, or delivery lines in Massachusetts (38 miles), Connecticut (15 miles), and New Hampshire (7 miles) to provide natural gas to local markets.

The general location of the Project facilities is shown in appendix 2.

## **Land Requirements for Construction**

Construction of the planned facilities would disturb about 6,761 acres of land for the pipeline and above-ground facilities, not including temporary access roads which are not yet determined. Following construction, Tennessee Gas would maintain about 2,602 acres for permanent operation of the Project's facilities, not including permanent access roads; the remaining acreage would be restored and revert to former uses. About 82 percent of the planned pipeline route parallels existing pipeline and utility rights-of-way.

## **The EIS Process**

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires the Commission to take into account the environmental impacts that could result from an action whenever it considers the issuance of a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity. NEPA also requires us to discover and address concerns the public may have about proposals. This process is referred to as scoping. The main goal of the scoping process is to focus the analysis in the EIS on the important environmental issues. By this notice, the Commission requests public comments on the scope of the issues to address in the EIS. We will consider all filed comments during the preparation of the EIS.

In the EIS we will discuss impacts that could occur as a result of the construction and operation of the planned Project under these general headings:

- geology and soils;
- water resources and wetlands;
- vegetation and wildlife;
- cultural resources;
- land use, recreation, and visual resources;
- socioeconomics;
- air quality and noise;
- cumulative impacts; and
- public safety.

As part of our analysis under NEPA, we will consider or recommend measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts on specific resources. We will also evaluate possible alternatives to the planned Project or portions of the Project. Tennessee Gas has proposed a number of alternatives, developed through the company's route selection process or identified by stakeholders, in draft Resource Report 10 filed with the FERC in Docket No. PF14-22-000 on March 13, 2015. During scoping, we are specifically soliciting comments on the range of alternatives for the Project.

Although no formal application has been filed, we have already initiated our environmental review under the Commission's pre-filing process. The purpose of the pre-filing process is to encourage early involvement of interested stakeholders and to identify and resolve issues before the FERC receives a formal application from Tennessee Gas. During the pre-filing process, we have contacted federal and state agencies to discuss their involvement in scoping and the preparation of the EIS.

The EIS will present our independent analysis of the issues. We will publish and distribute the draft EIS for public comment. After the comment period, we will consider all timely comments and revise the document, as necessary, before issuing a final EIS. To ensure we have the opportunity to consider and address your comments, please carefully follow the instructions in the Public Participation section, beginning on page 2.

With this notice, we are asking agencies with jurisdiction by law and/or special expertise with respect to the environmental issues related to this Project to formally cooperate with us in the preparation of the EIS. Agencies that would like to request cooperating agency status should follow the instructions for filing comments provided under the Public Participation section of this notice.

### **Consultations Under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act**

In accordance with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation's implementing regulations for Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, we are using this notice to initiate consultation with the applicable State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPOs), and to solicit their views and those of other government agencies, interested Indian tribes, and the public on the project's potential effects on historic properties. We will define the Project-specific Area of Potential Effects (APE) in consultation with the SHPOs as the Project develops. On natural gas facility projects, the APE at a minimum encompasses all areas subject to ground disturbance (examples include construction right-of-way, contractor/pipe storage yards, compressor stations, and access roads). Our EIS for this Project will document our findings on the impacts on historic properties and summarize the status of consultations under Section 106.

### **Environmental Mailing List**

The environmental mailing list includes federal, state, and local government representatives and agencies; elected officials; environmental and public interest groups; Indian tribes and Native American organizations; other interested parties; and local libraries and newspapers. This list also includes all affected landowners (as defined in the Commission's regulations) who are potential right-of-way grantors, whose property may be used temporarily for Project purposes, or who own homes within certain distances of aboveground facilities, and anyone who provides a mailing address when they submit comments on the Project. We will update the environmental mailing list as the analysis proceeds to ensure that we send the information related to this environmental review to all individuals, organizations, and government entities interested in and/or potentially affected by the planned Project.

Copies of the draft EIS will be sent to the environmental mailing list for public review and comment. If you would prefer to receive a paper copy of the document instead of the CD version or would like to remove your name from the mailing list, please return the attached Information Request (appendix 3).

### **Becoming an Intervenor**

Once Tennessee Gas files its application with the Commission, you may want to become an "intervenor" which is an official party to the Commission's proceeding. Intervenor play a more formal role in the process and are able to file briefs, appear at hearings, and be heard by the courts if they choose to appeal

the Commission's final ruling. An intervenor formally participates in the proceeding by filing a request to intervene. Instructions for becoming an intervenor are in the User's Guide under the "e-filing" link on the Commission's website. Please note that the Commission will not accept requests for intervenor status at this time. You must wait until the Commission receives a formal application for the Project.

### **Additional Information**

Additional information about the Project is available from the Commission's Office of External Affairs, at (866) 208-FERC, or on the FERC website ([www.ferc.gov](http://www.ferc.gov)) using the eLibrary link. Click on the eLibrary link, click on "General Search" and enter the docket number, excluding the last three digits in the Docket Number field (i.e., PF14 22-000). Be sure you have selected an appropriate date range. For assistance, please contact FERC Online Support at [FercOnlineSupport@ferc.gov](mailto:FercOnlineSupport@ferc.gov) or toll free at (866) 208-3676, or for TTY, contact (202) 502-8659. The eLibrary link also provides access to the texts of formal documents issued by the Commission, such as orders, notices, and rulemakings.

In addition, the Commission offers a free service called eSubscription which allows you to keep track of all formal issuances and submittals in specific dockets. This can reduce the amount of time you spend researching proceedings by automatically providing you with notification of these filings, document summaries, and direct links to the documents. Go to [www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/esubscription.asp](http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/esubscription.asp).

Finally, public meetings or site visits will be posted on the Commission's calendar located at [www.ferc.gov/EventCalendar/EventsList.aspx](http://www.ferc.gov/EventCalendar/EventsList.aspx) along with other related information.

Kimberly D. Bose,  
Secretary.

## **Appendix 1**

*{FERC's Environmental Review Process flow chart, not included here}*

## **Appendix 2 Project Maps**

*{maps, not included here}*

## **Appendix 3**

### **INFORMATION REQUEST NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT PROJECT**

Name \_\_\_\_\_  
Agency \_\_\_\_\_  
Address \_\_\_\_\_  
City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip Code \_\_\_\_\_

Please send me a paper copy of the draft EIS

[ ] Please remove my name from the mailing list

---

FROM \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

ATTN: OEP - DG2E - Gas 3, PJ-11.3  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE  
Washington, DC 20426

Docket No. PF14-22-000 Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Project

Staple or Tape Here

**20150630-5018(30679539).txt**

Carol M DiPirro, Merrimack, NH.

I have heard that a scoping meeting has been set in Milford NH and I am happy you are responding to all the requests. However, I have 2 concerns. 1- If this is meant for the county, you have picked too small a venue for all the people who want to attend. 2- I believe a public meeting like this needs to be in a handicap accessible place. I think it has an elevator but I hear the doorways are not wide enough to accommodate a wheelchair. I ask that you consider another venue.

Sincerely,

Carol DiPirro

**20150630-5022(30679547).txt**

Carol M DiPirro, Merrimack, NH.

Carol DiPirro of Merrimack NH. Kinder Morgan has been dispatching surveyors and some were spotted recently here in Merrimack. Merrimack, NH has not yet come to an agreement with Kinder Morgan about surveying town land. Yet they come and sample soil in town right of way. This behavior makes the citizens question the ethics of this company. It does not seem to me that they can do this and I ask you vehemently to take this behavior into consideration. What else have they been dishonest about with both southern NH towns but FERC as well. I know for one thing the maps and numbers of people in the "danger zone" were WRONG.

I don't trust them and I know I am not alone. This pipeline will just bring dependency on LNG. As an agency of the government you need to look over these filings with extreme care as it ruins the land and is for the benefit of private company at the residents expense. Please deny this pipeline.

**20150630-5032(30679567).txt**

Holly Higinbotham, Windsor, MA.  
June 29, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose  
Secretary Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE  
Room 1 A  
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., Docket No. PF14-22

Dear Secretary Bose;

So, let's see. FERC would let Kinder Morgan install a 36-inch pipeline and compressor stations every 20 miles, despite contamination of untold numbers of public drinking water reservoirs, the ground water table, the soil upon which people grow food, and the air we breathe—all for the sake of a private company shipping liquefied natural gas overseas to other countries for its own profit? I say this because it's been well-established that New England neither needs nor will receive much if any of the LNG that will be shipped across its precious soil. And if you people at FERC actually think that this fuel is necessary for the citizens of the United States, then why are you thinking of letting it be shipped abroad? And why are you not pushing for the use of more renewable resources, which would also benefit the citizenry of the USA, as well as the planet—as opposed to LNG which only destroys the Earth (and finite fossil fuel supplies) and atmosphere, degrades human communities, threatens and/or eliminates other animal and plant life, contaminates water and air, and destroys the fabrics of rural communities upon which our nation is founded?

It appears to me, and most everyone I speak with, that FERC is prepared to rubber-stamp Kinder Morgan's plan to destroy the land, water, air, and people of the United States for the sake of its financial profit margin and its investors...which is no surprise given the way in which the energy industry has taken over the government of the USA. However, FERC is supposed to represent the interests of the American public, not the oil and gas industry.

Let me tell you why I believe FERC should NOT approve the NED pipeline project:

1. It is not going to provide any necessary energy resources to New England, nor is it necessary. From all available information, it appears that nearly all of this LNG is to be exported to Europe and elsewhere, not to remain in New England. And despite the proclamations of our governor in Massachusetts, Charlie Baker, there is no need for additional fossil fuel here—current delivery systems are only utilized at something like 46% capacity. And, if there were any efforts made to tighten up that infrastructure—eliminating leaks, increasing efficiency--we'd have more than enough of what we need.
2. It is a major environmental threat to New England, which makes it a financial threat and a public health threat. The proposal to put a pipeline that is several times larger than any existing pipeline through both rural and urban communities raises the threat of leaks, explosions and fires in communities ill-equipped to protect public safety. Furthermore, the level of pollution to air, water, and land through emissions of toxic chemicals is unconscionable.
3. The pipeline is for the profit of a private corporation, NOT FOR PUBLIC USE. It should not be allowed to take private property by eminent domain. Not only is the use of eminent domain inappropriate and illegal, the plan to pass the cost of constructing the pipeline on to electric and gas ratepayers is unconscionable: we are supposed to fund the capital improvements of a private corporation that will reap enormous profits from this project?
4. The fabric and character of our rural communities will be destroyed. Already, those of us who live in rural towns in New England do so because we have discerned that there is enormous (non-financial, but personal and public health) value to living close to the earth in communities with people who are connected to each other and their ancestors. What is being proposed will destroyed our land and our sense of community—both because of the way in which our land, and water, and air, and light, are going to be destroyed if this happens, and the ways in which townspeople—even families—are being pitted against each other. Land and home values near both pipelines and compressor stations will plummet, which will negatively impact tax revenues to the towns and cities which are already hard-pressed to meet their financial obligations.

5. People who belong to unions are being lied to about the potential that they will have jobs as a result of this project. There is no evidence whatsoever that anyone will receive any long-term employment as a result of the construction or maintenance of this pipeline or the compressors stations along the way. So far, we only see vehicles with out-of-state license plates, and it's clear that if construction does begin, it will involve out-of-state crews who will contribute to the local economy only through a few nights in a motel. There are no long-term jobs available to local people

6. The compressor stations that are being slated for every 20 miles along the NED pipeline will destroy property and land values for miles in each direction, pollute the air, contaminate the land with the emissions of gasses from the stations, destroy water quality (blasting is likely to contaminate water quality, and overuse is likely to dry up wells for miles around), and set neighbors against each other (because land for compressor stations can only be acquired if the owner sells at enormous profit as opposed to being forced to concede their land via eminent domain). Most recently, we are hearing about the ways in which people whose houses are close to compressor stations will lose their homeowners' insurance coverage, which will cause their houses to be condemned! We are also hearing of the possibility that mortgage loans will be called in because people have violated the terms of their loan by placing explosive devices (AKA pipelines) on their property. Is this America? Really?

For all the reasons listed above, I urge FERC to deny permission to Kinder Morgan to build the NED pipeline. It is not necessary, it is not safe, it will harm us.

When you schedule the scoping hearings for this project, I respectfully request that one be held in Windsor, given the plans for a compressor station here, and I further request that FERC delay that hearing until Kinder Morgan submits its final Resource Reports and other updated information. I also believe that Kinder Morgan should be required to hold an Open House in Windsor, given that many residents are not well-informed about how this project will impact this town.

Thank you,

Holly Higinbotham  
300 High Street Hill Road  
Windsor, MA 01270  
higinbo@hotmail.com

cc: Governor Charlie Baker  
Senator Elizabeth Warren  
Senator Ed Markey  
Representative Richard Neal  
State Rep. Paul Mark  
State Sen. Benjamin Downing  
Secretary Matthew Beaton (Executive Office of Energy & Environmental Affairs)  
Attorney General Maura Healey  
DPU Chair Ann Berwick  
DPU Chair Angela O'Connor  
Berkshire Regional Planning Commission Director Nathaniel Karns

**20150630-5082(30680557).txt**

Barbara Ferullo, New Ipswich, NH.  
June 30, 2015

FERC

Dear FERC,

We have received a letter from Tennessee Gas Pipeline stating we are in the 1/2 mile zone of a new compressor station. Please take a moment to hear my concerns regarding the impending Kinder Morgan pipeline

in my town of New Ipswich, NH. I know your time is brief so I will try my best at summarizing in bullet point for your quick reference. Please hear our pleas to block this in our quiet, safe town. I truly appreciate your time & action!

- **COST:** This will adversely affect our property values, ability to sell now & in the future, ability to refinance with the low rates that are currently available. Increase hazard insurance. For some homeowners – this could affect their positions with their lienholders!
- **LIVABILITY:** This will take away from our quiet & peaceful community & way of life. The compressor station is set to be down the road from us - just a 1/2 mile. The sound alone will be unbearable. We are used to pure quiet every day & night. The noise from the “blow downs” which are compared to 4 diesel locomotives will occur very near my house, I have 3 children + I have my own sleeping issues. The vibrations could damage foundations & structures. The heavy trucks & equipment will further destroy our already damaged, weak roads with all the heavy equipment, rock blasting etc. It will take away from the beauty of the town, removing a vast number of trees.
- **SAFETY:** I have researched & see that this isn't SAFE! Accidents happen & have happened! Explosions, fires, leaks, spills, gases emitted into the air – who knows what else, but I personally think that's more risk than I'm willing to take on! Also - I am in the “incineration” zone. Seriously – that's what it is called!! I have 3 beautiful young children 10, 8, & 4. How do I explain when we're blasted away (assuming we aren't dead) that I knew about these dangers & didn't move our family? How do you justify that? Who would pay the high costs of hospitalization & rehab for such an atrocity? And back to bullet 1 – we're being screwed out of our home values, so how do you just “move” at this point?
- **HEALTH** – reports from people living near the compressor stations (again – my family, along w/many others) have reported issues such as nausea, dizziness, eye & nasal irritations, strokes, abnormal EEG, headaches, and nervous system impacts. Is this really what we want – not only for us as adults – but for the young children, our future? Or will they even have a future here? There won't be anything they grew up with – quiet, beautiful, peaceful, safe town to raise their children.
- **BENEFITS?** – NONE. We aren't opening new permanent jobs. We aren't able to use the gas for the town or homes. The environmental damage, including our private wells, are going to be affected in ways that no one really knows, and cannot guarantee for the safety of us or our children. Again, not safe for our families – not good for property values. Increased costs (financial & personal) for homeowners.

This is not why I moved to NH 10 1/2 years ago. I moved here to ensure a better quality of life for my children.

Please consider this and please help us stop this. For our families & for our town.

Thank you in advance & thank you for your time.

Barbara E Ferullo  
50 Stowell Road  
Po Box 164  
New Ipswich NH 03071  
(603) 291-0458

**20150630-5146(30681764).pdf**

**TOWN OF CONWAY, MASSACHUSETTS  
Board of Selectmen**

P.O. Box 240, Conway, MA 01341  
Town Office: 32 Main St.. Town Hall: 5 Academy Hill Rd.  
Phone (413) 369-4235 . (413) 369-4237 fax  
www.townofconway.com

June 29, 2015

Secretary Kimberly D. Bose  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426  
RE: Docket #PF14-22

Dear Members of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission:

The Board of Selectmen of the Town of Conway, Massachusetts hereby submits this letter and attachment as part of the proceedings under this docket.

On May 12, 2014, at its annual Town Meeting, the Town of Conway voted with a strong majority to adopt a resolution opposing this project. The resolution has been filed as part of these proceedings.

In addition to the thoughts and concerns voiced in the attached statement of the Town's Pipeline Task Force, an appointed body with the charge of gathering information on the question of whether or not the proposed pipeline should be supported or opposed, the Board of Selectmen would like to make the following points:

- 1) The Town needs clear information on the location of the pipeline in order to assess with due diligence its impact on the Town and its resources. There have been two very different routes proposed, each having quite different residences, hydrogeology, wetlands, and other issues.
- 2) In case the pipeline is approved, the Town will need substantial and on-going training in emergency response measures appropriate to various disaster scenarios, including a blow-out. We are concerned that special equipment might be needed, and ask FERC to require Kinder Morgan to assist the Town financially in any preparations which the Town has not already made.
- 3) The Town requests an independent risk assessment of the project and evidence of sufficient insurance for the maximum risk prior to the project's implementation.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

John P. O'Rourke, Chair

Jim Moore

Robert Baker

BOARD OF SELECTMEN

-----  
**Town of CONWAY, Massachusetts**

P.O. Box 240, Conway, MA 01341 (413) 369-4235 fax (413) 369-4237

Town Office @ 32 Main St.. Town Hall @ 5 Academy Hill Rd.

[www.townofconway.com](http://www.townofconway.com)

The following statement was voted and signed by the Ad Hoc Pipeline Task Force, Town of Conway, MA at a duly posted meeting on June 10, 2015. These comments pertain to Docket #PF 14-22 currently in pre-filing status with FERC.

In May, 2014 at a duly posted town meeting, registered voters from the Town of Conway ( hereafter referred to as the Town) overwhelmingly adopted Article 29 regarding the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Proposed Natural Gas Pipeline and requested the Selectboard "to convey our opposition to this project to all concerned (including our State and Federal legislators) on our behalf." Subsequently, the Selectboard sent a letter opposing the proposed NED pipeline to Kinder Morgan with copies sent to Senators Warren, Markey, and Downing as well as Representatives Neal and Kulik.

The Selectboard voted on August 25, 2014 to appoint an Ad Hoc Pipeline Task Force (comprised of representatives from the Board of Health, Board of Assessors, Planning Board, Conservation Commission, and Emergency Management) to gather information regarding the NED Proposed Natural Gas Pipeline and, to the extent possible, assess the impact of the proposed pipeline on the Town. An initial report, available on the town website, was delivered to the Selectboard at a duly posted meeting on February 17, 2015.

Approximately 3.41 miles of the proposed pipeline crosses the northern end of the Town. According to the revised “Draft Environmental Report” from March of this year, the current route through Conway will be co-located along an existing utility right of way maintained by Eversource (formerly WMECO).

The proposed route crosses privately held properties, including one property under APR restrictions, and crosses or abuts areas that would require a Notice of Intent Process with the Conservation Commission. Concerns of the Conservation Commission include the legality of a pipeline crossing land that is held in Agricultural Preservation Restriction.

The Board of Health and the Emergency Management Director both concluded that the proposed project constitutes an unreasonable risk to the health and safety of the citizens of the Town. The Planning Board is reviewing current bylaws and ordinances intended to protect the health and safety of residents. Of specific concern are impacts of increased noise to residents of town, and maintenance of water and air quality.

The Planning Board and Board of Health both received requests from AECOM, on behalf of Tennessee Gas, for information necessary for completion of Tennessee Gas NEPA review. Both Boards responded to AECOM, though neither Board received a response from AECOM. It should be noted that the maps provided in support of the information request were not current, but dated to the late 1980’s. To date the Conservation Commission has received no direct communication from Tennessee Gas or any organization acting on their behalf regarding the proposed pipeline project.

Kinder Morgan has now filed three versions of the required Resource Reports. Still listed as TBD in the most current version are the exact location of the compressor station and exact locations of main line valves; both structural components of concern to the Town.

Concerns raised include the risk of community exposure to contaminants of natural gas transported through Conway that could occur through planned or unplanned emissions from the pipeline if valves are located within the town borders. In the event of a pipeline leak or significant incident during construction or thereafter is the potential for ground and well water’ contamination. All residents and municipal building in the Town of Conway rely on private wells as a water source. The Town does not have the resources to conduct routine monitoring of all private well water nor an alternative water source in the event of aquifer contamination. Because of its size (2000 pop.) and demographic as a bedroom community the Town’s first responders are for the most part volunteers with many who work out of town during the day. Conway does not have 24 hour round the clock the clock professionals on staff to respond to a significant incident. Conway is not alone is sharing these challenges. Multiple towns along the pipeline route share the same challenges and concerns. We request that FERC consider all the towns along the proposed route as aggregate and not individual municipal entities when weighing risks of a pipeline against the proposed “benefit of the public interest”.

1 <http://www.townofconway.com/committees/ad-hoc-committees!pipeline-task-force!conway-ad-hoc-pipelinetask-force-report-january-2015!>

Respectfully submitted,

Margaret Burch  
Board of Health Member  
Chair Conway Ad Hoc Pipeline Task Force

Marcelle W. Morgan  
Conway Conservation Commission  
Ad Hoc Pipeline Task Force

Sue K. McFarland  
Planning Board, Town of Conway

Jim Moore  
Selectman, Conway

PROPERTY ACCESS DENIED

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: 6-27-2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

RE: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

Street Address: 779 Old Homestead Hwy,

Town & Zip: Richmond, NH 03470

Map & Lot Number(s) (if known) Map 402 Lot 74

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Kimberly E. Mason-Nearing

CC:

FERC

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, NE, Room 1A

Washington, DC 20426

**20150701-5013(30684278).txt**

Marilyn Learner, Hollis, NH.

Notice of Intent in Docket 14-22-0000 has been issued and Scoping meetings have been announced. These are for the purpose of “determining public convenience and necessity.” The public is invited to provide input; “Your comments should focus on the potential environmental effects, reasonable alternatives, and measures to avoid or lessen environmental impacts.”

Scoping meetings are about WHERE the pipeline should go, not IF the pipeline should be built. When does FERC hold hearings about THAT? There is more to consider than only the physical impacts on the geographical environment when deciding whether to build massive, permanent infrastructure such as NED. When does a comprehensive study of the long term consequences affecting public health happen?? When are the significant environmental and public health consequences of several massive projects in one geographical area considered? When is long term energy policy and portfolio diversity considered?

I would also like to know WHEN and HOW people affected by Kinder Morgan’s proposed Northeast Energy Direct pipeline get a fair shake in the pipeline approval process. As it stands now, the people most affected are treated as though they are, at best, inconveniences and, at worst, expendable. WHEN, HOW, WHERE does the PUBLIC get to comment about NEED, PUBLIC INTEREST, PUBLIC HEALTH and ENERGY POLICY and is there any guarantee that FERC will LISTEN? (There is no need to comment on public convenience; there is nothing “convenient” about an invasive, massive intrusion of large earth moving machinery forever changing a landscape and rendering it unusable.)

There is apparently no mechanism whereby FERC seeks information about whether or not pipelines should be built from the point of view of the public, whose “interests” and “greater good” are supposed to be part of the equation. The public has expertise and a point of view to contribute to the discussion of “need,” beyond

the self-profiting arguments espoused by the oil and gas interests. Additionally the public health community and environmental scientists have data to contribute about the health effects of chemicals used in gas extraction (fracking) which are released in compressor station blow-downs and pipeline leaks. When are those considerations entered into the public record? Why is the public essentially excluded from the approval process?

There has been a lot of pleading to FERC to not approve NED via ecomments, but FERC outsources comment reading, immediately discarding most comments and disregarding many others. Sometimes congressional letter writers get responses to requests for modifications to the process, but these often result in placating responses.

It is time to publicly acknowledge that the approval process is flawed because 1) it never gives the public a chance to weigh in on whether the pipeline is NEEDED by the public or in the PUBLIC INTEREST and 2) it completely ignores public health impacts and consequences. FERC's charge is to promote the building of pipelines and the approval process is designed to fulfill that charge.

If FERC's charge doesn't require thoughtful, comprehensive hearings and consideration of all parameters, it SHOULD, and the system and process should be changed so that it is not biased toward business and special interests. Adherence to credible, orderly procedures and processes is important in a democratic society, but that credibility is predicated on those processes being well designed and relevant to the current day. The public needs to trust that the process is fair; FERC's process is not fair because it is too narrowly focused. The FERC approval process is out-of-date and encumbered with many procedural steps to appear "diligent," but it was designed to produce a pre-determined result. The process lacks integrity. Pipeline approvals are never turned down!!!

NED was conceived and designed in a back room, blessed in Kinder Morgan's (and Algonquin Power and Utility's) boardroom, sent to FERC to be sanctioned, and foisted upon our living rooms. The FERC gas pipeline approval process is flawed at best; rigged at worst. Flawed decision making processes yield flawed decisions! We need a moratorium on the process and decisions until those processes are reviewed and made appropriately relevant to our 21st century energy and environmental goals, for the present and the future. NED is the perfect example of a pipeline that SHOULD NOT be approved, and WOULD NOT be approved, if FERC's approval process accurately and impartially assessed public need, public interest, public health consequences and regional energy policies and goals.

**20150701-5014(30684280).txt**

Daein R Ballard, Mason, NH.

The chosen towns for the upcoming scoping meetings are woefully inadequate! Especially for the state I live in, the State of NH. There are only two meetings, one of which is in Nashua, which is not along the proposed pipeline route and most certainly has the least number of stake holders of all the towns along the NH/MA border from VT to the Merrimack river! The vast majority of us stake holders have full time jobs and only two opportunities to attend a scoping meeting and only on a weekday is unacceptable!

There needs to be a scoping meeting in each town along the route. Considering the magnitude of the impact to stake holders, many of which (like me) are residential families (who will have their lives interrupted and permanently altered), if this pipeline is given a certificate of need. Tennessee Gas Pipeline and Kinder Morgan should be required to provide every opportunity for participation in the process and only two scoping meetings in the whole state falls far short of that!

- Daein Ballard  
Mason, NH

**20150701-5040(30684538).pdf**

**NMGPC**  
**Northeast Municipal Gas Pipeline Coalition**

Massachusetts Communities: Andover, Ashby, Dracut, Dunstable, Groton, Littleton, Peabody,  
Pepperell, North Reading, Tewksbury, Townsend, Wilmington

New Hampshire Communities: Brookline

Mailing Address:  
c/o NMCOG  
40 Church St., Suite 200  
Lowell, MA 01852

June 30, 2015

Norman Bay  
Chairman  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE  
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Scoping Meetings for the Northeast Direct Project, Docket No. 14-22

Dear Chairman Bay,

We write as municipal representatives of directly impacted communities of the proposed Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline project. The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) is in receipt of the pre-application filing for this proposed project. On March 13, 2015, Kinder Morgan filed the first draft of an Environmental Report (ER) for the proposed NED project. As you are no doubt aware, this voluminous filing contained thirteen (13) Resource Reports. Unfortunately, even a cursory glance at these materials revealed that Kinder Morgan failed to provide a substantial amount of information critical to the careful analysis and deliberation of the project, with “TBD” being their most commonly used word.

With many thousands of data points still missing from their materials, and the release for the update now delayed until July 2015, we strongly request that FERC delay any scoping meetings until such time as a thoughtful review and analysis, by all impacted communities and state agencies, of the yet-to-be released revised drafts of all thirteen Resource Report volumes is possible.

How can we as community leaders provide the guidance our constituents deserve and require with so many unknowns remaining and major changes still pending? Kinder Morgan has yet to meet with some of our directly-impacted member communities. They sent letters to newly impacted landowners just two weeks ago in one of our member communities, and two other communities have only received verbal descriptions of major changes, with only promises of documentation to follow some time “in early summer.” The long awaited locations of the nine (9) compressor stations were finally released just a few weeks ago, impacting hundreds of new landowners along the entire route.

Kinder Morgan has provided few substantive answers to our many concerns; it is now imperative that the impacted communities receive the benefit of a full disclosure of information with which to critically evaluate the far reaching impacts of this project.

In addition to requesting adequate time for the full deliberation on the Resource Reports prior to the scheduling of the FERC scoping meetings, we want to ensure that FERC schedules multiple scoping meetings along the entire proposed route. Specifically, we request that you host scoping sessions not just in the counties in Massachusetts where the pipeline is proposed, but also in each of the communities that are most impacted by proposed new infrastructure, including, but not limited to compressor stations, valve stations and meter stations. This was not the case during the Open Houses, and it is important to ensure that this potentially deliberate oversight by Kinder Morgan is corrected. Ensuring the safety of the residents and environment that this proposed pipeline could affect is paramount, and we hope FERC will provide full opportunity for all of our constituents to be heard before any determination on this proposal is made.

Specifically we request that:

- a. The scoping meetings be scheduled no sooner than one month after the completed Resource Reports.
- b. The Scoping Meetings be held in municipal buildings most familiar and accessible to communities.
- c. Scoping Meetings be held in each community with above ground infrastructure - compressor station, metering station, ground valve - and in at least one community along each lateral.
- d. The Scoping Meetings avoid major US holidays such as Independence Day or Labor Day by no less than a week before and after.

Thank you in advance for considering our requests which are aimed at ensuring that our residents are afforded every opportunity possible to provide valuable input that is essential in any public process. We ask that this input be carefully considered and weighed during FERC's decision-making process.

Sincerely,

Stuart Schulman  
Co-Chair

Stephen Themelis  
Co-Chair

Andrew Sheehan  
Co-Chair

CC: Senator Elizabeth Warren (D-MA)  
 Senator Edward Markey (D-MA)  
 Representative Richard Neal (MA-1)  
 Representative Jim McGovern (MA-2)  
 Representative Niki Tsongas (MA-3)  
 Representative Seth Moulton (MA-6)  
 Governor Charlie Baker  
 Secretary Matthew Beaton, Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs  
 Attorney General Maura Healey

**20150701-5056(30684728).txt**

Tyler W Seppala, Rindge, NH.

We have three landowners on just my road that have never received any sort of correspondence from Kinder Morgan in regards to the pipeline coming through their property and we now have scoping meetings already being set-up. How many landowners have not been informed by Kinder Morgan? I'm willing to bet quite a bit. This just shows me that Kinder Morgan will do as little as possible since they believe this project is already a done deal.

We have only two meetings set-up in NH as of now in which some of us would have to drive over 1 hour just to get to these meetings. On top of that they are scheduled for week days which is ridiculous as many people work the late shift. Nashua NH isn't even along the route. This whole process is rigged in Kinder Morgan's' favor.

**20150701-5078(30685311).txt**

Andrew Vernon, Northfield, MA.  
 Norman Bay  
 Chairman  
 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
 888 First Street NE Washington, DC 20426

Re: Scoping meetings

Chairman Bay,

Northfield has been targeted for one of the industrial monstrosities, i.e., compressor stations, to move gas to the coast. Since then we seem to have been side-stepped by the federal process of pipeline approval. Open houses were held only regionally, not in our town, and the result was that only some Northfielders could be "educated" by the KM presentations and try to clarify questions. Also, a woefully inadequate preliminary environmental assessment was presented, and I wonder, without accurate surveys, how detailed the final

impact report will be? Yet the process rolls along with little regard for citizens' voices.

The scoping meeting announcement is of great concern to us. There should be many more of these presentations, especially in the towns that are getting compressor stations. Many of us would make it to Greenfield, but how many could voice their concerns in the time allotted?

I see that an unscheduled meeting is planned for "near Winchester, NH". This meeting MUST be held in Northfield. If it is placed in Keene, NH, for instance, it will be too far away for some. I suggest our High School (Pioneer Valley Regional) or perhaps contacting Northfield Mount Hermon School for a venue. I know our select board will be demanding the same.

86% of townspeople voted against this pipeline. They are afraid for the security of their water, their housing values, their way of life...and with researched justification. And now we, for the most part supporters of government, have found that the system has been rigged against common citizens. At bare minimum, Northfielders should have a scoping meeting to voice our specific concerns.

In the meantime I still await believable evidence that this project is for "public need", and I wonder why the many other alternative solutions are not seriously considered.

Thank You,

Andrew Vernon  
Northfield, MA

#### **20150701-5223(30688219).txt**

Kaela Law, Pelham, NH.

On January 13, 2015 a gentleman came to my door in Pelham, NH and asked me to sign survey permission. I looked at him blankly, he slapped his forehead and said, "oh yeah," thumbed through a folder in his hand and took out a few unopened envelopes. "These should have been mailed to you," he explained, "We didn't have your mailing address." This was my introduction to the Northeast Energy Direct Project.

I didn't sign then, barring more information, nor will I sign now, still lacking sufficient information.

Today is July 1. My research has been expansive, yet I am not going to become a natural gas pipeline expert in only a few short months. Today, I decided I am no longer going to expend energy trying to become one. This project is taking valuable time away from raising my 1 and 1/2 year old daughter. I am not getting paid for my time and research. These young moments in my daughter's life are precious and I am not going to make her compete with an imaginary pipeline for my attention anymore. I've exhausted five months. I've attended multiple meetings a week: Board of Selectmen meetings, Conservation Commission meetings, community groups in town, community groups across the state to share information, I've joined Facebook against my better judgement in order to keep current on the N.E.D project, and I have even attended as many Q&A, Open Houses in various towns with Kinder Morgan / TGP representatives as possible. I've stayed awake until the early morning hours, glued in front of my computer, both researching and sending / receiving thousands of emails (literally thousands). All of this in an effort to learn about this project to make a knowledgeable decision regarding it. All of this, and I still do not know enough.

I am asking from those who are actually being paid for their time and research to present us with open and transparent answers.

The following are questions I want answers to (whether from FERC or the State House, PUC, Liberty Utilities or Kinder Morgan, although I would like real answers and not some carefully worded Kinder Morgan half-answer):

I would like to know where all the specific "bottlenecks" are on the Concord Lateral in NH, and in all points where "bottleneck" claims are occurring in Massachusetts as well. For example, Nashua NH has 25,276 residential natural gas customers and 2,497 commercial natural gas customers. (numbers from Nashua Regional Planning Commission – see picture at bottom) The existing lateral line that services Nashua, NH is 8-inches in diameter. I suspect this might be one of the "bottlenecks". Is that assumption correct? Is the

Nashua lateral off the Concord Lateral considered a ‘bottleneck’? Would that “bottleneck” be fixed if the 8-inch pipeline were upgraded to a 12-inch or a 14-inch pipeline? Kinder Morgan representatives have told us the Concord Lateral easement has been built up against too much to allow any expansion. Is that true? Is that true for the Nashua Lateral running through the town of Hudson? If there is a smaller-cost solution to remedy a situation for price spikes that occur literally only a few days out of the entire year, is the FERC the regulatory body that oversees bringing the people the smallest cost alternative? Is the PUC the state regulatory body responsible for ensuring the smallest cost alternative for the people? Have either of these agencies asked where the Nashua plans for the N.E.D pipeline have gone and why? To be clear I am not recommending routing through Hollis, NH again. I am merely pointing out that plans for reaching Nashua and all points out from Nashua are seemingly missing from the preferred proposal being set forth by Kinder Morgan. In missing that, we are having difficulty with understanding how, regardless of whether the Liberty Utilities docket 14-380 is approved or denied at the PUC, service to these areas will be “made more reliable.” Does Liberty BUILD pipelines? Actual incremental upgrades should be made to the pipeline systems in NH and Massachusetts before the multi-billion-dollar construction of a new pipeline system network that might still not remedy price spikes. If I am mistaken, please somebody RESPOND to my comment and explain it to me. When the Northeast Energy Direct was routed in Massachusetts south of the NH border, there was a new Nashua lateral proposed. It was the only piece of the N.E.D pipeline system that poked up into our state. Now that such a large portion of the N.E.D has come north of the state border I can’t help but notice the proposed Nashua lateral has disappeared. Can somebody help explain to us either how the N.E.D project as it stands now is planning on getting more of the gas to Nashua. Is that still a priority? We keep hearing from Kinder Morgan representatives that their project is in response to “demand” – with 27,773 natural gas customers in Nashua, I can’t imagine they aren’t a large piece to what Kinder Morgan is calling a “demand.” Of the towns represented by the Nashua Regional Planning Commission, Hudson NH is the second largest for natural gas customers with a total residential and commercial customers combined of 5,218. BAE Systems is located in Hudson. BAE has been specifically sited by Kinder Morgan in their Town Hall informational meetings with us, as part of KM’s “demand” from the region. BAE systems, unless I am mistaken would also be fed off of that 8-inch existing Nashua lateral. Again, I welcome a RESPONSE, to help explain where I am wrong. A citizen from Merrimack, who has been researching alongside me, is fairly certain Merrimack’s gas comes up the Daniel Webster Highway/Old Route 3 from Nashua, and if so would be fed off that Nashua lateral. Are all of the towns depicted in the picture below fed from the existing 8-inch Nashua lateral? Liberty Utilities serves roughly 87,000 natural gas customers in NH. Does the 8-inch Nashua Lateral feed close to half of all Liberty’s gas customers in the state of NH?

finished in comment part 2

#### **20150701-5226(30688225).txt**

Kaela Law, Pelham, NH.

cont from part 1:

Again, I would like to know where all the specific “bottlenecks” are on the Concord Lateral in NH, and in all points where “bottleneck” claims are occurring in Massachusetts as well. In addition I would like a comprehensive explanation as to how the N.E.D pipeline proposal will remediate those points. I would also like to see a very detailed map issued for the Concord Lateral in its entirety as it exists today. Since it already exists, this should not be a difficult request made to Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline. I would like this map to be current as of 2015 showing all the new development along the existing Concord Lateral and its accompanying distribution lines. I would also like a compiled package of the PUC /FERC filings and decisions presented to this docket pf14-22 regarding every upgrade made on the Concord Lateral pipeline system over its lifetime. I would like to know why the compressor station 270B in Pelham NH is “rarely in use,” as we have been told at numerous town hall meetings. Before FERC and the PUC can make a ruling one way or the other regarding dockets pf14-22 and 14-380 respectively a much closer look at the existing pipeline system in the state of New Hampshire must be evaluated. For the sake of transparency, we must

ALL in NH understand this Concord Lateral pipeline system's deficiencies before we can decide the level of investment or not we should make into expanding natural gas infrastructure in our state. The sales pitch for the N.E.D Pipeline has been that it will "bring cheap, Marcellus gas" to the region. It took me five months to realize TGP lines are already carrying gas from that region to New England. The sales pitch for N.E.D has also been to "lower our electricity prices" but the construction for it relies on contracts made with local distribution companies. The sales pitch for the only New Hampshire LDC, Liberty Utilities, is that they will grow their customer base by signing up for excessive amount of gas from the N.E.D, more gas than they could possibly use. I would like a RESPONSE to help describe how trying to grow a customer base will bring down prices for the current customer base and how growing a commercial and residential customer base has anything to do with bringing cheaper electricity to New Hampshire.

I would like to know the size of the existing pipelines in the Tennessee Gas Pipeline system in Massachusetts. They are the black lines in the picture below:

Last question for this particular comment, and perhaps it belongs in a separate comment: Why is Dracut, MA considered a "hub" but Haverhill, MA or Methuen, MA is not? From the picture above it is hard to see exactly where all the points from the different pipelines terminate, but Haverhill or Methuen appears to have a connection between the Maritimes and Northeast Pipelines system, the PNGTS and Algonquin and TGP laterals, with a major metering station already. Why isn't this considered a "hub" but Dracut is?

My daughter is awake from her nap and I don't have time to proofread my comment before sending it around. Please forgive grammatical errors. If the pictures don't carry into my ecomment from WORD doc please visit NRPC website to find them. Do you have to just read all comments or do you actually have to visit this website because it is in my comment?

**20150701-5350(30689252).pdf**

## **MASSACHUSETTS PIPELINE AWARENESS NETWORK**

[WWW.MassPLAN.org](http://WWW.MassPLAN.org)

July 1, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20216

Re: Docket No. CP14-529, TGP Connecticut Expansion and  
Docket No. PF14-22, TGP Northeast Energy Direct

Dear Secretary Bose:

We write to urge the Commission to consider collectively the capacity contracts that Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC ("TGP") has arranged for several New England local gas distribution companies ("LDCs") on its Northeast Energy Direct project ("NED") and its Connecticut Expansion Project (the "CT Expansion"), and to consider them in the context of other proposed pipeline expansions and other energy solutions in the region.<sup>1</sup>

The Southern Connecticut Gas Company ("SCG"), Connecticut Natural Gas Corporation ("CNG"), and The Berkshire Gas Company ("Berkshire") are all subsidiaries of UIL Holdings Corporation (these three subsidiaries together, the "UIL Affiliates"). All three of these UIL Affiliates are among the seven anchor shippers announced for the TGP Northeast Energy Direct project ("NED"). SCG and CNG are also two of the three anchor shippers for the TGP Connecticut Expansion Project (the "CT Expansion"). We have already raised the issue of improper segmentation in a previous comment in Docket No. CP14-529, but we did not address the specific role of Berkshire Gas and other LDCs in TGP's plans.

Berkshire has imposed a moratorium on any new or expanded gas service in its Eastern Division (which comprises eight municipalities in the Pioneer Valley, on both sides of the Connecticut River in Western

Massachusetts). Berkshire has stated on its ratepayers' bills that the moratorium will remain in place until the NED project "is permitted and built". It is our understanding that Berkshire is one of four gas companies served via the TGP Northampton Lateral. Three of these companies (Berkshire, Columbia Gas of Massachusetts, and The City of Westfield Gas & Electric Light Department) are anchor shippers for NED, and both Berkshire and Columbia Gas have imposed moratoria in their service areas served off of the Northampton lateral.

In the Commission's May 15, 2015 comments on TGP's NED resource reports, the Commission instructs TGP as follows: "Identify any structural or engineering changes on the existing 200 Line [ ] that could accommodate all or a portion of the NED planned gas volumes. This may include, but should not be limited to: additional compression, pipeline uprates, replacements, looping or a combination of these." The Commission also asked for "additional environmental, engineering, and economic analysis" of the 200 Line alternative.

In a proceeding before the Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities, Berkshire is seeking approval of a capacity contract with TGP on the NED pipeline for 36,000 Dth/day. In that proceeding, the Massachusetts Attorney General's Office has questioned why Berkshire did not seek to participate in TGP's proposed project along the 200 Line (which has developed into the CT Expansion). Berkshire's response does not provide a satisfactory answer.

Berkshire states that the CT Expansion "was specifically developed at the request of CT Natural Gas, Southern CT Gas and Yankee Gas in the 2012 timeframe" and that "Berkshire did not participate in the Open Season at that time because it had already begun discussions regarding the Northeast Expansion Project (now known as the NED Project) which would provide substantially more benefits due to its route traversing both Berkshire service areas." However, given the situation Berkshire claims to be in with respect to capacity – so that it is now turning away potential new customers and not allowing current customers to expand their gas use – it is odd that Berkshire did not participate in the development of this project that includes looping on the 200 Line and has a planned completion date a full two years sooner than the NED project.

Had Berkshire chosen to participate in the development of the smaller project, it could presumably have negotiated with TGP for a loop on the 200 Line targeted to meet its needs, expansions along the existing TGP laterals that serve Berkshire's Eastern and Western Divisions, and/or additional compression. Berkshire negotiated as part of a group of LDCs (including but not limited to the other UIL Affiliates) for the NED precedent agreement terms. Berkshire (and Columbia Gas) could have negotiated with the other LDCs in the region to meet the immediate needs of the existing and potential customers in their respective service areas, rather than signing up for a pipeline that would cross hundreds of miles in areas that have no gas service (and no plans for gas service).

TGP appears to have carefully divvied up the UIL Affiliates' capacity contracts, as well as other capacity contracts, to enable its expansions in the Northeast to go forward in two segments, to the detriment of gas customers and potential gas customers in the Pioneer Valley. If the Commission does not agree that it has a legal obligation to require these projects to be viewed as a single proposed expansion, it is certainly within the Commission's power to do so. We urge the Commission to exercise that power.

As recently as December 2012, TGP was contemplating expansion along the 200 Line that would accommodate up to 1 Bcf/day (see slide 17 of the attached). The announced capacity of NED combined with the CT Expansion totals under .65 Bcf/day (and some of that is along the 300 Line). NED – originally called the "Bullet Line" (see slide 16 of the attached) was envisioned as a possible larger project, and simply does not make sense given the contracts that TGP has announced. The customers and capacity levels identified by TGP do not justify a 400-mile pipeline with nine new compressor stations, four of them many times larger than any ever built in the Northeastern United States, when alternatives with less environmental impact abound.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathryn R. Eiseman, Director

Massachusetts PipeLine Awareness Network  
17 Packard Road  
Cummington, MA 01026  
(413) 320-0747

1 “In considering the impact of new construction projects on existing pipelines, the Commission’s goal is to appropriately consider the enhancement of competitive transportation alternatives, the possibility of overbuilding, the avoidance of unnecessary disruption of the environment, and the unneeded exercise of eminent domain.” Certification of New Interstate Natural Gas Pipeline Facilities (Policy Statement), 88 FERC ¶ 61,227 (1999).

KINDER MORGAN

Northeast Gas Association  
Pre-Winter Briefing 2012 / 2013  
Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co. L.L.C.  
Dodson Skipworth  
Account Director, Northeast  
December 3, 2012

#### Forward-Looking Statements / Non-GAAP Financial Measures

This presentation contains forward-looking statements. These forward-looking statements are identified as any statement that does not relate strictly to historical or current facts. In particular, statements, express or implied, concerning future actions, conditions or events, future operating results or the ability to generate revenues, income or cash flow or to make distributions or pay dividends are forward-looking statements. Forward-looking statements are not guarantees of performance. They involve risks, uncertainties and assumptions. Future actions, conditions or events and future results of operations of Kinder Morgan Energy Partners, L.P., Kinder Morgan Management, LLC, El Paso Pipeline Partners, L.P., and Kinder Morgan, Inc. may differ materially from those expressed in these forward-looking statements. Many of the factors that will determine these results are beyond Kinder Morgan’s ability to control or predict. These statements are necessarily based upon various assumptions involving judgments with respect to the future, including, among others, the ability to achieve synergies and revenue growth; national, international, regional and local economic, competitive and regulatory conditions and developments; technological developments; capital and credit markets conditions; inflation rates; interest rates; the political and economic stability of oil producing nations; energy markets; weather conditions; environmental conditions; business and regulatory or legal decisions; the pace of deregulation of retail natural gas and electricity and certain agricultural products; the timing and success of business development efforts; terrorism; and other uncertainties. There is no assurance that any of the actions, events or results of the forward-looking statements will occur, or if any of them do, what impact they will have on our results of operations or financial condition. Because of these uncertainties, you are cautioned not to put undue reliance on any forward-looking statement.

• We use non-generally accepted accounting principles (“non-GAAP”) financial measures in this presentation, and our reconciliations of non-GAAP financial measures to our GAAP financial statements are on our website, at [www.kinderMorgan.com](http://www.kinderMorgan.com). These non-GAAP measures should not be considered an alternative to GAAP financial measures.

#### Agenda

- TGP Dynamics, Recent Trends
- Key points Winter 2012/2013
- Power Generation Market Awareness
- TGP Market Development Activities

{16 panels of maps/charts, not reproduced here}

**20150701-5353(30689256).pdf**

*{duplicate of 20150701-5350(30689252).pdf above}*

**2220150702-0015(30691206).pdf**

**FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20426**

June 5, 2015

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

The Honorable Kelly Ayotte  
United States Senate  
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Ayotte:

Thank you for your April 30, 2015, letter regarding Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.'s (Tennessee Gas) planned Northeast Energy Direct Project (Docket No. PF14-22-000).

The Commission approved Tennessee Gas's request to enter into our pre-filing process for the planned project on October 2, 2014. The Commission's pre-filing process allows our staff to actively participate with landowners, interested parties, other federal and state agencies, elected officials, and the applicant in order to identify environmental or other issues, and discuss potential solutions and route modifications before an application is filed. By engaging the public early in the process, we believe that we can conduct a comprehensive and meaningful review of the project as part of our obligation under the National Environmental Policy Act.

This planned project is still early in our environmental review process and staff has not opened the formal public comment period. As always, the Commission will accept and consider written comments from any interested stakeholder at any time during the pre-filing and application review process. Please know that the Commission gives equal consideration to written comments and comments received at a public meeting.

Scoping meeting dates and locations will be announced in staff's Notice of Intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the project. Meeting locations will be selected across the project area to be convenient for the greatest number of people who might be interested in the project. Additionally, during the process of preparing the EIS for the project, the public will have numerous opportunities to comment on the project and the adequacy of the EIS.

As in any Commission matter, please be assured that we strive to make our review of energy proposals both accessible and transparent to the public. If I can be of further assistance in this or any other Commission matter, I hope you will not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely,

Norman C. Bay  
Chairman

**20150702-0016(30692652).pdf**

**FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20426**

June 5, 2015

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

The Honorable Kirsten Gillibrand  
United States Senate

Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Gillibrand:

Thank you for your April 28, 2015, letter regarding Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.'s (Tennessee Gas) planned Northeast Energy Direct Project (Docket No. PF14-22-000).

The Commission approved Tennessee Gas's request to enter into our pre-filing process for the planned project on October 2, 2014. The Commission's pre-filing process allows our staff to actively participate with landowners, interested parties, other federal and state agencies, elected officials, and the applicant in order to identify environmental or other issues, and discuss potential solutions and route modifications before an application is filed. By engaging the public early in the process, we believe that we can conduct a comprehensive and meaningful review of the project as part of our obligation under the National Environmental Policy Act.

This planned project is still early in our environmental review process and staff has not opened the formal public comment period. As always, the Commission will accept and consider written comments from any interested stakeholder at any time during the pre-filing and application review process. Please know that the Commission gives equal consideration to written comments and comments received at a public meeting.

Scoping meeting dates and locations will be announced in staff's Notice of Intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the project. Meeting locations will be selected across the project area to be convenient for the greatest number of people who might be interested in the project. Additionally, during the process of preparing the EIS for the project, the public will have numerous opportunities to comment on the project and the adequacy of the EIS.

As in any Commission matter, please be assured that we strive to make our review of energy proposals both accessible and transparent to the public. If I can be of further assistance in this or any other Commission matter, I hope you will not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely,

Norman C. Bay  
Chairman

**20150702-0017(30691205).pdf**

**FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION**  
WASHINGTON, DC 20426

June 5, 2015

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

The Honorable Jeanne Shaheen  
United States Senate  
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Shaheen:

Thank you for your April 30, 2015, letter regarding Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.'s (Tennessee Gas) planned Northeast Energy Direct Project (Docket No. PF14-22-000).

The Commission approved Tennessee Gas's request to enter into our pre-filing process for the planned project on October 2, 2014. The Commission's pre-filing process allows our staff to actively participate with landowners, interested parties, other federal and state agencies, elected officials, and the applicant in order to identify environmental or other issues, and discuss potential solutions and route modifications before an application is filed. By engaging the public early in the process, we believe that we can conduct a comprehensive and meaningful review of the project as part of our obligation under the National Environmental Policy Act.

This planned project is still early in our environmental review process and staff has not opened the formal

public comment period. As always, the Commission will accept and consider written comments &om any interested stakeholder at any time during the pre-filing and application review process. Please know that the Commission gives equal consideration to written comments and comments received at a public meeting.

Scoping meeting dates and locations will be announced in staff s Notice of Intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the project. Meeting locations will be selected across the project area to be convenient for the greatest number of people who might be interested in the project. Additionally, during the process of preparing the EIS for the project, the public will have numerous opportunities to comment on the project and the adequacy of the EIS.

As in any Commission matter, please be assured that we strive to make our review of energy proposals both accessible and transparent to the public. If I can be of further assistance in this or any other Commission matter, I hope you will not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely,

Norman C. Bay  
Chairman

**20150702-0018(30692243).pdf**

**FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION**  
WASHINGTON, DC 20426

June 5, 2015

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

The Honorable Frank Guinta  
U.S. House of Representatives  
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Congressman Guinta:

Thank you for your April 30, 2015, letter regarding Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.'s(Tennessee Gas) planned Northeast Energy Direct Project (Docket No PF14-22-000).

The Commission approved Tennessee Gas'equest to enter into our pre-filing process for the planned project on October 2, 2014. The Commission's pre-filing process allows our staff to actively participate with landowners, interested parties, other federal and state agencies, elected officials, and the applicant in order to identify environmental or other issues, and discuss potential solutions and route modifications before an application is filed. By engaging the public early in the process, we believe that we can conduct a comprehensive and meaningful review of the project as part of our obligation under the National Environmental Policy Act.

This planned project is still early in our environmental review process and staff has not opened the formal public comment period. As always, the Commission will accept and consider written comments &om any interested stakeholder at any time during the pre-filing and application review process. Please know that the Commission gives equal consideration to written comments and comments received at a public meeting.

Scoping meeting dates and locations will be announced in staff s Notice of Intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the project. Meeting locations will be selected across the project area to be convenient for the greatest number of people who might be interested in the project. Additionally, during the process of preparing the EIS for the project, the public will have numerous opportunities to comment on the project and the adequacy of the EIS.

As in any Commission matter, please be assured that we strive to make our review of energy proposals both accessible and transparent to the public. If I can be of further assistance in this or any other Commission matter, I hope you will not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely,

Norman C. Bay  
Chairman

**20150702-0019(30692651).pdf**

**FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION**  
WASHINGTON, DC 20426

June 5, 2015

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

The Honorable Ann McLane Kuster  
U.S. House of Representatives  
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Congresswoman Kuster:

Thank you for your April 30, 2015, letter regarding Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.'s (Tennessee Gas) planned Northeast Energy Direct Project (Docket No. PF14-22-000).

The Commission approved Tennessee Gas' request to enter into our pre-filing process for the planned project on October 2, 2014. The Commission's pre-filing process allows our staff to actively participate with landowners, interested parties, other federal and state agencies, elected officials, and the applicant in order to identify environmental or other issues, and discuss potential solutions and route modifications before an application is filed. By engaging the public early in the process, we believe that we can conduct a comprehensive and meaningful review of the project as part of our obligation under the National Environmental Policy Act.

This planned project is still early in our environmental review process and staff has not opened the formal public comment period. As always, the Commission will accept and consider written comments from any interested stakeholder at any time during the pre-filing and application review process. Please know that the Commission gives equal consideration to written comments and comments received at a public meeting.

Scoping meeting dates and locations will be announced in staff's Notice of Intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the project. Meeting locations will be selected across the project area to be convenient for the greatest number of people who might be interested in the project. Additionally, during the process of preparing the EIS for the project, the public will have numerous opportunities to comment on the project and the adequacy of the EIS.

As in any Commission matter, please be assured that we strive to make our review of energy proposals both accessible and transparent to the public. If I can be of further assistance in this or any other Commission matter, I hope you will not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely,

Norman C. Bay  
Chairman

**20150702-0020(30689605).tif**

**FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION**  
WASHINGTON, DC 20426

June 5, 2015

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

The Honorable Charles Schumer  
U.S. House of Representatives  
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Senator Schumer:

Thank you for your April 28, 2015, letter regarding Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.'s (Tennessee Gas) planned Northeast Energy Direct Project (Docket No. PF14-22-000).

The Commission approved Tennessee Gas's request to enter into our pre-filing process for the planned project on October 2, 2014. The Commission's pre-filing process allows our staff to actively participate with landowners, interested parties, other federal and state agencies, elected officials, and the applicant in order to identify environmental or other issues, and discuss potential solutions and route modifications before an application is filed. By engaging the public early in the process, we believe that we can conduct a comprehensive and meaningful review of the project as part of our obligation under the National Environmental Policy Act.

This planned project is still early in our environmental review process and staff has not opened the formal public comment period. As always, the Commission will accept and consider written comments from any interested stakeholder at any time during the pre-filing and application review process. Please know that the Commission gives equal consideration to written comments and comments received at a public meeting.

Scoping meeting dates and locations will be announced in staff's Notice of Intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the project. Meeting locations will be selected across the project area to be convenient for the greatest number of people who might be interested in the project. Additionally, during the process of preparing the EIS for the project, the public will have numerous opportunities to comment on the project and the adequacy of the EIS.

As in any Commission matter, please be assured that we strive to make our review of energy proposals both accessible and transparent to the public. If I can be of further assistance in this or any other Commission matter, I hope you will not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely,

Norman C. Bay  
Chairman

**0150702-0022(30692650).pdf**

**Congress of the United States  
House of Representatives  
Washington, DC 20515**

June 29, 2015

Norman C. Bay, Chairman  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

Dear Chairman Bay:

I was informed by the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC of the proposed locations of the compressor stations if the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline is approved (Docket No. PF14-22-0000). I am writing to reiterate my position on this proposal and share with you the resolutions and correspondence of some of the impacted stakeholders in my district.

I support expanding access to a broad range of energy resources, including the modernization and improvement of infrastructure to move these resources. Expanded access will lower energy costs for my constituents, create jobs, and improve our energy security. However, I have significant concerns with this proposed project for a variety of reasons and, therefore, I do not support the proposal in its current form.

Based on my many conversations with concerned residents across the 19th District, my reservations focus on public safety and potential environmental and economic impacts. It's vital that we make improvements to our infrastructure with tremendous care and maximum input from local residents. Unfortunately, Kinder Morgan has not provided adequate information about its plans. Neighbors of this pipeline have many ques-

tions, and those questions should be answered by the applicant in a public forum.

It is important that the process by which this proposal moves forward is transparent and proves the safety of the project. In addition, there should be substantial risk mitigation planning and the process should engage and be responsive to local concerns. The project should also provide significant local benefit, especially given potential financial burdens from decreased property value. Our community should not bear the burden of the project, take on all the risk, and not benefit from the construction and placement of the pipeline. Furthermore, with several other projects recently approved or close to approval, it is important that we not over-develop, which could increase risk and significantly decrease any offsetting economic benefits to local communities.

I've included Resolutions approved by multiple local legislative bodies and state officials opposing this plan. I believe it is important that, as an elected representative, I listen to all of my constituencies and advocate for what is best for our communities. 'The current proposal will not provide a long term benefits to these communities and I will continue my advocacy to ensure our communities and constituents have a seat at the table.

For these reasons I forward these resolutions to be included in the public record on this project.

If you have any questions, please contact my office at 518-610 ..813:3

Sincerely,

Chris Gibson

Member of Congress

-----  
**THE SENATE**  
**STATE OF NEW YORK**  
KATHLEEN A. MARCHION  
SENATOR 43rd DISTRICT

April 29, 2015

Mr. Norman C. Bay, Chairman  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERE)  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

Dear Chairman Bay:

I write to convey my serious reservations regarding the proposed Kinder Morgan Pipeline project which would impact families residing within New York State's 43rd Senate District, whom I am so honored and fortunate to serve. Like many of my constituents, and the local elected officials who represent them, I oppose the Kinder Morgan Pipeline project for a variety of reasons.

First and foremost among my concerns with the proposed pipeline is the issue of safety. It has been shared with me that if the project went forward, the pipeline would operate under much greater pressure than what other local gas pipelines are subjected. In addition, there are unanswered questions about the inspection standards of the pipeline welds. Addressing these and other safety concerns for communities across Rensselaer County must be at the forefront of any evaluation.

Second, the proposed pipeline project is expected to have a negative impact on local property values. Advancing a project that would likely drive down local property values would be completely unfair to local homeowners.

Third, the proposed pipeline would provide little to no financial benefit for local communities throughout Rensselaer County. The lack of any clear residual benefit from the pipeline project would result in towns, villages and cities across Rensselaer County assuming a lion's share of the significant risks while receiving none of the benefits. Such a situation is simply unacceptable,

In conclusion, for the cited reasons . safety, local property values and lack of any residual benefit for area communities -I respectfully request that FERC deny a certificate of public convenience and necessity for the proposed Kinder Morgan Pipeline. There is significant, strong and growing local opposition to this proposed pipeline project, as evidenced by four local resolutions enacted against it. I cannot, in good conscience, support this pipeline project as proposed due to the fact that these specific concerns have not been addressed to my satisfaction.

Thank you for your timely consideration of this request made on behalf of my Rensselaer County constituents.

Sincerely,

Kathleen A. Marchion  
State Senator, 43rd District

cc: United States Senator Charles Schumer  
United States Senator Kirsten Gillibrand  
Congressman Chris Gibson  
Rensselaer County Executive Kathy Jimino  
Rensselaer County Board of Legislators  
Stephentown Tawil Board  
Nassau Town Board  
Schodack Town Board

-----  
**TOWN OF STEPHENTOWN**  
**OFFICE OF THE TOWN CLERK**

Re: Opposing the Proposed Pipeline

Dear Elected Representative,

Enclosed you will find a certified copy of Resolution #27 of 2015 of the Town of Stephentown titled "RESOLUTION STATING OPPOSITION TO THE KINDER MORGAN NATURAL GAS PIPELINE PROPOSED TO BE ROUTED THROUGH STEPHENTOWN,"

Our residents and Town Board of Stephentown have spoken and are encouraging you to do the same.

If you have any questions or concerns please feel free to contact me at your convenience.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Wagar  
Stephentown Town Clerk

• 26 Grange Hall Road, Stephentown, New York 12168 • Tel (518) 733-9195 • Fax (518) 733-6493

-----  
**TOWN OF STEPHENTOWN**  
**OFFICE OF THE TOWN CLERK**

26 GRANGE HALL ROAD, STEPHENTOWN, NY 12168

ADOPTED: APRIL 20, 2015

RESOLUTION #27 OF 2015 RESOLUTION STATING OPPOSITION TO THE KINDER MORGAN NATURAL GAS PIPELINE PROPOSED TO BE ROUTED THROUGH STEPHENTOWN

WHEREAS, A large natural gas pipeline, called the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline project, has been proposed by Kinder Morgan and its subsidiary Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC, to be routed through Rensselaer County, including the entire width of the Town of Stephentown; and

WHEREAS, The proposed NED pipeline would transport natural gas from other parts of the country for

intended export out of New York State and possibly overseas, with no natural gas benefits to the residents of Rensselaer County or the Town of Stephentown; and

WHEREAS, The project applicant, Kinder Morgan, is seeking federal eminent domain status to allow for property to be secured for the routing of the pipeline, including properties in the Town of Stephentown; and

WHEREAS, The proposed NED pipeline would be much larger, up to 36 inches in diameter, and operate at much higher pressures, up to 1460 psi, than currently operating natural gas pipelines in this area; and

WHEREAS, The proposed NED pipeline route through the Town of Stephentown would closely follow the high voltage right-of-way presently owned and operated by National Grid, raising reasonable concern for the detrimental interaction between the pipeline and the electromagnetic fields established by the high voltage wires; and

WHEREAS, The thickness/strength of the proposed NED pipeline, the depth at which it would be buried in the ground and the inspection methods for the necessary welds are proposed to be significantly less for our rural area than those required for urban areas; and

WHEREAS, Property values in the vicinity of the proposed NED pipeline are likely to be significantly reduced if it is constructed, adversely impacting future development in the Town of Stephentown; and

WHEREAS, The proposed NED pipeline could cause disruption and undue burdens for emergency services and would significantly increase the potential for catastrophic damage to lives, property, roadways, streams, and wetlands in our small, rural community; and

WHEREAS, The Stephentown Town Board believes the level of compensation and mitigation that may potentially be offered by the developers - of the proposed NED pipeline would not outweigh the long

WHEREAS. The Stephentown Town Board understands that a huge majority of Stephentown residents. as evidenced by many letters, emails and phone calls. the attendance and participation at an Open Forum hosted by Stephentown residents. a Public Hearing hosted by the Stephentown Town Board. and numerous regular meetings of the Stephentown Town Board. are adamantly opposed to the construction and operation of the proposed NED pipeline; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, The Stephentown Town Board does hereby declare its strong opposition to the construction of the proposed NED pipeline through the Town of Stephentown; and. be it further

RESOLVED. The Stephentown Town Board requests that, because of the abundant un-answered concerns and questions brought forth by townspeople. the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) deny a certificate of public convenience and necessity to Kinder Morgan and the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company for the construction of the proposed NED pipeline; and. be it further

RESOLVED, The Stephentown Town Clerk is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to our elected officials: U.S. Senator Charles Schumer, U.S. Senator Kirsten Gillibrand, U.S. Congressman Chris Gibson, NYS Governor Andrew Cuomo. NYS Senator Kathy Marchione. NYS Assemblyman Steve Mclaughlin, Rensselaer County Legislator Stan Brownell and Rensselaer County Legislator Lester Goodermote; and be it further

RESOLVED, The Stephentown Town Board requests that the Town Boards of our neighboring Rensselaer County towns of Nassau and Schodack pass similar, strong resolutions in opposition to the proposed NED pipeline.

MOTION BY: JENNINGS SECONDED BY: DEMICK

VOTES OF: 4 AYE 0 NAY 0 ABSTAINED

The Resolution was declared duly adopted

CERTIFICATION OF THE TOWN CLERK

STATE OF NEW YORK )

) SS

COUNTY OF RENSSELAER )

I Stephanie M. Wagar. Town Clerk of the Town of Stephentown. do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy. and the whole thereof, a resolution duly adopted by the Town Clerk of the Town of Stephentown 011 the 20th day of April, 2015.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereuntn subscribed my name and signed this certificate this 20th day of April. 2015.

-----  
I, Barbara A. Biittig. Town Clerk of the Town of Sand Lake, Rensselaer County, New York.

DO HEREBY CERTIFY, that I have compared the foregoing with the original resolution adopted by the Town Board of the Town of Sand Lake at a meeting of said Board held on June 10.2011; and that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of said original resolution and of the whole thereof, and that said original resolution is on file in my office.

I DO FURTHER CERTIFY, that each of the members of said Town Board had due notice of said meeting, and that, Supervisor Flora Fasold!. Councilwomen Christine Kronllu. Barbara Glasser and Councilmen. Mark Cioffi aud Rav Turner were present at such meeting.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereto set my hand and the seal of the Town of Sand Lake, this June 22. 2015

-----  
RESOLUTION#2015-06-46

Supporting Neighboring Towns in Opposition to the Kinder Morgan Natural Gas Pipeline Proposed to be Routed through Rensselaer County

Supervisor Fasoldt moved and Councilman Cioffi seconded the following resolution:

Whereas, a large natural gas pipeline called the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline project, has been proposed by Kinder Morgan and its subsidiary Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LLC, to be routed through Rensselaer County, including the neighboring Towns of Schodack, Nassau and Stephentown; and

Whereas, the proposed NED pipeline would operate at much higher pressures, than currently operating natural gas pipelines in Rensselaer County; and Whereas, the pipeline proposed for routing through neighboring towns will be approximately 36 inches in diameter, and routed on existing rights of way, along with nearby private properties and include a large gas compressor station or stations that will encompass extensive acreage and possibly located near residential areas; and,

Whereas, the proposed NED pipeline would transport natural gas from other parts of the country for intended export out of New York State and possibly overseas, with no natural gas benefits to the residents of Rensselaer County; and

Whereas, neighboring Towns directly impacted by the proposed NED pipeline have endeavored to be fully informed of this project and have documented and reported the potential detrimental impacts of this project, to include, but are not limited to:

1. As proposed, this pipeline will run across private property, directly adjacent to homes and through waterways; and,
2. As proposed, this project will impact residential wells, natural groundwater recharge areas and aquifers; and.
3. This proposal is expected to blast through the Rensselaer Plateau which is one of New York's largest intact forested areas that has brought economic opportunity through tourism and responsible business to many areas of Rensselear County; and,
4. This proposal would impact designated areas of archeological sensitivity across communities; and,
5. As currently proposed, this pipeline has significant potential impact in the areas of public health and safety, home values, businesses, sensitive habitat fragmentation and the further stalling of economic

development; and,

6. The project applicant, Kimler Morgan, is seeking federal eminent domain status to allow for property to be secured for the routing of the pipeline which will not benefit the residents of our neighboring communities and give the company and its affiliates an unfair advantage over property owners in these communities; and
  7. The proposed NED pipeline would closely follow the high voltage right-of-way raising reasonable concern for the detrimental interaction between the pipeline and the electromagnetic fields established by the high voltage wires; and
  8. The thickness/strength of the proposed NED pipeline, the depth at which it would be buried in the ground and the inspection methods for the necessary welds are proposed to be significantly less for rural areas than those required by urban areas; and
  9. The proposed NED pipeline carries an inherent risk of leaks, ruptures, fires, explosions, and accidents, which may cause disruption and undue burden for emergency services and would significantly increase the potential for catastrophic damage to lives, property, roadways, streams, wells, aquifers and wetlands in our neighboring rural communities; and
  10. Neighboring towns believe the level of compensation and mitigation would not outweigh the long term fiscal, health, safety, business, environmental and quality of life impacts to those neighboring towns; and
- II. The proposed pipeline is contrary to the rural residential character of these communities and fails to follow the already existing pipeline corridor; and,
12. The proposed use of land for an industrial compressor station necessary to operate this pipeline, would have dramatic and long term, environmental, social and economic impacts on the rural residential character of our neighboring towns; and
  13. The proposed use of land for this project is in direct contradiction to town law as well as the comprehensive plans of these communities; now therefore,

Be it Resolved, that due to the widespread serious concerns and questions raised by residents and the potentially significant negative impacts of the proposed project, the Town of Sand Lake stands in solidarity with the neighboring Towns of Rensselaer County in opposition to the construction of the proposed NED pipeline; and,

Be it Further Resolved, that the Town Clerk of the Town of Sand Lake is hereby directed to transmit certified copies of this resolution to United States Senator Charles Schumer, United States Senator Kirsten Gillibrand, Congressman Chis Gibson, Congressman Paul Tonko, Governor Andrew Cuomo, New York State Senator Marchione, State Assemblyman Steve Mcl.aughlin and Rensselaer County Executive Kathy Jimino.

ADOPTED = AYES 5 NAYS 0

-----  
**Village of East Nassau**  
P.O. Box 268 • East Nassau, NY 12062  
518.794.0289

June 17, 2015

Governor Andrew M. Cuomo  
The Executive Chamber  
State Capitol  
Albany, New York 12224

U.S. Senator Charles Schumer  
Leo O'Brien Building - Room 420  
11A Clinton Avenue

Congressman Paul Tonko  
61 Columbia Street - 41h Floor  
Albany, New York 12210

Honorable Kathleen Marchione  
Legislative Office Bldg. - Room 918  
188 State Street

Albany, New York 12207  
U.S. Senator Kirsten Gillibrand  
Leo O'Brien Building - Room 721  
11A Clinton Avenue  
Albany, New York 12207  
Congressman Chris Gibson  
1 Hudson Street  
10 Box 775  
Kinderhook, New York 12106

Albany, New York 12247  
Honorable Steve McLaughlin  
Legislative Office Bldg. - Room 533  
188 State Street  
Albany, New York 12247  
Honorable Kathleen Jimino  
Rensselaer County Executive  
1600 Seventh Avenue - 5th Floor  
Troy, New York 12180

Re: Resolution Stating Opposition to Kinder Morgan Gas Pipeline

Dear Government Representative:

Enclosed herewith is the Resolution adopted by the Village Board of the Village of East Nassau, New York at its monthly meeting held on June 10, 2015.

This Resolution states the village's opposition to the Kinder Morgan Natural Gas Pipeline proposed to be routed through the Town of Nassau north or the Village of East Nassau.

We are asking your support in favor of this resolution. Thank you for your attention to this very important matter for the citizens of the Village of East Nassau and the Town of Nassau.

Respectfully yours,

Diane Maguire  
Village Clerk

Encl

-----  
**Resolution of the Board of Trustees of the Village of East Nassau**

STATING OPPOSITION TO THE KINDER MORGAN NATURAL GAS PIPELINE PROPOSED TO BE  
ROUTED THROUGH THE TOWN OF NASSAU NORTH OF THE VILLAGE OF EAST NASSAU

WHEREAS, a large natural gas pipeline called the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline project, has been proposed by Kinder Morgan and its subsidiary Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LLC, to be routed through Rensselaer County, including the entire width of the northern portion of the Town of Nassau; and

WHEREAS, the proposed NED pipeline would transport natural gas from other parts of the country for intended export out of New York State and possibly overseas, with no natural gas benefits to the residents of the Village of East Nassau, the Town of Nassau, or Rensselaer County; and

WHEREAS, the Village of East Nassau is less than two miles from the proposed compressor station in the Town of Nassau, and less than one mile from the proposed pipeline route; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Nassau, through its Natural Resources Committee, has done extensive research into the impacts of the proposed pipeline and has concluded that the pipeline would cause detrimental impacts to biodiversity and natural areas along and around the pipeline route; and Whereas, the Village Board has received numerous communications from village residents expressing concern about impacts of the proposed pipeline find unanimous opposition to the project; and Whereas, this proposed pipeline has a significant potential impact in the areas of public safety, home values, and businesses throughout the Village of East Nassau and beyond; NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Village Board hereby declares its strong opposition to the construction of the proposed NED pipeline through the Town of Nassau; and, be it further

RESOLVED, that the Village Board of the Village of East Nassau requests that, because of the abundant unanswered questions, impacts, and concerns brought forward by our village residents and by our representa-

tives in the Town of Nassau. the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) deny a certificate of public convenience and necessity to Kinder Morgan and the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company for the construction of the proposed NED pipeline; and, be it further

RESOLVED, that the Village Clerk of the Village of East Nassau is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution 10 United States Senator Charles Schumer, United States Senator Kirsten Gillibrand. Congressman Chris Gibson, Congressman Paul Tonko, Governor Andrew Cuomo, New York State Senator Kathy Marchione, State Assemblyman Steve Mcl.aughlin and Rensselaer County Executive Kathy Jimino.

Upon motion made by Trustee Bill Davis. and seconded by Trustee Lydia Davis, the foregoing resolution was duly adopted by a majority of the members of the Village Board of the Village of East Nassau at its Regular Meeting held on June 10,2015.

Certification by Village Clerk

Dianne C. Maguire, Village Clerk

-----  
**Resolution of the Town Board of the Town of Nassau**

**STATING OPPOSITION TO THE KINDER MORGAN NATURAL GAS PIPELINE PROPOSED TO BE ROUTED THROUGH THE TOWN OF NASSAU**

Resolution No. 11

WHEREAS, a large natural gas pipeline called the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline project, has been proposed by Kinder Morgan and its subsidiary Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LLC, to be routed through Rensselaer County, including the entire width of the northern portion of the Town of Nassau; and

WHEREAS, the proposed NED pipeline would be much larger, up to 36 inches in diameter, and operate at much higher pressures, than currently operating natural gas pipelines in Rensselaer County; and

WHEREAS, the proposed NED pipeline would transport natural gas from other parts of the country for intended export out of New York State and possibly overseas, with no natural gas benefits to the residents of the Town of Nassau or Rensselaer County; and

WHEREAS, this project, as currently planned, would not follow a route through the community already impacted by a pipeline in the southern end of the Town of Nassau; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board of the Town of Nassau has endeavored to be fully informed of this project and its impacts and has requested that the Town's Natural Resources Committee review and provide a report of the natural resources impacts of this project;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Town Board of the Town of Nassau does hereby make the following findings:

WHEREAS, the Nassau Natural Resources Committee has completed this report and the document provides an outline of real and detrimental impacts to the biodiversity and natural areas of concern across the width of the Town of Nassau from the current route proposed for this industrial project: and

1. as proposed, this pipeline will run across private property, directly adjacent to homes and through waterways; and
2. as proposed, this project will impact residential wells, natural groundwater recharge areas and aquifers; and
3. this proposal is expected to blast through the Rensselaer Plateau which is one of New York's largest intact forested areas that has brought economic opportunity through tourism and responsible business to many areas of Rensselaer County - including Nassau; and
4. this proposal would impact designated areas of archeological sensitivity across the community; and
5. the Town Board of the Town of Nassau has received numerous public comments during TOWTI meetings as well as numerous calls and messages of concern from residents impacted by this project which have

stated opposition to this project; and

6. the Town Board of the Town of Nassau has received letters of opposition and messages from business owners and community groups in the town expressing specific and economically damaging concerns about the impacts on business operations and programs from construction and operation of this pipeline; and

7. the loss of business activity even during this proposed project construction period could mean the closure of small operations in this fragile economy; and

8. members of the Town Board of the Town of Nassau have attended the only Rensselaer County informational meeting hosted by Kinder Morgan and Board Members have also attended community forums across Rensselaer County on this project which were sponsored by community members to collect and share information on this proposal; and

9. as currently proposed, this pipeline has a significant potential impact in the areas of public safety, home values, businesses, sensitive habitat fragmentation and further stalling of economic opportunity; and

10. the project applicant, Kinder Morgan, is seeking federal eminent domain status to allow for property to be secured for the routing of the pipeline, including properties in the Town of Nassau; and

11. the granting of and threat of federal eminent domain status to Kinder Morgan for this project which will not benefit our residents will give the company and its affiliates an unfair advantage over property owners in this community; and

12. as proposed, this pipeline project will result in significant amounts of private property being incorporated into this project which will lead to a decline in property values, ability to conduct business and a decrease in taxable values for the community as a whole; and

13. the proposed NED pipeline route through the Town of Nassau would closely follow the high voltage right-of-way presently owned and operated by National Grid, raising reasonable concern for the detrimental interaction between the pipeline and the electromagnetic fields established by the high voltage wires; and

14. the thickness/strength of the proposed NED pipeline, the depth at which it would be buried in the ground and the inspection methods for the necessary welds are proposed to be significantly less for our rural area than those required for urban areas; and

15. the proposed NED pipeline could cause disruption and undue burdens for emergency services and would significantly increase the potential for catastrophic damage to lives, property, roadways, streams, wells, aquifers and wetlands in our small, rural community; and

16. the Town Board of the Town of Nassau believes the level of compensation and mitigation that may potentially be offered by the developers of the proposed NED pipeline would not outweigh the long term fiscal, health, safety, business, environmental and quality of life impacts to our community; and

17. the proposed pipeline project is contrary to the rural residential character of the community and will fail to follow the already existing pipeline corridor; and

18. the proposed use of lands of the town of Nassau for an industrial compressor station necessary to operate this pipeline, in any portion of the community, would have dramatic and long term, environmental, social and economic impacts on the rural residential character of the community; and

19. the construction and operation of such a gas compressor station is contrary to Town laws as well as the Town of Nassau Comprehensive Plan as developed and approved by the community in July 2011;

and, be it further RESOLVED, that based on the above findings, the Town Board hereby declares its strong opposition to the construction of the proposed NED pipeline through the Town of Nassau; and, be it further

RESOLVED, that the Town Board of the Town of Nassau requests that, because of the abundant unanswered questions, impacts, and concerns brought forward by our residents, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) deny a certificate of public convenience and necessity to Kinder Morgan and the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company for the construction of the proposed NED pipeline; and, be it further

RESOLVED, that the Town Board of the Town of Nassau does hereby oppose the granting of eminent

domain status for the Kinder Morgan natural gas pipeline proposed to cut through the community; and, be it further

RESOLVED, that the Town Board of the Town of Nassau does hereby oppose the use of lands of the Town of Nassau for an industrial compressor station in any portion of the community as such usage would be in violation with local planning documents and local laws; and, be it further

RESOLVED, that the Town Clerk of the Town of Nassau is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to United States Senator Charles Schumer, United States Senator Kirsten Gillibrand, Congressman Chris Gibson, Congressman Paul Tonko, Governor Andrew Cuomo, New York State Senator Kathy Marchione, State Assemblyman Steve McLaughlin and Rensselaer County Executive Kathy Jimino,

Upon motion made by Supervisor David Fleming, and seconded by Ms. Richards, the foregoing resolution was duly adopted by a majority of the members of the Town Board of the Town of Nassau at its Regular Meeting held on May 14, 2015, by roll call vote as follows:

Ronald Sears, Council member	No_	Yes X	Absent_	Abstain_
Lani Richards, Council member	No_	Yes X	Absent_	Abstain_
Jonathan Goebel, Councilmember	No_	Yes X	Absent_	Abstain_.
Robert Rings, Councilmember	No_	Yes X	Absent_	Abstain_
David Fleming, Supervisor	No_	Yes X	Absent_	Abstain __

Said Resolution was duly adopted: May 14, 2015. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and the seal of the Town of Nassau, Rensselaer County, New York.

Sandra L. Rings, Town Clerk Dated: May 22, 2015

-----  
**Office of the Schodack Town Clerk**

265 Schuurman Rd.

Castleton, NY 12033

TELEPHONE (518) 417-7590

FAX (518) 477-2439

DONNA L. CONLIN  
TOWN CLERK

KAREN A. VECCHIONE, DEPUTY  
IOIS M. CICCONE, DEPUTY

May 18, 2015

The Hon. Chris Gibson  
PO Box 775  
Kinderhook, NY 12106

Dear Congressman Gibson:

Enclosed you will find a certified resolution adopted by the Town Board of the Town of Schodack on May 14, 2015 opposing the Kinder Morgan (NED) pipeline that is proposed to go through the Town of Schodack. Many residents of our community have voiced their concerns at Town Board meetings and other public venues in opposition to this line. The Town Board assessed all the information presented by Kinder Morgan and others before making their decision to join with the towns of Nassau and Stephentown as well as Rensselaer County in opposition to the pipeline. The enclosed resolution outlines the justifications for why we oppose the pipeline.

We seek your support in challenging the placement of this 36 inch in diameter pipeline and possible compressor station in the Town of Schodack. Further, as our Congressman, we would sincerely appreciate it if you would reach out to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission on our behalf to voice our concerns.

Sincerely,

Donna L. Conlin/CMC/RMC  
Schodack Town Clerk

Enc: (1)

**Office of the Schodack Town Clerk**

265 Schuurman Rd.

Castleton, NY 12033

TELEPHONE (518) 417-7590

FAX (518) 477-2439

DONNA L. CONLIN  
TOWN CLERK

KAREN A. VECCHIONE, DEPUTY  
IOIS M. CICCONE, DEPUTY

STATE OF NEW YORK )  
COUNTY OF RENSSELAER )SS.:  
TOWN OF SCHODACK )

I, the undersigned Clerk of the Town of Schodack, do hereby certify as follows:

1. A Special Meeting of the Town Board of the Town of Schodack, State of New York, was duly held on 05/14/2015 , and Minutes of said meeting have been duly recorded in the Minute Book kept by me in accordance with law for the purpose of recording the Minutes of meetings of said Board. I have compared the attached Extract with said Minutes so recorded and said Extract is a true copy of said Minutes and of the whole thereof insofar as said Minutes relate to matters referred to in said Extract.
2. Said Minutes correctly state the time when said Meeting was convened and the place where such Meeting was held and the members of said Board who attended said Meeting.
3. Public Notice of the time and place of the said Meeting was duly given to the public and the news media in accordance with the Open Meetings Law, constituting Chapter 511 of the Laws of 1976 of the State of New York, and that the members of said Board had due notice of said Meeting and the Meeting was in all respects duly held and a quorum was present and acted throughout.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and have hereunto affixed the corporate seal of the Town of Schodack this 15th day of May 2015.

Donnam L. Conlin  
Schodack Town Clerk IRMC

At a Regular Meeting of the Town Board of the Town of Schodack, Rensselaer County, New York. held at 265 Schuurman Road, in said Town on the 14th of May, 2015 at 7:05 P.M.

The meeting was called to order by Dennis Dowds, Supervisor, and upon roll being called, the following were:

	PRESENT	ABSENT
DENNIS E. DOWDS	X	
FRANCIS H. CURTIS	X	
JAMES N. BULT	X	
MICHAEL KENNEY	X	
SCOTT SWARTZ	X	

The following resolution was offered by Councilperson Swartz who moved its adoption and was seconded by Supervisor Dowds:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE TOWN BOARD OF THE TOWN OF SCHODACK DOES HEREBY:

WHEREAS. Kinder Morgan, by its subsidiary Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LLC, is proposing a large natural gas pipeline to run through southern Rensselaer County. including the Town of Schodack, referenced as the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline project; and

WHEREAS, Kinder Morgan is seeking approval from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) for federal eminent domain status, to allow the project to proceed; and

WHEREAS, the citizens of the Town of Schodack have expressed strong opposition to this project, based upon a series of concerns:

1. The proposed NED pipeline would be large (36 inches in diameter) with a high pressure (1460 psi), which in turn would result in major public safety issues in the Town of Schodack;
2. The public safety issues will result in strains to fire departments and other emergency responders in the Town;
3. The public safety concerns will reduce property values in the Town of Schodack along the route of the proposed pipeline;
4. The project would create the risk of substantial damage to the health, safety, and environment of the Town of Schodack including damage to the aquifer;
5. The compensation, if any, paid to property owners by the pipeline operator would not come close to compensating for the major economic and environmental damages to the Town;
6. The project includes the siting of a compressor station, reportedly in the Town of Schodack. The industrial size of this proposed compressor station would result in significant noise and other environmental impacts to residents near the compressor site; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board of the Town of Schodack shares the concerns expressed by many residents, and wishes to give formal expression of this opposition to Kinder Morgan, FERC, and more particularly to our federal representatives in Congress;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Town Board of the Town of Schodack hereby goes on record to express its strong opposition to the siting of this pipeline and the compressor station anywhere within the Town of Schodack; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Schodack Town Clerk is hereby directed to send a certified copy of this resolution to the representatives of the Town in Congress, to wit, Hon. Charles Schumer, Hon. Kirsten Gillibrand, and Hon. Chris Gibson and Hon. Paul Tonko.

Upon the vote being cast, the members voted as follows:

	AYE	NAY	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
DENNIS E. DOWDS	X			
FRANCIS CURTIS	X			
JAMES N. BULT	X			
MICHAEL KENNEY	X			
SCOTT SWARTZ	X			

The Resolution, having received a majority vote of the members of the Town Board was declared by the Supervisor to be adopted.

-----  
**DELAWARE COUNTY**  
**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**  
Senator Charles D, Cook County Office Building  
111Main Street  
Delhi, New York 13753  
Telephone: 607-832-5110  
Fax: 607-832-5111

James E. Eisel, Sr. Cbairman  
Cbrlsra M.Schafer, Clerk

April 23, 2015

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

RE: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC., Docket No. PFI4-22-000

Proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project

On behalf of the affected Towns in Delaware County I am writing to convey serious concerns we have about the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline that is proposed to be routed through Delaware County. The line is being proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company (TGPC) a subsidiary of KinderMorgan. The TGPC line will traverse 45.6 miles of Delaware County through the Towns of Masonville, Sidney, Franklin; Dav- enport and Harpersfield. The County, TOWNS and hundreds of landowners will be directly impacted by this proposal. There are also many concerns about indirect impacts to neighboring towns and villages as the construction traffic traverses their roads and community to gain access to the proposed line. At our April 8, 2015 Board of Supervisors meeting Kinder Morgan gave a presentation about the proposed line and took questions from my colleagues and County staff. While they committed to mitigate many of the concerns raised, we herewith request that FERC formalize these commitments prior to your issuance of the Certificate of Public Necessity and Convenience. Delaware County and the affected Towns within it will take strong opposition to the line if FERC does not take actions to ensure that the impacts of the line are mitigated and the taxpayers of the municipalities are held harmless of the total costs of constructing this line.

Public safety and the protection of municipal infrastructure are of paramount importance to the Towns and County. To that end there will be legal costs and engineering time expended by all municipalities through which construction traffic will flow to ensure that a road use agreement is developed that protects the safety of the traveling public and protect the structural integrity of the roads. The municipalities will track these costs closely and accurately. The local costs for these efforts must be paid by the developer.

We are also deeply concerned about what the future will hold for additional natural gas pipelines traversing the same route. This is the second line to follow the exact same route through the County. This route is obviously a desirable route from the productive gas fields in Pennsylvania to cities and ports along the East Coast. We are very concerned about the cumulative effects of multiple lines through our County. We request that FERC require a comprehensive plan be developed by experts in health, environment, public safety, social, economic, land values and quality of life. This plan shall address the maximum number of lines that could reasonably be constructed safely so that our residents can be aware of what could ultimately be developed here. Since FERC supersedes all local land use requirements, it is only reasonable that the communities have an accurate vision of what could ultimately happen so they can plan around it.

Delaware County's concerns are based on past utility and proposed project experiences that have or are about to traverse our County. For instance we are having difficulty getting a road use agreement with Constitution Pipeline (one that FERC recently approved). In light of this ongoing experience we can only anticipate the same difficulties with TOPC. This is consuming substantial amounts of legal and engineering which should be reimbursed to the County but is not currently. We recognize the benefits that these projects have to America's economic growth, worldwide competitiveness and quality of life for the greater population. However, the costs associated with these benefits should not be carried by a small portion of the population. It is imperative that the entire costs of the project should be addressed by the developers and ultimately by the consumers. Environmental justice laws are in place to prevent a few poorer people from having to shoulder huge costs at the benefit of all end users. We request that FERC truly address all the costs. In some towns, the proposed pipeline will be all additional natural gas line to the pending Constitution natural gas line and an existing liquid propane line. Just to provide you with a visual in the event you are unfamiliar with this region, Delaware County lies in the beautiful Catskill Mountains and we love our rural way of life, feel very secure away from the maddening crowds, and are proud to call this home. Now there is a possibility

of yet another approval from FERC which will put 3 pipelines in some of our towns in the Cennty. This certainly will put a scar on this pristine area and our rural mountainsides. To date, the ropc proposal has not offered any commitment for substantial economic compensation. Our requests that follow arc tiny, relative to the financial benefits the pipeline companies and natural gas providers will reap from the installation of this line, as are the cost savings the end consumers will enjoy.

Our County also has the dubious distinction of being regulated by both governruental and quasi-governmen-tal entities which include New York City, Delaware River Basin Commission and Susquehanna River Basin Commission, with no representation and in the case of the latter two, no financial support for compliance with their regulations. Half of our county land is regulated by New York City and provides half of the daily water consumption of New York City with no direct benefit (0 the residents of the County, The County also has major electrical transmission lines going through it and one of the largest substations in the state, both of which are there to support power to the City of New York area with no benefit to the County residents. All of these major utilities have left major impacts to the land and people of the county while providing economical services to the Cities of the east coast. The County is dependent on FERC to ensure that the true costs of this proposed project are bOJ1lby the developers and that the hosts of the projects arc not lell with costs without any benefit. The host communities must see some benefit from the project in order for justice to be done. Our residents will see little or no benefit ill the medium (J)' long-term from this project as has been the cllse on other utility projects. New York City managed to get natural gas drilling banned in half of Delaware County before New York State banned it altogether. Frankly, we are tired of being the doormat of outside entities that take far more than they give, while receiving substantial economic benefits hundreds of miles away from our residents without enduring any inconvenience or risk for their economic gain while the interests of our residents arc summarily dismissed.

Our county is one of the fastest aging counties in the state and one of the poorest. Our median household income is 30% lower than the state median household income. We are ill dire need of affordable senior housing and housing for hundreds of residents displaced by floods of record over the past 15 years. Our manufacturing and agriculture enterprises are shrinking. With declining enterprises, we are depending more and more on the second home owners who come to enjoy the scenic resources of the County and tourism. When development takes the scenery away we have nothing left to support our residents.

A study by the Open Space Institute on the Catskills used data from the CornellProgram on Applied Demographics which indicated "that [a certain geographic area in the Catskills is anticipated to) average 4% growth between2005 and 2035." Delaware County, however "is ex-peeled to lose 23% of its population and was therefore excluded from the total and development growth analysis" conducted by the Open Space Institute because it severely distorted the projected growth in the other counties. The same data showed that demographic "projections by Cornell University show a decline of population of43% for the age group 0 to 60 and an increase of21% for ages 60 to 85" for Delaware County. They demonstrated that by separating population projections by age Delaware County "shows a steep decline in the working-age population." Iwent)' five percent of OUT residents are on some form of public assistance and its anticipated that will increase. This data illustrates that Delaware County is facing many economic challenges including jobs to retain our youth and lends itself to questions of how we will meet the challenges of a rapidly aging population on fixe-d incomes combined with a declining work force accompanied by little or no growth in lax base?

Unfortunately, according to a report published by The Weather Channel, evaluating the 50 worst places to OW11 a home, Delaware County ranked as the 10th worst place to own a home. There are over 3.000 counties in the United States. The list includes cost to heat and cool homes to weather-related deaths in homes. Delaware County's ranking is based almost entirely upon the risk for weather impacts such as .flood damage and heating costs.

With a declining tax base, we have not been able to upgrade our transportation system. Om' roads, with very few exceptions. have developed over time from the original horse and buggy trails. They are not designed to handle the present day truck loadings. It is imperative that FERC include provisions in the approvals to ensure that all the roads used during the construction and testing phases are protected.

FERC should also ensure that all reasonable legal costs incurred by municipalities affected by this project will be reimbursed by TGPC.

1. We request that FERC strongly consider including the following items in the Certificate of Public Necessity and Convenience: The commitments we seek from TGPC are:

- The elected town officials and the entire County Board of Supervisors shall be kept fully informed as the project is developed. The standard for TOPC going forward shall be the highest level of transparency for all townships that will be affected either by the line 01' construction traffic and the full Delaware County Board of Supervisors so that they can communicate effectively with their constituents about the proposed pipeline.
- TOPC will provide usable maps with parcels and other relevant electronic data in a timely manner to the affected TOI-TIS through our County Planning Department and in a format that is compatible with the software used by our Delaware County Planning Department.
- They shall make public presentations to the Board of Supervisors when requested and will keep them fully informed as the project progresses and respond expeditiously to specific requests of the Board.
- The Chairman of the Board will be their contact point on matters brought forth by fellow supervisors.
- We expect that local comments be taken seriously and respond to them promptly in writing,

2. Facts reported to the County on September 5, 2014 by Kinder Morgan.

- They will pre-file with FERC in approximately two weeks from September 5th.
- They anticipate a full FERC filing in the Fall of 2015,
- Total project extends at least 400 miles at a cost of \$4 billion.
- There are currently 260 landowners who will be affected by the proposal pipeline in Delaware County.
- Allowing access by a gas distribution company to an interstate pipeline to distribute local is required by law.

3. Requests to offset the expenses and good faith commitments by TGPC:

- We ask that all alternatives related to landowner, local economic impacts, costs to local municipalities and environmental concerns be evaluated by PERC 011 on a cumulative basis and establish accounts to offset these expenses to be used at the discretion of the County.
  - o Serious consideration should be given to constructing Kinder Morgan concurrently with the Constitution pipeline to minimize the negative effects of the construction process for our residents and communities.
  - o With the addition of the TGPC pipeline to the Constitution Pipeline some small properties may be left with an unacceptable lot size. In those cases, Kinder Morgan should be required to purchase the entire lot with improvements. The local tax base cannot be undermined by this process and individual property owners should be paid fair market value plus 50% of the value of their improved property to offset the cost and emotional trauma of relocating.
- We want the following host community benefits. This is a preliminary list subject to change.
  - o As part of road use agreements, Kinder Morgan or TGPC should establish an account for all municipalities to access for unknown or unanticipated repair and maintenance costs that present themselves in the future under the administration of the Delaware County Department of Public Works. Minimum \$5 million.
  - o TOPC or Kinder Morgan should establish an account for the County to use for the Rehabilitation, Replacement, Modification, and Upgrade of its Emergency Radio Communications System-which all first responders and municipalities in the County will be utilizing upon its completion, Our Current public safety radio system is antiquated and frequently has failures. At this time we suffer from poor to absent interoperability, limited coverage for responders and a critical problem to acquire

ing parts when we do have breakages. Our current system as it stands today could severely inhibit any response to a large scale pipeline emergency. First Responders will play an integral part in any pipeline emergency and having a reliable communications system is paramount, These funds will be administered by the Department of Emergency Services. Minimum \$5 million.

- o Kinder Morgan or TGPC should establish a \$5 million fund for use by the affected municipalities to enable them to comply with unfunded environmental regulations related to stormwater protection, any aspect of flood mitigation or septic waste resulting from this project. These funds will be used at the discretion of these municipalities. These funds will be administered by the Delaware County Department of Watershed Affairs on behalf of those affected and administrative costs incurred by the municipalities and Watershed Affairs will also be covered.

- o Kinder Morgan or TGPC should provide \$5 million dollars for the purposes of providing unmatched grants to businesses, public or private schools in Delaware County with priority given to the five towns to access, for the betterment of these entities and students, This would help enhance the economic climate and offer greater educational opportunities for the children of this county, To be administered by our Department of Economic Development with administrative costs covered.

- o Kinder Morgan or TGPC should voluntarily provide \$5 million for the purposes of creating or assisting affected municipalities with affordable housing alternatives. These funds will be administered by our Delaware County Planning Department as they have contractual planning services with each of the affected municipalities. The county planning department administrative costs and any administrative costs incurred by the municipalities will be covered by these funds as well.

- o That Kinder Morgan or TGPC pay for all costs (If construction of a distribution system that provides natural gas to small communities such as Franklin, Davenport and Sidney. These are examples of host communities for which TGPC should consider as the cost of doing business. The income of Kinder Morgan from distributing the natural gas let alone the suppliers of the natural gas dwarf by hard-to-estimate orders of magnitude compared to our request over 50 years. The Pipeline Companies and those who benefit in New England must pay for the benefits we outline.

- o FERC should require TGPC to re-establish their pipeline headquarters and establish future staging headquarters in Delaware County rather than in a County that is unaffected by the pipeline.

- o We will request of FERC and the EPA to consider a determination of environmental justice as a low income group affected by this pipeline and others.

In closing, we look forward to and expect complete transparency and cooperation with our requests and suggestions. Our preliminary request of \$25 million for road use agreements, housing, environmental regulation compliance, economic development/school education and emergency communications is slightly over .5% of the \$4 billion cost; a rounding error in the budget of this scope. In addition to that, administrative and legal costs of the Towns and County during construction along with future associated expenses needs reimbursement as well. Escrow accounts should be set up to handle all potential unforeseen expenses. Our financial requests are but loose change relative to Kinder Morgan's or TO PC construction cost and anticipated revenue over the next 50 years. I believe these costs must be shared by the gas companies, pipeline companies and end users who will benefit the most. These clearly justifiable requests are merely part of the cost of doing business for TO PC or Kinder Morgan. FERC should hold them and others responsible on our behalf as we receive no benefits except for property tax. The local costs we will endure during this process would likely never be recouped. They should be added to any projected property tax revenue that may be generated. Experience tells us that Kinder Morgan, like the rest, will challenge their assessment overtime with a barrage of attorneys that we would not have the resources to combat, ultimately winning their challenges by wearing us down and burning our limited resources.

Thank you for your consideration of our requests and I look forward to your response to this letter.

Sincerely,

James E. Eisel, Sr., Chairman  
Delaware County Board of Supervisors

cc: US Senator Charles E. Schumer  
US Senator Kirsten Gillibrand  
US Congressman Chris Gibson  
US Environmental Protection Agency  
NY Governor Andrew Cuomo  
NY Dept. Environmental Conservation  
NY Department of State  
NY Office of the Attorney General

Allen Fore, Kinder Morgan  
NY Senator John Bonacic  
NY Senator James Seward  
NY Senator Tom Libous  
NY Assemblyman Pete Lopez  
NY Assemblyman Clifford Crouch  
NY Assemblywoman Claudia Tenney  
Department of the Army

**20150702-0023(30692241).pdf**

**TOWN OF ANDOVER**

Town Offices  
36 Bartiet Street  
Andover, MA 01810  
(978) 623-8200  
[www.town.andover.ma.us](http://www.town.andover.ma.us)

June 12, 2015

Mr. Norman C. Bay, Chairman  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Room IA  
Washington, DC 20146

Re: Gas Pipeline Resolution

Dear Mr. Bay:

Please be advised that the following resolution was passed at the May, 2015 Andover Annual Town Meeting.

ARTICLE 59. To see if the Town will vote to approve the following Resolution to ban the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline project and to Support Sustainable Energy in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the citizens of the Town of Andover, Massachusetts:

1. Hereby commend our Town Manager and Selectmen for their efforts to re-route the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline company's high-pressured pipeline through Andover.
2. Believe that the proposed pipeline goes against current Commonwealth of Massachusetts and Andover commitments to renewable energy technologies and combating global climate change; and
3. Call upon businesses and residents to maximize energy conservation to reduce demand; call upon utilities and the state to actively reduce peak demand shortfalls through pricing and backup storage options; and call upon the state to continue to aggressively promote adoption of renewable energy technologies.
4. Demand that the Commonwealth require and oversee the repair to all existing gas pipelines prior to and as a condition of allowing expansion of gas supply pipelines, and give preference to incremental expansion of existing pipelines and to short-term solutions such as liquefied natural gas prior to any consideration of building new pipeline infrastructure in the State.
5. Hereby request our State and Federal Legislators and our Executive Branch Officials to enact legislation, and take such other and further actions, as is necessary to disallow such projects that go against our commitments to life, the environment, our economic well-being and our personal health and safety; and, instead, to legislate more stringent energy efficiency and further exploration of, and subsidies for, renewable energy sources; and also:

*{no further pages in the FERC PDF}*

**20150702-0025(30692638).pdf**

Town of Troy  
16 Central Square - PO Box 249 - Troy, New Hampshire 03465

June 22, 2015

Norman Bay, Chairman  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

Dear Chairman Bay,

We write to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission regarding Kinder Morgan's proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project, Docket N. PF-14-22-000. We, the Selectmen of the Town of Troy, NH, formally request that you schedule a pre-filing scoping meeting in Troy, NH to allow our residents ample opportunity to express their views on the proposed natural gas pipeline. Our Community Center would be an excellent location and we will work with you to find a mutually convenient date and time for the meeting.

We believe it is imperative that our residents be afforded the opportunity to engage in open and transparent dialog with FERC about the pipeline and the proposed route before any final decision is made.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this request and we look forward to seeing you in Troy, NH.

Sincerely

Howard M. Sheats, Jr., Chairman  
William T. Matson  
Gideon L. Nadeau, Sr.

Town Hall - Selectmen's Office ----- Tel. 603-242-7722 ----- Fax 603-242-3430

**20150702-0026(30692636).pdf**

**CITY OF PEABODY**

24 LOWELL STREET  
PEABODY, MA 01960

P. 978-538-5700  
F. 978-538-5960

**OFFICE OF THE MAYOR**

**EDWARD A. BETTENCOURT JR.**

June 12, 2015

Sandra Waldstein, Director  
The State, International and Public Affairs Division  
FERC  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: Docket No. PF14-22

Dear Ms. Waldstein:

The Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LL.C. has submitted to FERC an Application to open a pre-filing proceeding of Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. under New Docket for Tennessee's Northeast Energy Direct Project under PF 14-22.

As part of this project, Tennessee Gas has proposed building a spur of subsurface pipeline in an area of Peabody, Massachusetts wholly unsuited for such a utility. As Mayor of Peabody, I feel it is my duty to convey to FERC the concerns and fears of so many in our community.

First, the area proposed for pipeline construction runs adjacent to one of our city's most beloved and tight knit neighborhoods. Families who live here are justly concerned about a disruptive construction project which could forever alter the landscape of their homes. Homeowners have also expressed to me their concerns relative to public safety and protection of property.

Also, the area proposed for pipeline construction runs along the Peabody Independence Greenway. Known locally as simply 'the Bikepath,' the Greenway is a favorite destination for thousands of walkers, joggers, cyclists and wildlife enthusiasts. Many of these individuals have expressed their dismay over this pipeline proposal and I share their concern for preservation of this vital community resource.

Finally, the area proposed for pipeline construction is home to a number of natural resources which could be jeopardized by such a large scale and disruptive project. Thanks to its vicinity to the Ipswich River, the area is rife with wetlands, plants, trees, and other types of vegetation. While Peabody is renowned as a center of industry and technology, we treasure our open space and natural resources.

I join my fellow elected officials on the City Council as well as hundreds of Peabody residents who have united to oppose this project. The Tennessee Gas proposal will disrupt Peabody neighborhoods, jeopardize public safety, decimate a treasured recreational amenity and wipe out precious natural resources. Thank you for your consideration of this public comment.

Warmest regards,

Edward A. Bettencourt, Jr.

Mayor, City of Peabody

Cc -Kimberly D. Bose

**20150702-0027(30692637).pdf**

**Office of Board of Selectmen  
Town of Mason**  
16 Darling Hill Road — Mann House  
Mason, New Hampshire 03048  
(603) 878-2070 (603) 878-4892 Fax

June 9, 2015

Norman C. Bay, Chairman  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Request for scoping meeting

Docket No. PF-14-22, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co., Northeast Energy Direct proposal

Dear Mr. Bay:

The Select Board of the Town of Mason, New Hampshire, respectfully requests that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission hold a pre-filing scoping meeting in our town. We believe it is important that you hear directly from the selectmen, the planning board, the conservation commission, and the citizens of this community. We are a small, pristine, rural town with a wide range of concerns about the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's Northeast Energy Direct pipeline project.

Mason is one of the New Hampshire towns most intensely impacted by the proposed pipeline, as Tennessee is proposing to locate both the main line and the "Fitchburg lateral" here, effectively trisecting the town with approximately 9 miles of pipeline.

Please contact Jeannine, Administrative Assistant to the selectmen, to discuss a time and location for a scoping meeting in Mason, New Hampshire.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this request.

Sincerely,  
BOARD OF SELECTMEN  
Bernard O'Grady, Chairman  
Duly Authorized

**20150702-0028(30692635).pdf**

**TOWN OF  
TEMPLE, NEW HAMPSHIRE  
03084  
OFFICE OF THE SELECTMEN**

P.O. Box 191  
Phone: 603-878-2536  
FAX: 603-878-5067

June 16, 2015

Norman Bay, Chairman  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington DC 20426

Dear Chairman Bay,

We write to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission regarding Kinder Morgan's proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project, Docket N. PF-14-22-000.

We, the Selectmen of the Town of Temple NH, formally request that you schedule a pre-filing scoping meeting in Temple NH to allow our residents ample opportunity to express their views on this proposed natural gas pipeline and compressor station. We note that the latter is within a half mile of dozens of our residences and our only town elementary school.

Our Temple School auditorium would be an excellent location and we will work with you to find a mutually convenient date and time for the meeting.

We believe that it is imperative that our residents have an opportunity to engage in open and transparent dialog with FERC about the pipeline, the proposed route and siting of the compressor station before any final decision is made.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this request and we look forward to seeing you in Temple, NH.

Respectfully,

Gail Cromwell, Chairman, Board of Selectmen  
George Willard, Selectman  
Ken Causse, Selectman

**20150702-0029(30692634).pdf**

**Town of Warwick**

June 17, 2015

Mr. Norman Bay, Chairman  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: Northeast Energy Direct Project, Docket No. PF-14-22-000

Dear Chairman Bay,

On behalf of the Town of Warwick, we respectfully request consideration be given to holding a scoping session within the Town of Northfield as they are one of two communities being proposed to host an 80,000 horsepower compressor station.

If these sessions are held in Boston, that means a 180 mile round trip for Northfield and Warwick residents to participate. This translates to a full day off of work. With the exception of Dracut, Massachusetts, all of the other Massachusetts towns affected by the NED Project are located to the west of Northfield and Warwick.

We believe it is imperative that our residents be afforded the opportunity to engage in open and transparent dialog with FERC regarding the pipeline and the proposed route, impacts, and mitigation requirements before any final decision is made.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this request and we look forward to welcoming you in Northfield.

Sincerely,

THE SELECTBOARD OF WARWICK, MASSACHUSETTS

Dawn Magi  
Selectboard Chair

cc: Allen Fore, Kinder Morgan  
Peggy Sloan, Franklin Regional Council of Governments

**20150702-0030(30692642).pdf**

**BOARD OF SELECTMEN**  
P.O. BOX 725  
13 TEMPLETON TURNPIKE  
**FITZWILLIAM, NH 03447**  
(603) 585-7723 Fax: (603) 585-7744

June 18, 2015

Norman Bay, Chairman  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

We write to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission regarding Kinder Morgan's proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project, Docket # PF-14-22-000. We are formally requesting that you schedule a pre-filing scoping meeting in Fitzwilliam to allow our residents ample opportunity to express their views on this proposed natural gas pipeline. Our Town Hall would be an excellent location with a meeting room capacity of 200 people. We will work with you to find a mutually convenient date and time for this meeting to take place.

We believe it is imperative that our residents be afforded the opportunity to engage in open and transparent dialog with FERC about the pipeline and the proposed route before any final decision is made.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this request and we look forward to seeing you in Fitzwilliam, NH.

Sincerely,

Nancy Camey, Chmn.  
Christopher Holman  
Susan Silverman  
Board of Selectmen

**20150702-0031(30691207).pdf**

**State of New Hampshire**

**House of Representatives**  
Concord

PO Box G  
Keene, NH 03431

June 14, 2015

Norman Bay, Chair  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Kinder Morgan proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project  
Docket N. PF14-22-000

Dear Chairman Bay:

I'm writing to inquire if you've received the attached letter, which was mailed May 16th.

If you have, could you tell me when it was posted on your website?

Sincerely,

James W. McConnell  
State Representative  
Cheshire 12

-----  
**State of New Hampshire**  
**House of Representatives**  
Concord

PO Box G  
Keene, NH 03431

May 15, 2015

Norman Bay, Chair  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Kinder Morgan proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project  
Docket N.PF14-22-000

Dear Chairman Bay:

This letter is written in opposition to Kinder Morgan's proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project. This is a position I share with a large majority of the legislators and virtually all of the towns in the project's proposed New Hampshire path.

Kinder Morgan has disappointed at every turn. It delayed meeting with almost all of the towns in the pipeline's proposed path for something on the order of ninety days. When Massachusetts residents demanded the same meetings last year along the original route, they were conducted singularly in each town over the course of many hours per night to accommodate all of the public inquiry. Subsequent meetings recently demanded by New Hampshire residents along the new preferred route were cut short as they were scheduled as back to back meetings in several towns per night seemingly in an effort to minimize or avoid public input.

The company has also conducted a campaign to create the appearance of progress from month to month but since its first Environmental Report, these reports have been full of "TBDs" in place of actual plans.

Thank you, Chairman Bay for your April 30th response to my docket letter dated April 2, 2015. Please understand that I have no expectation that any current or future "Draft" environmental report will at any point

be deemed the “Final” report that TGP intends to file with its formal application. Nor would I expect TGP to file a formal application before all issues discussed during scoping hearings had been fully vetted and incorporated into the “Final” resource reports. I and my constituents have no expectation that TGP should or will finalize their resource reports in advance of scoping hearings. I find it necessary to point out again however that the current “Draft” report is covered with “TBD’s” that should be addressed by TGP long before scoping hearings commence. I would encourage you and your commission staff to review all current and future draft resource reports and require TGP to provide a thorough site plan and/or business plan in place of all “TBDs” prior to initiating any formal public comment period. This is particularly urgent regarding business and site plans associated with the proposed 80,000 HP compressor station.

I would like to reiterate my hope that you will delay scoping hearings until all the “TBDs” and TGP’s full business intentions have been adequately addressed. Ultimately, I hope you will deny TGP’s application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity as their claims of demand along the proposed route through New Hampshire are suspect and their proposed route crossings will damage sensitive conservation lands, including numerous wetlands and aquifers.

In contrast to Kinder Morgan’s Northeast Energy Direct pipeline proposal, the expansion of the existing Algonquin pipeline (Algonquin Incremental Market) supplying existing power plants in Connecticut, Massachusetts and, through existing connecting pipelines, New Hampshire, promises to reduce the energy shortfall in southern New England and help lower the cost of electricity throughout the region without the need for excessive and destructive infrastructure overbuild.

The Algonquin pipeline, which runs across Connecticut into eastern Massachusetts, will require only partial expansion, as some portions of the pipeline already have the ability to handle additional volume. Changes to the pipeline’s existing route will not be required. Construction can be accomplished and the pipeline’s expanded capacity can be up and running as soon as 2016.

New England has some of the highest electricity prices in the nation, making it expensive to live here and uncompetitive for many manufacturers. Expanding an existing pipeline to supply existing power plants to reduce the cost of electricity is an option I can strongly support. Senseless and destructive overbuild associated with the NED project, I cannot.

Sincerely,

James W. McConnell  
State Representative  
Cheshire 12

*{file appears to be missing some pages?}*

BE IT RESOLVED that the following individuals receive an Official Copy of This RESOLUTION:

President Barack Obama

United States Senator Elizabeth Warren

United States Senator Edward Markey

United States Representative Seth Moulton

United States Representative Niki Tsongas

Governor Charlie Baker

Massachusetts Senator Barbara L ‘Italien

Massachusetts Representative James Lyons

Massachusetts Representative Frank Moran

All five Commissioners of the Federal Regulatory Commission

Very truly yours,

ANDOVER BOARD OF SELECTMEN

Mary T. O’Donoghue, Chair

Alexander J. Vispoli, Vice-Chair

Paul J. Salafia, Secretary

Daniel H. Kowalski  
Robert A. Landry

**20150702-0039(30692660).pdf**

Hand written card, Julia Steed Mason, 17 South S? Dr, Pelham, NH, requesting scoping meeting in Pelham

**20150702-0040(30692686).pdf**

Hand written card, Susan Janle, 23 Winterberry Rd, Pelham, NH, opposing

**20150702-0047(30692691).pdf**

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Date: June 25, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Opposition to the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline natural gas pipeline and compressor installation in New Hampshire

As the owner of the property located at:

408 Timbertop Rd  
New Ipswich, NH 03071

I am opposed to the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline natural gas pipeline and compressor installation in my community.

I am writing to ask FERC to plan a Scoping Meeting in my Southern New Hampshire town of New Ipswich  
Dr. Melissa T. Sulin

**20150702-0048(30692690).pdf**

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Date: June 25, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Opposition to the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline natural gas pipeline and compressor installation in New Hampshire

As the owner of the property located at:

228 Temple Rd  
New Ipswich, NH 03071

I am opposed to the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline natural gas pipeline and compressor installation in my community.

I am writing to ask FERC to plan a Scoping Meeting in my Southern New Hampshire town of:

Robert J. Kiely  
Jana M. Kiely

June 22, 2015

Dear Governor Hassan,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Governor, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England. We believe it will harm the communities in southern NH.

Though the pipeline will not be going through Temple, about 200 houses in Temple, including our family home, will be within a two-mile radius of the compressor station on the SKAT land in New Ipswich.

While the pipeline is a large issue, the compressor station is an even larger one. The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent “blow downs” where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline.

These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station —again my family’s house —along with many others including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby!

The property values near this compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit including my home in New Ipswich!

Governor Hassan, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

Roger & Joan Crooker

-----

June 22, 2015

Dear Senator Ayotte,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Senator, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England. We believe it will harm the communities in southern NH.

Though the pipeline will not be going through Temple, about 200 houses in Temple, including our family home, will be within a two-mile radius of the compressor station on the SKAT land in New Ipswich.

While the pipeline is a large issue, the compressor station is an even larger one. The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent “blow downs” where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline.

These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station —again my family’s house —along with many others including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby!

The property values near this compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit including my home in New Ipswich!

Senator Ayotte, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,  
Roger & Joan Crooker

-----  
June 22, 2015

Dear Senator Shaheen,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Senator, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England. We believe it will harm the communities in southern NH.

Though the pipeline will not be going through Temple, about 200 houses in Temple, including our family home, will be within a two-mile radius of the compressor station on the SKAT land in New Ipswich.

While the pipeline is a large issue, the compressor station is an even larger one. The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent "blow downs" where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline.

These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station —again my family's house —along with many others including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby!

The property values near this compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit including my home in New Ipswich!

Senator Shaheen, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,  
Roger & Joan Crooker

**20150702-0056(30692669).pdf**

*{was "File 30690204\_1.tif cannot be converted to PDF."; OCR conversion done here}*

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Chairman Howard C. Bay

Office of the Chairman

888 First Street NE, Room 1A

Washington, DC 20426

June 23, 2015

Dear Chairman Bay,

Please see attached letter to NYS Dept. of Health Commissioner Dr. Howard A. Zucker.

Respectfully yours,

Shelley M. Bennett

474 Burden Lake Road

Nassau, NY 12123

518-366-9594 (cell)

-----  
NYS Dept. of Health Commissioner Dr. Howard A. Zucker

Empire State Plaza

Corning Tower, Room 2531

Albany, New York 12237

June 10, 2015

Re: Kinder Morgan NED Pipeline and Clark's Chapel Road Compressor Station  
FERC Docket #PF 14-22

Dear Commissioner Zucker,

I am writing this personal letter to you because I have the greatest respect for you, sir. I believe you will be the one person who will help us.

I've had the opportunity and interest to read many of your comments and recommendations to Governor Cuomo regarding fracking gas in New York State.

I have read that as a physician treating patients and now the NYS Health Commissioner, you ask yourself, "What would I do if it was my family?" I so wish more officials and our elected representatives would take a page from your book and ask themselves the same questions.

My community is overwhelmingly opposed to this pipeline, and is extremely fearful to have this 90,000 horse power compressor station so close to our homes. I have personally spoken to Dr. David Carpenter, Director of the Institute of Health & Environment, quoted in the enclosed Times Union article. Dr. Carpenter has also been kind enough to forward to me more studies that support his findings.

To my great regret, I realize if the compressor station is allowed to be built here all of us close to this site and its toxic emissions will have an increased risk of cancer. I have lost my father and my husband to cancer. I was their caretaker and I will carry their suffering from this disease with me every day for the rest of my life.

I have cared for many cancer patients since cancer touched my life. Sadly, many times I've heard someone regret their lifestyle choices like smoking, or taking a job like asbestos removal that carried a higher risk of cancer. I've never heard a person say, "I regret that I didn't move from my home."

It is incomprehensible to me that a company, government agency or person would allow something hazardous to be installed that would increase a human being's risk of cancer. To me, anyone that allowed that would not only be inhumane, but inhuman. It's unthinkable that my family or my neighbors could develop cancer because some company wanted to make millions of dollars more or our government doesn't want to rely on foreign oil. It's heartbreaking to imagine the children riding their bikes past my house could become the cancer patients of tomorrow.

We have all written many letters, had petitions signed and called our elected representatives. So far we haven't been able to talk to any of these officials personally. We can't get anyone to come to our community and see how close this proposed compressor site is to our homes and how it will adversely affect our lives. I feel our elected representatives are not representing us or protecting our health aggressively enough.

We need you.

I have a quote from you taped to my bathroom mirror that I start and end my day with. It says, "There will be no fracking any time in the near future, and therefore no environmental impact, and no risk, real or hypothetical, to human health." The transporting of fracked gas through New York State should not be allowed to affect human health either.

I beg you to help us and make your statement a reality. Thank you.

I have enclosed a copy of our "PACS" petition which already has hundreds of signatures of concerned citizens like myself.

Very respectfully yours,

Shelley M. Bennett  
474 Burden Lake Road  
Nassau, New York 12123  
518-477-4573

518-366-9594 (cell)

Enclosures (2)

Cc: Gov. Cuomo, Senators Schumer and Gillibrand, Representatives Gibson and Tonko, FERC

*{multi-column printed attachments not included here}*

**20150702-0057(30692667).pdf**

Eric Tomasi, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

June 23, 2015

Dear Mr. Tomasi,

Please see attached letter to NYS Dept. of Health Commissioner Dr. Howard A. Zucker.

Respectfully yours,

Shelley M. Bennett

474 Burden Lake Road

Nassau, NY 12123

518-366-9594 (cell)

-----  
NYS Dept. of Health Commissioner Dr. Howard A. Zucker  
Empire State Plaza  
Corning Tower, Room 2531  
Albany, New York 12237

June 10, 2015

Re: Kinder Morgan NED Pipeline and Clark's Chapel Road Compressor Station  
FERC Docket gPF 14-22

Dear Commissioner Zucker,

I am writing this personal letter to you because I have the greatest respect for you, sir. I believe you will be the one person who will help us.

I've had the opportunity and interest to read many of your comments and recommendations to Governor Cuomo regarding fracking gas in New York State.

I have read that as a physician treating patients and now the NYS Health Commissioner, you ask yourself, "What would I do if it was my family?" I so wish more officials and our elected representatives would take a page from your book and ask themselves the same questions.

My community is overwhelmingly opposed to this pipeline, and is extremely fearful to have this 90,000 horse power compressor station so close to our homes. I have personally spoken to Dr. David Carpenter, Director of the Institute of Health and Environment, quoted in the enclosed Times Union article. Dr. Carpenter has also been kind enough to forward to me more studies that support his findings.

To my great regret, I realize if the compressor station is allowed to be built here all of us close to this site and its toxic emissions will have an increased risk of cancer. I have lost my father and my husband to cancer. I was their caretaker and I will carry their suffering from this disease with me every day for the rest of my life.

I have cared for many cancer patients since cancer touched my life. Sadly, many times I've heard someone regret their lifestyle choices like smoking, or taking a job like asbestos removal that carried a higher risk of cancer. I've never heard a person say, "I regret that I didn't move from my home."

It is incomprehensible to me that a company, government agency or person would allow something hazardous to be installed that would increase a human being's risk of cancer. To me, anyone that allowed that would not only be inhumane, but inhuman. It's unthinkable that my family or my neighbors could develop cancer because some company wanted to make millions of dollars more or our government doesn't want to rely on foreign oil. It's heartbaking to imagine the children riding their bikes past my house could become the cancer patients of tomorrow.

We have all written many letters, had petitions signed and called our elected representatives. So far we haven't been able to talk to any of these officials personally. We can't get anyone to come to our community and see how close this proposed compressor site is to our homes and how it will adversely affect our lives. I feel our elected representatives are not representing us or protecting our health aggressively enough.

We need you.

I have a quote from you taped to my bathroom mirror that I start and end my day with. It says, 'There will be no fracking any time in the near future, and therefore no environmental impact, and no risk, real or hypothetical, to human health.' The transporting of fracked gas through New York State should not be allowed to affect human health either.

I beg you to help us and make your statement a reality. Thank you.

I have enclosed a copy of our "PACS" petition which already has hundreds of signatures of concerned citizens like myself.

Very respectfully yours,

Shelley M. Bennett  
474 Burden Lake Road  
Nassau, New York 12123  
518-4774573  
518-366-9594 (cell)

Enclosures (2)

Cc: Gov. Cuomo, Senators Schumer and Gillibrand, Representatives Gibson and Tonko, FERC

**20150702-0058(30692685).pdf**

June 27, 2015

Stacey Cummings, Interim Executive Director  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA)  
East Building, 2nd Floor  
1200 New Jersey Ave., SE  
Washington, DC 20590

Dear Stacey Cummings:

I live in New Ipswich, New Hampshire within the 1/2 mile circle from the proposed 80,000+ hp compressor station site for the NED gas pipeline planned by Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas. I recently received the mandatory notification of the project to those within that radius.

The letter defines the New Ipswich site to include:

- ~ two Titan 250 turbines
- ~ one Titan 130 turbine
- ~ compressor building
- ~ office building for Tennessee personnel
- ~ and auxiliary facilities
- ~ 10 acres estimated for compressor station site

~ 165 acres estimated total property to be acquired (approximate)

Per the PHMSA web site, your Mission & Goals are stated as:

“Our mission is to protect people and the environment from the risks of hazardous materials transportation. To do this, we establish national policy, set and enforce standards, educate, and conduct research to prevent incidents. We also prepare the public and first responders to reduce consequences if an incident does occur.

Our vision is that no harm results from hazardous materials transportation. We cannot accept death as an inevitable consequence of transporting hazardous materials, so we will work continuously to find new ways to reduce risk toward zero deaths, injuries, environmental and property damage, and transportation disruptions.”

This letter is to bring to your attention a discussion at the information session at the high school in New Ipswich earlier this year whereby Kinder Morgan representatives stated they are unable to guarantee the safety of this pipeline. They acknowledged accidents have caused injuries and death in the past and that they anticipate additional accidents will continue to occur, including those that cause injury and death.

This is not to say they want injuries and death to continue, but these statements are immensely troubling as it seems the corporate position is to accept injury and death as an inevitable consequence whereby PHMSA does not.

Therefore, I am seeking your help in stopping this pipeline.

We have been told the pipe proposed through New Hampshire is the ‘thinner’ variety which is acceptable in areas of lower population density. How is it that the quality of a pipe is determined by population density? Does one life matter more than another depending upon where one lives?

We have also been told the noise from compressor stations is generally equivalent to normal conversation except for short periods of time during blow downs/pressure releases. I viewed a film at a pipeline meeting in Sharon, NH, where a person who lives in a home next to a far smaller compressor station than what’s planned for New Ipswich spoke amid the noise from 10 foot tall fans and other equipment and said it is so obstructing that they are unable to hold normal family gatherings outside their home. The disruptions to the family’s prior peaceful existence are continuously present day and night. The spokesperson said his only relief is when he retreats to his cellar.

Who would buy such a home? Studies have shown that most people would not choose to buy a home in close proximity to a compressor station. If this pipeline goes forward, that is the situation that will be forced upon me. I am not being offered any compensation yet I will lose many times over:

1. I will lose the value of my home which I expect I must sell to downsize for my retirement. I am 64 and cannot re-do my lifetime of earnings. How is it that a private company can eliminate my life savings in exchange for private profit?
2. I will be exposed to health hazards. It is documented that nose bleeds and other ill health effects occur in those living next to compressor stations. I had a severe brain aneurysm bleed in 2003 that surgeons at Dartmouth Hitchcock Hospital in Hanover, NH described as coming as close to death as one can come without dying. A section of my skull was removed. The aneurysm was clipped and I have metal supports used to secure the skull piece back in place. My recovery has not been easy and never complete. How is it that a private company can expose me to toxins that have been proven to cause bodily harm for the sole purpose of private profit?
3. I lose my right to peace and happiness. Pipelines have been noted as terrorist targets. How does Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas expect to manage that risk? How is it that a private corporation can be authorized to proceed when it is known gas pipelines have been identified as terrorist targets? Why must I be placed in harm’s way for private profit? Are Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas executives living next to a compressor station? If it’s such a great idea, why not?
4. I will lose my right to receive reasonable protection from unnecessary harm. What security information

and insight does Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas have to protect the pipeline from terrorist actions? What protections and response methods can they disseminate to the millions of people along the pipeline route from the fracking sites in Pennsylvania to the distribution point in Dracut, MA? Is this to say that a private corporation has been granted authority to force thousands of people from their homes and millions of others along the route to succumb to being positioned next to a known terrorist target?

I would think that action could be viewed as criminal.

We have been told this gas will not be received by any of the New Hampshire towns directly in the path of the pipeline. The purpose of this pipeline appears to be to deliver our limited non-renewable gas supplies outside the United States.

What cost must we endure by way of our public health, loss of the character of our neighborhoods, destruction of the beauty of the landscape, upset to the ecologic balance, increased opportunity for forest fires, financial loss to individuals, towns and states, and the fear of living next to a known terrorist target that travels on and on and on for miles and miles and miles for private corporate profit?

I seek your assistance to deem this project irresponsible and not in the interest of the local, state or national public good. I seek your commitment to uphold your Mission dt Goals and prevent this pipeline expansion. The solution to our energy needs is complicated but the destruction humans have beset upon themselves and the planet must be reversed. This is your opportunity to turn the tides and insist on finding better ways. We must gather our brightest resources to solve our energy needs through safer and more efficient means that preserve and protect life and the planet that sustains it.

As much as I despise the corporate greed culture, I am willing to tolerate it but not to the extent that it destroys, denies and sacrifices my right to earn a pleasant and healthful place to live.

Thank you,

Evelyn Taylor  
213 Old Wilton Road  
New Ipswich, NH 03071

Cc: Stephen L. Domodor, Chief Safety Officer/Assistant Administrator, PHMSA  
Rosanne Goodwill, Director of Civil Rights, PHMSA  
Maggie Hassan, Governor of New Hampshire  
Tony Clark, Commissioner, FERC  
Cheryl A. LaFleur, Commissioner, FERC  
Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary, FERC  
Tom Burack, Commissioner, NH Dept. of Environmental Services

**20150702-5001(30689092).txt**

James Carvalho, Bolton, MA.

Subject: Docket #PF14-22: Comment on Draft Environmental Report 10.1.2.3

In Resource Report 10.1.2.3 TGP dismisses the alternative contribution that Geothermal Power can make to meet the energy needs of Massachusetts.

“Large scale geothermal energy is available only at tectonic plate boundaries or at geothermally active hotspots. Due to a lack of these features in the Project area, geothermal energy will not be available for development as an alternative to natural gas.”

In fact, modern geothermal systems, air source heat pumps (ASHP), ground source heat pumps (GSHP) and hybrid water heaters, provide heat using electricity at a better efficiency than traditional electrical heaters thus reducing the total energy demand. As the FERC develops the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the NED, more attention needs to be given to Section 10.1.2.3 Geothermal Power. The implementation of geothermal systems throughout Massachusetts by themselves or in combination with other alternatives may equally achieve the aim of energy “necessity”, electrical grid reliability and electricity price

stability which is the stated objective of the NED project. The FERC EIS must include a comprehensive evaluation of geothermal energy. If geothermal energy or a combination of geothermal and other alternative implementations can satisfy the projected peak energy demand without the approval of the NED natural gas pipeline application, and in consideration of the serious consequences of approval, the FERC must report the finding of insufficient “necessity” and disapprove the permitting of the NED project.

In 2014 the Massachusetts Department of Energy Resources (DOER) retained Synapse Energy Economics to conduct a low demand modeling analysis to consider various gas demand scenarios and to evaluate a range of solutions to meet Massachusetts’ short and long-term resource needs, considering greenhouse gas reductions, economic costs and benefits, and system reliability.

<http://www.synapse-energy.com/project/massachusetts-low-demand-analysis>

Although flawed in many ways, not the least of which was that none of the provided scenarios were in compliance with the Massachusetts Global Warming Solutions Act (GWSA) with respect to state goals for reductions in greenhouse gases, it provides an analytic approach to the Massachusetts energy needs and sources that the FERC should use with appropriate assumptions as part of the evaluation of “necessity” for the NED project. The collection of support materials generated as a result of this analysis is available from the Massachusetts Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs

[www.mass.gov/eea/docs/doer/fuels/low-demand-support-material.zip](http://www.mass.gov/eea/docs/doer/fuels/low-demand-support-material.zip)

which includes Excel spreadsheets to analyze the projected energy savings from various alternatives offsetting the “necessity” for additional natural gas infrastructure during the 10 to 27 days each year, for about 3 hours per day, when gas heating competes with electricity generation for natural gas resources.

#### Air Source Heat Pumps (ASHP)

ASHP are generally targeted to upgrade existing residential homes which use electric resistance baseboard heating without installed ductwork. ASHP have a high Coefficient of Efficiency. They produce 2 or 3 times the heat for the same electric power as traditional resistance baseboard heating, even at the low winter temperatures when peak demand occurs. The “AirHeatPump” spreadsheet tab includes an assumption of the typical size and number of ASHP installs and then computes the resulting MMBTU savings during winter peak hours. That MMBTU savings converts to BCuFt/day of natural gas capacity avoided due to implementation of the ASHP alternative. The typical ASHP used is a 5 ton unit, 60,000 BTU. Heating requirements differ. A 1500 sq ft home well sealed and insulated to R70 levels might have a single 3/4 ton ASHP primary heat source. Other, larger, not as well insulated, homes might require more. 1 1/2 ton ASHP may represent a more typical installation.

In the DOER spreadsheets

	5 ton installs	1 1/2 ton installs	MMBTU/Hr	MMBTU/Day	BCuFt/Day
2015	20	67	9	216	.0002107
2020	240	1600	104	2496	.0024351
2030	3576	11920	1549	37176	.0362693

There are approximately 3 million electric ratepayers in Massachusetts and 14.6% use electric space heating, 438,000 homes. 11920 installs is 2.7% of electrically heated homes over 15 years. FERC must challenge this low estimate. Vermont VEIC filing estimated a 40% ASHP penetration by 2034 in “EEU-2013-01, DRP Scenario Analysis 2015-2034 VEIC”

<http://psb.vermont.gov/sites/psb/files/projects/EEU/drp2013/VEIC%20-%20Scenario%20Analysis%20-%20DRP%20-%202015-2034.pdf>

Penetration of ASHP could be influenced by public policy via an aggressive ratepayer subsidy via rebates.

% Installs	BCuFt/Day
2.7%	.036

10 %	.134
25 %	.336
50 %	.672

If the number of ASHP installs could approach 50% of the electric heat market in Massachusetts this one alternative alone could avoid .6 BCuFt/Day peak demand.

#### Ground Source Heat Pumps (GSHP)

GSHP, because of the need to bury heat pump pipes, are generally targeted for new home builds. According to the US Census Bureau there were 14486 new housing permits in Massachusetts during 2014. The “Gnd-HeatPump” spreadsheet tab estimates a GSHP installation rate and winter heat MMBTU saving as 1/4 of ASHP projecting a 387 MMBTU/Hr natural gas offset in 2030, .0090673 BCuFt/Day. In their alternatives analysis the FERC must challenge the GSHP assumptions in the DOER report. GSHP are more efficient than ASHP, however, the installed cost is several times higher than the equivalent ASHP. FERC must do a complete study of the natural gas alternative GSHP.

#### Hybrid Water Heaters

Homes and buildings which are not good candidates for solar hot water heating and which currently utilize traditional resistance hot water heating may be good candidates for geothermal hybrid water heaters. Hybrid water heaters are 2 to 3 times more efficient than traditional electrical resistance water heaters. FERC must do a complete study of alternative hybrid water heaters.

#### **20150702-5005(30689104).txt**

Amy Glowacki, Mason, NH.

With so many land survey access denials are helicopter fly overs really the best way to get informed, accurate information to build a pipeline of such magnitude and consequence? New Hampshire residents are not embracing this project. Why are filings proceeding so quickly, can we take some time, slow down, receive accurate information to move forward in an honest, fair way that protects the interests of all involved?

#### **20150702-5007(30689108).txt**

John Belliveau, New Ipswich, NH.

TGP has notified me that they are planning to build a very large (80,000 HP) compressor station within a 1/2 mile radius of my home. I am requesting that an Environmental Impact Statement be prepared and published by commission environmental staff, and the a notice of intent be mailed to

federal, state, and local government representatives and agencies, elected officials, Native American tribes, potentially affected landowners, environmental and public interest groups, newspapers and libraries in the project area, and all other parties to this proceeding.

#### **20150702-5035(30689277).pdf**

*{3-page brochure, not reproduced here}*

*{ copy of June 29, 2015, 3-page letter -see original at 20150629-5097(30676456).pdf above}*

-----  
**The Livestock Conservancy**

1 July 2015

To Whom It May Concern.

This letter is to confirm the Endangered status of Newfoundland ponies.

Newfoundland ponies are endangered and are listed in the Critical category of The Livestock Conservancy’s Conservation Priority List (enclosed). The Livestock Conservancy is a nongovernmental organization and

maintains census records of American livestock and poultry breeds. Long recognized as endangered by Rare Breeds Canada and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), Newfoundland ponies were added to the Livestock Conservancy's list in 2012 based on the presence of breeding herds within the United States, including that of Ms. Chetkowski.

Newfoundland ponies are a true genetic breed that evolved in the Newfoundland province of Canada in the 16th and 17th centuries. Mechanization put these ponies out of a job in the 20th century, and they were dispersed, slaughtered and ignored so that now only a tiny and widely scattered population of breeding animals remains. DNA studies published in 2011 confirmed the unique genetic makeup of this breed. They are registered (pedigreed) by the Newfoundland Pony Society of Canada

Fewer than 50 Newfoundland ponies are born each year, and the total population of breeding animals in the United States and Canada combined is less than 250. They represent unique genetics that are not found in other breeds of horses and ponies, and conservation of breeding animals is considered a priority.

We hope that this statement clarifies the Endangered status of Newfoundland ponies, and please do not hesitate to contact us with any questions about the breed.

Sincerely,

Alison G. Martin, Ph.D.

Research and Technical Program Director

P.O. Box 477 Pittsboro, North Carolina 27312

919-542-5704 [amartin@livestockconservancy.org](mailto:amartin@livestockconservancy.org)

[www.livestockconservancy.org](http://www.livestockconservancy.org)

Conserving Heritage Breeds Since 1977

-----  
NEW SOLUTIONS, Vol. 22(1) 51-77, 2012

Scientific Solutions

IMPACTS OF GAS DRILLING ON HUMAN AND ANIMAL HEALTH

MICHELLE BAMBERGER

ROBERT E. OSWALD

ABSTRACT

Environmental concerns surrounding drilling for gas are intense due to expansion of shale gas drilling operations. Controversy surrounding the impact of drilling on air and water quality has pitted industry and lease - holders against individuals and groups concerned with environmental protection and public health. Because animals often are exposed continually to air, soil, and groundwater and have more frequent reproductive cycles, animals can be used as sentinels to monitor impacts to human health. This study involved interviews with animal owners who live near gas drilling operations. The findings illustrate which aspects of the drilling process may lead to health problems and suggest modifications that would lessen but not eliminate impacts. Complete evidence regarding health impacts of gas drilling cannot be obtained due to incomplete testing and disclosure of chemicals, and nondisclosure agreements. Without rigorous scientific studies, the gas drilling boom sweeping the world will remain an uncontrolled health experiment on an enormous scale.

