

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

**VOLUME 1 (r3): Comments from start in September 2014 through February 28, 2015**  
*updated (r3) August 10, 2015, to include some previously missed submissions*

{this Volume is : [http://www.Mason-NH.org/FERC\\_COMMENTS\\_vol\\_1.pdf](http://www.Mason-NH.org/FERC_COMMENTS_vol_1.pdf) }

**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 this and any other volumes**

*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 OCRed 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. In most cases 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 are in the order archived by FERC:*

<i>Comments received in September 2014 begin on page</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Comments received in October 2014 begin on page</i>	<i>41</i>
<i>Comments received in November 2014 begin on page</i>	<i>106</i>
<i>Comments received in December 2014 begin on page</i>	<i>200</i>
<i>Comments received in January 2015 begin on page</i>	<i>281</i>
<i>Comments received in February 2015 begin on page</i>	<i>424</i>

**20140915-5200 - Application for Pre-Filing, 22 files, 98.5 MB**

*Containing the following files (all "20140915-5200" followed by (xxxxxxx) )*

(29786276).docx Application, 14 pages, 60 KB

Request to Use Pre-filing Procedures, Project overview

*{included below as 20140915-5200(29786276).docx }*

***{note: the following files are not included but can be downloaded directly from FERC's eLibrary}***

(29786277).pdf APPENDIX A, 1 page, 4 KB, no information

(29786278).pdf Maps: Supply Path Component, 47 pages, 14.4 MB:

Project location map - PA, NJ, NY, CT, MA, NH, ME

PA: Bradford, Susquehanna Counties

NY: Broome County

(29786279).pdf Maps: Supply Path Component, 50 pages, 13.5 MB:

NY: Broome, Delaware, Schoharie Counties

(29786280).pdf Maps: Market Path Component, 51 pages, 16.6 MB:

Project location map - PA, NJ, NY, CT, MA, NH, ME

NY: Schoharie, Albany, Rensselaer, Columbia Counties

MA: Berkshire, Hampshire, Franklin Counties

(29786281).pdf Maps: Market Path Component, 50 pages, 16.7 MB:

MA: Franklin, Worcester, Middlesex, Essex Counties

(29786282).pdf Maps: Connecticut Loppes & Project Laterals, 50 pages, 19.6 MB

Project location map - PA, NJ, NY, CT, MA, NH, ME

CT: Fairfield, Hartford Counties

MA: Berkshire, Worcester, Middlesex, Essex, Hillsborough Counties

NH: Hillsborough, Rockingham Counties

(29786283).pdf Maps: Meter & Regulation Stations, 9 pages, 4.8 MB

Project location map - PA, NJ, NY, CT, MA, NH, ME

MA: Berkshire, Worcester, Middlesex, Essex Counties

NY: Schoharie County

(29786284).pdf Maps: Meter & Regulation Stations, 9 pages, 3.6 MB

CT: Fairfield, New Haven, Hartford Counties

RI: Providence County

MA: Berkshire, Essex Counties

(29786285).pdf Maps: Meter & Regulation Stations, 9 pages, 3.6 MB

MA: Essex, Hampden, Worcester, Berkshire, Hillsborough, Middlesex, Franklin Counties

(29786286).pdf Plot Plan Typical Compressor Station, 1 page, 68 KB

(29786287).pdf APPENDIX B, 1 page, 4 KB

Agencies and Tribes Contacted, Permit List

(29786288).xlsx Pre-file Mailing & Meeting lists, 2 sheets, 44 KB

Agency List (Federal, State, Tribal)

(29786289).pdf Anticipated Federal and State Environmental Permit Approvals/Consultations,  
5 pages, 220 KB

(29786290).pdf APPENDIX C: Examples of Consultation Letters, 1 page, 4 KB, no information

(29786291).pdf 3 page form letter, 39 pages total, 328 KB, sent to:

State Archaeologists, CT

State Archaeologists, MA

Department of Cultural Resources, NH  
NOAA Fisheries, MA  
New York State Department of Agriculture & Markets, NY  
Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture, PA  
Susquehanna River Basin Commission, PA  
USACE – Baltimore District, MD  
EPA Regional Administrator, MA  
USFWS New England Field Office, NH  
National Park Service Regional Director, PA  
Abenaki Nation of New Hampshire, NH  
Rivers Management and Protection Program, Rivers Coordinator, NH

(29786292).pdf Project Location Map: 1 page, 4.8 MB  
Project location map - PA, NJ, NY, CT, MA, NH, ME

(29786293).pdf APPENDIX E, 1 page, 4 KB  
Governmental Officials  
Non-Governmental Organizations

(29786294).xlsx Government Officials, 1 sheet 8x740, 60 KB  
Federal, State, County, Municipalities

(29786295).xlsx NGO and Civil Organizations, 1 sheet 5x51, 16 KB

(29786296).pdf APPENDIX F: Public Participation Plan, 1 page, 4 KB

(29786297).pdf APPENDIX F: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN, 4 pages, 232 KB

**20140915-5200(29786276).docx**

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

September 15, 2014

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-\_\_\_\_-000  
Request to Use Pre-filing Procedures  
Proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Ms. Bose:

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. (“Tennessee”) submits to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (“Commission”) this request to use the pre-filing procedures (“Request”) for Tennessee’s proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project (“NED Project” or “Project”). Tennessee submits this Request in compliance with Section 157.21 of the Commission’s regulations. [1]

The proposed NED Project, as described in further detail herein, consists of approximately 167 miles of new and co-located pipeline and two pipeline looping segments on Tennessee’s existing 300 Line in Pennsylvania, and compression facilities designed to receive gas from Tennessee’s 300 Line for deliveries to Tennessee’s system near Wright, New York, Iroquois Gas Transmission System, LP, and/or the proposed Constitution Project (referred to as the supply path component of the NED Project), and approximately 177 miles of new and co-located pipeline facilities extending from Wright, New York to an interconnect with the Joint Facilities of Maritimes & Northeast Pipeline System and Portland Natural Gas Transmission System

("Joint Facilities") at Dracut, Massachusetts and Tennessee's existing 200 Line near Dracut, Massachusetts (referred to as the market path component of the NED Project). In addition, the Project includes the construction of eight (8) new compressor stations, modifications at an existing compressor station, and approximately 73 miles of market delivery laterals and pipeline looping segments located in the states of Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New Hampshire.

The Project will provide up to 2.2 billion cubic ("Bcf") per day ("Bcf/day") of additional natural gas transportation capacity to meet the growing energy needs in the Northeast U.S., particularly in New England. This includes needs of local distribution companies ("LDCs"), gas-fired power generators, industrial plants, and other New England consumers. As noted above, the NED Project is planned to interconnect with the Joint Facilities in Dracut, Massachusetts and Tennessee's existing 200 Line near Dracut, Massachusetts. The interconnection with the Joint Facilities, together with the anticipated reversal of the primary flow direction of the Joint Facilities, will enable the NED Project to access more New England customers in New Hampshire and Maine and in the Atlantic Canada region, as well as Algonquin Gas Transmission's system through the HubLine. Potential Atlantic Canada customers include LDCs, power generators, industrials, and liquefied natural gas ("LNG") export projects. Additionally, the interconnection of the NED Project with Tennessee's existing 200 Line will enable Tennessee to provide customers with increased volumes of natural gas to flow south from Dracut, Massachusetts to Tennessee's customers in Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island.

The NED Project is being developed to meet the growing energy needs in the Northeast and, more specifically, the New England region. The New England region as a whole stands to benefit from the NED Project as it will enable New England 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 low-cost gas. 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 New England region. As demand for natural gas in the region increases, Tennessee's LDC customers have expressed the need for additional firm transportation capacity to serve their growing markets. In addition, multiple studies have concluded that additional pipeline infrastructure is needed in the region to serve increasing demand from LDCs and the power sector.[2] As a result of the fact that current natural gas transportation infrastructure is inadequate to meet the growing demand in the New England region, gas prices in New England are the highest in the United States.[3] Limited natural gas transportation infrastructure also has led to extremely high electricity prices in the Northeast U.S., and threatens the reliability of the region's electric grid.[4] Additional natural gas infrastructure may benefit the region in the form of lower energy costs and enhanced reliability to both the gas transmission system and the power grid, while also reducing the region's reliance on higher polluting coal and oil fired power plants. A recent study by the INGAA Foundation and ICF International predicted that 6.0 Bcf/day of new natural gas pipeline capacity will be needed in the Northeast U.S. by 2020, and 10.1 Bcf/day of capacity will be needed by 2035.[5]

This Project will add significant new pipeline capacity, alleviating the transportation constraint in the region and leading to lower natural gas costs over time. To the extent that the region increases its gas-fired generation, it will also provide generation resources to support the intermittent generation resources contributed by wind and solar resources. Thus, increased natural gas supplies available to the region will support wind power and solar power development. Similar co-existence profiles have developed in other regions of the country, including the Midwest, Southeast, Southwest, and Northwest.

To meet this expansive demand, Tennessee is scaling the NED Project to provide up to 2.2 Bcf/day of capacity into the market, expected to be operational by November 2018. During the non-binding open season for the NED Project conducted in February and March 2014, Tennessee received significant interest from a wide range of potential customers, and it has numerous ongoing discussions and marketing efforts aimed at executing long-term binding agreements. As of the date of this Request, Tennessee has reached commercial agreement, subject to the customary approvals, for approximately 500,000 dekatherms per day ("Dth/day) of long-term firm transportation capacity on the market path component of the proposed NED Project with The

Berkshire Gas Company, Columbia Gas of Massachusetts, Connecticut Natural Gas Corporation, Liberty Utilities (EnergyNorth Natural Gas) Corp., National Grid, Southern Connecticut Gas Corporation, and three other LDCs. Tennessee will continue discussions with additional potential shippers during the pre-filing process to secure long-term binding agreements for NED Project capacity. Tennessee will build facilities for incremental capacity as required by the present or future public convenience and necessity, demonstrated in part by executed long-term binding firm precedent agreements reflecting sufficient revenues to justify proceeding with the substantial risks associated with the certification and construction of a project of this scale.

For purposes of the environmental review of the Project in pre-filing process, Tennessee has proposed the facilities described in more detail below, including a 36-inch diameter pipeline from Wright, New York to Dracut, Massachusetts capable of transporting up to 2.2 Bcf per day of natural gas on a firm basis. Tennessee may, depending on market conditions and regional developments, ultimately propose to proceed with a 30-inch diameter pipeline from Wright, New York to Dracut, Massachusetts in the certificate application for the Project that is anticipated to be filed at the conclusion of the pre-filing process in the latter half of 2015.

The NED Project, employing either the 36-inch design capacity or the 30-inch design capacity, will serve the emergent need for significant natural gas transportation capacity into New England to begin delivering sufficient additional supplies that should, based upon basic market forces of supply and demand, put favorable downward pressure on commodity prices, now among the highest in the United States, while also assuring greater reliability in the electric markets with sufficient supplies of favorably priced fuel for electric generation.

In accordance with Section 157.21(d) of the Commission's regulations, Tennessee submits the following information to support its Request:

1. A description of the proposed schedule for the Project, including the expected application filing date and the desired date for Commission approval.

Tennessee requests approval to commence the pre-filing process by September 30, 2014. During the pre-filing process, Tennessee will continue to conduct field surveys for cultural resources, wetlands, and endangered species to identify and address significant issues. Tennessee will also continue its meetings with federal, state, and local regulatory agencies and governmental officials, including extensive, ongoing discussions with the Commonwealth of Massachusetts regarding Article 97 properties. Tennessee will develop a complete Environmental Report ("ER") for the Project and anticipates submitting two drafts of the ER to the Commission for review and comments prior to submitting the final ER with the certificate application for the Project. Throughout the pre-filing process, Tennessee will also continue its outreach to landowners and other stakeholders not only to obtain survey permission, but also to obtain consultation, both formal and informal, as the resource reports, certificate application, and necessary permit applications are being prepared.

Pursuant to Section 157.21(f)(4) and (5) of the Commission's regulations, 18 C.F.R. § 157.21 (f)(4) and (5) (2014), Tennessee recognizes that it must file drafts of Resource Report 1, General Project Description ("RR1") and Resource Report 10, Alternatives ("RR10") for the Project, as well as the stakeholder mailing list, within thirty (30) days of the issuance of the Commission's notice commencing the pre-filing process pursuant to this Request. Tennessee respectfully requests that the Commission's notice commencing the pre-filing process specifically permits Tennessee to submit its draft RR1 and RR10 and the stakeholder mailing list by October 31, 2014, the date by which Tennessee will have such information prepared for submittal to the Commission. Tennessee plans to host approximately 12 open houses during the months of November and December 2014 between Wright, New York and Dracut, Massachusetts, and approximately 5 open houses during the months of January and February 2015 between Troy, Pennsylvania and Wright, New York. Further details regarding the open houses are set forth in the Public Participation Plan, attached as Appendix F to this Request. These open houses and ongoing consultations with federal and state agencies and government officials will provide valuable input as Tennessee prepares the draft ER for the Project. Tennessee proposes that it will prepare and file a first draft of the

ER by March 6, 2015, and a second draft of the ER by June 5, 2015.

Tennessee anticipates filing its Natural Gas Act (“NGA”) Section 7(c) certificate application for the Project in September 2015. The application will request that the Commission issue a certificate authorizing the Project by October 31, 2016. Approval by this date will provide Tennessee a reasonable opportunity to meet its anticipated in-service date of November 1, 2018 for the core Project facilities (all Project facilities with the exception of two proposed pipeline looping segments in Connecticut), consistent with the terms and conditions of the precedent agreements executed with Tennessee’s customers. It is anticipated that two proposed pipeline looping segments in Connecticut will be placed in-service by November 1, 2019.

The proposed Project timeline is as follows:

June 2014	Began civil surveys
July 2014	Began environmental surveys
September 15, 2014	Submit pre-filing request letter
September 30, 2014 (anticipated)	Staff issues pre-filing notice
October 31, 2014	File draft Resource Report 1 and draft Resource Report 10 and updated stakeholder mailing list
November and December 2014	Conduct open houses (Wright, New York to Dracut, Massachusetts)
January and February 2015	Conduct open houses (Troy, Pennsylvania to Wright, New York)
March 2015	File first draft of ER
June 2015	File second draft of ER
September 2015	File Section 7(c) Certificate Application (including final ER)
October 2016	Requested issuance of Certificate Order
January 2017	Anticipated start of tree felling for 2017 construction
April 2017	Anticipated start of 2017 construction
October 2018	Anticipated start of tree felling for 2018 construction
April 2018	Anticipated start of 2018 construction
November 2018	Anticipated In-Service Date for NED Project
November 2018	Anticipated start of tree felling for 2019 construction (two pipeline looping segments in Connecticut)
April 2019	Anticipated start of 2019 construction (two pipeline looping segments in Connecticut)
November 2019	Anticipated In-Service Date (two pipeline looping segments in Connecticut)

2. For LNG terminal facilities, a description of the zoning and availability of the proposed site and marine facility location.

There are no LNG terminal facilities related to or proposed as part of the Project.

3. For natural gas facilities other than LNG terminal facilities and related jurisdictional natural gas facilities, an explanation of why the prospective applicant is requesting to use the pre-filing process under this section.

Tennessee requests that the Commission grant Tennessee’s request to use the pre-filing process for its Project for two primary reasons. First, implementing the pre-filing process will provide early receipt of stakeholder and participating agency input, thus establishing and maintaining constructive stakeholder relations. Second, early identification and consideration of issues will result in the most expedient processing of Tennessee’s certificate application for the Project and the development of a supporting record of decision. Early review of environmental documentation by Commission staff and its consul-

tants as well as its participation in Tennessee's public outreach effort will facilitate the development of a complete record, including a well-documented environmental document as required by NEPA and the Commission's regulations in support of a finding by the Commission that the Project is required by the present or future public convenience and necessity and the issuance of a certificate at the earliest practicable time.

4. A detailed description of the project, including location maps and plot plans to scale showing all major plant components, that will serve as the initial discussion point for stakeholder review.

The proposed NED Project currently includes the following components:

- The installation of new (greenfield) pipeline from Troy, Pennsylvania to Wright, New York, totaling approximately 135 miles of 30-inch pipeline.
- The installation of new (greenfield) pipeline from Wright, New York to Dracut, Massachusetts, totally approximately 177.16 miles of 36-inch pipeline.
- The installation of two (2) pipeline looping segments in Pennsylvania along Tennessee's existing 300 Line, totaling approximately 32 miles of 36-inch pipeline (one pipeline looping segment is approximately 22.92 miles in length beginning at existing Station 317, and the other pipeline looping segment is approximately 9.05 miles in length beginning at existing Station 319).
- The installation of the following pipeline laterals and loops:
  - o Haverhill Lateral (approximately 6.99 miles of 16-inch pipeline in Massachusetts and New Hampshire).
  - o Lynnfield Lateral (approximately 16.62 miles of 20-inch pipeline in Massachusetts).
  - o West Nashua Lateral (approximately 11.95 miles of 12-inch pipeline in Massachusetts and New Hampshire).
  - o Fitchburg Lateral Extension (approximately 4.97 miles of 12-inch pipeline in Massachusetts).
  - o North Worcester Lateral (approximately 14.13 miles of 12-inch pipeline in Massachusetts).
  - o 300 Line CT Loop (approximately 14.57 miles of 24-inch pipeline looping in Connecticut).
  - o Stamford Loop (approximately 1.51 miles of 12-inch pipeline looping in Connecticut).
  - o Pittsfield Lateral (approximately 1.78 miles of 12-inch pipeline in Massachusetts).
- Modifications to the existing Station 319 in Pennsylvania, including restaging the existing compressor, adding an ESD silencer, and modifying the existing station piping to accommodate the new 36-inch loops.
- Installation of the following new compressor stations in Pennsylvania, New York, and Massachusetts:
  - o Supply Path Head Station -- This new compressor station, to be located in Susquehanna County, Pennsylvania, will include two (2) Mars 100 turbines, for a total of 32,000 horsepower.
  - o Supply Path Mid Station -- This new compressor station, to be located in Delaware County, Pennsylvania, will include one (1) Titan 130 turbine, for a total of 20,500 horsepower.
  - o Supply Path Tail Station -- This new compressor station, to be located in Schoharie County, New York, will include one (1) Titan 250 turbine, for a total of 30,000 horsepower.
  - o Market Path Head Station -- This new compressor station, to be located in Schoharie County, New York, will include two (2) Taurus compressors, for a total of 20,000 horsepower.
  - o Market Path Mid Station 1 -- This new compressor station, to be located in Columbia County, New York, will include four (4) Titan 250 turbines, for a total of 120,000 horsepower.
  - o Market Path Mid Station 2 -- This new compressor station, to be located in Franklin County, Massachusetts, will include four (4) Titan 250 turbines, for a total of 120,000 horsepower.
  - o Market Path Mid Station 3 -- This new compressor station, to be located in Middlesex County, Massachusetts, will include four (4) Titan 250 turbines, for a total of 120,000 horsepower.
  - o Market Path Tail Station -- This new compressor station, to be located in Middlesex County, Massachusetts, will include a 23,000 horsepower electrical unit.

- Installation of the following fifteen (15) metering and regulation facilities, including tap, metering, heating, flow control, overpressure protection, and communications facilities, as necessary:
  - o Fitchburg Lateral Check -- Worcester County, Massachusetts
  - o 200-1 Check -- Essex County, Massachusetts
  - o Haverhill Check -- Essex County, Massachusetts
  - o 200-2 Check -- Middlesex County, Massachusetts
  - o North Adams Check -- Berkshire County, Massachusetts
  - o 200 Line OPP and Check -- Schoharie County, New York
  - o ITG-Constitution Custody -- Schoharie County, New York
  - o Longmeadow -- Hampden County, Massachusetts
  - o Gardner -- Worcester County, Massachusetts
  - o Dalton -- Berkshire County, Massachusetts
  - o West Nashua -- Hillsborough County, New Hampshire
  - o Maritimes -- Middlesex County, Massachusetts
  - o North Worcester -- Worcester County, Massachusetts
  - o Everett -- Middlesex County, Massachusetts
  - o West Greenfield -- Franklin County, Massachusetts
- Modifications to the following seven (7) existing metering and regulation facilities in Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island:
  - o Long Ridge -- Fairfield County, Connecticut (installation of new interconnecting station piping).
  - o Stamford -- Fairfield County, Connecticut (installation of an additional hot tap assembly, as well as upgraded interconnecting station piping and metering).
  - o Bridgeport -- Fairfield County, Connecticut (installation of new interconnecting station piping and cathodic protection).
  - o New Britain -- Hartford County, Connecticut (installation of two (2) new tap assemblies and new interconnecting station piping).
  - o Bloomfield -- Hartford County, Connecticut (installation of a new tap assembly that includes fitting, tap valve, riser, check valve, and appurtenances).
  - o North Adams Custody -- Berkshire County, Massachusetts (installation of a new tie-in assembly that includes fitting, tap valve, riser, and check valve, and new interconnecting station piping and metering).
  - o Lawrence -- Essex County, Massachusetts (installation of a new tie-in assembly that includes fitting, valve, and riser, modifications to the existing interconnecting station piping and metering, and the addition of cathodic protection).

(Tennessee notes that increased flow is anticipated at three existing metering and regulation facilities as a result of the proposed Project (Milford in New Haven County, Connecticut; Cranston in Providence County, Rhode Island; and Granite/Pleasant St. in Essex County, Massachusetts), but no modifications to existing facilities at these meter stations are necessary to accommodate the anticipated increased flow).

Location maps for the pipeline facilities (including new metering and regulations facilities) and a representative plot plan showing all major plant components for new compressor stations for the Project are included in Appendix A to this Request. Tennessee notes it is continuing to determine the specific locations for the new compressor stations and has identified in this Request the county/state for these proposed facilities. Tennessee will include the specific locations for the new compressor stations, including location-specific plot plans for each facility, no later than when it submits the first draft of the ER for the proposed Project in March 2015.

Tennessee is continuing to evaluate potential route alternatives for the proposed Project, including alternatives in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts regarding Article 97 properties and mitigation

and co-location opportunities and will continue to meet with officials in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in the coming months. Tennessee will continue its evaluation of potential route alternatives as part of the pre-filing process. In the event that Tennessee determines, based on its review and information received from stakeholders, that a potential route alternative should be incorporated as part of the proposed Project, Tennessee will notify the Commission and revise the proposed Project facility scope accordingly.

5. A list of the relevant federal and state agencies in the project area with permitting requirements. For LNG terminal facilities, the list shall identify the agency designated by the governor of the state in which the project will be located to consult with the Commission regarding state and local safety considerations.

Relevant federal and state agencies are aware of Tennessee's intention to use the Commission's pre-filing process as Tennessee has initiated consultation with the relevant federal and state agencies, which includes outlining the Commission's pre-filing process to such agencies, and requesting such agencies' participation in the Commission's pre-filing process. Appendix B to this Request provides a table that includes a list of relevant federal and state regulatory agencies within the Project area with permitting requirements, including contact names and telephone numbers for those agencies. The table also identifies those agencies that have responded to Tennessee's request to participate in the pre-filing process as of the date of this filing. Examples of the consultation letters are provided in Appendix C to this Request. Also included in Appendix B is a table listing the anticipated federal and state environmental permits, approvals, and consultations for the Project that have been identified as of the date of this Request. Tennessee anticipates that applications for all federal environmental permits, approvals, and consultations for the Project will be filed on or before the date that the certificate application is submitted for the Project. Tennessee will provide a schedule of the anticipated dates for submitting the applications for federal and state environmental permits, approvals, and consultations for the Project in the draft Resource Report 1 for the Project, to be submitted October 31, 2014.

Information regarding LNG terminal facilities is not applicable as the Project does not include any LNG terminal facilities.

6. A list and description of the interest of other persons and organizations who have been contacted about the project (including contact names and telephone numbers).

Appendix D to this Request includes a preliminary list of landowners affected by the Project along the proposed mainline pipeline, pipeline looping segments, and lateral routes. As noted above, Tennessee has not determined the specific locations for the new compressor stations, but has identified the county/state for these proposed facilities. Once those locations are identified and that information provided to the Commission, Tennessee will provide the Commission with updated landowner lists for the affected landowners at those locations and provide notification to those landowners. Due to privacy concerns, Tennessee is requesting privileged and confidential treatment of this information in accordance with Section 388.112 of the Commission's regulations, 18 C.F.R. § 388.112 (2014). An original copy of Appendix D is being filed in a separate section marked "Contains Privileged Information - Do Not Release." Appendix E to this Request includes a list of the representatives of affected federal, state, and local political jurisdictions. Additionally, a list of Native American tribes that Tennessee has contacted to obtain input on the Project is included as part of Appendix B to this Request.

7. A description of what work has already been done, e.g., contacting stakeholders, agency consultations, project engineering, route planning, environmental and engineering contractor engagement, environmental surveys/studies, and open houses. This description shall also include the identification of the environmental and engineering firms and sub-contractors under contract to develop the project.

Activities conducted to date include a comprehensive feasibility study addressing engineering requirements to meet market demand, a critical issues analysis for Project development, agency discussions, initial stakeholder outreach, desk-top environmental analysis of the proposed route and primary alter-

natives, as well as right-of-way, engineering, and preliminary alternative route assessments that have included aerial and field-based reconnaissance.

Initial routing for the NED Project began in the second quarter of 2013. Refinement of the initial routing commenced in the third quarter of 2013 and will be a continuing effort throughout this pre-filing process. As of the date of this Request, field engineers, land agents, and operations personnel have been mobilized to examine pipeline road crossings and access points and to identify possible locations for construction workspace, as well as pipeyards/contractor yards. Review and confirmation of possible horizontal directional drill crossing locations is underway, and a geotechnical investigation plan for the Project is under development.

Environmental, safety, and public awareness training of field crews was conducted in June and July 2014. Civil and environmental surveys (including wetlands and cultural resources) and property survey efforts began the first week of July 2014 and are currently ongoing. These survey efforts are expected to continue through December 2014 (weather permitting), and then resume in spring 2015 when weather conditions permit.

Engineering progress as of the date of this Request has been crucial in advancing the development of the proposed Project and is continuing. Aerial photography covering 95 percent of the proposed route has been developed for the Project as a result of specific fly-overs completed in July 2014. The next phase of detailed design will begin as detailed survey information is obtained as a result of the field surveys and that information is used to develop the draft resource reports for the Project.

Line lists, tract maps, and related right-of-way activities are well underway. As of the date of this Request, Tennessee has:

- received survey permission from approximately 46 percent of the landowners along the proposed pipeline corridor;
- staked approximately 60 miles of the proposed pipeline corridor for civil and environmental surveys; and
- completed approximately 18 miles of the wetland surveys and approximately 3 miles of the cultural surveys, all in New York.

Consultants contracted to work on the Project include:

- Hatch Mott MacDonald (“HMM”) is the primary contractor that has been engaged by Tennessee for engineering services, environmental services, civil surveys, and route planning for the Project.
- HMM has subcontracted with AECOM to assist Tennessee in managing the environmental aspects of the Project, including but not limited to preparation of the drafts of the Environmental Report that will be submitted to the Commission during the pre-filing process, the final Environmental Report that will be submitted to the Commission as part of the application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity for the Project, all federal and state permit applications, and wetland and threatened and endangered species consultation.
- AECOM has subcontracted with (a) The Louis Berger Group, Inc. to manage the cultural resource portion of the Project; and (b) the firms Epsilon Associates, Inc., Normandeau Environmental Consultants, and Oxbow Associates, Inc. to conduct specialty surveys and wetlands and threatened and endangered species-specific surveys, as well as to assist in the preparation of the applicable federal and state permit applications for the Project.
- The NLS Group and Atwell Field Services are providing right-of-way services for the proposed Project, including coordination of efforts to determine landownership, obtain survey permissions, and eventual acquisition of rights-of-way/easements for the Project.

Consistent open and forthright communications with stakeholders throughout the NED Project area is a priority for Tennessee. Beginning in early 2014, Tennessee has held numerous meetings and distributed information through the Project area to keep stakeholders updated and receive feedback on the proposed

Project. Tennessee plans to continue this extensive outreach throughout the pre-filing and certificate processes in order to keep stakeholders and members of the public informed about the proposed Project. As part of the Project's proactive stakeholder outreach and public participation plan, Tennessee has spent the past seven months engaging individuals and organizations in Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New Hampshire. Tennessee representatives have had multiple contacts with all 93 impacted municipalities. As part of that contact, Tennessee representatives have given 34 public presentations about the proposed Project that were attended by over 3,500 members of the public and where over 1,100 questions about the proposed Project were answered. Tennessee representatives have briefed the offices of the Governors, ten U.S. Senators, 16 U.S. members of the Congress, and over 150 state legislators and members of their staff in the five states affected by the proposed Project. In addition, Tennessee has made it a priority to engage with non-governmental organizations, holding meetings about the proposed Project with over 45 business, environmental, and civic and labor organizations. Tennessee has distributed information about the Project to stakeholders, including more than 900 informational letters that were sent to government officials who represent affected areas. Tennessee has also prepared and distributed hundreds of Project fact card brochures, fact sheets, and frequently asked question documents, and has provided detailed preliminary route maps to various stakeholders. A Project website has been developed ([http://www.kindermorgan.com/business/gas\\_pipelines/east/neenergydirect/](http://www.kindermorgan.com/business/gas_pipelines/east/neenergydirect/)) and is frequently updated. Tennessee has created a Project email address ([nedinfo@kindermorgan.com](mailto:nedinfo@kindermorgan.com)) that members of the public and elected officials have used to provide feedback and ask questions regarding the proposed Project. Also, Tennessee has done extensive media outreach regarding the proposed Project, including interviews with local press outlets.

Other initial outreach activities include:

- In August 2014, Tennessee sent letters to federal and state agencies requesting their participation in the Commission's pre-filing process.
- In September 2014, Tennessee is sending letters to federal and state agencies (Pennsylvania, New York, and Connecticut) requesting consultation regarding environmental resources.
- Initial meetings with applicable U.S. Army Corps of Engineers districts (Baltimore District, Pennsylvania Section; New York District; Buffalo District; and New England District), as well as discussions with the North Atlantic Division Headquarters, have been conducted.
- Initial meetings with Massachusetts and New York state environmental permitting agencies have been conducted.
- Tennessee has had initial and follow-up meetings with officials of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Department of Energy and Environment and Department of Transportation regarding the Project impacts in Massachusetts, including but not limited to impacts to Article 97 properties and mitigation for routing Project facilities through or around such properties, and will continue these discussions throughout the pre-filing process. This includes a follow-up meeting with the Massachusetts Department of Energy and Environment in mid-October 2014.
- An initial cultural resource meeting and records review with the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation has been conducted. Cultural resource surveys (following environmental, safety, and public awareness training of field crews) began in high probability areas in New York the week of August 18, 2014.
- An initial cultural resource meeting and records review was held with the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission.

8. For LNG terminal projects, proposals for at least three prospective third-party contractors from which Commission staff may make a selection to assist in the preparation of the requisite NEPA document.

Not applicable. There are no LNG terminal facilities related to or proposed as part of the Project.

9. For natural gas facilities other than LNG terminal facilities and related jurisdictional natural gas

facilities, proposals for at least three prospective third party contractors from which Commission staff may make a selection to assist in the preparation of the requisite NEPA document, or a proposal for the submission of an applicant-prepared draft Environmental Assessment as determined during the initial consultation described in paragraph (c) of Section 157.21.

Tennessee has forwarded directly to Commission staff a copy of one bid from a qualifying third party environmental contractor and anticipates providing directly to Commission Staff copies of other bids from qualifying third party environmental contractors as those bids are received.

10. Acknowledgement that a complete Environmental Report and complete application are required at the time of filing.

Tennessee acknowledges that a complete Environmental Report and a complete certificate application are required at the time of filing and will be submitted as required under Section 7(c) of the NGA. The certificate application submitted by Tennessee will meet all filing requirements of the Commission's regulations, including but not limited to those regulations implementing NEPA, 18 C.F.R. Part 380 (2014).

Tennessee anticipates submitting the certificate application, including the complete Environmental Report, to the Commission in September 2015.

11. A description of a Public Participation Plan which identifies specific tools and actions to facilitate stakeholder communications and public information, including a project website and a single point of contact. This plan shall also describe how the applicant intends to respond to requests for information from federal and state permitting agencies, including, if applicable, the governor's designated agency for consultation regarding state and local safety considerations with respect to LNG facilities.

The Public Participation Plan is enclosed as Appendix F to this Request.

12. Certification that a Letter of Intent and a Preliminary WSA have been submitted to the U.S. Coast Guard or, for modifications to an existing or approved LNG terminal, that the U.S. Coast Guard did not require such information.

Not applicable. There are no LNG terminal facilities related to or proposed as part of the Project.

Accordingly, Tennessee respectfully requests the assistance of the Commission Staff in implementing the Commission pre-filing review process for the NED Project. Any questions concerning the enclosed filing should be addressed to Ms. Jacquelyne Rocan at (713) 420-4544 or to Mr. Richard Siegel at (713) 420-5535

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

---

[1] 18 C.F.R. § 157.21 (2014).

[2] Current natural gas transportation infrastructure is inadequate to meet the growing demand in the New England region. See, e.g., U.S. Dept. of Energy, Quadrennial Energy Review Meeting, Statement of Gordon van Welie, President and Chief Executive Officer of ISO New England, at pp. 4-5 (Apr. 21, 2014), available at [www.iso-ne.com/pubs/pubcomm/pres\\_spchs/2014/van\\_welie\\_statement\\_4-21-14.pdf](http://www.iso-ne.com/pubs/pubcomm/pres_spchs/2014/van_welie_statement_4-21-14.pdf); U.S. Dept. of Energy, Energy Information Administration, High Prices Show Stresses in New England Natural Gas Delivery System at 1 (Feb. 7, 2014), available at [www.eia.gov/naturalgas/issuesand trends/deliverysystem/2013/pdf/newengland\\_natgas.pdf](http://www.eia.gov/naturalgas/issuesand trends/deliverysystem/2013/pdf/newengland_natgas.pdf). Id. at 8; see also U.S. Dept. of Energy, Energy Information Administration, Natural Gas Explained: Natural Gas Prices (Jun. 29, 2010), available at [www.eia.gov/energyexplained/index.cfm?page=natural\\_gas\\_prices](http://www.eia.gov/energyexplained/index.cfm?page=natural_gas_prices).

[3] See ISO New England, 2013 Wholesale Electricity Prices in New England Rose on Higher Natural Gas Prices: Pipeline Constraints and Higher Demand Pushed Up Prices for Both Natural Gas and Power at 1 (Mar. 18, 2014), available at [http://www.iso-ne.com/nwsiss/pr/2014/2013\\_price%20release\\_03182014\\_final.pdf](http://www.iso-ne.com/nwsiss/pr/2014/2013_price%20release_03182014_final.pdf).

[4] Id. at 2. See also Massachusetts Office of The Attorney General, Overview of Electricity & Natural Gas Rates, available at <http://www.mass.gov/ago/doing-business-in-massachusetts/energy-and-utilities/energy-rates-and-billing/electric-and-gas-rates.html>

[5] The INGAA Foundation, North American Midstream Infrastructure through 2035: Capitalizing on Our Energy Abundance at 12 (Mar. 18, 2014), available at <http://www.ingaa.org/File.aspx?id=21498>

**20140915-5201 - privledged (non-public) parts of Application for Pre-filing,**

3 KB PDF + 431 KB Excel files

**20140917-4001(29789308).pdf**

*Originally available only as Scanned letter from Commonwealth of MA to FERC*

**The Commonwealth of Massachusetts**  
Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs  
100 Cambridge Street, Suit 900  
Boston, MA 02114

September 16, 2014

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  
Request to Use Pre-filing Procedures  
Proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Ms. Bose:

I have received notice that Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LLC, (“Tennessee Gas” or lithe Company”), proponent of the Northeast Direct Natural Gas Pipeline, has submitted a pre-filing application with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (“FERC”). I understand that FERC will be providing more information to the public in the near future with regard to opportunities for the public to learn more about the project and also to comment on the proposed pipeline.

As you are aware, Governor Patrick wrote to Acting Chairman LaFleur this summer to encourage a robust and full public review of this proposal. As the pre-filing stage of the FERC proceeding has commenced, so has the opportunity for full and meaningful input from the public. I urge FERC to consult with the Commonwealth’s Energy Facilities Siting Board to make sure that a comprehensive public outreach plan is developed and implemented and that there are meaningful opportunities for public input. The Company has repeatedly pledged to the Commonwealth’s Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs (EEA) and to the public that it will be open to making adjustments to its proposal during the pre-filing process. FERC should use its resources during this pre-filing process to hold the Company to that pledge.

Massachusetts, through its Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs and agencies within that Secretariat, has a number of interests affected by the proposal and will be an active participant in the pre-filing process and any subsequent application process. As will be discussed in additional detail below, the interests of the Commonwealth include, but are not limited to:

1. Ensuring a full analysis of the need for the project in Massachusetts and regionally;
2. Ensuring a full environmental review and consideration of environmental permitting requirements for

the proposal; and

3. Ensuring a full examination of the proposed routing and seeking ways to avoid or minimize the impacts to important natural resources managed by the Commonwealth through its land management and wildlife agencies, as well as other property dedicated to conservation, farming and forestry purposes.

Tennessee Gas has noted that the NED Project is projected to provide capacity scalable from approximately 800,000 Dth/d to 1.2 Bcf/d to 2.2 Bcf/d of additional natural gas to the region. However, it is unclear whether Massachusetts needs additional infrastructure to meet demand, and if so, how much. We urge the Company to share any data available regarding regional demand for natural gas. Also of interest is whether the Company perceives any unmet demand to be the result of Massachusetts' thermal needs, generation needs, or both. We are also interested in whether the Company is planning only to meet the demand of existing customers or if it is preparing to serve new gas customers through this project. Lastly, we are particularly concerned with whether the Company is planning to serve customers outside the state or even New England. Massachusetts is conducting its own study to determine whether additional infrastructure is required to meet projected demand, and how to account for environmental, reliability, and cost considerations should new infrastructure be needed. Given the Commonwealth's climate goals, it is critical that any efforts to build additional natural gas infrastructure are limited to only what is determined to be necessary. We urge Tennessee Gas to work with Massachusetts EEA agencies to properly assess the need for this project.

#### Environmental Review

The project is significant in size and scope. Based on presentations made by company representatives at meetings with EEA and its agencies, the proponent describes a pipeline over 127 miles in length, crossing northern Massachusetts from Richmond to Dracut. The project will require a 100 foot right-of-way during construction and will require the maintenance of a permanent easement of 50 feet in width throughout the length of the project. Based on preliminary reviews, the project will cross wetland resources, protected forest habitat including but not limited to BioMap2 Forest Cores and seventeen BioMap2 Critical Natural Landscape Blocks, active and prime agricultural lands, waterbodies, mapped habitat for endangered, threatened and special concern state-listed species, five BioMap2 Vernal Pool Cores and Areas of Critical Environmental Concern. The proposed pipeline route traverses some of the most critical habitats for approximately 15 % of all state-listed "Endangered", "Threatened", and "Special Concern" species and has the potential to result in a significant level of "Take" within the Commonwealth for this project. There are likely to be additional environmental issues identified when the proponent identifies the access routes needed for construction and work on lateral lines related to this project.

#### Impacts on Conservation Lands and Other State Managed Natural Resources

In addition to the environmental impacts discussed above, the proposed route crosses over 19 miles of Commonwealth managed conservation fee lands (through its Department of Conservation and Recreation and Department of Fish and Game and Division of Fisheries and Wildlife) and lands in which the Commonwealth holds a property interest for conservation and agricultural purposes. These conservation lands are protected by the Massachusetts Constitution, and the environmental agencies hold fee interests, conservation restrictions, easements, agricultural preservation restrictions or other real property interests on these lands for the direct use and enjoyment and on behalf of the citizens of our state. At several meetings over the past months, EEA and its agencies have urged Tennessee Gas to seriously examine alternatives, including the use of existing rights of way to avoid or minimize disturbing valuable conservation properties. EEA and the agencies have provided detailed information about existing GIS data layers, available to the proponent and the public, which delineate these resources. It is the position of EEA and the agencies that the Company can and should do more analysis to avoid negatively affecting important environmental and recreational resources.

It should be noted that the Patrick Administration has made an unprecedented investment of over \$360 million in land protection, resulting in the conservation of over 125,000 acres of land in the past seven years. In addition to expanding state ownership, EEA and its agencies have partnered with municipalities, non-profit

organizations and landowners to conserve properties held by these entities. A large number of these stakeholders expressed concerns about the proponent's project and the impact of its proposed route on their communities and on specific properties. The Commonwealth's Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs has convened several meetings of concerned stakeholders with the Company in an effort to facilitate dialogue and ensure that the proponent is fully considering these concerns.

A preliminary, non-exhaustive, review by EEA and the agencies shows that the pipeline would pass through approximately nine Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs) and four Wildlife Conservation Easements (WCEs). As only one illustrative example, properties such as the Montague Plains WMA will see years of active habitat management for species recovery and restoration through prescribed fire and other means potentially disrupted as the current proposed pipeline goes through the very center of the WMA. The proposed route similarly traverses the Birch Hill, Fairfield Brook, George L. Darey, Millers River, Peru, Townsend Hill, Tully Mountain, and Upper Westfield River WMAs, as well as the Housatonic River East Branch, Little Tully Mountain, Pepperell Springs, and Windsor Brook WCEs. Further, the construction and maintenance of the pipeline has secondary impacts that can destroy important habitat, hamper ongoing wildlife restoration efforts, and introduce a variety of management concerns.

The pipeline also passes through several park and forest facilities, raising the possibility that the pipeline will pass through important recreational facilities like campgrounds and through important natural resource areas set aside for special protection. In addition, the proposed route intersects with three long distance trails, including the Appalachian Trail that traverses the entire eastern part of the country. Further, the proposed route passes through four Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, which are nominated by citizens for special protection and designated under EEA regulations.

Farmers who are subject to Agricultural Preservation Restrictions have been in contact with the Department of Agricultural Resources, noting that the route, as planned, may make continued farming on their properties impossible. The state Department of Agricultural Resources acquires these easements with state funding that is often matched by funds from the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

The pipeline will impact up to 12 farm properties in which the Department holds a covenant or restriction, creating management and access issues. This includes uprooting part of a 44 acre fourth generation orchard that produces 100 varieties of apples, peaches and pears and splitting a 350 acre parcel used to produce potatoes. Fragmentation of farmland creates management issues and impacts the viability of the farm.

Each of these cases calls for a more detailed analysis of the extent of impact and to determine whether the route can be adjusted to avoid or at least minimize impacts to these irreplaceable resources. To date, detailed discussion about these very real examples has not taken place and the Company has not proposed any route adjustments for any state properties. Tennessee Gas indicates that it is amenable to these types of discussion and making adjustments to its route, but to date the Company has not undertaken the type of detailed analysis to facilitate a meaningful review of the route, nor has it demonstrated that it has fully considered alternative routes to minimize impacts.

In the months ahead, EEA and its agencies intend to fully engage in the public process and hope to have meaningful discussions with the Company about the questions and concerns raised above and other issues identified during the pre-filing process. I urge FERC to establish clear and reasonable schedules to allow the public and affected property owners the chance to review and discuss the proposal and to fully scope the environmental issues that will need to be addressed for any future filing with FERC. As noted earlier, I also urge FERC to work with our Energy Facilities Siting Board to ensure that the pre-filing process is appropriate for a project of this size and significance.

Sincerely,

Maeve Vallely Bartlett  
Secretary

**20140919-5110(29795200).pdf**

Carolyn Sellars, Townsend, MA.

September 20, 2014

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 Request to Use Pre-filing Procedures for Proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Secretary Bose:

I have had the opportunity to download and review the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.'s request to use the pre-filing process. I understand the pre-filing process will provide the public opportunities to learn more about the project and to provide comments. You should know that Tennessee's pre-filing may not have adequately addressed the pre-filing requirements of 18C.F.R. Section 157.21(d)(4). Specifically, significantly out of date information was used in the location maps of the route in this pre-filing request.

The Townsend, MA maps do not show numerous homes and businesses, many which have been in existence for 20 years or more. For example, the route and a possible compressor station is located behind homes in the Pheasant Ridge subdivision, off Route 13, just south of Townsend center which are not shown. While the roads are shown on the map, anyone not familiar with the site would have no way of knowing that there are homes all along the roads. This development was completed 20 years ago. The Ryan Road subdivision off Lunenburg Road in West Townsend is another example. To see if only the Townsend maps were outdated, I checked an area of southeastern Winchendon. Again, many of the homes and a large church on Route 140 along the proposed route are not shown on the map. The church and some homes are more than 30 years old. I can only surmise that similar problems exist on all the maps presented.

I respectfully request that you not accept the pre-filing request or begin the pre-filing process until up to date maps are submitted. As a greenfield pipeline cutting through more than a hundred miles of our Commonwealth, it is critical that maps for the entire route be at least reasonably up to date before a meaningful pre-filing process can commence. This is particularly critical for Townsend, the potential location of a large compressor station. The public, regulators and the proponent need reliable base data to properly assess possible impacts. Mott Hatch McDonald indicates, "maps were compiled utilizing existing publicly available GIS resources." Since with just a few mouse clicks even I can find much more up to date GIS information than those submitted, I request that you ask the proponent to refile the request providing maps with more recent GIS information. The current severely 20140919-5110 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 9/19/2014 2:37:32 PM out of date maps would jeopardize a meaningful pre-filing and scoping process.

Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Carolyn Sellars

cc: Governor Deval Patrick, Senator Elizabeth Warren, Senator Ed Markey, Representative Niki Tsongas  
Maeve Vallely-Bartlett, Secretary of Energy and Environmental Affairs, Townsend Board of Selectmen

**20140922-0029(29804106).tif**

Letter from Cornerstone Church of the Assemblies of God, Winchendon, MA, opposing

**20140922-5001(29795770).pdf**

Charles E Long, Canaan, NY.

This present pipeline and the proposed expansion runs under waters in the Queechee Lake watershed in Canaan, NY (Columbia County) This is a pristine rural area with an exceptional clean lake used for fishing and water recreation by local residents and not so local visitors. Queechee Lake attracts visitors which help support local business and the area economy. Air, water and noise pollution from the proposed compressor station could adversely effect the eco system of the area, which in turn could hurt local business and the surrounding economy. I know that many who live in the area and depend on its economy are also concerned about the impact of the pipeline expansion and a new compressor station so close to the Lake.

**20140923-5008(29797028).txt**

Martha Tirk, Ashfield, MA.

It has come to our attention that the map of our region, filed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company in conjunction with their proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project, does not show either our home at 375 Bellus Road in the town of Ashfield (built in 1994 and shown clearly here on current Massachusetts GIS maps: [http://maps.massgis.state.ma.us/map\\_ol/oliver.php](http://maps.massgis.state.ma.us/map_ol/oliver.php)) or our well, our only water source.

The map in question is on page 50, and our home sits within a few hundred feet east of proposed pipeline mile marker 86.9. I also notice that there are three other dwellings within less than a half-mile of ours that are not on the TGP-prepared map but that do appear on the state GIS maps.

Given that updated information and maps are readily available, it's an outright deception to have submitted maps to FERC that do not accurately portray the number of residents who would be personally and adversely impacted by this project.

**20140923-5011(29797034).txt**

Nicholas T Miller, Groton, MA.

Regarding Tennessee Gas Pipeline's (TGP's) Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project under PF14-22:

I was very surprised and disheartened when examining the maps that accompanied the FERC pre-filing for this proposed pipeline project. The maps included in the pre-filing are very outdated and are missing crucial information from at least the past two decades.

These are examples of some of the items that are missing from the TGP maps of my town of Groton, MA but are in the path of the proposed pipeline:

- 1.) The current Groton-Dunstable Regional High School is home to some 850 students. The campus was constructed in 2003, over a decade ago. The proposed TGP pipeline runs across a quarter of a mile of the campus - but the map submitted to FERC shows this as undeveloped land.
- 2.) There is a residential development of twenty plus homes on Overlook Drive in my neighborhood. These homes were constructed in the mid to late 1990's. The proposed TGP pipeline passes very close to this development and residents there have received survey requests from TGP - but the map submitted to FERC shows this as undeveloped land.
- 3.) An unused railroad bed along the Nashua River was converted to the very popular and heavily traveled Nashua River Rail Trail that opened in 2002. The proposed TGP pipeline crosses this rail trail - but the map submitted to FERC shows it as a rail bed.

The list goes on and on. As you would expect, a large number of development projects have occurred in the past 20 plus years and they are all absent from these flawed maps.

Since this is a new greenfields pipeline, maps for the entire route should be up to date before the pre-filing process should begin. I don't see how maps that are missing this level of detail can possibly be anything but extremely misleading to FERC as it considers the potential negative impacts of this proposed pipeline.

In my opinion, this pre-filing should be suspended until maps that include structures built during the past two plus decades are depicted accurately. How can FERC possibly evaluate this project with so much vital

information missing from these maps?

Thank you for your time and consideration of this serious issue.

Regards,

Nicholas Miller

**20140923-5013(29797036).txt**

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

Request to Use Pre-filing Procedures for Proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Secretary Bose:

I thought you should know that the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. used very out of date maps in their pre-filing request. I grew up in Townsend Massachusetts and I'm very familiar with the area where they want to put their pipeline. It looks like they used maps from about when I was in middle school, and I'm almost 50! A lot has changed in Central Massachusetts in the last 35 years.

In my old neighborhood, where my mother still lives, there must be at least 20 homes on Wyman Rd, New Fitchburg Rd, Blood Rd, and West Elm Street that don't appear on their maps. In fact, there is a whole street they missed, Jonathan Lane, that has about a dozen houses and is within about 1000 feet of where they might put their compressor.

Since this is a brand new greenfield pipeline, maps for the entire route should be up to date before the pre-filing process should begin. The public, regulators and Kinder Morgan need better maps to assess the impacts of this project. The maps don't represent reality. This misleading information makes the pre-filing and scoping process a waste of time.

Thank you for your time and consideration of this problem.

Yours truly,

Lori Stevenson

cc: Governor Deval Patrick

Senator Elizabeth Warren

Senator Ed Markey

U.S. Representative Niki Tsongas

Maeve Vallely-Bartlett, Secretary of Energy and Environmental Affairs

**20140923-5040(29797502).pdf**

Jennifer C. Markens, Ashfield, MA.

RE: Docket #PF14-22

We have become aware that the map of our region, filed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company (aka Kinder Morgan) in their proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project, does not show either our home at 597 Bellus Road in the town of Ashfield (built in 1992 and shown clearly here ([http://maps.massgis.state.ma.us/map\\_ol/oliver.php](http://maps.massgis.state.ma.us/map_ol/oliver.php)) on Massachusetts GIS maps: or our well, the only source of water for this home.

- This map does also not reflect that there are currently two existing easements for two sets of high voltage, direct transmission electricity cables crossing the property, and indeed, the entire town and other affected properties.

- And it does not show the presence of wetlands. There is a narrow stretch of woods between our home and these two separate easements for two separate sets of direct current high voltage electricity cables supported with two differing sets of pillars. Our well is located between these easements of live cables and our home.

- The map in question is on page 50, and our home sits within a couple hundred feet east of the proposed pipeline at mile marker 87.4.

- We also notice that there are several other dwellings, and a place of business, within less than a quarter mile, and in many cases, less than an eighth of a mile, of our home that are also not on the TGP-(KM) prepared map, but that do appear on the state GIS maps. On looking at maps through our town, this is true in a number of other locations in the town and this should be carefully compared with more current data. The map submitted to FERC is clearly decades old.
- Since the updated information and maps are readily available ([http://maps.massgis.state.ma.us/map\\_ol/oliver.php](http://maps.massgis.state.ma.us/map_ol/oliver.php)), it is an outright deception to have submitted maps that do not accurately portray the number of residents who would be adversely and so personally impacted by this proposal.
- I will further note that we contacted Kinder Morgan (TGP) and requested information about where, on our property, the proposed pipeline would go and have not received any information from them, despite their public statements that this information was readily available to us.
- Yet another matter is that we are concerned that Kinder Morgan is mischaracterizing the number of willing participants it publicly says are cooperating with their demands for survey. This is inconsistent with the overwhelmingly negative response reflected in votes across the state, and we encourage FERC to conduct a sampling of these to verify the actual numbers in this matter. Numerous individuals report having rescinded permission for survey upon access to facts not provided by the company, 20140923-5040 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 9/23/2014 9:31:40 AM following unannounced, intrusive home visits that were residents' first notice of this plan.

Lastly, these behaviors are consistent with a disrespectful, manipulative, and at times hostile attitude toward residents. Questions are not answered. Public statements of activity are not privately upheld. At times communities of people have been kept waiting for company representatives to show up, or meetings are cancelled at the last minute.

The overall attitude has been dismissive and cavalier, at times disrespectful. A glaring example of this is was a FRCOG meeting which TGP attended in July where a representative of the company, a Mr. Curtis Cole, stated that our region "looked just like North Korea from satellite photos" (surveillance). This said to American citizens, whose families hereabouts go back to colonial times in our nation.

I will gently remind members of FERC that we are all both ratepayers, and also persons who ALREADY subsidize the electricity grid (s), through our property taxes, as well as gas extraction, from which Kinder Morgan derives untold wealth, which is heavily subsidized by the citizens of this country through their federal taxes.

Thank you for any attention you are willing to give to these concerns.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Markens

### **20140923-5111(29799866).pdf**

Susan Slattery, Hinsdale, MA.

I am writing to formally protest the pipeline project.

This pipeline runs less than two feet from our well in Hinsdale.

This pipeline will decimate our property value.

I have never used ANY chemicals on the lawn or in my gardens. This pipeline company's gas line will leach toxic chemicals into the aquifer that feeds our well. On top of that, boatloads of RoundUp will be sprayed all over and around the pipeline to keep it clear--and this includes near our well.

We do what we can to keep toads, snakes and birds around here safe. They will not be safe with the chemicals in and around this pipeline. Neither will we. I buy grass fed beef, wild fish and organic vegetables, yet I will be drinking and bathing and washing our clothing in RoundUp and god knows what other chemicals if this pipeline goes through. Additionally I do not want to bear the COST of this pipeline, and I KNOW all of

this fracked gas will be exported.

I do not want to compromise my health, my property value and the water quality everywhere along this pipeline. Please do not allow it to proceed. I believe in solar, wind and other renewable technologies... we have to get away from gas and from oil, and start investing in renewable technologies. Put up a wind farm behind us and I won't quibble, but this, this is poison, this will ruin our property, and our lives, and I'm quite sure these chemicals will ultimately KILL US.

I'm writing to say this pipeline is not good for me, or for anyone along the pipeline route, and frankly, it's not even good for this country. Stop depleting these resources and look towards something renewable.

**20140924-0032(29807231).pdf**

**The Commonwealth of Massachusetts**  
Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs  
100 Cambridge Street, Suite 900  
Boston, MA 02114

Deval Patrick, Governor  
Maeve Vallely Bartlett, Secretary  
September 16, 2014

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

Request to Use Pre-filing Procedures

Proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Ms. Bose:

I have received notice that Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LLC, ("Tennessee Gas" or "the Company"), proponent of the Northeast Direct Natural Gas Pipeline, has submitted a pre-filing application with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). I understand that FERC will be providing more information to the public in the near future with regard to opportunities for the public to learn more about the project and also to comment on the proposed pipeline.

As you are aware, Governor Patrick wrote to Acting Chairman LaFleur this summer to encourage a robust and full public review of this proposal. As the pre-filing stage of the FERC proceeding has commenced, so has the opportunity for full and meaningful input from the public. I urge FERC to consult with the Commonwealth's Energy Facilities Siting Board to make sure that a comprehensive public outreach plan is developed and implemented and that there are meaningful opportunities for public input. The Company has repeatedly pledged to the Commonwealth's Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs (EEA) and to the public that it will be open to making adjustments to its proposal during the pre-filing process. FERC should use its resources during this pre-filing process to hold the Company to that pledge.

Massachusetts, through its Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs and agencies within that Secretariat, has a number of interests affected by the proposal and will be an active participant in the pre-filing process and any subsequent application process. As will be discussed in additional detail below, the interests of the Commonwealth include, but are not limited to:

1. Ensuring a full analysis of the need for the project in Massachusetts and regionally;
2. Ensuring a full environmental review and consideration of environmental permitting requirements for the proposal; and

3. Ensuring a full examination of the proposed routing and seeking ways to avoid or minimize the impacts to important natural resources managed by the Commonwealth through its land management and wildlife agencies, as well as other property dedicated to conservation, farming and forestry purposes.

#### Need

Tennessee Gas has noted that the NED Project is projected to provide capacity scalable from approximately 800,000 Dth/d to 1.2 Bcf/d to 2.2 Bcf/d of additional natural gas to the region. However, it is unclear whether Massachusetts needs additional infrastructure to meet demand, and if so, how much. We urge the Company to share any data available regarding regional demand for natural gas. Also of interest is whether the Company perceives any unmet demand to be the result of Massachusetts' thermal needs, generation needs, or both. We are also interested in whether the Company is planning only to meet the demand of existing customers or if it is preparing to serve new gas customers through this project. Lastly, we are particularly concerned with whether the Company is planning to serve customers outside the state or even New England. Massachusetts is conducting its own study to determine whether additional infrastructure is required to meet projected demand, and how to account for environmental, reliability, and cost considerations should new infrastructure be needed. Given the Commonwealth's climate goals, it is critical that any efforts to build additional natural gas infrastructure are limited to only what is determined to be necessary. We urge Tennessee Gas to work with Massachusetts EEA agencies to properly assess the need for this project.

#### Environmental Review

The project is significant in size and scope. Based on presentations made by company representatives at meetings with EEA and its agencies, the proponent describes a pipeline over 127 miles in length, crossing northern Massachusetts from Richmond to Dracut. The project will require a 100 foot right-of-way during construction and will require the maintenance of a permanent easement of 50 feet in width throughout the length of the project. Based on preliminary reviews, the project will cross wetland resources, protected forest habitat including but not limited to BioMap2 Forest Cores and seventeen BioMap2 Critical Natural Landscape Blocks, active and prime agricultural lands, waterbodies, mapped habitat for endangered, threatened and special concern state-listed species, five BioMap2 Vernal Pool Cores and Areas of Critical Environmental Concern. The proposed pipeline route traverses some of the most critical habitats for approximately 15 % of all state-listed "Endangered", "Threatened", and "Special Concern" species and has the potential to result in a significant level of "Take" within the Commonwealth for this project. There are likely to be additional environmental issues identified when the proponent identifies the access routes needed for construction and work on lateral lines related to this project.

#### Impacts on Conservation Lands and Other State Managed Natural Resources

In addition to the environmental impacts discussed above, the proposed route crosses over 19 miles of Commonwealth managed conservation fee lands (through its Department of Conservation and Recreation and Department of Fish and Game and Division of Fisheries and Wildlife) and lands in which the Commonwealth holds a property interest for conservation and agricultural purposes. These conservation lands are protected by the Massachusetts Constitution, and the environmental agencies hold fee interests, conservation restrictions, easements, agricultural preservation restrictions or other real property interests on these lands for the direct use and enjoyment and on behalf of the citizens of our state. At several meetings over the past months, EEA and its agencies have urged Tennessee Gas to seriously examine alternatives, including the use of existing rights of way to avoid or minimize disturbing valuable conservation properties. EEA and the agencies have provided detailed information about existing GIS data layers, available to the proponent and the public, which delineate these resources. It is the position of EEA and the agencies that the Company can and should do more analysis to avoid negatively affecting important environmental and recreational resources.

It should be noted that the Patrick Administration has made an unprecedented investment of over \$360 million in land protection, resulting in the conservation of over 125,000 acres of land in the past seven years. In addition to expanding state ownership, EEA and its agencies have partnered with municipalities, non-profit

organizations and landowners to conserve properties held by these entities. A large number of these stakeholders expressed concerns about the proponent's project and the impact of its proposed route on their communities and on specific properties. The Commonwealth's Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs has convened several meetings of concerned stakeholders with the Company in an effort to facilitate dialogue and ensure that the proponent is fully considering these concerns.

A preliminary, non-exhaustive, review by EEA and the agencies shows that the pipeline would pass through approximately nine Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs) and four Wildlife Conservation Easements (WCEs). As only one illustrative example, properties such as the Montague Plains WMA will see years of active habitat management for species recovery and restoration through prescribed fire and other means potentially disrupted as the current proposed pipeline goes through the very center of the WMA. The proposed route similarly traverses the Birch Hill, Fairfield Brook, George L. Darey, Millers River, Peru, Townsend Hill, Tully Mountain, and Upper Westfield River WMAs, as well as the Housatonic River East Branch, Little Tully Mountain, Pepperell Springs, and Windsor Brook WCEs. Further, the construction and maintenance of the pipeline has secondary impacts that can destroy important habitat, hamper ongoing wildlife restoration efforts, and introduce a variety of management concerns.

The pipeline also passes through several park and forest facilities, raising the possibility that the pipeline will pass through important recreational facilities like campgrounds and through important natural resource areas set aside for special protection. In addition, the proposed route intersects with three long distance trails, including the Appalachian Trail that traverses the entire eastern part of the country. Further, the proposed route passes through four Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, which are nominated by citizens for special protection and designated under EEA regulations.

Farmers who are subject to Agricultural Preservation Restrictions have been in contact with the Department of Agricultural Resources, noting that the route, as planned, may make continued farming on their properties impossible. The state Department of Agricultural Resources acquires these easements with state funding that is often matched by funds from the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

The pipeline will impact up to 12 farm properties in which the Department holds a covenant or restriction, creating management and access issues. This includes uprooting part of a 44 acre fourth generation orchard that produces 100 varieties of apples, peaches and pears and splitting a 350 acre parcel used to produce potatoes. Fragmentation of farmland creates management issues and impacts the viability of the farm.

Each of these cases calls for a more detailed analysis of the extent of impact and to determine whether the route can be adjusted to avoid or at least minimize impacts to these irreplaceable resources. To date, detailed discussion about these very real examples has not taken place and the Company has not proposed any route adjustments for any state properties. Tennessee Gas indicates that it is amenable to these types of discussion and making adjustments to its route, but to date the Company has not undertaken the type of detailed analysis to facilitate a meaningful review of the route, nor has it demonstrated that it has fully considered alternative routes to minimize impacts.

In the months ahead, EEA and its agencies intend to fully engage in the public process and hope to have meaningful discussions with the Company about the questions and concerns raised above and other issues identified during the pre-filing process. I urge FERC to establish clear and reasonable schedules to allow the public and affected property owners the chance to review and discuss the proposal and to fully scope the environmental issues that will need to be addressed for any future filing with FERC. As noted earlier, I also urge FERC to work with our Energy Facilities Siting Board to ensure that the pre-filing process is appropriate for a project of this size and significance.

Sincerely,

Maeve Vallely Bartlett  
Secretary

**20140924-5014(29801024).pdf**

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., Docket No. PF14-22-000  
Request to Use Pre-filing Procedures for Proposed Northeast Energy Direct  
Project

Dear Secretary Bose:

I thought you should know that the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. used very out of date maps in their pre-filing request.

For example, on Coppersmith Way in Townsend they missed 22 homes, on Penny Lane the missed 7 homes. There is also planned extension to add 10 more homes to this division.

I am also concerned that the Nashua River Rail Trail, an 11 mile trail for pedestrians, bicyclists, inline skaters, wheelchairs, and crosscountry skiers only appeared as a disused rail bed. Hundreds of people use this trail daily.

It was upsetting to see that Groton-Dunstable High School, home to 850 students was also not on the map. Since this is a brand new pipeline, maps for the entire route should be up to date before the pre-filing process should begin. The public, regulators and Kinder Morgan need better maps to assess the impacts of this project. The maps don't represent reality. This misleading information makes the pre-filing and scoping process a waste of time.

Thank you for your time and consideration of this problem.

Sincerely,

Melissa Hermann

cc: Governor Deval Patrick, Senator Elizabeth Warren, Senator Ed Markey, Representative Niki Tsongas  
Maeve Vallely-Bartlett, Secretary of Energy and Environmental Affairs, Townsend Board of Selectmen

**20140924-5081(29802914).pdf**

re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., Docket No. PF14-22-000  
Request to Use Pre-filing Procedures for Proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Secretary Bose:

I am writing in regards to the fact that the maps Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. used in their pre-filing request are very much out-of-date.

Looking only at maps 84 and 85 and the area surrounding the two properties the proposed pipeline crosses that are owned by the Townsend Conservation Land Trust, I would like to make you aware of the following:

1. On map 84, Partridge Circle is penciled in (white line) coming off of Route 13 when it actually comes off of Pheasant Ridge Road.
2. There are at least 55 houses missing on these maps.

This is a brand new greenfield pipeline, and the areas on Maps 84 and 85 are designated for the location of a compressor station. These maps do not reflect what the Town of Townsend looks like from at least 1988 on, and are misleading. Maps for the entire route should be up to date before the pre-filing process begins in order for the public, regulators and Kinder Morgan to assess the impacts of this project.

Thank you for your time and consideration of this problem.

Sincerely,

Veronica Kell  
Townsend, MA

cc: Governor Deval Patrick, Senator Elizabeth Warren, Senator Ed Markey, Congresswoman Niki Tsongas  
Maeve Vallely-Bartlett, Secretary of Energy and Environmental Affairs,

**20140925-5044(29804770).pdf**

Eminent Domain and Closed Door Decisions

Kinder Morgan's Northeast Energy Directive includes a plan to build a new 36-inch high pressure natural gas pipeline across 45 Massachusetts towns. This company will be applying to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) for a license that would give them Federal eminent domain rights for the project. If granted, such rights would allow them to take a 100-foot easement for pipeline construction from any of the more than 1,000 affected landowners with whom they could not reach a voluntary agreement.

Granting a private, for-profit company this type of power over the property rights of so many organizations and individuals is a matter of grave concern and one that demands intense scrutiny from officials at all levels of government. And it also demands that the need for a project that could result in the taking of so much private property be determined in an open, public forum where all interested parties are invited to participate and comment.

I believe that there are two specific steps that are necessary before such eminent domain use can be justified:

1.) An open, public examination of New England's current and future energy needs must occur. Such an examination must give full consideration to available conservation measures, alternative energy sources, repair of existing pipeline leaks, the effects on climate change, etc. as well as the more conventional topics of peak energy needs, plans for the decommissioning of existing power plants, etc. This open, public examination is an absolutely essential first step in the process - and it has not yet occurred.

2.) If Step 1 above does determine that New England has energy needs that must be met through the construction of new infrastructure in the form of a new natural gas pipeline, there must once again be an open, public process where all interested parties are invited to participate in and comment upon the determination of the proper route for such a pipeline. It is simply not acceptable to have a private company determine their preferred pipeline route in a closed, secretive process and then present it as the only option available. There are obviously tradeoffs concerning cost and convenience where a private company's pipeline routing preferences might differ greatly from those of the public at large.

In summary, granting a private company the ability to override the rights of so many Massachusetts' property owners with eminent domain powers is a gravely serious matter. Before such powers are granted, common sense demands that the necessity for taking such a step be justified in a completely open and public forum. Allowing such matters to be decided behind closed doors is simply wrong and will foster citizens' feelings of the indifference of and the betrayal by officials at all levels of government.

Nick Miller

Groton, MA

**20140925-5061(29805487).pdf**

Miriam Kurland, mansfield center, CT.

The Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. and their cohorts say they are building an enormous gas pipeline to supply energy to New England... this while our own homegrown, renewable, clean energy solutions are working and expanding beautifully to solve our energy needs with safe, productive and effective means to grow our economy. There are many, many, many hazards that construction and use of this pipeline would bring to our lands and life on it. For example, the gas pipeline requires constant release of methane at numerous points to avoid pressure build up and consequential explosion. Methane release is much worse for climate change than release of carbon into the air. Homeowners who allow their lands to be used will likely suffer loss of their homeowner insurances and mortgages due to the huge risks of the transmission of the toxic gases on their lands. Neighboring land owners' and town properties will lose value and town revenues will suffer as people will want to move as far away as possible from the dangers of the pipeline. In rural areas, weaker pipelines will be used, as they are not required in low dense areas. The pipeline will go

through both farmlands and cities, impacting food and people on those lands. Trees, plants and wildlife will be significantly adversely impacted. Gas is not a clean energy, as they would like us to believe and fracked gas, which this would be from, has severe environmental impacts on land, water and air. Most of the gas will not be used in New England at all, but will be brought for export to Europe in geopolitical effort to take over Russia's gas production. Allowing this pipeline to go through would be irresponsible, undemocratic, disrespectful and in complete opposition to viable and necessary solutions for our time. Allowing the project to go through would be a powerful statement of the corruption of our governmental agencies and cause increasing strength for the environmental and climate movements that are growing daily to oppose it.

**20140925-5107(29806393).pdf**

*Letter from TGP*

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

September 25, 2014

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

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., Docket No. PF14-22-000  
Northeast Energy Direct Project ("NED Project")  
Response to Comments

Dear Ms. Bose:

Tennessee filed its Request to Use Pre-filing Procedures ("Pre-filing Request") for the NED Project with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("Commission") on September 15, 2014 in the above-referenced docket. Tennessee's Pre-filing Request conforms to the requirements of Section 157.21(d) of the Commission's regulations, 18 C.F.R. § 157.21(d), and includes all of the required information, including a detailed project description, a list of federal and state agencies with permitting responsibility, a description of Tennessee's planning, engineering, and stakeholder outreach activities, a public participation plan, and location maps drawn to scale that show all major plant components.

Recently some individuals filed comments asserting that the maps that Tennessee filed with its Pre-filing Request are inadequate and do not show certain roads or structures. Tennessee recognizes that the maps it filed as part of its Pre-filing Request are basic topography maps that do not depict all extant roads and structures. However, at this early juncture in the project review process, the Commission's regulations do not require such a high level of detail. Thirty days after the Director of the Office of Energy Projects ("Director") finds that Tennessee has adequately addressed the Commission's initial pre-filing requirements, Tennessee will be required to file a draft version of Resource Report 1, in accordance with Section 380.12(c) of the Commission's regulations, 18 C.F.R. § 380.12(c), and a summary of the alternatives under consideration. Along with draft Resource Report 1, Tennessee will file more detailed photo based aerial images of the properties along the proposed route for the NED Project, with the proposed pipeline facilities and all major aboveground facilities superimposed over the images, in conformance with Section 380.12(c)(3) of the Commission's regulations, 18 C.F.R. § 380.12(c)(3). At that time, affected landowners and members of the public are welcome to file comments on the detailed maps in order to assist the Commission in its review of the Project. Tennessee also welcomes comments and corrections so that it may appropriately scope its Project.

Tennessee's Pre-filing Request complies with the requirements of Section 157.21 of the Commission regulations, 18 C.F.R. § 157.21, and Tennessee respectfully requests the Director approve its Pre-filing Request. Should the Commission need any additional information to process Tennessee's request, Tennessee is pre-

pared to respond diligently. Any questions concerning the letter should be addressed to the undersigned at (713) 420-4544.

Respectfully submitted,

TENNESSEE GAS PIPELINE COMPANY, L.L.C.

By: /s/ Jacquelyne M. Rocan

Jacquelyne M. Rocan

Assistant General Counsel

**20140926-5012(29806763).pdf**

Katie A Wallace, Andover, MA.

Dear Ms. Bose;

We are reaching out to you to express our frustration and opposition to the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Expansion Project. My husband and I are residents of Andover and owners of conservation land where this proposed pipeline would run.

Our family and several community members are growing more and more concerned over the negative impact that such a project could cause. We understand that the Natural Gas Act is “legally obligated to approve LNG exports deemed to be in the public interest.” The question moving forward though is how is this proposed pipeline in the public’s best interest? The DC bureau reported the exports are “presumed” to be in the public’s best interest “unless opponents successfully argue that they’re not.” Therefore, we are one family among many that are advocating that this pipeline project not be allowed and if it is necessary, that the route be changed to avoid such a close vicinity to Fish Brook and the Andover school system.

According to the Clean Water Act, Section 404(b)(1) a guideline exists and states that there should be a “practicable alternative to the proposed discharge which would have less adverse impact on the aquatic ecosystem.” Given this guideline above, we can easily argue against the proposed pipeline and even more so against the proposed route. If you look back on the environmental record of high-volume hydrofracking you will discover that much controversy exists regarding its environmental safety. Further alternatives need to be explored (i.e. solar energy). This is our town’s drinking supply and our precious wetlands. What about water quality or toxic effluent standards? Let’s also consider the threat to our endangered species (i.e. the Wood Turtle and other species).

It seems as though there are numerous economic and environmental consequences. According to the DC Bureau, ‘the environmental advocacy group claims an LNG-export induced fracking boom would be a calamity for the nation’s water and air quality, and it would exacerbate climate change.’ What about other concerns such as earthquakes as well. Additionally, the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 requires agencies to “avoid or minimize any possible adverse effects of their actions upon the quality of the human environment.” Even if this pipeline was properly installed, what about issues in the years to come? When I researched the list of pipeline accidents in the US since the 21st century, I already counted over 12 since 2014, 34 in 2013, and 42 in 2012. Can we agree that this seems to be a major issue?

What about the possibility of this pipeline becoming the site of a terrorist attack or the location of an unintentional accident. Have you read about the Walnut Creek Pipeline Blast that occurred in 2004? Here is information taken directly from the article. “The company will pay a \$10 million fine in the criminal case, involving violations of the state labor code, and \$5 million to end a related civil prosecution, Deputy District Attorney Lon Wixson said.” “The explosion occurred Nov. 9, 2004, when a Mountain Cascade backhoe operator was installing a waterdistrict main near Newell Avenue and South Broadway and punctured a high-pressure Kinder Morgan pipeline.” ‘Kinder Morgan had failed to mark a bend in the Walnut Creek line.’ There were several additional pipeline issues as well. Look at the accident that occurred in July of 2010 involving a 30 inch oil pipeline that leaked in Michigan for 17 hours before the leak was even detected. This incident caused 843,000 gallons of oil to spill into the wetlands. Kinder Morgan’s proposed route has a 90 degree bend right near Fish Brook.

Should we go further...let's consider the possibility of natural gas depletion? How can we expect an unlimited supply? It has been reported that wells have a lifespan of less than 10 years. At this rate, more wells will be needed to keep up with the demand abroad. The jobs provided to perform this project are primarily out-of-state specialized construction workers and will only last for the duration of the construction. Local jobs will consist of fixing the leaks in the existing gas infrastructure.

We are strongly against a pipeline going in, especially given the selected route through Andover's Fishbrook watershed/recreational area. The Nebraska Pipeline route for the Keystone XL Decision revealed that there was a dispute over the initial route that was proposed as the people in Nebraska claimed that it was intended to go through "ecologically fragile wetlands of the Nebraska sand hills. TransCanada revised it and the governor's office approved the revision." Could you please refer back to this case and at least REVISE the route! Thank you for taking the time to read this letter. We are hopeful that you will see the negative impact that such a pipeline project could cause to our Andover environment. Could we please work together to at the very least change the pipeline route away from Fish Brook and the Andover school system?

Also, could you please refer to the pictures submitted by Kinder Morgan regarding their proposed route. Refer to the section "1.7" below. This is at Mercury Circle. Their picture shows that they only cross wetlands for the small section based on their legend. This is inaccurate. If you refer to the interactive MIMAP system from the town of Andover, it reveals that a large portion of this region is wetlands.

Thank you for taking the time to read this comment. We hope to work together with you to find a better alternative.

#### **20140926-5125(29807710).pdf**

Mary F. Small, Townsend, MA.

The word is spreading quickly around Townsend. Kinder Morgan used an outdated map, and new housing developments are threatened by the proposed pipeline! I suspect that the pipeline route can be slightly altered, but the public relations problem will remain: how can Kinder Morgan state that this is the best route when they didn't even make sure that their maps were current? FERC has the opportunity to fix this perception by requiring Kinder Morgan to complete an EIS, not simply an environmental report; by requiring them to start at the beginning, with an alternatives analysis that includes a no-build option and looks at alternative sources of energy; and that this alternatives analysis be done by reputable engineering and environmental firms. Otherwise, the residents of this area will always suspect that Kinder Morgan ran their pipeline through the easiest route, not the best.

#### **20140929-5003(29808284).pdf**

Stephen J. Kmiotek, Townsend, MA. September 26, 2014

FERC Re: Docket Number PF14-22-000

Dear Reader:

I would like to comment on the proposed Kinder Morgan natural gas transmission pipeline proposed to be installed from Wright, NY, to Dracut, MA, and specifically transecting Townsend, MA, where I reside.

1. Kinder Morgan has chosen to use a 1988 topographic map for its mapping of the route. The map is nearly 30 years out of date when current maps are readily available and misses key features that have been developed since that time. Frankly, if Kinder Morgan cannot even use a correct map, they should not be trusted to construct the pipeline. At minimum, they should be obligated to conduct a thorough and complete Environmental Impact Study that includes current information and has a full and complete alternatives assessment, including the no-build alternative.

2. Kinder Morgan has an embarrassingly poor process safety record. Their record includes violations associated with inaccurate mapping of their pipelines, which resulted in explosions when innocent individuals dug in areas they thought safe. As above, if Kinder Morgan cannot even accurately locate their own pipes on a

map, they should not be allowed to construct the pipeline. At a minimum, an independent contractor should inspect and verify all locations.

3. In addition, their record includes violations associated with failing to adequately maintain their pipeline, which resulted in fractures and explosions. If Kinder Morgan cannot even maintain their existing infrastructure, they should not be allowed to construct new systems. At a minimum, they should be required to establish an escrow account sufficient to maintain the pipeline throughout its useful life.

Very truly yours,  
Stephen J. Kmiotek, Ph.D., PE  
317 Townsend Hill Road  
Townsend, MA 01469  
skmiotek@comcast.net

**20140929-5007(29808292).pdf**

*originally "Could not be converted"*

Scott E Cohen, East Chatham, NY.  
To whom it may concern at FERC,

I am a land abutter to the proposed NED project here in New Lebanon, NY. KinderMorgan and Tennessee Gas Pipeline's expansion of this pipeline should not be allowed to continue. We are a small community in upstate New York not equipped to deal with the hazards this type of pressured, amount and as we all now know lethal hydraulically fracked natural gas that will come through this pipeline. There is no public necessity for this gas especially in my area where the greatest potential for disaster could take place. We all know that the New England states can be warmed in the winter from the existing flow of gas. To put a strain and increase an infrastructure already old and decrepit is simply wanting to put people's lives at risk.

Why is there no great regulation of this fossil fuel? Why are American properties, land and rural communities that once were able to feed the nation, and be the back bone of this nation becoming a playground for continued abusive measures by corporate greed? Fracking is killing the land. It will kill people in the future, natural gas is a finite fuel with a very limited life span. So the idea is to keep on drilling until all of our states are filled with lethal methane and a variety of carcinogens that are know to kill? Why can't we stop it now instead of finding out 25 years from now how it has killed us all and the government is sued for billions? Why can't we find other ways ot fuel our country NOW.

I beg FERC to consider all the variables in this filing. Environmental, necessity, rural population and beauty, economic value in the areas it is effecting(none), and at the very least the needs of KM to manage pipeline with the population in mind, not money. All pipe should be equipped with the strongest of material, all pipe should not have to fell 300 year old trees. All pipe should be carefully inspected all the time, old pipe should be replaced before it leaks. Please put a damper on the abusive behavior of this horrific industry.

Thank you.

Scott E Cohen  
217 Wadsworth Hill Rd.  
East Chatham, NY 12060

**20140929-5014(29808311).pdf**

Rob Chesebrough, Hollis, NH.

September 27, 2014

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

Survey Permission Letter

Dear Ms. Bose:

We are writing in response to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC's response below.

"A spokesman for Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC, Richard Wheatley, said planners attempt to be as environmentally friendly as possible when routing the pipeline. About 37 percent of Massachusetts property owners contacted for land surveys have given their permission, according to Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC."

We are writing to make it very clear to FERC that the survey letter which I hold and will not return to Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (TGP) for the following reasons should be counted as "Permission Denied" and not a positive or neutral response.

It is our understanding that the purpose of the requested survey is to facilitate TGP's plan to construct a natural gas pipeline through our property.

We are opposed to any pipeline being laid through our land. Clearing a permanent pathway, digging and blasting for a trench for a pipeline, with its attendant destruction and disruption of vegetation and fauna, is fundamentally incompatible with our values and our rights as landowners.

We will therefore oppose any plan to go through our property, whether before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC), before local and state permitting authorities, or in court.

As stewards and guardians of the natural habitat, drinking water, and visually appealing resources that exists on our property and in recognition of our private ownership rights within the community and in absence of any Federal permit rights granted to TGP, we do not give consent to entry upon our land for any purpose.

The following were not provided:

1. We were not notified of, exactly, where TGP would propose to enter the property, how far and to what parts of the property would TGP's 20140929-5014 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 9/27/2014 3:20:32 PM surveying extend. This would have required a detailed map showing the area to be involved.
2. We were not offered a detailed proposal to drill or excavate on the property. We were not offered additional activities which TGP proposed to undertake on the property. We would have expected a complete and detailed list enumerating all proposed survey activities, including, but not limited to the following:
  - a. We were not informed of how many vehicles would enter the property and of what type (size, weight, etc.).
  - b. We were not informed that a forester and biologist of our selection would be hired to perform an evaluation of the tree, animal, and plant community that would be disturbed by entering the property with vehicles.
  - c. We were not informed that a timber harvester of our selection would be hired to clear the route for any vehicles entering the property.
  - d. We were not assured that TGP would honor the forester's estimate of the value of trees cut and reimburse us for those trees prior to cutting.
  - e. We were not informed as to whether heavy equipment would be brought onto the property. We have external structures including stone wall, retaining wall, well, leach field, and septic system. We did not have TGP's assurance that these structures would not be damaged or perturbed in any way, and if they were, they would be rebuilt or restored to new condition with the complete cost to be borne by TGP. We would have expected a written contract defining TGP's obligation to restore the land and any structures, including a timeline for restoration.
  - f. We were not informed that there would be a Request for Determination or Notice of Intent filed with the Conservation Commission before any disturbance, including clearing, planned to occur within 100 feet of

wetlands or 200 feet of a perennial stream, as required by the New Hampshire Wetlands Protection Act.

g. We were not informed that TGP is prepared to restore the property to its original state, with the planting of 3 trees for every one tree removed. This would need to occur within 3 months of any tree removal, regardless of whether the project was to continue or be aborted.

h. We were not informed of how the clean-up following tree removal would be conducted. Nor who would hire the people for the cleanup and how soon after tree removal would all slash be cleared from the site.

i. We were not informed of any guarantee that TGP employees or agents/contractors would enter the property only when the owners or their agents were available to accompany them. We were not informed of guidelines for ample notice to be given. 20140929-5014 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 9/27/2014 3:20:32 PM

j. We were not informed of our authority to retain the right to sue for additional damages should we not agree with TGP's assessment of tree value, quality of cleanup, or restoration of the property.

To date, we have limited information concerning the pipeline. We believe that it will be beneficial for all parties if TGP is more forthcoming in explaining their company's process and intentions.

We urge FERC to require TGP to provide those specific data related to survey permissions. Those data must include:

1. The exact number of properties affected by the Northeast Energy Direct proposal
2. The exact number of survey permission letters mailed to affected property owners
3. The exact number of survey permission letters returned from affected property owners
4. The exact number of survey permissions granted
5. The exact number of survey permissions rescinded

Any other method used for the quoted percentage of cooperation would be misleading to FERC and the general public.

Sincerely,

Rob & Lynn Chesebrough

**20140929-5025(29808338).pdf**

Carolyn Sellars, Townsend, MA. September 28, 2014

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

Request to Use Pre-filing Procedures for Proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Secretary Bose:

I have had the opportunity to review the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.'s (Tennessee) September 25th response to the concerns raised about the age of the base maps used in the request for pre-filing (Docket PF14- 22). I appreciate Tennessee's acknowledgement that the maps "do not depict all extant roads and structures." However, the assertion that the 25 year old base maps submitted can adequately "serve as the initial discussion point for stakeholder review" as specified in 18 C.F.F. Section 157.21(d) is misguided and not even consistent with Tennessee's own statement in the pre-filing request:

"Consistent open and forthright communications with stakeholders throughout the NED Project area is a priority for Tennessee" (Docket PF14-22, 9/15/14 request for pre-filing letter from J. Curtis Moffatt to Kimberly Bose).

The maps Tennessee submitted are not only old, they are very hard for the average citizen to read and understand. The map files are not well labeled or indexed requiring people to download and review many maps to find the part of the proposed project affecting their community. In contrast, the Spectra AIM pipeline pre-filing docket (PF13-16) contained maps that were quickly downloaded and easy to read. Information on possible compressor stations, metering facilities and laterals were together on one map so a citizen could clearly see how their community could be affected. Tennessee would show its commitment to “open and forthright communications” by immediately submitting maps similar to what the Spectra pre-filing contained.

To make it clear, I am not asking for FERC to deny the pre-filing request and I fully understand that if the pre-filing request is approved, thirty days later, Tennessee Gas will submit Resource Report 1 which will include maps and recent air photo information. However, based on Tennessee’s proposed Public Participation Plan, the first Project Open House could take place just 10 days after that. This leaves little time for stakeholder awareness and involvement in the Open House process. This project contains more than 300 miles of new greenfield pipeline through many rural communities not served by daily or even weekly papers. Many affected residents do not have access to the internet. It takes 20140929-5025 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 9/28/2014 7:29:39 PM time for news to get out to these communities. The timely submittal of easy to read maps is critical in this effort.

I respectfully reiterate my request that you not accept the pre-filing or begin the pre-filing process until more up-to-date and easy to read maps are submitted. This is not a LNG facility with a limited footprint. This is a new greenfield pipeline cutting through more than 44 of our Commonwealth’s communities, many which have experienced substantial residential development in the last 30 years. It is critical that better maps for the entire route be made available before the official pre-filing process commences. Anything less would jeopardize a meaningful pre-filing and scoping process.

Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Carolyn Sellars

cc: Governor Deval Patrick, Senator Elizabeth Warren, Senator Ed Markey, Representative Niki Tsongas, Secretary Maeve Vallely-Bartlett, Townsend Board of Selectmen

**20140929-5027(29808336).pdf**

Elaine Mroz, Lunenburg, MA.

Dear Secretary Bose,

Please thank the Commission for taking some extra time to determine whether Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company’s submission of a request to use the pre-filing process, Docket No. PF14-22 ,meets the Commission’s standards for pre-filing.

I have seen the questions regarding whether the base maps meet any pre-filing threshold, and TGP/KM’s response that these maps meet the letter of the law. I have a more fundamental issue regarding misstatements in the submission.

I understand the purpose of the pre-filing process is to alert relevant stakeholders that a longer process is about to begin. I suspect few of these stakeholders intend to read all of the 360 page document submitted. Most people will scan the document to understand where they might be impacted.

I have found two inconsistencies or misstatements in the sixteen page cover letter. I have absolutely no background in pipelines, but these were quite apparent to me. On Page 7, the list of potential compressor stations includes one “.to be located in Delaware County, Pennsylvania...” As a former resident of Delaware County, Pennsylvania this puzzled me. I was quite sure this suburban Philadelphia region was not likely on the route. Further investigation showed that the new compressor station is proposed for 200 miles away in Delaware County, New York.

On Page 8, TGP lists “Gardner--Worcester County, Massachusetts” as a potential site for a metering station.

I'm also familiar with Gardner, so this got my attention. A map on Page 284 (of the FERC-generated pdf) shows a potential metering station labeled "Gardner" but clearly within the Wiinchendon corporate boundary.

Aside from those two mistakes in the cover letter, two more mistakes caught my attention in the maps. The center bottom title of Page 249 says "Middlesex and Worcester Counties Massachusetts." The text on the topographic map itself clearly shows Essex County being across the corporate boundary next to Dracut. Dracut is nowhere near Worcester County. This means the title of the page is incorrect. Page 244 is titled "Middlesex County and Hillsborough County Massachusetts." There is no Hillsborough County in Massachusetts, although there is one in New Hampshire. The title of the page is incorrect. I found these mistakes because they involved areas familiar to me. I have to believe that there are more mistakes involving communities about which I know nothing.

It's hard to know why Tennessee Gas/Kinder Morgan has allowed these obvious errors to pass into the pre-filing process. One possibility is that it is a deliberate attempt to obfuscate what should be an open process. Another possibility is that TGP did not respect the pre-filing process enough to put adequate checks into their system before pre- 20140929-5027 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 9/28/2014 9:25:21 PM filing. A third possibility is that they just didn't have people competent enough to do the job properly.

None of these explanations is reassuring when the same team in the same corporation seeks to run a new greenfield high-pressure gas pipeline across the length of Massachusetts. I respectfully request that you delay your acceptance of the pre-filing until Tennessee Gas/Kinder Morgan can provide accurate information about its proposal.

Sincerely,

Elaine P. Mroz

cc: Governor Deval Patrick, Senator Elizabeth Warren, Senator Ed Markey, Representative Niki Tsongas, Secretary Maeve Vallely-Bartlett

**20140929-5118(29809813).pdf**

Mark Selby, Ashfield, MA.

RE: Kinder Morgan pipeline extension thru western Massachusetts: From Enron to KM high leverage is the norm, and cash flows are imperative to maintain KM as an organization ;like Enron KM will go bust. The supply of NG is far in excess of local NE needs. Cash flow is driving this deal, and without taxpayer support the deal will not go thru. Remember that once Compressed Natural Gas hits the cargo hold, the price is based on the international rate, which is 3-4 times the local rate. So if the consumer thinks this is a god deal, they are wrong. The potential supply of LNG is far in excess of local needs which can be met by conservation, and improving efficiencies of scale. Corroding pipeline need to repaired.

This message needs to clearly get thru.

Please review PF 14-22 critically. I personally oppose the KM /TGP expansion thru northern Massachusetts to Dracut.

**20140929-5145(29809886).pdf**

*originally "Letter from Townsend, MA, Conservation Commission"*

Office of the  
**CONSERVATION COMMISSION**

Town of Townsend,  
272 Main Street Townsend, Massachusetts 01469 978-597-1700, ext. 1739  
978-597-8135 fax  
conservation@townsend.ma.us

September 27, 2014

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  
Request to Use Pre-filing Procedures for Proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Secretary Bose:

Now that the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company has pre-filed, we will be sharing our many concerns with FERC over the next few months. In response to their pre-filing, we join others in stating that it is misleading at best for Tennessee Gas to use 1988 USGS topo maps when MassGIS maps are current and readily available. Substantial development has taken place in the past almost 30 years since these maps were issued. How can FERC make accurate decisions without a clear understanding of the magnitude of the impact in this area without 21st century maps?

The pre-filing request letter presents glowing predictions of meeting the energy needs of the New England region on the one hand, and lowers expectations on the other. It states that “The New England region as a whole stands to benefit from the NED Project as it will enable New England to sustain its electric grid and lower energy costs...” Yet in just the next paragraph, we read that “Additional natural gas infrastructure may benefit the region in the form of lower energy costs...”