Keywords: hydraulic fracturing, shale gas drilling, veterinary medicine, environmental toxicology

At what point does preliminary evidence of harm become definitive evidence of harm? When someone says, "We were not aware of the dangers of these chemicals back then," whom do they mean by we?

—Sandra Steingraber, *Living Downstream* (Da Capo Press, 2010)

Direct reprint requests to:

Robert E. Oswald

Department of Molecular Medicine  
Cornell University  
Ithaca, NY 14853  
e-mail: reol@cornell.edu

*{25-page report containing many charts & graphs, cannot be reproduced here}  
{I've appended only the report's Conclusions paragraph and the reference Notes}*

## CONCLUSION

Animals, especially livestock, are sensitive to the contaminants released into the environment by drilling and by its cumulative impacts. Documentation of cases in six states strongly implicates exposure to gas drilling operations in serious health effects on humans, companion animals, livestock, horses, and wildlife. Although the lack of complete testing of water, air, soil and animal tissues hampers thorough analysis of the connection between gas drilling and health, policy changes could assist in the collection of more complete data sets and also partially mitigate the risk to humans and animals. Without complete studies, given the many apparent adverse impacts on human and animal health, a ban on shale gas drilling is essential for the protection of public health. In states that nevertheless allow this process, the use of commonsense measures to reduce the impact on human and animals must be required in addition to full disclosure and testing of air, water, soil, animals, and humans.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank Sandra Podulka (Cornell University) and Dr. Sandra Steingraber (Ithaca College) for comments on an early draft of the manuscript.

## NOTES

1. U.S. Department of Energy, "Natural Gas," <http://www.energy.gov/energysources/naturalgas.htm> (accessed July 6, 2011).
2. Chesapeake Energy, "Water Use in Marcellus Deep Shale Gas Exploration," [http://www.chk.com/Media/Educational-Library/Fact-Sheets/Marcellus/Marcellus\\_Water\\_Use\\_Fact\\_Sheet.pdf](http://www.chk.com/Media/Educational-Library/Fact-Sheets/Marcellus/Marcellus_Water_Use_Fact_Sheet.pdf) (accessed July 6, 2011).
3. U.S. Department of Energy Office of Fossil Energy and National Energy Technology Laboratory, "Modern Shale Gas Development in the United States: A Primer," [http://www.netl.doe.gov/technologies/oil-gas/publications/EPreports/Shale\\_Gas\\_Primer\\_2009.pdf](http://www.netl.doe.gov/technologies/oil-gas/publications/EPreports/Shale_Gas_Primer_2009.pdf) (accessed July 14, 2011).
4. K. Cohen, "Facts on the Hydraulic Fracturing Process," <http://www.exxonmobilperspectives.com/2011/06/17/facts-hydraulic-fracturing-process/> (accessed November 28, 2011).
5. T. Colborn et al., "Natural Gas Operations from a Public Health Perspective," *Journal of Human and Ecological Risk Assessment: An International Journal* 17(5) (2011): 1039-1056, doi: 10.1080/10807039.2011.605662.
6. Science and Environmental Health Network, "Wingspread Conference on the Pre - cautionary Principle," <http://www.sehn.org/wing.html> (accessed July 6, 2011).
7. S. A. Glantz et al., "Looking through a Keyhole at the Tobacco Industry. The Brown and Williamson Documents," *Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association* 274(3) (1995): 219-24, doi: 10.1001/jama.274.3.219.
8. A. J. Crisp, A. K. Bhalla, and B. I. Hoffbrand, "Acute Tubular Necrosis after Exposure to Diesel Oil," *British Medical Journal* 2(6183) (1979): 177, doi: 10.1136/bmj.2.6183.177.
9. W. H. Dice et al., "Pulmonary Toxicity Following Gastrointestinal Ingestion of Kerosene," *Annals of Emergency Medicine* 11(3) (1982): 138-42, doi: S0196-0644(82) 80239-4 [pii].
10. N. R. Eade, L. M. Taussig, and M. I. Marks, "Hydrocarbon Pneumonitis," *Pediatrics* 54(3) (1974): 351-7.
11. M. Lippmann and L. C. Chen, "Health Effects of Concentrated Ambient Air Particulate Matter (Caps) and Its Components," *Critical Reviews in Toxicology* 39(10) (2009): 865-913, doi: 10.3109/10408440903300080.
12. G. D. Ritchie et al., "Biological and Health Effects of Exposure to Kerosene-Based Jet Fuels and Performance Additives," *Journal of Toxicology and Environmental Health Part B* 6(4) (2003): 357-451, doi: 10.1080/10937400306473.
13. E. Truemper, S. Reyes de la Rocha, and S. D. Atkinson, "Clinical Characteristics, Pathophysiology, and Management of Hydrocarbon Ingestion: Case Report and Review of the Literature," *Pediatric Emergency Care* 3(3) (1987): 187-93, doi: 10.1097/00006565-198709000-00015.

14. N. K. Weaver, "Gasoline Toxicology: Implications for Human Health," *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 534(1) (1988): 441-451, doi: 10.1111/j.1749-6632.1988.tb30133.x.
15. J. Wolfsdorf and H. Kundig, "Kerosene Poisoning in Primates," *South African Medical Journal* 46(20) (1972): 619-21.
16. R. W. Coppock et al., "Toxicology of Oil Field Pollutants in Cattle: A Review," *Veterinary and Human Toxicology* 37(6) (1995): 569-76.
17. R. W. Coppock et al., "Toxicopathology of Oilfield Poisoning in Cattle: A Review," *Veterinary and Human Toxicology* 38(1) (1996): 36-42.
18. V. C. Edwards, R. W. Coppock, and L. L. Zinn, "Toxicoses Related to the Petroleum Industry," *Veterinary and Human Toxicology* 21(5) (1979): 328-337.
19. W. C. Edwards, "Toxicology of Oil Field Wastes. Hazards to Livestock Associated with the Petroleum Industry," *Veterinary Clinics of North America. Food Animal Practice* 5(2) (1989): 363-74.
20. W. C. Edwards and D. G. Gregory, "Livestock Poisoning from Oil Field Drilling Fluids, Muds and Additives," *Veterinary and Human Toxicology* 33(5) (1991): 502-4.
21. W. C. Edwards and L. L. Zinn, "Diagnosis of Petroleum Hydrocarbon Poisoning in Cattle," *Veterinary Medicine, Small Animal Clinician* 74(10) (1979): 1516-8.
22. E. A. Gibson and J. L. Linzell, "Diesel Oil Poisoning in Cattle," *Veterinary Record* 60(6) (1948): 60-61.
23. S. F. Ranger, "A Case of Diesel Oil Poisoning in a Ewe," *Veterinary Record* 99(25-26) (1976): 508-9.
24. L. D. Rowe, J. W. Dollahite, and B. J. Camp, "Toxicity of Two Crude Oils and of Kerosine to Cattle," *Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association* 162(1) (1973): 61-6.
25. F. Toofanian, S. Aliakbari, and B. Ivoghli, "Acute Diesel Fuel Poisoning in Goats," *Tropical Animal Health and Production* 11(1) (1979): 98-101, doi: 10.1007/BF02237779.
26. J. K. Winkler and W. J. Gibbons, "Petroleum Poisoning in Cattle," *Modern Veterinary Practice* 54(12) (1973): 45-6.
27. A. A. Case and J. R. Coffman, "Waste Oil: Toxic for Horses," *Veterinary Clinics of North America* 3(2) (1973): 273-7.
28. F. A. Leighton, "Clinical, Gross, and Histological Findings in Herring Gulls and Atlantic Puffins That Ingested Prudhoe Bay Crude Oil," *Veterinary Pathology* 23(3) (1986): 254-63.
29. A. Chalifoux et al., "Intoxication par Ingestion d'Huile a Moteur Chez un Chien. Dystrophie des Hepatocytes et Cholostase Secondaire," *Canadian Veterinary Journal* 14(3) (1973): 68-70.
30. M. L. Finkel and A. Law, "The Rush to Drill for Natural Gas: A Public Health Cautionary Tale," *American Journal of Public Health* 101(5) (2011): 784-5, doi: AJP.2010.300089 [pii] 10.2105/AJP.2010.300089.
31. R. Adler et al., "Toxicosis in Sheep Following Ingestion of Natural Gas Condensate," *Veterinary Pathology* 29(1) (1992): 11-20, doi: 10.1177/030098589202900102.
32. C. L. Waldner, C. S. Ribble, and E. D. Janzen, "Evaluation of the Impact of a Natural Gas Leak from a Pipeline on Productivity of Beef Cattle," *Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association* 212(1) (1998): 41-8.
33. C. L. Waldner et al., "Associations between Oil- and Gas-Well Sites, Processing Facilities, Flaring, and Beef Cattle Reproduction and Calf Mortality in Western Canada," *Preventive Veterinary Medicine* 50(1-2) (2001): 1-17, doi: S0167587701002148 [pii].
34. H. R. Sawyer et al., "Winter Habitat Selection of Mule Deer before and During Development of a Natural Gas Field," *Journal of Wildlife Management* 70(2) (2006): 396-403, doi: 10.2193/0022-541X(2006)70[396:WHSOMD]2.0.CO;2.
35. H. Sawyer and R. Nielson, *Mule Deer Monitoring in the Pinedale Anticline Project Area: 2010 Annual Report*, September 14, 2010 (prepared for Pinedale Anticline Planning Office).
36. Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality, "Case Ai No. 164544," 2010, <http://edms.deq.louisiana.gov/app/doc/querydef.aspx> (accessed July 14, 2011).
37. L. Adelson and I. Sunshine, "Fatal Poisoning Due to a Cationic Detergent of the Quaternary Ammonium Compound Type," *American Journal of Clinical Pathology* 22(7) (1952): 656-61.
38. C. N. Cheng and D. D. Focht, "Production of Arsine and Methylarsines in Soil and in Culture," *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* 38(3) (1979): 494-8.
39. Environmental Protection Agency, "Arsenic Compounds," <http://www.epa.gov/ttnatw01/hlthef/arsenic.html> (accessed July 9, 2011).

40. L. A. Selby et al., "Epidemiology and Toxicology of Arsenic Poisoning in Domestic Animals," *Environmental Health Perspectives* 19(1977): 183-189.
41. Agency for Toxic Substances & Disease Registry, "Toxfaqs for Arsenic," <http://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/toxfaqs/TF.asp?id=19&tid=3> (accessed July 8, 2011).
42. O. Inoue et al., "Quantitative Relation of Urinary Phenol Levels to Breathzone Benzene Concentrations: A Factory Survey," *British Journal of Industrial Medicine* 43(10) (1986): 692-7.
43. Agency for Toxic Substances & Disease Registry, "Toxic Substances Portal – Strontium," <http://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/phs/phs.asp?id=654&tid=120> (accessed July 26, 2011).
44. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture, Right-to-Know Law Request No. 111012, Veterinary Report Dated June 24, 2010: Memo to Dr. Anthony Labarbera from Dr. Amy Nestlerodt. Subject: Frac Water Holding Pond Still on Beef Farm in Tioga County (accessed October 20, 2011).
45. G. F. Fries, G. S. Marrow, and P. A. Snow, "Soil Ingestion by Dairy Cattle," *Journal of Dairy Science* 65(4) (1982): 611-8, doi: S0022-0302(82)82238-8 [pii] 10.3168/jds.S0022-0302(82)82238-8.
46. H. F. Mayland, G. E. Shewmaker, and R.C. Bull, "Soil Ingestion by Cattle Grazing Crested Wheatgrass," *Journal of Range Management* 30(4) (1977): 264-265.
47. H. F. Hintz and D. E. Hogue, "Effect of Selenium, Sulfur and Sulfur Amino Acids on Nutritional Muscular Dystrophy in the Lamb," *Journal of Nutrition* 82(1964): 495-8.
48. J. Ivancic, Jr. and W. P. Weiss, "Effect of Dietary Sulfur and Selenium Concentrations on Selenium Balance of Lactating Holstein Cows," *Journal of Dairy Science* 84(1) (2001): 225-32, doi: S0022-0302(01)74472-4 [pii] 10.3168/jds.S0022-0302(01)74472-4.
49. A. L. Pope et al., "The Effect of Sulphur on <sup>75</sup>Se Absorption and Retention in Sheep," *Journal of Nutrition* 109(8) (1979): 1448-55.
50. J. W. Spears, "Trace Mineral Bioavailability in Ruminants," *Journal of Nutrition* 133(5 Suppl 1) (2003): 1506S-9S.
51. J. P. Orr and B. R. Blakley, "Investigation of the Selenium Status of Aborted Calves with Cardiac Failure and Myocardial Necrosis," *Journal of Veterinary Diagnostic Investigation* 9(2) (1997): 172-9, doi: 10.1177/104063879700900211.
52. L. J. Hutchinson, R. W. Scholz, and T. R. Drake, "Nutritional Myodegeneration in a Group of Chianina Heifers," *Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association* 181(6) (1982): 581-4.
53. J. Riviere (Co-Founder and Co-Director, USDA Food Animal Residue Avoidance Databank), personal communication, July 25, 2010.
54. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Final Report: The National Morbidity, Mortality, and Air Pollution Study: Morbidity and Mortality from Air Pollution in the United States (Jonathan M. Samet, investigator), March 2005, [http://cfpub1.epa.gov/ncer\\_abstracts/index.cfm/fuseaction/display.abstractDetail/abstract/2399/report/F](http://cfpub1.epa.gov/ncer_abstracts/index.cfm/fuseaction/display.abstractDetail/abstract/2399/report/F) (accessed July 11, 2011).
55. Environmental Protection Agency, "Draft Plan to Study the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Drinking Water Resources," [http://water.epa.gov/type/groundwater/uic/class2/hydraulicfracturing/upload/HFStudyPlanDraft\\_SAB\\_020711.pdf](http://water.epa.gov/type/groundwater/uic/class2/hydraulicfracturing/upload/HFStudyPlanDraft_SAB_020711.pdf) (accessed July 11, 2011).
56. R. E. Bishop, "Chemical and Biological Risk Assessment for Natural Gas Extraction in New York," <http://well-watch.files.wordpress.com/2011/05/risk-assessment-natural-gas-extraction.pdf> (accessed July 11, 2011).
57. S. G. Osborn et al., "Methane Contamination of Drinking Water Accompanying Gas-Well Drilling and Hydraulic Fracturing," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA* 108(20) (2011): 8172-6, doi: 1100682108 [pii] 10.1073/pnas.1100682108.
58. Wolf Eagle Environmental, "Dispersion Modeling of Emissions from Natural Gas Compressor Stations," [http://www.townofdish.com/objects/DISH\\_Report.pdf1.pdf](http://www.townofdish.com/objects/DISH_Report.pdf1.pdf) (accessed July 23, 2011).
59. Minority Staff U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Energy and Commerce, "Chemicals Used in Hydraulic Fracturing," <http://democrats.energycommerce.house.gov/sites/default/files/documents/Hydraulic%20Fracturing%20Report%204.18.11.pdf> (accessed July 11, 2011).
60. Marcellus Drilling News, "Southwest Pa Waste Hauler Indicted for Illegally Dumping Marcellus Drilling Wastewater," <http://marcellusdrilling.com/2011/03/southwest-pawaste-hauler-indicted-for-illegally-dumping-marcell/> (accessed July 11, 2011).
61. Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection, "Year to Date Inspections/ Violations (Including

Marcellus) [2011]” <http://www.dep.state.pa.us/dep/deputate/minres/oilgas/OGInspectionsViolations/2011/2011AllViolations.xls> (accessed July 11, 2011).

62. J. Legenos (Information Specialist, Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection), personal communication, July 3, 2011.
63. United States Congress. Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works and its Subcommittee on Water and Wildlife. Natural Gas Drilling: Public Health and Environmental Impacts. April 12, 2011. 112th Congress, 1st session. Testimony of Dr. Conrad Daniel Volz. [http://epw.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?FuseAction=Files.View&FileStore\\_id=57d1bfd4-9237-488e-999f-4e1e71f72e52](http://epw.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?FuseAction=Files.View&FileStore_id=57d1bfd4-9237-488e-999f-4e1e71f72e52) (accessed July 14, 2011).
64. Associated Press, “Gas Well Spews Polluted Water,” New York Times, April 21, 2011, [http://www.nytimes.com/2011/04/21/us/21frack.html?\\_r=1&scp=1&sq=bradford%20blowout%20%22april%2020%22%20gas%20chESAPEAK&st=cse](http://www.nytimes.com/2011/04/21/us/21frack.html?_r=1&scp=1&sq=bradford%20blowout%20%22april%2020%22%20gas%20chESAPEAK&st=cse) (accessed July 20, 2011).
65. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Identification and Listing of Hazardous Waste. 40 C.F.R. §261.4(b)(5) (2002).
66. P. Ramirez, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Region 6, Environmental Contaminants Program, Reserve Pit Management: Risks to Migratory Birds, September 2009, <http://www.fws.gov/mountain-prairie/contaminants/documents/ReservePits.pdf> (accessed July 14, 2011).
67. W. Y. Kim, The Lamont Cooperative Seismic Network and the National Seismic System: Earthquake Hazard Studies in the Northeastern United States, 2001, [www.ideo.columbia.edu/LCSN/.../LCSN\\_Tech\\_Report-98-01.pdf](http://www.ideo.columbia.edu/LCSN/.../LCSN_Tech_Report-98-01.pdf) (accessed November 16, 2011).
68. Associated Press, “Disposal Halted at Well after New Quake in Ohio,” New York Times, January 1, 2012, [http://www.nytimes.com/2012/01/02/science/earth/youngstown-injection-well-stays-shut-after-earthquake.html?\\_r=1&ref=todayspaper](http://www.nytimes.com/2012/01/02/science/earth/youngstown-injection-well-stays-shut-after-earthquake.html?_r=1&ref=todayspaper) (accessed January 2, 2012).

© 2012, Baywood Publishing Co., Inc.  
doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2190/NS.22.1.e>  
<http://baywood.com>

### **20150702-5051(30689263).txt**

Kaela Law, Pelham, NH.

It occurred to me that I have mentioned the Merrimack Valley Reliability Project a number of times on these FERC filings, as has Donna Butler from Pelham. In order to better help you understand what the project is about I am including a website link:

[http://www.ma-nhsolution.com/merrimack\\_valley\\_reliability\\_project](http://www.ma-nhsolution.com/merrimack_valley_reliability_project)

Please visit this link and take note of the map through Londonderry, Hudson, Windham and especially PELHAM. This is same route the pipeline is trying to take.

Large scale construction projects in the same general vicinity one right after the other need to be taken into account together. They must be looked at as a whole to fully understand the disruption to our homes, the conservation lands they cross and everything else considered.

I am not convinced the pipeline can be theoretically co-located with the power line row in Pelham. I recently watched a couple of young surveyors from PA taking soil resistivity tests. They stuck a metal pole a few inches in length into the ground a foot away from the edge of route 38 in Pelham, where the ‘soil’ is mostly plowing sand. They took these readings before the construction of the new overhead 345 kv power line. They took these readings in the absolute center of the utility row, which confused me since we have been told the pipeline will be off to either one side or the other. I do not feel comfortable after having watched this part of the induction of current studies. I assumed it would have been a more involved sort of process.

I have tried contacting a few independent experts to help explain to me what Induction of current studies are exactly, all the different facets of testing they involve; soil moisture, amperage, etc ... I have asked Kinder Morgan to answer these questions through my town administrator and I have not received an answer so now I am asking FERC to find out for us since I do not have the resources to gather this information. I would like

FERC to get an answer posted to this docket number from both Kinder Morgan and an independent source that we may compare their answers: Explain in depth and detail, what is an Induction of Current Study? What sorts of tests and formulas does it include? Do the findings of an induction of current study site the pipeline further away from the power line row? Do the findings of an induction of current study ensure that extra protective corrosive coating on the outside and inside of the pipe will be layered? I would like to know all the chemicals in that coating since it could have a contaminant impact to my well water. I want to know if the pipeline being buried above the frost line in New England right next to the power lines that also have corrosive effects is being carefully considered by FERC, Kinder Morgan and everyone else who is playing so recklessly with my property and my family's well-being.

**20150702-5208(30690966).pdf**

**Massachusetts Association of Conservation Commissions**

*protecting wetlands, open space and biological diversity through education and advocacy*

10 Juniper Road / Belmont, MA 02478

Phone: 617-489-3930 / Fax: 617-489-3935 / [www.maccweb.org](http://www.maccweb.org)

Electronically filed with FERC

July 2, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., Docket No. PF14-22-000  
Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Ms. Bose:

I am writing for the Massachusetts Association of Conservation Commissions (MACC) regarding the above referenced project of Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, a Kinder Morgan company.

The purpose of this letter is to support the June 30, 2015, request of the Northeast Municipal Gas Pipeline Coalition that the National Environmental Policy Act scoping meetings be postponed until after Kinder Morgan has filed its revised Resource Reports and after there is adequate time to review the reports. In addition, the deadline for written and electronic comments should be similarly rescheduled to a later date. I ask that this letter be brought to the attention of Chairman Norman Bay.

For background, MACC is the professional association of Massachusetts conservation commissions.

Each of the 351 cities and towns in Massachusetts has a conservation commission. Conservation commissions are the municipal government wetlands, wildlife and open space boards exercising the Police Power, Home Rule power, and public ownership of conservation, park, and natural resource properties as well as public easements, land restrictions, and other rights. Conservation commissions protect conservation lands and other natural resources in their communities under the Massachusetts Conservation Act (G.L. c.40, § 8c) and administer and enforce the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act (G.L. c.131, § 40) and local home-rule municipal wetlands laws and regulations. MACC supports conservation commissions through education and advocacy. We have been doing that work since 1961.

On February 6, 2015, I filed written comments on the first draft of the Resource Reports. I did not comment on the second draft because that draft did not take my comments into consideration. Since then, Kinder Morgan has announced changes to the project and that it would submit another set of Resource Reports. I look forward to reviewing those Resource Reports to see how the project, and Kinder Morgan's assessment

of impacts, may have evolved. It will take time to review the reports and write appropriate comments.

Conservation commissions in the municipalities that will be affected by the project have been closely following the FERC process. Many attended the project open houses earlier this year. I understand many of them intend to participate in the scoping meetings and comment in writing or electronically. MACC intends to participate and comment. For those comments to be complete and comprehensive, the public, non-governmental organizations, and government agencies need adequate time to review and analyze the Resource Reports. That will be best accomplished by rescheduling the scoping sessions and comment deadline.

I also note that July and August are traditional vacation months in New England. Children are out of school and beaches, lakes, mountains, and rivers beckon. Many people are away from home for part of the summer. Holding scoping meetings during July and August assures a lower turnout at the meetings; it disadvantages people who have made vacation plans, often with family, which will take them out of town. That will also make it difficult for many people to file comprehensive written or electronic comments by the August 31 deadline set forth in the Notice of Intent.

I urge that the scoping meetings be rescheduled to take place at least thirty days after the new Resource Reports are filed, and not in July or August. I also urge that the deadline for written and electronic comments be rescheduled to September 30, or at least thirty days after the new Resource Reports are filed, whichever is later.

Please add me to the Commission's environmental mailing list for this project.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Eugene B. Benson

Executive Director

Email: eugene.benson@macweb.org

Copy:

United States Senator Elizabeth Warren

United States Senator Edward Markey

Massachusetts Secretary of Energy and Environmental Affairs Matthew A. Beaton

Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection Commissioner Martin Suuberg

Northeast Municipal Gas Pipeline Coalition

#### **20150702-5238(30691129).txt**

Sandra Gillis, Fitzwilliam, NH.

#### **Fitzwilliam Economic Committee**

Town of Fitzwilliam, NH

The remarks below reflect the concerns of the **Fitzwilliam Economic Committee** regarding the proposed Kinder Morgan/NED Pipeline and its impact on our historic Town, our residents and visitors.

The Fitzwilliam Economic Committee Is unanimous in voicing their opposition to the Kinder Morgan/NED Pipeline project. The construction of the pipeline and subsequent devastation to Fitzwilliam's wetlands, view sheds and rural character will greatly adversely affect our homeowner values and our primary industry in town, which is tourism.

Our concerns extend to: Fitzwilliam wetlands near the Troy town line; Scott Pond disruption - the plan is to drill horizontally under this very ecologically sensitive area. There are many second homes on this Pond, and this will adversely affect property values there and curb the desire to own a second home in Fitzwilliam. The Troy Mills Superfund site, which is on the Fitzwilliam/Troy line, is an extremely fragile area. The potential for the release of toxins and disruption of that site will adversely affect Fitzwilliam residents' wells and health. The impact will be devastating on directly affected residential properties on Scott Pond,

Bowkerville Rd, Upper Gap Mountain Road and along the entire route.

This construction will reduce the value of real estate, greatly reducing the largest asset most of our towns-people have, their homes. In effect this pipeline would squeeze the value out of our property values and in some cases reduce it to be worthless.

The existence of the pipeline in Fitzwilliam will result in lower home values. Instead of a home buyer wanting to buy a home in our rural and historic community, they will go elsewhere, where there is no threat of pipeline safety issues. The material used to construct the actual pipe in rural areas is less thick, making our area more susceptible to leaks of harmful gas, accidents and subsequent fires. This safety threat increases the fear factor and will affect the entire town's property values, and create a negative economic impact.

**20150706-0006(30692704).pdf**

June 27, 2015

Stacey Cummings, Interim Executive Director  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA)  
East Building, 2nd Floor  
1200 New Jersey Ave., SE  
Washington, DC 20590

Dear Stacey Cummings:

I live in New Ipswich, New Hampshire within the 1/2 mile circle from the proposed 80,000+ hp compressor station site for the NED gas pipeline planned by Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas. I recently received the mandatory notification of the project to those within that radius.

The letter defines the New Ipswich site to include:

- ~ two Titan 250 turbines
- ~ one Titan 130turbine
- ~ compressor building
- ~ office building for Tennessee personnel
- ~ and auxiliary facilities
- ~ 10 acres estimated for compressor station site
- ~ 165 acies estimated total property to be acquired (approximate)

Per the PHMSA web site, your Mission & Goals are stated as:

“Our mission is to protect people and the environment from the risks of hazardous materials transportation. To do this, we establish national policy, set and enforce standards, educate, and conduct research to prevent incidents. We also prepare the public and first responders to reduce consequences if an incident does occur.

Our vision is that no harm results from hazardous materials transportation. We cannot accept death as an inevitable consequence of transporting hazardous materials, so we will work continuously to find new ways to reduce risk toward zero deaths, injuries, environmental and property damage, and transportation disruptions.”

This letter is to bring to your attention a discussion at the information session at the high school in New Ipswich earlier this year whereby Kinder Morgan representatives stated they are unable to guarantee the safety of this pipeline. They acknowledged accidents have caused injuries and death in the past and that they anticipate additional accidents will continue to occur, including those that cause injury and death.

This is not to say they want injuries and death to continue, but these statements are immensely troubling as it seems the corporate position is to accept injury and death as an inevitable consequence whereby PHMSA does not.

Therefore, I am seeking your help in stopping this pipeline.

We have been told the pipe proposed through New Hampshire is the ‘thinner’ variety which is acceptable in areas of lower population density. How is it that the quality of a pipe is determined by population density? Does one life matter more than another depending upon where one lives?

We have also been told the noise from compressor stations is generally equivalent to normal conversation except for short periods of time during blow downs/pressure releases. I viewed a film at a pipeline meeting in Sharon, NH, where a person who lives in a home next to a far smaller compressor station than what’s planned for New Ipswich spoke amid the noise from 10 foot tall fans and other equipment and said it is so obstructing that they are unable to hold normal family gatherings outside their home. The disruptions to the family’s prior peaceful existence are continuously present day and night. The spokesperson said his only relief is when he retreats to his cellar.

Who would buy such a home? Studies have shown that most people would not choose to buy a home in close proximity to a compressor station. If this pipeline goes forward, that is the situation that will be forced upon me. I am not being offered any compensation yet I will lose many times over:

1. I will lose the value of my home which I expect I must sell to downsize for my retirement. I am 64 and cannot re-do my lifetime of earnings. How is it that a private company can eliminate my life savings in exchange for private profit?
2. I will be exposed to health hazards. It is documented that nose bleeds and other ill health effects occur in those living next to compressor stations. I had a severe brain aneurysm bleed in 2003 that surgeons at Dartmouth Hitchcock Hospital in Hanover, NH described as coming as close to death as one can come without dying. A section of my skull was removed. The aneurysm was clipped and I have metal supports used to secure the skull piece back in place. My recovery has not been easy and never complete. How is it that a private company can expose me to toxins that have been proven to cause bodily harm for the sole purpose of private profit?
3. I lose my right to peace and happiness. Pipelines have been noted as terrorist targets. How does Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas expect to manage that risk? How is it that a private corporation can be authorized to proceed when it is known gas pipelines have been identified as terrorist targets? Why must I be placed in harm’s way for private profit? Are Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas executives living next to a compressor station? If it’s such a great idea, why not?
4. I will lose my right to receive reasonable protection from unnecessary harm. What security information and insight does Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas have to protect the pipeline from terrorist actions? What protections and response methods can they disseminate to the millions of people along the pipeline route from the fracking sites in Pennsylvania to the distribution point in Dracut, MA? Is this to say that a private corporation has been granted authority to force thousands of people from their homes and millions of others along the route to succumb to being positioned next to a known terrorist target?

I would think that action could be viewed as criminal.

We have been told this gas will not be received by any of the New Hampshire towns directly in the path of the pipeline. The purpose of this pipeline appears to be to deliver our limited non-renewable gas supplies outside the United States.

What cost must we endure by way of our public health, loss of the character of our neighborhoods, destruction of the beauty of the landscape, upset to the ecologic balance, increased opportunity for forest fires, financial loss to individuals, towns and states, and the fear of living next to a known terrorist target that travels on and on and on for miles and miles and miles for private corporate profit?

I seek your assistance to deem this project irresponsible and not in the interest of the local, state or national public good. I seek your commitment to uphold your Mission and Goals and prevent this pipeline expansion.

The solution to our energy needs is complicated but the destruction humans have beset upon themselves and the planet must be reversed. This is your opportunity to turn the tides and insist on finding better ways. We must gather our brightest resources to solve our energy needs through safer and more efficient means that

preserve and protect life and the planet that sustains it.

As much as I despise the corporate greed culture, I am willing to tolerate it but not to the extent that it destroys, denies and sacrifices my right to earn a pleasant and healthful place to live.

Thank you,

Evelyn Taylor  
213 Old Wilton Road  
New Ipswich, NH 03071

Cc: Stephen L. Domodor, Chief Safety Officer/Assistant Administrator, PHMSA  
Rosanne Goodwill, Director of Civil Rights, PHMSA  
Maggie Hassan, Governor of New Hampshire  
Tony Clark, Commissioner, FERC  
Cheryl A. LaFleur, Commissioner, FERC  
Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary, FERC  
Tom Burack, Commissioner, NH Dept. of Environmental Services

**20150706-0015(30692721).pdf**

*{“File 30692357\_1.tif cannot be converted to PDF.” easily OCR converted here}*

S.A. Matthews  
40 Settlement Hill  
New Ipswich, NH 03071  
June 29, 2015

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

We need a scoping meeting in New Ipswich, Temple, Greenville, and Mason NH as participants in an equal, adequate, and comprehensive process established by the FERC.

The planned compressor station site poses numerous and complicated aspects that require time and attention to develop a comprehensive, planned response from both New Ipswich and Temple ..

Briefly, the site is:

- Within a half-mile of the Temple NH elementary school
- Adjacent to a thriving organic beef business
- On the same parcel containing a brownfield site (lead shot, old shooting range)
- On the watershed for the Greenville NH reservoir (their primary source of domestic water)
- Dividing the primary path (Route 45) for joint Temple-Greenville police and emergency services
- A half-mile from a nunnery.
- in the path of prevailing winds that affect New Ipswich, Temple, Greenville, and Mason and will deposit evacuated gas and chemicals onto those communities.

We're doing our best to communicate with FERC to get a level playing field in this process. Our affected land-owners were notified on June 2nd by Kinder Morgan of the compressor station site and we are scrambling to get in touch with affected land owners and focus our efforts to inform our friends and family.

We hope that FERC appreciate that we citizens and residents of these affected towns are volunteering in this effort in addition to the personal demands of work, family, and typical community activities.

On the other hand KM has vast economic and human resources together with political influence. We have nothing but our personal earnings, wits, guts, courage, and love for our families, and community.

We owe it to every resident in these four towns to follow a comprehensive and adequate FERC process so we get enough information to make personal, community, and town-wide decisions to plan for the worst while we hope for the best.

None of these four towns has a need nor provides a reasonable market for natural gas providers to deliver this natural resource to our homes and business.

In the meantime, we need to plan for the worst and need more time and dialog to consider at a minimum the following for each of our towns:

- environmental impact
- economic impact
- health impact (do we need to baseline the health of all residents?)
- tax base changes due to deflation in local housing market .
- potential litigation expenses against KM who has not been forthright nor respectful in its business practices
- accuracy in bonding for potential road damage or other damage from construction and operation
- the 5-, 10-, 15-, and 20-year costs of a drastic change in our community
- local tax code changes so that we have a remote opportunity for accurate taxation to offset expenses
- many, many, many more ...

I am surely rehashing known issues to FERC and Kinder Morgan.; We however, are collectively reeling.

My hope is that this message is heard and there is a response to a simple question with due respect of FERC and the hope of consistent, nationwide American ideals.

When will New Ipswich, Temple, Greenville, and Mason each have a scoping meeting?

We need time and opportunity to respond.

Sincerely,

**20150706-0020**

Richard R. Silvestro  
215 Colburn Road  
Temple, NH 03084  
June 26, 2015

Pertaining to Tennessee Gas Pipeline (TGP)  
Docket No. PF14-22-000  
Proposed Northeast Energy Direct (NED)  
pipeline

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Dear Secretary Bose:

Most of my neighbors and fellow townspeople as well as myself, have become aware of the NED pipeline and its compressor stations. Kinder Morgan (KM) is falsifying the need of this excessively large and unnecessary gas pipeline in New England. We understand that before KM or any other fuel company can disrupt the lives and property rights, and cause negative economic effects to any and all of the residents concerned, it must be proved that the fuel to be delivered is absolutely necessary for the public needs of the states, towns, and people of that region. New Hampshire does not need this energy. New Hampshire already

produces so much extra energy that it exports the excess to neighboring states that need it. It would seem that all these so called power needs are made up by, based on their behavior in this matter, what can only be termed the local energy oligarchy, NESCOE (New England State Committee on Electricity).

The real reason KM wants this pipeline is that they want to export the gas overseas so that they can make lots (read as billions of dollars) of money, while saddling the New Hampshire taxpayers with much of the cost of installation and maintenance as proposed by NESCOE, and at the same time subjecting us to hazards of pipeline explosions, compressor fires and explosions and a constant exposure to everyone in southern New Hampshire and Northern Massachusetts to noise, water, air and light pollution.

Our Temple elementary school is within the buffer/burn zone of the New Ipswich compressor station. Even without a fiery catastrophe, blow downs and pipe flushing will release along with millions of cubic feet of methane, pollutants which would include Radon 222 and its radioactive decay isotopes of heavy metals, and the other toxic chemicals used in the fracking process. These will settle through the air, where they can be inhaled, and to the ground where they can be contacted and absorbed through the skin of the children playing on the school grounds and elsewhere in the many square miles surrounding each station, and where they can perk down to our aquifers, our only source of water for not just our small towns but our major cities as well. How many pipe flushings at 22 million gallons each will our aquifers sustain?

The NED is a private enterprise, and what KM is demanding is permission to harm private citizens, both physically and financially so they can make even more money than they are now. The fact is that what NESCOE, KM, and TGP are proposing is in violation of previous FERC Statements of Policy, and illegal.'

Sincerely,

Richard R. Silvestro

**20150706-0021**

354 Old Vernon Road  
Northfield, Massachusetts 01360  
June 29, 2015

Secretary Kimberly D. Bose  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First St. NE Room 1A  
Washington DC 20426

RE: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., Northeast Energy Direct Project  
FERC Docket 1PF14-22~

Dear Secretary Bose,

As United States Citizens, residents of Northfield, Massachusetts, we write to you to express our concerns with the "Northeast Energy Direct" Pipeline project proposed by Kinder Morgan and its subsidiary, TGPWE urge FERC to deny a license to Kinder Morgan, based on FERC's mandate to identify need in order to grant a "certificate of public convenience and necessity". This pipeline will neither be "convenient" nor is it a "necessity" for the people living in Massachusetts, New York and New Hampshire where the line is proposed to run. It is also clear that this pipeline is not needed for the region as a whole and that simple alternatives will satisfy peak demand scenarios which occur a few days a year for a couple of hours, such as utilizing existing liquefied natural gas infrastructure, upgrading existing leaking (and corroding) pipelines, installation and greater dependency on renewables, and promotion of efficiency standards in homes and buildings. Rather than installing a new, dangerous, obtrusive and unwanted pipeline through an area that is valued for its ecological, aesthetic and rural virtues, we also urge you to listen to the people, encourage the adjustment of regional pricing and supply policies which created inflated natural gas pricing last year, and also adjust your own policies, if needed, in the face of today's energy innovations, alternatives and the impact that methane-producing pipelines have on global warming, which has undeniably been accelerated through human con-

sumption of fossil fuels, including natural gas.

The following provides a brief summary of why this pipeline project should not be permitting to move forward, in addition to the clear and absolute lack of need for additional pipeline capacity in our region:

- A pipeline is not safe, especially with the proposed Class 1 pipeline that is proposed to be installed along the entire route, allowable because of the number of residents within the “impact area”, or 660 feet. Explosions are not rare — they do occur and frequently on both new pipelines and old. In addition, almost the entire route is heavily forested, presenting a direct and certain threat of ensuing forest fire, should an explosion occur.
- Bedrock will be a consistent obstacle along this proposed route, which will require blasting and the use of chemicals to install the pipe. Use of pesticides along the route is also regular practice. These practices will have a direct impact on private wells and possibly on septic systems, which the majority, if not all, of homes along the route utilize.
- Kinder Morgan has only received permission for survey for about a quarter of the total impacted landowners along the route. Forcing invasive surveys and eventual eminent domain on the majority of landowners along this route is unacceptable. Furthermore, KM has a proven record of using deceitful and fear-mongering tactics to “convince” landowners to cooperate and sell easements, also unacceptable. These are residents and landowners of the United States of America and deserve better.
- Building this pipeline will have a negative economic impact on landowners, towns and the regional population as a whole. Landowners will experience a proven decrease in property values. Townspeople will experience the impact of damage to existing infrastructure and payment for repairs, such as roads and bridges during the construction phase and through the life of the project, with little compensation from the pipeline company. The region will experience eventual increase in the cost of natural gas, as this pipeline is clearly meant for export to more competitive markets.
- The environmental impact of pipeline construction and operation is proven to be far more negative than Kinder Morgan has portrayed. Not surprisingly, given the breadth and scope of violations that Kinder Morgan has committed. The pipeline is proposed to cross over major rivers, streams and wetlands across the state and will also require major widening of the existing corridor, as pipe must be placed next to, not within, the power line corridor.

The town of Northfield is unique in that a compressor station is also proposed to be located here. This will be the biggest compressor station that Kinder Morgan has ever built, in a town that is dependent upon its rural and agricultural character. Vital economic attractions will be impacted directly, such as the National Scenic New England Trail which the proposed pipeline would intersect and that the proposed compressor station would be within a quarter-mile of. Compressor stations emit toxins into the air, produce noise at unacceptable decibel levels, and are harshly and continuously lit. These factors will ruin the character, and therefore economic resources, that the town has to offer to prospective home buyers, visitors, and investors. FERC’s Statement of Policy (Docket no. PL399-3-000) states that issuance of a Certificate “should be designed to foster competitive markets, protect captive customers and avoid unnecessary environmental and community impacts while serving increasing demand for natural gas”. We urge FERC to deny a license to Kinder Morgan for its Northeast Direct Pipeline. If the commission claims any question of need or impact at this time, perhaps it is time for FERC’s policies to be reviewed and updated through a public and transparent process, before any future Certificates are issued.

Thank you for your review and consideration of our comments,

Elizabeth Lareau Whitcomb

James A. Whitcomb

**20150706-0022**

236 Starch Mill Road

Mason, NH 03048

28 June 2015

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

Ref: Docket no. PF14-22-000

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter serves notice that I am denying permission of property access to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any purpose in furtherance of a pipeline in&ustructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized and treated as trespass. My land consists of parcels known as D-18 and D-19 at 236 Starch Mill Road in Mason, NH.

With local shallow bedrock I am very worried about probable blasting damage to my 193 year-old home (built in 1822). It has the original granite block foundations, along with a massive central chimney and three fireplaces which are supported also by original granite block piers located in the basement. For over a decade I have monitored the basement foundation wall distance to ceiling beams at four designated reference points to ensure no significant movement has taken place.

Sincerely,

Peter L. LeCount

CC: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
Town of Mason, NH, Police Department

**20150706-0023**

Ronald A. Pulos  
112 West Road  
Temple, NH 03084  
June 29, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC, Docket No. PF14-22-000  
FERC Scoping Meeting Schedule for Temple, NH

Dear Ms. Bose:

Would you or one of your staff, please tell me when the FERC plans to hold a scoping meeting in Temple New Hampshire, regarding the Kinder-Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline project? Of particular concern in Temple is the wide-reaching, detrimental impact the location of an 80,000 hp compressor station would have upon our community, if sited as currently proposed.

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Respectfully,

Ronald A. Pulos

**20150706-0024**

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Date: June 24, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Opposition to the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline natural gas pipeline and compressor installation in New Hampshire

As the owner of the property located at:

11 Main St, New Ipswich, NH 03071

I am opposed to the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline natural gas pipeline compressor installation in my community.

*{hand written text stating strong opposition}*

I am writing to ask FERC to plan a Scoping Meeting in my Southern New Hampshire town of New Ipswich  
Elizabeth L. Thoms

**20150706-0026**

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: 06/28/2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

End of Silver St, Lanesborough, MA 01201

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

David K Pemble

Ray Elworthy

copy sent to: Kimberly D. Dose  
FERC  
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

**20150706-0027**

Ronald A. Pulos  
112 West Road  
Temple, NH 03084

June 29, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC, Docket No. PF14-22-000  
FERC Scoping Meetings Schedule - New Hampshire

Dear Ms. Bose:

I am writing to obtain FERC's schedule for holding scoping meetings in the towns of New Ipswich, Temple, Greenville and Mason, New Hampshire. All of these southern New Hampshire communities would be greatly impacted by the placement of the NED pipeline and/or compressor station, as currently proposed by Kinder-Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline.

Since I have thus far been unsuccessful in locating, online or elsewhere, any information pertaining to the FERC's plans for holding these meetings, I would greatly appreciate your assistance.

Respectfully,

Ronald A. Pulos

**20150706-0028**

June 30, 2015

Paul Stevens  
156 Tlmbertop Rd  
New Ipswich, NH 03071

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Regarding Docket PF 14-22

We request scoping meetings be held in New Ipswich, Temple, Greenville, and Mason NH.

The planned compressor station site for Northeast Energy Direct (NED) poses numerous and complicated aspects that require time and attention for the residents to develop a comprehensive and planned response.

Briefly, the proposed, 80,000 HP compressor site is:

- On a scale unprecedented for these towns
- Within a half-mile of the Temple NH elementary school (which is their emergency shelter)
- Adjacent to a thriving organic beef business
- On the watershed for the Greenville NH reservoir (their primary source of domestic water)
- Dividing the primary path (Route 45) for joint Temple-Greenville police and emergency services
- A half-mile from a convalescent home for nuns.
- In the path of prevailing winds that affect New Ipswich, Temple, Greenville, and Mason residents

Affected homeowners were notified on June 2nd by Kinder Morgan of the compressor station location and we are now scrambling to help those home owners and local authorities to prepare a response.

We're doing our best to communicate with FERC to level the playing field in this process. However, KM appears to have vast economic resources and overt political influence. We volunteers have nothing but our personal earnings, courage, and love for our children, and community and ultimately our votes.

We owe it to every resident in these four towns to follow a comprehensive and adequate FERC process so we get enough information to make a considered presentation regarding the negative impacts. It should also be noted that no resident of these four towns consumes or distributes natural gas. So obviously, we have no

experience with this commodity and need time to educate ourselves.

We need time to ponder the following aspects for each of our towns:

- environmental impact
- economic impact
- health impact (do we need to baseline the health of all residents?)
- tax base changes due to significant deflation in local housing market
- potential litigation expenses against KM
- escrow funds
- accuracy in bonding for potential road damage from construction or accident
- the 5-, 10-, 15-, and 20-year costs of such a drastic change in our community
- many, many, many more...

My hope is you will show due diligence in your responses to these questions and you will behave in a way consistent with National, Democratic, American ideals.

When will New Ipswich, Temple, Greenville, and Mason each have their scoping meetings?

Sincerely,

Paul Stevens

**20150706-0029**

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Date: June 25, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Opposition to the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline natural gas pipeline and compressor installation in New Hampshire

As the owner of the property located at:

180 Ashby Road  
New Ipswich, NH 03071

I am opposed to the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline natural gas pipeline compressor installation in my community.

*{hand written text stating strong opposition}*

I am writing to ask FERC to plan a Scoping Meeting in my Southern New Hampshire town of New Ipswich

Jean B. Randle

**20150706-0030**

Kimberly D. Bose  
Secretary Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE  
Room1A  
Washington, DC 20426

re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline (TGP) Company, L.L.C., Docket No. PF14-22-000

Dear Secretary Bose,

An irresponsible Texas-based corporation, Kinder Morgan TGP, wants to place a high-pressure, fracked-gas pipeline - the Northeast Energy Direct (NED)- through New York, Massachusetts and New Hampshire.

New York state has outlawed fracking, owing to the possible health risks, which residents will nevertheless be exposed to if this pipeline is approved.

Parts of the pipeline - which would only meet the lowest industry safety standards, and be put in place by a corporation with an infamously poor safety record - will go within a mile or so of my house in Nassau, Rensselaer County, NY.

I am opposed for many reasons, but there are two prime and powerful ones. 1) It is not needed. 2) It will make us sick.

First: This pipeline meets no “need” of this nation, and it provides no benefit to New York.

The ultimate goal of this project is to move liquified natural gas to Europe, which obviates any argument that this pipeline is needed by the United States. Indeed, this could result in HIGHER, not lower, energy prices for Americans.

This potential gouging for profit of American consumers by Kinder Morgan is something that 22 United States senators highlighted last year in a letter to President Obama,

“Recently, the Department of Energy approved exports of liquefied natural gas from a sixth export facility. This means that total approved exports, combined with existing and approved export pipelines, now exceeds the total amount of gas that is currently used in every single American home and commercial business. This level of exports well exceeds the “high export scenario” referenced by a Department of Energy study in 2012 that indicated prices could increase by up to 54 percent. Price increases of this scale could translate into more than \$60 billion a year in higher energy costs for American consumers and businesses. “

In short, this pipeline would only exacerbate the “high-export scenario,” adding tens of billions of dollars of cost to the American consumer.

If there is a need, the need is to STOP this pipeline.

Under the Natural Gas Act, no pipeline can be built without a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity from FERC.

FERC’s own Statement of Policy demands the the Commission consider “the enhancement of competitive transportation alternatives, the possibility of overbuilding, the avoidance of unnecessary disruption of the environment, and the unneeded exercise of eminent domain.”

This proposal fails to meet the standard of any of those requirements, and if FERC approves this pipeline it would be disregarding the welfare - both physical and economic - of the residents of the communities through which this pipeline would pass.

Kinder Morgan argues that New England needs this gas.

Why is NED “needed” if the proposed Spectra Access Northeast pipeline will meet the all energy needs of New England, as well as cause far less disruption to our neighborhoods and our green spaces?

Spectra Access Northeast involves the enhancement of existing routes. While NED clearly represents overbuilding, unnecessary disruption of the environment and - as is evidenced by the large outcry from NED’s opponents in New Hampshire - involves the “unneeded exercise of eminent domain.”

It is clear from the hundreds of comments you have received from residents who live along the proposed path of this pipeline: NED would be an “unnecessary disruption” of not only the environment, but our lives.

The other argument in favor of Spectra Access is that Kinder Morgan is unwilling to maintain its existing pipeline, and has been sued in Delaware courts by shareholder Jon Sitoroff for raiding its pipeline maintenance fund to pursue a reckless strategy of overbuilding pipeline - pipeline that the company is uninterested

in maintaining.

“Kinder Morgan Inc. has ensured that, quarter after quarter, hundreds of millions of dollars exit Kinder Morgan Energy Partners (KMP) and are thereafter not available for needed maintenance,” Siotoroff was reported as saying by Bloomberg News.

The suit points to inadequate maintenance of the pipelines, which has led to problems and accidents, including a 100,000-gallon diesel spill in California in 2004.

And it is not just shareholders who are concerned. Investment bankers are as well.

“Every company defines maintenance (capital expenditure) differently, but we struggle to understand how KMP can safely operate the largest portfolio of transmission and storage assets in the industry for just a fraction of its peers’ expenditures,” an investment banker was quoted as saying in Barron’s, the financial magazine.

The Barron’s article went on: “Comparing Kinder Morgan with ... Spectra Energy Partners, another big pipeline operator, (the banker) found that Kinder Morgan was spending about half the maintenance capital of Spectra per mile of pipeline.”

In 2013, a financial research firm, Hedgeve. released a report on Kinder Morgan that said:

“We believe that Kinder Morgan’s high-level business strategy is to starve its pipelines and related infrastructure of routine maintenance spending in order to maximize distributable cash flow.”

The report added that “a broader, and more important concern is the reliability and safety of Kinder Morgan’s pipelines. In 2012, Kinder Morgan acquired El Paso, then the largest natural gas pipeline company in the US, in a \$30 billion deal. Kinder Morgan has already cut maintenance expenses by 70-99% and maintenance [capital expenditures] by -60% on most of those assets. In our view, it is alarming that Kinder Morgan supporters believe that this is a sound business practice.”

Why would FERC grant a certificate of “need” for a pipeline to a company that apparently feels little “need” to maintain the pipeline that it now owns?

Putting aside the real danger the pipeline poses in the way of explosions and fires owing to shoddy construction and liWe-to-nonexistent maintenance, my prime concern is the plans for a massive compression plant near our family farm. This is not an area zoned by the town for industry or commerce. It is zoned for farms and residences.

The 90,000 horsepower compression plant set for Nassau will blow off poisons, including benzene, toluene, xylene, and formaldehyde, exposing children in nearby homes to these toxins.

Dozens of homes are within the arbitrary one-half mile deatMncineration radius around this proposed plant site. Dozens of children live within this circle and will be exposed to these toxins and other dangers.

The World Health Organization has said exposure to benzene is a major health concern, and it has been associated with a range of acute and long-term adverse health effects and diseases, including cancer and aplastic anaemia. There is also evidence of the carcinogenicity of toluene.

The Pennsylvania-based Environmental Health Project (EHP) has determined that there is increasing evidence that the poisons spewed out by shale gas compressor stations make people sick.

A February 2015 study by the EHP said that “recent research that has been conducted near compressor stations in different parts of the country shows consistencies in the types of symptoms experienced by those living near those sites. These systems are associated with health impacts on respiratory, neurological and cardiovascular body systems.”

What steps will be taken to ensure that our children are shielded from these poisons Kinder Morgan wants to release in our community?

No community needs these poisons, especially not Nassau.

The children who would live near this proposed compression station are already potentially exposed to poi-

sons that have been dumped here by other corporations.

Why would the federal government willfully allow children to be exposed to toxins? Or in the case of Nassau, additional toxins?

Within the past century a 20-acre area within 1-2 miles of our Nassau farm was used as a major industrial dump - the Dewey Loeffel Superfund site - for 46,000 tons of toxic waste. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has acknowledged that the ground water near the dump, as well as Lake Nassau, has been poisoned by toxins including PCBs and industrial solvents, which were placed here by General Electric and other large companies.

According to the EPA: "Volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and other hazardous substances have seeped out of the landfill and contaminated the ground water. PCBs have also moved downstream, causing contamination of sediment and several species of fish in and near Nassau Lake."

Dewey Loeffel is within a mile and 1/4 of a proposed compression station site in Nassau. What logiC was used to determine that a compression station, at which there could be an explosion, be put so close to a EPA superfund site? What agency will ensure that the construction of the compression station and pipeline, or a subsequent accident, won't cause the landfill to release even more toxins into our groundwater?

Our groundwater is poisoned. Our lake is poisoned. Our land is poisoned.

Now, Kinder Morgan. wants to come poison our air with VOCs - and possibly add to the poisons already in our water and soil.

Can Kinder Morgan or FERC answer the question: Why must Nassau continue to be poisoned?

The federal process for approving and constructing gas pipelines violates the requirement of the National Environmental Policy Act to minimize cumulative negative impacts that federal agency decisions may have on public safety, health and the environment.

We in Nassau have had enough "cumulative negative impacts" on our health and environment.

And there is more than just poison that comes with this plant.

The turbines at the plant will generate noise equivalent to that of aircraft engines. Does Kinder Morgan plan on putting these engines in sound-proof buildings, so we can continue to live in the quiet that some of our families have invested in for centuries? What efforts - if any - will be made to mitigate the noise pollution of this plant?

On our farm, we have had people ask for permission to set up telescopes in our fields so they can look at the stars. Now, Kinder Morgan wants to pollute our night skies with lighting at this massive compression station. What technology would be implemented to reduce the light pollution produced by this plant?

This area in upstate New York already hosts pipelines and compression plants, but most of these existing plants are a fraction of the size of those proposed for NED.

This begs many questions:

Why does this plant in Nassau have to be so large and expose so many people to its dangers?

Has there been any discussion about reducing the size of the plant or moving it out of an area zoned for residential use and inhabited by young families with children?

Will FERC - or any government agency - demand that Kinder Morgan prove that the station won't poison us when there is growing evidence that it will, in fact, make us sick?

The residents of Nassau must be assured that will not be subject to further corporate-sponsored poisoning or any other kind of corporate-sponsored risk.

Otherwise, what agency issues the certificate of "need" to poison a community?

To repeat:

One: There is no "need" for a redundant pipeline, a pipeline that will exacerbate the "export scenario" - especially a pipeline build by an unscrupulous company unwilling to safely maintain its pipeline.

Second: We have been poisoned and polluted enough here in Nassau. We do not need Kinder Morgan to poison us more, solely to further enrich shareholders and gouge consumers, owing to the “high-export scenario.’

For many months now, I have been looking forward to having my year-old grandson move back to his ancestral home here in Nassau - a farm that has been in his family for more than 150 years

Now, Kinder Morgan has come to shatter those dreams, and the dreams of many of us here in Nassau. I do not want my grandson to grow up in the shadow of a facility that could poison him.

Sincerely,

Charles J. Waggoner  
586 Nassau-Averill Park Road  
Nassau, NY 12123

**20150706-0032**

**The Metropolitan District**

water supply .environmental services .geographic information

June 26, 2015

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

Re: Proposed Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Pipeline Project, Tennessee Gas Pipeline L.L.C.I  
Kinder Morgan (FERC Docket No. PF14-22-000)

Dear Secretary Bose:

The Metropolitan District (MDC) is a public, non-profit municipal corporation that provides clean, safe drinking water to over 400,000 people in the greater Hartford, Connecticut area.

We have been following the NED Tennessee Gas/Kinder Morgan pipeline proposal with great interest, and, on behalf of the MDC, I write in order to express some concern that the proposed pipeline could potentially impact MDC’s public drinking water supplies in West Hartford and Bloomfield, Connecticut. The pipeline is proposed to be constructed on critical public water supply watershed land near drinking water reservoirs at our West Hartford and Reservoir #6 facilities.

Based on the “ExhibitA” map of the “Proposed Tennessee Gas license Area,” we estimate that the project could potentially disturb a large area (250 acres or more) on MDC property, and encompass a distance of approximately 5 miles running north-south, carving through the watersheds of MDC Reservoirs #2, #3, #5 and #6. This land is classified as Class I and Class II water company land in Connecticut and, accordingly, its use is highly regulated by the Connecticut Department of Public Health. By law, Class I and Class II water company land is protected and preserved to safeguard the state’s water resources.

We have been monitoring the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) website, and we are aware that the first drafts of the Environmental Reports (ER’s) on this proposal have been submitted to FERC, including the proposal for expansion of the pipeline in Hartford County. We note that the Environmental Reports are lacking in critical resource information - including reference to and consideration of the existence of our public water supply reservoirs and watershed lands in the area of proposed expansion. In fact, Environmental Resource Report #2 -Water Use and Quality, Section 2.2.6.1.5 Public Watershed Areas, incorrectly states that the project area is not located within any public drinking water or aquifer protection areas.

Therefore, it appears to the MDC that the initial environmental review process is deficient, that potential impacts to these vital water resources are not being addressed in any manner, and that more public input is

essential. This is of great concern because the second draft of the Environmental Report to FERC has been reported to be targeted for submittal in July 2015, and a true public forum has not yet been held in Connecticut.

We are formally requesting that FERC compel Tennessee Gas/Kinder Morgan to conduct a well advertised public meeting be held in the West Hartford area (i.e., at Town Hall) in order to present and discuss with the public the proposed project, answer questions and address public concerns. Adequate and advance notice of this meeting should be mandated. In addition to the issues associated with the public water supply, there are many residents from the MDC's eight member towns, as well as from throughout the state, who recreate extensively at our West Hartford and Bloomfield facilities, and the MDC is concerned that these stakeholders are not aware of this project.

Protecting the health and integrity of our public water supply reservoirs and watershed lands is the MDC's highest priority. We appreciate your cooperation and look forward to having a public meeting scheduled and advertised in the near future.

Thank you for consideration of this important request, and if you have any questions, do not hesitate to contact me at (860)278-7850 x3200.

Sincerely,

THE METROPOLITAN DISTRICT

Scott W. Jellson, P.E.  
Chief Executive Officer

Cc: Mr. J. Curtis Moffat

Deputy General Counsel and Vice President  
Gas Group Legal  
Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1001 Louisiana Street, Suite 1000  
Houston, TX 77009

Mr. Eric Tomasi  
Environmental Project Manager  
Office of Energy Projects  
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20426

Lori Ferry  
Project Manager  
AECOM  
10 Orms St., Suite 405  
Providence RI 02904

Ms. Lori Mathieu  
Section Chief, Drinking Water Section  
State of Connecticut-Department of Public Health  
410 Capitol Avenue, MS #51 WAT PO Box 340308  
Hartford, CT 06134-0308

**20150706-0033**

PROPERTY ACCESS DENIED

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001  
Date: 6-27-15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

RE: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

Street Address: 900 Old Homestead Hwy

Town & Zip: Richmond, NH

Map & Lot Number(s) (if known) map 000402 lot 000036

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Kathleen T. Picotte

CC:

FERC

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, NE, Room 1A

Washington, DC 20426

**20150706-0036**

Julie McAdoo  
258 Cutter Rd.  
Temple, NH 03084

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC

To Whom It May Concern:

Regarding FERC docket # PF 14-22:

I would like to know when the scoping meeting will take place for the town of Temple, NH, for the proposed Kinder Morgan/Tennessee natural Gas gas pipeline project.

My property in Temple would be affected by the pipeline and the planned compressor station, which would be located a few miles from my home.

Sincerely,

Julie McAdoo

**20150706-0038**

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, NE

Room 1A

Washington, DC 20426

Date: 6/29/2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Opposition to the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline natural gas pipeline and compressor installation in New Hampshire

As the owner of the property located at:

424 Temple Road, New Ipswich, NH

I am opposed to the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline natural gas pipeline compressor installation in my community.

*{hand written text stating strong opposition}*

I am writing to ask FERC to plan a Scoping Meeting in my Southern New Hampshire town of New Ipswich  
Sebastian Barthelmes

**20150706-0039**

June 29, 2015

Dear Congressman Guinta,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Congressman, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England.

The pipeline construction process will pollute our air, contaminate our aquifers, wells and other water resources. Over 800 NH families will lose their homes and it will destroy conservation lands. It will harm the tourist industry and rural character of New Hampshire.

The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent "blow downs" where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline. These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis and will eventually cause ruin to all of New Hampshire.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station, including the Temple Elementary School will likely burm to the ground along with anyone nearby. Are the children of New Hampshire not important?

The property values near the pipeline and compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit! The only one benefiting is Kinder Morgan - making tons of money off of people who are struggling on a day-to-day basis to make ends meet and now will lose everything they have worked so hard for all their lives!

Congressman Guinta, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

Nat & Holly Crooker

cc: FERC

-----  
June 29, 2015

Dear Congresswoman Kuster,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Congresswoman, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England.

The pipeline construction process will pollute our air, contaminate our aquifers, wells and other water resources. Over 800 NH families will lose their homes and it will destroy conservation lands. It will harm the tourist industry and rural character of New Hampshire.

The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent "blow downs" where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline. These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems

for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis and will eventually cause ruin to all of New Hampshire.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station, including the Temple Elementary School will likely be buried to the ground along with anyone nearby. Are the children of New Hampshire not important?

The property values near the pipeline and compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit! The only one benefiting is Kinder Morgan - making tons of money off of people who are struggling on a day-to-day basis to make ends meet and now will lose everything they have worked so hard for all their lives!

Congresswoman Kuster, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

Nat & Holly Crooker

cc: FERC

**20150706-0040**

June 29, 2015

Dear Governor Hassan,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Governor, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England.

The pipeline construction process will pollute our air, contaminate our aquifers, wells and other water resources. Over 800 NH families will lose their homes and it will destroy conservation lands. It will harm the tourist industry and rural character of New Hampshire.

The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent "blow downs" where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline. These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis and will eventually cause ruin to all of New Hampshire.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station, including the Temple Elementary School will likely be buried to the ground along with anyone nearby. Are the children of New Hampshire not important?

The property values near the pipeline and compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit! The only one benefiting is Kinder Morgan - making tons of money off of people who are struggling on a day-to-day basis to make ends meet and now will lose everything they have worked so hard for all their lives!

Governor Hassan, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

Roger & Joan Crooker

cc: FERC

-----  
June 29, 2015

Dear Senator Ayotte,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Senator, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England.

The pipeline construction process will pollute our air, contaminate our aquifers, wells and other water resources. Over 800 NH families will lose their homes and it will destroy conservation lands. It will harm the tourist industry and rural character of New Hampshire.

The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent “blow downs” where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline. These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis and will eventually cause ruin to all of New Hampshire.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station, including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby. Are the children of New Hampshire not important?

The property values near the pipeline and compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit! The only one benefiting is Kinder Morgan - making tons of money off of people who are struggling on a day-to-day basis to make ends meet and now will lose everything they have worked so hard for all their lives!

Senator Ayotte, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

Roger & Joan Crooker

cc: FERC

-----  
June 29, 2015

Dear Senator Shaheen,,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Senator, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England.

The pipeline construction process will pollute our air, contaminate our aquifers, wells and other water resources. Over 800 NH families will lose their homes and it will destroy conservation lands. It will harm the tourist industry and rural character of New Hampshire.

The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent “blow downs” where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline. These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis and will eventually cause ruin to all of New Hampshire.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station, including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby. Are the children of New Hampshire not important?

The property values near the pipeline and compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit! The only one benefiting is Kinder Morgan - making tons of money off of people who are struggling on a day-to-day basis to make ends meet and now will lose everything they have worked so hard for all their lives!

Senator Shaheen,, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

Roger & Joan Crooker

cc: FERC

**20150706-0041**

June 29, 2015

Dear Congressman Guinta,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Congressman, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England.

The pipeline construction process will pollute our air, contaminate our aquifers, wells and other water resources. Over 800 NH families will lose their homes and it will destroy conservation lands. It will harm the tourist industry and rural character of New Hampshire.

The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent "blow downs" where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline. These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis and will eventually cause ruin to all of New Hampshire.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station, including the Temple Elementary School will likely burm to the ground along with anyone nearby. Are the children of New Hampshire not important?

The property values near the pipeline and compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit! The only one benefiting is Kinder Morgan - making tons of money off of people who are struggling on a day-to-day basis to make ends meet and now will lose everything they have worked so hard for all their lives!

Congressman Guinta, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

Roger & Joan Crooker

cc: FERC

-----

June 29, 2015

Dear Congresswoman Kuster,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Congresswoman, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England.

The pipeline construction process will pollute our air, contaminate our aquifers, wells and other water resources. Over 800 NH families will lose their homes and it will destroy conservation lands. It will harm the tourist industry and rural character of New Hampshire.

The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent "blow downs" where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline. These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis and will eventually cause ruin to all of New Hampshire.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station, including the Temple Elementary School will likely burm to the ground along with anyone nearby. Are the children of New Hampshire not important?

The property values near the pipeline and compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be

worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit! The only one benefiting is Kinder Morgan - making tons of money off of people who are struggling on a day-to-day basis to make ends meet and now will lose everything they have worked so hard for all their lives!

Congresswoman Kuster, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

Roger & Joan Crooker

cc: FERC

**20150706-0043**

Hand written card, Paul Stevens, 156 Timbertop Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, demanding Scoping meetings in New Ipswich, Greenville, Mason, Milford, Amherst, etc.

**20150706-0044**

Hand written card, Audrey Kay, 1 Juniper Drive, Amherst NH 03031, requesting schedule for Scoping Meeting in Amherst.

**20150706-0045**

Hand written card, Paul Stevens, 156 Timbertop Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, requesting schedule for Scoping Meetings in New Ipswich, Greenville, Mason, Milford and Amherst.

**20150706-0046**

Hand written card, Donna Nordengren, 16 Jamil Lane, Salem, NH 03079, opposing

**20150706-0047**

Hand written card, Timothy E Somero, 42 Old Tenney Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, was told by KM that natural gas would be available in New Ipswich, but sees nothing in 10-year plan. When will it be available?

**20150706-0049**

Hand written card, Joseph Stacy, 773 Millers Falls Rd, Northfield, MA 01360, opposing

**20150706-0057**

Hand written card, S.A. Matthews, 40 Settlement Hill, New Ipswich, NH 03071, must have Scoping Meeting in New Ipswich.

**20150706-0058**

Hand written card, S.A. Matthews, 40 Settlement Hill, New Ipswich, NH 03071, opposing

**20150706-0060**

Hand written card, Cherylann Pierce, 23 Mayflower Drive, Londonderry, NH, opposing

**20150706-0061**

Hand written card, Julia McAdoo, 258 Cutter Rd, Temple, NH 03084, opposing.

**20150706-0062**

Hand written card, Kathy Fedorka, 107 Kullgren Road, Temple, NH 03084, opposing.

**20150706-0063**

Hand written card, Lisa Oden, 6 Upper Pratt Pond Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, opposing

**20150706-0064**

Hand written card, Michael Clayton, 369 West Rd, Temple, NH 03084, opposing.

**20150706-0065**

Hand written card, Abby Turner, 44 Canaan Road, Richmond, MA 01254, opposing

**20150706-0067**

Hand written card, Monica Kay, 1 Juniper Drive, Amherst NH 03031, when will Scoping Meeting for Amherst be announced?

**20150706-0068**

Hand written card, Paul Stevens, 156 Timbertop Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, opposing

**20150706-0069**

Hand written postcard, Kathleen Durkin, 216 Trout Brook Rd, Dracut, MA 01820, opposing

**20150706-0073**

79 Colburn Road  
Temple, NH 03084

July 1, 2015

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: FERC docket number PF14-22

Dear Sirs:

In regard to the proposed Kinder Morgan/TGP natural gas pipeline, when is FERC going to hold its scoping meetings in the towns of New Ipswich, Temple, Greenville, and Mason, NH?

All of these towns would be affected by the potential compressor station.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Perry

**20150706-0074**

Hand written card, Nancy Jackson, Temple, NH 03084, when will Scoping Meetings be held in New Ipswich, Temple, Greenville and Mason which are all affected by the compressor station?.

**20150706-5000(30691227).txt**

Sharon Rosenfelder, New Ipswich, NH.

Dear Sir or Madam,

I feel each town affected by the proposed Kinder Morgan pipeline, deserves a scoping session. We are all voters and taxpayers and need the opportunity to voice our concerns. The construction and operation of KM project would affect residents' safety, health, and would disturb our environment.

Sharon Rosenfelder.

James Carvalho, Bolton, MA.

Subject: Docket #PF14-22: Comment on FERC Draft Environmental Impact Statement - Fracking

In the development of the NED project Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) the FERC must adhere to all aspects of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) 42 U.S.C. 4321. 40 CFR 1508.7 requires the study of "cumulative impacts," defined as "the impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions... Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time." There is therefore no doubt whatsoever that hydraulic fracturing (fracking) is a "reasonably foreseeable future action... taking place over a period of time". The total amount of natural gas being produced in Pennsylvania may be sufficient to fill the NED pipeline's capacity at present, but much of that gas already is being transported in other pipelines to other end destinations. During the 50 year, or more, lifetime of the NED gas pipeline, the delivery of 2.2 BCuFt/day of additional natural gas from the Marcellus Shale formation in Pennsylvania cannot be sustained without drilling any new wells. FERC must conduct an analysis of the impacts associated with the reasonably foreseeable increased production needed to sustain the NED project over the project lifetime. The NED project also will induce construction and operation of a new distribution system for the transportation of gas from the wellheads to delivery points, causing additional impacts to the environment. FERC's responsibility under NEPA is to account for the reasonably foreseeable environmental effects of drilling and fracking at each and every newly developed or serviced well induced by projects under its jurisdiction.

NEPA requires that FERC engage in a detailed and useful analysis of these cumulative effects. FERC may not conclude that these significant impacts will be sufficiently mitigated by simply stating that impacts are environmentally acceptable actions. In order for these induced impacts to be reduced to less than significant levels, the mitigation plan and measures must be clearly described and must be enforceable. Otherwise, the FERC must include this in the analysis of cumulative effects the environmental impacts of the fracking done as a consequence of the approval of the NED pipeline, including dewatering streams and surface and groundwater pollution.

A number of studies exist which the FERC can use in its analysis of the upstream cumulative effect of approval of the NED gas pipeline. In 2010 the EPA conducted an analysis of fracking upon drinking water resources concluding that between 2 and 10 million gallons of water are required in the fracking of a single Marcellus shale gas well.

[http://yosemite.epa.gov/sab/sabproduct.nsf/0/D3483AB445AE61418525775900603E79/\\$File/Draft+Plan+to+Study+the+Potential+Impacts+of+Hydraulic+Fracturing+on+Drinking+Water+Resources-February+2011.pdf](http://yosemite.epa.gov/sab/sabproduct.nsf/0/D3483AB445AE61418525775900603E79/$File/Draft+Plan+to+Study+the+Potential+Impacts+of+Hydraulic+Fracturing+on+Drinking+Water+Resources-February+2011.pdf)

A 2013 water resource report of Pennsylvania and West Virginia Marcellus wells by Downstream Strategies revealed that approximately 4.3 million gallons of water is injected per shale gas well in Pennsylvania.

[http://www.downstreamstrategies.com/documents/reports\\_publication/marcellus\\_wv\\_pa.pdf](http://www.downstreamstrategies.com/documents/reports_publication/marcellus_wv_pa.pdf)

This report concludes that 94% of the fluids injected into wells remain underground,

permanently removed from the hydrologic cycle. The water removed by the process of natural gas well production via fracking is between 3.2 and 4.2 gallons per Mcf. This means that the incremental cumulative effect of the NED gas pipeline approval by the FERC, with 2.2 BcF/day of capacity over 50 years, is the loss of 18 billion gallons of ground water permanently removed from the environment. This ground water is contaminated by the fracking fluid including benzene, dimethyldisulfide, trimethyl benzene, diethyl benzene, tetramethyl benzene, carbon disulfide, naphthalenes, methyl pyridine, carbonyl sulfide and toluene.

Natural gas from the Marcellus Shale in Pennsylvania produced by fracking contains 8 to 32 times higher than normally occurring levels of Radon-222, the second largest cause of lung cancer in the United States. The half life of Radon-222 is 3.8 days. Marcellus Shale gas can travel through the NED project into local

distribution pipe lines, and get consumed in cooking in heating fires within a matter of hours. A 2012 study of “Radon in Natural Gas from Marcellus Shale” by Marvin Resnikoff estimated between 1200 and 30,000 excess lung cancer deaths due to the distribution of Marcellus Shale gas.

<https://www.nirs.org/radiation/radonmarcellus.pdf>

It has been estimated that the transportation of two to five million gallons of water (fresh or waste water) per well requires 1400 truck trips. Thus, not only does water used for fracking deplete fresh water supplies and impact aquatic habitat, the transportation of so much water also creates localized air quality, safety and road repair issues. The FERC must include the environmental impact of these cumulative effects as well in the NEPA analysis.

Fracking will become the asbestos of the 21st century. NEPA requires the FERC to analyze these cumulative effects in the development of the EIS for the NED project. In consideration of this and other serious consequences of approval, the FERC must report the finding of insufficient convenience and disapprove the NED project.

**20150706-5003(30691235).txt**

Laura or Kenneth Lynch, Temple, NH.

We deny access to our property and oppose the NED pipeline project.

**20150706-5006(30691241).txt**

Allegra Schecter, Cherry Valley, NY.

I wish to protest the simultaneous scheduling of the NED Scoping Hearings in Schoharie, NY and Oneonta, NY on July 16 at 7pm. Not only does it make it impossible to attend both hearings and hear what is being said, but it makes it impossible to support our neighbors when they are being confronted by intimidating bussed-in Union workers who have no idea what an environmental scoping hearing is for.

At the FERC scoping hearings for the Constitution Pipeline, residents who were there to state their valid environmental concerns were bullied by Union workers. My daughter was rudely interrupted when she was speaking and physically approached by several men afterwards as she tried to get to her car. There were several complaints filed about this at the time and I will re-submit mine for you. I personally would not want to go through such a thing again.

By making us chose one or another site to comment, you are making it less comfortable for people to speak, because they will be greatly out-numbered by Union men in orange shirts. These men monopolized the microphone, by saying the same thing- they want jobs. We all know this already. It is not what a scoping hearing is supposed to be about. This is not right. We are entitled to speak in a safe environment, and present our long thought-out and written environmental scoping comments.

Please re-consider these simultaneous dates.

Thank you.

**20150706-5010(30691249).txt**

James Carvalho, Bolton, MA.

Subject: Docket #PF14-22: Comment on FERC Draft Environmental Impact Statement – Greenhouse Gas and Climate Change

In the development of the NED project Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) the FERC must adhere to all aspects of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) 42 U.S.C. 4321. 40 CFR 1508.7 requires the study of ”cumulative impacts” defined as “the impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions... Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time.” There is no doubt whatsoever that greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and the result-

ing climate change impact is a “reasonably foreseeable future action... taking place over a period of time”. During the more than 50 year lifetime of the NED gas pipeline, the delivery of 2.2 BCuFt/day of additional natural gas from the Marcellus Shale formation will result in GHG emissions which will cause further warming and long-lasting changes in all components of the climate system, increasing the likelihood of severe, pervasive and irreversible impacts for people and ecosystems. Climate change is a key contributor to the on-going sixth greatest extinction event in the history of the earth. The CEQ “Revised Draft Guidance on the Consideration of Greenhouse Gas Emissions and the Effect of Climate Change in NEPA Reviews” requires this analysis for projects which exceed 25,000 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e GHG per year.

<https://www.whitehouse.gov/administration/eop/ceq/initiatives/nepa/ghg-guidance>

FERC’s responsibility under NEPA is to account for the reasonably foreseeable environmental effects of the production of an additional 2.2 BCuFt/day of natural gas.

NEPA requires that the FERC engage in a detailed and useful analysis of these cumulative effects. The FERC may not conclude that these significant impacts will be sufficiently mitigated by simply stating that impacts are environmentally acceptable actions or by displacing other fossil fuel development of greater environmental consequence. A thorough analysis of the cumulative effects of natural gas at all points of production, distribution and consumption will show that with regard to GHG emissions that natural gas is worse for climate change than coal or oil for the same energy produced. But, this is a false comparison because the FERC must complete a full analysis of a combination of all alternative de-carbonized energy sources, solar, wind, hydro, geothermal, conservation and efficiency, to conclude that no new fossil energy source, no pipeline, is required.

Natural gas is primarily CH<sub>4</sub>, methane. CO<sub>2</sub> is produced when natural gas is burned, a foreseeable consequence of approving the NED gas pipeline. CO<sub>2</sub> is a powerful GHG which traps heat in the atmosphere. But, if burning methane into CO<sub>2</sub> were not bad enough, methane is a fugitive release to the atmosphere at each step in the process. Methane leaks are a foreseeable consequence of approving the NED gas pipeline. Methane is an 86 times more heat trapping GHG as CO<sub>2</sub> over a 20-year period. <http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2013/10/02/2708911/fracking-ipcc-methane/>

119.9 lbs of CO<sub>2</sub> is produced when a thousand cubic feet of natural gas is burned. This means that each year 9.63 trillion pounds, 4.36 million metric tons, of CO<sub>2</sub> will be generated by burning the gas resulting from approval of the NED pipeline project whether that gas is burned in New England or half way around the world at the true export destination. Over the 50 year operating lifetime 218 million metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub> GHG will be released into the atmosphere.

Methane is released when hydraulic fracturing (fracking) creates a new natural gas well. Methane is released by leaks in gathering pipelines which feed the main gas pipeline and by leaks in the pipeline itself. Methane is released by compressor stations which push the gas along situated every 10 to 40 miles along the main pipeline route. Methane is leaked in local distribution company pipelines to local (or exported) homes, businesses and power plants.

A study done on behalf of the Department of Energy “Life Cycle Greenhouse Gas Perspective on Exporting Liquefied Natural Gas from the United States” uses an estimated methane leakage “cradle to liquefaction” of between 1.2% and 1.6%.

<http://energy.gov/sites/prod/files/2014/05/f16/Life%20Cycle%20GHG%20Perspective%20Report.pdf>

Leakage of methane from the NED project at a 1.4% rate would release the equivalent of 5.5 million additional metric tons of GHG equivalent to CO<sub>2</sub> per year, 277 million metric tons over the 50 year operating life of the pipeline.

Alternately, a study in Science, “Methane Leaks from North American Natural Gas Systems”, reviewing more than 200 earlier studies concluded that natural gas well leakage rates were about 5.4%.

<http://www.sciencemag.org/content/343/6172/733.summary>

Leakage of methane from the NED project at a 5.4% rate would release the equivalent of 20.2 million ad-

ditional metric tons per year of GHG equivalent to CO2 per year, one billion metric tons over the 50 year operating life of the pipeline.

And, because 80-90% of the natural gas planned for the NED pipeline will be sold for export, methane is also leaked and GHG produced during LNG tanker delivery and LNG vaporization at the destination. In addition distribution pipelines and their associated compressor stations transporting gas to the end export destination produce more GHG.

The CH4 leakage and the CO2 released by distribution and processing are predictable GHG cumulative consequences of approval of the NED pipeline project. NEPA requires the FERC to analyze these cumulative effects in the development of the EIS. In consideration of the serious consequences of approval, the NED project must not be approved.

**20150706-5012(30691253).txt**

Suzy Winkler, Burlington, Flats, NY.

I'm writing to protest FERC's recently released strategic schedule for the North East Direct Scoping Hearing's which are cynically set to occur simultaneously in both Oneonta and Schoharie, NY.

It is true that the hearings are only one of the ways for our communities to comment on the pipeline proposal, but it's common knowledge that these meetings are an opportunity for attendees to hear the perspectives of their entire community.

Surely FERC is aware of the public's interest in these events as the venues have in the past been packed with citizen's anxious to be involved in the proceedings.

I believe this synchronization is inappropriate and I urge FERC to rethink the timing of these 2 hearings.

Please re-consider this divide and conquer strategy and change the schedule in order for the public to attend both sessions and get a full sense of the public's opinions and insights into the North East Direct pipeline and compressor proposals.

Please reschedule one of these hearings and stop trying to shut the public out of the process.

Thank you.

Suzy Winkler  
174 Pickens Road  
Burlington Flats, NY 13315

**20150706-5013(30691255).txt**

Susan R Jacques, Schoharie, NY.

I believe a grave error has been made.

To show that they are on the "up and up" Kinder Morgan needs to reschedule one of the two scoping meetings scheduled on the same evening of July 16, 2015.

Since this company has not been straight forward and not able to answer any pertinent questions...in addition not producing any legitimate maps we have to be leary of their objective in this scheduling.

I should hope they come fully loaded with all the information that the landowners need since it is an unnecessary project at that for the what they state are their encompassed goals.

Legally they are out of line with the planned project going forward offering nothing more than exporting and increased prices in energy to the northeast and the country!

I would hope you will keep them honest and have them re-schedule one of these meetings to another evening.

And we would appreciate the roaring and past abusive treatment from the unions that come only to take our seats will be curtailed.

Furthermore a great injustice has been performed in Schoharie and all counties these pipelines go through making it a thouroughfare of explosive devices no more than an outright case of “terrorism!”

I would have thought that you would have looked; and I believe you did and didn’t care, at the fact that you were placing not one but two companies on top of a third through the same towns!

This is seen by all of us from Pa to Canada and Nova Scotia as deliberate Harrassment and lack of concern and intelligence.

I look forward to a quick remedy for the meetings to be performed.

Thank you

Susan Jacques

**20150706-5016(30691261).txt**

Wiliam Kelly, Averill Park, NY.

I write to strongly support the construction of the Northeast Energy Direct natural gas pipeline. I live approximately one mile from the proposed right-of-way and have no objections to the new pipeline. I urge FERC to consider the need for additional infrastructure of this kind at the national level and not be swayed by local activists whose agenda is apparently rooted in general opposition to fossil fuels and the expanded use thereof.

**20150706-5017(30691263).txt**

James Carvalho, Bolton, MA.

Subject: Docket #PF14-22: Comment on FERC Draft Environmental Impact Statement – Global Climate Change

In the development of the NED project Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) the FERC must adhere to all aspects of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) 42 U.S.C. 4321. 40 CFR 1508.7 requires the study of ”cumulative impacts,” defined as “the impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions... Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time.” There is no doubt that greenhouse gases (GHG) will be generated as a result of FERC approval of the NED project and there is no doubt that GHG contributes to Global Climate Change. The FERC must study the amount of GHG produced as a consequence of approval of the NED project including CO2 produced when the 2.2 BCuFt/day of natural gas is burned and CH4 leaked at each stage of production, transport and distribution. Since the majority of the natural gas supplied by the NED project will be exported the FERC study must include CH4 leaked as a result of LNG liquefaction, LNG transport and vaporization at the destination.

The FERC may not claim that “it is not practical to analyze the cumulative effects of an action on the universe”. There is an economic cost associated with Global Climate Change due to the increasing levels of GHG added to the earth’s atmosphere each year.

When the FERC develops the EIS for the NED project it needs to thoroughly evaluate all alternatives, solar, wind, hydro, geothermal, conservation, efficiency, which could individually or in combination displace the energy needed for additional natural capacity in the NED pipeline. The FERC may conclude that these alternatives are not cost effective as compared to the NED pipeline, but, unless the FERC analyzes the true cost of implementing the NED pipeline including the cost of the cumulative economic impact of Global Climate Change that conclusion would be arbitrary and capricious.

The World Bank “Economics of Adaptation to Climate Change” study in 2010 estimated that an average of between 70 and 100 billion dollars each year between 2010 and 2050 would be required for adaptation in the agriculture, forestry, fisheries, infrastructure, water resource management, and coastal zone sectors, including impacts on health, ecosystem services, and the effects of extreme-weather events. <http://sitere->

[sources.worldbank.org/EXTCC/Resources/EACC\\_FinalSynthesisReport0803\\_2010.pdf](http://sources.worldbank.org/EXTCC/Resources/EACC_FinalSynthesisReport0803_2010.pdf)

The Stern Review “The Economics of Climate Change” for the UK government in 2010 concluded that “if we don’t act, the overall costs and risks of climate change will be equivalent to losing at least 5% of global GDP each year, now and forever”.

<http://www.webcitation.org/5nCeyEYJr>

According to an estimate by the World Bank, the 2013 nominal Global World Product (GWP) was approximately US\$75.59 trillion. A 5% loss in GWP would be a global cost of \$3.78 trillion.

<http://databank.worldbank.org/data/download/GDP.pdf>

In 2010 the IPCC computed global GHG emissions at 49 Gigatonnes (metric tons) of CO2 equivalent.

[https://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/unfccc/sbsta40/SED/1\\_blanco\\_sed3.pdf](https://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/unfccc/sbsta40/SED/1_blanco_sed3.pdf)

The FERC can establish the economic impact for adaptation and impact to GWP resulting from approval of the NED project by dividing the incremental annual GHG emissions of the NED project to the total global emissions and multiplying the global economic impact by the result.

In case the incremental annual GHG contributions of the NED project were found to be 24.5 million metric tons CO2 equivalent then the economic impact of the NED project for adaptation would be as much as \$50 million annually. For GWP the NED project impact would be \$1.9 billion annually. The FERC must take into account the incremental contribution that approval of the NED project will have on Global Climate Change.

**20150706-5018(30691265).txt**

Jeff & Susan Landon, Tewksbury, MA.

July 3, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Expansion Project  
Northeast Energy Direct, PF14-22-000

Dear Secretary Bose,

We are writing to express our concern with and opposition to the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Expansion project.

As residents of Tewksbury for 23 years, we are directly affected by the proposed path of the Lynnfield Lateral pipeline and the potential consequences of its construction and operation. This pipeline is currently proposed to be a 20-inch diameter pipe carrying natural gas at an incredibly high pressure of greater than 1400 psi. This pipe is planned to run through our property as well as that of our neighbors. We have significant concerns about having such a high volume, high pressure gas line so close to residential areas including the risk of gas leak-related explosion, a decline in property values and an increase in insurance costs. These safety concerns in particular relate not just to my area but all other residents potentially located near the pipeline.

We also have a number of environmental concerns with this project. According to a Town of Tewksbury Zoning Map (February 2015), our property and the planned pipeline lie within a Groundwater Protection District. Town and state maps show streams, wetlands and vernal pools lie directly in or adjacent to the project. The purpose of this Groundwater Protection District is to:

a. promote the health, safety, and general welfare of the community by ensuring and adequate quality and quantity of drinking water for the residents, institutions, and businesses of the

Town of Tewksbury

- b. preserve and protect existing and potential sources of drinking water supplies
- c. conserve the natural resources of the town; and
- d. prevent temporary and permanent contamination of the environment.

Additionally, my street, Dunvegan Road, is already impacted by the presence of a power easement with high voltage power lines that run through the front yards of homes across the street. These power lines already subject us and our neighbors to loss of aesthetics and valued of our properties.

In summary, we object to the Tennessee Pipeline Northeast Expansion Project for numerous reasons – direct impacts to our and other residents’ quality of life, the taking of private lands and the potential safety risks, as well as the loss of open space. The proposed pipeline merely perpetuates reliance on non-renewable resources for short-term gain while ignoring the long-term benefits of renewable solutions that are safer, less invasive and potentially less costly. Massachusetts has a strong track record promoting renewable energy and energy efficiency programs to meet its energy needs. We urge you to fully prioritize further investment in and deployment of these solutions, and to take any actions as are necessary to deny the Tennessee Pipeline Expansion project.

Sincerely,

Jeff and Susan Landon  
56 Dunvegan Road  
Tewksbury, MA 01876

C:

Rep. Seth Moulton  
State Rep. James Lyons  
State Sen. Barbara L’Italien

**20150706-5020(30691269).txt**

James Carvalho, Bolton, MA.

Subject: Docket #PF14-22: Comment – A Question Of Morality

“And that is what is at stake, our ability to live on planet Earth, to have a future as a civilization. I believe this is a moral issue, it is your time to seize this issue, it is our time to rise again to secure our future.” Al Gore, 2006

After all the reasonable arguments against approval of the Kinder Morgan NED project have been made, about public and private property rights, about environmental disruption, about the concerns for public safety, about the economics, and the FERC dismisses these as insufficient cause to deny the Kinder Morgan application, it comes down to the moral issue of the 21st century, climate change.

“Climate change is a global problem with grave implications: environmental, social, economic, political and for the distribution of goods. It represents one of the principal challenges facing humanity in our day. Its worst impact

will probably be felt by developing countries in coming decades. Many of the poor live in areas particularly affected by phenomena related to warming, and their means of subsistence are largely dependent on natural reserves and eco-systemic services such as agriculture, fishing and forestry. They have no other financial activities or resources which can enable them to adapt to climate change or to face natural disasters, and their access to social services and protection is very limited. There is an urgent need to develop policies so that, in the next few years, the emission of carbon dioxide and other highly polluting gases can be drastically reduced, for example, substituting for fossil fuels and developing sources of renewable energy. Reducing greenhouse gases requires honesty, courage and responsibility, above all on the part of those countries which are more powerful and pollute the most. The countries which have benefited from a high degree of industri-

alization at the cost of enormous emissions of greenhouse gases, have a greater responsibility for providing a solution to the problems they have caused.” These are not my words. These words come from the Encyclical Letter, On Care Of Our Common Home, by Pope Francis.

Climate change is a result of increased greenhouse gases in the atmosphere due to the burning of fossil fuels. This conclusion is a result of multitudes of studies by leading scientists. Those who reject these arguments engage in the politics of selfishness in favor of short-term interests over catastrophic long-term consequences. Ice caps are melted, the Gulf Stream is redirected, regions are put into drought, the seas are killed and species are driven into extinction. Climate change is causing drastic changes worldwide, disproportionately affecting the world’s poor.

Drought in Africa, Pakistan, Brazil, China and Central America/Caribbean region.

Floods in Bangladesh, China, Vietnam, Indonesia, India, Thailand, the Philippines, Burma and Malaysia.

Food supplies jeopardized in Djibouti, Sudan, Somalia, Yemen and Eritrea.

The longer we put off corrective action, the more disruptive the outcome is likely to be. The future of humanity is at stake leaving our grandchildren a tab that can never be repaid. We cannot put our hope on future technological innovations to solve these problems which may never come. Industrialized countries such as the United States who have polluted the most need to take the lead in reducing greenhouse gases now. Climate change skeptics may claim that the United States is “economically dependent” on fossil fuels. But, 19th century skeptics claimed that the United States was “economically dependent” on slavery. Yet, the 19th century United States overcame the moral issue of it’s time. Climate change skeptics who claim there is insufficient resolve to make this transition overlook the mobilization this nation achieved in response to the moral issue of the 20th century, World War II. The FERC must not approve the NED project based upon the claim that natural gas is slightly better than the coal and oil it will displace. First of all, this is a false claim because the CH<sub>4</sub> leaks in production and delivery combined with the CO<sub>2</sub> produced by burning is worse than either coal or oil. And, second, because even if this claim were true, that natural gas was incrementally better than the coal or oil it replaces, the reduction in greenhouse gas which results is insufficient. The NED project needs to be rejected in favor of de-carbonized alternatives, solar, wind, hydro, geothermal, efficiency and conservation. Because, the alternatives are better for the planet. Because, it’s the moral thing to do.

#### **20150706-5024(30691277).txt**

Karen Sullivan, New Ipswich, NH.

I am concerned about the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company/Kinder Morgan/NED’s plan to install the pipeline & compressor station in New Ipswich, New Hampshire. I will be within 1/2 mile of this compression station. It will be the largest compression station in the Northeast United States. It will be a 80,000-90,000 HP Compression Station. These stations are associated with health, safety and environmental risks including but not limited to explosions, fires, leaks & spills, documented emissions of volatile

organic compounds (for example: formaldehyde, benzene, CO, methane, nitrogen oxides, as well as other potential exposure threats). Compressor stations are significant contributors to global warming. They emit radon-222. They are noisy. “Blow-downs” lasting up to 2-3 hours sound like jet engines. The 24/7 operating sound has been compared to 4 diesel locomotives. This can be

heard by residents up to 1 mile away. They emit audible sound & inaudible, low frequency vibrations that travel even further. This could possibly damage foundations & structures.

Kinder Morgan does not have a good safety record. Since 2011, there have been 11 accidents-explosions & fires at compressor stations in the following towns: Lathrop, PA, Brooklyn Township, PA, Montrose, PA, Branchville, NJ, Langton, OK, Clinton, AK, Windsor, NY, Pinedale, WY, Nine Mile Canyon, UT, Marengo County, AL, Oaktown, IN and others.

Kinder Morgan Pipeline has had numerous cited safety violations. In 2009, the Pipeline & Hazardous Ma-

terials Safety Admin.(PHMSA) cited Kinder Morgan for violation safety standards regarding the distance between a natural gas pipeline & a “high consequence area” such as a school or hospital; the pipeline was too close for safe operation in case of a leak. In 2011 PHMSA cited Kinder Morgan for these safety violations: Failing to test pipeline

safety devices, Failing to maintain proper firefighting equipment, Failing to inspect its pipeline as required, Failing to adequately monitor the pipes corrosion levels.

In 2013, the headline “Wall Street Worries About Kinder Morgan’s Safety Record”: pipeline operator slashes & defers maintenance spending. This was a concern to anyone who lived or worked near a Kinder Morgan pipeline. The Wall Street Journal asked: “Is Kinder Morgan Scrimping on its Pipelines?” Deferred maintenance may account for the high number of Kinder Morgan pipeline accidents in the last decade.

PHMSA’s incident reports for Kinder Morgan’s onshore gas transmission pipeline shows that faulty infrastructure causes 45% of onshore gas transmission pipeline significant leaks. Failure of the pipe, a cracked weld & faulty pipeline equipment together account for 28.3% of pipeline leaks & corrosion of the pipe causes 16.8% of the leaks.

Kinder Morgan does not have a good accident record. PHMSA’s incident reports for Kinder Morgan’s onshore gas transmission

pipelines have been responsible for at least 180 spills, evacuations, explosions, fires & fatalities in 24 states-- PHMSA

Pipeline Integrity & Releases from Kinder Morgan’s SEC 10-K filing:

“From time to time, despite our best efforts, our pipelines experience leaks & ruptures. These leaks & ruptures may cause explosions, fire & damage to the environment, damage to property and/or personal injury or death” (From references & footnotes #25-#35) [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kinder Morgan](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kinder_Morgan)

The HEALTH IMPACTS are numerous. The following have been reported by people living 50 feet to 2 miles from compressor stations & metering stations:

frequent nausea\*,throat irritation\*,eyes burning\*,nasal irritation\*,sinus problems\*,bronchitis\*,persistent cough,weakness\*,tiredness\*,chronic eye irritation\*,shortness of breath,muscles aches\*,dizziness,ringing in ears,sores & ulcers in mouth,urinary infections,depression\*,decreased motor skills\*,falling&staggering \*,frequent irritation\*,brain disorders\*,severe headaches\*,frequent nose bleeds,sleep disturbances,difficulty concentration,joint pain,nervous system-impacts,forgetfulness,irregular/rapid heart beat,stroke,allergies,easy bruising,severe anxiety\*,excessive sweating,abnormal EEG\*,spleen,lump in breast,pre-cancerous lesions\*,amnesia & thyroid problems.

\*61% of Health Impacts Associated with Chemicals present in Excess of Short & Long Term Effects Screening Levels in the air.

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES WITH EXTENSIVE REPORTS: <http://www.environmentalhealthproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/2013/Compressor-station-emissions-and-health-impacts-0>

<http://www.otseqo2000.org/wpcontent/uploads/2012/08Madison County DOH Comments-Docket No. CP14-497-000.pdf>

My husband & I looked for over 1 year to find our dream home in New Ipswich, NH. We signed for our house in October of 2012. This was our little piece of heaven for our remaining years. We came for the clean rivers, lakes, streams,brooks, wet lands & water ways, clean well water, peace & quiet. The natural beauty of the area. It is rapidly becoming just the opposite. All due to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline company/Kinder Morgan/NED. We are heart sick in hearing that we will be living within the incineration zone of the compression station & pipeline. This was/is our last move. We are both senior citizens & just do not have the resources nor the energy to move again.

PLEASE DO NOT GRANT PERMISSION FOR THE TENNESSEE GAS PIPELINE COMPANY/KINDER MORGAN/NED TO BUILD THE PIPELINE & COMPRESSOR STATION IN NEW HAMPSHIRE.

We should be looking into renewable energy resources. This compressor station was only announced it would be in New Ipswich when Kinder Morgan filed their intent to FERC to acquire specified land (SCAT) on June 1, 2015. I received a letter dated June 8, 2015 informing me of the intention to build an 80K horsepower compressor station within 1/2 mile of my home & property. In fact, the letter was addressed to a non-existent address. I got it because my letter carrier knows my name & correct address. WE DO NOT HAVE ADEQUATE TIME TO INFORM OURSELVES &/or FIGHT THIS.

**20150706-5027(30691283).txt**

Peter Hudiburg, South Plymouth, NY.

I protest the simultaneous scheduling of the NED Scoping Hearings in Schoharie, NY and Oneonta, NY on July 16 at 7pm.

I wish to attend both hearings and your scheduling makes that impossible.

Bused-in Union workers at certain locations regarding the Constitution Pipeline did their best to be very intimidating. The hearing officers did nothing to restrict their rowdy behavior.

We are entitled to speak in a safe environment, and present our carefully considered environmental comments without harassment from jeering union men.

By making us choose one or the other site to comment, you are making it more intimidating for people to speak, because they may be greatly out-numbered by Union men in orange shirts who managed to monopolize the microphone, even though they all said the same thing, they want jobs. That is not addressing the subject of a scoping hearing. This is not right.

Please hold separate, non-simultaneous hearings for each site.

**20150706-5060(30691618).docx**

Gentlemen, we need to get away from fossil fuels, not add more. All that extra volume will enable war in Europe. The Pope has already called the conflict in Ukraine “the seeds of WW III”. Another company, Portland, has offered to use their existing capacity to feed New Hampshire’s future growth needs over another route. If KM gets this pipe their market share will grow past 25% and edge them towards monopoly, destabilizing the industry, allowing KM to fix prices.

**20150706-5061(30691619).docx**

Gentlemen,

Outgoing presidents like to leave a legacy for the history books. Help Mr. Obama do something more than simply being the first black president. After all, that was not really his achievement, it was the voters’. Give him something we can be proud of, give him a swath of New England free of petro chemical development. Stop NED.

Concerned citizen against gas pipeline expansion in NH.

**20150706-5062(30691620).docx**

Gentlemen,

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 rather than sell it to foreigners for a fast buck. Don’t facilitate this foolishness. Look to the future and stop NED.

Concerned citizen against gas pipeline expansion in NH.

**20150706-5063(30691621).docx**

Gentlemen,

The vast majority of the people living along the pipe route have rejected the pipe. It is morally wrong to forcibly take their land and ruin the landscape just so that a few people can get richer selling gas overseas. New Hampshire does not need or want this gas, not at this price.

Concerned citizen against gas pipeline expansion in NH.

**20150706-5066(30691630).docx**

Peggy Huard  
13 David Drive  
Hudson, NH 03051  
603-578-9346

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., Docket No. PF14-22-000  
Northeast Energy Direct Project

July 6, 2015

Dear Ms. Bose:

It is my opinion that Tennessee Gas Pipeline/Kinder Morgan should not be issued a certificate of public convenience and necessity for the proposed project outlined in Docket # PF14-22.

Both KINDER MORGAN and TENNESSEE GAS PIPELINE have past associations with negligence, energy and financial fraud as well as political/public corruption.

There have been many false statements made in the proposal sent to FERC by TGP/KINDER MORGAN for the proposed pipeline project. The representatives from these companies at the meetings with the public have made many false statements as well.

KINDER MORGAN/TENNESSEE GAS PIPELINE not only lacks integrity, but has caused significant harm and even deaths due to their continued negligence. (Wikipedia-TENNESSEE PIPELINE and KM Form 10K for 12/31/14 @ sec.gov) These incidents are the ones that have been reported and disclosed. Their own public filing states, "From time to time, despite our best efforts, our pipelines experience leaks and ruptures. These leaks and ruptures may cause explosions, fire, and damage to the environment, damage to property and/or personal injury or death. In connection with these incidents, we may be sued for damages caused by an alleged failure to properly mark the locations of our pipelines and/or to properly maintain our pipelines. Depending upon the facts and circumstances of a particular incident, state and federal regulatory authorities may seek civil and/or criminal fines and penalties."

KINDER MORGAN is a publically traded, Texas company, founded in 1997 by Richard Kinder, currently CEO and one of the top executive shareholders at KINDER MORGAN. KINDER MORGAN was formerly ENRON LIQUID PIPELINE COMPANY (ELPC), a subsidiary of ENRON Corporation. RICHARD KINDER purchased ELPC with William Morgan in 1996. Richard Kinder had been president and Chief Operating Officer of ENRON until 1996, where he was 1 of 3 top executive shareholders. Until his departure from ENRON in 1996, Richard Kinder had worked with Kenneth Lay, Enron executive deemed to have lead corruption scandal responsible for collapse of Enron and financial crisis in 2001.

KINDER MORGAN executive Steven Kean is also a former executive and shareholder in ENRON CORPORATION. This is not disclosed in his biography on Kinder Morgan's website. In 2001, Steven Kean was

named as one of many defendants in a class action suit for violations of the Federal Securities Laws against purchasers of ENRON securities. He is one of many defendants, along with other executives and public accounting firm, Arthur Anderson, accused of insider trading causing substantial loss to shareholders. These executives were charged with making several false statements causing the stock to be traded at an inflated price allowing these executives to dump their stock at these inflated prices. While Steven Kean was not one of the executives that were later imprisoned, he disposed of his stock for \$5M during the time in question. There have been announcements and speculation that Steven Kean will replace Richard Kinder upon his retirement.

While Richard Kinder had left ENRON at the time in question and is not named in this lawsuit, he was the third highest ranking executive/manager shareholder, in 1996, his last year with Enron. I have yet to find information on how and at what price he disposed of this stock at. There is also controversy over the business structure that KINDER MORGAN operates under, master limited partnerships. The growth and greed of KINDER MORGAN is following the same patterns as the growth and later demise of ENRON.

For a period of four years leading up to the collapse of ENRON, numerous political committees were receiving sizeable contributions from ENRON, many single ones at \$50-100 TH each! These contributions would have been paid out of profits that belonged to the shareholders and were being paid to various political committees that were affiliated with the national committees of each party. These political committees are used to illegally influence elections and legislation.

Financial and energy fraud (fraudulent market manipulations/capped retail electricity prices/illegal shut-downs of pipelines) by Enron caused California Electricity Crisis and contributed to demise of Enron in 2001. (Wikipedia-California Electricity Crisis)

Enron had a secret role in creating artificial power shortages in California, helping to trigger an energy crisis in 2000 and 2001 which cost residents billions of dollars in surcharges. (theguardian.com 02/04/05)

KINDER MORGAN has made numerous acquisitions over many years, including El Paso Corporation (EPC) in 2012, creating the largest midstream energy company in North America. EPC owned the largest natural gas pipeline system including subsidiary Tennessee Pipeline Company. KINDER MORGAN just recently merged with EL PASO CORPORATION in November of 2014 with final merger and dissolution on 1/1/15. TENNESSEE GAS PIPELINE COMPANY, LLC, is now a KINDER MORGAN subsidiary.

EPC was also involved in energy fraud in the 2000 and 2001 California energy crisis. FERC investigated and later indicted EPC energy trader for making false energy trades.

“On November 24, 2014, APUC announced its agreement to participate in a natural gas pipeline transmission project in partnership with KINDER MORGAN LIMITED PARTNERSHIP. LIBERTY UTILITIES (Pipeline & Transmission) Corp., a wholly owned subsidiary of APUC, and KINDER MORGAN LIMITED PARTNERSHIP have agreed to form a new entity (“Northeast Expansion LLC”) to undertake the development, construction and ownership of a 30-inch or 36-inch natural gas transmission pipeline to be located between Wright, New York and Dracut, Massachusetts. The project is scalable up to 2.2 billion cubic feet per day (Bcf/d), and the pipeline capacity will be contracted with local distribution utilities, and other customers, to help ease constraints on natural gas supply in the northeast U.S. and help ensure much needed reliability to the power-generation grid. It is anticipated that the project will receive a Federal Energy Regulation Commission (“FERC”) certificate in the fourth quarter of 2016, with commercial operations occurring by late 2018. Under the agreement, APUC will initially subscribe for a 2.5% interest in Northeast Expansion LLC with an opportunity to increase its participation up to 10%. The total capital investment opportunity for APUC could be up to U.S. \$400 million, depending on the final pipeline configuration and design capacity.” (Form 40F dated 3/31/15 @ sec.gov)

Address of ALGONQUIN POWER AND UTILITIES CORPORATION is 354 David Road, Oakville, Ontario L6J2X1 Canada.

Kinder Morgan is a publically held company. Their public filing are available at fec.gov. ALGONQUIN POWER AND UTILITIES CORPORATION stock is traded on the Toronto Stock Exchange. Various reports

are required to be filed and are available at sec.gov.

The goal of a publically traded companies like KINDER MORGAN and ALGONQUIN POWER AND UTILITIES CORPORATION is profit/shareholder return and pension contributions.

The financial reports for 12/31/14, available at Bloomberg.com, show a net profit of \$35 MILLION to be distributed to the common shareholders of ALGONQUIN POWER AND UTILITIES CORPORATION (APUC).

It appears from all of the information and evidence available that Kinder Morgan and this proposed project is following in Enron's footsteps with the same negligence, fraud and corruption.

There are NUMEROUS political committees that use whatever means possible to pull in contributions and unethically uses this exorbitant amount of money to influence elections and legislation. Each committee uses a different corrupt scheme. The trail to these political committees and this PUBLIC CORRUPTION are found in publically disclosed reports available at fec.gov (Federal Election Commission).

This PUBLIC CORRUPTION is running, following and is a HUGE part of Kinder Morgan, the energy industry, this proposed pipeline project. The energy industry including KINDER MORGAN/TGP and LIBERTY UTILITIES have enjoyed the rewards from this PUBLIC CORRUPTION for many years, pushing people off their land and destroying precious lives and land.

#### EXAMPLE OF POLITICAL CONTRIBUTION MADE AND PUBLIC CORRUPTION ASSOCIATED WITH THEM

##### KENNETH LAY

Kenneth Lay made \$250,000 in contributions to the Republican National Committee, a perpetual committee that organizes the PUBLIC CORRUPTION in WASHINGTON, DC. This committee often transfers money to the state and local party committees to saturate the campaigning for the party choice. They also lobby behind legislation. Kenneth Lay also contributed numerous small amounts to ENRON Political Action Committee as well as numerous contributions to other candidates for various elections. All of these committees are continuously used to unethically swing the elections as the corrupt parties and lobbyists desire.

##### El PASO Corporation and El Paso Energy Services

El Paso Corporation and El Paso Energy Services also made numerous large contributions for a total of over \$1M over a period of years leading up the energy crisis in 2001 and continued to make several large ones into 2002. Many of these contributions were made to the Republican National Committees and related subcommittees.

##### RICHARD AND NANCY KINDER

Richard and Nancy Kinder, Kinder Morgan (KM) and Kinder Foundation (KF) made the following large, political contributions over the most recent years. (fec.gov)

- 5/10/12 Nancy Kinder (KF) to Texas Conservatives Fund \$100,000
- 7/30/12 Nancy Kinder (KF) to Texas Conservatives Fund 50,000
- 10/24/14 Nancy Kinder (KF) to American Crossroads 100,000
- 04/30/13 Richard Kinder (KM) to JAN PAC 10,000
- 5/31/00 Richard Kinder (KME)>RNC State Elections Comm. 240,000
- Texas Conservatives Fund is a Republican SuperPAC that ran \$5.8 MILLION in advertisements opposing Texas Republican, David H. Dewhurst in the 2012 Senatorial Election. Texas Senator Ted Cruz won this election. Only ONE major vendor, SRH Media, benefited from this campaign, earning \$5.7M out of the \$5.8M spent on advertising. (fec.gov and opensecrets.org) Ted Cruz has announced his candidacy for the 2016 Presidential election.
- American Crossroads is a Republican SuperPAC created to advertise both for and against op-

posing candidates for the House and Senate race in 2014. \$22 Million was raised by this SuperPAC for this race. \$15M was paid to Main Street Media Group and \$4M to Mentzer Services Inc. (fec.gov and opensecrets.org)

- JanPAC is a Republican SuperPAC. It is affiliated with Arizona's Republican governor, Jan Brewer. JanPac advertised for and against mostly Arizona, House and Senatorial Candidates as well as for Presidential candidate, Mitt Romney. (opensecrets.org)
- American Crossroads, Texas Conservatives Fund and JANPAC all filed a letter with the Federal Election Commission to raise funds in UNLIMITED amounts, "consistent with US Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia decision in Speech Now vs FEC. Both intended on making INDEPENDENT expenditures.

Kinder Foundation funded projects including Bush Center. Richard Kinder campaigned for Bush and McCain.

### FERC COMMISSIONERS

Four out of the five commissioners for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission made contributions to political committees. These commissioners are appointed by the president. FERC is the government oversight that has the authority to issue a certificate of public convenience and necessity. These contributions are a conflict of interest and many were made to many of our federally elected officials that are involved in PUBLIC CORRUPTION, including our own Senator, Jeanne Shaheen.

### LIBERTY UTILITY ATTORNEY-SUSAN KNOWLTON

In 2009, Susan Knowlton was employed by McLane Law firm. She made a \$250 political contribution to the Anne McLane Kuster/Kuster for Congress committee. Attorney Knowlton left McLane Law Firm in July of 2011 to work as legal counsel for PSNH and then went onto become legal counsel for Liberty Utilities in July of 2012. While the size of the contribution is small and isolated, it shows her support for and participation in the political corruption that controls elections and legislation.

### ENERGY COMPANIES

Numerous energy companies contributed over \$10 MILLION combined over a period of years leading up to the energy crisis in 2001 and continue to make large contributions today. They were contributed to a variety of political committees.

A TEXAS energy company, Clayton Williams Energy, Inc. made a one time contribution of \$1 MILLION to American Crossroads in 2012 and \$100 TH in 2014. American Crossroads is a Republican SuperPAC created to advertise both for and against opposing candidates for the House and Senate race in 2014.

Another energy company, Murray Energy Corporation made a \$300 TH contribution in 2014 to KENTUCKIANS FOR STRONG LEADERSHIP.

### LABOR UNIONS

The worker's union following the proposed project is, LIUNA, LABORERS' INTERNATIONAL UNION OF NA On 9/30/14 LIUNA made a political contribution to HOUSE MAJORITY PAC for \$475,000!!!!!!! HOUSE MAJORITY PAC in turn spends hundreds of thousands of dollars to advertise/campaign for AND against numerous federal candidates all over the country. The majority of the expenditures (hundreds of thousands) from this PAC go to a company called Waterfront Strategies. This company has a mysterious origin and is believed to be an internal branch of GMMB, a company receiving the majority of the campaign funds from the Obama campaign committee!! Million dollar donors to this PAC are Michael Bloomberg and Fred Eychaner.

There are also numerous other labor unions that contribute to these controversial political committees, including the UTILITY WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA. This union in turn contributes/transfers money

to candidate and state and national party committees to help manipulate the elections.

On the website of LIBERTY UTILITIES, there is a company called ACCENTURE, LLP listed in companies able to provide natural gas aggregation services. Their address is listed as 161 North Clark Street, Suite 2300, from Chicago, IL 60601. Obama for America, principal campaign committee for Obama's presidential campaign rented office space from a company named Accenture located in Chicago, Illinois. In researching Accenture with the 2008 presidential election, I found that it was a division of Arthur Anderson, formally called Arthur Anderson Consulting. Arthur Anderson was the accounting firm for Enron and was dissolved because of its involvement with the Enron fraud and corruption. In January, 2001, Arthur Anderson Consulting had changed their name to Accenture before the collapse of Enron and Arthur Anderson, and Accenture was able to survive through the scandal.

Due to this past and continuing negligence, fraud and public corruption, it is most apparent that these companies cannot be relied on for the accuracy of their statements and the plans outlined in their proposal filed with FERC, Therefore with all good conscience, FERC should deny TGP/KINDER MORGAN'S request and mitigate unnecessary damages.

Please be advised, that should you ignore all of the pleas and requests that have been made to you and grant the certificate requested, we will hold each and every FERC commissioner personally responsible for all damages and or loss of life!

Regretfully,

Peggy Huard

**20150706-5069(30691634).pdf**

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., Docket No. PF14-22-000

As FERC considers Kinder Morgan's Northeast Energy Direct proposal, I ask that you also consider the following from a concerned citizen.

Dear FERC – What's The Rush?

On June 30th of this year FERC released its "Notice of Intent" (NOI) for Kinder Morgan's proposed Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline project. The title of this document reads:

NOTICE OF INTENT TO PREPARE AN

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR THE PLANNED

NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT PROJECT,

REQUEST FOR COMMENTS ON ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES, AND NOTICE OF PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS

So FERC is requesting public comments on the environmental issues regarding NED and is giving notice of its upcoming scoping meetings. These meetings represent the affected public's first official chance to offer in-person feedback to FERC regarding the NED project and the environmental issues that the public wants to insure that FERC addresses in its Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Included in the NOI document is a schedule of the planned scoping meetings, to run from July 14th through August 12th, 2015.

But wait – one critical input to FERC's EIS is the set of detailed Resource Reports being prepared by Kinder Morgan. On March 13th, Kinder Morgan filed the first draft of the Resource Reports for the NED project with FERC. This filing consisted of thirteen Resource Reports, eight appendices and four companion documents. This was a massive filing, one that requires dedication to simply download, much less to browse and to actually attempt to analyze. The thirteen reports comprise a total of 1,940 pages and this does not include the appendices and companion documents.

But any serious attempt at analysis of the March 13 Resource Reports very quickly ran into an insurmountable problem – these were preliminary reports and very much a work in progress. A cursory look at the Resource Reports shows that they are laughably incomplete, with much of the critical information shown as “TBD” (To Be Determined). One of the 13 reports contained nearly 3,000 instances of “TBD”. Another contained 7,000. There were a total of nearly 12,000 instances of “TBD” in the draft reports.

Here are some examples of the “information” that Kinder Morgan provided in those March 13th draft reports:

*{tables, all filled with “TDD”, only table titles reproduced here}*

*TABLE TITLES:*

*BASELINE SUND LEVEL MEASUREMENT RESULTS AT NOISE-SENSITIVE AREAS NEAR MARKET PATH HEAD STATION*

*PROPOSED APPURTENANT ABOVEGROUND FACILITIES FOR THE PROJECT*

*SHALLOW DEPTH TO BEDROCK FOR THE PROJECT*

*EMMISSIONS FROM CONSTRUCTION OF THE PROJECT BY STATE - 2017*

Kinder Morgan promised updated reports in June. It didn’t happen. The updated reports are now expected in July – but it is now July 4th and they have not yet been released.

So this is the situation that the public finds itself in with respect to the NED project:

- The draft Resource Reports released in March are preliminary and laughably incomplete. Remember the nearly 12,000 TBDs included in those reports.
- The promised update of the Resource Reports has not been released by Kinder Morgan within the expected timeframe.
- If and when the updated reports are released by Kinder Morgan, they will require time to consider and to analyze. Remember - there are thirteen reports comprising 1,940 pages plus eight appendices and four companion documents.
- The first NED scoping meeting is scheduled to occur on July 14th, just ten days from now.
- All scoping meeting will then occur in the following 4 weeks.

If and when Kinder Morgan makes a complete set of Resource Reports available to the public, it will take time for the affected towns, organizations and individuals to digest and make sense of the information and further time to prepare their comments to FERC.

I am at a loss to imagine how FERC can consider scheduling scoping meetings for Kinder Morgan’s proposed NED pipeline proposal given the very sorry state of the environmental impact data currently available to the public from Kinder Morgan for this project.

And yet, it may not be so surprising after all. FERC seems bound and determined to keep the NED project moving along its pipeline approval assembly line. Only draft resource reports available? – no problem. Kinder Morgan’s critical information is delayed? – no problem. The public needs time to analyze the nearly 2,000 page reports when they are finally released? – no problem. Gotta keep checking off those check boxes and keep this baby chugging along towards the approval that seems all but inevitable from FERC. And it’s simply too bad about the public and its right to be informed about this project and to have time to formulate a response to it and to communicate that response in person to FERC regarding the negative environmental impacts of this project.

FERC has recently received requests from the Northeast Municipal Gas Pipeline Coalition (NMGPC - a coalition of local government officials and others from local towns), from the Massachusetts Association of Conservation Commissions (MACC), and from numerous affected towns and individuals – all urging FERC to not hold scoping meetings until the updated Resource Reports are released and interested parties have had

time to digest them. So far, I have seen no response from FERC. So FERC – What’s The Rush???

Nick Miller Groton, MA

**20150706-5072(30691637).docx**

Gentlemen,

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.

Concerned citizen against gas pipeline expansion in NH.

**20150706-5073(30691641).docx**

Gentlemen,

We can’t have this in our neighborhood. I have some good friends whose lives will be decimated by the compressor station. This monster will emit “regulated” toxins and noise 24/7. Right now there are beautiful, quiet woods. We can’t let that be mowed down in favor of some horrible industrial complex. Property values will be cut dramatically. No one will want to buy our homes. I never thought I could campaign for a cause, but when the cause is my way of life...

Concerned citizen against gas pipeline expansion in NH.

**20150706-5074(30691642).docx**

Gentlemen,

Studies commissioned by NESCOE showed that if current levels of state energy efficiency programs continue, there is no need for additional natural gas infrastructure even with economic growth taken into account, yet ISO New England and NESCOE are calling for more pipeline capacity. The fact that the “Low Demand Scenario” created by current efficiency programs was never analyzed and the study in general were termed “flawed” during our meeting with the Governor and Sec. of Energy and Environmental Affairs. The Dept. of Energy Resources has undertaken a new study of cost benefits and risks of following the current trend of efficiency that currently keeping demand for electricity flat. Results of this new study may be available as early as the beginning of next year.

Concerned citizen against gas pipeline expansion in NH

**20150706-5075(30691643).docx**

Gentlemen,

The need for more capacity has been cited as peak demand during cold weather when gas for heating and gas for electric generation compete for existing pipeline capacity. These conditions only happen for a few hours a day, about 10-27 days a year, and it has never led to a dip into our electric generation buffer (the extra electric capacity ISO-NE likes to keep on hand), let alone actual electric demand.

Concerned citizen against gas pipeline expansion in NH.

**20150706-5076(30691644).docx**

Gentlemen,

One of our pipeline-watchers has also just discovered that ISO New England has been issuing “Minimum Generation Emergency Warnings.” These are times when consumers were using so little electricity that the grid operator had to ask power plants to NOT generate electricity. As we understand it, this happens far, far more often than the times ISO-NE comes close to dipping into the buffer of electric generation during the 10-27 peak usage days per year that occur in winter. A quick look at the ISO-NE calendar shows that this

“Minimum Generation Emergency Warning” happens about 10-20 a MONTH – about 12 times more often than the supposed “capacity constraint” that led to the request for more pipelines.

Concerned citizen against gas pipeline expansion in NH.

**20150706-5077(30691645).docx**

Gentlemen,

Even if there were an actual need, there are currently enough leaks in the existing infrastructure to provide another 400 MW of power. The two most dangerous classes of these leaks are now slated to be fixed under new legislation that has passed, but repairing Class 3 leaks (considered non-dangerous) is not mandatory. We think it should be.

There are also existing pipelines that are standing at least partially unused. Using these to capacity to store gas during non-peak times can keep enough reserve to cover the few days every winter when peak demand drives up prices. This project is not being driven by a shortage of gas supply, just a shortage of cheap gas available to electric generation plants during extremely cold weather when people use more of the gas supply for heat.

Concerned citizen against gas pipeline expansion in NH.

**20150706-5078(30691646).pdf**

Allegra Schechter  
211 Adair Rd.  
Cherry Valley, NY 13320

April 2, 2014

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
The FERC  
888 First St. NE, Room 1A  
Washington, D.C 20426

Re: Docket CP13-499, CP 13-502

US Army Corps Of Engineers  
NY District CENAN-OP-R  
Upstate Regulatory Field Office  
1 Buffington St. Bldg. 10, 3rd Fl.  
Watervliet, NY 12189-4000

Re: NAN-2012-00449-UBR

Dear Secretary Bose,

Last night, at the Oneonta FERC EIS Hearing, the FERC Environmental Representatives got to witness first hand the intimidation tactics used by the Constitution Pipeline on landowners and residents in the affected counties and towns along the route. Three busloads of very loud boisterous construction workers wearing bright orange shirts, with Constitution Pipeline printed on the sleeves, took over the proceedings. They were rude, there was loud booing and cat calls, yelling TIME, speaking over the commenter before the FERC reps had timed them out. They went as far as heckling my daughter while she was trying to make her oral presentation - and actually followed her out of the auditorium. She was confronted five times trying to leave, by different men saying things like, “Where did you get your information?”, “Did you google it?” and “Can you back it up?”.

My daughter is a strong woman and handled it very well. Others might not have done as well. This is the kind of pressure that people along the pipeline route have been experiencing from Constitution representatives for over a year. Older people, living alone in a rural setting without nearby neighbors, have been liter-

ally afraid to say NO, when confronted by land men using pressure tactics to sign easements.

These FERC hearings are supposed to be about listening to comments about the draft Environmental Impact Statement - not listening to booing and whistling union workers who were bussed in from all over the state by Constitution to say how they want the jobs. Of course, we all want jobs. That is not what the EIS FERC hearings are supposed to be about. They monopolized the microphone, talking over substantive comments specific to the EIS that these residents and landowners have painstakingly written and composed with great effort. Yes, they will be handwritten and submitted to FERC too, but this was their moment to speak up on all that has been bothering them and building up inside them all these weeks and months. There hasn't been any pre-written comments for people to use, or adapt to their own words. The comments have all been written by individuals, from their heart. Preparing our statements for these EIS hearings has meant basically putting our lives on hold, trying to get through this 945 page document within the totally inadequate time frame allowed. We deserve the chance to deliver our thoughtful, time-consuming, hard-written comments in a polite and respectful venue.

I don't blame any landowner who doesn't bother to come to the remaining hearings, as we have been told the same rude busloads of men in orange shirts will be delivered to all the venues. This has turned into a circus. This should not be allowed. Constitution has used these people to make their case, they want jobs. We got it. NOW, let the people who live along the proposed Constitution Pipeline route, have a chance to make theirs.

We need an extension of the deadline, we will need new hearings when a more complete revised draft EIS has been written, and Constitution should NOT be allowed to bully and intimidate people who have pertinent comments to make.

Thank you,

Allegra Schecter

#### **20150706-5079(30691647).docx**

I wish to protest the simultaneous scheduling of the NED Scoping Hearings in Schoharie, NY and Oneonta, NY on July 16 at 7pm. Not only does it make it impossible to attend both hearings and hear what is being said, but it makes it impossible to support our neighbors when they are being confronted by intimidating bussed-in Union workers who have no idea what an environmental scoping hearing is all about.

At the FERC scoping hearings for the Constitution Pipeline, residents who were there to state their valid environmental concerns were bullied by Union workers. Union workers are bought t-shirts and dinner. They are not ordinary citizens. They are bussed in, provided a script. Their job is to harass and interrupt other speakers. At the DEC hearing on Constitution Pipeline, which was much better run than FERC hearings, numerous campus police were on hand to escort these people out when they became disruptive.

By making us chose one or another site to comment, you are making it less comfortable for people to speak, because they will be greatly out-numbered by Union men in orange shirts. These men monopolized the microphone, ALL saying the same thing- they want jobs. We all know this already. It is not what a scoping hearing is supposed to be about. This is not right. We are entitled to speak in a safe environment, and present our long thought-out and written environmental scoping comments.

Please re-consider these simultaneous dates.

Thank you.

#### **20150706-5134(30691972).txt**

Florence Carnahan, Burlington Flats, NY.

It would be good if the FERC hearings on the local pipelines were on multiple nights in each community. This is a rural area and we have to travel a distance to get to the appropriate meetings. Scheduling around only one meeting means that people who want to attend and comment may not be able to. Of course, if that

is the intention then it might be working! There are landowners who are older (like me) and driving a distance at night is not always possible. I can comment online and I do. But there are others who would like to comment in person. Please make these hearings accessible by having more of them. This is important to us because we live here and do not want to live with pipelines and other ancillary infrastructure!

Thank you for your consideration.

**20150706-5195(30692304).txt**

deborah pomerleau, Londonderry, NH.

I am still trying to get your attention. NH doesn't want or need this pipeline. MA doesn't want or need this pipeline. We asked for individual towns to get scoping meetings and you denied that. I was really sad and frustrated. We are trying to stop this, and trying to inform FERC about the dangers and problems of these pipelines. Yes, you all who are FERC. Please. Please hear us. We are terribly worried about our water, our property, our property values, our tourism, our children's health, our own health, our environment, our state. We are a tiny state, that doesn't want or need this pipeline. Please respect us. Please respect our wishes.

**20150706-5256(30692610).txt**

Colleen McKinney, Unadilla, NY.

I'm writing to protest the simultaneous scheduling of two FERC scoping hearings regarding Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline's proposed NED project. The two hearings--one in Schoharie, NY, the other in Oneonta, NY--are scheduled to take place at the exact same time: July 16 at 7pm.

Not only does this make it impossible to attend both hearings and hear what is said, it makes it impossible for us to support our neighbors. The residents at these hearings will be confronted by dozens, if not hundreds, of bussed-in union workers who have one message: They want the short-term jobs this permanently devastating pipeline project might offer them.

Scoping hearings are not about jobs. They are held so that local residents and representatives can state how these pipeline projects will affect the environment. We whose communities will be permanently affected by these pipelines deserve the opportunity to hear ALL that is said at these hearings.

I ask that you reconsider these simultaneous dates.

Thank you.

**20150707-0008**

Howard and Glenna Henderson  
64 Hoags Corners Road  
Nassau, NY 12123

Kimberly D. Rose, Secretary FERC  
First Street, NE- Room 1A  
Washington, D.C. 20426

Re: Docket PF14-22

June 16, 2015

Dear Ms. Rose:

We are writing to express our strong opposition to the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline project proposed by Kinder Morgan and its subsidiary, Tennessee Gas to build and operate a 36-inch, high-pressured pipeline to transport hydro-fractured gas from Pennsylvania, through New York State. The pipeline is proposed to cross both roads that intersect at our property less than a mile in both directions. This poses huge risks to our family's lives, safety, health, and security.

As the project is of no benefit to our town, state, or even our country and for the simple fact that there is a concerted effort to move towards green energy; we feel that it would be a huge mistake and an unnecessary burden on our town, county, state, and our residents. We urge FERC to deny any further permits for this pro-

jectl Going forward with this project would be disastrous to our environment and residential properties.

- ~ There is a dangerous threat of catastrophic explosions and serious injury.
- ~ Our community's emergency response facilities are not equipped to deal with such catastrophes.
- ~ There is a high risk of serious health issues due to spraying of deadly chemicals to kill vegetation for construction, leaching of noxious chemicals into our air and drinking water through intentional venting at the compressor stations, leaks in the pipeline, and during blasting and construction.
- ~ This project poses a negative impact on our property values, eligibility for mortgages, and imposing increased insurance requirements.
- ~ Contamination of our residential wells, soil, and our precious aquifer is likely.
- ~ Drying up of our wells is also likely due to blasting and construction.
- ~ There are inadequate federal and state regulations and resources to ensure pipeline safety and maintenance.
- ~ Since the gas is being sold to foreign markets; the pipeline is of no benefit to our town, state, or even country.
- ~ The power of Eminent Domain should not be used for the profits of a private company and with no benefit to US citizens.
- ~ There will be excessive noise pollution from the compressor stations.
- ~ There is a concerted effort to move towards green energy.

It has come to our attention that Kinder Morgan may have already purchased a large plot of land as a possible location for a compressor station very close to our home. We appreciate your prompt attention to this matter!

Sincerely,

Howard and Glenna Henderson

**20150707-0009**

*{small typeface + poor scan + stamped on top of text = very poor OCR}*

Dhect pipe(km ~ Tlennmsea Qca Q) want to co locate wth Nstuxud Gapa power bnes ht our t-cmty. I hope that ycu a(so oppose tins pipebne state your oppcxdtion and actively work against it.

'lhc pipeline will leak Sacked gss ontaining toxic chemiocls tbst threacm our hsamt and that of our fend(les, neighbors, sad cmmmmritien Damage to the envimmnt (soiL air and wana) wgl resuk Snm pipeline coas-  
ttructioa spd leskmg gss, and our Snests, streuns, rivccn, youmhmtsr, and scprifcrs sre at risk ofbahg pollut-  
ed. And what about the contamination of our wells,~and Sums? In addition, the gas is methane, a H~~~~g  
greealxmm gss. Smely expsmhng fossil fuel infinstrctcnnes is s step backward Som national and state goals  
ofdeveloping renewable easrgy esouuceea.

In rural cress, such ss aura, pipebne caibty~sm lass stringent thm in deasaly Opubrtcri areas so that here the  
tbbmest pipes penniued sre usecL and shusolf valves to seal olf sections of pipe in ths event of en emer-  
gency cce placed tea mges spat. In sdditicm, the tops ofih pipes sce bmicd oaly 36 deep evea though the  
Sost line ih these parts is 46"deep, and pipes baca ruptmed Som Sost heave. These ccinpaniss have vcsy  
poor safety records, and we have sees in the news thm pipelines cause catastrophic explosions and Scca Our  
local Ere depstrtnmtn are uagkaly to be able co~ly respcd to such sa event. According to Pubhc Employees  
for Envimmntal Respcdsbility, the Pipeline and Hamrdoes Materi@ Safety Administrarion (PHMSA),  
which is charged with the "safe" sad "envjromtsntally sound opersthm of gss plpebncl hss only 135 mspec-  
tom to oversee 2.6 mglion miles of pipegne and only a filh of that pipeline system hss been mspecCM by  
PHMSA or ils stets partners smce 2006. 'Iba National Transpotstion and Safety Administration recently  
issued a report Sndmg tbst PHMSA bss inadsqums

Local homeowners may be forced to give the companies a right of way, but will remain responsible for taxes on the property. Their property values~many will be~to live with a pipeline as a neighbor and wonder daily about its dangers. Blasting and the heavy machinery required to build the pipeline will damage our towns' infrastructure and who will pay for that? The economic vitality of our towns is at stake, for who would want to buy a house, or locate a business, or invest in a farm in a town at risk of such dangers?

I believe that most of the gas will likely be for export and sale in the international market where gas prices are higher than they are here. Won't that drive up our own cost of gas? We, your constituents, are assuming the risk of dangers associated with the pipeline while the companies collect profits at our expense. Are we truly inconsequential and invisible in the eyes of those who have the authority to stop the pipeline? How many assaults on our health, how many deaths, and how much environmental degradation should we tolerate? I believe hundreds of political leaders making deals to get something for their constituents in return for accepting this pipeline. Please, I don't want this pipeline under any circumstances. Do not make any deals on my behalf. Just fight it as hard as you can.

Very truly yours,

Jeffrey H. Ellefsen

63 No. Schodack Rd, East Greenbush, NY 120161

**20150707-0020**

Hand written card, Laura Clayton, 369 West Rd, Temple, NH 03084, opposing.

**20150707-0021**

Hand written card, Timothy E. Somero, 42 Old Tenney Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, what venues will be used for Scoping meetings?

**20150707-0022**

Hand written card, Power to the People, Mill Street, Greenville, NH 03048, opposing.

**20150707-0023**

Hand written card, Ben Kay, 1 Juniper Drive, Amherst NH 03031, when will Scoping meeting for Amherst, NH, be announced?

**20150707-0024**

Hand written card, Autumn Kay, 1 Juniper Drive, Amherst NH 03031, when will Scoping meeting for Amherst, NH, be announced?

**20150707-0025**

Hand written card, S.A. Matthews, 40 Settlement Hill, New Ipswich, NH 03071, very disappointed with sitting of Scoping meeting - too little space, too little time for 7 towns.

**20150707-0026**

Hand written card, Power to the People, Mill Street, Greenville, NH 03048, opposing.

**20150707-5011(30692746).txt**

kathy chapman, mason, NH.

Please point out the connection between electricity rates and the NED project, if any.

“Tennessee Gas Pipelines’ proposed NED project will provide New Hampshire with additional access to lower cost, clean, abundant and domestic natural gas supplies enabling the development of gas distribu-

tion systems to serve communities and industries where natural gas is not available today. The availability of a low cost energy source is critical to attracting new industries which can bring jobs and economic growth to the state. Conversely, lower cost natural gas is also critical in keeping existing industries in New Hampshire and their associated jobs either from conversion from higher cost fuels to natural gas or lowered electricity rates pursuant to power plants converting to lower cost natural gas. As reflected in the map below, natural gas service is currently not available in most areas of New Hampshire. Because of its close proximity, the NED New Hampshire pipeline would provide the opportunity for gas service to some of the following towns: Keene, Swanzey, Rindge, Jaffrey, Amherst, and New Ipswich among others.” from [www.kinder Morgan.com/content/docs/Benefits\\_2015.pdf](http://www.kinder Morgan.com/content/docs/Benefits_2015.pdf)

However, the only “customer” of this pipeline in New Hampshire is Liberty Utilities. Liberty is not a “Algoquin said it will initially take a 2.5% stake in the new entity -- Northeast Expansion LLC -- with an option to increase its stake to as much as 10%.” Algoquin Grabs Stake in Kinder Morgan Pipeline Project, Keith Goldberg, <http://www.law360.com/articles/599267/algonquin-grabs-stake-in-kinder-morgan-pipeline-project>.

Liberty Utilities is NOT a generator of electricity, and thus, the gas that Liberty may contract for is not destined for the electric grid, but instead for Liberty’s gas customers. Even if gas prices were decreased for the Liberty gas customers, their electric rates cannot be affected by the gas from the KM pipeline.

No electricity generator in New Hampshire is contracting for gas from the NED pipeline. Where is the connection to electric rates that KM is advertising?

#### **20150707-5012(30692748).txt**

kathy chapman, mason, NH.

There are over 200,000 people in the affected towns and nearby towns in New Hampshire alone. The capacity of the Milford Town Hall is less than 500. The capacity of the largest meeting room at the Nashua Radisson is 1000. No location for a possible Winchester, NH, meeting has been announced. These meetings are held on consecutive nights the last week in July. For people who have already made plans and paid for vacations, there is no other opportunity in New Hampshire to voice their concerns. The scoping meetings begin at 6:30 and the halls have been reserved until 11PM. If each and every minute were devoted to attendee comments, and each comment lasted approximated three minutes, only 70 people can speak! In fact, the FERC scoping announcement of June 30, 2015, states that part of the time will be taken up by an introduction to the environmental process.

#### **20150707-5013(30692750).txt**

joseph wiley, mason, NH.

To Whom It May Concern,

We are writing to state that our family is in opposition of the Kinder Morgan 36” high pressure gas pipeline project, including the 12” lateral pipeline from Mason, NH to Fitchburg, MA. The 12” lateral pipeline is slated to go through the back of our property with blasting required. (K-40-1)

We moved to this 14 acre property to have a healthy, calm and quiet environment in which nurture our adult sons, living with autism, and to provide their compromised systems with a safe food supply. We raise a large garden and our own poultry and goats for meat, eggs and milk. We also make and sell Goats Milk products, including soaps and lotions. Ours sons feed and care for our animals and also help in the garden. They love to swing and watch the animals play. This pipeline will render roughly one quarter to a third of our property, useless.

Due to the Autism our sons have extreme anxiety issues, which can lead to aggressive behaviors. Any disruption in daily routine or environment can trigger a meltdown and/or depression. Autistic people are very sensitive to loud noises. The blasting and large earthmoving equipment used for installing the pipeline will definitely have physical and emotional impact on the boys. Having this pipeline go through our property

will be detrimental to their health and wellbeing.

The pipeline are also poses risks to our animals and gardens by contaminating our water supplies, soil and air. We have a stream and pond on our property that all kinds of wildlife in our 14 acres of woods get water from. Our personal water supply comes from wells on the property which can be damaged by the shock-wave from the blasting on ours and our neighbor's properties.

This letter only addresses our property; our small community is made up of many lots similar to our own. We are not equipped to handle gas leaks, explosions or fires that this pipeline could create. This small town does not have city supplied water. All residences rely on artesian wells which could be damaged by the blasting. Our fire department is volunteer and ill equipped to handle any disaster brought on by this pipeline. This pipeline will place an unfair burden on our community.

Thank you for reading and considering the needs of our family.

Sincerely,

Joseph A. Wiley, Teresa C. Osterbur-Wiley, James M. Wiley and John A. Wiley  
1459 Valley Rd.  
Mason, NH 03048

## **20150707-5052**

Karen Sullivan, New Ipswich, NH.

If the pipeline companies are not fairing well in terms of funding & economic conditions why would FERC even consider approving

the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company/Kinder Morgan/NED's application for the pipeline & compressor station for southern NH?

(Docket No:PF14-22-000). See the article in the Wall Street Journal "Regulators Warn Banks On Loans to Oil, Gas Producers" by Gillian Tan, Ryan Tracy & Ryan Dezember updated July 2, 2015. ([www.wsj.com/articles/banks-face-curbs-onoil-gaslending](http://www.wsj.com/articles/banks-face-curbs-onoil-gaslending)). See the article on Zero Hedge ([www.zerohedge.com](http://www.zerohedge.com)) "Shale Drillers About To Be "Zero Hedged" As Loss Protection Expires" by Tyler Durden July 2, 2015.

In my opinion the installation of the pipeline & compressor station in southern New Hampshire is akin to a rape. Our country side, water ways, including our rivers, streams, ponds, brooks, aqua-filters and drinking water is going to be subjected to a rape by the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co/Kinder Morgan/NED with FERC's approval. The compressor station in the

towns of New Ipswich & Temple, New Hampshire will forever change our rural way of life.

From an economic standpoint it makes no sense. From a moral & environmental standpoint it is OUTRAGEOUS.

We are two very small rural towns in southern New Hampshire. We do not have the infrastructure to install town water for all. Most of us rely on well water. We live here because we enjoy the natural beauty of the area. It is teeming with wild life, fresh air, clean water ways & drinking water & forested mountain sides, along with peace & quiet. I could go on and on about the natural environment we live in. We do not want this to change. I do not see the Tennessee Gas Pipeline/Kinder Morgan/NED project as a step up or a step forward for our area.

From the economic standpoint why approve the pipeline & compressor station only to have it shelved later, after it is built & the land/area raped when there is no more funding & no more use for it? The Portland Gas Company pipeline is not at capacity. We have plenty of pipelines/projects to take care of what ever it is that the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company/Kinder Morgan/NED group thinks they are going to be transporting. The Marshalls Shale area does not have a indefinite supply of gas for the taking.

From a health standpoint it is even worse for us. See the following websites for further information of the health problems created by pipelines & compressor stations. The following websites have extensive reports

on the environmental/health impacts of pipelines/compressor stations:

[http://www.earthworksaction.org/files/publications/SUBRA 3 Shale Gas Plays-Health Impacts sm.pdf](http://www.earthworksaction.org/files/publications/SUBRA%203%20Shale%20Gas%20Plays-Health%20Impacts%20sm.pdf)

<http://www.environmentalhealthproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/Compressor-station-emissions-and-health-impacts-0>

[http://www.ostego2000.org/wpcontent/uploads/2012/08Madison County DOH Comments-Docket No CP14-497-000.pdf](http://www.ostego2000.org/wpcontent/uploads/2012/08Madison%20County%20DOH%20Comments-Docket%20No%20CP14-497-000.pdf)

The American Medical Association published in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette on June 12, 2015 an article titled: American Medical Association Blasts secret Shale Records.

Thank you for your time. Please DENY the Tennessee Gas Pipeline company/Kinder Morgan/NED's application for the pipeline

& compressor station in the southern New Hampshire area. It is not needed nor is it wanted.

On June 1, 2015 the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company filed updated information regarding the specific locations for the proposed compressor stations. One of those compressor stations is going to be located in New Ipswich on the border with Temple, NH. This does not give the citizens of these two towns, the most impacted by the compressor station, a chance to educate, research the impact of this decision or make an informed decision of something that is going to forever change their lives.

I do not understand why FERC did not schedule a scoping meeting in the two towns most impacted by the compressor station, New Ipswich & Temple, NH. One scoping meeting is in Nashua, NH on Wednesday July 29, 2015 at the Nashua Radisson Hotel. The second scoping meeting is on Thursday July 30 in Milford, NH at the Milford Town Hall. A very small venue I must add.

I will again thank you for your time. I will again ask you to DENY the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company/Kinder Morgan/NED's application for the pipeline & compressor station in the southern New Hampshire area. It is not needed. It is not wanted.

#### **20150707-5061**

Amy Glowacki, Mason, NH.

Many New Hampshire towns requested scoping sessions. How can you justify just two scoping sessions for 17 towns? There are many unanswered questions that have not been addressed at town informational meetings. Moving to scoping session and then only hosting two in NH is not acceptable. NH legislators have requested NH residents have a fair opportunity and voice in this process. Only two sessions is not enough. Why is there not a meeting in Mason? We have the 36" pipeline and the 12" lateral. If this is a fair and open process then give the residents of these 17 impacted towns in NH a chance to have a fair voice. This is our land, our health, our lives. How can you not provide a proper voice? We are tax payers and are asking for fair consideration. This entire process thus far is tilted towards big business - why do you exclude the voice of those directly impacted and who have to live with your decisions? Please schedule more scoping sessions. Why are you moving so quickly? Give us a proper voice. Two sessions in NH are not enough-especially in light of all the survey denials. The surveys are not accurate-they can't be if they are done by air or without permission as we know has been happening. Treat the NH properly and fairly and with respect.

#### **20150707-5101**

Heather Hollenbeck, Temple, NH.

As a resident of Temple, NH, I strongly oppose this project. The 80,000 horsepower compression station is planned to be built 1/2 mile from my son's elementary school. Many non-gas industry funded studies site numerous adverse health effects due to VOCs released from compressor stations and this compressor station is planned to be one of the biggest in the entire US. It is simply not good enough to be told by Kinder Morgan that they are the "safest" in an unsafe industry or that they meet all the minimal environmental standards when those standards are lowered to allow them to build all over the country. Please deny this project on the

basis that there is not enough proof that it is safe for New Hampshire.

**20150708-0017**

Hand written card, Ian Kay, 1 Juniper Drive, Amherst NH 03031, asking when Amherst, NH, Scoping meeting is scheduled?

**20150708-0018**

Hand written card, Paul Stevens, 156 Timbertop Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, opposing

**20150708-0022**

June 29, 2015

Dear Governor Hassan,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Governor, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England.

The pipeline construction process will pollute our air, contaminate our aquifers, wells and other water resources. Over 800 NH families will lose their homes and it will destroy conservation lands. It will harm the tourist industry and rural character of New Hampshire.

The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent "blow downs" where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline. These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis and will eventually cause ruin to all of New Hampshire.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station, including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby. Are the children of New Hampshire not important?

The property values near the pipeline and compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit! The only one benefiting is Kinder Morgan - making tons of money off of people who are struggling on a day-to-day basis to make ends meet and now will lose everything they have worked so hard for all their lives!

Governor Hassan, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

Nat & Holly Crooker

cc: FERC

**20150708-0023**

June 29, 2015

Dear Congressman Guinta,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Congressman, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England.

The pipeline construction process will pollute our air, contaminate our aquifers, wells and other water resources. Over 800 NH families will lose their homes and it will destroy conservation lands. It will harm the tourist industry and rural character of New Hampshire.

The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and

deafening noise, prone to frequent “blow downs” where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline. These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis and will eventually cause ruin to all of New Hampshire.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station, including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby. Are the children of New Hampshire not important?

The property values near the pipeline and compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit! The only one benefiting is Kinder Morgan - making tons of money off of people who are struggling on a day-to-day basis to make ends meet and now will lose everything they have worked so hard for all their lives!

Congressman Guinta, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

??

cc: FERC

#### **20150708-0024**

June 29, 2015

Dear Congresswoman Kuster,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Congresswoman, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England.

The pipeline construction process will pollute our air, contaminate our aquifers, wells and other water resources. Over 800 NH families will lose their homes and it will destroy conservation lands. It will harm the tourist industry and rural character of New Hampshire.

The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent “blow downs” where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline. These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis and will eventually cause ruin to all of New Hampshire.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station, including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby. Are the children of New Hampshire not important?

The property values near the pipeline and compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit! The only one benefiting is Kinder Morgan - making tons of money off of people who are struggling on a day-to-day basis to make ends meet and now will lose everything they have worked so hard for all their lives!

Congresswoman Kuster, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

??

cc: FERC

**20150708-0025**

June 29, 2015

Dear Senator Shaheen,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Senator, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England.

The pipeline construction process will pollute our air, contaminate our aquifers, wells and other water resources. Over 800 NH families will lose their homes and it will destroy conservation lands. It will harm the tourist industry and rural character of New Hampshire.

The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent “blow downs” where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline. These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis and will eventually cause ruin to all of New Hampshire.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station, including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby. Are the children of New Hampshire not important?

The property values near the pipeline and compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit! The only one benefiting is Kinder Morgan - making tons of money off of people who are struggling on a day-to-day basis to make ends meet and now will lose everything they have worked so hard for all their lives!

Senator Shaheen, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

Nat & Holly Crooker

cc: FERC

**20150708-0026**

June 29, 2015

Dear Senator Ayotte,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Senator, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England.

The pipeline construction process will pollute our air, contaminate our aquifers, wells and other water resources. Over 800 NH families will lose their homes and it will destroy conservation lands. It will harm the tourist industry and rural character of New Hampshire.

The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent “blow downs” where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline. These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis and will eventually cause ruin to all of New Hampshire.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station, including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby. Are the children of New Hampshire not important?

The property values near the pipeline and compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit! The only one

benefiting is Kinder Morgan - making tons of money off of people who are struggling on a day-to-day basis to make ends meet and now will lose everything they have worked so hard for all their lives!

Senator Ayotte, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

Nat & Holly Crooker

cc: FERC

**20150708-0027**

Hand written card, Susan S. Space, 63 Cross Rd, Northfield, MA 01360, opposing

**20150708-0029**

June 29, 2015

Dear Senator Shaheen,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Senator, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England.

The pipeline construction process will pollute our air, contaminate our aquifers, wells and other water resources. Over 800 NH families will lose their homes and it will destroy conservation lands. It will harm the tourist industry and rural character of New Hampshire.

The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent "blow downs" where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline. These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis and will eventually cause ruin to all of New Hampshire.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station, including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby. Are the children of New Hampshire not important?

The property values near the pipeline and compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit! The only one benefiting is Kinder Morgan - making tons of money off of people who are struggling on a day-to-day basis to make ends meet and now will lose everything they have worked so hard for all their lives!

Senator Shaheen, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

??

cc: FERC

**20150708-0030**

June 29, 2015

Dear Senator Ayotte,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Senator, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England.

The pipeline construction process will pollute our air, contaminate our aquifers, wells and other water resources. Over 800 NH families will lose their homes and it will destroy conservation lands. It will harm the tourist industry and rural character of New Hampshire.

The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and

deafening noise, prone to frequent “blow downs” where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline. These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis and will eventually cause ruin to all of New Hampshire.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station, including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby. Are the children of New Hampshire not important?

The property values near the pipeline and compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit! The only one benefiting is Kinder Morgan - making tons of money off of people who are struggling on a day-to-day basis to make ends meet and now will lose everything they have worked so hard for all their lives!

Senator Ayotte, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

??

cc: FERC

### **20150708-0031**

June 29, 2015

Dear Governor Hassan,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Governor, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England.

The pipeline construction process will pollute our air, contaminate our aquifers, wells and other water resources. Over 800 NH families will lose their homes and it will destroy conservation lands. It will harm the tourist industry and rural character of New Hampshire.

The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent “blow downs” where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline. These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis and will eventually cause ruin to all of New Hampshire.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station, including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby. Are the children of New Hampshire not important?

The property values near the pipeline and compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit! The only one benefiting is Kinder Morgan - making tons of money off of people who are struggling on a day-to-day basis to make ends meet and now will lose everything they have worked so hard for all their lives!

Governor Hassan, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

??

cc: FERC

Sarah Carr, East Schodack, NY.

RE: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Docket No. PF 14-22

Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Project of Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Gas Co.

Honorable Senators, Members of the Assembly, and Public Officials:

As you may already be aware, there is pending before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) a proposal to build a pipeline to transport fracked gas from the Marcellus Shale fields of Pennsylvania through New York, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and back to Dracut, Massachusetts. Strong evidence indicates that from Dracut most of the gas will be transported north to Canada where it will be exported. On a daily basis, the 36" pipeline would transmit up to 2.2 billion cubic feet of gas at a pressure of up to 460 pounds per square inch. This project is referred to as the Northeast Energy Project.

These pipelines are dangerous and emit methane (a greenhouse gas) along with the toxic chemicals that are used in the fracking process- the same process New York State has BANNED for health reasons. New Yorkers gain nothing from this pipeline; the New York counties of Broome, Delaware, Schoharie, Albany and Rensselaer are simply the pipeline's path. If FERC approves the pipeline, New Yorkers are put at risk of grave dangers, severe health problems, lowered property values, and loss of property rights through eminent domain. In addition, the vitality of towns along the pipeline route is likely to be eroded.

Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas (the private corporate applicants before FERC) has identified compressor station sites for the NED. The site in Rensselaer County is in the Town of Nassau on Clarks Chapel Road. The parcel of land that is under contract for the compressor station is 142 acres. The compressor station itself will have 90,000 horsepower to transmit the fracked gas along the pipeline route. This will be an industrial facility operating 24 hours per day, 7 days per week, with around the clock lighting and noise and routine venting of methane along with the toxins associated with fracking. Its proposed location is in the midst of rural beauty and working farms, some organic. Additionally, the private seller of this parcel falsified the decibel testing that Kinder Morgan submitted.

This site also lies less than one mile from the Dewey Loeffel Landfill site. This site was used for disposal of estimated 46,000 tons of waste material generated several Capital District companies including General Electric, Bendix Corporation (now Honeywell) and Schenectady International (now SI Group, Inc.). The waste included industrial solvents, waste oils, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), scrap materials, sludge and solids. Volatile organic compounds and other hazardous substances have seeped out of the landfill and contaminated the groundwater. In 2009, the EPA collected sediment samples from downstream water bodies. The analytical results indicated the continued presence of PCBs, despite extensive clean-up efforts. Residents in the area are concerned about the combined poisons in their environment from the superfund site and the proximity to the proposed pipeline and compressor station.

Numerous studies have been conducted recently regarding the air quality around these compressor stations and the impacts on the residents that live near them. I implore you to fully read these studies before making a decision as they indicate severe negative health impacts to those who live within the vicinity including nose bleeds and severe respiratory difficulties. Also, homeowners living in Hancock, New York have seen a fifty percent decrease in the value of their homes directly related to the location and proximity of one of these compressor stations. Not only will the residents of our beautiful town be subjected to severe adverse health effects, but they will never be able to sell their home or be appropriately compensated.

There are upwards of 40 children that live near this proposed compressor site. As a resident of Rensselaer County and living within one mile of the proposed compressor station, my family and I are devastated by this proposal. I grew up next door to the house I currently live in and could never have imagined being anywhere else. Now, all of my future plans, my economic security and dreams for my family are at the mercy of FERC. FERC has offered little to no opportunity for the residents directly impacted by this decision to influence its decision. How is this freedom or the American dream?

I understand that interstate pipelines are matters within the federal government's jurisdiction, but it's time for New York State to step up and protect its citizens. I invite you to personally visit the proposed site and the surrounding area to have a more complete understanding of how devastating a facility like this would be to the area and its residents.

Sincerely,

Sarah A Carr  
451 Burden Lake Road  
East Schodack, NY 12063

## **20150708-5006**

deborah pomerleau, Londonderry, NH.

My husband's aunt is near death from pancreatic cancer. She has 2 teenage boys. Their dad died too. Life is short. Why do I say all this? Because life is short. Please remember that we are here to always do things that we will be proud of. We don't own this land. We are just temporary guardians. Long after we are gone, this land will be here. We have to keep in mind our place in history. We have to keep in mind that we should always do what is right and good. We have to keep in mind, that greed never helps anyone. Please. Please find a way to not approve this pipeline. We don't need this. KM wants it for profit. It won't help the land but will only hurt it. You know this in your heart. You know this. If every one of you in FERC, just stood up and took a stand, your heart will be full of joy. Sounds cliché. BUT, I do think it is true. The story of the damage to the land by fracking, by compressor stations, by the digging, it is coming out. It will be apparent to future generations that we had a choice.

## **20150708-5011**

### **P L A N Pipe Line Awareness Network for the North East, Inc.**

July 7, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20216

Re: Docket No. PF14-22, TGP Northeast Energy Direct – Scoping; Alternatives & Impacts

Dear Secretary Bose:

I am writing, first, to support the requests of the Northeast Municipal Gas Pipeline Coalition, the Massachusetts Association of Conservation Commissions, and others, calling for the NEPA scoping meetings for this project to be postponed until at least 30 days after the filing of the draft resource reports that Kinder Morgan has stated will be issued this month for the TGP Northeast Energy Direct (“NED”) project. The comment period should similarly be extended by at least 30 days to provide adequate time for review of these draft reports, which are anticipated to be far more complete than the March drafts. The Pipe Line Awareness Network for the Northeast, Inc. is a broad-based coalition of municipalities, organizations, businesses, citizen groups, legislators, affected landowners, gas ratepayers and concerned citizens, and I make this request on behalf of this wide array of stakeholders.

Secondly, I note that the Commission's May 15th comments on the company's draft resource reports state that “more information should be provided to explain expected requirements for natural gas in New England over the next few years.” To that end, I am providing the recently released Acadia Center three-part series that was originally published in Commonwealth Magazine. I request that in its NEPA review of the NED

project, the Commission thoroughly consider the issues raised by the Acadia Center in these documents.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathryn R. Eiseman, President  
Pipe Line Awareness Network for the Northeast, Inc.  
17 Packard Road  
Cummington, MA 01026  
info@plan-ne.org  
413-320-0747

*{the appended 21 pages from Acadia Center are not OCR compatible, thus not included here}*

*{ but can be downloaded from: }*

The-Missing-Energy-Crisis\_Part-I\_052215.PDF.....2-8

[http://acadiacenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/The-Missing-Energy-Crisis\\_Part-I\\_052215.pdf](http://acadiacenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/The-Missing-Energy-Crisis_Part-I_052215.pdf)

The-Missing-Energy-Crisis\_Part-II\_060815.PDF.....9-15

[http://acadiacenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/The-Missing-Energy-Crisis\\_Part-II\\_060815.pdf](http://acadiacenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/The-Missing-Energy-Crisis_Part-II_060815.pdf)

The-Missing-Energy-Crisis\_Part-III\_061515.PDF.....16-22

[http://acadiacenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/The-Missing-Energy-Crisis\\_Part-III\\_061515.pdf](http://acadiacenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/The-Missing-Energy-Crisis_Part-III_061515.pdf)

#### **20150708-5041**

William Mason, Mount Vision, NY.

I am opposed to FERC scheduling two meetings at the same time, and in different locations in our area of concern, Central NY. I am disgusted with FERC's blatant rubber stamping of every industry proposal. None of these is in the public interest, or for the public's convenience. They are purely for the industry's profits, and will ultimately provide LNG to export terminals.

#### **20150708-5104**

Byran Carr, East Schodack, NY.

RE: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Docket No. PF 14-22

Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Project of Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Gas Co.

Honorable Senators, Members of the Assembly, and Public Officials:

As you may already be aware, there is pending before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) a proposal to build a pipeline to transport fracked gas from the Marcellus Shale fields of Pennsylvania through New York, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and back to Dracut, Massachusetts. Strong evidence indicates that from Dracut most of the gas will be transported north to Canada where it will be exported. On a daily basis, the 36" pipeline would transmit up to 2.2 billion cubic feet of gas at a pressure of up to 460 pounds per square inch. This project is referred to as the Northeast Energy Project.

These pipelines are dangerous and emit methane (a greenhouse gas) along with the toxic chemicals that are used in the fracking process- the same process New York State has BANNED for health reasons. New Yorkers gain nothing from this pipeline; the New York counties of Broome, Delaware, Schoharie, Albany and Rensselaer are simply the pipeline's path. If FERC approves the pipeline, New Yorkers are put at risk of grave dangers, severe health problems, lowered property values, and loss of property rights through eminent domain. In addition, the vitality of towns along the pipeline route is likely to be eroded.

Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas (the private corporate applicants before FERC) has identified compressor station sites for the NED. The site in Rensselaer County is in the Town of Nassau on Clarks Chapel Road. The parcel of land that is under contract for the compressor station is 142 acres. The compressor station itself will have 90,000 horsepower to transmit the fracked gas along the pipeline route. This will be an industrial facility operating 24 hours per day, 7 days per week, with around the clock lighting and noise and

routine venting of methane along with the toxins associated with fracking. Its proposed location is in the midst of rural beauty and working farms, some organic. Additionally, the private seller of this parcel falsified the decibel testing that Kinder Morgan submitted.

This site also lies less than one mile from the Dewey Loeffel Landfill site. This site was used for disposal of estimated 46,000 tons of waste material generated several Capital District companies including General Electric, Bendix Corporation (now Honeywell) and Schenectady International (now SI Group, Inc.). The waste included industrial solvents, waste oils, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), scrap materials, sludge and solids. Volatile organic compounds and other hazardous substances have seeped out of the landfill and contaminated the groundwater. In 2009, the EPA collected sediment samples from downstream water bodies. The analytical results indicated the continued presence of PCBs, despite extensive clean-up efforts. Residents in the area are concerned about the combined poisons in their environment from the superfund site and the proximity to the proposed pipeline and compressor station.

Numerous studies have been conducted recently regarding the air quality around these compressor stations and the impacts on the residents that live near them. I implore you to fully read these studies before making a decision as they indicate severe negative health impacts to those who live within the vicinity including nose bleeds and severe respiratory difficulties. Also, homeowners living in Hancock, New York have seen a fifty percent decrease in the value of their homes directly related to the location and proximity of one of these compressor stations. Not only will the residents of our beautiful town be subjected to severe adverse health effects, but they will never be able to sell their home or be appropriately compensated.

There are upwards of 40 children that live near this proposed compressor site. As a resident of Rensselaer County and living within one mile of the proposed compressor station, my family and I are devastated by this proposal. My wife and I built our home here in hopes of raising our family in this wonderful neighborhood. Now, all of my future plans, my economic security and dreams for my family are at the mercy of FERC. Additionally, I am very concerned over the health impacts this compressor station will have as my wife already suffers from a chronic and severe respiratory condition. FERC has offered little to no opportunity for the residents directly impacted by this decision to influence its decision. How is this freedom or the American dream?

I understand that interstate pipelines are matters within the federal government's jurisdiction, but it's time for New York State to step up and protect its citizens. I invite you to personally visit the proposed site and the surrounding area to have a more complete understanding of how devastating a facility like this would be to the area and its residents.

**20150708-5107**

**Tennessee Gas Pipeline  
Company L.L.C.**  
a Kinder Morgan company

July 8, 2015

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

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., Docket No. PF14-22-000  
Northeast Energy Direct Project  
Monthly Status Report -- May 2015

Dear Ms. Bose:

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. ("Tennessee") is filing with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("Commission") in Docket No. PF14-22-000 its monthly pre-filing status report for the above-

referenced project. The enclosed status report covers the period June 1 through June 30, 2015.

In accordance with the Commission's filing requirements, Tennessee is submitting this filing with the Commission's Secretary through the eFiling system. Tennessee is also providing complete copies of this filing to the Office of Energy Projects ("OEP"). Any questions concerning the enclosed filing should be addressed to Ms. Jacquelyne Rocan at (713) 420-4544 or to Ms. Shannon Miller at (713) 420-4038.

Respectfully submitted,

TENNESSEE GAS PIPELINE COMPANY, L.L.C.

By: /s/ J. Curtis Moffatt

J. Curtis Moffatt

Deputy General Counsel and Vice President

Gas Group Legal

Enclosure

cc: Mr. Michael McGehee

Mr. Rich McGuire

Mr. Eric Tomasi

-----  
Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. ("Tennessee")

Northeast Energy Direct ("NED") Project, Docket No. PF14-22-000

Pre-Filing Monthly Activity Report

(Reporting Period: June 1, 2015 through June 30, 2015)

Public Outreach

Tennessee provided the following NED Project notifications:

On June 2, 2015, Tennessee provided impacted elected officials in Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, New Hampshire, and New York with information about the proposed nine new compressor station locations.

On June 2, 2015, Tennessee provided impacted elected officials in Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Connecticut with information about the removal of two pipeline laterals and modifications at three existing meter stations from the scope of the Project.

On June 24, 2015, Tennessee provided impacted elected officials in Massachusetts with the Beacon Hill Institute economic study of the Project in Massachusetts

• Tennessee conducted the following town presentations:

June 2, 2015: Winchester, New Hampshire

June 10, 2015: Brookline, New Hampshire

June 11, 2015: Methuen, Massachusetts

June 15, 2015: North Reading, Massachusetts

June 16, 2015: Hudson, New Hampshire

June 18, 2015: Londonderry, New Hampshire

June 23, 2015: Peabody, Massachusetts

Environmental

Tennessee continued to prepare the second draft of the Environmental Report (Resource Reports 1 through 13) for the anticipated filing of the report in July 2015.

Tennessee continued field surveys during the reporting period, including cultural, environmental, and threatened and endangered species surveys. Threatened and endangered species surveys conducted during the

reporting period include bat acoustic surveys in Pennsylvania, New York, and Massachusetts; bog turtle surveys in Rensselaer County, New York; and plant surveys in Pennsylvania, New York, and Connecticut. Tennessee continues to prepare for additional threatened and endangered species surveys throughout the Project area once survey protocols are finalized.

Tennessee submitted additional threatened and endangered species consultation letters to respective agencies based on Project route modifications, and identification of Project access roads and compressor station locations.

As of June 30, 2015, biological surveys (including streams and wetlands) have taken place over approximately 48.46 miles, or 30 percent, of the NED Project Supply Path component route, and approximately 60.69 miles, or 24 percent, of the NED Project Market Path component route. In addition, cultural resource surveys have taken place over approximately 80.34 miles, or 51 percent, of the NED Project Supply Path component route, and approximately 32.65 miles, or 13 percent, of the NED Project Market Path component route. Table 1 below summarizes the completion status of environmental and cultural surveys.

Table 1: Civil, Biological, and Cultural Surveys Performed

Segment	Survey Area* (miles)	Survey Completed (miles)		
		Civil	Environmental	Cultural
NED Project (Supply Path)	171	S: 95.3 D: 86.4	48.46	80.34
NED Project (Market Path)	248	S: 39.9 D: 30.8	60.69	32.65
% Complete		S: 32% D: 28%	26%	27%

\*The total survey area in Table 1 does not correlate precisely to proposed total length of pipeline for the NED Project. This number represents the survey area for the proposed pipeline and for evaluation of route alternatives.

\*\* “C” represents center line staking. “D” represents completed civil detail survey.

### Project Meetings

Tennessee met with the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection on June 10, 2015.

Tennessee met with the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (“MEPA”) Unit on June 11, 2015.

Tennessee held a meeting with the New Hampshire Alteration of Terrain Bureau on June 17, 2015.

Tennessee attended a meeting with the New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources on June 17, 2015.

### Right-of-Way

Tennessee has obtained survey permission for approximately 39% of the NED Project Market Path component area, and approximately 54% of the NED Project Supply Path component area.

Title work is approximately 88% completed for the NED Project Market Path component area and approximately 93% completed for the NED Supply Path component area.

Tennessee has received 213 calls as of the date of this report on the toll-free phone number established for the Project.

Tennessee is continuing with survey permission requests in order to conduct bat surveys and access road surveys throughout the Project area.

Tennessee continues to work with landowners and towns through the survey permission process to identify concerns and investigate minor deviations and alternative routing.

## Engineering

Tennessee continues to evaluate the proposed route for the Project. Deviations to the proposed route are being reviewed to accommodate construction constraints, and requests from landowners, towns, and applicable regulatory agencies. Some examples include requests for routing deviations submitted by Amherst, New Hampshire and Haverhill, Massachusetts. Tennessee will continue these evaluations based on information provided during the upcoming scoping meetings.

Tennessee continues to evaluate the proposed major river crossings, including potential Horizontal Directional Drill (“HDD”) locations. Tennessee is conducting environmental surveys where access is available at these potential locations, and will seek appropriate permits, as needed, for geotechnical investigations.

Tennessee contracted for aerial photography of the proposed primary route for the Project and for several alternative routes discussed in the draft Resource Report 10 submitted on March 13, 2015. The primary route was flown to a one-mile corridor and the imagery continues to be processed. LiDAR information as well as high resolution photography has been acquired and is currently being processed, and will be included with the certificate application filing targeted for October 2015.

Tennessee provided locations of the proposed compressor station sites in a supplemental filing to the Commission on June 1, 2015, and supplemented on June 3, 2015.

On June 2, 2015 Tennessee filed an update with the Commission regarding removal of facilities from the proposed scope of the Project, including (i) approximately 15.6 miles of pipeline associated with the North Worcester Lateral in Massachusetts and the Stamford Loop in Connecticut, (ii) the proposed new North Worcester meter station in Massachusetts, and (iii) the proposed modifications at three (3) existing meter stations in Connecticut (Long Ridge Meter Station, Stamford Meter Station, and New Britain Meter Station).

Tennessee field engineers continue to identify available access roads, pipe/construction yards, and other areas proposed for use during construction.

Survey activities identifying and staking the centerline along all routes on accessible land continued during the reporting period. Work being performed includes staking and detail survey along the pipeline route and surveys of supporting sites such as contractor yards and compressor stations.

Tennessee continued discussions with the electric utility companies regarding the co-location of proposed Project facilities with existing utility corridors.

Tennessee has conducted an initial analysis based on public imagery to review class locations to allow for siting of mainline valves. Mainline valve sites continue to be field-reviewed. Locations will be reevaluated following the final imagery and class determination.

Structures along the proposed pipeline alignment were located during the aerial flights. This information is being evaluated for final class location determination.

Preliminary construction spreads have been determined. A hydrostatic test plan is being developed, including depicting potential water supplies and discharge locations.

Residential figures are being developed for residences within 50 feet of the proposed workspace.

Resistivity surveys were initiated along the pipeline route in support of the cathodic protection and AC mitigation design.

### **20150708-5175**

Lawrence Hoell, Deposit, NY.

Why is another pipeline required when there is an existing pipeline providing gas to the northeast.

All small property owners with 20 acres or less would be impacted due to, the fact that the pipeline would take away building lots.

Property owners with lots of 20 acres or less would lose the use of their land, but still be taxed on land they would be unable to utilize.

There is no benefit to landowners . There is only a possible benefit to people receiving the gas.

The pipeline would reduce their land usage, taxes would not be transferred to the pipeline company. The sale value of the property would be reduced while taxes would be unchanged.

The big question is? Why is Stateland exempted and property owners have no choice when it come to eminent domain.

**20150709-0007**

**TOWN OF RINDGE**  
30 PAYSON HILL ROAD  
RINDGE, NH 03461

Tel. (603) 699-5161 Fax (603) 699-2101 TDD 1-800-735-2964  
www.town.rindge.nh.us

June 24, 2015

Norman Bay, Chairman  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

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

Nathaniel J. Davis  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Project  
Docket Number PF-14-22-000

Ladies and Gentlemen:

We, the Selectmen of the Town of Rindge, New Hampshire, formally request that you schedule a pre-filing scoping meeting in Rindge in order to allow our residents an adequate opportunity to express their views and concerns regarding the proposed natural gas pipeline. We have excellent facilities here in Rindge for such a meeting and we will work with you to establish a mutually convenient date and time.

Rindge is a unique community with many special characteristics and we believe that it is imperative that our residents be given the opportunity to engage in a constructive and transparent dialogue with FERC about the pipeline and its proposed route before any final decision is made.

Thank you for your consideration of this request and we look forward to meeting with you in Rindge.

Very truly yours,

Robert Hamilton  
Chairman

Roberta Oeser  
Selectman

Daniel Aho  
Selectman

**20150709-0013**

**TOWN OF PELHAM**  
**Office of the Selectmen**  
6 Village Green

Pelham, NH 03076

Tel:(603) 635-8233

Fax:(603) 635-8274

Email: selectmen@pelhamweb.com

July 1, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Re: FERC NOTICE OF Scoping Meeting Docket No. PF14-22-000 (Reg. No. 18301  
FERC ID 1 F291489j

Dear Ms. Bose:

I recently received a notice of the scoping hearings scheduled for New Hampshire and noticed that the Town of Pelham, New Hampshire was not selected as a hearing location.

The Town of Pelham will be significantly impacted by this proposed project, more than any other New Hampshire community. The proposed route of this pipeline will traverse 6.1 miles through our community including conservation property and impact over 75 land abutters.

I respectfully request that you reconsider including the Town of Pelham, New Hampshire as a FERC scoping hearing location for this project and allow the citizens of the largest impacted community to be heard.

Lastly, please address any filings, communications and correspondence regarding this project to: The Pelham Board of Selectmen, 6 Village Green Pelham, New Hampshire 03076.

Respectfully submitted,

Brian McCarthy  
Town Administrator

cc: Board of Selectmen  
File

**20150709-0015**

Wendy Drovin  
322 Colburn Rd  
Temple, NH 03084

July 1, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: FERC docket number PF14-22

Dear Secretary Bose

In regard to the proposed, Kinder Morgan/TGP natural gas pipeline, when is FERC going to hold its scoping meetings in the towns of New Ipswich, Temple, Greenville, and Mason, NH?

All of these towns would be affected by the potential compressor station.

Sincerely,

**20150709-0016**

236 Starch Mill Road

28 June 2015

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Sufield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Ref: Docket no. PF14-22-000

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter serves notice that I am denying permission of property access to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized and treated as trespass. My land consists of parcels known as D-18 and D-19 at 236 Starch Mill Road in Mason, NH.

With local shallow bedrock I am very worried about probable blasting damage to my 193 year-old home (built in 1822). It has the original granite block foundations, along with a massive central chimney and three fireplaces which are supported also by original granite block piers located in the basement. For over a decade I have monitored the basement foundation wall distance to ceiling beams at four designated reference points to ensure no significant movement has taken place.

Sincerely,

Peter L. LeCount

CC: Kimberly Bose, Secretary, FERC ✓  
Town of Mason, NH, Police Department

**20150709-0017**

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
Chairman Norman C. Bay  
888 First Street NE  
Washington, DC 20426

June 27, 2015

Dear Chairman Bay,

Attached are letters of opposition to the Kinder Morgan I Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co. proposed pipeline, called NED (Northeast Dimct, FERC Docket 114-22), through Rensselaer County and its compressor station proposed for Clark's Chapel Road in the Town of Schodack,

Since Andrew Cuomo, Governor of New York State, rejected hydrofracking of gas in this State because of health risks, why should any company be allowed to build a frecked gas pipeline for transporting gas through New York State to some other destination? The gas pipeline has some health risks, and the compressor stations all have confirmed health risks per studies recently completed in Pennsylvania. The pipeline is not planned to benefit New York, but to use us as a conduit for the company's financial benefit. Please reject Kinder Morgan's proposal until love of natural gas becomes more important than children's and adults' lives.

Please protect our families from developers who do not have our interests in their hearts.

Very respectfully yours

Clark J. Shaughnessy  
474 Burden Lake Road  
Nassau, New York 12123  
518-441-1685 (cell)

-----  
Letter of Opposition

to

Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's  
Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Docket PF14-22

I am a resident of Rensselaer County, State of New York, and one of your constituents. I am opposed to the construction and operation of the NED pipeline and its pumping station. Some of my opposition is based on the following problems occurring in other pipelines in other States.

- ~ Compressor blow-off regulating pipe pressure pollutes air with gas and carcinogens.
- ~ Compressor blow-off may pollute soil and water with carcinogens used in fracking.
- ~ Leaks in pipes can also contaminate ground water and soil.
- ~ New York citizens are not proposed to receive gas from pipeline. We are just a conduit.
- ~ Residents may see rise in homeowner's insurance due to risks of the pipeline and pump station.
- ~ Loud noise of operation of compressor stations.
- ~ Negative impact on Market property values, especially those near pump stations.
- ~ Having an industrial operation forced onto Residential and Farm Zoning districts.
- ~ Fear of the large number of pipeline and pump station accidents elsewhere in the United States.
- ~ Loss of local and self-determination of what our neighborhoods should offer for quality of living.
- ~ Impossibility of firemen to halt gas fire, if ignited.
- ~ Fear of rusting failures of steel pipe and shut-off valves over the years.
- ~ Federal government's lack of inspection resources if constructed

Also, I do not believe any lands or easements should be granted to the pipeline owners via Eminent Domain because the interest of the New York State public will not be served.

Clark J. Shaughnessy  
474 Burden Lake Road  
Nassau, NH 12123

-----  
Letter of Opposition

to

Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's  
Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Docket PF14-22

I am a resident of Rensselaer County, State of New York, and one of your constituents. I am opposed to the construction and operation of the NED pipeline and its pumping station. Some of my opposition is based on the following problems occurring in other pipelines in other States.

- ~ Compressor blow-off regulating pipe pressure pollutes air with gas and carcinogens.
- ~ Carcinogens from fracking also in compressor blow-off.
- ~ Leaks in pipes pollute ground water.
- ~ New York citizens will not receive gas from pipeline.
- ~ New York citizens will take all the risks of the pipeline.
- ~ Pipeline pressure will reach 1460 pounds per square inch.
- ~ Loud noise of compressor stations.
- ~ Strength of pipe will be less than required in urban areas.
- ~ Negative impact on property values.
- ~ Existing incidences of accidents along U.S.A. pipelines in general.
- ~ Added infrastructure costs to towns.

- ~ Nuisance to citizens during constnaslao.
- ~ Inrpossibility of firemen to halt gas fire after ignition.
- ~ Rusting of steel pipe and shut-off valves over the years.
- ~ Governments lack of inspection once constructed.

Also, I do not believe any lands or easements should be granted to the pipeline owners via Eminent Domain because the interest of the New York State public will not be served.

Theresa Hoisa?  
 3 Bellwood Ln  
 Castleton NY 12033

-----  
 Letter of Opposition  
 to  
 Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's  
 Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project  
 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Docket PF14-22

I am a resident of Rensselaer County, State ofNew York, and one of your constituents. I am opposed to the construction and operation of the NED pipeline and its pumping station. Some of my opposition is based on the following problems occurring in other pipelines in other States.

- ~ Compressor blow-off regulating pipe pressure pollutes air with gas and carcinogens.
- ~ Carcinogens from fracking also in compressor blow-off.
- ~ Leaks in pipes pollute ground water.
- ~ New York citizens will not receive gas from pipeline.
- ~ New York citizens will take all the risks of the pipeline.
- ~ Pipeline pressure will reach 1460 pounds per square inch.
- ~ Loud noise of compressor stations.
- ~ Strength of pipe wiii be less that required in urban areas.
- ~ Negative impact an property values.
- ~ Existing incidences of accidents along U.S.A. pipelines in general.
- ~ Added infrastructure costs to towns.
- ~ Nuisance to citizens during constnaslao.
- ~ Inrpossibility of firemen to halt gas fire after ignition.
- ~ Rusting of steel pipe and shut-off valves over the years.
- ~ Governments lack of inspection once constructed.

Also, I do not believe any lands or easements should be granted to the pipeline owners via Eminent Domain because the interest of the New York State public will not be served.

Andre Dzelcciourius  
 22 N Colonial Hts  
 Troy, NY 12180

-----  
 Letter of Opposition  
 to  
 Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's  
 Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project  
 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Docket PF14-22

I am a resident of Rensselaer County, State ofNew York, and one of your constituents. I am opposed to the construction and operation of the NED pipeline and its pumping station. Some of my opposition is based on the following problems occurring in other pipelines in other States.

- ~ Compressor blow-off regulating pipe pressure pollutes air with gas and carcinogens.
- ~ Carcinogens from fracking also in compressor blow-off.
- ~ Leaks in pipes pollute ground water.
- ~ New York citizens will not receive gas from pipeline.
- ~ New York citizens will take all the risks of the pipeline.
- ~ Pipeline pressure will reach 1460 pounds per square inch.
- ~ Loud noise of compressor stations.
- ~ Strength of pipe will be less than required in urban areas.
- ~ Negative impact on property values.
- ~ Existing incidences of accidents along U.S.A. pipelines in general.
- ~ Added infrastructure costs to towns.
- ~ Nuisance to citizens during construction.
- ~ Impossibility of firemen to halt gas fire after ignition.
- ~ Rusting of steel pipe and shut-off valves over the years.
- ~ Governments lack of inspection once constructed.

Also, I do not believe any lands or easements should be granted to the pipeline owners via Eminent Domain because the interest of the New York State public will not be served.

Elizabeth Reilly  
 149 Clarks Chapel Rd  
 Nassau, NY 12123

-----  
 Letter of Opposition  
 to

Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's  
 Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project  
 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Docket PF14-22

I am a resident of Rensselaer County, State of New York, and one of your constituents. I am opposed to the construction and operation of the NED pipeline and its pumping station. Some of my opposition is based on the following problems occurring in other pipelines in other States.

- ~ Compressor blow-off regulating pipe pressure pollutes air with gas and carcinogens.
- ~ Carcinogens from fracking also in compressor blow-off.
- ~ Leaks in pipes pollute ground water.
- ~ New York citizens will not receive gas from pipeline.
- ~ New York citizens will take all the risks of the pipeline.
- ~ Pipeline pressure will reach 1460 pounds per square inch.
- ~ Loud noise of compressor stations.
- ~ Strength of pipe will be less than required in urban areas.
- ~ Negative impact on property values.
- ~ Existing incidences of accidents along U.S.A. pipelines in general.
- ~ Added infrastructure costs to towns.
- ~ Nuisance to citizens during construction.
- ~ Impossibility of firemen to halt gas fire after ignition.
- ~ Rusting of steel pipe and shut-off valves over the years.
- ~ Governments lack of inspection once constructed.

Also, I do not believe any lands or easements should be granted to the pipeline owners via Eminent Domain because the interest of the New York State public will not be served.

Scott Reilly  
 149 Clarks Chapel Rd

-----  
Letter of Opposition

to

Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's  
Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Docket PF14-22

I am a resident of Rensselaer County, State of New York, and one of your constituents. I am opposed to the construction and operation of the NED pipeline and its pumping station. Some of my opposition is based on the following problems occurring in other pipelines in other States.

- ~ Compressor blow-off regulating pipe pressure pollutes air with gas and carcinogens.
- ~ Carcinogens from fracking also in compressor blow-off.
- ~ Leaks in pipes pollute ground water.
- ~ New York citizens will not receive gas from pipeline.
- ~ New York citizens will take all the risks of the pipeline.
- ~ Pipeline pressure will reach 1460 pounds per square inch.
- ~ Loud noise of compressor stations.
- ~ Strength of pipe will be less than required in urban areas.
- ~ Negative impact on property values.
- ~ Existing incidences of accidents along U.S.A. pipelines in general.
- ~ Added infrastructure costs to towns.
- ~ Nuisance to citizens during construction.
- ~ Impossibility of firemen to halt gas fire after ignition.
- ~ Rusting of steel pipe and shut-off valves over the years.
- ~ Governments lack of inspection once constructed.

Also, I do not believe any lands or easements should be granted to the pipeline owners via Eminent Domain because the interest of the New York State public will not be served.

John Holland  
140 Clarks Chapel  
Nassau, NY 12123

-----  
Letter of Opposition

to

Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's  
Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Docket PF14-22

I am a resident of Rensselaer County, State of New York, and one of your constituents. I am opposed to the construction and operation of the NED pipeline and its pumping station. Some of my opposition is based on the following problems occurring in other pipelines in other States.

- ~ Compressor blow-off regulating pipe pressure pollutes air with gas and carcinogens.
- ~ Carcinogens from fracking also in compressor blow-off.
- ~ Leaks in pipes pollute ground water.
- ~ New York citizens will not receive gas from pipeline.
- ~ New York citizens will take all the risks of the pipeline.
- ~ Pipeline pressure will reach 1460 pounds per square inch.
- ~ Loud noise of compressor stations.
- ~ Strength of pipe will be less than required in urban areas.
- ~ Negative impact on property values.

- ~ Existing incidences of accidents along U.S.A. pipelines in general.
- ~ Added infrastructure costs to towns.
- ~ Nuisance to citizens during constnaslao.
- ~ Inrpossibility of firemen to halt gas fire after ignition.
- ~ Rusting of steel pipe and shut-off valves over the years.
- ~ Governments lack of inspection once constructed.

Also, I do not believe any lands or easements should be granted to the pipeline owners via Eminent Domain because the interest of the New York State public will not be served.

Wesley D. Petrone  
 16 Clarks Chapel Rd  
 Nassau, NY 12123

-----  
 Letter of Opposition

to

Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's  
 Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project  
 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Docket PF14-22

I am a resident of Rensselaer County, State ofNew York, and one of your constituents. I am opposed to the construction and operation of the NED pipeline and its pumping station. Some of my opposition is based on the following problems occurring in other pipelines in other States.

- ~ Compressor blow-off regulating pipe pressure pollutes air with gas and carcinogens.
- ~ Carcinogens from fracking also in compressor blow-off.
- ~ Leaks in pipes pollute ground water.
- ~ New York citizens will not receive gas from pipeline.
- ~ New York citizens will take all the risks of the pipeline.
- ~ Pipeline pressure will reach 1460 pounds per square inch.
- ~ Loud noise of compressor stations.
- ~ Strength of pipe wiii be less that required in urban areas.
- ~ Negative impact an property values.
- ~ Existing incidences of accidents along U.S.A. pipelines in general.
- ~ Added infrastructure costs to towns.
- ~ Nuisance to citizens during constnaslao.
- ~ Inrpossibility of firemen to halt gas fire after ignition.
- ~ Rusting of steel pipe and shut-off valves over the years.
- ~ Governments lack of inspection once constructed.

Also, I do not believe any lands or easements should be granted to the pipeline owners via Eminent Domain because the interest of the New York State public will not be served.

Patricia L. Petrone  
 16 Clarks Chapel Rd  
 Nassau, NY 12123

-----  
 Letter of Opposition

to

Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's  
 Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project  
 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Docket PF14-22

I am a resident of Rensselaer County, State ofNew York, and one of your constituents. I am opposed to the construction and operation of the NED pipeline and its pumping station. Some of my opposition is based on

the following problems occurring in other pipelines in other States.

- ~ Compressor blow-off regulating pipe pressure pollutes air with gas and carcinogens.
- ~ Compressor blow-off may pollute soil and water with carcinogens used in fracking.
- ~ Leaks in pipes can also contaminate ground water and soil.
- ~ New York citizens are not proposed to receive gas from pipeline. We are just a conduit.
- ~ Residents may see rise in homeowner's insurance due to risks of the pipeline and pump station.
- ~ Loud noise of operation of compressor stations.
- ~ Negative impact on Market property values, especially those near pump stations.
- ~ Having an industrial operation forced onto Residential and Farm Zoning districts.
- ~ Fear of the large number of pipeline and pump station accidents elsewhere in the United States.
- ~ Loss of local and self-determination of what our neighborhoods should offer for quality of living.
- ~ Impossibility of firemen to halt gas fire, if ignited.
- ~ Fear of rusting failures of steel pipe and shut-off valves over the years.
- ~ Federal government's lack of inspection resources if constructed

Also, I do not believe any lands or easements should be granted to the pipeline owners via Eminent Domain because the interest of the New York State public will not be served.

Christine Kolodich  
457 Burden Lake Rd  
Nassau, NY 12123

-----  
Letter of Opposition  
to

Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's  
Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Docket PF14-22

I am a resident of Rensselaer County, State of New York, and one of your constituents. I am opposed to the construction and operation of the NED pipeline and its pumping station. Some of my opposition is based on the following problems occurring in other pipelines in other States.

- ~ Compressor blow-off regulating pipe pressure pollutes air with gas and carcinogens.
- ~ Compressor blow-off may pollute soil and water with carcinogens used in fracking.
- ~ Leaks in pipes can also contaminate ground water and soil.
- ~ New York citizens are not proposed to receive gas from pipeline. We are just a conduit.
- ~ Residents may see rise in homeowner's insurance due to risks of the pipeline and pump station.
- ~ Loud noise of operation of compressor stations.
- ~ Negative impact on Market property values, especially those near pump stations.
- ~ Having an industrial operation forced onto Residential and Farm Zoning districts.
- ~ Fear of the large number of pipeline and pump station accidents elsewhere in the United States.
- ~ Loss of local and self-determination of what our neighborhoods should offer for quality of living.
- ~ Impossibility of firemen to halt gas fire, if ignited.
- ~ Fear of rusting failures of steel pipe and shut-off valves over the years.
- ~ Federal government's lack of inspection resources if constructed

Also, I do not believe any lands or easements should be granted to the pipeline owners via Eminent Domain because the interest of the New York State public will not be served.

Michael Julia  
457 Burden Lake Rd  
Nassau, NY 12123

-----  
Letter of Opposition

to  
Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's  
Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Docket PF14-22

I am a resident of Rensselaer County, State of New York, and one of your constituents. I am opposed to the construction and operation of the NED pipeline and its pumping station. Some of my opposition is based on the following problems occurring in other pipelines in other States.

- ~ Compressor blow-off regulating pipe pressure pollutes air with gas and carcinogens.
- ~ Carcinogens from fracking also in compressor blow-off.
- ~ Leaks in pipes pollute ground water.
- ~ New York citizens will not receive gas from pipeline.
- ~ New York citizens will take all the risks of the pipeline.
- ~ Pipeline pressure will reach 1460 pounds per square inch.
- ~ Loud noise of compressor stations.
- ~ Strength of pipe will be less than required in urban areas.
- ~ Negative impact on property values.
- ~ Existing incidences of accidents along U.S.A. pipelines in general.
- ~ Added infrastructure costs to towns.
- ~ Nuisance to citizens during construction.
- ~ Impossibility of firemen to halt gas fire after ignition.
- ~ Rusting of steel pipe and shut-off valves over the years.
- ~ Government's lack of inspection once constructed.

Also, I do not believe any lands or easements should be granted to the pipeline owners via Eminent Domain because the interest of the New York State public will not be served.

Emily Tedford  
37 Clarks Chapel Rd  
Nassau, NY 12123

-----  
Letter of Opposition  
to

Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's  
Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Docket PF14-22

I am a resident of Rensselaer County, State of New York, and one of your constituents. I am opposed to the construction and operation of the NED pipeline and its pumping station. Some of my opposition is based on the following problems occurring in other pipelines in other States.

- ~ Compressor blow-off regulating pipe pressure pollutes air with gas and carcinogens.
- ~ Carcinogens from fracking also in compressor blow-off.
- ~ Leaks in pipes pollute ground water.
- ~ New York citizens will not receive gas from pipeline.
- ~ New York citizens will take all the risks of the pipeline.
- ~ Pipeline pressure will reach 1460 pounds per square inch.
- ~ Loud noise of compressor stations.
- ~ Strength of pipe will be less than required in urban areas.
- ~ Negative impact on property values.
- ~ Existing incidences of accidents along U.S.A. pipelines in general.
- ~ Added infrastructure costs to towns.
- ~ Nuisance to citizens during construction.

- ~ Inpossibility of firemen to halt gas fire after ignition.
- ~ Rusting of steel pipe and shut-off valves over the years.
- ~ Governments lack of inspection once constructed.

Also, I do not believe any lands or easements should be granted to the pipeline owners via Eminent Domain because the interest of the New York State public will not be served.

Mark Tedford  
37 Clarks Chapel Rd  
Nassau, NY 12123

-----

Letter of Opposition

to

Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's  
Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Docket PF14-22

I am a resident of Rensselaer County, State of New York, and one of your constituents. I am opposed to the construction and operation of the NED pipeline and its pumping station. Some of my opposition is based on the following problems occurring in other pipelines in other States.

- ~ Compressor blow-off regulating pipe pressure pollutes air with gas and carcinogens.
- ~ Compressor blow-off may pollute soil and water with carcinogens used in fracking.
- ~ Leaks in pipes can also contaminate ground water and soil.
- ~ New York citizens are not proposed to receive gas from pipeline. We are just a conduit.
- ~ Residents may see rise in homeowner's insurance due to risks of the pipeline and pump station.
- ~ Loud noise of operation of compressor stations.
- ~ Negative impact on Market property values, especially those near pump stations.
- ~ Having an industrial operation forced onto Residential and Farm Zoning districts.
- ~ Fear of the large number of pipeline and pump station accidents elsewhere in the United States.
- ~ Loss of local and self-determination of what our neighborhoods should offer for quality of living.
- ~ Impossibility of firemen to halt gas fire, if ignited.
- ~ Fear of rusting failures of steel pipe and shut-off valves over the years.
- ~ Federal government's lack of inspection resources if constructed

Also, I do not believe any lands or easements should be granted to the pipeline owners via Eminent Domain because the interest of the New York State public will not be served.

Bonnie L. Curtis  
464 Boyce Rd  
Nassau, NY 12123

-----

Letter of Opposition

to

Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's  
Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Docket PF14-22

I am a resident of Rensselaer County, State of New York, and one of your constituents. I am opposed to the construction and operation of the NED pipeline and its pumping station. Some of my opposition is based on the following problems occurring in other pipelines in other States.

- ~ Compressor blow-off regulating pipe pressure pollutes air with gas and carcinogens.
- ~ Carcinogens from fracking also in compressor blow-off.
- ~ Leaks in pipes pollute ground water.
- ~ New York citizens will not receive gas from pipeline.

- ~ New York citizens will take all the risks of the pipeline.
- ~ Pipeline pressure will reach 1460 pounds per square inch.
- ~ Loud noise of compressor stations.
- ~ Strength of pipe will be less than required in urban areas.
- ~ Negative impact on property values.
- ~ Existing incidences of accidents along U.S.A. pipelines in general.
- ~ Added infrastructure costs to towns.
- ~ Nuisance to citizens during construction.
- ~ Impossibility of firemen to halt gas fire after ignition.
- ~ Rusting of steel pipe and shut-off valves over the years.
- ~ Governments lack of inspection once constructed.

Also, I do not believe any lands or easements should be granted to the pipeline owners via Eminent Domain because the interest of the New York State public will not be served.

Robert LeBlanc  
14 Holland Lane  
Castleton, NY

-----  
Letter of Opposition

to

Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's  
Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Docket PF14-22

I am a resident of Rensselaer County, State of New York, and one of your constituents. I am opposed to the construction and operation of the NED pipeline and its pumping station. Some of my opposition is based on the following problems occurring in other pipelines in other States.

- ~ Compressor blow-off regulating pipe pressure pollutes air with gas and carcinogens.
- ~ Carcinogens from fracking also in compressor blow-off.
- ~ Leaks in pipes pollute ground water.
- ~ New York citizens will not receive gas from pipeline.
- ~ New York citizens will take all the risks of the pipeline.
- ~ Pipeline pressure will reach 1460 pounds per square inch.
- ~ Loud noise of compressor stations.
- ~ Strength of pipe will be less than required in urban areas.
- ~ Negative impact on property values.
- ~ Existing incidences of accidents along U.S.A. pipelines in general.
- ~ Added infrastructure costs to towns.
- ~ Nuisance to citizens during construction.
- ~ Impossibility of firemen to halt gas fire after ignition.
- ~ Rusting of steel pipe and shut-off valves over the years.
- ~ Governments lack of inspection once constructed.

Also, I do not believe any lands or easements should be granted to the pipeline owners via Eminent Domain because the interest of the New York State public will not be served.

Lisa LeBlanc  
14 Holland Lane  
Castleton, NY

-----  
Letter of Opposition

to

Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's  
Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Docket PF14-22

I am a resident of Rensselaer County, State of New York, and one of your constituents. I am opposed to the construction and operation of the NED pipeline and its pumping station. Some of my opposition is based on the following problems occurring in other pipelines in other States.

- ~ Compressor blow-off regulating pipe pressure pollutes air with gas and carcinogens.
- ~ Carcinogens from fracking also in compressor blow-off.
- ~ Leaks in pipes pollute ground water.
- ~ New York citizens will not receive gas from pipeline.
- ~ New York citizens will take all the risks of the pipeline.
- ~ Pipeline pressure will reach 1460 pounds per square inch.
- ~ Loud noise of compressor stations.
- ~ Strength of pipe will be less than required in urban areas.
- ~ Negative impact on property values.
- ~ Existing incidences of accidents along U.S.A. pipelines in general.
- ~ Added infrastructure costs to towns.
- ~ Nuisance to citizens during construction.
- ~ Impossibility of firemen to halt gas fire after ignition.
- ~ Rusting of steel pipe and shut-off valves over the years.
- ~ Governments lack of inspection once constructed.

Also, I do not believe any lands or easements should be granted to the pipeline owners via Eminent Domain because the interest of the New York State public will not be served.

Richard Murray  
110 Clarks Chapel Rd  
Nassau, NY 12123-2612

-----  
Letter of Opposition  
to

Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's  
Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Docket PF14-22

I am a resident of Rensselaer County, State of New York, and one of your constituents. I am opposed to the construction and operation of the NED pipeline and its pumping station. Some of my opposition is based on the following problems occurring in other pipelines in other States.

- ~ Compressor blow-off regulating pipe pressure pollutes air with gas and carcinogens.
- ~ Carcinogens from fracking also in compressor blow-off.
- ~ Leaks in pipes pollute ground water.
- ~ New York citizens will not receive gas from pipeline.
- ~ New York citizens will take all the risks of the pipeline.
- ~ Pipeline pressure will reach 1460 pounds per square inch.
- ~ Loud noise of compressor stations.
- ~ Strength of pipe will be less than required in urban areas.
- ~ Negative impact on property values.
- ~ Existing incidences of accidents along U.S.A. pipelines in general.
- ~ Added infrastructure costs to towns.
- ~ Nuisance to citizens during construction.
- ~ Impossibility of firemen to halt gas fire after ignition.

- ~ Rusting of steel pipe and shut-off valves over the years.
- ~ Governments lack of inspection once constructed.

Also, I do not believe any lands or easements should be granted to the pipeline owners via Eminent Domain because the interest of the New York State public will not be served.

Lucie Murray  
 110 Clarks Chapel Rd  
 Nassau, NY 12123

-----  
 Letter of Opposition  
 to

Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's  
 Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project  
 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Docket PF14-22

I am a resident of Rensselaer County, State of New York, and one of your constituents. I am opposed to the construction and operation of the NED pipeline and its pumping station. Some of my opposition is based on the following problems occurring in other pipelines in other States.

- ~ Compressor blow-off regulating pipe pressure pollutes air with gas and carcinogens.
- ~ Compressor blow-off may pollute soil and water with carcinogens used in fracking.
- ~ Leaks in pipes can also contaminate ground water and soil.
- ~ New York citizens are not proposed to receive gas from pipeline. We are just a conduit.
- ~ Residents may see rise in homeowner's insurance due to risks of the pipeline and pump station.
- ~ Loud noise of operation of compressor stations.
- ~ Negative impact on Market property values, especially those near pump stations.
- ~ Having an industrial operation forced onto Residential and Farm Zoning districts.
- ~ Fear of the large number of pipeline and pump station accidents elsewhere in the United States.
- ~ Loss of local and self-determination of what our neighborhoods should offer for quality of living.
- ~ Impossibility of firemen to halt gas fire, if ignited.
- ~ Fear of rusting failures of steel pipe and shut-off valves over the years.
- ~ Federal government's lack of inspection resources if constructed

Also, I do not believe any lands or easements should be granted to the pipeline owners via Eminent Domain because the interest of the New York State public will not be served.

Edward C Brehm  
 482 Burden Lake Rd  
 Nassau, NY 12123

-----  
 Letter of Opposition  
 to

Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's  
 Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project  
 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Docket PF14-22

I am a resident of Rensselaer County, State of New York, and one of your constituents. I am opposed to the construction and operation of the NED pipeline and its pumping station. Some of my opposition is based on the following problems occurring in other pipelines in other States.

- ~ Compressor blow-off regulating pipe pressure pollutes air with gas and carcinogens.
- ~ Compressor blow-off may pollute soil and water with carcinogens used in fracking.
- ~ Leaks in pipes can also contaminate ground water and soil.
- ~ New York citizens are not proposed to receive gas from pipeline. We are just a conduit.
- ~ Residents may see rise in homeowner's insurance due to risks of the pipeline and pump station.

- ~ Loud noise of operation of compressor stations.
- ~ Negative impact on Market property values, especially those near pump stations.
- ~ Having an industrial operation forced onto Residential and Farm Zoning districts.
- ~ Fear of the large number of pipeline and pump station accidents elsewhere in the United States.
- ~ Loss of local and self-determination of what our neighborhoods should offer for quality of living.
- ~ Impossibility of firemen to halt gas fire, if ignited.
- ~ Fear of rusting failures of steel pipe and shut-off valves over the years.
- ~ Federal government's lack of inspection resources if constructed

Also, I do not believe any lands or easements should be granted to the pipeline owners via Eminent Domain because the interest of the New York State public will not be served.

Debra L. Curtis  
464 Boyce Rd  
Nassau, NY 12123

-----  
Letter of Opposition

to

Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's  
Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Docket PF14-22

I am a resident of Rensselaer County, State of New York, and one of your constituents. I am opposed to the construction and operation of the NED pipeline and its pumping station. Some of my opposition is based on the following problems occurring in other pipelines in other States.

- ~ Compressor blow-off regulating pipe pressure pollutes air with gas and carcinogens.
- ~ Compressor blow-off may pollute soil and water with carcinogens used in fracking.
- ~ Leaks in pipes can also contaminate ground water and soil.
- ~ New York citizens are not proposed to receive gas from pipeline. We are just a conduit.
- ~ Residents may see rise in homeowner's insurance due to risks of the pipeline and pump station.
- ~ Loud noise of operation of compressor stations.
- ~ Negative impact on Market property values, especially those near pump stations.
- ~ Having an industrial operation forced onto Residential and Farm Zoning districts.
- ~ Fear of the large number of pipeline and pump station accidents elsewhere in the United States.
- ~ Loss of local and self-determination of what our neighborhoods should offer for quality of living.
- ~ Impossibility of firemen to halt gas fire, if ignited.
- ~ Fear of rusting failures of steel pipe and shut-off valves over the years.
- ~ Federal government's lack of inspection resources if constructed

Also, I do not believe any lands or easements should be granted to the pipeline owners via Eminent Domain because the interest of the New York State public will not be served.

Joseph Grimaldi  
285 Boyce Rd  
Nassau, NY 12123

-----  
Letter of Opposition

to

Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's  
Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Docket PF14-22

I am a resident of Rensselaer County, State of New York, and one of your constituents. I am opposed to the construction and operation of the NED pipeline and its pumping station. Some of my opposition is based on

the following problems occurring in other pipelines in other States.

- ~ Compressor blow-off regulating pipe pressure pollutes air with gas and carcinogens.
- ~ Compressor blow-off may pollute soil and water with carcinogens used in fracking.
- ~ Leaks in pipes can also contaminate ground water and soil.
- ~ New York citizens are not proposed to receive gas from pipeline. We are just a conduit.
- ~ Residents may see rise in homeowner's insurance due to risks of the pipeline and pump station.
- ~ Loud noise of operation of compressor stations.
- ~ Negative impact on Market property values, especially those near pump stations.
- ~ Having an industrial operation forced onto Residential and Farm Zoning districts.
- ~ Fear of the large number of pipeline and pump station accidents elsewhere in the United States.
- ~ Loss of local and self-determination of what our neighborhoods should offer for quality of living.
- ~ Impossibility of firemen to halt gas fire, if ignited.
- ~ Fear of rusting failures of steel pipe and shut-off valves over the years.
- ~ Federal government's lack of inspection resources if constructed

Also, I do not believe any lands or easements should be granted to the pipeline owners via Eminent Domain because the interest of the New York State public will not be served.

Mary Ellen Grimaldi  
285 Boyce Rd  
Nassau, NY 12123

-----  
Letter of Opposition  
to

Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's  
Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Docket PF14-22

I am a resident of Rensselaer County, State of New York, and one of your constituents. I am opposed to the construction and operation of the NED pipeline and its pumping station. Some of my opposition is based on the following problems occurring in other pipelines in other States.

- ~ Compressor blow-off regulating pipe pressure pollutes air with gas and carcinogens.
- ~ Compressor blow-off may pollute soil and water with carcinogens used in fracking.
- ~ Leaks in pipes can also contaminate ground water and soil.
- ~ New York citizens are not proposed to receive gas from pipeline. We are just a conduit.
- ~ Residents may see rise in homeowner's insurance due to risks of the pipeline and pump station.
- ~ Loud noise of operation of compressor stations.
- ~ Negative impact on Market property values, especially those near pump stations.
- ~ Having an industrial operation forced onto Residential and Farm Zoning districts.
- ~ Fear of the large number of pipeline and pump station accidents elsewhere in the United States.
- ~ Loss of local and self-determination of what our neighborhoods should offer for quality of living.
- ~ Impossibility of firemen to halt gas fire, if ignited.
- ~ Fear of rusting failures of steel pipe and shut-off valves over the years.
- ~ Federal government's lack of inspection resources if constructed

Also, I do not believe any lands or easements should be granted to the pipeline owners via Eminent Domain because the interest of the New York State public will not be served.

Nicole Thomas  
268 Boyce Rd  
Nassau, NY 12123

-----  
Letter of Opposition

to  
Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's  
Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Docket PF14-22

I am a resident of Rensselaer County, State of New York, and one of your constituents. I am opposed to the construction and operation of the NED pipeline and its pumping station. Some of my opposition is based on the following problems occurring in other pipelines in other States.

- ~ Compressor blow-off regulating pipe pressure pollutes air with gas and carcinogens.
- ~ Compressor blow-off may pollute soil and water with carcinogens used in fracking.
- ~ Leaks in pipes can also contaminate ground water and soil.
- ~ New York citizens are not proposed to receive gas from pipeline. We are just a conduit.
- ~ Residents may see rise in homeowner's insurance due to risks of the pipeline and pump station.
- ~ Loud noise of operation of compressor stations.
- ~ Negative impact on Market property values, especially those near pump stations.
- ~ Having an industrial operation forced onto Residential and Farm Zoning districts.
- ~ Fear of the large number of pipeline and pump station accidents elsewhere in the United States.
- ~ Loss of local and self-determination of what our neighborhoods should offer for quality of living.
- ~ Impossibility of firemen to halt gas fire, if ignited.
- ~ Fear of rusting failures of steel pipe and shut-off valves over the years.
- ~ Federal government's lack of inspection resources if constructed

Also, I do not believe any lands or easements should be granted to the pipeline owners via Eminent Domain because the interest of the New York State public will not be served.

Dean Thomas  
268 Boyce Rd  
Nassau, NY 12123

-----  
Letter of Opposition  
to

Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's  
Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Docket PF14-22

I am a resident of Rensselaer County, State of New York, and one of your constituents. I am opposed to the construction and operation of the NED pipeline and its pumping station. Some of my opposition is based on the following problems occurring in other pipelines in other States.

- ~ Compressor blow-off regulating pipe pressure pollutes air with gas and carcinogens.
- ~ Compressor blow-off may pollute soil and water with carcinogens used in fracking.
- ~ Leaks in pipes can also contaminate ground water and soil.
- ~ New York citizens are not proposed to receive gas from pipeline. We are just a conduit.
- ~ Residents may see rise in homeowner's insurance due to risks of the pipeline and pump station.
- ~ Loud noise of operation of compressor stations.
- ~ Negative impact on Market property values, especially those near pump stations.
- ~ Having an industrial operation forced onto Residential and Farm Zoning districts.
- ~ Fear of the large number of pipeline and pump station accidents elsewhere in the United States.
- ~ Loss of local and self-determination of what our neighborhoods should offer for quality of living.
- ~ Impossibility of firemen to halt gas fire, if ignited.
- ~ Fear of rusting failures of steel pipe and shut-off valves over the years.
- ~ Federal government's lack of inspection resources if constructed

Also, I do not believe any lands or easements should be granted to the pipeline owners via Eminent Domain

because the interest of the New York State public will not be served.

Carol Naberzeny  
338 Burden Lake Rd  
East Greenbush, NY 12061

-----  
Letter of Opposition

to

Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's  
Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Docket PF14-22

I am a resident of Rensselaer County, State of New York, and one of your constituents. I am opposed to the construction and operation of the NED pipeline and its pumping station. Some of my opposition is based on the following problems occurring in other pipelines in other States.

- ~ Compressor blow-off regulating pipe pressure pollutes air with gas and carcinogens.
- ~ Compressor blow-off may pollute soil and water with carcinogens used in fracking.
- ~ Leaks in pipes can also contaminate ground water and soil.
- ~ New York citizens are not proposed to receive gas from pipeline. We are just a conduit.
- ~ Residents may see rise in homeowner's insurance due to risks of the pipeline and pump station.
- ~ Loud noise of operation of compressor stations.
- ~ Negative impact on Market property values, especially those near pump stations.
- ~ Having an industrial operation forced onto Residential and Farm Zoning districts.
- ~ Fear of the large number of pipeline and pump station accidents elsewhere in the United States.
- ~ Loss of local and self-determination of what our neighborhoods should offer for quality of living.
- ~ Impossibility of firemen to halt gas fire, if ignited.
- ~ Fear of rusting failures of steel pipe and shut-off valves over the years.
- ~ Federal government's lack of inspection resources if constructed

Also, I do not believe any lands or easements should be granted to the pipeline owners via Eminent Domain because the interest of the New York State public will not be served.

Cynthia Shaffer  
338 Burden Lake Rd  
East Greenbush, NY 12061

-----  
Letter of Opposition

to

Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's  
Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Docket PF14-22

I am a resident of Rensselaer County, State of New York, and one of your constituents. I am opposed to the construction and operation of the NED pipeline and its pumping station. Some of my opposition is based on the following problems occurring in other pipelines in other States.

- ~ Compressor blow-off regulating pipe pressure pollutes air with gas and carcinogens.
- ~ Compressor blow-off may pollute soil and water with carcinogens used in fracking.
- ~ Leaks in pipes can also contaminate ground water and soil.
- ~ New York citizens are not proposed to receive gas from pipeline. We are just a conduit.
- ~ Residents may see rise in homeowner's insurance due to risks of the pipeline and pump station.
- ~ Loud noise of operation of compressor stations.
- ~ Negative impact on Market property values, especially those near pump stations.
- ~ Having an industrial operation forced onto Residential and Farm Zoning districts.

- ~ Fear of the large number of pipeline and pump station accidents elsewhere in the United States.
- ~ Loss of local and self-determination of what our neighborhoods should offer for quality of living.
- ~ Impossibility of firemen to halt gas fire, if ignited.
- ~ Fear of rusting failures of steel pipe and shut-off valves over the years.
- ~ Federal government's lack of inspection resources if constructed

Also, I do not believe any lands or easements should be granted to the pipeline owners via Eminent Domain because the interest of the New York State public will not be served.

Karen Kaufmann  
 402 Burden Lake Rd  
 East Greenbush, NY 12061

-----  
 Letter of Opposition

to

Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's  
 Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project  
 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Docket PF14-22

I am a resident of Rensselaer County, State of New York, and one of your constituents. I am opposed to the construction and operation of the NED pipeline and its pumping station. Some of my opposition is based on the following problems occurring in other pipelines in other States.

- ~ Compressor blow-off regulating pipe pressure pollutes air with gas and carcinogens.
- ~ Compressor blow-off may pollute soil and water with carcinogens used in fracking.
- ~ Leaks in pipes can also contaminate ground water and soil.
- ~ New York citizens are not proposed to receive gas from pipeline. We are just a conduit.
- ~ Residents may see rise in homeowner's insurance due to risks of the pipeline and pump station.
- ~ Loud noise of operation of compressor stations.
- ~ Negative impact on Market property values, especially those near pump stations.
- ~ Having an industrial operation forced onto Residential and Farm Zoning districts.
- ~ Fear of the large number of pipeline and pump station accidents elsewhere in the United States.
- ~ Loss of local and self-determination of what our neighborhoods should offer for quality of living.
- ~ Impossibility of firemen to halt gas fire, if ignited.
- ~ Fear of rusting failures of steel pipe and shut-off valves over the years.
- ~ Federal government's lack of inspection resources if constructed

Also, I do not believe any lands or easements should be granted to the pipeline owners via Eminent Domain because the interest of the New York State public will not be served.

Robert Ketzer Jr.  
 364 Burden Lake Rd  
 East Greenbush, NY 12061

-----  
 Letter of Opposition

to

Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's  
 Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project  
 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Docket PF14-22

I am a resident of Rensselaer County, State of New York, and one of your constituents. I am opposed to the construction and operation of the NED pipeline and its pumping station. Some of my opposition is based on the following problems occurring in other pipelines in other States.

- ~ Compressor blow-off regulating pipe pressure pollutes air with gas and carcinogens.
- ~ Compressor blow-off may pollute soil and water with carcinogens used in fracking.

- ~ Leaks in pipes can also contaminate ground water and soil.
- ~ New York citizens are not proposed to receive gas from pipeline. We are just a conduit.
- ~ Residents may see rise in homeowner's insurance due to risks of the pipeline and pump station.
- ~ Loud noise of operation of compressor stations.
- ~ Negative impact on Market property values, especially those near pump stations.
- ~ Having an industrial operation forced onto Residential and Farm Zoning districts.
- ~ Fear of the large number of pipeline and pump station accidents elsewhere in the United States.
- ~ Loss of local and self-determination of what our neighborhoods should offer for quality of living.
- ~ Impossibility of firemen to halt gas fire, if ignited.
- ~ Fear of rusting failures of steel pipe and shut-off valves over the years.
- ~ Federal government's lack of inspection resources if constructed

Also, I do not believe any lands or easements should be granted to the pipeline owners via Eminent Domain because the interest of the New York State public will not be served.

Denise Ketzner

364 Burden Lake Rd  
East Greenbush, NY 12061

-----  
Letter of Opposition

to

Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's  
Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Docket PF14-22

I am a resident of Rensselaer County, State of New York, and one of your constituents. I am opposed to the construction and operation of the NED pipeline and its pumping station. Some of my opposition is based on the following problems occurring in other pipelines in other States.

- ~ Compressor blow-off regulating pipe pressure pollutes air with gas and carcinogens.
- ~ Compressor blow-off may pollute soil and water with carcinogens used in fracking.
- ~ Leaks in pipes can also contaminate ground water and soil.
- ~ New York citizens are not proposed to receive gas from pipeline. We are just a conduit.
- ~ Residents may see rise in homeowner's insurance due to risks of the pipeline and pump station.
- ~ Loud noise of operation of compressor stations.
- ~ Negative impact on Market property values, especially those near pump stations.
- ~ Having an industrial operation forced onto Residential and Farm Zoning districts.
- ~ Fear of the large number of pipeline and pump station accidents elsewhere in the United States.
- ~ Loss of local and self-determination of what our neighborhoods should offer for quality of living.
- ~ Impossibility of firemen to halt gas fire, if ignited.
- ~ Fear of rusting failures of steel pipe and shut-off valves over the years.
- ~ Federal government's lack of inspection resources if constructed

Also, I do not believe any lands or easements should be granted to the pipeline owners via Eminent Domain because the interest of the New York State public will not be served.

Jacqueline K. Phillips  
346 Burden Lake Rd  
East Greenbush, NY 12061

-----  
Letter of Opposition

to

Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's  
Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project

I am a resident of Rensselaer County, State of New York, and one of your constituents. I am opposed to the construction and operation of the NED pipeline and its pumping station. Some of my opposition is based on the following problems occurring in other pipelines in other States.

- ~ Compressor blow-off regulating pipe pressure pollutes air with gas and carcinogens.
- ~ Compressor blow-off may pollute soil and water with carcinogens used in fracking.
- ~ Leaks in pipes can also contaminate ground water and soil.
- ~ New York citizens are not proposed to receive gas from pipeline. We are just a conduit.
- ~ Residents may see rise in homeowner's insurance due to risks of the pipeline and pump station.
- ~ Loud noise of operation of compressor stations.
- ~ Negative impact on Market property values, especially those near pump stations.
- ~ Having an industrial operation forced onto Residential and Farm Zoning districts.
- ~ Fear of the large number of pipeline and pump station accidents elsewhere in the United States.
- ~ Loss of local and self-determination of what our neighborhoods should offer for quality of living.
- ~ Impossibility of firemen to halt gas fire, if ignited.
- ~ Fear of rusting failures of steel pipe and shut-off valves over the years.
- ~ Federal government's lack of inspection resources if constructed

Also, I do not believe any lands or easements should be granted to the pipeline owners via Eminent Domain because the interest of the New York State public will not be served.

William A. Phillips  
346 Burden Lake Rd  
East Greenbush, NY 12061

-----  
Letter of Opposition

to

Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's  
Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Docket PF14-22

I am a resident of Rensselaer County, State of New York, and one of your constituents. I am opposed to the construction and operation of the NED pipeline and its pumping station. Some of my opposition is based on the following problems occurring in other pipelines in other States.

- ~ Compressor blow-off regulating pipe pressure pollutes air with gas and carcinogens.
- ~ Compressor blow-off may pollute soil and water with carcinogens used in fracking.
- ~ Leaks in pipes can also contaminate ground water and soil.
- ~ New York citizens are not proposed to receive gas from pipeline. We are just a conduit.
- ~ Residents may see rise in homeowner's insurance due to risks of the pipeline and pump station.
- ~ Loud noise of operation of compressor stations.
- ~ Negative impact on Market property values, especially those near pump stations.
- ~ Having an industrial operation forced onto Residential and Farm Zoning districts.
- ~ Fear of the large number of pipeline and pump station accidents elsewhere in the United States.
- ~ Loss of local and self-determination of what our neighborhoods should offer for quality of living.
- ~ Impossibility of firemen to halt gas fire, if ignited.
- ~ Fear of rusting failures of steel pipe and shut-off valves over the years.
- ~ Federal government's lack of inspection resources if constructed

Also, I do not believe any lands or easements should be granted to the pipeline owners via Eminent Domain because the interest of the New York State public will not be served.

Tami Nallay  
287 Burden Lake Rd

-----  
Letter of Opposition

to

Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's  
Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Docket PF14-22

I am a resident of Rensselaer County, State of New York, and one of your constituents. I am opposed to the construction and operation of the NED pipeline and its pumping station. Some of my opposition is based on the following problems occurring in other pipelines in other States.

- ~ Compressor blow-off regulating pipe pressure pollutes air with gas and carcinogens.
- ~ Compressor blow-off may pollute soil and water with carcinogens used in fracking.
- ~ Leaks in pipes can also contaminate ground water and soil.
- ~ New York citizens are not proposed to receive gas from pipeline. We are just a conduit.
- ~ Residents may see rise in homeowner's insurance due to risks of the pipeline and pump station.
- ~ Loud noise of operation of compressor stations.
- ~ Negative impact on Market property values, especially those near pump stations.
- ~ Having an industrial operation forced onto Residential and Farm Zoning districts.
- ~ Fear of the large number of pipeline and pump station accidents elsewhere in the United States.
- ~ Loss of local and self-determination of what our neighborhoods should offer for quality of living.
- ~ Impossibility of firemen to halt gas fire, if ignited.
- ~ Fear of rusting failures of steel pipe and shut-off valves over the years.
- ~ Federal government's lack of inspection resources if constructed

Also, I do not believe any lands or easements should be granted to the pipeline owners via Eminent Domain because the interest of the New York State public will not be served.

Don A. Nallay, Jr.  
287 Burden Lake Rd  
East Greenbush, NY 12061

-----  
**PETITION**

Community Statement

Re: Proposed Pipeline and Compressor Station in Rensselaer County  
New York

For the following reasons I oppose the proposed Kinder Morgan NED pipeline and, especially compressor stations:

- ~ Risk to human life.
- Health studies proving increased risk of cancer, respiratory and central nerve disease of humans near gas compressor sites.
- Periodic emissions of gas, tracking chemicals, carcinogens, toxins, all unseen by the naked eye.
- Possible and unexpected leakage into the ground and into well water.
- Devaluation of homes and property due to forced insertion of industrial complexes and pipelines.
- 24 hour/7 day a week noise to homeowners and taxpayers who reside and pay taxes in an established rural residential zone.
- Conceding existing rural residential zoning for an industrial usage.

**56 separate names, addresses, signatures**

-----

**PETITION**  
**JUST SAY NO**

To the proposed Kinder Morgan NED Sacked gas pipeline and, especially compressor stations in Rensselaer County, State of New York. I oppose their construction for the following reasons:

- ~ Risk to human life.
- ~ Health studies proving increased risk of cancer, respiratory and central nerve disease of humans near gas compressor sites.
- ~ Periodic emissions of gas, fracking chemicals, carcinogens, toxins, all unseen by the naked eye.
- ~ Possible and unexpected leakage into the ground and into well water.
- ~ Devaluation of homes and property due to forced insertion of industrial complexes and pipelines.
- ~ 24 hour (7 day a week) noise to homeowners and taxpayers who reside and pay taxes to live in an established rural residential zone.
- ~ Forced concession of existing rural residential zoning to industrial usage.
- ~ No gas will be supplied to New York State residences or businesses.

**48 separate names, addresses, signatures**

**20150709-5066**

Milton Djuric, Northfield, MA.  
Dear FERC

I write as a concerned resident of Northfield, MA, in opposition to Kinder Morgan's plan to run a natural gas pipeline through western Massachusetts and Northfield and build a large compressor station on Gulf Road in Northfield.

FERC's Policy Statement on Pipeline Certificates directs FERC to consider several specific factors in deciding whether or not to approve a pipeline. Also, under the National Environmental Policy Act, FERC is required to consider alternatives to the project as well as to consider a wide range of potential impacts, including socio-economic and cumulative impacts.

The Kinder Morgan plan falls far short of meeting most of these criteria.

1. Economic analysis by the plan's own proponents shows that there is no economic benefit from the pipeline at current levels of gas and electricity usage.
2. The justification for the pipeline based on future demand is built upon overly optimistic cost assumptions. The actual pipeline costs could very well be multiples of the cost assumed in the projections and push the return-on-investment period out by a decade or more.
3. There is reason to question current projections for the useful economic lifetime of the shale fields in New York and Pennsylvania from which the pipeline would draw its supply. This would, of course, exacerbate concerns about return-on-investment.
4. Apart from its dubious economic feasibility, the benefits of the pipeline, even if it should work as advertised, would only be in terms of regional natural gas costs relative to national natural gas costs. It would provide no protection whatsoever from global increases in natural gas prices. Moreover, the plan could lock New England into natural gas for decades, regardless of the pricing relative to other energy alternatives.
5. The fracking method of extracting natural gas that will travel in this pipeline remains highly controversial. It was banned from New York State in December 2014 by Governor Andrew Cuomo, and Pennsylvania has a strong and growing movement that seeks to ban fracking in that state.

6. Overwhelming evidence reported in studies conducted in the last few years has shown that natural gas production and distribution in general and fracked gas production in particular have a much larger impact on climate change than was previously understood, thus undermining the case for natural gas as an environmentally friendly alternative to other fossil fuels.
7. The particular gas that would be carried in the proposed pipeline is likely to be particularly high in toxins and radiation, the health impact of which has not been studied for people who would be living near the pipeline or consuming the gas in their homes.
8. The fracking activity in neighboring states that would feed the proposed pipeline will generate increased ozone air pollution, the impact of which on New England has not been studied.
9. The proposed pipeline route requires a new right-of-way that would cut through many miles of environmentally sensitive areas, including in Northfield and adjoining towns, and take permanently protected land out of that protection in possible violation of Article 97 of the Massachusetts Constitution.
10. Finally, the 80,000 horsepower compressor station proposed for Gulf Road would impact an environmentally sensitive area and cut off long-established major hiking trails. The complex would require 10-20 acres and it would be completely out of scale for a small town like Northfield. Moreover, compressor stations emit volatile organic compounds, nitrogen oxides, formaldehyde and greenhouse gases, posing a threat to the town's air quality. Among other environmental concerns, these stations are notorious for emitting high and low frequency high decibel noise that is constant since the station works 24 hours a day.

In view of these concerns, I believe that the Kinder Morgan pipeline should not be certified by FERC and that alternatives should be considered to meet energy demands, per the National Environmental Policy Act. Among them, allow natural market pricing effects to impact demand, reform natural gas market mechanisms, increase investment in energy efficiency, fix leaky pipelines, and increase investment in renewable energy. These alternatives have not been adequately studied, nor have they been weighed against the Kinder Morgan pipeline with its sources of real concern.

Respectfully,  
Milton Djuric

#### **20150709-5089**

Stephanie Syre-Hager, Mason, NH.

I am very concerned about building a pipeline infrastructure through Mason NH. This rural community is a beautiful retreat from urban and suburban life. I am most concerned with how our wells will be affected from drilling and blasting granite throughout the town. What contamination will we find in our air, water, soil, vegetation, and wetlands? My home of 16 years is scheduled to be in the "incineration zone". This is a frightening proposition for me and my family. I cannot see one benefit to this project, and I would like to publicly state that I am vehemently opposed to building it at all. I recommend that we look to the future with green alternatives such as wind and solar power, and leave these archaic methods behind us.

#### **20150709-5148**

Francis H Curtis  
464 Boyce Rd  
Nassau, NY 12123

Docket No. PF14-22-000

July 9,2015

Mr. Norman C Bay, Chairman  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC)  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

Dear Mr. Bay:

I am writing this letter as a property owner adjoining the proposed NED pipeline on the National Grid power lines. I am also a member of the Town of Schodack Town Board and a recently retired County Director of Real Property Tax Services for Rensselaer County with 40 years of experience in the field of Real Property.

The proposed pipeline on the National Grid power lines is not the best way for the pipeline to go. The power lines were purchased back in 1968 by Niagara Mohawk Power Company. Niagara Mohawk purchased a ROW for high tension power lines to run from New Scotland (NY) to Williamstown (MA) with a width of 250 feet. Niagara Mohawk built the lines off set to the north side. This was done so that in the future a second line could be built. The proposed pipeline is shown on the north side of the lines. There is not sufficient area to construct the pipeline without having to acquire additional land from property owners. The pipeline would have to be constructed on the south side in order to stay within the ROW of National Grid.

With the ROW only being 250 feet wide hundreds of homes are very near this ROW and many as close as 10 feet from property line. This is not a safe distance from homes to the pipeline. Also, the ROW has limited access to public roads. There are places that are 3 miles long and only accessible at each end. This is 1.5 miles of ROW each way that can be accessed by only one road. In the middle of winter you would not be able to access the pipeline in case of an emergency. Also, the ROW is very hilly and runs thru Designated NYSDEC Wetlands. The area above the pipeline will need to be maintained.

If the pipeline runs along the National Grid ROW the assessed value of the pipeline will need to be assessed for taxation by every local Assessor. This is very specialized property and extremely difficult for a local Assessor to determine the Fair and Equitable assessment for the pipeline within their jurisdiction. The company (Kinder Morgan) would have to deal with each Assessor and each jurisdiction to challenge their yearly assessment for taxation.

Another route that has been proposed is running along the 1-90 corridor. The 1-90 corridor is much wider, running from 450 feet up to over 1,000 feet wide. This corridor has already been utilized by several Public Utilities. The 1-90 corridor is accessible much more readily year round. The 1-90 corridor is owned by New York State and the State maintains it. Therefore, the pipeline would be within a couple 100 feet to maintain instead of several miles. Also, if the pipeline is on Public Property (New State) then the NYS Office of Real Property would be responsible for the assessing of the pipeline. Therefore the company (Kinder Morgan) would only have to deal with one entity, the State, for their assessment to be fair and equitable for taxation.

Houses near the 1-90 corridor are at a much greater distance from the pipeline and therefore much safer. Therefore the residents would be more at ease.

In conclusion, the 1-90 corridor is a much less intrusive, with easier maintainability and a safer choice for residents then the National Grid ROW.

If I can be of assistance please don't hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely

Francis H Curtis

Land Owner

Schodack Town Board Member

Retired County Real Property Director

**20150709-5161**

Sheila DS Foraker

205 China Hill Road  
Nassau, NY 12123  
sdsforaker@gmail.com

Cell: (707) 318-4240

Tel: (518) 766-2047

July 7, 2015

John Proulx TGP, LLC  
Kinder Morgan

1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Re: Denial of access to my property

To whom it may concern:

As the owner of property located at  
203 and 205 China Hill Road, Nassau, NY 12123

I hereby deny to Kinder Morgan and its subsidiaries and affiliated entities, including with limitation Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company and its subsidiaries and related entities, as well as NYSEG, National Grid or other electric utility company with whom any of them co-locate or propose to co-locate any pipeline, and their respective employees, agents, representatives and contractors, permission to enter my property identified above, to perform surveys or for any other purpose (other than access by my utility company directly related to the supply of electricity to my property) without prior written notice specifying the purpose of such access and my express consent.

Any entry on my property without my consent will be considered unauthorized and treated as trespass

Sheila DS Foraker

cc Town Board of the Town of Nassau  
FERC  
National Grid  
NYSEG

**20150710-0008**

Hand written card, William Finlayson, 167 Heald Rd, Wilton, NH 03086, opposing

**20150710-0009**

GOVERNOR MAGGIE HASSAN  
Office of the Governor  
State House  
107 North Main Street  
Concord, NH 03301

July 1, 2015

Dear Governor Hassan:

‘The care of rivers is not a question of rivers but the human heart’. - Tanaka Shozo

Considered Japan’s first conservationist, Shozo, a politician, was instrumental in passing the 1911 Factory Law-the first law to address industrial pollution.

I reference Shozo’s actions in regards to the NED pipeline project. Shozo was a politician who recognized the dire environmental consequences of big business exploiting natural resources for profit. Shozo stepped up as a public advocate against the Ashio Copper Mine that dumped pollutants in the water.

Who will stand up for the people of NH and protect our rivers, streams and aquifers? Our water supplies are directly threatened by the fracked gas that will be pumped through the pipelines. In Mason we are 100% dependent on well water. While the NED pipeline endangers our clean water and our very existence what plan in place for our protection? Kinder Morgan offered precious few details at the Mason ‘informational’ town meeting.

In Mason, impacted residents and abutters have denied survey access to Kinder Morgan. We recognize the dangers and consequences of this project. We are asking and waiting for the evidence that this pipeline is truly for public gain. We have not seen proof that Mason residents benefit from the pipeline. Based on the current evidence the serious risks to our clean water are for private business and corporate gain. We are

faced with losing control of our private lands without benefit of fair, honest information that truly reflects the needs for increased natural gas supplies and how the NED pipeline is the most sound solution for this need.

The magnitude of this project and the real, long-term risks to NH residents including contaminated or disappearing water supplies, dangers and loss of property value deserve more scrutiny. The high number of survey access denials prevents Kinder Morgan from thoroughly evaluating the route. Helicopter fly overs do not provide the necessary details for a project with such steep consequences.

Where are you our brave NH politician - our elected official? We're hearing precious little from you in response to our questions and requests for answers. I have received the same form letter at least five times from your office. Where are you? Will you step up, take a stand and be our advocate and acknowledge the environmental consequences like Tanaka Shozo did 100 years ago?

Sincerely,

Amy Glowaki , Mason, NH

#### **20150710-0010**

Hand written card, ?? Finlayson, PhD, wanting to know when Scoping meeting will be held in New Ipswich, Temple, Greenville and Mason, NH, all affected by proposed compressor station.

#### **20150710-0011**

Hand written card, Dr. Leslie Finlayson, PhD, wanting to know when Scoping meeting will be held in New Ipswich, Temple, Greenville and Mason, NH, all affected by proposed compressor station.

#### **20150710-0012**

##### PROPERTY ACCESS DENIED

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: June 8, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

RE: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

Street Address: 121 Athol Rd  
Town & Zip: Richmond, NH 03470-4203  
Map & Lot Number(s) (if known) 000202 000037

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Robert Haught, Anna Haught

CC:

FERC

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

**20150710-0013**

PROPERTY ACCESS DENIED

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: June 2, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

RE: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

Street Address: 410 Fish Hatchery Rd  
Town & Zip: Richmond, NH 03470-4203  
Map & Lot Number(s) (if known) 000407 000001  
000408 000093  
000408 000094  
000408 000095

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

E Allen Houbrook

CC:

FERC

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

**20150710-5003**

Michelle Cross, Nassau, NY.

I adamantly oppose not only the suggested location of the 90,000 HP compressor station on Clarks Chapel Road in Nassau, NY but also the construction of the NED gas pipeline to run along the ROW of National Grid that will ultimately incur the loss of property by homeowners that abut the ROW. As has been previously stated, the materials that the pipes are constructed of are detrimentally affected by the power lines and will therefore be compromised creating a public hazard to the families that are living along the proposed route. With the community having emergency personnel that is solely based on volunteers, I believe that this will place a heavy burden on all surrounding fire districts with a volunteer member base.

I would also like to bring to your attention that the winter months have on regular occasions made our roads impassable, sometimes for multiple days which would make any emergencies an environmental disaster.

Please strongly consider requiring Kinder Morgan to consider other alternatives, such as upgrading existing gas lines, or running parallel to the existing pipelines that currently run through Rensselaer county.

Thank you,

Mrs. Michelle Cross  
Property owner  
115 China Hill Road  
Nassau, NY

**20150710-5004**

deborah pomerleau, Londonderry, NH.

FERC is like the addict sibling that you want to fix, but you know you can't. Ha. I am so frustrated with trying to get you to listen to me. Why is it so hard to look beyond your world at FERC and decide, wow, we need to do what is right for our country and for our world? These gas pipelines are not good. YOU know it. In the long run, it is just polluting our world. How will you live with your conscience? Texas is already encountering ground water pollution. This is nothing new. This pipeline through MA and southern NH is so wrong. Please just stop it. Stop it. Stop it. Please.

**20150713-0019**

Hand written card, Charles Payson, 15 Appaloosa Road, Pelham, NH 03076, opposing

**20150713-0020**

Hand written card, Alfred Guadagni, 76 Greenbriar Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, Milford, NH, Town Hall is not big enough to accomodate all who want to attend

**20150713-0021**

Hand written card, Patricia H. Silvestro, 2015 Colburn Road, Temple, NH 03084, opposing.

**20150713-0022**

Hand written card, Sullivan Family, 155 Old Wilton Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, opposing

**20150713-0023**

Hand written card, Conlin Bradley, 1095 North St, Windsor, MA 01270, opposing

**20150713-0024**

Hand written card, William R. Kilpatrick, 166 Gulf Rd, Northfield, MA 01360, opposing

**20150713-0025**

Hand written card, Alfred Guadagni, 76 Greenbriar Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, Milford, NH, wants Scoping meeting in New Ipswich, NH

**20150713-0026**

Hand written card, Karen Guadagni, 76 Greenbriar Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, Milford, NH, Town Hall is not big enough to accomodate all who want to be heard

**20150713-0027**

Hand written card, Karen Guadagni, 76 Greenbriar Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, New Ipswich, NH, should be allowed a Scoping meeting

**20150713-0028**

Hand written card, S. Matthews, 40 Settlement Hill, New Ipswich, NH 03071, location & timing of Scoping meeting: miles away, timing gives no time to prepare

**20150713-0029**

Hand written card, Tim Waship, PO Box 143, Temple, NH 03084, when is FERC going to hold Scoping meeting for New Ipswich, Temple, Greenville and Mason, NH.

**20150713-0030**

Hand written card, Timothy Somero, 40 Old Tenney Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, well water is precious, require least intrusive construction method - hammering & cutting

**20150713-0034**

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Subject The Proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline and Compressor station in New Hampshire.

Date: July 1, 2015

Hello,

How is this happening? How are we in a position where our way of life is being changed and we have no control, no voice? Please listen to our cries for help, this is the most important letter I will probably ever write.

My name is Chris Long. Like so many people who are ready for a change out of the hustle and bustle, I moved to New Ipswich, New Hampshire 17 years ago. I have good neighbors, 5 acres of land, fresh air, peace and quiet I have to travel a half hour to Home Depot or Lowe's but eh nothing is perfect, ha ha!

My typical week day is my morning commute from my home to Monadnock Hospital in Peterborough. Along the way I drive past some camps, an elementary school, the Greenville reservoir, through Temple center, onto RT 101 over Temple Mountain and cut across to where I work never hitting a traffic light. It is truly a wonderful part of the state to live.

Three years ago I changed my life and began running, and haven't stopped since. I am not very fast, but I love how it makes me feel. And with every 5k I participate in, I meet more people who also love where we live in this great state of New Hampshire.

Please give me a chance to explain what it is like for me. Running slang, my heart beating, the sound of my breath, my feet hitting the pavement, an occasional car, the sound and feel of the wind, the birds. I pass by a neighbor's house, a small running stream to my left, another couple of neighbor's houses, then the buzzing of the power lines overhead as I pass under them. To my left as I run is woods....lots of woods. This is the proposed site of the compressor station for the pipeline....then it's past the open fields of cattle, past more neighbors. As I continue on my right is the Temple Elementary School, past a couple more houses to my half way mark at the Greenville drinking water reservoir, then I turn around and continue back. It's a lot more fun than it sounds, ha ha!

I know there are changes that need to be made to stop our dependence for overseas fuels. I do understand our needs for alternative sources of energy and I am on board with those ideas; but having a compressor station put in New Ipswich is not the right answer.

I don't have all the answers yet, but I am trying to become educated and at this point I have no choice but to find out as much as possible, hopefully I'm not too late.

I am hearing that this 10-acre site will be one of the biggest, and the noise will change our way of life here. I hear so many negative things about what this project is going to do to the homeowners who live their lives here in New Hampshire, and only positives for the gas company.

I am begging you to please help us if you can.

Christopher Long  
182 Senator Tobey Highway RT45  
New Ipswich NH 03071

(my mailing address Greenville post office delivers my mail)

Christopher Long  
182 Tobey Highway  
Greenville NH 03048

**20150713-0037**

July 6, 2015

Kimberly Bose,

The Northeast Direct pipeline in New Hampshire is a bad idea.

Recently, Pope Francis remarked that global warming has been primarily driven by carbon emissions in high-income countries. Nations must develop a plan of action to address this problem and advance a 'bold cultural revolution' to change how people interact with nature.

The corporate gains of Kinder Morgan have become a priority in the name of the rampant consumerism of a throwaway culture. Pipeline projects are similar to the waterways this country polluted one hundred years ago. At the end of The Pipeline Era we will not only have to clean up and undo the mess of the probably non-existent corporations that built them in addition to mourning the toxic accidents and tragedies that occurred along the way.

Call for a revolution against pipelines in New Hampshire, today.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Nancy Harm  
60 Wolf Tree Road  
Winchester, NH 03470  
603-630-0712

**20150713-0039**

sklawyers, pllc  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW  
PROFESSIONAL LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY

Karyn Krause Cumberland, Esq.  
Messsa M. Zani, Esq.  
Katherine Buddia Stearas, Esq.  
Nicolc RDion, Rsq.licensed Massachusetts only  
Christopher E.Ratte', Esq.  
Deborah M. Baain, Esq.  
Sheliah M. Kaufold, Rsq.  
Lynne R. Rocheleutb Esq.  
Keri A. Welch, Esq.  
Theodore R. Whitieabms, Rsq.  
Mae Bradshasr, Esq.

July 6, 2015

Allen Fore, VP  
Kinder Morgan  
9 Park Street  
Suite 200  
Boston MA 02018

RE: Fox Rnn Road, Milford NH

Northeast Energy Direct Project (NED) - FERC 1 PF14-22-000

Dear Mr. Fore:

On February 4, 2015, I wrote to you to advise you that Kinder Morgan and its agents did not have permission to enter Fox Run Road in Milford, New Hampshire (copy enclosed). As I explained to you, Fox Run Road is Privately owned and maintained by the residents it serves. Per my February 4 letter, I advised that Kinder Morgan and its agents were precluded from entering Fox Run Road for any reason.

Almost immediately, Kinder Morgan entered Fox Run Road for a site review. Then, on July 2, 2015, AE-COM, an agent for Kinder Morgan, also entered Fox Run Road to collect environmental data. I am unclear why Kinder Morgan has opted to violate the directive the owners of Fox Run Road have issued, however, I assure you that should Kinder Morgan or its agents enter Fox Run Road in the future, it will be treated as a trespass and pursued both criminally and civilly.

Sincerely,

Sheliah M. Kaufold

cc: FERC

-----

sklawyers, pllc  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW  
PROFESSIONAL LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY

February 4, 2015

Allen Fore, Vice President

Kinder Morgan

9 Park Street

Suite 200

Boston MA 02108

RE: Northeast Energy Direct Project (NED)

PERC Docket PF14-22-000

Dear Kinder Morgan:

I am writing in behalf of the Fox Run Road Village District (PRRVD) located in Milford, New Hampshire. The PRRVD is an organization established under NH RSA 52 for the purpose of maintaining the private road that services the homes located on Fox Run Road. Fox Run Road is not a town road and has been specifically rejected by the Town as such. Therefore, the Town of Milford does not maintain Fox Run Road, does not plow it in the winter or repair it in the spring after the thaw devastates the unpaved, dirt surface. Many years ago, the residents of Fox Run Road voted to establish a village district for the purpose of forming an organization to plow, maintain and repair the road and to raise the necessary funds to do so. Each resident contributes an annual fee for these purposes.

The NED Project as proposed will be located just below the PRRVD. Fox Run Road leads directly to the power lines and proposed pipeline area. However, Kinder Morgan should be aware that due to the fragile nature of Fox Run Road, and its status as a private road, Kinder Morgan does not have PRRVD's permission to utilize Fox Run Road to access the project area. Any such attempt by Kinder Morgan or its agents to utilize Fox Run Road for any purpose will be considered a trespass and addressed accordingly.

If you have any questions regarding this notice, please direct them to my attention. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sheliah M. Kaufold, Esquire

cc: FERC

**20150713-0040**

**NEW HAMPSHIRE DIVISION OF HISTORICAL RESOURCES**  
State of New Hampshire, Department of Cultural Resources 603-271-3483  
19 Pillsbury Street, Concord, NH 03301-3570 603-271-3558  
TDD Access: Relay NH 1-800-735-2964 FAX 603-271-3433

July 6, 2015

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

Re: Request for Comment on NOI to Prepare EIS for the Planned Northeast Energy Direct Project,  
Docket No. PF14-22-000, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC. (DHR 1611 I)

Dear Secretary Bose:

The Division of Historical Resources (Division) has received the Notice of Intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the planned Northeast Energy Direct Project as cited above. To the Division's understanding, this Project will include approximately 71 miles of pipeline, plus approximately 7 miles of laterals, one compressor station and one meter station located within a number of towns in Cheshire, Hillsborough and Rockingham Counties. The Division understands that this notice is being used to initiate Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act with the applicable State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPOs). To date the Division has not participated in the development of the Area of Potential Effect (APE) for either direct or indirect effects.

With this letter the Division is requesting Section 106 consultation on project-specific APEs as the project develops. At a minimum the Division agrees with an APE that encompasses all areas subject to ground disturbances, including the width of proposed mainline and lateral corridors.

Once again, we look forward to consultation on this project.

Sincerely,

Edna Feighner, Archaeologist  
Review and Compliance Coordinator

Cc: Michael Letson, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company LLC  
Eric Tomasi, FERC

**20150713-0041**

July 2, 2015

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

Dear Secretary,

My name is Leslie Carey and I live at 34 Reno Road, Averill Park, NY 12018

I am one of your constituents. I have learned about Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline's NED Proposal and have concerns.

I am concerned about...

- the fact that NY citizens will NOT receive any benefit from this project, but will take all the risks
- the high pressure in the proposed pipeline

- the pipeline going under the Hudson River
- the possible health and safety risks
- leaks and explosions
- chemical off-gassing at compressor stations
- the impact on property values
- the impact on our rural character
- the impact on tourism
- what happens when the pipelines are abandoned
- the dangerous chemicals in the gas
- what fracking has done to communities where the gas is extracted
- the increasing incidences of accidents along pipelines
- the transmission of fracked gas; fracking being a practice and industry causing irreversible damage to people, communities, and the environment. The toxic chemicals in fracked gas are released to the environment in the drilling fields, along the transmission lines, compressor stations, pigging operations and via old, leaky distribution systems in population centers.
- chemical off gassing of over 60 known carcinogens, neurotoxins and endocrine disrupters that can create serious health risks.
- added infrastructure costs to towns
- nuisance to citizens during construction

I hope that you will:

- learn more about this issue
- hold hearings about these issues
- encourage a statewide ban on fracking
- Support a ban on this pipeline within the Federal bureaucracy, with FERC, with the Congress and with the President.
- Support additional funding to strengthen the EPA and FERC.
- Encourage the President to appoint people with environmental expertise to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.
- Introduce legislation in both houses of Congress to strengthen the EPA and its oversight of this industry and to rescind the “Halliburton loophole.” The exemptions from the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, the Safe Drinking Water Act, the Superfund Act and the Freedom of Information Act granted to the Oil and Gas Industry in the 2005 Energy Act make no sense.
- Require air quality, drinking water and radioactivity testing on a regular basis at compressor stations and pigging operations.
- Pass legislation, as they have done in Massachusetts, to repairs leaks in distribution lines.
- Require gas companies to be more vigilant in repairing leaks in transmission lines.
- Require gas companies to have the same safety procedures for rural and higher density population areas in transmission lines. Put odorants in all gas, require stronger gauge piping and closer spacing of shut-off valves in all areas.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Leslie Carey  
34 Reno Road

Averill Park, Ny 12018

**20150713-0042**

July 6, 2015

Dear Congresswoman Kuster,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Congresswoman, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England.

The pipeline construction process will pollute our air, contaminate our aquifers, wells and other water resources. Over 800 NH families will lose their homes and it will destroy conservation lands. It will harm the tourist industry and rural character of New Hampshire.

The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent “blow downs” where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline. These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis and will eventually cause ruin to all of New Hampshire.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station, including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby. Please don't let this happen!

The property values near the pipeline and compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit. Help us save our homes and New Hampshire!

Congresswoman Kuster, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

Roger & Joan Crooker

cc: FERC

**20150713-0043**

July 6, 2015

Dear Governor Hassan,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Governor, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England.

The pipeline construction process will pollute our air, contaminate our aquifers, wells and other water resources. Over 800 NH families will lose their homes and it will destroy conservation lands. It will harm the tourist industry and rural character of New Hampshire.

The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent “blow downs” where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline. These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis and will eventually cause ruin to all of New Hampshire.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station, including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby. Please don't let this happen!

The property values near the pipeline and compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit. Help us save our homes and New Hampshire!

Governor Hassan, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

signed ??

cc: FERC

**20150713-0044**

July 6, 2015

Dear Senator Ayotte,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Senator, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England.

The pipeline construction process will pollute our air, contaminate our aquifers, wells and other water resources. Over 800 NH families will lose their homes and it will destroy conservation lands. It will harm the tourist industry and rural character of New Hampshire.

The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent "blow downs" where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline. These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis and will eventually cause ruin to all of New Hampshire.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station, including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby. Please don't let this happen!

The property values near the pipeline and compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit. Help us save our homes and New Hampshire!

Senator Ayotte, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

signed ??

cc: FERC

**20150713-0045**

July 6, 2015

Dear Congressman Guinta,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Congressman, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England.

The pipeline construction process will pollute our air, contaminate our aquifers, wells and other water resources. Over 800 NH families will lose their homes and it will destroy conservation lands. It will harm the tourist industry and rural character of New Hampshire.

The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent "blow downs" where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline. These gasses can travel anywhere from

one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis and will eventually cause ruin to all of New Hampshire.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station, including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby. Please don't let this happen!

The property values near the pipeline and compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit. Help us save our homes and New Hampshire!

Congressman Guinta, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

signed ??

cc: FERC

**20150713-0046**

July 6, 2015

Dear Congresswoman Kuster,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Congresswoman, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England.

The pipeline construction process will pollute our air, contaminate our aquifers, wells and other water resources. Over 800 NH families will lose their homes and it will destroy conservation lands. It will harm the tourist industry and rural character of New Hampshire.

The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent "blow downs" where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline. These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis and will eventually cause ruin to all of New Hampshire.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station, including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby. Please don't let this happen!

The property values near the pipeline and compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit. Help us save our homes and New Hampshire!

Congresswoman Kuster, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

signed ??

cc: FERC

**20150713-0047**

July 6, 2015

Dear Governor Hassan,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Governor, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England.

The pipeline construction process will pollute our air, contaminate our aquifers, wells and other water resources. Over 800 NH families will lose their homes and it will destroy conservation lands. It will harm the tourist industry and rural character of New Hampshire.

The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent “blow downs” where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline. These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis and will eventually cause ruin to all of New Hampshire.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station, including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby. Please don't let this happen!

The property values near the pipeline and compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit. Help us save our homes and New Hampshire!

Governor Hassan, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

Nat & Holly Crooker

cc: FERC

#### **20150713-0048**

July 6, 2015

Dear Senator Ayotte,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Senator, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England.

The pipeline construction process will pollute our air, contaminate our aquifers, wells and other water resources. Over 800 NH families will lose their homes and it will destroy conservation lands. It will harm the tourist industry and rural character of New Hampshire.

The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent “blow downs” where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline. These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis and will eventually cause ruin to all of New Hampshire.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station, including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby. Please don't let this happen!

The property values near the pipeline and compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit. Help us save our homes and New Hampshire!

Senator Ayotte, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

Nat & Holly Crooker

cc: FERC

**20150713-0049**

July 6, 2015

Dear Senator Shaheen,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Senator, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England.

The pipeline construction process will pollute our air, contaminate our aquifers, wells and other water resources. Over 800 NH families will lose their homes and it will destroy conservation lands. It will harm the tourist industry and rural character of New Hampshire.

The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent “blow downs” where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline. These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis and will eventually cause ruin to all of New Hampshire.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station, including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby. Please don't let this happen!

The property values near the pipeline and compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit. Help us save our homes and New Hampshire!

Senator Shaheen, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

Nat & Holly Crooker

cc: FERC

**20150713-0050**

July 6, 2015

Dear Congressman Guinta,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Congressman, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England.

The pipeline construction process will pollute our air, contaminate our aquifers, wells and other water resources. Over 800 NH families will lose their homes and it will destroy conservation lands. It will harm the tourist industry and rural character of New Hampshire.

The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent “blow downs” where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline. These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis and will eventually cause ruin to all of New Hampshire.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station, including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby. Please don't let this happen!

The property values near the pipeline and compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit. Help us save

our homes and New Hampshire!

Congressman Guinta, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

Roger & Joan Crooker

cc: FERC

**20150713-0054**

July 6, 2015

Dear Congressman Guinta,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Congressman, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England.

The pipeline construction process will pollute our air, contaminate our aquifers, wells and other water resources. Over 800 NH families will lose their homes and it will destroy conservation lands. It will harm the tourist industry and rural character of New Hampshire.

The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent "blow downs" where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline. These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis and will eventually cause ruin to all of New Hampshire.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station, including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby. Please don't let this happen!

The property values near the pipeline and compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit. Help us save our homes and New Hampshire!

Congressman Guinta, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

Nat & Holly Crooker

cc: FERC

**20150713-0055**

July 6, 2015

Dear Senator Shaheen,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Senator, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England.

The pipeline construction process will pollute our air, contaminate our aquifers, wells and other water resources. Over 800 NH families will lose their homes and it will destroy conservation lands. It will harm the tourist industry and rural character of New Hampshire.

The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent "blow downs" where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline. These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis and will eventually cause ruin to all of New

Hampshire.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station, including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby. Please don't let this happen!

The property values near the pipeline and compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit. Help us save our homes and New Hampshire!

Senator Shaheen, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

Roger & Joan Crooker

cc: FERC

**20150713-0056**

July 6, 2015

Dear Senator Ayotte,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Senator, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England.

The pipeline construction process will pollute our air, contaminate our aquifers, wells and other water resources. Over 800 NH families will lose their homes and it will destroy conservation lands. It will harm the tourist industry and rural character of New Hampshire.

The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent "blow downs" where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline. These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis and will eventually cause ruin to all of New Hampshire.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station, including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby. Please don't let this happen!

The property values near the pipeline and compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit. Help us save our homes and New Hampshire!

Senator Ayotte, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

Roger & Joan Crooker

cc: FERC

**20150713-0057**

July 6, 2015

Dear Governor Hassan,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Governor, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England.

The pipeline construction process will pollute our air, contaminate our aquifers, wells and other water resources. Over 800 NH families will lose their homes and it will destroy conservation lands. It will harm the tourist industry and rural character of New Hampshire.

The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent “blow downs” where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline. These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis and will eventually cause ruin to all of New Hampshire.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station, including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby. Please don't let this happen!

The property values near the pipeline and compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit. Help us save our homes and New Hampshire!

Governor Hassan, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

Roger & Joan Crooker

cc: FERC

**20150713-0058**

July 6, 2015

Dear Congresswoman Kuster,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Congresswoman, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England.

The pipeline construction process will pollute our air, contaminate our aquifers, wells and other water resources. Over 800 NH families will lose their homes and it will destroy conservation lands. It will harm the tourist industry and rural character of New Hampshire.

The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent “blow downs” where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline. These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis and will eventually cause ruin to all of New Hampshire.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station, including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby. Please don't let this happen!

The property values near the pipeline and compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit. Help us save our homes and New Hampshire!

Congresswoman Kuster, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

Nat & Holly Crooker

cc: FERC

**20150713-0068**

Brian W. Callahan

20 Blacksmith Rd.  
Dracut Mass. 01826  
email: bcallahan01comcast.net

Kimberly D. Bose  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, N.E.  
Washington, DC 20426

REF: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
Northeast Energy Dhuct Project  
Docket No. PF14-22-000

Dear Ms. Bose,

As an affected property owner I have recently been notified by the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Group(Kinder Morgan) that they plan to build an industrial compressor station within 500 yards of my home. I believe the proposed 36 in. high pressure pipe line and the industrial compressor station proposed so close to our residential neighborhood will be a significant safety risk to my family and my neighbors. Ours is a very quiet neighborhood, one acre lots are the norm. Most of us have lived 30 years or more in the neighborhood and an industrial project of this magnitude is totally out of place and should not be allowed. There are other ways of addressing New England's energy needs without destroying our neighborhoods.

Consider for a moment the ramifications of this project to the local homeowners. We will have to live with toxic air quality, significant noise on a 24hr/7day basis, random blow downs of the gas pipe relief valves and the ever present risk of a catastrophic gas explosion.

The pipeline and compressor station doesn't belong here.

If this plan is implemented I and all my neighbors will lose a significant amount of the value of our home, not to mention the peace and tranquility of our homes and neighborhoods. No one will want to consider moving their family into the "blast zone". Approximately 200 homes are affected here in my neighborhood alone.

There are so many other alternatives. Please demand that Kinder Morgan alters their design or better yet refuse to issue a permit to build this pipeline. Make Kinder Morgan come up with a better less disruptive plan to all the communities involved.

Sincerely,

Brian W. Callahan

**20150713-0069**

**TOWN OF RINDGE**  
30 PAYSON HILL ROAD  
RINDGE, NH 03461  
Tel. (603) 899-5181 Fax (603) 899-2101 TDD 1-800-735-2964  
[www.town.rindge.nh.us](http://www.town.rindge.nh.us)

June 24, 2015

Norman Bay, Chairman  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

Kimberly D. Bose  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE

Washington, DC 20426

Nathaniel J. Davis  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Project  
Docket Number PF-14-22-000

Ladies and Gentlemen:

We, the Selectmen of the Town of Rindge, New Hampshire, formally request that you schedule a pre-filing scoping meeting in Rindge in order to allow our residents an adequate opportunity to express their views and concerns regarding the proposed natural gas pipeline. We have excellent facilities here in Rindge for such a meeting and we will work with you to establish a mutually convenient date and time.

Rindge is a unique community with many special characteristics and we believe that it is imperative that our residents be given the opportunity to engage in a constructive and transparent dialogue with FERC about the pipeline and its proposed route before any final decision is made.

Thank you for your consideration of this request and we look forward to meeting with you in Rindge.

Very truly yours,

Robert Hamilton  
Chairman

Roberta Oeser  
Selectman

Daniel Aho  
Selectman

**20150713-0070**

July 2, 2015  
Kimberly D. Bose  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

Dear Secretary,

My name is Donald Clendaniel and I live at 34 Reno Road, Averill Park, NY 12018

I am one of your constituents. I have learned about Kinder Morgan's Tennessee Gas Pipeline's NED Proposal and have concerns.

I am concerned about...

- the fact that NY citizens will NOT receive any benefit from this project, but will take all the risks
- the high pressure in the proposed pipeline
- the pipeline going under the Hudson River
- the possible health and safety risks
- leaks and explosions
- chemical off-gassing at compressor stations
- the impact on property values
- the impact on our rural character
- the impact on tourism
- what happens when the pipelines are abandoned
- the dangerous chemicals in the gas
- what fracking has done to communities where the gas is extracted

- the increasing incidences of accidents along pipelines
- the transmission of fracked gas; fracking being a practice and industry causing irreversible damage to people, communities, and the environment. The toxic chemicals in fracked gas are released to the environment in the drilling fields, along the transmission lines, compressor stations, pigging operations and via old, leaky distribution systems in population centers.
- chemical off gassing of over 60 known carcinogens, neurotoxins and endocrine disrupters that can create serious health risks.
- added infrastructure costs to towns
- nuisance to citizens during construction

I hope that you will:

- learn more about this issue
- hold hearings about these issues
- encourage a statewide ban on fracking
- Support a ban on this pipeline within the Federal bureaucracy, with FERC, with the Congress and with the President.
- Support additional funding to strengthen the EPA and FERC.
- Encourage the President to appoint people with environmental expertise to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.
- Introduce legislation in both houses of Congress to strengthen the EPA and its oversight of this industry and to rescind the “Halliburton loophole.” The exemptions from the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, the Safe Drinking Water Act, the Superfund Act and the Freedom of Information Act granted to the Oil and Gas Industry in the 2005 Energy Act make no sense.
- Require air quality, drinking water and radioactivity testing on a regular basis at compressor stations and pigging operations.
- Pass legislation, as they have done in Massachusetts, to repairs leaks in distribution lines.
- Require gas companies to be more vigilant in repairing leaks in transmission lines.
- Require gas companies to have the same safety procedures for rural and higher density population areas in transmission lines. Put odorants in all gas, require stronger gauge piping and closer spacing of shut-off valves in all areas.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Donald Clendaniel  
34 Reno Road  
Averill Park, Ny 12018

**20150713-0071**

July 2, 2015  
Kimberly D. Bose  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

Dear Secretary,

My name is Matthew Morley and I live at 34 Reno Road, Averill Park, NY 12018

I am one of your constituents. I have learned about Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline’s NED Proposal

and have concerns.

I am concerned about...

- the fact that NY citizens will NOT receive any benefit from this project, but will take all the risks
- the high pressure in the proposed pipeline
- the pipeline going under the Hudson River
- the possible health and safety risks
- leaks and explosions
- chemical off-gassing at compressor stations
- the impact on property values
- the impact on our rural character
- the impact on tourism
- what happens when the pipelines are abandoned
- the dangerous chemicals in the gas
- what fracking has done to communities where the gas is extracted
- the increasing incidences of accidents along pipelines
- the transmission of fracked gas; fracking being a practice and industry causing irreversible damage to people, communities, and the environment. The toxic chemicals in fracked gas are released to the environment in the drilling fields, along the transmission lines, compressor stations, pigging operations and via old, leaky distribution systems in population centers.
- chemical off gassing of over 60 known carcinogens, neurotoxins and endocrine disrupters that can create serious health risks.
- added infrastructure costs to towns
- nuisance to citizens during construction

I hope that you will:

- learn more about this issue
- hold hearings about these issues
- encourage a statewide ban on fracking
- Support a ban on this pipeline within the Federal bureaucracy, with FERC, with the Congress and with the President.
- Support additional funding to strengthen the EPA and FERC.
- Encourage the President to appoint people with environmental expertise to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.
- Introduce legislation in both houses of Congress to strengthen the EPA and its oversight of this industry and to rescind the “Halliburton loophole.” The exemptions from the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, the Safe Drinking Water Act, the Superfund Act and the Freedom of Information Act granted to the Oil and Gas Industry in the 2005 Energy Act make no sense.
- Require air quality, drinking water and radioactivity testing on a regular basis at compressor stations and pigging operations.
- Pass legislation, as they have done in Massachusetts, to repairs leaks in distribution lines.
- Require gas companies to be more vigilant in repairing leaks in transmission lines.
- Require gas companies to have the same safety procedures for rural and higher density population areas in transmission lines. Put odorants in all gas, require stronger gauge piping and closer spacing of shut-off

valves in all areas.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Matthew Morley  
34 Reno Road  
Averill Park, NY 12018

**20150713-0072**

jean Darnell  
89 Kullgren Rd  
Temple NH 03084

To Whom It May Concern  
FERC Docket 1 PF14-22

Please send me the timeline for the scoping sessions for the towns of New Ipswich, NH, Temple, NH, Greenville, NH and Mason, NH. They each need to have a separate scoping session and need to know when they will take place. They will each be harmed by the potential siting of your 80,000 horse power compressor station.

We have not received any notice of any public meetings as of yet.

Additionally I would hope that the meetings would be held at a time that the majority of residents could attend.

Thank you,  
Jean Darnell

**20150713-0077**

**STOP THE  
NED PIPELINE**

Yes...conservation, insulation, energy  
efficiency education, install renewable  
energy methods, Rx leaky pipes, protect our  
farms and forests, protect our precious  
water, preserve our air, preserve this planet  
for kids and Grandkids, write your  
representatives TODAY

**NO PIPELINE,  
NO COMPRESSOR PLANT,  
NO FRACKED GAS,  
NO EXPORTED GAS**

**20150713-0078**

**Town of Warwick  
Planning Board**  
12 Athol Road  
Warwick, MA 01378  
Phone 978-544-6315  
PAX: 978-544-6499

July 5, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., Docket No. PF14-22-000  
Northeast Energy Direct Project (“NED Project”)

Dear Chairman Bose:

The Town of Warwick, MA, Planning Board is writing in reference to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company’s (TGP) October 2, 2014 approved use of pre-filing procedures, and release of Resource Report 1 and Resource Report 10, Dated November, 2014, for the proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project.14.11.14. We request that you require our issues to be addressed.

#### **DOCUMENTATION OF NEED FOR PIPELINE**

Resource Report 1 (RR-1) Section 1.1.1 states that 6.0 Bcf/d of natural gas will be needed by 2020 and 10.0 Bcf/d by 2035 in New England and proposes to build a 2.2 Bcf/d natural gas pipeline to supply it. However, it only has long-term firm commitments for 500 dekatherms. The pipeline is scheduled to go into operation in 2018.

1. If the demand in 2020 will be 6.0 Bcf/day, just 2 years after the pipeline is commissioned, why not size the pipe for the need?
2. If the need is so great within New England, why would TGP suggest exporting the gas out of the country?
3. TGP should explain why it would want its pipes to be used to export gas.
4. The purpose of the pipeline is to serve a documented need. If the documented need is 500 dekatherms, why isn’t the pipe sized for that?
5. The need for the pipeline is partly based on the price of the natural gas. Some have stated that the price of natural gas in Massachusetts will be lower with the pipeline, but others have stated that since the price of gas in Europe and Asia is 2 to 4 times higher than in the United States, exporting will not result in lower prices in New England. The stated goal by TGP is to reduce gas prices and assure gas supplies in New England. The issue of price and its relationship to exporting gas out of the country should be looked at carefully and fully documented by TGP.
6. While FERC’s authority ends at the national border, the impact of whether or not the gas is export is of significant regional concern. If TGP is not interested in supplying gas to entities outside of the US that should be clearly stated. If it claims that it must sell to any approved buyer the impact of that on prices with the region should be considered, even if there is no immediate plan to export any gas.

#### **RR-1, Section 1.3.2.2 RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION**

1. Massachusetts law requiring the covering of trenches at night and when not working should be addressed.
2. SURFICIAL GEOLOGY: The homes in our region have private wells and septic systems. The pipeline can provide an avenue for pollutants, impact private wells both up-gradient and down-gradient from the pipeline, and impact the water yield from hard rock wells and possibly pollute them with perchlorate. The glacial deposits in valleys are complex layers of sand, clay and gravel. Digging an 8 foot deep trench can have significant impacts on water yields from shallow wells and on septic fields at distances exceeding 250 feet from the trench, which should be considered when TGP is doing monitoring.

#### **RR-1, Section 1.3.2.1, 1.3.2.7, 1.3.2.9, 1.3.9.9.1 & 2. 1.3.3.9, and other sections, TOWN OF WARWICK CONSERVATION COMMISSION**

In Massachusetts the Conservation Commissions function as agents of the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection regarding wetlands and should be specifically mentioned as such when discussing

wetland issues.

## **REPLICATING WETLANDS**

RR-1, Section 1.1 Cleared Areas- At an Open House a Kinder Morgan representative stated that wetlands in Massachusetts need not be replicated because the impact of the pipeline is temporary. That is not how it works in Massachusetts. Crossing THROUGH a wetland damages it in many ways, some obvious and some more subtle. For this reason it is standard practice in this state to require wetland replication when wetlands on the scale of this project will be crossed pursuant to MGL Chapter 131 Section 40. This is a critical issue to address.

## **PERMITS, LICENSES, APPROVALS AND CERTIFICATIONS**

Table 1.6-1 is incomplete, and should include the following:

MGL Chapter 61 — The Forest Tax Law: Forest land with a management plan, certified and registered in the Registry of Deeds, requires an approved Cutting Plan for any significant harvest of trees. Failure to manage for timber production, as would happen with a clear cut for a right of way or cutting without an approved cutting plan, results in decertification of that portion and the possibility of a conveyance tax and repayment with interest of back taxes saved. If the area of managed forest is reduced below 10 acres, the entire parcel is decertified with possible financial penalties.

MGL Chapter 184, Sections 30 to 33 — Conservation Lands: Gives Article 97 protection to private lands with a Conservation Restriction, Lands in Massachusetts with this protection should be specifically identified in the resource report.

MGL Chapter 40, Section 1SC — Scenic Roads: Some roads in rural area are Scenic Roads, which require a joint hearing before the Town Planning Board and the Town Tree Warden for the cutting of any trees within the public right of way, and before the Planning Board for removal of any portion of a stone wall within or abutting the public way. If a tree or trees in the public way covered by the Scenic Roads Act as adopted by the town must be cut to cross a road then a hearing must be held. We feel there is nothing in the federal regulations that addresses the scenic quality of roadside trees and request it be addressed.

MGL Chapter 87, Sections 1-6: Shade Tree Law: Only by authority of the Tree Warden may trees in the public way be cut and then only after a public hearing advertised and held as specified in Sections 3 and S. If any objection before or during the hearing is raised, Section 4 requires the additional approval of the Selectmen. Trees in the public way require a hearing before being cut. We believe this is not preempted by federal regulations, but in any case request it be addressed

MGL Chapter 40A and Zoning By-laws of the Town of Warwick SECTION TWO: PERMITTED AND PROHIBITED USES, C. USES ALLOWED BY SPECIAL PERMIT: “The following uses are allowed only by a Special Permit issued by the Zoning Board of Appeals” 3. “Any commercial or industrial use...” Warwick is zoned as a single district -Agricultural/Residential. The pipeline is a commercial or industrial use and would require such a hearing. We are not clear whether or not this is preempted by federal regulations and request it be addressed.

MGL Chapter 61 — Forest Tax Law: Forests certified by the state forester and registered in the Registry of Deeds as improving the quantity and quality of a continuous forest crop. Clearing for the pipeline right of way would not meet the standards, so the land or the portion of the land cleared for the pipeline would have to be decertified. Who will pay for the new, amended management plan with it forest type mapping, etc.? How will the possible tax penalties and conveyance tax involved in the taking be handled? This is an area ignored in the Resource Report but these lands and the method of dealing with them should be addressed.

## **THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES**

RR-1, Section 1.8.2.1-The route of the pipeline seems to suggest that no effort was made to avoid critical habitats which are clearly identified on GIS maps. Why there is no apparent effort to avoid them should be explained. Copies of maps showing NHESP BioMap 2 Core Habitat and Critical Natural Landscape, NHESP Living Waters Core Habitat and Critical Supporting Watersheds, Parcel Boundaries, Pipeline Lo-

cation, Certified Vernal Pools as of 2012, NHESP Priority Habitats of Rare Species as of 2008, Wetland Boundaries, Permanently Protected Lands, Limited Protection Lands and Chapter 61 Lands are available to TGP are available and should be used, included in the Resource Report and locations referenced.

### **VERNAL POOLS —SECTION 401**

The Federal Clean Water Act Sections 401 and 404 and The Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act provide protection to vernal pools. Many town Conservation Commissions have an ongoing program of Vernal Pool identification, verification and certification. The most current publicly circulated maps do not reflect the most recent certifications, so the most recent data must be used, not old maps. The date and source of the information used in Resource Reports concerning vernal pools should be stated.

### **ENERGY CONSERVATION**

RR-10, Section 10.1.1-TGP says, “While energy conservation reduces demand for energy sources ... implementation of sufficient energy conservation measures to eliminate the need for the proposed project is not feasible in the short term.” This argument is without merit. The proposed pipeline is not a short term solution. It is a long term commitment. The proposed project does not comply with the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Clean Energy and Climate Plan, nor with Franklin Regional Plan for Sustainable Development, which call for increased energy conservation and renewable energy generation. Public convenience and necessity dictate a far more detailed analysis to document necessity, including a review of recent progress and projections into the future of reducing fossil fuel demand in Massachusetts. Significant alternative sources of energy including wind, solar and biomass are coming online. Significant improvements in energy conservation and energy utilization are also being implemented, such as air heat pumps, LED bulbs, and retrofit insulation which reduce energy use. Massachusetts is recognized as a national leader in energy conservation. The quoted perfunctory statement above and the following Sections (10.1.sto 10.1.10) need to be significantly expanded to fully explain the statement and justify the public convenience and necessity.

### **DETERMINATION OF SERVICE AREA**

U.S. Code Section 717f(f)—”Determination of Service Area: (1) The Commission, after a hearing upon its own motion or upon application, may determine the service area to which each authorization under this section is to be limited. Within such service area as determined by the Commission a natural-gas company may enlarge or extend its facilities for the purpose of supplying increased market demand in such servicing area without further authorization.” We request that the service area be limited to the New England or Massachusetts and that no export of natural gas from this pipeline, nor any pipeline it may connect to, be allowed. By this we mean that since a stated purpose of the pipeline is to reduce the price of gas to New England and to stabilize its cost, then any export of the gas out of the region, whether by interconnection or directly constitutes a breach of the agreement with the region. It should be specifically stated that the service area is limited to New England and shall not be increased either directly or indirectly. Prohibiting export is consistent with the demand study that the applicant used to justify the project, of an unmet demand of 6.0 Bcf/day by 2020 and 10.0 Bcf/day by 2035. If FERC does not choose to specifically define the service area as limited only to New England, then it should require the applicant to clearly explain in detail how the demand it has projected will be met.

The purpose of requiring this limitation is to prove that both FERC and the Applicant are acting in good faith. We want assurance that the stated purpose of the pipeline is just what the applicant is saying it is, and not “a foot in the door” for something larger that would never have been approved if applied for upfront.

### **IMPACT OF GAS LEAKS**

Public convenience and necessity requires that the 2010 study that showed local gas companies were losing 1.7 Bcf/y of natural gas from leaks be considered, as well as the reported savings through conservation of 1.1 Bcf/y and the anticipated impact of the recent legislation in Massachusetts to repair the leaks as these relate to the short and long term demand for natural gas in Massachusetts.

Pursuant to the subsection, the Town of Warwick requests that the Commission “determine the service

area to which (authorization of the TGP pipeline) is to be limited” be New England or Massachusetts and no place beyond. This request is based on the overwhelming advantage to TGP of exporting the gas in its entirety leaving the carrier (Massachusetts alone) of the severe burden of providing a corridor across its pristine northern forests for needed natural gas that will end up entirely in Europe and Asia. The Commission is empowered under Section 717f(f) to assure that any benefits from the pipeline will be fairly allocated with the burden.

### **VERIFICATION OF LONG TERM SUPPLY**

18 U.S. Code Section 717f(e): “...a certificate shall be issued ...if it is found that the applicant is able and willing properly to do the acts and to perform the services proposed and to conform to the provisions of this chapter and the requirements, rules and regulations hereunder, ...otherwise such application shall be denied.” In particular, TGP must show that it is able and willing to provide natural gas to New England, insofar as (a) the Marcellus play may be exhausted or no longer in significant production sooner than the end of the projected lifespan of the pipeline, (b) prices in New England are only a small fraction of the prices in Europe and the Far East, (c) gas from even the sweet spots in the Marcellus play cost more to extract than the maximum for which it can be sold in New England, (d) sale of Marcellus gas within New England may become uneconomical as a result of elimination of federal subsidies including the 0-interest borrowing rights of gas drillers, (e) the alternative gas play: Utica Shale, has much smaller reserves than Marcellus and is more expensive to develop, and like Marcellus, at most its sweet spots are economically developable. Public convenience and necessity require that TGP provide gas to New England users in priority over foreign users and that accordingly appropriate assurances must be placed in the certificate. TGP is likely unable or unwilling to do this on its own, and accordingly certificate conditions accomplishing this end are necessary. Public convenience and necessity require that the relative climate impacts of hydro-fractured (fracked) natural gas and other fossil fuels be established by FERC before a certificate issues, insofar as recent studies have shown that through leakage in production, transportation and consumption, the climatic impacts of fracked gas and in particular the gas to be carried by this pipeline are as much as 3 times worse than coal and that for this reason state and local controls prohibiting the use of natural gas may shortly be necessitated under the Clean Air Act. Additionally and alternatively, conditions are needed on the certificate requiring that all existing and future emission requirements be met by the gas and gas users to which TGP delivers within and outside the United States.

### **LOW DEMAND ANALYSIS**

Public convenience and necessity requires the Low Demand Case identified by NESCOE’s Black and Veatch Gas-Electric Study should be fully evaluated from both a cost-benefit standpoint and in regard to its contribution to climate change as an alternative to building the pipeline.

### **ABIDING BY STATE AND LOCAL LAWS**

Public convenience and necessity require TGP abide by all federal, state and local environmental and health and safety requirements, including but not limited to those provisions of Massachusetts and Town of Warwick law referenced herein, and including but not limited to the DCR “zoning” of state forest provisions and the Warwick “Scenic Highways” provisions.

### **IMPACT OF 2% ELECTRICITY TARIFF**

The New England Governors’ council has proposed a 2% tariff on electricity sales within New England to help defray the cost of the pipeline. Public convenience and necessity requires a complete analysis of the useful life of the pipeline and its assured ability to deliver gas for the life of pipeline to justify this burden on the citizens of New England. In addition, the total impact of the 2% tariff on the cost of the pipeline to the applicant and to the customers over the life of the tariff and the life of the pipeline should be included in Resource Report.

### **UNCONSTITUTIONAL TAKING OF PRIVATE PROPERTY**

The United State Constitution Amendment 5: “Private property shall not be taken for public use without

just compensation.” The pipeline serves no public use within the meaning of the Constitution for the reasons including, but not limited to, those stated in this letter with regard to public convenience and necessity. In addition, the constitutional impacts to taking private land by eminent domain for a pipeline that will be exporting gas should be explained in detail if the service area will not be limited to New England.

### **ROUTE ALTERNATIVES**

RR-10, Section 10.3- The Route Alternatives Section does not adequately address values associated with the various route alternatives and these values need to be more fully evaluated due the unique nature of the routes.

### **ROUTE ALTERNATIVES —PRISTINE WETLANDS**

Research has shown that wetlands immediately adjacent to heavily traveled roads, such as Route 2 and the Massachusetts Turnpike, have less value than wetlands in pristine areas, such as a state forest, and very rural areas. The Route Alternatives Analysis does not recognize this and should. Special care should be taken to preserve pristine wetlands in urbanized states such as Massachusetts. The Warwick Conservation Commission and the Warwick Planning Board can assist the proponent locating models in determining how to value pristine wetlands compared to wetlands adjacent to major highways. The “by the numbers” approach of simply counting the number of wetlands and acres is not close to adequate.

### **ROUTE ALTERNATIVES —OVERWEIGHT TRUCKS**

Many New England roads are little more than paved over wagon roads without a good foundation. There was no mention of overweight trucks, their impact on rural roads and bridges. This is a major concern in our area. Many of our bridges are old and substandard. How does the applicant plan to protect this every expensive town resource? Is the applicant willing to bond the roads? If there will be no overweight trucks that should be stated. If there will be overweight trucks, the plan of their deployment and the protection of town maintained roads should be explained.

### **ROUTE ALTERNATIVES —DARK SKIES**

The Town of Northfield has identified in its Plan that it is a Dark Skies community which attracts those visitors who wish to view nocturnal celestial events. Other towns may have similar situations. The impact of compressor station lighting should be specifically addressed and mitigated to come as close as possible to the neighborhood light level.

### **ROUTE ALTERNATIVES —NOISE LEVEL**

Noise levels should meet state standards. In rural areas away from major highways the ambient noise level is low. The ambient noise level should be confirmed during the design phase so that the design meets state standards.

### **ROUTE ALTERNATIVES —PRIME FARMLAND**

In an urbanized environment such as Massachusetts prime farmlands have special value. While pipeline advocates state that they will return prime farmland to its original condition that may not be fully possible. Prime Farmlands should be separately listed as part of each Alternative Route analysis.

### **ROUTE ALTERNATIVES —EMINENT DOMAIN**

The preferred route requires more eminent domain takings than other potential routes. Private lands with conservation restrictions must be taken by eminent domain. Public lands which require a 2/3 vote of both houses of the legislature should be considered as an eminent domain taking. If the proponent is not going to obey the Massachusetts General Laws with regard to The Shade Tree Law, The Scenic Roads Law, and the Zoning Laws, these should also be considered eminent domain takings. These takings should be clearly shown for each alternative compared to the preferred route.