The truth comes out in just the next paragraph. Quoting their industry’s professional organization, the International Natural Gas Association of America Foundation, funded by pipeline operators and their contractors, in the article North American Midstream Infrastructure through 2035: Capitalizing on Our Energy Abundance, Reaping the Benefits, it is stated that:

*The unprecedented pace of natural gas and crude oil development in North America has turned the U.S. into the world’s largest natural gas producer. As a result, it has become possible to envision a world in which America, once heavily reliant upon foreign crude oil, becomes a net oil and liquefied natural gas (LNG) exporter within a couple of decades. However, getting there will require a vast investment in midstream infrastructure, according to a study released in April by the Interstate Natural Gas Association of America (INGAA) Foundation. America’s Natural Gas Alliance was a joint sponsor of the infrastructure study. The study, North American Midstream Infrastructure through 2035: Capitalizing on Our Energy Abundance, found that companies will need to invest \$641 billion over the next two decades in pipelines, processing plants, pumps and other infrastructure to keep up with the natural gas, crude oil and natural gas liquids (NGL) flowing from U.S. fields.”*

Clearly the proposed Northeast Direct Project is about keeping up with production, not meeting demand or lowering energy costs in New England. In fact, their footnote reference to the article failed to include the rest of the title, “REAPING THE BENEFITS”. This is the article they chose to quote in their pre-filing letter! There is so much gas that drillers have simply stopped drilling some fields, so new pipelines are needed to prop up the price of gas. Yet at what expense? Homeowners with their property as their only asset? The environment that the people of Townsend have spent generations protecting?

Townsend, just advised that it is the proposed site of one of two large compressor stations in Massachusetts, will NOT REAP THE BENEFITS of this pipeline. The environmental impacts alone will be catastrophic for Townsend. The town voted unanimously in a Special Town Meeting this July to oppose the pipeline. Townsend’s residents have long recognized what they have, and know that it is worth protecting. Below is a list of laws that have been approved by the residents of Townsend:

Squannacook and Nissitissit Rivers Sanctuary Act, passed in 1975

Townsend Wetlands Bylaw, passed in 1983

Townsend Wetlands Bylaw Regulations, passed in 1989

Squannassit Area of Critical Environmental Concern, passed in 2002

Illicit Discharges and Stormwater Bylaws, passed in 2007

Almost all of the waters and wetlands are designated Outstanding Resource Waters

Townsend has partnered with the MA Division of Fisheries and Wildlife to protect large tracts of land for wildlife refuges, and partnered with the MA Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs in protecting a large tract of land under the jurisdiction of the Conservation Commission, through which this proposed pipeline would travel. Most of these areas are significant habitat for rare and endangered species.

MA EOEEA Secretary Bartlett proposes in her letter to FERC that it is unclear whether the capacity of this pipeline is needed. The Commonwealth is conducting its own study to determine whether additional infrastructure is needed. We respectfully request that you delay the issuing of a pre-filing notice until that needs study has been completed, or at least current maps presenting an accurate view of the impact of this proposed pipeline are presented.

Thank you very much for your consideration of our concerns.

Sincerely,

Townsend Conservation Commission

Cc: Senator Edward Markey  
Senator Elizabeth Warren  
Representative Niki Tsongas  
Governor Deval Patrick  
Maeve Valley-Bartlett, Secretary of Energy and Environmental Affairs  
Townsend Board of Selectmen

**20140930-0013(29815707).pdf**

September 20, 2014

Chairwoman Cheryl A. LaFleur  
888 First Street NE  
Washington DC, 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Expansion Project

Dear Chairwoman Cheryl A. LaFleur,

I am writing to express my concern with and opposition to the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast-Direct project. Docket No. PF14-22-000

As a resident of Massachusetts, through which the proposed pipeline is routed, I am directly affected by its potential consequences, including the risk of gas leak-related explosion and contamination, as well as decline in property values and increase in insurance costs. Furthermore, as currently planned, this project will cross sensitive conservation lands, wetlands, and rivers leaving a permanent scar through some of Massachusetts' most picturesque open spaces and putting many of our towns' primary sources of drinking water at risk of contamination.

The effort to meet Massachusetts ongoing energy needs should not adversely impact residents' quality of life, nor come at the expense of open space benefiting 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, energy efficiency programs, and a policy to switch to renewable sources of energy generation now and in the future. I urge you to fully prioritize further investment in and deployment of these solutions, and to take any actions as are necessary to begin a public dialog to determine whether this project is necessary or advisable for our state.

Sincerely

Dolores Pontz

**20140930-0014(29815708).pdf**

Text identical to above *20140930-0013(29815707).pdf* but submitted by a different person.

**20140930-0015(29815709).pdf**

Text identical to above *20140930-0013(29815707).pdf* but submitted by a different person.

**20140930-0016(29815710).pdf**

Text identical to above *20140930-0013(29815707).pdf* but submitted by a different person.

**20140930-0017(29815711).pdf**

Text identical to above *20140930-0013(29815707).pdf* but submitted by a different person.

**20140930-0018(29815712).pdf**

Text identical to above *20140930-0013(29815707).pdf* but submitted by a different person.

**20140930-0019(29815713).pdf**

Text identical to above *20140930-0013(29815707).pdf* but submitted by a different person.

**20140930-0020(29815714).pdf**

Text identical to above *20140930-0013(29815707).pdf* but submitted by a different person.

**20140930-0021(29815715).pdf**

Text identical to above *20140930-0013(29815707).pdf* but submitted by a different person.

**20140930-0022(29815716).pdf**

Text identical to above *20140930-0013(29815707).pdf* but submitted by a different person.

**20140930-0023(29815717).pdf**

Text identical to above *20140930-0013(29815707).pdf* but submitted by a different person.

**20140930-0024(29815718).pdf**

Text identical to above *20140930-0013(29815707).pdf* but submitted by a different person.

**20140930-0026(29816811).pdf**

*originally "Letter from Groton, MA, Board of Selectmen"*

**TOWN OF GROTON**

173 Main Street

Groton, Massachusetts 01450-1237

Tel: (978) 448-1111

Fax: (978) 448-1115

Board of Selectmen

Joshua A. Dugan, Chairman

Anna Eliot, Vice-Chairman

Stuart M. Schulman, Clerk

Peter S. Cunningham, Member

John G. Petropoulos, Member

Town Manager  
Mark W. Haddad

September 16, 2014

Cheryl A. LeFleur, Chairman  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

Dear Chairman LeFleur:

The Town of Groton has been studying the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Energy Direct Project by Kinder Morgan for several months. We understand that there are several alternatives being investigated by various federal and state agencies, as well as energy supply companies, to address New England's energy challenges.

The Kinder Morgan proposal does not represent the optimal solution for New England and the Town of Groton and therefore should be reconsidered. Instead, policy makers should immediately turn their focus to the many viable alternatives, including but not limited to: alternative paths for a Kinder Morgan project, competing pipeline projects by other companies, and/or other diverse energy supply options for New England's energy challenges.

Importantly, our conclusion is based on regional considerations, not just the concerns of Groton's residents and sensitive lands. We present a summary of these regional considerations below:

~ Kinder-Morgan's currently proposed path would cause substantial damage to protected and critically important land areas in Massachusetts.

~ Alternative paths for the Kinder Morgan project exist, which could include existing utility rights of way and transportation corridors, and should be immediately and thoroughly evaluated as to their costs and the environmental benefits.

~ Alternative pipeline proposals exist, and thus Kinder Morgan's project cannot be classified as the sole imperative.

~ There is no single solution — Kinder Morgan's or otherwise — and the best solution to New England's energy challenges must include the implementation of many diverse measures including, but not limited to: expanding renewable and other supply options, pumped storage hydro, a firm liquefied natural gas supply, grid-level electricity storage technologies, and energy conservation and load shifting programs.

We, the Town of Groton Board of Selectmen, would respectfully request that you do everything in your power to consider alternative proposals to the Kinder Morgan project.

Sincerely,

Groton Board of Selectmen  
Joshua A. Degen  
Chairman

cc: Pipeline Working Group Committee

**20140930-5255(29815021).pdf**

Cheryl D Rose, Dalton, MA.

I am writing to strongly oppose the construction of this high capacity gas pipeline. I object to this proposed investment and long term commitment to new fossil fuel infrastructure when the options for meeting our energy needs through increased use of renewable energy sources and conservation have not been comprehensively explored.

The debate on climate disruption should be over, and the negative impacts of fossil fuels are known. We need to move decisively toward sustainable, safer choices. I believe we have the technology and resources

to do that; and this pipeline is not necessary nor convenient.

**20140930-5270(29815132).pdf**

Henry Rose, Dalton, MA.

I strongly object to the construction of a massive pipeline that would obligate the continued use of fossil fuel for many additional years. I am concerned this project would promote more fracking and its associated impact on environmental and human health, not to mention the potential risks of the pipeline itself. Global warming, catastrophic climate disruption, and contaminated water supplies are real problems that must be considered. Conservation and use of renewable energy sources are much better solutions to meeting our energy needs.

**20140930-5298(29815533).pdf**

*originally scanned: "Letter from Townsend, MA, Board of Selectmen"*

Office of the  
**BOARD OF SELECTMEN**  
272 Main Street  
Townsend, Massachusetts 01469

Sue Lisio, Chairman  
Andrew J. Sheehan,  
Town Administrator

Colin McNabb, Vice-Chairman

Carolyn Smart, Clerk  
Office (978)597-1701  
Fax (978)597-1719

September 26, 2014

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. PFI4-22-000

Request to Use Pre-filing Procedures for Proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Secretary Bose:

The Town of Townsend has reviewed the information filed by Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. for the Northeast Energy Direct Project. We have serious concerns about the accuracy of the information presented. We note that the route maps use United States Geological Survey (USGS) topographic maps from 1988. Townsend has seen substantial growth in the past 26 years. This growth is not reflected on the NED maps. Furthermore, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has an extensive geographic information system (MassGIS). These maps are much more current and would provide a more accurate depiction of the impacts of the project.

For example, the Pheasant Ridge Road single family residential subdivision, located off Route 13 south of Route 119, is not shown on the pre-filing maps. The pipeline is proposed to be located near this road. However, with the outdated information provided, we cannot determine the impact the property owners on this street.

The maps indicate Townsend will host a compression station. The maps show only possible compression station locations, presented at a grossly inadequate level of detail. According to the detail in the plans a typical compression station is 50 - 75 acres in size. The out of date maps used in the pre-filing are insufficient to allow us to fully evaluate the impacts of the compression station on the Town and its residents.

As a new greenfield pipeline the pre-filing should use current data in the development of the base maps. Residents, public officials, and FERC should have the full picture of the project and its impacts. For this reason, we implore FERC to extend the pre-filing period by at least 90 days and furthermore to direct Kinder

Morgan/Tennessee Gas to submit plans using current, available base mapping data for the entire project.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Very truly yours,

Sue Lisio, Colin McNabb

cc: Governor Deval Patrick

US Sen. Elizabeth Warren

US Sen. Edward I. Markey

US Congresswoman Niki Tsongas

State Sen. Jennifer L. Flanagan

State Rep. Sheila Harrington

Maeve Vallely-Bartlett, Secretary of Energy and Environmental Affairs

Office of the  
**BOARD OF SELECTMEN**

272 Main Street

Townsend, Massachusetts 01469

Sue Lisio, Chairman

Andrew J. Sheehan,

Town Administrator

Colin McNabb, Vice-Chairman

Carolyn Smart, Clerk

Office (978)597-1701

Fax (978)597-1719

Secretary Bose:

The Town of Townsend under separate cover dated September 26, 2014 submitted comments regarding the Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.c. Northeast Energy Direct Project. In addition to those comments we wish to inform you that the Town of Townsend adopted a resolution in opposition to the project. Townsend's local legislative authority is vested in the traditional New England open Town Meeting whereby any registered voter may participate and vote on town matters.

On or about June 16, 2014, the Townsend Board of Selectmen received a petition signed by several hundred registered voters. The petition directed the Board of Selectmen to call a Special Town Meeting at which the petition would be discussed, debated, and voted.

The Board of Selectmen called a Special Town Meeting which was held on July 31, 2014. At said Special Town Meeting the voters of the Town voted unanimously to adopt a resolution in opposition to the project. A copy of the vote of the Town Meeting is attached. Please take this resolution into consideration when reviewing the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct project.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Very truly yours,

Andrew J. Sheehan

Town Administrator

Enc.

cc: Governor Deval Patrick

US Sen. Elizabeth Warren

US Sen. Edward J. Markey

US Congresswoman Niki Tsongas

State Sen. Jennifer L. Flanagan

State Rep. Sheila Harrington

Maeve Vallely-Bartlett, Secretary of Energy and Environmental Affairs

ARTICLE 1

I move that the Town vote to adopt the following resolution:

Resolution opposing the Northeast Expansion of the Tennessee Gas Pipeline in Massachusetts

WHEREAS, Townsend and our neighboring communities have adopted comprehensive master plans, zoning bylaws, wetlands bylaws and other land use controls to provide for the orderly development of our communities and the conservation and protection of our communities for future generations to come, as good stewards of the land should; and

WHEREAS, the elimination of environmental threats to our forests and streams from improvident development is the fundamental purpose for the adoption of our land use controls and master plans; and

WHEREAS, Townsend and our neighboring communities have publicly and privately set aside large tracts of land and restricted their development for conservation and open space purposes as part of their master plans; and

WHEREAS, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has acquired and set aside large tracts of land in Townsend and neighboring communities for state parks, forests, wildlife management areas and for the maintenance of open spaces; and

WHEREAS, there is a proposed interstate gas pipeline expansion from Wright, NY to Dracut, which will cross Townsend and our neighboring communities on its way to Dracut; and

WHEREAS, the proposed route cuts through an undetermined amount of forest land, wetlands, conservation land, and farmland in Townsend and neighboring communities, and appears to pass beneath the Squannacook, Nashua and Nissitissit Rivers, among numerous other streams and waters; and

WHEREAS, the proposed pipeline will transport natural gas of shippers who supply gas obtained through hydraulic fracturing, a drilling method under study for its groundwater contamination impacts, impacts on air quality, and the harmful health effects of its chemical byproducts, among other things; and

WHEREAS, a high pressure gas pipeline, by its nature, carries the potential for leakage, rupture or devastating explosion causing injury, or death, to persons and property; and

WHEREAS, the construction of the proposed pipeline and its maintenance will permanently alter the ecosystem that the route crosses by the creation of a fifty (50) foot wide right of way for the pipeline and its attendant structures and routine maintenance; and

WHEREAS, it is our obligation and duty as good stewards to protect our communities from preventable environmental threats and risks posed by the construction of the proposed pipeline and the maintenance in perpetuity of its 50 foot right-of-way; and

WHEREAS, representatives of Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co., LLC are entering Townsend and our neighboring communities to request the right to survey our Town properties and our own private property; and

WHEREAS, residents of Townsend and our neighboring communities are reluctant to grant permission for surveying their land and Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co., LLC has notified residents of its intention to proceed before the DPU for permission to survey their lands; and

WHEREAS, our energy challenges are better addressed through investments in energy conservation measures as well as green and renewable energy solutions; and

WHEREAS, as residents of Townsend, we wish to express our firm opposition to the proposed pipeline route and wish to declare the right of the people to have the final say as to whether projects such as this one, which carry risks and threats to our public safety, our environment, our economic wellbeing and our sense of community, proceed within our borders;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the people of Townsend hereby call on our Selectmen:

To stand in opposition to Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC's Northeast Expansion pipeline and not

allow it within town borders;

To stand in opposition to all similar projects that may be later proposed; and

To oppose any proposal for pipeline construction for carrying natural gas obtained through hydraulic fracturing within the borders of our Commonwealth; And

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the people of Townsend hereby call on our State and Federal legislators and executive branch officers:

To enact legislation and take any such other actions as are necessary to oppose energy projects that go against our commitment to public safety, the environment, our economic well being and sense of community; to legislate more stringent energy efficiency standards; and to appropriate more funding for renewable energy sources.

SUBMITTED BY: Petition

READ BY: Emily Norton

VOTE: Passed Unanimously

A True copy, Attest

Town Clerk, Townsend, MA

**20140930-5310(29815616).pdf**

Christina Marmonti, Hollis, NH.

Dear FERC Commission Members:

We urge you to NOT approve the application for Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, Docket No. PF14-22-000.

As residents of NH we strongly oppose this project. Replacing one fossil fuel energy source with another finite fossil fuel energy source is very short sighted and does not get us to the end goal of using more renewable fuels any faster. The amount of destruction to many private properties, conservation lands, water supplies, and wildlife that would be negatively impacted by this project would be irreversible and irresponsible. Putting such a huge infrastructure into place for a purported "bridge fuel" need does not make any logical sense, and seems like a huge investment that can only benefit the for profit company installing it, not anyone else. Massachusetts has already made a strong stance to you opposing the project, and the voices of New Hampshire are ready to be heard as well. Please do not permit this project to move forward.

Respectfully,

Christina & EJ Marmonti

Hollis, NH

**20141001-4005(29824879).pdf**

October 1, 2014

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

Northeast Energy Direct Project

Response to Pre-filing (concerned citizens and parents)

Dear FERC Chairman and Commissioners,

We are reaching out to you to express our frustration and opposition to the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Expansion Project. My husband and I are residents of Andover and owners of conservation land where this proposed pipeline would run.

Our family and several community members are growing more and more concerned over the negative impact that such a project could cause. We understand that the Natural Gas Act is "legally obligated to approve LNG exports deemed to be in the public interest." The question moving forward though is how is this pro-

posed pipeline in the public's best interest? The DC bureau reported the exports are "presumed" to be in the public's best interest "unless opponents successfully argue that they're not." Therefore, we are one family among many that are advocating that this pipeline project not be allowed and if it is necessary, that the route be changed to avoid such a close vicinity to Fish Brook and the Andover school system.

According to the Clean Water Act, Section 404(b)(1) a guideline exists and states that there should be a "practicable alternative to the proposed discharge which would have less adverse impact on the aquatic ecosystem." Given this guideline above, we can easily argue against the proposed pipeline and even more so against the proposed route. If you look back on the environmental record of high-volume hydrofracking you will discover that much controversy exists regarding its environmental safety. Further alternatives need to be explored (i.e. solar energy). This is our town's drinking supply and our precious wetlands. What about water 20141001-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/01/2014 quality or toxic effluent standards? Let's also consider the threat to our endangered species (i.e. the Wood Turtle: several neighbors have taken pictures of different wood turtles last year and they have recently returned as of this week).

It seems as though there are numerous economic and environmental consequences. According to the DC Bureau, 'the environmental advocacy group claims an LNGexport induced fracking boom would be a calamity for the nation's water and air quality, and it would exacerbate climate change.' What about other concerns such as earthquakes as well. Additionally, the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 requires agencies to "avoid or minimize any possible adverse effects of their actions upon the quality of the human environment." Let's also consider the history that Kinder Morgan has with gas leaks and problems with the infrastructure of their pipelines. Even if this pipeline was properly installed, what about issues in the years to come? When I researched the list of pipeline accidents in the US since the 21st century, I already counted over 12 since 2014, 34 in 2013, and 42 in 2012. Can we agree that this seems to be a major issue?

What about the possibility of this pipeline becoming the site of a terrorist attack or the location of an unintentional accident. Have you read about the Walnut Creek Pipeline Blast that occurred in 2004? Here is information taken directly from the article. "The company will pay a \$10 million fine in the criminal case, involving violations of the state labor code, and \$5 million to end a related civil prosecution, Deputy District Attorney Lon Wixson<<http://www.sfgate.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=bayarea&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22Lon+Wixson%22>> said." "The explosion occurred Nov. 9, 2004, when a Mountain Cascade backhoe operator was installing a water-district main near Newell Avenue and South Broadway and punctured a high-pressure Kinder Morgan pipeline." "Kinder Morgan had failed to mark a bend in the Walnut Creek line, according to state workplace safety regulator Cal/OSHA, which found the Houston company primarily at fault and fined it \$140,000." There were several additional pipeline issues as well. Look at the accident that occurred in July of 2010 involving a 30 inch oil pipeline that leaked in Michigan for 17 hours before the leak was even detected. This incident caused 843,000 gallons of oil to spill into the wetlands. Should we go further...let's consider the possibility of natural gas depletion? How can we expect an unlimited supply? It has been reported that wells have a lifespan of less than 10 years. At this rate, more wells will be needed to keep up with the demand abroad. The jobs provided to perform this project are primarily out-ofstate specialized construction workers and will only last for the duration of the construction. Local jobs will consist of fixing the leaks in the existing gas infrastructure.

We are strongly against a pipeline going in, especially given the selected route through Andover's Fishbrook watershed/recreational area. The Nebraska Pipeline route for the Keystone XL Decision revealed that there was a dispute over the 20141001-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/01/2014 initial route that was proposed as the people in Nebraska claimed that it was intended to go through "ecologically fragile wetlands of the Nebraska sand hills. TransCanada revised it and the governor's office approved the revision." Could you please refer back to this case and at least REVISE the route! Thank you for taking the time to read this letter. We are hopeful that you will see the negative impact that such a pipeline project could cause to our Andover environment.

Could we please work together to at the very least change the pipeline route away from Fish Brook and the Andover school system?

Sincerely,  
Eric & Kate Wallace

**20141001-5049(29816714).pdf**

October 1, 2014

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 Request to Use Pre-filing Procedures for Proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Secretary Bose:

I write to you in reference to Tennessee Gas Pipeline's September 25th letter regarding the company's route maps and their alleged compliance with the requirements of your Commission's regulation 18 C.F.R. § 157.21(d), which requires applicants to provide:

"A detailed description of the project, including location maps and plot plans to scale showing all major plant components, that will serve as the initial discussion point for stakeholder review"

The clear policy intent of this regulation is to provide sufficient information to the public. These maps are not meant for the Company's planning purposes or for the Commission's deliberations; they are intended for the general public.

When the general public expresses overwhelming disapproval with the utility of such a map set, it would seem especially important to listen, comprehend, and appropriately address those concerns.

Tennessee's letter misrepresents the nature of multiple complaints as being merely about the level of detail provided. Rather, the complaints center on the Company's choice of a historical map base that erases thirty years of development from the pipeline route. That includes homes, businesses, houses of worship, schools, and recreational facilities that should otherwise appear at the level of detail used in the maps. The result is an understated impact, an undermined public discussion, and a level of outrage that should not be ignored.

Unfortunately, Tennessee's casual dismissal of these concerns is just the latest instance in a troubling pattern of behavior by Tennessee and its Parent Company, Kinder Morgan. Time and again in its interactions with the public, the Company has given the impression that it just doesn't care.

**Kinder Morgan/Tennessee doesn't care about making a good first impression with the public or with maintaining good community relations.**

Tennessee's Public Participation Plan, found under Appendix F of its filing, provides for correspondence and briefings for local officials, and courtesy training for survey crews. That looks great on paper, but only works in practice when those elements happen in the proper sequence.

In our town, the public's first notice of the Northeast Energy Direct proposal came in January, in the form of Kinder Morgan/Tennessee agents going door-to-door to request survey permissions from homeowners. Calls to Town Hall were referred to the local police, because Town government had not yet been informed of the Company's plans, and because the surveyors' canvassing activities were almost universally perceived as harassment.

This botched implementation of its own Public Participation Plan was our first impression of Kinder Morgan/Tennessee. By putting its worst foot forward on day one, the Company inspired an opposition movement of offended and disgruntled residents from the start. As a result, "Stop the Pipeline" signs soon proliferated on lawns all across town.

The Company's subsequent actions did nothing to address our mistrust or to repair the damaged relationship between our community and the Company.

**Kinder Morgan/Tennessee doesn't care about having a well-informed public.**

In June, Kinder Morgan/Tennessee sent representatives to our town for an information session on their proposed pipeline. These representatives seemed oblivious to the idea that information, unlike a natural gas pipeline, is meant to flow in both directions at once. Citizen concerns about the pipeline route were dismissed because the route was prospective and could change—but only at the company’s discretion, in a process taking place behind closed doors. Citizen concerns about the need for the project were dismissed because the entire project might never advance to the pre-filing stage—but again, that decision would be at the company’s discretion, based on their private negotiations with undisclosed potential purchasers of pipeline capacity.

To date, Kinder Morgan/Tennessee has shown no sign that any public concerns have been considered, or have had any impact on the Company’s ongoing route and project planning. Partially because of the Company’s perceived lack of empathy, a Special Town Meeting adopted a non-binding referendum opposing the project. Partially because of the Company’s withholding of important information, our town’s Board of Selectmen unanimously voted on a resolution to oppose the project.

Tennessee’s pre-filing boasts of answering over 1,100 questions from the public. What they don’t say is how many of those answers were a “we’ll get back to you on that,” followed by months of silence. Their planning process, routing criteria, potential customers, safety record, export plans, among other topics have been withheld from inquiring members of the public as well as from our elected officials.

In our town, individual residents and our Board of Selectmen are still waiting on promised answers to questions addressed to Kinder Morgan representative Allen Fore during our meeting back in June.

These broken promises and unanswered questions have led many residents and landowners to rescind survey permission that had previously been granted to Tennessee.

#### **Kinder Morgan/Tennessee doesn’t care about public safety.**

Kinder Morgan/Tennessee cites its safety record, but has made no data available to the public despite repeated requests. However, it is clear that the Company does none of the things that safety-focused companies are known to do; they don’t innovate new safety measures; they don’t advocate for stronger safety regulations applicable to their industry; and they can’t cite a single safety feature they regularly use that goes above and beyond what they are required to provide under the law.

When Kinder Morgan/Tennessee representatives use the word “safety,” we assume that what they really mean is “compliance with safety regulations.” This is not necessarily a bad thing, assuming that adequate safety regulations exist, but it is certainly no substitute for actually caring about safety.

No matter how robust the Company’s compliance program may be, or how rigorously it is followed, compliance efforts alone will always fall short of public expectations. When we ask Kinder Morgan/Tennessee representatives about safety, it frightens us to receive an answer that boils down to, “We try not to break any laws.”

In the absence of any effort above the absolute minimum, many of us will never be satisfied about the safety of this project’s installation and ongoing maintenance.

#### **Kinder Morgan/Tennessee does not care about New England’s energy needs.**

On the topic of energy needs, Tennessee’s application cites a number of studies that are biased, outdated, and incomplete in ways that I am not qualified to enumerate. On this basis, they conclude that their own long-term, year-round infrastructure proposal is the best solution to New England’s medium-term, winter-only natural gas bottlenecks.

Because our state’s energy needs are so important, and the potential solutions so costly and long-lived, Massachusetts has undertaken a new study that promises to be unbiased, up-to-date, complete, and compiled through a transparent process with significant public input.

There is no way of knowing whether the forthcoming study will support or undermine the Company’s pipeline proposal, but it’s disturbing that Kinder Morgan/Tennessee has chosen not to participate. In her comment letter to the Commission, Maeve Valley Bartlett of the Commonwealth’s Executive Office of Energy

and Environmental Affairs called the Company out for withholding information that could make the study even more complete and useful.

Kinder Morgan/Tennessee has also chosen not to wait for the results of the new study. By pushing its application forward without the best possible information about this project's necessity, Kinder Morgan/Tennessee has put its own needs and interests above the needs and interests of the public.

Among the potential customers Tennessee cites in its cover letter are LNG export terminals in the Maritime Provinces. That should serve as a red flag for anyone considering the necessity of this project. If the Northeast Energy Direct project truly exists to provide New England with a necessary amount of natural gas, there would be little to no excess passing onward into Canada, beyond the jurisdiction of US-based energy regulations.

If this project does enable Tennessee to expose New England's natural gas supply to price competition from international markets, it has the potential to cause energy shortages, higher prices, a drag on our economy, a less competitive business environment, and fewer jobs—the exact opposite of what we're being promised by the Company.

#### **Kinder Morgan/Tennessee doesn't care about local businesses.**

Among the non-government organizations identified by Tennessee as stakeholders in its pre-filing are a number of Chambers of Commerce including one that covers our region. Kinder Morgan/Tennessee hasn't just addressed or interacted with the Chamber, they have joined it at the highest sponsorship level. In doing so, they instantly became the Chamber's largest and most powerful member despite not having an office, employees, or customers in the Chamber's area of service.

Since that time, a Chamber that once existed to champion locally-owned businesses has instead held pro-pipeline events for Kinder Morgan/Tennessee, distributed the Company's electronic newsletter to its own mailing list, and otherwise served as the Company's own private propaganda machine.

In response to having their voices suppressed by an out-of-state entity, over a hundred local businesses signed onto a petition to the state legislature objecting to the Company's actions and opposing the pipeline.

#### **Kinder Morgan/Tennessee doesn't care about the environment.**

In addition to their other failings, the maps provided by the Company also fail to properly show environmental resources that would be disrupted by the proposed pipeline. From the western Massachusetts border to the terminal in Dracut, Kinder Morgan/Tennessee could hardly have chosen a more damaging path through a larger number of critical habitats if they had tried. The Company also seems to have maximized disruption to a number of conservation lands specifically protected by Article 97 of the Massachusetts Constitution.

Although the Company has been secretive about what criteria went into picking its new "greenfields" route over other potential routes, or over an expansion of its existing rights-of-way, the selected path demonstrates that Kinder Morgan/Tennessee does not care about the environment, the conservation investments that have been made in these lands, or the protections provided by our highest state laws.

As a result, many residents feel that this proposal puts their very way of life under siege.

#### **Kinder Morgan/Tennessee doesn't care about not caring.**

The experiences of our town are not unique, and are the reason why around three dozen municipalities in Massachusetts and New Hampshire have passed non-binding resolutions opposing the Northeast Energy Direct project, as currently proposed. It did not have to be this way, but the Company's actions and attitudes have created and fostered a level of opposition above and beyond any that would otherwise exist.

The project and its route are also opposed by a coalition of state legislators, the Governor's office, both of our state's U.S. Senators, and a number of our U.S. Representatives. And yet, a project so clearly in need of serious reassessment is still being rushed forward, and the Company's disdain and disrespect for the public has only grown.

In its letter, Tennessee seems to be saying that it has, or is in the process of compiling, a more accurate and up-to-date set of maps, but that those maps are being deliberately withheld until a later stage in the pre-filing process. Tennessee believes that the public doesn't need maps that depict the project's impact on any structures built since the 1980s. And despite a chorus of stakeholders who have filed comments stating otherwise, Tennessee believes that it is in the best position to know what information those stakeholders need at this time.

When neither the business interests of the Company nor the basic human compassion of its officers and agents have created a caring environment at Kinder Morgan/Tennessee, I have no illusions that your Commission can compel the Company to show genuine concern for public necessity, public safety, public health, or other public concerns.

However, your Commission does have a public mandate, and its regulations are based on public interests. Your Commission has the power to interpret regulation 18 C.F.R. § 157.21(d) in a manner consistent with its intent by compelling the Company to release more reliable and up-to-date maps, and to follow up with other information necessary for the public to fully participate in a well-informed discussion.

As you consider Tennessee's request to use the pre-filing process, please take into account how the deficiencies in the Company's map set are symptomatic of an ongoing pattern that includes withholding information from the public, ignoring legitimate public concerns, and caring for nothing but the lowest possible level of compliance.

All citizens in the towns affected by this proposal are depending on your Commission to force this project into the light.

Sincerely yours,

Greg R. Fishbone, Groton MA

cc: Governor Deval Patrick US Senator Elizabeth Warren US Senator Edward J. Markey State Senator Eileen Donahue State Representative Sheila Harrington Maeve Valley Bartlett, Secretary of Energy and Environmental Affairs

#### **20141001-5098(29817353).pdf**

Sarah Cammer, Lunenburg, MA.

I have reviewed the maps presented by KinderMorgan via Hatch and MacDonald. (doc 20140915-5200(29786282), pages 25-28. They lack a great amount of data regarding conservation areas, watershed protection areas, recreation areas, sensitive historic sites and many other layers required to adequately consider all the risk the route proposed through my town presents. As MassGIS makes all of this data readily available to everyone, maps proposed to show potential impacts of the route should at a minimum, contain this data to be considered acceptable professionally.

Additionally, the majority of Lunenburg will not be provided with natural gas as a result of this project, as the majority of companies being supplied natural gas through this project do not serve the residents of Lunenburg.

As it does not provide any economic benefit to me as a homeowner or a long term benefit to the residents of Lunenburg, and presents an added risk to my town which already struggles to support adequate town services and infrastructure, I encourage you to recognize that KinderMorgan's application is not in the best interest or representative of the greater good for the inhabitants of Lunenburg.

#### **20141001-5118(29817389).pdf**

Anne Perkins, Amherst, MA.

It is obvious that this proposed pipeline is on zero worth to the people of Western Massachusetts whose lives will be profoundly disturbed by its installation. In order for Tennessee Gas to move their gas from Pennsylvania to the Canadian port, they should use the existing pipeline that runs parallel to the Massachusetts

Turnpike. To ruin open land and farmland is simply wrong.

**20141001-5194(29818017).pdf**

Eleni Xifaras, Andover, MA.

Dear Ms. Bose,

We are writing to express concern with and opposition to the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Expansion project.

As residents of Andover, Massachusetts, through which the proposed pipeline is routed, we are directly affected by its potential consequences including the risk of a gas leak-related explosion and contamination, as well as a decline in our property value, and an increase in insurance costs.

As currently planned, this project will cross through miles of conservation and wetlands, including Fish Brook, Andover's primary source of drinking water, resulting in the risk of contamination and devastation. The burden has not and will not be met to even potentially consider justification for this project. We implore that the Tennessee Gas Pipeline ("Tennessee") application and research in support for this project be challenged from every perspective. The demand for natural gas in New England pursuant to NESCOE's own study is the same as it has been and will likely remain the same. The current infrastructure can and will meet the demand. Any spike in demand can most certainly be met by policy and consumer decisions and investment in energy efficiency.

If it is ultimately approved for this project to go forward, we call on you to reject the proposed route and take it out of the path of protected lands, including our backyard, and the school that our children attend. As provided in the many comments in response to Tennessee's pre-filing, the maps used are out of date and do not even come close to depicting the enormous infringement of private property and vast green fields protected under Article 97 of the Massachusetts Constitution. As you will come to understand the route proposed by Tennessee, you will conclude that the vast majority of Massachusetts residents affected by the proposed route will not see a benefit nor will come to use this new supply of natural gas this project is promising. These residents will only see a detriment to their property value and livelihoods.

You should know that in early July, Tennessee representatives came to the town of Andover to have an informal meeting with town officials and residents. They went through their slides, and conveyed that they wanted to work with each homeowner, and further stated that our input was very important and critical. Tennessee also invited proposals for a different route, and advised that careful consideration would be taken to any alternate route proposed. In early August, a letter was sent to Tennessee from the desk of the Andover Town Selectmen citing five alternate routes, which limit the proximity to environmentally sensitive areas, residential private properties and municipal properties of Andover. Each suggested alternate route follows an established right of way. Based on the pre-filing documents submitted by Tennessee, none of these routes were considered. These routes were not hidden from Tennessee prior to their disclosure of the proposed route, but yet somehow Tennessee finds it more appropriate to propose the current route!

WHY?? Arguably, it all comes down to money. Why incur additional cost when it's cheaper to run a high pressure fracked gas pipeline through protected green fields, and on or along the private property of countless of Massachusetts residents. Any argument that necessity for this project takes precedent over peoples' lives and property is ridiculous!

Again, we implore that a serious environmental study and study for the argued necessity of this pipeline be vetted completely before any authority is provided to move forward with this catastrophic project. The effort to meet 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.

Our country has a strong track record promoting renewable energy and energy efficiency programs. We urge

you to fully analyze the consequences of this project, and to take any actions as are necessary to disallow the Tennessee Pipeline Northeast Expansion project.

George and Eleni Xifaras

**20141001-5454(29819477).pdf**

32 Fletcher Lane  
Hollis, NH 03049

October 1, 2014

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

Dear Secretary Bose:

I am writing to express my views regarding the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) gas pipeline project proposed by Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline (docket no. PF14-22-000).

In the short time since the pre-filing took place, you have heard from a large and growing number of people expressing concern over many aspects of the proposed project, including the inappropriateness of routing the pipeline through conservation lands, the usurpation of the rights of citizens to exercise thoughtful stewardship of their own communities and property, the absence of any clear benefit to those who would be obliged to surrender their land, and the arrogance and obfuscation of Kinder Morgan. I share all of those concerns and strongly believe that they provide sufficient reason to deny the application.

However, the foregoing issues are—or should be—beside the point.

In the process of evaluating any proposed energy project, the very first question that needs to be answered is: How would implementation of the proposal affect the transition from the extraction and burning of fossil fuels to the use of clean, sustainable energy sources that do not contribute to global warming? That this transition is necessary is beyond dispute, as is the fact that it must take place as soon and as rapidly as possible. In the case of NED, the answer is very clearly: Implementation of the proposal would severely impede that transition.

Beyond the devastating environmental toll that expansion of the fracking/pipeline infrastructure exacts, construction of such a massive project would stand as a powerful disincentive to the establishment of modern, environmentally responsible energy policies. The technologies needed to stop our headlong rush to oblivion already exist (though they can and should be improved), and though the proponents of fossil fuels would have us believe otherwise, the economics of doing so are actually favorable rather than prohibitive. Opportunities abound to revitalize our manufacturing base, create thousands of quality jobs, and divert huge sums of money from efforts to address the effects of pollution and accidents and from subsidies doled out to corporate giants like Kinder Morgan to other purposes such as repair of our transportation infrastructure and support for our educational system.

FERC declares that its mission is to “promote the development of safe, reliable and efficient energy infrastructure that serves the public interest.” Natural gas pipelines, as evidenced by frequent explosions resulting in death, injury, and destruction of property (to say nothing of the less visible but potentially even more devastating leaks of heat-trapping methane into the atmosphere), are inherently unsafe. Fracking wells are being rapidly exhausted, and increased public awareness of the enormous environmental and social damage caused by fracking is leading to ever more intense and widespread resistance to the practice, calling the reliability of natural gas into question. Gas leaks at every stage from well to burn point cost ratepayers billions of dollars, while Kinder Morgan and others resist demands that they repair their existing pipes, making a mockery of the notion of efficiency. And far from serving the public interest, projects like NED are entirely antithetical to it.

Of course New England, like the rest of the world, needs energy. There are multiple ways to meet that need, and the NED project is very far from being the best way. As Massachusetts Senator Elizabeth Warren concluded in her eloquent statement of opposition to the proposed project, “We can do better.”

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Stephen J. Spaulding

**20141002-3010(29821080).pdf**

**FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20426

OFFICE OF ENERGY PROJECTS

In Reply Refer To:  
OEP/DG2E/Gas 3  
Tennessee Gas Pipeline  
Company, LLC  
Northeast Energy Direct Project  
Docket No. PF14-22-000

October 2, 2014

J. Curtis Moffat

Deputy General Counsel and Vice President

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC

1001 Louisiana Street, Suite 1000

Houston, Texas 77002

Re: Approval of Pre-Filing Request

Dear Mr. Moffat:

Thank you for your letter, filed September 15, 2014, requesting use of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission’s (FERC or Commission) pre-filing review process for Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC’s (Tennessee) planned Northeast Energy Direct Project (NED Project). We believe that beginning the Commission’s review of this proposal prior to the receipt of your application will greatly improve our ability to identify issues early and address them in our environmental document.

As stated in your letter, Tennessee plans to construct about 135 miles of 30-inch diameter pipeline from Troy, Pennsylvania to Wright, New York; 177 miles of 36-inch diameter pipeline from Wright, New York to Dracut, Massachusetts; and two pipeline looping segments in Pennsylvania along Tennessee’s existing 300 Line, totaling about 32 miles of 36-inch diameter pipeline. The NED Project would also involve construction of several pipeline laterals and loops in Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New Hampshire; and new compressor stations in Susquehanna County, Pennsylvania; Delaware and Columbia Counties, New York; and Franklin and Middlesex Counties, Massachusetts. The NED Project would provide up to 2.2 billion cubic feet per day of additional natural gas transportation capacity to markets in New England.

Your letter also stated that Tennessee intends to file an application no later than September 2015. When Tennessee files its application with the Commission, we will evaluate the progress made during the pre-filing process, based in part on our success in resolving the issues raised during scoping. Once we determine that your application is ready for processing, we will establish a schedule for completion of the environmental document and for the issuance of all other federal authorizations.

My staff has reviewed the proposals submitted for the selection of a third-party contractor to assist us in preparing the National Environmental Policy Act documentation. We have selected Edge Engineering & Science (Edge) as the third-party contractor to work under the direct supervision and control of the Commission staff. I request that you proceed with executing a contract with Edge so work may begin as soon as possible.

If you have any questions, please contact the Office of Energy Projects' Environmental Project Manager for your project, Eric J. Tomasi at (202) 502-8097.

Sincerely,

Jeff C. Wright  
Director  
Office of Energy Projects

**20141002-4008(29825037).pdf**

*originally scanned "Letter New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation"*

**New York State Office of Parks,  
Recreation and Historic Preservation**  
Division for Historic Preservation  
P.O. Box 189, Waterford, New York 12188-0189  
518-237 -8643

2 October 2014

Ms. Hope Luhman, Ph.D.  
Louis Berger  
20 Corporate Woods Boulevard  
Albany, NY 12211

Re: FERC, CORPS PERMITS

Northeast Energy Direct

Albany, Broome, Chenango, Columbia, Delaware, Rensselaer, and Schoharie Counties

14PR03876

Dear Ms. Luhman:

The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) has reviewed the information submitted for this project ("Northeast Energy Direct Project, Project Description"). Our review has been in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and relevant implementing regulations.

Based on the material provided, SHPO concurs with the proposed approaches to conduct identification-level (Phase I) surveys for architectural and archaeological historic properties within this project's Area of Potential Effects (APE). We look forward to reviewing the resulting reports.

Please note that separate reports, in electronic format, should be submitted for the architectural and archaeological surveys.

If you have any questions please don't hesitate to contact me.

**20141003-5000(29825856).pdf**

Eric Ryherd, Hollis, NH.

I oppose the Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Natural Gas Pipeline proposed to pass through my town and currently within 1200' of my property. This is a residential neighborhood and the proposed route passes quite close to my neighbors and far too close to my property to not impact my home values.

The recent pipeline explosion in California shows the devastation that can be had near a similar high pressure pipeline.

TGP has not been forthcoming in its dealings with the public and appears to be trying to dodge engaging with the local residents. Instead it has simply filed directly with FREC with minimal direct public presentation on the risks and benefits of the pipeline.

Residents of Hollis it would appear have NO benefits from the pipeline. The gas is going to the city of Nashua and is not available to us. There is no tax benefit that has been shown.

While I know that the USA needs alternate sources of energy, this project is not acceptable with the current proposed route.

Thank You for your time,  
Eric Ryherd

**20141003-5094(29828369).pdf**

Patricia Patierno, Groton, MA.

My comments today are regarding the KINDER-MORGAN TGP Northeast Expansion in Massachusetts. This expansion will be a total destruction of NATURE AT ITS FINEST!!! Land that has been saved at the expense of millions of dollars – blood – sweat & tears. The efforts to get land into conservation has been phenomenal!! This land has been save for a reason!!! To keep it in its most natural state. There are going to be many generations after us that will be thankful for these efforts. What we do TODAY will greatly affect tomorrow!!

To have the audacity to think that dropping a pipeline in the middle of all that has been saved is ludicrous. For Kinder-Morgan to think that their affects will be minimal is just a PIPE DREAM. They come – drop a pipeline – make billions of dollars – never look back. We must live with the devastation of a 100 ft dig site and then a permanent 50ft barren strip.

Massachusetts is already strapped with a pipeline in our southern area of the state. Improvements to that pipeline could increase their quantity of gas transportation. Stradling that pipeline with another pipeline would be less intrusive and I am sure they already have those approvals and eminent domains in place. Traveling on already existing power line easements should also be a consideration. Again, less intrusive and much less destructive. BUT it is not my place to decide where this pipeline gets to DESTROY, it is yours!!!!

I understand that we need energy. But at what COST!!! We are only the people that pay for all this – in more ways than one. We don't have millions of dollars to spend on lobbyists and propaganda. We are friends, neighborhoods and towns that are all trying to organize and get the message to Kinder-Morgan (they are only one sighted - MONEY). But, we have YOU. You are going to need to be our voice. You are going to need to look at all the pros and cons and make the choice that will change lives, families, towns and states FOREVER.

WE ARE COUNTING ON YOU!!!!!!

**20141006-0022(29830914).pdf**

*originally scanned "Letter from Townsend, MA, Board of Selectmen"*

Office of the  
**BOARD OF SELECTMEN**  
272 Main Street  
Townsend, Massachusetts 01469

Sue Lisio, Chairman  
Andrew J. Sheehan,  
Town Administrator  
Secretary Bose:

Colin McNabb, Vice-Chairman

Carolyn Smart, Clerk  
Office (978)597-1701  
Fax (978)597-1719

The Town of Townsend under separate cover dated September 26,2014 submitted comments regarding the Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.c. Northeast Energy Direct Project. In addition to those comments we wish to inform you that the Town of Townsend adopted a resolution in opposition to the project. Townsend's local legislative authority is vested in the traditional New England open Town Meeting

whereby any registered voter may participate and vote on town matters.

On or about June 16,2014, the Townsend Board of Selectmen received a petition signed by several hundred registered voters. The petition directed the Board of Selectmen to call a Special Town Meeting at which the petition would be discussed, debated, and voted.