### **ROUTE ALTERNATIVES - NATIONAL TRAILS**

RR-10, Section 10.3—Lists one National Trail, the Appalachian Trail, but there is a second, the New England Scenic Trail. In addition, each crossing of a national trail should be addressed individually. USC Sec-

tion IBSclearly states that pipelines are not to cross National Park Service lands and these two trails are considered National Park Service lands.

#### **ROUTE ALTERNATIVES —QUABBIN TO CARDIGAN SPECIES-MIGRATION CORRIDOR**

Public and private entities in the region through which the pipeline will pass are in the planning stages of a Quabbin-to-Cardigan species-migration corridor necessitated by anticipated climate change. Proponents, to meet the present and future public convenience and necessity, must demonstrate that the pipeline, without relocation to a less-environmentally-sensitive area, will not harm the operation of the Quabbin to Cardigan corridor.

#### **ROUTE ALTERNATIVES —INVASIVE SPECIES CONTROL PLAN AND ACTION**

Without control a corridor, such as proposed, is an invitation for wholesale migration and expansion of invasive species populations. Accordingly, the proponent must prepare and abide by a workable plan for the control of invasive species in the corridor, and other land areas associated with the project. The present and future public convenience and necessity require that the proponent adopt such a plan, submit it to review by independent parties, and provide a performance bond or bonds to those agencies, including the town, the amount of which shall be increased on an annual basis in accordance with any increases in the consumer-price index, which will implement the plan if the proponent fails to do so.

#### **ROUTE ALTERNATIVES —NATIVE AMERICANS**

The proposed route goes through some of the most undeveloped land in Massachusetts with documented Native American populations in pre-colonial times. Because the area is so undeveloped there have been almost no archeological investigations. Public convenience and necessity, as well as the legal rights of Native Americans, require the identification and protection of all American Indian historic or religious sites along the entire pipeline corridor before any construction is commenced, and insofar as any such site is discovered, during any phase of construction, including excavation, that work be immediately stopped until the appropriate interested parties, officials and agencies can determine and take appropriate action.

#### **ROUTE ALTERNATIVES —LEAST NEGATIVE IMPACT**

Public convenience and necessity require that an alternate route, such as along Route 90, Route 2 or a railroad right-of-way rather than one requiring serious environmental impacts and the exercise of eminent domain be chosen.

#### **ROUTE ALTERNATIVES —SURFICIAL GEOLOGIC GIS MAPS**

Massachusetts GIS has data layers for surficial geology in many areas of the state including much of the proposed pipeline routes. This data layer has not been used in the preliminary maps for the possible routes. A better analysis can be done if this information is presented for the preferred route and the alternative routes.

The Town of Warwick respectfully requests that the Commission require responses from TGP for all of the above items so the Commission may conduct a full and fair evaluation of the proposal.

Sincerely,

Edwin B.Cady, Jr  
Chair, Warwick Planning Board

Copy: Selectboard

#### **20150713-5002**

deborah pomerleau, Londonderry, NH.

Dear FERC,

I am a citizen of Londonderry, NH. I grew up in Mason, NH, and graduated from high school in New Ipswich, NH. I have friends all around the state. I went to college at Keene State, and then at the University of NH. I did leave the state for a while. I am back now, and am passionately against this KM pipeline. The

compressor station that is proposed for New Ipswich, NH is gigantic by compressor station horse power. This tiny town can't handle the damage this could bring. The town of Temple is not on the route, but their elementary school is within a half mile of this proposed compressor station. Everywhere you look in this area, there are small, medium, and large swamps, wetlands, marshes. Lots of streams and rivers. Lots of ponds and lakes. The potential damage to this aquifer is too huge to risk. Already a recent article said that ground water in parts of Texas is already polluted from this type of construction. Please do not approve this project.

**20150713-5004**

Barbara Ann Bundas, Northfield, MA.

To Whom it May Concern:

As a part time (summer) resident of Northfield, Massachusetts for over 50 years, I am stating my position against the proposed pipeline project by Kinder Morgan.

In Massachusetts, one of the most energy efficient states in the nation for four years running, demand is not there for the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline. This is a 365-day solution to a 30- to 40-day a year problem. There is no proof this pipeline will save money for the people of Massachusetts or that less impactful alternatives to the environment have been adequately considered.

The pipeline planned by Kinder Morgan will come at the expense of our environment by cutting across miles of environmentally sensitive areas. It will take permanently protected land out of that protection, possibly violating state law.

If there is a need for more gas for New England, the problem is solvable by infrastructure already in place or with build-out much less invasive than Kinder Morgan's. There is an LNG terminal in Everett, MA, and two underwater several miles off the state's North Shore. The latter have been virtually unused except for one time this past winter. This is apparently because of the lack of need. Also, the Access Northeast pipeline project proposed by Spectra to bring more gas across lower New England to the coast promises little pipeline construction through areas where pipelines don't already exist. This makes much more environmental sense. Note that Spectra has agreements already with electric generating plants serving 70 percent of New England's electric customers.

In Northfield, we have the added concern of facing an 80,000 horsepower compressor station, one of the largest east of the Mississippi, to push the gas through the pipes. This compressor station would sit on a site high on a mountain near a frequently used road, emitting noise and light 24 hours a day, seven days a week and promising to wreck the tranquility of this historic valley.

The compressors, through periodic release of gases as well as potential explosions, could pose significant health and safety risks to residents in this small town, where the Main Street is listed on the National Registry. Also, the volunteer fire department is ill equipped to face a major explosion from high-pressure, high-capacity natural gas pipelines and the compressors themselves.

Kinder Morgan has had difficulty signing many companies across Massachusetts to take gas from their proposed pipeline. They may want the business, but not for our needs. The only plausible reason for Kinder Morgan to build this pipeline is to export natural gas overseas and help its bottom line. Spectra will be able to bring gas to the coast if needed through a pipeline path already in place.

Kinder Morgan's proposal is an oversized solution to a non-existing problem, and it promises to ruin some of the most pristine environment in the state.

Thank you,

Barbara Ann Bundas

1 West Lane

Northfield, Massachusetts 01360

**20150713-5006**

Catherine M Holleran, New Milford, PA.

My siblings and I own 22+ acres in Susquehanna County, which is already being cut entirely through (almost 5 acres being taken out of 22, nearly one-quarter of the property) by Constitution Pipeline. We know that Northeast Energy Direct Project is following the exact same corridor, parallel to Constitution. The Constitution is already planning on wiping out a great deal of the woods behind the house, woods that contain many sugar maple trees which we use for our Maple Syrup business, which will be lost forever - there is no replacing 50-100+ year old trees. This corridor behind the house comes very close to the drilled well, the sole water supply for the home. It cuts through three early American stone walls that are intact on the property. It cuts through all our fields. That pipeline is also cutting through our lake property, which fronts on a private spring-fed lake - cutting directly through (under?) a stream inlet that runs through our property, one of the three major inlets into said lake. We have never signed with Constitution. They are taking the route by eminent domain.

Northeast Energy Direct Project is planning to do the VERY SAME THING. This will be a SECOND swath cut through our woods, destroying what little trees and sugar maples we will have left(if any), since it runs to the east of the Constitution in a parallel route, and that is where the last of the woods would remain. It will be EVEN CLOSER to the drilled well. It will AGAIN cut through our lake frontage property and directly through the spring-fed stream which feeds the lake. There is no telling how much damage these TWO monstrous disturbances will cause to the lake ecosystem and surrounding inlet area, not to mention the delicate wildlife of a lake and streams.

All this, despite the fact that we have, on numerous occasions, suggested an alternative to the Constitution route, which they have refused to even consider, apparently. That is, to move the route just WEST of our property (beyond a stone quarry which our neighbor to the west retains), and cut through his uninhabited woods at the top of the mountain, coming back out to the road which then again meets our corner field, one of the fields they are cutting through anyway. This route would completely miss the bulk of our parcel, save our woods and maples, and save the lake frontage property and stream from any disturbance whatsoever. We would then have NO PROBLEM negotiating with any pipeline for passage through just our field. Our neighbor to the west has no maple syrup business to disrupt and destroy, no lake frontage or inlet stream to cut through, no stone walls, no house or drilled well to disturb. No one asked him. He has already told us he would negotiate with the pipelines through his property. WE WILL NOT. This is a viable alternative and no one will discuss it. Now Northeast Energy Direct wants to follow the same route, tearing through our entire 22 acre parcel AGAIN, doing the same damage again. Our answer will be the same. I should think someone would come to their senses and try to take the route of least resistance, when there is one available.

**20150713-5009**

deborah pomerleau, Londonderry, NH.

Please. Please don't approve this pipeline. I don't understand why there needs to be a lateral through Mason into Fitchburg. There is no "need" for gas down in Fitchburg. There are a lot of streams, rivers, ponds, and lakes in this area. This is a poor area. They shouldn't be subjected to this pipeline because of their poverty. This lateral ends in a church parking lot. What does this say about our country? The air pollution from the compressor station that will go there, will hurt the people of this area. How can this lateral line go safely north to south? There is no safe way to place this pipeline through here.

**20150713-5011**

Melissa Komora, Nassau, NY.

The proposed installation of a fracked gas pipeline running through New York State and specifically near my current hometown of Nassau, NY has not been sufficiently demonstrated to be structurally or environmentally sound by the company making the application, Kinder Morgan. Nor are there guarantees of sufficient oversight by FERC or its related agencies in ensuring necessary compliance with its rules, regulations,

and required processes. As a homeowner with an investment in my community, I am most concerned about water impacts --- especially potable water, as many homes in the community are on wells, including mine, as research has demonstrated that natural water systems that are part of well systems have been potentially negatively impacted or even compromised to non-potable or even polluted status by the fracking extraction and transportation process. In addition the proposed compressor station in Nassau as part of the proposed pipeline system is of great concern given its size (considered "super-sized") in relation to other proposed stations along the proposed pipeline route, causing extreme noise pollution in an area that is zoned residential (residential "rural" designation does not lessen the harmful impact). I respectfully request that the FERC specifically address these issues and respond to how the agency will mandate Kinder Morgan to adhere to the necessary guidelines for ensuring safety and quality of life for all residents of the surrounding community. I also request that the FERC respond to how they will provide assurances as to the environmental safety of the project in their review and how FERC verified that the information in the Kinder Morgan application, especially regarding environmental and personal property impact, was accurate.

#### **20150713-5014**

deborah pomerleau, Londonderry, NH.

There are a lot of people out there who don't want this pipeline. You know this, because by your own statistics, 90% of the people on the pipeline route have refused Kinder Morgan. People have spoken. They don't want their property used this way. The power lines that criss cross this country are needed. Everything needs electricity. Gas is different. You don't have to have a gas stove, you can have an electric stove. The same with a furnace. This may be a naive way of looking at it, but it is effective. KM has not demonstrated complete "need" for gas in all of New England. The "need" is not there. KM wants to run a pipeline all the way to the coast. The coast does not "need" gas. KM "wants" to provide a pipeline for profit, for monetary gain. Eminent domain for monetary gain is illegal. This is not a necessary pipeline. Other pipelines can be expanded and other pipelines are being built. "FERC must find that the project is in the public interest, and that overall, the benefits of the project outweigh the adverse impacts." This pipeline is not in the public interest. The benefits of this projects DO NOT outweigh the adverse impacts upon the environment and the people of this country.

#### **20150713-5035**

Letter sent to the Kinder Morgan representatives who stopped by the sanctuary unannounced, Lucas S Meyer of Kinder Morgan, and Martha Hudzinski of Percheron Field Services.

July 10, 2015

To whom it may concern,

Kinder Morgan representatives stopped by the sanctuary 7/8/2015, called us from the street and asked to come in to discuss questions or concerns we may have. While we don't allow visitors without an appointment, I also told the young man that we are a 501c3 qualified charitable organization with a full board, legal counsel, constitution and by-laws. The board had also previously agreed that if any of us were contacted by anyone re: the pipeline we were to defer until the board and our general counsel could also be in the meeting. All of us have questions and concerns and for me to meet privately with your representatives would be in conflict of a board decision. This is not a lot to ask, this is proper conduct.

We would like to meet with Kinder Morgan to discuss the very serious situation here of a protected endangered species pony herd so close to the compressor, a herd that is impossible to evacuate in an emergency.

We have followed all procedures to alert the powers that be of the situation yet have heard nothing that addresses our specific situation. We turned to the media, rare breed experts worldwide, and other outlets across the USA and Canada so our concerns would be heard. They have all responded, very concerned and eager to help. More media coverage is in the queue.

In the next few weeks, a documentary in which we figure quite prominently, is being released all over this

continent. At that time there will be a myriad of media attention here. At that time, since the film's focus is the challenges and dangers the pony faces, we will be vocal about the situation here.

We think it is in everyone's best interest that we meet, most especially for 10 of the only 250 Newfoundland Ponies left in the world.

We are available the last week of July. Early evening is best. Wednesday the 29th at 6 or 7 is ideal and meeting at the sanctuary would be best.

Thank you,

Emily

Emily Chetkowski, President

Villi Poni Farm, Newfoundland Pony Sanctuary

PO Box 371

New Ipswich, NH 03071

Sanctuary: 603-291-0424

villiponifarm@me.com

“Preserving the future, one Newfoundland Pony at a time.”

### **20150713-5038**

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., Docket No. PF14-22-000

As FERC considers Kinder Morgan's Northeast Energy Direct proposal, I ask that you also consider the following from a concerned citizen.

#### **A Pipeline is Part of a Much Larger System**

Pipelines form connections - and pipelines are built to transport a liquid or gas from a source to a destination. No company would plan to build a pipeline without knowing both the pipeline's intended source and destination. This brings us to Kinder Morgan's proposed Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. If constructed, it will connect the natural gas source in Pennsylvania's Marcellus Shale fracking wells with an existing gas pipeline network in Dracut, MA. This begs the question of where the gas will then travel once it reaches Dracut and where it will actually be consumed. What is the final destination for the gas that would be carried in the NED pipeline?

There are currently multiple pipeline proposals for New England that would have the capacity to supply some 4.4 billion cubic feet of natural gas each day. This is four or more times the amount of natural gas that even pipeline proponents believe that New England can use. The NED pipeline alone could supply half of that 4.4 billion cubic feet - and even this amount is more than those proponents claim is needed in New England. It is apparent then that some of the NED gas would be consumed outside of New England. And it is logical to then conclude that this pipeline is being proposed in part to supply gas to the LNG export facilities that are being planned and prepared on the coasts of Maine and Eastern Canada.

So we can identify NED's source as being the Pennsylvania fracking wells and one of its destinations as being East Coast LNG export facilities. I would ask that the FERC commissioners acknowledge this reality and take it into account as they oversee the preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the NED project. FERC needs to consider the additional fracking that would occur at the gas source and the LNG compression and export activity that would occur at the gas destination - because all of these activities would come as a direct result of the construction of this NED pipeline.

What guidance is available to FERC as it prepares an EIS for a pipeline project when that project would also be directly responsible for promoting activities at the gas source and at the gas destination - activities that have their own negative environmental impacts?

The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) is a division of the Executive Office of the President that coordinates Federal environmental efforts in the US and works closely with agencies in the development of environmental and energy policy. The CEQ was created by the same Federal law that created the NEPA review process that FERC follows. In December of 2014, the CEQ issued draft guidance to all Federal agencies on when and how to consider the effects of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and climate change in their evaluation of proposed projects. Under this guidance, a NEPA review should consider emissions from activities occurring prior to or “upstream” of the proposed project, as well as follow-on or “downstream” activities. In addition, the standard consideration of direct, indirect and cumulative effects, as directed by the CEQ regulations, has to be conducted and included in the NEPA review.

So the White House has acknowledged that a natural gas pipeline is not simply a buried pipe together with its associated compressor stations and metering stations – a pipeline is only one part of a much larger system of natural gas infrastructure. And so it is not sufficient for FERC to consider just the negative environmental impacts of the clear cutting, of the road building, of the trenching, of the blasting and of the construction and operation of compressor stations and metering stations that will occur directly along the pipeline’s path. It is also necessary for FERC to address the greenhouse gas and climate change impacts of the upstream and downstream natural gas infrastructure that the NED pipeline would connect to.

In the past, FERC has resisted including such upstream and downstream consequences of new energy infrastructure proposals in their NEPA reviews and in the associated Environmental Impact Statements. FERC complains that it is not their job to do so and that in any case, there are no accepted standards for accomplishing such an evaluation. But it now seems that the Executive branch is very much of the opinion that this is, in fact, precisely FERC’s job. The five sitting FERC commissioners have all been appointed by President Obama and the NED pipeline proposal would seem to provide an excellent opportunity for them to begin to comply with the current Executive branch guidance on including upstream and downstream GHG and climate change impacts in their project reviews.

Another important point for FERC to consider in the preparation of the NED EIS is the fact that this is not simply a proposal to build a pipeline. The environmental impacts are not just those that would occur as a consequence of the damage caused during the construction of the pipeline and its related infrastructure. Further serious damage will result from the operation of the pipeline, and this damage must also be considered. If built, the NED pipeline will carry high pressure fracked gas. This gas is comprised mainly of methane, a potent greenhouse gas that is much more destructive to the atmosphere than carbon dioxide. The gas also contains a variety of known carcinogens and neurotoxins that are introduced both during fracking operations and during the transport of the gas through the pipeline. During the normal operation of such a pipeline, a portion of the gas is burned by gas-powered compressor stations along the pipeline route and additional gas is leaked and at times deliberately released to the atmosphere during pipeline operations. And this is just considering the running of the pipeline itself. As we have seen, guidance from the Executive branch directs that FERC also evaluate the greenhouse gas and climate change impacts of the additional fracking that must occur to procure the gas and the LNG compression needed to ready it for export.

While FERC is preparing the NED Environmental Impact Statement, I strongly request:

1. That FERC be careful to consider not just the negative environmental impacts of the construction of the NED pipeline, but also the ongoing impacts of the operation of this pipeline.
2. That the commissioners honor the guidance from the Executive branch on considering the entirety of the negative environmental impacts of the NED project, including both upstream and downstream greenhouse gas and climate change impacts.

Thank you for your time and your consideration of these concerns.

Nick Miller Groton, MA

**Town of Amherst, New Hampshire**  
P.O. Box 960, 2 Main Street  
Amherst, NH 03031  
1.(603).673.6041 | www.amherstnh.gov

July 10, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. (“TGP”)  
Docket No. PF14-22-000: Proposed Northeast Energy Direct (“NED”)

Dear Ms. Bose:

On Tuesday, June 30, 2015, the Town of Amherst Pipeline Taskforce held a meeting with representatives of the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company/Kinder Morgan. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the alternative options for the pipeline route through Amherst currently under analysis by Kinder Morgan. This served as a follow up to an earlier meeting during which sensitive areas were identified by the Amherst Pipeline Taskforce as priority areas to be avoided. The Town appreciates the efforts of Kinder Morgan to meet the Taskforce’s avoidance criteria between Bon Terrain and the Merrimack town line, and is disappointed that there were no changes to the Option 1 route proposed between the Milford town line and Bon Terrain. We hope that this section of the proposed route will continue to be reviewed and appropriate changes proposed to continue to avoid impacts to existing dense residential development, and a future Workforce Housing Development which has recently received municipal approval.

I respectfully ask that this letter and the accompanying documents be included as part of the public record. Thank you for your consideration of this information.

James M. O’Mara, Jr.  
Town Administrator

Cc:  
Website  
File w/ attachments

JOM/cpm

-----  
Town of Amherst  
Pipeline Taskforce Meeting  
June 3D, 2015  
3pm

1. Introductions:

John D’Angelo	Amherst PTFand BOS
Barry Duff	Kinder Morgan Project Manager (New Hampshire Section -- NED)
Jim Hartman	Tenn. Gas Pipeline - Principal Land Specialist (Right of Way Agent)
Mark Hamarich	Kinder Morgan - Project Manager
Lucas Meyer	Kinder Morgan - Media Relations
Norman Clifton	Kinder Morgan
David Beach	Amherst PTF
Colin Lonsdale	Amherst PTF
Joseph McCool	Amherst PTF
Colleen Mailloux	Amherst Community Development Director

Shannon Chandley  
Reed Panasiti

Amherst PTF  
Amherst PTF

## 2. Kinder Morgan- Results of Alternate Routes Analysis

L. Meyer stated that April 28 was the last meeting. Since then, they have explored other route possibilities and Barry will speak on the results of the analysis.

B. Duff spoke:

Looked at alternatives.

Option 3. Route: Federal Hill rd. at power line- greenfield- IOla intersection- back down and meets original plan

Option 2. Don't leave the power line so early; otherwise similar to Option 3.

Options 2 and 3 avoid all areas of concern from PTFmeeting.

Option 1. Avoids all areas of concern except one area (Patricia Lane area). Route follows the railroad to PC-Connection, then follows Continental Blvd and rejoins original route at Camp Sergeant.

As a rule, pipelines do not like to follow roads because communities expand.

Continental Blvd from the dealership on is relatively undeveloped. We would be about 100' off the road.

Options 2 and 3 impact more land owners, crossing more streams and are not preferred.

They have a big concern around the rail line. It is close with not much space. How active is the rail line?

J. D'Angelo stated it is used, but not much. Not used all winter with feet of snow on it. Some residents who about the railroad tracks report that two (slow) trains per week use it, often at night.

They will leave copies of the map with the Taskforce so that the Taskforce can review it.

Internally they are not partial to option 2 and 3, but they are interested in option 1.

Local utility line is in that area too. - Eversource/ Liberty- so they will have to be contacted.

M. Hamarich stated Option 1 will be discussed and further evaluated. Many groups have looked at it.

B. Duff stated that another reason pipelines don't like roads is that access to main line valves can be more difficult. There will be a valve in Amherst. There may need to be an offshoot to allow access to the valve.

There are large catch basins by Home Depot and Waterworks (in Merrimack). They still need to understand how those work.

J. D'Angelo stated that option 1 looks similar to what the PTF thought would make sense. The next step is to mention it in the next resource report and state that they will be investigating particularly option 1.

(B. Duff stated the report is already typed up with that information included)

Timeline:

M. Hamarich said they're trying to line up construction- July- survey needs to be done. That will take a couple of months. End of September is the goal. Schedule next draft in July and file the NED application with the FERC in 4th quarter of this year. Want major routing points by that time.

D. Beach asked about the relative advantages and disadvantages of Option 1 as compared to the original route.

B. Duff stated Option 2 has less impact on original line than option 3. What they do is take that segment and do a direct comparison to the alternative. Look at land use and which option is impacting uses more. Contractors will assess different qualities of the wetland and conservation.

D. Beach followed up, what does your analysis tell you?

Option 1 looks interesting.

J. D'Angelo so the timeline is to complete work on this a couple of months and walkthrough the public land in July. Yes.

J. McCool- is Option 1 the best route in that area?

B. Duff stated this route avoided the areas of concern with the school etc.

M. Hamarich stated there are some areas in option 1 that need more attention.

Residents and Taskforce members discussed the area that includes Patricia Lane and the church. Residents informed KM personnel that the church plans to (re)open a school on premises in the near future”.

J. D’Angelo informed KM personnel that a workforce housing development (16 units) will be built and in existence on this section of the route by the time ground is broken for pipeline construction. The proposed route bisects this housing development and runs under at least two of the planned units”.

1 Information received on 1-July from K. Bury, 7 Patricia Lane: “the minister of the Amherst Christian Church has told me that they plan to re-open the school in the church annex. This would not only violate Amherst criteria but also violate KM’s policy to avoid schools. The church building includes several classrooms that were in the past used for kindergarten and pre-school classes. Please contact Pastor Ron Tannariello at 603- 672-1541 for more information.

2 C. Mailloux sent a copy of the approved site plan for this planned workforce housing development (Amherst Fields) to B. Duff on 1-July.

J. D’Angelo clarified that at this time they are still exploring Option 1 and the original plan. Yes.

D. Beach asked about a scoping meeting scheduled for July 30 in Milford.

M. Hamarich explained that the scoping meetings are FERC meetings. FERC schedules and organizes and sends notices to residents and stakeholders.

D. Beach asked, do they get notices of all of the scoping meetings if they get noticed for one?

M. Hamarich- Good question. They will check with counsel and let C. Mailloux know.

J. D’Angelo will ask the Conservation Commission to look at Option 1. The ACE’s two main concerns have been eliminated with Option 1.

S. Chandley asked and it was clarified that the goal is to determine by the end of September which route it will be.

Mark Bender, Milford Town Administrator- Option 3 impacts Milford so he asked for a copy of the map. He will get one and they will get it in electronic form and send it out as well.

After the meeting concluded, several PTF members asked Barry Duff and other Kinder Morgan representatives why alternate Option 1 wasn’t moved further south (based on all three of the alternate routes proposed by the PTF) to distance it from Patricia Lane. Duff indicated there is a significant slope on the other side of Route 122 that has some bearing on that portion of the Option 1 alternative. He said an engineering contractor looked at options for moving it south in that area but didn’t like the implications of such a move. However, at the urging of PTF members, Duff and other company officials indicated that KM would have another look at that area of Option 1 in an attempt to reduce impacts and report back to PTF at a later date.

Respectfully submitted,

Jessica Marchant

*{map, not reproduced here}*

**20150713-5077**

Karen Zantay, Averill Park, NY.

I am writing to you concerning the 90,000 horsepower compressor station slated to be built in Rensselaer County.

I am so baffled as to how the biggest ever compressor station might be allowed to be built there. It is 3,000 feet away from a very populated lake. Our lake has two bald eagles nests, painted turtles, blue herons and many more species. It is in very close proximity to an Alpaca Farm. It is slated to be built across the street

from an organic working farm. There is a stream that runs from that farm through the proposed site into the Valatie Kill and into the Dewey Loeffel Landfill Site. I have even heard that part of the pipeline is being laid on Logan's Fault Line according to the US Geological Survey. The shale in our area is easily erodible because of large deposits of limestone. This is of course not to mention the humans including countless children, which it will affect through radon, methane and other toxic gas exposure -although it seems that the only way to fight this is through what it will do to everything else but humans!

Personally, we will not be able to keep our lake house of many generations. It is a cherished place that my father's ashes are buried in.

Governor Cuomo has done such a fine job with environmental causes in New York. We all were so relieved that a moratorium on Fracking was implemented in NYS, and his work increasing Solar has been nothing short of phenomenal. But why stop at the next step?? The compressor stations and the pipeline itself are the next most dangerous factors after the actual fracking. The danger of this pipeline based on KinderMorgan's safety record alone is inhumane. A compressor station of that magnitude will surely be a health hazard to all around it for miles. It causes asthma and other respiratory diseases as well as cancers and mental issues. Even the construction creates these issues. The wind patterns according to Albany Airport show that it will blow the methane gas so that it will directly settle right on top of 3 bodies of water and countless creeks including Kinderhook. What are the health risks of swimming, fishing and boating in a lake with gases sitting on it?

It seems so backward that a private company has eminent domain. The real kicker is that the community accounts for only 2% of who will benefit from this natural gas. We are taking the brunt for foreign markets. Makes you wonder who the real terrorists are doesn't it?

Obviously KinderMorgan is a remnant from the Bush/Cheney era but is anyone thinking about what the cost of the cleanup from all this will be in the years to come? Do we leave this to the next generation? And what happens to a town when people sell/leave their houses which are what the majority of owners, are talking about? How does it survive with minimal taxes collected?

For these reasons, I am begging you to not grant approval for this compressor station in this area.

Thank you so much for your time,  
Karen Zantay

**20150713-5190**

Sheila DS Foraker

205 China Hill Road  
Nassau, NY 12123  
sdsforaker@gmail.com  
July 9, 2015

Cell: (707) 318-4240  
Tel: (518) 766-2047

Kinder Morgan  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Re: Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline's NED proposal through Nassau Township (Docket No. PF14-22-000)

To whom it may concern:

If you are allowed to build this gas pipeline, our whole way of life will be changed forever. It will be devastating to humans, animals, nature, our environment. This proposed pipeline has no lasting benefit to our community. On the contrary it is fraught with dangerous consequences. Our opinion is based on the extensive research we have done on this proposed pipeline. We oppose it.

Your compressor stations will destroy our environment with poisonous air, water pollution and noise pollution. Furthermore, we have learned that as large a station as you propose to build here has never been built on any of the pipelines in our area. The existing smaller compressor stations already produce unacceptable levels of noise and air pollution, among other dangers. One of the compressor stations will be on County Route 15 and Clarks Chapel Road, right in my backyard. A major path of National Grid utility poles is already behind my house, and your proposal lays the pipeline right alongside it. It is well documented that the emissions from electric power poles may corrode pipelines buried under the ground.

Further facts in support of our opposition to your proposal:

- The fracked gas is planned to be shipped outside the US. Fracking is illegal in New York State and it should be illegal to pipe fracked gas through our state as well. Since all the fracked gas will be sent abroad, our community gets nothing from this but destruction of our peaceful way of life, our pure air and water, and our wildlife.
- Pipelines have been known to explode, not infrequently, leveling everything on both sides. We will not accept this unnecessary endangerment to our lives.
- All pipelines leak and they are not well monitored. Our groundwater will be exposed to severe risk.
- The shut-off valves are far apart, one every 21 miles in a rural area.
- Fire departments would not be prepared to handle a catastrophe such as a pipeline explosion. They are not equipped to handle fires caused by pipeline or compressor station explosions.
- This will be one of the biggest pipeline projects in the US. Also, the proposed compressor that moves the gas through the pipeline will be 90,000 horsepower, much larger than the standard compressors. The unceasing noise and pollution levels of such magnitude would forever destroy not only our environment but also our community's entire economy.
- To save money the pipeline is made thinner, and therefore less stable, where it passes through rural areas, such as ours.
- Few jobs would be created and those that are, temporary. According to our research, you have your own crew from out of state, who have no loyalty to the people and environment of our area. They do their job with no one to monitor them. Quality control is nil because the pipes are buried without being checked.

Would you and your family live by a compressor station or next to this pipeline? I think not.

Sincerely yours,

Sheila DS Foraker

CC: Senator Charles Schumer, Senator Kirsten Gillibrand, Governor Andrew Cuomo, Congressman Chris Gibson, Assemblyman Steven McLaughlin, Senator Kathleen Marchione, Town Board of Town of Nassau, FERC

**20150714-0022**

**FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION**  
WASHINGTON, DC 20426

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN  
The Honorable Bernard O'Grady  
Chairman  
Town of Mason  
16 Darling Hill Road — Mann House  
Mason, NH 03048

July 10, 2015

Dear Chairman O'Grady:

Thank you for your June 9, 2015, letter requesting a public scoping meeting in Mason, New Hampshire

regarding the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company LLC's (Tennessee Gas) planned Northeast Energy Direct Project (Docket No. PF14-22-000).

We recently issued our Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for this project on June 30, 2015, which initiates the formal public scoping period and identifies the locations, dates, and times for the public scoping meetings. (A copy of that notice is enclosed.) The 14 meeting locations were selected to be convenient for the greatest number of people who might be interested in the project. While Commission staff does not plan to hold a scoping meeting in the Town of Mason, two of the planned scoping meetings are within a short distance of Mason. We encourage you and the citizens of Mason to attend these meetings. As detailed in the Notice, public scoping meetings are just one of the avenues for stakeholder input. Stakeholders may also file written comments with the Commission. Those comments will receive the same attention and scrutiny as comments received at the public meetings.

Since October 2, 2014, Tennessee Gas has participated in the Commission's pre-filing process for the project, which is designed to engage stakeholders to identify and resolve environmental issues before the formal filing of an application with the Commission. As you may know, Tennessee Gas held several public open house meetings in close proximity to Mason early this year, to provide landowners and other stakeholders an opportunity to learn about the project and to discuss their concerns. Commission staff participated in two of these meetings to explain our environmental review process, including the one held on February 24, 2015, in Milford, New Hampshire and the one held on February 26, 2015, in Fitchburg, Massachusetts. This public engagement through Tennessee Gas' open house meetings and formal public scoping period will allow the Commission to conduct a comprehensive and meaningful review of the project as part of our obligation under the National Environmental Policy Act.

Thank you for sharing your concerns as we continue our review of the project. If I can be of further assistance in this or any other Commission matter, do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely,

Norman C. Bay

Chairman

Enclosure

*{note: NO enclosure was included in the FERC file "20150714-0022(30715138).pdf"}*

#### **20150714-0024**

Card, ? Muskavitch?, 37 Josiah Lane, Temple, NH 03084, asking when FERC is going to hold scoping meeting in New Ipswich, Temple, Greenville and Mason, NH?

#### **20150714-0026**

RE: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Docket No. PF 14-22

Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Project of Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Gas Co

Honorable Senators, Members of the Assembly, and Public Officials

As you may already be aware, there is pending before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) a proposal to build a pipeline to transport fracked gas from the Marcellus Shale fields of Pennsylvania through New York, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and back to Dracut, Massachusetts. Strong evidence indicates that from Dracut most of the gas will be transported north to Canada where it will be exported. On a daily basis, the 36" pipeline would transmit up to 2.2 billion cubic feet of gas at a pressure of up to 460 pounds per square inch. This project is referred to as the Northeast Energy Project.

These pipelines are dangerous and emit methane (a greenhouse gas) along with the toxic chemicals that are used in the fracking process- the same process New York State has BANNED for health reasons. New Yorkers gain nothing from this pipeline; the New York counties of Broome, Delaware, Schoharie, Albany and Rensselaer are simply the pipeline's path. If FERC approves the pipeline, New Yorkers are put at risk of

grave dangers, severe health problems, lowered property values, and loss of property rights through eminent domain. In addition, the vitality of towns along the pipeline route is likely to be eroded.

Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas (the private corporate applicants before FERC) has identified compressor station sites for the NED. The site in Rensselaer County is in the Town of Nassau on Clarks Chapel Road. The parcel of land that is under contract for the compressor station is 142 acres. The compressor station itself will have 90,000 horsepower to transmit the fracked gas along the pipeline route. This will be an industrial facility operating 24 hours per day, 7 days per week, with around the clock lighting and noise and routine venting of methane along with the toxins associated with fracking. Its proposed location is in the midst of rural beauty and working farms, some organic. Additionally, the private seller of this parcel falsified the decibel testing that Kinder Morgan submitted.

This site also lies less than one mile from the Dewey Loeffel landfill site. This site was used for disposal of estimated 46,000 tons of Waste material generated several Capital District companies including General Electric, Bendix Corporation (now Honeywell) and Schenectady International (now 51 Group, Inc.). The waste included industrial solvents, Waste oils, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), scrap materials, sludge and solids. Volatile organic compounds and other hazardous substances have seeped out of the landfill and contaminated the groundwater. In 2009, the EPA collected sediment samples from downstream water bodies. The analytical results indicated the continued presence of PCBs, despite extensive clean-up efforts. Residents in the area are concerned about the combined poisons in their environment from the superfund site and the proximity to the proposed pipeline and compressor station.

Numerous studies have been conducted recently regarding the air quality around these compressor stations and the impacts on the residents that live near them. I implore you to fully read these studies before making a decision as they indicate severe negative health impacts to those who live within the vicinity including nose bleeds and severe respiratory difficulties. Also, homeowners living in Hancock, New York have seen a fifty percent decrease in the value of their homes directly related to the location and proximity of one of these compressor stations. Not only will the residents of our beautiful town be subjected to severe adverse health effects, but they will never be able to sell their home or be appropriately compensated.

There are upwards of 40 children that live near this proposed compressor site. As a resident of Rensselaer County and living within one mile of the proposed compressor station, my family and I are devastated by this proposal. My wife and I built our home here in hopes of raising our family in this wonderful neighborhood. Now, all of my future plans, my economic security and dreams for my family are at the mercy of FERC. Additionally, I am very concerned over the health impacts this compressor station will have as my wife already suffers from a chronic and severe respiratory condition. FERC has offered little to no opportunity for the residents directly impacted by this decision to influence its decision. How is this freedom or the American dream?

I understand that interstate pipelines are matters within the federal government's jurisdiction, but it's time for New York State to step up and protect its citizens. I invite you to personally visit the proposed site and the surrounding area to have a more complete understanding of how devastating a facility like this would be to the area and its residents.

Sincerely,

Bryan J Carr  
451 Burden Lake Road  
East Schodack, NY 12063

**20150714-0027**

Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield St  
Agwam, MA 01001

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr., Deputy Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

Date: July 8, 2015

RE: Denying property access

FERC PF 14-22 Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Project

As the owner of the property located at  
16 Pikes Pond Rd, Averill Park, NY 12018

I am denying permission to Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land to perform surveys, or for any other purpose.

Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Nancy A. Brandt

**20150714-0029**

Hand written letter, Nancy Jackson, 174 Colburn Rd, Temple, NH 03084, opposing.

**20150714-0030**

July 1, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: FERC docket number PF14-22

Dear Secretary Bose:

In regard to the proposed Kinder Morgan/TGF natural gas pipeline, when is FERC going to hold its scoping meetings in the towns of New Ipswich, Temple, Greenville, and Mason, NH?

All of these towns would be affected by the potential compressor station.

Sincerely,

Patricia H. Silvestro  
215 Colburn Rd  
Temple, NH 03084

**20150714-0031**

July 1, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: FERC docket number PF14-22

Dear Secretary Bose:

In regard to the proposed Kinder Morgan/TGF natural gas pipeline, when is FERC going to hold its scoping

meetings in the towns of New Ipswich, Temple, Greenville, and Mason, NH?

All of these towns would be affected by the potential compressor station, including Temple Elementary which is 1/2 mile away.

Sincerely,  
Amy Cabana  
7 Laurelwood Drive  
Temple, NH 03084

**20150714-0032**

July 1, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: FERC docket number PF14-22

Dear Secretary Bose:

In regard to the proposed Kinder Morgan/TGF natural gas pipeline, when is FERC going to hold its scoping meetings in the towns of New Ipswich, Temple, Greenville, and Mason, NH?

All of these towns would be affected by the potential compressor station.

Sincerely,  
Mattson Family,  
64 Glen Farm Rd  
Temple, NH 03084

**20150714-0033**

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulation Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Date: 7-6-2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access: PF 14-22-000

As the owner of the property located at:

37 Comstock Drive  
Milford, NH 03055

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose. Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

John F. Orthmann  
Joanne M. Orthmann

**20150714-0049**

Hand written card, Mrs. Bason, 619 New Rd , Lyndeborough, NH 03082, opposing

**20150714-0050**

Hand written card, Lisa Derby Oden, 6 Upper Pratt Pond Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, asking if independent air quality studies will be done

**20150714-0051**

Hand written card, Mrs. Bason, 619 New Rd , Lyndeborough, NH 03082, requesting 1 Scoping meeting per town, asking about schedule

**20150714-0052**

Hand written card, ? Bason, 619 New Rd , Lyndeborough, NH 03082, concerned about safety

**20150714-0053**

Hand written card, Stan Bason, 619 New Rd , Lyndeborough, NH 03082, need Scoping, 1 per town

**20150714-0054**

Hand written card, Robert Feyh, 199 Kullgren Rd, Temple, NH 03084, opposing.

**20150714-0055**

Hand written card, Lisa Oden, 6 Upper Pratt Pond Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, how will weather patterns affect fallout from compressor stations

**20150714-0056**

Hand written card, Korin Feyh, 199 Kullgren Rd, Temple, NH 03084, opposing.

**20150714-0057**

Hand written card, Nolan Kitfield, 19 Mt. Hermon Sta. Rd, Northfield, MA 01360, essential to have Scoping session in Northfield, MA

**20150714-0058**

Hand written card, Marilyn Griska, 18 Atlantic Dr, Rindge, NH 03461, opposing. "You don't even listen to our voices"

**20150714-0059**

Hand written card, Timothy Somero, 42 Old Tenney Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, wild live surveys important

**20150714-0060**

Hand written card, Marilyn Griska, 18 Atlantic Dr, Rindge, NH 03461, opposing. "You don't even listen to our voices"

**20150714-0061**

Hand written card, John Tallarico, 417 Kimball Hill Rd, Wilton, NH 03086, opposing

**20150714-0062**

Hand written card, Timothy Somero, 42 Old Tenney Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, opposing

**20150714-0063**

Hand written card, Paul Stevens, 156 Timbertop Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, “mostly for export” opposing

**20150714-0064**

Hand written card, Helen Shepherd, 417 Kimball Hill Rd, Wilton, NH 03086, opposing

**20150714-0066**

RE: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Docket No. PF 14-22

Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Project of Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Gas Co.

Honorable Senators, Members of the Assembly, and Public Officials:

As you may already be aware, there is pending before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) a proposal to build a pipeline to transport fracked gas from the Marcellus Shale fields of Pennsylvania through New York, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and back to Dracut, Massachusetts. Strong evidence indicates that from Dracut most of the gas will be transported north to Canada where it will be exported. On a daily basis, the 36” pipeline would transmit up to 2.2 billion cubic feet of gas at a pressure of up to 460 pounds per square inch. This project is referred to as the Northeast Energy Project.

These pipelines are dangerous and emit methane (a greenhouse gas) along with the toxic chemicals that are used in the fracking process- the same process New York State has BANNED for health reasons. New Yorkers gain nothing from this pipeline; the New York counties of Broome, Delaware, Schoharie, Albany and Rensselaer are simply the pipeline’s path. If FERC approves the pipeline, New Yorkers are put at risk of grave dangers, severe health problems, lowered property values, and loss of property rights through eminent domain. In addition, the vitality of towns along the pipeline route is likely to be eroded.

Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas (the private corporate applicants before FERC) has identified compressor station sites for the NED. The site in Rensselaer County is in the Town of Nassau on Clarks Chapel Road. The parcel of land that is under contract for the compressor station is 142 acres. The compressor station itself will have 90,000 horsepower to transmit the fracked gas along the pipeline route. This will be an industrial facility operating 24 hours per day, 7 days per week, with around the clock lighting and noise and routine venting of methane along with the toxins associated with fracking. Its proposed location is in the midst of rural beauty and working farms, some organic. Additionally, the private seller of this parcel falsified the decibel testing that Kinder Morgan submitted.

This site also lies less than one mile from the Dewey Loeffel Landfill site. This site was used for disposal of estimated 46,000 tons of waste material generated several Capital District companies including General Electric, Bendix Corporation (now Honeywell) and Schenectady International (now SI Group, Inc.). The waste included industrial solvents, waste oils, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), scrap materials, sludge and solids. Volatile organic compounds and other hazardous substances have seeped out of the landfill and contaminated the groundwater. In 2009, the EPA collected sediment samples from downstream water bodies. The analytical results indicated the continued presence of PCBs, despite extensive clean-up efforts. Residents in the area are concerned about the combined poisons in their environment from the superfund site and the proximity to the proposed pipeline and compressor station.

Numerous studies have been conducted recently regarding the air quality around these compressor stations and the impacts on the residents that live near them. I implore you to fully read these studies before making a decision as they indicate severe negative health impacts to those who live within the vicinity including nose bleeds and severe respiratory difficulties. Also, homeowners living in Hancock, New York have seen a fifty percent decrease in the value of their homes directly related to the location and proximity of one of these compressor stations. Not only will the residents of our beautiful town be subjected to severe adverse health effects, but they will never be able to sell their home or be appropriately compensated.

There are upwards of 40 children that live near this proposed compressor site. As a resident of Rensselaer

County and living within one mile of the proposed compressor station, my family and I are devastated by this proposal. I grew up next door to the house I currently live in and could never have imagined being anywhere else. Now, all of my future plans, my economic security and dreams for my family are at the mercy of FERC. FERC has offered little to no opportunity for the residents directly impacted by this decision to influence its decision. How is this freedom or the American dream?

I understand that interstate pipelines are matters within the federal government's jurisdiction, but it's time for New York State to step up and protect its citizens. I invite you to personally visit the proposed site and the surrounding area to have a more complete understanding of how devastating a facility like this would be to the area and its residents.

Sincerely,

Sarah A Carr  
451 Burden Lake Road  
East Schodack, NY 12063

**20150714-0067**

Hand written card, Richard R. Silvestro, 215 Colburn Rd, Temple, NH 03084, when is FERC holding its Scoping meeting in New Ipswich, Temple, Greenville and Mason, NH. All affected by compressor station..

**20150714-0073**

July 6, 2015

Dear Senator Shaheen,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Senator, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England.

The pipeline construction process will pollute our air, contaminate our aquifers, wells and other water resources. Over 800 NH families will lose their homes and it will destroy conservation lands. It will harm the tourist industry and rural character of New Hampshire.

The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent "blow downs" where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline. These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis and will eventually cause ruin to all of New Hampshire.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station, including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby. Please don't let this happen!

The property values near the pipeline and compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit. Help us save our homes and New Hampshire!

Senator Shaheen, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

signed: ??

cc: FERC

**20150714-0076**

Hand written card, William R. Kilpatrick, 166 Gulf Rd, Northfield, MA 01360, opposing

**20150714-0079**

Hand written letter, Stephen ?Dean, 48 Crossway Rd, Nassau, NY 12123, opposing

**20150714-3028**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
**FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.

Docket No. PF14-22-000

ERRATA NOTICE

(July 14, 2015)

On June 30, 2015, the Commission issued a Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the Planned Northeast Energy Direct Project, Request for Comments on Environmental Issues, and Notice of Public Scoping Meetings.

Under the Location portion of the FERC Public Scoping Meeting table, the street address for the Greenfield Middle School for the July 29, 2015 meeting is incorrect. The correct address is listed below.

Wednesday, July 29, 2015  
6:30 pm

Greenfield Middle School  
195 Federal Street  
Greenfield, MA 01301  
(413) 772-1360

Kimberly D. Bose,  
Secretary.

**20150714-5005**

deborah pomerleau, Londonderry, NH.  
FERC.

One of the huge issues which has not been dealt with clearly is that of owning property that has been partially annexed for the pipeline. The problem is the issue of homeowner's insurance and mortgages. One can't get one without the other. It is a tricky balance. Most mortgages have disclosures about flammable or toxic "items" not being allowed. Gas in a pipeline on your property seems like it would be, especially if it is a pipeline that is 36" in diameter. I'm no scientist. I am a mom, with a college education, worried about the future for my children, grandchildren and future generations. Now there are the same issues with homeowners' insurance policies. No one wants to insure a property with a highly flammable and dangerous pipeline or contraption of some kind. Yet, whenever someone mentions these potential situations, everyone gets silent and nervous. There must be a company that specializes in this, and like all things, it is possible at a tremendous price. I have lived around the country, and bought and sold 4 homes. I know what goes in a realtor's mind, a buyer's mind, a seller's mind. This needs tremendous clarification. What if you had friends over for dinner, and boom, the pipeline blows. Who pays the friends' families for loss of life, loss of wages, pain and suffering? Who gets sued? Who pays? These questions have not been answered whatsoever. Will insurance companies provide insurance for these properties? Will mortgage companies provide mortgages to these buyers? Will you be able to sell a property that has a pipeline? Who will want to buy it? Really, if you had a choice for a home with a pipeline or without, no doubt, you would choose the one without a pipeline. KM likes to show a slide of a subdivision with a buried pipeline as proof that people live with pipelines. That was before people became educated. That is before we saw the videos of the intense fires these pipelines can produce. That was before we saw the gas causing geysers in a river, when the pipe broke. That was before we saw the photo of a pipeline that was exposed to the air, because a flood had washed away the dirt around it. Citizens know what all this means now. We are more aware of the potential problems because problems happen around the country. As a Please. Please get these answered. Please stop this pipeline from being approved.

**20150714-5006**

June 11, 2015

The Honorable Kimberly Bose  
Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
Room 1A East  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington DC 20426

Re: Electronic Filing

Projects CP14-522-000, PF14-22, PF15-12

**AMENDED MOTION TO INTERVENE FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADDING ALL DOCKET NUMBERS RELATED TO THE NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT AND ALGONQUIN PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS**

Dear Secretary Bose:

Please find enclosed my Amended Motion for Intervention in Projects CP14-522-000, CP14-22, and PF15-12. Pursuant to 18 CFR 385.214 (A) (2), the Petitioner, Sue Carrillo, hereby provides notice that the Petitioner intervened in the above-styled proceedings, CP14-522-000, otherwise known as Algonquin Gas Transmission, LLC Pipeline Project, and all of their associated Blank Certificates on May 11, 2015. The Petitioner's Motion to Intervene was not opposed by any party to the proceeding within the FERC deadline. Since FERC has assigned more docket numbers to this one massive and interconnected project, the Petitioner is filing this Amended Motion to Intervene for the purpose of being a participatory party in all of the proceedings related to the CP14-522-000 Project, including PF14-22 and PF15-12. The Petitioner files this Motion to Intervene due to the failure of FERC to comply with the NEPA and the state regulatory requirements for a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) in these projects. The Petitioner filed the original Motion to Intervene on May 11, 2015 via the efile FERC online system. The attached Motion has been submitted by electronic file and copied to the service list. As a Consultant, I have many years of experience in environmental assessments, manufacturing quality control and economic analysis. Since FERC has failed to comply with federal regulatory requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and to meet the criteria set in the Natural Gas Act of 1938 for eminent domain authorization, I am filing a Motion to Intervene in order to ensure that FERC completes a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) prior to any current or future authorizations by FERC for any of the aforementioned projects and to prohibit FERC from illegally seizing private property in violation of the US Constitution. FERC's Environmental Assessment is currently not in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). FERC must conduct a thorough investigation of environmental impacts by requiring and disclosing all currently available information from all of the participatory states in this massive pipeline project. Full analysis must include assessments regarding the locations of all water, sewer, gas and electric infrastructure and all pertinent state data from monitoring of environmentally sensitive areas (including public aquifers, wildlife protected areas, wetlands, storm water reservoirs and historic preservation sites) as part of the FERC EIS. FERC has failed to request or disclose to the public all relevant information requisite for a full EIS review and authorization. Wherefore, the Petitioner respectfully requests that the Commission grant the Petitioner's request to Amend the Petitioner's Motion to Intervene filed on May 11, 2015. The Petitioner hereby intervenes in PF 14-22 (Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC/Northeast Energy Direct Project) and PF15-12 (Algonquin Incremental Market).

Sincerely,

Sue Chris Carrillo, Consultant, KEYS, knowledgeinexhaustibleelectorate@yahoo.com

CC: FERC Service List, (original with signature mailed) (518) 242-6866

BEFORE THE  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
FEDERAL REGULATORY COMMISSION

Algonquin Gas Transmission, LLC  
Tennessee Gas

Docket Numbers: CP14-522-000, PF 14-22,  
PF15-12, et. al.

ALL Related pipelines from Pennsylvania, New York, Connecticut, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts

AMENDED MOTION TO INTERVENE

Pursuant to 18 CFR 385.214 (A) (2), the Petitioner, Sue Carrillo, hereby provides notice that the Petitioner is intervening in the above-styled proceedings, related to the Northeast Energy Project, Constitution Pipeline Project, and Algonquin Gas Transmission, LLC Pipeline Project. The Petitioner files this Motion to Intervene due to the failure of FERC to comply with the NEPA requirement for a full Environmental Impact Statement and with the Natural Gas Act of 1938 requirement to justify the “public necessity” of the project. The Petitioner filed the original Motion to Intervene on May 11, 2015 via the efile FERC online system. The Petitioner hereby intervenes in CP14-522, PF14-22 and PF15-12. The Petitioner’s intervention, because there is no other party representing the people, who live downstream and downwind of these massive project locations and are affected by this project.

Please add the Petitioner to the electronic service list for all FERC proceedings related to the above-referenced projects:

Sue Chris Carrillo  
Consultant, KEYS  
knowledgeinexhaustibleelectorate@yahoo.com  
(518) 242-6866

As grounds for the Petition, the Petitioner respectfully asserts:

1. The Petitioner is a Consultant in the field of environmental technologies, manufacturing quality control and economics. As a Consultant, the Petitioner is concerned that FERC’s failure to meet both the NEPA and the state environmental regulatory requirements can adversely affect East Coast communities downstream and downwind of this massive project. The failure to properly assess the environmental impacts of these pipeline projects will increase the probability of public health hazards, which could otherwise be prevented. The benefits to the public of a compliant Environmental Impact Statement include the prevention of the following health hazards: public drinking water contamination, hazardous waste remediation of gas pipeline leaks and toxic air emissions;
2. States have jurisdiction in this matter, especially when eminent domain is not sufficiently justified by the federal government. Accordingly, the FERC must cooperate with the public and all of the state governments involved in this massive project to ensure a full assessment of the environmental impacts of these projects. The states are charged by law to implement state policies that maintain standards of water quality consistent with public health, the propagation and protection of fish and wildlife, including the use of safe and responsible methods to prevent water pollution. This includes the duty to monitor water quality and to ensure public safety. The FERC Environmental Impact Statement has not included sufficient study of the cumulative environmental impacts of this massive project on communities downstream and downwind of a pipeline that spans five states. The states ability to certify water quality standards in compliance with the Clean Water Act must be verified and FERC must hold public meetings, which are inclusive of all the state regulators. The cumulative environmental impacts cannot be assessed without all of the states assessing the bordering impacts from each state on neighboring states. Therefore, it is illegal, pursuant to Section 401 of the Clean Water Act [33 USC Section 1341], for the FERC to authorize the EIS without an assessment of the cumulative impacts on water quality in both

participating states and in states downstream of the project;

3. Further, states are charged by law to implement a permit program to control stormwater runoff from construction activities. The projects must be authorized under each State Department of Environmental Conservation State Pollution Discharge Elimination System (SPDES). States are responsible for issuing the permits for stormwater discharges from construction activities and will be required to develop a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to prevent discharges of construction-related pollutants to surface waters and to other state waterways;

4. Further, states are charged by law to implement the state policies to maintain a reasonable degree of purity of the air sources of the state consistent with public health and welfare.

State regulatory requirements will prevent potentially hazardous air emissions from having harmful public health effects on populations outside of the affected states and downwind from the gas pipeline locations;

5. Further, the Petitioner's participation is in the public interest, because communities downstream and downwind from the massive gas pipeline project are not adequately represented by any other party; and

6. Existing parties will not be prejudiced by the participation of the Petitioner.

Wherefore, the Petitioner respectfully requests that the Commission grant the Petitioner's request to amend the Petitioner's Motion to Intervene filed on May 11, 2015 and to add the following docket entry projects: CP14-522, PF14-22 and PF15-12. These projects are all part of the same massive pipeline project and cannot be considered in isolation. To parcel out this one massive undertaking into smaller environmental reviews will not meet NEPA requirements, since the cumulative environmental impacts will not be assessed. Furthermore, the Petitioner requests that the Commission abide by the intervention guidelines and provide notice of and opportunity to appear at all hearings in the FERC proceedings, to produce evidence and witnesses, to cross-examine witnesses, and to be heard by counsel or other representatives for briefing and oral argument. Furthermore, Petitioner request that FERC honor the Petitioner's right to appeal any current or future FERC authorizations.

Respectfully Submitted,

\_(original signed and mailed)\_\_\_\_\_

Sue Chris Carrillo

Consultant, KEYS knowledgeinexhaustibleelectorate@yahoo.com

(518) 242-6866

## **20150714-5020**

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., Docket No. PF14-22-000

As FERC considers Kinder Morgan's Northeast Energy Direct proposal, I ask that you also consider the following from a concerned citizen.

### **Dear FERC – What's The Rush? – PART 2**

On June 30th of this year FERC released its "Notice of Intent" (NOI) for Kinder Morgan's proposed Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline project. In the NOI, FERC solicited public comments on the environmental issues regarding NED and also announced the schedule for its upcoming scoping meetings. These meetings represent the first chance that interested and affected citizens, towns and organizations have to give direct, face-to-face feedback to FERC personnel. This is the public's opportunity to inform FERC of their specific concerns regarding the impact that the construction and operation of the NED pipeline would have on their families and their lives. This opportunity is of crucial importance to the public – so that FERC can be made aware of their concerns, so that FERC can include these in the NED Environmental Impact State-

ment (EIS) and so that FERC can perhaps mitigate some of these negative impacts - if and when the pipeline is approved.

How is it that the public can get informed about the plans for the pipeline – specific plans that include details and hard numbers? Surely not by attending the dog-and-pony shows hosted by Kinder Morgan. The meetings where Kinder Morgan blandly assures the public that:

- “Natural gas pipelines don’t affect property values”; and
- “All of the gas that goes into one end of the pipeline arrives at the other end”; etc., etc.

The meetings where Kinder Morgan spokesman Allen Fore projects a slide showing a building to “give you an idea of what a compressor station looks like”, without mentioning that:

- The small shingled building pictured is simply an outbuilding associated with a small existing 6,000 HP compressor station, not the actual compressor building at that site; and
- Kinder Morgan is proposing 80,000 and 90,000 HP compressor stations for the NED pipeline, 13 to 15 times the size of the station associated with the small outbuilding

No, those meetings were definitely not the place to go for details and hard numbers.

But there is supposed to be a much better source for hard data about proposed pipelines and their impacts. That data is contained in a set of Resource Reports that FERC requires that pipeline applicants like Kinder Morgan prepare and make available to the public. These reports consist of documents that go into detail on thirteen different topics, including “Water Use and Quality”, “Air and Noise Quality” and “Land Use, Recreation and Aesthetics”. These NED Resource Reports run to a total of nearly 2,000 pages, not including their multiple appendices and companion documents. They contain a host of data. They are available to both FERC and to the public - and they represent a critical source of information for anyone interested in determining the negative environmental impacts of a proposed pipeline.

So these Resource Reports should then prove invaluable to the public as preparations are made for the NED scoping meetings, correct? That’s the way it is supposed to work. But there is one small problem. The current Resource Reports are preliminary reports and are very much a work in progress. A cursory look at the Resource Reports shows that they are laughably incomplete, with much of their critical information shown as “TBD” (To Be Determined). One of the thirteen reports contained nearly 3,000 instances of “TBD”. Another contained 7,000. There are a total of nearly 12,000 instances of “TBD” in the draft reports.

Here (again) are some examples of the “information” that Kinder Morgan provides in the currently available draft reports:

***{tables all filled with “TBD”: “Baseline Sound Level Measurements...”, “Proposed Appurtenant Aboveground Facilities...”, Shallow Depth to Bedrock...” and “Emmissions from Construction...”, not reproduced here }***

This is a sample of the type of the information currently available to members of the public trying to prepare for scoping meetings. Kinder Morgan promised updated reports in June. They missed that date. The updated reports are now supposed to be delivered in July – but it is now July 14th and they have still not yet been released.

You might assume then that FERC would simply delay the scoping sessions until completed versions of these critical reports are released by Kinder Morgan and the public has been given a chance to read and analyze them. You would be very much wrong in that assumption, however.

The first two scoping sessions will be held tonight, July 14th in PA and NY. There will be two more held on the 15th and two more on the 16th. That’s it for scoping meetings in PA and NY. It’s just too bad for PA and NY residents who wished to see actual, completed resource reports before their scoping meetings. FERC apparently feels that it needs to keep this pipeline application moving along, even when the applicant is late on delivering critical data to the public.

The last scoping meeting is scheduled for August 12th. Who knows when the updated resource reports will

finally be released by Kinder Morgan and how complete those reports will actually be? Remember, those 12,000 TBDs in the draft reports that need to be filled in. And how many scoping sessions will remain at that point? And will there be time for concerned MA and NH citizens to read and digest the reports ahead of their own local scoping sessions? If Kinder Morgan can delay releasing completed NED resource reports to the public with no sanctions or project delay being applied by FERC, why wouldn't this pipeline company simply continue to delay?

I've always understood that Kinder Morgan feared having an informed public. An informed public asks hard questions and won't accept vague, misleading answers and it is more difficult to lie to an informed public. An informed public can't help but be a detriment to a project that is as misguided as this NED project is. And so Kinder Morgan lies to the public with words and with pictures, by omission and by commission – trying to keep as much of the public as possible in the dark for as long as possible.

But it now appears that FERC also shares this same fear of an informed public. An informed public refuses to be silently bulldozed into accepting a pipeline that will cause so much damage and that makes so little sense. An informed public would interfere with what FERC seems to feel is its mission - to approve every pipeline that is proposed to it, and to do so as quickly as possible. There are check boxes to be checked and milestones to be hit – and it's just too bad for the public's right to be informed in a timely manner about a pipeline that will have such a negative effect on their lives and on their peace of mind. FERC appears to care more about the energy companies priorities and about the push to approve additional fossil fuel infrastructure than they care about the public's right to be informed in a timely manner. And that's why FERC is in such a rush – a rush to complete these scoping meetings, a rush to check the “scoping meetings” check box as being completed and a rush to move ahead towards approval of this pipeline as quickly as they can.

Nick Miller Groton, MA

## **20150714-5032**

James Carvalho, Bolton, MA.

Subject: Docket #PF14-22: Comment on FERC Draft Environmental Impact Statement – Greenhouse Gas Mitigation

In the development of the NED project Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) the FERC must adhere to all aspects of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) 42 U.S.C. 4321. NEPA requires a thorough analysis of the consequences of approval of the NED project including the cumulative effects of the “reasonably foreseeable” incremental greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and the impact these emissions have upon global climate change which result. Climate change threatens the planet. The FERC may not dismiss these consequences with a finding of no significant impact (FONSI). The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) guidance on Considering Cumulative Effects Under the NEPA specifies that a determination of significant impact requires the inclusion of additional mitigation (or a detailed justification for not implementing mitigation). Mitigation must be express, measurable and viable. Mitigation must be enforceable. The FERC must require carbon-neutral mitigation of GHG emissions as a pre-requisite to approval of the NED project in order to establish environmental equilibrium, to eliminate the impact on global climate change.

GHG emissions resulting from approval of the NED project include the carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) which results from the burning 2.2 BCuFt/day of natural gas plus the CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent from leakage of methane (CH<sub>4</sub>) in all aspects of well development, distribution and LNG processing. Approval of the NED gas pipeline without mitigation is in conflict with the EPA Clean Power Plan and the Massachusetts Global Warming Solutions Act (GWSA), the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (RGGI). Whereas the EPA plan and the GWSA work to cut carbon pollution, approval of the NED pipeline increases carbon pollution. 119.9 lbs of CO<sub>2</sub> is produced when a thousand cubic feet of natural gas is burned. 2.2 BCuFT/day results in 4.4 million metric tons (tonnes) of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions annually. Using the optimistic DOE study which estimates between 1.2% and 1.6% CH<sub>4</sub> leakage and studies which indicate that CH<sub>4</sub> is 86 times as potent a GHG as is CO<sub>2</sub>,

the resulting CO2 equivalent emissions amounts to another 5.5 million metric tons annually. Together this results in 9.9 million metric tons of GHG, CO2 equivalent each year of NED gas pipeline operation. Actual GHG emissions resulting from approval of the NED gas pipeline may differ, may be higher. A study in Science indicates the real CH4 leakage rate to be 5.4%, resulting in 24.5 million metric tons of GHG. The FERC must conduct a complete analysis to establish the baseline GHG consequences of approval of the NED gas pipeline. The FERC should solicit advice on this analysis from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) as a co-operating agency in the NED EIS development.

The FERC may then establish the annual mitigation pre-requisite to Kinder Morgan (KM) as a requirement for approval of the NED gas pipeline without imposing a specific method whereby KM can comply with this requirement. KM can meet this requirement on an annual basis in multiple ways, including

- Purchase carbon credits (equal to 1 metric ton of CO2 equivalent – EU Exchanges currently trade carbon credits at \$11, \$109M annual for 9.9 million metric tons – which might equate to a GHG mitigation cost of \$.13/dekatherm/day, FERC needs to compute )
- Carbon capture and sequestration (CCS), (KM currently uses this technology for enhanced oil recovery (EOR), EOR would NOT be allowed to satisfy the requirement, only permanent CCS would be allowed)
- Investment in reforestation and bio-sequestration
- Investment in the efficiency of older KM equipment, reduction in GHG emissions
- Investment in reduction of CH4 fugitive emissions in existing KM gas distribution systems
- Other methods

The FERC will need to establish an independent agent to certify that KM is in compliance with the GHG mitigation pre-requisite and an enforceable penalty for non-compliance sufficient to purchase the deficit carbon credits.

KM will incur added expense to establish compliance with the GHG reduction mitigation requirement. The FERC will need to take this into account when they establish the tariff rate for gas delivered by the NED gas pipeline, to allow KM to recover this expense. The FERC approved tariff will consist of the reservation rate, the maximum commodity rate and a GHG mitigation rate. Including this mitigation cost in establishing the approved tariff rate for the NED pipeline is within the jurisdiction of the FERC. While this process will increase the net cost of natural gas to the end user, it will nonetheless establish a natural gas price point consistent with the true cost of the energy supplied.

This FERC policy is necessary to re-establish carbon-neutral compliance, avoiding, minimizing and mitigating the adverse effect upon global climate change of approval of the NED project. This action will also enhance the relative competitiveness of alternate energy sources, solar, wind, hydro, geothermal, conservation and efficiency, all of which result in a reduction in GHG and the reasonably predictable effects upon global climate change. When the true cost of the natural gas which the NED project will deliver is established by this policy, the economics may cause the FERC to reconsider approval. The economics may cause KM to reconsider applying for approval. Reconsideration would be good for global climate change, good for the planet.

## **20150714-5040**

Rachel I Branch, North Adams, MA.

July 14, 2015, 11:00 a.m.

Docket No. PF14-22-000

### **COMMENT FOR SCOPING MEETINGS**

I am Rachel I. Branch, a Citizen of the United States of America, a resident of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and therefore claim standing to oppose the issuance of a Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) permit for the Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., and its Northeast Energy

Direct Project.

Prior to my questions for the Scoping meetings, I expressly and respectfully request that these meetings be postponed until all the Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas resource information is supplied to FERC. It is essential for postponement so that those of us opposing this project have all the information available to pursue specific, fact-based, pertinent questions for the Scoping meetings. I further strongly respectfully request that these meetings be held in the cities and towns directly impacted by the proposed pipeline and compressor stations.

Questions:

1. Will Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas (KM/TG) assure FERC and all Americans, with no equivocation, that public health and public safety will be paramount and protected BEFORE pursuing this project?
2. Will KM/TG be required to supply all environmental studies and those entities that performed these studies to FERC for the public's perusal?
3. Will KM/TG be required to supply the amounts paid, and to whom, for those studies?
4. Will KM/TG be required to provide all public health and public safety assurances, backed up by factual specificity, BEFORE any proposed pipeline construction is begun?
5. Will KM/TG be required to provide all public health and public safety assurances, backed up by factual specificity, BEFORE any proposed compressor station construction is begun?
6. Will KM/TG be required to prove the necessity of this proposed pipeline with studies verifying the actual need, and, once again, supply information pertinent to how much was paid and who compiled such studies or information?
7. Will KM/TG be required to provide answers to all questions without being allowed to respond with "TBD," as its use allows omission of information FERC and the public need?
8. Will KM/TG be required to state, unequivocally, the actual cost of the proposed pipeline and be specific in regard to environmental protections for human beings, the ecosystem, the air, the water, the soil, the wetlands, the extraordinary biodiversity that sustains the beings that cannot speak for themselves in our woods, our hills, our mountains, our lakes, ponds and streams, and the extraordinary biodiversity that sustains life and our earth?

This matter before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission is so crucially vital that every avenue available to the Commission must be given the highest priority for the good of the American people, your sworn obligation to protect the public health and public safety, and the understanding that the Commission's integrity must not be compromised and is sacrosanct and inviolate. Anything other than thorough transparency is not acceptable, unconscionable, and does not protect our Constitutional right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Respectfully, submitted,

Rachel I. Branch  
99 Massachusetts Avenue  
North Adams, MA 01247-2231  
Telephone: 413-664-0134

**20150714-5061**

Polly Ryan, Plainfield, MA.  
Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE  
Washington, D.C. 20426  
July 14, 2015

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
Docket No. PF14-22-000  
Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Secretary Bose:

I am an affected landowner on the proposed NED pipeline route and I am requesting that the scoping meetings scheduled for the Northeast Energy Direct project be postponed for reasons I've outline below.

- The second Kinder Morgan resource report that FECR requested be done on the May 14th 2015 is not yet available and there are so many TBD's in the first report that it is difficult to make comprehensive, informed and, productive comments in shaping the scope of the Environmental Impact Study.
- In addition, many questions were not addressed at Kinder Morgan Open Houses or their informational meetings. I, as well as many in my community, attended KM presentations and several open houses. Our consensus was that they intentionally avoided questions that would shed light on the cons of this project while only addressing questions that promoted the pros.
- The timeline you are maintaining in having these meetings is based only on meeting Kinder Morgan's project deadline schedule and does not reflect the needs of communities still trying to get detailed information that will provide them the resources for educated scoping comments.
- Our DPU has not as of yet granted KM any customer contracts'.
- Our Governor has not made it clear whether he supports greenfield gas infrastructure over improvements and additions to brownfield infrastructure.
- Our Attorney General, along with a great majority of citizen's advocate for alternative solutions to our energy needs over fossil fuel infrastructures which will impact our Global Warming Solutions Act.
- Our Attorney General has just announced her office intends to lead a regional gas capacity study. A key focus of the study, which won't be complete until October 2015, will be the question of whether more natural gas is needed in the region, and if so, how much more capacity is necessary.

These reasons sum up to say we have been under and mis-informed of the projects details and scope and therefore cannot effectively comment on the scope of the environmental impact. In addition, the factors defining the need and all potential alternatives are unresolved.

Sincerely,

Polly Ryan  
11 Windsor Avenue  
Plainfield, MA 01070

#### **20150715-0017**

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: 7-9-15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

521 Townsend Rd  
Mason, N.H.

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from

the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Philip M. Garside

**20150715-0018**

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: 7-7-15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

211 Townsend Rd  
Mason, N.H.

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Amy Schutte

**20150715-0019**

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: 7-7-15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

220 Townsend Rd  
Mason, NH 03048

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Danielle Carrier

**20150715-0020**

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: 7-9-15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

1487 Valley Rd

Mason, NH 03048

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Jeffrey Thibodeau

**20150715-0021**

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: 7/6/15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

200 Townsend Rd  
Mason, NH 03048

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Pamela Sage

**20150715-0022**

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: 7/6/2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

693 Starch Mill Rd, Mason, NH 03048

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Marsha Neal

**20150715-0023**

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: 7/6/15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:  
259 Townsend Rd, Mason, NH 03048

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Alfred J. Broadbent

**20150715-0024**

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: 7/6/15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

301 Townsend Rd  
Mason, NH 03048

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Paul Silva

**20150715-0025**

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: 7-6-2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

1276 Valley Rd  
Mason, NH 03048

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Patricia Greene

**20150715-0026**

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: January 26 - 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

Wilton Road  
Mason, NH 03048

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Jenny M. Greenwood

**20150715-0039**

**NASHUA RIVER WATERSHED ASSOCIATION**

*Protecting our water, our land, our communities*

July 9, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE—Room 1A  
Washington, D.C. 20426

RE: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LL.C., Docket No. PF14-22-000  
“Northeast Energy Direct Project”  
TGP is a Kinder Morgan Company

Dear Ms. Bose:

The Nashua River Watershed Association (NRWA) supports the July 2, 2015 request of the Massachusetts Association of Conservation Commissions that the National Environmental Policy Act scoping meetings be postponed until after Kinder Morgan has filed its revised Resource Reports and after there is adequate time to review the reports. The deadline for written and electronic comments should be similarly rescheduled to a later date.

Founded in 1969, the NRWA is an environmental nonprofit organization protecting land & water resources and providing environmental education in 32 communities in central Massachusetts and southern New Hampshire. The currently indicated route for the proposed natural gas pipeline directly impacts our communities of Brookline, Mason, & Milford NH and Townsend & Lunenburg MA. The many people and organizations in these communities that want to review the revised Resource Reports need to have at least 30 days to do so, ideally not in the middle of the summer vacation months.

Thank you for your consideration of our viewpoint on this matter.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Ainsley Campbell  
Executive Director

**20150715-0040**

Hand written letter, Stephen Dean, expressing concerns about pollution by compressor station of China Hill stream, a pure trout stream.

**20150715-0041**

July 1, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: FERC docket number PF14-22

Dear Secretary Bose:

In regard to the proposed Kinder Morgan/TGP natural gas pipeline, when is FERC going to hold its scoping meetings in the towns of New Ipswich, Temple, Greenville, and Mason, NH?

All of these towns would be affected by the potential compressor station.

Matthew Cabana,  
7 Laurel Wood Dr,  
Temple, NH 03084

#### **20150715-0044**

Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Nathaniel j. Davis, Sr., Deputy Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

Date: 10 July 15

RE: Denying property access

FERC PF 14-22 Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Project

As the owner of the property located at:

26B Hoags Corners Rd, Nassau, NY 12123

I am denying permission to Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land to perform surveys, or for any other purpose.

Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

E.V. Lanci

#### **20150715-0045**

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, D.C. 20426

Docket No. PF14-22-000, NED Project

July 9, 2015

Dear Secretary Bose,

My concerns regarding the above Project are as follows:

1) The Market Path comes into Massachusetts, digresses North through southern New Hampshire, then terminates in Massachusetts. NH has no need for this pipeline, as we are a net exporter of energy. (Ref EIA Tables) The beneficiaries of this project are Massachusetts and offshore interests. Logic and common sense

would seem to dictate there is no Public Necessity nor Convenience served by this Path as it is neither necessary nor convenient to New Hampshire. If it is necessary to Massachusetts, then it should be routed through there rather than detoured through NH.

2) The construction would of necessity involve blasting and heavy equipment operation, generating enormous amounts of vibration and underground shock waves. These would endanger artesian wells, septic systems and leaching fields, house foundations and underground water supplies (aquifers). Any home, including ours, within a reasonable distance (say 100-500 yards) of the construction, would be exposed to potentially considerable damage.

3) We have 4 acres of property in line with and adjacent to this proposed pipeline, much of which is forested and home to indigenous wildlife. Most of the 71 miles of proposed pipeline are very similar to our property; therefore, consider the calamitous effect this construction would have on the wildlife.

4) We have lived in the town of Amherst for thirty years, are both either side of 70, and are in no position to relocate. The loathsome prospect of Eminent Domain, particularly for an entirely unnecessary and spurious reason, is totally unacceptable not only to us, but also the 60-70 other homes considered to be "in the way" of this ghastly and ill-conceived project. Where is the Public Necessity and Convenience for NH? It is neither necessary nor convenient; we realize no benefit from this project whatsoever. Perhaps it may be needed for Massachusetts, which, in that case, they should be confronting the formidable challenges it poses. Kinder Morgan should be required to re-route their pipeline to where it is needed.

Very Sincerely yours

Kenneth C. Taylor  
81 Seaverns Bridge Rd.  
Amherst, NH 03031

#### **20150715-0051**

July 1, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.  
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: FERCdocket number PF14-22

Dear Secretary Bose:

In regard to the proposed Kinder Morgan/TGP natural gas pipeline, when is FERC going to hold its scoping meetings in the towns of New Ipswich, Temple, Greenville, and Mason, NH?

All of these towns would be affected by the potential compressor station.

Sincerely,

A M Krulis  
328B Gen. Miller Hwy  
Temple, NH03084

#### **20150715-0052**

Velitchka LaPier  
1218 Nassau Averill Park Rd  
Nassau, NY 12123

July 1, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Northeast Energy Direct Project, Docket #PF14-22

Dear Ms. Bose:

My name is Velitchka LaPier and I am a resident of Rensselaer County, NY. Recently I learned about the so-called “Northeast Energy Direct Project” and I have serious concerns. I oppose the high-pressure fracked-gas pipeline and compressor stations (known as “the Northeast Energy Direct Project”) that Kinder Morgan Energy and Tennessee Gas are proposing to build along National Grid’s power lines. I urge you to use the power of your office to stop this project.

There is an enormous opposition to this project so far from the residents and local legislators of the impacted states and communities. My opposition to the high volume hydraulic tracked pipeline stems from many things. My concerns are listed below:

- 1} Fracked gas contains many toxic chemicals that are harmful for public health and the environment. Over time, even the soundest of pipes develop leaks. The air pollution through intentional venting and leaks will be inevitable. Just recently a research paper prepared by scientists at Harvard University (published in the journal Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences) found that methane leaks from gas pipelines are 2-3 times higher than government estimates. Other studies have confirmed the emission of formaldehyde, benzene and other carcinogenic chemicals. There are schools in close proximity to the proposed compressor stations. We do not want to expose our kids to these toxic chemicals.
- 2} In rural areas such as ours, pipeline safety standards are less stringent than in more densely populated places.
- 3} The frost line here is 48”. The proposed pipe will be only 36” below ground - vulnerable to frost heave.
- 4} The National Transportation and Safety Administration found PHMSA (the agency responsible for pipeline safety regulation compliance) to be under-funded and under-manned.
- 5} If a catastrophic event takes place, local fire departments may not be equipped to respond adequately. Additional training and equipment may be required and small towns don’t have the money for the kind of upgrade required.
- 6} Homeowners who don’t favor the project may be legally forced to grant a right of way. They will still have to pay taxes on the land where the pipe they opposed lies buried.
- 7) Being in the so-called “incineration zone,” our insurance premiums would surely go up.
- 8) Damage to our infrastructure and beautiful landscape will be inevitable - deforestation will occur during construction, which will cause loss of habitat to so many species.
- 9) The economic strength of our town is at stake. In a degraded, high-risk area, buying a home, business or farm would be unappealing. Property values would certainly go down. Health care costs would go up. Tourism will be negatively impacted. All this will spiral the negative effects to the entire state economy.
- 10) Approving projects like NED, that increase the availability of natural gas, could reduce the development, implementation and utilization of clean renewable energy sources. I strongly believe that efforts and funds should be focused on further development of clean energy sources and natural gas is not one of them.
- 11) It is my understanding that most of the gas carried by the pipeline is to be exported overseas. It will not be used by Americans and will profit only Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas and their shareholders. Why would we cede our land, risk our health, suffer environmental degradation, or risk catastrophe just to improve the bottom line of an already very rich entity?

This week the NY Department of Environmental Conservation posted on their web site the Findings statement. The 43 page document, a result of long and thorough research based on which they banned the high-volume hydraulic fracturing in the state of NY, confirms and reinforces my concerns. Their conclusion is that “In the end, there are no feasible or prudent alternatives that would adequately avoid or minimize

adverse environmental impacts and that address the scientific uncertainties and risks to public health from this activity.”

Please, Ms. Bose, consider our concerns and all the research and scientific evidence of the enormous negative impacts of natural gas fracking development and do not approve the Northeast Energy Direct Project.

Sincerely,

Velitchka LaPier

**20150715-0053**

**Delaware River Basin Commission**

25 State Police Drive

PO Box 7360

West Trenton, New Jersey

08628-0360

Phone: (609) 883-9500 Fax: (609) 883-9522

Web Site: <http://www.drbc.net>

Steven J. Tambini, P.E.

Executive Director

Via Electronic Mail to: [michael\\_letson@kindermorgan.com](mailto:michael_letson@kindermorgan.com)

and US Certified Mail #7008 3230 0001 3988 4091,

Return Receipt Requested

July 9, 2015

Michael Letson, Environmental Lead  
Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC.

1001 Louisiana Street

Houston, TX 77002

SUBJECT: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC., Northeast Energy Direct Project

FERCDocket No PF14-22-00

Town of Sanford, Broome County and Town of Afton, Chenango County, New York

Dear Mr. Letson:

The Delaware River Basin Commission (DRBC or Commission) has reviewed information submitted by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC. (UTGP”) to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) regarding the TGP Northeast Energy Direct Project (“NED Project or Project”). The purpose of this letter is to inform you that based on this information, the NED Project will likely require review and approval by the Commission.

According to the Draft Resource Report 1 (dRR1) and the Draft Resource Report 2 (dRR2), both dated March 2015, the NED Project includes the following activities proposed within or potentially within the Delaware River Basin:

- Construction of about 16 miles of new 30-inch-diameter pipeline (Segment D) in the Town of Sanford, Broome County New York and the Town of Afton, Chenango County, New York;
- Withdrawal(s) of water for hydrostatic testing of the new pipeline from unknown sources and volumes in New York State;
- Discharge(s) of water to unidentified upland locations through filter structures in New York State.

Table 1.6-1 of the dRR1 (p, 1-126) recognizes that water allocation approval from the DRBC is required for the construction of the project and that an application would be submitted to the Commission in November 2015. Other aspects of the NED Project may also be subject to review and approval by the DRBC as provided in the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure (RPP). These are summarized below:

**Withdrawals and Interbasin Transfers:**

- a. The RPP provides that Section 3.8 review and approval are required for daily average gross water

withdrawals - whether from surface water or groundwater - of more than 100,000 gpd during any 30 consecutive day period. No approval is required for a daily average gross withdrawal that does not exceed 100,000 gallons over any 30 consecutive-day period. See RPP§§ 2.3.5 A 2. and 3.

b. If hydrostatic test water is drawn from sources that have a current DRBC docket (or dockets) and if no increase in an approved DRBC allocation is needed, then the use of basin water for hydrostatic testing does not require separate DRBC approval.

c. If 100,000 gpd or more of water is to be imported - i.e. drawn from a source (or sources) outside the Delaware River Basin for use within the Basin - or exported - i.e., drawn from a source (or sources) within the Basin for use outside it, then DRBC review and approval are required in accordance with the Water Code (WC) and the RPP. See WC § 2.30 and RPP§§ 2.3.4 A16. and 17.

### **Discharges**

a. The RPP provides that facilities for the direct discharge of industrial wastewater to surface or ground waters of the basin are subject to Section 3.8 review and approval; however facilities designed for the direct discharge to surface or ground waters of industrial waste having design capacities of less than 10,000 gpd in the drainage area of Special Protection Waters or less than 50,000 gpd elsewhere in the basin do not require review. See RPP§ 2.3.5 AS.

### **Wetlands**

a. The RPP provides that the draining, filling, or otherwise altering marshes or wetlands when the area affected is 25 acres or greater are subject to Section 3.8 review and approval.

### **Natural Gas Pipelines**

a. The RPP provides that natural gas pipelines that pass in, on, or under an existing or proposed reservoir or recreation project area as designated in the Comprehensive Plan are subject to Section 3.8 review and approval.

### **Floodplain Regulations**

a. If the project is determined to be reviewable under Section 3.8, a special use permit is required for the pipeline constructed within a floodway in accordance with Section 6.3.4 of the Commission's Floodplain Regulations.

DRBC staff understand that survey work is progressing and additional information will be available around July 2015 when additional Resource Reports are submitted to the FERC. I recommend that you contact me at 609-477-7221 or via email at [william.muszynski@drbc.state.nj.us](mailto:william.muszynski@drbc.state.nj.us) or David Kovach, Supervisor of the Project Review Section at 609-477-72~4 or via email at [david.kovach@drbc.state.nj.us](mailto:david.kovach@drbc.state.nj.us) to discuss the project relative to the Commission's regulations. Please be advised that the Commission meets four times per year and projects such as these can only be approved at one of these meetings after a public hearing. Additionally, you should file the application for the project a minimum of six to nine months prior to projected initiation of construction activity to allow adequate time for Commission review and processing. If the Project is found to be reviewable by the Commission, there shall be no substantial construction activity thereon, including the preparation of land, unless and until the project has been approved by the Commission.

Sincerely,

William J. Muszynski, P.E.  
Water Resources Manager

c: Lieutenant Colonel Michael A. Bliss, USACE  
Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary, FERC  
Kara Coates, DNREC  
Angus Eaton, NYSDEC  
Kelly Jean Heffner, PADEP  
Daniel M. Kennedy, NJDEP

20150715-0058

**Congress of the United States**  
**House of Representatives**  
Washington, DC 20515

CHRIS GIBSON  
19th District, New York  
1706 Longworth Building  
Washington, DC 20515  
I202i 225-5614  
<http://gibson.house.gov>  
June 29, 2015

Norman C. Bay, Chairman  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

Dear Chairman Bay:

I was informed by the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC of the proposed locations of the compressor stations if the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline is approved (Docket No. PF14-22-000)

I am writing to reiterate my position on this proposal and share with you the resolutions and correspondence of some of the impacted stakeholders in my district.

I support expanding access to a broad range of energy resources, including the modernization and improvement of infrastructure to move these resources. Expanded access will lower energy costs for my constituent, create jobs, and improve our energy security. However, I have significant concerns with this proposed project for a variety of reasons and, therefore, I do not support the proposal in its current form.

Based on my many conversations with concerned residents across the 19 District, my reservations focus on public safety and potential environmental and economic impacts. It's vital that we make improvements to our infrastructure with tremendous care and maximum input from local residents. Unfortunately, Kinder Morgan has not provided adequate information about its plans. Neighbors of this pipeline have many questions, and those questions should be answered by the applicant in a public forum.

It is important that the process by which this proposal moves forward is transparent and proves the safety of the project. In addition, there should be substantial risk mitigation planning and the process should engage and be responsive to local concerns. The project should also provide significant local benefit, especially given potential financial burdens from decreased property value. Our community should not bear the burden of the project, take on all the risk, and not benefit from the construction and placement of the pipeline. Furthermore, with several other projects recently approved or close to approval, it is important that we not over-develop, which could increase risk and significantly decrease any offsetting economic benefit to local communities.

I've included Resolutions approved by multiple local legislative bodies and state officials opposing this plan. I believe it is important that, as an elected representative, I listen to all of my constituencies and advocate for what is best for our communities. The current proposal will not provide a long term benefit to these communities and I will continue my advocacy to ensure our communities and constituents have a seat at the table.

For these reasons I forward these resolutions to be included in the public record on this project.

If you have any questions, please contact my office at 518-610-8133

Sincerely,  
Chris Gibson  
Member of Congress

-----  
**THE SENATE**  
**STATE OF NEW YORK**  
KATHLEEN A. MARCHIONE  
SENATOR 43RD DISTRICT

April 29, 2015

Mr. Norman C. Bay, Chairman  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC)  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

Dear Chairman Bay:

I write to convey my serious reservations regarding the proposed Kinder Morgan Pipeline project which would impact families residing within New York State's 43 Senate District, whom I am so honored and fortunate to serve. Like many of my constituents, and the local elected officials who represent them, I oppose the Kinder Morgan Pipeline project for a variety of reasons.

First and foremost among my concerns with the proposed pipeline is the issue of safety. It has been shared with me that if the project went forward, the pipeline would operate under much greater pressure than what other local gas pipelines are subjected. In addition, there are unanswered questions about the inspection standards of the pipeline welds. Addressing these and other safety concerns for communities across Rensselaer County must be at the forefront of any evaluation.

Second, the proposed pipeline project is expected to have a negative impact on local property values. Advancing a project that would likely drive down local property values would be completely unfair to local homeowners.

Third, the proposed pipeline would provide little to no financial benefit for local communities throughout Rensselaer County. The lack of any clear residual benefit from the pipeline project would result in towns, villages and cities across Rensselaer County assuming a lion's share of the significant risks while receiving none of the benefits. Such a situation is simply unacceptable.

In conclusion, for the cited reasons — safety, local property values and lack of any residual benefit for area communities — I respectfully request that FERC deny a certificate of public convenience and necessity for the proposed Kinder Morgan Pipeline. There is significant, strong and growing local opposition to this proposed pipeline project, as evidenced by four local resolutions enacted against it. I cannot, in good conscience, support this pipeline project as proposed due to the fact that these specific concerns have not been addressed to my satisfaction.

Thank you for your timely consideration of this request made on behalf of my Rensselaer County constituents.

Sincerely,

Kathleen A. Marchione

State Senator, 43 District

CC: United States Senator Charles Schumer  
United States Senator Kirsten Gillibrand  
Congressman Chris Gibson  
Rensselaer County Executive Kathy Jimino  
Rensselaer County Board of Legislators

Stephentown Town Board  
Nassau Town Board  
Schodack Town Board

-----  
**TOWN OF STEPHENTOWN**  
**OFFICE OF THE TOWN CLERK**

Stephanie M. Wagar  
TOWN CLERK OF STEPHENTOWN

April 22, 2015

Re: Opposing the Proposed Pipeline

Dear Elected Representative,

Enclosed you will find a certified copy of Resolution #27 of 2015 of the Town of Stephentown titled "RESOLUTION STATING OPPOSITION TO THE KINDER MORGAN NATURAL GAS PIPELINE PROPOSED TO BE ROUTED THROUGH STEPHENTOWN."

Our residents and Town Board of Stephentown have spoken and are encouraging you to do the same.

If you have any questions or concerns please feel free to contact me at your convenience.

Sincerely

Stephanie Wagar  
Stephentown Town Clerk

-----  
**TOWN OF STEPHENTOWN**  
**OFFICE OF THE TOWN CLERK**

26 GRANGE HALL ROAD, STEPHENTOWN, NY 12168

ADOPTED: APRIL 20, 2015

RESOLUTION #27 of 2015 RESOLUTION STATING OPPOSITION TO THE KINDER MORGAN NATURAL GAS PIPELINE PROPOSED TO BE ROUTED THROUGH STEPHENTOWN

WHEREAS, A large natural gas pipeline, called the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline project, has been proposed by Kinder Morgan and its subsidiary Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC, to be routed through Rensselaer County, including the entire width of the Town of Stephentown; and

WHEREAS, The proposed NED pipeline would transport natural gas from other parts of the country for intended export out of New York State and possibly overseas, with no natural gas benefits to the residents of Rensselaer County or the Town of Stephentown; and

WHEREAS, The project applicant, Kinder Morgan, is seeking federal eminent domain status to allow for property to be secured for the routing of the pipeline, including properties in the Town of Stephentown; and

WHEREAS, The proposed NED pipeline would be much larger, up to 36 inches in diameter, and operate at much higher pressures, up to 1460 psi, than currently operating natural gas pipelines in this area; and

WHEREAS, The proposed NED pipeline route through the Town of Stephentown would closely follow the high voltage right-of-way presently owned and operated by National Grid, raising reasonable concern for the detrimental interaction between the pipeline and the electromagnetic fields established by the high voltage wires; and

WHEREAS, The thickness/strength of the proposed NED pipeline, the depth at which it would be buried in the ground and the inspection methods for the necessary welds are proposed to be significantly less for our rural area than those required for urban areas; and

WHEREAS, Property values in the vicinity of the proposed NED pipeline are likely to be significantly re-

duced if it is constructed, adversely impacting future development in the Town of Stephentown; and  
WHEREAS, The proposed NED pipeline could cause disruption and undue burdens for emergency services and would significantly increase the potential for catastrophic damage to lives, property, roadways, streams, and wetlands in our small, rural community; and

WHEREAS, The Stephentown Town Board believes the level of compensation and mitigation that may potentially be offered by the developers of the proposed NED pipeline would not outweigh the long term fiscal, health, safety, environmental and quality of life impacts to our community; and

WHEREAS, The Stephentown Town Board understands that a huge majority of Stephentown residents, as evidenced by many letters, emails and phone calls, the attendance and participation at an Open Forum hosted by Stephentown residents, a Public Hearing hosted by the Stephentown Town Board, and numerous regular meetings of the Stephentown Town Board, are adamantly opposed to the construction and operation of the proposed NED pipeline; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, The Stephentown Town Board does hereby declare its strong opposition to the construction of the proposed NED pipeline through the Town of Stephentown; and, be it further

RESOLVED, The Stephentown Town Board requests that, because of the abundant un-answered concerns and questions brought forth by townspeople, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) deny a certificate of public convenience and necessity to Kinder Morgan and the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company for the construction of the proposed NED pipeline; and, be it further

RESOLVED, The Stephentown Town Clerk is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to our elected Officials: U.S. Senator Charles Schumer, U.S. Senator Kirsten Gillibrand, U.S. Congressman Chris Gibson, NYS Governor Andrew Cuomo, NYS Senator Kathy Marchione, NYS Assemblyman Steve McLaughlin, Rensselaer County Legislator Stan Brownell and Rensselaer County Legislator Lester Goodermote; and be it further

RESOLVED, The Stephentown Town Board requests that the Town Boards of our neighboring Rensselaer County towns of Nassau and Schodack pass similar, strong resolutions in opposition to the proposed NED pipeline.

MOTION BY:JENNINGS SECONDED BY:DEMICK

VOTES of: 4 AYE            0 NAY            0 ABSTAINED

The Resolution was declared duly adopted

CERTIFICATION OF THE TOWN CLERK

STATE OF NEW YORK )

)SS

COUNTY OF RENSSELAER )

I, Stephanie M. Wager, Town Clerk of the Town of Stephentown do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy, and the whole thereof, a resolution duly adopted by the Town Clerk of the Town of Stephentown on the 20th day of April, 2015.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto subscribed my name and signed this certificate this 20th day of April, 2015

STATE OF NEW YORK )

COUNTY OF RENSSELAER ) ss.:

TOWN OF SAND LAKE )

I, Barbara A. Biittia, Town Clerk of the Town of Sand Lake, Rensselaer County, New York, DO HEREBY CERTIFY, that I have compared the foregoing with the original resolution adopted by the Town Board of the Town of Sand Lake at a meeting of said Board held on June 10, 2015 and that the foregoing is a true and

correct transcript of said original resolution and of the whole thereof, and that said original resolution is on file in my office.

I DO FURTHER CERTIFY, that each of the members of said Town Board had due notice of said meeting, and that, Sunervlsor Flora Fasoldt. Councilwomen Christine Kronau. Barbara Glasser and Councilmen. Mark CiotB and Rsv Turner were nresent at such meetinu.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereto set my hand and the seal of the Town of Sand Lake, this June 22, 2015

Town Clerk

-----  
RESOLUTION 2015-06-46

Supporting Neighboring Towns in Opposition to the Kinder Morgan Natural Gas Pipeline Proposed to be Routed through Rensselaer County

Supervisor Fasoldt moved and Councilman Cioffi seconded the following resolution:

Whereas, a large natural gas pipeline called the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline project, has been proposed by Kinder Morgan and its subsidiary Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LLC, to be touted through Rensselaer County, including the neighboring Towns of Schodack, Nassau and Stephentown; and

Whereas, the proposed NED pipeline would operate at much higher pressures, than currently operating natural gas pipelines in Rensselaer County; and

Whereas, the pipeline proposed for routing through neighboring towns will be approximately 36 inches in diameter, and routed on existing rights of way, along with nearby private properties and include a large gas compressor station or stations that will encompass extensive acreage and possibly located near residential areas; and,

Whereas, the proposed NED pipeline would transport natural gas from other parts of the country for intended export out of New York State and possibly overseas, with no natural gas benefits to the residents of Rensselaer County; and

Whereas, neighboring Towns directly impacted by the proposed NED pipeline have endeavored to be fully informed of this project and have documented and reported the potential detrimental impacts of this project, to include, but are not limited to:

1. As proposed, this pipeline will run across private property, directly adjacent to homes and through waterways; and,
2. As proposed, this project will impact residential wells, natural groundwater recharge areas and aquifers; and,
3. This proposal is expected to blast through the Rensselaer Plateau which is one of New York's largest intact forested areas that has brought economic opportunity through tourism and responsible business to many areas of Rensselear County; and,
4. This proposal would impact designated areas of archeological sensitivity across communities; and,
5. As currently proposed, this pipeline has significant potential impact in the areas of public health and safety, home values, businesses, sensitive habitat fragmentation and the further stalling of economic development; and,
6. The project applicant, Kinder Morgan, is seeking federal eminent domain status to allow for property to be secured for the routing of the pipeline which will not benefit the residents of our neighboring communities and give the company and its affiliates an unfair advantage over property owners in these communities; and
7. The proposed NED pipeline would closely follow the high voltage right-of-way raising reasonable concern for the detrimental interaction between the pipeline and the electromagnet fields established by

the high voltage wires; and

8. The thickness/sttength of the proposed NED pipeline, the depth at which it would be buried in the ground and the inspection methods for the necessary welds are proposed to be significantly less for rural areas than those required by urban areas; and

9. The proposed NED pipeline carries an inherent risk of leaks, ruptures, fires, explosions, and accidents, which may cause disruption and undue burden for emergency services aud would significantly increase the potential for catastmpbic damage to lives, property, roadways, streams, wells, aquifers and wetlands in our neighboring rural communities; and

10. Neighboring towns believe the level of compensation and mitigation would not outweigh the long term fiscal, health, safety, business, environmental and quality of life impacts to those neighboring towns; and

11. The proposed pipeline is contrary to the rural residential character of these communities and fails to follow the already existing pipeline corridor; and,

12. The proposed use of land for an industrial compressor station necessary to operate this pipeline, would have dramatic and long term, environmental, social and economic impacts on the rural residential character of our neighboring towns; and

13. The proposed use of land for this project is in direct contradiction to town law as well as the comprehensive plans of these communities; now therefore,

Be it Resolved, that due to the widespread serious concerns and questions raised by residents and the potentially significant negative impacts of the proposed project, the Town of Sand Lake stands in solidarity with the neighboring Towns of Rensselaer County in opposition to the construction of the proposed NED pipeline; and,

Be it Further Resolved, that the Town Clerk of the Town of Sand Lake is hereby directed to transnut certified copies of this resolution to United States Senator Charles Schumer, United States Senator Kirsten Gillibrand, Congressman Chis Gibson, Congressman Paul Tonko, Governor Andrew Cuomo, New York State Senator Marchione, State Assemblyman Steve McLaughlin and Rensselaer County Executive Kathy Jimino.

ADOPTED = AYES 5    NAYS 0

-----  
**Village of East Nassau**

P.O. Box 268 w East Nassau, NY 12062

518.794.0289

villageofeastnassau.org

MITCHELL LEVINN

Mayor

June 17, 2015

Governor Andrew M. Cuomo  
The Executive Chamber  
State Capitol  
Albany, New York 12224

U.S. Senator Charles Schumer  
Leo O'rien Building —Room 420  
11A Clinton Avenue  
Albany, New York 12207

U.S. Senator Kirsten Gillibrand  
Leo O'rien Building —Room 721

Congressman Paul Tonko  
61 Columbia Street-4 Floor  
Albany, New York 12210

Honorable Kathleen Marchione  
Legislative OKce Bldg. —Room 918  
188 State Street  
Albany, New York 12247

Honorable Steve McLaughlin  
Legislative 015ce Bldg. —Room 533

11A Clinton Avenue  
Albany, New York 12207  
Congressman Chris Gibson  
2 Hudson Street  
PO Box 775  
Kinderhook, New York 12106

188 State Street  
Albany, New York 12247  
Honorable Kathleen Jimino  
Rensselaer County Executive  
1600 Seventh Avenue —5 Floor  
Troy, New York 12180

Re: Resolution Stating Opposition to Kinder Morgan Gas Pipeline

Dear Government Representative:

Enclosed herewith is the Resolution adopted by the Village Board of the Village of East Nassau, New York at its monthly meeting held on June 10, 2015.

This Resolution states the village's opposition to the Kinder Morgan Natural Gas Pipeline proposed to be routed through the Town of Nassau north or the Village of East Nassau.

We are asking your support in favor of this resolution. Thank you for your attention to this very important matter for the citizens of the Village of East Nassau and the Town of Nassau.

Encl.

Respectfully yours,

Diane Maguire  
Village Clerk

-----  
Resolution of the Board of Trustees of the **Village of East Nassau**

STATING OPPOSITION TO THE KINDER MORGAN NATURAL GAS PIPELINE PROPOSED TO BE ROUTED THROUGH THE TOWN OF NASSAU NORTH OF THE VILLAGE OF EAST NASSAU

WHEREAS, a large natural gas pipeline called the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline project, has been proposed by Kinder Morgan and its subsidiary Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LLC, to be routed through Rensselaer County, including the entire width of the northern portion of the Town of Nassau; and

WHEREAS, the proposed NED pipeline would transport natural gas from other parts of the country for intended export out of New York State and possibly overseas, with no natural gas benefits to the residents of the Village of East Nassau, the Town of Nassau, or Rensselaer County; and

WHEREAS, the Village of East Nassau is less than two miles from the proposed compressor station in the Town of Nassau, and less than one mile from the proposed pipeline route; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Nassau, through its Natural Resources Committee, has done extensive research into the impacts of the proposed pipeline and has concluded that the pipeline would cause detrimental impacts to biodiversity and natural areas along and around the pipeline route; and

Whereas, the Village Board has received numerous communications from village residents expressing concern about impacts of the proposed pipeline and unanimous opposition to the project; and Whereas, this proposed pipeline has a significant potential impact in the areas of public safety, home values, and businesses throughout the Village of East Nassau and beyond;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Village Board hereby declares its strong opposition to the construction of the proposed NED pipeline through the Town of Nassau; and, be it further

RESOLVED, that the Village Board of the Village of East Nassau requests that, because of the abundant unanswered questions, impacts, and concerns brought forward by our village residents and by our representatives in the Town of Nassau, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) deny a certificate of public convenience and necessity to Kinder Morgan and the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company for the construction of the proposed NED pipeline; and, be it further

RESOLVED, that the Village Clerk of the Village of East Nassau is hereby directed to transmit copies of

this resolution to United States Senator Charles Schumer, United States Senator Kirsten Gillibrand, Congressman Chris Gibson, Congressman Paul Tonko, Governor Andrew Cuomo, New York State Senator Kathy Marchione, State Assemblyman Steve McLaughlin and Rensselaer County Executive Kathy Jimino. Upon motion made by Trustee Bill Davis, and seconded by Trustee Lydia Davis, the foregoing resolution was duly adopted by a majority of the members of the Village Board of the Village of East Nassau at its Regular Meeting held on June 10, 2015.

Certification by Village Clerk

-----  
Resolution of the Town Board of the **Town of Nassau**

STATING OPPOSITION TO THE KINDER MORGAN NATURAL GAS PIPELINE PROPOSED TO BE ROUTED THROUGH THE TOWN OF NASSAU

Resolution No. 11

WHEREAS, a large natural gas pipeline called the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline project, has been proposed by Kinder Morgan and its subsidiary Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LLC, to be routed through Rensselaer County, including the entire width of the northern portion of the Town of Nassau; and

WHEREAS, the proposed NED pipeline would be much larger, up to 36 inches in diameter, and operate at much higher pressures, than currently operating natural gas pipelines in Rensselaer County; and

WHEREAS, the proposed NED pipeline would transport natural gas from other parts of the country for intended export out of New York State and possibly overseas, with no natural gas benefits to the residents of the Town of Nassau or Rensselaer County; and

WHEREAS, this project, as currently planned, would not follow a route through the community already impacted by a pipeline in the southern end of the Town of Nassau; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board of the Town of Nassau has endeavored to be fully informed of this project and its impacts and has requested that the Town's Natural Resources Committee review and provide a report of the natural gas resources impacts of this project;

NOW THEREFORE RESOLVED, that the Town Board of the Town of Nassau does hereby make the following findings:

WHEREAS, the Nassau Natural Resources Committee has completed this report and the document provides an outline of real and detrimental impacts to the biodiversity and natural gas areas of concern across the width of the Town of Nassau &om the current route proposed for this industrial project; and

1. as proposed, this pipeline will run across private property, directly adjacent to homes and through waterways; and
2. as proposed, this project will impact residential wells, natural groundwater recharge areas and aquifers; and
3. this proposal is expected to blast through the Rensselaer Plateau which is one of New York's largest intact forested areas that has brought economic opportunity through tourism and responsible business to many areas of Rensselaer County — including Nassau; and
4. this proposal would impact designated areas of archeological sensitivity across the community; and
5. the Town Board of the Town of Nassau has received numerous public comments during Town meetings as well as numerous calls and messages of concern &om residents impacted by this project which have stated opposition to this project; and
6. the Town Board of the Town of Nassau has received letters of opposition and messages &om business owners and community groups in the town expressing specific and economically damaging concerns about the impacts on business operations and programs &om construction and operation of this pipeline; and

7. the loss of business activity even during this proposed project construction period could mean the closure of small operations in this & agile economy; and
8. members of the Town Board of the Town of Nassau have attended the only Rensselaer County informational meeting hosted by Kinder Morgan and Board Members have also attended community forums across Rensselaer County on this project which were sponsored by community members to collect and share information on this proposal; and
9. as currently proposed, this pipeline has a significant potential impact in the areas of public safety, home values, businesses, sensitive habitat fragmentation and further stalling of economic opportunity; and
10. the project applicant, Kinder Morgan, is seeking federal eminent domain status to allow for property to be secured for the routing of the pipeline, including properties in the Town of Nassau; and
11. the granting of and threat of federal eminent domain status to Kinder Morgan for this project which will not benefit our residents will give the company and its affiliates an unfair advantage over property owners in this community; and
12. as proposed, this pipeline project will result in significant amounts of private property being incorporated into this project which will lead to a decline in property values, ability to conduct business and a decrease in taxable values for the community as a whole; and
13. the proposed NED pipeline route through the Town of Nassau would closely follow the high voltage right-of-way presently owned and operated by National Grid, raising reasonable concern for the detrimental interaction between the pipeline and the electromagnetic fields established by the high voltage wires; and
14. the thickness/strength of the proposed NED pipeline, the depth at which it would be buried in the ground and the inspection methods for the necessary welds are proposed to be significantly less for our rural area than those required for urban areas; and
15. the proposed NED pipeline could cause disruption and undue burdens for emergency services and would significantly increase the potential for catastrophic damage to lives, property, roadways, streams, wells, aquifers and wetlands in our small, rural community; and
16. the Town Board of the Town of Nassau believes the level of compensation and mitigation that may potentially be offered by the developers of the proposed NED pipeline would not outweigh the long term fiscal, health, safety, business, environmental and quality of life impacts to our community; and
17. the proposed pipeline project is contrary to the rural residential character of the community and will have to follow the already existing pipeline corridor; and
18. the proposed use of lands of the town of Nassau for an industrial compressor station necessary to operate this pipeline, in any portion of the community, would have dramatic and long term, environmental, social and economic impacts on the rural residential character of the community; and
19. the construction and operation of such a gas compressor station is contrary to Town laws as well as the Town of Nassau Comprehensive Plan as developed and approved by the community in July 2011;

and, be it further RESOLVED, that based on the above findings, the Town Board hereby declares its strong opposition to the construction of the proposed NED pipeline through the Town of Nassau; and, be it further RESOLVED, that the Town Board of the Town of Nassau requests that, because of the abundant unanswered questions, impacts, and concerns brought forward by our residents, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) deny a certificate of public convenience and necessity to Kinder Morgan and the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company for the construction of the proposed NED pipeline; and, be it further RESOLVED, that the Town Board of the Town of Nassau does hereby oppose the granting of eminent domain status for the Kinder Morgan natural gas pipeline proposed to cut through the community; and, be it further

RESOLVED, that the Town Board of the Town of Nassau does hereby oppose the use of lands of the Town of Nassau for an industrial compressor station in any portion of the community as such usage would be in violation with local planning documents and local laws; and, be it further

RESOLVED, that the Town Clerk of the Town of Nassau is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to United States Senator Charles Schumer, United States Senator Kirsten Gillibrand, Congressman Chris Gibson, Congressman Paul Tonko, Governor Andrew Cuomo, New York State Senator Kathy Marchione, State Assemblyman Steve McLaughlin and Rensselaer County Executive Kathy Jimino.

Upon motion made by Supervisor David Fleming, and seconded by Ms. Richards, the foregoing resolution was duly adopted by a majority of the members of the Town Board of the Town of Nassau at its Regular Meeting held on May 14, 2015, by roll call vote as follows:

Ronald Sears, Councilmember	No_	Yes X	Absent/Abstain_
Lani Richards, Councilmember	No_	Yes X	Absent/Abstain_
Jonathan Goebel, Councilmember	No_	Yes X	Absent/Abstain_
Robert Rings, Councilmember	No_	Yes X	Absent/Abstain_
David Fleming, Supervisor	No_	Yes X	Absent/Abstain_

Said Resolution was duly adopted: May 14, 2015. IN WITNESS THEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and the seal of the Town of Nassau, Rensselaer County, New York.

Sandra L. Rings, Town Clerk, Dated: May 22, 2015

-----  
**Office of the Schodack Town Clerk**

265 Schuurman Rd.

Castleton, NY 12033

TELEPHONE (518) 477-7590

FAX (818) 477-2439

DONNA L CONLIN  
TOWN CLERK

May 18, 2015

The Hon. Chris Gibson  
PO Box 775  
Kinderhook, NY 12106

Dear Congressman Gibson:

Enclosed you will find a certified resolution adopted by the Town Board of the Town of Schodack on May 14, 2015 opposing the Kinder Morgan (NED) pipeline that is proposed to go through the Town of Schodack. Many residents of our community have voiced their concerns at Town Board meetings and other public venues in opposition to this line. The Town Board assessed all the information presented by Kinder Morgan and others before making their decision to join with the towns of Nassau and Stephentown as well as Rensselaer County in opposition to the pipeline. The enclosed resolution outlines the justifications for why we oppose the pipeline.

We seek your support in challenging the placement of this 36 inch in diameter pipeline and possible compressor station in the Town of Schodack. Further, as our Congressman, we would sincerely appreciate it if you would reach out to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission on our behalf to voice our concerns.

Sincerely,

Donna L. Conlin/CMC/RMC  
Schodack Town Clerk

KAREN A. VECCHIONE, DEPUTY  
LOIS M. CICCOLELLA, DEPUTY

Enc: (1

-----  
**Office of the Schodack Town Clerk**

265 Schuurman Rd.

Castleton, NY 12033

TELEPHONE (518)477-7590

FAX (518)477-2489

DONNA L CONLIN

TOWN CLERK

KAREN A. VECCHIONE, DEPUTY

LOIS M. CICCOLELLA, DEPUTY

STATE OF NEW YORK )  
COUNTY OF RENSSELAER )SS.:  
TOWN OF SCHODACK )

I, the undersigned Clerk of the Town of Schodack, do hereby certify as follows:

1. A Special Meeting of the Town Board of the Town of Schodack, State of New York, was duly held on 05/14/2015, and Minutes of said meeting have been duly recorded in the Minute Book kept by me in accordance with law for the purpose of recording the Minutes of meetings of said Board. I have compared the attached Extract with said Minutes so recorded and said Extract is a true copy of said Minutes and of the whole thereof insofar as said Minutes relate to matters referred to in said Extract.
2. Said Minutes correctly state the time when said Meeting was convened and the place where such Meeting was held and the members of said Board who attended said Meeting.
3. Public Notice of the time and place of the said Meeting was duly given to the public and the news media in accordance with the Open Meetings Law, constituting Chapter 511 of the Laws of 1976 of the State of New York, and that the members of said Board had due notice of said Meeting and the Meeting was in all respects duly held and a quorum was present and acted throughout.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and have hereunto affixed the corporate seal of the Town of Schodack this 15 day of May 2015. ~.~P..) Donna E. Conlin  
Schodack Town Clerk/RMC

At a Regular Meeting of the Town Board of the Town of Schodack, Rensselaer County, New York, held at 265 Schuurman Road, in said Town on the 14 of Msy, 2015 at 7:05 P.M.

The meeting was called to order by Dennis Dowds, Supervisor, and upon roll being called, the following

	PRESENT	ABSENT
DENNIS E. DOWDS	X	
FRANCIS H. CURTIS	X	
JAMES N. BULT	X	
MICHAEL KENNEY	X	
SCOTT SWARTZ	X	

The following resolution was offered by Councilperson Swartz who moved its adoption and was seconded by Supervisor Dowds:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE TOWN BOARD OF THE TOWN OF SCHODACK DOES HEREBY:

2015-145) WHEREAS, Kinder Morgan, by its subsidiary Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LLC, is proposing a large natural gas pipeline to run through southern Rensselaer County, including the Town of Schodack, referenced as the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline project; and

WHEREAS, Kinder Morgan is seeking approval from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC)

for federal eminent domain status, to allow the project to proceed; and

WHEREAS, the citizens of the Town of Schodack have expressed strong opposmon to this project, based upon a series of concerns:

1. The proposed NED pipeline would be large (36 inches in diameter) with a high pressure (1460 psi), which in turn would result in major public safety issues in the Town of Schodack;
2. The public safety issues will result in strains to fire departments and other emergency responders in the Town;
3. The public safety concerns will reduce property values in the Town of Schodack along the route of the proposed pipeline;
4. The project would create the risk of substantial damage to the health, safety, and environment of the Town of Schodack including damage to the aquifer;
5. The compensation, if any, paid to property owners by the pipeline operator would not come close to compensating for the major economic and environmental damages to the Town;
6. The project includes the siting of a compressor station, reportedly in the Town of Schodack. The industrial size of this proposed compressor station would result in significant noise and other environmental impacts to residents near the compressor site; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board of the Town of Schodack shares the concerns expressed by many residents, and wishes to give formal expression of this opposition to Kinder Morgan, FERC, and more particularly to our federal representatives in Congress;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Town Board of the Town of Schodack hereby goes on record to express its strong opposition to the siting of this pipeline and the compressor station anywhere within the Town of Schodack; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Schodack Town Clerk is hereby directed to send a certified copy of this resolution to the representatives of the Town in Congress, to wit, Hon. Charles Schumer, Hon. Kirsten Gillibrand, and Hon. Chris Gibson and Hon. Paul Tonko.

Upon the vote being cast, the members voted as follows:

	AYE	NAY	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
DENNIS E. DOWDS	X			
FRANCIS CURTIS	X			
JAMES N. BULT	X			
MICHAEL KENNEY	X			
SCOTT SWARTZ	X			

The Resolution, having received a majority vote of the members of the Town Board was declared by the Supervisor to be adopted.

-----  
**DELAWARE COUNTY**  
**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

Senator Charles D. Cook County Once Building  
111Main Street  
Delhi, New York 13753  
Telephone: 607-832-5110  
Fax: 607-832-5111

James E. Eisel, Sr., Chalriuan  
Chrlista M. Schafer, Clerk

April 23, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., Docket No. PF14-22-000  
Proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project

On behalf of the affected Towns in Delaware County I am writing to convey serious concerns we have about the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline that is proposed to be routed through Delaware County. The line is being proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company (TGPC) a subsidiary of Kinder Morgan. The TGPC line will traverse 45.6 miles of Delaware County through the Towns of Masonville, Sidney, Franklin, Davenport and Harpersfield. The County, Towns and hundreds of landowners will be directly impacted by this proposal. There are also many concerns about indirect impacts to neighboring towns and villages as the construction traffic traverses their roads and community to gain access to the proposed line. At our April 8, 2015 Board of Supervisors meeting Kinder Morgan gave a presentation about the proposed line and took questions from my colleagues and County staff. While they committed to mitigate many of the concerns raised, we herewith request that FERC formalize these commitments prior to your issuance of the Certificate of Public Necessity and Convenience. Delaware County and the affected Towns within it will take strong opposition to the line if FERC does not take actions to ensure that the impacts of the line are mitigated and the taxpayers of the municipalities are held harmless of the total costs of constructing this line.

Public safety and the protection of municipal infrastructure are of paramount importance to the Towns and County. To that end there will be legal costs and engineering time expended by all municipalities through which construction traffic will flow to ensure that a road use agreement is developed that protects the safety of the traveling public and protect the structural integrity of the roads. The municipalities will track these costs closely and accurately. The local costs for these efforts must be paid by the developer.

We are also deeply concerned about what the future will hold for additional natural gas pipelines traversing the same route. This is the second line to follow the exact same route through the county. This route is obviously a desirable route from the productive gas fields in Pennsylvania to cities and ports along the East Coast. We are very concerned about the cumulative effects of multiple lines through our County. We request that FERC require a comprehensive plan be developed by experts in health, environment, public safety, social/ economic, land values and quality of life. This plan shall address the maximum number of lines that could reasonably be constructed safely so that our residents can be aware of what could ultimately be developed here. Since FERC supersedes all local land use requirements, it is only reasonable that the communities have an accurate vision of what could ultimately happen so they can plan around it.

Delaware County's concerns are based on past utility and proposed project experiences that have or are about to traverse our County. For instance we are having difficulty getting a road use agreement with Constitution Pipeline (one that FERC recently approved). In light of this ongoing experience we can only anticipate the same difficulties with TGPC. This is consuming substantial amounts of legal and engineering which should be reimbursed to the County but is not currently. We recognize the benefits that these projects have to America's economic growth, worldwide competitiveness and quality of life for the greater population. However, the costs associated with these benefits should not be carried by a small portion of the population. It is imperative that the entire costs of the project should be addressed by the developers and ultimately by the consumers. Environmental justice laws are in place to prevent a few poorer people from having to shoulder huge costs at the benefit of all end users. We request that FERC truly address all the costs. In some towns, the TGPC pipeline will be an additional natural gas line to the pending Constitution natural gas line and an existing liquid propane line. Just to provide you with a visual in the event you are unfamiliar with this region, Delaware County is in the beautiful Catskill Mountains and we love our rural way of life, feel very secure away from the maddening crowds, and are proud to call this home. Now there is a possibility of yet

another approval from FERC which will put 3 pipelines in some of our towns in the County. This certainly will put a scar on this pristine area and our rural mountainsides. To date, the TGPC proposal has not offered any commitment for substantial economic compensation. Our requests that follow are tiny, relative to the financial benefits the pipeline companies and natural gas providers will reap &om the installation of this line, as are the cost savings the end consumers will enjoy.

Our County also has the dubious distinction of being regulated by both governmental and quasi-governmental entities which include New York City, Delaware River Basin Commission and Susquehanna River Basin Commission, with no representation and in the case of the latter two, no financial support for compliance with their regulations. Half of our county land is regulated by New York City and provides half of the daily water consumption of New York City with no direct benefit to the residents of the County. The County also has major electrical transmission lines going through it and one of the largest substations in the state, both of which are there to support power to the City of New York area with no benefit to the County residents. All of these major utilities have left major impacts to the land and people of the county while providing economical services to the Cities of the east coast. The County is dependent on FERC to ensure that the true costs of this proposed project are born by the developers and that the hosts of the projects are not left with costs without any benefit. The host communities must see some benefit from the project in order for justice to be done. Our residents will see little or no benefit in the medium or long-term &om this project as has been the case on other utility projects. New York City managed to get natural gas drilling banned in half of Delaware County before New York State banned it altogether. Frankly, we are tired of being the doormat of outside entities that take far more than they give, while receiving substantial economic benefits hundreds of miles away from our residents without enduring any inconvenience or risk for their economic gain while the interests of our residents are summarily dismissed.

Our county is one of the fastest aging counties in the state and one of the poorest. Our median household income is 30% lower than the state median household income. We are in dire need of affordable senior housing and housing for hundreds of residents displaced by floods of record over the past 15 years. Our manufacturing and agriculture enterprises are shrinking. With declining enterprises, we are depending more and more on the second home owners who come to enjoy the scenic resources of the County and tourism. When development takes the scenery away we have nothing left to support our residents.

A study by the Open Space Institute on the Catskills used data from the Cornell Program on Applied Demographics which indicated “that [a certain geographic area in the Catskills is anticipated to] average 4% growth between 2005 and 2035.” Delaware County, however “is expected to lose 23% of its population and was therefore excluded &om the total and development growth analysis” conducted by the Open Space Institute because it severely distorted the projected growth in the other counties. The same data showed that demographic “projections by Cornell University show a decline of population of 43% for the age group 0 to 60 and an increase of 21% for ages 60 to 85” for Delaware County. They demonstrated that by separating population projections by age Delaware County “shows a steep decline in the working-age population.” Twenty five percent of our residents are on some form of public assistance and its anticipated that will increase. This data illustrates that Delaware County is facing many economic challenges including jobs to retain our youth and lends itself to questions of how we will meet the challenges of a rapidly aging population on fixed incomes combined with a declining work force accompanied by little or no growth in tax base?

Unfortunately, according to a report published by The Weather Channel, evaluating the 50 worst places to own a home, Delaware County ranked as the 10th worst place to own a home. There are over 3,000 counties in the United States. The list includes cost to heat and cool homes to weather-related deaths in homes. Delaware County’s ranking is based almost entirely upon the risk for weather impacts such as flood damage and heating costs.

With a declining tax base, we have not been able to upgrade our transportation system. Our roads, with very few exceptions, have developed over time from the original horse and buggy trails. They are not designed to handle the present day truck loadings. It is imperative that FERC include provisions in the approvals to ensure that all the roads used during the construction and testing phases are protected.

FERC should also ensure that all reasonable legal costs incurred by municipalities affected by this project will be reimbursed by TGPC.

1. We request that FERC strongly consider including the following items in the Certificate of Public Necessity and Convenience: The commitments we seek from TGPC are:

~ The elected town officials and the entire County Board of Supervisors shall be kept fully informed as the project is developed. The standard for TGPC going forward shall be the highest level of transparency for all townships that will be affected either by the line or construction traffic and the full Delaware County Board of Supervisors so that they can communicate effectively with their constituents about the proposed pipeline.

~ TGPC will provide usable maps with parcels and other relevant electronic data in a timely manner to the affected towns through our County Planning Department and in a format that is compatible with the software used by our Delaware County Planning Department.

~ They shall make public presentations to the Board of Supervisors when requested and will keep them fully informed as the project progresses and respond expeditiously to specific requests of the Board.

~ The Chairman of the Board will be their contact point on matters brought forth by fellow supervisors.

~ We expect that local comments be taken seriously and respond to them promptly in writing.

2. Facts reported to the County on September 5, 2014 by Kinder Morgan.

They will pre-file with FERC in approximately two weeks & on September 5th.

They anticipate a full FERC filing in the Fall of 2015.

Total project extends at least 400 miles at a cost of \$4 billion.

There are currently 260 landowners who will be affected by the proposal pipeline in Delaware County.

Allowing access by a gas distribution company to an interstate pipeline to distribute local is required by law.

3. Requests to offset the expenses and good faith commitments by TGPC:

~ We ask that all alternatives related to landowner, local economic impacts, costs to local municipalities and environmental concerns be evaluated by FERC on a cumulative basis and establish accounts to offset these expenses to be used at the discretion of the County.

o Serious consideration should be given to constructing Kinder Morgan concurrently with the Constitution pipeline to minimize the negative effects of the construction process for our residents and communities.

o With the addition of the TGPC pipeline to the Constitution Pipeline some small properties may be left with an unacceptable lot size. In those cases, Kinder Morgan should be required to purchase the entire lot with improvements. The local tax base cannot be undermined by this process and individual property owners should be paid fair market value plus 50% of the value of their improved property to offset the cost and emotional trauma of relocating.

~ We want the following host community benefits. This is a preliminary list subject to change.

o As part of road use agreements, Kinder Morgan or TGPC should establish an account for all municipalities to access for unknown or unanticipated repair and maintenance costs that present themselves in the future under the administration of the Delaware County Department of Public Works. Minimum \$5 million.

o TGPC or Kinder Morgan should establish an account for the County to use for the Rehabilitation, Replacement, Modification, and Upgrade of its Emergency Radio Communications System—which all first responders and municipalities in the County will be utilizing upon its completion. Our current public safety radio system is antiquated and frequently has failures. At this time we suffer & poor to absent interoperability, limited coverage for responders and a critical problem of acquir-

ing parts when we do have breakages. Our current system as it stands today could severely inhibit any response to a large scale pipeline emergency. First Responders will play an integral part in any pipeline emergency and having a reliable communications system is paramount. These funds will be administered by the Department of Emergency Services. Minimum \$5 million.

- o Kinder Morgan or TGPC should establish a \$5million fund for use by the affected municipalities to enable them to comply with unfunded environmental regulations related to stormwater protection, any aspect of flood mitigation or septic waste resulting from this project. These funds will be used at the discretion of these municipalities. These funds will be administered by the Delaware County Department of Watershed Affairs on behalf of those towns and administrative costs incurred by the municipalities and Watershed Affairs will also be covered.

- o Kinder Morgan or TGPC should provide \$5 million dollars for the purposes of providing unmatched grants to businesses, public or private schools in Delaware County with priority given to the five towns to access, for the betterment of these entities and students. This would help enhance the economic climate and offer greater educational opportunities for the children of this county. To be administered by our Department of Economic Development with administrative costs covered.

- o Kinder Morgan or TGPC should voluntarily provide \$5 million for the purposes of creating or assisting affected municipalities with affordable housing alternatives. These funds will be administered by our Delaware County Planning Department as they have contractual planning services with each of the affected municipalities. The county planning department administrative costs and any administrative costs incurred by the municipalities will be covered by these funds as well.

- o That Kinder Morgan or TGPC pay for all costs of construction of a distribution system that provides natural gas to small communities such as Franklin, Davenport and Sidney. These are examples of host communities for which TGPC should consider as the cost of doing business. The income of Kinder Morgan from distributing the natural gas let alone the suppliers of the natural gas dwarf by hard-to-estimate orders of magnitude compared to our request over 50 years. The Pipeline Companies and those who benefit in New England must pay for the benefits we outline.

- o FERC should require TGPC to re-establish their pipeline headquarters and establish future staging headquarters in Delaware County rather than in a County that is unaffected by the pipeline.

- o We will request of FERC and the EPA to consider a determination of environmental justice as a low income group affected by this pipeline and others.

In closing, we look forward to and expect complete transparency and cooperation with our requests and suggestions. Our preliminary request of \$25 million for road use agreements, housing, environmental regulation compliance, economic development/school education and emergency communications is slightly over 5% of the \$ 4 billion cost; a rounding error in a budget of this scope. In addition to that, administrative and legal costs of the Towns and County during construction along with future associated expenses needs reimbursement as well. Escrow accounts should be set up to handle all potential unforeseen expenses. Our financial requests are but loose change relative to Kinder Morgan's or TGPC construction cost and anticipated revenue over the next 50 years. I believe these costs must be shared by the gas companies, pipeline companies and end users who will benefit the most. These clearly justifiable requests are merely part of the cost of doing business for TGPC or Kinder Morgan. FERC should hold them and others responsible on our behalf as we receive no benefits except for property tax. The local costs we will endure during this process would likely never be recouped. They should be added to any projected property tax revenue that may be generated. Experience tells us that TGPC or Kinder Morgan, like the rest, will challenge their assessment overtime with a barrage of attorneys that we would not have the resources to combat, ultimately winning their challenges by wearing us down and burning our limited resources.

Thank you for your consideration of our requests and I look forward to your response to this letter.

Sincerely,

James E. Eisel, Sr., Chairman  
Delaware County Board of Supervisors

cc: US Senator Charles E. Schumer  
US Senator Kirsten Gillibrand  
US Congressman Chris Gibson  
US Environmental Protection Agency  
NY Governor Andrew Cuomo  
NY Dept. Environmental Conservation  
NY Department of State  
NY Office of the Attorney General

Allen Fore, Kinder Morgan  
NY Senator John Bonacic  
NY Senator James Seward  
NY Senator Tom Libous  
NY Assemblyman Pete Lopez  
NY Assemblyman Clifford Crouch  
NY Assemblywoman Claudia Tenney  
Department of the Army

**20150715-0059**

**TOWN OF GILL  
MASSACHUSETTS**

June 29, 2015

Mr. Norman Bay, Chairman  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: Northeast Energy Direct Project, Docket No. PF-14-22-000

Dear Chairman Bay:

On behalf of the Town of Gill, we echo the letters from our counterparts in the Towns of Northfield and Warwick, and respectfully request consideration be given to holding a scoping session within the Town of Northfield. Northfield is one of two communities being proposed to host an 80,000 horsepower compressor station.

Our town is a neighbor to Northfield, sharing a land border as well as more than five miles of border along the Connecticut River. We have many questions and concerns about the proposed location for the compressor station, as well as the possibility of light and noise pollution and impacts on air quality.

If these sessions are held in Boston, that means a 180+ mile round trip for Northfield and Gill residents to participate. This translates to a full day off from work. With the exception of Dracut, Massachusetts, all of the other Massachusetts towns affected by the NED Project are located to the west of Northfield.

We believe it is imperative that our residents be afforded the opportunity to engage in open and transparent dialog with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission regarding the need for pipeline, its proposed route, impacts, and mitigation requirements before any final decision is made.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this request and we look forward to welcoming you in Northfield.

Sincerely,

THE SELECTBOARD OF GILL, MASSACHUSETTS

Gregory M. Snedeker  
Selectboard Chair

cc: Allen Fore, Kinder Morgan  
Peggy Sloan, Franklin Regional Council of Governments

**20150715-0060**

**TOWN OF WENDELL MASSACHUSETTS 01379**  
TOWN OFFICE BUILDING 978-544-3395 fax: 978-544-7467

June 17, 2015

Mr. Norman Bay, Chairman Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: Northeast Energy Direct Project, Docket No. PF-14-22-000

Dear Chairman Bay,

On behalf of the Town of Wendell, we respectfully request consideration be given to holding a scoping session within the Town of Northfield as they are one of two communities being proposed to host an 80,000 horsepower compressor station.

If these sessions are held in Boston, that means a 180 mile round trip for Northfield and Wendell residents to participate. This translates to a full day off of work. With the exception of Dracut, Massachusetts, all of the other Massachusetts towns affected by the NED Project are located to the west of Northfield and Wendell.

We believe it is imperative that our residents be afforded the opportunity to engage in open and transparent dialog with FERC regarding the pipeline and the proposed route, impacts, and mitigation requirements before any final decision is made.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this request and we look forward to welcoming you in Northfield.

Sincerely,

THE SELECTBOARD OF WENDELL, MASSACHUSETTS

Christine Heard Daniel Keller Jeffrey Pooser

cc:Allen Fore, Kinder Morgan Peggy Sloan, Franklin Regional Council of Governments

**20150715-0061**

**Town of Richmond**

105 Old Homestead Highway Richmond, NH 03470

P: (603) 239-4232 F: (603)239-9994

www.richmond.nh. aov

Norman Bay, Chairman  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

Dear Chairman Bay,

We write the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission regarding Kinder Morgan's proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project, Docket N. PF-14-22-000. We, the Selectmen of the Town of Richmond, NH formally request that you schedule a pre-filing scoping meeting in Richmond, NH to allow our residents ample opportunity to express their views on this proposed natural gas pipeline. Our historic Veteran's Hall would be an excellent location and we will work with you to find a mutually convenient date and time for the meeting.

We believe it is imperative that our residents be afforded the opportunity to engage in open and transparent dialog with FERC about the pipeline and the proposed route before any final decision is made.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this request and we look forward to seeing you in Richmond, NH.

Respectfully,

Carol Jameson, Chairman  
Kathryn McWhirk, Selectman  
Christin Daugherty, Selectman

Cc Tennessee Gas Pipeline LLC  
Kinder Morgan

20150715-0063

**TOWN OF RINDGE**  
30 PAYSON HILL ROAD  
RINDGE, NH 03461  
Tel. (603) 699-5161 Fax (603) 899-2101 TDD 1-600-735-2964  
www.town.rindge.nh.ua

June 18, 2015

Norman Bay, Chairman  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

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

Nathaniel J. Davis  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Project  
Docket Number PF-14-22MO

Ladies and Gentlemen:

We, the Selectmen of the Town of Rindge, New Hampshire, formally request that you schedule a pre-filing scoping meeting in Rindge in order to allow our residents an adequate opportunity to express their views and concerns regarding the proposed natural gas pipeline. We have excellent facilities here in Rindge for such a meeting and we will work with you to establish a mutually convenient date and time.

Rindge is a unique community with many special characteristics and we believe that it is imperative that our residents be given the opportunity to engage in a constructive and transparent dialogue with FERC about the pipeline and its proposed route before any final decision is made.

Thank you for your consideration of this request and we look forward to meeting with you in Rindge.

Very truly yours,

Robert Hamilton                      Roberta Oeser                      Daniel Aho

20150715-0107

**FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION**  
WASHINGTON, DC 20426

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

July 10, 2015

The Honorable Bernard O'Grady  
Chairman  
Town of Mason  
16 Darling Hill Road — Mann House  
Mason, NH 03048

Dear Chairman O'Grady:

Thank you for your June 9, 2015, letter requesting a public scoping meeting in Mason, New Hampshire

regarding the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company LLC's (Tennessee Gas) planned Northeast Energy Direct Project (Docket No. PF14-22-000).

We recently issued our Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for this project on June 30, 2015, which initiates the formal public scoping period and identifies the locations, dates, and times for the public scoping meetings. (A copy of that notice is enclosed.) The 14 meeting locations were selected to be convenient for the greatest number of people who might be interested in the project. While Commission staff does not plan to hold a scoping meeting in the Town of Mason, two of the planned scoping meetings are within a short distance of Mason. We encourage you and the citizens of Mason to attend these meetings. As detailed in the Notice, public scoping meetings are just one of the avenues for stakeholder input. Stakeholders may also file written comments with the Commission. Those comments will receive the same attention and scrutiny as comments received at the public meetings.

Since October 2, 2014, Tennessee Gas has participated in the Commission's pre-filing process for the project, which is designed to engage stakeholders to identify and resolve environmental issues before the formal filing of an application with the Commission. As you may know, Tennessee Gas held several public open house meetings in close proximity to Mason early this year, to provide landowners and other stakeholders an opportunity to learn about the project and to discuss their concerns. Commission staff participated in two of these meetings to explain our environmental review process, including the one held on February 24, 2015, in Milford, New Hampshire and the one held on February 26, 2015, in Fitchburg, Massachusetts. This public engagement through Tennessee Gas' open house meetings and formal public scoping period will allow the Commission to conduct a comprehensive and meaningful review of the project as part of our obligation under the National Environmental Policy Act.

Thank you for sharing your concerns as we continue our review of the project. If I can be of further assistance in this or any other Commission matter, do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely,

Norman C. Bay

Chairman

Enclosure

*{note: NO enclosure was included in FERC file "20150715-0107(30721519).pdf"}*

#### **20150715-5000**

gerry avitable, nassau, NY.

Alternate compressor station location

It seems that in the 6 months that Kinder Morgan has allotted to propose the "northern route" through the town of Nassau, they have not fully evaluated the potential sites for the 90,000 HP compressor station.

The area where Rice road intersects the proposed northern route and west towards Poyneer road presents an open area which abuts fewer residences and being flatter would involve less disruption to the environment during both construction and operation.

Maps suggests room for a 1/2 mile buffer zone that would affect fewer properties than the Clarks Chapel Rd locati

The Southern Route as supported by the Nassau Town government would be far less damaging than the proposed route, but in any circumstance Kinder Morgan needs to explore all potential Compressor Station sites to minimize environmental impacts and reduction in property values whatever route if any is allowed.

#### **20150715-5002**

deborah pomerleau, Londonderry, NH.

This is the e-comment I sent to President Obama today. I am very concerned about the roads of NH and the

roads of it's small towns. "Dear Mr. President, I am writing to you about FERC and about the Kinder Morgan pipeline proposed to go through southern NH. Now I have outlined many issues concerning this pipeline in the past. What I would like to address is the infrastructure: the roads. The roads of NH are unique. Many are dirt roads, many have bridges or cement pipes that allow a stream to flow under a road. During many floods, these roads have problems. Dirt washes out leaving the cement pipe. This allows the town to fill in around the pipe, and then everyone can drive across again. These pipes are designed for cars to go over them and occasional trucks. To have continuous use by heavy equipment like huge dump trucks, huge backhoes, and other heavy equipment to go over these bridges and roads designed for small town use, raises a huge risk issue. What if one suddenly collapses from the weight, only a school bus is what falls into the stream? It all may seem dramatic and overstated, yet we are talking about some small small towns here. I grew up here with these wooden bridges, dirt roads, and culvert/cement pipe bridges on less traveled roads. This is a realistic concern that has not been addressed at Open Houses by Kinder Morgan or in any other forum. This is a legitimate concern. I am worried about these old roads and bridges that were not meant to have heavy trucks travel over them day after day. What will happen? What could happen? These are questions that are not being addressed. Please. Please look into this. Please Please. Don't allow this pipeline to happen. Please these issues have not been addressed and need to be looked into. Please re-consider this. Please look into this further. Please don't let the citizens of NH down. "

#### **20150715-5014**

Amy Glowacki, Mason, NH.

I am concerned that the process to site the NED Pipeline through New Hampshire is moving too quickly without proper time provided for impacted townspeople to examine documents and to comment appropriately. Scoping sessions are already planned and the EIS are not available for review at this time. Less than two weeks from the scoping meetings does not provide adequate or fair time for review. This massive project will have environmental impacts and needs proper review. Anything less than 30 days for review is inappropriate and does not reflect a fair and open communication process.

Reps from 13 of the impacted towns in NH signed a letter to our elected officials requesting that FERC honor our requests for a fair and open process. Allowing at minimum 30 days review is key to that fair and open process. The high survey denial rate is surely impacting the proper siting and location of this pipeline. Moving more quickly is not the answer. Honest, fair information sharing is not occurring between residents and Tennessee Gas/Kinder Morgan representatives. Too much of the information cited by official documents submitted by TGP/KM states TBD. Lacking this information creates a situation that is less than honest and open. To have mutual trust and create the best situation please allow time for comprehensive materials to be provided and adequate time for review. It is the only way to make this process open and fair.

For FERC to subject people to eminent domain without due process and fair and honest communication is ethically wrong.

#### **20150715-5019**

Kat McGhee, Hollis, NH.

As gas providers jockey for a piece of New England's energy pie, policy makers ask us to embrace natural gas as our go-to fuel for heating, transportation, and electric power generation. Five New England gas projects, including Northeast Energy Direct (NED), sprouted from a brief peak-demand constraint, worry over electric-market price-spikes, and indecision on plans for our aging power plants. These common energy sector challenges became a "crisis" just in time to meet the availability of Marcellus shale gas. Thus launched New England's NED-Time Story, a tale of three fables: It's cheap, it's clean and we need it.