The Board of Selectmen called a Special Town Meeting which was held on July 31,2014. At said Special Town Meeting the voters of the Town voted unanimously to adopt a resolution in opposition to the project. A copy of the vote of the Town Meeting is attached. Please take this resolution into consideration when reviewing the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct project.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Very truly yours,

Andrew J. Sheehan  
Town Administrator

Enc.

cc: Governor Deval Patrick  
US Sen. Elizabeth Warren  
US Sen. Edward J. Markey  
US Congresswoman Niki Tsongas  
State Sen. Jennifer L. Flanagan  
State Rep. Sheila Harrington  
Maeve Valley-Bartlett, Secretary of Energy and Environmental Affairs

SPECIAL TOWN MEETING — JULY 31,2014, 7:00PM, HAWTHORNE BROOK MIDDLE SCHOOL  
ARTICLE 1

I move that the Town vote to adopt the following resolution:

Resolution opposing the Northeast Expansion of the Tennessee Gas Pipeline in Massachusetts

WHEREAS, Townsend and our neighboring communities have adopted comprehensive master plans, zoning bylaws, wetlands bylaws and other land use controls to provide for the orderly development of our communities and the conservation and protection of our communities for future generations to come, as good stewards of the land should; and

WHEREAS, the elimination of environmental threats to our forests and streams from improvident development is the fundamental purpose for the adoption of our land use controls and master plans; and

WHEREAS, Townsend and our neighboring communities have publicly and privately set aside large tracts of land and restricted their development for conservation and open space purposes as part of their master plans; and

WHEREAS, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has acquired and set aside large tracts of land in Townsend and neighboring communities for state parks, forests, wildlife management areas and for the maintenance of open spaces; and

WHEREAS, there is a proposed interstate gas pipeline expansion from Wright, NY to Dracut, which will cross Townsend and our neighboring communities on its way to Dracut; and

WHEREAS, the proposed route cuts through an undetermined amount of forest land, wetlands, conservation land, and farmland in Townsend and neighboring communities, and appears to pass beneath the Squannacook, Nashua and Nissitissit Rivers, among numerous other streams and waters; and

WHEREAS, the proposed pipeline will transport natural gas of shippers who supply gas obtained through hydraulic fracturing, a drilling method under study for its groundwater contamination impacts, impacts on air quality, and the harmful health effects of its chemical byproducts, among other things; and

WHEREAS, a high pressure gas pipeline, by its nature, carries the potential for leakage, rupture or devastating explosion causing injury, or death, to persons and property; and

WHEREAS, the construction of the proposed pipeline and its maintenance will permanently alter the ecosystem that the route crosses by the creation of a fifty (50) foot wide right of way for the pipeline and its attendant structures and routine maintenance; and

WHEREAS, it is our obligation and duty as good stewards to protect our communities from preventable environmental threats and risks posed by the construction of the proposed pipeline and the maintenance in perpetuity of its 50 foot right-of-way; and

WHEREAS, representatives of Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co., LLC are entering Townsend and our neighboring communities to request the right to survey our Town properties and our own private property; and

WHEREAS, residents of Townsend and our neighboring communities are reluctant to grant permission for surveying their land and Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co., LLC has notified residents of its intention to proceed before the DPU for permission to survey their lands; and

WHEREAS, our energy challenges are better addressed through investments 111 energy conservation measures as well as green and renewable energy solutions; and

WHEREAS, as residents of Townsend, we wish to express our firm opposition to the proposed pipeline route and wish to declare the right of the people to have the final say as to whether projects such as this one, which carry risks and threats and to our public safety, our environment, our economic wellbeing and our sense of community, proceed within our borders;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the people of Townsend hereby call on our Selectmen:

To stand in opposition to Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC's Northeast Expansion pipeline and not allow it within town borders;

To stand in opposition to all similar projects that may be later proposed; and

To oppose any proposal for pipeline construction for carrying natural gas obtained through hydraulic fracturing within the borders of our Commonwealth; And

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the people of Townsend hereby call on our State and Federal legislators and executive branch officers:

To enact legislation and take any such other actions as are necessary to oppose energy projects that go against our commitment to public safety, the environment, our economic well being and sense of community; to legislate more stringent energy efficiency standards; and to appropriate more funding for renewable energy sources.

SUBMITTED BY: Petition

READ BY: Emily Norton

VOTE: Passed Unanimously

A True copy, Attest

Town Clerk, Townsend, MA

**20141006-0032(29830793).pdf**

*originally scanned "Letter from Townsend, MA, Board of Selectmen"*

Office of the  
**BOARD OF SELECTMEN**

272 Main Street

Townsend, Massachusetts 01469

Sue Lisio, Chairman  
Andrew J. Sheehan,

Colin McNabb, Vice-Chairman

Carolyn Smart, Clerk  
Office (978)597-1701

Town Administrator

Fax (978)597-1719

September 26, 2014

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. PFI4-22-000  
Request to Use Pre-filing Procedures for Proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Secretary Bose:

The Town of Townsend has reviewed the information filed by Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. for the Northeast Energy Direct Project. We have serious concerns about the accuracy of the information presented. We note that the route maps use United States Geological Survey (USGS) topographic maps from 1988. Townsend has seen substantial growth in the past 26 years. This growth is not reflected on the NED maps. Furthermore, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has an extensive geographic information system (MassGIS). These maps are much more current and would provide a more accurate depiction of the impacts of the project.

For example, the Pheasant Ridge Road single family residential subdivision, located off Route 13 south of Route 119, is not shown on the pre-filing maps. The pipeline is proposed to be located near this road. However, with the outdated information provided, we cannot determine the impact the property owners on this street.

The maps indicate Townsend will host a compression station. The maps show only possible compression station locations, presented at a grossly inadequate level of detail. According to the detail in the plans a typical compression station is 50 - 75 acres in size. The out of date maps used in the pre-filing are insufficient to allow us to fully evaluate the impacts of the compression station on the Town and its residents.

As a new greenfield pipeline the pre-filing should use current data in the development of the base maps. Residents, public officials, and FERC should have the full picture of the project and its impacts. For this reason, we implore FERC to extend the pre-filing period by at least 90 days and furthermore to direct Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas to submit plans using current, available base mapping data for the entire project.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Very truly yours,

Sue Lisio, Colin McNabb

cc: Governor Deval Patrick  
US Sen. Elizabeth Warren  
US Sen. Edward I. Markey  
US Congresswoman Niki Tsongas  
State Sen. Jenni fer L. Flanagan  
State Rep. Sheila Harrington  
Maeve Vallely-Bartlett, Secretary of Energy and Environmental Affairs

**20141006-0034(29830756).pdf**

Handwritten letter from Suzanna Black, opposing

**20141006-0036(29830757).pdf**

September 24, 2014

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

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

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC., Docket 1 PF14-2200 Request to Use Pre-filing Procedures for Proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Secretary Bose:

I am writing to express my concern that in their pre-filing request, the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC. has used old and out dated maps.

For example, an area on Map 90 (for the Groton MA area) shows only an undeveloped field which in fact is now the site of the Groton Dunstable Regional High School. On another, the Nashua River Rail Trail, which is heavily used by residents of the surrounding communities is show as an unused railbed. And a housing development in Townsend MA which would be close to a proposed compressor station is not even listed on the map that Kinder Morgan has used in the pre-filing request.

Since this would be a brand new pipeline, maps for the entire route should be the most up to date before any pre-filing process begins. Everyone involved needs to have adequate and current data in order to assess the impact of this project.

In their rush to do a pre-filing this fall, Kinder Morgan has used documentation (some of it 30 years old) which in no way mirrors the present landscape of the proposed route. This misleading information makes the pre-filing and scoping process a waste of time and is a disservice to your commission and the residents of the 45 impacted Massachusetts communities.

Thank you for your time and consideration of this problem.

Sincerely,

cc:Governor Deval Patrick, Senator Ed Markey, Senator Elizabeth Warren, Representative Niki Tsongas, Pepperell MA Board of Selectmen

**20141006-0054(29832307).pdf**

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

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.,Docket No. PF14-22-000 Northeast Energy Direct Project ('NED Project' )

Dear Chairman LaFleur:

I am writing in reference to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's (Tennessee) September 15, 2014, request to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) to use the pre-filing procedures (Request) for Tennessee's proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project (Project) and the Commission's subsequent acceptance of that request today.

On September 16, 2014, the Massachusetts Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs (EEA) recognized the submission of the Tennessee pre-filing application and noted a number of interests affected by the Project including:

- \* Ensuring a full analysis of the need for the project in Massachusetts and regionally;
- \* Ensuring a full environmental review and consideration of environmental permitting requirements for the proposal; and
- \* Ensuring a full examination of the proposed routing and seeking ways to avoid or minimize the impacts to important natural resources managed by the Commonwealth through its land management and wildlife

agencies, as well as other property dedicated to conservation, farming and forestry purposes.

EEA requests that FERC establish clear and reasonable schedules to allow the public and affected property owners the chance to review and discuss the proposal and that FERC fully scope the environmental issues that will need to be addressed in any future filing with FERC. Additionally, EEA requests that FERC work with the MA Energy Facilities Siting board to ensure that the pre-filing process is appropriate. I fully support the Commonwealth's requests as detailed.

I am also writing to express my extreme disappointment in FERC's acceptance of Tennessee's pre-filing application today. I have significant concerns about the ability of my constituents to fully participate in the public outreach process given the timing of this acceptance, the outdated maps included in this pre-filing application and the outreach schedule as proposed by Tennessee.

A number of constituents have written to FERC detailing their concerns about the outdated topographical maps (over 25 years old) that Tennessee utilized in their Request. In response to those concerns, in a September 25, 2014, letter to FERC, Tennessee stated that "the maps it filed as part of its Pre-filing Request are basic topography maps that do not depict all extant roads and structures. However, at this early juncture in the project review process, the Commission's regulations do not require such a high level of detail."

18 C.F.R. f 157.21(d)(4) requires a "detailed description of the project, including location maps and plot plans to scale showing all major plant components, that will serve as the initial discussion point for stakeholder review." The starting point for stakeholder review should contain detailed current maps, particularly in light of the proposed outreach plan. Tennessee's September 25, 2014, letter states that "Thirty days after the Director of the Office of Energy Projects (Director) finds that Tennessee has adequately addressed the Commission's initial pre-filing requirements...along with draft Resource Report 1, Tennessee will file more detailed photo based aerial images of the properties along the proposed route for the NED Project." Tennessee's public outreach plan states that "Subject to consultation with Commission Staff, the expectation is to complete a first set of approximately twelve open houses between November 10, 2014 and December 12, 2014."

Given the Commission's acceptance of Tennessee's pre-filing today, residents will be provided with a detailed current map of the proposed route on or about November 2, 2014, leaving only five business days for review before the first scheduled public outreach meeting. Additionally, many of the communities along the proposed route are considered "underserved" by broadband providers. Finding a way to download and/or print these maps may prove difficult for residents of the region. Finally, the proposed outreach schedule leaves very little time for public notice of the open houses, particularly in a region that is heavily reliant upon local newspapers.

I fully support the Commonwealth's requests noted in its September 15, 2014, letter and respectfully request that the Commission give them every full and fair consideration. Additionally, I respectfully request that FERC take whatever actions it can to amend the public outreach plan to reflect a schedule that will allow for meaningful and thoughtful input from my constituents and communities. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

James P. McGovern  
Member of Congress

**20141006-5005(29829061).pdf**

Cara Sanford, Lancaster, MA.

Dear Ms. Bose,

I am writing to express my opposition to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Energy Expansion (NED), Docket #PF14-22.

I think that this NED project has more to do with Tennessee Gas Pipeline pursuing its monetary aims than

fulfilling the energy needs of Massachusetts residents. I am thankful to live in this state because we are accustomed to local control and having a voice in government, which includes directing local land-use zoning and conservation matters. I've either participated in municipal efforts to develop a master plan for my community of Lancaster, MA (near one of the lateral line locations) or led the effort as Open Space and Recreation Committee chairman. It is very disheartening to put all this effort into local and regional alternative energy planning and infrastructure to then have an outside entity impose a fossil fuel pipeline across the length of the State. In the last 4 years, Lancaster has constructed three large solar arrays and a fourth is in the works. This is a lot for a town of 7,400. We were one of the first communities to pass a stretch energy code. Conservation-minded people like me across the state are making huge efforts to create the communities in which we wish to live. The State of Massachusetts has invested in green energy projects. Truly, Massachusetts' residents and businesses are working toward a low-demand energy scenario, an alternative scenario that is not explored in the Tennessee Gas Pipeline pre-application.

Because the proposed main line goes through some of the best Article 97 conservation land in the state, it is very poorly placed. Locating the proposed line in this location completely ignores local control and years of land protection work by numerous volunteers like me. What's the point of all this planning and work if an outside party can come in and locate a pipeline in some of the State's last pristine land that all of us have worked so hard to protect? And if the idea of eminent domain is for the public good, then who decides what that public good is? It is not my public good and, in my opinion, not the public good of the majority of Massachusetts citizens.

We Yankees are pretty sensitive about controlling and planning our own destiny. I and the majority of Massachusetts residents are striving for a future of low energy demand where alternative energy and energy conservation are seriously explored and where protected conservation lands stay that way.

Sincerely,

Cara Sanford

#### **20141006-5013(29829098).pdf**

Carl Berg, Nassau, NY.

Although we are fully appreciative of the energy needs and limited resources that this country faces and the additional need to transport these resources via pipeline across great distances, it is important that consideration be given to certain key environmental impact factors in your environmental assessment process that ultimately leads to your issuance of a Certificate for this additional pipeline.

It is imperative to put this proposal into an environmental context. Pumping station #254 in Columbia County, New York is situated in an exclusively rural residential area in the pristine foothills of the Berkshire Mountains. There are absolutely no commercial facilities or structures in the immediate area. By considerable margin, the highest structure in the surrounding countryside is the smoke stacks and radio tower connected to the pumping station with its strobe light during the day and a red beacon during evening hours. It is located immediately adjacent to the Kinderhook Creek, a category one, public trout fishing stream. We reside approximately one-half mile due north of the pumping station, perched on a hill elevated above the station. In fact, one border of our property abuts the underground two pipelines exiting the pumping station. It is within this environmental context that the current pumping station exists and that the proposed two and one quarter increase in compressor capacity is proposed additional high pressure and high capacity pipeline be installed.

The environmental concerns that need to be brought to your attention are fourfold and will be elaborated below. These concerns involve operation hours and seasons, noise, safety/security and fuel burning emissions and discharges

#### **OPERATION HOURS AND SEASONS:**

We have resided in the area for approximately thirty-five years. It has unflinchingly been the case, until this

past year, that the pumping station operates twenty-four hours per day, twelve months a year. The operation of the pumping station is all too apparent due to the noise, vibrations and smell it generates from the compressor turbines. There have been disturbing noises of sudden and loud gas discharges and roars equivalent to jet planes taking off. When inquiries have been made by phone, on a number of separate occasions, we have received responses ranging from: "We are required by the EPA to test emissions which will last a week;" "We are testing newly installed equipment and the operation is temporary;" to lastly, "We have always operated twelve months a year and these operations are standard operating procedures and represents no change." Has this operation been evaluated for its environmental impact? I have received no notice or correspondence of its impact on this residential community.

#### NOISE:

The noise and vibrations from the running of the existing compressor is quite apparent and disturbing. When running at full throttle in the winter months the sound from the compressor can be heard inside my home with all the double paned windows closed. During the past year, even during the summer months a constant drone is heard twenty-four hours per day. The compressors are housed in a simple corrugated metal structure with windows and apparently no sound reduction insulation. It is now proposed that an additional high capacity and high pressure pipeline be installed. That prospect is frightening and disturbing. An investment in a sound proof structure housing this turbine is mandatory, along with something equivalent to car "mufflers" on the numerous stacks that exhaust the combustion material necessary to run the compressor turbines.

#### SAFETY AND SECURITY:

Given the volume and pressure of this highly volatile and explosive material being transported underground and in this above ground pipeline pumping station, the issue of safety and security is paramount. We have never been informed of the safety considerations and plans of this facility. An early warning system alerting residents of danger to the surrounding numerous homes and its occupants has never been established and an evacuation plan never formulated and put in place and tested. By visual inspection, the facility is surrounded simply by a chain-link fence and there appears to be no visual surveillance equipment or security personnel patrolling the area. This situation leaves one feeling in great jeopardy regarding person and property.

#### FUEL BURNING EMISSIONS:

The compressor turbines are operated by the burning of fossil fuels. The exhaust of the combustion is discharged by the numerous stacks on the facility. I have no equipment to measure this output, but can report to the commission that a distinct odor is apparent during the operating months. Since it appears that operation is now twelve months a year, there is a continuous presence of this exhaust. Why hasn't this facility been required to install catalytic converters equivalent to those required in motor vehicle combustion? An additional pipeline simply compounds the existing problems.

These are the concerns regarding this proposal. The negative impact on the environment, health, safety and property values on the community are unquestionable and indisputable. A further investment in the infrastructure to support a fuel source in limited supply rather than developing renewable and unlimited energy sources seems short sighted and ill conceived. We urge the commission to carefully consider the points and concerns raised.

Carl Berg, Ph.D.

**20141006-5019(29829087).pdf**

October 1, 2014

Kimberly D. Bose

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, NE

Room 1A

Washington, DC 20426

Re: Docket No. PF14-22-000

Dear Secretary Bose:

We are Massachusetts homeowners from a community in the path of the proposed Northeast Energy Direct pipeline. We submit this Comment for three reasons: (1) to request answers to the questions listed below; (2) to express our chief concerns about the Tennessee Gas Pipeline (“TGP”) proposal based on the limited information available at this time; and (3) to request a robust and full public discussion of the proposal before any determination is made to certify the project.

#### Unanswered Questions

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (“Commission”) follows a three-step process in evaluating proposals for new interstate natural gas pipeline facilities. First, the Commission examines whether the project can proceed without subsidies from its existing customers. Second, the Commission assesses whether the applicant has made efforts to eliminate or minimize any adverse effects the project might have on customers, economic interests, and communities. Finally, the Commission weighs the “evidence of the project’s public benefits against its residual adverse effects,” and will only approve an application for a certificate “if the public benefits outweigh any adverse effect.” The Commission has declared that its “goal is to give appropriate consideration” to several factors including “the avoidance of unnecessary disruptions of the environment” and “the unneeded exercise of eminent domain in evaluating new pipeline construction.”

In order to conduct that cost/benefit analysis and comparison of alternatives, the Commission must obtain reliable, independent data and information sufficient to consider the relevant factors and perform the required balancing tests. In this case, the following questions have not yet been answered.

- \* Is the proposed pipeline necessary to meet Massachusetts’ energy demands, or could they be met through a combination of energy efficiency initiatives, reductions in peak energy demand, improvements to existing pipelines, and sustainable energy sources?
- \* What is the total cost of the proposed pipeline, including the future cost of abandonment, repairs, leaks, and accidents?
- \* What costs, including subsidies and tariffs, would be shifted from the pipeline proponent, TGP, to Massachusetts residents and taxpayers?
- \* What risks would the proposed pipeline pose to those who live in close proximity?
- \* What risks would the proposed pipeline pose to the public water supply, including local water sources along the pipeline route?
- \* What damage would the proposed pipeline do to undeveloped agricultural land, forests, and wetlands, including land protected under conservation easements?
- \* Would the proposed pipeline violate federal or state law protecting endangered species?
- \* What is the total amount of carbon dioxide, methane, and other greenhouse gases that would be released if the proposed pipeline were completed, taking into account leaks along the pipeline, controlled release events, and pollutants released when the natural gas is extracted and consumed?
- \* Would any natural gas transported through the proposed pipeline be processed for export as liquefied natural gas?
- \* What is the probability that the proposed pipeline will be abandoned or disused, and in what timeframe, under various energy use, supply, and policy scenarios?
- \* When will the comprehensive study be conducted to explore alternative routes along existing rights-of-way, which would reduce the pipeline’s environmental impacts and avoid the unneeded exercise of eminent domain?

The Commission should not consider TGP’s proposal until these questions are answered and substantiated by reliable, independent data.

## Fundamental Flaws with the Northeast Energy Direct Proposal

At this time, we believe the TGP proposal falls short of the Commission's standards for certifying a new pipeline of this size and scale.

First, the proposed pipeline does not meet the Commission's "threshold requirement" that applicants proposing new construction projects "must be prepared to financially support the project without relying on subsidization from existing customers." In this case, public officials in Massachusetts have asserted that a tariff may be imposed on utility customers to finance the \$5 to \$10 billion infrastructure project. In other words, the public will bear a disproportionate share of the costs of this project—both upfront and in the form of risks to the environment, human health, and the economy—while TGP endeavors to make a short-term, private profit. Furthermore, in public forums, TGP officials have admitted that the future costs of abandonment, disassembly, and remediation, which could be equal to the cost of construction, have not been studied, estimated, or reported. Those analyses are necessary in order to address the threshold criterion of proceeding without subsidies from existing customers.

Second, the proposed pipeline design appears to maximize, not minimize, its local environmental footprint and the use of eminent domain. TGP situated the proposed pipeline in areas that include pristine forestland, farmland, and wetlands. The project will require extensive clear-cutting, bedrock blasting, and trenching along its length. Some of the affected land is protected by state conservation easements; some is home to rare and precious species classified as endangered or threatened. TGP has not availed itself of existing rights-of-way, including existing pipelines, electrical transmission routes, and other public corridors, which would significantly lessen the local environmental impact of the project and would reduce the need to seize private property through the use of eminent domain. Without any impact studies, public hearings, or comparison of alternatives, it is clear that the applicant has not made the required efforts to eliminate or minimize any adverse effects the project might have on customers, economic interests, and communities. As currently proposed, the adverse consequences of the design to landowners, communities, and the environment greatly outweigh the public benefits, with no evidence to the contrary and no studies of alternatives.

Third, the proposed pipeline is not a cost-effective and environmentally defensible way to "transition" from fossil fuels to sustainable energy technologies. Investing billions of dollars in a brand new fossil fuel infrastructure will not advance us towards sustainable energy technologies at all. Rather, the costs and impacts of the new gas pipeline will hold Massachusetts back for years to come, limiting the state's ability to invest in promising new technologies and preventing it from becoming a leader in the sustainable energy economy. Massachusetts' economy would benefit more from investment in sustainable energy technologies rather than retrograde fossil fuel infrastructure.

### Meaningful Public Engagement

Our families and communities are extremely concerned about TGP's proposal. Individuals, organizations, and elected officials at the local, state, and national levels have voiced their concerns publicly. But, as discussed above, the public still lacks critical information about the proposal. We respectfully ask that the public be given access to detailed, independent, and reliable information about this project, and that we then have an opportunity not merely to comment on the proposal, but to engage in a robust discussion of the proposal and its alternatives before the Commission takes any final action.

\*\*\*

The proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project does not meet the Commission's standards. TGP cannot show that the project's benefits outweigh its significant, adverse effects on economic interests and quality of the human environment. We respectfully request that the public record be supplemented with a robust evaluation of this project, economically and environmentally. We request a full public debate on the merits of the presently proposed project once the appropriate data and information have been published. And we request that the Commission reject TGP's current proposal, because that proposal fails to meet the standards set by the Commission. The proposed project does not avoid unnecessary disruptions of the environment, does not avoid the unneeded exercise of eminent domain, and will require subsidization by existing customers. TGP

has not studied or evaluated the total costs of this project—in dollars or environmental harm—nor conducted a robust comparison of alternatives that could meet the standards of the Commission.

Respectfully Submitted,

s/

Jean McOwen  
Paul McOwen  
Adam McOwen  
Maureen McOwen  
700 South Mountain Road  
Northfield, MA 01360

**20141007-0072(29839645).pdf**

**Federal Energy Regulatory Commission**

The Honorable Niki Tsongas  
U.S. House of Representatives  
11 Kearney Square, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Lowell, MA 01852

October 6, 2014

Dear Congresswoman Tsongas:

Thank you for your September 9, 2014, letter regarding Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.'s (Tennessee) proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project (Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Docket No. PF14-22-000). I appreciate your views, and the concerns of your constituents, regarding the potential impacts of Tennessee's planned project route on fragile environmental areas, wildlife resources, and public and privately-held conservation lands.

The Commission approved Tennessee's request to enter into our pre-filing process on October 2, 2014. This process is designed to engage stakeholders to identify and resolve environmental issues before the formal filing of an application with the Commission. The Commission's pre-filing process will include our staff's active participation with landowners, interested parties, and federal and state agencies, to identify areas where impacts may be reduced or avoided. My staff will also attend Tennessee's planned open house meetings and hold scoping meetings throughout the project area. By engaging the public early in the process, we believe that we can conduct a more comprehensive and meaningful review of the project as part of our obligation under the National Environmental Policy Act.

Once Tennessee files its application, the Commission's environmental staff will prepare a draft environmental impact statement (EIS) for this project and the public will have additional opportunities to comment on the project and the adequacy of this document. I can assure you that the draft EIS will take into account impacts on private and public conservation lands and sensitive wildlife, and will consider alternative routes through the diverse and historic Massachusetts landscape. The final EIS will address any comments received on the draft EIS, and the Commission will consider the findings of the final EIS before making its decision on whether or not to authorize this project.

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,

Cheryl A. LaFleur  
Chairman

**20141007-0079(29844571).pdf**

September 20, 2014

Chairwoman Cheryl A. LaFleur  
888 First Street NE  
Washington DC, 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Expansion Project

Dear Chairwoman Cheryl A. LaFleur,

I am writing to express my concern with and opposition to the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline -Northeast-Directproject. Docket No. PF14-22-000

As a resident of Massachusetts, through which the proposed pipeline is routed, I am directly affected by its potential consequences, including the risk of gas leak-related explosion and contamination, as well as decline in property values and and increase in insurance costs. Furthermore, as currently planned, this project will cross sensitive conservation lands, wetlands, and rivers leaving a permanent scar through some of Massachusetts'ost picturesque open spaces and putting many of our towns'rimary sources of drinking water at risk of contamination.

The effort to meet Massachusetts ongoing energy needs should not adversely impact residents'uality of life, nor come at the expense of open space benefiting 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, energy efficiency programs, and a policy to switch to renewable sources of energy generation now and in the future. I urge you to fully prioritize further investment in and deployment of these solutions, and to take any actions as are necessary to begin a public dialog to determine whether this project is necessary or advisable for our state.

Sincerely,

**20141007-5185(29832463).pdf**

*original scanned "Letter from Mass Audubon"*

**Mass Audubon**  
Protecting the Nature of Massachusetts

October 6, 2014

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

Re: Docket No. PF 14-22-000

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., Proposed Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project,  
Objection to Request to Use Pre-filing Procedures

Dear Secretary Bose:

On behalf of Mass Audubon, I request that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) undertake a thorough and transparent review of Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's (TGP) proposed NED Project in relation to project need and alternatives for meeting the regional energy demand: project alignment and alternatives to avoid and minimize impacts to protected conservation lands and other sensitive natural resources; and mitigation including full costs of meaningful and adequate mitigation Cor any unavoidable impacts. Mass Audubon also requests that FERC involve Massachusetts state agencies fully in this review, including the Energy Facilities Siting Board (EFSB), Department of Public Utilities, and the Executive Of-

Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs and its agencies. Every effort should be made to ensure that a gas pipeline expansion project, if approved, complies with state laws to the maximum extent feasible including compliance with the Massachusetts Global Warming Solutions Act (GWSA) and avoidance of impacts to land permanently protected under Article 97 of the Massachusetts State Constitution, state-listed rare and endangered species, wetlands and water resources, and other sensitive natural features.

Mass Audubon is a directly impacted landowner, as the owner of properties in Plainfield and Ashburnham, Massachusetts within the proposed pipeline corridor. Mass Audubon strenuously objects to the proposed placement of new gas pipelines on its properties and other permanently protected lands owned by the federal, state, or municipal governments or private land trusts.

The NED Request to use the FERC's voluntary pre-filing process and expedited review of the certification proceedings describes the scope and extent of what is truly a massive, extremely significant proposed project in its scope, complexity, impacts to natural resources, and effects on literally hundreds of people and their communities. As set forth, in relevant part, in NED's September 15, 2014 filing:

The proposed NED Project, ..., consists of approximately 167 miles of new and co-located pipeline, two pipeline looping segments on Tennessee's existing 300 Line in Pennsylvania, and compression facilities designed to receive gas from Tennessee's 300 Line for deliveries [of fracked gas] to Tennessee's system near Wright, New York, Iroquois Gas Transmission System, LP, and/or

[t]he proposed Constitution Project (referred to as the supply path component of the NED Project), and approximately 177 miles of new and co-located pipeline facilities extending from Wright, New York to an interconnect with the Joint Facilities of Maritimes & Northeast Pipeline System and Portland Natural Gas Transmission System ("Joint Facilities") at Dracut, Massachusetts and Tennessee's existing 200 Line near Dracut, Massachusetts (referred to as the market path component of the NED Project).

In addition, the Project includes the construction of eight (8) new compressor stations, modifications at an existing compressor station, and approximately 73 miles of market delivery laterals and pipeline looping segments located in the states of Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New Hampshire.

NED is, in reality, requesting the right to impose enormous alterations and disruptions in five states, over hundreds of miles, to install over 344 miles of pipeline and compressor stations (excluding the required 100 foot construction right-of-way and the operational 50 foot width throughout the length of the pipeline) and to expose the public and the environment to the attendant construction risks posed by compressed gas, leaks, blasting, and extensive excavation. This process, NED goes on to request, should be "processed" by the FERC as expeditiously as possible, as if this was the installation of a new set of traffic lights.

NED has requested this approval as part of a pre-filing application that is deficient in several important respects:

It does not recognize that the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is presently reviewing the need for and alternatives to major new gas pipeline infrastructure, threshold inquiries when considering the impacts imposed by a project of this scope.'

The maps presented in the pre-filing application are outdated and do not include numerous natural resources and structures despite the fact that abundant, accurate mapping information is freely available through the MassGIS system. Several commenters brought these inaccuracies to the attention of the NED proponent, pointing out that no credible, forthright inquiry or discussion with the oversight agencies and the stakeholders affected by the proposed project could be initiated without true, accurate, and complete information.'

[1] As set forth in the September 16, 2014 correspondence from the Massachusetts Secretary of Energy and Environmental Affairs, Maeve Vallely Bartlett:

*Massachusetts is conducting its own study to determine whether additional infrastructure is required to meet projected demand, and how to account for environmental, reliability, and cost considerations should new infrastructure be needed. Given the Commonwealth's climate goals, it is critical that any efforts to build additional natural gas infrastructure are limited to*

only what is determined to be necessary.

The interests of the Commonwealth include, but are not limited to:

1. Ensuring a full analysis of the need for the project in Massachusetts and regionally;
2. Ensuring a full environmental review and consideration of environmental permitting requirements for the proposal; and
3. Ensuring a full examination of the proposed routing and seeking ways to avoid or minimize the impacts to important natural resources ...

[2] See, for example, comments submitted and docketed at Ascension Nos. 20240919-5100, 2014929-5025, 20140924-5081, 20140926-5125, 2014929-5027, 20140930-5298, 20141001-5049, 20141001-5098, 20140923-5040, and 20140925-5061.

The very purpose of providing accurate and complete maps at the initiation of the pre-filing process is to provide the basis upon which all affected parties and participants may engage in analysis and informed discussion, exchange and suggest relevant data, and develop a full understanding of what is being proposed, as required by the Natural Gas Act, 15 U.S.c. §§ 717 et. seq. and the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 U.S. C. §§ 4321 et.~.

NED filed a response to these comments with the FERC, stating:

Recently, some individuals filed comments asserting that the maps that Tennessee filed with its Pre-Filing Request are inadequate and do not show certain roads or structures. Tennessee recognizes that the maps filed as part of its Pre-Filing Request are basic topography maps that do not depict all extant roads and structures. However, at this early juncture in the project review process, the Commission's regulations do not require such a high level of detail.'

It is not the intent of these comments to debate the interpretation of FERC's regulations. Rather, the NED response would appear to be a harbinger, an indication that the NED proponent desires to acquire FERC certification without any interest in stakeholder understanding or engagement, and with disregard of the fundamental importance of transparency and truth as to what is being proposed and why.

18 CFR § 157.21 (d)( 4), describes the mapping component of a complete and comprehensive pre-filing application as, "A detailed description of the project, including location maps and plot plans to scale showing all major plant components, that will serve as the initial discussion point for stakeholder review."

Review of the maps and plans filed by NED fail, even using NED's own description of its filing, to satisfy this basic FERC requirement.

The company should not be allowed to expedite review of the project when it has failed to make use of extensive, available information in its pre-filing. Although TGP has indicated that more up to date maps and other information will be utilized when it files its Resource Report I, its plan to submit a draft Resource Report 1 by October 31, 2104 is unrealistic given the amount of updated information that needs to be considered and incorporated. Mass Audubon informed company representatives several times, beginning with an April 9, 2014 meeting, regarding the availability of MassGIS datalayers, yet that information was not utilized or presented in the pre-filing. By failing to use this information, the company has developed a fatally flawed proposed route that will need to be reconsidered extensively. Mere minor refinements in routing are not acceptable.

The pre-filing also does not reveal whether the company intends to utilize the new gas pipeline infrastructure to transport natural gas for export markets - this information is crucial for proper evaluation of project need as well as cost, since gas prices overseas are significantly higher than in the U.S. The selection of language used in the pre-filing is concerning the end-consumers of the gas to be transported. It mixes the issue of forecasted energy resource requirements in New England with descriptions about the project, but nowhere does it state that the pipeline proposed will provide and sell the gas directly to New England consumers instead of re-selling it after export prices are first realized. Such a strategy would significantly increase energy costs for end-use customers in Massachusetts and regionally.

[3] Comments submitted by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC.; Ascension No. 2014925-5107 (September 25, 2014).

## Project Need

The NED pre-filing indicates the project will provide scalable capacity up to 2.2 billion cubic feet per day (Bcf/day). The Commonwealth of Massachusetts is presently conducting a study, to be completed before the end of 2014, regarding energy supply and demand, specifically whether additional gas supply capacity is needed and if so the appropriate amount.” Massachusetts has a commitment under the Global Warming Solutions Act to reduce its Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions by 80% compared to 1990 levels, by 2050. In considering potential new construction of gas pipeline supplies into Massachusetts, the effect on that goal and alternatives for meeting regional energy supplies need to be carefully evaluated.’ Mass Audubon urges FERC to carefully and transparently work with Massachusetts state agencies including the EFSB, the Massachusetts Department of Energy Resources (DOER), the state agency who forecasts energy resource needs and evaluates long-term forecast and supply plans, and the PUC in reviewing the project. We request that TGP fully and accurately disclose any potential future use of the proposed new pipeline facilities for export markets,

## Corridor Alignment, Article 97 Protected Lands, Critical Resources

TGP has selected a proposed route for the 127 mile long NED project across Massachusetts and associated lateral pipelines and related equipment that has extensive, unacceptable, and avoidable environmental impacts. The company indicated in all “NED Project Questions and Answers” document to the Franklin Regional Council of Governments that it selected the proposed route in order to avoid developed areas and infrastructure due to cost considerations associated with placing the pipeline along less environmentally sensitive routes such as existing road corridors. This utterly ignores the very real costs to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, municipalities, private land trusts, and landowners of constructing a new gas pipeline corridor through some of the most pristine and sensitive lands in the state.

*[4]The proposed 2.2 billion cubic feet of scaled capacity is dramatically inconsistent with project capacity forecasts for the region, which have been estimated, through 2020, to grow to approximately 600,000 mcf/day from 2012 supplies. EIA Monthly (June, October 2013).*

*[5] Reliance on natural gas in New England has grown to 63% throughout the region. That reliance can be particularly acute in during the winter. New England. Arctic winter temperatures simultaneously drive high heating and electricity demand, straining supply. This supply scarcity results in gas price spikes and even supply shortages. Natural gas is typically the marginal generator—the last generator dispatched to meet peak demand, which therefore sets the wholesale electricity price for all generators, according to market rules. So when gas prices jump, electricity prices skyrocket, too. That is exactly what happened this winter. A Thanksgiving cold snap drove power prices over \$100/MWh, more than 10 times normal. On January 24th, wholesale power prices jumped above \$200/MWh on spot gas prices over \$30/MMBtu.*

*The fact that natural gas is the fuel dominating New England’s energy portfolio is particularly worrisome. Natural gas has a history of price volatility, which in the past has turned seemingly smart investments in new natural gas capacity upside down. While an oversupply of unconventional shale gas has kept prices low and stable for the past few years, a number of mechanisms can cause volatility to return: rapid demand growth surpassing supply, LNG exports causing prices to link to global markets, and regulations limited the supply or raising the cost of gas produced through hydraulic fracturing, to name a few. Energy Information Administration, Office of Oil and Gas. Natural Gas Division, Gas Transportation Information System (January 2014).*

Massachusetts is the third most densely populated state in the nation. It has invested hundreds of millions of dollars in planning and protection for its natural resources. This investment must be respected. In partnership with the state, federal and local governments, private land trusts, and thousands of residents have worked together to protect an interconnected network of highly diverse natural lands representing many of the best remaining examples of every natural community type native to the state. TGP now enters the scene and proposes to carve this carefully protected landscape into fragments dissected by a 100 foot wide construction easement.

The selected route would impact at least 17 BioMap2 Critical Natural Landscape Blocks, several large forest core and vernal pool core areas, lands designated as Forests Reserves by the Department of Conservation and Recreation, habitat for approximately 15% of all state-listed rare or endangered species, and several state-designated Areas of Critical Environmental Concern.

The company claims that the land along this easement will be “restored” following construction, despite ample scientific evidence that such utility corridors have permanent, irreversible negative impacts. This includes permanent destruction, fragmentation, and degradation of pristine natural communities; introduction and spread of invasive plant species; attractive nuisance including illegal access by Off Road Vehicles (ORVs); and impediments to land management for ecological, forestry, or agricultural purposes. The same concerns apply to privately owned lands that may be protected in the future, or where the landowner desires to maintain land-based activities like forestry and agriculture. Properties that are protected under Article 97 of the Massachusetts Constitution enjoy the highest level of protection, which typically can only be overturned by 2/3 majority vote in both houses of the state Legislature. The Commonwealth did not create this statewide network of protected lands for the convenience of an energy infrastructure project and this high level of protection should not be overturned lightly and without thorough consideration of every available alternative.

The true cost of compensating for these losses and degradation need to be considered. In instances where the last, best, remaining examples of natural habitats will be impacted, no amount of money can compensate for the loss. And landowners all along the corridor will forever bear the costs of managing invasive plants and illegal OHVs while experiencing reduced ability to manage their own lands.

#### Mass Audubon Properties Impacted

The proposed pipeline alignment would cross two of Mass Audubon’s wildlife sanctuaries: Cheshire Pond in Ashburnham and West Mountain in Plainfield. At Cheshire Pond, the project would cut across more than a mile of the most pristine portion of the property, and would also impact adjoining property owned by the Department of Conservation and Recreation. The western portion of the proposed route on Mass Audubon’s land (more than 1,600 feet) is a healthy natural wetland complex, with a spruce/fir/hardwood swamp, beaver meadows, and shrub swamp. This land is also protected by a Conservation Restriction held by Mt. Grace Land Trust, and is protected under Article 97.6

*[6] It should be noted here that the oft-repeated statement that the Natural Gas Act preempts state law is not entirely accurate when the areas of subject to oversight are distinctly different. Federal “occupation of the field” does not override state law addressing a distinctly different area or scope of authority. Article 97 and its attendant rights in enhancement and preservation of Massachusetts natural resources and the right of any Massachusetts citizen to enjoy and partake of those resources does not offer the scenarios embraced by federal preemption doctrine, where express or field preemption. As determined by the United States Supreme Court in Medtronic, Inc. Lohr, 518 U.S. 475,485 (1996):*

The proposed route in Plainfield parallels the northern edge of the existing powerline corridor at West Mountain, crossing about 4,700 feet of Mass Audubon’s sanctuary. This corridor crosses the sanctuary over a series of bedrock-defined ridges and valleys, with an elevation range of up to 200 feet. Exposed ledge is common in this terrain, and extensive blasting would likely be required to construct the pipeline in this area. We are concerned regarding impacts to water resources such as changes in rock fracturing that may divert water away from existing seeps and springs feeding the area’s coldwater fishery streams.

Although the proposed route no longer directly impacts Mass Audubon’s Pleasant Valley Wildlife Sanctuary in Lenox, it would cross adjoining watershed lands owned by the Town of Lenox as well as the town’s Kennedy Park. Mass Audubon is concerned about these and other impacts to parklands and sensitive areas such as water supply protection lands. We urge that if a pipeline must be built, every effort be made to avoid sensitive resources, and where that is physically impossible, to place it at the edge of natural areas rather than cutting through and fragmenting intact habitats.

Mass Audubon has denied TGP permission to survey its lands, and not only because alternative routes should be considered. We are also concerned about the impacts associated with surveying activities (cutting vegetation, equipment access, geotechnical drilling) and the risk that hard-to-observe features such as rare species may be overlooked and recorded as being absent when they are in fact present.

We request that:

FERC consider the benefit to all of requiring from TGP complete, comprehensive, transparent, and cred-

ible information from the outset. That begins with providing accurate, complete mapping as a component of the pre-filing application, without defaulting to a subsequent draft filing (Draft Resource Report 1) as TGP has proposed;

FERC recognize that the pre-filing process; intended as it is to increase process efficiencies and decrease delays and extended procedural duration; direct TGP to provide current, accurate, science-based information and data for consideration of the affected landowners, the resource agencies, and the public, such that the need for, the public purpose to be served by, the existence of physical and non-physical alternatives for, and the true scope and extent of the impacts imposed by the NED; and

FERC direct that TGP provide a direct response to the question of whether the company intends to use the proposed pipeline to transport natural gas to be sold directly to Massachusetts end-use of transported natural gas to be directly sold to citizens of the Commonwealth.

*[b]ecause the States are independent sovereigns in our federal system, we have long presumed that Congress does not cavalierly pre-empt state-law causes of action. In all pre-emption cases, and particularly in those in which Congress has "legislated, .. in a field which the States have traditionally occupied," Rice v. Santa Fe Elevator Corp., 331 U. S. 218, 230 (1947), we "start with the assumption that the historic police powers of the States were not to be superseded by the Federal Act unless that was the clear and manifest purpose of Congress." Ibid; Hillsborough CD', 471 U. S., at 715-716; cf. Fort Halifax Packing Co. v. CO'11e.482 U. S. I, ' )2 (1987) .. Although dissenting Justices have argued that this assumption should apply only to the question of whether Congress intended any pre-emption at all, we use a "presumption against the pre-emption of state police power regulations." That approach is consistent with both federalism concerns and the historic primacy of state regulation of matters of public health, public welfare, and public safety.*

Finally, we request that FERC not force surveys on landowners without first requiring the company to more carefully consider alternatives to routing pipelines through protected lands and sensitive resource areas.

Sincerely,

Henry Tepper  
President

cc: EEA Secretary Maeve Vallely Bartlett  
EFSB  
NHESP  
Mount Grace Land Trust

**20141008-0024(29836949).pdf**

**The Commonwealth of Massachusetts**  
William Francis Galvin Secretary of the Commonwealth  
Massachusetts Historical Commission

October 1, 2014

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., a Kinder Morgan Company, Northeast Energy Direct Project, PA, MA, CT, NH. FERC No. Not Provided. MHC 1RC.56771.

Dear Secretary Bose:

Staff of the Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC), office of the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), received a letter dated August 29, 2014, from the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., a Kinder Morgan Company, (TGP) regarding the project referenced above, received by the MHC on September 2, 2014. The letter from TGP, without a return address, was accompanied by a large scale map that shows the general location of the proposed project in the geographic setting of the Northeastern United States.

The portion of the project located in Massachusetts is described in the TGP letter as consisting of ca. 50 miles of pipeline co-located with the TGP 200 Line in both New York and Massachusetts, 129 miles of new pipeline, various laterals and looping segments, new compressor and meter stations, modifications to existing compressor and meter stations, and appurtenant facilities including mainline valves, cathodic protection and pig launchers/receiver. These activities have the potential to cause effects to historic properties (see 36 CFR 800.3(a)).

The information submitted requested the MHC's participation in the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (FERC) "pre-filing" process (18CFR 157.21 (2014)). The regulations refer to National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requirements in which the SHPO has no role, ordinarily. However, if the FERC proposes to coordinate its NEPA process with the separate and distinct process required by the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as amended (16USC 470fa 470h-2) and 36 CFR 800, then the FERC should follow the steps required by 36 CFR 800.8, including notification of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the MHC (see 36 CFR 800.8(c)).

The information submitted is insufficient for the MHC to understand the precise location and area of potential effects of the project within Massachusetts. A list of the Massachusetts municipalities in which the project is proposed should be provided to the MHC. The location and boundaries of the project, including the new pipeline, temporary and permanent construction easements, access ways, staging areas, equipment and materials storage areas, and all other related project work areas should be clearly indicated on USGS locus maps and on project plans and drawings. Project plans and drawings submitted to the MHC should be no larger than 8-1/2" x 14"

A list of all other federal agency and all state agency permits and approvals required for the project should be submitted to the MHC. The MHC would appreciate being informed if a Lead Federal Agency is designated (36 CFR 800.2(a)(2)).

The MHC, as the office of the SHPO, will advise and assist the FERC in carrying out its responsibilities to take into consideration the effects of the project to historic and archaeological resources and to provide consulting parties the opportunity to comment on its findings and determinations (36 CFR 800.2(c)(1)).

The MHC advises the FERC that potential consulting parties may include, among others, (a) the local government historical commissions of the municipalities in which the project is proposed; (b) historic district commissions of any local historic district (MGL c. 9, s. 40C) in which the project is proposed; (c) Tribal Historic Preservation Officers of the Stockbridge-Munsee Community, the Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head (Aquinnah), and the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe; and (d) the Massachusetts Board of Underwater Archaeological Resources for any submerged lands of the Commonwealth in which the project is located (36 CFR 800.2(c)(2), (3), (5)).