Fable 1: Cheap

The NED-time story starts with the premise that a new, huge pipeline will lower energy costs. Gas projects other than NED are planned to address regional electric rates - so no savings there. Domestic gas prices are

low today, but that temporary market disruption is due to an uneven playing field. The Energy Act of 2005 exempt gas suppliers from paying for damage to air and water. We still pay for harmful emissions and unusable water; but the optics of the NED-time story keep the myth of cheap gas, alive. The costs of climate disruption are becoming more real every day and our response is to permit increased fossil fuel infrastructure? This policy only works if we ignore the science and support the NED-time storyline.

NED carries a price tag of \$4-\$6 billion, and is the only one of five gas project planned to use wide-scale land-taking by eminent domain. NED's land-use estimates target 6,761 acres of as-yet-undisturbed land from Wright, N.Y. to Dracut, Mass. Massive compressor stations, a 36-inch transmission pipe pushing the highest pressure allowed, and an as-yet-undisclosed co-location agreement with Eversource for right-of-way access, contribute to the most costly utility route in memory. Yet, we are asked to believe NED will yield the least expensive gas.

#### Fable 2: Clean

Like all good fairy tales, we skip the parts that keep us up at night. We've allowed gas to rebrand itself as "clean," even though clean energy is defined as "energy that does not release harmful greenhouse gases into the atmosphere." Gas is made of methane and its use results in the release of both methane and carbon dioxide. We're ignoring reports that say more natural gas reliance means increased emissions. We're accepting assurances that NED gas will be a temporary bridging fuel. But the scale of NED signals a shift backward - not a bridge to cleaner energy.

New Hampshire wants cost-effective, environmentally responsible energy. Kinder Morgan wants maximized profits and increased market share. Examining both goals reveals they are at cross-purposes. NED favors Kinder Morgan's goal of dominant market-share. We tell ourselves we can significantly increase our reliance on natural gas with no adverse economic or environmental impact. New England's electric grid dependence will go from 24 percent gas in 2000, to approximately 87 percent in the next few years. Near-total reliance on one fossil fuel for our electric power generation takes clean energy efforts back 40 years. But being 40 years later, we cannot afford this massive expansion of fossil fuel use, without greater and more costly climate devastation. See Science Magazine - July 3, 2015 for details of the destruction of the oceans - that cannot be stopped without serious changes to our dirty energy practices. Acting as though we have no alternatives is the height of irresponsibility, and only in a fossil fuel influenced world, do we allow this illusion to persist.

#### Fable 3: Need

NED is sized to ship far more gas than New England's energy forecasts require. After more than a year of courting customers, 20-year commitments for NED gas remain tepid. Massachusetts filings show Portland Natural Gas offering to cover NED's long-term contracts through existing pipes, without eminent domain or harm to homesteads, land and watersheds. Recently signed long term liquid natural gas contracts address peak demand heating needs through 2024. Without NED, ratepayers suffer no loss of service or price spikes and domestic shale gas will reach Dracut through existing pipelines. NED plans count on gas conversions in every energy sector and they are willing to fake it until they make it - to obtain regional fuel dominance.

New Hampshire has strong reasons to resist NED's over-built gas infrastructure and so does the region.

The Northeast Energy Direct line promotes over-reliance on an unsustainable fossil fuel, increasing conditions for price volatility and unravelling energy portfolio diversity gains. NED forces ratepayers to bankroll 20th century infrastructure without solving 21st century problems, taking market share from 'clean energy competitors (gas prices closed Vermont Yankee), and ignoring our responsibility to the next generation - the impetus for our decades-long clean energy path.

Any of these outcomes would damage our regional energy economy; all are likely with NED.

Why would NH sacrifice 17 towns to the altar of increased fossil fuel dependence, when less costly strategies exist? NED promises easy solutions to difficult problems - the kind that only exist in NED-time stories.

Granite Staters know the meaning of need; we don't need NED.

-----  
I ask that you consider these very real issues when deciding whether to permit the NED project. The process is carefully designed so that these questions go unanswered. We are past the time when we must face the reality of our energy choices. We look to FERC to recognize the need for their leadership in curbing rampant infrastructure for the sake of last gasp profits for the fossil fuel industry. If gas is a bridging fuel, permit it as such and limit unfettered expansion that takes us in the wrong direction.

Sincerely,

Kat McGhee, M.Ed., PMP

**20150715-5023**

**MERRIMACK SCHOOL DISTRICT**

School Administrative Unit #26

36 McElwain Street

Merrimack, New Hampshire 03054

Tel. (603) 424-6200 • Fax (603) 424-6229

MARJORIE C. CHIAFERY

Superintendent of Schools

DR. MARK E. MCLAUGHLIN

Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum

MATTHEW D. SHEVENELL

Business Administrator

LINDA M. HASTINGS

Director of Human Resources

July 15, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, NE, Room 1A

Washington, DC 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC ("TGP")

Docket No. PF14-22-000: Proposed Northeast Energy Direct ("NED")

Dear Ms. Bose:

The Merrimack School District (SAU #26) opposes, by unanimous vote of the School Board, any route that comes within 1,000 feet of a district school building.' We hope that the proposed route referenced below, and future proposed routes, be removed from consideration to avoid impacts to a facility where our children and employees congregate.

On Tuesday, June 30, 2015, the Town of Amherst (NH) Pipeline Taskforce held a meeting with representatives of the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company/Kinder Morgan. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss alternative options for the pipeline route through Amherst currently under analysis by Kinder Morgan. Please refer to the July 10, 2015 letter to you from Amherst Town Administrator, James O'Mara, Jr.

I call to your attention something that was not discussed at that meeting nor in its summarization; the Option 1 route proposed and discussed at that meeting, running along Continental Blvd in Merrimack, comes within 500 feet of Thorntons Ferry School, located at 134 Camp Sargent Rd, Merrimack, NH. Thorntons Ferry School is a K-4 school in our district with a daily population of over 500 students and 85 staff members.

I respectfully ask that this letter and the accompanying documents be included as part of the public record.

Thank you for your consideration of this information.

Sincerely,

Christopher S. Ortega

Chairman, Merrimack School Board, SAU 26

cc:

Gov. Maggie Hassan

State Rep. Richard Hinch

Sen. Jeanne Shaheen  
Sen. Kelly Ayotte  
Rep. Frank Guinta  
State Sen. Gary Daniels  
State Rep. John Balcom  
State Rep. Richard Barry  
State Rep. Chris Christensen

State Rep. Josh Moore  
State Rep. Jeanine Notter  
State Rep. Anthony Pelligrino  
State Rep. Phillip Straight  
Kinder Morgan Public Affairs, Allen Fore  
Town Manager, Eileen Cabanel for Merrimack Town Council  
Amherst Town Administrator, James O'Mara, Jr.

*{map, not reproduced here}*

**20150715-5028**

**TOWN OF NEW IPSWICH**

661 Turnpike Rd New Ipswich NH 03071  
Board of Selectmen

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

July 14, 2015

Re: Request for scoping meeting

Docket No. PF-14-22, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co., Northeast Energy Direct Proposal

Dear Ms. Bose:

We, the Board of Selectmen of the Town of New Ipswich, New Hampshire, respectfully request the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission reconsider holding a pre-filing scoping meeting in our Town. New Ipswich is one of the New Hampshire towns most intensely impacted by the proposed pipeline, as Kinder Morgan is proposing to locate approximately 6.2 miles of the main line and an unprecedented 80,000 HP compressor in our Town.

We are a small, economically diverse, rural town with a wide range of concerns about the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's Northeast Energy Direct pipeline project. We recently on 2 June learned of the siting of the compressor station in New Ipswich. Given this development, we believe it is extremely important that our citizens be given an opportunity to participate in the pre-filing process, including the opportunity to speak directly to FERC at a scoping meeting.

In addition, we have serious concerns about the lack of access to scoping meetings currently afforded our citizens. There are only two scoping meetings proposed for all of Hillsborough County, one in Milford, NH which requires our citizens to travel approximately 20 miles and a second in Nashua, NH which is approximately 33 miles away.

The auditorium in the Milford Town Hall will only seat approximately 299. With the towns of New Ipswich, Amherst, Brookline, Greenville, Mason, Merrimack, Milford, Rindge, Sharon, and Temple wishing to be represented, we do not believe this offers an adequate opportunity for New Ipswich citizens to provide input to FERC on the potential environmental effects of this proposed project.

We thank you for your urgent attention to this request and, once again, we welcome the opportunity of seeing you in New Ipswich.

Sincerely,

Board of Selectmen

George H. Lawrence, Chairman

Rebecca M. Doyle

Woody Meisner

cc: Maggie Hassan, Governor of New Hampshire

Joseph Foster, Attorney General of New Hampshire

Shawn Jasper, Speaker of the New Hampshire House of Representatives

Chuck Morse, President of the New Hampshire State Senate  
David Wheeler, Executive Councilor  
Kelly Ayotte, U.S. Senator  
Jeanne Shaheen, U.S. Senator  
Ann McLane Custer, U.S. House of Representatives

**20150715-5040**

Frank Gullotto, Wilmington, MA.

I am commenting regarding my concerns about the proposed Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas NED pipeline project that will impact Wilmington, Massachusetts and surrounding towns.

Specifically, Kinder Morgan has not provided updated information in writing regarding a revised route for the Lynnfield Lateral portion of the pipeline. To this point The town only has the original plan which documents locations that Kinder Morgan has said they will no longer use as part of the NED project. As filing dates approach, It is extremely unfair that the residents of this town will not have an opportunity to review the current plan and comment accordingly.

The original KM plan included routing the pipeline through the town's drinking water supply and KM said they will reroute, but without the proper communication of a revised route, there is no chance to determine if the change does in fact avoid town drinking water.

Also, Any plan should include a detailed response for why the Lynnfield Lateral is part of the overall pipeline project. To this point residents of impacted towns have been given no information about the use of this branch of the line.

Thank you,

Frank Gullotto  
12 Draper Drive, Wilmington, MA

**20150715-5044**

Lynn Huntington, East Greenbush, NY.

Eighteen years ago a life long dream to live in a rural area was fulfilled for me. We made the largest investment of our lives and purchased a home in the quiet town of Schodack. We recently renovated a large portion of our 1857 home, expanding our investment in our lifestyle and in this quiet community. The proposed compressor station for this project is within only a few miles of our property. The adverse effects of this going forward include but are not limited to: Noise, traffic, chemical pollution, lower property value and headaches to which I am quite susceptible from the release of formaldehyde gas. Of special concern is the possibility of an uncontrolled fire that our volunteer fire department would be helpless to control. I see no benefit to our community, the small number of jobs it could create would not offset the diminished quality of life for thousands of local residents. Nor would we benefit in lowering local energy costs.

**20150715-5055**

Chales Waggoner, Nassau, NY.

Nassau, NY, is home to an EPA superfund site, the Dewey Loeffel landfill, at which more than 46,000 tons of hazardous waste was deposited by corporations. That's twice the amount dumped at Love Canal.

Our groundwater is poisoned. Our soil is poisoned.

Now, a ruthless, irresponsible corporation, Kinder Morgan, which feels little need to maintain its infrastructure, wants to come poison our air with a 90,000 HP fracked-gas compression station.

This plant will spew out carcinogens and neurotoxins in a rural/residential neighborhood with dozens of children.

It's planned for Clarks Chapel Road in Nassau, just one and a quarter miles from Dewey Loeffel.

Is this madness?

We are being poisoned by land and water — now by air?

When will the poisoning of Nassau stop?

Is there no one in this process who has any sense of decency?

## 20150715-5072

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., Docket No. PF14-22-000

As FERC considers Kinder Morgan's Northeast Energy Direct proposal, I ask that you also consider the following from a concerned citizen.

### **Dear FERC – “Open”, “Transparent”, “Accessible” – Seriously?**

FERC is more than a little fond of telling all who will listen that their agency and its processes are “Open”, “Transparent” and “Accessible” to all comers. On their web site, one of the five Guiding Principles listed by FERC is this:

**Due Process and Transparency: Paramount in all of its proceedings is the Commission's determination to be open and fair to all participants.**

In the many letters from the FERC chairman responding to elected officials who have contacted FERC to ask them to please treat their constituents fairly in one way or another, we see this same boilerplate sentence in FERC's closing paragraph:

**“As in any Commission matter, please be assured that we strive to make our review of energy proposals both accessible and transparent to the public.”**

“Open”, “Transparent” and “Accessible”? Can the FERC commissioners seriously be making this claim? Can they actually be using these three words again and again to describe their actions and their agency's processes?

As we all know, talk is cheap and actions speak much louder than words. Let's review a bit and see how well FERC's past actions have matched their words. [Bear with me over the next several pages, dear reader – there is much to tell]

---

### **Situation:**

Kinder Morgan, in its initial pre-filing for the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) project, used horribly outdated maps. These were low resolution maps from the late 1980s – and were therefore missing entire neighborhoods, school complexes, etc., etc. All of the things that you might imagine missing when your maps are 25+ years out of date.

There were immediate loud and sustained complaints from many of those following the NED project wanting to know how such ridiculous, misleading maps could possibly be accepted by FERC as the basis for a project's pre-filing.

### **FERC's Action:**

Nothing. Nada. Zilch. I simply never saw a public response from FERC to these complaints. The Kinder Morgan pre-filing process continued undisturbed.

This is what US Representative Jim McGovern had to say about the experience:

**“And FERC kind of automatically accepted [the pre-filing]. And we lodged a protest with FERC because the information that the energy company was providing FERC is outdated. The maps aren't even up to date. How do you accept even a pre-filing for a pipeline without at least [having]**

**Situation:**

Kinder Morgan, at FERC’s urging, has held a number of open houses. These are public meetings ostensibly set up to educate the public about their NED pipeline proposal. At these sessions, various Kinder Morgan personnel have openly and repeatedly lied to the public. They lied in one-on-one sessions, they lied in small groups and they lied in presentations to hundreds of local residents. They lied with words and they lied with pictures. They lied by omission and they lied by commission.

Numerous attendees have filed comments with FERC documenting where, when and how these lies were told to the public by Kinder Morgan.

**FERC’s Action:**

To my knowledge, FERC has had absolutely no public response to any of the reports made to them of Kinder Morgan’s lies. As a matter of fact, FERC had information booths set up at some of these meetings, giving at least the appearance of a FERC stamp of approval for the entire proceeding. FERC was in effect providing cover for the Kinder Morgan’s lies when they did this.

Just what was an unwary citizen to think if they attended such a meeting, saw the FERC information booth and then heard Allen Fore, the main Kinder Morgan spokesman, telling them that “Natural gas pipelines don’t affect property values” or that “All of the gas that enters a pipeline makes it to the other end”? \*I have personally heard Mr. Fore say both of these things+

---

**Situation:**

This summer, FERC has scheduled scoping meetings, as required, to allow the public to attend and provide face-to-face feedback to FERC personnel about their concerns regarding the proposed NED pipeline. This is done to insure that the public’s valid environmental concerns are heard by FERC and are incorporated into the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) that must be prepared by FERC as part of the NEPA review of the pipeline proposal.

One critical source of data for members of the public seeking to understand the entirety of the negative environmental impact of a proposed pipeline is the Resource Reports for the proposed pipeline. These are a large, detailed set of documents that must be prepared by an applicant proposing to build a pipeline. Kinder Morgan dutifully prepared a set of draft Resource Reports and released them in March.

But there is a problem - these initial reports are woefully incomplete. They contain more than 12,000 instances of “TBD” (To Be Determined) serving as placeholders where there is missing data. This missing data will theoretically be provided by Kinder Morgan in a future update of the resource reports. Kinder Morgan had promised updated resource reports in June, but reneged on this promise and no update has yet been released as of the middle of July, 2015.

The trouble is that FERC’s scoping meetings have already started without this data being available to the public. Foreseeing the possibility that Kinder Morgan would delay these resource reports, dozens of individuals, organizations and elected officials began asking FERC more than two months ago to please not let the scoping meetings proceed until after complete Resource Reports were released.

**FERC’s Action:**

Despite these repeated pleas from a wide variety affected parties, FERC simply proceeded with the scoping meetings, apparently unconcerned that Kinder Morgan had missed its June deadline and that usable Resource Reports were simply not available to the public attending these meetings.

---

**Situation:**

Because the scoping meetings are so vitally important to the NEPA review process, it is critical for FERC to accurately capture and publish the comments of the members of the public who speak at these meetings. The only way to insure that this happens is to have accurate transcriptions made of the comments. Without an accurate transcription, a person's true thoughts will not be captured and will not find their way into the FERC's EIS.

**FERC's Action:**

The NED scoping meetings have just begun and so no NED transcripts have yet been published. But let's take a look at some transcriptions from a March 18, 2015 scoping meeting for the Atlantic Coast Pipeline. Each example below shows the text of what was read at the meeting followed by the subsequent FERC transcription. This link tells the story. {[http://www.newsadvance.com/nelson\\_county\\_times/news/speakers-holes-errors-rife-throughout-ferc-meeting-transcripts/article\\_4da8f008-0f98-11e5-bc38-d768b6b958d4.html](http://www.newsadvance.com/nelson_county_times/news/speakers-holes-errors-rife-throughout-ferc-meeting-transcripts/article_4da8f008-0f98-11e5-bc38-d768b6b958d4.html)}

**EXAMPLE 1**

What was read:

**“FERC’s analysis of alternatives in the EIS must include the potential of renewables and increased efficiency to meet the purported needs and goals of the project.”**

The FERC transcript reads:

**“FERC does not believe that in the EIS must be proved for potentials and removals and the recent efficiency to meet performing needs and goals of the public.”**

**EXAMPLE 2**

What was read:

**“The one-mile swath of pipeline proposed for Shannon Farm would tear up sensitive wetlands and plow through the climax breech forest in our designated wilderness area. It would disrupt out organic gardens, where some members...grow a sizeable portion of their food.”**

The FERC transcript reads:

**“The one hot swath of pipeline proposed for Shannon Farm would tear up sensitive wetlands and plow through the planet’s beech forests in our designated wilderness area and would destruct our organic environments for some members...for a sizeable portion of their food.”**

**EXAMPLE 3**

What was read:

**“In light of the FERC guidance and the DOE report cited above and the unacceptable impacts to Nelson County this pipeline would cause if routed through the County, request FERC require the ACP LLC to....”**

The FERC transcript reads:

**“And lining the DOE reports sitting the law the only acceptable impasse to Nelson County is — requests FERC requiring the ACC LLC to...”**

I'll leave it to your imagination just exactly how open, transparent and accessible these three scoping meeting speakers found the FERC processes to be. Note to all future scoping meeting speakers – you may wish to also electronically submit your comments to FERC.

---

**Situation:**

An energy company is not allowed to divide a larger project into multiple smaller parts and submit these

separate parts to FERC piecemeal. This tactic is called segmentation and by using segmentation, an energy company can attempt to obscure the true total impact of a larger project that it is planning to build.

As the regulatory agency responsible for overseeing the approval of pipeline projects, FERC is charged with being alert to possible attempts at segmentation by the energy companies making proposals and it must insure that this tactic is not allowed.

In 2014, Tennessee Gas Pipeline (TGP) was seeking approval from FERC for a 40-mile natural gas pipeline loop named the Northeast project. And yes, this is the same Kinder Morgan subsidiary proposing the NED project.

**FERC’s Action:**

FERC issued a certificate of public convenience and necessity to the TGP project, thereby approving the project to go forward as a standalone project.

Environmental groups sued FERC, claiming that this was a clear case of segmentation.

The US Court of Appeals for the DC Circuit agreed with the plaintiffs. The court found that FERC should have considered the Northeast Project in conjunction with three other upgrade projects in other locations along the same pipeline that were under separate FERC review. The court also held that FERC impermissibly segmented its NEPA review of the projects.

FERC was very publicly called out for shirking its regulatory duty and shortchanging the NEPA review process. FERC was then forced to redo the project NEPA review.

---

**Situation:**

During the snowiest New England winter weather in 81 years, FERC staff “strongly recommended” that Kinder Morgan reschedule the NED public Open Houses planned for a week in February in order to insure that those planning to attend the meetings were not deterred by the record amount of snow already on the ground and the two significant storms predicted for the upcoming week.

Kinder Morgan thought it over and simply refused FERC’s strong recommendation to reschedule. The open houses went ahead as planned, in very snowy conditions.

**FERC’s Action:**

Absolutely nothing – there was no public reaction from FERC to Kinder Morgan thumbing their nose at FERC (and at the public).

This may seem to have been a fairly insignificant event, but I found it telling. FERC is supposed to have control over the evaluation of this pipeline proposal. If they don’t have any control, how can they talk about the process being “Open”, “Transparent” and “Accessible”? And yet Kinder Morgan felt no compunction to comply with FERC’s strong recommendation that one week’s worth of meetings be rescheduled. And there were simply no sanctions or repercussions or anything at all that came from FERC as a result. This really opened my eyes to the relationship between FERC and Kinder Morgan – and it doesn’t appear to be the relationship one might expect between a regulator and an applicant.

---

**Situation:**

Over the years, FERC has been presented with dozens of natural gas pipeline proposals. As a “regulatory” agency, one might assume that FERC has seen its way clear to deny approval to pipelines that weren’t needed, that were duplicative, that would cause too much damage while providing too little public good, etc.

**FERC’s Action:**

A member of the FERC team manning an information booth at one of the NED public information sessions was asked if he knew of any natural gas pipelines that FERC had ever denied a certificate of public

convenience and necessity for. He thought a minute and recalled an odd sounding proposal in Florida for an underwater pipeline proposed to go through an endangered coral reef – that one was denied. But that was the only example that he knew of.

Senator Elizabeth Warren has said:

**“I am very concerned about a regulatory agency that is only able to say ‘yes, yes, yes.’ That’s not the job of a regulatory agency.”**

---

### **Situation:**

US Representative Jim McGovern has had dealings with FERC concerning the NED pipeline, and he has attempted to obtain information for himself and his constituents. What have his experiences caused him to think about FERC and the whole pipeline approval process?

**“I also really detest the process in which energy companies get to put pipelines through states. They go through this kind of secretive process where they design where they want the pipeline to go and they give the public the bare minimum in terms of what we need to know. And then they go to FERC – the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission in Washington – to get the OK. And once they get the FERC OK then they have the full backing of the Federal government to do whatever they want to do. And I think this process stinks, quite frankly. I think any kind of process ought to involve the people in the communities that will be adversely impacted.”**

---

### **Summary:**

Rather than “Open”, “Transparent” and “Accessible”, I might suggest that FERC find itself a new set of favorite words. Perhaps “Rushed”, “Rigged” and “Rubberstamped”? For many of those tracking the progress of the NED pipeline proposal through the FERC process, these latter terms would seem to provide a much truer picture of the FERC that we find ourselves dealing with.

During the past year, I have witnessed firsthand the deception and the misdirection that Kinder Morgan uses in parceling out information to the towns and individuals impacted by their proposed pipeline. But as the FERC pre-filing process progressed, I also came to see that Kinder Morgan was in effect being given cover by FERC. Kinder Morgan would tell the public that FERC was in charge of the process, but in the meantime FERC would simply be looking the other way. As the months went by, FERC seemed to be acting more as a silent partner to Kinder Morgan than as the watchdog agency that I had (naively) assumed it to be. FERC exerted little or no control over the orgy of misinformation that Kinder Morgan provided to the public about their pipeline plans.

Of late, FERC has found itself more and more frequently confronted by an increasingly enraged public. A public that is convinced that FERC is a captive agency beholden to the energy companies that it is supposed to be regulating, an agency that has almost never seen a pipeline proposal that it didn’t like and an agency that seems unwilling to truly listen to members of the public who are being negatively impacted by the many projects that FERC so willingly approves. Such public rage is not typically directed at an organization that is perceived to be “Open”, “Transparent” and “Accessible” to the public.

Nick Miller Groton, MA

### **20150715-5131**

gerry avitable, nassau, NY.

clarifying my comment of 7/14/15

The compressor site suggested between Rice road and Poyneer Road in is the Town of Schodack, NY

Chelsea Zantay, Averill Park, NY.  
Chelsea Zantay  
35 Blue Heron Drive  
Averill Park, New York 12018  
(203) 837-0002  
czantay@gmail.com

Wednesday, July 15th, 2015

In regards to FERC Docket Number PF14-22:

I live on Burden Lake in Averill Park, New York. I am concerned about the effects of the 90,000 horsepower compressor station slated to be built on Clark's Chapel Road in Nassau, New York, less than 3,000 feet away from Burden Lake. Living on the lake my entire life, I have seen the appearance of American bald eagles, our national bird. They have built two nests on our lake. In addition, the lake is host to a plethora of wildlife including painted turtles and blue herons. Surprisingly enough, Alpacas (not native to the area, but thriving anyway) are being raised on a local farm in the town of Nassau, New York and Alpaca products are being sold. These species could all be at risk due to the changing ecosystem that a compressor station would cause.

Perhaps of most concern is the fact that sections of pipeline could be laid on Logan's Fault Line. Disturbance of this fault could trigger potential earthquakes (U.S. Geological Survey). Furthermore, if leaks occur along the pipeline, it could affect Kinderhook Creek, which flows southwest, and has a drainage area of over 329 square miles. If this creek or any other creek in the vicinity is contaminated, we could be looking at water contamination into Albany, Rensselaer, Columbia, and Greene counties. The Environmental Impact Statement should include how these habitats, creeks, and fault lines will be avoided by the pipeline and compressor stations.

"Director of the Institute for Health and the Environment at the University at Albany David Carpenter, who participated as a researcher in the DEC's fracking study, calls compressor stations among the worst of all the fracking infrastructure. 'Our previous studies showed that some of the most serious air pollution came from the compressor stations. There needs to be a statewide analysis of the health of the population of New York from these compressor stations...'" I ask: why have we banned hydraulic fracturing in New York State but still allow compressor stations, if said stations are worse for the environment?

This compressor station would lie extremely close to the Dewey Loeffel Landfill Site, which is a superfund site. Residents living near Dewey Loeffel have reported contaminated groundwater directly resulting from the superfund site. In addition, the proposed compressor station site on Clark's Chapel Road would be across the street from an organic working farm. That farm has a stream that runs through the proposed site into the Valatie Kill and into the Dewey Loeffel Landfill Site. Again, this is a potential recipe for creek contamination. Also, due to a strong southern wind in this area, the station would blow methane and other toxins, including radon, benzene, formaldehyde, as well as others onto a highly populated recreational site (Burden Lake, which is a series of three interconnected lakes that flows into the Wynants Kill). The Environmental Impact Statement should specify how the habitat that lives in and surrounds the lake would be avoided, as well as how the entire Hudson River Watershed will be protected from contamination.

I implore you to look at Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Gas Pipeline's safety record before giving approval to this project. In 2011, PHMSA cited Kinder Morgan for these safety violations:

- Failing to maintain/update maps showing pipeline locations,
- Failing to test pipeline safety devices
- Failing to maintain proper firefighting equipment,
- Failing to inspect its pipelines as required, and
- Failing to adequately monitor pipes' corrosion levels.

Thus begs the questions: how can the public expect Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Gas Pipeline to address

unknown or unforeseeable impacts? And how can the general public, or FERC for that matter, trust a company with such a poor safety record to respond in the event of an emergency?

If you are concerned that this compressor station would disturb the rural regional character of the impacted communities, rest assured, it will. Noise pollution will drown out the sounds of nature, light pollution will prevent the stars from being seen at night, and air pollution will cause serious health risks to humans, including, but not limited to respiratory ailments and diseases. You will rob residents of New York State, visitors and tourists, as well as all United States citizens right to enjoy their public and private lands. This project will most certainly impact these communities, but will not benefit them, as most of the gas will be exported to overseas markets. Please also look into the economical impact that a large pipeline would have on this area. Speaking personally, if this compressor station should come to fruition, my family and I will no longer have a presence in Rensselaer or Albany counties, which means bringing our potential business and consumerism elsewhere.

Members of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, I ask that you take a true hard look at these impacts before giving this project approval. I ask that you do an all inclusive cost benefit analysis of this pipeline and compressor stations. I ask that you take the time to study potential impacts to wildlife, economics, and rural character. Is this project going to serve the public good? Please do not close the scoping comment period until 60 days after Kinder Morgan files new, complete Resource Reports. I implore you to reconsider this site as a potential location for a compressor station and pipeline and to consider a “no action” alternative.

Thank you,

Chelsea Zantay

## **20150716-0011**

433 NH Route 119 East  
Fitzwilliam NH 03447  
dgoettle@gmail.com  
h: 603.585.3311 c: 617.947.9027

July 10, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A Docket PF14-22  
Washington, DC 20426

Dear Secretary Bose and Commission Members:

I strongly urge you to oppose the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project and the extension of Kinder Morgan’s Tennessee Gas Pipeline. My reasons are:

- 1) The monetary and environmental burdens on New Hampshire residents and towns could greatly exceed any direct benefits to consumers and net tax revenues;
- 2) The promise of lower gas and electricity prices is a pipe dream. Current contractual commitments account for less than 45% of a proposed 30” pipeline’s capacity or 25% of a proposed 36” pipeline’s capacity. Moreover only 21% of these commitments serve New Hampshire. Since under Federal law pipeline operators cannot discriminate among customers, the majority of this gas is most likely to be exported to Canada and overseas through new LNG facilities located in Nova Scotia. With the US ultimately becoming an exporter of shale oil and gas, world prices not US prices will govern the market;
- 3) Spectra Energy’s Access Northeast, Algonquin Incremental Market and Atlantic Bridge projects offer much more environmentally and economically responsible ways for bringing natural gas to New England customers and power generators;
- 4) The Distrigas LNG facility located in Everett, MA, has significant excess capacity despite increases in

LNG shipments. It could easily accommodate imports from new LNG export terminals proposed or being built elsewhere in the US;

5) The shale oil and gas industries are heavily debt-financed “gold rushes” dependent on clever geological and financial engineering. The viability of current practices is highly questionable under regulatory scrutiny as we learn more about their seismic and toxic consequences;

6) The NED project is NOT a jobs-creator for New Hampshire residents. The surveyors currently observed in New Hampshire have out-of-state license plates. Pipeline construction is more than likely to be carried out by non-local expert contractors. Subsequent to construction, pipeline operations employ very few people;

7) The most sensible way for northern New England (Vermont, New Hampshire and Maine) to benefit from America’s energy boom is to expand current coastal pipeline infrastructure and ship gas AND electricity from eastern population centers to the lower density west as market conditions warrant. The least sensible way is the west to east infrastructure of the NED project.

Respectfully yours,

Richard J. Goettle IV, PhD

Environmental Economist and Citizen Voter

**20150716-0034**

Gary Nielsen  
185 Colburn Rd  
Temple, NH 03084

July 6, 2015

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

Need for Scoping Meeting in towns affected by compressor station: Doc1PF14-22

FERC:

When will you be holding a scoping for the KM/TGP pipeline in the towns (New Ipswich, Temple, Greenville, & Mason) affected by the New Ipswich, NH compressor station?

I am writing to request a scoping meeting for the towns of New Ipswich and its neighbors (Temple, Greenville, & Mason, NH) that will be affected by the compressor station sited in New Ipswich near the border with Temple. It is a hardship to expect working people and those that are homebound to travel 20 or 30 miles to discuss issues that will disrupt life in their own backyards. Surely, Kinder- Morgan should have the common courtesy to discuss these great changes to our rural and peaceful existence with the people most affected in a face-to-face forum.

The proposed New Ipswich compressor station will only be I4 mile from our (Temple) elementary school - the only structure in town that can function as our emergency shelter. How can we be forced into such a tenuous situation without an opportunity to address those that would put our community into peril?

I implore you to have Kinder-Morgan hold this scoping meeting at the very community resource they so blithely endanger, Temple Elementary School

Thank you!

Sincerely,

Gary Nielsen

**20150716-0035**

Julielle Cabana  
7 Laurel Wood Dr  
Temple, NH 03084  
July 1,2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Reguhrtoty Commission  
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426  
RE: FERC dodcet number PF14-22

Dear Secretary Bose:

In regatd in the proposed Kinder Morgan/TGP natural gas pipeline, when is FERC going to hold its scoping meetings in the towns ofNew Ipswich, Temple, Greenville, and Mason, NH?

All of these towns would be~by the potential compressor station.

Sincerely,

Julielle Cabana

**20150716-0068**

Hand written card, Lisa Derby Oden, 6 Upper Pratt Pond Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, “will KM build a containment system for sound and pollutants released during a blow-down?”

**20150716-0069**

Hand written card, Maureen Petro, 307 Hadley Hwy, Temple, NH 03084, opposing.

**20150716-0070**

Hand written card, Debra Rodier, 5 D Street, Hudson, NH 03051, opposing

**20150716-0071**

Hand written card, Graham Bradlie, 219 East Rd, Temple, NH 03084, opposing.

**20150716-0073**

Adriane Robbins  
447 Colburn Rd  
Temple, NH 03084  
July 1,2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Reguhrtoty Commission  
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426  
RE: FERC dodcet number PF14-22

Dear Secretary Bose:

In regatd in the proposed Kinder Morgan/TGP natural gas pipeline, when is FERC going to hold its scoping meetings in the towns ofNew Ipswich, Temple, Greenville, and Mason, NH?

All of these towns would be~by the potential compressor station.

Sincerely,

**20150716-5000**

Alison Jaskiewicz, Mason, NH.

Sent today (7/15/15) to all my NH government officials, from the Governor on down:

I urge you to speak up on behalf of your NH constituents with respect to the recent scheduling of FERC scoping meetings. Two meetings, with a potential third, are woefully inadequate for NH citizens to have a realistic conversation with FERC about the environmental impact of the proposed Northeast Direct pipeline.

Thousands of people are directly affected by the proposed pipeline and many thousands more will be in the incineration zone of the pipeline or close to an industrial complex sized compressor station. How many citizens will have the opportunity to speak out to FERC in just two 5 hour meetings with speaking time limited? Such meetings also have a history of being crashed by bussed in union workers who bully and intimidate. Please help assure such behavior is not allowed here in NH.

Multiple southern NH towns are in the target sights of Kinder Morgan to lose their peaceful, rural nature and become dumping grounds for toxins for absolutely no direct benefit to any NH citizens and for a project that has been proven to be unnecessary for future New England energy needs. At the moment FEFC appears to be in Kinder Morgan's pocket with the travesty of the announced minimal Scoping meetings. This is decidedly NOT DEMOCRACY at work. Do you believe in democracy for NH citizens? If yes, you MUST please speak out, promptly and decisively.

Please do not listen only to the 'corporate line' about this pipeline. Many thousands of NH, MA and NY citizens have been extensively researching the need for this pipeline and can tell you, in detail, why it is not needed. Crowd sourced research is incredibly powerful. Other pipeline expansions already approved will more than fulfill natural gas needs while we grow our renewable energy infrastructure. We are being used purely as a conduit to export US natural gas overseas. That is corporate greed not New England's need.

Will you stand with NH citizens or abandon them to corporate greed?

Corporation greed or NH quality of life? You decide.

**20150716-5004**

Carol DiPirro, Merrimack, NH.

To FERC,

I write to you with great urgency. I have learned that the town of Amherst, NH while they are opposed to this pipeline, have suggested a route to Kinder Morgan that would minimize the impact on their town.

Three possible routes were suggested and option 1 seems to be the preferred route which puts the pipeline through Merrimack aquifers. This now puts the route running along side a major thoroughfare, which during the construction phase will be very disruptive to a major business but it will run by a hospice house. Kinder Morgan will now be placing several additional neighbors on Tinker and an additional 41 homes in the danger zone in addition to the 120+ and Outlet malls. And on top of it all, it will be close to an Elementary school!!!!

I am asking you, please now that things have changed, please postpone the scoping meetings planned here in New Hampshire and allow us to have accurate information. This is a MAJOR change, and Merrimack does not want this pipeline but this route is even more hazardous. PLEASE delay these meetings!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Thank you,

Carol DiPirro

Merrimack NH

**20150716-5008**

Rob Keplin, New Ipswich, NH.

To whom it may concern,

My wife and I are in our mid twenties. We saved our money and just bought our first house in New Ipswich, NH this year. My wife is nine months pregnant.

We recently found out that the proposed NED pipeline will cross through our back yard in Jacqueline Drive, and the proposed compressor station will be less than 1/2 mile away.

We are extremely concerned about this. We don't want this to happen. We chose our first house in New Ipswich, NH because we love the peace and quietness of a rural town. We love enjoying the outdoors: fishing, horseback riding, walking trails and jogging.

If this pipeline goes in, our property value will drop. Four of our neighbors have their house up for sale because they want to move away before it happens. Everyone is beyond upset and feels they have no control of their private land that they love.

Property value is the least of my concern, though. I am real worried about the health issues that my newborn will have. Living within 1/2 mile of the compressor station simply cannot be healthy. It will have burn downs for hours twice a year. We simply will not feel safe breathing all the toxins and carcinogens that are left in the air from the station.

If this pipeline and compressor station really "NEEDS" to be put in place, I ask that it be put in the original route: through Massachusetts. It is not fair if Kinder Morgan originally wanted to go through Massachusetts, but the state rejected it, and so it gets put in New Hampshire through eminent domain.

Nobody wants this pipeline to go through their state and private land.

Please consider the health of my newborn. Reject Kinder Morgan's request to put this pipeline in through New Hampshire.

Yours truly,  
Rob Keplin

## **20150716-5036**

Diane K Varney-Parker, Mason, NH.

As a resident of Mason NH I would like to express my disappointment that FERC has not granted our town a scoping meeting for the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project proposed by Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co., FERC Docket # PF 14-22-000. Both our town's Board of Selectmen and Conservation Commission have made requests to FERC, but the system seems set up to approve a pipeline without a true desire to listen to the communities that will be affected by this pipeline.

We here in Mason believe we warrant a meeting for the following reasons:

- \* Mason is slated to have both the main high-pressure pipeline and the Fitchburg lateral for a total of 8.9 miles of pipeline, more than any other NH town.
- \* All Mason residents depend on individual wells drilled into bedrock or stratified drift aquifers. Since a significant portion of this pipeline is routed to go across shallow-to-bedrock soils we are concerned about the blasting needed to construct the pipeline and the risks it may pose in contaminating these aquifers and altering their flow.
- \* The pipelines cross Mason's largest stratified drift aquifer. What are the foreseeable and potential effects on this aquifer of the withdrawal and discharge of hydrostatic testing water?
- \* Mason's wetlands and streams have been seriously under-counted and misrepresented in NED Resource Reports and maps. Resource Report 2 on Water documents no wetlands for the lateral in Mason. This cannot be true, since it crosses the Mason Brook valley.
- \* State and town conservation lands and conservation easements in Mason are threatened with taking for the pipelines, risking violation of the public trust. These lands include some of NH's Highest Ranked Wildlife Habitat as documented in NH Wildlife Action Plan.
- \* We are one of the closest towns to the proposed 80,000 hp compressor station. We have many concerns

about this and how it will affect our area.

**20150716-5038**

Barbara Markessinis, Pittsfield, MA.

My mailing address is Pittsfield MA but I reside at 9 and 20 Taylor Road in Hancock MA. The pipeline is slated to go RIGHT through my property. It would go under the Kinderhook Creek and by my home. I have no idea how said pipeline is going to go under the creek but I bet it won't be pretty. There are wetlands all around the creek and an abundance of wildlife. In addition, my property is historic, being the old Hancock Woolen Co. circa 1876. The buildings on the property are the ORIGINAL buildings including the dye house and boarding house. I have much information on the mill from the Town Historical Society. Are they REALLY going to destroy a piece of history, natural beauty and wildlife for a stupid pipeline that is going to ship gas OUT OF THE USA? We get NOTHING!!!! I had an aunt in Ohio who granted a right of way to the gas company and she got FREE gas for LIFE! What do we get? We get our property destroyed or, at the very least, devalued to the point of taking away our only asset which we are depending on in retirement only a few years away. I realize that NOBODY cares about anything in the country anymore except MONEY. Disgusting and repulsive treatment of US citizens.

**20150716-5046**

anne olcott, new haven, CT.

Re:PF14-22-000

I am deeply concerned about the proposed pipeline route and compressor station to be located in close proximity to my property in Nassau, NY.

-It may not be directly on my land, but it is too close for comfort. It will affect my family and good friends and neighbors by damaging property, diminishing our livelihood and property values, hurting our health, and causing us to move away.

-There is daily evidence in the news that fracking causes more harm than good. Supporting the transport of fracked natural gas may reduce the pollution from coal fired electric plants, but it also increases the release of methane which is the major contributor to global warming. Supporting fracking does nothing to reduce the United States' reliance on fossil fuels. Supporting fracking does not limit the collateral damage from every step of the natural gas production process which results in the rape of land, air, and water by profit-driven energy companies. My property, my life, and my dreams are part of that collateral damage.

-Larger pipelines and larger compressor stations such as the ones planned for Nassau increase the potential for noise, light, and chemical pollution. Since none of this size has ever been built, the amount of pollution and its effect on the environment and community is a giant unknown.

-There is no indication that Kinder Morgan can adequately predict and prepare for how to adequately mitigate the pollution from a compressor station that is unprecedented in size in the US.

-There is no evidence that Kinder Morgan is planning to use filters to reduce emissions such as are required in Europe.

-There is no long-lasting benefit to anyone in the Town of Nassau from this project. There will be long-lasting costs. The short-term benefits are not enough to outweigh the future costs.

-No one from Kinder Morgan or FERC will live one mile from the constant turbine noise and deafening blow down sounds, have light pollution blank out the stars in the night sky, or have their health suffer from the release of volatile organic compounds into the air. No one from Kinder Morgan or FERC has to ponder the consequences of their property being located near an incineration zone (I have survived one house fire and know exactly what destruction by fire means).

I urge you to either reject this application, reduce the size of the compressor station, or apply the strictest noise, light, and chemical pollution controls.

**20150716-5047**

Sally W Sober, Nassau, NY.

I attended the FERC session at Birch Hill 7/14 and wish to add additional comments and suggestions.

First of all, with all of the additional information presented to you that evening regarding personal health, safety, and livelihoods that would be damaged by the location of this pipeline and compressor station, I hope you realize how serious we are about blocking it.

The fact that the American Medical Society has supported the call for legislation requiring a comprehensive assessment of health risks from this type of project lends credence to our rational belief that the NED poses at least possible danger to our health.

Secondly, I hope you took note of the fact that our area has a burgeoning solar development movement at work. Both my sons have put on solar roofs. Our schools, many businesses, and some churches have all added solar. Should this project not go through, we will do the same, even though we built a certified energy efficient home 7 years ago. One of the later gentlemen who spoke quoted facts and figures about the drop in energy requirements here in the Northeast because of states' initiatives, and the fact that this decrease will continue in the future. Perhaps FERC should change its focus to providing truly safe and efficient energy sources.

Kinder Morgan's claim that their goal is to provide clean energy for the Northeastern United States is simply not true on many levels. Therefore, this project cannot legally be allowed to claim the land of private citizens and endanger our welfare.

When I left the meeting at 11:45, I heard the statement from another attendee that, according to Kinder Morgan's own admission to her, fracked gas is already being transmitted through the aged pipes currently running through my property. I have never been informed of this and, since they exude no odor, have no way of knowing if my family and I have already been exposed to carcinogens from leaking pipes. If fracked gas is being used, or will be in the future, these old pipes must be replaced with new technology before a new project is approved. Immediate testing by an independent firm (one not in any way connected to Kinder Morgan or pipeline development) must be initiated. If they are leaking, is it possible to hold the company responsible for this impure air quality now? I will be contacting the relevant departments with this question.

I also heard late at night from you that we should be open to change (paraphrased). To me, that was another way of saying what that obnoxious union organizer shouted at us, "if you don't like it, move." He, by the way, and none of the other three or four who spoke for the jobs this would bring (as they mistakenly think) to people of this area, actually live on property to be grabbed or devalued by this project, else they would have --like everyone else who spoke-- announced where they live. I suggest the statement of name and address be required in future sessions. I would also point out that those who spoke for the project were not booed by the green banded majority, though they were not stopped from booing or personally attacking the elected officials who spoke. That was in direct violation of your no-booing policy and I trust will not occur in future sessions.

The rush to ram this project through is fueled by greed, plain and simple. During the past few weeks, changes have been occurring in Greece, Russia, and Iran that are going to decrease the need for energy markets in Europe. If the NED is approved without comprehensive assessment of its ramifications, we will have been put at risk for not even Kinder Morgan's profit.

**20150716-5054**

Jan Schmidt, Nashua, NH.

The company is lying in its ads run in NH - telling people the gas is for us, and it will be cheap. The truth is they are aiming the end of their line for deep costal waters where they can ship our own US gas abroad and sell it for higher \$\$

Meanwhile the quality of their lines is questionable, the reports of poor service and explosions and spills are high - and pristine areas of NH are vulnerable - to the misuse of our land, and to the money hungry towns that will just put on blinders to the danger.

This isn't something that can just disappear - a break under a river or stream will damage us for decades - an explosion at a compressor station - the noise - the intrusion... as a small state, we rely on tourism to sustain our state programs - this is damaging in so very many ways.

For their higher profit. NH does not want to be used this way, and most citizens are furious!

Please protect us - please...

**20150716-5081**

Michael DeMarco, Troy, NH.

I purchased my house in 2006 for it's location and the wildlife. We have a daily visit from natures creatures big and small. A pipeline here would not only destroy our well , we cannot get town water here, but would rid the area of wildlife , and severely lower the value of our property. The town does not have the ability to handle any accidents that could happen. The farm beside me has a known historical value (it would lose). All the reasons to run a pipeline here are because we are a small town that Tennessee Gas feels it can take or buy for their profit. Why can't they go where there is nothing to destroy, not a nice tiny town now getting ready for its 200th year anniversary. Please stop this pipeline.

I won't even be able to let my own pets out during any of the work done in the whole front of my house. I pray you can help us.

Sincerely

Mike DeMarco

**20150716-5097**

Dennis Gauvin, New Ipswich, NH.

Dennis Gauvin  
61 Beechwood Road  
New Ipswich, NH 03071

July 16, 2015

Ms. Debra Howland  
Executive Director and Secretary  
New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission  
21 S. Fruit St, Suite 10  
Concord, New Hampshire 03301

RE: DG 14-3 80 Liberty Utilities (Energy North Natural Gas) Corp. d/b/a Liberty Utilities

Ms. Howland:

I have been a resident in Greenville & New Ipswich for all of my 65 years and never before have I been faced with such an atrocious invasion of our quaint rural area.

The proposed NED pipeline will have a negative impact on the environment and economics of the area throughout southern NH. The current needs of New England can be realized through existing delivery systems. We should also be spending our time and efforts developing wind and solar.

This project poses safety risks and passes along costs to customers that are not in line with customer needs. The substantial excess capacity of this pipeline would not be used in the state but expected to be shipped north to be sold overseas.

The project will disturb and redirect numerous aquifers, ponds, watersheds, and lakes.

Noise from compressor stations and pollutants from blow downs will disturb wildlife and the citizenry and will impact hunting, fishing, snowmobiling, hiking etc. in the Monadnock region.

The proposed 80,000hp compressor station in New Ipswich is too near the Temple elementary school and the Greenville reservoir. Noise from this station will easily be heard in the centers of all three abutting towns as were the shotgun blasts of yesteryear when the site was a shooting range.

The plan by Spectra Energy to expand the capacity for delivery of natural gas into New Hampshire along existing Spectra pipelines is an alternative to NED. This plan builds on existing infrastructure and does not disturb undeveloped and sensitive environments.

The testimony of Melissa Whitten, the utility consultant hired by the PUC staff, states quite clearly the lack of need for this project. The NH Office of Consumer Advocate likewise recommended against approval.

I urge you not to approve this contract!

Respectfully,

Dennis Gauvin

### **20150716-5098**

Kathleen Gauvin, New Ipswich, NH.

Kathleen Gauvin

61 Beechwood Rd.

New Ipswich, NH 03071

July 16, 2015

Ms. Debra Howland

Executive Director and Secretary

New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission

21 S. Fruit Street Suite 10

Concord, NH 03301

RE: DG 14-3 80 Liberty Utilities (Energy North Natural Gas) Corp. d/b/a Liberty Utilities

The Northeast Direct pipeline in New Hampshire is a horrible concept.

The corporate gains of Kinder Morgan have become a priority!

Companies polluted our waterways one hundred years ago. It has taken numerous years and enormous funding to clean up the messes that were created by that pollution. Now we are embarking into an era when pipeline projects will ravage our country sides and communities in a similar manner. The citizens of the futures will be forced to try to undo the pipeline messes and clean up the toxic damage done by companies that are long gone!

The plan by Spectra Energy to expand the capacity for delivery of natural gas into New Hampshire via the existing Spectra pipelines is an alternative to NED. This plan builds on existing infrastructure. Congratulations to a company that has been sensitive to country sides, communities, waterways, wildlife, and citizens, unlike Kinder Morgan whose priority is corporate gains. Kinder Morgan will ravage the pristine rural areas of southern New Hampshire to make a buck!

How can the testimony of the utility consultant, Melissa Whitten, hired by the PUC, be ignored? Ms. Whitten states that this project is not needed.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Gauvin

**20150716-5131**

Peter Whitney, Cheshire, MA.

As a land and business owner in Cheshire, MA 01225 I am opposed to the pipeline going directly thru our property which has been a family business for about 50 years. The pipeline will go directly thru property which has been a site for family fun for many years. Will parents want their children playing over a gas pipeline with all its dangers? If there is a break the closest shut off is 20 miles away - meanwhile gas is pouring into the ground contaminating our land.

I am sure the pipeline will effect our land and business in a negative way.

Hopefully you will see that the pipeline will be a detriment to everyone in the community.

**20150716-5156**

Craig Cahill, Nassau, NY.

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

July 16, 2015

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC)

888 First Street, NE

Washington, DC 20426

Re: Northeast Energy Direct Docket #PF14-22 & E-1 RM15-14-000 Revised Critical Infrastructure Protection Reliability Standards E-2 ER15-1745-000 Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc.

I am requesting that FERC expand E-1 RM15-14-000, which calls for the Development of Supply Chain Cyber Controls in New Reliability Standards, to include gas pipeline cyber security. This should include the Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company (TGPC) Northeast Energy Direct Project in particular and all pipelines either gas or oil nationwide that are controlled remotely via the internet. If E-1 RM15-14-000 cannot be expanded to include pipelines I would submit that a Revised Critical Infrastructure Protection Reliability Standards for cyber security be implemented for pipelines.

I am requesting this because I am an abutter to the current TGPC pipeline as well as the proposed new 36" pipeline. Kinder Morgan / TGPC tout the fact that their 90,000 horsepower compressor stations, which are unmanned and are controlled and monitored from Houston, Texas via the internet, are completely safe.

At the July 14, 2015 FERC scoping meeting held in Schodack, NY, the prospect of a physical terrorist attack or a cyber attack of a compressor station was brought up. Given today's climate of multiple cyber attacks on Private Corporations and the Federal government this is a highly plausible scenario. I would submit that a cyber attack on NED compressor stations (9) would be devastating to persons not only in close proximity to a compressor station but those residing next to and in close proximity to the entire 400+/- miles of pipeline from Pennsylvania, via New York, Massachusetts, New Hampshire and back to Massachusetts. I would submit to you that pipeline cyber security would be in the best interest of NATIONAL SECURITY.

I would respectfully submit that the Kinder Morgan / TGPC pre-application be put on hold or rejected until a new cyber security system, to prevent hacking of the NED compressor stations, is not only developed but proven to be impenetrable before the pre-application or formal application of the NED is considered.

Sincerely,

Craig Cahill

**20150716-5176**

Hello, my name is Dennis Higgins. It is FERC's mission to consider public convenience and necessity. FERC must insure energy supplies are sufficient and consider pricing. Here's the public convenience and necessity part of NED: Kinder Morgan wants to move its gas. We here in New York don't need it. Massachusetts has already said they don't need it. Nearly 50 town resolutions have been passed opposing NED. Where is the gas going? We can connect the dots. K-M's gas is headed for a proposed LNG terminal in Nova Scotia. With FERC approval, Kinder Morgan will be able to seize New Yorkers' land, bulldoze our

forests, trash our rivers, and export their gas to China. This project's sole aim is to make money for Kinder Morgan and New Yorkers and New Englanders will suffer the health and environmental costs. There is no public convenience or necessity here. Awarding this permit violates your mission. And here's a lesson in supply and demand, when the gas gets to Canada for export, our price for gas goes up.

Like many others here, I want to talk about jobs. I, personally, would not want a temporary job if it meant a neighbor lost his land. But for those looking for work, there are lots of jobs in the booming solar industry. Renovus, over in Ithaca, is hiring right now. I want to talk about FERC jobs, too. I spoke with David Hanovic in your Office of Energy Products. Dave prepares a statement (he called it a NEPA document), which is meant to disclose the environmental impacts of a proposal. But something is really wrong here. Either Dave isn't writing up a proper EIS, or you guys aren't reading it. Look what happened with the Constitution Pipeline in 2012, where fifteen thousand people told you about the environmental harms, but you approved an unnecessary pipeline to the company with the worst environmental record in PA, and approved construction along the worst possible route. For its part, Kinder Morgan has been fined by the US government for stealing coal from customers' stockpiles, lying to air pollution regulators, and mixing hazardous waste into gasoline. Kinder Morgan's doesn't bother with maintenance and their pipelines are plagued by leaks and explosions, including two large spills in residential neighborhoods of British Columbia. Of course, you guys – that's FERC itself - have been found guilty in Federal Court of violating the National Environmental Policy Act by allowing project segmentation as a way of avoiding cumulative impacts analysis. FERC is accused of using illegal stalling tactics to keep lawsuits out of the courts while projects get built. Someone definitely ought to lose their job here. Is it you guys, the commissioners, or Dave? If you ask me, unemployment insurance is too good for you.

Everyone in this room knows what's going to happen here. FERC employees are paid by oil and gas companies, and you approve every fracked gas project that's proposed. But we in New York want you to know something, and you're going to hear the same thing in Massachusetts and New Hampshire: NED is not going to happen here.

#### **20150716-5226**

Richard R. Silvestro, Temple, NH.

Docket No. PF14-22-000

Proposed Northeast Energy Direct(NED)pipeline

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, NE, Room 1A

Washington, DC 20426

Dear Secretary Vose:

New Hampshire news carried the story a couple of days ago that Liberty Utilities made some agreement with Kinder/Morgan to use a bit of the gas from the NED Pipeline. This does not change the fact that New Hampshire has an excess of available energy that should last for the next thirty years. This agreement between the two corporations does not qualify as a need for more gas, and under no circumstance justifies the personal health, fiscal well-being and safety risks to the people nor the environment of Southern New Hampshire. And yes, our Temple Elementary School is in the burn zone of the New Ipswich compressor station as is the reservoir for the town of Greenville, NH. STOP THEM!

Richard R. Silvestro

#### **20150717-0011**

Hand written card, Kathy & Bob Thornber, 1725 East Windsor Rd, Windsor, MA 01270, opposing

20150717-0012

PROPERTY ACCESS DENIED

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: 6/11/15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

RE: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

Street Address: 121 Fish Hatchery Rd  
Town & Zip: Richmond, NH 03470  
Map & Lot Number(s) (if known)

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Joshua Jarvis?

CC:

FERC

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

20150717-5056

**THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS  
ENERGY FACILITIES SITING BOARD**

ONE SOUTH STATION  
BOSTON, MA 02110  
(617) 305-3525

CHARLES D. BAKER  
GOVERNOR

KARYN E. POLITO  
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC COMMENT HEARINGS BY THE  
MASSACHUSETTS ENERGY FACILITIES SITING BOARD:**

**NATURAL GAS PIPELINE AND ASSOCIATED FACILITIES IN  
BERKSHIRE, ESSEX, FRANKLIN, HAMPDEN, HAMPSHIRE,  
MIDDLESEX, AND WORCESTER COUNTIES PROPOSED BY  
TENNESSEE GAS PIPELINE COMPANY**

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company has proposed a new natural gas pipeline known as the Northeast Energy Direct Project ("Project") to be constructed in Pennsylvania, New York, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire. In Massachusetts, the Project would include approximately 101.3 miles of new pipeline, plus additional facilities as indicated below:

**Proposed New Pipeline Facilities in Massachusetts**

<u>Facility Name</u>	<u>Diameter</u>	<u>Location(s)</u>	<u>Length</u>
MA Mainline	30 or 36	Hancock, Lanesborough, Cheshire, Dalton, Hinsdale,	63.75

Pipeline	inch	Peru, Windsor, Plainfield, Ashfield, Conway, Shelburne, Deerfield, Montague, Erving, Northfield, Warwick, and Dracut	miles
Fitchburg Lateral	12 inch	Townsend & Lunenburg	8.90 miles
Lynnfield Lateral	20 inch	Dracut, Andover, Tewksbury, Wilmington, North Reading, Reading, & Lynnfield	15.86 miles
Haverhill Lateral	20 inch	Dracut and Methuen	5.72 miles
Concord Delivery Line	24 inch	Dracut	0.51 miles
Maritimes Delivery Line	30 inch	Dracut	1.20 miles
Peabody Lateral	24 inch	Lynnfield, Middleton, Peabody, and Danvers	5.37 miles

### Additional Proposed Facilities in Massachusetts

Facility Type	Locations
New compressor stations (3 in total)	Windsor, Northfield, Dracut
New meter stations (10 in total)	Lanesborough, Dalton, Deerfield, Dracut (3), Lynnfield, Lunenburg, Longmeadow, Everett
Modifications to existing meter stations (2 in total)	North Adams, Methuen

The Project is currently being reviewed by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (“FERC”) in what is called the Pre-Filing Process. FERC will prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”) to satisfy the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act. The EIS will be used by FERC to consider the environmental impacts that could result if it approves the Project. FERC is required to review and recommend measures to avoid, minimize or mitigate such impacts.

The Massachusetts Energy Facilities Siting Board (“Siting Board”) participates in FERC proceedings for natural gas pipelines to represent the interests of the Commonwealth and its citizens. The Siting Board will hold four public hearings to hear directly from residents, officials, and other interested persons about their concerns relating to the Project. The Siting Board hearings below are separate and distinct from the public hearings being held by FERC.

Monday, August 3, 2015, 7:00 p.m.  
 Dracut Senior High School Auditorium  
 1540 Lakeview Avenue  
 Dracut, MA 01826

Tuesday, August 4, 2015, 7:00 p.m.  
 Taconic High School Auditorium  
 96 Valentine Road  
 Pittsfield, MA 01201

Wednesday, August 5, 2015, 7:00 p.m.  
 Greenfield Community College  
 1 College Drive (Dining Commons)  
 Greenfield, MA 01301

Thursday, August 6, 2015, 7:00 p.m.  
 Lunenburg High School Auditorium  
 1079 Massachusetts Avenue  
 Lunenburg, MA 01426

The Siting Board also seeks written comments concerning the proposed Project. Comments should be sent by email to both [Stephen.August@state.ma.us](mailto:Stephen.August@state.ma.us) and [dpu.efiling@state.ma.us](mailto:dpu.efiling@state.ma.us) or by U.S. mail to: Energy Facilities Siting Board, One South Station, Boston, Massachusetts 02110, Attention: Stephen August, Presiding Officer. The comments should be sent to the Siting Board by August 13, 2015. The Siting Board will use the

comments it receives, whether oral or written, in drafting a comment letter on the Project to FERC. If you have any questions, please contact Stephen August at the e-mail or physical address above.

Additional information about the Project is available on the FERC website (<http://www.ferc.gov>). Click on the eLibrary link, click on "General Search" and enter the FERC docket number "PF14-22". For assistance, please contact FERC Online Support at [ferconlinesupport@ferc.gov](mailto:ferconlinesupport@ferc.gov) or call FERC at 1-202-502-8659 or 1-866-208-3676.

## **20150717-5101**

selma josell, lanesboro, MA.

MY REASONS FOR OPPOSING THE PROPOSED KINDER MORGAN PIPELINE:

### **1- ENVIRONMENTAL AND HEALTH CONCERNS**

There is a major potential for damaging the Lanesboro water aquifer both during the laying of the proposed pipeline and afterwards. A pipeline leak would destroy our water supply. The pipeline could be repaired but contaminants would remain in the water aquifer. We have no other clean water source to replace the loss of our aquifer.

Over 6000 acres of land will incur significant environmental destruction and damage during construction of the proposed pipeline. Heavy truck traffic and noise will disturb our peaceful neighborhoods.

The enormous compressor stations on proposed 40-100 acres in Windsor will emit constant noise and bright lights. Noxious gases will contaminate the atmosphere, especially during blowdowns. This region is noted for its' pristine natural environment and has many hiking and skiing trails which would have to be abandoned.

Explosions do occur and are deadly, destroying property and killing people.

### **2- FINANCIAL IMPACTS**

Kinder Morgan is a limited liability company which means they repair ONLY the damaged pipeline. Property and personal damage have to be paid for by the property owner.

They have a very poor safety record. There are many incidents of gas leakage and explosions on record.

### **3- NO BENEFIT TO TOWNS THROUGH WHICH PROPOSED PIPELINE WILL PASS**

The proposed KM pipeline is primarily for transport of gas across the state and much will be exported out of the country. Only a small portion will be purchased by Berkshire Gas. Most of the area through which the pipeline would run will not have access to the gas.

The lure for the towns is revenue. It would be determined by amount of gas flow which is dependent upon purchase by potential customers and amount of gas flow. Fracked gas wells provide less and less gas as their productivity drops significantly in 3 to 5 years. KM has customers for less than half of the proposed gas flow.

The amount of money KM estimates it would pay to impacted towns is unrealistically high and not worth it, considering the potential for environmental damage and health concerns.

WE NEED TO PUT OUR EFFORTS INTO RENEWABLE ENERGY.

## **20150717-5217**

### **An Analysis of Municipal Response in MA and NH to the Kinder Morgan NED Project**

by Garth Fletcher, Mason, NH 03048 (em: [garth@Mason-NH.org](mailto:garth@Mason-NH.org))

Evaluating public response to massive projects which have widespread public and private consequences across a large number of communities - such as Kinder Morgan's proposed NED project - is of great importance, but performing such an evaluation is complicated.

Simply comparing the number of supportive versus opposing comments in the FERC docket can provide

some insight, but is not a very “robust” measure and is subject to valid criticism as being sensitive to bias by prolific writers or well organized letter writing campaigns.

Evaluating the “quality” of those comments - for example giving less weight to simple “I love it” or “I hate it” comments and greater weight to longer well reasoned comments or to those from organizations rather than individuals - could improve the measure, but requires extensive analysis and remains very subjective.

Furthermore, the above approaches only sample those individuals or organizations which have recorded their comments into the FERC Docket. In researching this topic **I have found that a very large portion of municipal comments or actions have never been recorded in the FERC docket.** These many comments placed in other media can be difficult to find or available only to subscribers.

Looking at “Official Governmental Acts”, such as resolutions or ordinances passed by the legislative or executive branches of local governments, provides a much more robust measure. Such actions represent the “*majority will of the citizens*” organized as entire municipalities, expressed either directly by the voters themselves or by their elected or appointed representatives, rather than expressions from individuals. Such actions are also part of the public record and thus more readily accessible.

Looking at “Official Governmental Acts” is the approach taken in this report:

**In my analysis I have only included official governmental actions which clearly expressed support or opposition while leaving out submissions which only expressed concerns or discussed specific issues - the latter being more in the nature of “scoping” documents highlighting special areas of concern rather than actions clearly indicating community support or opposition..**

**If I have missed relevant official acts please email details to [garth@Mason-NH.org](mailto:garth@Mason-NH.org).**

*First a brief explanation for readers not familiar with the nature of local governments in Massachusetts and New Hampshire:*

*With the exception of large cities, most municipalities in the region use some variant of “Town Meeting” governance. The majority use the “Open Town Meeting” (Open\_TM) form in which all registered voters can participate; a smaller number use a “Representative Town Meeting” (Repr\_TM) in which voting is by elected representatives rather than by the citizens themselves.*

*In terms of the more familiar Federal model, the Town Meeting functions as the “Legislative Branch”; the elected “Board of Selectmen” or “Select Board” head the “Executive Branch”, and the “Judicial Branch” is usually implemented at the County or State levels.*

*Town Meeting is held at least once a year - the “Annual Town Meeting” - and can be called into session as needed for “Special Town Meetings”. As with any legislature, its focus is on budgetary issues and the passing of local zoning and other ordinances.*

*The “Board of Selectmen”, most often either 3 or 5 members elected to overlapping multi-year terms, direct the day to day business of the Town and its various departments, and oversee local law enforcement.*

*In addition there are independent specialized Boards and Commissions such as a Planning Board, Board of Health, Conservation Commission, etc.*

*The Town Meeting form of government dates back to Colonial times. It can be cumbersome at times but it does represent “democracy” and the “will of the people” in its most pure and direct form.*

### **Executive Summary:**

A search was performed for any official actions by municipal governments or legislative bodies in Massachusetts and New Hampshire which clearly expressed support or opposition to the NED pipeline. The year(s) in [ ] in the right column indicate whether the town was crossed by the NED pipeline in the original

[2014] route through Massachusetts or in the revised [2015] route through New Hampshire. A number of towns not directly crossed by either NED proposal also took official actions (19 in MA, 3 in NH).

**No town in either State was found to have taken any official actions in support of NED.**

In Massachusetts 55 towns were found to have taken at least one official action in **opposition** to NED, representing a population of **551,766** residents (2010 census). Of the 50 MA towns crossed by NED, **72%** (36/50) took official action in opposition, joined by another 19 MA towns not crossed by NED.

In New Hampshire, 20 towns were found to have taken at least one official action in **opposition** to NED, representing a population of **154,462** residents (2010 census). Of the 19 NH towns crossed by NED, **89%** (17/19) took official action in opposition, joined by another 3 NH towns not crossed by NED.

**Summary: Municipal opposition is very strong throughout the affected region with 72% (MA) to 89% (NH) of impacted towns in official opposition. NO municipal actions in support were found.**

---

**Massachusetts Towns having taken at least one official action in opposition to NED**

<b>Town</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>St</b>	<b>Popul.</b>	<b>Town Gvmt</b>	<b>Crossed by NED</b>
Becket	Berkshire	MA	1,779	Open_TM	
Cheshire	Berkshire	MA	3,235	Open_TM	[2015]
Dalton	Berkshire	MA	6,756	Open_TM	[2014, 2015]
Hancock	Berkshire	MA	721	Open_TM	[2015]
Lanesborough	Berkshire	MA	3,091	Open_TM	[2015]
Lenox	Berkshire	MA	5,025	Open_TM	[2014]
North Adams	Berkshire	MA	13,708	Mayor-CI	
Peru	Berkshire	MA	847	Open_TM	[2014, 2015]
Pittsfield	Berkshire	MA	44,737	Mayor-CI	[2014]
Richmond	Berkshire	MA	1,475	Open_TM	[2014]
Sandisfield	Berkshire	MA	915	Open_TM	
Washington	Berkshire	MA	538	Open_TM	[2014]
Williamstown	Berkshire	MA	7,754	Open_TM	
Windsor	Berkshire	MA	899	Open_TM	[2014, 2015]
Amherst	Hampshire	MA	37,819	Repr_TM	
Chesterfield	Hampshire	MA	1,222	Open_TM	
Cummington	Hampshire	MA	872	Open_TM	
Middlefield	Hampshire	MA	521	Open_TM	
Northampton	Hampshire	MA	28,549	Mayor-CI	
Pelham	Hampshire	MA	1,321	Open_TM	
Plainfield	Hampshire	MA	648	Open_TM	[2014, 2015]
Worthington	Hampshire	MA	1,156	Open_TM	
Ashfield	Franklin	MA	1,737	Open_TM	[2014, 2015]
Buckland	Franklin	MA	1,902	Open_TM	
Conway	Franklin	MA	1,897	Open_TM	[2014, 2015]
Deerfield	Franklin	MA	5,125	Open_TM	[2014, 2015]
Erving	Franklin	MA	1,800	Open_TM	[2014, 2015]
Gill	Franklin	MA	1,500	Open_TM	
Greenfield	Franklin	MA	17,456	Mayor-CI	
Leverett	Franklin	MA	1,851	Open_TM	
Northfield	Franklin	MA	3,032	Open_TM	[2015]
Orange	Franklin	MA	7,839	Open_TM	[2014]
Shelburne	Franklin	MA	1,893	Open_TM	[2015]
Sunderland	Franklin	MA	3,684	Open_TM	

Warwick	Franklin	MA	780	Open_TM	[2014, 2015]
Wendell	Franklin	MA	848	Open_TM	
Ashburnham	Worcester	MA	6,081	Open_TM	[2014]
Athol	Worcester	MA	11,584	Open_TM	[2014]
Berlin	Worcester	MA	2,866	Open_TM	[2015]
Bolton	Worcester	MA	4,897	Open_TM	[2014, 2015]
Royalston	Worcester	MA	1,258	Open_TM	[2014]
Templeton	Worcester	MA	8,013	Open_TM	
Winchendon	Worcester	MA	10,300	Open_TM	[2014]
Ashby	Middlesex	MA	3,074	Open_TM	[2014]
Dracut	Middlesex	MA	29,457	Open_TM	[2014, 2015]
Dunstable	Middlesex	MA	3,179	Open_TM	[2014]
Groton	Middlesex	MA	10,646	Open_TM	[2014]
Pepperell	Middlesex	MA	11,497	Open_TM	[2014]
Townsend	Middlesex	MA	8,926	Open_TM	[2014, 2015]
Tyngsborough	Middlesex	MA	11,292	Open_TM	[2014]
Wilmington	Middlesex	MA	22,325	Open_TM	[2014]
Andover	Essex	MA	33,201	Open_TM	[2014, 2015]
Methuen	Essex	MA	47,255	Mayor-CI	[2014, 2015]
Peabody	Essex	MA	52,251	Mayor-CI	[2015]
Brookline	Norfolk	MA	58,732	Repr_TM	

55 Towns in MA, total population of **551,766**

**New Hampshire Towns having taken at least one official action in opposition to NED**

<b>Town</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>St</b>	<b>Popul.</b>	<b>Town Gvmt</b>	<b>Crossed by NED</b>
Fitzwilliam	Cheshire	NH	2,394	Open_TM	[2015]
Richmond	Cheshire	NH	1,161	Open_TM	[2015]
Rindge	Cheshire	NH	6,045	TM+TwnMgr	[2015]
Troy	Cheshire	NH	2,146	Open_TM	[2015]
Winchester	Cheshire	NH	4,340	Open_TM	[2015]
Amherst	Hillsborough	NH	11,308	Open_TM	[2014, 2015]
Brookline	Hillsborough	NH	5,053	Open_TM	[2015]
Greenville	Hillsborough	NH	2,079	Open_TM	[2015]
Hollis	Hillsborough	NH	7,702	Open_TM	[2014]
Hudson	Hillsborough	NH	24,538	Open_TM	[2015]
Litchfield	Hillsborough	NH	8,271	Open_TM	[2015]
Mason	Hillsborough	NH	1,389	Open_TM	[2015]
Merrimack	Hillsborough	NH	25,494	T.Council	[2015]
Milford	Hillsborough	NH	15,099	Open_TM	[2015]
New Ipswich	Hillsborough	NH	5,116	Open_TM	[2015]
Pelham	Hillsborough	NH	12,970	Open_TM	[2015]
Sharon	Hillsborough	NH	352	Open_TM	
Temple	Hillsborough	NH	1,372	Open_TM	
Wilton	Hillsborough	NH	3,673	Open_TM	
Windham	Rockingham	NH	13,960	Open_TM	[2015]

20 Towns in NH, total population of **154,462**

**The main body of this report is organized in three sections:**

Section 1: *Overview of Pipeline* which reviews the NED proposal's history and the affected towns

Section 2: *Summary* which contains a brief description of the actions taken by each town

Section 3: *Supporting materials*: which contains the entire text of each action (bookmarked by town)

---

## Section 1: Overview of proposed pipeline routing

---

The original proposal was last described in the Tennessee Gas Pipeline (TGP) November 2014 "RE-SOURCE REPORT 1, GENERAL PROJECT DESCRIPTION" (FERC Docket PF14-22 : 20141105-5096(29901023).pdf). This proposal has been replaced.

It proposed the following pipeline segments:

<u>Leng</u>	<u>Town</u>	<u>County, State</u>	<u>Leng</u>	<u>Town</u>	<u>County, State</u>
<b>Wright to Dracut Pipeline Segment (36'')</b>			<b>Pittsfield Lateral (12'')</b>		
4.48	Richmond	Berkshire, MA	0.72	Dalton	Berkshire, MA
5.55	Lenox	Berkshire, MA	1.05	Pittsfield	Berkshire, MA
0.33	Washington	Berkshire, MA	<b>West Nashua Lateral (12'')</b>		
1.39	Pittsfield	Berkshire, MA	3.56	Pepperell	Middlesex, MA
5.63	Dalton	Berkshire, MA	8.10	Hollis	Hillsborough, NH
3.40	Hinsdale	Berkshire, MA	0.28	Amherst	Hillsborough, NH
0.88	Peru	Berkshire, MA	<b>Lynnfield Lateral (20'')</b>		
4.71	Windsor	Berkshire, MA	0.93	Methuen	Essex, MA
5.57	Plainfield	Hampshire, MA	7.34	Andover	Essex, MA
7.10	Ashfield	Franklin, MA	1.66	Tewksbury	Middlesex, MA
4.17	Conway	Franklin, MA	2.77	Wilmington	Middlesex, MA
5.73	Deerfield	Franklin, MA	3.17	North_Reading	Middlesex, MA
4.55	Montague	Franklin, MA	0.38	Reading	Middlesex, MA
1.53	Erving	Franklin, MA	0.37	Lynnfield	Essex, MA
3.46	Warwick	Franklin, MA	<b>Haverhill Lateral (16'')</b>		
4.58	Orange	Franklin, MA	4.84	Methuen	Essex, MA
3.67	Athol	Worcester, MA	2.15	Salem	Rockingham, NH
2.24	Royalston	Worcester, MA	<b>North Worcester Lateral (12'')</b>		
7.01	Winchendon	Worcester, MA	2.60	Bolton	Worcester, MA
7.36	Ashburnham	Worcester, MA	12.44	Boylston	Worcester, MA
4.91	Ashby	Middlesex, MA	0.30	Northborough	Worcester, MA
7.40	Townsend	Middlesex, MA	0.49	West_Boylston	Worcester, MA
4.41	Pepperell	Middlesex, MA	0.15	Shrewsbury	Worcester, MA
2.00	Groton	Middlesex, MA	0.02	Worcester	Worcester, MA
5.10	Dunstable	Middlesex, MA	<b>Fitchburg Lateral Extension (12'')</b>		
4.72	Tyngsborough	Middlesex, MA	1.26	Townsend	Middlesex, MA
8.42	Dracut	Middlesex, MA	3.70	Lunenburg	Worcester, MA

*Note: Leng is the length in miles of pipeline in each town. Where the pipeline meandered back and forth across town boundaries, rather than having multiple separate entries for a town (as was done in the TGP document), I have instead summed the lengths within each town into a single entry.*

On December 8, 2014, TGP submitted a substantial change which moved a large section of the proposed pipeline Northward out of Massachusetts and into New Hampshire (FERC Docket PF14-22 : 20141208-5217). The most recent description of this revised proposal is found in TGP's March 2015 "RESOURCE REPORT 1, GENERAL PROJECT DESCRIPTION" (FERC Docket PF14-22 : 20150313-5090(30329510).pdf) This revised proposal, as of March 2015, now lists the following pipeline segments:

<b><i>Leng</i></b>	<b><i>Town</i></b>	<b><i>County, State</i></b>	<b><i>Leng</i></b>	<b><i>Town</i></b>	<b><i>County, State</i></b>
<b>Wright to Dracut Pipeline Segment (36")</b>			<b>Maritimes Delivery Line (30")</b>		
2.52	Hancock	Berkshire, MA	1.20	Dracut	Middlesex, MA
4.99	Lanesborough	Berkshire, MA	<b>Concord Delivery Line (24")</b>		
1.92	Cheshire	Berkshire, MA	0.51	Dracut	Middlesex, MA
3.40	Dalton	Berkshire, MA	<b>Lynnfield Lateral (20")</b>		
3.00	Hinsdale	Berkshire, MA	2.68	Dracut	Middlesex, MA
0.84	Peru	Berkshire, MA	4.04	Andover	Essex, MA
4.74	Windsor	Berkshire, MA	2.41	Tewksbury	Middlesex, MA
5.55	Plainfield	Hampshire, MA	2.78	Wilmington	Middlesex, MA
7.10	Ashfield	Franklin, MA	3.20	North_Reading	Middlesex, MA
3.39	Conway	Franklin, MA	0.38	Reading	Middlesex, MA
1.27	Shelburne	Franklin, MA	0.37	Lynnfield	Essex, MA
5.37	Deerfield	Franklin, MA	<b>Peabody Lateral (24")</b>		
4.72	Montague	Franklin, MA	2.51	Lynnfield	Essex, MA
2.81	Erving	Franklin, MA	0.34	Middleton	Essex, MA
8.54	Northfield	Franklin, MA	1.82	Peabody	Essex, MA
0.77	Warwick	Franklin, MA	0.70	Danvers	Essex, MA
5.57	Winchester	Cheshire, NH	<b>Haverhill Lateral (20")</b>		
6.15	Richmond	Cheshire, NH	1.67	Dracut	Middlesex, MA
1.59	Troy	Cheshire, NH	1.99	Salem	Rockingham, NH
5.75	Fitzwilliam	Cheshire, NH	4.05	Methuen	Essex, MA
8.90	Rindge	Cheshire, NH	<b>North Worcester Lateral (12")</b>		
6.30	New_Ipswich	Hillsborough, NH	2.62	Bolton	Worcester, MA
1.68	Greenville	Hillsborough, NH	4.21	Berlin	Worcester, MA
3.91	Mason	Hillsborough, NH	0.29	Northborough	Worcester, MA
1.18	Milford	Hillsborough, NH	6.37	Boylston	Worcester, MA
2.73	Brookline	Hillsborough, NH	0.48	West_Boylston	Worcester, MA
1.93	Milford	Hillsborough, NH	0.15	Shrewsbury	Worcester, MA
4.03	Amherst	Hillsborough, NH	0.02	Worcester	Worcester, MA
4.49	Merrimack	Hillsborough, NH	<b>Fitchburg Lateral Extension (12")</b>		
2.68	Litchfield	Hillsborough, NH	5.08	Mason	Hillsborough, NH
2.54	Londonderry	Rockingham, NH	5.20	Townsend	Middlesex, MA
2.48	Hudson	Hillsborough, NH	3.70	Lunenburg	Worcester, MA
2.23	Windham	Rockingham, NH			
5.45	Pelham	Hillsborough, NH			
2.82	Dracut	Middlesex, MA			

**One further change:** on June 2, 2015, TGP announced that it was removing the "North Worcester Lateral" from the project (FERC Docket PF14-22 : 20150602-5146).

---

## Section 2: Summary, sorted by State, then within Counties by Town name

---

The municipalities are listed alphabetically within each County. The Counties are arranged within a State by West to East direction, more or less following the pipeline's path, and bookmarked by County.

The header line for each entry contains : Municipality **Name**, **County**, **State**, **Population** and **Governance** style (e.g., **Open\_TM** for Open Town Meeting, **Repr\_TM** for Representative Town Meeting, **Mayor-CI** for Mayor plus Council, **TM+TwnMgr** for combined Town Meeting with a Town Manager, or **T\_Council** for Town Council forms of governance, respectively).

Each town's exposure to the pipeline is indicated in [ ] at the right edge as follows:

crossed by pipeline in November 2014 proposed routing [2014]

crossed by pipeline in March 2015 proposed routing [2015]

Some towns without pipeline crossings in either routing have taken actions as a result of concerns about indirect impacts or in solidarity with the affected towns - for example Temple, NH, whose elementary school and emergency response center are within 1/2 mile of the compressor station in New Ipswich, NH.

The line following the header line contains the telephone number for the Town or City Clerk, if known, otherwise for the main office number; followed by the URL for the official town website if one exists.

Subsequent lines list the date, body and brief description of each act in opposition.

The full text of each action, e.g., resolution, letter, etc., can be found in Section 3: Supporting Materials, where the entries are arranged alphabetically by town name and so bookmarked for ease of access.

---

### Berkshire County, MA

---

**Becket**      **Berkshire**      **MA**      **1,779**      **Open\_TM**      **[]**  
413-623-8934 x11      <<http://www.townofbecket.org>>

May 10, 2014, Annual Town Meeting, Article 28: Resolution To Ban "Fracked Gas" Pipelines And To Champion Sustainable Energy

**Cheshire**      **Berkshire**      **MA**      **3,235**      **Open\_TM**      **[2015]**  
(413) 743-1690 x22      <<http://www.cheshire-ma.com>>

June 8, 2015, Annual Town Meeting, Article 14: Resolution Opposing the Gas Pipeline in Cheshire, MA

.....

**NOTE: to save space the remainder of this report (pages 6 to 190), is not included here.**

**Pages 6 to 16: Section 2: Summary, sorted by State, then within Counties by Town name  
(only the first part of that section's first page is shown above)**

**Pages 17 to 190: Section 3: Supporting materials:  
containing the complete text of each official action listed in Section 2**

**The complete report can be downloaded from FERC at**

**[http://elibrary.FERC.gov/idmws/file\\_list.asp?accession\\_num=20150717-5217](http://elibrary.FERC.gov/idmws/file_list.asp?accession_num=20150717-5217)**

**or alternatively from:**

**[http://www.Mason-NH.org/MA+NH\\_Municip\\_Resp\\_to\\_NED.pdf](http://www.Mason-NH.org/MA+NH_Municip_Resp_to_NED.pdf)**

**20150720-0016**

Caden Cabana  
7 Laurel Wood Dr  
Temple, NH 03084

July 1, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose. Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street; NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: FERC docket number PF14-22

Dear Secretary Bose:

In regard to the proposed Kinder Morgan/TGP natural gas pipeline, when is FERC going to hold its scoping meetings in the towns of New Ipswich, Temple, Greenville, and Mason, NH?

All of these towns would be affected by the potential compressor station.

Sincerely,

**20150720-0018**

54 Old Vernon Road  
Northfield, Massachusetts D1360

July 15, 2015

Secretary Kimberly D. Bose  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First St. NE Room 1A  
Washington DC 20426

Dear Secretary Bose:

I am writing to express our concern with and opposition to the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Expansion project. I have written you about this matter in the past. Those letters expressed objections based on facts and figures. This letter is being written from the heart.

My husband and I have lived in Northfield, Massachusetts for over 35 years. It is the town where we chose to raise our children. It is the town where we plan to live out our retirement years. It is also the town chosen to be the site of the largest compression station ever proposed by Kinder Morgan, a compression station that will be approximately 2.5 times larger than any the company currently operates.

A drive through town clearly indicates local feelings about the pipeline and the compressor station. Main Street is lined with anti-pipeline signs. Pro-pipeline signs are non-existent. At a recent town election, residents voted 8596 to 1596 against the pipeline. Yet, it feels like the construction of the pipeline is a foregone conclusion. Why is this? Why must we feel that our state and federal regulatory boards are ignoring the public and kowtowing to the utilities? Why is it that our appeals to our state- and federal-level political representatives are falling on deaf ears? Why is greed allowed to dominate over care for our natural resources? Why, in the wake of all that is known about the dangers of fracking and the short-sightedness of relying upon fossil fuels, are we ignoring what can be accomplished through use of renewable energy sources and conservation? Above all, why are our politicians ignoring us and our so-called regulatory commissions giving industry everything it asks for?

The people of the various towns affected by the proposed pipeline have made their feelings known in a clear and intelligent manner. Our local politicians are doing what they can to preserve and protect the towns and

people they serve. Yet, Kinder Morgan and its affiliates continue to act as if it is their right to construct the pipeline, as if full approval has already been granted.

I urge you to do all in your power to stop this pipeline. It is time that politicians and regulatory commissions remember that they serve the people, not the corporations.

Sincerely yours,

Elizabeth Lareau Whitcomb  
James A. Whitcomb

**20150720-0021**

Commonwealth of Massachusetts  
**MASSACHUSETTS SENATE**  
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

SENATOR STAN ROSENBERG  
PRESIDENT  
Hampshire, Franklin and Worcester District

July 14, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Room 1A  
Washington, D.C. 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. Docket No. PFI4-22-000  
Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Ms. Bose:

I am writing to you regarding the Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Planned Northeast Energy Direct Project (NED), Request for Comments on Environmental Issues, and Notice of Public Scoping Meetings in Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. Docket No. PF14-22-000 issued by the staff of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) on June 30, 2015. In the notice, FERC states that the Commission will use the scoping process to gather input from the public and interested agencies on environmental issues related to the Project in accordance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

The proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project (NED) if permitted, would have a substantial impact on towns in my district and there is significant opposition to the Project overall in those communities on environmental and other grounds. The schedule set by FERC staff for the public scoping sessions does not give adequate time to affected communities to prepare a technical analysis and substantive response to the Company's plans to construct and operate 412 miles of new natural gas transmission pipeline and associated facilities. The only proposed hearing in my district is scheduled for July 29, 2015 at Greenfield Middle School. Given the magnitude of this project, it is incumbent upon FERC to make sure that everyone who seeks to participate is able to do so, and one hearing scheduled mid-summer is insufficient for the public and town officials.

Therefore, I respectfully request that you postpone the scoping hearing scheduled for Greenfield until September at the earliest to make sure that stakeholders in my community are able to discuss the impacts of the NED Project on the myriad issues considered in the EIS pursuant to NEPA. If FERC is not willing to postpone the July 29th hearing, I request that the Commission schedule a second hearing at a later date, but prior to issuance of an EIS and a formal application, in order to inform the staff analysis. Finally, I also request that FERC reschedule the filing deadline for written and electronic comments until thirty days after the new Resource Reports are filed.

Evaluation of a project this size must be thorough and complete with maximum participation by the public. I appreciate your consideration of my requests and ask for immediate action on postponement.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely

STAN ROSENBERG

President of the Senate

Hampshire, Franklin and Worcester District

**20150720-0022**

Mrs. Gloria Barefoot  
PO Box 484  
Fitzwilliam, NH 03447  
July 12, 2015

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First St., NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: Docket No. PF14-22-000 Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Project and Possible Alternatives

The proposed NED pipeline designed to transmit high-pressure, non-odorized gas through 70 miles of Southern New Hampshire will have a negative impact on the environment and economics of the area. The project will disturb and redirect numerous aquifers, ponds, watersheds, and lakes. Noise and exhaust from blow down valves and compressor stations will disturb wildlife and will impact hunting, fishing, snowmobiling, and boating in some of the most beautiful country in New England. Is it really the time to invest in excessive infrastructure, constructing the largest gas pipeline and most powerful compressor stations to date in New Hampshire?

There are alternatives! The distance from the wellhead to the customer may be several hundred miles, and because natural gas is relatively low in energy content per unit volume, it is expensive to transport.

~ One alternative is gas to power (GTP) or gas to wire (GTW). Large scale electric power generation from natural gas, perhaps via gas turbines, closer to the wellheads can then be transmitted by wire. Wire can be strung in many topographies where trenching is problematic, such as across wetlands and aquifers, granite ledge, and ravines. GTW has no incineration zone and less risk of explosion. There is no risk of gas leaks caused by earth movement or violent weather, which is safer since it takes up to 2 hours to shut down natural gas flow in a pipeline emergency. With GTW there is no risk of gas line accidents caused by stray voltage in a mixed-use utility corridor as would be the case with NED.

~ Liquefied natural gas transportation has now become more economic due to improvements in technology and thermodynamic efficiencies of LNG facilities. The cost of transport per mile is less than for pipeline.

~ The plan by Spectra Energy to expand the capacity for delivery of natural gas into New Hampshire along existing Spectra pipelines is another alternative to NED. This plan builds on existing infrastructure and does not disturb undeveloped and sensitive environments. The increase in capacity from this project will more than meet the needs of New Hampshire. The Spectra Energy plan addresses how the cost of the project will be handled, while NED plans do not.

~ Other methods for transporting gas include Compressed Natural Gas (CNG), Gas to Solid (GtS), and Gas to Liquid (GtL).

Please consider supporting the position that there are better alternatives for New Hampshire and the Northeastern US than NED.

Respecffully,  
Gloria L Barefoot

**20150720-0023**

Temple, NH 03084

July 1,2015

Kimberly D. Bose. Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street; NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: FERC docket number PF14-22

Dear Secretary Bose:

In regard to the proposed Kinder Morgan/TGP natural gas pipeline, when is FERC going to hold its scoping meetings in the towns of New Ipswich, Temple, Greenville, and Mason, NH?

All of these towns would be affected by the potential compressor station.

Sincerely,

John S. Leo?

**20150720-0024**

Hand written letter, Carol Culhane, New Ipswich, NH 03071, opposing

**20150720-0029**

July 10, 2015

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
FERC  
888 First Street, NE Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Dear Kimberly:

Please find enclosed a copy of the letter I sent to New Hampshire Governor Hassan to voice my opposition to the gas pipeline proposal by Kinder Morgan. I plan on attending the meeting on July 29” in Nashua, NH. Thank you for the notice you sent me on it.

Carol P. Angell

-----

Governor Maggie Hassan  
Office of the Governor  
107 North Main Street  
Concord, NH 03301

July 9, 2015

Dear Governor Hassan,

It is with dismay that I must write to you again about the proposed natural gas pipeline being planned by Kinder Morgan. Since my last letter, much more factual information has come out about the detrimental results this pipeline will cause to our beautiful state. Several towns have spent substantial money studying the impact to their town, such as Amherst and Milford. These studies describe the serious environmental damage the pipeline will cause and the dangerous risks it will pose to those living near the pipeline. Of course property values will plummet for those living near the pipeline. In the long run this will hurt tax revenues to

the towns.

One of the studies found that only about Gyes of the natural gas transported will be used by New Hampshire and yet our state will suffer from all the negative aspects of the project. (See Nashua Telegraph articles by Kathy Cleveland on 6-20-15 and 6-14-15)These gas pipelines have been shown to leak methane gas into the atmosphere. We can expect a higher incidence of birth defects and probably cancer rates for those living near the pipeline also. And what about the thousands of wells which supply water to the residents in the affected towns and perhaps even many towns away? Remember that there are many rivers underground that feed these wells. There is no way they can promise that these wells will not be impacted by all the blasting of granite and construction that will take place through the wetlands, over the hills and valleys along the proposed route. This is not to mention the huge impact this will have on many species of wild animals, birds, fish, reptiles and other living creatures whose habitats will be destroyed or badly damaged. Towns will need to spend more money and resources for further environmental studies and species inventories.

Another important consideration is that Kinder Morgan does not have a stellar safety record and in our country many gas explosions have occurred causing vast damage and loss of life.

Why should New Hampshire be the scapegoat here? Most of this natural gas will be shipped out of our region. The additional energy we need can be supplied by a much smaller and less intrusive solution. Plus a lot more can be done to conserve energy and encourage alternative energy sources.

Please do all in your power to stop this vast intrusion and damage of our beautiful state and many NH residents' roperities.

How would you like to live near the pipeline? Did you know any properties within 900 feet of the pipeline are in the incineration zone labeled by Kinder Morgan? That includes a lot of people and properties. Is this what you want as a legacy for your time serving the citizens of New Hampshire? Kinder Morgan needs to be stopped and I pray that you have the courage to stand up for our beautiful state whose motto ironically is "Live free or die".

Thank you so much for listening to the many voices against this project. We all love New Hampshire and do not believe Kinder Morgan should be allowed to exploit us for their gain.

Sincerely yours,

Carol Angell

12 Nevens Street, Hudson, NH 03051 and Richmond, NH

Email address: coaneell56@email.com 603-689-5029

## **20150720-0030**

Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC

1615 Suffield Street

Agawam, MA 01001

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Nathaniel j. Davis, Sr., Deputy Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, NE

Washington, DC 20426

Date: July 12, 2015

RE: Denying property access

FERC PF 14-22 Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Project

As the owner of the property located at:

755 County Rte #7, East Schodack, NY 12063

I am denying permission to Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its repre-

sentatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land to perform surveys, or for any other purpose.

Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Nancy Pozniakas  
William Pozniakas

**20150720-0032**

Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Nathaniel j. Davis, Sr., Deputy Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

Date: 6-25-15

RE: Denying property access

FERC PF 14-22 Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Project

As the owner of the property located at:

227 Hoags Corners Rd  
Nassau, NY 12123

I am denying permission to Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land to perform surveys, or for any other purpose.

Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

John Zurlo

**20150720-0033**

Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Nathaniel j. Davis, Sr., Deputy Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

Date: 6/25/15

RE: Denying property access

FERC PF 14-22 Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Project

As the owner of the property located at:

239 Hoags Corners Rd, Nassau,

I am denying permission to Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land to perform surveys, or for any other purpose.

Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Amanda Tromblee

**20150720-0035**

**State of New Hampshire**  
**House of Representatives**  
Concord

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First St NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: Docket PF14-22

I am writing to oppose the Northeast Energy Direct Project (NED).under PF14-22 as currently proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. Division of Kinder Morgan (KM).

There is no argument that a gas supply bottle neck is causing high energy costs in New England. The region needs additional capacity if only to replace generation from retiring coal, oil and nuclear facilities. That said, the region does not need all the proposed projects to meet our capacity shortfall. My simple calculations from ISO-NE projections show that we need to replace about 4,000 MW in the next 3-4 years. That could be met with 1Bcu-ft/day of additional gas pipeline capacity.

In reviewing all the various project proposals to expand gas pipeline capacity the KM NED project as proposed is the most disruptive. Furthermore, by the time the KM supply comes on line, the Spectra Access Northeast expansion will already have met the 1Bcu-ft/day need.

For that reason, KM should not be allowed to take property by eminent domain because the project will not be needed for the public good by the time it is built. KM should instead bargain with property owners for this merchant project.

If, however, the FERC finds the KM NED project is needed, I ask that you approve the original route through Massachusetts. This MA direct route was abandoned by KM because it was opposed by powerful political lobbies who complained about green field development and Article 97 violations. The FERC has the power and authority to overrule State law. The NH detour (current plan of record) is longer, disrupts more green space, goes through more difficult terrain with more elevation change, and will create far greater environmental damage and negative visual impacts to local residents. Because the KM NED project has no shared rights of way with PSNH, it must clear a wide swath of trees that now serve as a hedge along the electric transmission corridor. Property owners will now suddenly have in their front and back yards power lines that were hidden from view for generations. "Collocation" with power lines as proposed by KM is really a ruse to avoid political opposition to green field development in MA when this is, in fact, green field development in NH.

Please reject the NH alternative route as proposed in the KM NED pre-filing. In your investigations I am available to discuss the many negative impacts this project will impose on my constituents. Thank-you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Jim Parison - NH State Representative  
House Science, Technology and Energy Committee  
40 Old Rindge Road  
New Ipswich, NH 03071  
603-878-5001  
508-468-431(c)

**20150720-0036**

To: Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

July 11, 2015

FERC- Washington, D.C.

Re: Project docket 1PF14-22400 - Northeast Energy Direct Project

My siblings and I own 22+ acres in Susquehanna County, which is already being cut entirely through (almost 5 acs being utilized out of 22, nearly one-quarter of the property), by the Constitution Pipeline. We know that Northeast Energy Direct project is following the exact same corridor, parallel to Constitution. The Constitution is already planning on wiping out a great deal of the woods behind the house, woods that contain many sugar maple trees which we use for our Maple Syrup business, which will be lost forever- there is no replacing 50-100+year old trees. This corridor behind the house comes very close to the drilled well, the sole water supply for the house. It cuts through three early American stone walls that are intact on our property. It cuts through all our fields. That pipeline is also cutting through our lake property, which fronts on a private spring-fed lake —cutting directly through (under) a stream inlet that runs through our property, one of the three major inlets into said lake. We have never signed with Constitution, and they are taking the route by eminent domain.

Northeast Energy Direct project is planning to do the VERY SAME THING. This will be a SECOND swath cut through our woods, destroying what little trees and sugar maples we have left (if any), since it runs to the east of the Constitution in a parallel route, and that's where the last of the woods would remain. It will be EVEN CLOSER to the drilled well. It will, AGAIN, cut through our lake frontage property and directly through the spring-fed stream which feeds the lake. There's no telling how much damage these TWO monstrous disturbances will cause to the lake ecosystem and surrounding inlet area, not to mention the delicate wildlife of a lake and streams.

All this, despite the fact that we have, on numerous occasions, suggested an alternative to the Constitution route, which they refused to even consider. That is, to move the route just WEST of our property (beyond a stone quarry which our neighbor to the west retains), and cut through his uninhabited woods at the top of the mountain, coming back out on the road which then again meets our property at the corner field, one of the fields they are cutting through anyway. This route would completely miss the bulk of our parcel, save our woods and maples, and save the lake frontage portion and stream from any disturbance whatsoever. We would then have NO PROBLEM negotiating with any pipeline for passage through just our field. Our neighbor to the west has no maple syrup business to disrupt and destroy, no lake frontage or inlet stream to cut through, no stone walls, no house or drilled well to disturb. No one asked him. He has already told us he would negotiate with the pipelines through his property. WE WILL NOT. This is a viable alternative, and no one will discuss it. Now Northeast Energy Direct wants to follow the same route, tearing through all of our property AGAIN, doing the same damage again. Our answer will be the same. I should think someone would come to their senses and try to take the route of least resistance, when there is one available.

Sincerely,

Catherine M. Holleran, etal  
2749 Stephens Road  
New Milford, PA 18834  
Parcel 1127.00-1,063.00

**20150720-0038**

Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001  
Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Nathaniel j. Davis, Sr., Deputy Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

Date: 6/25/2015

RE: Denying property access

FERC PF 14-22 Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Project

As the owner of the property located at:

50 Christmas Tree Way, Nassau, NY

I am denying permission to Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land to perform surveys, or for any other purpose.

Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Denise M. Leggett

**20150720-0039**

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
Chairman Norman C. Bay  
888 First Street NE  
Washington, DC 20426

July 11, 2015

Re: Second mailing of opposition to Docket 1PF14-22-000

Dear Chairman Bay,

Attached are petitions, with new signatures of opposition to the Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co. proposed pipeline, called NED (Northeast Direct, FERC Docket 114-22), through Rensselaer County and its compressor station proposed for Clark's Chapel Road in the Town of Schodack,

Since Andrew Cuomo, Governor of New York State, rejected hydrofracking of gas in this State because of health risks, why should any company be allowed to build a fracked gas pipeline for transporting gas through New York State to some other destination? The gas pipeline has some health risks, and the compressor stations all have confirmed health risks per studies recently completed in Pennsylvania. The pipeline is not planned to benefit New York, but to use us as a conduit for the company's financial benefit. Please reject Kinder Morgan's proposal until love of natural gas becomes more important than children's and adults' lives.

Please protect our families from developers who do not have our interests in their hearts.

Very respectfully yours,

Shelley M. Bennett                      474 Burden Lake Road  
518-366-9594                      Nassau, New York, 12123

Clark J. Shaughnessy                      474 Burden Lake Road  
518-441-1685                      Nassau, New York, 12123

-----  
PACS

People Against Compressor Station

We, the citizens of Nassau, Schodack, Sand Lake and Rensselaer County, NY oppose the intended Kinder Morgan NED fracked gas pipeline and compressor station planned for Clark's Chapel Road and Route 15 (FERC //PF 14-22). We are specifically against the construction of a 90,000 horsepower industrial compress-

sor station in our rural residential community for the following reasons:

- ~ Risk to human life.
- ~ Health studies prove increased risk of cancer, respiratory and central nerve disease for humans residing near gas compressor station sites.
- ~ Periodic emissions of gas, fracking chemicals, carcinogens, toxins, all unseen by the naked eye.
- ~ Possible and unexpected leakage into the ground and into well water.
- ~ Devaluation of homes and property due to forced insertion of industrial complexes and pipelines.
- ~ Constant 24/7 loud noise forced on homeowners who reside and pay taxes in a rural residential zone.
- ~ Forced concession of existing rural residential zoning for an industrial usage.
- ~ No gas will be supplied to New York State residences or businesses.

Signed by: **239** Names, with signatures and addresses

**20150720-0059**

Diane Varney-Parker  
1241 Brookline Rd  
Mason, NH 03048

July 1, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street; NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: FERC docket number PF14-22

Dear Secretary Bose:

In regard to the proposed Kinder Morgan/TGP natural gas pipeline, when is FERC going to hold its scoping meetings in the towns of New Ipswich, Temple, Greenville, and Mason, NH?

All of these towns would be affected by the potential compressor station.

Sincerely,

**20150720-0063**

Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Nathaniel j. Davis, Sr., Deputy Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

Date: July 11, 2015

RE: Denying property access

FERC PF 14-22 Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Project

As the owner of the property located at:

1315 Nassau Averill Park Road, Nassau, NY 12123

I am denying permission to Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land to perform surveys, or for any other

purpose.

Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Mary Jo DePhilippis

**20150720-0065**

Commonwealth of Massachusetts  
**Town of Lanesborough**

Newton Memorial Town Hall  
Post Office Box 1492  
83 North Main Street  
Lanesborough, MA 01237  
Tel. (413)442-1167  
FAX (413)443-5811  
[www.lanesborough-ma.gov](http://www.lanesborough-ma.gov)

OFFICE OF THE  
BOARD OF SELECTMEN

July 7, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Agency (FERC)  
888 First Street NE  
Washington, DC 20426.

Dear Ms. Bose:

As the elected representatives of the Town of Lanesborough, we are writing to urge you to take note of the attached petition which was signed by over **500** people. The Town Secretary of the Town of Lanesborough is in possession of the original petition with all the signatures. The petition requests that the Kinder-Morgan', Tennessee Natural Gas pipeline be stopped. The petition was also overwhelmingly supported by the citizens of Lanesborough at our Annual Town Meeting on June 9, 2015. By this action, Lanesborough joins the many towns in the Commonwealth on record in opposition to this construction.

Representing the residents of our Town we ask you to carefully review the petition and take into account the strong feelings expressed by the residents who signed this petition and stand opposed to the construction of this pipeline.

Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

John Goerlach, Chair  
Henry Sayers  
Robert Ericson

enc.

-----  
Town of Lanesborough: Citizen's Petition Form

The citizens of Lanesborough call upon the Selectmen to send a letter to Rep. Gail Cariddi, Sen. Ben Downing, Governor Baker, Secretary of the ERC, Senators Markey and Warren, Congressman Neal, the FERC, the Speaker of the State House of Representative and Majority Leader of the State Senate urging them to do all they can to stop the TNG pipeline from being built in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Whereas a proposed High-Pressure Pipeline carrying natural gas and assorted chemicals obtained through hydraulic fracturing has been designated to come through Lanesborough and neighboring communities,

bringing said fuel to Dracut, Mass; and

Whereas said pipeline goes against current Massachusetts commitments to renewable energies and combating global climate change; and

Whereas the existence of a gas pipeline in our town would have a devastating impact on property values and the ability of citizens to sell their land when necessary; and

Whereas said pipeline would impact unknowable amounts of forest, conservation land, farmland, the recharge area for the Lanesborough town water supply; and

Whereas a high-pressure gas pipeline must be vented periodically releasing gas and dangerous carcinogens into the air and, by its nature, carries potential for leaks, rupture, or devastating explosion causing untold damage to property, lives, and our drinking water; and

Whereas the cost of said pipeline would require Massachusetts citizens to pay a utility bill tariff as well as environmental costs not required by law for Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (“TGP”, a subsidiary of Kinder Morgan Energy Partners, L.P.), making ratepayers bear financial risk for the endeavors of a private corporation; and

Whereas the projected route of the pipeline traverses the Water Supply Protection Overlay District of the Lanesborough zoning bylaw which was established to “preserve and protect existing and potential sources of drinking water supplies and prevent temporary and permanent contamination of the environment.”; and

Whereas the pipeline traverses the Flood Plain/Wetlands Protection Overlay District of the Lanesborough zoning bylaw which was established to “protect, preserve and maintain the water table and the water recharge areas within the town so as to preserve present and potential water supplies for the public health and safety of the residents of the town of Lanesborough;” and

Whereas, we the citizens of Lanesborough, Massachusetts, which became a Green Community in 2014, choose not to participate in such encumbrances to the life, vibrancy, economic stability, and general well being of our community and wherever hydraulic fracturing is occurring and the pressurized pipeline is running; now, therefore be it

Resolved, that the people of Lanesborough, Massachusetts:

Hereby call on our Selectmen to stand in opposition to TGP’s high pressured pipeline and not allow it within our town borders:

1. Oppose said pipeline, and any pipeline carrying natural gas obtained through hydraulic fracturing, within the borders of our Commonwealth or our nation; and
2. Stand in solidarity with nearby communities working to disallow the Pipeline within its borders and ban its construction in our region, including (as of 12/20/2014)Becket, Dalton, Hinsdale, Lenox, North Adams, Pittsfield, Peru, Richmond, Sandisfield, Washington, Windsor, Chesterfield, Cummington, Northampton, Pelham, Plainfield, Worthington, Ashfield, Buckland, Conway, Deerfield, Gill, Greenfield, Leverett, Montague, Northfield, Orange, Shelburne, Warwick, Wendell, Ashburnham, Athol, Berlin, Bolton, Royalston, Templeton, Winchedon, Ashby, Dunstable, Groton, Pepperell, Townsend, Tyngsborough, Brookline; and
3. Cause a copy of this resolution to be presented to the Town of Lanesborough’s state and federal legislative representatives, FERC and the Governor and Secretary of the Department of Conservation and Recreation, asking them to take action to prevent construction of the Pipeline within the borders of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and to enact legislation and take such other actions as are necessary to disallow such projects that go against our commitments to life, the environment, our economic well being and our bodily safety and instead to legislate more stringent energy efficiency and further exploration of subsidies for renewable energy sources.

**20150720-0070**

PROPERTY ACCESS DENIED

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: July 13, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

RE: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

Street Address: 77 Scott Pond Road  
Town & Zip: Fitzwilliam, NH 03447  
Map & Lot Number(s) (if known) 000016-000003-000000

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Richard B. Bullock

CC:

FERC

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

**20150720-0072**

Dear Kimberly Bose:

Kinder Morgan and its subsidiary, Tennessee Gas, propose to build and operate a 36-inch pipeline to daily transport up to 2.2 billion cubic feet of hydro-fractured gas at a pressure of up to 1,460 pounds per square inch from Pennsylvania, through New York to Dracut, Massachusetts. The proposal is called the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline project (NED).

Please stop the NED in order to protect my family and community. I oppose this project for the following reasons:

- No New York resident or business will receive any of the gas and almost all of it will be exported to foreign markets.
- Pipeline safety standards in rural areas are much lower than in urban areas, effectively treating constituents who live in the rural communities along the proposed route as second class citizens.
- The governing federal and state regulations and the resources used to ensure pipeline safety during construction, operation and decommissioning phases are woefully inadequate.
- Only landowners whose lands abut the pipeline route may receive compensation. All other residents along the pipeline corridor, even those within the “incineration zone,” involuntarily assume the risk of death, personal injury and property damage in the event of a rupture, but receive no compensation for their risk and diminished quality of life.
- Property values along the pipeline will decline and reduce assessed valuations. This in turn will increase the tax burden on properties further away from the pipeline.
- The federal process for approving and constructing gas pipelines violates the requirement of the Na-

tional Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) to minimize cumulative negative impacts that federal agency decisions may have on public safety, health and the environment.

—No single federal entity oversees the NED project as a whole. For example, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission decides whether and where the NED is built. The Department of State decides whether the gas may be exported. The Pipeline and Hazardous Material Safety Administration governs pipeline safety. Each agency pleads lack of jurisdiction to review or do anything that could be seen as falling within the jurisdiction of another agency. Oversight of the project is therefore segmented, hindering the public's ability to effectively review and voice concerns about the NED.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Alan Friedel  
67 Old Route 66  
Averill Park, NY 12018

### **20150720-0073**

Dear Secretary Bose:

Kinder Morgan and its subsidiary, Tennessee Gas, propose to build and operate a 36-inch pipeline to daily transport up to 2.2 billion cubic feet of hydro-fractured gas at a pressure of up to 1,460 pounds per square inch from Pennsylvania, through New York to Dracut, Massachusetts. The proposal is called the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline project (NED).

Please stop the NED in order to protect my family and community. I oppose this project for the following reasons:

—No New York resident or business will receive any of the gas and almost all of it will be exported to foreign markets.

—Pipeline safety standards in rural areas are much lower than in urban areas, effectively treating constituents who live in the rural communities along the proposed route as second class citizens.

—The governing federal and state regulations and the resources used to ensure pipeline safety during construction, operation and decommissioning phases are woefully inadequate.

—Only landowners whose lands abut the pipeline route may receive compensation. All other residents along the pipeline corridor, even those within the "incineration zone," involuntarily assume the risk of death, personal injury and property damage in the event of a rupture, but receive no compensation for their risk and diminished quality of life.

—Property values along the pipeline will decline and reduce assessed valuations. This in turn will increase the tax burden on properties further away from the pipeline.

—The federal process for approving and constructing gas pipelines violates the requirement of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) to minimize cumulative negative impacts that federal agency decisions may have on public safety, health and the environment.

—No single federal entity oversees the NED project as a whole. For example, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission decides whether and where the NED is built. The Department of State decides whether the gas may be exported. The Pipeline and Hazardous Material Safety Administration governs pipeline safety. Each agency pleads lack of jurisdiction to review or do anything that could be seen as falling within the jurisdiction of another agency. Oversight of the project is therefore segmented, hindering the public's ability to effectively review and voice concerns about the NED.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Brandon Vioria  
55 N. Schodack Rd  
E. Greenbush, NY 12061

**20150720-0074**

Dear Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary:

Kinder Morgan and its subsidiary, Tennessee Gas, propose to build and operate a 36-inch pipeline to daily transport up to 2.2 billion cubic feet of hydro-fractured gas at a pressure of up to 1,460 pounds per square inch from Pennsylvania, through New York to Dracut, Massachusetts. The proposal is called the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline project (NED).

Please stop the NED in order to protect my family and community. I oppose this project for the following reasons:

- No New York resident or business will receive any of the gas and almost all of it will be exported to foreign markets.
- Pipeline safety standards in rural areas are much lower than in urban areas, effectively treating constituents who live in the rural communities along the proposed route as second class citizens.
- The governing federal and state regulations and the resources used to ensure pipeline safety during construction, operation and decommissioning phases are woefully inadequate.
- Only landowners whose lands abut the pipeline route may receive compensation. All other residents along the pipeline corridor, even those within the “incineration zone,” involuntarily assume the risk of death, personal injury and property damage in the event of a rupture, but receive no compensation for their risk and diminished quality of life.
- Property values along the pipeline will decline and reduce assessed valuations. This in turn will increase the tax burden on properties further away from the pipeline.
- The federal process for approving and constructing gas pipelines violates the requirement of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) to minimize cumulative negative impacts that federal agency decisions may have on public safety, health and the environment.
- No single federal entity oversees the NED project as a whole. For example, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission decides whether and where the NED is built. The Department of State decides whether the gas may be exported. The Pipeline and Hazardous Material Safety Administration governs pipeline safety. Each agency pleads lack of jurisdiction to review or do anything that could be seen as falling within the jurisdiction of another agency. Oversight of the project is therefore segmented, hindering the public’s ability to effectively review and voice concerns about the NED.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Bernadette Wagar  
251 Maryland Ave.  
Rensselaer, NH 12144

**20150720-0075**

Dear FERC:

Kinder Morgan and its subsidiary, Tennessee Gas, propose to build and operate a 36-inch pipeline to daily transport up to 2.2 billion cubic feet of hydro-fractured gas at a pressure of up to 1,460 pounds per square inch from Pennsylvania, through New York to Dracut, Massachusetts. The proposal is called the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline project (NED).

Please stop the NED in order to protect my family and community. I oppose this project for the following reasons:

- No New York resident or business will receive any of the gas and almost all of it will be exported to foreign markets.
- Pipeline safety standards in rural areas are much lower than in urban areas, effectively treating constituents who live in the rural communities along the proposed route as second class citizens.

- The governing federal and state regulations and the resources used to ensure pipeline safety during construction, operation and decommissioning phases are woefully inadequate.
- Only landowners whose lands abut the pipeline route may receive compensation. All other residents along the pipeline corridor, even those within the “incineration zone,” involuntarily assume the risk of death, personal injury and property damage in the event of a rupture, but receive no compensation for their risk and diminished quality of life.
- Property values along the pipeline will decline and reduce assessed valuations. This in turn will increase the tax burden on properties further away from the pipeline.
- The federal process for approving and constructing gas pipelines violates the requirement of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) to minimize cumulative negative impacts that federal agency decisions may have on public safety, health and the environment.
- No single federal entity oversees the NED project as a whole. For example, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission decides whether and where the NED is built. The Department of State decides whether the gas may be exported. The Pipeline and Hazardous Material Safety Administration governs pipeline safety. Each agency pleads lack of jurisdiction to review or do anything that could be seen as falling within the jurisdiction of another agency. Oversight of the project is therefore segmented, hindering the public’s ability to effectively review and voice concerns about the NED.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Stephanie Vilorio  
 55 N. Schodack Rd  
 E. Greenbush, NY 12061

**20150720-0076**

Dear Secretary Bose:

Kinder Morgan and its subsidiary, Tennessee Gas, propose to build and operate a 36-inch pipeline to daily transport up to 2.2 billion cubic feet of hydro-fractured gas at a pressure of up to 1,460 pounds per square inch from Pennsylvania, through New York to Dracut, Massachusetts. The proposal is called the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline project (NED).

Please stop the NED in order to protect my family and community. I oppose this project for the following reasons:

- No New York resident or business will receive any of the gas and almost all of it will be exported to foreign markets.
- Pipeline safety standards in rural areas are much lower than in urban areas, effectively treating constituents who live in the rural communities along the proposed route as second class citizens.
- The governing federal and state regulations and the resources used to ensure pipeline safety during construction, operation and decommissioning phases are woefully inadequate.
- Only landowners whose lands abut the pipeline route may receive compensation. All other residents along the pipeline corridor, even those within the “incineration zone,” involuntarily assume the risk of death, personal injury and property damage in the event of a rupture, but receive no compensation for their risk and diminished quality of life.
- Property values along the pipeline will decline and reduce assessed valuations. This in turn will increase the tax burden on properties further away from the pipeline.
- The federal process for approving and constructing gas pipelines violates the requirement of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) to minimize cumulative negative impacts that federal agency decisions may have on public safety, health and the environment.
- No single federal entity oversees the NED project as a whole. For example, the Federal Energy

Regulatory Commission decides whether and where the NED is built. The Department of State decides whether the gas may be exported. The Pipeline and Hazardous Material Safety Administration governs pipeline safety. Each agency pleads lack of jurisdiction to review or do anything that could be seen as falling within the jurisdiction of another agency. Oversight of the project is therefore segmented, hindering the public's ability to effectively review and voice concerns about the NED.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Mollie Turner  
175 Pond Hollow Rd.  
Averill Park, NY 12018

## **20150720-0077**

Dear Ms. Kimberly Bose, Secretary:

Kinder Morgan and its subsidiary, Tennessee Gas, propose to build and operate a 36-inch pipeline to daily transport up to 2.2 billion cubic feet of hydro-fractured gas at a pressure of up to 1,460 pounds per square inch from Pennsylvania, through New York to Dracut, Massachusetts. The proposal is called the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline project (NED).

Please stop the NED in order to protect my family and community. I oppose this project for the following reasons:

- No New York resident or business will receive any of the gas and almost all of it will be exported to foreign markets.
- Pipeline safety standards in rural areas are much lower than in urban areas, effectively treating constituents who live in the rural communities along the proposed route as second class citizens.
- The governing federal and state regulations and the resources used to ensure pipeline safety during construction, operation and decommissioning phases are woefully inadequate.
- Only landowners whose lands abut the pipeline route may receive compensation. All other residents along the pipeline corridor, even those within the “incineration zone,” involuntarily assume the risk of death, personal injury and property damage in the event of a rupture, but receive no compensation for their risk and diminished quality of life.
- Property values along the pipeline will decline and reduce assessed valuations. This in turn will increase the tax burden on properties further away from the pipeline.
- The federal process for approving and constructing gas pipelines violates the requirement of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) to minimize cumulative negative impacts that federal agency decisions may have on public safety, health and the environment.
- No single federal entity oversees the NED project as a whole. For example, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission decides whether and where the NED is built. The Department of State decides whether the gas may be exported. The Pipeline and Hazardous Material Safety Administration governs pipeline safety. Each agency pleads lack of jurisdiction to review or do anything that could be seen as falling within the jurisdiction of another agency. Oversight of the project is therefore segmented, hindering the public's ability to effectively review and voice concerns about the NED.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Anthony DeFrancesca  
67 Old Route 66  
Averill Park, NY 12018

## **20150720-0078**

Dear Secretary Bose:

Kinder Morgan and its subsidiary, Tennessee Gas, propose to build and operate a 36-inch pipeline to daily transport up to 2.2 billion cubic feet of hydro-fractured gas at a pressure of up to 1,460 pounds per square inch from Pennsylvania, through New York to Dracut, Massachusetts. The proposal is called the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline project (NED).

Please stop the NED in order to protect my family and community. I oppose this project for the following reasons:

- No New York resident or business will receive any of the gas and almost all of it will be exported to foreign markets.
- Pipeline safety standards in rural areas are much lower than in urban areas, effectively treating constituents who live in the rural communities along the proposed route as second class citizens.
- The governing federal and state regulations and the resources used to ensure pipeline safety during construction, operation and decommissioning phases are woefully inadequate.
- Only landowners whose lands abut the pipeline route may receive compensation. All other residents along the pipeline corridor, even those within the “incineration zone,” involuntarily assume the risk of death, personal injury and property damage in the event of a rupture, but receive no compensation for their risk and diminished quality of life.
- Property values along the pipeline will decline and reduce assessed valuations. This in turn will increase the tax burden on properties further away from the pipeline.
- The federal process for approving and constructing gas pipelines violates the requirement of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) to minimize cumulative negative impacts that federal agency decisions may have on public safety, health and the environment.
- No single federal entity oversees the NED project as a whole. For example, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission decides whether and where the NED is built. The Department of State decides whether the gas may be exported. The Pipeline and Hazardous Material Safety Administration governs pipeline safety. Each agency pleads lack of jurisdiction to review or do anything that could be seen as falling within the jurisdiction of another agency. Oversight of the project is therefore segmented, hindering the public’s ability to effectively review and voice concerns about the NED.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Peter Turner  
175 Pond Hollow Rd  
Averill Park, NY 12018

**20150720-0079**

Hand written card, Rachel Gordon, 36A Rogers Ave, Sommerville, MA 02144, opposed

**20150720-0080**

Hand written card, Kevin Smith, 299 Flower Hill Rd, Warwick, MA 01378, opposing

**20150720-0081**

July 13, 2015

Dear Congresswoman Kuster,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Congresswoman, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England. We believe it will harm the communities in southern NH.

Though the pipeline will not be going through Temple, about 200 houses in Temple, including our home, will be within a two-mile radius of the compressor station on the SKAT land in New Ipswich.

While the pipeline is a large issue, the compressor station is an even larger one. The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent “blow downs” where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline.

These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station — again our family home — along with many others including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby!

Our property values near this compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit.

Congresswoman Kuster, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

Nat & Holly Crooker

cc: FERC

### **20150720-0082**

July 13, 2015

Dear Congressman Guinta,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Congressman, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England. We believe it will harm the communities in southern NH.

Though the pipeline will not be going through Temple, about 200 houses in Temple, including our home, will be within a two-mile radius of the compressor station on the SKAT land in New Ipswich.

While the pipeline is a large issue, the compressor station is an even larger one. The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent “blow downs” where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline.

These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station — again our family home — along with many others including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby!

Our property values near this compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit.

Congressman Guinta, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

Nat & Holly Crooker

cc: FERC

### **20150720-0083**

July 13, 2015

Dear Congresswoman Kuster,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Congresswoman, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct

(NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England. We believe it will harm the communities in southern NH.

Though the pipeline will not be going through Temple, about 200 houses in Temple, including our home, will be within a two-mile radius of the compressor station on the SKAT land in New Ipswich.

While the pipeline is a large issue, the compressor station is an even larger one. The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent “blow downs” where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline.

These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station — again our family home — along with many others including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby!

Our property values near this compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit.

Congresswoman Kuster, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

Roger & Joan Crooker

cc: FERC

**20150720-0084**

July 13, 2015

Dear Congressman Guinta,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Congressman, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England. We believe it will harm the communities in southern NH.

Though the pipeline will not be going through Temple, about 200 houses in Temple, including our home, will be within a two-mile radius of the compressor station on the SKAT land in New Ipswich.

While the pipeline is a large issue, the compressor station is an even larger one. The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent “blow downs” where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline.

These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station — again our family home — along with many others including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby!

Our property values near this compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit.

Congressman Guinta, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

Roger & Joan Crooker

cc: FERC

**20150720-0085**

July 13, 2015

Dear Senator Shaheen,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Senator, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England. We believe it will harm the communities in southern NH.

Though the pipeline will not be going through Temple, about 200 houses in Temple, including our home, will be within a two-mile radius of the compressor station on the SKAT land in New Ipswich.

While the pipeline is a large issue, the compressor station is an even larger one. The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent “blow downs” where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline.

These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station — again our family home — along with many others including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby!

Our property values near this compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit.

Senator Shaheen, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

Roger & Joan Crooker

cc: FERC

**20150720-0086**

July 13, 2015

Dear Senator Ayotte,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Senator, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England. We believe it will harm the communities in southern NH.

Though the pipeline will not be going through Temple, about 200 houses in Temple, including our home, will be within a two-mile radius of the compressor station on the SKAT land in New Ipswich.

While the pipeline is a large issue, the compressor station is an even larger one. The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent “blow downs” where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline.

These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station — again our family home — along with many others including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby!

Our property values near this compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit.

Senator Ayotte, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,  
Roger & Joan Crooker  
cc: FERC

**20150720-0087**

July 13, 2015

Dear Congresswoman Kuster,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Congresswoman, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England. We believe it will harm the communities in southern NH.

Though the pipeline will not be going through Temple, about 200 houses in Temple, including our home, will be within a two-mile radius of the compressor station on the SKAT land in New Ipswich.

While the pipeline is a large issue, the compressor station is an even larger one. The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent “blow downs” where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline.

These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station — again our family home — along with many others including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby!

Our property values near this compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit.

Congresswoman Kuster, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,  
*{signature not legible}*  
cc: FERC

**20150720-0088**

Dear Congressman Guinta,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Congressman, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England. We believe it will harm the communities in southern NH.

Though the pipeline will not be going through Temple, about 200 houses in Temple, including our home, will be within a two-mile radius of the compressor station on the SKAT land in New Ipswich.

While the pipeline is a large issue, the compressor station is an even larger one. The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent “blow downs” where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline.

These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station — again our family home — along with many others including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby!

Our property values near this compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless.

What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit.  
Congressman Guinta, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,  
{signature not legible}

cc: FERC

**20150720-0089**

July 13, 2015

Dear Senator Shaheen,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Senator, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England. We believe it will harm the communities in southern NH.

Though the pipeline will not be going through Temple, about 200 houses in Temple, including our home, will be within a two-mile radius of the compressor station on the SKAT land in New Ipswich.

While the pipeline is a large issue, the compressor station is an even larger one. The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent “blow downs” where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline.

These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station — again our family home — along with many others including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby!

Our property values near this compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit.

Senator Shaheen, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,  
{signature not legible}

cc: FERC

**20150720-0090**

July 13, 2015

Dear Senator Ayotte,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Senator, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England. We believe it will harm the communities in southern NH.

Though the pipeline will not be going through Temple, about 200 houses in Temple, including our home, will be within a two-mile radius of the compressor station on the SKAT land in New Ipswich.

While the pipeline is a large issue, the compressor station is an even larger one. The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent “blow downs” where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline.

These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station — again our family home — along with many others including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby!

Our property values near this compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit.

Senator Ayotte, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

*{signature not legible}*

cc: FERC

**20150720-0091**

July 13, 2015

Dear Governor Hassan,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Governor, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England. We believe it will harm the communities in southern NH.

Though the pipeline will not be going through Temple, about 200 houses in Temple, including our home, will be within a two-mile radius of the compressor station on the SKAT land in New Ipswich.

While the pipeline is a large issue, the compressor station is an even larger one. The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent “blow downs” where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline.

These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station — again our family home — along with many others including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby!

Our property values near this compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit.

Governor Hassan, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

*{signature not legible}*

cc: FERC

**20150720-0092**

July 13, 2015

Dear Senator Ayotte,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Senator, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England. We believe it will harm the communities in southern NH.

Though the pipeline will not be going through Temple, about 200 houses in Temple, including our home, will be within a two-mile radius of the compressor station on the SKAT land in New Ipswich.

While the pipeline is a large issue, the compressor station is an even larger one. The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to

frequent “blow downs” where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline.

These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station — again our family home — along with many others including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby!

Our property values near this compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit.

Senator Ayotte, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

Nat & Holly Crooker

cc: FERC

### **20150720-0093**

Dear Governor Hassan,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Governor, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England. We believe it will harm the communities in southern NH.

Though the pipeline will not be going through Temple, about 200 houses in Temple, including our home, will be within a two-mile radius of the compressor station on the SKAT land in New Ipswich.

While the pipeline is a large issue, the compressor station is an even larger one. The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent “blow downs” where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline.

These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station — again our family home — along with many others including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby!

Our property values near this compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit.

Governor Hassan, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

Nat & Holly Crooker

cc: FERC

### **20150720-0094**

July 13, 2015

Dear Senator Shaheen,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Senator, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England. We believe it will harm the communities in southern NH.

Though the pipeline will not be going through Temple, about 200 houses in Temple, including our home,

will be within a two-mile radius of the compressor station on the SKAT land in New Ipswich.

While the pipeline is a large issue, the compressor station is an even larger one. The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent “blow downs” where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline.

These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station — again our family home — along with many others including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby!

Our property values near this compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit.

Senator Shaheen, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

Nat & Holly Crooker

cc: FERC

**20150720-0100**

Hand written card, Elizabeth Hamin, 75 State St, Amherst, MA 01002, opposing

**20150720-0101**

Hand written card, Amy Braunel, 131 Old Branch Rd, Wingdale, NY 12594, opposing

**20150720-0102**

Hand written postcard, John Waite, 15 Keets Rd, Deerfield, MA 01342, opposing

**20150720-0103**

Hand written card, J. David Boles, 36 Phyllis Ln, Greenfield, MA 01301, opposing

**20150720-0104**

Hand written card, John Stemon?, 214 ?, Williamsburg, MA 01096, opposing

**20150720-0105**

Hand written card, Jon Gaine, 789 Grove Hill Rd, Thetford Center, VT 05075, opposing

**20150720-0106**

Hand written card, David Hiler, 134 Upper Du?, Brattleboro, VT 05307, supporting

**20150720-0107**

Hand written card, Liz Quinn, 86 Gray St #2, Amherst, MA 01002, opposing

**20150720-0108**

Hand written card, Elaine Fontaine, PO Box 703, Chepachet, RI 02814, opposing

**20150720-0109**

Hand written card, Margaret van Baakin, 51 Chapin Rd, Bernardston, MA 01337, opposing

**20150720-0110**

Hand written postcard, Eve Brown-Waite, 15 Keets Rd, Deerfield, MA, opposing

**20150720-0111**

Hand written card, Mary Patterson, 44 Morrison Ave, Somerville, MA 02144, opposing

**20150720-0112**

Hand written card, Julia Blatt, 27 Skahan? Rd, Belmont, MA 02478, opposing

**20150720-0113**

Hand written card, Nathan Swaziz, 96 Parsons Rd, Conway, MA 01341, opposing

**20150720-0114**

Hand written card, Tobi Jacobi, 314 Lynda Lane, Fort Collins, CO, 80526, opposing

**20150720-0115**

Hand written card, Christine Perham, 35 Brookside Ave, Greenfield, MA 01303, opposing

**20150720-0116**

Hand written card, Jess Pech, Shamrock St, Worcester, MA 01605, opposing

**20150720-0117**

Hand written card, Lisa Birklund, 76 Coe St, ?, CT 06088, opposing

**20150720-0118**

Hand written card, Magda Ponce Castro, 261A Old Wendell Rd., Northfield, MA 01360, opposing

**20150720-0119**

Hand written postcard, Julia Cavacco, 123 No. Hillside Rd, South Deerfield, MA 01373, opposing

**20150720-0120**

Hand written card, Phyllis Keenan, PO Box 3366, Amherst, MA 01002, opposing

**20150720-0121**

Hand written card, Catherine P?, 3610 Hillside Rd, South Deerfield, MA 01373, opposing

**20150720-0122**

Hand written card, Sue Kelly, 142 Colinsf? Dr, Amherst, MA 01002, opposing

**20150720-0123**

Hand written card, Lisa Cornish, 25 Burr? Rd, Heath, MA 01346, opposing

**20150720-0124**

Hand written card, Vickie Hutchinson, 33 Spruce St, Greenfield, MA 01301, opposing

**20150720-0125**

Hand written card, Matt Niland, 361 South End Rd, Plantsville, CT 06479, opposing

**20150720-0126**

Hand written card, Matthew Steffens, 51 Rankin Ave, Basking Ridge, NJ 07920, opposing

**20150720-0127**

Hand written card, Paul Stevens, 156 Timbertop Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, opposing

**20150720-0128**

Hand written card, Wayne Kelling, 384 Hadley Hwy, Temple, NH 03084, opposing.

**20150720-0129**

Hand written card, Peter B?, PO Box 137, New Ipswich, NH 03071, opposing

**20150720-0130**

Hand written card, Wendy Kerlin, Augu? Rd, Marlboro, VT 05344, opposing

**20150720-0131**

Hand written card, Walter Kondig, 47 Scott Rd, Ashby, MA 01431, opposing

**20150720-0159**

**Equus Survival Trust**  
EXTINCTION IS FOREVER

*Help endangered Equines! Become a Supporter!*

July 3, 2015

Dear Kinder Morgan Executives,

It has come to our attention that the Newfoundland Pony, a endangered historic breed of pony may soon be in the crossfire of your NED project, gas for export overseas.

Your website states you are the largest energy infrastructure company in North America. Your pipelines transport natural gas, refined petroleum products, crude oil, carbon dioxide (CO2) and more. On your .com website your company claims to be “committed to being a good corporate citizen and conducting ourselves in an ethical and responsible manner.”

Why then is the company locating an 80,000 horsepower Gas Compressor station within I mile of a sanctuary for a critically endangered pony without at least a plan to compensate the sanctuary so it can relocate?

Fact: These Compressors emit dangerous toxins into the air.

Fact: These Toxins can contaminate the air, water, and plants the ponies depend upon.

Fact: These Compressors have a history of explosive accidents and fires.

Fact: In an emergency, the pony herd does not have the means to be easily evacuated.

As the world’s only conservation group exclusive to equines, the Equus Survival Trust is greatly concerned for the welfare of this pony. Less than 250 ponies’ exist worldwide and only two breeding stations exist outside of Canada, Villi Poni Farml Newfoundland Pony Sanctuary being one of those two conservation

breeders.

Why does It matter?

The Newfoundland Pony is unique. not only to North America, but to the world. A stout landrace breed shaped by 400 years of natural environment and human agricultural usage, the Newfoundland Pony is the only surviving purebred pony breed indigenous to the North American continent. The rest have become extinct.

This surviving' pony breed is further protected under the Newfoundland government Heritage Animal legislation and requires the ponies be tracked and protected in their pure form by the Newfoundland Pony Society (NPS). The breed is also recognized by conservation groups Rare Breeds Canada and the Live-stock Conservancy (USA). The entire Villi herd, located in New Hampshire, is registered with the NPS, and furthermore this conservation breeder is recognized by the Equus Survival Trust as an important keystone haven, not only in the USA, but to the overall survival of this very rare pony.

Listed as "Critical" on the Equus Survival Trust's Equine Conservation List since 2008, and backed by DNA studies in 2011 to confirm it's unique status; every effort eshould be made to preserve the Newfoundland Pony in its traditional form and to ensure the-conservation of it's distinct genetic package.

We urge Kinder Morgan to reconsider the route its pipeline will take, and at the very least fully compensate the Newfoundland Pony Sanctuary for fair market value for their property and associated costs to safely relocate this herd out of harm's way.

Respectfully,

Victoria Tollman, Executive Director  
Equus Survival Trust

*{multi-column brochure, etc., not reproduced here}*

## **20150720-0160**

RE: Docket # PF14-22-000 Northeast Energy Direct Project

Linda Mahoney  
604 Gulf Rd.  
Northfield, MA 01360  
413-498-4380  
Imahonev@huaahes.net

July 1, 2015

KIMBERLY D. BOSE, SECRETARY  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Dear Ms Bose,

I am submitting my concerns about this pipeline and compressor station project. I live just beyond the Th mile incineration zone of the proposed 80,000 BTU compressor station in rural Northfield, Massachusetts. We built our home here 30 years ago on a 6.5 acre lot. So most of my concerns are based on my direct experience in the immediate area.

Geology and Soils

- ~ Much of the land has thin soil and is ledge or rock outcropping and would require extensive blasting for construction
- ~ Will the blasting damage my well and the foundations of my house and studio?
- ~ Blasting may impact groundwater flow

- ~ Installation of the pipeline in the frost zone may pose a threat to pipe integrity
- ~ Lack of proper bedding due to ledge and grading on steep slopes may impact pipe integrity
- ~ Depth of pipeline will prevent farming or recreational use above it.

#### Water Resources and Wetlands

- ~ There are many small streams and vernal pools in the area and these habitats should not be destroyed.
- ~ Will my well water become contaminated? Will the well's capacity be diminished?
- ~ Will my well suffer physical damage?
- ~ Wetlands will be destroyed
- ~ Surface water drainage patterns will be altered
- ~ Drinking water and streams will probably be contaminated during and after construction and when the compressor station is in operation

#### Vegetation and Wildlife

- ~ These are healthy mixed woodlands that support a variety of nesting and year round birds, deer, moose, bear, coyote, porcupine, fisher, beaver, skunk, opossum, woodchucks, weasels, rabbits as well as reptiles, amphibians and insects. Their habitats will be destroyed and so they will perish or not thrive.

#### Cultural Resources

- ~ The Historic Swan Homestead is on the hiking trail.
- ~ The Richardson Cabin is available for camping on the New England Trail and will not be usable.

#### Land Use, Recreation and Visual Resources

- ~ We use the land for hiking, cross-country skiing, bird-watching and foraging for edible mushrooms.
- ~ Mushrooms should only be harvested from unpolluted habitats.
- ~ The light emitted at night will negatively impact the visual beauty of the night sky for humans and may impact the nocturnal behavior of animals.
- ~ As an artist I have painted some of the landscapes in the area of the compressor station; this is an area of great natural beauty, which would be forever altered.
- ~ Many parcels of land along the route have been carefully conserved so the public may enjoy and use them; many of these are targeted for destruction by the pipeline. This is morally wrong and undermines the efforts and philosophy of conservation.

#### Socioeconomics

- ~ The resale value of my property will be negatively impacted. If I am not able to tolerate the changes to my lifestyle and environment, (noise, air quality, changes of bird and animal behaviors, light pollution) I fear that I would not be able to sell my property for its current value. And I really did not plan on moving.
- ~ What happens if most properties in town are devalued, does our tax rate increase?
- ~ Are the taxpayers going to be charged for the construction?

#### Air Quality and Noise

- ~ The released air pollution may settle on my land and contaminate my organic fruit trees and vegetable garden. It may also cause respiratory and other health problems and have an offensive odor.
- ~ The extreme noise of construction will impact my quality of life by ruining the peace and quiet of the natural environment.
- ~ Constant noise of the compressor station will create mental and physical distress.
- ~ Louder "gassing off" will be extremely distressing to humans and animals.

## Cumulative impacts

- ~ Heavy equipment during construction will damage town roads
- ~ Blasting adjacent to power lines will threaten transmission line integrity
- ~ Critical nature of construction should mandate an independent 3<sup>rd</sup> party construction monitor and certification
- ~ What happens when the habitats and environments of animals and birds are destroyed, altered, or compromised by various forms of pollution?

## Public Safety

~ Northfield does not have resources to protect against terror or vandalism threats or to monitor the human behavior issues during construction and operation.

~ Northfield does not have the manpower, expertise or equipment to address pipeline accidents

I believe this compressor station will be monitored from a computer in Texas and there will not be human presence on site.

## Alternative suggestions:

We do not need this capacity of pipeline as most is slated for shipment overseas. Can we not use the Spectra line that exists across the southern part of the state instead of destroying so much open space land?

If we must do this, the utility consumers should not be charged a construction fee for a commercial project, unless we reap some of the profits.

Can the pipeline be smaller and the compressor stations operated by electricity instead of gas? I have heard that this is much less polluting.

If this will come to pass, can Kinder Morgan be required to buy out houses within a mile of the compressor station?

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Mahoney

## 20150720-5006

K Sullivan, New Ipswich, NH.