The MHC looks forward to consultation with the FERC on the FERC's determination and documentation of the project's area of potential effects for historic and for archaeological resources (36 CFR 800.4(a)(1)).

The MHC looks forward to consultation with the FERC for development of an adequate scope for identification and evaluation efforts for historic and archaeological resources that may be affected by the project, consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation (48 Fed. Reg. 190 (1983)) and the State Archaeologist's field investigation regulations (950 CMR 70 (36 CFR 800.4(b) to (c))).

The MHC advises the FERC that the locations of archaeological resources should not be disclosed in documents prepared for public review (see 36 CFR 800.11(c) and MGL c. 9, s. 26A(1) & (5)).

These comments are offered to assist in compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as amended (36 CFR 800) and MGL c. 9, ss. 26-27C (950 CMR 70-71). If you have any 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

xc: Eileen Banach, AECOM, Providence, RI  
State Historic Preservation Officers of CT, NH, NY, and PA

**20141008-5038(29844733).pdf**

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:

As FERC considers Kinder Morgan's Northeast Energy Direct proposal, I ask that you also consider the following from an affected homeowner along the pipeline path.

**Why Kinder Morgan Isn't More Forthcoming**

Kinder Morgan is proposing to build a large, high pressure natural gas pipeline through 45 towns in Massachusetts, including Groton. In January, 2014, agents of this company entered the town of Groton and began requesting that affected residents sign survey permission forms but didn't even bother to notify the town of their plans. It wasn't until five months later, after considerable pressure from our Town Manager, that Kinder Morgan finally came to town to present their plans. This pattern was repeated throughout Massachusetts.

Why didn't Kinder Morgan approach each of the impacted MA towns and present their plans in an open and timely manner before they started asking for survey permission? Why the secrecy and why the long delay before meeting with Groton townspeople? And why is it still so hard to get timely and accurate information from them?

Simply put, Kinder Morgan has nothing to gain and much to lose by fully informing the public of their plans. They know that rational citizens will look at their planned pipeline route and the thousands of currently untouched properties that it would violate – and they will begin to ask some questions:

- \* Do we need this much additional natural gas in Massachusetts or even in New England?
- \* Have we fully explored the role of conservation and of renewables in our energy future?
- \* Isn't the real intent here to export this gas? If not, why are so many LNG export facilities being readied in the Canadian Maritimes? Won't gas be more expensive if we're competing with the LNG export market?
- \* And if there is a proven need for more gas, why this company's proposal and why this irrational route through so much unspoiled land?

And finally and most importantly of all:

- \* Does it make any sense to allow a private energy company to use eminent domain against so many citizens of this Commonwealth without fully answering all of the above questions?

Kinder Morgan knows that as citizens realize that these questions have not been fully considered and fully answered, they will begin to talk with others, to contact their elected officials and to get organized in opposing this pipeline. So Kinder Morgan delays and simply punts on questions that they prefer not to answer.

These are some of my own direct experiences over the past several months with Kinder Morgan's less than forthcoming approach to informing the public about their pipeline plans:

1. They delayed scheduling a public town meeting for five months while they repeatedly asked affected

residents for survey permission.

2. When they did finally have a public presentation in town, they simply chose not to answer certain questions asked by residents. And even when the moderator stepped in to ask that they please answer a particular question, no answer was forthcoming.

3. They agreed to provide answers to written questions from the town selectmen - but they never did.

4. They changed their proposed pipeline route through town (as mapped several months earlier) and didn't bother to contact the town officials or the majority of the residents affected by the change.

5. They pre-filed with FERC using maps that are 26 years out of date and that contain many factual errors.

If this project is approved, thousands of Massachusetts land owners, conservation trustees, town government officials and other residents will be forced to interact closely with Kinder Morgan and will have to rely on them to provide timely and accurate information about their pipeline plans. In the past nine months, Kinder Morgan has not demonstrated that they are worthy of this level of trust. And if this is how they behave before they have gained FERC approval for their project (when they have some reason to be on their best behavior), what can we possibly expect of them if FERC does provide approval? Does anyone think that things will improve after that?

Nick Miller  
Groton, MA

**20141008-5148(29836744).pdf**

Donald O LeClaire, Hinsdale, MA.

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:

As FERC considers Kinder Morgan's Northeast Energy Direct proposal, I ask that you also consider the following from an affected homeowner along the pipeline path. As a life-long native of Berkshire Country I am deeply concerned about the severe environment impact this project will have on our pristine community as well as the global effect of continuing to promote fossil fuels over sustainable, renewable energy initiatives. So long as huge gas corporations, subsidized by tax-payer's money, are allowed to continue to seize and destroy the land of average hard-working Americans for their own short-sighted greed, the new sustainable, jobproducing energy economy will not emerge. We need leaders like yourself to promote sustainable, long-term, eco-friendly energy solutions. I implore you to reject this project before it goes any further.

On a personal note, my wife and I have spent the last 30 years paying off our modest home in the country, paying our state, local, and federal taxes, trying our best to be good citizens and live in harmony with our beautiful environment. If this project goes through it will utterly destroy everything we've worked for. Our home will become worthless, unliveable, and unsellable. The proposed pipeline route will put it within 20 feet of our 10 foot deep shallow well. Our domestic water, which for the past 30 years has been the best you can get anywhere, will become undrinkable - not necessarily from the gas itself (although that is a very real concern) but from the tons of poisonous pesticides Kinder Morgan uses to keep their pipe-way clear. Our air will be poisoned gas leaking from the pipeline. We would have to live in constant fear of being incinerated in our sleep due to a pipeline rupture. In short, we will be forced out of our home, will be financially devastated, and probably spend the rest of our lives just trying to re-build what we lost.

Please consider the many hundreds (possibly thousands) of lives that will be seriously effected if this project is allowed to go forward, the environmental and ecological degradation of Berkshire Country, and the long-

term global climate changes that this project will cause, and deny Kinder Morgan's Northeast Energy Direct proposal.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,

Don LeClaire

**20141010-0010(29847060).pdf**

September 20, 2014

Chairwoman Cheryl A. LaFleur  
888 First Street NE  
Washington DC, 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Expansion Project

Dear Chairwoman Cheryl A. LaFleur,

I am writing to express my concern with and opposition to the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline -Northeast-Directproject. Docket No. PF14-22-000

As a resident of Massachusetts, through which the proposed pipeline is routed, I am directly affected by its potential consequences, including the risk of gas leak-related explosion and contamination, as well as decline in property values and and increase in insurance costs. Furthermore, as currently planned, this project will cross sensitive conservation lands, wetlands, and rivers leaving a permanent scar through some of Massachusetts'ost picturesque open spaces and putting many of our towns'rimary sources of drinking water at risk of contamination.

The effort to meet Massachusetts ongoing energy needs should not adversely impact residents'uality of life, nor come at the expense of open space benefiting 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, energy efficiency programs, and a policy to switch to renewable sources of energy generation now and in the future. I urge you to fully prioritize further investment in and deployment of these solutions, and to take any actions as are necessary to begin a public dialog to determine whether this project is necessary or advisable for our state.

Sincerely,

**20141014-5005(29844500).pdf**

Glendyne R. Wergland, Dalton, MA.

FEMA should deny permission for Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline's proposed Northeast Development project through Massachusetts. It would be an outrage on our environment and a danger to my neighborhood.

Kinder Morgan plans to remove water from some ponds, pollute it by running it through their pipes, and pour it back onto the land, laden with chemicals.

We, on the other hand, want to protect the environment, not damage it.

Kinder Morgan representatives have said they don't intend to do any blasting. Whether this is their mistaken belief or an outright lie, I don't know – but either way, I don't trust them or their judgment any more than I'd trust a snake-oil salesman.

Knowing the terrain along part of their proposed route as well as I do, I know they will have to blast – and I wonder about the impact on springs and wells in the vicinity.

Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Gas Pipeline have a poor safety record, and their personnel seem to have no

moral center. When I asked the advance team how they can justify building a high-pressure 36” pipeline less than fifty (50) feet from a dwelling when the blast distance is over nine hundred (900 feet), they answered, “Because FERC allows it.”

FERC may think that’s okay, but I most certainly do not. And Kinder Morgan personnel apparently have no sense of personal responsibility for the hazards of the pipelines they build.

Where I live, we prefer to live explosion-free.

If, as the Declaration of Independence says, we are truly endowed by our Creator with certain unalienable Rights, and that among them are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, then FERC will stop this pipeline because it is destructive of those rights.

We do not want a Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline to invade Massachusetts, pollute our water, endanger our population, or violate Mother Earth.

PLEASE end this ill-advised, potentially hazardous, and environmentally ruinous project.

Glendyne R. Wergland  
Dalton, Massachusetts

### **20141014-5006(29844499).pdf**

Gerald Wergland, Dalton, MA.

FERC should deny permission for Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline’s proposed Northeast Development project through Massachusetts.

In point of fact, Kinder Morgan cannot be trusted. Here’s the evidence:

First: Answering the well-reasoned conclusion that that the company wants to build this pipeline so they can export U.S. natural gas abroad, a Kinder Morgan advance man stated on 9/17 that it is “sheer speculation” and that the pipeline provides “open access” to any qualified customer. However, Kinder Morgan’s pre-filing letter to FERC on 9/15 states clearly that their potential Atlantic Canada customers include “LDCs, power generators, industrials, and liquefied natural gas (“LNG”) export projects.” That sounds like export ... and the charge of “sheer speculation” and “open access” an attempt to hide Kinder Morgan’s clear intent to export large quantities of natural gas to Western Europe, where higher gas prices will reflect back to the US market (open access, indeed)

Second: Kinder Morgan representatives have said repeatedly that most of their pipeline explosions are caused by third-party damage. That is patently untrue.

The Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration’s accident reports say that of ninety (90) Kinder Morgan gas pipeline leaks from 2003 to 2014, forty-nine (54%) were caused by faulty infrastructure, including internal or external corrosion of the pipe, cracked welds, malfunction of control/relief equipment, improperly installed pipe, and failures of pipe fittings or components.

Third-party damage caused only three of the ninety leaks; such is Kinder Morgan’s “truthiness.” (Source: PHMSA Pipeline Safety State Pages at <http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov>.)

Third: Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline may have contributed to the third-party damage they tout because they inadequately map their pipelines.

In 2011, PHMSA cited Kinder Morgan for safety violations including failing to maintain updated maps showing pipeline locations, failing to test pipeline safety devices, failing to maintain proper firefighting equipment, failing to inspect its pipelines, and failing to monitor pipes’ corrosion levels. (Source: PHMSA letter to Hugh Harden, Kinder Morgan, February 28, 2011, at <http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comm/reports/enforce/documents/>, accessed June 2014.)

Kinder Morgan lacks credibility in a number of important respects, including making misleading statements which are probably just the tip of the iceberg. We don’t trust anything they say.

Deny permission to Kinder Morgan ... deny, deny, deny.

20141014-5014(29844492).pdf

James Carvalho, Bolton, MA.  
James and Barbara Carvalho  
Bolton, MA

October 11, 2014

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:

2.2 BCuft/day. That's the design capacity of the Kinder Morgan NED gas pipeline. The NESCOE study says New England has an energy capacity shortfall of 0.6 BCuft/day but Kinder Morgan proposes 2.2 BCuft/day, so it will be 2.2 BCuft/day and the pipe will be filled to capacity. Whatever New England consumes, the balance will be delivered through Dracut for export as LNG. But whether this fossil fuel is evaporated locally or half a world away, the resulting greenhouse gas will be vented into our one atmosphere with a devastating impact on global climate change. What is the resulting greenhouse gas effect of burning 2.2BCuft/day of CH4 methane? 119.9 lbs of CO2 is produced when a thousand cubic feet of gas is burned. This means that each year nearly 10 Billion pounds of CO2 will be generated by the NED pipeline project. 10 Billion pounds of CO2 sounds like a lot. What is that like? In 1991 Mount Pinatubo in the Philippines exploded, resulting in the 2nd largest volcanic eruption of the 20th Century. Mount Pinatubo produced just less than 10 Billion pounds of CO2. So the NED gas pipeline alone will be responsible for the CO2 venting equivalent of Mount Pinatubo into our atmosphere every year for 50 years. But there is more greenhouse gas resulting from the NED pipeline. Hydraulic fracturing that produces the gas for the NED pipeline destroys the land and vents methane, compression stations which push the gas along vent methane, pipelines themselves leak and the LNG process vents methane. Methane is an 86 times more potent green house gas. If the CO2 burden of the Kinder Morgan pipeline was not bad enough, the CO2 plus the methane leaks combine to produce green house gases equal to twice the effect of CO2 alone. The NED gas pipeline will produce the equivalent of one trillion pounds of CO2 over its 50 year operating lifetime. Or you can stop this before it starts.

We're retired now. We won't live to see the worst of the effects of the NED pipeline release of CO2. But our three grandchildren will. New England has a short-term energy shortfall. We can solve that shortfall with a combination of solar, wind, hydro, demand/response, efficiency and conservation which will not contribute to climate change. Or we can build the NED gas pipeline with a long term legacy of CO2 venting equivalent to a major volcano each year and a devastating impact on climate change. The FERC has a moral responsibility to future generations. Don't pick the fossil fuel option. The FERC is not supposed to approve new infrastructure that goes against the public necessity. We don't need this new pipeline. The FERC has the public trust. The FERC is not supposed to approve the necessity of greedy Kinder Morgan to make a profit. Don't approve the Kinder Morgan NED gas pipeline. Don't approve any new gas pipeline where reasonable alternative energy sources exist. But don't do this for the newts and salamanders in the vernal pools here in Bolton that Kinder Morgan will destroy during this pipeline construction. Don't do this to prevent a lasting scar on some of the most beautiful Massachusetts countryside we have come to love. Don't even do this to minimize the CO2 escape, the resulting climate change, the polar bears, the sea plankton, the ever increasing frequency and severity of major storms and drought. Stop this pipeline. Do it for Emma, and for William, and for Cameron.

Sincerely,

James and Barbara Carvalho

cc: Governor Deval Patrick, Senator Elizabeth Warren, Senator Ed Markey, Representative Niki Tsongas, Secretary Maeve Vallely-Bartlett

**20141014-5015(29844491).pdf**

Polly Ryan, Plainfield, MA.

Dear FECR commissioners,

Please consider reflecting on the idea of whether eminent domain is for the greater good as I voice my concerns around the installation of the Tennessee gas pipeline in Massachusetts. Personally, I'm strongly opposed to this project and not just because it's going through my back yard. I am a single Mom and literally built my own house hoping to pass it on to my children and grandchildren. I've worked very hard to accomplish the "American dream" and have done so with an income level that borders on the poverty line. I chose to live in a rural area because I value good health, strong community and self-sufficiency. Now, I am faced with the prospect of all this being lost by eminent domain thanks to a billion dollar corporation's intent to get richer no matter what the consequence is to residents. Kinder Morgan continues to tell our community that we must make this sacrifice for the greater good of all. They insist there is a demand for energy in our region which they can fulfill.

If Kinder Morgan were my child, I'd caution them against telling lies. The truth is they will transport five times more frac'ed gas through this pipe than Massachusetts currently says it needs and that there are 18 applications to FERC for export stations along the East coast. This is the real purpose of the pipeline. It will afford Kinder Morgan a huge profit when they sell the gas to those who will ship it overseas for several times a greater price than they get in the states. Once these exporters like Goldboro and Canaport get this price overseas, I have no doubt they will hike our gas price too. To me this feels like a classic example of how the rich get richer while hard working American's literally lose the shirt off their backs.

It's also my understanding that my bank has the right to demand my mortgage in full once the pipeline is installed. This is because Fannie Mae contracts prohibit explosives on land they lien. In addition, my house insurance will go up because of the increased liability. Should I choose to try to sell my property, no one who applies for a Fannie Mae mortgage will be able to purchase it. Most likely, no one else would want to live with a toxic explosive in their back yard anyway. So, I'm expecting my property value to plummet.

According to Kinder Morgan, my one and only asset needs to be sacrificed for our greater good. I am not alone in this sacrifice. Kinder Morgan has no qualms about installing the pipeline right through farms and orchards destroying life-long family businesses. So, I ask, why should we all suffer while Kinder Morgan's profit soars? Just whose greater good are we talking about? There are many ways we can conserve and reduce our energy consumption while we meet our power needs with carbon neutral solutions. I've focused on the monetary loss this installation will afford landowners, but even more importantly are concerns about safety and health issues. Transported frac'ed gas contains at least 60 other chemicals besides the main ingredient methane, like toluene and benzene. These chemicals are known carcinogens, endocrine disrupters, and neurotoxins! Although some measurements along pipelines show leak rates only up to 4%, total transit estimates from well head to burner tip are showing up to 20% and intentional off-gassing is part of normal operations in several key components to a large transmission line, including compressor stations (every 40-60 miles), pigging facilities (about the same distance) and valve stations (every 10 miles in rural areas, as close as every 2-1/2 miles in more populated areas). This makes acid rain a minor concern compared to toluene rain. I won't be able to grow my own food anymore like I have done for years. And the fresh country air will be polluted with chemicals that will rob my family of their longevity and may even result in a painful, prolonged, and a costly death! And what if there is an accident that results in an explosion? My rural town doesn't have the capacity to deal with such a disaster. Again...who's greater good are we talking about here? These were the preliminary concerns I had when the Northern Land Clearing Company, the surveyor's for Kinder Morgan, knocked on my back door. Now that I've become more informed about the bigger picture of frac'ed gas in the nation, I am even more horrified at the prospect of this installation. Methane is 34 times

more potent a greenhouse gas over a 100 year period than carbon monoxide is. Is it in our greater interest that our species rush into extinction?

In Massachusetts, legislative commitments have been made to foster conservation while promoting carbon neutral energy sources for our greater good. I am in support of this way forward in meeting the energy demand Massachusetts needs. Our constitution reads, "Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness for all". Isn't the best way to provide this through long term health, well-being and a sustainable future all our families can count on?

Nation-wide, the practice of frac'ing for gas (which is how we get 95% of our "natural gas") has caused massive destruction to aquifers, farm land, conservation land, National Parks and communities. Communities who were promised growth and prosperity find themselves in worse predicaments when the gas wells dry up, the partially imported labor pool disappears, and the gas giants abandon their infrastructure and leave polluted water behind. All of this is in the name of the greater good!?!

I say, it's time we wake up and smell the Methane! (by the way, you can't smell methane unless it's cut with Mercaptan, a lovely sulfide smelling chemical, which Kinder Morgan may or may not use in the pipeline... think about the outcome of either scenario though...toxic gas in the air that you can't smell or toxic gas in the air that smells like rotting eggs). So how about it FERC commissioners, what is the greater good and how will our sacrifices benefit it? Please let us know.

#### **20141014-5016(29844490).pdf**

Erin Jaworski, Northfield, MA.

I am a concerned citizen who lives in a town along the proposed pipeline route. I grew up on a property that the pipeline may pass through. My parents still own and reside on that property. They recently entered into a conservation restriction.

I am concerned about this pipeline on several fronts. I do not believe it should pass through any conservation land. This land was put in conservation so that it would remain pristine for future generations. Putting a pipeline through conservation lands is antithetical to the nature of conservation.

I am also deeply worried that eminent domain may be used to secure the right of way for this pipeline. I do not believe that building a pipeline for corporate profits is in the best interest of the public. Yes, we all want lower energy prices and more energy stability but there is no guarantee that this pipeline would provide either. This pipeline, once built would be the property of Kinder Morgan, it will be used to transport gas to wherever is most profitable... Perhaps New England, perhaps not.

I feel that this project is being fast tracked to the detriment of all of us. Everyone needs more time to see if this is truly a viable option or if there are better solutions to our energy needs. Please, take the time to consider all of the implications of this project. Listen to the communities and landowners who oppose it, we should have a right to determine how our land is used. Thank you very much

#### **20141014-5022(29845000).pdf**

What is the format for a PF docket filing ?

Specifically what are the requirements or can any individual or corporation file?

Is community scoping required for PF docket filing?

If so what requirement are there for scoping

#### **20141014-5029(29844993).pdf**

Marilyn Learner, Hollis, NH.

I live in Hollis NH, a small town with a long tradition of putting land into conservation easements to preserve its rural legacy. My town is in danger of being bisected by a utility corridor for an unnecessary fracked

gas pipeline if the West Nashua Lateral and NED are approved. While I understand there is a demand for more natural gas in NE, due to what has become a lopsided reliance on “cheap” gas for electricity generation, research has taught me that this gas is not “cheap” in the long term, and that that our over-reliance on it and the rush to build excessive permanent infrastructure to supply it are short-sighted and destructive.

As the Department of Energy literature describes, infrastructure, once built, is relatively inflexible and therefore dictates policy. Building more and bigger pipelines from oil shale fracking fields in PA and NY through green space in MA and NH ensures continued reliance on fossil fuels for the long term. That reliance will most certainly will delay research, advancements and investments in renewable energy storage and delivery systems due to a decreased urgency to solve the problem.

Natural gas might be useful and even necessary as a bridging fuel, but massive pipeline company construction projects guarantee that gas will remain a foundation fuel. That is a basic mistake. We can do better than to perpetuate over dependence on fossil fuels! We have figured out that our national highway system is big enough; when we need more capacity at peak commute times we add lanes or spurs or high speed HOV or transponder lanes. Sometimes we build alternative systems, such as high speed rail. We don’t build another massive superhighway! Hopefully we will transfer that type of pragmatic problem solving to our energy policy. We need to be self sufficient, but not embrace “easy, old technologies” that are ultimately self-destructive for a myriad of environmental reasons just because powerful private corporations have a vested interest in perpetuating them.

I hope that FERC members deliberate and act with the understanding that your responsibility and the decisions you make as you review this massive pipeline project are about more than ensuring that procedural checklist requirements are met. Your rulings shape comprehensive national energy systems, and you must take regional, state and local interests and practices into account. You also must think LONG TERM. I urge you to seriously consider input from ALL constituencies as you deliberate and make decisions.

As it stands now, KM has the right to build this project, and every town, landowner and citizen in opposition has to fight to defend itself against it. Why is the public put on the defensive? My town and many others in NED’s path are forced to deplete meticulously crafted budgets pursuing legal advice to protect their sovereign integrity. Why is a private forprofit company determining regional and potentially national decisions, from the size of the pipeline to the route. Why is a private for-profit company allowed to use the threat of federal eminent domain to accomplish its self-serving business plan? Why has no regional energy plan been developed with route specifications and stipulations that KM must comply with? Why is the deck stacked in favor of KM and against citizens?

It is an open secret that the FERC is a rubber stamp for big oil and gas interests. It is time to dispel that widely held perception that the “FERC never met a pipeline they didn’t like!” The FERC is supposed to work for the best over-all interests of the people of this country, ensuring that conflicting needs are considered in a fair, balanced way. Preserving natural resources, clean water and air, open space and local input are no less important than corporate profits. It is essential that FERC members remember that what is good for the oil and gas industry is not necessarily synonymous with the best interests of the people of this country and our descendants. There are better solutions for New England than the NED project!

Thank you for considering my comments.

**20141014-5239(29845762).pdf**

*originally scanned “Ashby, MA, Board of Selectmen re Town Meeting adoption of resolution in opposition”*

**TOWN OF ASHBY**

895 Main Street

Ashby, Mass. 01431

Town Hall Fax: 978-386-2490

Board of Selectmen &  
Town Administrator

978-386-2490  
Town Collector &  
Board of Assessors  
978-386-2427

October 8,2014

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  
Request to Use Pre-filing Procedures for Proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Secretary Bose,

The Board of Selectmen for the Town of Ashby wishes to inform you that the Town of Ashby adopted a resolution in opposition to the Kinder Morgan Tennessee Gas Pipeline, L.L.C., Northeast Energy Direct Project (then called "Northeast Expansion Project") during our Annual Town Meeting on May 3rd of this year. The vote by the citizens of Ashby on warrant article # 12 regarding the resolution in opposition to the pipeline, was unanimous.

A copy of the vote is attached. Please consider the will of the Town of Ashby, along with that of more than 2 dozen other towns in Massachusetts who have adopted similar resolutions, when reviewing the Kinder Morgan Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Energy Direct Project Docket No. PF14-22-000.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Very truly yours,

Robert B. Hanson  
Town Administrator, Ashby, Massachusetts

cc: Governor Deval Patrick  
US Senator Elizabeth Warren  
US Senator Edward J. Markey  
US Congresswoman Niki Tsongas  
State Senator Stephen Brewer  
State Representative Sheila Harrington  
Maeve Vallely-Bartlett, Secretary of Energy and Environmental Affairs

**TOWN OF ASHBY**  
895 Main Street  
Ashby, Mass. 01431  
Town Hall Fax: 978-386-2490

Board of Selectmen &  
Town Administrator  
978-386-2490  
Town Collector &  
Board of Assessors  
978-386-2427

October 8, 2014

I, Lorraine Pease, Town Clerk of Ashby, hereby certify the following vote was taken at the Annual Town

Meeting held Saturday, May 3, 2014.

Article 12. The motion was made and seconded to endorse the following non-binding resolution:

**RESOLUTION TO BAN “FRACKED GAS” PIPELINES  
AND TO CHAMPION SUSTAINABLE ENERGY**

Whereas a proposed High-Pressure Pipeline carrying natural gas obtained through hydraulic fracturing may come through Ashby, or neighboring communities, bringing said fuel en route to Dracut, Massachusetts to be used for electricity generation; 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, conservation land and farmland with the installation of the pipeline and maintenance in perpetuity of a 50 foot right-of-way through the use of herbicides; and

Whereas said pipeline would destroy unknowable amounts of wetlands and the flora and fauna dependent upon Ashby’s rivers and streams, all of which have been identified as outstanding resource waters; and

Whereas said pipeline would adversely affect property values of properties within 300 feet of the pipeline as well as probable lise of eminent domain to secure parcels along the pipeline route; 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 said pipeline has the potential to ruin wells and drinking water through blasting activities and/or leakage of methane gas; 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, 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 Ashby, Massachusetts choose not to participate in such encumbrances to the life, vibrancy, economic stability, and general well being to our neighbors in New York and elsewhere, wherever hydraulic fracturing is occurring and the pressurized pipeline is running; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the people of Ashby, Massachusetts:

1. Hereby call on our Board of Selectmen to stand in opposition to ‘1’GP’s high pressured pipeline and not allow it within our town borders;
- 2, Oppose said pipeline, and any pipeline carrying natural gas obtained through hydraulic fracturing, within the borders of our Commonwealth; and
3. Hereby instruct our state and federal legislators and executive branch officials to enact legislation and take any 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 and subsidies for renewable energy sources.

VOTE: UNANIMOUS

Lorraine Pease  
Ashby Town Clerk  
CERTIFIED COPY

**20141014-5349(29846605).pdf**

Edward Holub, Dalton, MA.

I am opposed to the Kinder Morgan (Tennessee gas pipeline) Northeast Direct Project for the following reasons:

The pipeline construction will disturb contaminants already present along the east branch of the Housatonic River. For two hundred years various mills have operated along this branch of the Housatonic River in Dalton, MA. While most of these mills ceased manufacturing long ago, many hazardous contaminants remain in the soil where they once operated. Clearing trees to accommodate constructing the pipeline through Dalton will clearly increase stormwater runoff into the river. This will result in additional contaminated soil flowing into the river.

These contaminants will impact areas beyond Dalton and have a serious negative impact on the quality of the river water.

**20141015-0007(29855017).pdf**

**TOWN OF ASHBY**  
895 Main Street  
Ashby, Mass. 01431

October 8, 2014

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 Request to Use Pre-filing Procedures for Proposal Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Secretary Bose,

The Board of Selectmen for the Town of Ashby wishes to inform you that the Town of Ashby adopted a resolution in opposition to the Kinder Morgan Tennessee Gas Pipeline, L.L.C., Northeast Energy Direct Project (then called "Northeast Expansion Project") during our Annual Town Meeting on May 3 of this year. The vote by the citizens of Ashby on warrant article 112 regarding the resolution in opposition to the pipeline, was unanimous.

A copy of the vote is attached. Please consider the will of the Town of Ashby, along with that of more than 2 dozen other towns in Massachusetts who have adopted similar resolutions, when reviewing the Kinder Morgan Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Energy Direct Project Docket No. PF14-22-000.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Very truly yours,

Robert B. Hanson  
Town Administrator, Ashby, Massachusetts

cc: Governor Deval Patrick, US Senator Elizabeth Warren, US Senator Edward J. Markey  
US Congresswoman Niki Tsongas, State Senator Stephen Brewer, State Representative Sheila H~n  
Maeve Vallely-Bartlett, Secretary of Energy and Environmental Affairs

October 8, 2014

I, Lorraine Pease, Town Clerk of Ashby, hereby certify the following vote was taken at the Annual Town Meeting held Saturday, May 3, 2014.

Article 12. The motion was made and seconded to endorse the following non-binding resolution:

**RESOLUTION TO BAN "FRACKED GAS" PIPELINES  
AND TO CHAMPION SUSTAINABLE ENERGY**

Whereas a proposed High-Pressure Pipeline carrying natural gas obtained through hydraulic fracturing may

come through Ashby, or neighboring communities, bringing said fuel en route to Dracut, Massachusetts to be used for electricity generation; 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, conservation land and farmland with the installation of the pipeline and maintenance in perpetuity of a 50 foot right-of-way through the use of herbicides; and

Whereas said pipeline would destroy unknowable amounts of wetlands and the flora and fauna dependent upon Ashby's rivers and streams, all of which have been identified as outstanding resource waters; and

Whereas said pipeline would adversely affect property values of properties within 300 feet of the pipeline as well as probable use of eminent domain to secure parcels along the pipeline route; 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 said pipeline has the potential to ruin wells and drinking water through blasting activities and/or leakage of methane gas; 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, 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 Ashby, Massachusetts choose not to participate in such encumbrances to the life, vibrancy, economic stability, and general well being to our neighbors in New York and elsewhere, wherever hydraulic fracturing is occurring and the pressurized pipeline is running; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the people of Ashby, Massachusetts:

1. Hereby call on our Board of Selectmen to stand in opposition to TOP's high pressured pipeline and not allow it within our town borders;
2. Oppose said pipeline, and any pipeline carrying natural gas obtained through hydraulic fracturing, within the borders of our Commonwealth; and
3. Hereby instruct our state and federal legislators and executive branch officials to enact legislation and take any 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 and subsidies for renewable energy sources.

VOTE: UNANIMOUS

Lorraine Pease

Ashby Town Clerk

#### **20141016-5126(29856314).pdf**

Glendyne Wergland, Dalton, MA.

FERC should deny permission for Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline's proposed Northeast Energy Direct project through Massachusetts. It is neither necessary nor a public convenience.

This pipeline would be an outrage on our environment and a danger to my neighborhood.

Kinder Morgan plans to remove water from some ponds, pollute it by running it through their pipes, and pour it back onto the land, laden with chemicals.

In addition, they use cancer-causing teratogenic defoliants on their right-of-way.

We don't need or want those in our neighborhood.

We want to protect the environment, not damage it.

Moreover, Kinder Morgan's information is inadequate and misleading. Kinder Morgan representatives have

said they don't intend to do any blasting. Whether this is their mistaken belief or an outright lie, I don't know – but either way, I don't trust them or their judgment.

Knowing the terrain along part of their proposed route as well as I do, I'm certain they will have to blast if they want the pipe to be underground in ledge and protected from erosion on a steep grade. I wonder about the impact on springs and wells in the vicinity.

Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Gas Pipeline have a poor safety record, and I can see why: their personnel seem to have no moral center. When I asked the advance team how they can justify building a high-pressure 36" pipeline less than fifty (50) feet from a dwelling when the blast distance is over nine hundred (900) feet, they answered, "Because DOT allows it."

FERC may think that's okay, but I most certainly do not.

Kinder Morgan personnel apparently have no sense of personal responsibility for the hazards of the pipelines they build. We cannot entrust them with our safety. We prefer to live EXPLOSION-FREE.

If, as the Declaration of Independence says, we are truly endowed by our Creator with certain unalienable Rights, and that among them are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, then FERC will stop this pipeline because it is destructive of those rights.

We do not want a Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline to invade Massachusetts, pollute our water, endanger our population, or violate Mother Earth.

I vehemently OPPOSE this unnecessary, ill-advised, potentially hazardous, and environmentally ruinous project.

Glendyne R. Wergland  
Dalton, Massachusetts

**20141017-0031(29856812).pdf**

**Congress of the United States**

October 15, 2014

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

Dear Chairwoman LaFleur:

Over the last several months, community official and residents in Hollis, Brookline, and Salem, New Hampshire have contacted our offices to express their concerns with Kinder-Morgan's proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project, which would bring natural gas through southern New Hampshire before terminating in Merrimack, NH. As you may know, they have raised questions with our offices regarding the overall need for the project, its proposed route, as well as its potential impact on sensitive conservation areas and on public safety. In addition, the New Hampshire Attorney General's Office and the New Hampshire Department of Fish and Game have also outlined several important concerns relative to conservation areas and wildlife habitats.

We understand Kinder-Morgan has submitted its project pre-filing to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. The scoping meetings that are part of this process, as well as the other opportunities for the public to make comments, will be critical given the deep concerns that exist in these communities. As FERC begins its review of the Northeast Energy Direct Project, we ask that you give priority attention to these issues. In addition, we would ask you to encourage the applicant to find a path forward that addresses these local concerns.

Thank you and we look forward to learning more about the status of FERC's review.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Shaheen, United States Senator  
Kelly Ayotte, United States Senator  
Anne Kuster, Member of Congress

**20141017-0040(29856748).pdf**

September 20, 2014

Chairwoman Cheryl A. LaFleur  
888 First Street NE  
Washington DC, 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Expansion Project

Dear Chairwoman Cheryl A. LaFleur,

I am writing to express my concern with and opposition to the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Direct project. Docket No. PF14-22

As a resident of Massachusetts, through which the proposed pipeline is routed, I am directly affected by its potential consequences, including the risk of gas leak-related explosion and contamination, as well as decline in property values and an increase in insurance costs. Furthermore, as currently planned, this project will cross sensitive conservation lands, wetlands, and rivers leaving a permanent scar through some of Massachusetts' most picturesque open spaces and putting many of our towns' primary sources of drinking water at risk of contamination.

The effort to meet Massachusetts' ongoing energy needs should not adversely impact residents' quality of life, nor come at the expense of open space benefiting 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, energy efficiency programs, and a policy to switch to renewable sources of energy generation now and in the future. I urge you to fully prioritize further investment in and deployment of these solutions, and to take any actions as are necessary to begin a public dialog to determine whether this project is necessary or advisable for our state.

Sincerely,

**20141017-5094(29856614).pdf**

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:

As FERC considers Kinder Morgan's Northeast Energy Direct proposal, I ask that you also consider the following from an affected homeowner along the pipeline path.

One Simple Question For Kinder Morgan

On June 23 of this year, Kinder Morgan representatives traveled to Groton, MA to explain their plans to build a high-pressure natural gas pipeline through 45 Massachusetts towns. The main presenter was Kinder Morgan spokesman Alan Fore. After his presentation, residents were invited to ask questions of the Kinder Morgan reps.

A local woman asked a simple question: "Would you really want this pipeline going through your backyard?"

Alan stated that he would only know the answer to that if it was actually his land that was being impacted and he didn't think it was "fair" for him to try to put himself into her shoes. Boos were heard from the audience. Alan then began the familiar tap dance about the upcoming rigorous environmental review and that it was not really up to Kinder Morgan to decide about the pipeline because it was actually the regulators who would determine...

The meeting moderator interrupted, asking him to "Please answer the lady's question". The audience applauded.

Alan tried a new tack. "Well, my house is in a city so it's not possible that this could be built in my backyard". This resulted in more grumbling and cat calls from the audience. "Pretend" someone said.

Alan turned to the audience. "Pretend? Pretend if I had 100 acres ... or 50 acres ... or it was next to my house ... 20 ... 2?" This elicited increasingly louder complaints from the audience. The moderator finally stepped in and put Alan out of his misery, stating that if Alan didn't feel that he could answer the question, they would move on.

I wonder if Mr. Fore ever considered actually answering the question. How would he feel if a private, for-profit company was planning to force the construction of a pipeline through his property? It might happen like this...

One day there's a knock on Alan's front door and a Kinder Morgan agent shows him a map. On this map he can see his parcel – and someone has drawn a line through it. He immediately realizes what this means for the property that he and his wife bought, and fixed up, and scrimped to pay the mortgage on - the property where they are now raising their children. Kinder Morgan has drawn a line on a map – and his life and the lives of thousands of others along that line are going to be significantly changed for the worse if this pipeline is built.

One serious concern is his loss of control. Kinder Morgan is asking the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for eminent domain rights along their selected pipeline route. With these rights, they can take an easement through his property if he won't agree to their terms. He will never again have complete control over what he had always considered to be his property. From now on, he will share that control with an out-of-state pipeline company.

And he is concerned about his property's value. He understands that Kinder Morgan's position is that pipelines do not decrease property values (as a company spokesman, he has told many others this very thing). So he knows that his chances of being fairly compensated for the decrease in property value caused by the pipeline are not too good. He can accept what they offer - or else they will take the easement and then decide what to pay him.

He also worries about safety, pollution, remediation, the ugliness of a 100-foot clear cut pipeline scar, etc., etc.

As embarrassing as it must have been to be called out twice by the moderator for not answering that one simple question, it was probably much less embarrassing than it would have been for Alan to give a truthful answer. After all, who in their right mind would want this pipeline to be anywhere near a property that they cared about?

[You can view a video of this meeting at <http://grotonspace.com/pipeline/category/videos/>. Scroll down and click on Video from our meeting with Kinder Morgan. The question is asked at 1:25:04.]

Nick Miller  
Groton, MA

**20141017-5113(29856680).pdf**

*originally scanned "Letter from Massachusetts Energy Facilities Siting Board to TGP"*

**THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS  
ENERGY FACILITIES SITING BOARD**

ONE SOUTH STATION  
BOSTON, MA 02110  
(617) 305-3525

DEVAL L. PATRICK  
GOVERNOR

October 17, 2014

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, N.E.  
Washington, D.C. 2042

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C, PF14-22-000

Dear Secretary Bose:

The Massachusetts Energy Facilities Siting Board (“Siting Board”), an administrative agency of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, appreciates the opportunity to submit these preliminary comments in conjunction with the pre-filing phase of Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company’s (“Tennessee” or “Company”) proposed Northeast Energy Direct pipeline (“NED” or “Project”). The Siting Board hereby notifies both FERC and the Company of its intention to actively participate in the pre-filing phase of FERC natural gas pipeline proceedings in order to preserve the rights of interested citizens of the Commonwealth, pursuant to 980 C.M.R. § 7.07(9).

The Project as proposed would be the largest natural gas pipeline ever to be built in Massachusetts - including the original interstate pipelines extended into New England in the 1950s and 1960s. In particular, Tennessee proposes to construct and operate in Massachusetts over 127 miles of new pipeline, up to 36 inches in diameter, capable of transporting up to 2.2 billion cubic feet per day of natural gas. The Project would extend from the Massachusetts border with New York State at Richmond, Massachusetts to Dracut. In addition to the 127 miles of new mainline pipe in Massachusetts (a significant portion of which would be located in greenfield areas), Tennessee also proposes to construct the following new pipeline laterals and loops in Massachusetts:

1. Haverhill Lateral Approximately 6.99 miles of 12-inch pipeline in Massachusetts and New Hampshire;
2. Lynnfield Lateral Approximately 16.62 miles of 20-inch pipeline in Massachusetts;
3. West Nashua Lateral Approximately 11.95 miles of 12-inch pipeline in Massachusetts and New Hampshire;
4. Fitchburg Lateral Ext. Approximately 4.97 miles of 12-inch pipeline in Massachusetts;
5. North Worcester Lateral Approximately 14.13 miles of 12-inch pipeline in Massachusetts; and
6. Pittsfield Lateral Approximately 1.78 miles of 12-inch pipeline in Massachusetts.

In Massachusetts, the Project would involve the installation of three new compressor stations, as well as metering and regulation facilities, including tap, metering, heating, flow control, overpressure protection, and communications facilities, as necessary, at an additional twelve locations. Modifications to the two existing Massachusetts metering and regulation facilities are also proposed by Tennessee as part of the Project.

Given the unprecedented scale of the Project, as well as the many residential properties and sensitive natural resource/open space areas potentially impacted by the Project, a number of issues implicating interests of the Commonwealth need to be fully addressed. As you are aware, the Massachusetts Secretary of Energy and Environmental Affairs has already filed initial comments with FERC on substantive issues as well as the need for a robust public process moving forward. In light of those interests, the Siting Board intends to be an active participant in the pre-filing process. The Siting Board also urges both Tennessee and FERC to develop a comprehensive public outreach effort in the pre-filing process, and to fully scope the environmental issues

that will need to be addressed in any future certificate application at FERC for this Project.

Andrew G. Greene

Director

cc: Michael Letson, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company

**20141017-5128(29856703).pdf**

Bruce Shenker, New Lebanon, NY.

More than 20 miles of the Northeast Direct Project pass through the Columbia County towns of Chatham, Canaan and New Lebanon in eastern New York. The town boards of all three towns have repeatedly asked Kinder Morgan to come and present their plans to the residents of their towns. Kinder Morgan kept assuring these officials that they would come and present before the end of the year.

Yesterday Kinder Morgan announced their “community outreach” schedule for the rest of the year. There are no events planned for Columbia County and in fact for the more than 60 miles of pipeline they want to put in New York State they have only scheduled an “open house” for Schodack, NY. It has been our experience that the open house format is great for the company because it does not give anyone with any objections or difficult questions a platform for raising these issues in front of a large group of people. However it does not provide the affected citizens with a good resource for getting information and the full picture of the project.. A preferred venue would be community forum where both sides of the issue could be discussed.

I am sure that this “community outreach” schedule ticks the box and follows the letter of the law, but it surely does not follow the spirit of the law and reveals the lie to Kinder Morgan’s claim to being a good neighbor.

**20141020-0019(29857329).pdf**

**Groton Board of Selectmen**

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 Request to Use Pre-filing Procedures for Proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Secretary Bose:

On June 30, 2014, the Groton Board of Selectmen called for and held a Special Town Meeting to discuss the Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. Northeast Energy Direct Project. At this Special Town Meeting, the voters of the Town of Groton voted unanimously to adopt a resolution in opposition to the project. A copy of the vote of the Town Meeting is attached. Groton’s local legislative authority is vested in the traditional New England open Town Meeting whereby any registered voter may participate and vote on town matters.

Please take this resolution into consideration when reviewing the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct project.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,  
Joshua A. Dergen, Chairman  
Groton Board of Selectmen

**20141020-5090(29856945).pdf**

Susan Sedlmayr, East Chatham, NY.

This pipeline runs thru my backyard in Columbia County, NY. I understand this project has been split up into many projects, but all will hook together to bring FRACKED shale gas from the Marcellus shale in Pennsylvania thru NY, Massachusetts and up the coast to be liquefied and shipped over seas. NO gas will be provided to US, but our beautiful hills and valleys, wetlands and forests will be plundered. And this “ early application “ to dismiss the environmental impact statement is Criminal.

This new pipeline will be intentionally made with thinner walls in rural areas, which is where I live. My husband and I have a farm on our land, and our water, soil, air, night sky, wildlife and all the natural beauty of this country will be compromised by a privately held company looking to sell THEIR product overseas for high prices. Their goal is to increase shareholders profit, and OUR federal agencies are supposed to be protecting me and my neighbors from just this very thing. With this newly proposed FRACKED gas pipe-line ..... The pipe is going from a size 10 inches to 36-42 inches. The pressure to move the volume will be 4 times what it is in the present pipes. New compressor stations are needed to accomplish this. They expel poisons into the air, but since the chemicals are not disclosed to the public we will not know what we are being poisoned with! Haven't we seen this too many times in our country's past?

PLEASE..... STOP THIS .....

IT WILL ..... Compromise our farm, our health, our lives!!

**20141020-5111(29857011).pdf**

**BERKSHIRE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION**

1 FENN STREET, SUITE 201, PITTSFIELD, MASSACHUSETTS 01201

TELEPHONE (413) 442-1521 · FAX (413) 442-1523

Massachusetts Relay Service: TTY: 771 or 1-800-439-2370

[www.berkshireplanning.org](http://www.berkshireplanning.org)

SHEILA IRVIN, Chair

KYLE HANLON, Vice-Chair

MARIE RAFTERY, Clerk

CHARLES P. OGDEN, Treasurer

NATHANIEL W. KARNS, A.I.C.P.

Executive Director

October 17, 2014

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, N.E.

Washington, DC 20426

RE: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., PF14-22-000

Dear Secretary Bose:

The Berkshire Regional Planning Commission (BRPC), a substate district of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts established pursuant to Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 40B, appreciates the opportunity to submit these preliminary comments in conjunction with the pre-filing phase of Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's (TGP) proposed Northeast Energy Direct pipeline (Project). BRPC hereby notifies both FERC and TGP of its intention to actively participate in the pre-filing phase of FERC natural gas pipeline proceedings in order to preserve the rights of its member local governments, pursuant to 980 C.M.R. § 7.07(9).

The Project as proposed would be the largest natural gas pipeline ever to be built in Berkshire County, Massachusetts, including the original interstate pipelines extended through Berkshire County in the 1950s and 1960s. In particular, TGP proposes to construct and operate in Berkshire County over 26 miles of new pipeline, up to 36 inches in diameter, capable of transporting up to 2.2 billion cubic feet per day of natural

gas. The project would extend from the Berkshire County border with New York State at Richmond, Massachusetts, to the Hampshire County, Massachusetts, border of Berkshire County in Windsor, Massachusetts, impacting eight Berkshire County towns and cities. In addition to the over 26 miles of new mainline pipe in Berkshire County (a significant portion of which would be located in municipal watersheds and publically and privately protected permanent open space and recreation lands), TGP also proposed to construct a new pipeline lateral and loop as the Pittsfield Lateral, impacting the City of Pittsfield and Town of Dalton, with approximately 1.78 miles of 12-inch pipeline. In Berkshire County, the Project would also involve metering and regulation facilities.

Given the unprecedented scale of the project, the many residential properties, sensitive natural resource/open space areas, and the Housatonic “Rest of River” site which is under the jurisdiction by EPA under a Federal Consent Decree, potentially impacted by the Project, a number of issues implicating the interests of the BRPC and its member towns and cities need to be fully addressed. In light of those interests, the BRPC intends to be an active participant in the pre-filing process. BRPC also urges both TGP and FERC to develop a comprehensive public outreach effort in the pre-filing process, and to fully scope the environmental issues that will need to be addressed in any future certificate application at FERC for this project.

Sincerely,

Nathaniel W. Karns, AICP  
Executive Director

**20141020-5118(29857015).pdf**

*originally scanned “Letter from New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation”*

Andrew M. Cuomo  
Governor  
Rose Harvey  
Commissioner

**New York State Office of Parks,  
Recreation and Historic Preservation**

Albany, New York 12238  
www.nysparks.com

October 20,2014

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

RE: Docket No. PF 14-22-000 Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC, Proposed  
Northeast Energy Direct Project. .

Dear Secretary Bose,

The New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (OPRHP) has been invited to be a participating agency in the above mentioned pre-filing process for the Tennessee Gas Pipeline’s (TGP) Northeast Energy Direct Project (Docket No. PFI4-22- 000).

This letter is to indicate that OPRHP is accepting this invitation to participate in the pre-filing process.

Please include the following staff on all related mailing and contact lists.

John Bonafide, Director  
Bureau for Technical Preservation Services  
NYS Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation  
Peebles Island State Park  
PO Box 189

Waterford, NY 12188  
Diana Carter, Director  
Resource and Facility Planning Bureau  
NYS Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation  
625 Broadway, 2nd Floor  
Albany, NY 12207

Robert Hiltbrand, Regional Director  
NYS OPRHP Central NY State Park Region  
6105 E Seneca Turnpike  
Jamesville, NY 13078

Alane Ball-Chinian, Regional Director  
NYS OPRHP Saratoga-Capital District State Park Region  
19 Roosevelt Drive  
Saratoga Springs, NY 12866

Please feel free to contact me as well at the address listed below.

Sincerely,

Tom Alwortli, Deputy Commissioner  
Natural Resources and Partnerships  
NYS Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation  
Albany, NY 12238

CC: Michael Letson, Kinder-Morgan  
John Bonafide, NYS OPRHP  
Diana Carter, NYS OPRHP

**20141021-0025(29860905).pdf**

The Honorable James P. McGovern  
U.S. House of Representatives  
Washington, D.C. 20515

October 20, 2014

Dear Congressman McGovern:

Thank you for your October 2, 2014, letter regarding Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.'s (Tennessee) proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project (Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Docket No. PF14-22-000).

As you mentioned, the Commission recently approved Tennessee's request to enter into our pre-filing process for the project on October 2, 2014. The process is designed to engage stakeholders to identify and resolve environmental issues before the formal filing of an application with the Commission. The Commission's pre-filing process will include our staff's active participation with landowners, interested parties, and federal and state agencies (including the Massachusetts Energy Facilities Siting Board), to identify areas where impacts may be reduced or avoided. My staff will also attend Tennessee's planned open house meetings and hold scoping meetings throughout the project area. By engaging the public early in the process, we believe that we can conduct a more comprehensive and meaningful review of the project as part of our obligation under the National Environmental Policy Act.

I appreciate your concerns regarding the availability of detailed maps of the project for Massachusetts residents to review. During our pre-filing process, our docket for the project will be routinely updated with more detailed project information, and we anticipate that Tennessee will have detailed project maps available at its planned open house meetings. Once Tennessee files its application, the Commission's environmental staff will prepare a draft environmental impact statement (EIS) for this project and the public will have additional

opportunities to comment on the project and the adequacy of this document. I can assure you that the draft EIS will take into account impacts on both private and public conservation lands, sensitive wildlife, and consider alternatives routes through the diverse and historic Massachusetts landscape. The final EIS will address any comments received on the draft EIS, and the Commission will consider the findings of the final EIS before making its decision on whether to authorize this project.

Please be assured, as in any Commission matter, 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,  
Cheryl A. LaFleur  
Chairman

**20141021-5163(29860639).pdf**

October 21, 2014

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  
Open House Dates and 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 Tennessee’s Northeast Energy Direct Project (“Project”). By notice issued October 2, 2014, the Commission approved Tennessee’s request to use the pre-filing procedures in Docket No. PF14-22-000.

As required by Section 157.21(f)(1) of the Commission’s pre-filing procedures, 18 C.F.R. § 157.21(f)(1)(2014), Tennessee has established the dates and locations at which Tennessee will conduct open houses with stakeholders (including agencies) and Commission staff for the portion of the proposed Northeast Energy Direct (“NED”) Project located between Wright, New York and Dracut, Massachusetts. Tennessee is submitting a list of these open house dates and locations, which will be held in November and December 2014. In addition, Tennessee included this information in the notification letters that were sent to affected landowners and governmental officials. Tennessee will submit a list of the open house dates and locations for the portion of the NED Project located between Troy, Pennsylvania and Wright, New York by the end of December 2014.

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 the undersigned at (713) 420-4544 or to Mr. Richard Siegel at (713) 420-5535.

Respectfully submitted,

TENNESSEE GAS PIPELINE COMPANY, L.L.C.  
Jacquelyne M. Rocan  
Assistant General Counsel

Enclosure

cc: Mr. Rich McGuire

Mr. Michael McGehee

Mr. Eric Tomasi

NED Open House Dates/Locations

\*\*All Open Houses are 6pm-8pm

- \* Nov. 12, 2014: North Reading, MA
  - o North Reading High School; 191 Park St., North Reading, MA
- \* Nov. 13, 2014: Pepperell, MA
  - o Varnum Brook Elementary School; 10 Hollis St., Pepperell, MA
- \* Nov. 17, 2014: Dracut, MA
  - o Richardson Middle School; 1570 Lakeview Ave., Dracut, MA
- \* Nov. 18, 2014: Hollis, NH
  - o Hollis-Brookline High School; 24 Cavalier Ct., Hollis, NH
- \* Nov. 19, 2014: Northborough, MA
  - o Marguerite Peaslee Elementary School; 31 Maple Street., Northborough, MA
- \* Nov. 20, 2014: Ashburnham, MA
  - o Oakmont Regional High School; 9 Oakmont Dr., Ashburnham, MA
- \* Dec. 2, 2014: Orange, MA
  - o Orange Innovation Center; 131 West Main St., Orange, MA
- \* Dec. 3, 2014: Greenfield, MA
  - o Greenfield Community College; One College Drive, Greenfield, MA
- \* Dec. 4, 2014: Schodack, NY
  - o Green Meadow Elementary School- 234 Schuurman Rd., Castleton On Hudson, NY
- \* Dec. 9, 2014: Pittsfield, MA
  - o Berkshire Community College; 1350 West St., Pittsfield, MA
- \* Dec. 10, 2014: Shelburne, MA
  - o Mohawk Trail Regional High School; 24 Ashfield Rd., Shelburne Falls, MA
- \* Dec. 11, 2014: Farmington, CT
  - o Farmington High School; 10 Montieth Dr., Farmington, CT

**20141022-0018(29873532).pdf**

**HAUDENOSAUMEE  
TUSCARORA NATION**

2006 MT. HOPE ROAD — VIA: LEWISTON, NEW YORK I4092

October 17, 2014

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

Dear Ms. Bose:

The Tuscarora Nation wish to inform you that they are interested in the project listed on the attached sheet. They ask that if any human remains, funerary or sacred objects are uncovered during this project, that work cease and the Tuscarora Nation be notified and we can consult on what steps to take to handle the findings. The Nation also wishes to be kept informed of the progress of the whole project from start to finish. If you need to telephone the Tuscarora Nation, telephone 716-601-4737.

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

ONEH!

Chief Leo R. Henry, Clerk

Tuscarora Nation

**20141023-0009(29866904).pdf**

Jemfer D. Picard  
Email: jenjane1724gsgmail.com  
285 Main Street  
Lenox, Ma 01240  
October 17, 2014

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First St., NE  
Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Attention: Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
RE: Docket File #PF1422 — Request for intervener Status

Dear Secretary Bose:

I wish to formally request Intervener Status in the matter referenced above in opposition to the Kinder Morgan Tennessee Gas Pipeline, Northeast Energy Direct Project (also called Northeast Expansion Project.) My property directly abuts the Kennedy Park Region of Lenox and I will be adversely affected by any decision to approve the Kinder Morgan Pipeline through the area.

Sincerely,  
Jenifer Picard

**20141023-0011(29866815).pdf**

**TOWN OF LENOX**

October 17, 2014  
Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First St., NE  
Room 1 A  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC, Docket No. PF14-22-000 Pre-filing Procedures for Proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Secretary Bose:

On May 1, 2014 at the Annual Town Meeting, residents of the Town of Lenox adopted a resolution in opposition to the Kinder Morgan Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LLC, Northeast Energy Direct Project (aka Northeast Expansion Project). The vote by the citizens of Lenox on Warrant Article 24 regarding the resolution in opposition to the pipeline, was passed by majority vote.

A certified copy of the vote is enclosed. Please consider this vote when reviewing the Kinder Morgan Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Energy Direct Project Docket No. PF14-22-000.

I appreciate your time and consideration of this measure.

Sincerely,  
Jenifer D. Picard  
Town Clerk

Enclosure: Certified Copy vote of the Annual Town Meeting Article 124  
cc: His Excellency Deval Patrick Governor

The Honorable Elizabeth Warren, US Senator  
The Honorable Edward J. Markey, US Senator  
The Honorable Richard E. Neal, US Congressman  
The Honorable Benjamin B. Downing, State Senator  
The Honorable William “Smitty” Pignatelli, State Representative  
Secretary Maeve Vallely-Bartlett, Secretary of Energy and Environmental Affairs

Certified Vote Annual Town Meeting

May I, 2014

ARTICLE 24. It was moved and seconded to approve the RESOLUTION TO BAN “FRACKED GAS” PIPELINES AND TO CHAMPION SUSTAINABLE ENERGY Petition.

Whereas a proposed High-Pressure Pipeline carrying natural gas obtained through hydraulic fracturing may come through Lenox, which is a Green Community that supports the transition to new energy technologies; so be it resolved that we, the people of Lenox, Massachusetts:

1. Hereby call on our Selectboard to stand in opposition to Tennessee Gas Company LLC’s high pressure pipeline, and not allow it with in our town borders;
2. Oppose said pipeline, and any pipeline carrying natural gas obtained through hydraulic fracturing, within our borders; and
3. Hereby instruct our state and federal legislators and executive branch officials 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, carbon and methane emissions restrictions, and further exploration of and subsidies for renewable energy sources. (Petition — Non-binding)

The article passed with a vote of 132 in favor and 53 opposed.

Attest: Jenifer D. Picard, Town Clerk

**20141024-0018(29868433).pdf**

September 20, 2014

Chairwoman Cheryl A. LaFleur  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Expansion Project

Dear Chairwoman Cheryl A. LaFleur,

I am writing to express my concern with and opposition to the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Directproject. Docket No. PF14-22-000

As a resident of Massachusetts, through which the proposed pipeline is routed, I am directly affected by its potential consequences, including the risk of gas leak-related explosion and contamination, as well as decline in property values and and increase in insurance costs. Furthermore, as currently planned, this project will cross sensitive conservation lands, wetlands, and rivers leaving a permanent scar through some of Massachusetts’ most picturesque open spaces and putting many of our towns’ primary sources of drinking water at risk of contamination.

The effort to meet Massachusetts’ ongoing energy needs should not adversely impact residents’ quality of life, nor come at the expense of open space benefiting 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, energy efficiency programs, and a policy to switch to renewable sources of energy generation now and in the future. I urge you to fully prioritize further investment in and deployment of these solutions, and to take any actions as are necessary to begin a public dialog to determine whether this project is necessary or advisable for our state.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Weaver

**20141024-0019(29868553).pdf**

Same text as “20141024-0018(29868433).pdf” above, signed by Glen B. Hastings

**20141024-5001(29866915).pdf**

Joseph Wallace, Townsend, MA.

Hello,

My name is Joseph Wallace, affected landowner in Townsend, MA. I received a visit on February 2nd this year from field agent Steve Martin requesting permission to survey my land for this pipeline. During the short conversation, without a whole lot of information, I didn't think much of it and signed. I have since sent a letter rescinding access to my land through certified mail to their Agawam address and am now opposed to this project. I implore you to not let this route continue as planned, as it affects many residential parcels and protected lands.

There are a few reasons why I will not allow this on my property. All reasons outweigh any monetary gain that would come out of an easement agreement. I will follow up with reasons for it.

Reasons against:

- 1) Health and Safety. I have a 19 month old son who I love dearly. I will not willfully invite a possible hazard to his health, which this pipeline could bring if there were any leaks or explosions. Energy companies do not have a good track record lately and we've seen dozens of disasters over the years. BP poisoning the Gulf of Mexico comes to mind. There is an extremely high water table on my land and all of the seasonal run off from the hill behind my house seeps into my basement. The concerns for my property for gas leaks are very high. This fear for health and safety might make my land not livable.
- 2) Privacy. I don't want them to be able to have access to my yard at any time they choose. Also, they will destroy any privacy I have from others who chose to walk (or snowmobile) the path that they will be creating through the woods behind my house. I chose this house mainly on the privacy that the woods provide.
- 3) Future use. My land has a nice wide open field that they are looking to put this pipeline though. I don't even think I could list all of the things I could do with that land in the future. A quick list is constructing a Barn, a Pool, a Garden, and having Baseball practice with my son. Not sure if I could even walk on that land being used by Kinder Morgan due to imposed restrictions and herbicides. They want to nearly bisect my land. If they get federal approval to take my land using Eminent Domain, could they at least put the pipe along the edge of my land, not right through it.
- 4) Routes. Millions have been spent in this state conserving land and keeping it's natural beauty. We care about these spaces for future generations and it is important that they not have a giant scar of cleared land running through them. Never mind all of the habitats being destroyed. <http://www.theguardian.com/environment/2014/sep/29/earthlost-50-wildlife-in-40-years-wwf> a study by the WWF just found that 50% of of earth's wildlife has been wiped out in the last 40 years. This would be contributing to that trend.
- 5) Compression Station. What luck I have! They want to put 4 noisy jet engine type compressors that emit dangerous fumes within 2 or so miles from my house and take over 70 acres of land from someone.
- 6) Security. Do they have security all along the route to make sure no one is tampering with the pipeline? This pipeline could become a target for people trying to do our country harm and I don't feel comfortable living near that.

7) Loss of property value/Not able to sell. I have put considerable time and money (for a young family) into this house over the last 2 years to improve it's value and they could possibly wipe that out. No one is going to want to buy my house if there's a gas highway running next to where they would sleep.

Reasons for:

1) This would cut my mowing time in half...

Thanks for reading. It's not so simple for us people who would need to live next to this Pipeline. There are real lives affected by this company who is looking to profit off of land that does not belong to them. My final question/point would be... Would you want to raise a child in a house next to one of their Pipelines

## **20141024-5006(29866943).pdf**

October 20, 2014

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

Question to the FERC

We are writing this letter to ask the following critical questions regarding reasons the FERC would deny permitting to Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company (TGP) for the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) proposal.

### **Deny permit for lack of public necessity**

More than 30 communities along the pipeline route, including Hollis, New Hampshire, have passed resolutions to clearly express their right to decide the destiny of their town's treasured land. Would the FERC deny permit of this proposal based on this unprecedented action across multiple states where the public has weighed the risk and benefits of the NED pipeline proposal and publicly stated, through more than 30 resolutions, they have no public necessity for the NED project?

### **Deny permit for lack of need**

The contested need for this pipeline for New England is to meet a 0.6bcf/day shortage which occurred for a maximum of 26 days during the Polar Vortex of 2014. Further, the high demand shortage occurred during 1 1/2 hour periods in the morning and 1 1/2 periods in the evenings of those 26 days. The result is a maximum shortage in New England of 80 hours during 2014. Approximately 8,600 hours of the same year of the Polar Vortex, New England's existing pipeline infrastructure had more capacity than needed. That clearly shows that the need for the 0.6bcf/day pipeline is less than 1% of the daily hours in a year. Would the FERC deny permit of this proposal recognizing that a 1% benefit is not worth putting the lives of American citizens at risk from accidental fire and explosion and/or the taking of private, public and conservation land by eminent domain? Deny permit for overbuilding Spectra Energy Corporation proposes incremental expansion along existing pipeline routes to meet the New England need. Distrigas proposes that New England's high demand hours could be met by the use of stored LNG. Renewable energy companies propose solar, wind and geothermal sources to further reduce the need for fossil fuels. Energy efficiency and conservation programs provide additional methods to decrease energy needs. TGP disregards these proposals to decrease need and instead proposes to overbuild a fossil fuel infrastructure nearly four times larger than any New England need. Would the FERC deny permit of a proposal sized multiple times larger than any established need even at peak demand?

### **Deny permit for deceptive public communication**

The first notice received about this project by our family and many other affected residents was by a Northeast Land Services Agent. The letter from the Agent was for permission to survey property for the Northeast

Expansion Project.

*“As you may know, the demand for clean-burning natural gas in the Northeastern United States is increasing.”*

TGP deceptive example #1: Town residents, not intimately familiar with natural gas, would casually overlook TGP’s obvious attempt to disregard the dirty fact that methane, a potent greenhouse gas, leaks from drilling, gathering, compression, transportation and distribution and only mentions “clean-burning”. [1]

*“To meet this increasing demand, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, (Tennessee), a Kinder Morgan Company, is planning to expand its natural gas transmission system in your area.”*

TGP deceptive example #2: Town residents, not intimately familiar with natural gas pipeline types would overlook “transmission” in the statement about expanding and therefore think this natural gas system is for the community. TGP should have clearly stated that this high pressure transmission pipeline would not connect directly to the homes being surveyed inside the study corridor. [2]

*“Tennessee anticipates that it will be able to locate a significant portion of the pipeline adjacent, or generally parallel to, existing pipeline and electrical utility corridors.”*

TGP deceptive example #3: The route TGP chose through Hollis does not have a significant portion adjacent, or generally parallel to, existing pipelines or electrical utility corridors. The route from Wright, NY to Dracut, MA is a “greenfields” project with no intention of using existing right-of-ways. [3]

*“This expansion project is developed to meet increased demand in the U.S. Northeast for transportation capacity for natural gas”*

Deceptive example #4: Residents of Hollis do not have a substantial increase in demand for natural gas. Liberty Utilities, the LDC serving the town of Hollis, has not stated plans for increasing natural gas service to residential customers in Hollis. Additionally, at 2.2bcf/day this project is clearly developed to meet speculative demand outside of the U.S. Northeast. This plan would impose domestic pressure on the price of gas which would ultimately hurt local economies over dependent on a diminishing supply due to demand elsewhere. [4]

Would the FERC deny permit to a proposal by a company purposely making deceptive statements to land-owners while threatening the taking of their land by eminent domain?

#### **Deny permit for lack of confirmed destination**

The 8 1/2” x 11” map included in the Survey Permission Letter package showed New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Vermont, New Hampshire and Maine. Clearly a letter sized map showing nine states offered no details of the actual land location of the Energy North Lateral of the Northeast Expansion Project. [5]

The name of the Northeast Expansion was changed to NED. Further the name of the Energy North Lateral was changed to the West Nashua Lateral. Beyond the name change the terminus moved from Merrimack, New Hampshire to Amherst, New Hampshire. Amherst is even farther away from West Nashua, New Hampshire. Confused? So are local residents. Would the FERC deny a permit for a proposal with multiple names and multiple terminus points that still doesn’t reach its West Nashua destination?

Our family, town residents, town officials and state officials implore the FERC to carefully evaluate the need, public necessity, proposal to overbuild, and the practice of TGP to deceive and withhold information from the public when considering permitting of the NED project.

Sincerely yours,

Rob & Lynn Chesebrough

References Attached:

- 1-2. Northeast Expansion Survey Letter (SurveyLetter.jpg)
- 3-4. Northeast Expansion Project Overview Letter (ProjectOverview.jpg)
5. Northeast Expansion Project Scope Map (ProjectScope.jpg)

**TOWN OF ANDOVER**

Town Offices  
36 Bartlet Street  
Andover, MA 01810

October 20, 2014

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20146

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

Dear Secretary Bose:

The Town of Andover, Massachusetts has reviewed Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Gas Pipeline's Request to Use Pre-Filing Procedures for the proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project. We have a number of concerns with the currently proposed route of the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Lynnfield Lateral through Andover due to the number of detrimental impacts to this community's drinking water supply and surrounding watershed, Town-owned conservation land, protected wetlands, school and municipal properties, ancient historical sites 'and the overall safety of our residents. Additionally, we have concerns regarding the accuracy of the United States Geological Survey (USGS) topographical maps from 1988 that were utilized to design the proposed natural gas pipeline route and submitted with the Pre-Filing request. All of these concerns are address below.

**Negative Impacts of the Currently Proposed Route**

The first concern is protection of Andover's drinking water source and its surrounding watershed. The majority of the current proposed route for the natural gas pipeline (approximately 3.5 miles of the total 6 miles which pass through Andover) falls within the Fish Brook/Haggetts Pond Watershed Protection Overlay District (WPOD). This district was created to preserve and protect surface and ground water resources for the health, safety and welfare of its people and to protect the community from detrimental use and development of land and waters within the WPOD. Fish Brook is a tributary to Haggetts Pond, Andover's primary source of drinking water. Andover also provides drinking water to our neighbor community of North Reading. The construction of a 50-foot to 100-foot wide pipeline corridor through the Fish Brook/Haggetts' Pond watershed would be 'a direct threat' by causing physical, chemical and biological. harm to our drinking water source serving a population of approximately 48,000 persons..

A second concern is the protection of the Town's conservation lands, wetlands and forested areas. Town-owned land that is in the care and custody of the Conservation Commission is entitled to protection under Article 97 of the Articles of Amendment to the Massachusetts Constitution. Additionally, the Town is concerned about the negative impacts the pipeline would have on criticalHy-sensitive environmental and ecological areas such as our wetlands, streams and forested areas. The need to "clear-cut" trees and shrubs during pipeline construction, the bedding materials used to line pipeline trenches and the use of herbicides and periodic cutting to maintain the pipeline corridor Right-of-Way will permanently alter the habitats of wildlife, protected State-listed species and endanger water quality.

Thirdly, the Town has concern for the historical preservation of documented Native American archeological sites in areas the pipeline is proposed to traverse; and lastly, the Town is concerned for the safety and protections of our residents, businesses and municipal properties as the proposed pipeline route traverses several private properties and municipal lands which include school property.

**Accuracy of the Information Submitted**

The topographical maps submitted with the pre-filing documents are outdated and inaccurate. The Town

questions the choice by Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LLC to use USGC maps from 1988 rather than current Mass GIS maps which are readily available. Andover, like many cities and towns in Massachusetts, has experienced significant growth and development in the past twenty-five years. The Town looks forward to thoroughly reviewing the more detailed photo-based aerial images for the proposed route that Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LLC have stated (correspondence dated September 25, 2014) will be included with the submittal of the draft Resource Report I, expected on November 1, 2014.

#### Potential Alternate Routes

The Town of Andover has identified five (5) potential alternate routes for consideration. These were discussed with Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC representatives prior to the submittal of their Pre-Filing Request on September 15, 2014. The proposed alternate routes limit the proximity to environmentally-sensitive areas, residential private properties and municipal properties. The alternate routes follow existing Right-of-Ways (ROWs) for interstate highways, electric power transmission lines and existing pipelines. These alternate routes are on land that is already disturbed in established ROWs, as opposed to having to develop a new pipeline route which would create a vast disturbance through natural undisturbed and protected land.

Thank you for your time and consideration of our concerns regarding this project

Very truly yours,

ANDOVER BOARD OF SELECTMEN

CC: U. S. Senator Elizabeth Warren

U. S. Senator Edward J. Markey

U. S. Representative NikiS. Tsongas

Governor Deval L. Patrick

State Senator Barry R. Finegold

State Representative James J. Lyons, Jr.

State Representative A. Frank Moran

Allen Fore, Public Relations Director, Kinder Morgan

Beverly Woods, Executive Director, Northern Middlesex Council of Governments

#### **20141027-5002(29871145).pdf**

Peggy White, Peru, MA.

This comment is in reference to Docket #PF14-22-000. I am concerned about the potential to fast track a proposed high pressure gas pipeline in Massachusetts. Allowing fast track approval of this pipeline circumvents essential environmental impact studies. The plan for Kinder Morgan involves proposed pipeline through the whole state of Massachusetts along sensitive ecosystems, water sheds, land in conservation trusts, farms and towns. As a resident of Massachusetts I am adamant that all state environmental guidelines should be followed explicitly. Article 97 of the state's Constitution prohibits taking conservation lands under almost all conditions. I am very concerned about private property being taken by eminent domain, wetlands and farms being destroyed and water sources being contaminated. The process of testing the solvent coated pipes is a big enough concern environmentally for me. Do not allow Kinder Morgan to go directly to FERC approval for the proposed Massachusetts pipeline.

This project in its entirety far exceeds the projected natural gas needs for New England, is counter to Massachusetts's commitment to clean energy and is not supported by many of our elected officials in Massachusetts. We need to move forward and away from supporting fossil fuel especially fracked gas that is so destructive. We need to look to our future in preserving our environment, health and wellbeing. Thank you for your time.

Lynda King, Bolton, MA.

I stand with thousands of other people across the state of Massachusetts who are opposed to the new Tennessee Gas pipeline being proposed by Kinder Morgan. This pipeline would violate the state from one end to the other, crossing protected conservation and farm lands, intruding on and devaluing residential properties, and bringing danger to the communities affected.

This pipeline would transport gas derived from fracking, a process which, in every step along the way, releases methane gas into the air, a gas believed to be a major contributor to global warming. Facilitating and enabling the use of this gas flies in the face of Massachusetts' longstanding commitment to support a healthy, "green" environment, and is contrary to the federal government's stated goals of working toward a "green energy" future for our country. In addition, as I understand it, fracked gas is more volatile than what is coursing through older, existing lines, not only because of the many chemicals (more than 600) that are used in the process, but also because of the pressure with which the gas is pushed through the lines.

Communities all along the proposed pipeline route have drafted formal resolutions expressing their opposition to the pipeline, and the Massachusetts Department of Energy and Environmental Affairs has called for further justification of the project, even as it stands against the intrusion of the pipeline on lands that Massachusetts has chosen to protect for future generations with an investment of millions of dollars.

Yet the looming electricity rate increases in Massachusetts that have been a topic of discussion in recent media reports have been fanning flames of panic about a need for more gas pipeline infrastructure, and seem to be laying the groundwork for public acceptance of the pipeline as something that is inevitable. It has been said that the increases in natural gas prices in this region are among the highest in the nation, and is a problem that must be addressed. But I question whether these prices have been sufficiently justified by need or have been motivated by the drive for increased profits. The hard reality is that the proposed pipeline will do nothing about the high prices people will be paying this winter: if the project moves forward, the pipeline won't even be online for a good four years. And I doubt we'd be seeing prices go down at that point; in fact, it seems to me that higher prices will be in store to help pay for this project. It seems to me that the push for this project has more to do with corporate profits than meeting any proven need for energy.

In a July 16 conference call between Kinder Morgan representatives and key investors, Thomas A. Martin—Vice President and President of Natural Gas Pipelines—stated that some percentage of the gas to be transported along the proposed pipeline will in fact be destined for export. I can't imagine why the federal government—represented by FERC—would approve a project that would be devastating for so many Massachusetts residents in order to further the profits of a private company, rather than to solely meet the energy needs of the Northeast region, which is supposedly the basis for justifying this project in the first place. I am very disappointed that the pipeline project could even reach its current stage with so little regard for the people of Massachusetts.

I recently attended an informational meeting about the pipeline, at which someone raised the question: if the pipeline is really needed, why couldn't it be located in public rights-of-way, such as median strips along highways, rather than through our precious conservation lands, farmlands and communities? The answer seemed to be one of cost: highergrade materials and more stringent requirements would be required, because those are considered "high impact" areas. So the apparent conclusion is that our rural communities are considered "low impact": any losses experienced from explosions would be of minimal consequence in the grand scheme of things.

Last month (Sept. 23), USA Today published an article on the dangers of gas pipelines, particularly the aging infrastructure already in place. To quote from that article:

"About every other day over the past decade, a gas leak in the United States has destroyed property, hurt someone or killed someone, a USA TODAY Network investigation finds. The most destructive blasts have killed at least 135 people, injured 600 and caused \$2 billion in damages since 2004."

If the Tennessee Gas project in Massachusetts moves forward, and I sincerely hope it does not, I don't believe that Kinder Morgan should be allowed to use materials and processes less stringent than what is required in public rights-of-way in building a pipeline through any community. I have been told that it uses "industry standard" materials and processes, but I think that, in this case, it's a conflict for the industry to set the standard, especially when it could pose such serious danger to the public, none of whom would consider themselves to be "low impact."

**20141028-0014(29876220).pdf**

**Commonwealth of Massachusetts**  
Department of Fish and Game

October 22, 2014

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose:

The Massachusetts Department of Fish and Game (mDFG), including its Division of Fisheries and Wildlife ("DFW"), hereby notifies both FERC and TGP of its intention to actively participate in the pre-filing process for the Northeast Energy Direct ("NED") project proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. (mTGP). The initial September 16, 2014 comments filed with FERC by the Secretary of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs (mEEA) summarize the range of EEA agency interests and concerns associated with the proposed NED project, and we intend to address our agency-specific ones in more detail during the pre-filing process.

Sincerely,

Mary B. Griffin  
Commissioner

cc: Wayne F. MacCallum, Director, DFW  
Martin Suuberg, Undersecretary, EEA  
Michael Letson, TGP

**20141028-5005(29873568).pdf**

Guy O'Donnell, Holyoke, MA.

I would like to express my opposition to the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline proposal by Kinder Morgan. Natural gas contributes to global warming and we need to divest away from fossil fuels instead of building additional infrastructure. Additionally, the methane released during the fracking process represents a greenhouse gas over 86 times more powerful than CO2 in the first 20 years that it hits the atmosphere, 34 times more over a 100 year period. When a full accounting of methane's impact is taken into account from drill site to burner tip, studies show that it has no benefit over coal or oil in reducing greenhouse gas effects. I am also concerned about the issue of the seemingly inevitable leaks given that the proposal calls for the cheapest gage pipe permissible. The leaks will pollute our grounds and water

**20141028-5006(29873570).pdf**

Gary Loomis, Holyoke, MA.

I am opposed to the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline proposal by Kinder Morgan. As an avid gardener and outdoor enthusiast, I worry about the effects this pipeline will have on the private and public land in Massa-

chusetts, including conservation land. Land will have to remain cleared for the pipeline, disrupting delicate plant and animal habitats already stressed by climate change. Additionally, I am concerned about the real potential for leaking natural gas pollution as well as the potential for natural gas explosions as have occurred in West Virginia, Kansas, Minnesota, Kentucky, and Wyoming. I urge you to deny Kinder Morgan the permits to build this pipeline

**20141028-5038(29874265).pdf**

32 Fletcher Lane  
Hollis, NH 03049

October 1, 2014

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

Dear Secretary Bose:

At a special town meeting on September 20, 2014, the citizens of Hollis, New Hampshire, passed by a vote of 419-1 fourteen warrant articles in opposition to the construction of the West Nashua Lateral portion of the proposed Northeast Energy Direct pipeline. In response, the Board of Selectmen adopted a resolution opposing siting of the pipeline in Hollis. A copy of that resolution is attached for inclusion as a comment on Docket # PF14-22-000.

Sincerely,  
Stephen J. Spaulding

**20141028-5081(29875739).pdf**

Barbara Zemlin, Groton, MA.

I am strongly opposed to the taking of private land for the purposes of routing this pipeline through the northeast. If a commercial company (who will profit by the sale of the natural gas flowing through the pipeline) wants to build a pipeline infrastructure, they should be required to individually approach each landowner and purchase the land outright.

Eminent domain should not be associated with this pipeline project. If the affected state governments (including Massachusetts) feel that the public would benefit from additional natural gas supply, the pipeline should be routed along existing infrastructure, such as highways or power lines.

I also strongly oppose the view that Massachusetts will benefit from additional natural gas supply. The northeast region, and indeed the entire country, is too dependent on fossil fuel. Instead of spending taxpayer money or taking taxpayer land to expand our fossil fuel infrastructure, our money and efforts should be spent on developing alternative fuel sources.

Please do not allow the taking of private land for this pipeline

**20141028-5154(29876568).pdf**

**THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS  
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL**

October 28, 2014

By Electronic Filing

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., Proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project,  
Docket No. PF14-22-000 (“Project”)

Dear Secretary Bose:

As set forth in our September 8, 2014, correspondence to Mr. Michael Letson of the Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Gas Pipeline L.L.C. companies, the Massachusetts Attorney General’s Office hereby provides notice of its intent to participate, pursuant to the Energy Policy Act of 2005 and 18 CFR § 157.21, in the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission’s pre-filing process for the Project.

Sincerely,

Chief, Environmental Protection Division  
Melissa A. Hoffer

**20141029-5002(29879500).pdf**

Joel Dansky, Northampton, MA, MA.

We don’t usually get involved in energy siting issues, but having been to the large climate action march in New York last month and some local meetings in Western Mass., we feel we must speak out. We share the concerns expressed by Maeve Vallely Bartlett, Secretary of the Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in her letter to FERC. We hope to see a full and open process for evaluating the TGP Northeast Energy proposal. It is our understanding that pre-filing would allow Tennessee Gas Pipeline to avoid public scrutiny of the details of their proposal. We question the necessity of expanded facilities for fracked gas, especially since much of this gas would be intended for export. We would prefer to see resources directed to expanding renewable energy resources. We are also concerned about the environmental damage that this particular pipeline would cause.

Sincerely,

Joel Dansky and Nancy Felton

**20141029-5042(29882256).pdf**

Virginia Vollmar, Groton, MA.

I am against the Tennessee Gas Pipeline project that is proposed to run from upstate New York through most of northern Massachusetts, ending in Dracut, MA. I am against this proposal for several reasons. - The pipeline would cut through many areas of undisturbed conservation land that has been set aside by towns specifically because of its value to the town and environment and species native to the area. There is no reason to cut a path for a pipeline through conservation land when there are other, existing pipeline routes that KM owns that they can use. - The pipeline would cut through school property in Groton, MA which is much too close to our students to take a chance with their safety. - The proposed pipeline route would entail taking many people’s land by eminent domain. This is just wrong, especially when other routes exist and already have a right-of-way that can be utilized. - A real need for more natural gas in New England has not been proven at this time. If companies would just fix the many leaks that exist, it would most likely take care of the problem.

Virginia Vollmar

**20141029-5105(29883180).pdf**

Bowditch & Dewey  
Attorneys

October 29, 2014

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 Ms. Bose:

I am writing on behalf of Northeast Energy Solutions (“NEES”) to recognize that Northeast Direct, a natural gas pipeline project proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LLC, (“the Company”), is under pre-file review by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (“FERC”).

NEES is an organization comprised of economic stakeholders, including conservation land owners, and is committed to investigating and providing sound and thorough energy infrastructure analysis and advocacy regarding the economics and routing of energy transportation projects in the Northeast. NEES is concerned about the effect of energy infrastructure development as it relates to economic vitality and environmental impacts. The mission of NEES is to thoroughly analyze and advocate for responsible energy infrastructure development by means of public education and formal advocacy. The participants of NEES include former DOE senior management and non-partisan professionals who hold sophisticated expertise regarding industry, market, municipal, and grassroots concerns. NEES intends to use its assets to eruditely inform FERC throughout this matter.

During the pre-filing stage of the FERC proceeding, NEES looks forward to thoughtful input from other stakeholders and the public at-large. NEES will also work with relevant state agencies and regulatory bodies throughout the Northeast. Further, NEES will pursue the Company’s promise of being open to adjusting its proposal during the pre-filing process. In fact, NEES has already reached out to the Company. Should NEES directly or indirectly learn the Company’s promise to be a vaporous one, NEES will duly inform the FERC and all relevant agencies for appropriate action.

Independently, by way of its members, NEES has immediate and direct interests that will be impacted by the proposed project and, as such, NEES will be an aggressive participant in the pre-filing concerns, in a detailed fashion, that are potentially impacted by the proposed project. Such concerns include, but are not limited to:

- Increasing demand for natural gas in the region versus peak demand during certain weather events;
- The current ability of distribution companies’ to meet non-peak load demands;
- Pipeline capacity and pricing for end-users;
- Developer guarantees of lower energy costs as a condition precedent;
- Optimal pipeline-to-port routes for exporting natural gas to new and expanding markets;
- States entering the pipeline capacity market;
- Energy efficiency and leak remediation, versus new infrastructure;
- Requirement of “de-bottlenecking” before pipeline expansion;
- Federal protection of conservation lands and watersheds;
- Natural gas for thermal use versus generation needs;
- Increasing storage capacity for natural gas and liquefied natural gas;
- Pipelines safety;
- Segmentation and cumulative impacts analysis, including industry activities related to natural gas production and processing; and,
- Archeological protection.

Analysis of these concerns will help address the uncertainty and confusion surrounding the need for the

Company's proposed project in a regional context. Therefore, at this stage, NEES welcomes any available analysis-the Company can provide-regarding regional demand. Also; the Company-should - provide initial information about how their project will meet end-user needs. Further, the Company needs to answer this question: Will the proposed project meet only thermal energy requirements? In addition, the Company should thoroughly and soon respond to the broad belief that the proposed project, including any embedded future expansion, is intended for customers outside of the Northeast.

While NEES anticipates industrious, direct discussions with the Company about the questions and concerns raised herein, we also look forward to being fully engaged in the FERC's process. Thank you for the opportunity to provide this correspondence.

Sincerely,

Vincent Devito

**20141029-5154(29883326).pdf**

**COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS · EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF ENERGY & ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS**  
Department of Conservation and Recreation

October 29, 2014

BY ELECTRONIC FILING

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose:

The Massachusetts Department of Conservation and Recreation hereby provides notice to both the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC") and Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. of the Department's intention to actively participate in the pre-filing process for the proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project ("Project"). Consistent with the initial comments dated September 16, 2014 and filed with FERC by the Secretary of the Massachusetts Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs, the Department intends to fully engage in the public process and have meaningful discussions about agency-specific concerns and issues identified during the pre-filing process.

Sincerely,

Thomas J. LaRosa  
Deputy General Counsel

**20141029-5169(29883343).pdf**

*originally Scanned "letter from Northern Middlesex Council of Governments"*

**Northern Middlesex Council of Governments**

October 29, 2014

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.; Proposed Northeast Energy Direct

Project, Docket No. PF14-22-000

Dear Secretary Bose:

The Northern Middlesex Council of Governments (NMCOG) hereby provides notice of its intent to participate in the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's pre-filing process for the Northeast Direct Energy Project. NMCOG was established in 1963 under Chapter 40B of the Massachusetts General Laws and has a statutory review role under the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (MEPA), 301 CMR 11.00. As one of thirteen regional planning agencies in Massachusetts, NMCOG is providing technical assistance to its affected member municipalities relative to the land use, economic, environmental and energy impacts associated with the proposed project.

Sincerely,

Beverly Woods  
Executive Director

Cc: NMCOG Councilors

Dracut, Dunstable, Pepperell, Tewksbury, Tyngsborough:

-Town Managers/Administrators

-Boards of Selectmen

Representative Colleen Garry

Representative Sheila Harrington

Representative James Miceli

Representative James Lyons

Senator Eileen Donoghue

Senator Barry Finegold

Congressman John Tierney

Congresswoman Niki Tsongas

**20141030-4002(29886429).pdf**

From: Turnbull, Marissa [mailto:mturnbull@mptn-nsn.gov]

Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2014 2:40 PM

To: 'rbrodeur@louisberger.com'; Paul Friedman

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

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC: Proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project in Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Connecticut, New York, and Pennsylvania. FERC Docket No. PF14-22-000

The Mashantucket (Western) Pequot Tribal Historic Preservation Office has received your letter dated October 21, 2014 seeking our input of possible sites of religious or cultural significance that could be affected by the proposed NED project. As our tribe historically frequented and lived in the locations proposed for this project, sites of religious and cultural significance may be affected, specifically the new lateral pipeline to be built in Connecticut. Please keep me informed on developments as they commence, as well as the cultural resource surveys by Louis Berger once they are completed.

The Mashantucket (Western) Pequot Tribe appreciates the opportunity to have reviewed and provide input on this proposed project.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Marissa

Marissa Turnbull | Tribal Historic Preservation Officer  
Natural Resources Protection & Regulatory Affairs

Mashantucket Pequot Tribal Nation  
550 Trolley Line Blvd., P.O. Box 3202, Mashantucket, CT 06338-3202  
T: 860.396.7570 IF: 860.396.6745  
mturnbull@mptn-nsn.gov

**20141030-4003(29886541).pdf**

*originally Scanned "letter from Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe, Tribal History Preservation Office"*

**Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe**  
Tribal Historic Preservation Office  
Environmental Review Comments

October 20, 2014

Kimberly Bose  
Secretary  
F.E.R.C.  
888 First St.N .E.,  
Washington, D.C. 20426

RE: Project Docket Number (PF 14-22-000) Tennessee Gas Pipeline ce., LLC  
Proposed N.E. Energy Direct Project

Dear Kimberly Bose,

The Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe's Historic Preservation Office acknowledges the importance of timely consultations and the clear need to set precedence with regards to our expectations in the protection of cultural resources through consultation. It is important to establish protocol and procedures to follow in these pragmatic consultations with Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (Kinder Morgan Company) and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commissions' oversight of the tribes involved in this Section 106 "Undertaking".

We have several concerns with the project moving forward, and encourage a meeting with Michael Letson to discuss our involvement in all Gas pipeline projects classified as federal undertakings. Our primary concerns at this time are focused on the protocol procedures as defined in the Draft Unanticipated Discoveries Plan. Issues that seem to warrant discussions in order to clearly delineate the roles of consulting parties in regard to potential unanticipated findings and the notification process as well as monitoring of possible sites/burials. It suggests that all oversight and determination of significant sites is being delegated to the proponent which is unacceptable.

We welcome a F.E.R.C. representative's presence at a future meeting, to discuss the required sequence in which notification and response letters are expected.

The Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe's historic preservation department is dedicated to protecting Native American burials and remains first and foremost. We require monitoring of all ground disturbances as they relate to archaeological assessments, surveys, reconnaissance and recoveries whether terrestrial or marine in the future.

Our Office encourages sitting down with all parties involved in this process to clarify and rectify protocol procedures with regard to the Draft Unanticipated Discoveries Plan and our involvement in the mandated review process.

In closing, we look forward to meeting with the proponents to resolve these issues as soon as possible so that the project remains on schedule. I'd be happy to respond to any further questions or concerns that you may have regarding this project.

In Thanksgiving,

Mashpee Wampanoag THPO

Cc: Brona Simon, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, SHPO

Jim Peters, Commission on Indian Affairs  
Greg Dubell, PAL  
Eric Tomasi, FERC  
Michael Letson, Kinder Morgan

483 Great Neck Rd. South, Mashpee, MA 02649 ! 508.477.0208\*102 I Rpeters@mwtribe.com

**20141031-4005(29890453).pdf**

Hand written card, Heidi Graff, 111 Sunridge Rd, Rindge, NH 03461, opposing

**20141103-0022(29898345).pdf**

**Northern Middlesex Council of Governments**

October 29, 2014

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose:

The Northern Middlesex Council of Governments (NMCOG) hereby provides notice of its intent to participate in the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's pre-filing process for the Northeast Direct Energy Project. NMCOG was established in 1963 under Chapter 408 of the Massachusetts General Laws and has a statutory review role under the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (MEPA), 301CMR 11.00. As one of thirteen regional planning agencies in Massachusetts, NMCOG is providing technical assistance to its affected member municipalities relative to the land use, economic, environmental and energy impacts associated with the proposed project.

Sincerely,

Beverly Woods  
Executive Director

Cc: NMCOG Councilors

Dracut, Dunstable, Pepperell, Tewksbury, Tyngsborough:  
-Town Managers/Administrators  
-Boards of Selectmen  
Representative Colleen Garry  
Representative Sheila Harrington  
Representative James Miceli  
Representative James Lyons  
Senator Eileen Donoghue  
Senator Barry Finegold  
Congressman John Tierney  
Congresswoman Niki Tsongas

**20141103-0023(29898330).pdf**

**Bolton Conservation Commission**

October 29, 2014

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

Request to Use Pre-filing Procedures for Proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Secretary Bose:

We are writing in opposition to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline (TGP) Company's September 15, 2014, request to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) to use the pre-filing procedure for TGP's proposed Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project and the Commission's subsequent acceptance of that request. The Bolton Conservation Commission is writing in opposition to TGP's NED project.