If the pipeline companies are not fairing well in terms of funding & economic conditions why would FERC even consider approving the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company/Kinder Morgan/NED's application for the pipeline & compressor station for southern NH?

(Docket No:PF14-22-000). See the article in the Wall Street Journal by Gillian Tan, Ryan Tracy & Ryan Dezember updated July 2, 2015.

In my opinion the installation of the pipeline & compressor station in southern New Hampshire is akin to a rape. Our country side, water ways, including our rivers, streams, ponds, brooks, aqua-filters and drinking water is going to be subjected to a rape by the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co/Kinder Morgan/NED with FERC's approval. The compressor station in the towns of New Ipswich & Temple, New Hampshire will forever change our rural way of life.

From an economic standpoint it makes no sense. From a moral & environmental standpoint it is OUTRAGEOUS.

We are two very small rural towns in southern New Hampshire. We do not have the infrastructure to install town water for all. Most of us rely on well water. We live here because we enjoy the natural beauty of the area. It is teeming with wild life, fresh air, clean water ways & drinking water & forested mountain sides, along with peace & quiet. I could go on and on about the natural environment we live in. We do not want this to change. I do not see the Tennessee Gas Pipeline/Kinder Morgan/NED project as a step up or a step forward for our area.

From the economic standpoint why approve the pipeline & compressor station only to have it shelved later, after it is built & the land/area raped when there is no more funding & no more use for it? The Portland Gas Company pipeline is not at capacity. We have plenty of pipelines/projects to take care of what ever it is that the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company/Kinder Morgan/NED group thinks they are going to be transporting. The Marshalls Shale area does not have a indefinite supply of gas for the taking.

From a health standpoint it is even worse for us. See the following websites for further information of the health problems created by pipelines & compressor stations. The following websites have extensive reports on the environmental/health impacts of pipelines/compressor stations:

[http://www.earthworksaction.org/files/publications/SUBRA 3 Shale Gas Plays-Health Impacts sm.pdf](http://www.earthworksaction.org/files/publications/SUBRA%203%20Shale%20Gas%20Plays-Health%20Impacts%20sm.pdf)

<http://www.environmentalhealthproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/Compressor-station-emissions-and-health-impacts-0>

[http://www.ostego2000.org/wpcontent/uploads/2012/08Madison County DOH Comments-Docket No CP14-497-000.pdf](http://www.ostego2000.org/wpcontent/uploads/2012/08Madison%20County%20DOH%20Comments-Docket%20No%20CP14-497-000.pdf)

Thank you for your time. Please DENY the Tennessee Gas Pipeline company/Kinder Morgan/NED's application for the pipeline & compressor station in the southern New Hampshire area. It is not needed nor is it wanted.

### **20150720-5007**

Sullivan Family, New Ipswich, NH.

I am concerned about the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company/Kinder Morgan/NED's plan to install the pipeline & compressor station in New Ipswich, New Hampshire. I will be within 1/2 mile of this compression station. It will be the largest compression station in the Northeast United States. It will be a 80,000-90,000 HP Compression Station. These stations are associated with health, safety and environmental risks including but not limited to explosions, fires, leaks & spills, documented emissions of volatile

organic compounds (for example:formaldehyde, benzene, CO, methane, nitrogen oxides, as well as other potential exposure threats). Compressor stations are significant contributors to global warming. They emit radon-222. They are noisy. "Blow-downs"lasting up to 2-3 hours sound like jet engines. The 24/7 operating sound has been compared to 4 diesel locomotives. This can be heard by residents up to 1 mile away. They emit audible sound & inaudible, low frequency vibrations that travel even further.This could possibly damage foundations & structures.

Kinder Morgan does not have a good safety record. Since 2011, there have been 11 accidents-explosions & fires at compressor stations in the following towns: Lathrop, PA, Brooklyn Township, PA, Montrose, PA, Branchville, NJ, Langton, OK, Clinton, AK, Windsor, NY, Pinedale, WY, Nine Mile Canyon, UT, Marengo County, AL, Oaktown, IN and others.

Kinder Morgan Pipeline has had numerous cited safety violations. In 2009, the Pipeline & Hazardous Materials Safety Admin.(PHMSA) cited Kinder Morgan for violation safety standards regarding the distance between a natural gas pipeline & a "high consequence area" such as a school or hospital; the pipeline was too close for safe operation in case of a leak. In 2011 PHMSA cited Kinder Morgan for these safety violations: Failing to test pipeline safety devices, Failing to maintain proper firefighting equipment, Failing to inspect its pipeline as required, Failing to adequately monitor the pipes corrosion levels.

In 2013, the headline "Wall Street Worries About Kinder Morgan's Safety Record": pipeline operator slashes & defers maintenance spending. This was a concern to anyone who lived or worked near a Kinder Morgan pipeline. The Wall Street Journal asked: "Is Kinder Morgan Scrimping on its Pipelines?" Deferred maintenance may account for the high number of Kinder Morgan pipeline accidents in the last decade.

PHMSA's incident reports for Kinder Morgan's onshore gas transmission pipeline shows that faulty infrastructure causes 45% of onshore gas transmission pipeline significant leaks. Failure of the pipe, a cracked weld & faulty pipeline equipment together account for 28.3% of pipeline leaks & corrosion of the pipe

causes 16.8% of the leaks.

Kinder Morgan does not have a good accident record. PHMSA's incident reports for Kinder Morgan's on-shore gas transmission pipelines have been responsible for at least 180 spills, evacuations, explosions, fires & fatalities in 24 states--PHMSA Pipeline Integrity & Releases from Kinder Morgan's SEC 10-K filing:

"From time to time, despite our best efforts, our pipelines experience leaks & ruptures. These leaks & ruptures may cause explosions, fire & damage to the environment, damage to property and/or personal injury or death" (From references & footnotes #25-#35) [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kinder\\_Morgan](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kinder_Morgan)

The HEALTH IMPACTS are numerous. The following have been reported by people living 50 feet to 2 miles from compressor stations & metering stations:

frequent nausea\*, throat irritation\*, eyes burning\*, nasal irritation\*, sinus problems\*, bronchitis\*, persistent cough, weakness\*, tiredness\*, chronic eye irritation\*, shortness of breath, muscles aches\*, dizziness, ringing in ears, sores & ulcers in mouth, urinary infections, depression\*, decreased motor skills\*, falling & staggering\*, frequent irritation\*, brain disorders\*, severe headaches\*, frequent nose bleeds, sleep disturbances, difficulty concentration, joint pain, nervous system-impacts, forgetfulness, irregular/rapid heart beat, strokes, allergies, easy bruising, severe anxiety\*, excessive sweating, abnormal EEG\*, spleen, lump in breast, pre-cancerous lesions\*, amnesia & thyroid problems.

\*61% of Health Impacts Associated with Chemicals present in Excess of Short & Long Term Effects Screening Levels in the air.

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES WITH EXTENSIVE REPORTS: <http://www.environmentalhealthproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/2013/Compressor-station-emissions-and-health-impacts-0>

[http://www.otseqo2000.org/wpcontent/uploads/2012/08Madison County DOH Comments-Docket No. CP14-497-000.pdf](http://www.otseqo2000.org/wpcontent/uploads/2012/08Madison_County_DOH_Comments-Docket_No_CP14-497-000.pdf)

My husband & I looked for over 1 year to find our dream home in New Ipswich, NH. We signed for our house in October of 2012. This was our little piece of heaven for our remaining years. We came for the clean rivers, lakes, streams, brooks, wet lands & water ways, clean well water, peace & quiet. The natural beauty of the area. It is rapidly becoming just the opposite. All due to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline company/Kinder Morgan/NED. We are heart sick in hearing that we will be living within the incineration zone of the compression station & pipeline. This was/is our last move. We are both senior citizens & just do not have the resources nor the energy to move again.

PLEASE DO NOT GRANT PERMISSION FOR THE TENNESSEE GAS PIPELINE COMPANY/KINDER MORGAN/NED TO BUILD THE PIPELINE & COMPRESSOR STATION IN NEW HAMPSHIRE. We should be looking into renewable energy resources. This compressor station was only announced it would be in New Ipswich when Kinder Morgan filed their intent to FERC to acquire specified land (SCAT) on June 1, 2015. I received a letter dated June 8, 2015 informing me of the intention to build an 80K horsepower compressor station within 1/2 mile of my home & property. In fact, the letter was addressed to a non-existent address. I got it because my letter carrier knows my name & correct address. WE DO NOT HAVE ADEQUATE TIME TO INFORM OURSELVES &/or FIGHT THIS.

## **20150720-5008**

D Arotsky, New Ipswich, NH.

I am concerned about the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company/Kinder Morgan/NED's plan to install the pipeline & compressor station in New Ipswich, New Hampshire. I will be within 1/2 mile of this compression station. It will be the largest compression station in the Northeast United States. It will be a 80,000-90,000 HP Compression Station. These stations are associated with health, safety and environmental risks including but not limited to explosions, fires, leaks & spills, documented emissions of volatile organic compounds (for example: formaldehyde, benzene, CO, methane, nitrogen oxides, as well as other potential exposure threats). Compressor stations are significant contributors to global warming. They emit radon-222. They are noisy.

“Blow-downs”lasting up to 2-3 hours sound like jet engines. The 24/7 operating sound has been compared to 4 diesel locomotives. This can be heard by residents up to 1 mile away. They emit audible sound & inaudible, low frequency vibrations that travel even further. This could possibly damage foundations & structures.

Kinder Morgan does not have a good safety record. Since 2011, there have been 11 accidents-explosions & fires at compressor stations in the following towns: Lathrop, PA, Brooklyn Township, PA, Montrose, PA, Branchville, NJ, Langton, OK, Clinton, AK, Windsor, NY, Pinedale, WY, Nine Mile Canyon, UT, Marengo County, AL, Oaktown, IN and others.

Kinder Morgan Pipeline has had numerous cited safety violations. In 2009, the Pipeline & Hazardous Materials Safety Admin.(PHMSA) cited Kinder Morgan for violation safety standards regarding the distance between a natural gas pipeline & a “high consequence area” such as a school or hospital; the pipeline was too close for safe operation in case of a leak. In 2011 PHMSA cited Kinder Morgan for these safety violations: Failing to test pipeline safety devices, Failing to maintain proper firefighting equipment, Failing to inspect its pipeline as required, Failing to adequately monitor the pipes corrosion levels.

In 2013, the headline “Wall Street Worries About Kinder Morgan’s Safety Record”: pipeline operator slashes & defers maintenance spending. This was a concern to anyone who lived or worked near a Kinder Morgan pipeline. The Wall Street Journal asked: “Is Kinder Morgan Scrimping on its Pipelines?” Deferred maintenance may account for the high number of Kinder Morgan pipeline accidents in the last decade.

PHMSA’s incident reports for Kinder Morgan’s onshore gas transmission pipeline shows that faulty infrastructure causes 45% of onshore gas transmission pipeline significant leaks. Failure of the pipe, a cracked weld & faulty pipeline equipment together account for 28.3% of pipeline leaks & corrosion of the pipe causes 16.8% of the leaks.

Kinder Morgan does not have a good accident record. PHMSA’s incident reports for Kinder Morgan’s onshore gas transmission pipelines have been responsible for at least 180 spills, evacuations, explosions, fires & fatalities in 24 states--PHMSA Pipeline Integrity & Releases from Kinder Morgan’s SEC 10-K filing:

“From time to time, despite our best efforts, our pipelines experience leaks & ruptures. These leaks & ruptures may cause explosions, fire & damage to the environment, damage to property and/or personal injury or death” (From references & footnotes #25-#35) [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kinder Morgan](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kinder_Morgan)

The HEALTH IMPACTS are numerous. The following have been reported by people living 50 feet to 2 miles from compressor stations & metering stations:

frequent nausea\*, throat irritation\*, eyes burning\*, nasal irritation\*, sinus problems\*, bronchitis\*, persistent cough, weakness\*, tiredness\*, chronic eye irritation\*, shortness of breath, muscles aches\*, dizziness, ringing in ears, sores & ulcers in mouth, urinary infections, depression\*, decreased motor skills\*, falling & staggering\*, frequent irritation\*, brain disorders\*, severe headaches\*, frequent nose bleeds, sleep disturbances, difficulty concentration, joint pain, nervous system-impacts, forgetfulness, irregular/rapid heart beat, strokes, allergies, easy bruising, severe anxiety\*, excessive sweating, abnormal EEG\*, spleen, lump in breast, pre-cancerous lesions\*, amnesia & thyroid problems.

\*61% of Health Impacts Associated with Chemicals present in Excess of Short & Long Term Effects Screening Levels in the air.

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES WITH EXTENSIVE REPORTS: <http://www.environmentalhealthproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/2013/Compressor-station-emissions-and-health-impacts-0>

[http://www.otsego2000.org/wpcontent/uploads/2012/08Madison County DOH Comments-Docket No. CP14-497-000.pdf](http://www.otsego2000.org/wpcontent/uploads/2012/08Madison%20County%20DOH%20Comments-Docket%20No.%20CP14-497-000.pdf)

My wife & I looked for over 1 & 1/2 years to find our dream home in New Ipswich, NH. We signed for our house in October of 2012. This was our little piece of heaven for our remaining years. We came for the clean rivers, lakes, streams, brooks, wet lands & water ways, clean well water, peace & quiet. The natural beauty of the area. It is rapidly becoming just the opposite. All due to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline company/Kinder

Morgan/NED. We are heart sick in hearing that we will be living within the incineration zone of the compression station & pipeline. This was/is our last move. We are both senior citizens & just do not have the resources nor the energy to move again.

DO NOT GRANT PERMISSION FOR THE TENNESSEE GAS PIPELINE COMPANY/KINDER MORGAN/NED TO BUILD THE PIPELINE & COMPRESSOR STATION IN NEW HAMPSHIRE. We should be looking into renewable energy resources. This compressor station was only announced it would be in New Ipswich when Kinder Morgan filed their intent to FERC to acquire specified land on June 1, 2015. I received a letter dated June 8, 2015 informing me of the intention to build an 80K horsepower compressor station within 1/2 mile of my home & property. In fact, the letter was addressed to an empty lot. I got it because my letter carrier knows my name & correct address. WE DO NOT HAVE ADEQUATE TIME TO INFORM OURSELVES &/or FIGHT THIS. THIS PIPELINE IS NOT NEEDED,

**20150720-5009**

Doug Zantay, Averill Park, NY.

To whom it May Concern,

July 17,2015

I am writing to you to protest the proposed pipeline and compressor station by Burden Lake. There are a variety of reasons why I am opposed to this. Firstly, the compressor station will adversely affect the wildlife that lives in and near the lake. This includes two bald eagle nests, painted turtles, blue herons and a variety of fish and fowl that live here. Another concern I have is the effect the compressor station will have on the air and water quality of the region. The direction of the wind according to Albany Airport will blow harmful gas emitted by the compressor station on the lake and in our wells. Another concern is the light pollution generated by the compressor station that will kill off the insects and greatly impact the food chain. It should be noted that there are month long fireworks on Burden Lake surrounding July 4th, particularly on the side of the lake by Clark's Chapel Road where the compressor station is to be built. Additionally, there are many snowmobiles and quads operating throughout the lake and surrounding areas, routinely on the proposed site. In addition to all these things, the streams that are on the proposed sight of the compressor station leads into the Dewey Loeffel Landfill. This is a recipe for disaster. Positioning a pipeline on Logan's fault line is another bad idea. Kinder Morgan's safety record is extremely poor and I urge you to look into it.

I am asking you, the members of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, to take an intensive look at these impacts before giving this project approval. I ask that you do an all inclusive cost benefit analysis of this pipeline and compressor stations. Please take the time to study potential impacts to wildlife, economics, and health risks. Clearly, this project is not going to serve the public good. The initial report by David Carpenter, Director of the Institute for Health and the Environment at SUNY Albany, sights compressor stations as the most serious source of air pollution. He asked for a statewide analysis of the health of the population of New York from these compressor stations. Please do not close the scoping comment period until 60 days after Kinder Morgan files new, complete Resource Reports. Even though they have already brought their pipe in, I implore you to reconsider this site as a potential location for a compressor station and pipeline and to consider a "no action" alternative.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Doug Zantay

**20150720-5011**

Jazz T Zantay, Averill Park, NY.

Jazz Zantay

Wednesday, July 17th, 2015

35 Blue Heron Drive

Averill Park, New York 12018

(203) 837-0002

jzantay@gmail.com

In regards to FERC Docket Number PF14-22:

I live on Burden Lake in Averill Park, New York. I am concerned about the effects of the 90,000 horsepower compressor station slated to be built on Clark's Chapel Road in Nassau, New York, less than 3,000 feet away from Burden Lake.

New York State has been given the gift of a diverse environmental landscape. Every day that I am able to spend enjoying the nature and natural beauty on Burden Lake is truly a blessing. However, the result of the proposed compressor station will destroy the ecosystem of the lake, as well as the surrounding farmlands, and the precious natural splendor of the area. As a resident of Burden Lake, I am disheartened, disconcerted, and disgusted at the political process, and inevitable pollution that will commence. Furthermore, not only do the health effects present a hazardous and lethal lifestyle to the wildlife and humans in the area, but it has also been proven that living near construction sites and the creation of new infrastructure is a catalyst for anxiety and stress among its residents, flora, fauna, and the plethora of creatures living among us. The Environmental Impact Statement should reflect how said human and wildlife will be undisturbed.

I find myself extremely alarmed and uneasy with the thought of Kinder Morgan implementing a compressor station in my backyard. For example, Boston has many leaking pipelines throughout the city. How will Kinder Morgan and FERC assure the public that this will not be a concern at the proposed compressor station on Clarks Chapel Road? How will Kinder Morgan respond to any foreseeable, and frankly, inevitable emergency situations? This will be one of the largest compressor stations ever built to date.

As stated by nhpipelineawareness.org, "In Texas from 2003 to 2014, Kinder Morgan experienced 36 'significant incidents', resulting in fatalities or hospitalization, fires, explosions, or spills. Throughout the U.S. since 2003, Kinder Morgan and its subsidiaries' pipelines have been responsible for a least 180 spills, evacuations, explosions, fire, and fatalities in 24 states." This clearly paints a grim picture into the future of New York State. Additionally, in 2013 in Louisiana, a Kinder Morgan pipeline ruptured. It was described that "the ground around the crater is completely bare. 'The dirt around it is just like it had been cooking in a kiln,' and an 80-foot section of pipe was destroyed." The pipeline and accompanying compressor station at Clarks Chapel Road will be even larger than the previously stated compressor stations, clearly showing that the environment in New York State is apparently dispensable.

Undoubtedly, if this compressor station comes to fruition my family and I who have been enjoying our lake house on Burden Lake for thirty plus years will have no choice but to leave our place of solace and peace, taking our consumerism and business elsewhere. This location has brought indescribable joy to my family and instilled in us a love of nature and community on Burden Lake, along with the realization that everything is precious and must be protected. It is criminal that this compressor station could even be a possibility in our world that is so precious, yet not treasured enough, especially in its current fragile state.

Members of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, I ask that you take a true hard look at these impacts before giving this project approval. I ask that you do an all inclusive cost benefit analysis of this pipeline and compressor stations. I ask that you take the time to study potential impacts to wildlife, economics, and rural character, and health effects. Is this project going to serve the public good? Please do not close the scoping comment period until 60 days after Kinder Morgan files new, complete Resource Reports. I implore you to reconsider this site as a potential location for a compressor station and pipeline and to consider a "no action" alternative.

Thank you,  
Jazz Zantay

**20150720-5018**

Sean Radcliffe, T, NH.  
7/18/2015

I Sean Radcliffe and Colleen P Pascu of 45 Mountain View Road, Temple, NH 03084 deny access to my property for purposes of surveying or any other activity associated with the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline project.

**20150720-5020**

Denise and Mitchell Cole, Peabody, MA.

We are writing to express our opposition to the pipeline proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. We purchased our house at 39 Glen Drive in Peabody, MA in 2011. Many walkers, joggers, bicyclists, babies in carriages, and dogs on leashes enjoy the Peabody Independence Greenway, also known as the bike path. The Ipswich River runs alongside of the bike path, making it scenic and peaceful. This proposal would devastate this beautiful area by tearing up the bike path, removing trees and disrupting a wide variety of fish and wildlife.

However, the beauty of this area is not the important matter at stake here. It is the safety of the families that live in the surrounding neighborhoods that we are concerned about. We truly feel that our lives will be threatened by having a gas pipeline run through such a heavily populated area. This high-pressure pipeline is proposed to be 24" wide and will be very close to an active quarry. There are signs posted on the bike path that no one is allowed to walk in designated areas on Thursdays, when blasting occurs. The Bostik chemical plant is also adjacent to the proposed area. There was a dramatic explosion there in 2011, which resulted in a four-alarm fire. It shook our neighborhood and shattered some windows.

Another safety issue is our drinking water. The proposed pipeline would be in close proximity to the Ipswich River and construction would cross many of the streams that lead into it. According to The Ipswich River Watershed Association the river supplies drinking water to 335,000 people and many businesses in 14 communities. We must protect and preserve this valuable resource.

We hope you will consider the safety of the residents of Peabody and the surrounding areas that could suffer greatly from a gas pipeline explosion. If demand for more natural gas makes it necessary to build a new pipeline rather than expand existing routes, then we hope you will agree that it should be constructed in a rural area.

Thank you,

Denise and Mitchell Cole

**20150720-5023**

Jonathan C Oltman, South Deerfield, MA.

36 North Hillside Road

South Deerfield, MA 01373

July 18th, 2015

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC)

Re: Northeast Energy Direct Project, of Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C./ Kinder-Morgan Corporation

I strongly encourage FERC to deny the request for approval of the Northeast Energy Direct Project, for the following reasons:

I believe the claims of need for additional natural gas delivery capacity to the Northeast are greatly exaggerated by the companies who wish to build this pipeline, and the local gas providers who will buy and deliver the gas. The efforts of these companies should focus on improving efficiency and safety of existing gas delivery infrastructure and use.

It seems impossible that our region will require the volume of gas this pipeline is designed to carry, therefore it must be assumed that the company(s)' plan is to export a significant amount of this gas, the profits from which will do nothing to improve our regional economy. Also, much of the cost of this project will

be passed to local people in the form of surcharges for gas use, and the need for additional emergency and public services funded by local taxes.

From my reading, the safety record of Kinder-Morgan and Tennessee Gas leave much to be desired. The people of this region are proud of our beautiful environment, and are reliant on that beauty as a draw for tourism, an essential part of our local economy. The risks associated with gas leaks, explosions, and accidents involving construction and maintenance of this project are unacceptable.

Our global environment is changing rapidly, with strong evidence linking this change to the burning of fossil fuels. FERC should, I believe, be supporting and encouraging projects that have a much smaller negative impact on the environment, such as solar and wind power.

Thank you.

Jonathan C. Oltman

## **20150720-5027**

Marilyn S. Griska, Rindge, NH.

I sent the following letter to the New Hampshire PUC, my two state reps and state senator.

I don't want this pipeline and will do everything in my power to stop it.

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

Re: DG 14-380

With the upcoming decision of the PUC to act on the agreement between Liberty Utilities and Tennessee Gas, I urge a rejection of Docket 14-380 for the following reason:

The speed with which this whole proposal has been moving has left little time to explore possible more cost effective and less disruptive options. The assessments have not been thorough.

As a resident of Rindge, and an abutter, this town will be highly impacted. Could the expansion of existing lines (Spectra and PNGTS) solve the claimed shortfall? Could the LNG plants be more effectively utilized?

The line, whether 30" or 36", has great deal more capacity than Liberty Utilities has agreed to purchase. Liberty presently is proposing a Lateral to go to Keene, to increase customer volume. The ratepayers will be burdened with the cost of this pipeline for the life of the contract.

The suggestion of lower electricity rates is difficult to understand when not one electric generating customer has purchased any of the gas that the NED project will transport.

Kinder Morgan has given the affected communities little voice. The fancy PR sessions and limited time for speakers speaks loudly to their lack of concern. The FERC Scoping Sessions are following a alarmingly similar pattern.

The western portion of the pipeline's path covers very rural areas with perhaps the largest amount of water: rivers, wetlands, vernal ponds and conservation areas. The area is teeming with wildlife. All the communities in this area are served by private wells. The ROW contains significant granite. What will blasting to bury the pipe do to our potable water?

How does a huge natural gas pipeline address NH OEP 10 year strategy for diversity of supply for energy? Conservation and green energy have already reduced need.

Again. I strongly recommend that the PUC reject this proposal; it needs a great deal of further study.

Marilyn Griska  
Rindge, NH 03461

**20150720-5028**

Jan A. Griska, Rindge, NH.

I sent the following letter to the NH PUC and my state reps and senator. Please stop this pipeline madness.

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

7/18/2015

Re: DG 14-380 Liberty Precedent Agreement

I have been following the Liberty precedent proceedings (docket 14-380. While I'm not a Liberty customer, I am a resident of Rindge, NH and abutter to the Eversource ROW. The NED project as currently planned will run through my property. I am concerned about the impact of the subject agreement on my community and it's environment.

Liberty and Kinder Morgan have grossly overstated the need for the natural gas the NED pipeline will be carrying through New Hampshire to get it to Dracut, Ma. Truthfully stating the actual amount of gas needed here in New Hampshire would never get them FERC approval of the project.

Spectra Energy's Access Northeast, Algonquin Incremental Market and Atlantic Bridge projects offer much more environmentally and economically responsible ways for bringing natural gas to New England customers and power generating utilities.

The PUC's own expert consultant, Melissa Whitten, recommended against approving the proposed Liberty agreement, stating it was "speculative and would leave the company and rate payers with substantial excess capacity over the life of the contract." Any major investment for New Hampshire rate payers should be sized for what is actually needed and should follow the NH Office of Energy and Planning's 10 year strategy.

The promise of lower gas and electricity prices is a pipe dream. Current contractual commitments account for less than 45% of a proposed 30" pipeline's capacity or 25% of a proposed 36" pipeline's capacity. Moreover only 21% of these commitments serve New Hampshire. Since under Federal law pipeline operators cannot discriminate among customers, the majority of this gas is most likely to be exported to Canada and overseas through new LNG facilities located in Nova Scotia. With the US ultimately becoming an exporter of shale oil and gas, world prices not US prices will govern the market.

I strongly encourage the PUC Commissioners to reject the late filed settlement agreement because of its' clearly overstated need and the fact that the real beneficiaries of this project are the stock holders of Liberty and Kinder Morgan, not the New Hampshire's rate payers.

Thank You,

Jan A. Griska  
Rindge, NH.

**20150720-5029**

Kathleen Gauvin, New Ipswich, NH.  
61 Beechwood Rd.  
New Ipswich, NH 03071

Ms. Debra Howland  
Executive Director and Secretary  
New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission  
21 S. Fruit St, Suite 10  
Concord, New Hampshire 03301

This letter has been sent to the NH Dept. of Environmental Services and has been filed with FERC.

7/19/2015

RE: DG 14-3 80 Liberty Utilities (Energy North Natural Gas) Corp. d/b/a Liberty Utilities

Ms. Howland:

I am trying to come to grips with the idea that anyone would think that we need Kinder Morgan's very disruptive project, NED, when there are already other options that could be used to adequately transport the projected needs for natural gas in New Hampshire in the future. Why does Kinder Morgan keep pushing for their new pipeline and compressor stations project? I can only guess that they want a bigger piece of the profits, larger than they already are reaping, but at what cost? The NED pipeline will traverse many small, rural towns and a few small sized cities. The beauty of the area will be disrupted in abundant venues. Residents will be put at risk for breathing in toxics from the "blow offs" from the compressor stations. Many of us have concerns that the pipeline and the compressor stations will pose safety issues in the future. Was this pipeline proposal moved to our 17 town area once Massachusetts politicians and active community resistance groups dug in their heels? They kicked the project out of most of their state. Did Kinder Morgan think that we'd be easy prey?

Portland Gas already has the capacity to use a pipeline that is already in place. Portland Gas can provide any New Hampshire natural gas needs, now or in the future, by constructing a few compressor stations in remote areas, thus leaving our communities untouched. The other option that I refer to is the Spectra pipeline that would be located beside an already constructed pipeline. Both are creative ideas, but ignored by many who are not looking for alternatives, but are Kinder Morgan advocates.

Melissa Whitten, a utility consultant hired by the PUC, testified quite clearly the lack of need for this project. The NH Office of Consumer Advocate likewise recommended against approval.

I implore you to look at these alternatives before you grant a contract to Liberty Utilities.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Gauvin

**20150720-5031**

Tammy Mondor, Amherst, NH.

July 19, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Docket No. PF14-22-000

Northeast Energy Direct Project (NED)  
Kinder Morgan Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company ( KMTG)  
Public Comments for Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Ms. Bose:

I am writing to you to let you know that I am very much OPPOSED to the NED project and have many concerns, some of which are outlined below. I don't believe this project is in the best interest to the state of New Hampshire (NH) and specifically the town of Amherst, NH.

The KMTG NED is proposing in its current path, to run a 36 inch diameter, 1,400 psi pipeline through part of the Ponemah Bog Wildlife Sanctuary located on Rhodora Drive in Amherst, NH. The Ponemah Bog is a 75 acre sanctuary under the protection of the Audubon Society of New Hampshire, which also monitors many of the state's endangered species.

"The bog resulted from the last receding glacier, which left a kettle hole pond in the Souhegan River outwash plain. Changes over the last 12,000 years have been recorded in the bog itself, which has preserved,

in its layers of peat, pollen blown in from the surrounding woods. The moss mat has advanced over the last 6,000 years to gradually fill in the pond with plant remains. In May, brilliant magenta rhodora flowers in this marsh.”<sup>1</sup>

The historical and educational value of the Ponemah Bog Wildlife Sanctuary is not replaceable. The consequence of the disruption to the sensitive acidic environment during construction, contamination from a leaking pipeline, and use of herbicides to keep the pipeline clear of vegetation on this sanctuary could be irreversible. “The Ponemah Bog is a living museum, a relict habitat for plants far from home and an outdoor classroom for wetland botany and ecology.”<sup>1</sup>

The pipeline is proposed to run through the Souhegan River four times in a half mile area. According to KMTG representatives the process for installing a pipeline through waterways is much more extensive than through land. It requires a method of tunnel drilling down below the river and a much wider staging area is needed for machinery and equipment.

The risk of contamination from a leaking pipeline, and herbicides used to keep the pipeline clear of vegetation near the Souhegan River could negatively impact at least 35,000 people and the 28 threatened or endangered species that share the watershed.<sup>2</sup> Some of the rare, threatened and endangered species in the watershed are the eastern hog nosed snake, Woodhouse’s toad, blue spotted salamander, Blanding’s turtle, spotted turtle, marbled salamander and great blue heron.<sup>3</sup>

The Souhegan River is included in the New Hampshire Rivers Management Protection Program. “This program was established in 1988 with the passage of RSA 483 to protect certain rivers, called Designated Rivers, for their outstanding natural and cultural resources.”<sup>2</sup> “The Souhegan River was one of two designated rivers chosen to be part of the Instream Flow Pilot Program. This pilot program is part of a state-wide development of water use sustainability designed to support river ecosystems and the water needs of riparian users.”

One of the most important concerns is the safety of the pipeline. An article published in the New Hampshire Union Leader dated February 7, 2015, indicated that KMTG has a very poor safety record. It reported that there have been over “20 accidents since 2003 that have been serious enough to be reported to the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration.” According to another article, “Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company was the second leakiest company with 55 reported major leaks from 2009 to 2013.”<sup>6</sup>

For the sake of comparison in 2010, a 30 inch pipeline operated by Pacific Gas & Electric exploded in San Bruno, California killing 8 people and destroying 38 homes. The pipeline that is proposed to run through Amherst is 36 inches. The explosion in San Bruno left a crater 167 feet long, 26 feet wide, and 40 feet deep. It took up to 90 minutes to shut down the gas line. Approximately 200 firefighters battled the fire which burned for about 17 hours. The emergency responders and fire departments of Amherst and the surrounding towns do not have the training and equipment to handle such an emergency.

The proposed pipeline path runs close to Souhegan High School and Amherst Middle School within what is called the High Consequence Area (HCA), incineration zone or blast zone. It is not acceptable to put approximately 1,500 children in this dangerous situation. There are also several cul-de-sac neighborhoods impacted by the proposed route that only have one point of access and egress leaving residents trapped in the event of an emergency.

New Hampshire poses many challenges for a pipeline installation. The ground is unstable due to various types of soils, harsh temperature fluctuations and geologic activity. “Earthquake hazard maps generally show that in most parts of New England, there is a 2% chance that in any given 50 year period of time, earthquake vibrations that are particularly damaging will strike.”

It has been well documented that a consequence of building a pipeline next to high voltage power lines is that the pipeline becomes energized by the magnetic fields in the air and soil. “The AC interference can cause corrosion to the pipeline coating, insulated flanges, rectifiers or even direct damage to the pipeline’s wall itself.”<sup>8</sup> How is KMTG planning to mitigate the environmental, geological, and power line concerns?

The pipeline crosses through 17 towns in NH, with a combined population of approximately 165,611 people according to 2013, population estimates from the Office of Energy and Planning. 9 Residents in the 17 towns in the direct path of the NED are justifiably concerned. Their single largest asset is their home or land that will be taken by eminent domain. Property values will go down, some properties will become un-insurable and therefore unsellable because a mortgage cannot be secured on the property. The ripple effect will hurt local businesses and ultimately the NH economy.

The major factor against the NED is that there has not been a demonstrated need for a natural gas pipeline in the state of NH. New Hampshire is a net exporter of electricity and will not benefit from it. The majority of the natural gas is intended to be exported to European and Asian markets. The route through NH is an alternative route and was never the original plan. NH has simply been chosen for convenience at our expense. The people of NH have become collateral damage in KMTG's effort to push their pipeline through. This pipeline ends in Dracut, Massachusetts, so why is it in New Hampshire at all?

I implore you to reconsider the route into NH and in particular the route through Amherst. Please consider the people, families, conservations lands, rivers, aquifers, bogs, sanctuaries, threatened and endangered species directly impacted by this unnecessary project. Please review the safety record of KMTG. The health, safety and way of life in NH are being threatened for the sake of corporate greed. Please do not approve this project and STOP THE NED.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Tammy Mondor  
Amherst, NH

cc: Margaret W. Hassan, Governor of New Hampshire

Source Notes

- (1) <http://merrimack.wildnh.com/ponehmahbog/>
- (2) <http://www.souheganriver.org/>
- (3) <http://des.nh.gov/organization/divisions/water/wmb/rivers/documents/souh-report.pdf>
- (4) <http://des.nh.gov/organization/commissioner/pip/factsheets/rl/documents/rl-17.pdf>
- (5) <http://www.unionleader.com/article/20150208/NEWS05/150209202&source=RSS>
- (6) <http://www.motherjones.com/environment/2014/03/how-dangerous-are-gas-pipes-under-your-city>
- (7) [https://www2.bc.edu/~kafka/Why\\_Quakes/why\\_quakes.html](https://www2.bc.edu/~kafka/Why_Quakes/why_quakes.html)
- (8) [http://www.sestech.com/pdf/User2000\\_I.pdf](http://www.sestech.com/pdf/User2000_I.pdf) Safety of Pipelines in Close Proximity to Electric Transmission Lines
- (9) <http://www.nh.gov/oep/data-center/documents/population-estimates-2013.pdf>

## 20150720-5036

James Carvalho, Bolton, MA.

Subject: Docket #PF14-22: Comment – Kinder Morgan and the NED, NOT Good for Organized Labor

Unemployment in the construction sector is running at over 10%. It has been at that level, or worse, for the past 8 years. And, while the economy in general is in recovery, jobs for LiUNA employees lag far behind. A big reason for this sluggish sector is the continued opposition by the Congress to approval of a long-term transportation bill to fix our crumbling infrastructure. Steady income for LiUNA employees has suffered. It is understandable that LiUNA members cannot prioritize the long term catastrophe which climate change will bring to the planet as a result of continued dependence upon fossil fuel over the need to provide for their families today. Kinder Morgan has promised 3000 construction jobs to LiUNA members if the NED gas pipeline is approved. LiUNA has become the only ally that Kinder Morgan has in the approval

of the NED gas pipeline project. But, this is a false loyalty which Kinder Morgan does not deserve, that actually works against the best interest of LiUNA members.

The NED pipeline will cost between \$2 billion and \$6 billion. A 2009 UMass study estimated that \$2 billion spent on energy efficiency, renewable energy projects would create over 22,000 jobs.

[http://cdn.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/issues/2009/06/pdf/peri\\_report\\_execsumm.pdf](http://cdn.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/issues/2009/06/pdf/peri_report_execsumm.pdf)

These are well paying jobs for which LiUNA members are well qualified, well trained, with comprehensive skills. My IBEW union contact tells me “we don’t find solar and the pipeline to be mutually exclusive. We are first and foremost concerned with generating any work opportunity for our members that provide a fair wage, benefits and a safe work environment.” But, there is a choice. Massachusetts DPU is currently investigating provisions for electric ratepayers to finance the building of the NED pipeline by way of a tariff on electric bills (DPU docket #15-37). <http://web1.env.state.ma.us/DPU/FileRoom/dockets/bynumber> Approval of the NED pipeline will suppress the investment in renewable energy, solar, wind, hydro, geothermal, efficiency and conservation, investments which will create 7 times as many good paying jobs for years, jobs which will benefit LiUNA members and the BlueGreen Alliance of union and environmental groups (LiUNA left the Alliance over pipeline issues). Approval of the NED pipeline will allow Kinder Morgan to provide 80% of the natural gas for export as LNG, approved by the DOE according to free trade agreements, NAFTA, TPP and others. This gas export will result in the rising cost of domestic natural gas, accelerate the decline of manufacturing and productivity throughout the United States, have a negative effect on the United States balance of trade, will result in a strategic loss of critical United States resources and will result in a loss of American jobs to countries which import US natural gas. A report by Synapse Energy Economics in 2013 indicates that LNG export could cost the US job loss in the hundreds of thousands of jobs each year. [http://vault.sierraclub.org/pressroom/downloads/Ex%205\\_Synapse-LNG-Exports-Study.pdf](http://vault.sierraclub.org/pressroom/downloads/Ex%205_Synapse-LNG-Exports-Study.pdf)

The support of union labor for construction of the NED pipeline by Kinder Morgan is an alliance of convenience, convenient to Kinder Morgan. Kinder Morgan is not a friend of organized labor. The record shows:

- In 2011 the US Labor Department sued Kinder Morgan for violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act for failing to pay overtime to 4,659 workers over a 2 year period. Kinder Morgan settled with a payment of \$830,000. <http://www.chron.com/business/energy/article/More-than-4-600-Kinder-Morgan-workers-to-get-back-2081463.php>
- In 2013 Kinder Morgan failed in it’s attempt to privatize the port of Wilmington, DE. This take over was opposed by the International Longshoreman’s Association because this takeover would eliminate 500 union jobs. <http://gpde.us/2013/01/privatizing-the-port-of-wilmington-bad-for-the-environment-unions-jobs-and-democracy/>
- In 2013 Kinder Morgan’s choice of non-union Loutex, who doesn’t pay employee benefits and so was able to under bid other contractors, to build a pipeline in Columbia, MS was protested by Local 798 Welders Union. Alan Fore of KM stated “We look at the contractor will we believe is the most efficiently and effectively and safely construct this pipeline.” <http://www.wdam.com/story/21800986/kinder-morgan-rep-weights-in-on-loutex-picket>

A LiUNA motto is “Reshaping America’s Energy Future with Jobs for the 21st Century.” Members also have skills in new technologies and are trained installers of solar panels, wind turbines, and green roofs, as well as building retrofit specialists and energy auditors. Unions have trained a new generation of workers for Green Jobs, jobs for the 21st Century. The NED pipeline is 20th Century technology, 20th Century “think” at best. When LiUNA members come to the NED scoping meetings with their orange t-shirts and say “we want jobs” show sympathy for what they are dealing with. LiUNA is also a victim of the Kinder Morgan deceptive campaign for profit over people. The future is renewable sustainable energy, NOT approval of the Kinder Morgan NED pipeline. Disapprove the NED pipeline. Disapprove it for the good of America, for the good of the planet, for the good of organized labor, including LiUNA.

## Updated Summary Of Denials Of Property Access Recorded In FERC Docket PF14-22

current as of July 19, 2015, replacing my earlier June 8 summary, filed under 20150612-5030

A review of FERC's Docket PF14-22 submissions through July 19, 2015, reveals 262 submissions referencing the denial (or rescission) of property access permission to Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company (KM/TGP)'s NED project staff, contractors or agents.

In some cases FERC contractors had bundled several separate denials into a single file, the most extreme case being 20150414-0055 which combined the letters of denial from 30 different landowners into a single submission. The total number of letters is at least 296, *almost 10% of the comments in the Docket*.

That list of such submissions, listed by FERC eLibrary "accession number", is appended below.

While every letter denied access to at least on property, others listed several separate properties and some, such as the NH Towns of Fitzwilliam, Rindge and Winchester, along with Dalton and Dracut, MA, denied access to "all town property" while Richmond, NH, denied access to a list of 51 specific town properties.

If one counts Richmond as "denying access to all town properties", then it adds up to approximately **336** lots + 6 Towns listing "All town property" without specific lot numbers

If one instead includes the 51 enumerated Richmond lots then the total is **387** lots + 5 other Towns listing "All town property".

This summary may include some over-counts as I did not cross-reference the denials by addresses or lot numbers. Some may have appeared twice, for example once in the original denial and a second time in a letter complaining to FERC about that denial having been ignored by KM/TGP surveyors (unfortunately reports suggest this may not be a rare occurrence).

On the other hand, assuming local conditions are representative, the count is much more likely to be a very significant under-count. Only a rather limited sub-set of landowners seem to take the extra step of notifying FERC about letters of denial that they have sent to KM/TGP, its contractors or its agents.

**Consequently only KM/TGP is able to determine the actual number of property access denials or rescissions that have been sent. I strongly recommend that FERC require this information from KM/TGP in order to have a better understanding of the frequency and geographic distribution of access denials.**

### FERC PF14-22 Docket eLibrary accession numbers for submissions referencing denials (or rescission) of access permission to KM/TGP staff, contractors or agents:

#### Denials of access to private properties

#### 262 FERC submissions containing 296 individual letters listing 336 parcels

20141024-5001 R-1	20141105-5139 D-1	20141124-5231 R-1	20141215-0009 D-1
20141216-5012 D-1	20141222-5008 D-1	20141222-5129 D-1	20141223-5014 D-1
20141223-5285 D-1	20141224-5003 D-1	20141229-0012 D-1	20150114-0006 D-1
20150116-0020 D-5	20150116-0021 D-1	20150116-0022 D-5	20150120-0006 D-1
20150120-0132 D-1	20150120-0133 D-1	20150120-0134 D-1	20150120-5265 D-1
20150122-0006 D-1	20150122-0007 D-1	20150122-0016 D-1	20150123-0022 D-1
20150123-0024 D-1	20150123-0027 D-1	20150126-0023 D-1	20150126-0028 D-1
20150126-0030 D-1	20150127-0058 D-1	20150128-0025 D-1	20150128-0034 D-1
20150128-0035 D-1	20150129-0032 D-1	20150129-0033 D-1	20150129-0034 D-1
20150129-0035 D-1	20150130-0021 D-1	20150202-0068 D-1	20150202-0103 D-2
20150202-5035 D-1	20150203-0021 D-1	20150203-0022 D-1	20150203-0030 D-1
20150204-0006 D-1	20150206-0018 D-1	20150206-0019 D-1	20150206-0020 D-1
20150209-0007 D-1	20150209-0066 D-1	20150209-0081 D-1	20150209-0082 D-1
20150209-0083 D-1	20150209-5065 D-1	20150209-5074 D-1	20150209-5086 D-1
20150209-5132 D-1	20150210-0040 D-1	20150212-0044 D-1	20150212-5028 D-1
20150213-0019 D-1	20150218-0046 D-1	20150218-0048 D-1	20150218-0088 D-1
20150218-0110 D-1	20150219-0075 D-1	20150220-0008 D-1	20150223-0008 D-1

20150223-0009 D-3/3	20150223-0021 D-2	20150223-0022 D-1	20150223-0023 D-2
20150223-0032 D-1	20150223-0033 D-1	20150223-5000 D-1	20150224-0025 D-1
20150224-0026 D-1	20150224-0028 D-1	20150224-0042 D-1	20150225-0030 D-5/5
20150225-0031 D-1	20150226-0011 D-1	20150226-0056 D-1	20150302-0032 D-1
20150302-0047 D-1	20150302-0050 D-1	20150302-0051 D-1	20150309-0111 D-1
20150309-0116 D-3	20150309-0119 D-1	20150309-0121 D-1	20150309-0125 D-1
20150309-0157 D-1	20150310-0057 D-1	20150310-0058 D-1	20150310-0059 D-1
20150311-0023 D-1	20150312-0016 D-5	20150313-0026 D-1	20150313-0027 D-1
20150313-0042 D-1	20150315-4000 D-1	20150316-0028 D-2	20150316-0033 D-1
20150316-0060 D-1	20150316-0066 D-1	20150317-0040 D-1	20150317-0043 D-1
20150318-0027 D-1	20150323-0025 D-1	20150323-0026 D-1	20150323-0030 D-1
20150323-0032 D-1	20150323-0034 D-1	20150323-0046 D-4	20150323-0060 D-1
20150326-5004 D-1	20150327-0009 D-1	20150330-0043 D-1	20150330-0051 D-1
20150330-5008 D-1	20150331-0009 D-1	20150331-0010 D-1	20150331-0028 D-1
20150331-0029 R-1	20150403-0023 D-1	20150403-0032 D-1	20150406-0101 D-1
20150407-0031 D-1	20150408-0026 D-1	20150409-0017 D-2	20150409-0025 D-1
20150413-0050 D-1	20150413-0070 D-1	20150414-0055 D-28/28	20150414-0055 R-2/2
20150414-0056 D-1	20150414-0057 D-1	20150420-0137 D-1	20150427-0119 D-1
20150427-0138 D-1	20150427-0396 D-1	20150427-0397 D-1	20150428-0008 D-1
20150428-0009 R-1	20150430-0029 D-1	20150501-0044 D-1	20150501-0045 D-2
20150501-0046 R-1	20150501-0048 D-1	20150504-0312 D-1	20150504-0313 R-1
20150504-0320 D-1	20150504-0328 D-1	20150504-0336 D-1	20150504-0337 D-1
20150504-0340 D-1	20150504-0350 R-1	20150504-0360 D-1	20150504-0364 D-1
20150505-0259 D-3	20150505-0275 D-1	20150506-0013 D-4	20150506-0014 D-1
20150508-0028 D-1	20150508-0031 D-1	20150508-0032 D-1	20150511-0022 D-1
20150511-0024 D-1	20150511-0035 D-1	20150511-0036 D-1	20150511-0037 D-2
20150511-0079 D-1	20150513-0019 D-1	20150515-0030 D-1	20150515-0031 D-1
20150515-0032 D-1	20150515-0033 D-1	20150515-0034 D-1	20150518-0030 D-1
20150518-0032 D-1	20150518-0058 R-1	20150519-0047 R-1	20150519-5021 D-1
20150521-0023 D-1	20150602-0012 D-1	20150602-0014 D-1	20150602-0015 D-1
20150602-0086 D-1	20150602-0088 D-1	20150602-0276 D-1	20150602-0292 D-1
20150603-0085 D-1	20150604-0037 D-1	20150604-5037 D-1	20150605-0035 D-1
20150608-0123 D-1	20150608-0129 D-1	20150609-0050 D-1	20150609-0064 D-1
20150609-0065 D-1	20150609-0066 D-1	20150610-0021 D-1	20150611-0059 D-1
20150612-5069 D-3	20150616-0047 D-1	20150616-0048 D-2	20150616-0049 D-1
20150616-0050 D-1	20150616-0052 D-1	20150616-0053 D-1	20150617-0006 D-1
20150617-0011 D-1	20150617-0012 D-1	20150617-0023 D-2	20150617-0024 D-1
20150617-0025 D-1	20150617-0027 D-1	20150619-0038 D-1	20150622-0020 D-1
20150622-0021 D-1	20150622-0022 D-1	20150622-0024 D-1	20150622-5047 D-1
20150623-0015 D-1	20150623-0033 D-1	20150624-0012 D-1	20150624-0013 D-1
20150629-0027 D-1	20150629-0028 D-1	20150629-0029 D-1	20150629-0030 D-1
20150629-0031 D-1	20150629-0032 R-1	20150629-0033 D-1	20150629-0034 D-1
20150629-0035 D-1	20150629-0036 D-1	20150629-0037 D-1	20150630-0270 D-2
20150630-0271 D-1	20150630-0275 D-1	20150701-0167 D-1	20150706-0022 D-2
20150706-0026 D-1	20150706-0033 D-1	20150706-5003 D-1	20150709-5161 D-2
20150710-0012 D-1	20150710-0013 D-4	20150714-0027 D-1	20150714-0033 D-1
20150715-0017 D-1	20150715-0018 D-1	20150715-0019 D-1	20150715-0020 D-1
20150715-0021 D-1	20150715-0022 D-1	20150715-0023 D-1	20150715-0024 D-1
20150715-0025 D-1	20150715-0026 D-1	20150717-0012 D-1	

**Denials of access to public properties**

20150113-0086 all Fitzwilliam, NH	20150501-0028 all Rindge, NH
20150407-0030 51 Richmond, NH	20150428-0084 all Dalton, MA
20150413-0073 all Wincheste, NH (also 20150414-0031)	20150603-0079 all Dracut, MA

Table annotations: “**D-1**” = Denial for 1 lot, “**R-1**” = Rescission of permission for 1 lot  
“**/3**” = bundles 3 separate landowners into the submission,  
for example: “**D-28/28**” indicates 28 Denials involving 28 separate owners

Garth Fletcher, Mason, NH 03048,

*if you find errors or omissions, please email corrections to: garth@Mason-NH.org*

**20150720-5080**

July 17, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: Docket PF 14-22 (Kinder-Morgan /  
Tennessee Gas Pipeline proposed Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline)

Dear Secretary Bose,

I am writing as a New Hampshire property owner who is greatly concerned about the proposed Kinder Morgan pipeline to be constructed through 17 towns in southern New Hampshire. My property is in Temple 3/4 of a mile from the proposed site of the gas compression station. The property is agricultural and is characterized by open fields and woodlands. It is a thriving habitat for diverse species of wildlife, and has been cultivated as farmland for over 150 years. The preservation of this land and its attributes are of great importance, not only to me and my family, but to the region as a whole. Temple and its neighbors are not communities of wealth or prestige. The value and resources of these communities lie in their natural, open spaces, spaces that attract tourists for recreational pursuits, spaces that support farming and agriculture, spaces that are characteristic of the rural way of life that is the essence of much of New Hampshire.

The proposed pipeline and compression station pose a very real threat to this area and that very way of life. The research is clear that the risks associated with pipeline projects are significant. In the last five years, the National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) investigated three major gas transmission pipeline accidents where deficiencies with the operators' Integrity Management programs were identified as a concern. These three accidents resulted in 8 fatalities, over 50 injuries, and 41 homes destroyed with many more damaged. In 2015 an NTSB safety report detailed 119 "incidents" in gas transmission pipelines. The report also noted a mounting frequency of these incidents in what it called areas of "high consequence." The NSTB found that "inadequate evaluation of interactive threats" leads pipeline operators to "underestimate the true magnitude of risks to a pipeline."<sup>1</sup> Since 2004, the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration has recorded 34 "significant" gas leaks involving Southern California Gas Company pipelines that resulted in four deaths, four injuries, and more than \$11 million in damage. Nationwide, there have been more than 1,700 significant gas leaks over that time, resulting in 135 deaths, 600 injuries, and about \$2 billion in damages. The national average of hazardous leaks per 1,000 miles of pipeline is about 35 per 1,000 miles. <sup>2</sup> Even in the absence of accidents or leaks, there is inherent danger. There is a small but growing body of literature on emissions from shale gas extraction, processing and transport activities. In its early stages of inquiry, the focus was predominantly on drill pad activity, but there are now reports on natural gas compressor station emissions. Below are examples of chemicals that have been found at or near compressor stations during operations. These emissions reports are consistent whether from public databases or from a private sector firm or organization. <sup>3</sup>

MTBE	2-methyl butane
CO	2 methyl pentane
iso-Butane	3 methyl pentane
methyl mercaptan	ethyl benzene
n-Butane	benzene
n-hexane	ethane
n-octane	propane
nitrogen dioxide	methanol
nitrous- acidstyrene	naphthelene

The potential exposure to these chemicals is high with routine operation of the compressor station. As I am sure you are aware, the Temple elementary school is less than a mile from the proposed site in New Ipswich, potentially placing children and teachers at risk. The Senator Tobey reservoir which provides drinking water to the town of Greenville is also in close proximity. Interstate Natural Gas Association of America (INGAA) guidelines require pipeline planning to address natural resources affected by the project, including land, air, water, vegetation and wildlife, as well as the interests of the general public. However, given Kinder Morgan's plan to locate an 80,000 horse power compression station in such close proximity to these critical and vulnerable sites, one must conclude that the company's planning has clearly been flawed and has not adhered to INGAA guidelines or taken into account these resources.

Kinder Morgan would like us to believe that the pipeline will provide a needed energy resource. This argument is incorrect in more than one way. Firstly, there is no critical need for additional energy resources. Clean energy measures such as conservation and renewable energy sources can easily address the occasional peak capacity needs that occur currently. And more funding for renewable energy resources will address the long term needs of the region. If adequate resources were allocated now to alternative energy sources, the use of gas as a "bridge" would be unnecessary. Secondly, only a small amount of gas from the Kinder Morgan pipeline will be offloaded in New Hampshire: the largest amount is headed for export. None of this gas will be available for home use in rural areas. A study commissioned by the U. S. Department of Energy (DOE) last spring found that exporting U.S. gas would actually raise the fuel's price here at home. More buyers overseas will drive up our domestic price by as much as 27 percent, according to the DOE. The DOE found that only one economic sector wins from gas exports: the gas industry!<sup>4</sup> So this project will actually reduce the available energy resource for our region.

Kinder Morgan's plan benefits Kinder Morgan and its shareholders. It is not necessary. It poses untold health and safety risks. Not only is it of no benefit to the people of New Hampshire, it has the potential to do real harm. I respectfully call on the FERC to support the real interests of residents and taxpayers. Consider the health, safety, and very way of life of the people of this rural area of New Hampshire. There is absolutely no benefit that this project could possibly offer that is worth the price New Hampshire would have to pay. The NED Kinder Morgan Project must not go forward.

Sincerely,

Jean M. Nigro  
241 Hadley Highway  
Temple, NH 03084  
jeenigro@yahoo.com  
978-394-0171

1. NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD: Safety Study Integrity Management of Gas Transmission Pipelines in High Consequence Areas NTSB SS-15/01
2. The Desert Sun September 24, 2014
3. SOUTHWEST PENNSYLVANIA ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH PROJECT [www.environmental-healthproject.org](http://www.environmental-healthproject.org) Summary on Compressor Stations and Health Impacts February 24, 2015
4. A Big Fracking Lie: President Obama isn't just not fixing climate change. He's making it worse. Bill McKibben & Mike Tidwell January 1, 2014

## **20150720-5087**

I used to think that FERC was broken. But I've come to realize that I was wrong. I see now that FERC does exactly what it was designed to do, and that is to keep the public locked out of the regulatory process.

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission was conceived of and built as a fortress, with impenetrable walls, intended to ignore citizens and protect corporations. Your agency was fortified by a moat, so deep and wide in its circular thinking, that the oil and gas industry bank rolls the agency through its permit fees and

is continuously bolstered by the revolving door of industry, elected officials, and it's presidentially appointed commissioners.

As we citizens have become involved and forceful in our opposition to individual projects like the Un-Constitution Pipeline and FERC's rubber stamp, FERC also evolved with yet another layer of protection, your tolling orders... intended to block the public's ability to get into court and be heard.

In fact, The Second Circuit Court of Appeals denied

"Stop The Pipeline's" petition for a writ of mandamus saying that STP did not meet the requirements of mandamus and I believe, that in so doing, the court has enabled FERC's behavior.

Though we've learned from our predecessors, it's still taken 3 years for activist's to get up to speed, to witness the life cycle of the system for ourselves, to absorb the process and to unearth FERC as an independent agency solidly under the thumb of the oil and gas industry. But, now it's clear as day that the process is fixed.

Best thing I can say tonight is that my eyes, OUR eyes are finally wide open and our numbers are growing... one filthy rubber stamp at a time.

Suzy Winkler

Burlington, NY

**20150720-5136**

**TOWN OF MERRIMACK, NH**

6 BABOOSIC LAKE ROAD· MERRIMACK, NH 03054· WWW.MERRIMACKNH.GOV

July 16, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, NE, Room 1A

Washington, DC 20426

RE: Comments of the Town of Merrimack, NH - Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. ("TGP"), Docket No. PF14-22-000: Proposed Northeast Energy Direct ("NED")

Dear Ms. Bose:

On behalf of the Merrimack Town Council, please find this letter as additional testimony pertaining to the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) natural gas transmission pipeline project (FERC Docket No. PF14-22) proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company (TGP) and Kinder Morgan (KM). The Town has submitted previous correspondence related to this pre-filing through its attorney and Community Development Director (in response to TGP/KM's request for information submitted to their consultant AECOM) to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC).

The Town continues to review the pre-filing and various Town entities (Conservation Commission, Wastewater Division, and Merrimack Village District, the Town's primary water service provider) have retained professional consultants that will be producing additional correspondence to FERC as it relates to their specific topic areas over the course of the pre-filing period.

The Town recently reviewed the letter from the Town of Amherst (Submittal 20150609-5069) that was made available on the FERC website. The Town of Merrimack supports the positions and concerns relayed to FERC by the Town of Amherst in their June 8, 2015 letter, and offers the following additional and supplementary comments and concerns:

- The Town of Merrimack remains concerned about KM/TGP's citation of "regional energy needs" as their main justification for the NED pipeline as the basis for their pre-filing with FERC. Merrimack shares Amherst's concern about the status of New Hampshire's actual energy needs and whether or not the NED project will have any significant impact in addressing whatever the State's energy needs are in

actuality. Merrimack agrees with Amherst that this issue requires clarification for the State's residents and should be settled through thorough review of the pre-filing and weighed against the negative impacts to New Hampshire's environment and property owners.

- The Town of Merrimack does not believe that the NED project will make a significant impact to New Hampshire's power generation situation. New Hampshire currently generates more power within its borders than is used by its residents and businesses. As such, a good portion of the power generated in the state is "exported" to other New England states. Merrimack questions why the NED project must pass within southern New Hampshire without any real connection to the power generation grid within the State. It appears as though the current proposed route through New Hampshire is merely a "pass through" in order to connect to the hub in Dracut, MA. It is our belief that the route through New Hampshire is merely a matter of convenience and a perceived "path of least resistance" as opposed to a route based on the needs of the State of New Hampshire.
- The Town of Merrimack is concerned that the NED project continues a trend toward the use of natural gas for power generation, and as such threatens to unbalance the diversity of fuel sources for power generation in New Hampshire and New England. With the decommissioning of several power generation facilities (from nuclear to coal and gas fired facilities) recently or in the near future, it appears that natural gas will become the dominant fuel source for power generation in New England. Merrimack is concerned that over-reliance on a single fuel source for power generation places the region in a vulnerable position in the event of any natural gas shortages or catastrophic events that disrupt the distribution of natural gas to the region. The Town of Merrimack supports a diverse variety of power generation sources, and maintaining as much balance as is practicable in the manner in which energy is delivered to the region.
- The Town of Merrimack remains committed to participating in the FERC process throughout the pre-filing period, and additional comments will be forthcoming in the coming weeks as the consultants retained by various entities (see second paragraph of this letter) complete their review and field work associated with the NED project. We reserve the right to supplement this letter and any subsequent letter from the Town, its residents, businesses, and agencies as deemed appropriate.

Sincerely, on the behalf of the Merrimack Town Council,

Eileen Cabanel  
Town Manager

cc: Merrimack Town Council

Allen Fore, Kinder Morgan  
Lucas Meyer, Kinder Morgan  
Maggie Hassan, Governor of New Hampshire  
Joseph Foster, Attorney General of New Hampshire  
Shawn Jasper, Speaker of the New Hampshire House of Representatives  
Chuck Morse, President of the New Hampshire State Senate  
Kelly Ayotte, U.S. Senator  
Jeanne Shaheen, U.S. Senator  
Frank Guinta, U.S. House of Representatives  
Ann McLane Kuster, U.S. House of Representatives

Attachment: Preliminary List of "Sensitive Environmental Areas" within 0.25 or 0.50 Miles of NED "Study Corridor"

- Two Town-owned parcels of conservation land are crossed by the proposed route:
  - o Horse Hill Nature Preserve; and
  - o Gilmore Hill Memorial Forest;

- At least 12 wetland areas (including Naticook Brook and the Merrimack River) are crossed by the proposed route
  - o At least 4 ponds and small streams are located on the Horse Hill Nature Preserve property, providing important habitat area for several endangered/threatened species;
  - o An area of Gilmore Hill Memorial Forest contains an area of sensitive vegetation/habitat that will be explained further in future responses;
  - o Of particular concern regarding the Merrimack River is the construction of the pipeline under the river, the permanence of the installation under the river as it may be affected by flow or river course changes over time, and the safety history of such river crossings.
    - The Lower Merrimack River is a Designated Protected River under NH RSA483 in accordance with the State’s Rivers Management and Protection Program.
- The Town’s highest yield aquifer is located within the study area, which is part of both a Wellhead Protection Area and Aquifer Conservation District (see also attached letter and map from MVD);
  - o 2 of the Merrimack Village District (MVD)water supply wells are located in close proximity to the proposed route (MVDWell #2 is approximately 550 feet from the proposed route, MVDWell #3 is approximately 2500 feet from the proposed route);
  - o This aquifer and pair of supply wells provide more than half of the water service to the Town;
- The proposed route would cross MVDwaterlines in at least 10 locations;
- The propose route would cross municipal and private sewer lines in at least 4 locations:
  - o Camp Sargent Rd (across from Talant Rd);
  - o The private Merrimack Premium Outlets’ sewer lateral;
  - o The entrance to Elbit Systems on Rt. 3 (Daniel Webster Highway); and
  - o The Town’s main sewer interceptor line along the B&M Railroad tracks/right-of-way
- The proposed route is within 0.25 and 0.50 miles of several residential neighborhoods, some of which rely upon private wells and septic systems.

**20150720-5193**

Debra Huffman, Merrimack, NH.  
July 20, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: Docket PF14-22-000

Dear Secretary Bose,

The FERC’s Statement of Policy (Docket No. PL99-3-000) provides guidance on requirements for approval of projects such as Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline’s Northeast Energy Direct (NED) project. The Policy defines how the interests of landowners are to be weighed against evidence of public benefit.

The policy states that the required threshold of public benefit is based on the percentage of right-of-way agreements reached with property owners. If the applicant has acquired “... all, or substantially all, of the necessary right-of-way by negotiation prior to filing the application” the burden of proof of benefit is fairly light. However, if there has been some property owner resistance, “... significant public benefit would outweigh the modest use of federal eminent domain authority.”

But what if property owner resistance is substantial? The Policy is not explicit, but we can infer that if modest use of federal eminent domain authority requires significant public benefit, then immodest use of federal

eminent domain authority would require overwhelming public benefit.

In community after community, property owners in the path of this project have declared that they will not willingly sign over rights to their property. Significant use of eminent domain authority will be required. According to the FERC's own policy, then, overwhelming public benefit must be proven.

Does the NED project provide overwhelming public benefit? Not by any stretch of the definition. To summarize some of the many studies and statistics previously filed with the FERC:

- New England has abundant natural gas supply during all but a few peak hours of the year.
- The 2015 heating season proved that energy needs during peak hours can be amply met with Liquefied Natural Gas.
- With the proliferation of pipeline projects currently approved or proposed, New England will soon have abundant natural gas, well beyond even what is needed during peak hours.
- Market reforms, such as the Winter Reliability Program, have proven sufficient to curb price spikes. Wholesale electricity prices fell 40% between 2014 and 2015.

Clearly, overwhelming public benefit does not exist. Although not necessarily decisional, denying the property rights of hundreds of property owners without overwhelming public benefit constitutes a failure of a significant test as defined in the policy. If the FERC is to follow its own policy, it has no choice but to deny this application.

In the Live Free or Die state, we take our property rights seriously. The federal government, and by extension the FERC, would do well to remember that.

Sincerely,

Debra Huffman

## 20150720-5195

July 20, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: Docket PF14-22-000

Dear Secretary Bose,

The FERC's Statement of Policy (Docket No. PL99-3-000) provides guidance on requirements for approval of projects such as Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline's Northeast Energy Direct (NED) project. The Policy defines how the interests of landowners are to be weighed against evidence of public benefit.

The policy states that the required threshold of public benefit is based on the percentage of right-of-way agreements reached with property owners. If the applicant has acquired "... all, or substantially all, of the necessary right-of-way by negotiation prior to filing the application" the burden of proof of benefit is fairly light. However, if there has been some property owner resistance, "... significant public benefit would outweigh the modest use of federal eminent domain authority."

But what if property owner resistance is substantial? The Policy is not explicit, but we can infer that if modest use of federal eminent domain authority requires significant public benefit, then immodest use of federal eminent domain authority would require overwhelming public benefit.

In community after community, property owners in the path of this project have declared that they will not willingly sign over rights to their property. Significant use of eminent domain authority will be required. According to the FERC's own policy, then, overwhelming public benefit must be proven.

Does the NED project provide overwhelming public benefit? Not by any stretch of the definition. To sum-

marize some of the many studies and statistics previously filed with the FERC:

- New England has abundant natural gas supply during all but a few peak hours of the year.
- The 2015 heating season proved that energy needs during peak hours can be amply met with Liquefied Natural Gas.
- With the proliferation of pipeline projects currently approved or proposed, New England will soon have abundant natural gas, well beyond even what is needed during peak hours.
- Market reforms, such as the Winter Reliability Program, have proven sufficient to curb price spikes. Wholesale electricity prices fell 40% between 2014 and 2015

Clearly, overwhelming public benefit does not exist. Although not necessarily decisional, denying the property rights of hundreds of property owners without overwhelming public benefit constitutes a failure of a significant test as defined in the policy. If the FERC is to follow its own policy, it has no choice but to deny this application.

In the Live Free or Die state, we take our property rights seriously. The federal government, and by extension the FERC, would do well to remember that.

Sincerely,

Debra Huffman

**20150720-5229**

Wendy Lavallee, Northfield, MA.

Dear Federal Energy Regulatory Commission officials:

This is to voice my deep concern about plans by Kinder Morgan to build a pipeline to carry fracked gas from Pennsylvania across western Massachusetts and southern New Hampshire. Dozens of communities have voted against the planned Northeast Direct (NED) pipeline. Cited with these actions were serious concerns about harm to the environment caused by fracked gas and connected chemicals, including methane, a most potent greenhouse gas. Also of grave concern is the planned destruction of thousands of acres of conservation land as a means by Kinder Morgan to increase its profits at our expense.

Kinder Morgan reportedly had a difficult time getting enough customers to justify the pipeline. Its plan to cut back the project's scope seems directly connected to this. It appears its new plan is a way of keeping its "foot in the door," hoping the need for natural gas will grow. However, if Massachusetts sticks to its already successful efforts to lower its dependence on fossil fuel, this will not happen.

If on the few days each year an amount of gas needed in New England is above average, the problem is solvable by infrastructure already in place. There is an LNG terminal in Everett, MA, and two underwater terminals several miles off the state's North Shore. The latter have been virtually unused except for one time this past, brutal winter. This lack of use is apparently because of the lack of need.

There is no proof the NED pipeline will save money for the people of Massachusetts or that less impactful alternatives to the environment have been adequately considered. However, logic dictates if an unneeded pipeline and accompanying compressor stations are put in, we will pay the price – probably not only in our gas and electric bills but most assuredly with the quality of our air and water, our quiet surroundings, and even a night sky that now allows us to see the stars. Has Kinder Morgan even considered Massachusetts' strict air quality guidelines for this area and the state's noise guidelines as it pushes forth?

According to published reports, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission has never turned down a request for a new pipeline such as the one planned by Kinder Morgan. Let this be the place where that record changes. Let this be the place where the pipeline is stopped.

Sincerely,

Wendy Lavallee

**20150720-5230**

Marilyn S. Griska, Rindge, NH.

NH Rep. Susan Emerson  
Cheshire County, Dist. 11  
Rindge, NH 03461

Has asked me to submit the following document to FERC for her. It is a copy of the letter she sent to the NH. PUC.

July 16, 2015

Debra Howland, Executive Director  
New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission  
21 South Fruit Street, Suite 10  
Concord, NH 03301-2429

Dear Ms. Howland:

I am a State Representative of New Hampshire representing District 11 of Cheshire County, and a resident of Rindge, NH. I am submitting this letter on behalf of my constituents.

The PUC Staff, the OCA and PLAN-NE all submitted written testimony on May 8 in respect to Energy-North's request for approval. All three testimonies were highly critical of EnergyNorth's proposal and all three parties recommend that the agreement, as filed, NOT be approved. The key issues can be summarized as follows:

1. EnergyNorth's stated "need" for an additional 65,000 dth is not supported by facts
  - The experts testifying believe the actual need may be as low as 25,000 dth over current capacity.
2. EnergyNorth did not adequately evaluate options other than NED
  - Options including upgrade to the Concord lateral; buying gas on the open market during peak periods (as they do today); also, the Spectra and PNGTS projects were not adequately analyzed.
3. EnergyNorth does not demonstrate that NED, as proposed, is the "best cost" or "least cost" solution for ratepayers and indeed may cost more than other options
  - The experts comment that EnergyNorth fails to show how consumers will benefit from the project as proposed; indeed PLAN-NE's expert believes the net cost to ratepayers will be higher under NED than under other options.
4. Current retail ratepayers carry the bulk of cost risk and burden
  - Even though residential demand is expected to decline over time, and the additional gas is targeted for projected growth in commercial and industrial sectors, Liberty proposes to charge ALL customers for the cost of this pipeline project through a cost of gas adjustment mechanism.

I respectfully request that you do not approve the agreement between TGP and EnergyNorth. We are just beginning to deal with the stranded costs associated with the Merrimack Scrubber. Let's not add to the ratepayer burden with additional supply side solutions.

Sincerely,

Rep. Susan Emerson  
Cheshire County, Dist. 11  
Marilyn Griska  
Rindge, NH 03461

**20150720-5239**

**TOWN OF NEW IPSWICH**  
661 Turnpike Rd New Ipswich NH 03071

Board of Selectmen

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

July 15, 2015

Re: Request for Third-Party Environmental Document Preparation

Docket No. PF-14-22, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co., Northeast Energy Direct Proposal

Dear Ms. Bose:

We, the Board of Selectmen of the Town of New Ipswich, New Hampshire, respectfully request the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission give serious consideration to utilizing the Guidance Manual for Environmental Report Preparation (ERPMAN), Section 5.0 Preparation of Third Party Environmental Documents.

In the Kinder Morgan March 2015 submission of Resource Reports 2 through 11, most of the sections are severely incomplete or “TBD.” Kinder Morgan’s response to FERC’s comments concerning the 13 March 2005 submittal of Resource Reports 1 and 10 was often “Comment will be addressed in the Final ER submitted with certification application.”

We understand from our discussions with Mr. Eric Tomaski, FERC’s Environmental Project Manager for the NED Project, FERC expects the Town of New Ipswich and/or individual property owners within New Ipswich to provide adequate information to FERC during the pre-filing comment period, either in writing or at a Scoping Meeting, of what to “avoid, mitigate, minimize or compensate.” We find this an unreasonable burden to place on the Town of New Ipswich or its citizens without assistance.

It is common in site plan reviews before the New Ipswich Planning Board or variance applications before the New Ipswich Zoning Board of Adjustment, for the Board to require a Third-Party analysis and/or study be conducted at the expense of the applicant to verify or expand upon information provided by an applicant before the review can continue. We expect Section 5.0 of the ERPMAN is a similar provision allowed within the FERC review process.

Without funding from Kinder Morgan, the Town of New Ipswich does not have the resources to conduct independent studies concerning the following areas where we know we have specific concerns:

- Water Use and Quality
- Fish, Wildlife and Vegetation
- Cultural Resources
- Socioeconomics
- Geological Resources
- Soils
- Land Use, Recreation and Aesthetics
- Air, Noise and Quality
- Reliability and Safety

In addition, New Ipswich is the location proposed for an 80,000 HP compressor station, as well as 6.2 miles of the main line. An 80,000 HP compressor station is unprecedented. The US Energy Information Administration in their report, Natural Gas Compressor Stations on the Interstate Pipeline Network, dated November 2007, describes the average compressor station as 14,055 horsepower and the median horsepower rating as 8,900. As the current compressor stations in New Hampshire are less than average in size, we are concerned that, as a Town, we have no way of accessing the near-term or long-term impacts of such an industrial complex, something that would not be allowed by our Ordinances.

As mentioned above, the Town of New Ipswich believes this project will have, not only negative environmental impacts, but also negative socioeconomics impacts. This begins now with FERC placing the burden

of identifying areas to “avoid, mitigate, minimize or compensate” on the Town. With \$4.5M in funding and approximately 14 months, we believe we can identify independent consultants and conduct studies in each of the areas identified above. Asking the Town to take on this burden as you are today, with less than two months to the anticipated filing of the certificate application and no resources, we can only be assured that the Town of New Ipswich will suffer irreparable harm from this project.

We thank you for your urgent attention to this request.

Sincerely

BOARD OF SELECTMEN

George H. Lawrence, Chairman

Rebecca M. Doyle

Woody Meissner

cc: Maggie Hassan, Governor of New Hampshire

Joseph Foster, Attorney General of New Hampshire

Shawn Jasper, Speaker of the New Hampshire House of Representatives

Chuck Morse, President of the New Hampshire State Senate

David Wheeler, Executive Councilor

Kelly Ayotte, U.S. Senator

Jeanne Shaheen, U.S. Senator

Ann McLane Custer, U.S. House of Representatives

**20150721-0013**

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC

1615 Suffield Street

Agawam, MA 01001

Date: 7/6/15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

753 Starch Mill Rd, Mason, NH

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

John Cartier

**20150721-0014**

Card, Tamara Andrews, 306 Colburn Rd, Temple, NH 03084, asking when Scoping meetings scheduled in the towns of New Ipswich, Temple, Greenville and Mason, NH.

All these towns would be affected by the potential compressor station.

**20150721-0016**

Hand written card, Gail R. Smith, 59 Woodbound Rd, Rindge, NH 03461, opposing

**20150721-0017**

Hand written card, Karen Miller, 161 Ashburnham Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, opposing

**20150721-0018**

Hand written card, Carl R. Smith, 59 Woodbound Rd, Rindge, NH 03461, opposing

**20150721-0019**

Hand written card, Carl R. Smith, 59 Woodbound Rd, Rindge, NH 03461, opposing

**20150721-0020**

Hand written card, Gail R. Smith, 59 Woodbound Rd, Rindge, NH 03461, opposing

**20150721-0021**

Hand written card, Sophie Rich, 36 Addington Rd #2, Brookline, MA 02445, opposing

**20150721-0022**

Hand written card, Daryl Essensa, 220 Davis St, Greenfield, MA 01303, opposing

**20150721-0023**

Hand written card, Josh Ribett, 1745 Cliffview Dr, L644, Rochester Hills, MI 48306, opposing

**20150721-0024**

Hand written card, Dorothea Arnold, 408 Moore Hill Rd, Athol, MA 01331, opposing

**20150721-0025**

Hand written card, Karen Miller, 161 Ashburnham Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, opposing

**20150721-0026**

Hand written card, Doris B. Lowe, 92 Brown Rd, Temple, NH 03084, opposing.

**20150721-0027**

Hand written card, Susan Duhamel, 83 Greenbriar Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, opposing

**20150721-0028**

Hand written card, Karen Miller, 161 Ashburnham Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, need time and Scoping meeting in New Ipswich

**20150721-0029**

Hand written card, Audrey Greene, 110 Hill Cemetery Rd, Windsor, MA 01270, opposing

**20150721-0030**

Hand written card, Catherine & Len Thompson, 52 Dutton Lane, Temple, NH 03084, opposing.

**20150721-0031**

Hand written card, Joseph L. Pfeifer, MD, 110 Hill Cemetery Rd, Windsor, MA 01270, opposing

**20150721-0032**

Hand written card, Judy Spring, 40 Boston View Dr, New Ipswich, NH 03071, need Scoping meeting in New Ipswich

**20150721-0041**

Hand written card, Marilyn Griska, 18 Atlantic Dr, Rindge, NH 03461, opposing, demanding more Scoping meetings in NH

**20150721-0044**

Card, Donald J. McFireavy, 306 Colburn Rd, Temple, NH 03084, asking when Scoping meetings scheduled in the towns of New Ipswich, Temple, Greenville and Mason, NH.

All these towns would be affected by the potential compressor station.

**20150721-0046**

Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr., Deputy Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

Date: July 1, 2015

RE: Denying property access

FERC PF 14-22 Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Project

As the owner of the property located at:

4 North Nassau Rd, Averill Park, NY 12018

I am denying permission to Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land to perform surveys, or for any other purpose.

Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Barbara Heck

**20150721-0050**

Card, Denise Ginzler, Mason Public Library, 16 Darling Hill Rd, Mason, NH 03048, asking when Scoping meetings scheduled in the towns of New Ipswich, Temple, Greenville and Mason, NH.

All these towns would be affected by the potential compressor station.

**20150721-0053**

John Proulx  
Kinder Morgan,  
Tennessee Gas Pipeline  
1615 Sufield Street Agawam, MA. 01001

General Counsel  
National Grid  
40 Sylvan Road Waltham, MA 02451

General Counsel  
NYSEG Customer Relations Center  
18 Link Drive Binghamton, NY 13904

Date: July 15, 2015

Re: Denial of access to my property As the owner of property located at  
67 Mead Rd (191.-5-6 and 191-5-3)

I hereby deny to Kinder Morgan and its subsidiaries and affiliated entities, including without limitation Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company and its subsidiaries and related entities, as well as NYSEG, National Grid or other electric utility company with whom any of them co-locate or propose to co-locate any pipeline, and their respective employees, agents, representatives and contractors, permission to enter my property identified above, to perform surveys or for any other purpose (other than for access by my utility company directly related to the supply of electricity to my property) without prior written notice specifying the purpose of such access and my express consent. Any entry on my property without my consent will be considered unauthorized and treated as trespass.

Anne E. Olcott

**20150721-0054**

July 17, 2015

Docket No: PF14-22-000

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Dear Kimberly D. Bose:

Please include this correspondence in Docket No. PF14-224RJO

I am asking the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (a.k.a. FERC) to help sort the truth about the NED Pipeline proposal as I don't feel I am receiving good-faith responses from Tennessee Gas or Kinder Morgan.

I received a letter dated June 4, 2015 from Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. identifying me as a landowner whose property is located within one half mile of the compressor station planned for New Ipswich, NH as part of the Northeast Energy Direct project.

~ The letter says nothing about safety or what to do if there is a gas leak, fire or explosion.

~ The letter has no mention of the toxins associated to compressor stations and pipelines or the myriad of illnesses reported by people living near them.

~ The letter says nothing about whether I should periodically check my well water for toxins.

~ The letter does not offer compensation for the expected loss of value of my home due to the close proximity of my home to a large industrial complex that will permanently destroy the rural landscape for which the people of New Ipswich and other bordering towns have worked so hard to obtain and maintain.

~ The letter makes no mention about the excess noise and vibrations from the planned complex and how that results in disrupted sleep essential for good health. Lack of restful sleep promptly brings on a myriad of illnesses that can lead to premature death.

~ ...but the letter does make these statements:

1. "Tennessee strives to be a good neighbor..."
2. "The northeast region as a whole stands to benefit from the Project as it will enable the region to sustain its electric grid and lower energy costs to compete on a more level economic playing field with other regions of the nation with access to reliable, low-cost gas supplies."
3. "As part of Tennessee's fully integrated natural gas pipeline transportation system, the project will provide additional access to diverse supplies of natural gas to expansion customers in the northeast region, including New England."

I take issue with these select good news” statements and ask the FERC to do the same. The pipeline is a major life-altering impediment that Inflicts spiritual, physical and financial distrem upon us. We deserve the whole truth. We must have all the details of the hazards of this project disclosed and displayed before us and we must have Tennessee Gas clearly explain what they will do to protect us from them.

Let me elaborate on the three claims of benefit listed above.

### 1. Good neiehbor?

- ~ Do good neighbors destroy ecosystems, neighborhoods and communities?
- ~ Do good neighbors kick people from their homes, disrupting families and life styles and memories and in many cases, entire livelihoods?
- ~ Do good neighbors precipitate huge financial loss to thousands who have properties and homes close to the pipeline or compressor station but are not entitled to compensation via eminent domain’?
- ~ Do good neighbors trap people next to dangerous compressor stations by way of having no financial means or just compensation for their losses to allow them to relocate elsewhere?
- ~ Do good neighbors construct a known terrorist target without the intelligence, security or response team mechanisms in place to identify, prevent or protect from terrorist activity?
- ~ Do good neighbors introduce a thermal radiation risk of such immense magnitude that it will incinerate and spread rapid fire through forests and homes’
- ~ Do good neighbors spew invisible toxic chemicals upon people and the places they live and visit?
- ~ Do good neighbors threaten pristine drinking water resources that could leave homes and families without a potable water supply?
- ~ Do good neighbors upset the entire concept of a rural state where people can live and visit with the expectation of enjoying the beauty and benefit nature provides?
- ~ Do good neighbors threaten the economic survival of dozens of towns on or near the pipeline route? We have plenty of homes for sale right now with essentially no buyers.
- ~ We have people considering defaulting on their mortgages as the remaining debt now far exceeds the net worth. Banks are taking notice. The financial consequences of the pipeline across southern New Hampshire affect the governing stability of not only the entire state of New Hampshire, but also affects the economy and governing stability of Massachusetts, Maine and Vermont.

Throughout the history of the United States energy companies have slaughtered the environment and ecosystems and caused illness and death to wildlife and hundreds of thousands of people. Over the years, regulatory agencies have lapsed in their responsibilities, granting privilege for energy industries to pollute and destroy. It is only after extreme exposures such as the Exxon Alaska Valdez incident or the BP Gulf spill that significant actions were taken against these giant conglomerates, and even then, improvements have been slow coming whereby energy companies remain one of the largest, richest and most environmentally offending industries on the planet.

Inch by inch, acre by acre, mile by mile, state by state, country by country they have ripped apart environments, destroying and causing harm to habitats, plants, animals, water supplies, and yes, people. In this regard, it seems an endangered animal species receives far more protection than people. It seems the health problems bestowed upon humans from these industries are neither publicized nor seriously addressed because we’e allowed arguments with skewed scientific assessment to overrule common sense.

Any statement that compressor stations are benign health risks is as false as the decades of claims by tobacco companies that smoking did not contribute to lung cancer. As it turns out, pipelines are far more significant in this regard because the damage they impose is not an optional choice to those being harmed.

~ I cannot move my house away from a compressor station.

~ I cannot breathe an alternate air supply as toxins are pumped into the air around my home.

- ~ I cannot block out the noise and remove harmful vibrations to my body while at home.
- ~ I cannot bring back the financial loss of the value of my home that I spent the past 22 years paying for.
- ~ I am 64. I cannot relive those years to recoup those losses.
- ~ If this pipeline goes forward, I can no longer anticipate the safe, calm and pleasant retirement I expected to have after a lifetime of earnings.
- ~ If an explosion and fire along the pipeline route occurs, we cannot replace a forest or revive those who perish in its path.
- ~ The thought that a network of underground gas pipelines will be built to service homes in New Hampshire Maine and Vermont is absurd. Imagine the blasting and construction nightmare it would take to penetrate such wilderness. People who live in the wilderness respect and preserve it and have no desire for it to become another Cleveland. I'm not picking on Cleveland; I'm just saying we like our wilderness and prefer to keep it that way.

As you can see, this project requires serious consideration. Everything along the route of the pipeline is vulnerable and victimized, not for need, but for private profit. How can a private company be given such far reaching powers as to exercise eminent domain and to leave thousands of others stripped of the value of their lives and properties?

We, meaning all of us, including YOU, must demand from companies with such power and unabated influence to redirect money to safer energy applications. To expect the world to continue to survive on non-renewable energy supplies is foolish and ignorant of all life other than one's own need for greed.

How can the FERC or any other entity approve a plan that causes so much harm and destruction? As individuals, if we attempted even one of the harms brought upon us by this project we would be cited or criminally prosecuted for deliberate and intentional harassment or for causing injury or death to someone.

Does Tennessee Gas really strive to be a good neighbor?

- ~ Will any Tennessee Gas or Kinder Morgan executives strive to be our good neighbor within the 8 mile radius of the planned large compressor station?
- ~ Will any Tennessee Gas or Kinder Morgan executives jump at the opportunity to lose sleep day and night due to persistent excessive noise and vibration?
- ~ Are energy company executives willing to be doused in invisible, harmful chemicals that are spewed into the air?
- ~ Are energy company executives willing to drink from private well water supplies beside a compressor station and along the pipeline route?
- ~ Are any Tennessee Gas executives losing the value of their home while doing the same to mine?
- ~ Will any Tennessee Gas executives offer their homes to eminent domain as they hastily exercise that practice upon others in the way of their pipeline profits?

I ask: Is it justice to grant a different standard to those in the energy industry than that which is imposed upon the rest of us? Is it truly legal for a private company to do such broad and sweeping harm when we would be severely punished if doing similar deeds?

It is time for the FERC to stand up against these ill-conceived practices and to deny permission to cause spiritual, physical and financial harm to abiding citizens for no just cause. This project is not an essential national security or war effort nor is it in the best interest of the United States to allow our non-renewable resources to leave our borders. It is a grave injustice to continue to destroy miles and miles of healthy habitats and ecosystems and pristine watersheds that are essential to all life on earth. How can we achieve health and wellness if we keep destroying the ecosystems required to bestow it?

This project does not justify raping tax-paying Americans of their homes and properties and refusing due compensation to thousands of others who will suffer enormous financial loss. Tennessee Gas and Kinder

Morgan executives have taken billions of dollars into their own pockets from these practices. ENOUGH IS ENOUGH.

New Hampshire is not a primary beneficiary of this gas, so why should we be mandated to suffer the consequences of these acts of greed? Must we accept a major terrorist target into our neighborhoods knowing there is no sufficiently effective means to keep us safe? No, we must not accept it. We must protect our right to protect ourselves. We must tell Tennessee Gas and Kinder Morgan that we have the right to defend ourselves from harm. We have the right to deflect an intruder who has demonstrated repeated acts of harm.

If I were to cause hundreds of miles of damage to ecosystems and impose harm or death by toxins or potential explosive materials or increase the chance of a massive damaging wilderness fire, those actions would be judged as criminal and I could become imprisoned. Why are corporations given permission to do these same activities and even praised to achieve them?

I demand justice! I demand NO pipeline! The energy industries should form and fund global task teams to work on safer renewable alternatives. They should be ordered to clean up hazardous wastes and fracking sites and other damaged areas resulting from their activities, and they should be ordered to compensate for emotional stress and financial loss to innocent, victimized Americans. Only then might they become a good neighbor.

## 2. The northeast region as a whole stands to benefit?

The people of New Ipswich were told at an information meeting at the town high school in late March, 2015, that no one in the New Hampshire towns affected by the proposed route of the pipeline would receive gas from this pipeline. We were told it was going directly to Dracut, MA.

We were also told local trades-people would not be hired for the construction as Tennessee Gas/Kinder Morgan has its own team of trained workers who would do the construction.

We asked where the gas was going after reaching Dracut, MA. We were told they did not know. We asked if it was leaving the United States. We were told they did not know.

A mere 70 days elapsed from the date of that meeting at the high school to the date of the aforementioned letter I received from Tennessee Gas during which time Tennessee Gas went from saying that Southern NH residents would receive no benefit to now saying the project is beneficial to the entire northeast region as a whole, including New England, providing access to reliable low-cost gas supplies. They also went from saying no jobs would be created to now saying thousands of jobs will be generated. All these added benefits in just 70 days? What kind of company offers such disparate intentions to achieve its goal?

If the pipeline was truly for the overall good it would not be necessary to continuously change the rhetoric. An honest proposal offers up an initial fair deal. If we are to sacrifice our homes, health, financial survival and spirit, we certainly deserve the truth in this ever changing storyline.

~ What supports the claim of low-cost gas? Show us the analysis and calculations that prove lowered cost to us.

~ When would we see lower cost and for how long? Liberty seeks a 24 year arrangement with Tennessee Gas. Will we receive 24 years of low-cost gas?

~ Is the gas only going to be available through Liberty or from other utility companies as well?

~ Is this a scheme towards forming a monopoly? Is the relationship between Liberty and Tennessee Gas innocuous or another nuance of a greedy plan?

~ Does Tennessee Gas have a commitment to pass along savings to residential consumers by way of reduced electric or gas bills? If I am not going to see real savings on my bill, what is the benefit to me?

## 3. The project will provide additional access to diverse supplies of natural gas to expansion customers in the northeast region, including New England.

What is Tennessee Gas's definition of "expansion customers"? Does that definition fit within their statement, "The northeast region as a whole stands to benefit from the project as it will enable the region to

sustain its electric grid and lower energy costs to compete on a more level economic playing field with other regions of the nation with access to reliable, low-cost gas supplies” ?

In fairness to those being asked to sacrifice and to those being vaguely spoken to as if a huge benefit of some sort is imminent and applicable to large numbers of people, we need Tennessee Gas to disclose in detail exactly what this project will deliver and when. A constantly changing plan inhibits and honest exchange of what will occur and what it means to us. This project should not be allowed to proceed until we are granted sufficient time to review and respond to a final proposal.

I believe Tennessee Gas should be forced to answer all questions in detail and that their responses should be substantiated by an independent overseer. Our health, our lives, our livelihoods, and the environment are at risk. We need Tennessee Gas to give us the whole story, the whole truth. Failing to do so leaves us unprepared and vulnerable which can result in unnecessary harm or death.

~ Who are the “expansion customers”? How many are they in number, where are they, when will they benefit, what is the benefit and what is the monetary value of that benefit?

~ Who are not “expansion customers”? How many are they in number, where are they, will they benefit or take a loss, what is that benefit or loss, and what is the monetary value of that benefit or loss?

~ How many individuals in New England, state by state, will receive a benefit of reduced energy costs from what they are paying now? I do not rest easy thinking people can be evicted from their homes and livelihoods and thousands of others put in harm’s way to achieve a \$10 a month savings on our electric bills. Those extreme sacrifices and personal punishments deserve solid proof that this project is worth the price we are being asked to pay.

~ What will be sent through this pipeline: gas from Pennsylvania or gas from somewhere else?

~ Where is the Marcellus gas going? Is it being exported outside the U.S. at the expense of New Hampshire residents being sacrificed spiritually, financially and physically?

~ What happens to this pipeline when the Marcellus supply is no longer viable? I’ve heard it has peaked and I’ve heard it could be available for 100 years. What is the truth and what happens to the pipeline when the supply ceases? What are the dangers posed as a decommissioned pipeline disintegrates? How long does that process take? What use restrictions exist and for how long after a pipeline is no longer used?

~ What is the life expectancy of the thinner, cheaper pipe we’ve been told will be used based on the environmental conditions it will be exposed to along the New Hampshire route?

~ Will an odorant be in this gas? I heard it is not generally used in transport lines due to additional weight and cost. How will we know if there is a leak? Complaints of headache, nose bleeds, nausea, disorientation, neurological upsets, rashes, asthma, and many, many other ailments are being observed in areas with pipeline activities. How are we protected if we can’t even smell the gas?

~ How are leaks detected and what action is taken once a leak is found?

~ How is the source of a leak found?

~ How does one know there’s a leak if it has not yet surfaced above ground?

~ How do we defend ourselves from a leak? With shut off valves up to a mile away from one another, if a leak occurs at a valve, we can have 2 miles or more of pressurized gas escape before being contained. How far will such a disaster travel and cause illness and/or death?

~ I want a full list of chemicals and the concentrations expected for all pipeline activities, i.e., those in the pipeline, those used for maintenance, those used at the compressor station, those released into the environment or used in any other way, especially at the compressor site but also along the pipeline route.

~ I want a Materials Safety Data Sheet for each of those chemicals and I want to know how Tennessee Gas/ Kinder Morgan protects us from the risks of each of those chemicals.

~ Who pays for additional tests of our well water?

~ What happens to waste solutions used in pipeline activities? Where will it be contained until it can be disposed or decontaminated? What is the process to dispose or decontaminate such solutions or materials that have become contaminated?

As you can see, there are many, many, many questions that have not been answered. Those listed above are just

a beginning.

In closing I ask:

1. How much money must I spend to keep these hazards away from me?
2. How much pain and suffering must I endure to avoid being harassed and threatened with an act that brings toxins into my body?
3. How is it that the some of our country's most beautiful countryside and pristine water supplies can be stomped upon and put at risk of destruction and ruin?
4. How much loss of sleep and anguish must I endure because others do not heed such critical warnings of the errors of human ways that have brought irreparable mass destruction to the lands, seas and air of the planet?
5. What is the purpose of me working so many years of my life to be taxed to create and continuously fund protective agencies such as the Environmental Protection Agency and measures such as the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) Program If those agencies and measures have no meaning or restrictive powers to stop those intent on violating the most basic protective principals that spurred their creation?
6. Why are others allowed to stand above the laws against causing spiritual, physical and financial harm to others while I must abide?
7. Why is it that my losses are immediate and enduring and without consideration or compensation so others can add billions of dollars to their pocket books?

This is no small matter. I urge you to take notice of these inequities and deny this pipeline proposal, demand justice to those who have already suffered from the bold hand of Tennessee Gas and other corporate giants and to exercise common sense and fairness to prevent further injustices from being brought upon the public under the guise of being a good neighbor.

Thank you,

Evelyn Taylor  
213 Old Wilton Road  
New Ipswich, NH 03071

Cc: Governor Maggie Hassan (New Hampshire)  
Governor Paul R. LePage (Maine)  
Governor Peter Shumlin (Vermont)  
Loretta E. Lynch, Attorney General of the United States

**20150721-0059**

Hand written letter, William J. Finlayson, 167 Heald Rd, Wilton, NH 03086, opposing

**20150721-0081**

Commonwealth of Massachusetts  
Town of Lanesborough

Newton Memorial Town Hall  
Post Office Son 1492  
83 North Main Street

**OFFICE OF THE  
BOARD OF SELECTMEN**

July 7, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Agency (FERC)  
888 First Street NE  
Washington, DC 20426.

Dear Ms. Bose:

As the elected representatives of the Town of Lanesborough, we are writing to urge you to take note of the attached petition which was signed by over **500** people. The Town Secretary of the Town of Lanesborough is in possession of the original petition with all the signatures. The petition requests that the Kinder-Morgan', Tennessee Natural Gas pipeline be stopped. The petition was also overwhelming supported by the citizens of Lanesborough at our Annual Town Meeting on June 9, 2015. By this action, Lanesborough joins the many towns in the Commonwealth on record in opposition to this construction.

Representing the residents of our Town we ask you to carefully review the petition and take into account the strong feelings expressed by the residents who signed this petition and stand opposed to the construction of this pipeline.

Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

John Goerlach, Chair  
Henry Sayers  
Robert Ericson

enc.

-----

Town of Lanesborough: Citizen's Petition Form

The citizens of Lanesborough call upon the Selectmen to send a letter to Rep. Gail Cariddi, Sen. Ben Downing, Governor Baker, Secretary of the ERC, Senators Markey and Warren, Congressman Neal, the FERC, the Speaker of the State House of Representative and Majority Leader of the State Senate urging them to do all they can to stop the TNG pipeline from being built in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Whereas a proposed High-Pressure Pipeline carrying natural gas and assorted chemicals obtained through hydraulic fracturing has been designated to come through Lanesborough and neighboring communities, bringing said fuel to Dracut, Mass; and

Whereas said pipeline goes against current Massachusetts commitments to renewable energies and combating global climate change; and

Whereas the existence of a gas pipeline in our town would have a devastating impact on property values and the ability of citizens to sell their land when necessary; and

Whereas said pipeline would impact unknowable amounts of forest, conservation land, farmland, the recharge area for the Lanesborough town water supply; and

Whereas a high-pressure gas pipeline must be vented periodically releasing gas and dangerous carcinogens into the air and, by its nature, carries potential for leaks, rupture, or devastating explosion causing untold damage to property, lives, and our drinking water; and

Whereas the cost of said pipeline would require Massachusetts citizens to pay a utility bill tariff as well as environmental costs not required by law for Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (“TGP”, a subsidiary of Kinder Morgan Energy Partners, L.P.), making ratepayers bear financial risk for the endeavors of a private corporation; and

Whereas the projected route of the pipeline traverses the Water Supply Protection Overlay District of the Lanesborough zoning bylaw which was established to “preserve and protect existing and potential sources of drinking water supplies and prevent temporary and permanent contamination of the environment.”; and

Whereas the pipeline traverses the Flood Plain/Wetlands Protection Overlay District of the Lanesborough zoning bylaw which was established to “protect, preserve and maintain the water table and the water re-charge areas within the town so as to preserve present and potential water supplies for the public health and safety of the residents of the town of Lanesborough;” and

Whereas, we the citizens of Lanesborough, Massachusetts, which became a Green Community in 2014, choose not to participate in such encumbrances to the life, vibrancy, economic stability, and general well being of our community and wherever hydraulic fracturing is occurring and the pressurized pipeline is running; now, therefore be it

Resolved, that the people of Lanesborough, Massachusetts:

Hereby call on our Selectmen to stand in opposition to TGP’s high pressured pipeline and not allow it within our town borders:

1. Oppose said pipeline, and any pipeline carrying natural gas obtained through hydraulic fracturing, within the borders of our Commonwealth or our nation; and
2. Stand in solidarity with nearby communities working to disallow the Pipeline within its borders and ban its construction in our region, including (as of 12/20/2014)Becket, Dalton, Hinsdale, Lenox, North Adams, Pittsfield, Peru, Richmond, Sandisfield, Washington, Windsor, Chesterfield, Cummington, Northampton, Pelham, Plainfield, Worthington, Ashfield, Buckland, Conway, Deerfield, Gill, Greenfield, Leverett, Montague, Northfield, Orange, Shelburne, Warwick, Wendell, Ashburnham, Athol, Berlin, Bolton, Royalston, Templeton, Winchedon, Ashby, Dunstable, Groton, Pepperell, Townsend, Tyngsborough, Brookline; and
3. Cause a copy of this resolution to be presented to the Town of Lanesborough’s state and federal legislative representatives, FERC and the Governor and Secretary of the Department of Conservation and Recreation, asking them to take action to prevent construction of the Pipeline within the borders of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and to enact legislation and take such other actions as are necessary to disallow such projects that go against our commitments to life, the environment, our economic well being and our bodily safety and instead to legislate more stringent energy efficiency and further exploration of subsidies for renewable energy sources.

### **20150721-5003**

kathy chapman, mason, NH.

Please explain how you are going to assess the seasonal variation in wildlife when the environmental assessment for the proposed project is only being conducted in a single season. The Town of Mason has hired professional assistance in determining which significant natural resources in the town may be affected by the proposed Kinder Morgan pipeline. This environmental survey and its results are spanning the course of no more than three months. What about the animals that only arrive in the fall, winter, and spring? What about vernal pools? The Town of Mason has diligently followed the FERC process, and has done its best to hire consultants and collect data in a timely manner, but the fact is that the Town of Mason has known about the pipeline for less than a year. There is no possible way that an adequate survey could have been conducted in the time that has elapsed since December 2014.

Please give the affected towns more time to collect data, assess impacts, and make counter proposals. Is the

hurry about Kinder Morgan's bottom line because it certainly isn't about benefit to the affected people of New Hampshire.

Best regards,  
Kathy Chapman

**20150721-5005**

Darrell J. Scott, Mason, NH.  
Herbicides

Regarding the Northeast Energy Direct Project across Mason, Milford, Amherst, and Brookline and its Fitchburg lateral thru Mason.

I am concerned about the use of herbicides to maintain the pipeline right of way after construction is completed. The pipeline is crossing through major aquifers which feed my well and most all other Mason resident's wells. Local streams that are crossed by the pipelines flow into the Nissitissit River which is a trout fishing stream. Milford, Amherst, and Merrimac sections pass adjacent to the Pennichuck Watershed which supplies water for the entire Nashua region.

The existing (PSNH) Eversource power line is maintained by mechanical mowing, and does not introduce chemicals to the local water sheds. I request that you require the same means of pipeline maintenance for the NED and laterals through New Hampshire.

**20150721-5006**

Darrell J. Scott, Mason, NH.  
Just compensation clause of eminent domain.

I have a 21 acre woodlot purchased primarily as a retirement investment. Mason zoning laws require a 5 acre minimum lot size for new building lots. The Fitchburg lateral of the Northeast Energy Direct Project will bisect the western-most 5 acre lot rendering it unusable to install a house, well, septic system, driveway etc. Present day lot values are \$90,000 for a buildable lot. I am concerned that Kinder Morgan will not give me just compensation for the taking of my property.

The United States Constitution 5th amendment requires "just compensation" for the taking of property for "public use". Considering the public use of this pipeline project is to supply natural gas through the Maritimes & Northeast pipeline to LNG export terminals such as Goldboro, Nova Scotia to Europe, South America, and Asia, and that the monetary profit of the pipeline and natural gas companies will be significant, I am requesting that just compensation be made to all affected property owners as myself.

**20150721-5008**

Darrell Scott, Mason, NH.  
Pipeline safety due to "burial" in solid granite

I concerned that the pipeline will not be safe after it is "buried" in solid granite. The proposed route of the main 36 inch pipeline in NH crosses Kidder Mtn. in New Ipswich, Fletcher Granite quarry in Mason, and historical quarries in Milford. It will traverse numerous ledges and outcroppings at very steep pitches. How will the pipeline be buried sufficiently below grade to protect it from erosion and ATV traffic.

**20150721-5024**

Diana Portalatin, Oneonta, NY.

Dear FERC,

The compounded environmental and social impacts of the NED project alongside the Constitution Pipeline

makes the NED project unacceptable to the residents and land owners in the area. As a landowner in the Village of Franklin, I see our retirement dream slip away. We purchased 27 acres of land with a beautiful pond in order to build a little house in which to retire. This parcel would be about 2 miles away from the proposed Compression Station.

We were unhappy about the Constitution Pipeline, which will traverse about a half mile away from our parcel, but figured that it would not affect us too much since it is on the downslope. And, we have seen support from the local business and municipalities that will tap into the Constitution pipeline to get gas. This proposed NED project changes everything. It compounds the risks for environmental destruction along the route, and it brings in the Compressor Station to Franklin, NY. From scientific research and scholarly articles that my husband and I have read....the pollution within 6 miles of the station is significant, not only in the air, but brought down by rain into the water table.

This area does not need the NED project. There is no benefits to the area residents. Tennessee Gas Co is opportunistic and greedy and should not be allowed to bring another pipeline. The negative impacts on residents throughout its route all the way to Nova Scotia cannot be ignored. Gas for export is already available through other routes. Have the gas companies share their lines instead. Also, we need to invest in infrastructure for solar and wind, not further investing in natural gas.

Please do not grant a permit to the NED project. My husband and I will have to sell our land at a loss or forfeit to taxes. But we can not live under the pollution emitted by the proposed station.

We know we are not the only ones in this position. And, it is sad.

Please deny the permits to the NED project.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Diana Portalatin  
Landowner; Poet Hill Rd.  
Franklin, NY

### **20150721-5113**

Janet DeGrazia, Croton on Hudson, NY.

To Whom this May Concern,

As your constituent, I respectfully urge you to oppose the construction of the gas pipeline that was proposed. As you are aware, the pipeline would carry hydrofracked gas from Pennsylvania through New York to Massachusetts without any benefit to New York State residents. Supporting a project that bears large risks without the possibility of benefitting New York residents seems to be an irrational position to support.

As a concerned citizen of Stephentown, New York, I am worried about the environmental impact a gas line will have on our area. To name a few, I have growing concerns regarding the following:

(1) the potential for ongoing small leaks of toxic chemicals into our air, water and soil. The possibility of well-water contamination that is used for consumption is a large concern for my family and me. I also worry for my neighboring farmers, specifically the protection of their produce and livestock, on which they depend throughout their daily lives. Also, I have a growing worry around the potential negative effects that the project would have on the river, which is stocked by New York fisheries and depended upon for recreational use.

(2) The inevitability of pinhole development in pipe walls and the possibility of catastrophic rupture. Not only on the environment, but this then leads me to be concerned about the harm to our health and the risk to our safety that the project poses. More and more, there are reports of accidents along pipelines. We hear reports of leaks, ruptures, even explosions. We know that fracked gas contains carcinogens, neurotoxins, and endocrine disrupters that are proven to cause of disease and disability. Experts on the source have also shared that even reasonably sound pipes develop small holes over time. The overall effect of small leaks of

these toxins on a continuous basis can be devastating. The proposed location of this particular pipeline is adjacent to massive power lines; this seems dangerous, unnecessary, and avoidable.

In addition to the fact that the pipeline would bring about very real and present danger to all of us affected, we would now have to worry about insurance rates rising due to increased risk, property values decreasing due to the disturbed environment the project will create, and the general nuisance and inconvenience during construction that I, my family, and my neighbors will endure. The visible construction and ongoing maintenance and/or access roads will be an unnecessary eyesore of from my home.

Construction of the pipeline further represents a regressive step from the goal of renewable energy development. If we permit a hydrofracked product to be piped through our area, then we are, in essence, supporting the use of non-renewables to satisfy our energy needs. Our focus should be on increasing enticements to use environmentally friendly types of energy and decrease our dependence on destructive kinds; which necessitates then you publicly state your opposition to the proposed gas pipeline project and actively work against its implementation.

If you believe, as I do, that we risk the health and overall well-being of everyone in our community by allowing the construction of this pipeline, then I sincerely hope you will publicly say so and actively work against the proposed project for the benefit of the many that would be affected.

I thank you for your time, consideration, and, in advance, for the dedication you will put towards prevention of this project.

Best,

Janet DeGrazia

**20150722-0007**

Hand written card, LeeAnn LaFosse, 298 Monadnock St, Troy, NH 03465, opposing

**20150722-0008**

Hand written card, Evelyn Taylor, 213 Old Wilton Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, opposing

**20150722-0009**

Hand written card, Evelyn Taylor, 213 Old Wilton Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, will gas contain odorant?

**20150722-0010**

Hand written card, Evelyn Taylor, 213 Old Wilton Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, who will benefit?

**20150722-0011**

Hand written card, Evelyn Taylor, 213 Old Wilton Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, wants full disclosure of hazards & toxins from compressor stations, including hazardous materials safety sheets.

**20150722-0012**

Hand written card, Evelyn Taylor, 213 Old Wilton Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, steep slopes, frequency of checks for leaks, protection of electrical grids?

**20150722-0013**

Hand written card, Evelyn Taylor, 213 Old Wilton Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, protection from terrorists?

**20150722-0014**

Hand written card, Kathleen Ga?, 61 Beechwood Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, need more time.

**20150722-0015**

Hand written card, Timothy Somero, 42 Old Tenney Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, opposing.

**20150722-0016**

Hand written card, Evelyn Taylor, 213 Old Wilton Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, what happens if project pollutes my well?

**20150722-0017**

Hand written card, Paul Stevens, 156 Timbertop Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, NED = higher gas prices, opposing

**20150722-0018**

Hand written card, Evelyn Taylor, 213 Old Wilton Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, compensation for lower house prices?

**20150722-0019**

Hand written card, Timothy Somero, 42 Old Tenney Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, housing market already in chaos, need more time before Scoping.

**20150722-0020**

Hand written card, Paula Footer, 133 5th St, Providence, RI 02906, opposing

**20150722-0021**

Hand written card, Linda & Charles Steinhacker, 100 Hurlburt Rd, Great Barrington, MA 01230, opposing

**20150722-0022**

Hand written card, L. Clayton, 100 Hurlburt Rd, Great Barrington, MA 01230, opposing

**20150722-0023**

Hand written card, Jacob Greene, 110 Hill Cemetery Rd, Windsor, MA 01270, opposing

**20150722-0024**

Hand written card, Carol Culhane, 66 Ashburnham Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, opposing

**20150722-0025**

Hand written card, Dennis Gauvin, 61 Beechwood Road, New Ipswich, NH 03071, opposing, not enough time to prepare for scoping.

**20150722-0026**

Hand written card, Kathleen Gauvin, 61 Beechwood Road, New Ipswich, NH 03071, opposing

**20150722-0027**

Hand written card, Robert Culhane, 66 Ashburnham Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, opposing

**20150722-0028**

Hand written card, Kathleen Gauvin, 61 Beechwood Road, New Ipswich, NH 03071, need scoping meeting

**20150722-0029**

Hand written card, Barb Zabriskie, 305 Abel Road, Rindge, NH 03461, opposing

**20150722-0030**

Hand written card, Randy Smith, 266 Amherst Rd, Pelham, MA 01002, opposing

**20150722-0035**

**Tennessee Gas Pipeline  
Company, L.L.C.**  
a Kinder Morgan company

January 30, 2015

Irving Spear  
204 Starch Mill Rd  
Mason, N.H. 0304\$

RE: Northeast Energy Direct Project  
LL# NH FLE 12.00  
Hillsborough Co/Mason  
PL 900-1

Dear Mr. Spear,

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company,(Tennessee). a Kinder Morgan Company, is planning to expand its natural gas transmission system to meet the increasing demand for clean-burning natural gss in the Northeastern United States. Our proposed expansion project is called the Northeast Energy Direct Project.

We received your Access Denial Letter, on December 20, 2014, mgarding Tennessee's request for survey permission across a portion of your property in Mason. At that time you indicated that you would not allow the survey work to occur on your properly. This letter is to follow up on that request and to provide you with some additional Project information. We will plan to follow up with another presonal visit to answer any ad-ditional questions you may have.

To comply with federal and state regulatory requirements, Tennessee will perform various preliminary survey and studies along the proposed pipeline route. This preliminary survey process will involve up to five types of surveys: (I) civil surveys which identify the boundaries of the corridor for all other surveys, obtain an accurate description of existing features, and locate the future pipeline,(2) geotechnical surveys, (3) archaeological surveys, (4) wetland and stream surveys, and (5) surveys for rare, threatened, or endangered species. The information obtained &om these surveys will be included in Tennessee's application to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and to other federal and state agencies.

Tennessee has been a part of the New Hampshire community for more than 50 years. The success of this project will continue to build upon Tennessee's long tradition of gas transmission in the state. The Northeast Energy Direct Project supports Tennessee's commitment to serve growing markets with predictable deliveries of natmal gas.

For your convenience, we have included a project fact sheet and handout about the proposed field work. Also enclosed is a survey permission form that provides you with the opportunity to note any special conditions or concerns you may have regarding the survey activities on your property.

Thank you for your cooperation. Should you need additional information about our proposed project, please feel free to contact me at (413) 821-2070 or my cell phone (802) 673-9325.

Very truly yours,

Roblt Naramore  
Percheron LLC

Contract Land Agent to  
Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company

**20150722-0039**

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

July 16, 2015

Dear NH PUC,

I am puzzled by your approval of the agreement between Liberty Utilities and Tennessee Gas:

1. Your own staff expert consultant, Melissa Whitten, recommended against approving the Proposed Liberty Agreement because of lack of cost effectiveness and because there would be substantial excess capacity over the life of the contract.
2. The NH (OCA) Office of Consumer Advocates recommended against approval of the petition stating that the analysis was not thorough.
3. The NH (OEP) Office of Energy and Planning's 10 year strategy strongly promotes "Diversity of Supply as one of the principal components of a sound and stable energy policy. New England is over 50 percent in natural gas use. The proposed Tennessee Pipeline would significantly undermine the diversity of this supply policy.
4. Liberty Utilities's own expert, Francisco C. DaFonte, points out that Kinder Morgan is completely non-committal about expanding service to the vast unserved areas of New Hampshire for the benefit of our citizens.

We hear from proponents of natural gas that we need to lower energy costs in NH and that we need natural gas to accomplish this;

1. Jerry Elmer of CFL Scoop News June 15, 2015 from the Conservation Law Foundation quotes ISO New England, "additional renewables are expected to decrease wholesale electric prices in New England." "As the penetration of wind and other solar resources grow, the price reducing effects of renewables on electric prices will Increase."
2. Mr Elmer continues in quoting ISO New England, "Clean low~ renewables are going to drive coal, oil, and nuclear out of the market."
3. And finally, Mr Elmer says "The ISO is recognizing - not tacitly either - the Increasing importance of renewable energy In New England wholesale electric markets."
4. Natural Resources Defense Council, Clean Air Task Force, and Sierra Club In a joint report state that "The Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (RGGI) is a model for the nation.....10 states (Including NH ) are already using a market based system to cap carbon pollution while lowering energy bills for businesses and consumers creating Jobs."

It would seem that your decision to support the agreement between Liberty Gas and Kinder Morgan is not consistent with the trust that has been placed in you as a commission to oversee the proper and fair regulation of our public utilities. I am genuinely interested in understanding your thinking. Please respond as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Frances Riggs  
201 Temple Road,  
New Ipswich, NH 03071  
CC Kimberly D. Bose

Secretary FERC

**20150722-0040**

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulation Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Date: 07/08/2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access: PF 14-22-000

As the owner of the property located at:

204 Hubbard Pond Road  
New Ipswich, NH 03071

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose. Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Jason Caetano

**20150722-0041**

**New York            Agriculture  
                                 and Markets**

ANDREW M. CUOMO  
Governor

RICHARD A. BALL  
Commissioner

July 16, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First St., N.E., Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Project Docket No. PF14-22-000; Participation as a Cooperating Agency

Dear Secretary Bose:

The New York State Department of Agriculture and Markets would like to be a cooperating agency for the purpose of producing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Northeast Energy Direct project. Our specific interest is agricultural land and we would like to have input on routing issues, construction methods, mitigation measures and restoration techniques.

Thank you for the opportunity to work directly with the FERC staff on this project.

Sincerely,

Matthew J. Brower  
Agricultural Resource Specialist

Division of Land and Water Resources 108 Airline Or. Albany, N.Y., 12235

**20150722-0042**

Hand written card, Jason Caetano, 204 Hubbard Pond Road, New Ipswich, NH 03071, opposing compressor station in New Ipswich

**20150722-0043**

Hand written card, Kelly Malcom-Hook, 162 Marshfield Rd, Temple, NH 03084, ? scoping session in New Ipswich, Temple, Greenville and Mason, all towns affected by compressor station.

**20150722-0050**

July 7, 2015

Kimberly D. Rose, Secretary, FERC,  
First Street NE, Room 1A,  
Washington, DC 20426.

Re: Denial of access to my property re: PF14-22-000, 888

As the owners of property located at 34 Reno Rd. Averill Park, NY 12018, we hereby deny to Kinder Morgan and its subsidiaries and affiliated entities, including without limitation Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company and its subsidiaries and related entities, as well as NYSEG, National Grid or other electric utility company with whom any of them co-locate or propose to co-locate any pipeline, and their respective employees, agents, representatives and contractors, permission to enter my property identified above, to perform surveys or for any other purpose (other than for access by my utility company directly related to the supply of electricity to my property) without prior written notice specifying the purpose of such access and my express consent.

Any entry on my property without my consent will be considered unauthorized and treated as trespass.

Donald Clendaniel  
Leslie Carey

**20150722-5002**

Alissa Urwiller, Rindge, NH.

I am opposed to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline that is project to run through my town, Rindge, NH. We all have private wells for drinking water and if anything happens to our ground water we all are at a loss. I don't feel that this project is worth gambling our water sources. I think that other alternative energy sources be used, such as solar power. Please listen to our concerns and stop the pipeline. Thank you.

**20150723-0008**

**FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20428**

July 22, 2015

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

Ms. Kathy Bauer  
Selectman  
Town of Milford  
1 Union Square  
Milford, NH 03055-4240

Dear Ms. Bauer:

Thank you for your June 2, 2015 letter regarding Tennessee Gas' proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project (Docket No. PF14-22-000) and requesting that Commission staff hold a public scoping meeting at the Milford Town Hall. A public scoping meeting will be held at the Milford Town Hall on Thursday, July 30.

Tennessee Gas filed its pre-filing request letter on September 15, 2014 and the Director of the Office of Energy Projects approved Tennessee Gas' request to enter into the pre-filing process. The Commission's pre-filing process allows staff to actively participate with landowners, interested parties, other federal and state

agencies, elected officials, and the applicant in order to identify environmental and other issues, and discuss potential solutions and route modifications before an application is filed. By engaging the public early in the process, we believe that we can conduct a comprehensive and meaningful review of the project as part of our obligations under the National Environmental Policy Act.

On June 30, 2015, Commission staff issued the Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the Planned Northeast Energy Direct Project, Request for Comments on Environmental Issues, and Notice of Public Scoping Meetings, which initiated the formal public scoping period and indicated the locations, dates, and times for the public scoping meetings, including the one in Milford. Additionally, while scoping meetings are a valuable tool for us to receive comments from the public, they are only one of several ways for interested parties to bring their concerns to the attention of the Commission. The Commission equally will consider comments that are submitted electronically or through the mail.

As in any Commission matter, please be assured that we strive to make our review of energy proposals accessible and transparent to the public. If I can be of further assistance in this or any other Commission matter, I hope you will not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely,

Norman Bay

Chairman

Enclosure

*{copy of June 30,2015 Notice of Intent - see 20150630-3044 above}*

**20150723-0009**

**FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

WASHINGTON, DC 20428

July 22, 2015

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

Mr. Gary Daniels

Selectman

Town of Milford

I Union Square

Milford, NH 03055-4240

Dear Mr. Daniels:

Thank you for your June 2, 2015 letter regarding Tennessee Gas' proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project (Docket No. PF14-22-000) and requesting that Commission staff hold a public scoping meeting at the Milford Town Hall. A public scoping meeting will be held at the Milford Town Hall on Thursday, July 30.

Tennessee Gas filed its pre-filing request letter on September 15, 2014 and the Director of the Office of Energy Projects approved Tennessee Gas' request to enter into the pre-filing process. The Commission's pre-filing process allows staff to actively participate with landowners, interested parties, other federal and state agencies, elected officials, and the applicant in order to identify environmental and other issues, and discuss potential solutions and route modifications before an application is filed. By engaging the public early in the process, we believe that we can conduct a comprehensive and meaningful review of the project as part of our obligations under the National Environmental Policy Act.

On June 30, 2015, Commission staff issued the Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the Planned Northeast Energy Direct Project, Request for Comments on Environmental Issues, and Notice of Public Scoping Meetings, which initiated the formal public scoping period and indicated the locations, dates, and times for the public scoping meetings, including the one in Milford. Additionally, while scoping meetings are a valuable tool for us to receive comments from the public, they are only one of several ways for interested parties to bring their concerns to the attention of the Commission. The Commission

equally will consider comments that are submitted electronically or through the mail.

As in any Commission matter, please be assured that we strive to make our review of energy proposals accessible and transparent to the public. If I can be of further assistance in this or any other Commission matter, I hope you will not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely,

Norman Bay  
Chairman

Enclosure

*{copy of June 30,2015 Notice of Intent - see 20150630-3044 above}*

**20150723-0010**

**FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION**  
WASHINGTON, DC 20428

July 22, 2015

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

Mr. Kevin Federico  
Vice-Chairman  
Town of Milford  
1 Union Square  
Milford, NH 03055-4240

Dear Mr. Federico:

Thank you for your June 2, 2015 letter regarding Tennessee Gas' proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project (Docket No. PFI4-22-000) and requesting that Commission staff hold a public scoping meeting at the Milford Town Hall. A public scoping meeting will be held at the Milford Town Hall on Thursday, July 30.

Tennessee Gas filed its pre-filing request letter on September 15, 2014 and the Director of the Office of Energy Projects approved Tennessee Gas' request to enter into the pre-filing process. The Commission's pre-filing process allows staff to actively participate with landowners, interested parties, other federal and state agencies, elected officials, and the applicant in order to identify environmental and other issues, and discuss potential solutions and route modifications before an application is filed. By engaging the public early in the process, we believe that we can conduct a comprehensive and meaningful review of the project as part of our obligations under the National Environmental Policy Act.

On June 30, 2015, Commission staff issued the Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the Planned Northeast Energy Direct Project, Request for Comments on Environmental Issues, and Notice of Public Scoping Meetings, which initiated the formal public scoping period and indicated the locations, dates, and times for the public scoping meetings, including the one in Milford. Additionally, while scoping meetings are a valuable tool for us to receive comments from the public, they are only one of several ways for interested parties to bring their concerns to the attention of the Commission. The Commission equally will consider comments that are submitted electronically or through the mail.

As in any Commission matter, please be assured that we strive to make our review of energy proposals accessible and transparent to the public. If I can be of further assistance in this or any other Commission matter, I hope you will not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely,

Norman Bay  
Chairman

Enclosure

*{copy of June 30,2015 Notice of Intent - see 20150630-3044 above}*

20150723-0011

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20428

July 22, 2015

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

Mr. Mark Fougere

Chairman

Town of Milford

1 Union Square

Milford, NH 03055-4240

Dear Chairman Fougere:

Thank you for your June 2, 2015 letter regarding Tennessee Gas' proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project (Docket No. PFI4-22-000) and requesting that Commission staff hold a public scoping meeting at the Milford Town Hall. A public scoping meeting will be held at the Milford Town Hall on Thursday, July 30.

Tennessee Gas filed its pre-filing request letter on September 15, 2014 and the Director of the Office of Energy Projects approved Tennessee Gas' request to enter into the pre-filing process. The Commission's pre-filing process allows staff to actively participate with landowners, interested parties, other federal and state agencies, elected officials, and the applicant in order to identify environmental and other issues, and discuss potential solutions and route modifications before an application is filed. By engaging the public early in the process, we believe that we can conduct a comprehensive and meaningful review of the project as part of our obligations under the National Environmental Policy Act.

On June 30, 2015, Commission staff issued the Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the Planned Northeast Energy Direct Project, Request for Comments on Environmental Issues, and Notice of Public Scoping Meetings, which initiated the formal public scoping period and indicated the locations, dates, and times for the public scoping meetings, including the one in Milford. Additionally, while scoping meetings are a valuable tool for us to receive comments from the public, they are only one of several ways for interested parties to bring their concerns to the attention of the Commission. The Commission equally will consider comments that are submitted electronically or through the mail.

As in any Commission matter, please be assured that we strive to make our review of energy proposals accessible and transparent to the public. If I can be of further assistance in this or any other Commission matter, I hope you will not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely,

Norman Bay

Chairman

Enclosure

*{copy of June 30,2015 Notice of Intent - see 20150630-3044 above}*

20150723-0012

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20428

July 22, 2015

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

Mr. Mike Putnam

Selectman

Town of Milford

1 Union Square

Milford, NH 03055-4240

Dear Mr. Putnam:

Thank you for your June 2, 2015 letter regarding Tennessee Gas' proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project (Docket No. PF14-22-000) and requesting that Commission staff hold a public scoping meeting at the Milford Town Hall. A public scoping meeting will be held at the Milford Town Hall on Thursday, July 30.

Tennessee Gas filed its pre-filing request letter on September 15, 2014 and the Director of the Office of Energy Projects approved Tennessee Gas' request to enter into the pre-filing process. The Commission's pre-filing process allows staff to actively participate with landowners, interested parties, other federal and state agencies, elected officials, and the applicant in order to identify environmental and other issues, and discuss potential solutions and route modifications before an application is filed. By engaging the public early in the process, we believe that we can conduct a comprehensive and meaningful review of the project as part of our obligations under the National Environmental Policy Act.

On June 30, 2015, Commission staff issued the Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the Planned Northeast Energy Direct Project, Request for Comments on Environmental Issues, and Notice of Public Scoping Meetings, which initiated the formal public scoping period and indicated the locations, dates, and times for the public scoping meetings, including the one in Milford. Additionally, while scoping meetings are a valuable tool for us to receive comments from the public, they are only one of several ways for interested parties to bring their concerns to the attention of the Commission. The Commission equally will consider comments that are submitted electronically or through the mail.

As in any Commission matter, please be assured that we strive to make our review of energy proposals accessible and transparent to the public. If I can be of further assistance in this or any other Commission matter, I hope you will not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely,

Norman Bay  
Chairman

Enclosure

*{copy of June 30,2015 Notice of Intent - see 20150630-3044 above}*

**20150723-0024**

FERC  
888 First Street NE  
Washington, DC 20426

Dear FERC,

Will you ever become a responsible, responsive regulatory agency? By which we mean regulate? As opposed caving in to corporate profiteering?

Fracking has already been deemed dangerous to the point of being declared illegal in three states. More state-wide bans are sure to follow. Why? Resulting earthquakes, for one. Witness Oklahoma Pipeline leaks. Witness coastal California. High-density carbon emissions from pipeline compressors! Isn't it time you/we pay attention to the planet's survival before we consent to corporate greed?

The proposed Kinder-Morgan Tennessee-Northeast pipeline from western Pennsylvania to Dracut, Massachusetts, is clearly designed, despite hedging and disavowals, to facilitate overseas sales of fracked gas. Meanwhile it compromises the safety, health, personal rights, and well-being of a great many inhabitants of the northeastern United States.

Are you listening? Or are you unresponsive, as you appear to have been for a long stretch of time ...

Please, please, as you consider the proposed pipeline, take into account the federal responsibility to consider, regulate, and defend the rights and well-being of private citizens over the ambitions of corporate entities,

especially when the latter choose to ignore the larger issues of regional, national, even global safety. For once, some backbone please? The word around here is that FERC “never met a pipeline it didn’t like.” Ever hopeful,  
Lynne Hanley and Paul Jenkins  
Conway, Massachusetts  
(a town on the proposed pipeline’s route)

**20150723-5022**

## **Mass Audubon**

### *Protecting the Nature of Massachusetts*

July 22, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC)  
888 First Street, NE  
Room IA  
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., Docket No. PF14-22-000, Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Secretary Bose:

The following comments are submitted in response to FERC’s June 30, 2015 Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Planned Northeast Energy Direct Project (NED), Request for Comments on Environmental Issues, and Notice of Public Scoping Sessions. The NED is proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline (TGP), a subsidiary of Kinder Morgan. Mass Audubon is a directly affected landowner, as the proposed project corridor crosses four parcels it holds for conservation purposes in Plainfield (Municipal MapBlock/Lot #s 19/011, 2010/3, 25/0/3, and 2010/1). Numerous other lands held by public and private entities for permanent conservation purposes will also be impacted, along with extensive areas of sensitive land and water resources.

We believe it is premature for FERC to proceed to this step in the project review process at this time, due to recent changes in the project and deficiencies in Kinder Morgan’s filings to date, including but not necessarily limited to the points described below. Mass Audubon respectfully requests that the schedule for the public scoping hearings and deadline for scoping comments be extended beyond August 31, 2015. In particular, we urge that further information be required on project need, alternatives and the economic and environmental costs and benefits of the project and alternatives. Kinder Morgan should also be required to submit updated and more complete Resource Reports based on the currently proposed project configuration and publicly available data including MassGIS datalayers and the University of Massachusetts Amherst Conservation Assessment and Prioritization System (CAPS).<sup>1</sup> In the event that PERC denies this request for delay and extension of the review process, we request that these comments be considered in developing the Scope for the EIS.

#### Project Needs and Alternatives

The need for and alternatives to the project must be more fully and objectively analyzed, before any further steps are taken toward proceeding with this massive, expensive, and environmentally destructive project. Massachusetts Attorney General Maura Healey recently announced that she is commissioning a study of electricity reliability needs in the New England region through 2030 and the options for meeting those needs. This study, conducted by the Analysis Group and Raab Associates, will fill a pressing need for analysis of the costs and benefits of various alternatives including energy efficiency, demand response, renewables, natural gas, and oil. This study is expected to be completed in October, 2015. It is vitally important from both an economic and environmental perspective to consider the results of this study before advancing

environmental review of the proposed gas transmission infrastructure being proposed in the NED project as well as the Algonquin/Spectra Access Northeast Project.

The Massachusetts Global Warming Solutions Act adopted in 2008 set ambitious targets for reductions of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by 25 percent by 2020 and 80 percent by 2050. This law and the Green Communities Act have catalyzed rapid progress in energy efficiency and development of renewable energy sources, both of which are making important contributions to our economy and environmental health. For the past four years in a row, Massachusetts ranked first in the nation in American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy's scorecard of the states.' Meanwhile, a recent report indicates that as a result of the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (RGGI), nine states in New England and the Mid-Atlantic region have gained \$1.3 billion in economic benefits and saved electric ratepayers \$460 million while reducing carbon emissions by 15 percent.' The clean energy economy (renewables and energy efficiency) in Massachusetts has added more than 28,000 jobs since 2010 and is now a \$10 billion industry sector." The NED project is incompatible with national, regional, and state policies and goals for GHG reductions, and comes with enormous, avoidable environmental and economic consequences. Major new pipelines increasing our dependence on natural gas will make it more difficult, not less, to meet GHG reduction goals over both the short and longer term. Life-cycle emissions from gas often exceed that of other fossil fuels they replace, while also causing other major environmental impacts that can be avoided through greater emphasis on energy efficiency and renewables.' Furthermore; if gas is exported through the proposed pipeline, the purported energy price benefits to consumers in New England will most likely evaporate, since gas prices are much higher in global markets.

#### Project Scope and Impacts

TGP has recently announced significant changes to the NED project, including the elimination of several laterals and the reduction of the diameter of the main line from 36" to 30". While these may somewhat reduce the environmental impacts of the project, those impacts remain at an unprecedented scale.

More than one hundred parcels of "permanently protected" lands conserved by public and private entities will be impacted by this project. Massachusetts has a long history of thoughtful land and water conservation, conducted based on scientifically based priorities. This carefully constructed matrix of protected lands encompasses 25 percent of the state. These lands are protected by Article 97 of the State Constitution and/or are held in public trust by charitable land trusts. It is ironic that a private, out of state company now views these areas as convenient for the construction of energy infrastructure at all unprecedented scale. A 2013 report on The Return on Investment in Parks and Open Space in Massachusetts found that every dollar invested in land conservation returned \$4 in natural goods and services to the Massachusetts economy, including clean air and water, recreation and tourism, and fish and wildlife habitat." The Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court has also recognized that lands held in conservation use by charitable trusts support a wide range of public benefits." Before any further consideration of impacts to these precious conservation lands as well as extensive other areas of wetlands, streams, forests and farmlands, alternative means of meeting state and regional energy needs must be considered.

Furthermore, the very fact that the project has changed so significantly has rendered the draft Resource Reports out of date and virtually useless. It is extremely difficult, if not impossible, for a reader to decipher what the impacts of the currently proposed project is based on those outdated reports.

#### Failure to Use Publicly Available Resource Data in Draft Resource Reports

Massachusetts has an extensive, advanced land use and environmental database with information publicly available through MassGIS. Mass Audubon met with representatives of Kinder Morgan/TGP as early as April 28, 2014, and communicated to the company at that time about the wealth of natural resources data available that could assist in analyzing impacts of the proposed project and how to minimize those impacts. We also attended other meetings in 2014 with company representatives hosted by state agencies, and are aware of several communications from agencies and other environmental groups to the company informing them of these resources and how to utilize them. This information was not in fact employed as it could

and should have been in the Resource Reports. Datalayers that are available including BioMap2 and Priority Habitat maps documenting the most ecologically sensitive locations in the state, along with associated information explaining each of the features in those maps including the natural communities and species associated with them. The failure to utilize the available, scientifically based resource information is a serious deficiency resulting in incomplete and superficial analysis of the significant impacts of the project.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Mass Audubon requests that PERC withdraw the Notice of Intent to Prepare an EIS and instead require TGP/Kinder Morgan to first conduct further analysis of project need and alternatives as well as environmental impacts. In the event FERC denies this request, please consider these comments in preparing the Scope for the EIS.

Sincerely,

Gary R. Clayton

Acting President/Vice President for Conservation Programs

Cc: MA EFSB & DPU

MA AG Maura Healey

MA Energy and Environmental Affairs Secretary Mathew Beaton

-----

1 UMass, Amherst, A Natural Resources Assessment of the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's Proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project's Pipeline Route Within Massachusetts, 2015.

2 <http://aceee.org/files/pdf/state-sheet!massachusetts.pdf>

3 The Analysis Group, The Economic Impacts of the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative on Nine Northeast and Mid-Atlantic States - Review of RGGI's Second Three-Year Compliance Period (2012-2014), 2015,

4 Massachusetts Clean Energy Center, 2014 Massachusetts Clean Energy Industry Report,

5 [http://www.ucsusa.org/clean\\_energy/our-energy-choices/coal-and-other-fossil-fuels/environmental-impacts-of-natural-gas.html](http://www.ucsusa.org/clean_energy/our-energy-choices/coal-and-other-fossil-fuels/environmental-impacts-of-natural-gas.html). Va-DhvlViko

6 [www.tpl.org/return-investment-parks-and-open-space-massachusetts](http://www.tpl.org/return-investment-parks-and-open-space-massachusetts)

7 New England Forestry Foundation, Inc, VS. Board of Assessors of Hawley 468 Mass, 138, <http://masscases.com/cases/sjc/468/468mass13g.htm>

**20150723-5061**

Commonwealth of Massachusetts  
**MASSACHUSETTS SENATE**  
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

SENATOR STAN ROSENBERG

PRESIDENT

Hampshire, Franklin and Worcester District

July 14, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, NE

Room 1A

Washington, D.C. 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. Docket No. PFI4-22-000

Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Ms. Bose:

I am writing to you regarding the Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for

the Planned Northeast Energy Direct Project (NED), Request for Comments on Environmental Issues, and Notice of Public Scoping Meetings in Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. Docket No. PF14-22-000 issued by the staff of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) on June 30, 2015. In the notice, FERC states that the Commission will use the scoping process to gather input from the public and interested agencies on environmental issues related to the Project in accordance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

The proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project (NED) if permitted, would have a substantial impact on towns in my district and there is significant opposition to the Project overall in those communities on environmental and other grounds. The schedule set by FERC staff for the public scoping sessions does not give adequate time to affected communities to prepare a technical analysis and substantive response to the Company's plans to construct and operate 412 miles of new natural gas transmission pipeline and associated facilities. The only proposed hearing in my district is scheduled for July 29, 2015 at Greenfield Middle School. Given the magnitude of this project, it is incumbent upon FERC to make sure that everyone who seeks to participate is able to do so, and one hearing scheduled mid-summer is insufficient for the public and town officials.

Therefore, I respectfully request that you postpone the scoping hearing scheduled for Greenfield until September at the earliest to make sure that stakeholders in my community are able to discuss the impacts of the NED Project on the myriad issues considered in the EIS pursuant to NEPA. If FERC is not willing to postpone the July 29th hearing, I request that the Commission schedule a second hearing at a later date, but prior to issuance of an EIS and a formal application, in order to inform the staff analysis. Finally, I also request that FERC reschedule the filing deadline for written and electronic comments until thirty days after the new Resource Reports are filed.

Evaluation of a project this size must be thorough and complete with maximum participation by the public. I appreciate your consideration of my requests and ask for immediate action on postponement.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely

STAN ROSENBERG

President of the Senate

Hampshire, Franklin and Worcester District

**20150723-5131**

Velitchka LaPier, Nassau, NY.

July 23, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, NE

Washington, DC 20426

Re: Northeast Energy Direct Project, Docket #PF14-22

Dear Secretary Bose:

I recently learned about the so-called "Northeast Energy Direct Project" and I wanted to express some serious concerns. I strongly oppose the high-pressure fracked-gas pipeline and compressor stations that Kinder Morgan Energy and Tennessee Gas are proposing to build, most likely across the street from my house in Nassau NY.

First, I would like to ask the question why the first piece of information that I received from Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas and from FERC regarding this project was not until June 2015, nine months after the company's initial pre-filing. To plan and propose such an enormous project without having a clear idea about the route and lands through which the construction of the gas pipelines and huge compressor stations

would occur is absolutely ridiculous. What it looks like is that this information was intentionally delayed in order to prevent the public from becoming informed and being able to react and have enough time to oppose this ridiculous project. In addition, all the documentation that Tennessee Gas has submitted so far seems to be incomplete or somewhat inaccurate. Where is the thorough analysis from the company proving that the benefits from this project will significantly outweigh the negative effects. How can somebody propose such a massive project without this kind of analysis being done upfront?

In their letter to us dated 6/4/15, Tennessee Gas provided us with a web site ([http://www.kinder Morgan.com/business/gas\\_pipelines/east/needenergydirect/](http://www.kinder Morgan.com/business/gas_pipelines/east/needenergydirect/)) that they created for additional information. I visited that web site and what I see is information about all the ‘great’ benefits that this project will bring to the local communities. For example, mentioning the inflow of taxes from this project that will benefit the local economies. However, if you read the NYDEC’s final findings on fracked gas (available on their web site <http://www.dec.ny.gov/energy/75370.html> ) you can see estimates of the additional funds and resources that a local government would need in order to be able to oversee and ensure compliance to the enormous mitigation measures that would be needed to reduce the adverse effects of fracked gas. So this benefit appears to no longer be a benefit, but it may actually lead to tax increases to cover these additional expenses or cuts to funding for education or other important projects.