The residents of Bolton passed a resolution on August 28, 2014 opposing this project as a community, as did a number of contiguous towns. We stand with our town as stewards of the land, and ask FERC to reject TGP's plan. There are many causes for our concern, including:

- ~ Loss of protected and environmentally important land that is a large component of our community and its heritage
- ~ The use of vague and outdated maps
- ~ Lack of transparency
- ~ Respect for state and local laws
- ~ Questionable necessity of the TGP project

Loss of protected and environmentally important land - The parcels of conservation land and farmland in Bolton protected by Massachusetts Conservation Restrictions and Agricultural Preservation Restrictions that would be traversed by the pipeline are significant to both Bolton and New England's environmental and cultural history. "Massachusetts Department of Conservation and Recreation and the Freedom's Way Heritage Association have collaborated to bring the Heritage Landscape Inventory program (HLI) (1) to communities" Bolton falls within the HLI project and is home to some of the most pristine landscapes in central Massachusetts. Many in Bolton list the town's abundance of open space and protected lands as a strong influence on their desire to live in this community. Many have given of their time, talent and treasure to purchase and protect land as well as secure agricultural/conservation restrictions. A decision by FERC to allow TGP to clear cut a 100 foot path through the heart of these lands, thus circumventing state and local laws designed to protect these lands, would be devastating to all of our efforts fostering indifference toward future opportunities to preserve our landscape.

The use of vague and outdated maps - TGP used 26 year old, outdated maps for creating what it claims to be a 21 century solution. We join others in stating that it is extremely misleading for TGP to use 1988 USGS topographical maps for their official pre-filing proposal when MassGIS maps are current and readily available. Without accurate maps, it is impossible for our community to properly consider the ecological impact, including the number of vernal pools and endangered species habitats that will be affected by this proposed project. We believe TGP's use of outdated maps is a clear violation of 18 C.F.R.157.21(d)(4) which requires a "detailed description of the project, including location maps and plot plans to scale showing all major plant components, that will serve as the initial discussion point for stakeholder review."

Lack of transparency — On June 26, 2014, TGP representatives attended a Selectmen's Meeting to answer questions from the commission and the community regarding this project. Most questions were submitted to TGP in advance and many had already been asked of TGP in other regional meetings, yet they openly refused to provide answers to many of these questions. Some unanswered questions include:

- ~ How does TGP propose to prevent the introduction of invasive species while working in protected lands?
- ~ How many pumping stations would be needed both now and in the future? What would the effects of

noise and heat from these stations have on wildlife?

~ How would the TGP propose to maintain the cleared land without the use of pesticides that would be extremely dangerous and detrimental to our conservation and wetlands? At this meeting, TGP refused to give us an accurate map of the proposed path that would cut through our town. This was the number one question submitted. TGP brought a project engineer to this meeting who did not know the size of pipe that is proposed to go through our town, nor that the proposed new pipe was of a larger diameter than the pipe it would be branching off of (which he admitted himself didn't make much sense). The fact that TGP's engineer did not know basic details of the project that our own citizens were able to uncover indicates to the Commission that this meeting was for 'show'nd served no real purpose of trying to engage/inform the public, rather it is being falsely used to claim that outreach has been done.

TGP hired The NLS Group to acquire contract rights, including approval to "survey" the municipal conservation land. The contractor was not given the authority to directly meet with the Commission to discuss any of the specifics about the survey. We were not provided with information about access either by vehicle or foot; what damage their might be to endangered species habitat, stonewalls, existing trails, and vegetation; who would conduct the survey; and how any evaluation of endangered species, forest value, archeological artifacts would be obtained. Neither TGP nor the consultant provided any information on how any damage to these municipal resources would be restored. TGP's approval form provided no guarantees that cleanup and restoration would occur in any form. We found TGP and their consultants to be less than forthcoming with their intentions. Respect for State and Local laws — Extrapolating from the information provided to Bolton to date, the Commission finds the proposed TGP line will be located within riparian corridors, cross streams, ponds, vegetated wetlands, and vernal pool habitat. The line will cross land owned and maintained by the Town of Bolton as conservation land under Article 97 of the Massachusetts Constitution, land owned and maintained by the Bolton Conservation Trust (a local land trust), private property with conservation restrictions and agricultural restrictions also protected under Article 97. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts (including the Town of Bolton) must determine if this NED project meets the criteria for the "exceptional circumstance" that would allow it to dispose of Massachusetts Article 97 land. Real estate of equal natural and monetary value would need to be found to ensure "no net loss of Article 97 lands under the ownership and control of the Commonwealth and its political subdivisions." In order to maintain the balance of these assets within this municipality, the Conservation Commission of Bolton, would need adequate time to explore and present the options available &om the limited pool of potential open spaces.(2)

Questionable necessity of the TGP project - MA EOEEA Secretary Bartlett proposes in her letter (September 16, 2014) to FERC that it is unclear whether the capacity of this pipeline is needed. The proposed New England portion of the TGP NED Project would deliver far more capacity than is needed to meet projected energy or power generation needs. An executive whose company owns gas-fired power plants in New England recently told the Wall Street Journal that proposing a massive pipeline-building program for our region is like "trying to kill a cockroach with a sledgehammer". Massachusetts has a number of viable, far less invasive options for meeting its future energy needs (options that include both renewable and fossil fuels). These include but are not limited to;

~ Fixing the leaks in existing pipelines in our region could improve energy efficiency substantially.

~ To address "peak" energy needs in the summer and the winter, "peak shaving" strategies can be improved. These include:

o Promoting new energy storage solutions to manage peak demand such as Electric Thermal Storage powered by air source heat pumps

o Switching to smart meters to create a market incentive for homes to run appliances during non-peak hours and for firms to invest in equipment that helps them manage peak usage

o Increasing storage of liquefied natural gas (LNG) at power generation facilities (LNG currently provides 30% of daily peak supply in the winter for several local gas utilities for heating fuel and provides about 10%ofNew England's total annual gas supply)

o Implementing innovations in the future such as distributed storage using electric

~ Programs that subsidize residential conversion of oil heating systems to natural gas can be scaled back, and some of those funds can be redirected to weatherization programs for homes that have oil or propane heat.

~ Lifting the cap on the amount of energy that can be sold back to the grid by customers with their own renewable energy systems — particularly by municipalities — would allow much of generation capacity lost when coal burning plants are closed down to be replaced by renewable energy. This cap was already reached and raised once earlier in 2014, due to the success of programs like the one in Gloucester, MA.

There is evidence that shale gas in Pennsylvania and New York will only be plentiful and cheap for a few years. Already, exploration is not profitable at present gas prices, so the promise of cheap gas prices after these pipelines are built may not come to fruition. Over the period from 2020 to 2030, shale drilling in New York may only be profitable at gas prices that are two to four times what we currently pay, making this the least desirable option for our energy needs that may prove to be a financial burden to our citizens.

As stewards of the land held in trust for the citizens of Bolton, regulators of waterways, wetlands and wild-life habitat, our Commission cannot, in good conscious endorse any aspect of this proposed plan, and we ask FERC to reject this Northeast Energy Direct Project.

For the Bolton Conservation Commission,

Carol A. Gumbart

Conservation Administrator

CC: Congressman James McGovern

Congresswoman Nicki Tsongas

Secretary Maeve Vallely Bartlett

Mass. Representative Kate Hogan

Mass. Senator Jennifer Flanagan

Bolton Town Administrator Donald Lowe

(1) <http://www.mass.eov/eea/docs/dcr/stewardshio/histland/recon-reoorts/holton.odf>

(2) <http://www.mass.rtoov/eea/docs/eea/dcs/dcsarticle97.odf>

### **20141103-5001(29893905).pdf**

Patricia Larson, Orange, MA.

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

There seem to be many flaws in the pre-filing application made by Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline in September to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. Even with outdated maps and a call for a delay due to a study of energy needs undertaken by the state of Massachusetts, the application was approved. This approval seems to show no respect for the work being done by the state on projected energy needs and the people's need to have more details about the proposed route. On October 15, 2014 Massachusetts Department of Energy Resources started a process with Synapse as consultants to do a Low Demand Analysis which will evaluate both the demand side and distributed resources that could reduce our over-reliance on natural gas. I do not know what this analysis will show, but it is possible that there is no need for a new 30-36" high pressure natural gas pipeline running across western and northern Massachusetts. This needs to be considered. Kinder Morgan has said in public meetings that some of the gas could go to Canada and then onto the international market. If this is the case this will not help with lowering prices in Massachusetts and could actually have the opposite effect. All this should be considered by FERC.

Besides the question of need and economics, there is the issue of environmental impact. The proposed pipeline crosses some of the state's most pristine land in the northern tier of Massachusetts. Protected land, wet-

lands, both public and private are threatened by the proposed pipeline. If Massachusetts is going to be able to protect land and preserve open space for future generations, the taking of land by Kinder Morgan/TGP is unacceptable.

Thank you for considering these comments from a citizen of Massachusetts.

Sincerely,

Patricia Larson  
173 Athol Road, Orange, MA 01364  
plarson24@hotmail.com (978-575-1226)

**20141103-5009(29893913).pdf**

Emily Kirkland, San Francisco, CA.

By building new gas pipelines, we're deepening our dependence on fossil fuels, at just the moment when we need to be transitioning to renewables.

**20141103-5057(29894086).pdf**

*originally Scanned letter from Nashua River Watershed Association*

**NASHUA RIVER WATERSHED ASSOCIATION**

*Protecting our water, our land, our communities*

October 30, 2014

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

RE: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, PF14-22-000

Dear Secretary Bose:

The Nashua River Watershed Association (NRWA) respectfully requests that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) conducts the most rigorous review of Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's (TGP) proposed Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project PF-1422. The NRWA strenuously objects to the proposed placement of greenfields pipelines on permanently protected lands whether owned by federal, state, or municipal governments or private land trusts as well as on other unprotected properties which contain sensitive natural resources including those lands which are within state-designated Areas of Critical Environmental Concern. [As a reference, we are attaching an earlier letter sent by NRWA to the Massachusetts Attorney General which more fully describes the environmental problems we foresee.]

If it is determined that this project is to move forward, there will be massive changes and disturbances to the watershed area that the NRWA's mission charges us to protect and defend. The results of the pipeline, lateral pipelines and compressor stations within the Nashua River watershed -- including the crossing of several state-designated Outstanding Resource Waters, public water supplies, high-yield aquifers and innumerable wetlands -- will permanently negatively impact irreplaceable sensitive natural resource areas. Consequently, the NRWA will be actively focused on the pre-filing process. Needless to say, we urge FERC--if it is determined that there is indeed a need for this NED pipeline -- to fully scope our myriad concerns via a full Environmental Impact Study that will need to be addressed in any future FERC certificate application for this unwanted and seemingly unwarranted project.

Sincerely,

Lucy B. Wallace  
NRWA President

**NASHUA RIVER WATERSHED ASSOCIATION**

*Protecting our water, our land, our communities*

May 28, 2014

Martha Coakley  
Attorney General  
One Ashburton Place  
Boston, MA 02108-1518

Dear Ms. Coakley:

The Board of Directors of the Nashua River Watershed Association is writing to ask for your assistance in preventing Kinder Morgan from proceeding with the currently proposed route for the Tennessee Gas pipeline in northern Massachusetts, which would cross through the Nashua River watershed towns of Ashburnham, Ashby, Dunstable, Groton, Pepperell, and Townsend. The proposed route of this 30 inch or larger high pressure pipeline transmitting natural gas to the metro-Boston area - in addition to several proposed lateral pipelines -- would largely pass through open spaces including wetlands, water bodies, and conservation lands of exceptionally high natural resource value to the Commonwealth. Our primary concern with this pipeline is the negative impacts it would have to these critically sensitive environmental areas, especially when there are alternative routes that could use existing rights of way with far less irreversible impact.

Egregiously, the negative environmental impacts would be occurring in a region where there are many tracts of conservation land, often purchased with public dollars expressly to protect their natural resources. Some of the conservation properties through which the proposed pipeline has been shown to pass include the Ashburnham, Willard Brook, and Townsend State Forests; the Nissitissit, Squannacook River and Townsend Hill Wildlife Management Areas; and the Heald Pond and Keyes Conservation Areas. Some tracts through which the pipeline would pass are encumbered by Conservation Restrictions which legally and permanently prohibit disturbance.

Furthermore, the pipeline's proposed route bisects the two largest Massachusetts state-designated Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs): the Squannacook and Petapawag ACECs. The Squannacook ACEC has 23 state-listed rare species, and the Petapawag has 16 state-listed rare species occurring within it.

Both of these ACECs are defined by their extraordinary natural habitat and highly significant drinking water supply and groundwater aquifer resources. The two ACECs include much BioMap Core Habitat and Supporting Natural Landscape. The designation of these ACECs as authorized under 301 CMR 12.00 (promulgated by the Secretary of the Executive Office of Environmental Affairs pursuant to M.G.L. c. 21A, s. 2(7)), resulted from an unprecedented amount of positive public input from residents of the involved towns, including Ashby, Dunstable, Groton, Pepperell, and Townsend.

Additionally, the proposed pipeline would cross two state-designated Outstanding Resource Waters - the Squannacook and the Nissitissit Rivers-which are protected by the 1975 Squannacook-Nissitissit Rivers Sanctuary Act (M.G.L. 132A: 17) and are cold water fisheries. The pipeline would also cross the Nashua River. Sections of these three rivers -- Nashua, Squannacook and Nissitissit -- are currently being considered for Study for inclusion in the federal National Park Service Partnership Wild and Scenic Rivers system given their high-quality characteristics and broad public support.

The proposed pipeline corridor would be at least 50 feet wide and would be kept free of vegetation above ground level in perpetuity. Clear cutting of the land would result in permanent habitat loss and forest fragmentation, and, because of this, interior forest wildlife species that are dependent on contiguous forest blocks will be endangered. While in certain instances creating a clear corridor can have benefits for those species seeking forest edges, a corridor is not acceptable along the pipeline route currently proposed. Loss of forest cover is well known to have a detrimental impact on water quality. Surface water and groundwater

flows will be altered which will adversely impact the numerous wetlands, rivers and streams the pipeline will cross.

During the construction phase of the proposed pipeline project (including access roads and compressor stations), numerous negative environmental impacts are likely to occur despite best efforts to avoid them, especially with regard to stream crossings and wetland involvement. Sedimentation and other inevitable runoff problems associated with erosion would be an anticipated consequence. Pollutants may be discharged during construction or as a result of accidents, including methane leaks. Such impacts would be greatly lessened or eliminated by routing the pipeline through existing rights of way, such as along roadways or by other utility easements as Kinder Morgan is now proposing to do for the section of this pipeline to run through New York state.

The Nashua River watershed's northern lands and water bodies are of particular environmental importance to the Commonwealth, as attested to by the two ACECs. The proposed pipeline route would be irrevocably harmful to public and private lands of remarkable ecological sensitivity. If it is determined that a new natural gas pipeline is essential and is in the best interest of the citizens of our Commonwealth, the Nashua River Watershed Association will steadfastly oppose the current proposed route, and urges that Kinder Morgan be directed to utilize alternative routes less damaging to the environment such as existing infrastructural corridors.

Sincerely,

Lucy B. Wallace  
President

Cc: Governor Deval Patrick

US Senator Elizabeth Warren

US Senator Edward Markey

US Representative James McGovern

US Representative Niki Tsongas

MA State Senator Stephen Brewer

MA State Senator Eileen Donoghue

MA State Senator Jennifer Flanagan

MA State Representative Sheila Harrington

MA State Representative Jonathan Zlotnik

MA Senator Benjamin Downing, Joint Committee on Telecommunications, Utilities and Energy

MA Representative John Keenan, Joint Committee on Telecommunications, Utilities and Energy

Richard Sullivan, MA Secretary Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs

Robert O'COIIDor, MA Director of Land and Forest Policy

Ann Berwick, Chair, MA Department of Public Utilities

Mark Sylvia, Commissioner, MA Department of Energy Resources

David Cash, Commissioner, MA Department of Environmental Protection

Jack Murray, Commissioner, MA Department of Conservation and Recreation

Mary Griffin, Commissioner, MA Department of Fish and Game

Susan Reid, Director Massachusetts Conservation Law Foundation

Henry Tepper, President, Massachusetts Audubon Society

Charles Knox, Executive Director, Massachusetts Land Trust Coalition

Eugene Benson, Executive Director, Massachusetts Association of Conservation Commissions

Robert Durand, former MA Secretary of Exec. Office of Environmental Affairs

Town Administrators (Ashburnham, Ashby, Dunstable, Groton, Pepperell, Townsend)

Conservation Agents (Ashburnham, Ashby, Dunstable, Groton, Pepperell, Townsend)

592 Main Srreer, Groton, MA 01450-1230 P 978.448.0299 f 978.448.0941 [www.nashuariverwarershed.org](http://www.nashuariverwarershed.org)

**20141103-5062(29896258).pdf**

Janet Miller, Concord, MA.

I am very concerned about the proposals by Kinder Morgan and others to build new pipelines to transport gas from fracking sources. At a time when it is becoming clearer and clearer that it is essential that we act now to reduce emissions of carbon dioxide, the idea that more infrastructure is needed should not be even considered. Natural gas has been touted as an energy source that is more environmentally friendly than coal. While that is true when you only consider the combustion of the two fuels, it is not true in that substantial amounts of methane are released at the wells and the input of energy to extract natural gas through fracking. Moreover, the demand for large amounts of water and the injection of unknown chemicals into the wells during the fracking process may well have substantial environmental damage.

The other aspect of the Kinder Morgan proposal is the route that they have proposed for the pipeline. They plan to cut wide corridors through land that has been set aside for conservation as well as productive farmland. We value that land in Massachusetts and do not want to see it degraded by building a pipeline.

For these reasons, I request that you do not approve their request or that of any other entity to build a pipeline in Massachusetts or in other locales.

**20141103-5063(29896263).pdf**

Sue Felshin, Concord, MA.

Dear FERC,

Natural gas is not clean energy. Maybe it's cleaner than coal -- or maybe not, once you count methane leaks. But either way, natural gas produces too much greenhouse gas. Please stop approving pipelines! Yes, it's expensive to insulate existing buildings, seal their air leaks, and replace their inefficient and oversized heating systems, but that's a better use of money than building pipelines -- it'll reduce carbon emissions, provide much more employment, and save money as well as lives in the long run. Yes, renewable energy is currently expensive, but only because we subsidize fossil fuel through tax breaks and by ignoring their pollution. Yes, New England is in an energy crunch this winter, but we couldn't build a pipeline fast enough to fix that.

Please do not approve the Kinder Morgan pipeline.

Thank you for your attention.

**20141103-5073(29896304).pdf**

Laura borth, Weymouth, MA.

The need for these pipelines cannot be justified in the long term. The destruction it will cause will greatly outweigh any possible benefits. By digging up the ground you impose habitat restrictions and destruction on species that may not be able to adapt. Gas pipes leak and poison surrounding water resources. The land that would be used for the pipeline could be better used for conservation or solar power. New pipelines aren't necessary, they just undo any progress we have made in stabilizing the climate. How long will the pipelines be used? When you run out of fracked gas, what will you do with the pipelines? Would you want to live directly next to a pipeline that is likely to leak and pollute the air around you? Invest is something long term and sustainable, not something that is going to run out in the near future. Building these pipelines will only lead to more climate chaos, you don't have to be a scientist to understand that. These pipelines are dirty and unsustainable, just look at past examples. If you build them, how will you assure the public that they won't leak? What will you do to maintain and stabilize the surrounding habitats? Don't be greedy, we all share the same planet, so let's take care of it together.

**20141103-5077(29894102).pdf**

Bouzha Cookman, Concord, MA.

Please stop all additional fossil fuel infrastructure in the United States and work to encourage renewables,

building code changes, conservation, and all other methods to stop our dependency on fossil fuels -- NOW  
Thank you

**20141103-5108(29894139).pdf**

Kenneth weiss, Framingham, MA.

Natural gas, Which May which may burn 50% cleaner than coal, is detrimental to the environment if it escapes to the atmosphere. Methane is 34 times more potent as a greenhouse gas and stays in the environment for 100 years or more.

It is estimated that about 10% of natural gas escapes into the atmosphere during its production and transportation. If you multiply multiply this 10% by 34 you get a product which is 400% worse than coal. NASA Released satellite images that are showing the methane is leaking across the United States and an alarming rate. Climate change is a serious issue and a serious challenge for our future generation and us. Natural gas is not a bridge fuel it should stay in the ground. There will be more public resistance to fossil fuel infrastructure. All these investments in the new pipelines our investments that are not going to see the light. Because our future is not with fossil fuels but with clean energy.

We can address the shortage of natural gas in Massachusetts by conservation. It is clear that what is motivating Kender Morgan and Spectra energy is the opportunity to export natural gas to other countries and not addressing the shortages in Massachusetts.

Please withdraw your support from the new natural gas infrastructure and support new energy which will be beneficial for us and future generations.

**20141103-5154(29894211).pdf**

Atid Kimelman, Summit, NJ.

With the current degree of uncertainty around the true leakage rates of methane, there is no clear or certain climate benefit to shifting from coal and petroleum to natural gas, particularly when evaluated over 20 years rather than 100 years.

Any proposal for new gas infrastructure must, at minimum, demonstrate:

- that the expansion of gas will not violate the legally required GHG reductions in Massachusetts for 2020 and 2050, along with interim requirements for 2030 and 2040 that have not yet been set. (Some research shows the contrary, that the expansion of natural gas will very likely violate the GWSA).
- that it is impossible to meet our energy needs through aggressive deployment and use of conservation measures, increased efficiency, renewable generation capacity, transmission, demand response and other load-balancing techniques, without new gas generation and pipeline capacity.

Studies commissioned by NESCOE showed that if current levels of Massachusetts state energy efficiency programs continue, there is no need for additional natural gas infrastructure even with economic growth taken into account,

**20141103-5172(29894242).pdf**

Takashi Tada, GROTON, MA.

TO: Kimberly Bose, Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

FROM: **Groton Conservation Commission**

DATE: November 3, 2014

SUBJECT: Opposing the Proposed Tennessee Gas (Kinder-Morgan) Pipeline

Dear :

Massachusetts and the town of Groton are fortunate in having significant open space preserved for the ben-

efit and enjoyment of the public and the preservation of our natural heritage. That natural space depends in no small part on the good stewardship and selfless volunteer efforts of members of the public to preserve for us and our children the benefits of an intact environment.

Over many years the citizens of Groton have made conscious decisions to preserve our natural heritage. Within the borders of our community, and all towns along the proposed pipeline route, there exist significant delicate natural areas. These areas are home to many species that are threatened or endangered. The pipeline route as proposed would destroy a 100' wide corridor through many of these environmentally sensitive areas. The construction would necessitate the destruction of wetlands, vernal pools, forested areas and other areas of high ecological value. After construction a permanent 50' wide right of way would be maintained in perpetuity by the use of mechanical and chemical means, thus eliminating the natural environments that existed prior to the pipelines construction. Once these sensitive areas have been destroyed or fragmented they cannot be restored.

There exist alternate routes along existing pipeline paths and rights of way that would preserve our environmentally sensitive areas as they would traverse existing disturbed corridors. That such an alternate route would entail additional time and expense is not in doubt, however, preservation of our irreplaceable natural heritage should be considered as a high, if not top, priority of any proposed project. The Groton Conservation Commission hopes that FERC will strongly consider the opinions and suggestions of other environmental groups, including the Massachusetts Audubon Society, The Nature Conservancy, and the Conservation Law Foundation, who also oppose this project.

The Groton Conservation Commission is not opposed to delivery of natural gas to Massachusetts via a pipeline, but with the choice of the proposed route. The Groton Conservation Commission therefore cannot support and so opposes the Tennessee Gas Pipeline (Kinder Morgan Energy Partners) project as proposed and urges the members of FERC to give the highest consideration to an alternate pipeline corridor that would not impact our environmentally sensitive areas.

Respectfully,

Groton Conservation Commission  
John Smegelski, Chairman  
Peter Morrison, Vice Chairman  
Susan Black, Clerk  
Renna Sweezy, Member  
Marshall E. Giguere, Member  
Bruce Easom, Member  
Mary Metzger, Member

**20141103-5173(29894235).pdf**

Kathleen Lique, Salem, MA.

Encouraging the use of natural gas rather than aggressively pursuing installation of alternative energy is a poor choice. We are only beginning to learn how destructive fracking is to our environment. Many in Eastern PA have lost their homes to fracking in nearby sites. In Texas and Oklahoma and many other places earthquakes have increase significantly. Water is being poisoned by chemicals that are used to frack. I strongly urge you not to approve either of these pipelines to protect the wellbeing of all.

**20141104-5000(29894264).pdf**

claire silvers, cambridge, MA.

I am writing to urge the FERC to deny these permits.

It is clear that we need to face the grim realities of climate change. The last thing we should be doing is to increase fossil fuel infrastructure. This would be like continuing to build more and bigger highway systems

while claiming to support reduction in use of fossil fuel powered cars. We need to work in a concerted manner to increase reliance on renewables and increase energy efficiency across the board. Any pipeline-related work should focus on current infrastructure management, to eliminate methane leakage.

Our state has laudable--and reachable--goals. But more natural gas pipelines would provide NO climate benefit and would most certainly violate the GWSA.

**20141104-5001(29894265).pdf**

Phyllis Duff, Worcester, MA.

To whom it may concern:

My name is Phyllis Duff, I am a Senior in college and am working now to receive my Bachelors degree as well as my educators initial license endorsement. I am hoping to one day become a middle school Science teacher. To earn my degree, I have to complete one hundred hours teaching in a school. I am working now in an inner city public school, and I have become extremely passionate about influencing my students to be passionate about science as well as become honest and just people.

Building new gas pipelines is injustice. My middle school students understand this. These gas pipelines will import and export 'natural gas' throughout the State of Massachusetts, and they will ultimately be burned, and will enter the atmosphere and will be a more potent green house gas. This will just be another step to increasing global temperature, which will ultimately lead to climatic chaos.

My students families, who come from all over the world, will be impacted. As a pre-service educator, it is my responsibility to protect my students, and to help them in developing skills to make the 'right' choices. Playing a hand in destroying their families homes, means I must protect them against these pipelines.

You must begin to listen to the scientists, the religious groups, the mothers, the teachers, the doctors, the nutritionist, the children, all of the people who are proving and stating that climatic chaos is happening; injustice is happening. By destroying the families of my students, you are destroying the future engineers, doctors, and politicians. You are destroying the future Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

Please, do not let these pipelines come through Massachusetts. Think about justice.

**20141104-5180(29898466).pdf**

**Franklin Regional Council of Governments**

November 4, 2014

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

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

RE: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., PF14-22-000

Dear Secretary Bose:

The Franklin Regional Council of Governments (FRCOG), the Regional Planning Agency for the 26 municipalities of Franklin County, appreciates the opportunity to submit these preliminary comments in conjunction with the pre-filing phase of Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's (TGP) proposed Northeast Energy Direct pipeline (Project). FRCOG hereby notifies both FERC and TGP of its intention to actively participate in the pre-filing phase of FERC's natural gas pipeline proceedings in order to preserve the rights of its member local governments.

The Project as proposed would be the largest natural gas pipeline ever to be built in Franklin County, Massachusetts. In particular, TGP proposes to construct and operate in Franklin County approximately 38 miles of new pipeline, as large as 36 inches in diameter, capable of transporting up to 2.2 billion cubic feet per day of

natural gas. In addition, a compression station and metering facilities are proposed to be located in Franklin County. The project would extend from the Franklin County border with Hampshire County at Plainfield, Massachusetts, across Franklin County, to the border of Worcester County at Athol, impacting nine Franklin County towns. The proposed pipeline will impact rare and endangered species habitat, permanently protected open space subject to Article 97 of the Massachusetts Constitution, prime farmland, Zone II recharge areas for public drinking water supplies, wetlands, ponds and rivers. The Project is not consistent with regional and State energy and sustainability plans that call for an increase in energy efficiency and renewable energy to meet electricity and heating demands rather than an increase in fossil fuel use.

Given the unprecedented scale of the Project that will impact many critical natural resources on both public lands and private property as well as the implications for long term energy policy, the interests of the FRCOG and its member town's need to be fully addressed. In light of those interests, the FRCOG intends to be an active participant in the pre-filing process and requests that the FERC require TGP to fully scope the environmental issues that should be addressed in any future certificate application for this Project. We also request that the FERC require a comprehensive analysis of alternatives to building the gas pipeline to address the short term winter reliability issues as part of the application process.

Sincerely,

Linda Dunlavy, Executive Director

CC.: Allen Fore, Kinder Morgan

Senator Stan Rosenberg

Senator Benjamin Downing

Representative Stephen Kulik

Representative Denise Andrews

Representative Paul Mark

Governor Patrick

Secretary Maeve Bartlett, EOEEA

**20141104-5192(29898482).pdf**

Benjamin Thompson, Allston, MA.

Building new pipeline infrastructure is unnecessary and would contribute to the climate crisis

**20141105-0072(29901949).pdf**

*{10 identical letters, each signed by a different individual, were bundled into this single file}*

September 20, 2014

Chairwoman Cheryl A. LaFleur

888 First Street NE

Washington DC, 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Expansion Project

Dear Chairwoman Cheryl A. LaFleur,

I am writing to express my concern with and opposition to the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Direct project. Docket No. PF14-22-000

As a resident of Massachusetts, through which the proposed pipeline is routed, I am directly affected by its potential consequences, including the risk of gas leak-related explosion and contamination, as well as decline in property values and an increase in insurance costs. Furthermore, as currently planned, this project will cross sensitive conservation lands, wetlands, and rivers leaving a permanent scar through some of Massachusetts' most picturesque open spaces and putting many of our towns' primary sources of drinking water at risk of contamination.

The effort to meet Massachusetts' ongoing energy needs should not adversely impact residents' quality of life, nor come at the expense of open space benefiting 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, energy efficiency programs, and a policy to switch to renewable sources of energy generation now and in the future. I urge you to fully prioritize further investment in and deployment of these solutions, and to take any actions as are necessary to begin a public dialog to determine whether this project is necessary or advisable for our state.

Sincerely,

**20141105-5003(29898575).pdf**

Shea M Riester, Somerville, MA.

We do not need more natural gas pipelines in Massachusetts. Building new gas pipelines will lead to increased greenhouse gas emissions and to an unstable climate. We now know that methane leaks make natural gas almost as bad as coal for the climate, as methane is 10 times as bad a greenhouse gas as carbon in the short term.

In addition, studies commissioned by NESCOE have showed that if current levels of state energy efficiency programs continue, particularly under a low demand analysis, there is no need for additional natural gas infrastructure in Massachusetts. Please see this link:

<http://www.nofrackedgasinmass.org/notgp/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/ISOassistance-Trans-+Gas-1-21-14.pdf>

Also, please refer to the report below, which cites numerous studies that show we must stop building new natural gas infrastructure to meet our energy needs!

<http://www.betterfutureproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/A-Bridge-Too-Far-Final.compressed.pdf>

**20141105-5007(29898581).pdf**

Erin Rowland, Belmont, MA.

There is a clear scientific consensus that climate change is occurring rapidly, that humans are responsible, and that it will bring major negative economic, health, and national security impacts. Given this consensus, the transition to clean energy must be pursued as quickly as possible. Investing in building new natural gas pipelines is a step in the wrong direction.

There is no clear climate benefit from natural gas: With the current degree of uncertainty around the true leakage rates of methane, there is no clear or certain climate benefit to shifting from coal and petroleum to natural gas, particularly when evaluated over 20 years rather than 100 years. In making its energy plans and GHG forecasts, the state government should count realistic estimates of methane leakage both within and outside of Massachusetts due to our consumption of natural gas. It is also essential that the state require the natural gas utilities to rapidly implement a program that will repair most or all of the leakage from distribution pipes within Massachusetts.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts should declare a moratorium on all new natural gas infrastructure, including pipelines and power plants. Any proposal for new gas infrastructure should demonstrate:

o that the expansion of gas will not violate the legally required GHG reductions for 2020 and 2050,

o that it is impossible to meet our energy needs through aggressive deployment and use of conservation measures, increased efficiency, renewable generation capacity, transmission, demand response and other load-balancing techniques, without new gas generation and pipeline.

Susan McGinn, Amherst, MA.

Why The Pipeline is the Wrong Direction for Massachusetts:

#### DEMAND IS NOT WHAT IT SEEMS

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.

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. This happens 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.

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. 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, and how all-renewable solutions could factor into meeting our needs. Results of this new study are expected to be released Dec. 23, 2014.

#### POOR INFRASTRUCTURE MANAGEMENT

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.

#### OVERSIZED SOLUTION TO PROPOSED “PROBLEM” – LIKELY EXPORT

Even if the Low Demand Scenario was not proven, the amount of additional pipeline capacity requested by NESCOE is 0.6 Billion cubic feet a day (Bcf/d).

But the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline project proposed by KM/TGP is being planned for 2.2 Bcf/d.

With nearly four times the capacity called for, where is the other three quarters of that capacity destined? The terminal hub in Dracut is also connection point to the Martimes & Northeast (M&NE) pipeline which has just applied to switch direction, bringing gas from Massachusetts, through Maine to the Maritimes of Canada, where two ports have just applied to switch from import to export. There is also new potential for export from facilities in Maine and Everett, MA.

In selectboard meetings across the state, KM representatives have repeatedly said that they have no control over who their customers are, so exports are on the table. Their own open season bidding memo called from LNG developers and customers in the Maritimes as well as local distribution and electric utilities.

#### INDUSTRY CONDITIONS MAY NOT LAST

With shale gas wells lasting far shorter than expected and increased concern that the gas market bubble may be about to burst, is this where we want to invest billions of dollars while sacrificing the some of the most valued lands in our state?

## ENVIRONMENTAL DISRUPTION

The proposed pipeline path runs through over a thousand private and public properties, including through some of the state's most sensitive eco-systems and lands set aside for conservation. Article 97 of the Massachusetts State Constitution was put in place to protect these lands in perpetuity.

## GAS CO2 EMISSIONS ARE HIGHER THAN AVG. OF STATE ELECTRIC SOURCES

Looking into the CO2 emissions averaged over all sources of electric generation in MA, the average per source is 910 lb. per MWh. The average natural gas generation plant is 1,210 lb. per MWh.

With renewables phasing in at an unprecedented rate, adding more natural gas would now take us in the wrong direction for achieving the state's greenhouse gas emissions goals – based on CO2 output alone.

## LEAKED METHANE IS CLIMATE HAZARD

Natural gas is also primarily methane, a greenhouse gas over 86 times more powerful than CO2 in the first 20 years that it hits the atmosphere, 34 times more over a 100 year period. When a full accounting of methane's impact is taken into account from drill site to burner tip, studies show that it has no benefit over coal or oil in reducing greenhouse gas effects.

## BUILDING MORE FOSSIL FUEL INFRASTRUCTURE IS DISINCENTIVE FOR PUSH FOR RENEWABLES

Investing billions into fossil fuel infrastructure commits our region to their increased and continuing use for decades. We are standing at the far end, having crossed the natural gas "bridge" to a clean energy economy. It's time to step forward into that future we've been building.

## ACCIDENTS WILL OCCUR

It's a given; we've had almost 8,000 pipeline accidents (gas and oil) in the U.S. since 1986 to end of May 2013 - and they are still occurring. » Try out this disturbing yet highly informative, interactive time-line of energy industry accidents, including pipeline accidents marked with yellow tabs, just from Jan. 2013 until the present. Links to stories explaining each one.

<https://secure.sierraclub.org/site/Advocacy?cmd=display&page=OnScreenThanks&id=13225>

## NEED I SAY ANYTHING MORE?

Please prevent any new gas pipelines in Massachusetts!

## 20141105-5059(29900752).pdf

*Scanned letter from Board of Selectmen, Town of Hollis, including notice of resolution passed*

**Board of Selectmen**  
Town of Hollis  
7 Monument Square  
Hollis, NH 03049  
Phone: 603.465.2209

November 5, 2014

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
Attn: Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 2046

RE TENNESSEE GAS PIPELINE - Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Secretary Bose,

I am enclosing a letter sent to Allen Fore, Director of Public Affairs for Kinder Morgan. This letter is in regards to the Hollis Board of Selectmen's opposition to the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Energy Direct Project.

On behalf of the Board of Selectmen and the residents of Hollis, I respectfully request that you include this letter, with attachments, as part of the FERC Pre-filing public record. If you have any questions or require additional information please contact me anytime.

Sincerely,

Troy R. Brown  
Town Administrator

CC: Board of Selectmen

**Board of Selectmen**  
Town of Hollis  
7 Monument Square  
Hollis, New Hampshire 03049  
Phone: 603.465.2209

November 3, 2014

Mr. Allen Fore  
Director, Public Affairs  
Kinder Morgan  
Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company  
3250 Lacey Road, Suite 700  
Downers Grove, Illinois 60515

In re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Expansion Project - Town of Hollis, New Hampshire

Dear Allen:

I am writing not only as a public citizen of the Town of Hollis, but as the Chairman of the Board of Selectmen to provide you with the position of the Board of Selectmen associated with your FERC Pre-Filing for the Lateral that your firm has filed with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission earlier this month.

First, although the Board leaves to the proof of Kinder Morgan the necessity of the proposed pipeline, the Selectmen of the Town do not take general issue with the bigger concern that energy resources for the residents of New Hampshire need to be bolstered and modernized to prevent future price rises, supply constraints and other viable concerns. However, the proposed route your firm has filed with FERC is unacceptable to the residents of our town who voted overwhelmingly in a special Town Meeting to instruct the Selectmen to oppose the permitting and construction of this lateral as represented in your filing documents. I have enclosed for your information a certified statement of the vote of the Town Meeting.

The reasons are manifest, but the primary concern of the residents and our Board rest on what appears to be a callous disregard for the intrinsic value associated with conservation lands that have taken over a century to amass, and which are protected with various easements that are thought to be inviolable. Multiple entities associated with the NHEFSEC process have registered their significant concerns regarding the chilling effect such a federal taking would constitute. It is clear to me and to my colleagues that if your firm prevails in securing a utility corridor through eminent domain through these lands, it will represent the first time that a Federal agency has seen fit to a taking of conservation lands for this purpose in the State of New Hampshire. Surely, there must be a more suitable alternative than the wholesale disruption of these lands, which enjoy significant habitat and provide watershed resources for multiple communities. All of us are very concerned that if your submission prevails in its current form it will establish a precedent that has a significant deleterious effect on future parcels considered for protection under multiple means of conservancy.

We would like to work with Kinder-Morgan to find a suitable alternative for this pipeline that would judiciously utilize established corridors and rights of way along roadways that are better suited for construction and maintenance of this proposed spur. We sincerely hope that this letter and the overwhelming sentiment of our community will encourage you to seek alternative routes that accomplish your ambition without resort-

ing to eminent domain, and the breaking of multiple easements of this pristine land, not to mention any type of goodwill that could be engendered through better cooperation.

Mark Le Doux

Chairman - Board of Selectmen of the Town of Hollis, New Hampshire

Enclosures:

Cc: Senator Jeanne Shaheen

Senator Kelly Ayotte,

Governor Maggie Hassan

Congresswoman Ann M. Kuster

## SPECIAL HOLLIS TOWN MEETING

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 2014

Moderator James Belanger opened the Special Town Meeting in Hollis/Brookline Co-operative High School at 9:00AM.

Pledge of Allegiance followed by recognition of Veterans. There was a reading of the rules for the Meeting and they were adopted.

The following document was read by Troy Brown, Administrator for the Town of Hollis: "On September 4, 2014 at 9:00am, I caused a copy of the warrant for this town meeting to be posted at H/B High School and Hollis Town Hall. On September 11, 2014, a copy of the warrant was also published in the Nashua Telegraph Newspaper. At the conclusion of this town meeting, I will file a certification of return with the Town Clerk, which shall be a public record."

Chairperson of the Hollis Selectmen, Mark LeDoux presented the reason and the history of why we are here.

ARTICLE 15 - was entered by Herb Gardner and will not be taken up if all of the other ARTICLES pass.

ARTICLE 1-14 Motion by Tammy Fareed to bring up ARTICLES 1-14 together. Seconded by Michael Harris. CARRIED Yes - 392 No - 1

Motion by Peter Jenney to bring up ARTICLES 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, and 9 separately. Seconded by Art Sweed. NOT CARRIED Yes - 3 No - 397

The ARTICLES are as follows:

ARTICLE 1 - Are you in favor of adopting the following as proposed by the Board of Selectmen: To see if the Town of Hollis will vote to oppose approval by the New Hampshire Energy Facility Site Evaluation Committee of the construction and installation of a natural gas pipeline by Tennessee Natural Gas Company as part of the Northeast Energy Direct Project because the proposal is inconsistent with the Town's goal of preserving the Town's rural character.

ARTICLE 2 - Are you in favor of adopting the following as proposed by the Board of Selectmen: To see if the Town of Hollis will vote to oppose approval by the New Hampshire Energy Facility Site Evaluation Committee of the construction and installation of a natural gas pipeline by Tennessee Natural Gas Company as part of the Northeast Energy Direct Project because the proposal is inconsistent with the Town's goal of protecting and preserving the water quality in the Town's lakes, rivers, streams, brooks, estuaries, groundwater, and other bodies of water.

ARTICLE 3 - Are you in favor of adopting the following as proposed by the Board of Selectmen: To see if the Town of Hollis will vote to oppose approval by the New Hampshire Energy Facility Site Evaluation Committee of the construction and installation of a natural gas pipeline by Tennessee Natural Gas Company as part of the Northeast Energy Direct Project because the proposal is inconsistent with the Town's goal of preserving and protecting local wildlife, including but not limited to the federally protected marbled salamander, hognose snake, hog-peanut, Sickel-pod, Wiegand's sedge, Houghton's umbrella sedge, ram's head lady's slipper burweed, goat's rue, and trailing arbutus.

ARTICLE 4 - Are you in favor of adopting the following as proposed by the Board of Selectmen: To see if the Town of Hollis will vote to oppose approval by the New Hampshire Energy Facility Site Evaluation Committee of the construction and installation of a natural gas pipeline by Tennessee Natural Gas Company as part of the Northeast Energy Direct Project because the proposal is inconsistent with the Town's goal of preserving its rural character because of the potential affects upon scenic roads, roadside trees, and stone-walls.

ARTICLE 5 - Are you in favor of adopting the following as proposed by the Board of Selectmen: To see if the Town of Hollis will vote to oppose approval by the New Hampshire Energy Facility Site Evaluation Committee of the construction and installation of a natural gas pipeline by Tennessee Natural Gas Company as part of the Northeast Energy Direct Project because the proposal is inconsistent with the Town's goal of preserving and protecting forests, woodlands, wetlands, and open-space areas for recreational purposes.

ARTICLE - 6 - Are you in favor of adopting the following as proposed by the Board of Selectmen: To see if the Town of Hollis will vote to oppose approval by the New Hampshire Energy Facility Site Evaluation Committee of the construction and installation of a natural gas pipeline by Tennessee Natural Gas Company as part of the Northeast Energy Direct Project because the proposal would have an adverse impact upon the property values within the Town, thereby reducing tax revenues and impairing the tax base of the Town, net of any positive tax impact from the proposed pipeline.

ARTICLE 7 - Are you in favor of adopting the following as proposed by the Board of Selectmen: To see if the Town of Hollis will vote to oppose approval by the New Hampshire Energy Facility Site Evaluation Committee of the construction and installation of a natural gas pipeline by Tennessee Natural Gas Company as part of the Northeast Energy Direct Project because the proposal would adversely affect aesthetics within the Town by disturbing pristine or recreational forests, trails, woodlands, and wetlands and by clear-cutting a fifty foot wide path for the construction of said pipeline.

ARTICLE 8 - Are you in favor of adopting the following as proposed by the Board of Selectmen: To see if the Town of Hollis will vote to oppose approval by the New Hampshire Energy Facility Site Evaluation Committee of the construction and installation of a natural gas pipeline by Tennessee Natural Gas Company as part of the Northeast Energy Direct Project because the proposal would adversely affect aesthetics within the Town by altering or disturbing scenic roads, roadside trees, and stonewalls and by clear-cutting a fifty - foot wide path for the construction of said pipeline.

ARTICLE 9 - Are you in favor of adopting the following as proposed by the Board of Selectmen: To see if the Town of Hollis will vote to oppose approval by the New Hampshire Energy Facility Site Evaluation Committee of the construction and installation of a natural gas pipeline by Tennessee Natural Gas Company as part of the Northeast Energy Direct Project because the proposal would adversely affect aesthetics within the Town by altering or disturbing historic sites and areas.

ARTICLE 10 - Are you in favor of adopting the following as proposed by the Board of Selectmen: To see if the Town of Hollis will vote to oppose approval by the New Hampshire Energy Facility Site Evaluation Committee of the construction and installation of a natural gas pipeline by Tennessee Natural Gas Company as part of the Northeast Energy Direct Project because the proposal would adversely affect health and safety within the region by causing construction materials, soil, dust, and potential contaminants to enter the water shed that supplies water to the greater Nashua area.

ARTICLE 11- Are you in favor of adopting the following as proposed by the Board of Selectmen: To see if the Town of Hollis will vote to oppose approval by the New Hampshire Energy Facility Site Evaluation Committee of the construction and installation of a natural gas pipeline by Tennessee Natural Gas Company as part of the Northeast Energy Direct Project because the proposal would adversely affect health and safety within the Town and in the greater Nashua area due to the continuous presence of a natural gas pipeline proximate to groundwater, aquifers, water sheds and surface water, which supply water to the greater Nahua area.

ARTICLE 12- Are you in favor of adopting the following as proposed by the Board of Selectmen: Tow see

if the Town of Hollis will vote to oppose approval by the New Hampshire Energy Facility Site Evaluation Committee of the construction and installation of a natural gas pipeline by Tennessee Natural Gas Company as part of the Northeast Energy Direct Project because the proposal would adversely affect health and safety within the Town by causing construction materials ,soil, dust, and potential contaminants to enter wetland areas and/or groundwater.