On that web site I also see information about fracked natural gas being presented as a ‘clean’ energy compared to coal and other fossil fuels because it has lower emissions of carbon dioxide. Yes, research has shown that fracked natural gas does have lower emissions of carbon dioxide. But I would not classify this as ‘clean’ energy. Where is the information about the emissions of methane, formaldehyde, benzene and other toxic chemicals released from gas pipelines and compressor stations? Methane is known to be one of the greenhouse gases and even more devastating to environment than carbon dioxide. Having people and especially children exposed to these toxic chemicals will deteriorate peoples’ health and will increase health care costs that are already out of control. If a catastrophic event takes place, local fire departments may not be equipped to respond adequately because they may not have the proper training and resources to do this. Again, this information is not provided because the company does not want the public to be fully informed and make an educated opinion.

The damage to our infrastructure and beautiful landscape will be inevitable – deforestation will occur during construction, which will cause loss of habitat to so many species that live in our area – deer, foxes, herons, owls, bald eagles, hawks, bats, butterflies, black bears, turtles, fish, and so many more (some of them endangered). Noise, air and water pollution will have such huge impact on environment, which no mitigation measures can really prevent. Research by NY DEC shows that the most significant threats to biodiversity in NY state currently are habitat destruction, alteration and fragmentation, pollution and climate change – all these negative effects will only be increased if the NED project gets approved.

So where exactly is the benefit for the people? Where is the research to prove that this project is even needed?

My family moved from Boston to this area for the clean air, the tranquility of the rural settings and the nature that surrounds us. We chose to live here and have been paying taxes for the last 10 years. How can somebody allow some company to build pipelines and toxic compressor stations in residential areas and destroy mine and so many other families’ lives by taking their land and exposing them to toxins? We are NOT just yellow dots on a map. Those yellow dots are people, children that will be within the so called “incineration zone” of the proposed huge compressor stations. There are schools in very close proximity of the compressor stations and the pipeline. We have the same right to our land and to clean air, water and environment as you do or any other person in this country. How can somebody justify a project that puts peoples’ health and life in danger and creates irreversible damage to the environment and the planet, and present this as a project “for the benefit and convenience of the people”? Is this the democracy that we pretend we have, where peoples’ voices become insignificant under the weight of a multi-billion dollar company?

Please, Secretary Bose, consider our concerns and all the research and scientific evidence of the enormous

negative impacts of natural gas fracking development activities and do not approve the Northeast Energy Direct Project. I urge you to use the power of your office to stop this unneeded project.

Sincerely,

Velitchka LaPier

**20150723-5144**

Mary Raven, Merrimack, NH.

I am writing to express my opposition to the pipeline proposed by Kinder-Morgan Northeast Energy Direct. I oppose it because the pipeline will provide no benefit to the people of New Hampshire, even though the pipeline will go through several towns in that state.

It will also be a potential hazard, both because of potential explosions, but also because of other pollution. This pipeline will go through a nature preserve called "Horse Hill." It will not be much of a nature preserve if there are leaks or explosions.

Instead of supporting this pipeline, please use your considerable influence to support more diverse sources of energy.

Thank you.

M Raven

**20150723-5162**

Margaret Huard  
13 David Drive  
Hudson, NH 03051  
603-578-9346

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: Environmental concerns for FERC's EIS report to Tennessee Gas Pipeline/Kinder Morgan  
FERC Docket # PF14-22

July 23, 2015

Dear Commissioners,

Please find below my environmental concerns specific for my property, neighborhood and town.

My home is FOUR houses down from the power lines and within or very close to the edge of the 1000 ft. that is considered to be a blast/incineration zone!

An explosion of this nature would be completely devastating to not only the environment, including our home and neighborhood, but a good amount of the rest of Hudson, NH as well because David Drive is a SENSITIVE ENVIRONMENTAL AREA.

David Drive is a watershed to one of our town's (Hudson, NH) greatest treasures, Robinson Pond. (See map of watershed area) This area is also home to numerous wildlife animals, including deer, red tail hawks, wild turkeys, numerous birds, etc. This is NOT properly noted in Tennessee Gas Pipeline/Kinder Morgan pre-filing proposal.

This watershed area has an intricate pipe system that carries ground water all the way from David Drive to a pond below our road some distance.

If this matter is not identified correctly and the proper procedures are not followed to protect this environment, the proposed project will negligently cause a significant amount of damage to one of Hudson's trea-

tures, Robinson Pond during BOTH construction and operation of the pipeline as well as any explosion. There are NUMEROUS wealthy families around the pond that will be effected by this negligence.

We also have a private well and septic that will be damaged by the construction. The well obviously provides us with drinking water that also feeds off of an aquifer that will be devastated during construction AND operation of any natural gas pipeline in the area as well as complete devastation in the event of an explosion.

Depending on the direction in which the final project goes, we stand to lose at least TWO entire houses along the power lines. This will devastate the balance of the environment by disturbing the homes for numerous wildlife.

I am certain that it is quite negligent of both the FERC and Tennessee Gas Pipeline/Kinder Morgan to gather and consider such important and devastating environmental issues in the manner in which you are. There have been so many letters that have been written to the FERC at this point, I wonder how many will be read and considered. In order to know that you have received and read this complaint, I ask that you send a short acknowledgment to me personally. If I do not receive this, I will assume that you did not receive this comment.

Regretfully,

Margaret Huard

*{Volunteer Lake Assessment Program Individual Lake Reports ROBINSON POND, HUDSON, NH}  
{with map, charts and graphs not reproduced here}*

#### **20150724-0011**

Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr., Deputy Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

Date: 7/18/15

RE: Denying property access

FERC PF 14-22 Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Project

As the owner of the property located at:

125 Slivko Rd, Nassau NY 12123

I am denying permission to Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land to perform surveys, or for any other purpose.

Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Jeffrey Raton

#### **20150724-0012**

Hand written card, Dennis Gauvin, 61 Beechwood Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, opposing

#### **20150724-0013**

Hand written card, Kathleen Gauvin, 61 Beechwood Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, opposing

**20150724-0027**

July 17, 2015

Ms. Kimberly Bose  
Docket # PF14-22  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

Dear Ms. Bose:

Kinder Morgan has failed to demonstrate the need for more gas in New Hampshire.

New Hampshire is a net exporter of power. New Hampshire net generation of power in 2012 was 19,264 thousand mega-watt hours, while consumption was only 10,870 thousand mega-watt hours.

I am opposed to this pipeline project.

Kafen Guadagni  
76 Greenbriar Road  
New Ipswich, NH 03071

**20150724-0057**

**Pennsylvania  
DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION  
AND NATURAL RESOURCES  
BUREAU OF FORESTRY**

Date July 15, 2015

PNDI Number: 22450

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company — Susquehanna West Project  
8.2 miles of Looping and 3 Compressors Stations  
Bradford dt Tioga Counties

Dear Ms. Bose,

Thank you for submission of the Pennsylvania Natural Diversity Inventory (PNDI) Environmental Review Receipt Number 22450 for review. PA Department of Conservation and Natural Resources screened this project for potential impacts to species and resources of concern under DCNR's responsibility, which includes plants, terrestrial invertebrates, natural communities, and geologic features only.

This project was reviewed November 20, 2014. Potential Impact was anticipated and a survey was requested. I have enclosed a copy of this correspondence for your information.

Should you have any questions or concerns, please contact Rich Shockey, Ecological Information Specialist, by phone (717-772-0263) or via email (c-rshockey@ua.aovh)

Sincerely,

Natural Heritage Program  
DCNR Bureau of Forestry

-----

Pennsylvania  
DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION  
AND NATURAL RESOURCES

BUREAU OF FORESTRY

November 20, 2014

PNDI Number: 22300

Matthew Stetter

Tetra Tech

Email: matt.stettertetratech.com (hard copy will NOT follow)

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company

Susquehanna West Project —0.2 miles of Looping and 3 Compressor Stations

Tioga and Bradford County, PA

Dear Mr. Stetter,

Thank you for the submission of the Pennsylvania Natural Diversity Inventory (PNDI) Environmental Review Receipt Number 22300 for review. PA Department of Conservation and Natural Resources screened this project for potential impacts to species and resources under DCNR's responsibility, which includes plants, terrestrial invertebrates, natural communities, and geologic features only. The proposed project will affect State Forest Lands within the Tioga State Forest District. Further coordination with the Bureau of Forestry is required. Additional information regarding this coordination is provided under the heading "Projects on State Forest Lands."

**Potential Impact Anticipated**

PNDI records indicate species or resources under DCNR's jurisdiction are located in the project vicinity. Based on a detailed PNDI review, DCNR determined potential impacts to the following threatened or endangered species or species of special concern.

**Survey Request**

There are species known within the proposed project area and nearby that use habitat types that may be present within the project footprint; therefore, we are requesting a qualified botanist conduct a survey for the species listed in the attached charts (habitat and flowering time information from The Plants of Pennsylvania, 2 Edition, by Rhoads and Block) at the appropriate time of year and then submitted to our office for review.

Your botanist should carefully review the new DCNR Botanical Survey Protocols available at <http://www.uis.dcnr.state.pa.us/huis-er/Loain.aspx>. These protocols are recommended to ensure that the all necessary information is collected and that survey reports are prepared properly. It is the expectation of DCNR that these protocols will be followed when conducting surveys for species under our jurisdiction. Contact our office prior to the survey for detailed information about the species, or for a list of qualified surveyors.

Any target and non-target state-listed species found during the site visit should be reported to our office. Mitigation measures and monitoring may be requested if species or communities of special concern are found on or adjacent to site. If the land type(s) does not exist onsite a survey may not be necessary; please submit a habitat assessment report which describes the current land cover, habitat types and species found onsite.

**Projects on State Forest Lands**

This project takes place on the Sproul State Forest District. The DCNR Bureau of Forestry's State Forest Resource Management Plan sets forth guidelines for ecologically-sound management of State Forest Lands and resources including protection of wetlands, wildlife, native wild plants and invasive species management. As such, the DCNR Bureau of Forestry may request additional surveys in association with this project. This letter applies to PNDI impacts only and does not authorize the initiation of any work on State Forest lands. Further coordination with the Bureau of Forestry is required. If you have not already done so, please contact Justin Shaffer, District Forester for Tioga State Forest, at 570.724.6575 for additional information.

This response represents the most up-to-date review of the PNDI data files and is valid for two years. If

project plans change or more information on listed or proposed species becomes available, our determination may be reconsidered. For PNHI project updates, please see the PNHP website at [www.naturalheritage.slate.na.us](http://www.naturalheritage.slate.na.us) for guidance. As a reminder, this finding applies to potential impacts under DCNR's jurisdiction only. Visit the PNHP website for directions on contacting the Commonwealth's other resource agencies for environmental review.

Should you have any questions or concerns, please contact Emilee Boyer Euker, Ecological Information Specialist at 717.787.7067 or [c-eboyerpa.gov](mailto:c-eboyerpa.gov).

Sincerely,

Rebecca H. Bovven, Section Chief  
Bureau of Foresuy, Ecological Services Section  
Pennsylvania Natural Heritage Program

*{chart, not reproduced here}*

**20150724-0058**

122 Jaffrey Road  
Fitzwilliam, NH 03447

July 20, 2015

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE  
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Docket 1PF14-224000

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to you to express my objections to the plan for the Northeast Energy Direct Project involving the construction and operation of facilities by the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company LLC (Kinder Morgan) in Fitzwilliam, New Hampshire and surrounding communities.

The construction of the pipeline will involve drilling and fracking that would disturb forever the delicate ecosystem we enjoy in this area. We are known for Rhododendron State Park, Monadnock Conservancy conservation lands, Scott Pond and family farms among others.

Due to our rural nature, most homeowners in the area rely solely on septic systems and leach fields for waste disposal and drilled or artesian wells for water. Even though our property is not directly on the pipeline route, the disturbance created by the drilling and fracking will reach far from the point of impact and could ultimately reach our property.

It is also my understanding that the construction and operation of the line once constructed will not create any local jobs as out-of-state and expert contractors rather than local contractors will be used.

Once construction has been completed, Kinder Morgan depends on chemicals for maintenance that are widely recognized to cause long-term damage to aquatic life, human life, birds and native plants.

In addition, none of the gas from the pipeline will be available to our area. We would merely serve as a conduit to deliver the gas to the coast and other markets.

In view of the devastating effect of climate change being demonstrated on a global level, I believe it is time to invest in the expansion of non-fossil fuels such as solar or wind as they are the least damaging to the environment rather than construct a natural gas pipeline.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Theresa L Robbitts

**20150724-0059**

Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr., Deputy Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

Date: 7/18/15

RE: Denying property access

FERC PF 14-22 Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Project

As the owner of the property located at:

80 Slivko Rd Nassau N.Y. 12123

I am denying permission to Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land to perform surveys, or for any other purpose.

Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Vincent A Fedorowicz Jr

**20150724-0060**

Hand written letter, Barb Zabriskie, 305 Abel Road, Rindge, NH 03461, opposing

**20150724-0061**

July 13, 2015

Dear Governor Hassan,

Thank you for sharing your views regarding the pipeline. I must say I am saddened to hear that you think the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline will bring benefit to New Hampshire.

It feels like the negative effects of this pipeline do not matter to elected officials. Well it matters to all of us who are being asked to live near a compressor station that will have 80,000- horsepower hub of noise, toxic chemicals and frequent “blow downs.” Where I live I can hear the cows moo — this is where the compressor station is proposed to go — near a beautiful farm. I enjoy the soft sounds of cows. What makes you think I want to hear a compressor station that sounds like a locomotive running 24/7? I cannot live near this compressor station and I ask if you, your family or friends would want to live there?

If you want this to go through I highly recommend that in your agreement with Kinder Morgan they must offer to buy the homes in the “burn zone” for fair market value if the owner wishes to sell! If you don’t do this my home will become worthless, it won’t sell for fair market value and I will eventually have to walk away with nothing — because I will not be able to live in the type of safe, clean environment that everyone in New Hampshire is entitled to!

After doing the research I am convinced the pipeline construction process will pollute our air, contaminate our aquifers, wells and other water resources. Over 800 NH families will lose their homes and it will destroy conservation lands. It will harm the tourist industry and rural character of New Hampshire.

As our Governor I’m not sure why you cannot see this. I think it’s time for a change for those representing New Hampshire.

Most Sincerely,

Roger & Joan Crooker  
Temple, NH  
cc:FERC

**20150724-0065**

Hand written letter, Barb Zabriskie, 305 Abel Road, Rindge, NH 03461, TO NH Public Utilities Commission, opposing Liberty Utilities applications

**20150724-0072**

**TOWN OF HUDSON  
Board of Selectmen**

12 School Street Hudson, New Hampshire 03051 603/886-6024 FAX 603/598-6481

July 10, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC, Docket No. PF14-22-000 (Reg. No. 18301 FERC ID # F291489)

Dear Ms. Bose:

The Town of Hudson, New Hampshire, is one of seventeen New Hampshire towns affected by the proposed Northeast Energy Direct (NED) high-pressure gas pipeline project as proposed by the Kinder Morgan Company and the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company. The Hudson Board of Selectmen is strongly in favor of increasing our energy supply in both availability and pricing to benefit more businesses in coming to the town and region, but believes that the Kinder Morgan project is too excessive for the Town of Hudson and the region.

Based on the citizens' testimony at a public meeting held by the Board of Selectmen on June 16, 2015 with representatives from Kinder Morgan and based on all of the information that we have acquired, we believe that this is not the best project for this area. We respectfully request that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission consider other approved or proposed lines along already established pipeline corridors in New England.

On June 23, 2015, the Hudson Board of Selectmen voted unanimously to oppose the proposed Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline.

Sincerely,

HUDSON BOARD OF SELECTMEN

Richard J. Maddox,  
Chairman

**20150724-5001**

Jim Parison, New Ipswch, NH.

Dear FERC ,

Thanks for sending notification to my email of all comments and activity referencing the PF14-22 docket. The system worked well .... until today.

Now, I seem to be denied access to all documents...the error message says :

“ You do not have permission to view this file. Can not find this FileNet Document ID=30739832 !”

What happened? Can this be fixed?

Thanks for your prompt attention to this matter. There are scores of emails for me to review each day and I am now falling behind until this is fixed.

Kind Regards,

Jim Parison - State Representative  
NH House Science, Technology and Energy Committee  
James.Parison@leg.state.nh.us

**20150724-5003**

Jean Nigro, Temple, NH.  
July 23, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: Docket PF 14-22 (Kinder-Morgan /  
Tennessee Gas Pipeline proposed Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline)

Dear Secretary Bose,

I am writing to respectfully request that FERC stand by its Guiding Principles with regard to open and fair participation of all parties with an interest in the location of the NED pipeline and compression stations.

FERC's guiding principles dictate that it "to be open and fair to all participants" and "ensure that interested parties have an appropriate opportunity to contribute to the performance of the Commission's responsibilities."

With regard to the opportunities to contribute to discussion on the NED pipeline, and specifically the location of the compression station in New Ipswich, NH, I am calling on FERC to schedule a scoping meeting in that community to afford local residents the opportunity for participation. The currently scheduled meetings/venues do not allow for all participants to access those opportunities.

Additionally, New Ipswich officials and residents need full and unbiased information about the impact of the compression station on their community. Kinder Morgan has not provided any environmental impact information to the community and should be required to do so in order for "fairness for all participants" to be guaranteed. I am requesting that FERC require Kinder Morgan to provide financial compensation to New Ipswich and neighboring communities so that they may investigate the environmental impact. Without such information, local communities, residents and property owners have no way of participating fully in the discussion supporting the Commission's fulfillment of their responsibilities.

If FERC's actions indeed do adhere to its Guiding Principles, it will add accessible scoping meetings to its schedule and require an environmental impact study to be completed at the expense of Kinder Morgan.

Thank you for your consideration,

Jean Nigro

**20150724-5061**

**Submittal of Draft Environmental Report (Resource Reports 1 through 13) and Project Scope Update of Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. under PF14-22.**

NOTE: downloaded file names below include 20150724-5061 prefix, e.g., **20150724-5061(30742800).docx**

<u>FERC Name</u>	<u>KM Original File Name</u>	<u>(pgs)</u>	<u>Size KB</u>
(30742800).docx	NED_TransLtr_July 2015 ER Submittal_Update(July 24).DOCX	(4)	40

(30742801).pdf	NED_DataResponseMatrix_Complete_FINAL_20150721.PDF	(84)	601
(30742802).pdf	NED AcronymsAbbreviations_072415_Public FINAL.PDF	(16)	177
(30742803).pdf	NED Table of Contents_072415_Public FINAL.PDF	(6)	56

Resource Reports :

(30742804).pdf	NED VolII RR 01_072415_Public FINAL.PDF RR 1 GENERAL PROJECT DESCRIPTION	(273)	19,562
(30742805).pdf	NED VolII RR 02_072415_Public FINAL_01of06.PDF RR 2 WATER USE AND QUALITY 1/6 Pages 1-185 text; 186-210 surficial aquifer maps; (Mason on pg 200)	(210)	31,323
(30742806).pdf	NED VolII RR 02_072415_Public FINAL_02of06.PDF RR 2 WATER USE AND QUALITY 2/6 pages 1-3 surficial aquifer maps; 4-30 USEPA Sole Source Aquifer maps	(30)	35,908
(30742807).pdf	NED VolII RR 02_072415_Public FINAL_03of06.PDF RR 2 WATER USE AND QUALITY 3/6	(14)	27,053
(30742809).pdf	NED VolII RR 02_072415_Public FINAL_04of06.PDF RR 2 WATER USE AND QUALITY 4/6	(14)	38,499
(30742810).pdf	NED VolII RR 02_072415_Public FINAL_05of06.PDF RR 2 WATER USE AND QUALITY 5/6	(22)	27,048
(30742821).pdf	NED VolII RR 02_072415_Public FINAL_06of06.PDF RR 2 WATER USE AND QUALITY 6/6	(106)	44,956
(30742852).pdf	NED VolII RR 03_072415_Public FINAL.PDF RR 3 FISH, WILDLIFE AND VEGETATION	(186)	14,040
(30742853).pdf	NED VolII RR 04_072415_Public FINAL.PDF RR 4 CULTURAL RESOURCES	(132)	1,656
(30742854).pdf	NED VolII RR 05_072415_Public FINAL.PDF RR 5 SOCIOECONOMICS	(56)	256
(30742855).pdf	NED VolII RR 06_072415_Public FINAL_01of02.PDF RR 6 GEOLOGICAL RESOURCES 1/2	(120)	14,707
(30742856).pdf	NED VolII RR 06_072415_Public FINAL_02of02.PDF RR 6 GEOLOGICAL RESOURCES 2/2	(195)	43,278
(30742857).pdf	NED VolII RR 07_072415_Public FINAL_01of04.PDF RR 7 SOILS 1/4	(62)	35,586
(30742858).pdf	NED VolII RR 07_072415_Public FINAL_02of04.PDF RR 7 SOILS 2/4	(30)	37,517
(30742859).pdf	NED VolII RR 07_072415_Public FINAL_03of04.PDF RR 7 SOILS 3/4	(30)	38,290
(30742860).pdf	NED VolII RR 07_072415_Public FINAL_04of04.PDF RR 7 SOILS 4/4	(474)	13,958
(30742861).pdf	NED VolII RR 08_072415_Public FINAL_01of02.PDF RR 8 LAND USE, RECREATION AND AESTHETICS 1/2	(320)	44,544
(30742862).pdf	NED VolII RR 08_072415_Public FINAL_02of02.PDF RR 8 LAND USE, RECREATION AND AESTHETICS 2/2	(306)	23,168
(30742864).pdf	NED VolII RR 09_072415_Public FINAL.PDF RR 9 AIR AND NOISE QUALITY	(494)	4,036

(30742865).pdf	NED VolII RR 10_072415_Public FINAL.PDF RR 10 ALTERNATIVES	(124)	14,526
(30742866).pdf	NED VolII RR 11_072415_Public FINAL.PDF RR 11 RELIABILITY AND SAFETY	(36)	162
(30742867).pdf	NED VolII RR 12_072415_Public FINAL.PDF RR 12 PCB CONTAMINATION	(8)	46
(30742868).pdf	NED VolII RR 13_072415_Public FINAL.PDF RR 13 ADDITIONAL INFORMATION RELATED TO LNG PLANTS	(8)	45
Appendices : A - D			
(30742869).pdf	NED VolIII App A_AgyContactList_072415_Public FINAL.PDF Federal and State Regulatory Agency Contact List	(108)	1,022
(30742870).pdf	NED VolIII App B_AgyCorr_072415_Public FINAL_01of02.PDF Agency Correspondence (as of May 1, 2015), 1/2	(502)	46,001
(30742871).pdf	NED VolIII App B_AgyCorr_072415_Public FINAL_02of02.PDF Agency Correspondence (as of May 1, 2015), 2/2	(504)	33,045
(30742872).pdf	NED VolIII App C_GovNGO TownPres_072415 Public FINAL.PDF Government Officials / Non-Governmental Organizations Contact List / List of Town Presentations	(36)	200
(30742873).pdf	NED VolIII App D_PublicParticPlan_072415_Public FINAL.PDF Public Participation Plan	(8)	93
Appendix E : USGS 7.5 Minute Topographic Map Excerpts			
(30742874).pdf	NED VolIII App E USGS Excerpts_072415_Public FINAL.PDF	(2)	37
(30742875).pdf	NED_Vol II_App E__USGS_072415_SUPPLY.PDF	(46)	27,198
(30742876).pdf	NED_Vol II_App E_USGS_072415_LATERALS.PDF	(22)	40,046
(30742877).pdf	NED_Vol II_App E_USGS_072415_MKT.PDF	(52)	32,318
Appendix F : Aerial Alignment Sheets			
(30742878).pdf	NED VolIII App F AS_Cvr_072415_Pub Lat_01_OF_08.PDF	(1)	225
(30742879).pdf	NED VolIII App F AS_SegL_072415_Pub Lat_02_OF_08.PDF	(2)	6,901
(30742880).pdf	NED VolIII App F AS_SegM_072415_Pub Lat_03_OF_08.PDF	(1)	3,889
(30742881).pdf	NED VolIII App F AS_SegN_072415_Pub Lat_04_OF_08.PDF	(19)	41,119
(30742882).pdf	NED VolIII App F AS_SegO_072415_Pub Lat_05_OF_08.PDF	(6)	25,164
(30742883).pdf	NED VolIII App F AS_SegP_072415_Pub Lat_06_OF_08.PDF	(9)	35,977
(30742884).pdf	NED VolIII App F AS_SegQ_072415_Pub Lat_07_OF_08.PDF	(15)	17,837
(30742885).pdf	NED VolIII App F AS_SegS_072415_Pub Lat_08_OF_08.PDF	(17)	16,987
(30742886).pdf	NED VolIII App F AS_Cvr_072415_Pub Mkt_01_OF_12.PDF	(1)	311
(30742887).pdf	NED VolIII App F AS_SegF_072415_Pub Mkt_02_OF_12.PDF	(28)	32,633
(30742888).pdf	NED VolIII App F AS_SegF_072415_Pub Mkt_03_OF_12.PDF	(28)	32,133
(30742889).pdf	NED VolIII App F AS_SegG_072415_Pub Mkt_04_OF_12.PDF	(18)	29,537
(30742890).pdf	NED VolIII App F AS_SegG_072415_Pub Mkt_05_OF_12.PDF	(18)	21,120
(30742891).pdf	NED VolIII App F AS_SegH_072415_Pub Mkt_06_OF_12.PDF	(16)	42,670
(30742892).pdf	NED VolIII App F AS_SegH_072415_Pub Mkt_07_OF_12.PDF	(15)	20,991

(30742893).pdf	NED VolII App F AS_SegI_072415_Pub Mkt_08_OF_12.PDF	(16)	31,923
(30742895).pdf	NED VolII App F AS_SegI_072415_Pub Mkt_09_OF_12.PDF	(15)	18,919
(30742896).pdf	NED VolII App F AS_SegJ_072415_Pub Mkt_10_OF_12.PDF	(21)	26,611
(30742898).pdf	NED VolII App F AS_SegJ_072415_Pub Mkt_11_OF_12.PDF	(21)	27,183
(30742899).pdf	NED VolII App F AS_SegK_072415_Pub Mkt_12_OF_12.PDF	(3)	12,893
(30742900).pdf	NED VolII App F AS_Cvr_072415_Pub Sup_01_OF_09.PDF	(1)	299
(30742901).pdf	NED VolII App F AS_SegA_072415_Pub Sup_02_OF_09.PDF	(29)	37,297
(30742903).pdf	NED VolII App F AS_SegB_072415_Pub Sup_03_OF_09.PDF	(10)	23,656
(30742904).pdf	NED VolII App F AS_SegC_072415_Pub Sup_04_OF_09.PDF	(20)	26,677
(30742905).pdf	NED VolII App F AS_SegC_072415_Pub Sup_05_OF_09.PDF	(19)	20,816
(30742906).pdf	NED VolII App F AS_SegD_072415_Pub Sup_06_OF_09.PDF	(25)	23,680
(30742907).pdf	NED VolII App F AS_SegD_072415_Pub Sup_07_OF_09.PDF	(24)	21,561
(30742908).pdf	NED VolII App F AS_SegE_072415_Pub Sup_08_OF_09.PDF	(26)	27,986
(30742909).pdf	NED VolII App F AS_SegE_072415_Pub Sup_09_OF_09.PDF	(26)	26,094

#### Appendices : G, H

(30742910).pdf	NED VolII App G TypConstDwgs_072415_Public.PDF Appendix G : Typical Construction Drawings	(21)	1,405
(30742911).pdf	NED VolII App H Plan and Procedures_072415_Public FINAL.PDF Appendix H : Tennessee's Plan and Procedures	(31)	340

#### Appendix I : Full-Size National Wetland Inventory Maps

(30742912).pdf	NED VolII App I NWI Maps_072415_Public FINAL.PDF	(2)	37
(30742913).pdf	NED_Vol II_App I_NWI_072415_LATERALS.PDF	(22)	16,347
(30742914).pdf	NED_Vol II_App I_NWI_072415_MARKET.PDF	(52)	28,398
(30742915).pdf	NED_Vol II_App I_NWI_072415_SUPPLY.PDF	(46)	24,547

#### Appendices : J - O

(30742917).pdf	NED VolII App J_ECP PA_072415_Public FINAL.PDF Appendix J : Environmental Construction Plan for Pennsylvania	(256)	3,004
(30742918).pdf	NED VolII App K_ECP NY_072415_Public FINAL.PDF Appendix K : Environmental Construction Plan for New York	(310)	3,790
(30742919).pdf	NED VolII App L_ECP MA_072415_Public FINAL.PDF Appendix L : Environmental Construction Plan for Massachusetts	(294)	2,681
(30742920).pdf	NED VolII App M_ECP NH_072415_Public FINAL.PDF Appendix M : Environmental Construction Plan for New Hampshire	(266)	2,420
(30742921).pdf	NED VolII App N_ECP CT_072415_Public FINAL.PDF Appendix N : Environmental Construction Plan for Connecticut	(250)	2,030
(30742922).pdf	NED VolII App O HDD Plans_072415_Public FINAL.PDF Appendix O : Site-Specific Horizontal Directional Drill Plans	(4)	44

#### Appendix P : Residential Construction Plans

(30742923).pdf	NED VolII App P ResConstPlans_072415_Public FINAL.PDF	(2)	37
(30742924).pdf	NED_Vol II_App P_RES_072415_LATERALS.PDF	(53)	5,161

(30742925).pdf NED\_Vol II\_App P\_RES\_072415\_MARKET.PDF (77) 6,834  
(30742926).pdf NED\_Vol II\_App P\_RES\_072415\_SUPPLY.PDF (45) 4,356

**TOTALS: 81 files, 6,821 pages, 1,412 MB of data**

**NOTE: THE FOLLOWING APPENDICES ARE NOT RELEASED TO THE PUBLIC:**

Volume III – Privileged and Confidential Information – Do Not Release APPENDICES  
List of Affected Landowners (as of May 1, 2015) Appendix AA  
Rare Species Agency Consultation Appendix BB  
Overview Report (Cultural Resources) Appendix CC  
Agency Correspondence and Workplans (Cultural Resources) Appendix DD  
Tribal Government Correspondence (Cultural Resources) Appendix EE  
Volume IV – CEII – Do Not Release APPENDICES  
Preliminary Draft Compressor Station Drawings Appendix AAA

**20150724-5062 - PRIVILEGED**

**20150724-5063 - CEII**

**20150724-5091**

Donna Dailey, Merrimack, NH.

I am writing to express my concern & dismay regarding the proposed pipeline in my neighborhood of Merrimack, NH. I strongly oppose the pipeline because it will directly impact the safety of our children, our school, and our home values. NED has not been forthright in identifying the value of this project to the NH constituents. I believe we have not exhausted all other alternatives to meet the demand for natural gas in NH.

The project ends in MA & should not be routed through NH.

Thank you for your consideration,

Tom & Donna Dailey

4 Cambridge Dr. Merrimack, NH 03054

**20150724-5111**

Gina Weaver, New Ipswich, NH.

This is in regards to the Kinder Morgan Tennessee Gas Pipeline - Northeast Energy Direct Project. This project will cross through 17 towns in the state of NH and will include an 80,000 square foot compressor station to be built within less than a half mile from an elementary school and emergency shelter. It will also be across from a Nunnery which will need to be taken via eminent domain. As well as being near homes and will cause homes to be lost via eminent domain by a private company not a public utility. NH does not have an energy crisis this is just a statement trumped up by Kinder Morgan so that they can produce gas to sell and ship off to Canada. NH would never even see the gas that they will be ruining our state for. Another thing to point out is NH actually has enough energy that it has a surplus that is actually sold to the state that has a deficit which is Massachusetts. This pipeline is not needed in our state. Why should we have the environmental, health, and light pollution just to benefit another state.

There are other options if NH needs to service natural gas needs for other states. There are multiple pipeline companies such as Spectra Energy with their Access Northeast project or Portland Natural Gas Transmission System - PNGTS' Pittsburgh to Westbrook project that will be able to supply natural gas deep into NH as well as the rest of New England without taking homes via eminent domain or ruining landscapes. They already have pipelines in NH and an existing right of way. These projects will be less disruptive to the state of NH. Please think of the people of NH and the beautiful landscapes of this state and reject Kinder Mor-

gan's NED project.

Thank you!

**20150724-5124**

Dean Zirolli, Avon, CT.

I am troubled by the potential for this pipeline to pass within a mile radius of my Fitzwilliam, NH property. I fail to see the causal relationship of the energy need to match the requirement. Further, the potential harm to the local environment appears to be an afterthought in this proposed project. I live on a small lake called Rockwood Pond, and the electrical path that the pipeline is proposing to follow is within hundreds of yards of the dam that secures our lake water. I worry greatly about the possible impact that disturbance of the areas so close to our body of water and dam may have on the water quality and the long-term enjoyment of the lake. And frankly, I worry even more about the close proximity of the pipeline to the Troy Superfund site just north of our lake. The potential to disturb the remediation work done on that site for years has to be a high risk, and yet, it does not appear to be a priority factor under evaluation in approving the pipeline path. I am just one citizen, but thousands like me have similar concerns.

Please re-think this project, and definitely do not approve it as currently planned.

Thank you.

Dean Zirolli

**20150724-5137**

PF14-22 NED "NO ACTION" Plea to FERC

My name is John Serio I live in Stephentown. My property abuts the right of way where based on the most recent filings, it appears the pipeline is planned to be located.

I say "appears" because, like everything else about this project, the exact location and the project's details are vague, uncertain and confusing. The only thing we know for sure is that a huge company from an industry known for price and product supply manipulation is planning a venture that will enrich that company. And we suspect that the only way the project will be stopped is if the company decides to withdraw due to financial reasons. FERC'S decision whether this project should proceed should be based on the public good, NOT on market conditions or the company's expectation of profits from transporting gas overseas.

FERC's role only seems to be to make sure the pipeline project does the least damage possible to the public but not to consider whether the pipeline should be built at all. FERC seems to be more concerned about damage that might be done to Kinder Morgan's business plan than they are about the lives, environment and socio-economic dynamics of our communities, region and country.

The company's filings so far contain hundreds "To be determined" in places where there is supposed to be specific detail. And in many instances, FERC has accepted this with a request that the pipeline company just tell FERC when they will actually provide the information.

What is the final proposed path? Is the pipeline going go on the North or the South side of the Right Of Way? How far will the pipeline and the associated construction encroach on property that is not already covered by the ROW? How much land will be disturbed during construction and how much will they need to take from me and my neighbors? How close will any above ground facilities be to my home? Where exactly will they be located in any case? What construction methods will be used? How will the two intersecting rivers behind my home be protected? How will they be crossed? Will there be blasting along the steep rock ledge along the ROW behind my house? Should I believe that there will be erosion and silt run-off controls that will not damage these beautiful, natural rivers and my property? Who will be watching? Will the river which they appear to have to run parallel to for many yards ever be the same? Will re-cycled timber mats be used to protect sensitive areas from heavy construction equipment? Will those mats carry invasive species to the ROW and my property? How will heavy equipment get to the ROW when many of our rural bridges

only allow light weight vehicles? Will they be flushing the pipes with PCB laden water from the Hudson? And where will that water be disposed of? What else are they not telling us about the construction and operation process that we might comment on?

I could easily go on with questions like these. Questions about the cumulative effect of decisions that may harm our community, questions about the need for this project in light of the several pipeline projects currently being considered and recently approved, and the existing leaks that need repairing. And questions about how a cost-benefit analysis that includes the true, complete life cycle health, environmental and socio-economic costs of all the project's impacts could conclude that this it results in a net public benefit. But we seem to be participating in an enormous charade: How can we raise issues when so much about this project is unknown and characterized by the company as To Be Determined or Confidential and Privileged? I therefore hereby request that each public comment period be extended 90 days beyond the point when the details of the project are fully disclosed and that additional scoping meetings be held during that time.

FERC must take a hard look at the answers to each of the questions I have raised above and address them in any decision made on the project.

Projects like this only delay the development of natural solar, natural wind, geo-thermal and other clean energy options. For this socio-economic reason alone FERC must take a hard look at the "no action" alternative under the National Environmental Policy Act and conclude that this project should not proceed. Supporting a project that is guaranteed to spew dangerous methane into the environment makes no sense.

The US Department of Defense has concluded that the international unrest that will be caused by climate change has the potential to be a huge national security threat. Methane is a powerful contributor to global warming. FERC must also take a hard look at this dangerous consequence of approving infrastructure that will definitely release noxious methane while delaying the growth of clean, really natural energy sources. Surely, in the long run, this anticipated threat to national security outweighs any contrived argument for introducing huge quantities of methane (although the supply will run out one day) to the atmosphere because it will make the US "energy independent". The sun, the wind, geo-thermal and improving energy efficiency can accomplish this, and forever!

FERC should convey the good reasons that this project is not in the public's interest to Kinder Morgan so they may withdraw this proposal and save FERC and the public any further inconvenience. Perhaps then they will consider partnering with New York communities on projects where they can make some money while doing some good locally.

July 24, 2015

**20150727-0007**

**STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE  
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR**

MARGARET WOOD HASSAN  
Governor

July 16, 2015

Norman C. Bay, Chairman  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: Docket No. PF14-22-000 Public Scoping Meetings

Dear Chairman Bay:

I write to request that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission schedule additional public scoping meetings in New Hampshire for the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project. The Commission's current plan, to hold only three such meetings, and none in locations along the middle of the proposed route, will not pro-

vide adequate opportunity for our citizens to learn and provide input about a project that has a potentially critical impact on the state's economy and environment.

As you know, your agency recently announced that it will hold public scoping meetings in New Hampshire regarding the NED Project proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline. To date, only two such meetings have been scheduled with a suggestion that there will be a third. Given the significance of this project to the people along the project's route, additional meetings —providing a choice of locations and times —will afford more meaningful access for our people. In addition, there appears to be no plan for a scoping meeting in New Ipswich, New Hampshire, the proposed location of one of the NED Project's compressor stations. It is difficult for New Ipswich residents to understand why such a meeting isn't a priority for the Commission, and I share their concern.

As you know, it is the responsibility of the Commission to ensure that any potential impacts to host communities are avoided or mitigated. By holding additional public scoping meetings along the proposed route, Commission staff will have a better understanding of the potential impacts of the proposed project and the best path forward. Additional scoping meetings will also ensure greater transparency and public participation in the process.

It is imperative that we ensure that all citizens have ample opportunity to participate in this important process to voice their concerns. The capacity of the Commission to be responsive to the concerns that citizens have about the number and location of the scoping meetings is really a measure of its commitment to the process.

Thank you for your consideration.

With every good wish,  
Margaret Wood Hassan  
Governor

**20150727-0008**

Commonwealth of Massachusetts  
**MASSACHUSETTS SENATE**  
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

SENATOR STAN ROSENBERG  
PRESIDENT  
Hampshire, Franklin and Worcester District  
July 14,2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Room 1A  
Washington, D.C. 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. Docket No. PF14-22-000  
Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Ms. Bose:

I am writing to you regarding the Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Planned Northeast Energy Direct Project (NED), Request for Comments on Environmental Issues, and Notice of Public Scoping Meetings in Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. Docket No. PF14-22-000 issued by the staff of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) on June 30,2015. In the notice, FERC states that the Commission will use the scoping process to gather input from the public and interested agencies on environmental issues related to the Project in accordance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

The proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project (NED) if permitted, would have a substantial impact on towns in my district and there is significant opposition to the Project overall in those communities on environmental and other grounds. The schedule set by FERC staff for the public scoping sessions does not give adequate time to affected communities to prepare a technical analysis and substantive response to the Company's plans to construct and operate 412 miles of new natural gas transmission pipeline and associated facilities. The only proposed hearing in my district is scheduled for July 29, 2015 at Greenfield Middle School. Given the magnitude of this project, it is incumbent upon FERC to make sure that everyone who seeks to participate is able to do so, and one hearing scheduled mid-summer is insufficient for the public and town officials.

Therefore, I respectfully request that you postpone the scoping hearing scheduled for Greenfield until September at the earliest to make sure that stakeholders in my community are able to discuss the impacts of the NED Project on the myriad issues considered in the EIS pursuant to NEP A. If FERC is not willing to postpone the July 29th hearing, I request that the Commission schedule a second hearing at a later date, but prior to issuance of an EIS and a formal application, in order to inform the staff analysis. Finally, I also request that FERC reschedule the filing deadline for written and electronic comments until thirty days after the new Resource Reports are filed.

Evaluation of a project this size must be thorough and complete with maximum participation by the public. I appreciate your consideration of my requests and ask for immediate action on postponement.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely

STAN ROSENBERG  
President of the Senate  
Hampshire, Franklin and Worcester District

**20150727-0009**

**STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE  
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR**

MARGARET WOOD HASSAN  
Governor

July 16, 2015

Norman C. Bay, Chairman  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: Docket No. PF14-22-000 Public Scoping Meetings

Dear Chairman Bay:

I write to request that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission schedule additional public scoping meetings in New Hampshire for the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project. The Commission's current plan, to hold only three such meetings, and none in locations along the middle of the proposed route, will not provide adequate opportunity for our citizens to learn and provide input about a project that has a potentially critical impact on the state's economy and environment.

As you know, your agency recently announced that it will hold public scoping meetings in New Hampshire regarding the NED Project proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline. To date, only two such meetings have been scheduled with a suggestion that there will be a third. Given the significance of this project to the people along the project's route, additional meetings — providing a choice of locations and times — will afford more meaningful access for our people. In addition, there appears to be no plan for a scoping meeting in New Ipswich, New Hampshire, the proposed location of one of the NED Project's compressor stations. It is

difficult for New Ipswich residents to understand why such a meeting isn't a priority for the Commission, and I share their concern.

As you know, it is the responsibility of the Commission to ensure that any potential impacts to host communities are avoided or mitigated. By holding additional public scoping meetings along the proposed route, Commission staff will have a better understanding of the potential impacts of the proposed project and the best path forward. Additional scoping meetings will also ensure greater transparency and public participation in the process.

It is imperative that we ensure that all citizens have ample opportunity to participate in this important process to voice their concerns. The capacity of the Commission to be responsive to the concerns that citizens have about the number and location of the scoping meetings is really a measure of its commitment to the process.

Thank you for your consideration.

With every good wish,

Margaret Wood Hassan  
Governor

**20150727-0017**

Hand written card, Devorah Hanson, PO Box 19, Temple, NH 03084, opposing.

**20150727-0018**

Hand written card, Celia A Kaski, 450 River Road, New Ipswich, NH 03071, opposing

**20150727-0019**

Hand written card, Frances Heury, 28 Old Rte 9, Cummington, MA 10126, opposing

**20150727-0026**

Card, Patricia C. Lee, 234 East Rd, Temple, NH 03084, asking when Scoping meetings scheduled in the towns of New Ipswich, Temple, Greenville and Mason, NH.

All these towns would be affected by the potential compressor station.

**20150727-0027**

July 20, 2015

Dear Senator Ayotte,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Senator, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England.

The pipeline construction process will pollute our air, contaminate our aquifers, wells and other water resources. Over 800 NH families will lose their homes and it will destroy conservation lands. It will harm the tourist industry and rural character of New Hampshire.

The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent "blow downs" where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline. These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis and will eventually cause ruin to all of New Hampshire.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station, including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby. Are the

children of New Hampshire not important?

The property values near the pipeline and compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit! The only one benefiting is Kinder Morgan - making tons of money off of people who are struggling on a day-to-day basis to make ends meet and now will lose everything they have worked so hard for all their lives!

Senator Ayotte, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

Nat & Holly Crooker

**20150727-0028**

July 20, 2015

Dear Governor Hassan,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Governor, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England.

The pipeline construction process will pollute our air, contaminate our aquifers, wells and other water resources. Over 800 NH families will lose their homes and it will destroy conservation lands. It will harm the tourist industry and rural character of New Hampshire.

The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent "blow downs" where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline. These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis and will eventually cause ruin to all of New Hampshire.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station, including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby. Are the children of New Hampshire not important?

The property values near the pipeline and compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit! The only one benefiting is Kinder Morgan - making tons of money off of people who are struggling on a day-to-day basis to make ends meet and now will lose everything they have worked so hard for all their lives!

Governor Hassan, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

Nat & Holly Crooker

**20150727-0029**

July 20, 2015

Dear Senator Shaheen,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Senator, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England.

The pipeline construction process will pollute our air, contaminate our aquifers, wells and other water resources. Over 800 NH families will lose their homes and it will destroy conservation lands. It will harm the tourist industry and rural character of New Hampshire.

The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent "blow downs" where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline. These gasses can travel anywhere from

one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis and will eventually cause ruin to all of New Hampshire.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station, including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby. Are the children of New Hampshire not important?

The property values near the pipeline and compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit! The only one benefiting is Kinder Morgan - making tons of money off of people who are struggling on a day-to-day basis to make ends meet and now will lose everything they have worked so hard for all their lives!

Senator Shaheen, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

Nat & Holly Crooker

**20150727-0040**

*{was "File 30754732\_1.tif cannot be converted to PDF"; easily OCR converted here}*

July 21,2015

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co LLC

PO Box 1008

Oneonta, NY 13820

And

Kimberly D Rose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First St, NE Room 1A

Washington, DC 20426

RE: Docket No. PF14-22-000

Dimock Twp, Susquehanna Co. Pa.

Map# 180.00-1,067.00

Dear Sir and/or Madam:

We are respectfully requesting a change in your proposed pipeline project through our property. The requested change would follow an existing pipeline on our property. This would lessen the environmental impact of forest and plant vegetation that protects erosion into White's Creek and not disturb semiwetlands on the west side of the creek. It would also cross the creek where an existing line crosses. We believe that this route would be more time and cost effective for your company by utilizing land that is already cleared.

We are enclosing a copy of your original proposal map with notations of existing pipelines on our and neighboring properties and our proposal for your pipeline.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

Jerry A. Myers and Pamela Jenner

3031 State Route 3021

Springville, Pa 18844

570-278-9296

*{map, not included here}*

**20150727-0074**

July 20, 2015

Dear Congressman Guinta,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Congressman, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England.

The pipeline construction process will pollute our air, contaminate our aquifers, wells and other water resources. Over 800 NH families will lose their homes and it will destroy conservation lands. It will harm the tourist industry and rural character of New Hampshire.

The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent "blow downs" where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline. These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis and will eventually cause ruin to all of New Hampshire.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station, including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby. Are the children of New Hampshire not important?

The property values near the pipeline and compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit! The only one benefiting is Kinder Morgan - making tons of money off of people who are struggling on a day-to-day basis to make ends meet and now will lose everything they have worked so hard for all their lives!

Congressman Guinta, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

Roger & Joan Crooker

**20150727-0075**

July 20, 2015

Dear Congresswoman Kuster,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Congresswoman, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England.

The pipeline construction process will pollute our air, contaminate our aquifers, wells and other water resources. Over 800 NH families will lose their homes and it will destroy conservation lands. It will harm the tourist industry and rural character of New Hampshire.

The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent "blow downs" where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline. These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis and will eventually cause ruin to all of New Hampshire.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station, including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby. Are the children of New Hampshire not important?

The property values near the pipeline and compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit! The only one

benefiting is Kinder Morgan - making tons of money off of people who are struggling on a day-to-day basis to make ends meet and now will lose everything they have worked so hard for all their lives!

Congresswoman Kuster, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

Roger & Joan Crooker

**20150727-0076**

July 20, 2015

Dear Congressman Guinta,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Congressman, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England.

The pipeline construction process will pollute our air, contaminate our aquifers, wells and other water resources. Over 800 NH families will lose their homes and it will destroy conservation lands. It will harm the tourist industry and rural character of New Hampshire.

The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent "blow downs" where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline. These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis and will eventually cause ruin to all of New Hampshire.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station, including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby. Are the children of New Hampshire not important?

The property values near the pipeline and compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit! The only one benefiting is Kinder Morgan - making tons of money off of people who are struggling on a day-to-day basis to make ends meet and now will lose everything they have worked so hard for all their lives!

Congressman Guinta, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

*{signature not legible}*

**20150727-0077**

July 20, 2015

Dear Congresswoman Kuster,

We are writing to ask that you, as our Congresswoman, oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline. This project will bring no benefit to New Hampshire and little to no benefit to New England.

The pipeline construction process will pollute our air, contaminate our aquifers, wells and other water resources. Over 800 NH families will lose their homes and it will destroy conservation lands. It will harm the tourist industry and rural character of New Hampshire.

The proposed compressor station will be a high-pressure, 80,000-horsepower hub of toxic chemicals and deafening noise, prone to frequent "blow downs" where volatile organic compounds and carcinogenic gases are released into the air to reduce pressure on the pipeline. These gasses can travel anywhere from one to one hundred miles depending on how the wind blows and they can cause a host of health problems

for people, ecosystems and water bodies on a day-to-day basis and will eventually cause ruin to all of New Hampshire.

In the event of a catastrophic disaster, any building within a half mile radius of the compressor station, including the Temple Elementary School will likely burn to the ground along with anyone nearby. Are the children of New Hampshire not important?

The property values near the pipeline and compressor station will plummet and our homes and land will be worthless. What is even worse about this pipeline - no local community will reap any benefit! The only one benefiting is Kinder Morgan - making tons of money off of people who are struggling on a day-to-day basis to make ends meet and now will lose everything they have worked so hard for all their lives!

Congresswoman Kuster, please oppose this pipeline and work with us to stop this project.

Most Sincerely,

*{signature not legible}*

**20150727-0079**

Subj: Fwd: Liberty Utilities Petition/PUC

Date: 7/20/2015 9:28:24A.M. Eastern Daylight Time

From: beniamin.tiltonfibleo.state.nh.us

To: bostoncaroenters/Btaol.com

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Tilton,Ben" &beniamin.tiltonleo.state.nh.us&

Date: 20 July 2015 8:00:34am GMTR

To: "debra.howlandfifiouc.nh.oov" &debra.howland/diouc.nh.oov&

Cc: "sandv.denofifiouc.nh.oov" &sandv.deno/8iouc.nh.oov&

Subject: Liberty Utilities Petition/PUC

July 20, 2015

Public Utilities Commission

Debra Howland

Executive Director and Secretary

New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission

21 S. Fruit Street, Suite 10

Concord NH 03301

Dear Executive Director Debra Howland,

I'm writing to request the Public Utilities Commission to reject the agreement between Liberty Utilities and Tennessee Gas.

I represent the residents of Richmond NH who overwhelmingly reject this agreement proposal. The Tennessee Pipeline is oversized and would leave ratepayers subsidizing a project which exports gas with little or no benefit to the citizens of southern NH.

The impact of this agreement will have a negative effect on property use, the environment, property values and the health and safety of our citizens. These issues have not been fully analyzed. It is my opinion that the negative effects of this agreement do not outweigh the benefits for NH citizens.

Given the significance of the Northeast Energy Direct project to the host communities, please ensure that the negative impacts of this proposal are alleviated by rejecting the unnecessary Liberty Utilities Transportation Agreement.

It is my opinion that the NED Pipeline is extremely oversized as a means to export gas with little or no benefit to NH ratepayers unless they happen to own Kinder Morgan stock.

Thank you for your serious consideration  
Representative Benjamin Tilton  
District 12 Cheshire County  
Room 301  
Legislative Office Building  
Concord NH 03301

**20150727-0081**

*{hand written cover letter explaining that due to the 3-minute limit the following was only partially read at the FERC Scoping meeting held in Oneonta, NY, July 16 2015}*

To: FERC

From: Mary Ellen Collier  
927 Henry Edwards Road  
Franklin NY 13775

I am here tonight because you invited me to address this hearing. Nearly half of my 21 acre home in Franklin is within the 'buffer zone' of the siting of the NED compressor station. I am here to express my anger. This compressor station endangers the value of my property, my only significant asset, and it endangers my health and the tranquility of my chosen home. I am a citizen of the United States, and I look to this commission, funded by my taxes, to respect my concerns and protect my well being.

According to your website, one of your functions is to "...oversee(s) environmental matters related to natural gas..." projects. A fact sheet assembled by the group, Compressor Free Franklin, states that "Pipeline construction will put at risk the Village of Franklin's (water) supply, as well as private wells and springs along the Ouleout aquifer." My water is provided by our spring, which lies close to the buffer zone. We have had that spring dry up in the late fall frequently in the years we have lived here. All my neighbors will attest that the waterfall at the head of Henry Edwards Road reduces to a dripping trickle most years. Some years we have been without water for over a month before sufficient rain fell. I don't believe that an industrial site like a compressor station won't have a negative impact on the reduction of the water table at my elevation in dry seasons. This station should be sited in an area of less residential density, or at a lower elevation nearer the river.

Other environmental concerns I have include noise and light pollution, and toxic emissions. The Compressor Free Franklin fact sheet also states that "Recent monitoring of compressor stations throughout the country has documented, in addition to methane, emissions of carbon dioxide, carbon monoxide, volatile organic compounds, benzene, toluene, and formaldehyde, a known carcinogen." Further, "Compressor stations'urbine power plant and compressor produce continuous noise and low frequency vibration while in operation. "...equipment breakdowns, routine maintenance and testing require rapid venting of up 15,000 cubic feet of methane from a segment of the pipe, causing a sound equivalent of a rocket blasting off." I have followed news stories about gas pipeline infrastructure for more than five years, since our area was first targeted for these pipelines, and I know that news comes out daily that corroborate these claims, and report station fires and accidents, often with photo and video documentation. Who will want to buy my property, with these conditions evident within a fraction of a mile? No one! I don't even want to live that close to a compressor station! It's evident that the value of my property will fall, and I will have difficulty selling it when the time comes. The recent report of a 50'k devaluation of homes near the Hancock compressor stations supports my concerns as well. If my property devalues to that extent I will be upside down on my mortgage. Your website also states that FERC "...regulates transmission and sale of natural gas for resale in interstate commerce." I am angry that you are approving new infrastructure in this time of instability in the commerce of fossil fuels. I believe that Kinder Morgan does not have contracts for all of the gas it proposes to transmit, and may likely export a large percent of it. It does not seem like 'meeting the public good', to enrich KM stockholders and executives at the direct expense of hundreds of landowners- individual citizens

who bear the financial and health risks. A recent Carbon Tracker report suggests that many of the proposed pipeline projects may not be feasible if “...emissions are cut to keep global temperatures rise below the internationally agreed target...” They state that “..many LNG projects being considered will not be needed.”, including up to \$71 Billion dollars worth of projects in the U.S. This report concludes that increasing action to cut carbon emissions, combined with falling renewable energy prices, will put some fossil fuel investments at risk. Last Tuesday’s report from the Brooklngs Institute draws the same conclusion. This conclusion highlights that new infrastructure and investment should be directed to renewables.

I am here because I am angry. My assets and my quality of life are being threatened by a hazardous project that may or may not enrich a corporation. My time and energy have been co-opted by combating this project and the previous pipeline for years now. As the world moves away from fossil fuel towards investments in renewable energy, my town is being tom apart by conflict brought by a dirty industry, hoping for a last stand profit from a changing energy industry. Stand up for me! Stand up for an ordinary citizen, trying to live a quiet life! Say NO to this project and YES to the environment.

**20150727-0082**

**The Commonwealth of Massachusetts**  
William Francis Galvin, Secretary of the Commonwealth  
**Massachusetts Historical Commission**

Stuart Fiedel  
Principal Investigator  
Louis Berger Group  
20 Corporate Woods Blvd  
Albany NY 12211-2370

RE: Tennessee Gas pipeline Company, L.L.C.,a Kinder Morgan Company, Northeast Energy Direct project.  
MHC 1RC.56771.FERC Docket 1PFI4-2M00.

Dear Mr. Fiedel:

Staff of the Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC), office of the State Historic Preservation Officer and State Archaeologist, have reviewed the revised State Archaeologist’s permit application submitted for reconnaissance historical and archaeological survey for the project referenced above.

The revised application is responsive to the MHC’s comments on the draft research design and methodology.

Regarding the submittal of the draft reports of the investigation (pages 38 and 69), please also provide the reports to the involved federal agencies for their review and consultations.

Enclosed please find the State Archaeologist’s field investigation permit issued for the reconnaissance survey.

Enclosed also is the Town of Deerfield’s “Archaeological Accountability Policy” that the Deerfield Historical Commission requested be provided to permittees conducting research in the town.

These comments are offered to assist in compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as amended (36 CFR 800), the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation (48 Fed. Reg. 190 (1983),and MGL c. 9, ss. 26-27C (950CMR 70). If you have sny questions, please contact Edward L. Bell, Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer at the MHC.

Sincerely,

Brona Simon  
State Historic Preservation Officer  
Executive Director  
State Archaeologist  
Massachusetts Historical Commission

Enclosures (SA Permit; Deerfield policy)

xc w/o enci:

Secretary Kimberly D. Bose, FERC  
Eric Tomasi, FERC

**20150727-0083**

July 17, 2015

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Dear Ms. Bose,

This letter is in regards to Project docket number PF14-22-000.

As a resident of Methuen, MA, I am opposed to the project that Tennessee Gas Pipeline is proposing. This project will have an adverse effect on the environment. It will cross many wetland areas in which different types of wildlife live.

The second point I would like to make is the safety issue. Tennessee Gas Pipeline is looking to replace a 10" line with one that will be double in size. This means that there will be 2 pipelines going in at the bottom front of my home. They need a wider easement that will affect my property as well as the wetlands across the street from my home.

The environmental impact will have a huge effect in our community. Let me list the immediate concerns of our community — soil changes, wetlands issues, vegetation and wildlife. We also have an historic bridge that may be disrupted.

This project will have a cumulative impact on the entire community.

These are the reasons that I am opposed to the project. The alternative should be to look at other areas that will not be subject to these environmental concerns.

Yours truly,

Stephen N. Zanni

**20150727-0088**

**PROPERTY ACCESS DENIED**

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: July 20, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

RE: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

Street Address: 130 Gap Mountain Rd

Town & Zip: Fitzwilliam, NH 03447

Map & Lot Number(s) (if known) 000015-000045-000001

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Jeffrey A. Lajoie

CC:

FERC  
Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

**20150727-0089**

Jean Waggoner  
586 Nassau-Averill Park Road  
Nassau, NY 12123

I reside in the Town of Nassau NY on a small farm that has been in my family since the 1850s. Since 1952, my family and community have been dealing with the impact of the Dewey Loeffel toxic dump, now a Superfund Site. For 63 years, we have worried about the health of our children, the safety of our drinking water and the condition of our streams and lakes. State and Federal officials first denied that the dump was causing any problems, then spent years arguing about how to proceed in dealing with it. In 2013, the EPA reached an agreement to proceed with a “Remedial Investigation//Feasibility Study” which the EPA describes as the first step in the long term cleanup of the site.

Now, when our community is finally hoping for fair treatment and a resolution of this environmental disaster, we are being faced with a second environmental disaster. Kinder Morgan is seeking approval to build a dangerous pipeline project through the Town of Nassau. The proposal includes a 90,000 HP compressor station to be located in a residential area within 2 miles of the Dewey Loeffel Superfund Site.

I believe that the approval of this pipeline and compressor station in the Town of Nassau is in direct violation of the regulations and goals of the Federal EPA’s Office of Environmental Justice.

According to the EPA, “Environmental Justice is the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, color, national origin, or income with respect to the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies. Fair treatment means that no group of people should bear a disproportionate share of the negative environmental consequences resulting from industrial, governmental and commercial operations or policies.”

-How much environmental degradation and risk to human life in one small community is considered a “disproportionate share”?

-How will the potential risk be evaluated of a disturbance to the fragile bed of rock that now partially contains the Dewey Loeffel toxins, due to a pipeline explosion or blasting during construction?

-In the event of a pipeline related “event” releasing the Dewey Loeffel toxins into the aquifer, how many poisoned wells will it take to reach a “disproportionate share of the negative environmental consequences resulting from industrial, governmental and commercial operations or policies.”?

-This proposed project was initially slated to be routed through the Bedtshires. How was it determined that the environmental impact of this project was less serious in the Town of Nassau than in the previous communities in the Berkshires?

-What role did the wealth and political power of residents along the initial pipeline route play in the route being removed from the Berkshires and routed through Rensselaer County instead?

The residents of Nassau have suffered enough. We have not been treated fairly for the last 63 years, while corporations made money at our expense. Clearly we are not being treated fairly now as Kinder Morgan is trying to push through an oversized response to a seasonal need for natural gas in New England, once again putting our families and our natural resources at risk for corporate profit. Other pipeline projects that have airily been approved will clearly be able to meet this seasonal need without the construction of the Kinder

Morgan line.

In accordance with EPA standards of Environmental Justice, I urge you to deny Kinder Morgan the right to plunder our community once again. If you refuse this reasonable course of action, at the very least you must insist that the project be downgraded to a smaller diameter, low pressure pipeline, thus eliminating the grotesque 90,000 HP compressor station in a residential area within two miles of the Dewey Loeilisl Superfund Site..

The residents of Nassau and all the towns along the pipeline are depending on you for fair treatment under the law. We deserve a just and humane decision. The residents of Nassau have already borne “a disproportionate share of the negative environmental consequences resulting from industrial, governmental and commercial operations or policies.”

Jean Waggoner

**20150727-0111**

Deborah A. Chipman  
64 Holman Rd.  
Fitzwilliam, NH 03447  
July 22, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Dear Secretary Bose:

I am writing today to urge you to oppose the Northeast Energy District (NED) Project and the extension of Kinder Morgan’s Tennessee Gas Pipeline. Project docket number PF14-22-000

The fossil fuel industry is in decline and the current shale oil and gas production is not sustainable, not to mention causing indefinite toxic and seismic problems. We should look to more environmentally and economically responsible solutions for bringing natural gas to New Hampshire. I understand there is currently a coastal pipeline that could be expanded to accommodate the fuel. Why disrupt and destroy so many New Hampshire communities for the Kinder Morgan project?

The NEO Project won’t bring many promised jobs to New Hampshire residents as it relies on out-of-state contractors. The economic benefits to the state will not make up for the monetary and environmental burdens on citizens.

The town of Fitzwilliam has an excellent aquifer system, a sparkling lake, a state park, a charming village and more. Wildlife is abundant and the countryside is pristine. Although it is a bedroom community, we see the population almost double in summer. Still it is quiet and beautiful. These are all reasons why we moved here from Connecticut in 1984. We have never regretted it, and now we want to save it from the pipeline threat.

Health and safety concerns in light of this project are frightening. What kind of economic impact can Fitzwilliam expect? We do expect health and safety issues, damage to wetlands, forests, wildlife and lower property values related to this project. I guess we won’t know unless the project progresses, but I feel it is a lose, lose proposition.

Please do not support the NED Project. Please help defeat the NED Project.

Respectfully yours,

Deborah A. Chipman

## Mass Audubon

Protecting the Nature of Massachusetts

July 22, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC)  
888 First Street, NE  
Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. Docket No. PF14-22-000. Northeast  
Energy Direct Project

Dear Secretary Bose:

The following comments are submitted in response to FERC's June 30, 2015 Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Planned Northeast Energy Direct Project (NED), Request for Comments on Environmental Issues, and Notice of Public Scoping Sessions. The NED is proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline (TGP), a subsidiary of Kinder Morgan. Mass Audubon is a directly affected landowner, as the proposed project corridor crosses four parcels it holds for conservation purposes in Plainfield (Municipal Map/Block/Lot 1s19/0/1, 20/0/3, 25/0/3, and 20/0/1). Numerous other lands held by public and private entities for permanent conservation purposes will also be impacted, along with extensive areas of sensitive land and water resources.

We believe it is premature for FERC to proceed to this step in the project review process at this time, due to recent changes in the project and deficiencies in Kinder Morgan's filings to date, including but not necessarily limited to the points described below. Mass Audubon respectfully requests that the schedule for the public scoping hearings and deadline for scoping comments be extended beyond August 31, 2015. In particular, we urge that further information be required on project need, alternatives and the economic and environmental costs and benefits of the project and alternatives. Kinder Morgan should also be required to submit updated and more complete Resource Reports based on the currently proposed project configuration and publicly available data including MassGIS datalayers and the University of Massachusetts/Amherst Conservation Assessment and Prioritization System (CAPS). In the event that FERC denies this request for delay and extension of the review process, we request that these comments be considered in developing the Scope for the EIS.

### Project Need and Alternatives

The need for and alternatives to the project must be more fully and objectively analyzed, before any further steps are taken toward proceeding with this massive, expensive, and environmentally destructive project. Massachusetts Attorney General Maura Healey recently announced that she is commissioning a study of electricity reliability needs in the New England region through 2030 and the options for meeting those needs. This study, conducted by the Analysis Group and Raab Associates, will fill a pressing need for analysis of the costs and benefits of various alternatives including energy efficiency, demand response, renewables, natural gas, and oil. This study is expected to be completed in October, 2015. It is vitally important from both an economic and environmental perspective to consider the results of this study before advancing environmental review of the proposed gas transmission infrastructure being proposed in the NED project as well as the Algonquin/Spectra Access Northeast Project.

The Massachusetts Global Warming Solutions Act adopted in 2008 set ambitious targets for reductions of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by 25 percent by 2020 and 80 percent by 2050. This law and the Green Communities Act have catalyzed rapid progress in energy efficiency and development of renewable energy sources, both of which are making important contributions to our economy and environmental health. For the past four years in a row, Massachusetts ranked first in the nation in American Council for an Energy-

Efficient Economy's scorecard of the states. Meanwhile, a recent report indicates that as a result of the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (RGGI), nine states in New England and the Mid-Atlantic region have gained \$1.3 billion in economic benefits and saved electric ratepayers \$460 million while reducing carbon emissions by 15 percent. The clean energy economy (renewables and energy efficiency) in Massachusetts has added more than 28,000 jobs since 2010 and is now a \$10 billion industry sector.<sup>4</sup> The NED project is incompatible with national, regional, and state policies and goals for GHG reductions, and comes with enormous, avoidable environmental and economic consequences. Major new pipelines increasing our dependence on natural gas will make it more difficult, not less, to meet GHG reduction goals over both the short and longer term. Life-cycle emissions from gas often exceed that of other fossil fuels they replace, while also causing other major environmental impacts that can be avoided through greater emphasis on energy efficiency and renewables. Furthermore, if gas is exported through the proposed pipeline, the purported energy price benefits to consumers in New England will most likely evaporate, since gas prices are much higher in global markets.

### Project Scope and Impacts

TGP has recently announced significant changes to the NED project, including the elimination of several laterals and the reduction of the diameter of the main line from 36" to 30". While these may somewhat reduce the environmental impacts of the project, those impacts remain at an unprecedented scale.

More than one hundred parcels of "permanently protected" lands conserved by public and private entities will be impacted by this project. Massachusetts has a long history of thoughtful land and water conservation, conducted based on scientifically based priorities. This carefully constructed matrix of protected lands encompasses 25 percent of the state. These lands are protected by Article 97 of the State Constitution and/or are held in public trust by charitable land trusts. It is ironic that a private, out of state company now views these areas as convenient for the construction of energy infrastructure at an unprecedented scale. A 2013 report on The Return on Investment in Parks and Open Space in Massachusetts found that every dollar invested in land conservation returned \$4 in natural goods and services to the Massachusetts economy, including clean air and water, recreation and tourism, and fish and wildlife habitat. The Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court has also recognized that lands held in conservation use by charitable trusts support a wide range of public benefits. Before any further consideration of impacts to these precious conservation lands as well as extensive other areas of wetlands, streams, forests and farmlands, alternative means of meeting state and regional energy needs must be considered.

Furthermore, the very fact that the project has changed so significantly has rendered the draft Resource Reports out of date and virtually useless. It is extremely difficult, if not impossible, for a reader to decipher what the impacts of the currently proposed project is based on those outdated reports.

### Failure to Use Publicly Available Resource Data in Draft Resource Reports

Massachusetts has an extensive, advanced land use and environmental database with information publicly available through MassGIS. Mass Audubon met with representatives of Kinder Morgan/TGP as early as April 2g, 2014, and communicated to the company at that time about the wealth of natural resources data available that could assist in analyzing impacts of the proposed project and how to minimize those impacts. We also attended other meetings in 2014 with company representatives hosted by state agencies, and are aware of several communications from agencies and other environmental groups to the company informing them of these resources and how to utilize them. This information was not in fact employed as it could and should have been in the Resource Reports. Datalayers that are available including BioMap2 and Priority Habitat maps documenting the most ecologically sensitive locations in the state, along with associated information explaining each of the features in those maps including the natural communities and species associated with them. The failure to utilize the available, scientifically based resource information is a serious deficiency resulting in incomplete and superficial analysis of the significant impacts of the project.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Mass Audubon requests that FERC withdraw the Notice of Intent to Prepare an EIS and instead require TGP/Kinder Morgan to first conduct further analysis of project need and

alternatives as well as environmental impacts. In the event FERC denies this request, please consider these comments in preparing the Scope for the EIS.

Sincerely,

Gary R. Clayton

Acting President/Vice President for Conservation Programs

Cc: MA EFSB4 DPU

MA AG Maura Healey

MA Energy and Environmental Affairs Secretary Mathew Beaton

1 UMass, Amherst, A Natural Resources Assessment of the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's Proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project's Pipeline Route Within Massachusetts, 2015.

2 <http://aceee.org/files/ndf/state-sheet/massachusetts.pdf>

3 The Analysis Group, The Economic Impacts of the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative on Nine Northeast and Mid-Atlantic States - Review of RGGI's Second Three-Year Compliance Period (2012-2014), 2015.

4 Massachusetts Clean Energy Center, 2014 Massachusetts Clean Energy Industry Report.

5 <http://www.ucsusa.org/clean-energy/our-energy-choices/coal-and-other-fossil-fuels/environmental-impacts-of-natural-gas.html>

6 [www.tohota.com/turn-investment-risks-and-ones-nace-massachusetts](http://www.tohota.com/turn-investment-risks-and-ones-nace-massachusetts)

7 New England Forestry Foundation, inc. vs. Board of Assessors of Hawley  
468 Mass. 138, <http://masscases.com/cases/sic/468/468mass138.html>

## 20150727-0113

Jean Waggoner

586 Nassau-Averill Park Road

Nassau, NY 12123

I reside in the Town of Nassau NY on a small farm that has been in my family since the 1850s. Since 1952, my family and community have been dealing with the impact of the Dewey Loeffel toxic dump, now a Superfund Site. For 63 years, we have worried about the health of our children, the safety of our drinking water and the condition of our streams and lakes. State and Federal officials first denied that the dump was causing any problems, then spent years arguing about how to proceed in dealing with it. In 2013, the EPA reached an agreement to proceed with a "Remedial Investigation//Feasibility Study" which the EPA describes as the first step in the long term cleanup of the site.

Now, when our community is finally hoping for fair treatment and a resolution of this environmental disaster, we are being faced with a second environmental disaster. Kinder Morgan is seeking approval to build a dangerous pipeline project through the Town of Nassau. The proposal includes a 90,000 HP compressor station to be located in a residential area within 2 miles of the Dewey Loeffel Superfund Site.

I believe that the approval of this pipeline and compressor station in the Town of Nassau is in direct violation of the regulations and goals of the Federal EPA's Office of Environmental Justice.

According to the EPA, "Environmental Justice is the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, color, national origin, or income with respect to the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies. Fair treatment means that no group of people should bear a disproportionate share of the negative environmental consequences resulting from industrial, governmental and commercial operations or policies."

-How much environmental degradation and risk to human life in one small community is considered a "disproportionate share"?

-How will the potential risk be evaluated of a disturbance to the fragile bed of rock that now partially contains the Dewey Loeffel toxins, due to a pipeline explosion or blasting during construction?

-In the event of a pipeline related “event” releasing the Dewey Loeffel toxins into the aquifer, how many poisoned wells will it take to reach a “disproportionate share of the negative environmental consequences resulting from industrial, governmental and commercial operations or policies.”?

-This proposed project was initially slated to be routed through the Bedtshires. How was it determined that the environmental impact of this project was less serious in the Town of Nassau than in the previous communities in the Berkshires?

-What role did the wealth and political power of residents along the initial pipeline route play in the route being removed from the Berkshires and routed through Rensselaer County instead?

The residents of Nassau have suffered enough. We have not been treated fairly for the last 63 years, while corporations made money at our expense. Clearly we are not being treated fairly now as Kinder Morgan is trying to push through an oversized response to a seasonal need for natural gas in New England, once again putting our families and our natural resources at risk for corporate profit. Other pipeline projects that have airily been approved will clearly be able to meet this seasonal need without the construction of the Kinder Morgan line.

In accordance with EPA standards of Environmental Justice, I urge you to deny Kinder Morgan the right to plunder our community once again. If you refuse this reasonable course of action, at the very least you must insist that the project be downgraded to a smaller diameter, low pressure pipeline, thus eliminating the grotesque 90,000 HP compressor station in a residential area within two miles of the Dewey Loeilisl Superfund Site..

The residents of Nassau and all the towns along the pipeline are depending on you for fair treatment under the law. We deserve a just and humane decision. The residents of Nassau have already borne “a disproportionate share of the negative environmental consequences resulting from industrial, governmental and commercial operations or policies.”

Jean Waggoner

**20150727-0115**

*{duplicate of 20150727-0113 above}*

**20150727-0117**

625 Schoharie Hill Road  
Schoharie, NY 12157  
May 17, 2013 & July 21, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426  
Docket No. PF14-22-000

Gentlemen:

The Constitution Pipeline certainly has been the curse of the century for a lot of folks in this area.

It is my understanding, that it was recommended that the Pipeline take the ‘I-88 Route’. This certainly would have been practical if the Pipeline entered the state at the point of Binghamton, N.Y., from Pennsylvania. But if the entry into New York State is at the eastern section of the state there seems to be no logical reason for taking the I-88 corridor.

I believe that several landowner s--in fact, my adjoining neighbors on all sides--have been pressured into

granting a right-of-way through their farms under the threat of 'eminent domain.'ut my old-math mind cannot see that this is a practical route for anybody concerned. And certainly not practical to take the route through the cropland that is crucial to the maintenance of one of the largest dairy herds in New York State (Stanton Farms). If the destination of the Pipeline is to be the sub-station in the Town of Wrioht. whv could the route not cross the Schoharie River at a more southern ooint like the Town of Gilboa or Blenheim. where the river is much narrower than at the ooint where I-88 crosses the river in the Town of Schoharie. The route could then orocceed alono the eastern uplands. away from the Villaaes of Middleburah and Schoharie. to its destination in the Town of Wrioht.

It is my understanding that your agency has the authority to grant the approval of the final route of the Pipe-line, and I respectfully request that you consider the eastern route before your permission is given.

Very truly yours,

Eileene Vroman  
emvroman@midtel.net

xc: Times Journal/ Editor  
Schoharie County Supervisors  
Stanton Farms

**20150727-0118**

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulation Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Date: June 23, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access:

As the owner of the property located at:  
LL#NHWD 241 Track #1 Block/Lot 03-07  
Greenville, NH

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose. Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Howard Bradler

**20150727-0119**

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulation Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Date: June 23, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access:

As the owner of the property located at:  
LL#NHWD 244 Track #1 Block/Lot 15A-04-B  
New Ipswich, NH

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose. Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.  
Howard Bradler

**20150727-0120**

**Office of the Board of Selectmen  
Town of Mason**

16 Darling Hill Road — Mann House  
Mason, New Hampshire 03048  
(603) 878-2070 (603) 878-4892 Fax

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

December 29, 2014

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access

At the Board of Selectmen meeting on Tuesday, December 23, 2014, the board passed the following resolution: The Board of Selectmen hereby adopt the findings of the Mason Conservation Commission regarding the proposed Northeast Energy Direct gas pipeline and associated infrastructure, and opposes said project. The Board of Selectmen deny permission to Kinder Morgan, Tennessee Pipeline Co. and its affiliates to enter upon land owned by the Town of Mason for any reason, including but not limited to surveying, until such time as Kinder Morgan has made a formal public presentation to the Board of Selectmen and the people of Mason, at which time the Selectmen may take further action as appropriate.

As the governing body for the Town of Mason, we, the Board of Selectmen, are denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter on town property or to perform surveys, or for any purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto said property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

cc: Board of Selectmen  
Allen Fore  
FERC

**20150727-0124**

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulation Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Date: June 23, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access:

As the owner of the property located at:  
LL#NHWD 243 Track #1 Block/Lot 03-040  
Greenville, NH

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its

representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose. Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Howard Bradler

**20150727-0125**

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulation Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Date: June 23, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access:

As the owner of the property located at:  
LL#NHWD 244 Track #1 Block/Lot 03-08  
Greenville, NH

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose. Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Jeremy Bradler

**20150727-0135**

To: FERC, concerning Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct Proposal

From: Paul and Mary McPhie

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC Docket No. pf 14-22-000

July 20, 2015

I ask that you become aware, if you are not already, of what the N.H. Department of Environmental Services has to say about blasting of crystalline bedrock. The department study concludes that the blasting of N.H. bedrock can contaminate the surrounding groundwater. The release or spillage of blasting chemicals and shaking loose silt, sand chemicals and various metals will contaminate the surrounding groundwater.

Here in Rindge, N.H., there is no town water. Therefore, everyone has a well and relies on the pristine groundwater that feed these wells. N.H. is in fact the granite state which will require KM to blast mile after mile to lay a 30-36 inch pipe. There is no need for this project other that corporate greed.

Please protect or drinking water and pristine countryside and say NO to this unnecessary environmental horror show.

**20150727-0158**

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company  
Northeast Energy Direct Project  
Docket No. PF14-22-000

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

Gas Branch 3, PJ-11.3  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

Dear Sir or Madam; 14 July 2014

I offer the following comments on potential impacts to the Hudson River Estuary in New York State from the proposed Northeast Energy Direct pipeline project. I will focus on location of the proposed Hudson River pipeline crossing, aspects of construction, emergency response, and the need for a broad based environmental impact assessment. Comments are based on the project as described in the applicant's Diufi Environmental Report of March 2015.

The proposed pipeline appears to cross the Hudson at an existing pipeline right-of-way just north or upriver of the village of Castleton, NY. It will cross the main stem Hudson as well as a tidal stream and marsh complex just east of the river called Papscanee Marsh and Creek.

The reach of main stem river containing the proposed pipeline crossing is used as a spawning and nursery area by shortnose sturgeon (AKRF 2010, Bain 1997, SSSRT 2010), American shad and striped bass (AKRF 2010, ASA 2013) and as a foraging area for juvenile Atlantic sturgeon (Bain 1997). Shortnose sturgeon is a federal and state listed endangered species (SSSRT 2010). American shad was a popular food and sport fish that is now at such low abundance that all fishing for the species is banned in NY State (HRFU 2009). The striped bass is an important food and game fish in NY (Euston et al. 2006, Nelson 2013) and the Atlantic sturgeon is a federally listed endangered species (NOAA 2012). The two endangered species warrant special protection and activities leading to direct harm or that affect critical habitat need to be avoided, altered, or mitigated.

The marsh and stream complex to the east of the river is an important spawning and nursery area for many Hudson River fish species including the alewife (NYSDOC 8h TNC 1990). Alewife are at low abundance and harvest is severely restricted (Hattala et al. 2011). This tidal complex has been designated as a "Significant Coastal Fish and Wildlife Habitat" by the NY State Department of State (NYSDOS dt TNC 1990). This formal designation provides extra protection and it means that activities that might lead to habitat impairment such as pipeline construction require special scrutiny.

A second NY State Department of State "Significant Coastal Fish and Wildlife Habitat" called Shad and Shimmerhorn Islands is located along the west shore of the river about 1.5 miles downriver of the proposed pipeline crossing (NYSDOS 8t TNC 1990). This marsh and stream complex is also used as a spawning and nursery area by many Hudson River fishes. Although it will not be directly affected by pipeline construction, it may be affected by drifting turbidity and any associated contaminants.

The environment reports prepared by the applicant are vague about specific construction techniques for the river and marsh crossing. The reports suggest that horizontal directional drilling will be used for the main river if feasible. It is silent on techniques for crossing the tidal marsh and stream complex to the east of the river. The following discusses issues associated with possible construction methods.

If excavation and backfilling of an open trench are used, construction should not occur when the area is used for fish migration, spawning, rearing of young, or feeding. The applicant should contact the Hudson River Fisheries Unit of the NY State Department of Environmental Conservation, New Paltz, NY for allowable construction dates.

If the trench is constructed in water, turbidity must be controlled with turbidity curtains.

If the trench is constructed within coffer dams, the discharge of turbid water must be restricted.

The bottom of the Hudson and tidal marshes contain a variety of contaminants (Bopp et al. 2006). Prior to any excavation, the applicant must test bottom sediments for contaminants across the entire width of the proposed trench as well as soils to be disturbed by onshore aspects of the pipeline crossing. If contaminants are detected, then plans must be made to contain contaminated materials disturbed during

construction.

The river and marsh bottom is home to a rich variety of macroinvertebrates which serve as important food for fishes (Strayer 2006). Construction of a trench will disturb or eliminate this community of organisms and this loss will impact fishes, especially the endangered shortnose sturgeon. Experience with pipeline and cable crossings elsewhere in the river suggests that bottom biota recover very slowly, if at all following such a disturbance.

If directional drilling is used, then drilling muds should be disposed of elsewhere, especially if sediments are contaminated.

Turbid water from onshore operations should not be released to the river until sediments have been removed

The applicant's environmental reports indicate that the proposed pipeline will be buried at least three feet deep. Given that a navigation channel is maintained through the reach of river containing the proposed pipeline and that the channel is used by oceangoing vessels, this may not be deep enough. I suggest that the applicant needs to check with both the US Coast Guard and the US Army Corps of Engineers for advice on an acceptable depth of burial in the river bottom. A power cable to be constructed just downriver of the pipeline project has much deeper burial requirements, especially under the navigation channel (DOE 2014).

The Environmental Reports are vague about response to emergencies such as leaks, fires, explosions, or natural catastrophes such as floods. The report does provide a generalized description of planned actions, but these actions may not apply to a pipeline buried in sediments at the bottom of the Hudson. Not only is the pipeline to be located in or near environmentally sensitive habitats, but it will be collocated with an existing gas pipeline that could add fuel to any conflagration. Moreover, the reach of river containing the proposed pipeline is routinely traversed by barges containing volatile crude oil from western oil fields (Mouawad 2014). Trainloads of this oil also travel down railroad tracks located along the west side of the river (Tumulty 2014). The applicant indicates that specific plans will be developed prior to commencement of pipeline operations. Given the importance and the unique aspects of the proposed river crossing location, I suggest that detailed emergency response plans should be prepared now and should be part of the pipeline review by FERC. Government agencies should also vet these plans. Appropriate agencies include, local and county governments, the NY State Departments of State and Environmental Conservation, the National Marine Fisheries Service, the US Army Corps of Engineers, and the US Coastguard.

Finally, the NED pipeline crossing is only one of several pipelines and power cables being proposed for the Hudson River corridor and it will only add to impacts from the other projects. Given the importance of the Hudson River to the endangered shortnose and Atlantic sturgeon, I suggest that FERC should ask the National Marine Fisheries Service to prepare a "Biological Opinion" concerning the cumulative impacts of all of the proposed projects to these endangered fish species.

Andrew Kahnle  
8 Phillips St.  
Nassau NY 12123  
518-766-3481  
hoosicvalleyapiary@gmmail.com

#### References:

AKRF 2010. Distribution patterns of selected fish species of the Hudson River 2002-2007. Prepared for: New York State Department of Environmental Conservation.

ASA (ASA Analysis and Communication Inc.) 2013. 2011 Year class report for the Hudson River Estuary monitoring program. Prepared by ASA on behalf of Dynege Roseton LLC Debtor in Possession Entergy Nuclear Indian Point 2 Jk 3 LLC, and Gen-on Bowline LLC. Washingtonville, NY

Bain, M.B. 1997. Atlantic and shortnose sturgeons of the Hudson River. common and divergent life history

attributes. *Environmental Biology of Fishes* 48:347-358.

Bopp, R. F., S. N. Chillrud, E. I. Shuster, and H. J. Simpson. 2006. Contaminant chronologies & Hudson River sedimentary records. Pages 383-397 in Jeffrey S. Levinton and John R. Waldman editors. *The Hudson River Estuary*. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY.

DOE (U.S. Department of Energy). 2014. Final Champlain Hudson POWER Express Transmission Line Project Environmental Impact Statement Volume I. Impact Analyses. U. S. Department of Energy, Washington, DC.

Euston, E. T., S. A. Hanley, K. A. Hattala, and A. W. Kahnle. 2006. Overview of Hudson River recreational fisheries, with an emphasis on striped bass. Pages 295-316 in J. R. Waldman, K. E. Limburg, and D. L. Strayer, editors. *Hudson River fishes and their environment*. American Fisheries Society, Symposium 51, Bethesda, MD.

Hattala, K. A., A. W. Kahnle, and R. D. Adams. 2011. Sustainable fishing plan for New York River Herring stocks. Submitted for review to the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission. NY Department of Environmental Conservation, Albany, NY.

HRFU (Hudson River Fisheries Unit). 2009. Hudson River American shad. An ecosystem based plan for recovery. NYS Department of Environmental Conservation, Albany, NY.

Mouawad, Jad. Bakken crude, rolling through Albany. *New York Times, Energy & Environment*, 27 February 2014

Nelson, G. 2013. Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission update of the striped bass stock assessment using final 2012 data. Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, Arlington, VA.

NOAA (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration). 2012. NOAA lists five Atlantic sturgeon populations under Endangered Species Act. [http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/stories/2012/01/31\\_atlantic\\_sturgeon.html](http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/stories/2012/01/31_atlantic_sturgeon.html).

NYS DOS & TNC (New York State Department of State and The Nature Conservancy). 1990. *Hudson River significant tidal habitats: A guide to the functions, values, and protection of the river's natural resources*. NYS Department of State, Albany, NY.

SSSRT (Shortnose Sturgeon Status Review Team). 2010. A Biological Assessment of shortnose sturgeon (*Acipenser brevirostrum*). Report to National Marine Fisheries Service, Northeast Regional Office. November 1, 2010. 417 pp.

Strayer, D. L. 2006. The benthic animal communities of the tidal & freshwater Hudson River Estuary. Pages 266-278 in Jeffrey S. Levinton and John R. Waldman editors. *The Hudson River Estuary*. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY.

Tumulty, Brian. CSX: 15-30 oil trains move weekly on Hudson River Line. *The Journal News*, 16 July 2014.

**20150727-4003**

**Transcript of July 14, 2015 Public Scoping Meeting in Castleton-on-Hudson, NY**

**Transcripts are kept in this separate file:**

**[http://www.Mason-NH.org/FERC\\_Scoping\\_Transcripts.pdf](http://www.Mason-NH.org/FERC_Scoping_Transcripts.pdf)**

**20150727-4004**

**Transcript of July 15, 2015 Public Scoping Meeting in Great Bend, Pennsylvania 18821**

**Transcripts are kept in this separate file:**

**[http://www.Mason-NH.org/FERC\\_Scoping\\_Transcripts.pdf](http://www.Mason-NH.org/FERC_Scoping_Transcripts.pdf)**

**20150727-4005**

**Transcript of July 14, 2015 Public Scoping Meeting in Towanda, Pennsylvania 18848**

**Transcripts are kept in this separate file:**

**[http://www.Mason-NH.org/FERC\\_Scoping\\_Transcripts.pdf](http://www.Mason-NH.org/FERC_Scoping_Transcripts.pdf)**

**20150727-5000**

Deirdre D Olson, Northfield, MA.

I live in Northfield on the Mtn. targeted for the immense compressor station and gas infrastructure build out. This is my second e comment. The first one apparently had an error so I will make this short.

I think of my life as before and after KM showed up in Feb 2014 . It hasn't been a pleasant experience. The main focus of this comment should be the inappropriate decision to locate an immense compressor station on the top of a steep Mtn. that gets regularly struck by lightening ,no cell service, many elderly in ill health, poor landline and loses power and many times we are unable to get off the Mtn. because of ice, down trees downed power lines. It is a beautiful area surrounded by conservation land wet lands wildlife, has the famous National New England scenic trail which KM wants to locate compressor station next to.

The Conservation Land trust much land donated by residents with the intent of preserving this unique area. The industrialization of this Mtn. would be a slap in the face to those who thought the state would protect their wishes and those of their relatives . WHO would ever donate land again? People have already said they wouldn't if this goes through.

The lack of safety access and response to a steep Mtn.that is very remote and has 3 ways on and off would be a dangerous horrifying situation to be in in case of an accident or fire. The recent comments by experts on the gas that can explode with sparks is a frightful lack of foresight and concern by KM . Their cavalier response at the open house they would use chisels to get thru the ledge shows how surprisingly un serious they can be . The use of explosives to blast thru the ledge damaging the many streams water wells and frightening wildlife . I know the wildlife and I cringe when I think of the mayhem and fear this would generate. This begs the question WHY ? WHY a Mtn. steep Mtn. surrounded by conservation land trusts unique why destroy it ? It would never be the same.

My next comments will cover the local banks refusing to cover mortgages , home owners insurance and local appraisers saying if this goes thru the homes in the area are worthless. NOT 50% devalued -worthless.

**20150727-5001**

Matsuda Thomas, Amherst, MA.

Given the amount of blanks still existing in the current Resource Reports and the fact that there could be substantial changes filed in the new draft resource reports, there's little point in holding scoping hearings based on incomplete information that might be rendered obsolete after the hearings are held. Please delay scoping hearings until AFTER Kinder Morgan files its updated documents, anticipated to be filed any day now.

Please hold scoping meetings in the towns of Schodack or Nassau, NY; Windsor, MA; Northfield, MA; New Ipswich, NH directly where compressor stations are sited.

Respectfully,

Thomas Matsuda

**20150727-5002**

Holly B Koski, Rindge, NH.

How convenient is this? Your FERC website has been experiencing this for a few days now....

Outage Notice: July 24, 2015 4:30 p.m. - eLibrary is experiencing intermittent issues. We are still working to restore full service. We will keep you updated. Thank you for your patience

Viewing the Tennessee Gas updated information has been quite aggravating - but what's new - NED has been a nightmare from the very beginning.

Natural Gas is not being installed to benefit New Hampshire- it is just wanting to pass through New Hampshire - destroy our land- our homes- our lives- So that they a PRIVATE Company can selfishly make more money for themselves.

What right do you have to approve this pipeline??? It is not for the good of the people of New Hampshire - it will only benefit those with deep pockets.

Do the right thing- say NO to this pipeline

**20150727-5003**

Peggy Huard, Hudson, NH.

ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY

SECOND ENVIRONMENT REPORT SUBMITTED TO FERC BY TENNESSEE GAS PIPELINE ON JULY 24, 2015

As I review the newest DRAFT filing submitted to FERC on 7/24/15 against this docket, I am disturbed by the negligent process to evaluate this proposal. People have their property, lives and emotional well being at stake.

You ARE NOT affording the citizens that will be effected, including myself the ample opportunity to address some very crucial and life threatening concerns.

This report speaks volumes for the negligence surrounding this project. The WHOLE entire project is dumped into one voluminous report. Each town and citizen then has to read through the entire report to figure out what pertains to them.

I have submitted my own environmental concerns under another comment.

I hereby request that TGP be required to prepare a detailed environmental report for EACH and EVERY town that it effects as well a separate one for EACH and every piece of property it will effect INCLUDING those homes in substantial radius from the proposed pipeline sight. I further request that TGP/Kinder Morgan meet once again with the Town's Board of Selectmen and citizens to explain this complex report and make sure that ALL environmental concerns are documented.

The pond and aquifers that will undoubtedly be destroyed by the construction, operation and possible explosion are NOT noted on the maps I have had a chance to look at so far.

To ignore this request would render FERC as well as KINDER MORGAN/TGP to be negligent regarding this matter.

Please call me at the earliest possible opportunity to show me that you are in fact reading these comments and letters!! If I do not hear from you in a timely manner, I will be forwarding my concerns to the appropriate law enforcement, which contrary to many people's belief have power over FERC, Kinder Morgan/TGP and the entire energy industry!

Peggy Huard  
603-578-9346

#### **20150727-5005**

Ron Komora, Nassau, NY.  
To: The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
From: A Schodack homeowner & taxpayer  
Re: Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed fracked gas pipeline project planned to run less than two miles from my home and the accompanying compressor station planned for Clark's Chapel Road in the nearby town of Nassau. This project will negatively impact us and almost everything around us—water use and quality, health, fisheries, vegetation, wildlife, cultural resources, agriculture, farms, soils, land use, recreation, aesthetics, air and noise quality, security and reliability, historic sites, and more. Are we to be sacrificed because we choose to live life in a rural area, away from the noise ugliness of urban life? We who live near Nassau Lake already deal with the dangers of pollution from the Dewey Loeffel dumping site—are we to add even more pollution from a compressor station that will be lit brightly all night and emit sounds that match that of a jet engine periodically and in the case of accident emit poisonous gasses (primarily methane) into the atmosphere? PLEASE stop the NY fracked gas pipeline!

#### **20150727-5006**

Rosanna Nadeau, Mason, NH.

Please extend the scoping period for FERC Docket PF14-22-000 due to lack of accurate data. The difficulty of fully scoping a meaningful EIS within the projected time frame is exacerbated by the extremely deficient database presented by Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline(KM/TGP) in their March 2015 Draft Resource Reports.

These Reports make a mockery of the NEPA process by listing "To Be Determined" (TBD) for so many resources and concerns throughout all the states targeted for NED. TBD appears over 10,000 times in these Resource Reports, as documented by Nick Miller in 20150416-5039(30494387).pdf .

FERC staff sent their detailed comments on the Reports' deficiencies to KM/TGP on May 15, 2015. But KM/TGP has not yet filed corrected Resource Reports. Without these corrected documents available to the public, it is pre-mature to open the scoping period.

FERC is participating in KM/TGP's mockery of the NEPA process by opening scoping on June 30, 2015. Scoping for the EIS should not begin until a decent period AFTER the public release of KM/TGP's corrected Resource Reports.

#### **20150727-5007**

Hiel Lindquist, Fitzwilliam, NH.  
Today (25 July 2015) I had an opportunity to read the NED Draft Environmental Report.

Although I recognize this is a draft report I find many errors and omissions in the small segment of the report for which I am familiar (Fitzwilliam, NH). These omissions concern issues which were specifically discussed with Tennessee and should have been included in the report.

In the Resource Report 8 Land Use, Recreation, and Aesthetics, page 8-48 the report begins a list of Public Conservation Land (Section 8.3.1). On page 8-57 begins a section on New Hampshire. I find no mention here of the Town of Fitzwilliam conservation land that will be crossed by the pipeline.

Further more, the report states:

Correspondence from the Fitzwilliam Board of Selectmen indicates that recreational and conservation areas in Fitzwilliam are present, but does not specify details concerning the areas (Silverman et al. 2014).

Tennessee received a complete list of properties impacted by the pipeline in Fitzwilliam, and has, in fact, sent several correspondences to the impacted land owners, one of which is the Town of Fitzwilliam. I find it disingenuous that Tennessee claims it doesn't have a record of the conserved land in Fitzwilliam, when in fact they have sent letters regarding the land parcel to the town.

Furthermore, there is no mention of the Metacomet / Monadnock Trail which will be crossed by the pipeline in Rhododendron State Park, nor any mention of the several impacts on the Wapack Trail in the town of New Ipswich. I, along with representatives from Friends of the Wapack, met specifically with Tennessee representative Lucas Meyer on 28 April 2015 to discuss these impacts and I am very disappointed that there is no mention in this report, other than a short entry in one of the tables indicating the Wapack Trail impact of 7 feet (which is grossly incorrect).

Furthermore, the report only mentions the impact, once the project is completed. There is no mention of impact and mitigation during construction. How will trail access be impacted during the construction and what actions will Tennessee take? We discussed this specifically with Lucas Meyer and he assured us that this impact would be addressed.

We also discussed with Lucas Meyer the impact of opening a new access path (IE the pipeline route) through Rhododendron State Park. We discussed how that area continues to see abuse from ATV and off road 4-wheel drive vehicles. There is no mention anywhere in the report on how Tennessee plans to address this situation. I am sure this same issue is going to present itself in many other areas along the pipeline route. Lucas Meyer indicated that Tennessee does not allow ATV or off-road vehicle use in the pipeline corridor yet there is no mention in the report on how this potential problems is going to be prevented.

Furthermore, I find it hard to believe that there is no mention of mitigation during construction for any of the numerous other trails mentioned in the report. Certainly the Appalachian Trail and several of the rail trails mentioned are heavily utilized. What is the mitigation for this during construction?

I admit I have limited knowledge concerning the other areas of this report, but the errors and omissions on the small segment in my areas raises concerns of shoddy work and oversight of this project. There have been constant assurances from Tennessee representatives about company operations, diligence, and safety. I find this hard to believe, based on the shoddy work I have seen so far.

Tennessee has also assured the citizens along the path that they will have opportunities for input on this project. I question why I went to the trouble of meeting with Tennessee representatives to discuss my concerns about specific areas that I felt were important and was completely ignored.

Tennessee actions continue to disappoint in many ways and raises concerns about the construction of the pipeline and the safety of this project on an ongoing basis.

## **20150727-5010**

Curtis L. Douglas, Richmond, NH.

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Dear Ms. Bose:

On three separate occasions, all of which have been documented in writing or on video, we have implored and invited representatives of KM/TGP to meet with us at our home to review and discuss the impact on our home of their proposed NED pipeline. And on all three occasions, we have received no follow-up from them. None. Nada. Zip. Zilch. Not one word, not one indication of a willingness to schedule a meeting, not one indication of any concern over the possible impact on us, not so much as a hint that they want to be the good neighbors they claim they want to be.

So imagine our alarm at finding in the recently released and revised EIS Residential Construction Plans Appendix P, a CAD drawing of OUR HOME. With a very detailed depiction of exactly how this company intends to build its pipeline approximately 40 feet from our house. So without talking to us, without explaining to us the potential impact of this construction, in essence without so much as a 'screw you AND your family', they've drawn up and submitted a fairly detailed plan to do exactly that. Is this the behavior of a good neighbor? Hardly.

There's just one problem with their little plan. Their measurements appear to be wrong. Which is understandable, since they've never set foot on our property. And now? Now it's going to take a court order for them to get in here and see it for themselves. Which I'm sure you'll be only too happy to help them secure.

Thus far, this whole FERC process has been one large scale con-job. The 11th-hour changing of the proposed route of the pipeline...the dog-and-pony show atmosphere of the open houses...the outright lying and spin-doctoring we all witnessed at the Town Hall meetings...the hurry-up and get it done scheduling of the scoping meetings (with only two of them currently planned FOR THE ENTIRE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE)...and lastly the release of the revised EIS mere days before the scoping meetings.

Heaven help us all if you and your accomplices at KM/TGP continue to herd us down this path with your sham of a project process. Because given the scope of the environmental damage that will be done, to say nothing of the loss of life and property when the operating pipeline inevitably ruptures and explodes somewhere along its length, I don't imagine help of the human variety will be of use to any of us.

## **20150727-5011**

Jon Michael Vore, Amherst, NH.  
Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr., Deputy Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

Docket no. PF14-22-000

Dear Senator Shaheen, Ayotte and Representative Kuster,

I am writing you to consider introducing a federal bill that would protect your constituents from being negatively impacted financially during Eminent Domain proceedings. I live in Amherst and currently the KM/TGP pipeline is slated to go through my yard approximately 50 feet from my bedroom window. Since we found out about this project 8 months ago, we have educated ourselves as well as we can. We understand that Kinder Morgan will not be required to purchase our entire property for their project but rather purchases a 50 foot wide swath which will be required as a permanent easement. We have heard reports that KM offers \$30-\$36 per linear foot. The one-time payment may be subjected to capital gains tax. Having a 30 to 36 inch pipeline coming through my yard logically decreases the value of my property and the sale price of my house. Potential homebuyers are not looking for a property with a natural gas pipeline easement, from which they derive no benefit and cannot develop at any point in the future.

Not only would there be a loss of actual land use but there would also be the destruction of the aesthetic quality of the property. A 50 foot wide swath cutting diagonally through my property is an eye sore that can never be repaired, especially with natural gas pipeline markers along the entire path. It seems extremely unfair and illogical that a company making billions from this project is able to offer an insultingly small

amount to landowners – an amount that can never fully compensate us for our loss. Why should the little people in this process bear the largest financial burden while the goliath sized energy companies reap the benefits of our sacrifice?

While you may not be willing to prevent the NED pipeline from occurring, leverage your position to make sure that your constituents are protected. The New Hampshire state legislature has proposed HB 227, which requires a natural gas pipeline to purchase an entire homeowner's property if it needs any part of it for a pipeline project. While I do not want to move, if the pipeline does happen I would receive fair market value for my home and could start a new life in a community that does not have a natural gas pipeline. HB 227 is still making its way through the New Hampshire legislature. Even if it does pass in NH, without federal backing, it may not be enforceable.

You have yet to still come out strongly against the NED natural gas pipeline proposal. New Hampshire's need is not for more energy but for better energy distribution, which will not be fixed by this proposal. With that said, in recent weeks you have asked the DOE and FERC for greater transparency and additional scoping meetings for your constituents. This is a step in the right direction but not enough. While you may believe that bringing more natural gas to New Hampshire will help lower gas prices, don't forget about the many constituents who will be bearing an even larger cost when they lose part of the property that they have worked long and hard for. Help protect us by introducing legislation in the United States House and Senate that will force utility companies to buy our entire properties (if we choose) at fair market value rather than just the portion that they need for their financial gain.

I hope this letter is not responded to with a generic letter stating that "New Hampshire is in an energy crisis and needs more natural gas" but rather with a logical response about why this shouldn't be the norm for natural gas Eminent Domain proceedings. Why should individual homeowners, some of whom will be financially ruined as their home is their greatest retirement asset, bear the greatest cost while Kinder Morgan further increases the dividends for their shareholders?

My hope is that you will do what you were elected to do and represent all of the constituents of your state. If we can't count on you to represent our interests as opposed to that of big business and the utility industry, then why should we re-elect an individual that isn't going to represent the people that put them there. Represent the interests of your constituents and the citizens of New Hampshire, not a Texas-based company that wants to sacrifice our states for its own interests and financial gains.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Jon Michael Vore  
Amherst, NH

CC:

The Honorable Annie Kuster  
137 Cannon House Office Building  
Washington, DC 20515  
Phone: (202) 225-5206  
Fax: (202) 225-2946

The Honorable Kelly Ayotte  
United States Senate 144 Russell Senate Office Building  
Washington, D.C. 20510-2907  
Phone: (202) 224-3324  
Fax: (202) 228-0399

The Honorable Jeanne Shaheen  
506 Hart Senate Office Building  
Washington, DC 20510

Phone: (202) 224-2841

Fax: (202) 228-3194

**20150727-5012**

Jon Michael Vore, Amherst, NH.

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr., Deputy Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, NE

Washington, DC 20426

Docket no. PF14-22-000

My name is Jon Michael Vore and I live on 23 Simeon Wilson Rd in Amherst, NH with my wife and four children. We first learned of the KM/TGP in December of 2014 when we received a letter from TGP stating that they wanted to put a 36 inch natural gas pipeline through our yard bringing fracked gas from the Marcellus shale in Pennsylvania terminating in Dracut, Mass. The current path puts the proposed pipeline within 50 feet of my bedroom. This pipeline is also slated to go near both our middle school and high school while also going through the Souhegan River 4 times in the span of a 1/2 mile and through the Ponemah BOG that has taken the past 10,000 years to evolve.

Despite assurances from the company that wants to force me to provide them with an easement on my property for their pipeline, I am extremely concerned with what this pipeline may do to my property value as well as that of my neighbors. I am even more concerned that a private company may be given the power of Eminent Domain by FERC to take part of my land for a private undertaking. Eminent Domain requires that if private property is taken that the taken land must benefit the public. As of today KM has not proven that this project will in anyway benefit the greater good of New Hampshire.

New Hampshire is currently a net exporter of energy. Our high cost of energy in New Hampshire is not due to a lack of energy in the region but more our ability to distribute it throughout the state. Even if we were to bring more energy it would not drive down our costs because we still have the issue of distribution. Kinder Morgan continues to group the New England states as one, yet the 6 states all have very different dynamics and needs. Those states that do not have an energy shortage should not bear the burden of housing a natural gas pipeline as well as compressor station that will not benefit our state.

New Hampshire is merely a pass through state to get the natural gas from Pennsylvania to Dracut, Mass. Interestingly enough, when the original line was proposed, New Hampshire was only slated to get a lateral as opposed to the main line that is now currently proposed. Why is that? If the preferred line was truly preferred then why wasn't it the original line proposed by Kinder Morgan? Either Kinder Morgan is lazy and didn't do their due diligence to find the best route possible initially or they merely feel that they will have an easier battle to fight with people in Southern New Hampshire than they would fighting the residents and legislators in Central Massachusetts.

Kinder Morgan's ultimate goal is to get something passed. They will continue to change the scope of the project until they can find a point at which people feel comfortable approving it. They have already decreased the size of the pipe from 36 to 30 inches and have decreased the amount that it will carry from 2.2 down to 1.3 BCF to show a supposed need. They don't care what they get passed as long as they get something. They want to take advantage of any revenue that they can while the natural gas market is good. Changes that have occurred even in the past few weeks are the best evidence that this pipeline is not needed. Energy conservation as well as other projects already approved can provide us with the bridge we need until renewable energies are more cost effective and widespread.

Let's not be naïve. Kinder Morgan is in no way concerned with how high the energy prices are in New England or whether there is a supposed energy shortage. The only concern for Kinder Morgan is how much revenue they can make for their shareholders. FERC's responsibility is not to be a rubber stamp and just push

things through. FERC has the responsibility to make sure that these pipelines are needed and appropriate. FERC possess the power to give private companies the ability to take what people have worked long and hard for. The granting of Eminent Domain not only can financially harm homeowners for years to come but it can also involve significant emotional harm that no amount of compensation can ever fix. While it may be my property that is currently at risk for condemnation what makes you think that the next expansion won't affect your property and livelihood? It is something we all need to keep in mind, even FERC.

Sincerely,

Jon Michael Vore

CC:

The Honorable Annie Kuster  
137 Cannon House Office Building  
Washington, DC 20515  
Phone: (202) 225-5206  
Fax: (202) 225-2946

The Honorable Kelly Ayotte  
United States Senate 144 Russell Senate Office Building  
Washington, D.C. 20510-2907  
Phone: (202) 224-3324  
Fax: (202) 228-0399

The Honorable Jeanne Shaheen  
506 Hart Senate Office Building  
Washington, DC 20510  
Phone: (202) 224-2841  
Fax: (202) 228-3194

### **20150727-5013**

Deirdre Olson, Northfield, MA.

This is my second comment about the Kinder Morgan NED. On Friday July 24 2015 Kinder Morgan did an environmental dump thousands of pages of documents updates were sent to the state. NoFrackedGasInMass is going thru and working on this immense job downloading documents trying to organize it for the citizens of MA.

The maps updates ,environmental, alternative routes extra laterals, new towns, all Kinder Morgan decided to add on and update. By the by we heard Deval Patrick was listed as the Governor he's been gone awhile and now Governor Baker is in charge .....See this lack of attention to details is very very worrisome.

Candidly I live on the Mtn in Northfield targeted for the immense compressor station and now apparently a piglet whatever that is. We have no cell phones, bad landline and very bad internet. Many elderly live on this Mtn have no computers this is the truly disenfranchised citizens that are living on ground zero.

In Feb Kinder Morgan had their open house in Greenfield Ma in an Ice storm . The residents braved the ice snow we drove took us 45 minutes to get to the Open house only to find Kinder Morgan had no pictures of the compressor station no information.We were disappointed, upset, shocked and were told wait for the FERC SCOPING !It's a process !

This Wed July 29 six thirty FERC will have this scoping. We do not have the time to cull through most of Kinder Morgan's latest updates in fact much still hasn't been released or gone thru . Many of the elderly in direct path of KM proposals they have no access to internet. Is there paper information for us ? Is there people to help ? Not that we can see.

Ferc said Friday it's a process ! You can still have a scope with no information I suppose which to us in the Sacrifice area we find very revealing . FERC is looking like a partner with the industry with no illusions to

be a regulatory agency. At the Open House FERC reps said 'FERC HAS NEVER DENIED A PIPELINE ..... Imagine saying that to distraught elderly sick residents .

So Wed July 29 2015 we will find out the FERC SCOPE is what just a process again where Kinder Morgan gets a pass like FERC gave them in the fall last year with their 25 year old survey maps . See there is a problem here a conflict of interests the publics rights against FERC KINDER MORGAN . FERC does not even pretend to want to play a regulatory part of this bizarre process. WHO holds a scoping without complete accurate information ? FERC KM.

Kinder Morgan has a horrific track record of safety violations The WSJ even wrote them up for poor pipeline safety maintenance and accidents . I understand FERC doesn't entertain that information they don't care .....What can be more bizarre than that. Let me say I gave FERC the benefit of the doubt for quite awhile , no longer they are sham in this process as they call it .....NEVER DENIED A PIPELINE . Begs the question "How's that working out for us ?" All the accidents spills explosions deaths .The buck stops at FERC.

I will be unable to attend the FERC SCOPE WED JULY 29 I have asthma the venue has no windows, air exchange or air conditioning they expect at least 700 people so I will have to wait for the movie.

Once again I and many of the elderly people with health issues who will be in the eye of KM Immense compressor station will not be able to be part of this rather absurd process. At this point in time I have no respect for the FERC KM PROCESS. This book will be written.

#### **20150727-5014**

James Carvalho, Bolton, MA.

Subject: Docket #PF14-22: Comment – Wrong Answers

In the development of the NED project Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) the FERC must adhere to all aspects of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) 42 U.S.C. 4321. 40 CFR 1508.7 requires the study of "cumulative impacts," defined as "the impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions... Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time."

While the FERC is enjoying the summer vacation, it is a good time to review the Commission's past year achievements in regulatory performance. Commissions who demonstrate difficulty in achieving expected milestones during the school year require remedial instruction. A review of the FERC's previous test scores reveals many Wrong Answers. A sampling of these test failures follows:

"Currently, there is no standard methodology to determine how the Project's incremental contribution to GHGs would result in physical effects on the environment, either locally or globally. However, estimated emissions associated with the Project would incrementally increase the atmospheric concentrations of GHGs, in combination with GHG emissions from other sources identified in the cumulative impacts analysis. Because we cannot determine the Project's incremental physical impacts due to climate change on the environment, we cannot determine whether or not the Project's contribution to cumulative impacts on climate change would be significant."

Cove Point LNG Project EA CP13-113 (5/15/14)

[http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/file\\_list.asp?document\\_id=14216408](http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/file_list.asp?document_id=14216408)

"it is not practical to analyze the cumulative effects of an action on the universe; the list of environmental effects must focus on those that are truly meaningful."

Constitution Pipeline Project Certificate CP13-499 (12/2/14)

<http://www.ferc.gov/CalendarFiles/20141202171918-CP13-499-000.pdf>

"First, we have found that increased natural gas production is not an indirect effect of the proposed project as contemplated by NEPA or the CEQ regulations. Second, the DOE Addendum is limited to general estimates about the environmental impacts associated with natural gas production with respect to DOE's autho-

rization of LNG exports. The DOE Addendum notes the difficulties in analyzing the specific environmental impacts of additional natural gas production”

“The EA identified many climate change-related environmental effects in the project region resulting from overall GHG emissions, but concluded that it cannot be determined whether the project’s contribution to cumulative impacts on climate change would be significant.”

Sabine LNG Project Pass Re-Hearing Denial CP13-552 (6/23/15)

<http://www.ferc.gov/CalendarFiles/20150623120157-CP13-552-001.pdf>

The FERC answers on these tests do not adequately analyze direct, cumulative, and indirect impacts on climate change from GHG emissions as required by NEPA. NEPA analyses take into account GHG emissions from activities that have a reasonably close causal relationship to the Federal action, such as those that may occur as a predicate for the agency action (often referred to as upstream emissions) and as a consequence of the agency action (often referred to as downstream emissions). As a result, the FERC has been assigned to following Summer Reading List:

Revised Draft Guidance for Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change Impacts

[https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/docs/nepa\\_revised\\_draft\\_ghg\\_guidance.pdf](https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/docs/nepa_revised_draft_ghg_guidance.pdf)

Fact Sheet: Social Cost of Carbon

<http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/Downloads/EPAactivities/scc-fact-sheet.pdf>

IPCC Fifth Annual Assessment Report (AR5)

<https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar5/>

Hopefully, this remedial study will result in improved regulatory performance at the FERC. Improvement will be evaluated when the Kinder Morgan NED gas pipeline project test is submitted for approval later this year. A thorough analysis of the cumulative effects of the NED gas pipeline at all points of production, distribution and consumption in the EIS will show significant GHG emissions (both CO<sub>2</sub> and CH<sub>4</sub>) and consequently a significant impact upon global climate change. The expectation is that the FERC will benefit from the summer reading list and use this knowledge in order to disapprove the NED project. Have a great summer. See you again in the Fall.

**20150727-5027**

**The Greater Northfield Watershed Association**  
P.O. Box 44 Northfield, MA 01360

July 17, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20216

RE: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, Docket No. PF14-22, Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Secretary Bose:

Update: As of July 26, 2015.... NED Resource Reports were just made available over the last few days; it makes sense that the scoping process be postponed until citizens can make a meaningful reading of the documents. That said, a glance over the reports suggests that many of the following concerns are not satisfactorily addressed. The procedures and studies focus on construction, but most information about compressor stations during operation are still deferred to the final draft. That is of great concern to the Greater Northfield Watershed Association and we submit our questions in original form, with some updates in italics.

In preparation for upcoming scoping meetings in our area, The Greater Northfield Watershed Association (GNWA) would like to add to our previous submission from February 27 (Accession # 20150227-5228).

First we would like to restate that our position has not changed since our last submittal:

The GNWA intends to watchdog the watershed and insist upon the utmost adherence to regulations. However, TGP and their parent company, Kinder Morgan, have a large budget for paying fines for environmental violations, and have a record of committing violations and paying the minimal fines without complaint, rather than adhering to laws. We therefore feel that the only way to ensure the protection of our watershed is to prevent TGP from having a presence to begin with. The GNWA holds that there are ways to provide power to the Northeast that will not negatively affect our watershed or our climate. We feel that this project will diminish incentives to invest in renewable energy. We first ask that FERC discourage TGP from continuing with their application.

-Julia Blyth, February 27 GNWA letter

As a non-profit group with a mission to protect our water resources, we are presenting our specific concerns for study regarding the pipeline and compressor station planned for our hillsides. The simple fact that the ROW for the powerlines lies elevated on a ridge does not mean that that is a good place for a pipeline. In addition, that a landowner is willing to contract with Kinder Morgan does not automatically mean that location is suitable for a compressor station. As the compressor station location has been announced since our last submission we can be more detailed with concerns for the affected watersheds. We believe that the water supply risks alone are enough to deny license to the project; when viewed in conjunction with a multitude of other effects on our region the pipeline becomes even more unjustifiable.

To quote our previous letter:

We are concerned about damage to these watersheds due to erosion and runoff during construction, the effects on surface water of a 6 foot deep trench, the effects on groundwater of blasting to create a trench through bedrock, and the potential release of contaminants at a compressor site. We also manage invasive species within the watershed and are concerned about the possibility of new introductions or the spread of invasive species.

-Julia Blyth, Feb 27 GNWA letter

The GNWA is aware that increasing research points to health hazards in the vicinity of compressor stations. In light of this we insist that in-depth studies be done on the following issues:

1. First, the geology of the area makes this a poor choice for this project by jeopardizing the water supply of the whole town east of the Connecticut River. We notice that the reports generally focus on aquifers/sources within .25 miles from construction areas; we feel that the operation of the compressor station requires a much broader study. The ROW runs along bedrock hilltops with very shallow soils. From the moment trees are cleared there will be significant run-off that will become more concentrated as it heads downstream. Previous logging in the area has demonstrated this. Most likely due to the many steep slopes along the ridge, construction will require "two-toning" to create a work zone ; that implies more blasting and disruption. The Miller's Brook watershed (see attached map) directly below the proposed compressor station has three main tributaries that begin near the ROW, and they in turn are fed by many tiny runs. The sources of these tributaries are numerous and do not appear on maps, and therefore are not well assessed in the reports. It would be highly unlikely that during pipeline installation horizontal boring would be used for these numerous small waterways, which means trenching and more blasting in addition to the large area that will need to be cleared for the station. The entire flow of water off the mountain will be significantly altered. The quantity of well water supplies downhill would be affected in addition to the quality of the water, and the majority of residents have private wells. Further, the run-off will enter porous glacial gravel toward the more populated area of town on the western end of water supply zone 6. This zone recharges the single well that supplies the downtown residents. This quote sums up the risk to most of the town's water supply due to the location of the pipeline/station:

There is one well serving the Northfield Water District, located along the Mill River off of Strowbridge Road. The well is a gravel developed well located in an unconfined narrow bedrock valley buried within glacially deposited sand and gravel. There is no evidence of a confining (protective) clay layer in the vicinity of the well. Wells located in an unconfined aquifer are considered to have a

high vulnerability to potential contamination due to the absence of hydrogeologic barriers (i.e. clay) that can prevent contaminant migration into the aquifer from the surface

- Source Water Assessment and Protection (SWAP) Report,  
MA DEP

. We understand from the new reports that KM would compensate owners of wells altered by construction. However, what might happen five to ten years from now due to settling emissions or spills? The other water sources in town are also vulnerable. There is a school on South Mountain Road that has its own water well and would be at risk for similar reason as above.

A third resource is district 4 in the north end of the town. In this case surface waters feed Grandin Reservoir, which serves the north end of town as well as the Northfield campus with potential service for thousands of people. Surface waters are particularly open to contamination, and the Mass. DEP SWAP report for this zone recommends that no herbicides be used for clearing the transmission line ROW already in place. We believe the installation of pipeline would also put this district at risk.

The GNWA insists that a full list of possible contaminants from pipeline construction, pressure testing, pigging operations, and compressor station air-borne emissions be provided and made public. This list should include the compounds used for field-coating welds before installation of pipeline.

Please also require that a full study of surficial and sub-surficial water flow and quality be carried out along all watersheds in town, including baseline tests ( for known compressor station contaminants) of wells and surface water sources in all zones (including the watershed to the southeast of the proposed station along Orange Road). The town should not be financially liable for any studies. Northfield deserves 100% assurance that our water supply is safe.

2. In February the GNWA cited trace hydrocarbons other than methane, including PCBs, as a concern as they can be released in blowdowns, pigging operations, and the disposal of liquid condensates that could be removed from the pipeline. We notice that there will be a pigging receiver and a main line valve near the compressor station. Again for the aforementioned water protection reasons, the GNWA requests full disclosure of the contents of, and protocols involving, pipeline liquids during normal operations.

3. We would like to add our concern for the contamination of water resources by herbicide use as well. The ROW in Northfield includes some very steep terrain and we question the ability of mowing equipment to handle it. We need assurance that no herbicides will be used above our watersheds which extend entirely along the route through our town.

4. The disturbance of soils in the ROW, station area, staging areas, and temporary construction access points will seriously increase the risk of invasive plant species in core habitat areas. Please require a detailed survey of present invasive species, at no expense to the town. What procedures would be in place to prevent the spread of invasive plants? This is partially answered in the reports, but will the surveys be conducted five years from now as well?

5. As steward of the natural environment of the watersheds of Northfield, the GNWA is extremely concerned that fragile habitats, connected to some of the few remaining intact wildlife corridors, will be changed permanently by the Kinder Morgan NED project. The GNWA is aware that the March Resource Reports make mention of the Biomap2 but wish to insist that the designations are considered seriously. We notice that both Market Station 2 in Winsor and our Market Station 3 are very disruptive to core habitats. These designated areas need not be at risk by construction, emissions/ spills during operation, or fire. Please insist that a full study of GIS mapped resources in all watersheds (including to the southeast of the proposed station) be carried out at no expense to the town. These studies should include, but not be limited to, certified and potential vernal pools, cold water fisheries, core habitats, and critical natural landscapes. We also request a “bio-blitz” to determine if any endangered species are present especially in the areas of Great Swamp (listed as Priority Habitat) and the Miller’s Brook watershed, that may have been missed by other agencies. Again, long after the pipeline has been installed, there will be emissions directly above these water sources.

In summary the GNWA would like to re-iterate that the construction process and the presence of a pipeline and compressor station would greatly endanger the health of our watershed systems, thereby unacceptably putting at risk the town's water supply and the related natural ecosystems. We feel that the recent Resource Reports were lacking in specifics about compressor stations, which present a host of risks to watersheds beyond those of pipeline construction and operation alone. The GNWA feels that simply because the power-line ROW happens to be on a ridge above our town, that does not imply that it is a good spot for a compressor station. As a very extensive environmental report is needed we make one final request: Please do not close the scoping comment period until well after the review of the new and complete resource reports from Kinder Morgan, and complete independent studies of the energy need in MA have been completed.

Thank you for your consideration,

Andrew Vernon

President, Greater Northfield Watershed Association

Northfield, MA

avernon@sau29.org

cc.

MA Representative Paul Mark

MA Senator Stan Rosenberg

US Representative Jim McGovern

US Senator Ed Markey

US Senator Elizabeth Warren

Governor Charlie Baker

MA Attorney General Maura Healey

Northfield Administrator Brian Noble

Northfield Selectboard

*{map, not included here}*

## **20150727-5051**

Thomas Gorman, Pelham, NH.

### Kinder Morgan Pipeline Opposition

We, Thomas and Robyn Gorman residing at 33 Winterberry Rd. Pelham, N.H. oppose the Kinder Morgan pipeline for the following reasons.

- 1) This pipeline, simply stated, is not needed. It provides no benefit to the town of Pelham and provides no benefit to the residents of any community through which it passes.
- 2) It is my understanding that a one hundred fifty (150) foot buffer area is required on either side boundary of the existing power lines. My building is situated within this zone.
- 3) My home is abutted on two sides by natural forest. The thick forest between my home and power lines will, in all likelihood, be ravaged by heavy equipment, leaving an ugly scar where lovely trees currently exist.
- 4) Property values along the proposed route will undoubtedly fall. We are a retired couple, having worked full time since the age of twenty. I'm proud of the home that my wife and I worked hard to buy. It would be a slap in the face for any hard working citizen to lose home equity simply to provide revenue to the Kinder Morgan Corporation.
- 5) It is my understanding that a Kinder Morgan competitor, currently providing gas in New Hampshire via an alternative route, has capacity to increase production via that route. It's ludicrous that the beautiful, scenic State of New Hampshire should allow the raping of our natural resources to build an unnecessary pipeline.

Thomas N. & Robyn A. Gorman

33 Winterberry Rd.  
Pelham, NH 03076

**20150727-5088**

Arthur Anderson, Amherst, NH.  
Dear FERC,

I am a resident of Amherst NH and live less than a mile from the proposed pipeline route.

I support the expansion of natural gas pipelines in New Hampshire:

1. New Hampshire needs more natural gas availability as it is clean burning, abundant and lower in cost than oil.
2. The “not in my back yard” folks are small in number but vocal.
3. If this were 80 years ago they would opposing the high tension wires for the same reasons.
4. New Hampshire is way behind in availability of clean burning natural gas. Homes which use wood or heating oil would be much better off with natural gas.

The reason we have an FERC and Utility Regulators is to cut through the raw emotions of a few affected homeowners and do what is right for the State and nation. Yes, providing a source for natural gas produced in Pennsylvania is good for New Hampshire and the country.

Somehow I am on a natural gas pipeline and enjoy the many benefits of this clean burning fuel. I believe the pipeline will benefit New Hampshire and the Nation over the longer run.

Arthur T Anderson  
7 Elmwood Way  
Amherst NH 03031

**20150728-0010**

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts  
**Town of Cheshire**  
Massachusetts 01225  
Office of the  
Board of Selectmen

July 21, 2015

Greetings:

The Cheshire Board of Selectmen submit the enclosed Resolution for your consideration.

This Resolution was presented to the Board of Selectmen by voter petition to be placed on the Cheshire Annual Town Meeting Warrant.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Webber  
Cheshire Town Administrator

-----  
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts  
**Town of Cheshire**  
Massachusetts 01225  
Office of the  
Town Clerk

At the Cheshire Annual Town Meeting held on June 8th, 2015

Article 14: To see if the Town will vote to adopt the following non-binding resolution, or take any other action in relation thereto:

[Note: This article is placed on the warrant via registered voter petition.]

### Resolution Opposing the Gas Pipeline in Cheshire, MA

Whereas a proposed High-Pressure Pipeline carrying natural gas obtained through hydraulic fracturing may come through Cheshire, MA or neighboring communities, and

Whereas said pipeline goes against current Massachusetts commitments to renewable energies and combating global climate change; and

Whereas said pipeline would destroy unknowable amounts of forest, wetland conservation land and farmland; potentially harm drinking water and personal health; and infringe on personal property rights; and

Whereas a high-pressure gas pipeline, by its nature, carries the potential for leak, rupture or devastating explosion causing untold damage to property and lives; and

Whereas the projected route of the pipeline traverses under the Cheshire Reservoir thus risking contamination of the lake, this would affect not only the people and wildlife in the area, but also the economics and reputation of the Town of Cheshire; and

Whereas the cost of said pipeline may require Massachusetts citizens to pay a utility bill tariff as well as environmental costs not required by law for Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. ("TGP", a subsidiary of Kinder Morgan Energy Partners, L.P.), making ratepayers bear financial risk for the endeavors of a private corporation; and

Whereas, we the citizens of Cheshire, Massachusetts choose not to participate in such encumbrances to the life, vibrancy, economic stability, and general well being of our neighbors in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and in the State of New York and elsewhere, wherever hydraulic fracturing is occurring and the pressurized pipeline is running;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the residents of Cheshire, Massachusetts:

1. Hereby call on our Select Board to stand in opposition to any high-pressured pipeline and not allow it within our town borders; and
2. Stand in solidarity with nearby communities who are taking measures to disallow the pipeline within their borders and to ban its construction in our region, including: Dalton, Hancock, Lenox, North Adams, Pittsfield, Richmond, Sandisfield, Washington, Windsor (Berkshire); Chesterfield, Cummington, Northampton, Pelham, Plainfield, Worthington (Hampshire); Ashfield, Buckland, Conway, Deerfield, Gill, Greenfield, Leverett, Montague, Northfield, Orange, Shelburne, Warwick, Wendell (Franklin); Ashburnham, Athol, Berlin, Bolton, Royalston, Templeton, Winchendon (Worcester); Ashby, Dracut, Dunstable, Groton, Pepperell, Townsend, Tyngsborough, Wilmington (Middlesex); Brookline (Norfolk); and Brookline, Hollis and Mason (Hillsborough County, New Hampshire); and
3. Cause a copy of this resolution to be presented to the Town of Cheshire's state and federal legislative representatives, FERC and the Governor and Secretary of the Department of Conservation and Recreation, asking them to take action to prevent construction of the Pipeline within the borders of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and to enact legislation and take such other actions as are necessary to disallow such projects that go against our commitments to life, the environment, our economic well being and our bodily safety, and instead to legislate more stringent energy efficiency and further exploration of subsidies for renewable energy sources.

Motion was passed and seconded.

Voice vote called.           **Motion carried. Article passed.**

Attest: True Copy

Christine B. Emerson

Cheshire Town Clerk

Congress of the United States  
Washington, DC 20510

July 15, 2015

The Honorable Gregory H. Friedman  
Inspector General  
U.S. Department of Energy  
1000 Independence Avenue, SW  
Washington, D.C. 20585

Dear Mr. Friedman:

We write to you regarding the interstate natural gas permitting process administered by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) pursuant to Section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act of 1938 (NGA).

We appreciate FERC's important role in the development and expansion of energy infrastructure, including natural gas pipelines; however, we are particularly concerned about the complexity of the permitting process and the extent to which public comment is considered during the application review.

Pursuant to the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (EPA 2005), FERC is designated as the lead agency to coordinate, review and process all natural gas infrastructure project applications under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and all federal authorizations. Therefore, it is essential that the Commission ensure that its permitting process allow sufficient opportunity for all stakeholders, especially private citizens affected by projects, to express their views and obtain accurate information about any infrastructure development.

The Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project, a pending interstate natural gas infrastructure project proposed by Kinder Morgan, has brought certain issues related to the FERC permitting process to our attention. Our constituents have expressed frustration about the lack of information from FERC and the limited extent that public input is considered in the Commission's review and approval process for energy infrastructure projects. This raises significant concerns for us given that the Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (CPCN) issued by FERC to authorize the construction of a pipeline project allows for land to be acquired through eminent domain. Moreover, the CPCN preempts any state or local action that may conflict with federal law in relation to a given project.

It is essential that all stakeholders be afforded meaningful opportunity to participate in the FERC permitting process; therefore, we respectfully request you examine FERC's interstate natural gas permitting process and respond to the following questions:

1. What actions is FERC taking to ensure that it fully complies with its statutory mandate to ensure all interstate natural gas infrastructure projects permitted by the Commission are consistent with public interest?
2. Has FERC put in place proper tools and conducted sufficient outreach efforts to ensure that all affected stakeholders have accurate information and instruction on the ways in which they can participate in the interstate natural gas permitting process?
3. Does FERC have in place performance measures and controls to provide reasonable assurance that it fully meets its obligations under Executive Order 13604 and other applicable statutes to promote the exchange of information among stakeholders?
4. In what way does FERC ensure that the opportunities for public comment currently required in the interstate natural gas permitting process allow for all stakeholders to meaningfully express their concerns about the potential impacts (environmental and otherwise) of a proposed pipeline project?
5. In what manner are comments from state and local officials and agencies considered during the permitting process?

Thank you for your attention to our request and we look forward to your timely response.

Jeanne Shaheen

Ann McLane Kuster

United States Senator  
Kelly Ayotte  
United States Senator  
CC.:

Member of Congress  
Frank Guinta  
Member of Congress

Chairman Norman Bay  
Commissioner Tony Clark  
Commissioner Cheryl LaFleur  
Commissioner Phillip Moeller  
Commissioner Colette Honorable

**20150728-0037**

Hand written letter, Cherylann Pierce, 23 Mayflower Drive, Londonderry, NH 03053-2518, opposing

**20150728-0039**

written card, Julie Steed Mawson, 17 South Shore Dr, Pelham, NH 03076, requesting Scoping Meeting for New Ipswich, NH

**20150728-0040**

Hand written card, Kathleen Gauvin, 61 Beechwood Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, opposing

**20150728-0050**

Hand written letter, Jeannine Wharton, Fitzwilliam, NH , opposing.

**20150728-5001**

Jeffrey Hooper, Londonderry, NH.

Dear Federal Energy Regulatory Commission,

Subject: Proposed Kinder/Morgan Pipeline, Docket Number PF12-22

My name is Jeffrey Hooper. I am a citizen of the United States of America and a resident of the town of Londonderry, New Hampshire. I DO NOT want the pipeline in New Hampshire. According to the Londonderry Times Newspaper dated 23 July 2015, the Town Council opposes this pipeline too. So there you have it—NO PIPELINE in NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Thank You,

Jeffrey Hooper

**20150728-5005**

Frederick Snell, Andover, MA.

You need to postpone FERC Scoping hearings for Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Direct because Resource Reports due in June just arrived on July 24 AFTER hearing in PA and NY and four days before MA and NH hearings begin.

Please allow a full 60 days for public input from the 7-24 release date for the documents; reschedule hearings for at least 30 days to allow people to digest the over 6000 pages of material; and repeat hearings in PA and NY to allow comments on the many new items disclosed.

Thank you,

Fred Snell

Comments on Environmental Issues with proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline,  
Docket No. PF 14-22-000

I respectfully request that the issues listed below be thoroughly addressed in the Environmental Impact Report conducted by FERC.

#### Compressor Stations

Determine impacts to the geology of Windsor Jamb's State Park due to the blasting required in construction.

Lighting - Assess impacts of the insects and other wildlife that will be attracted to the 24 hour intense lighting; how will relocation of these organisms away from typical wetland and riverine habitat affect fisheries?

Noise – Assess impacts on wildlife – including birds and bats – of the noise produced.

Exhaust - Assess impacts on air quality, and the alignment with declared goals of the Massachusetts Greenhouse Gas Emission Standards .

#### Water Quality

Delineate Vernal Pools. These seasonally flooded areas are critical spawning areas for amphibians – including protected species of salamanders.

Assess potential to contaminate aquifers over 100 years – the proposed pipeline is 0.25 miles from aquifers in several towns, including my community. Existing pipelines currently leak in “small” – below the required repair threshold – amounts. What is the cumulative impact on invaluable drinking water sources? Our groundwater quality cannot be risked.

Determine increased corrosion rate of pipe due to proximity to high voltage Electricity Transmission lines where pipeline is proposing “co-location”

#### Fisheries

Provide data on the impact of existing pipelines on fish health. In Massachusetts alone, the Project will cross 34 streams that are designated Coldwater Fisheries Resources, as well as numerous tributaries to these streams. These water bodies are valuable habitat for fish; agencies have been working to protect these fish for decades. Trout and salmon are also highly sought after by tourists coming to this area specifically to fly-fish.

#### Land-Use

Forests: Determine the number of mature trees to be cut and kept mowed (not replaced with trees) in the 243 miles of pipeline that crosses through designated forest land. Calculate the CO<sub>2</sub> uptake processed by the 243 miles of forest.

Require that the 3,672 acres of forest involved in construction be re-forested immediately, with a diverse planting of trees so as to avoid infestation of pests that have affected stands of single species trees.

Farms: Assess the impact in farm viability associated with the conversion of 296 acres of farmland to permanent ROW. Will farmers be cut off from portions of their income-producing land? Will trees and vineyards that require several years to harvest be destroyed in exchange for unproductive distant parcels?

Westfield River National Wild and Scenic River:

Determine how the fishery will be protected. The draft report by TGP states that a plan has not been developed for this federally recognized river.

State-protected Conservation Lands

Determine the precedent for disposition of lands permanently protected under Article 97 of the Massachusetts Constitution. The TGP report lists at least 56 parcels are affected.

Areas within 0.25 miles of project

Conduct studies to assess the impact on existing pipelines for leaks into groundwater and for land distur-

bance due to blasting for areas within a quarter mile of the project, i.e. Rose Ledges Rock Climbing area. Numerous protected conservation land and two national scenic trails lie within the quarter mile corridor.

#### Co-location

Enumerate the acreage affected by the additional 30 ft ROW beyond the existing ROW from co-location with power lines. Explain how leaks to groundwater will be monitored. List all access ways required for maintenance and mowing of this additional 30 foot ROW. TGP states that affected public and private protected lands will be not harmed by co-location, however the contamination by leaking pipelines is not visible, whereas the power lines present an eyesore, but not disruption of geology or spoiling of groundwater.

#### Alternatives to Project

Determine the quantity of demand for project that comes from anticipated TGP customers who are changing this project, BUT are currently using other existing pipelines.

Evaluate the capacity needed after present rates of photovoltaic installations and energy efficiency programs are considered.

#### **20150728-5036**

Brandon Cardinal, New Ipswich, NH.

Hello,

I am formerly requesting a stop to the current FERC scoping meetings for 60 days due to the recent document submission by Kinder Morgan. Submitting a new 6500 plus document for review in the midst of existing research, review, and discussion surrounding this project is not acceptable to me, nor should it be to the FERC or our Legislative body for New Hampshire. We will need additional time to review the new documents as you will as well. This is a project with massive implications to the people living around it.

Thank you,

#### **20150728-5038**

Samuel Whaley, East Nassau, NY.

Currently the Compressor Station for NED is slated to be sited near the intersection of Clarks Chapel Road and the Nassau Averill Park Road in the Town of Nassau. This is a very rural area near an organic farm. It would be better to site the Compressor Station along US Route 9 in the Town of Schodack which is zoned commercial or in the Port of Rensselaer with has been the site of Heavy Industry in the past and is still used today for industrial purposes.

#### **20150728-5039**

Bill Collins, Hudson, NH.

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission docket # PF14-22

To Who it may concern,

With the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission about to meet to discuss the proposed Kinder Morgan “Northeast Energy Direct” or NED natural gas pipe line which will pass through southern NH and my town of Hudson NH I would like to take this time to ask a few questions with regards to the matter.

If the pipe line is approved through the FERC process is there any Federal oversight provided during the construction phase? If so how is the construction process monitored? (i.e. physical site walks and inspections, contractor end of day review, monthly meetings?)

The Blanding’s Turtle is on the New Hampshire endangered species list. How does the licensing handle endangered species? This turtle has been spotted along the proposed pipe line corridor in Hudson NH. What considerations are given when the proposed gas line route would potentially destroy habitat where this species has been spotted? And is there any habitat restorative actions and programs that will be required by the

federal government to take place before, during and after construction has taken place?

Lastly this project may require taking of privately owned land through the “eminent domain process”. Eminent Domain, the right of a government or its agent to expropriate private property for public use, with payment of compensation. I did not see the “privately owned company” clause in the definition. How can a privately owned company which stands to make a significant annual profit force the taking of privately owned land? This pipe line is not for public use.

Thank you for your time and I hope that my input matters. If the questions asked can be answered that would be great.

Sincerely,

Bill Collins

Bcoll66956@comcast.net

Hudson NH, 03051

**20150728-5042**

## **How FERC Has Failed the Public on the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project**

### **Foreword**

The public has a great many valid complaints about FERC’s lax “regulation” of the fossil fuel industry’s numerous natural gas pipeline proposals. These complaints include, but are not limited to, the following:

- That many of FERC’s rules and processes date from the last century – before fracking was in common use and before it was envisioned that the US might become a major exporter of LNG. FERC guidelines desperately need updating to address today’s energy realities.
- That FERC’s definition of the “need” for new pipelines is simply market-based, with little actual consideration given to viable alternatives – especially those that FERC does not regulate.
- That FERC considers pipeline proposals in isolation from each other, ignoring the overbuilding of fossil fuel infrastructure that can result. Currently in New England, there are several pipelines being proposed that, if approved, would supply three or more times the amount of gas that even natural gas proponents believe that New England can use.
- That FERC is actively resisting calls (including the draft guidance from the Executive branch’s Council on Environmental Quality) to consider a pipeline’s “upstream” (i.e. fracking) and “downstream” (i.e., burning and/or LNG export) effects on greenhouse gases and climate change. In other words, FERC does not acknowledge that a new pipeline has negative environmental impacts well beyond the actual path of the pipeline.
- That in summary, FERC has rarely, if ever, met a pipeline proposal that it didn’t like (and readily approve). As currently formulated, FERC is in effect a siting agency (“What path should this pipeline take?”) rather than a true regulatory agency (“Does it make sense to approve this pipeline?”).

Such complaints are growing louder and more frequent and have led to the disruption of FERC’s public hearings and to the temporary shutdown of FERC headquarters itself.

But this document does not attempt to enumerate all of FERC’s many systemic problems. The purpose of this document is to detail specific problems that the public has experienced with FERC and specifically with FERC’s non-regulation of Kinder Morgan as that energy company progresses through FERC’s pre-filing process for the NED pipeline project. These FERC failings have directly harmed the public and the public’s right to be accurately informed about proposed natural gas pipelines and the damage that they cause.

This document will go into detail about the ways in which FERC has failed the public in regards to the NED project. The specific areas where FERC has failed are:

1. Kinder Morgan Open House Meetings
2. Kinder Morgan Resource Reports and FERC Scoping Meetings:

### **1. Kinder Morgan Open House Meetings**

The first step in informing the public about the NED project was for Kinder Morgan to hold the informational and open house meetings mentioned above. Kinder Morgan did the following while “informing” the public of their pipeline plans:

- Made presentations at town meetings where it agreed to provide answers to the written questions submitted by the town selectmen – and then simply never even attempted to provide those answers, despite repeated requests for them to do so.
- Filed pipeline maps with FERC that were based on 1980s topographical maps – laughably poor maps that are missing anything built within the past 25 years; maps with less detail than what any 12-year old could access in seconds on a smartphone.
- At public meetings with hundreds of impacted residents present, showed a slide presentation that included an image of a building to “give an idea of what a compressor station looks like” with the proviso “but not exactly like this”. What the audience was not told was that:
  - o The small wood-shingled building displayed was in fact an outbuilding at a compressor station, not the much larger compressor building itself;
  - o The building displayed was part of a 6,130 HP compressor station - but the NED project uses compressor stations of up to 41,000 HP, seven times that capacity.
  - o A 41,000 HP compressor station is a sizable, brightly lit, noisy industrial complex comprising several large buildings - it is not the single small wood shingled building that Kinder Morgan displayed in an attempt to mislead the public.
- Made changes to previously published pipeline maps with absolutely no effort to notify the newly affected (or the newly unaffected) towns and residents of those changes. Those folks were left to find this out from sources other than the company proposing to disrupt their lives.
- During the snowiest New England winter weather in 81 years, FERC staff “strongly recommended” that Kinder Morgan reschedule the public Open Houses planned for a week in February in order to insure that those planning to attend the meetings were not deterred by the record amount of snow and the two significant storms predicted for the upcoming week. Kinder Morgan thought it over and simply refused FERC’s strong recommendation to reschedule. The meetings proceeded under very snowy conditions.
- Told the public that the pipeline would be constructed mostly within an existing power line right-of-way (ROW) when the truth is that it will be built parallel to but almost completely outside of the existing ROW. This is a huge difference to those along the pipeline’s path.
- Kinder Morgan spokesman Allen Fore moderated most of the company’s open house meetings and he continually provided answers to the public that were one or more of the following:
  - o Vague (“FERC is in charge of deciding that, we’re just making a proposal to them”)
  - o Misleading (“There are no current plans to export any of this gas” and “Natural gas pipelines do not affect property values”)
  - o Misdirected (Mr. Fore loves to answer a question that has not been asked rather than the one that has been. When asked about his company’s pipeline safety record, he talks about the many safety regulations that apply to pipeline companies. When asked about the environmental damage caused by pipelines, he talks about the licensing procedures.)
  - o False (“All of it” – Mr. Fore’s answer to the question “How much of the gas put into the pipe at one end reaches the other end?”)

o Simply missing (Mr. Fore’s inability to answer the question “Would you want this pipeline in your backyard?” – left unanswered, despite multiple prompts from a meeting moderator.)

For the record, I have personally witnessed all of the Kinder Morgan misstatements, misdeeds and misbehavior detailed above – and more. But I was only present at a limited number of their public meetings, so I can only guess at the entirety of the misinformation they have spread during the past year.

To make the situation worse, FERC personnel were often present at these open house meetings, handing out pamphlets and answering questions. This had the effect of providing an implied FERC “stamp of approval” on the proceedings.

So it seemed that Kinder Morgan was at best misbehaving and at worst deliberately lying to the public about their plans through omission and commission, while ticking off the “public information” check boxes that FERC requires of them. This occurred at dozen of meetings held over many months and attended by thousands of citizens along the proposed pipeline route.

### **How FERC Failed the Public Regarding Open House Meetings**

Numerous attendees filed comments with FERC reporting Kinder Morgan’s ongoing attempts to misinform the public. And FERC personnel had been present at many of the meetings. But there was simply never any public response from FERC.

There appears to have been no attempt at all by FERC to monitor the (lack of) quality of the information being supplied to the public by Kinder Morgan, much less to try to control it or to remediate the damage done when the public is deliberately misled. FERC does not seem to be prepared to react to this situation at all, even when the public reports the misdeeds and misinformation to them. Is the public interest served by informational meetings where the public is deliberately misled by those presenting the information?

With no sanctions being applied by FERC, why would Kinder Morgan ever be expected to mend their ways? Simply stated, Kinder Morgan does not want there to be an informed public. An informed public does its homework, asks pointed questions and does not passively accept vague and inaccurate answers. It is to Kinder Morgan’s advantage to release as little information as possible, to delay its release as long as possible, to keep the information as vague as possible and to simply misinform when they can. An informed public will inevitably begin to question the need for a new pipeline as they realize what the actual short term and longer term costs of this massive new fossil fuel infrastructure would be.

And it was frankly eye-opening to see just how brazenly and openly Kinder Morgan carried this off. Initially there was some expectation by the public that FERC would have some control over Kinder Morgan’s actions and the information that it supplied to the public. But Kinder Morgan is obviously not too concerned about FERC’s reaction to any of this. For example, they felt free to ignore FERC’s “strong recommendation” to reschedule public meetings. And remember that Kinder Morgan has done this “public information” dance with FERC many times before and so they have a pretty good idea of where the out-of-bounds lines are (if indeed there are any).

FERC claims to strive to keep its processes “open” and “transparent” – but how can this possibly be achieved when FERC is party to such abuses of the public’s right to be informed?

And thus in regard to the open house meetings, FERC has failed the public. By not intervening, FERC provided their implicit stamp of approval to the orgy of misinformation supplied to the public by Kinder Morgan, robbing the public of its right to accurate and timely information about the NED project.

### **2. Kinder Morgan Resource Reports and FERC Scoping Meetings:**

FERC regulations require KM provide a set of “Resource Reports” which are a massive, detailed group of documents laying out expected impacts on air, land, water, noise, cultural and geological resources, etc., and containing many maps. These reports are the basis for FERC to prepare a valid and realistic Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), as mandated by the Federal NEPA review process. The public is invited to participate in developing the Scope of this EIS during Scoping Sessions conducted by FERC.

Kinder Morgan released a set of draft Resource Reports on March 13, 2015. But there was a problem - these initial reports were woefully incomplete. They contained more than 20,000 instances of “TBD” (To Be Determined) serving as placeholders where there was missing data.

The following are examples of some of the “data” available in the draft reports:

*{3 tables, each filled with “TBD” instead of data, not reproduced here}*

Many of these draft reports were simply not usable in their draft form. Kinder Morgan promised to provide updated Resource Reports in June, 2015.

How FERC Failed the Public Regarding Resource Reports and Scoping Meetings

When Kinder Morgan was promising the updated reports in June, FERC went ahead and scheduled its NED scoping meetings to start on July 14 and to end on August 12. This timing was already very tight for those planning to attend the July scoping meetings. There would just not be much time for the public to digest the updated Resource Reports, especially if Kinder Morgan released them towards the end of June.

Worried about this timing and foreseeing the possibility that Kinder Morgan might not deliver the revised reports as promised in June, dozens of individuals, environmental organizations, affected towns and elected officials filed comments with FERC in April, May, June and into July asking that FERC please not let the scoping meetings proceed until after Kinder Morgan released the updated Resource Reports and the public had had time to read and analyze them.

As feared, Kinder Morgan missed the promised June release date. The updated Resource Reports were not made available to the public until July 24, 2015.

And what was FERC’s response to the many pleas they had received to hold off scheduling scoping meetings until a usable set of Resource Reports was available? Nothing - they simply ignored these many requests and went ahead and kept their schedule of scoping meetings starting on July 14 and continuing until August 12.

And what was FERC’s response when Kinder Morgan then missed the promised June release date and the updated Resource Reports did not become available until July 24? Again, nothing – they simply went ahead with their previously scheduled scoping meetings. This denied all attendees of scoping meetings in PA and NY access to usable Resource Reports, since the updated reports had not yet been released when their meetings occurred. And it provided very little time for attendees of the five scoping meetings scheduled within less than a week of the release of the updated Resource Reports.

And as a final slap in the face to the public, FERC has not even extended the public comment period written comments for this phase of the NED project. August 31 remains the last day for any public comment to be considered by FERC in the preparation of the draft EIS for NED.

It is worth noting here just how massive a set of documents these updated Resource Reports are. There are thirteen resource reports, sixteen appendices and four companion documents. These are contained in 81 files that total 6,849 pages. It takes determination simply to download this entire set of reports and a great deal of time to read and analyze them carefully – even if you are concentrating on a relatively small section of the pipeline path.

So once again FERC has failed the public. Members of the public attending the earlier scoping meetings had no access whatever to usable Resource Reports and even those attending later scoping meetings will be afforded precious little time to read, analyze and comment upon the updated reports.

FERC appears to be in a rush to approve this project. When the Kinder Morgan misses its deadlines and critical data is not available to the public, FERC’s previously scheduled meeting dates and deadlines remain unchanged – and the public suffers, along with its right to be informed and to have its voice heard.

Nick Miller Groton, MA

**20150728-5050**

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

RE: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, Docket #PF14-22-000, Northeast Energy Direct Project  
July 28, 2015

Dear Secretary Bose,

I am a resident of Ashfield, Massachusetts and am submitting the following comments in response to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (FERC) notice of intent to prepare the environmental impact statement for the planned Northeast Energy Direct Project (NED) and request for comments on environmental issues. As the agency responsible for reviewing interstate natural gas pipeline proposals and ensuring that regulatory requirements are met throughout the projects, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) has a tremendous responsibility in this process, as the health and well being of all individuals and integrity of all ecosystems impacted by this process count on the FERC to be thorough and comprehensive in its review.

First of all I would like to address the fact that Kinder Morgan's new resource reports for the NED project were just released on Friday, July 24 and includes over 10,000 TBD's (to be determined). How does one comment on something that is yet to be determined? I ask that what we are commenting on be determined first. In addition, the timing of the release of these reports makes it extremely difficult to process all the information in the short window of time we have to do so. It would seem to me an extension is called for if you wish to be thorough and comprehensive in your review. However, despite these significant limitations, you have asked for comments and here they are.

The Public Trust Doctrine, (which became part of common law of the US as established in *Illinois Central Railroad v. Illinois*, 146 U.S. 387, 1892), is the principle that every sovereign government holds vital resources in "trust" for the public, i.e., present and future generations of citizen beneficiaries. It applies to our natural resources. The Public Trust Doctrine obligates the Government, as trustees of the public trust, to protect our natural resources and requires trust management for public benefit rather than private exploit. Though the FERC is an independent agency, its members are nominated by the President of the United States and need to be confirmed by the Senate; there is responsibility here to follow your own policies and procedures to protect this Trust for future generations.

Your agency requires comprehensive environmental impact statements for the projects you oversee. In addition, if any project is suspected of being connected to another, it requires the commission to order the issuance of a supplemental draft environmental statement that includes all the connected projects; you may not segment lines, as was determined in *Delaware Riverkeeper Network, et.al. versus the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company*. There is currently a case involving the Constitution Pipeline Company (docket #CP13-499) and the Iroquois Gas Transmission System (docket# CP13-502) in which Stop The Pipeline (STP) is requesting a rehearing and rescission of the FERC's December 2014 order granting a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to the Constitution Pipeline Company to construct the Constitution Pipeline and to Iroquois Gas Transmission Systems to construct the Wright Interconnect Project. STP states that "the Constitution Pipeline doesn't have a significant purpose unless the NED (Northeast Energy Direct, the line proposed to go through Ashfield) is constructed and the Iroquois reversed." This suggests the projects are connected and would require the FERC to "order the issuance of a supplemental draft environmental statement that includes the Constitution Pipeline, the supply and market segments of the proposed NED project, and the reversal of the flow in the Iroquois from the south to north." Does this have implications for the environmental impact statement for the NED line? I wonder, because possible violations of the Clean Water Act, the Natural Gas Act, the Fifth and Fourteen Amendments of

the US Constitution, and the National Environmental Policy Act are being questioned in this case. That's pretty significant. Further complicating this is the Connecticut Expansion Project (docket #14-529). Carolyn Elefant submitted comments March 30, 2015 on behalf of Sandisfield Taxpayers Opposing the Pipeline (S.T.O.P.) questioning whether or not Tennessee Gas "jumped the gun" in submitting an application for this project "as a means to artificially avoid an overlap with the Tennessee Gas Northeast Energy Direct (NED), from which the Connecticut Expansion Project has been segmented"; these projects appear to be dependent on each other to exist and the question of illegal segmentation of the projects is, from my point of view, a very real and legitimate concern.

In fact, it is my belief that the connections are much more involved and far reaching. Let's look at the mining of the sand in Wisconsin required for the fracking process. Wisconsin currently holds 75% of the frac sand market in the United States; without this sand, there is no fracked gas, without the fracked gas from the Marcellus Shale deposits, there is no NED project. What of the environmental impact of that industry on Wisconsin? Much of this sand is being mined, ironically, not far from where Aldo Leopold wrote *The Sand County Almanac*, a beautifully written book on the importance of our responsibility as stewards of our natural resources. In this book Leopold states, "A thing is right when it tends to preserve the integrity, stability, and beauty of the biotic community. It is wrong when it tends otherwise." This is the basis upon which we need to be making decisions regarding what is in the "public interest". There doesn't, in fact, appear to be an adequate and consistent definition of "public interest" on the part of the Department of Energy. On February 9, 2015, the Industrial Energy Consumers of America (IECA) filed a motion to intervene, suspend, and protest Pieridae Energy's application for long-term authorization to export 292 billion cubic feet per year of domestic natural gas as liquefied natural gas. (FE Docket No. 14-179-LNG). In this motion, IECA states that "The definition of "public interest" is at the core of this entire discussion. Yet, we cannot find where the DOE (Department of Energy) has articulated any such definition. More concerning is that the Government Accountability Office (GAO) reached the same conclusion in its September 2014 report. The GAO finds that neither the Natural Gas Act, nor the DOE, has defined public interest. "What then, is the "public interest"? It is unclear to me what, and whose, public interest is being used as the standard for decision making in these projects. I can't fathom how the loss of clean air, water, and soil (all of which are compromised at multiple stages in these projects; ask anyone living with the silica dust in Wisconsin, or the flammable water supplies in Pennsylvania, or the farmers whose organic farming certifications have been pulled) is in anyone's public interest. This docket already contains a massive number of comments addressing concerns about, arguments against, and impacts of, this project. Given all that has been presented, and no doubt will continue to be presented given the opposition, one can only wonder on what basis approval for it would be made, particularly if the very definition of "public interest" is at question.

From my perspective, the Public Trust (as well as trust of the public) has been violated when the regulatory commissions, through the permitting process, legalize the destruction of the very resources the Government has been entrusted to protect, thereby moving toward bankrupting the Trust, i.e., our natural resources, and in doing so imperil the life of all living organisms. The destruction has gone on far too long and it's time to bring an end to it. We are at a major turning point in the well-being of this planet and the natural resources that sustain us; we are of it, not separate from it, and the balance of nature is at stake. This too is all connected. It is in our hands...it is in your hands.

The first area to look at in this scoping process is avoidance. I challenge the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, given the public input, to lead the way in changing course and avoid further destruction by:

- 1) Denying this NED project on the basis of the destruction of the Trust you are entrusted to protect
- 2) Ending this reliance on carbon-based fuels
- 3) Moving toward sustainable energy projects to mitigate the harm that has already taken place.

I wish for the following to be your legacy as the current members of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission:

You halted the destruction and paved the way for a new course.

Respectfully,  
Jane Shaney  
2201 Conway Road  
Ashfield, Ma. 01330

**20150728-5060**

SM Kubiak, Franklin, NH.  
KMI NH Pipeline;  
To FERC,

KMI will make millions on this pipeline. How much will each NH resident save by allowing the pipeline to pass thru our beautiful state? How much has KMI and/or their partners contributed to all NH politician's campaign funds or other projects. That should be within your scope of investigation. In addition, who is responsible for the cost/cleanup of a pipeline leak or cleanup. Will you allow KMI to simply pass this off to the State of NH?

Thank you.

S Michael Kubiak  
PO Box 95  
Franklin, NH 03235

**20150728-5071**

Stephen Machovic, NASHUA, NH.

I believe that the Kinder Morgan Pipeline is vital to continuing economic growth of New Hampshire and the region as a whole. I strongly recommend you approve the completion of the pipeline.

**20150728-5072**

Dr. Susan R. Williams, New Ipswich, NH.

As President of the New Ipswich Historical Society, I am very concerned about the impact of this pipeline on the New Ipswich Center Village Historic District, included in the National Register of Historic Places. The district contains approximately 150 properties, dating from the 1730s to the 1980s. Although the district is located outside of the one-mile pipeline barrier, many of these resources are sensitive to air pollution, light pollution, and contamination of historic landscapes. What will FERC require of Tennessee Gas and Kinder Morgan to ensure the protection of these important historical resources?

Respectfully,

Dr. Susan Williams, President  
New Ipswich Historical Society

**20150728-5074**

Denise Morrissette, Brookline, NH.

It seems an absurd proposition to route this pipeline by Kinder Morgan north into New Hampshire only to route it south again. First and foremost, there is no genuine need to route it into New Hampshire. Second, I resent allocation of local assets to corporations who disappear when their systems malfunction from neglect. How many more super fund sites will our government be authorizing, because this feels like another in the making.

I respectfully request this request be denied.

Denise Morrissette  
Brookline, NH

**20150728-5077**

Susan Williams, New Ipswich, NH.

New Ipswich has important cultural landscapes, including Native American burial grounds, remnants of old mills, stone walls, colonial roads, and agricultural sites with rich historical integrity dating back to the early settlement period. Several of these agricultural sites also offer significant evidence about the history of Finnish settlement in New Ipswich, dating from the late 19th century. Finnish-Americans remain the strongest and most cohesive ethnic group in New Ipswich today and it is important to preserve and protect evidence of their contributions to the history of the town. The town is also the site of a highly significant religious commemorative site, dating from the 1840s and in continuous use from that time as a focus of traditional association with the group's historic identity. This particular site lies in the direct path of the pipeline.

Many of these cultural landscapes are directly threatened by the NED Pipeline, as it is currently configured. I urge you to carefully consider the impact on these resources as you make your determination about the Tennessee Gas application. Mitigation is not an option where cultural landscapes and structures or traditional cultural properties are concerned. Once they are disturbed, they are lost forever, along with their power to reinforce local, regional, and national identity. Our heritage is at stake and I do not see an energy need that is strong enough to offset the potential destruction of these cultural resources.

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. Susan R. Williams, Ph.D.

Emeritus Professor of History, Fitchburg State University and  
President, New Ipswich Historical Society

**20150728-5079**

Marcia Newell, Litchfield, NH.

I do not want this monstrosity in my back yard. It will completely destroy my septic system making this home that I have raised my two children in uninhabitable. The pipeline will take out all the trees on my property, and the wildlife that lives here along with endangered species of plants. I do not feel comfortable with a hidden danger literally under my nose and ready to blow at any given moment to obliterate my family and my neighbors. The pipeline DOES NOT help the New Hampshire people what so ever. There are schools within the blast range of the pipeline, there is a high school and a middle school where the children of Litchfield go to school every day that is less than a mile away. This pipeline is passing through my small town, a town that is small enough to let the pipe's metal be thinner. A thinner metal that is more likely to be punctured and explode, potentially killing children in schools where they are learning. They have enough to learn and worry about, their safety in going to school and possibly dying from a pipeline explosion that does not help our state, or town for that matter, should not be one of them. The value of my property will be going down tremendously if the pipeline goes down, making my taxes lower while raising the taxes on my fellow citizens of Litchfield. We like our scenic town the way it is with the taxes we have, we take pride in being a town that is a nice safe place for our children and our senior citizens of New Hampshire to live.

**20150728-5088**

Pamela Shuel-Sargent, Rindge, NH.

Please do not allow this Pipeline to go through New England. Massachusetts and New Hampshire do not want it and I know that New Hampshire doesn't need it. I live in the Monadnock area of New Hampshire. It's quiet, peaceful, beautiful views and wildlife. We all have well water. We also have soil that is full of rocks, boulders and tree roots. There is no way to bury the gas line pipes except for blasting. Blasting will disrupt the flow of all of our well water. We cannot afford to replace our wells for the pipeline to go through. We do not want to lose so many of our beautiful trees, wildlife, wetlands and conservation land. We have been told that since we have a smaller population than the former Massachusetts route they will use a thinner pipe. Thinner pipes are less safe. We do not want to lose our property or have it forever damaged

by the pipeline going through. I attended the local Kinder Morgan Open House. They gave us very, very few answers to our questions and the answers that they did give us doesn't seem to be accurate information. They also conducted the Open House with the lights turned down very low and they had to use flashlights to show us locations on their very dark town maps. Even after we refuse access to our properties the surveyors keep returning to survey when we aren't home. We don't want the Pipeline, we don't trust Kinder Morgan and we pray that you will refuse to okay this Pipeline that is not the correct answer to our power issues. Kinder Morgan's safety records are enough to please say no to the NED pipeline. PLEASE GIVE US MORE TIME BEFORE THE SCOPING MEETINGS.

**20150728-5090**

Charles Contos Jr., Amherst, NH.

Dear Sirs,

I want my voice to be heard that I am strongly against the Kinder Morgan gas pipeline being put through our Amherst, NH neighborhood.

My family and I have been residents in this home for over 30 years now. I have serious concerns about the pipeline having to wind back and forth over/under the Souhegan River. My major concern is the proximity of such a pipeline to a large Regional High School, Souhegan High. Putting our innocent children in danger of any unforeseen rupture is inexcusable, and negligent.

As it stands now with the threat of a pipeline being put in, our homes are unsellable and our home values are dropping. Would you want this in your backyard? This pipeline will run approximately one half mile from my home. There is no benefit to me and my family from it, just all the risk and pitfalls that may come along with a pipeline that we don't want.

Thank you for your time,

Charles Contos Jr.  
4 Mayhew Drive  
Amherst, NH. 03031

**20150728-5123**

Pauline Dawson, Concord, NH.

Please listen to the people of New Hampshire that this pipeline will impact rather than the Big Companies that will be making money off the final project. If they have to built, make it as less invasive as it can be, even if it costs them more. They will be making money in the future, the citizens will only be looking at ugliness or be affected forever.

**20150728-5129**

Peter J. Pyskaty, Windsor, MA.

I am in the process of retiring and have to sell our home which is our (NEST EGG) We have had several people interested in purchasing it and as soon as they find out that the PIPELINE is coming thru our backyard they either walk away or pull out of the sale.

Is Kinder Morgan going to help us out????

Our home is located within the 1/2 mile of the proposed Pumping Station and because of that and the fact that the Pipeline is going thru backyard we are having a very hard time to sell it.

Thank you for your time:

Peter J. Pyskaty

## 20150728-5137

Rosemary Wessel, Cummington, MA.

SCOPING MEETING COMMENTS FOR NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT - #PF14-22

Kinder Morgan finally released their long awaited Draft Environmental Report on Friday, July 24th - four days ago.

The 79 volumes of this report have 6,571 pages of maps, tables and technical drawings, but also still contain enormous gaps in information like a Horizontal Directional Drill Plan that consists of four pages containing one sentence, and over 10,000 instances of “TBD” in tables that should be filled with actual information that we can evaluate. There also still doesn’t seem to be any addressing of the overlap between the Northeast Energy Direct project and Kinder Morgan’s CT Expansion. These two projects should be combined into one filing to avoid the growing evidence of illegal segmentation.

Having previously been anticipated for a June release, this set of Resource Reports is now landing directly in the middle of the FERC Scoping Meeting Schedule. This puts people all along the pipeline route at disadvantage in two ways: Those in PA & NY who have had hearings already, weren’t allowed the opportunity to comment on the new information, and those of us in MA & NH have only begun to absorb and analyze thousands of pages of new documents.

We had four months to review the previous Resource Reports, and now, with a larger, more complex set we have just four days? Kinder Morgan, FERC and other regulatory bodies have time to review these documents - you do this for a living. The rest of us, who would bear the brunt of the impacts of this project have only have our spare time - on top of tending to our lives, our families, and our own jobs.

We could spend eternity debating whether of not the timing of this was deliberate and capricious on the part of Kinder Morgan. We could spend another eternity debating whether FERC is kowtowing to Kinder Morgan’s preferred application, approval and construction timeline. But regardless of these arguments, the fact still stands, given the timing of this massive document dump by Kinder Morgan just four days ago, that it’s the largest body of stakeholders, the people, who have received the short end of the stick.

By filing these massive new Resource Reports for an entirely re-scaled project, Kinder Morgan has rendered this current scoping schedule null and void.

We call on FERC to do the right thing:

- cancel this current round of scoping
- re-start the process with a new Notice of Intent
- schedule a new round of Scoping Meetings
- start a new, full 60-day comment period that would give the people time to properly evaluate the documents filed

ROSEMARY WESSEL

CUMMINGTON, MA

## 20150728-5142

Denise Greenleaf, Merrimack, NH.

You must stop Kinder Morgan from running a fracked gas line through southern NH!! This is not for local use, it’s for export to further line the pockets of politicians and Kinder Morgan. Taking property by eminent domain is illegal if it’s for private gain, which this is, and you know it.

It was kicked out of Massachusetts, it must not be allowed to go through N.H. either! This is dirty politics and dirty fossil fuel. Our country needs clean renewable energy, not more dangerous fracked gas. Kinder Morgan has an atrocious safety record all over this country!!

Pull up your big boy pants and vote the way you know you should! Say no to Kinder Morgan. Don’t sell NH down the river, stand up for what’s right. NH doesn’t want anything to do with this dangerous project!!!

**20150728-5163**

Denise Greenleaf, Merrimack, NH.

You must stop Kinder Morgan from running a fracked gas line through southern NH!! This is not for local use, it's for export to further line the pockets of politicians and Kinder Morgan. Taking property by eminent domain is illegal if it's for private gain, which this is, and you know it.

It was kicked out of Massachusetts, it must not be allowed to go through N.H. either! This is dirty politics and dirty fossil fuel. Our country needs clean renewable energy, not more dangerous fracked gas. Kinder Morgan has an atrocious safety record all over this country!!

Pull up your big boy pants and vote the way you know you should! Say no to Kinder Morgan. Don't sell NH down the river, stand up for what's right. NH doesn't want anything to do with this dangerous project!!!

**20150728-5166**

Jean Wagner, Windsor, MA.

I am a long-term resident of Windsor Ma. I am completely, totally opposed to the creation of a compressor station/pipeline in Windsor. This will destroy the quality of our town. There will be no jobs created for local residents. We will suffer adverse health effects and die from exposure to harmful chemicals. Our home values will go down. And what for? To line the pockets of already rich people of the gas industry. This gas will not even be used locally. How can the corporate employees of Kinder Morgan live with themselves? They are destroying the lives of our citizens and of our children. Shame on them. I intend on doing everything in my power to fight this. I will not allow our town to suffer this grave injustice at the hand of big business. Please Please Please stop the pipeline and compressor station now. Thank You, Jean Wagner

**20150728-5173**

Barbara Zaenglein, Amherst, NH.

The Town of Amherst, through its Board of Selectmen, strongly opposes the currently proposed route through the town of Amherst, NH for the NED pipeline. While (loosely) paralleling the Eversource ROW, the proposed route is disruptive to the character of the town and the quality of life for its residents, threatens unacceptable harm to ecologically sensitive areas, and represents apparently irresolvable safety concerns for at least some residents on or near the proposed route.

In New Hampshire, there is no need for even more power generation, nor is there any proof — which is required by FERC from an applicant — that this pipeline will result in reduced retail power prices, as has been claimed.

A quasi-governmental interstate organization has proposed to tax electric rate payers in six states to demonstrate to the federal government part of the proof of financial backing for the private enterprise that is the NED gas transmission pipeline in order to justify the potential seizure of private property. The FERC Statement of Policy, issued September 15, 1999 (Docket No. PL99-3-000) makes clear that pipeline expansions — which this one appears to be — are not to be subsidized by existing customers to ensure that there is a market need for the project.

Quoting the FERC Statement of Policy referenced above: “If one of the benefits of a proposed project would be to lower gas or electric rates for consumers, then the applicant’s market study would need to explain the basis for that projection. Vague assertions of public benefits will not be sufficient.”

FERC’s policy is that existing customers can have their rates increased if the pipeline can demonstrate that the expansion will improve service to existing customers. The distribution service problem faced by New Hampshire retail electric customers is clearly not addressed. A NESCOE tariff<sup>13</sup> — proposed or confirmed — undermines the whole purpose of the pre-filing and need determination phase of the NED project by giving New Hampshire residents the impression that even if needs analysis falls through later in the NED pipeline review process, an ex-post-facto tariff hangs out there ready to ‘rescue’ it.

Any method of raising the cost of electricity to retail customers in order to subsidize the proposed NED pipeline — whether through a tariff or through some even more creative and less transparent scheme — in hypothetical service to the goal of “lower gas or electric rates for customers” would appear to be a direct violation of the FERC’s Statement of Policy.

New Hampshire’s primary public need is for enhanced electric power and natural gas distribution, not added power generation or gas transmission. Yet the FERC is seriously considering a proposal championed by NESCOE to not only ask New Hampshire residents to potentially fund through tariffs / taxes a private enterprise that provides little to no demonstrated New Hampshire public power benefit, but also to give up portions of their town conservation lands, private property, and chosen life styles to build it. How is this project — in any way — either a public benefit or public necessity for New Hampshire and the residents of the Town of Amherst?

The Town of Amherst would like to better understand from the FERC how it will calculate the direct benefits to be provided by this project and offset them against the direct costs to individuals in its path.

If there are a number of different proposed pipelines for the New England region before the FERC right now, and the benefits of those lines accrue primarily to Massachusetts, those pipelines should be built in Massachusetts — as was originally proposed for the NED Pipeline project! Under what conceivable justification might the FERC and the United States Government impose burdens and taxation on the residents of New Hampshire for the ease, benefit, and convenience of residents of Massachusetts?

KM, using NESCOE regional data as a cover, proposes to subject New Hampshire property owners to potential losses in value, use, and enjoyment due to easements “negotiated” under the background threat of seizure by eminent domain.

The proposed NED project’s original route through Massachusetts — only entering New Hampshire with a lateral pipeline to supply the sole confirmed customer in New Hampshire — was a much better attempt to assign the burdens caused by the project onto the residents of the state that would receive the majority of the benefits of the NED pipeline. The decision to reroute this proposed pipeline through 71 miles of New Hampshire, to the detriment, harm and potential taxation of New Hampshire residents, and for the ease, comfort, and convenience of residents of Massachusetts would, if approved by the FERC, potentially represent an unconstitutional taking from residents of New Hampshire for the benefit of residents of another state.

FERC has an obligation to inform KM that its recently proposed route change for the NED pipeline — through 71 miles of New Hampshire — may be neither justifiable, nor legally supportable.

#### **20150728-5174**

Eugene A. Harrington, Londonderry, NH.

To FERC,

I would like to voice my concerns regarding the proposed route for Kinder Morgan’s NED Pipeline. I am specifically commenting on the proposed route through Londonderry NH and 3 protected parcels impacted by this route. The parcel identified on Londonderry Town Tax maps as Map 5 Lot 7 (pipeline mile post 172) was acquired by the Town as “Protected Open Space – not to be disturbed”. The parcel known as Map 5 Lot 62 (mile post 172.7-172.8) is partially covered by a Conservation Easement requested by the US Army Corps of Engineers to protect the nesting habitat of the endangered Blanding’s Turtle. Between mile post 173 and 173.5 the proposed route may impact Map 5 Lot 41, an orchard covered by a USDA Farmland Protection Easement.

If this pipeline is to be built, I would suggest a slightly different path. After crossing the Merrimack River and Route 3A in Litchfield NH, there is another power line ROW running south at mile post 170.3. This power line meets an existing gas line ROW (Liberty Utilities?) north of Ottarnic Pond in Hudson NH and then proceeds east to meet the Kinder Morgan proposed route near mile post 177.

As another alternative Kinder Morgan may like to re-consider the “Massachusetts Turnpike” route proposed

over a year ago.

Respectfully yours,

Eugene A Harrington

Vice Chair, Londonderry Conservation Commission

July 28, 2015

**20150728-5189**

David Lotto, Pittsfield, MA.

July, 28, 2015

I want to express my strong opposition to this project. For me, the issue of short term benefits such as increasing natural gas supply, lower natural gas prices, job creation, etc. or short term negative effects such as environmental disruption, possibility of explosions or leaks, etc. are not the issues FERC should be concerned about.

The issue is global climate change. We need to be using less fossil fuels and anything that facilitates more fossil fuel consumption needs to not happen. Future energy needs need to come from renewables, chiefly solar. The price of natural gas needs to go up, not down, so that renewable energy projects become economically as well as environmentally beneficial.

FERC, as a government agency, should be concerned with long term consequences of decisions. This is about the future of my children and grandchildren who deserve to live in a world that has not been ravaged by the effects of global warming. It is on you to protect them and all the people in this country and on this planet – even if it means disappointing those who think this project will bring short term benefits.

The threat of greenhouse gas caused global warming is extremely important to many to people. We are rapidly approaching the point where projects such as this may require additional funds being spent to provide security to prevent the disabling of construction equipment left over night on job sites.

David Lotto

**20150729-0006**

Edward C. Dow  
529 Main Street  
West Townsend, MA 01474

July 24, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 020426

Subject Comments on environmental issues concerning the Planned Northeast Energy Direct Project  
Docket No. PF14-22-000  
Field at 529 Main Street, West Townsend, Massachusetts

Dear Ms. Bose,

The proposed 12 inch “lateral” pipeline planned to cross our property, through our “Hay Field”, will have a dramatic long-term negative impact on the entire field as the entire field has been designated for storage of material and heavy equipment during construction by the Pipeline Company. The impact will damage the top soil by the heavy equipment and we will lose revenue over an unknown number of years after completion of the construction.

*{areal photo/map, not included here}*

Area designated by the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company for storage of material and heavy equipment is shown in cross-hatched red/purple and is our hay field. We refer to it as our West Field. The hay field produces 2 to 3 crops of hay each year and is a source of income. A major concern of ours is that leach field for our septic system is in the designated area.

We anticipate that the damage to the entire designated area of the field due to the heavy equipment and material may damage our septic system and will cause long-term environmental damage to the field and have a major impact on the amount and quality of hay for many years.

Sincerely,

Edward C. Dow, Owner

*{5 photos, not reproduced here}*

**20150729-0007**

FROM: Stephen Balog  
Kate Balog  
27 Orange Road  
Northfield, MA

DATE: July 24, 2015

RE: Kinder Morgan Proposed Compressor/Pipeline Project in Northfield, Massachusetts

Doc. #PF14-22-000

TO: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Chairperson

Stephen Balog's Comments: My wife and I are very concerned about having to live near such a large proposed gas compressor and gas project. We will live approximately 500 yards from the proposed compressor. There are no means to fight a fire on Brush Mountain. Water has to be brought to the mountain in fire truck tankers. We must rely on our voluntary fire department which is about 5 miles from the proposed compressor. The last time we had a major fire on the mountain a house burned to the ground due to the volunteer fire department response and the lack of water.

The mountain road or Gulf Road to the proposed compressor, is not easy to navigate as there are many curves and it is very steep. Gulf Road is not maintained well during the winter months. Therefore, several-vehicle accidents occur every year.

My wife has lived on top of Brush Mountain for 63 years. I've lived here forty years. I'm retired and live in our lovely, secluded home that we do not want to move from.

Kate Balog's Comments: I am very puzzled how FERC and Kinder Morgan, who have never lived in our town nor visited the Mountain, can look on a map and decide to take away our personal lives and invade the piece of earth that I was born and raised on? The only reason Northfield Mountain has been Chosen is because it is not highly populated.

The mountain has beautiful trees, historical sites, endangered and protected plants, animals and land on your proposed sacrificial mountain; all within feet of the proposed compressor. Not only are you destroying our lives, but all the animals that live on this mountain and the environment. My parents moved to this mountain in 1940 and raised myself and 6 siblings here. We chose to also live here and raise our family.

The Earth does not belong to you, Kinder Morgan or anyone else'. We have lived on this Mountain longer than you have known it existed. If you have a conscience, you will deny Kinder Morgan's proposed request to use Northfield Mountain and the Valley for this project;

My husband and I are hard-working, honest and kind people. It is my belief that as humans, we borrow the earth for the short time we are here and need to leave it a better place than when we first came.

I am assuming that anyone who would allow such an unnecessary, invasive destruction of our Mountain and Town, doesn't have the same ideals.

If you allow Kinder Morgan to destroy the Mountain, Valley and lives of every living thing in their path, you should all be ashamed of yourselves. I hope when you lay your head down on your pillow every night, you think of our beautiful Mountain and the destruction that you had a hand in allowing.

Perhaps the pipeline and compressor should be built within your living space or your children's and grandchildren's living space. You can't really believe this is a beneficial to our Community and the Earth.

We live on a dirt road, with no street lights; only the stars. At night it is completely silent except for an occasional car passing by our house. I request that you come to Northfield, Massachusetts and drive up into the Mountains before sealing our fate. I will gladly show you the stars at night and let you smell our clean air.

**20150729-0015**

Hand written card, Evelyn Taylor, 213 Old Wilton Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, opposing

**20150729-0016**

Hand written card, Evelyn Taylor, 213 Old Wilton Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, why no statements from Kinder Morgan about safety and environmental impacts?

**20150729-0017**

Hand written card, Evelyn Taylor, 213 Old Wilton Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, what risks to workers and environment when pipelines must be repaired. What toxins are released and how are they contained?

**20150729-0018**

Hand written card, Evelyn Taylor, 213 Old Wilton Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, what training is provided for emergency responders and medical personnel regarding pipeline & compressor station problems?

**20150729-0019**

Hand written card, Evelyn Taylor, 213 Old Wilton Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, no information has been provided concerning risks from pipeline & compressor stations. Information obtained suggests severe and lasting health impacts are possible. Why hasn't this topic been brought forward?

**20150729-0020**

Hand written card, Evelyn Taylor, 213 Old Wilton Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, how does Kinder Morgan compensate for health issues caused by the pipeline. Who compensates for injuries resulting from increased drought and fire along the cleared pipeline route.

**20150729-0021**

Hand written card, Evelyn Taylor, 213 Old Wilton Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, no one from KM or TGP has identified the disruption to our neighborhood during construction.

**20150729-0022**

Hand written card, Evelyn Taylor, 213 Old Wilton Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, we are told by Kinder Morgan that compressor stations are quiet - like normal conversations. Yet testimonials from persons living even a mile away demonstrate otherwise. Please explain this discrepancy.

**20150729-0023**

Hand written card, Evelyn Taylor, 213 Old Wilton Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, please have Tennessee Gas provide a list of all human ailments due to pipeline and compressor station activity. How did they react, did they pay full cost of those ailments?

**20150729-0024**

Hand written card, Evelyn Taylor, 213 Old Wilton Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, what are the know health effects from a pipeline, and from a compressor station? What are the suspected health effects?

**20150729-0025**

Hand written card, Evelyn Taylor, 213 Old Wilton Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, what is the source of water used to clean the pipeline. How will it be collected to avoid contaminant release. Please describe the process in detail from beginning to end.

**20150729-0026**

Hand written card, Evelyn Taylor, 213 Old Wilton Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, where will the wastes from pipeline activities be stored?

**20150729-0027**

Hand written card, Evelyn Taylor, 213 Old Wilton Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, pipelines and compressor stations are known terrorist targets. What actions taken to prevent attacks.

**20150729-0028**

Hand written card, Evelyn Taylor, 213 Old Wilton Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, are herbicides used to control growth of brush & trees?

**20150729-0029**

Hand written card, Melinda Hildreth Honkal, 143 Monument, Richmond, NH 03470, opposing

**20150729-0030**

Hand written card, Evelyn Taylor, 213 Old Wilton Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, how is access controlled?

**20150729-0031**

Hand written card, Evelyn Taylor, 213 Old Wilton Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, will TGP/KM pay for frequent testing of my private well?

**20150729-0032**

Hand written card, Maeve Townsend, 46 Vander? Ave, Pleasantville, NY 10570, opposing

**20150729-0033**

Hand written card, Evelyn Taylor, 213 Old Wilton Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, has TGP or KM funded studies of health impacts? What are the results? Have they been verified by independent review?

**20150729-0034**

Hand written card, Evelyn Taylor, 213 Old Wilton Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, has TGP or KM contacted emergency medical services to assess available resources and capabilities?

**20150729-0035**

Hand written card, Evelyn Taylor, 213 Old Wilton Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, how can people escape from fires or explosion in our wooded areas with few escape routes? Why hasn't KM discussed safety, evacuation and protective measures?

**20150729-0036**

Hand written card, Evelyn Taylor, 213 Old Wilton Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, what is plan to protect electric service on its wooden poles from pipeline fire?

**20150729-0037**

Hand written card, Evelyn Taylor, 213 Old Wilton Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, what are plans for training local medical emergency personnel?

**20150729-0038**

Hand written card, Evelyn Taylor, 213 Old Wilton Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, pipelines and compressor stations are assumed terrorist targets. Are background checks required on all employees?

**20150729-0039**

Hand written card, Margaret Viglione, 14 Hubbard Hill Rd, Greenville, NH 03048, compressor location in New Ipswich places an elementary school in its "incineration zone".

**20150729-0040**

Hand written card, Margaret Viglione, 14 Hubbard Hill Rd, Greenville, NH 03048, high risk of contamination to local wells, aquifer and the Greenville, NH, town reservoir - the only town water source.

**20150729-0041**

Hand written card, Evelyn Taylor, 213 Old Wilton Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, have TGP/KM provide a complete list of all toxic products used or produced by pipelines & compressor station activities. Include volume, concentration and hazardous materials Safety Data Sheets.

**20150729-0042**

Hand written card, Alice Bury, 7 Patricia Lane, Amherst NH 03031, opposing

**20150729-0043**

Hand written card, John Leoutsacos, 79 Mountain View Dr, Temple, NH 03084, opposing. High risk to residential wells, aquifers, and Greenville, NH, reservoir, its only water supply.

**20150729-0044**

Hand written card, John Leoutsacos, 79 Mountain View Dr, Temple, NH 03084, opposing. Noise pollution within 2 mile radius of New Ipswich compressor station.

**20150729-0045**

Hand written card, Margaret Viglione, 14 Hubbard Hill Rd, Greenville, NH 03048, opposing.

**20150729-0046**

Hand written card, Margaret Viglione, 14 Hubbard Hill Rd, Greenville, NH 03048, opposing.

**20150729-0048**

Hand written card, John Leoutsacos, 79 Mountain View Dr, Temple, NH 03084, opposing. Light pollution.

**20150729-0049**

Hand written card, Margaret Viglione, 14 Hubbard Hill Rd, Greenville, NH 03048, opposing. Constant poorly regulated and monitored toxic emissions.

**20150729-0050**

Hand written card, Margaret Viglione, 14 Hubbard Hill Rd, Greenville, NH 03048, opposing. Light pollution from compressor station harming wildlife and creating visual blight.

**20150729-0051**

Hand written card, Evelyn Taylor, 213 Old Wilton Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, will pipeline go above ground? How will it be kept safe?

**20150729-0053**

Hand written card, Margaret Viglione, 14 Hubbard Hill Rd, Greenville, NH 03048, negative impact on regional economy.

**20150729-0055**

Dear Ms. Bose,

Kinder Morgan and its subsidiary, Tennessee Gas, propose to build and operate a 36-inch pipeline to daily transport up to 22 billion cubic feet of hydro fractured gas at a pressure up to 1460 pounds per square inch from Pennsylvania, through New York to Dracut Massachusetts. The proposal is called the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline project (NED).

Please stop the NED in order to protect my family and community. I oppose this project for the following reasons:

—No New York resident or business will receive any of the gas and almost all of it will be exported to foreign markets.

—Pipeline safety standards in rural areas are much lower than in urban areas, effectively treating constituents who live in the rural communities along the proposed route as second class citizens.

—The governing federal and state regulations and the resources used to ensure pipeline safety during construction, operation and decommissioning phases are woefully inadequate.

—Only landowners whose lands about the pipeline route may receive compensation. All other residents along the pipeline corridor, even those within the “incineration zone,” involuntarily assume the risk of death, personal injury and property damage in the event of a rupture, but receive no compensation for their risk and diminished quality of life.

—Property values along the pipeline will decline and reduce assessed valuations. This in turn will increase the tax burden on properties further away from the pipeline.

—The federal process for approving and constructing gas pipelines violates the requirement of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) to minimize cumulative negative impacts that federal agency decisions may have on public safety, health and the environment.

—No single federal entity oversees the NED project as a whole. For example, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission decides whether and where the NED is built. The Department of State, decides whether the gas may be exported. The Pipeline and Hazardous Material Safety Administration governs pipeline safety. Each agency pleads lack of jurisdiction to review, or do anything, that could be seen as falling within the jurisdiction of another agency. Oversight of the project is segmented, thereby hindering the public’s ability to effectively review and voice concerns about the NED.

Thank you for your attention to this matter

Gail Griffith  
345 Totem Lodge Rd  
Averill Park, NY 12018

**20150729-0056**

170 Fish Hatchery Road  
Richmond, New Hampshire 03470  
newoodnh@ne.rr.com

July 23, 2015

Subject: NH Pipeline

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Dear Ms. Bose:

I am 88. My wife is 83. Our house is located in the "incineration zone" were a rupture in the proposed high pressure gas line occur. My understanding is that anything within a 900 foot radius of the pipe is so endangered. The neighbors directly abutting the pipeline will find their property affected and will have to move and will, I assume, receive some compensation from Kinder Morgan. My property is the next two lots as you walk up Fish Hatchery Road. The road frontage of each lot is approximately 320 feet. Our plan has been to count on the sale of our meticulously maintained salt box house on its 11.7 acres and the sale of the adjacent 10.3 acre lot to enable us to make that inevitable move as the years become evermore confining. That plan will fall apart if this pipeline receives the FERC approval I understand to be necessary before Kinder Morgan can break ground

I cannot get into environmental impact, aquifer, noise, wildlife, etc. impacts because they are, in my humble opinion, too conjecturable. But the impact on my wife and me is real and could be disastrous.

Although there may be a few I have yet to run across a fellow townsman in favor of the pipeline.

Common sense tells you that my property will either be unsaleable or the price so low that our plans of many years will prove unworkable. As a navy veteran from the very end of WWII and an army vet in the Korean war I find it difficult to believe that a private company could remove approval from a governmental authority (FERC) to so severely impact private citizens. I hate being put in a position where I have to practically beg, as I admit I am now, for a common sense decision against the pipeline.

Sincerely

Norman E. Woodward

**20150729-0058**

Four page hand written letter, Karen Miller, New Ipswich, NH 03071, opposing

**20150729-0061**

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulation Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Date: 7/22/2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access: PF 14-22-000

As the owner of the property located at:

394 Turnpike Road  
New Ipswich, NH 03071

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose. Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

George K. Slyman Sr

#### **20150729-0064**

Card, Marian Caisse, 320 Hadley Hwy, Temple, NH 03084, In regard to the proposed Kinder Morgan/TGP natural gas pipeline, when is FERC going to hold its Scoping meetings in the towns of New Ipswich, Temple, Greenville, and Mason, NH?

All of these towns would be affected by the potential compressor station.

#### **20150729-0066**

Planning Board

**Town of Sharon, New Hampshire**

432 NH Route 123 ~ Sharon, NH 03458

603-924-9250 ~ FAX 603-924-3103

[www.sharonnh.org](http://www.sharonnh.org)

July 23, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC)  
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.

Docket No.4-22-000: Proposed Northeast Energy Direct (NED)

Dear Ms. Bose:

The Town of Sharon, New Hampshire is a small rural-residential town located immediately north of New Ipswich and west of Temple. While not slated to host a portion of the proposed pipeline, it would run within two-thirds of a mile of our border. The Planning Board, within our responsibility of monitoring the safety, health and prosperity of our town, has reviewed information relating to the NED pipeline project and we have very serious concerns about the effect of this project on our town and on the many other towns that will be impacted. We find this project to be of no redeeming value to any of these towns and consider it to be the most egregious challenge to the continuing health and prosperity of the town and region that we have ever faced.

Proponents of the NED pipeline present it as an opportunity to bring more “clean” energy to the region and a reduction to the overall cost of energy. However, New Hampshire is already an exporter of energy. Those regions of the state having sufficient population to support the distribution of natural gas already have established distribution systems. Because of the low population density, it is not economically feasible for the balance of the state to support the infrastructure required for natural gas distribution.

We note the eastern terminal for the proposed pipeline is Dracut, Massachusetts where facilities are available to provide natural gas transshipment overseas. The market price of natural gas in foreign markets is substantially higher than domestic prices. The expanded markets could adversely affect domestic prices.

The proposal that this pipeline be funded in part by a tariff on electricity proposed by the New England Committee of Electricity (NESCOE), a “non-governmental organization”, clearly attempts to shift some of the burden of costs of construction to the backs of the citizens of New Hampshire. This is clearly contrary to FERC’s September 15, 1999 policy statement (Docket No. PL99-3-000) that pipeline expansions are not to be subsidized by existing customers.

NESCOE proposes that electric rates in six states be taxed to demonstrate to the federal government the need for the project to be subsidized by current users to justify the exercise of eminent domain.

Moreover, the construction of the pipeline itself gives us great concern. In the majority of the towns within and adjacent to the proposed line, citizens have private wells. For a distance of over 71 miles, it is proposed to blast a trench at least six feet deep into bedrock granite. In the vicinity of Sharon, there are two aquifers that support the water supply to our citizens that could be breached; these are only two examples of the many local aquifers that could potentially be disturbed. While the noise and disruption expected during construction could be grudgingly endured, disruption of water sources cannot be tolerated.

For Sharon, and for many other towns, conditions will only get worse after construction is complete and the pipeline is in operation. The noise from the operation of 41,000 HP compressors (described as the equivalent of a two or three diesel locomotive engines), will be a significant disturbing factor to the peace and tranquility of both the residents and wildlife of the area.

We understand that up to forty times a year there will be a “blow-down” at the compressor station, consisting of a release of natural gas to relieve the pressure build up. The noise of a “blow-down” has been described as a large jet plane taking off and may last up to thirty minutes. This commonly occurs in the middle of the night, which will be a further disruption to our rest and tranquility.

The gas released by these “blow-down” events and even during normal operations, contains a large number of known toxins, such as formaldehyde, benzene, ethyl benzene, xylene, hydrogen disulfide, carbon monoxide and other compounds or elements that are toxic, carcinogenic or neurotoxic. These toxins are released into the atmosphere and will ultimately poison the area around the compressor.

The frequent “blow-downs” will also have a devastating effect on the migration of birds and raptors, who utilize the “lead-line” of the Wapack Range for navigation during the annual migrations. This combined with the pipeline crossing the historic Wapack Trail three times will have disastrous impacts on the local population, both human and animal as well as a corresponding negative impact on local tourism.

**The end result of this proposed project will be a serious reduction in the values of homes and properties and a major degradation of the “Quality of Life” for the surrounding area.**

In our opinion the proposed NED project’s original route through Massachusetts was a much better attempt to assign the burdens caused by the project to the residents of the state that would receive the majority of benefits. The decision to reroute the pipeline through New Hampshire potentially represents an unconstitutional taking from residents of New Hampshire for the benefit of residents of another state. Should FERC permit such an abuse of power, we will strongly support the seeking of redress that the U.S. Constitution provides related to takings, equal protection, and states’ rights. We assert that it is FERC’s responsibility to advise NED that it must file an application that more accurately matches the burdens imposed with the potential benefits to be received.

Respectfully,

Mitchell Call, Chairman

Gerald DeBonis, Vice Chairman

Gary Backstrom, Member

Marc Carpenter, Member

Donald “Ted” O’Brien, Member

**TOWN OF MERRIMACK, NH**

6 BABOOSIC LAKE ROAD ~ MERRIMACK, NH 03054 [www.merrimacknh.gov](http://www.merrimacknh.gov)

July 16, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

**RE: Comments of the Town of Merrimack, NH - Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. ("TGP"), Docket No. PF14-22-000: Proposed Northeast Energy Direct ( NED )**

Dear Ms. Bose:

On behalf of the Merrimack Town Council, please find this letter as additional testimony pertaining to the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) natural gas transmission pipeline project (FERC Docket No. PF14-22) proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company (TGP) and Kinder Morgan (KM). The Town has submitted previous correspondence related to this pre-filing through its attorney and Community Development Director (in response to TGP/KM's request for information submitted to their consultant AECOM) to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC).

The Town continues to review the pre-filing and various Town entities (Conservation Commission, Waste-water Division, and Merrimack Village District, the Town's primary water service provider) have retained professional consultants that will be producing additional correspondence to FERC as it relates to their specific topic areas over the course of the pre-filing period.

The Town recently reviewed the letter from the Town of Amherst (Submittal 20150609-5069) that was made available on the FERC website. The Town of Merrimack supports the positions and concerns relayed to FERC by the Town of Amherst in their June 8, 2015 letter, and offers the following additional and supplementary comments and concerns:

~ The Town of Merrimack remains concerned about KM/TGP's citation of "regional energy needs" as their main justification for the NED pipeline as the basis for their pre-filing with FERC. Merrimack shares Amherst's concern about the status of New Hampshire's actual energy needs and whether or not the NED project will have any significant impact in addressing whatever the State's energy needs are in actuality. Merrimack agrees with Amherst that this issue requires clarification for the State's residents and should be settled through thorough review of the pre-filing and weighed against the negative impacts to New Hampshire's environment and property owners.

~ The Town of Merrimack does not believe that the NED project will make a significant impact to New Hampshire's power generation situation. New Hampshire currently generates more power within its borders than is used by its residents and businesses. As such, a good portion of the power generated in the state is "exported" to other New England states. Merrimack questions why the NED project must pass within southern New Hampshire without any real connection to the power generation grid within the State. It appears as though the current proposed route through New Hampshire is merely a "pass through" in order to connect to the hub in Dracut, MA. It is our belief that the route through New Hampshire is merely a matter of convenience and a perceived "path of least resistance" as opposed to a route based on the needs of the State of New Hampshire.

~ The Town of Merrimack is concerned that the NED project continues a trend toward the use of natural gas for power generation, and as such threatens to unbalance the diversity of fuel sources for power generation in New Hampshire and New England. With the decommissioning of several power generation facilities (from nuclear to coal and gas fired facilities) recently or in the near future, it appears that natural gas will become the dominant fuel source for power generation in New England. Merrimack is concerned that over-reliance on a single fuel source for power generation places the region in a vulner-

able position in the event of any natural gas shortages or catastrophic events that disrupt the distribution of natural gas to the region. The Town of Merrimack supports a diverse variety of power generation sources, and maintaining as much balance as is practicable in the manner in which energy is delivered to the region.

~ The Town of Merrimack remains committed to participating in the FERC process throughout the pre-filing period, and additional comments will be forthcoming in the coming weeks as the consultants retained by various entities (see second paragraph of this letter) complete their review and field work associated with the NED project. We reserve the right to supplement this letter and any subsequent letter from the Town, its residents, businesses, and agencies as deemed appropriate.

Sincerely, on the behalf of the Merrimack Town Council

Eileen Cabanel  
Town Manager

cc: Merrimack Town Council

Allen Fore, Kinder Morgan  
Lucas Meyer, Kinder Morgan  
Maggie Hassan, Governor of New Hampshire  
Joseph Foster, Attorney General of New Hampshire  
Shawn Jasper, Speaker of the New Hampshire House of Representatives  
Chuck Morse, President of the New Hampshire State Senate  
Kelly Ayotte, U. S.Senator  
Jeanne Shaheen, U. S.Senator  
Frank Guinta, U.S.House of Representatives  
Ann McLane Kuster, U. S.House of Representatives

-----  
Attachment: Preliminary List of Sensitive Environmental Areas within 0.25 or 0.50 miles of NED “Study Corridor”

~ Two Town-owned parcels of conservation land are crossed by the proposed route:

- o Horse Hill Nature Preserve; and
- o Gilmore Hill Memorial Forest;

~ At least 12 wetland areas (including Naticook Brook and the Merrimack River) are crossed by the proposed route

- o At least 4 ponds and small streams are located on the Horse Hill Nature Preserve property, providing important habitat area for several endangered/threatened species;
- o An area of Gilmore Hill Memorial Forest contains an area of sensitive vegetation/habitat that will be explained further in future responses;
- o Of particular concern regarding the Merrimack River is the construction of the pipeline under the river, the permanence of the installation under the river as it may be affected by flow or river course changes over time, and the safety history of such river crossings.

~ The Lower Merrimack River is a Designated Protected River under NH RSA 483 in accordance with the State’s Rivers Management and Protection Program.

~ The Town’s highest yield aquifer is located within the study area, which is part of both a Wellhead Protection Area and Aquifer Conservation District (see also attached letter and map from MVD);

- o 2 of the Merrimack Village District (MVD) water supply wells are located in close proximity to the proposed route (MVD Well 12 is approximately 550 feet from the proposed route, MVD Well 13 is approximately 2500 feet from the proposed route);
- o This aquifer and pair of supply wells provide more than half of the water service to the Town;

- ~ The proposed route would cross MVD waterlines in at least 10 locations;
- ~ The proposed route would cross municipal and private sewer lines in at least 4 locations:
  - o Camp Sargent Rd (across from Talant Rd);
  - o The private Merrimack Premium Outlets' sewer lateral;
  - o The entrance to Elbit Systems on Rt 3 (Daniel Webster Highway); and
  - o The Town's main sewer interceptor line along the B&M Railroad tracks/right-of-way
- ~ The proposed route is within 0.25 and 0.50 miles of several residential neighborhoods, some of which rely upon private wells and septic systems.

**20150729-0068**

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: July 18, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying Property Access

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., Docket No. PF14-22-000

As the owner of the property located at:

705 Brookline Road, Mason, N.H. 03048

F-38-5, F-38-6, F-38, F-38-8

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto my property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Howard Turner

CC To:

Kimberly D. Bose. Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A  
Washington. DC 20426

**20150729-5004**

michele Napolitano, Nashua, NH.

The supreme court has established that greenhouse gas emissions are harmful to the public health, and therefore the EPA is required to set limits on them. In response, the EPA drafted AMERICA CLEAN POWER PLAN, which is being issued under the CLEAN AIR ACT and will reduce dangerous greenhouse gas emissions from power plants by 30% below 2005 levels by 2030. We are headed in the right direction. So why would we want the pipeline with the chance of explosions and fires to come to New Hampshire. The compressor stations with their blowdowns all hours of night and day releasing tens of thousands of cancer causing toxins in the air polluting the wells in the area with Volatile Organic Compounds. We get no benefit from the pipeline all we do is ruin the small towns pollute their water, fill the air with Methane which is worse than Carbon dioxide for the environment. Kinder Morgan has a bad record in regard to safety many accidents with pipelines on file our emergency first responders are not equipped to handle such catastrophes who knows what would happen then to the homes and people and the air quality after such a fire as that. Again I mention the methane the cancer, Leukemia infertility issues birth defects just a few issues mentioned in other articles in regard to compressor stations. Thank You for your time

**20150729-5009**

**Southwest Region Planning Commission**

July 28, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: Project docket number: PFI4-22-000

Dear Ms. Bose:

Please accept this correspondence related to the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) proposal which would impact several communities in the planning district served by the Southwest Region Planning Commission (SWRPC). As you know, scoping meetings are being conducted at this time and comments regarding impacts of the proposal are being accepted by your agency through August 31, 2015. In view of the amount of information which has been filed, including a substantial filing of new information on July 24, 2015, I ask that the previously established comment period be extended to allow more time for review of this information in order to more fully assess potential impacts associated with NED.

NED represents a significant proposal in Southwest NH and perhaps the most substantial infrastructure project in the past several decades for those communities which lie along the suggested corridor. The intent of the FERC process includes the opportunity for public input. For this process to be effective and transparent, adequate time must be allowed to review the significant volume of information which has been filed, some of which was made available only days ago. A comment deadline of August 31, 2015 does not represent sufficient time for agencies like SWRPC and the communities we serve to conduct thoughtful and detailed review of the information and develop comments which thoroughly identify resource impacts anticipated as a result of this proposal.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Tim Murphy  
Executive Director

cc: US Senator Jeanne Shaheen  
US Senator Kelly Ayotte  
US Representative Ann McLane Kuster  
NH Governor Maggie Hassan

**20150729-5014**

**Mason Conservation Commission**

Date: July 28, 2015

From: Mason Conservation Commission  
Mann House, 16 Darling Hill Road  
Mason, NH 03048

To: Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, N.E.  
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Docket No. PF14-22-000  
Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project Scoping Premature

Dear Secretary Bose,

FERC must extend the scoping period for Docket PF14-22-000. FERC acted prematurely by opening scoping on June 30, 2015. The difficulty of fully scoping a meaningful EIS within the projected time frame has been exacerbated by the shamefully deficient database then available, namely, the Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline(KM/TGP) March 2015 Draft Resource Reports.

The March Reports made a mockery of the NEPA process by listing “To Be Determined” (TBD) for so many resources and concerns throughout all the states targeted for NED. TBD appears over 10,000 times in these Resource Reports, as documented by Nick Miller in 20150416-5039(30494387).pdf.

On July 24th, KM/TGP filed massive new Resource Reports. It took FERC staff two months to issue their detailed comments on KM/TGP’s March Resource Reports (May 15, 2015). FERC is unreasonable to expect the public to study and comment on these enormous new Reports (1,412 Megabytes total) in scoping sessions held only days after their release.

These Reports include additional deviations to the route of the Fitchburg lateral in Mason, NH. A route change released only days before the scoping meetings is yet another reason that scoping is premature.

FERC enables KM/TGP’s mockery of the NEPA process by closing scoping on August 31. Scoping for the EIS should not begin until at least a month AFTER the public release of KM/TGP’s new Resource Reports. The date for closing scoping must be moved accordingly.

To continue on the present scoping schedule makes FERC complicit with KM/TGP in denying the public our right to meaningfully participate in the NEPA process.

Sincerely,

Mason Conservation Commission:

Barbara DeVore

Bob Dillberger

Anna Faiello

Liz Fletcher

Lundy Lewis

## **20150729-5018**

John Lobsitz, Amherst, NH.  
Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First St. NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Subject: Docket No. PF14-22-000

July 28, 2015

Dear Ms. Bose,

This refers to the subject docket number and request for comments on Environmental Issues and Notice of Public Scoping. We have been following the discussions of the NED Project and its proposed route through the town of Amherst, NH. Under the initial proposed routing the installation of the pipeline diverts where from utility right of way that traverses north to cross the Souhegan River in Amherst, NH. The current route has the pipeline crossing the winding, Souhegan River no less than 4 times within one half mile.

The locations in Amherst where the pipeline will cross the river within one half mile four times are areas of wetlands and vernal pools which will be obviously impacted by construction as well as drilling and most likely impacted in the future. We are concerned about these impacts to the wildlife and their habitats in this area. We are not experts on what endangered or protected species may or may not be resident in this area and would appreciate if this is looked into as well since there are numerous species that make their homes in this region.

Additionally, we are concerned about the effects of drilling and construction of a pipeline across the river and through an area of our aquifer as to what impacts will be immediately determined that will effect resi-

dential drinking water systems, all the properties that the pipeline will cross are on shallow well systems and septic fields. Any change in the aquifer due to drilling nearby may change the quality of water to these wells during and after construction. Our understanding is that the proposed route through Amherst, NH is 56% RESIDENTIAL.

It is unclear to us how the construction and maintenance of a pipeline will affect ground water, surface water, residential drinking wells and the Souhegan River itself. It would seem that the proposed route may well have effects on soil stability and effect erosion and be a potential hazardous effect on storm water. I believe that much of the area is zoned a flood zone by FEMA. The risk of accidental spillage and/ or leaks is a major concern in these areas.

Since the proposed route through the Town of Amherst, NH is 56% Residential we are concerned about the impact on public health. This may be from ruptures of the system or from non-rupture leaks. It should be noted that the proposed route does cross roads which are cul-de-sacs and which are fairly heavily forested with old pines.

We understand that the Amherst Conservation Commission has a far better understanding of the environmental impact of the proposed route. We also understand that the Town has proposed alternate routing that would prove to be less intrusive and potentially less disruptive to the environment and citizen's public safety.

Lastly, we believe that the proposed NED pipeline will provide no benefit to the residents of New Hampshire. We believe that there are far more cost effective, prudent and less disruptive ways to meet the proposed market needs without this massive undertaking.

John and Cynthia Lobsitz  
26 Simeon Wilson Rd.  
Amherst, NH 03031

## **20150729-5039**

Ben Markens, Ashfield, MA.

Following is a copy of an email that I sent to the Massachusetts Energy Facilities Siting Board this morning, July 29, 2015. Stephen.August@state.ma.us and dpu.efiling@state.ma.us

Dear Mr. August et al.

I understand that sending you an email is the best way to register my comments about the proposed pipeline. There is ample evidence that the NED project is just too large to solve the problem at hand, and there are many alternatives that would address this problem with appropriate scale, including LNG, leak repair, renewables and alternative routes, like Spectra.

As I understand it you work for us, the citizens of the Commonwealth, and not for FERC or for the companies, like KM/TPG. As a result, I hope you feel it is your responsibility to act in our interests broadly.

Commonsense would say that no additional pipeline makes sense now. However, there is certainly NO sense (common or otherwise) in siting it through some of the most pristine and natural land and communities in the Commonwealth: Farmland, wetlands, preservation land, streams, rivers, forests – you name it. How do you (and KM/TGP) square the route's callous disregard of Article 97 - a fundamental, constitutional law of our Commonwealth?

Also, this canard about using existing electric right of ways is just that, a unfounded lie. They are asking for new rights of way parallel to the existing ones. You don't need to be a scientist to realize that putting that much fuel next to high power is a bad idea with tragic consequences.

KM/TGP has an existing right of way through the state that they can use. FERC and others have suggested using previously despoiled routes, like the MassPike or Route 2. KM/TGP has dismissed these possibilities and are stuck on what they want. They don't live here and have no interest in the Commonwealth, save for taking some of the "wealth." The number of jobs they project are paltry compared to the sacrifices.

I strongly urge you to advocate for your communities and citizens and say NO to the NED route. We don't need anything of this scale, and probably no additional pipelines at all. But destroying the pastoral beauty our State is clearly the worst of the bad alternatives.

Thanks very much. Please do the right thing.

Best regards,

Ben

Ben Markens

THE MARKENS GROUP, INC.

Springfield, MA

**20150729-5042**

Jim Bates, Greenfield, MA.

To Whom It May Concern;

I am writing to express my support of the planned Kinder Morgan's proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline project.

Anything that can be done to increase natural gas supply, I am all for.

I trust and rely on the fine Americans and/or others who will design and build the pipeline to hold each other to the highest standards during the process.

Massachusetts uses more electricity than it can generate, thus relying on outside sources to fill in when supplies are low.

This pipeline will help keep enough supply coming into Massachusetts and help to stabilize prices.

**20150729-5045**

Jan A. Griska, Rindge, NH.

To whom it may concern:

I sent the following letter to my Senators and Representative because of the shabby way FERC has treated the citizens of Southern New Hampshire. It's clear that FERC has made up their mind on the NED pipeline, so why bother listening to peoples concerns.

Senators Ayotte, Shaheen and Representative Kuster,

Please ask FERC to restart the scoping process on the NED pipeline project, for the following reasons:

The first issue, is that Kinder Morgan and FERC didn't give the New Hampshire citizens that are impacted by the NED project the same amount of time as the citizens of Massachusetts got.

The second issue, is that FERC purposely limited the number of scoping sessions to two (Nashua and Milford) when in fact there are 18 impacted towns in New Hampshire. I believe I could make a strong case for holding a third scoping session in Rindge as it is the most heavily impacted town in the Monadnock Region, but that isn't the point, the towns of south western New Hampshire need an opportunity to communicate our concerns in a face to face way, that the scoping process makes possible.

The third issue, is now just 4 days before the scoping session in Milford, Kinder Morgan drops a 6,571 page set of Resource Reports for a different size project in FERC's in basket. They have just handed an impossible task to the impacted citizens of New Hampshire. We need a new full 60 day comment period.

Thank you for your support in this matter.

Jan A. Griska

Rindge, NH 03461

**20150729-5060**

Andrew Graham, Keene, NH.

Please do not allow the Kinder-Morgan pipeline to go forward! What this country needs, and what people across the board here in New Hampshire support, is investment in renewable energy infrastructure, not fossil-fuel infrastructure. Investing in this pipeline is investing in the past, not the future. If it is allowed to go forward, the ecological consequences in the coming years and decades will range from destruction of habitat to higher greenhouse gas emissions and climate instability. As a voting resident of New Hampshire, I urge you not to grant a permit for the proposed pipeline.

~ Andrew Graham

**20150729-5061**

Marilyn S. Griska, Rindge, NH.

To Whom it may concern:

I've sent the following letter to my Senators and Representative the following letter because of the FERC's shabby treatment of the citizens of Southern New Hampshire.

Senators Ayotte, Shaheen and Representative Kuster,

FERC should extend the Scoping Process for the NED Project (Docket PF14-22)

The 18 impacted town's in New Hampshire will get only 2 Scoping sessions (the 29 and 30th of July). FERC promised a third in the Winchester area during this same week, and yet it is now Tuesday the 28th and there has been no announcement about the TBD third location. How will the number of impacted parties ever get a say?

On Friday, 7/24 Kinder Morgan Resource Reports were released (6,571 pages) and they were written for a different size project. How can the magnitude of this document ever be reviewed and commented upon in so short a period? Not even New Ipswich and its huge compressor station has been granted a hearing.

Whatever the opposition to the NED project, this feels like a done deal!, Kinder Morgan and FERC don't care about our opinions, property, air, or rural settings; we are just collateral damage in their huge quest for profits. With limited sessions, it is far easier to pretend they are listening.

Thank you,

Marilyn S. Griska  
Rindge, NH 03461

**20150729-5070**

Garth Shaneyfelt, Greenfield, MA.

For environmental review process, it is critical to look at the long-term legal and social effect of undoing 100+ years of "permanent" conservation in the State of MA. If the FERC and Kinder-Morgan undermine the APRs, Conservation Restrictions, and other protected areas zones in the State (and overrides Article 97 of Mass Constitution), that will have a chilling effect on future projects. Who would donate land? and why should taxpayers continue to fund conservation restrictions if the lands are in fact NOT protected?

There should be NO over-ride of Massachusetts (or NYS or NH) protections for the profit of a private company [yes, I am a shareholder, but I live here and I say NO!].

**20150729-5084**

Jason Pancoast, Windham, NH.

I am writing in opposition to the proposed natural gas pipeline through Windham NH and surrounding regions. Here are my primary reasons:

1) Eminent domain would be invoked, and eminent domain has no place in a free country.

- 2) Property values would be negatively impacted without landowner consent.
- 3) Investing in natural gas infrastructure is a step backwards in energy policy.
- 4) Adding energy capacity encourages further development of undeveloped land.

The USA is not a democracy; democracy is two wolves and a sheep voting on what's for dinner. The USA is a constitutional republic; the rights of each citizen must be protected by the representative leadership.

Thank you for declining the advancement of the Northeast Energy Direct Project.

Jason Pancoast, Windham, NH

**20150729-5130**

Chelsea Zantay, Averill Park, NY.

Chelsea Zantay

35 Blue Heron Drive

Averill Park, New York 12018

(203) 837-0002

czantay@gmail.com

Wednesday, July 29th, 2015

In regards to FERC Docket Number PF14-22:

After the Pennsylvania and New York Scoping Meetings for the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline, and four days before the Massachusetts and New Hampshire Scoping Meetings, Kinder Morgan dropped a brand new, 6,571-page set of Resource Reports for a different sized project. This massive document is impossible for the general public, or the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for that matter, to digest, evaluate, and comment appropriately by the August 31st deadline. This renders the current Scoping Period null and void. Members of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, please issue a new Notice of Intent, schedule new Scoping Meetings (held in the communities most impacted), and allow a new 60-day comment period.

Thank you,

Chelsea Zantay

**20150729-5134**

Paul Lipke, Montague, MA.

31 South St

Montague, MA 01351

413-367-2731 plipke@roomtomaneuver.com

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street NE

Washington, D.C. 20426

July 29, 2015

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC

Docket No. PF14-22-000, Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Secretary Bose:

I am a landowner with interests well within the proposed NED pipeline route's impacts.

1) Please reschedule or add additional scoping meetings. We are effectively being denied the right to have input/comment because a) We have only been given a few days to review over 6000 pages of KM's very overdue, draft EIS, b) There is a LOT of missing information, over 10,000 "TBD's."

In addition, Massachusetts' Attorney General Maura Healey is leading a regional energy and gas capacity study, which will be complete in October, 2015, and will address the question of whether more natural gas is needed in the region, and if so, how much more capacity is necessary. --There is much evidence that the 'need' for more gas is being grossly overstated by those with undue financial and/or political interests in gas

infrastructure and sales.

Thus, FERC EIS hearings should occur only after the AG's report is available, KM has been required to fill in the major blanks --in a second draft-- and citizens and policy-makers have been given adequate time to review the new information.

2) Please ensure FERC and the EIS study the entire route, especially Montague and the Montague Plains pine barren, for impacts on:

- wetlands, waterways, aquifers, public and private wells and septic systems
- any pollution to air, soil and water from natural gas and/or fracking chemicals, and their proximity and effects to human, animal and plant populations
- any rare or endangered species such as the northeastern bulrush, which is listed as being present in Montague, as well as other "listed," or exemplary flora, fauna or natural communities,
- streams and other waterways that support human uses, whether recreational or as drinking water
- certified and certifiable vernal pools and analysis of the means by which damage would be avoided or mitigated
- all temporary work zones and staging areas used during construction, the pre-construction condition of these areas and plans for restoration and mitigation of damages incurred during construction
- sources of water to be used for hydrostatic testing during the construction process and how such water sources would be replenished or restored;
- clean-up of water used in testing, and potential impacts of run-off from the testing process.

Thank you. Respectfully,

Paul Lipke

cc via email to: Montague Energy Committee, Montague Administrator, Kulik, Rosenberg, Healey

## **20150729-5154**

Elaine Mroz, Lunenburg, MA.

At the core of any FERC review must be a determination of the public benefit (need) of a project.

In Resource Report 1, Kinder Morgan has provided Attachment 1C for a list of sources describing the need for additional pipeline infrastructure in the Northeast, presumably to provide justification for the FERC review and eventual certification.

Of the 31 references provided in this attachment:

13 references have faulty hyperlinks which either don't work at all, or bring up a report of a different title than the one listed in the bibliography text.

7 references are apparently not available on line, as Kinder Morgan provided no hyperlink.

This means that only a third of the references are available for review, despite the fact that Kinder Morgan spent so much time on these reports that they weren't ready before scoping sessions began.

This sloppiness is frustrating for stakeholders who carve out time from other commitments to review this important proposal. And, it does not inspire confidence that a firm who operates high pressure pipelines can be so lax on its attention to detail.

Through FERC, I request that Kinder Morgan review ALL the hyperlinks in the 6000+ pages of Resource Reports posted last Friday so FERC reviewers and the general public can use their time efficiently as they study them.

20150730-0012

**Congress of the United States**  
**House of Representatives**  
Washington, DC 20515-2103  
July 20, 2015

Chairman Norman C. Bay  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

Dear Chairman Bay,

I write to express some of the concerns my constituents and local advocacy groups have raised with me relating to the scheduling of Federal Energy Regulatory Commission sponsored scoping meetings regarding the Northeast Energy Direct Project. As FERC released the Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the Northeast Energy Direct Project on June 30, 2015, the FERC sponsored scoping meetings are currently scheduled along the project's impacted communities throughout July and August.

The initial release of resource reports by Kinder Morgan were voluminous, with hundreds of pages of information for my constituents and other interested parties to read through to determine how the proposed Northeast Energy Direct project may affect their communities. As is common for projects of this size, some key pieces of information were left incomplete and are likely to be clarified in the second round of reports which Kinder Morgan plans to release in late July. However, holding the scoping meetings only weeks after the newest round of resource reports are released does a disservice to my constituents who wish to attend the scoping meetings fully informed of the potential impacts and prepared to ask knowledgeable questions in order to better inform FERC of local issues that must be examined in the Environmental Impact Statement.

As Kinder Morgan will be releasing the second round of resource reports in late July 2015, I respectfully request that the FERC sponsored scoping meetings be held 30 days after the second round of resource reports are publically released. I ask that you give this request every appropriate consideration. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to reach out to me directly, or your staff can contact my Economic Development Representative, Russell Pandres at 978-459-0101 or russell.pandres@mail.house.gov.

Sincerely,

Niki Tsongas  
Member of Congress

20150730-0018

Hand written card, Macy Mayshark-Stavel, 98 Lyman Rd, Northfield, MA 01360, opposing

20150730-5002

Steve Rice, Shutesbury, MA.

I am opposed to the NE Direct Project due to the following reasons:

Climate change is a critical issue that our society must address.

The burning of fossil fuels and the release of methane are major causes of climate change.

Our society must move quickly to renewable energy such as solar and wind and not invest more resources in fossil fuels.

The NE Energy Direct Project will lead to burning more fossil fuels and release of methane from fracturing.

The NEDP will also cause the investment of more capital into fossil fuel infrastructure which could cause burning of fossil fuel for decades to come.

Please vote no to this project to protect our planet from the ravages of climate change.

**20150730-5005**

BARBARA BARRINGTON, Lynn, MA.

Dear Friends,

I am writing to state my concerns about the proposed pipeline route and its potential to harm the Ipswich River watershed area; as well as its potential dangers to humans who may be adjacent to the pipeline.

From what I have read, there is some doubt cast on the need for the pipeline as well concern about the chosen route.

The foundational issue is who benefits and who will be harmed. In addition to the boilerplate about need (or potential need) for the pipeline please address the potential for profit to the companies sponsoring this endeavor - and justify why they cannot forgo some of that potential profit to pay landowners for rights-of-way.

I am NOT in favor of diminishing our protected wild wetlands such as the watershed. These protected lands are a treasure and should be our legacy to future generations.

I will be traveling at the the time of the scheduled meetings; so I hope you will consider my statements.

**20150730-5014**

July 29, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Dear Secretary Bose:

I am writing to advise you of (scoping) requirements that must be met in the extremely unfortunate event that the NED pipeline is approved. I restate my opposition to this project that, in view of the myriad conservation and renewable options, is not needed and will be monumentally destructive of the pristine New Hampshire landscape. Further, it was never the intent of the United States Congress that a certificate of convenience and necessity, allowing the taking property by private-for-profit companies, be granted for a project that will principally benefit the export market. For those and many more reasons, FERC should not allow this unneeded project that will leave hundreds of our families at constant risk of harm, or death.

In the event that FERC does approve NED, Kinder Morgan cannot be allowed to place the ongoing financial burden NED upon the citizens of New Hampshire. Please include the many necessary protections in the scoping of this project. While they are specific to my property in the Town of Mason, NH, they should be generically incorporated throughout the project:

1. Provide the Town of Mason with all necessary funds to create and maintain emergency response for explosion, fire, and risk to safety imposed by NED. As seen in the recent evaluation of such infrastructural costs in another Kinder Morgan project, the amount needed could easily exceed \$50 million. A trust fund must be established to assure the funding.
2. Require NED to maintain a \$500 million liability insurance policy so that they cannot walk away from a future explosion through legal maneuvering or bankruptcy, and thence place the burden of their actions onto the backs of the New Hampshire taxpayers.
3. Require NED to place all anticipated eminent domain funds in a trust so that New Hampshire landowners will have assurance of payment even after years of litigation and the unknown financial condition of NED at the conclusion of the litigation.
4. Require funding for Mason law enforcement services to insure against the trespass over the dangerous gas lines by damaging equipment, such all-terrain vehicles and snowmobiles. This has been a severe burden in other states and can be readily anticipated with NED. This burden, over miles of pipeline, could easily amount to over \$200,000 annually for the Town of Mason alone.

5. Require that NED bury the pipeline to a depth of six feet, and with the heaviest gauge pipe, on my property and throughout Mason due to frost shifting, spring thaw/mud, logging, and other issues.
6. Prohibit the use of pesticides on my property due to the downhill wash of the pesticides and the impact on fish and food production.
7. Require that a trust fund be funded in the amount of \$10 million to be used for the assurance of water and well quality following the blasting and excavation by NED.
8. Require that NED fully compensate any property owner within the incineration zone for the loss of use of their property, and not just those with access to eminent domain.
9. Require that NED fully compensate all property owners in the Town of Mason, and other towns, for the reduction in value of their property caused by NED, and not just those with access to eminent domain.
10. Establish a trust fund, initially funded by \$200 million, to compensate Mason, NH and other communities for the diminution in property value and attendant loss of property tax revenue resulting from the placement of this potentially life-threatening pipeline that will be inserted into their communities despite their robust objection.

These are but a few of the many conditions that FERC should place upon NED. Private, for-profit pipeline companies must be made to assume the full financial and liability burden that they impose upon citizens of America. They no longer should be allowed to pay a pittance for the destruction and ongoing burden to communities. FERC, and the United States of America, must not allow them to walk away from the very real and long-term costs of their dangerous and destructive projects.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jon L. Bryan  
Mason, NH

### **20150730-5026**

RE: PF14-22-000 - Tennessee Gas Pipeline

The expansion of the Tennessee Gas Pipeline through the Northeast is of no benefit to the citizens of CT. It will cost tax payers money and not in any way significantly lower our utility bills. It will cause disruption on our already congested streets. Most importantly, the expansion of natural gas is a step backwards away from sustainable energy which is the direction we should be committed to. Why invest in a limiting and very environmentally destructive source of energy? Fracking gas contaminates ground water and destabilizes regions creating more potential for earthquakes. There is nothing good about pursuing and expanding this type of energy. When will we ever learn? I hope that FERC will do its due diligence and investigate every aspect of this project. We do not want pipeline expansion for fracked gas in the Northeast!

Most sincerely,  
Deborah and Mark Roe  
16 Woodland Drive  
Granby, CT 06035

### **20150730-5030**

#### **FERC - Restart Scoping**

On March 13th of this year, Kinder Morgan released the first draft of its Resource Reports for the NED project. These early draft reports were very incomplete and contained more than 21,000 uses of TBD – To Be Determined. These TBDs indicated where necessary data was missing from the reports.

Because these draft reports were so incomplete, they were all but unusable for serious analysis of the NED environmental impacts. Kinder Morgan promised to release updated Resource Reports in June.

FERC went ahead and scheduled the initial Scoping meetings to start on July 14th. This scheduling was

very tight for those needing time to examine the updated reports ahead of the Scoping meetings.

Worried about this tight schedule and about the possibility that Kinder Morgan might not deliver the revised reports as promised in June, dozens of individuals, towns, environmental organizations and elected officials filed comments asking that FERC please not let the Scoping meetings proceed until after Kinder Morgan had released the updated Resource Reports and the public had had time to read and analyze them.

It is worth noting here just how massive a set of documents these updated reports are. There are thirteen resource reports, sixteen appendices and four companion documents. These total nearly 7,000 pages. This is not light reading.

What was FERC's response to the many requests they had received to delay the scheduling of Scoping meetings until a usable set of Resource Reports was available? Absolutely Nothing - they simply ignored these many requests and refused to delay the scheduled Scoping meetings.

And - what was FERC's response when Kinder Morgan did in fact miss the promised June release date and the updated reports did not become available until last Friday, July 24? Again Absolutely Nothing – FERC simply went ahead with the Scoping meetings as scheduled. The Pennsylvania and New York Scoping meetings took place before the updated Resource Reports were made available.

And FERC's schedule provides very little preparation time for attendees of this week's five Scoping meetings in Massachusetts and New Hampshire.

Simply stated, FERC has failed the public. Participants at the earlier Scoping meetings only had the unusable draft Resource Reports and even those attending later Scoping meetings will be afforded precious little time to read, analyze and prepare comments based upon the updated reports.

I add my voice to the many others calling upon FERC to restart the Scoping process for this pipeline proposal. FERC must provide those who would be so seriously impacted by this pipeline with the necessary time to read and digest these crucial reports. Surely FERC must want to receive the most complete and accurate Scoping feedback that a properly informed public can supply – and a restart of Scoping would allow that.

Thank you.

Nick Miller Groton, MA

### **20150730-5051**

I am writing in opposition to FERC approving Tennessee Gas Pipeline's Northeast Energy Direct Project which would pass through portions of Pennsylvania, New York, New Hampshire, Connecticut and my home state of Massachusetts.

Others have commented on specific problems related to water quality, noise, air quality, need, wetland protection, etc. These are important and complex concerns and technical experts will weigh in with thousands of pages of detailed commentary.

But I believe the core issue is very very simple. Scientists are nearly unanimous in their belief that 80% of fossil fuels currently in the ground must remain there in order to avoid catastrophic or near-catastrophic climate change. By catastrophic, I mean changes of the sort that threaten civilization as we know it.

This leads to an obvious conclusion: we must do nothing that increases reliance on fossil fuels; we must do everything to incentivize transition to renewable energy sources; we must do these things right now. And certainly, we need not dig for new sources of oil or gas, or build new infrastructure to transport fossil fuels.

On this basis alone the project should be rejected.

### **20150730-5060**

James L Giddings, Greenville, NH.

From: James Giddings

105 Old Mason Center Rd.

Greenville NH 03048

603-878-3702

jgiddings@igc.org

Here is a revised version of the statement I gave at the FERC scoping meeting in Nashua on July 29, since the written version does not contain all the material that I included in the oral statement.

1) I request that FERC require Kinder Morgan to promptly provide digital vector map layers of the proposed pipeline route and any other unique information at their disposal (such as the boundaries of compressor stations and other facilities) to the public, so that citizens opposed to the pipeline can create their own layered maps with which to make timely counterarguments to Kinder Morgan's proposals. Operating with the maps in Kinder Morgan's reports, which are essentially just pictures of maps, we cannot quickly determine the exact latitude and longitude of inflection points on the pipeline, precise locations of compressor stations and other ancillary equipment, river crossings, etc. Vector maps are mathematical constructs that can be used to do thought experiments and calculate statistics that could help us do this work. Combining these vector layers with other, publicly available, vector and raster layers, we can do our own analysis. The layers could be provided in the form of shapefiles or spreadsheets of latitudes and longitudes. Since very few of us use drafting boards, protractors and compasses to generate maps in the 21st century, Kinder Morgan must already have a digital plot of these features in their possession.

2) FERC needs to require Kinder Morgan to take into account New Hampshire's land conservation tax measure known as "Current Use". Towns allow landowners to pay a greatly reduced property tax rate on parcels of land that is placed in "current use" as farmland, managed forest or unmanaged forest. To take land out of current use status, a landowner must pay "treble dooimage", or three times the amount of total tax savings. Placing pipeline infrastructure on land that is in current use would probably violate the terms of the status and invoke the penalty, which is greater than typical landowners can afford. Kinder Morgan needs to determine what current use lands would be affected by the pipeline. This is probably the most common kind of conservation land in the state, and it is currently ignored in KM's determination of which parcels are protected and environmentally sensitive. The owner of the land on which my family lives is among the many rural landowners in Greenville and neighboring towns who depend on current use to keep our tax bills manageable. Property tax is the biggest tax most New Hampshire residents pay.

## **20150730-5076**

Joan Dargie, Milford, NH.

I would like to comment on the Kinder Morgan Pipeline.

First they only obtained a customer for this project in the last few months being Liberty Utilities. If there clearly was a shortage of gas in NH don't you think the customers would have been coming to them instead of them having to look for one in NE. Second FERC should be encouraging companies to invest in solar power or wind power not gas that will eventually dry up and we will have huge pipelines underground with potential gas pockets blowing up in the future. Third eminent domain should not be used for big business profit. In New England we have lots of sources for energy for heating we have not run out of gas the gas companies use a shortage as a way to jack up prices. So many of us in this pipeline area don't even use gas we use pellets or oil not a benefit to those of us. From all that I have read the gas is not going to even benefit those of us in NH it is going to other areas.

Please do not support this project. Suggest that they change the route to follow major roads that are already the width they need and not disturb individuals private property. My guess is they will go away as that is not cost effective for them.

Also, please consider the quality of life of the individuals directly affected by this project. This pipeline route runs through many retirement communities. These people have worked hard all their lives to settle down in a nice quiet area and now the stress that is being put on them because of what is going to happen around them is just not right. **QUALITY OF LIFE OF THE INDIVIDUALS AFFECTED SHOULD**

BE CONSIDERED ABOVE ALL THE PROFITS THAT KINDER MORGAN CAN MAKE WITH THIS PROJECT. This project benefits no one but Kinder Morgan. Please decline this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Joan Dargie

**20150730-5077**

Paul Sullivan, Windham, NH.

July 30, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE Rm 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Re: PF14-22-000

Dear Ms. Bose:

I attended last night's Scoping Hearing in Nashua New Hampshire. The moderator, Project Manager Eric Tomasi, urged landowners to allow surveys to be taken of their land. Mr. Tomasi argued that permitting the surveys would assist FERC in developing a draft environmental impact statement (DEIS).

This advocacy is a direct contradiction to a FERC benchmark. FERC requires Tennessee Gas to report the number of survey denials on a regular basis in order to gauge public opinion to the project. It raises the following issues...

- FERC is deliberately undercutting a benchmark used in measuring public reaction to the proposal.
- FERC allows the applicant to supply critical information. There is every reason, for the applicant to underreport or misreport this key information.

For all the talk of transparency and willingness to allow public input to the process. Small details such as this, confirm the suspicion that FERC does not represent the citizens rather an agency designed and streamlined to assist private corporations.

Sincerely;

Paul Sullivan  
3 Autumn St.  
Windham, NH. 03087

**20150730-5089**

anne d lunt, temple, NH.

TO: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

FROM: Anne D. Lunt

RE: Docket No. PF14-22  
Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline

30 JULY 2015

Thousands have written and called FERC begging to be spared the crushing consequences of the proposed pipeline (Docket No. PF14-22). Some of the pressing concerns of Temple villagers are:

- The impact on property values will be devastating. Scores of houses are presently on the market without a hope of purchasers. To cite but one example, not a single prospective buyer has looked at the lakeside cottage that a neighbor has had on the market since spring.
- The impact of noise will make life in this tranquil agrarian area a living hell.

In this area, the compressor will be situated a mile from the Temple Elementary School. How can pupils

learn when they are unrelentingly assailed by deafening noise? How can teachers teach? Will our town be forced to relocate the schoolhouse, and if so, where can we ensure the calm, reflective atmosphere essential to study and to learning?

The noise impact on domestic animals and on wildlife is incalculable.

- The impact on the thriving tourist industry in southern New Hampshire and northern Massachusetts -- fondly dubbed the Currier & Ives corner -- will be equally disastrous. Residents and visitors alike prize our homeland for its peaceful rural character, for the agrarian way of life that gives New England its special character.

It is this third issue that I wish to address.

On July 14, 2015, the Historical Society of Temple, NH presented Temple Barns & Farms, a self-guided tour of seven barns spanning more than two-and-a-half centuries. Upwards of 300 men, women, and children flocked to our village to visit the barns, to pet lambs and baby goats and miniature horses, to admire tractors and trucks and other vintage farm apparatus dating from the late 19th century. All the old vehicles were gleaming with fresh paint and kept in working order; several were running full blast and filling the air with satisfying groans, shrieks, and chugging sounds. That is the kind of low-grade cacophony that rural New Englanders -- and their envious guests and friends -- enjoy!

Temple's barn tour was far from an isolated affair. On the contrary, such delights as barn tours and tractor shows . . . contradances, house tours, and bed-and-breakfast excursions . . . and the like abound across New England. Both the NH Preservation Alliance and the town of Hancock offer barn tours on a regular basis. The throngs that attend these popular events are not made up solely of country people. Visitors from the Boston area, from New York, and from cities across the six New England states attended Temple Barns & Farms, as well as from towns and villages.

Is our agrarian way of life, so treasured throughout America, to vanish under the pressures of this pipeline and similar projects?

Together with fellow citizens of Temple and the surrounding towns, I beg that you will give your thoughtful consideration to this letter. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Anne D. Lunt

#### **20150730-5091**

michele, Nashua, NH.

According to the telegraph a filling of papers by Tennessee Gas was done on Friday July 24 the first meeting was held on July 29, 2015 how was that giving us enough time to look at documents and research them we need more time to look at these documents and see how we need to precede in this matter in the interest of fair play and also to show that you are looking at all the facts not just their side you need to give us 90 days to review documents and then hold another meeting to hear what we have to say on the matter. Also it will give the EPA and the Department of the Interior who will release later this summer their ruling to address Methane emissions by the gas industry which would be why Tennessee gas wants the settled but you can wait for that ruling.

#### **20150730-5126**

July 30th, 2015

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.

Docket No. PF14-22-000

Dear FERC; To Whom It May Concern,

My Name is Kari Dugas and I am writing to ask your help in stopping Kinder Morgan & the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC, from placing a gas pipe line in my back yard. I am asking this not only for personal reasons, but for reasons that are far out-reaching, more expansive than just me. I feel so fortunate to live in a State that is so wonderfully perfect. I can go see the ocean in an hour, be in the White Mountains in an hour or in a major metropolitan city in an hour. My home is located less than one mile from a proposed compressor station in New Hampshire. I am what they say, “in the incineration zone”. I have several concerns, of which I will start with:

**Fracking:** I am concerned for the fracking that will take place; the environmental impact of fracking alone has consequences that out way the ugliness of the stations itself. During the fracking process, millions of gallons of fracking fluid – a mixture of water, sand and toxic chemicals – are injected into the ground to break up the shale and release natural gas. Some of the fracking fluid does remain underground, where it will leach into our reservoirs, our groundwater and our drinking water. Not only is the fracking process (of what chemical, water, sand combination) a secret, but samples from well sites after fracking indicate fluids that contain formaldehyde, acetic acids, boric acids, citric acids among hundreds of other contaminants. In Pennsylvania alone, there have been over 1,400 environmental violations that have been attributed to deep gas wells utilizing the fracking process. Kinder Morgan does promise to pay if there is ground-well contamination, within 200 feet; however, fracking can upset aquifers over 30 miles away! 30 miles!! There is history to prove this. I can go to my tap right now, and drink the coldest, freshest, cleanest water I have ever drunk. Please don't let this change!

**Profits:** Natural Gas Will Not Benefit New Hampshire. Although one would think that placing a gas pipe line in our back-yard would benefit the people of New Hampshire, this is far from the truth. The pipeline will be delivering gas to Nova Scotia, where it will be converted to liquid natural gas and then exported. We will be paying Market Price for gas, with no benefit of price break to the people who live on the gas line. The only people I see profiting here are Kinder Morgan. Overall, Kinder Morgan reported a profit of \$ 469 million, up from \$287 million a year earlier. However, per-share earnings fell to 22 cents from 28 cents on an increase in shares outstanding. Excluding tax impacts and other one-time items, earnings rose to 58 cents from 55 cents. Revenue declined 11% to \$3.6 billion.<sup>1</sup>

**Health:** Jerome A. Paulson is a Professor in the Department of Environmental & Occupational Health at The George Washington University School of Public Health and Health Services, and a Professor in the Department of Pediatrics at The George Washington University School of Medicine and Health Sciences. On May 17th, 2014; he gave a lecture on what toxic exposure to gas drilling pollution does to children. Very interesting. You should take the time to watch the video. It's on YouTube. He talks about a “Pathway to Exposure”. If Kinder Morgan places a gas pipe line in our State, you are allowing the possibility of toxic substances everywhere! Please! Don't allow this in our State!

Not only children are affected, but young families who came to NH, or were born and raised in NH, and are here for the quality of life that NH brings; this will have profound effects on them as well. Elaine Hill at Cornell University compared pregnancy outcomes from a group of mothers who lived in proximity to active wells to outcomes in mothers who lived near wells currently under permit but not yet developed. The results showed an association between shale gas development and incidence of low birth weight and small for gestational age (25% and 18% increased risk).<sup>2</sup>

The proposed site is less than one mile away from an elementary school. Image if there were to be a disaster; the lives and wellbeing of small elementary children would be devastating for the community and all of New Hampshire.

In Conclusion, I have so much love for this State. I am imploring you to stop Kinder Morgan and aid in preventing this from happening. This project will have a profound ecologic impact that will forever change our state. It will have no financial benefits to the citizens of NH, and has far-reaching ramifications that go way beyond our small state of New Hampshire. I say these things because I have come to love New Hampshire.

It is my home. Please, please, don't allow this to happen in my back yard.

Most respectfully,

Kari Dugas

1. • Wall Street Journal, April 15th 2015; Tess Stynes

2. • Hill, E. Shale Gas Development and Infant Health: Evidence from Pennsylvania. Working paper. 2013. <http://dyson.cornell.edu/research/researchpdf/wp/2012/Cornell-Dyson-wp1212.pdf>

**20150730-5134**

30 July, 2015

Dear FERC Commissioners,

Docket # PF14-22-000,

Northeast Energy Direct Project

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC

We adamantly are opposed to all of the gas pipeline expansion projects proposed for Connecticut . These projects pose environmental threats to the land, water bodies, wildlife habitats, wildlife and to the health of our general population due to the programmed and accidental releases of gas, the detrimental effects of methane on global warming, the excavation activities in the pipeline expansion projects and the support of the extractive process that endangers the people, the ground water, food crops, etc. in the states where hydraulic fracturing is utilized to obtain the methane. However, in regards to this NED project, I am writing concerning the excavation activities.

My opposition to this project stems from the fact that the extent of excavation is too excessive and thus detrimental to the land and to the people who might have to be evicted. Because of potential evictions, as noted in Tennessee Gas's request, due to the unnecessary size of the pipes for supposed additional "transportation of gas to the region", we are leary of Tennessee Gas's true objectives in this project.

My assertion of excessiveness is based on the fact that Connecticut has long been serviced by existing smaller diameter pipelines. The increase in demand for the gas is one that has only resulted because of contracts that the state has signed with several pipeline companies. They in turn have signed contracts with Pieradae of Canada to assure delivery of .8 billion cubit feet of gas every day, 292 Bcf/ year, for their planned liquification plant in Goldboro, Nova Scotia for shipment to the very lucrative markets of Europe and India where they already have significant future delivery contracts.

In reality, Connecticut demand has a long way to go and the government here keeps pushing more industries and home owners for conversion to gas. The government is betting on the increase in demand locally and the successful delivery of the fract gas that will transit here to Goldboro. According to Pieridae, Goldboro will not be in operation for 4-5 years by which time demand for LNG abroad and here can drastically decline as more renewables come on board. Time and money that can better be used for necessary, safe, clean energy at home is being mis-directed and the land being dug for the larger pipeline loops, as well as the potentially evicted people, will all be for naught.

If their true purpose is to service our region as Tennessee Gas has asserted, then perhaps a smaller diameter pipe would meet our needs and then some, or perhaps additional compression stations to the existing lines would. However, if they truly want to meet our needs, they should help us invest in alternative energies instead of looking for a pot of gold at the end of a rainbow that might exist abroad.

Respectfully,

David Schneider

213 Crystal Lake Road

Tolland, CT 06084

(860) 872-6899

J. L. Wagener  
639 Mt Hermon Station Rd, Northfield MA 01360

2015-07-30

To: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC)

Subject: Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Proposal - Docket No. PF14-22-000

***This proposal is a bad deal for the nation, the state (Massachusetts), and my local community (Northfield), and should be definitively rejected.***

It is a bad deal for the nation because it would significantly increase the green-house-gasproducing infrastructure, with its associated foot-dragging on dealing with the climate change problem. The US should be playing a leadership role in addressing this problem. If we, as the strongest, most influential nation in the world, do not provide such leadership, future generations will suffer unduly and history will not be kind to the US.

It is a bad deal for the state because it would set back decades of investment, financially and in terms of human commitment, in safeguarding the environment. Massachusetts has aggressively promoted both permanent protection of open space and adoption of renewable energy infrastructure. These laudable goals have become part of the state's identity, with wide-spread support and involvement of residents, to say nothing of financial support by the state and individuals. This proposal flies in the face of this spirit of conservation, will adversely impact many of the associated achievements, and discourage further forward-looking commitment.

It is a bad deal for the community because it would be a permanent major setback to the tranquil magic of life in a pastoral rural environment. The distinctive characteristics of this environment are open space (farms and forests), walking/skiing trails, quiet surroundings, good air, and good water. All of these characteristics would be degraded by this proposal; the community would thus be transformed adversely.

For example, the pipeline and its compressor station would be located on or adjacent to much permanently-protected land in the town. The compressor station would be within sight and earshot of the "nerve center" of the community's trail system, including a long stretch of the New England National Scenic Trail. The pipeline and compressor station would be at the top of three watersheds that supply much of the town's drinking water and thus, over time, adversely affect the town's water quality. Likewise, with occasional venting of the pipeline, not to mention possible breaks and compressor pollution, air quality would be degraded.

The compressor station, with its massive industrial footprint and presence, would certainly be a "white elephant" in this peaceful, rural community.

**This proposal is a bad deal for the nation, the state, and the community. Reject it.**

20150730-5173

Michael Maki, New Ipswich, NH.  
July 30, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Northeast Energy Direct Project Docket #PF14-22

Dear Ms. Bose,

I am writing to register my opposition to the Northeast Energy Direct Project (NED) as currently proposed

by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. Division of Kinder Morgan, and to urge the Federal Regulatory Energy Commission to deny permits for the project to proceed.

Even though it is generally accepted that New England needs more energy, the NED pipeline would deliver far more natural gas than the region needs or could use. Other projects already approved can meet New England's current and projected shortfall and are much less disruptive than NED. One can only conclude that the natural gas supplied by NED will be sold for export with little or no gas supplied to or needed in New England. If this project is allowed to proceed the result will be the taking of more private property by eminent domain for corporate profit. The landowners are left with unusable land that they still own and pay taxes on, receiving a onetime token payment to host the pipeline and live with the consequences while Kinder Morgan generates a cash stream for themselves year after year.

Please reject the NED project.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Michael Maki  
71 Maki Road  
New Ipswich, NH 03071

#### **20150730-5204**

##### **Nashua Regional Planning Commission**

July 30, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: Project Docket Number: PF14-22-000

REQUEST TO EXTEND COMMENT PERIOD through October 23, 2015

Dear Ms. Bose:

The proposed Northeast Energy Direct (NED) project will directly impact eight of the 13 member municipalities served by the Nashua Regional Planning Commission (NRPC) including Mason, Brookline, Milford, Amherst, Merrimack, Litchfield, Hudson and Pelham New Hampshire. For the NRPC region and Southern New Hampshire as a whole, the NED proposal represents a significant expansion of gas pipeline infrastructure through relatively rural and undisturbed landscape, including significant environmental resources and residential areas.

On July 24, 2015, Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas submitted updated draft Environmental Resource Reports to the FERCDocket. It is critically important for NRPC and its member communities to review and understand these documents so that they may provide valuable input to the FERC pre-filing process. NRPC's Commissioners will convene on September 16, 2015 to revisit issues relative to the NED, and they need adequate time to synthesize all available information. For these reasons, I ask that the previously established comment period be extended through October 23, 2015 to allow more time for review of this information in order to more fully assess potential impacts associated with NED. Further, additional scoping meetings should be held to allow the public more opportunity to address the additional information.

An effective and transparent environmental process must allow all parties adequate time to review the significant volume of information which has been filed, some of which was made available only days ago. NRPC echoes the collective position of the Southwest Region Planning Commission that a comment deadline of August 31, 2015 does not represent sufficient time for agencies like NRPC and the communities we serve to provide thoughtful and detailed comment. NRPC respectfully requests that the public comment be extended to close of business on Friday, October 23, 2015.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input.

NASHUA REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

Tim Roache

Executive Director

cc: US Senator Jeanne Shaheen, US Senator Kelly Ayotte, US Congresswoman Ann McLane Kuster,  
US Congressman Frank Guinta, NH Governor Maggie Hassan, NRPC Commissioners

### **20150731-5000**

Thomas Indelicato, Amherst, NH.

I would like to take this opportunity to give my opinions regarding the proposed construction of the Northeast Energy Direct natural gas pipeline (NED) that Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline seeks to build in New England, New York, and Pennsylvania.

Let me begin by saying that I am not opposed to finding solutions to our nation's growing energy needs. I am an "all of the above" kind of person, supporting the responsible use and development of coal, oil, natural gas, wind, solar, nuclear, biomass, hydro, shale, fracking, and any other potential source of power. Our country leads the world in energy production, always has, and hopefully always will. That said, the current plan for this pipeline shows a frightening lack of good judgement. The NED pipeline, built according to the proposed plan, will cause far more problems than it could possibly solve.

We have been told that the New England region needs to have this pipeline built. The real numbers do not support this claim, however, as the peak demand in the region for natural gas is only a few hours on each of the 10-27 coldest days of the year. In fact, a 2014 presentation by GDF SUEZ ([http://northeastgas.org/pdf/g\\_whitney\\_2014.pdf](http://northeastgas.org/pdf/g_whitney_2014.pdf)) suggests that the needs of the entire region can be adequately handled without the NED pipeline through advanced planning and storage of LNG using the existing infrastructure.

Locating the pipeline in Southern New Hampshire is also problematic, considering the small number of residents who will benefit from it. The data show that Liberty Utilities (Energy North Natural Gas) Corp. is the only NH shipper to sign an agreement with Kinder Morgan, and that at most they would be purchasing 5% of the gas shipped through the pipeline. Liberty Utilities supplies fuel only to homes and businesses; this gas they purchase will not be used to produce electricity. This means that only their customers will benefit from the pipeline, as opposed to the large number of people affected by its presence.

The costs of construction for the pipeline would apparently borne by the electricity rate payers of New Hampshire, in the form of an additional tariff on their electric bills. Considering that the gas will not be used to produce electricity, this further impacts the people of New Hampshire who will be hit with costs but see no benefit.

Having the pipeline located in New Hampshire will involve clear cutting large swaths of terrain, destroying the natural beauty of the area, and potentially destroying a large number of wetland areas. In addition, hundreds of private homes, dozens of businesses, and possibly a number of schools will need to be seized by Eminent Domain. People living near the pipeline's path will find their property values plummet, which will affect the tax revenues for the affected towns. The potential destruction of watersheds resulting from the pipeline's construction could have serious impacts on the water quality of individual residents or perhaps entire towns.

Safety is another significant concern for this project. Natural gas pipeline leaks do occur periodically, often with disastrous results. Small towns are generally not prepared for a catastrophic explosion, and forcing the upgrade for equipment and training will hit taxpayers with another substantial burden.

For these and other significant reasons, I urge the Federal Energy Regulation Commission to reject the proposed plan, and prevent Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline from building the Northeast Energy Direct natural gas pipeline.

**20150731-5002**

Susan Baxter, Appleton, WI.

While reading Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co's wetland mitigation procedures for the NED, it ocured to me that the long term ROW maintenance activities have a restriction for tree removal which is not the same as the restriction window for tree clearing associated with protection of the Northern Long Eared Bat. Since these long term activities happen on lots of ROW's without a need for prior authorization, and pipelines (and other infrastructure) do go through NLEB territory, can something be done to alter the FERC timing restrictions?

In the instant case(s), I would suggest the appropriate timing restrictions for ROW maintenance activities be written in to the application.

I also wonder if wetland delineations should be done prior to each 3 year ROW mowing, and would really like to know what equipment is actually used in the wetlands to mow the 10 ft. corridor

Sincerely, Susan Baxter

**20150731-5004**

Karen Hatcher, Peterborough, NH.

After 50 years of living in NJ, my husband and I moved to Southern NH. The choice was easy given the pristine environment and conservation mentality of the people who live here. We planned to live out our retirement years in this beautiful country with its clean air, water and abundant wildlife. We were dismayed to learn that Kinder-Morgan has applied to bring the NED pipeline and compressor station to our area. As we researched, we found little evidence that our region was actually in need of this natural gas, yet the pipeline would run through pristine environmental and wetlands areas, the compressor station is proposed within a short distance to the elementary school, and the environmental and potential health impact to homeowners and residents would be extreme. At a time when consumption of natural gas is declining in the US, and KM will be reversing the pipeline flow to take the gas up to Canada for processing, how does this make sense? When we watched Kinder Morgan's own videos we learned that they'll make a ton of money exporting the gas to Europe and that the ratepayers will pay for the pipeline via a surcharge on our electric bills. They were actually gloating. If that weren't bad enough, Kinder Morgan's safety record is abysmal. A simple Google search brings up dozens of incidents of spills and injury and fines. How can the FERC in good conscience grant this permit? Isn't a need beyond corporate profits required -- where is the need in the region? I respectfully request that the FERC deny this application unless and until Kinder Morgan can prove that there is a sufficient need for natural gas in the region. Please do not allow corporate greed to carry the day. Thank you.

**20150731-5005**

Daein R Ballard, Mason, NH.

I attempted to attend the Milford Scoping meeting today, but was turned away at the door because the venue was over capacity! While I have the ability to submit e-comments many of the people who were there and were not allowed to enter can't! There were more people outside than there was inside! On top of that I was on time. The town hall in Milford was clearly an inadequate venue. Because of this many people will not have an opportunity to submit their input on the project. FERC needs to schedule a new venue with higher capacity in the same area. This should be done with adequate time for people to hear about the meeting and be able to match their scheduled to attend the meeting.

- Daein Ballard

**20150731-5008**

Stephen Billias, Deerfield, MA.

FERC:

I am writing to urge you to reject the proposed Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Energy Direct natural gas pipeline project. The citizens of Western Massachusetts have made it clear that they don't want this unneeded pipeline. Please listen to them. FERC has been a rubber-stamp for pipeline projects for the oil and gas industry. How many pipeline projects have you rejected? My understanding is "None." This is your opportunity to make a broader statement regarding the future direction of energy resources in this country. You can make a difference. Do you want your legacy to be that you unfailingly approved every gas and oil industry request, or that you acted in the way that an organization in a participatory democracy should act, and responded to the desires of the populace and rejected this completely unnecessary and intrusive pipeline, that will pass within a mile of my house and through some of the most beautiful conservation land in the country? Please do your job! Please listen to the citizenry. Please disapprove this pipeline!

**20150731-5025**

### **FERC – About Those Survey Permissions**

Mr. Tomasi,

In your opening remarks at yesterday's scoping meeting in Nashua, you requested that affected landowners allow Kinder Morgan contractors to survey their land, stating that this can help to avoid or mitigate possible impacts to their property and that such permission does not imply approval of the pipeline nor willingness to grant Kinder Morgan an easement.

Perhaps you can understand that people on this side of the microphone might have trouble totally trusting you on this. You are a FERC employee, and FERC has done little, if anything, to earn our trust at this point – quite the opposite. And you are suggesting something that will clearly make your job easier – more surveys means a quicker and easier FERC remediation plan.

You state that you are neither an advocate nor an opponent of this pipeline proposal. And yet I get the feeling that you believe that this pipeline will be built – that it is unstoppable. And since resistance is futile, landowners might as well accept it and try to mitigate the damage. But your belief that this pipeline will be built is not necessarily shared by those in attendance this evening.

FERC has indicated in the past that an increased need by a pipeline applicant to use eminent domain against landowners does count against approval of a pipeline application.

Many people feel that a survey denial is one of the few ways open to them to send what they hope is a clear message that they will fight this pipeline tooth and nail. They believe that the more of them that refuse permission to survey, the stronger the message that is being sent to both Kinder Morgan and to FERC – take your pipeline and go away.

I'd like to return to the matter of trust. Each month Kinder Morgan reports to FERC staff on the percentage of landowners who have given them permission to survey along the NED pipeline corridor. Considering the orgy of misinformation that Kinder Morgan has treated the public to in the past 18 months, I ask that FERC require Kinder Morgan to prove these numbers.

On other projects, Kinder Morgan has admitted that they were counting the percentage of landowners that had been asked for survey permission, not the total number. And at the Nashua scoping meeting last evening, we heard from one New Hampshire official that Kinder Morgan seems to have underestimated the number of affected landowners in Rindge by half. These sorts of tricks make the percentages of landowners allowing surveys look higher than they actually are.

Kinder Morgan has a history of making misleading statements and has every reason to spin their survey permission numbers. That's why I mistrust them and why I'm asking that FERC verify this Kinder Morgan statistic before publishing it again.

Thank you.

Nick Miller Groton, MA

**20150731-5031**

John Schenk, Rindge, NH.

Comments on NED Pipeline Construction Proposed (Project Docket PF14-22-000)

In setting the parameters for an EIS for this project, it is critically important that you recognize the role that sport game hunting and fishing play in the economy of New Hampshire, as well as its importance to the health and well-being of residents who live here because of the ready availability of such outdoor activities.

Any project which promises the environmental disruption of this one must consider existing and future stocks of fish and game and their ability to survive and thrive. Therefore, please study the location of existing stocks of deer, moose, black bear, turkeys, migratory wildfowl, and game fish, especially native and wild Eastern Brook Trout and Bass. Please also study the critical habitats of those species and the immediate and long-term impact of both construction efforts and continued maintenance of the right of way. Construction efforts should consider not only the actual pipeline site, but also staging and equipment corridors to supply the project. The project should consider ways of avoiding impact on these wild populations, and where impact is unavoidable, ways to minimize and mitigate the harm caused. A continued monitoring effort should be put in place to monitor the actual impact of initial assumptions over time.

The study for fish must consider both spawning waters and locations suitable for wintering-over populations. For the trout population which requires cool water temperatures all summer, efforts should be made to determine the impact of environmental changes on water supply and temperature. Special consideration should be given to water quality degradation caused by construction activities and subsequent erosion of the surrounding terrain.

The study for deer, moose and bear should locate and consider the impact of the project on travel routes, food supplies, wintering yards, and areas for birthing and rearing young. Thought and study should also be given to the impact on these populations of the increased noise accompanying the construction and regular operation of a pipeline and compressor stations.

Also, given the massive public cost in subsidies, lost land, and disruption during construction, in addition to the extra load on emergency services preparedness and environmental degradation through increased noise of operation, the study should carefully weigh the cost effectiveness of new pipeline supply of gas against weatherization and other efficiency measures as strategies for meeting New England energy needs.

Finally, given the sudden new introduction of Resource Reports by Kinder Morgan on a significantly altered project by size already substantially into the current comment period, I would ask that a new comment period be established to consider what is now a new project.

John D. Schenk  
44 Mountain Road  
Rindge, NH 03461

**20150731-5034**

Joel N Fowler, Northfield, MA.

The Northfield Historical Commission (NHC) is concerned about the following issues in regard to the siting of the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline project:

The NHC is concerned that the proposed pipeline would pass through the two most historic towns in the region, i.e. Deerfield and Northfield, Massachusetts. There are many identified and unidentified sites and archaeological resources upon which the proposed project has potential effect.

We are particularly concerned that the proposed pipeline would pass near or through areas in the southern end of Northfield that are identified as being archaeologically sensitive for both the pre- and post-contact period.

We are concerned that the proposed pipeline would pass through the historic Northfield Mountain Environmental & Recreational property which was created during its original licensing process. The historic pres-

ence of wildlife and geology at this site that the proposed project may impact is of further concern.

We are concerned about impacts on significant historic home sites at the northern end of the proposed pipeline in Northfield.

The NHC is concerned that Native American and all other sites along the way of the proposed pipeline may also be disturbed. This is the area that Mary Rowlandson passed through in her captivity during King Philip's War.

We are concerned that the proposed compressor station may also have an effect on significant historic and archaeological resources as well as to the greater historic land and view scape of the town and the area.

The Northfield Historical Commission requests that Kinder Morgan conduct an archaeological survey for the project area to determine significant historic or archaeological resources along the proposed route that may be impacted. We request that this survey be conducted under guidelines established in consultation with the Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC). The results of this survey should provide information to assist in consultation with the MHC and the NHC to avoid or mitigate any adverse effects to significant historic and archaeological resources as well as to the overall historic character of the town.

Finally, the NHC requests that the best solution is for Kinder Morgan / TGP to identify and select an alternate route that may have less adverse effect on cultural resources of historic places and thus that does not pass through Northfield at all.

**20150731-5038**

**Town of CONWAY, Massachusetts**

P.O. Box 240 - Conway, MA - (413) 369-4235 fax: (413) 369-4237  
Town Office @32 Main Street, Town Hall @ 5 Academy Hill Road  
www.townofconway.com

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
Attention: Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

July 30, 2015

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co. 's Northeast Energy Direct proposed gas pipeline project  
(Kinder Morgan Project)  
Project Docket number PF14-22-000

Mailed by United States Postal Service mail and sent electronically

To Whom It May Concern .

This letter is being submitted by the Conservation Commission for the Town of Conway, Massachusetts. We are requesting you consider the following and the enclosed information as you review the pending Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co, 's Northeast Energy Direct (TGPIKM) project application. Our comments are made as the duly appointed Conservation Commission for the Town of Conway, Massachusetts.

Our statutory and regulatory jurisdiction is pursuant to the provisions of Massachusetts General Laws (MGL) Chapter 131 section 40 (The Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act), Chapter 258 of the Acts of 1996 (The Massachusetts Rivers Act), The Code of Massachusetts Regulations (CMR) set forth in 310 CMR 10.00 et. seq., and the Massachusetts Stream Crossing Standards.

Our Commission is commenting only on issues within these areas of jurisdiction.

The proposed pipeline project in its projected location will cross the entire Town of Conway from west to east.

We have been advised, according to a notice issued by The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) on June 30, 2015, that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, within its review of the TGPIKM proj-

ect application, will analyze steps to “avoid, minimize Or mitigate impacts” of the environment. This submission is intended to address these issues. We have attached to this letter a report we have commissioned on these issues. As you can see from the report there are multiple and significant environmental issues effecting critical habitat, the environment, wetland areas, and river areas. There are at least three substantial stream and river crossings. In the submitted report we have highlighted four (4) critical areas as examples. This report is not intended to be a conclusive as to all critical or impacted areas, but rather is to support that it will be crucial, given the highly sensitive nature of the ecosystems that may be impacted, to, before any work is commenced, carefully study and then condition any work to avoid impacts, minimize impacts, and mitigate impacts both to the aquatic system and supporting terrestrial ecosystems.

It is our Commissions conclusion, supported by the report, that these issues must be fully evaluated and addressed in a Notice of Intent (the regulatory process for permitting proposed projects) to be filed by the applicant (we have been advised that the applicant intends to comply with the regulatory authority set forth in 310 CMR 10.00 et. seq.). These issues should be analyzed in detail and scientifically approached, and must be fully completed and submitted to FERC prior to any FERC approval of the project in order to allow FERC to analyze steps to “avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts” of the environment as FERC has indicated needs to be done (see above).

The report, submitted by the Commission as an attachment to this letter, is not intended to be a substitute for a full evaluation of the entire proposed project location; but rather the report submitted by the Commission is intended to support our determination that a complete analysis will be needed with evaluations along the entire proposed project location.

It cannot be stressed enough that the proposed project, whatever the merits are, is planned to go through highly sensitive ecosystems and thus the proposed work must be carefully conditioned to avoid impacts, minimize impacts, and or mitigate impacts to both the aquatic systems and the supporting terrestrial ecosystems.

We thank you for your consideration.

Very truly yours,

Conway Conservation Commission

PC: Selectboard Town of Conway

Pipeline Committee Town of Conway

Franklin Regional Counsel of Governments Pipeline Advisory Board

Enc: (1)

-----  
Stockman Associates

July 28,2015

Mr. John Gates, Chair

Conway Conservation Commission

PO Box 240

Conway, MA 01341

Re: Preliminary Wetland Resource Area Review

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.

Northeast Energy Direct Project

Proposed Pipeline Route

Conway,MA

Dear Mr. Gates and Commissioners:

Per your request, Stockman Associates LLC performed a preliminary review of the wetland resource areas located within the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. (TGP) Northeast Energy Direct Proj-

ect pipeline route within the town of Conway. The proposed pipeline location was provided by the Conway Conservation Commission; the majority of the footprint is within and along the existing high-tension line easement. During the review process, a potential modification of the easterly extent of the proposed footprint, veering to the north of the existing easement was indicated by the Commission. The goal of the review was to assist the Conway Conservation Commission will an initial review and inventory of protected inland wetland resource areas.

Based on a desktop review of current MassGIS and USDNRCS Soil Survey mapping as well as a field inspection of portions of the route, the proposed pipeline route crosses a number of sensitive wetland resource areas subject to protection under the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act (MA WPA) and its regulations, which the Conway Conservation Commission is charged with upholding. Inland wetland resources, which will be impacted by the proposed route include, Bank (310 CMR 10.54), Bordering Vegetated Wetlands (310 CMR 10.55), Land under Water Bodies and Waterways (310 CMR 10.56), Land Subject to Flooding (310 CMR 10.57), Riverfront Area (310 CMR 10.58) and potential vernal pool habitat. In addition, the proposed route wi!! impact Priority Habitat of Rare Species, Estimated Habitat of Rare Wildlife, Core Bio Habitat and Coldwater Fish Resources designated by the Massachusetts Natural Heritage Endangered Species Program (MA NHESP)and the Massachusetts Division of Fisheries and Wildlife. The pipeline route may also contain isolated wetlands subject to federal and state protection under Section 401 and 404 of the Clean Water Act.

As stated in 310 CMR 10.00, any proposed work within protected wetland resource areas is subject to the associated performance standards set forth in the regulations for each specific inland resource areas. While certain projects may be permitted as limited projects under 310 CMR 10.53 (Le. utilities), these limited projects must demonstrate that the proposed activity meets the regulatory definition of a limited project and meets the required performance standards to the maximum extent feasible. Avoiding, minimizing and mitigating for impacts is an essential component of the protection of wetland resource areas at the eight interests of MA WPA, which they serve.

The attached information summarizes the findings of four (4) specific areas visited along the proposed pipeline route. This information serves to provide an example of some of the unique ecosystems located along the proposed route and should not be considered as a complete inventory. On the contrary, the entire route throughout Conway contains numerous protected ecosystems, both mapped and unmapped, all of which require diligent study, delineation, and review to ensure necessary protection.

Sincerely,

Emily Stockman, M.S., P.W.S  
Senior Scientist/Owner  
Stockman Associates LLC

*{4 pages of maps, each with text overlay area, only the text is reproduced below}*

### **Bear River Crossing**

Under the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act (MA WPA) and its regulations the Bear River has an associated protected Bank, Land under Waterways, and Riverfront Area, Several areas along the Bear River may also contain protected Bordering Vegetated Wetlands jBVWsl and Bordering Land Subject to Flooding jBLSFI. In addition, the area is mapped by the Natural Heritage Endangered Species Program (MA NHESP) as Priority Habitat for Rare Species and Core Aquatic Habitat. This reach of the Bear River is also mapped by MA Department of Fisheries and Wildlife as a Cold Water Fisheries Resource. Based on field observations, a portion of the westerly Riverfront Area located within the current proposed pipeline crossing contains extremely steep slopes with unstable soils. Further upstream and to the east, the inner riparian zone within the proposed crossing area is dominated by mature forest. Given the highly sensitive nature of this riverine ecosystem any proposed work must be carefully conditioned to avoid impacts, minimize impacts. and mitigate for impacts to both the aquatic system and the supporting terrestrial ecosystem. Of particular concern is the potential for sedimentation within the Bear River. the removal of overhanging shade

trees, which help to regulate the water temperature. impacts from dewatering. and loss of wildlife habitat both within the Bear River and within the associated Riverfront Area.

### **Pea Brook Crossing**

Under the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act (MA WPA) and its regulations Pea Brook has an associated protected Bank, Land under Waterways, and Riverfront Area. Several areas along Pea Brook may also contain Bordering Land Subject to Flooding (BLSF). Protected Bordering Vegetated Wetlands (BVWs) are located within the proposed crossing area. In addition, the area is mapped by the Natural Heritage Endangered Species Program (MA NHESP) as Priority Habitat for Rare Species and Core Habitat. Based on field observations, the Riverfront Area located within the current proposed pipeline crossing contains a mosaic of upland and wetland ecosystems including mature forest, shrub swamps and emergent wetlands. Given the variety of ecosystems, the area serves to provide a number of functions including protection of public and private water supply, protection of ground water supply, flood control, storm damage prevention, prevention of pollution, protection of fisheries and numerous wildlife habitat features. As such, any proposed work must be carefully conditioned to avoid impacts, minimize impacts, and mitigate for impacts to both the aquatic system and the supporting terrestrial ecosystem. Of particular concern is the potential for sedimentation within the Pea Brook, the removal of overhanging shade trees, which help to regulate the water temperature, impacts from dewatering, and loss of wildlife habitat both within the Pea Brook and within the associated Riverfront Area and BVWs.

### **Sportsman Club Crossing**

The proposed crossing area near the Sportsman Club has numerous wetland resource areas subject to protection under the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act (MA WPA) and its regulations including intermittent stream Bank, Land under Waterways and Bordering Vegetated Wetlands (BVWs). In addition, the area is mapped by the Natural Heritage Endangered Species Program (MA NHESP) as Priority Habitat for Rare Species and Core Habitat. Based on field observations, there is a myriad of wetland ecosystems within the current proposed pipeline crossing area. Observed wetland types include shrub swamp, emergent marsh, wet meadow and forested swamp. These systems border on an intermittent stream channel. Given the diversity of the wetland ecosystem within this area any proposed work must be carefully conditioned to avoid impacts, minimize impacts, and mitigate for impacts. Of particular concern is the challenge of restoring in-kind wetland types to ensure that functions and values are reestablished.

### **Unmapped PVP, BVW, and Braided Intermittent Stream Crossing**

While there are numerous reference maps that assist in evaluating the potential presence of protected wetland resource areas it is essential that field verification take place. Case in point is the proposed pipeline crossing north of #482 New Hall Road. Based on observations made in the field this area contains a small inundated depression, which may meet the criteria for a Certified Vernal Pool. At the time of the site visit, numerous tadpoles were observed within the depression and wood frog chorusing; earlier in the season was reported. In addition to the Potential Vernal Pool (PVP), an unmapped Bordering Vegetated Wetland and braided intermittent stream were observed further to the east. Under the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act (MA WPA) and its regulations the proposed crossing area to the north of #482 New Hall Road contains wetland resource areas subject to protection including intermittent stream Bank, Land under Waterways and Bordering Vegetated Wetlands (BVWs). In addition, the area is mapped by the Natural Heritage Endangered Species Program (MA NHESP) as Priority Habitat for Rare Species and Core Habitat. Given the highly sensitive nature of vernal pools including their associated wetland and terrestrial supporting habitat additional assessment and data collection should take place to ensure the protection of this valuable ecosystem. Also of concern is the reestablishment of the easterly intermittent stream channel, which is highly braided, providing a complex hydrological connection to adjacent ecosystems.

**20150731-5078**

**Kleinke Associates**

306 Delaware Avenue

Delmar, New York 12054

(518) 439-7790

(518) 439-7837 Fax

e-mail: info@kleinkeassociates.com

23 July 2015

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, N.E.,

Washington, D.C. 20425

RE: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C Northeast Energy Direct Project - Docket No. PF14-22-000

Dear Secretary Bose:

I am writing on behalf of owners of property (tax map 109\_00-3-23.1) located in the Town of Bethlehem, Albany County NY where the Northeast Energy Direct Project proposes to route a new 36" segment pipeline through the middle of ±105 acres of existing farmland within the subject property.

Attached is a composite drawing showing the proposed route from Drawing No. TE-SEG\_F-026 and Drawing No. TE-SEG\_F-027, both from a drawing set entitled "NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT PROJECT, PROPOSED 36" PIPELINE, SEGMENT F, WRIGHT TO DRACUT PIPELINE SEGMENT, ALIGNMENT SHEET, ALBANY COUNTY, NEW YORK", dated 01-12-15 with 'Issue For FERC' date of 3/2015.

Included on the above drawing are additional features, such as tax map parcels, the NYS Thruway, the existing gas pipelines crossing the subject property, as well as suggested alternative pipeline routes, to name a few.

Of concern is the proposed alignment for a new 36" pipeline through the middle of farmland. It is understood that the present agricultural use of the land would be impacted less than the future developed use of Mixed Economic Development, for which the property is zoned.

In either case, a strip of land 100 ft. wide (50ft. permanent easement + 50 ft. staging area) by ±1,870 ft in length would transect the property. While the acreage involved may seem small with respect to the larger property, the impact on future development is significant.

According to a Kinder Morgan publication entitled Developer Handbook, with a revision date of July 2013, there are significant restrictions with respect to agriculture and non agriculture development on and around pipelines and their associated easements. These range from deep plowing to road and utility crossings. Such restrictions not only limit development potential for the property, but reduce the property's value and add significant development costs due to its proposed location across the middle of the property.

The purpose of the above drawing is to present two (2) alternative alignments for the new 36" segment pipeline that should be considered as part of studies for this project. Both alternative alignments would place the proposed pipeline along perimeter areas of the property and would place the proposed pipeline out of the primary development area.

As such, I would request that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) require alternate routes be studied as part of the Northeast Energy Direct Project, with specific attention made to the subject property identified herein.

I should note that there currently exist gas pipelines crossing the subject property to which the proposed 36" segment pipeline is to connect. In addition to the requested additional alternate route studies on the subject property, I would request that FERC require an analysis of this existing pipeline/easement configuration for inclusion of the proposed new 36' segment pipeline.

I appreciate your consideration of these requests. If you have questions or need additional information, please feel free to call or email me. Thank you.

Respectfully,

Edward F. Kleinke III

ATTACHMENT

cc. Rose Watkins

*{areal photo / map, not included here}*

### **20150731-5117**

Richard J. Florino, Jr., Windham, NH.

My property at 139 Castle Hill Road, Windham, NH is being crossed by the natural gas pipeline proposed by Kinder Morgan/ Tennessee Gas Pipeline.

My property will be affected several ways :

1) The driveway will be used by equipment & construction & maintenance personnel. It is a common shared driveway more than 1/8 of a mile long.

It will probably be heavily damaged in the process .

We will need compensation for that.

2) The pipeline will seriously undermine the market & potential sale value of my home & real property.

3) The pipeline comes with health & safety warnings . It is obviously inherently dangerous under any circumstances .

4) Large amounts of natural gas will be transported over my property at a great profit to Kinder Morgan & the Gas Company.

5) There is a value to each of the above issues. I do not oppose the gas pipeline but I would request that I be fairly compensated for the use of my property, the damage to the driveway & grounds, diminished value to my property & the dangerous condition to which my family & I will be subject to when the gas pipeline is completed & put in service.

### **20150731-5190**

Tyler W Seppala, Rindge, NH.

I drove 57 min to Milford NH to attend the FERC scoping session since FERFC thinks we only need 2 scoping sessions in NH. I arrived on time to find that it was overcapacity and the line of people spilled out of the hall and down 2 sets of stairs and I was unable to get inside. I'm a directly affected landowner but instead our spots are taken by people such as (Union Workers) not from NH and most likely paid by Kinder Morgan to take spots that should be reserved for the people and representatives of our STATE.

### **20150731-5215**

Robert Wallick, Windsor, CT.

I am concerned about the environmental impact that this proposed pipeline would have in regards to Global Warming / Climate Change. The fact is that there is a significant amount of natural gas that is released to the atmosphere between the well head and the point of use. This gas is commonly referred to as "Lost or Unaccounted for". According to US Department of Transportation Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration there are two main reasons for this "lost" gas. The first is leaks. The second is measurement issues caused by inconsistent meters or those temperature and pressure variations that cause meters to measure more or less gas, depending on environmental conditions. Let's look at some numbers...

As an example of reported lost gas, Southern California Gas Co. reported a 0.87 percent loss rate in 2012

and 0.84 percent in 2011. Washington Gas Light Co. had a 3.65 percent loss rate in 2012 and 4.04 percent in 2011. That is a wide range and I want to make sure you understand that not all lost gas is Methane, and not all lost gas reaches the atmosphere, but for the sake of discussion let's assume that between 0.6 and 1.1 % of the lost gas is methane that does reach the atmosphere.

This project is sized to transport up to 2.2 billion cubic feet of natural gas per day.

2.2 Billion Cubic Feet per day at .6% would release 13.2 Million cubic feet of Methane per day, that's 4.818 Billion Cubic Feet per Year of Methane.

2.2 Billion Cubic Feet per day at 1.1% would release 24.2 Million cubic feet of Methane per day, that's 8.833 Billion Cubic Feet per Year of Methane.

Please note that this is completely without any benefit, no electricity being generated, no cooking or heating.... Just outright damage to the ozone layer. Think about it 8 Billion 833 Million Cubic Feet of Methane which is 86 times more damaging than CO2.

President Obama in March of 2014, as part of his Climate Action Plan, "Directed the Administration to develop a comprehensive, inter-agency strategy to cut methane emissions."

How would adding 8.8 Billion cubic feet of Methane per year fit within this inter-agency strategy?

Can FERC explain how this ozone damage is evaluated in the Environmental Impact study? How will it affect the Green House Gas emission programs in the New England States or the President's plan on reducing GHG and Global Climate Change?

#### **20150731-5254**

Susan M Baxter, Appleton, WI.  
07/31/2015

I know the reports recently filed by TGP for the NED are only drafts, and thus might not be totally complete, due to missing surveys, etc, but since the scoping process for this project is occurring now, here are some comments I have about the only section I have looked at thus far "Wright to Dracut Pipeline Segment G".

In the areas where the working side of the proposed project is on the same side as the power transmission lines, the proposed workspace is 100 ft. In areas where the working side is on the opposite side of the pipeline from the powerlines, the proposed workspace is 95 ft. 95 ft of workspace is quite sufficient for the installation of a 30" pipeline in these types of soils. A casual look at the maps of this area show that there is a significant distance between the power lines themselves and the edge of the powerline easements. Much of the area toward the edge of the current powerline easements appears to be wooded, and obviously there will be many trees lost due to the requested Temporary Work Space. In the end, TGP will only maintain 25 ft of ROW to each side of the pipeline, and the overlap of easements will only be 20 ft. It makes more sense to leave the trees standing, and limit the TWS to 95 ft throughout this section where ever trees exist between these two "co-located" utilities. This might be a reasonable thing to think about for other segments as well.

Obviously there are circumstances where extra workspace is needed, and that is why project proponents submit requests for Additional Temporary Workspace. I am not the landowner, so all I have to look at is the maps, but the requests for ATWS-G-011 and ATWS-G-010 for 3.05 and 3.64 acres respectively seem rather large. The area looks more like UF than AG and/or OL/ROW. Are project proponents required to consider minimizing impacts to upland trees in their proposals?

Sincerely, Susan Baxter

*{intentionally blank page}*

*{intentionally blank page}*

*{intentionally blank page}*