ARTICLE 13 - Are you in favor of adopting the following as proposed by the Board of Selectmen: To see if the Town of Hollis will vote to oppose approval by the New Hampshire Energy Facility Site Evaluation Committee of the construction and installation of a natural gas pipeline by Tennessee Natural Gas Company as part of the Northeast Energy Direct Project because the proposal would traverse large tracts of conservation land property and would involve economic uses that are inconsistent with other economic uses within said areas, such as silviculture and agriculture.

ARTICLE 14- Are you in favor of adopting the following as proposed by the Board of Selectmen: To see if the Town of Hollis will vote to oppose approval by the New Hampshire Energy Facility Site Evaluation Committee of the construction and installation of a natural gas pipeline by Tennessee Natural Gas Company as part of the Northeast Energy Direct Project because the Town lacks the required equipment or personnel for emergency services to adequately address potential health and safety risks that the proposal presents.

Motion by Francis Kennedy to look at article 4 and the change the word “affects” to “effects”. Seconded by Michael Harris. Yes - 419 No- 1 CARRIED

There will be a resolution done before the Selectmen’s meeting on Monday, September 22,2014 - it will be strong and the will of the people and our town position.

Motion by Shirley Cohen to move question. Seconded by Michael Harris. CARRIED. Yes - 419 No -1.

ARTICLES1- 14 CARRIED Yes - 419 No -1 as amended ARTICLE4 - change to effects from affect.

ARTICLE 15 - Did not need to vote on this Article. Are you in favor of adopting the following as proposed by the Board of Selectmen: To see if the Town of Hollis will vote to oppose approval by the New Hampshire Energy Facility Site Evaluation Committee of the construction and installation of a natural gas pipeline by Tennessee Natural Gas Company as part of the Northeast Energy Direct Project because alternative locations exist that would address the needs of the Tennessee Natural Gas Company, such as pre-existing pipeline corridors, or other established corridors, or other routings, without creating adverse effects in the Town of Hollis.

Motion by Andrew Mason to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by Tammy Fareed. CARRIED.HAND VOTE.

Meeting adjourned at 10:55am.

A True Copy of Record - Attest:

Nancy B Ja~ard  
Hollis Town Clerk

**20141105-5096 Draft Resource Reports 1 & 10, updated stakeholder list, 49 files, 734 MB**

*Containing the following files (all “20141105-5096” followed by (xxxxxxx) )*

(29901022).docx Draft Environmental Resource Reports 1 and 10 and Updated Stakeholder Mailing List  
*{included beneath as 20141105-5096(29901022).docx }*

***{note: the following files are not included but can be downloaded directly from FERC’s eLibrary}***

(29901023).pdf	Resource Report 1, General Project Description,	98 pages, 3 MB
(29901024).pdf	Resource Report 10: Alternatives,	79 pages, 10.7 MB
(29901025).pdf	Appendix A: Federal and State Regulatory Agency Contact List,	32 pages, 268 KB
(29901026).pdf	Appendix B: Agency Correspondence (through October 23, 2014)	643 pages, 26.6 MB
(29901028).pdf	Appendix B: Agency Correspondence “ “, continued	567 pages, 20.9 MB

(29901029).pdf	Appendix C: Government Officials/Non-Governmental Organizations Contact Lists and Town Presentations	24 pages, 148 KB
(29901030).pdf	Appendix D: Public Participation Plan	5 pages, 212 KB
(29901031).docx	Attachment 1a – USGS Topographic and Aerial Imagery Maps,	1 page, 16 KB
(29901032).pdf	Maps: Connecticut Loops & Project Laterals	14 pages, 21.8 MB
(29901033).pdf	Maps: Connecticut Loops & Project Laterals	12 pages, 20.5 MB
(29901034).pdf	Maps: Connecticut Loops & Project Laterals	12 pages, 26.7 MB
(29901036).pdf	Maps: Connecticut Loops & Project Laterals	12 pages, 25.6 MB
(29901037).pdf	Maps: Connecticut Loops & Project Laterals	12 pages, 20.6 MB
(29901038).pdf	Maps: Connecticut Loops & Project Laterals	12 pages, 21.7 MB
(29901039).pdf	Maps: Connecticut Loops & Project Laterals	10 pages, 19.2 MB
(29901040).pdf	Maps: Connecticut Loops & Project Laterals	10 pages, 19.6 MB
(29901041).pdf	Maps: Connecticut Loops & Project Laterals	5 pages, 12.8 MB
(29901042).pdf	Maps: Meter Stations	16 pages, 12.0 MB
(29901043).pdf	Maps: Meter Stations	16 pages, 9.2 MB
(29901044).pdf	Maps: Meter Stations	17 pages, 9.7 MB
(29901045).pdf	Maps: Wright To Dracut Pipeline Segment	16 pages, 20.1 MB
(29901047).pdf	Maps: Wright To Dracut Pipeline Segment	14 pages, 22.0 MB
(29901048).pdf	Maps: Wright To Dracut Pipeline Segment	14 pages, 22.1 MB
(29901049).pdf	Maps: Wright To Dracut Pipeline Segment	12 pages, 19.8 MB
(29901050).pdf	Maps: Wright To Dracut Pipeline Segment	12 pages, 22.7 MB
(29901052).pdf	Maps: Wright To Dracut Pipeline Segment	12 pages, 23.6 MB
(29901053).pdf	Maps: Wright To Dracut Pipeline Segment	12 pages, 22.4 MB
(29901054).pdf	Maps: Wright To Dracut Pipeline Segment	12 pages, 21.8 MB
(29901055).pdf	Maps: Wright To Dracut Pipeline Segment	12 pages, 18.8 MB
(29901056).pdf	Maps: Wright To Dracut Pipeline Segment	12 pages, 19.7 MB
(29901057).pdf	Maps: Wright To Dracut Pipeline Segment	12 pages, 22.0 MB
(29901058).pdf	Maps: Wright To Dracut Pipeline Segment	12 pages, 14.5 MB
(29901059).pdf	Maps: Wright To Dracut Pipeline Segment	12 pages, 22.0 MB
(29901060).pdf	Maps: Wright To Dracut Pipeline Segment	12 pages, 20.0 MB
(29901061).pdf	Maps: Wright To Dracut Pipeline Segment	12 pages, 23.6 MB
(29901062).pdf	Maps: Wright To Dracut Pipeline Segment	12 pages, 25.0 MB
(29901063).pdf	Maps: Pennsylvania To Wright Pipeline Segment	16 pages, 24.1 MB
(29901064).pdf	Maps: Pennsylvania To Wright Pipeline Segment	16 pages, 27.0 MB
(29901065).pdf	Maps: Pennsylvania To Wright Pipeline Segment	16 pages, 7.2 MB
(29901066).pdf	Maps: Pennsylvania To Wright Pipeline Segment	18 pages, 4.4 MB
(29901067).pdf	Maps: Pennsylvania To Wright Pipeline Segment	6 pages, 10.9 MB
(29901068).pdf	Maps: Pennsylvania To Wright Pipeline Segment	18 pages, 8.1 MB
(29901069).pdf	Maps: Pennsylvania To Wright Pipeline Segment	16 pages, 4.8 MB
(29901070).pdf	Maps: Pennsylvania To Wright Pipeline Segment	18 pages, 5.2 MB

(29901072).pdf	Maps: Pennsylvania To Wright Pipeline Segment	16 pages, 4.8 MB
(29901073).pdf	Maps: Pennsylvania To Wright Pipeline Segment	18 pages, 5.6 MB
(29901074).pdf	Maps: Pennsylvania To Wright Pipeline Segment	16 pages, 5.2 MB
(29901075).pdf	Maps: Pennsylvania To Wright Pipeline Segment	19 pages, 5.6 MB

**20141105-5096(29901022).docx**

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)

November 5, 2014

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  
Draft Environmental Resource Reports 1 and 10 and Updated Stakeholder Mailing List

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 Commission’s pre-filing process, Tennessee is submitting draft Resource Reports 1 and 10 and an updated stakeholder mailing list for the Project with this filing. The draft of Resource Report 1 reflects the information available as of the date of this filing regarding the proposed Project facilities and anticipated land requirements, construction procedures, and permitting/clearance requirements for the Project. The draft of Resource Report 10 identifies the alternatives (system and routing) that Tennessee has identified and a discussion of the evaluation of those identified alternatives as of the date of this filing. The drafts of Resource Reports 1 and 10 are being submitted after the originally anticipated date of October 31, 2014, which was set forth in the schedule included with the September 15, 2014 pre-filing request letter. This is because, as part of the comprehensive stakeholder outreach plan for this Project, Tennessee has been engaged in ongoing meetings with state governmental officials and regulatory agencies and has been incorporating comments and suggestions raised in these outreach meetings in the draft resource reports, which required several additional days to finalize for this filing. Submitting the draft resource reports today will have no impact on the pre-filing process since Tennessee has proposed a full one year schedule for the pre-filing process for the Project (rather than the six month time period provided for in the Commission’s pre-filing procedures) to allow for full participation by stakeholders in the pre-filing process and a thorough review of the proposed Project.

Tennessee notes that its development of the resource reports for the Project is an ongoing process, and that updated drafts of both Resource Reports 1 and 10 will be submitted when the first draft of the Environmental Report (consisting of Resource Reports 1 through 13) are filed with the Commission in March 2015. The second draft of the Environmental Resource Report is anticipated to be filed with the Commission in June 2015.

In addition, as part of the Commission's pre-filing process, Tennessee is submitting an updated stakeholder mailing list for the Project. This stakeholder mailing list updates the contact information that was provided as part of Tennessee's September 15, 2014 pre-filing request in this proceeding for (1) affected landowners (contained in Volume III-Privileged and Confidential Information, Appendix AA), (2) representatives of affected federal, state and local political jurisdictions (contained in Volume II-Public, Appendix C), and (3) applicable federal and state regulatory agencies (contained in Volume II-Public, Appendix A). Due to privacy concerns, Tennessee, in accordance with Section 388.112 of the Commission's regulations, 18 C.F.R. § 388.112 (2014), is requesting privileged and confidential treatment of that portion of the stakeholder mailing list that includes information regarding affected landowners. An original copy of the affected landowner portion of the stakeholder mailing list is being filed in Volume III-Privileged and Confidential Information, Appendix AA, marked with the legend "Contains Privileged Information - Do Not Release".

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 Mr. Richard Siegel at (713) 420-5535.

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

**20141105-5102(29901121).pdf**

Ryan Pollin, Somerville, MA.

FERC,

You have a unique opportunity to restrict fossil fuel energy use by rejecting these gas pipeline expansion projects. The aim of these projects is to make money on providing cheap natural gas, but we know better. We know that the natural gas that would be transmitted by these pipelines comes from extreme sources that have devastating affects on water quality, on earthquake stability, and most obviously on the greenhouse affect that contributes to runaway climate change.

By cutting short the transmission lines from these hydraulic fracturing and other gas sites, you have a chance to push us in the right direction. Clean energy sources can and will provide just as much energy. They can do it cost-competitively as well, and are very obvious cheaper when considering the externalities now borne as social costs like disaster cleanup, health effects, etc.

Please do not let this or any other opportunity go to waste. We must cut greenhouse gases rapidly, and pipeline expansion will not allow that to happen.

Respectfully and Sincerely,

Ryan Pollin

**20141105-5139(29901323).pdf**

Jane C Perry, Franklin, NY.

On June 30th 2014 I sent a letter via Certified Mail denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC, 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.

**20141105-5231(29901881).pdf**

Tara Miller, Williamstown, MA.

More natural gas infrastructure is not needed. Natural gas is a bridge to NOWHERE. It will only bury us further in our climate crisis, not get us to the other side. Methane is such a potent greenhouse gas that as little as 5% leakage from infrastructure makes natural gas worse than coal. And research has shown that, on average, leakage is much higher than that. Natural gas is not clean. It will only delay the switch to renewables that we need NOW. The IPCC reports keep warning of even more and more dire climate consequences. What will you say when future generations ask you what you did about climate change? Will you admit that you contributed to burning the Earth alive? Or will you proudly state that you took a stand against natural gas and helped move our planet towards a greener future?

**20141106-0011(29904951).pdf**

**Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe**  
Tribal Historic Preservation Office  
Environmental Review Comments

Kimberly Bose  
Secretary  
F.E.R.C.  
888 First St.N.E.,  
Washington, D.C. 20426

RE: Project Docket Number (PF 14-22-000) Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co., LLC  
Proposed N.E. Energy Direct Project

Dear Kimberly Bose,

The Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe's Historic Preservation Office acknowledges the importance of timely consultations and the clear need to set precedence with regards to our expectations in the protection of cultural resources through consultation. It is important to establish protocol and procedures to follow in these pragmatic consultations with Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (Kinder Morgan Company) and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's oversight of the tribes involved in this Section 106 "Undertaking".

We have several concerns with the project moving forward, and encourage a meeting with Michael Letson to discuss our involvement in all Gas pipeline projects classified as federal undertakings. Our primary concerns at this time are focused on the protocol procedures as defined in the Draft Unanticipated Discoveries Plan. Issues that seem to warrant discussions in order to clearly delineate the roles of consulting parties in regard to potential unanticipated findings and the notification process as well as monitoring of possible sites/burials. It suggests that all oversight and determination of significant sites is being delegated to the proponent which is unacceptable.

We welcome a F.E.R.C. representative's presence at a future meeting, to discuss the required sequence in which notification and response letters are expected.

The Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe's historic preservation department is dedicated to protecting Native American burials and remains first and foremost. We require monitoring of all ground disturbances as they relate to archaeological assessments, surveys, reconnaissance and recoveries whether terrestrial or marine in the future.

Our Office encourages sitting down with all parties involved in this process to clarify and rectify protocol procedures with regard to the Draft Unanticipated Discoveries Plan and our involvement in the mandated review process.

In dosing, we look forward to meeting with the proponents to resolve these issues as soon as possible so that the project remains on schedule. I'd be happy to respond to any further questions or concerns that you may have regarding this project.

In Thanksgiving,

Mashpee Wampanoag THPO

Cc: Brona Simon, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, SHPO

Jim Peters, Commission on Indian Affairs

Greg DubeB, PAL

Eric Tomasi, FERC

Michael Letson, Kinder Morgan

**20141106-5001(29901920).pdf**

Sabine von Mering, Wayland, MA.

I hereby would like to register my strong objection against any new fossil fuel infrastructure in general, and gas pipelines here in New England in particular. The science about global warming leaves no doubt that we must urgently reduce greenhouse gases in the atmosphere to prevent catastrophic climate change. The latest synergy report from the IPCC (published on November 1, 2014) makes that abundantly clear. Fossil fuels must become a thing of the past. The Global Warming Solutions Act (GWSA) must be our guide. Any investment in gas or oil or coal infrastructure is not only a poor economic decision, but a disastrous one with respect to protecting our environment and the possibility for future generations to have a livable planet. There is no way to meet the longterm GWSA goals unless we begin to only invest in renewable energy now. We do not need the pipelines. Studies commissioned by NESCOE have shown 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.

As long as existing pipelines are standing around partially unused, and the peak need for energy to be covered by the new pipeline is only relevant less than three weeks per year, a pipeline that is built through miles of conservation land is a huge mistake.

As a region we must focus on dramatically reducing existing inefficiencies instead of investing in new fossil fuel infrastructure. Properly insulating older homes and requiring adequate insulation in all new construction is a much better way of addressing the peak time crunches than building more pipelines.

Building pipelines is wrong for our time. It is the wrong direction to take for us as a region. It is dangerous for our planet. The government and FERC must work hard to incentivize future-oriented investments. This means a focus on renewable energy infrastructure only.

Massachusetts is a national leader in knowledge-production and innovation. We must become energy and climate leaders as well. We are poised to show the entire nation how to power a future without fossil fuels. There are numerous added benefits to such leadership: Better air quality and fewer toxins inside our homes and outdoors, better protection of our conservation areas, less risk of leaks and explosions in our thickly settled communities. Not to mention the many economic benefits of investments in renewable energy projects that will create new jobs right here in our own neighborhoods.

It's the smart thing to do. It's the right thing to do. It is the only thing to do if we care about preserving a livable planet for future generations.

**20141106-5033(29903260).pdf**

**Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.**

A Kinder Morgan company

November 6, 2014

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:

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. Tennessee submitted the draft of Resource Report 1 (including information regarding the proposed facilities and anticipated land requirements, construction procedures, and permitting/clearance requirements for the Project) and Resource Report 10 (identification of system and routing alternatives and discussion of the evaluation of those identified alternatives) on November 5, 2014, several days later than the originally anticipated October 31, 2014 filing date).

As part of the pre-filing process, Tennessee scheduled dates and locations for twelve open houses to be conducted in November and December 2014 (with the first open house to be held on November 12, 2014) for the portion of the Project located between Wright, New York and Dracut, Massachusetts. A list of the open house dates and locations was filed with the Commission on October 21, 2014. This information was also included in the notification letters that were sent to affected landowners and governmental officials. In order to provide affected stakeholders with adequate time to review the draft resource reports that Tennessee filed on November 5, 2014, Tennessee is postponing the open houses that had been scheduled for November and December 2014. This postponement is consistent with letters that Tennessee received from Representative Jim McGovern and Representative Niki Tsongas requesting a delay in the proposed outreach schedule in order to provide affected landowners and communities the necessary time to review the draft Resource Reports 1 and 10 submitted on November 5, 2014. Tennessee will work with the Commission Staff to establish revised dates and locations for the postponed open houses for the portion of the Project located between Wright, New York and Dracut, Massachusetts and provide notification of those rescheduled open houses to affected stakeholders. Tennessee will also work with the Commission Staff to establish the open house dates and locations for the portion of the Project located between Troy, Pennsylvania and Wright, New York.

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 this filing to the Office of Energy Projects. A copy of this letter will also be sent to all affected landowners and the governmental officials that received the open house list in prior notification letters. Any questions concerning the enclosed filing should be addressed to Ms. Jacquelyne Rocan at (713) 420-4544 or to Mr. Richard Siegel at (713) 420-5535.

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

cc: Mr. Rich McGuire (Commission Staff)

Mr. Michael McGehee (Commission Staff)

Mr. Eric Tomasi (Commission Staff)

**20141106-5093(29904642).pdf**

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Susan Sedlmayr under PF14-22-000.

Submission Date: 11/6/2014 2:29:19 PM

Filed Date: 11/6/2014 2:29:19 PM

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 Chebo33@aol.com

Basis for Intervening:

This has not been a case Proven where Tennessee Gas needs to expand their pipeline thru 4 NY counties and then dig a path from west to eastt Massachusetts thru virgin land to then connect the pipelines in Dracut Massachusetts. To date facts prove there will be an enormous amount of "extra Fracked gas" that will be shipped to Nova Scotia to be processed into LNG to be exported.

My husband and I have a farm which borders the three pipelines in the ground in New Lebanon. We have been to the Kinder Morgan presentation last week in New Lebanon where we learned an 80 acre industrial zone called a compressor station will need to be built to support the new pipeline. We were told this station will be built about a mile from our farm.

PLEASE CONSIDER ANOTHER SITE!!! This WILL destroy our way of life. Endanger our health. Ruin our retirement.

Consider placing the site along Route 20, just a mile from projected place now. OR Along side Interstate 90. Since new pipe will have to be installed anyway, why not add the short distance to projected pipeline so compressor station can be placed where it won't disturb and enrage so many citizens?

Susan Sedlmayr. New Lebanon, NY 12060. Please grant me intervenor status Thank you

**20141106-5118(29904950).pdf**

Madeleine S-D, Boston, MA.

Dear FERC,

Please block the Kinder Morgan pipeline and the Spectra pipeline expansion. Any financial benefit that these pipelines might have is far outweighed by the financial damage climate change will cause in the near future, especially to Massachusetts farms and fisheries and waterfront neighborhoods. I currently live in East Boston, and my home will be underwater if climate change continues along the course scientists are projecting.

Providing inexpensive energy to Massachusetts families is very important, but current natural gas prices are already reasonable. When gas is this inexpensive, people have little motivation to think about the future and create sustainable long term energy solutions. Please don't expand current gas drilling infrastructure at the expense of our future health and safety.

Please stop these pipelines. The people of Massachusetts want you to do everything your power to slow climate change.

Thank you for your time.

*originally Scanned letter from Congressman Richard E. Neal*

**Congress of the United States**  
House of Representatives  
Washington, DC 20515

October 24, 2014

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

Re: Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project  
Docket Number PFI4-22-000

Dear Chairwoman LeFleur,

I am writing to you in regards to the pre-filing steps taken by the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission on September 15, 2014. Over the past few months, I have had countless conversations with residents of both Berkshire County and the Pioneer Valley who have voiced their opinions about a pipeline traveling through their communities. I feel that it is my responsibility to these individuals to share their varying concerns about a proposed pipeline with FERC as the commission begins to evaluate the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) project.

The well-being of all individuals affected by the proposed instillation of a pipeline has been, and will remain, a chief priority of mine throughout this process. One specific issue I have heard repeatedly pertains to the disturbance and threat of contamination to the local water table. There is unease as to whether or not any leaks from the pipeline could over time enter and contaminate the local water supply.

Many homes and businesses in western Massachusetts rely upon underground well pumping systems in order to maintain continuous water service. Disruption to subterranean water sources through extensive excavation has the potential to be nothing short of catastrophic. Along with this, should there be a shift in the aqua filter, many existing wells would have to be re-drilled in order to locate a new water source. This unforeseen financial burden on homeowners and businesses can come at the cost of thousands of dollars, not necessarily covered by an insurance policy.

Another factor that must be taken into consideration is the impact a pipeline would have on the day-to-day operations of the host cities and towns. Western Massachusetts is home to a number of world class museums, resorts, restaurants and shopping destinations. These institutions provide thousands of jobs and remain a significant component of the local economy. The instillation of pipeline underneath local roads and highways would ultimately require the excavation and demolition of existing infrastructure. Such a disruption to local traffic patterns has the potential to not only deter visitors to these establishments along with the residents of the area who frequently patronize such businesses.

Lastly, the long-term visible impact a pipeline would have on our environment must not be overlooked. In order to install the large segments of the pipeline, the deforestation of heavily wooded areas would occur in order to allow utility vehicles to travel to and from their worksite. After the construction crews have installed and completed their work on the pipeline, there will be a footprint left behind on the surrounding environment. It is my hope that any proposed pipeline route would impose the least amount harm to both the natural and scenic beauty of western Massachusetts.

In closing, I ask that you and FERC evaluate the range of factors that must be taken into consideration when reviewing the proposal for a natural gas pipeline in the days and weeks ahead.

Sincerely,  
Richard E. Neal  
Member of Congress

**20141107-5007(29905309).pdf**

Dana Demetrio, Cambridge, MA.

Please do not allow any additional natural gas pipelines to be built in Massachusetts.

Climate change is one of the greatest and most urgent challenges facing our world today. Rising sea levels, stronger and more destructive storms and droughts, threaten the health and livelihoods of current and future generations of people.

We need to stop burning fossil fuels in order to slow the planet's warming and minimize these terrible risks to society.

Building a new natural gas pipeline will threaten our future, because it will mean burning natural gas for many years to come. The burning of natural gas releases methane into the atmosphere, which is a very potent green house gas, much stronger than CO2.

Not only are these proposed projects dangerous for our state's future, but they are also unnecessary. Massachusetts does not need any new natural gas pipelines as an energy source. Our state has made much progress conserving energy, and using energy more efficiently.

It would be much more practical to fix the leaks in current natural gas pipelines- which will save energy and help to reduce wasteful emissions of methane. In addition, we must to transition to renewable sources of energy, and any new energy infrastructure projects should be focused on increasing renewable energy production in Massachusetts.

**20141107-5057(29905606).pdf**

Adele Franks, Florence, MA.

As a public health physician I am acutely aware of the impact of climate disruption on community health. Scientists around the world agree that the need to stop burning fossil fuels is an urgent one that cannot be postponed. The continued burning of fossil fuels will ultimately topple our civilization and reduce the human condition to a desperate one.

There is no doubt that we need to urgently pursue a mix of renewable energy sources to provide power to our region, as well as vigorously pursue reduced need through energy conservation measures. Even if those measures were to result in reduced power availability, that outcome would be far preferable to continued increase in infrastructure to burn more fossil fuels that will encourage more fossil fuel burning.

Furthermore, it is important to note that the release of methane in the extraction, transport and burning of natural gas is an even bigger threat to climate disruption than that of CO2 release. Therefore it is incumbent upon us to reduce the use of natural gas, not increase it.

The present moment is a crucial decision point. Either we travel down the road to severe climate disruption that will impact every living being, or we choose to bravely chart an alternative course which will benefit all of us and our descendants in the long run.

I am proud that my city, Northampton, MA, has passed a resolution in opposition to the proposed pipeline, along with multiple other municipalities. I urge you to listen to the voice of the people instead of to the call for greater profitability. Our world does not need more concentrated wealth, it needs creative solutions to the pending climate catastrophe.

**20141107-5232(29907640).txt**

Deborah Wolozin, Sudbury, MA.

I am opposed to building a new pipeline across Massachusetts. There are many reasons.

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. This pipeline is not for Massachusetts property owners and tax payers - it is being built so Kinder Morgan

can sell gas internationally.

There is much we can do in MA to optimize existing pipelines and other oil and gas infrastructure. Before building a new pipeline, repairing Class 3 leaks (considered non-dangerous) needs to happen. Also, there are existing pipelines that are standing at least partially unused. Using this 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. Both of these actions would result in an improvement in the efficient use of existing pipelines.

To meet Massachusetts' greenhouse gas emissions goals, adding more natural gas now takes MA in the wrong direction. Besides, renewables are being phased in at an unprecedented rate and the focus needs to remain on building renewable infrastructure, not gas infrastructure.

**20141107-5254(29908132).pdf**

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

November 7, 2014

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

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. This status report updates the information Tennessee provided in its September 15, 2014 pre-filing request letter through the month of October 2014. Subsequent status reports will be submitted on a calendar month basis.

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 Mr. Richard Siegel at (713) 420-5535.

Respectfully submitted,

TENNESSEE GAS PIPELINE COMPANY

By: J. Curtis Moffatt  
J. Curtis Moffatt  
Deputy General Counsel and Vice President  
Gas Group Legal

Enclosure

cc: Mr. Rich McGuire  
Mr. Michael McGehee  
Mr. Eric Tomasi

**20141110-5004(29907701).pdf**

Elizabeth Grace, Camarillo, CA.

The science is in, continuing with "business as usual" will result in a devastated world. While natural gas

has been advertised as a relatively “green” alternative to other energy sources, its production releases large amounts of methane, which is an extremely potent greenhouse gas.

If we care about the lives of our children and grandchildren (and all future human generations beyond that), then we **MUST** stop burning fossil fuels now, including natural gas.

Ours is the last generation that has any hope of stopping or slowing this runaway train before it goes over the cliff. Please be courageous, and say no to all future oil and gas

**20141110-5005(29907703).pdf**

William Holland, Newton, MA.

The boom in natural gas extraction using hydraulic fracturing has led to numerous proposals to build new and to expend existing natural gas distribution pipelines. To proceed with the development of this fossil fuel infrastructure is decidedly the wrong path to a livable future.

Natural gas has been called a bridge fuel. The meaning is that it is a convenient way to reduce carbon emissions below that produced in generating electricity with coal. There are at least two problems with this strategy. First, due to methane leakage during extraction and gas leaks from pipelines, greenhouse gas emissions are significantly higher for natural gas than was originally thought. Secondly, putting resources into gas pipelines takes resources away from the development of solar, wind, and water alternatives.

The need for additional pipeline infrastructure has been wildly overstated. It appears that the main motivation for the pipelines across Massachusetts is to profit from exporting natural gas to other countries. The actual need for additional supplies within the state appears to be limited to short periods on a few days a year. This demand could be much more readily accommodated by providing storage capacity near the end users. Additional pipeline capacity would then be totally unnecessary.

Natural gas is billed as a clean fuel. Certainly it burns without the particulate emissions of coal, but it is far from clean. Besides the greenhouse gas emissions mentioned above, the process of hydraulic fracturing poisons water supplies and destroys communities. While the “fracking” may not be taking place in Massachusetts, we are nevertheless morally responsible for the impacts of our energy policies throughout the country.

The costs of greenhouse gas emissions become clearer every day. We cannot afford to keep pumping methane and carbon dioxide into the atmosphere. The economic and health benefits of converting our energy system to renewable is also becoming clearer every day. We need a massive, sustained effort to convert our energy system to one that relies on clean, renewable, non-fossil fuel energy sources. This transition will need to take place in the next several decades. It therefore makes no sense to invest resources in fossil fuel related infrastructure at this time.

**20141110-5013(29907719).pdf**

Representative Joe Sweeney, Salem, NH.

I have many concerns and questions relating to this project, and know that I speak for many in the neighborhoods affected and for the businesses and individuals across Salem who will also be impacted by this project.

This project needs to be re-routed in order to avoid impact through residential areas. The right of way as currently laid out may have made sense in the 1950s and 1980s, however now is dense residential property and this pipeline through this part of Salem will impact too many hardworking families and residents.

A pathway needs be pursued by Tennessee Gas that mitigates residential impacts as much as possible. This project may have a benefit, in the long run, to lower utility rates that power New England. However, the short term impacts to the neighborhoods affected and to the town are quite severe. In order to get from point A to point B across Salem, the pipeline construction will take place across Route 28, a major artery for commerce and traffic in southern New Hampshire. Realizing that this is one impact that simply cannot be mitigated by Tennessee Gas, other impacts on Salem commerce and property should be pursued in good faith

and with as little disruption as possible.

The impact on property values abutting or near the proposed pipeline needs to be examined. The construction and deforestation around the pipeline will certainly have short term impacts on property values, while the possibility of pipelines going through backyards and existing houses will certainly have impact on the value of said property. This could lead, across Salem, to devalued property which will result in losses for homeowners while impacting the town's tax revenue.

I am a firm believer that Tennessee Gas can find a route through Salem that produces little impact, and look forward to seeing their solutions to the pressing matter. While this project has multiple pieces and filings to be made in the months and years to come, I will be paying close attention to the developments along the way.

Joe Sweeney  
N.H. State Representative  
Rockingham District 08  
Salem

**20141110-5022(29907737).pdf**

Reita Ennis, Brookline, MA.

I submit the following comments in regard to this proposed pipeline:

1. Increased natural gas infrastructure will likely exceed the legally mandated emission reductions in the Massachusetts Global Warming Solutions Act of 2008.
2. This pipeline will preclude the creation of a reformed power distribution system, one more accessible to the use of alternative energy.
3. Energy needs can be met by an active program of reducing and in some cases eliminating gas leaks.
3. The study currently being conducted examining the low-demand scenario must be considered before any decision.
4. The expansion of natural gas pipelines is not in the interest of the American people. Climate change is the emergency of our time. Reduction of fossil fuel use is the most important act that can be made today. This must be the major consideration in your decision making.

**20141110-5023(29907739).pdf**

Sara Hinchey, Andover, MA.

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Direct Project, Docket No. PF14-22.

As a resident of Andover, Massachusetts, through which the proposed pipeline is routed, I am directly affected by the pipeline's negative potential consequences, which include: the risk of contamination of local drinking water sources; the degradation of conservation land, wetlands, rivers and forests; and the risk of gas-leak related explosion.

The route of the proposed pipeline through Andover passes through a district that was created to preserve and protect the town's drinking water supply. Both the construction of a 50 to 100 foot wide pipeline corridor and the existence of a pipeline both pose a direct threat to the town's drinking water. In addition, the pipeline would pass through town conservation lands, wetlands, rivers and forests, leaving a permanent scar through picturesque open spaces that include both hiking trails and wildlife habitats. The proposed pipeline would also pass directly behind both High Plain Elementary School and Wood Hill Middle School, where my two children attend, along with over 900 Andover children. It is irresponsible to locate a high-pressure pipeline so close to two schools.

The effort to meet the ongoing energy needs of Massachusetts should not come at the expense of citizens'

safety and quality of life. Instead, Massachusetts should focus on renewable and sustainable energy solutions that do not have a negative impact on drinking water supplies, open space and safety.

**20141110-5033(29907760).pdf**

Karen Lamoureux, Pelham, NH.

November 9, 2014

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr., Deputy Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline

Dear FERC Representative:

I am writing to you in regards to my strong opposition to the route proposed by the Tennessee Gas Pipeline project (Docket # PF14-22). The Lynnfield Lateral is expected to be installed near Andover's water source (Fish Brook which supplies both Haggett's Pond in Andover) and the Merrimack River which supplies water to several nearby towns, it is proposed within 50-300 feet of some residence, within a close vicinity to Wood Hill Middle School and High Plain Elementary School, and through wetlands which contain state and federally protected wildlife in Andover, Massachusetts.

My concerns are as follows:

1. Andover Town and Merrimack River Water Sources: There is the opportunity for contamination from gases released. In addition, Herbicides used to maintain the area surrounding the pipeline could contaminate the town's drinking water. The pipeline route proposed is that close to the water source and actually is proposed to pass under these sources in several locations (Merrimack River).
2. Location of Pipeline: Tennessee Gas does have a history of reported leaks and explosions. Why would the federal and state governments allow for dead zones (areas close enough to a residence or the school system where lives would be lost instantly with no hopes of survival)? The schools outdoor fields are within this range.
3. Wetlands: It was my understanding that there are wildlife under the protection of local, state and federal governments. Wildlife which falls under these protection guidelines have been found in Andover, Massachusetts.

The Town of Andover has proposed alternative routes to Kinder Morgan. To date, Kinder Morgan has not accepted any of these solutions.

I am not opposed to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline or the advancement of our natural resources. My concern is with the current pipeline route which could have a major impact on the drinking water for a large number of people, children and wildlife.

Thank you for reviewing my concerns and taking the appropriate action to protect our communities.

Sincerely,

Karen Lamoureux

**20141110-5038(29907770).pdf**

Brian Lamoureux, Pelham, NH.

I have the following comments that government and company decision makers will be held accountable for.

1. According to a 2013 report from U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA) available at [http://www.eia.gov/forecasts/archive/aeo13/pdf/0383\(2013\).pdf](http://www.eia.gov/forecasts/archive/aeo13/pdf/0383(2013).pdf) which states on page 76 that Natural gas

consumption projections for residential customers will decrease steadily through 2040.

But MassPLAN at <http://www.massplan.org/annotated-faq/> under who pays states that;

— We as ratepayers could be required to help pay for new natural gas pipelines through a proposed new charge on our electric bills. (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))

— State or local taxpayer money would pay for emergency response in the event of explosions, fires, or evacuations. (Source: <http://www.fireengineering.com/articles/2012/05/firefighterresponse-to-natural-gas-leaks-and-emergencies.html>)

The question is: How is it justified by our government agencies and leaders that all residential electrical energy users in New England would pay for part of the pipeline if according to the U.S. Energy Information Administration the natural gas demands for residential is expected to decrease through 2040?

True leadership is simply doing the right thing because it's the right thing.

2. By admission, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. in a November 2014 report named RESOURCE REPORT 10, ALTERNATIVES stated clearly that “Reducing the need for additional energy usage is the preferred option wherever possible”.

And continues with “Conservation of energy reduces the demand for finite the limited and over-utilized fossil fuel reserves. Energy conservation is also advocated by both federal and state authorities.”

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company then tries to justify the pipeline by saying that “Energy conservation alone is not a viable alternative to the proposed Project. While energy conservation reduces demand for energy sources such as natural gas, and may be a long-term alternative or partial alternative for the Project, implementation of sufficient energy conservation measures to eliminate the need for the proposed Project is not feasible in the short-term.”

- Is it true that energy conservation measures are not feasible in the short-term simply because the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company says so without any data?

- The electrical rate increase is in and of itself a short-term energy conservation measure.

- Reducing energy is critical for many other sectors such as the electric power grid which is over burden and demand for a more reliable and resilient power delivery infrastructure is needed now. This is accomplished in large part by two methods, to reduce the existing demand and with a restructured electric distribution network that employs a large number of small distributed energy resources which can improve the level of system reliability.

- We need to understand the impact on energy reduction as a function of rate increase in combination with other energy reduction measures.

A two part proposal:

- a. State Government to impose an increase to the energy tax and observe how this reduces energy demand.
- b. From the funds produced from the rate increase, State Government to provide additional incentives for energy reduction.

I believe this is a reasonable and responsible approach to understanding our options and would provide for a data driven decision to prove if the required amount of energy reduction is possible in the short term.

#### **20141110-5040(29907774).pdf**

Kristy Toto, Pelham, NH.

I am writing to request a change to the proposed route of the Tennessee pipeline. It should be routed away from Andover's drinking water (Fish Brook) and the school system to prevent contaminated drinking water and any harm from impact if there was ever an issue with the pipeline. This is a safety issue. Thank you for

your time.

Kristy Toto

**20141110-5062(29907986).pdf**

Dear FERC,

(Comments on Northeast Energy Direct Project: Docket # PF14-22)

We built our house over 20 years ago on land that has been in our family for over 100 years. It was originally part of our great grandfather's family farm. The AT&T Communications Line, which is part of our property, runs parallel along that line for approximately 950 feet. The proposed path of the Tennessee Gas Pipeline runs on our property and on that easement. The proposed pipeline is 100 feet from our house, within 30 feet of our septic field, is 200 feet from our well and would run across our paved driveway. The proposed Tennessee pipeline would also run through wetlands below our house greatly disturbing and possibly doing permanent damage to these wetlands; as well as disturbing the natural ecosystem of the mountain which we have been conscience of since we built our house.

Osceola Road runs up the slope of Lenox Mountain. It is an ecologically sensitive area in the heart of Berkshire County. Across from our house the slope runs up a rocky ledge, which may require blasting to lay a 36" pipe. Our family was instrumental in preserving that property with Berkshire Natural Resource Council. We thought it would stop the destruction of pristine land and preserve the mountain. There are 80-100 year old oaks trees in the path, which help to hold the soil, one of which holds our tree house.

It is hard to put a price on old growth forest, wetlands teaming with wildlife, tracks of farmlands, and mountain slopes. We hope that FERC can weigh in all of these facts before allowing a pipeline that is questionably needed and potentially dangerous.

The path of the pipeline will be significantly costly for our family and the mountain we inhabit.

Rebecca & Wayne Marzotto

660 Osceola Road

Richmond, MA 01254

**20141110-5154(29909467).pdf**

Peter Ellis, Andover, MA.

I am writing on behalf of myself, my family, my friends and neighbors, and fellow Andover residents to strongly oppose Kinder-Morgan's natural gas infrastructure expansion project; a feeder-line of which is proposed to pass through parts of Andover.

I am terribly concerned about the route Kinder-Morgan has chosen through Andover as it appears that approximately 3.5 out of 6 total miles of pipeline is proposed to pass through conservation land; habitat that is home to a number of protected species of wildlife and part of a delicate ecosystem contained within the Fish Brook/Haggetts Pond Watershed Protection Overlay District. Andover's conservation land might seem to an outsider with billions of dollars at stake as a perfect route for a pipeline. Indeed, there are fewer logistical hurdles, but the irreparable damage that would be caused by clear-cutting and herbicide application in these areas is unacceptable to me, and to anybody with any manner of respect for the environment.

It is not clear to me that this pipeline expansion is even necessary, but assuming for a moment that it is critical for energy dependency I'd like to point out that there are at least five alternate routes that have been proposed which follow existing rights-of-way for interstate highways, electric power transmission lines and existing pipelines. These alternate routes are on land that is already disturbed as opposed to having to develop a new pipeline route.

My final issue is that of safety. The proposed route puts the highpressure feeder line adjacent to Wood Hill middle school as well as a number of residences. This only serves to reinforce the need to reconsider the route at a minimum, and in fact probably the entire project as a whole.

In closing, I'd like to point out that Andover's conservation land is crisscrossed by a network of hiking and biking trails maintained carefully by local volunteers and boy scout troops. Come take a walk and see for yourself what a valuable resource these lands are to our community and visualize what it would look like with a 50' to 100' wide swath of deforestation running right through it. The thought of such a sight makes me quite sad indeed.

Regards,  
Andover resident, Peter Ellis

**20141110-5236(29910034).pdf**

Miriam Kurland, mansfield center, CT.

I request that Kinder Morgan NOT be given permission to proceed with plans for any of their pipeline routes through the Northeastern United States. The harm from fracked gas and gas pipelines to the climate, environment, communities, animals and people makes this a poor solution for meeting energy needs. Conservation and clean energy solutions are currently available, growing and continuing to develop to meet the energy needs for this region. There is no accurate evidence that more energy is needed and certainly not at the vast expense humanity and our Earth would pay. It is obvious by now that we, the people, do not want this.

Please stand up to corporate greed and stop the destruction of our communities by those who care only about their own monetary gain.

**20141110-5249(29910088).pdf**

Timothy Havel, Boston, MA.

These pipeline expansions are not in the public interest. First, both burned and leaked methane contribute to climate change, and the electricity thereby produced will displace renewables and nuclear in addition to coal. Second, there are serious doubts among responsible analysts that the additional pipeline capacity is needed now, and even more serious doubts that it will be needed in the future as Massachusetts best-in-class energy efficiency programs continue to reduce demand. Third, it is outrageous breach of public trust that the spare capacity thereby created will be used for natural gas exports, enriching the corporations involved but doing nothing for the public. On top of that, they are asking the public to pay for it all! Please do not approve of these projects.

**20141112-0017(29915899).pdf**

Richard Crane  
95 Overlook Drive  
Groton, MA 01450

November 1, 2013

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

RE: FERC Docket No. PF14-22-000

Dear Secretary Bose:

I am a landowner in Massachusetts directly affected by the Northeast Energy Direct Project proposed by Kinder Morgan and the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC. As currently proposed the Northeast Energy Direct Project is a "greenfield" pipeline that will cross Massachusetts having a devastating affect on homeowners, conservation land and the environment. There is no natural gas pipeline that has this level of

impact and devastation that I could ever support. Please help the people of Massachusetts by getting Kinder Morgan to change their route so that pipeline goes through existing rights of way designated for public use to minimize the impact to Massachusetts. Until this can be achieved we urge the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to deny this project.

I come from a poor working class upbringing. At the age of 11 I took several jobs to help support my mother, a single parent who raised three boys on just a secretary's salary. I have worked hard all my life to get an education and build a career to support my family. The culmination of my life's effort was to find our dream home where my wife and I could raise our kids in a healthy and safe environment. It took us over 10 years from the time that we started looking to find our home. It is the perfect home in a neighborhood of homes surrounded by conservation land located in the Town of Groton Massachusetts, a quaint New England town. We risked everything financially to get our home. By some miracle we were able to purchase our home. It is our primary investment for our kids'ell being and our eventual retirement. This pipeline will significantly decrease our property value and devastate us financially. There are many other families throughout Massachusetts in the exact same situation. All of us are concerned about the devastating impact this pipeline will have on our families' inancial wellbeing and financial future.

On February 6, 2011 we held our first Super Bowl party at our new. home. This day was a disaster for both the Pittsburgh Steelers and our air conditioning system. Ice dams destroyed our back deck and air conditioning system. Fortunately we had insurance that paid for the repairs. After seeing the massive repair costs we realized that this was a blessing in disguise and replaced our air-conditioning with geothermal. Geothermal is a clean renewable energy solution. This was easy to do in Massachusetts since our state leads the way in clean renewable energy solutions. This pipeline impacts many things on our property including our geothermal wells. It is unimaginable that a fossil fuel solution such as a natural gas pipeline can take precedence over a clean renewable energy solution such as geothermal. We need to continue to be leaders in clean renewable energy and reject this project.

Our kids enjoy the benefits of living in a neighborhood bordered by conservation land. Often they walk the conservation land behind our homes to get exercise and enjoy nature. During the summer months they venture over to Wattles Pond to go fishing where they have always caught a fish. Then there is the "Save the Bullfrog" campaign my kids embark upon every year. For about a month at the start of summer they fish bullfngs out of our pool that migrate from the wetlands behind our house. As parents we enjoy sitting on the back deck looking out at the trees and watching the deer and turkeys traverse our property. Of course there is the occasional porcupine, fisher cat, or bear, but we like seeing them too. Ifthis pipeline project were to continue as-is all of the wetlands and conservation land that surround our neighborhood will be gone forever. The residents of Groton will have lost something precious that can never be replaced.

Conservation land is scarce in Massachusetts. Ours is just a piece of the conservation land that remains in our state. Massachusetts passed Article 97 in our state constitution to protect conservation land and open space from being developed. This pipeline is a "greenfield" project that affects conservation land throughout the state. It also impacts wetlands, priority habitats, core habitats, farmland, water supplies, protected water resources, scenic rivers, and wellhead protection areas all while going through peoples'omes. It is imperative that Massachusetts be able to preserve what conservation land and open space they have left. Kinder Morgan knows that this project would never be approved as-is if it were brought directly to Masmhushetts. That is why they are using federal eminent domain to push through a pmjct that the public would never agree too.

I have attended many of the public meetings held by elected officials and by Kinder Morgan regarding this pipeline. Contrary to what Kinder Morgan would like us to believe this is not for the benefit of people in New England. The reason for developing this pipeline is for corporate profit through the export of natural gas. We are more than willing to work with Kinder Morgan to help them achieve their goals, but it cannot be a detriment to the public as it is now.

Thank you for using the time to read my letter. Any attention you can give this matter is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely Yours,  
Richard Crane

cc:

Governor Devel Patrick  
US Senator Elizabeth Warren  
US Senator Edward J. Markey  
US Congresswoman Niki Tsongas  
Attorney General Martha Coakley  
State Senator Eileen Donoghue  
Shtte Representative Sheila Harrington  
Maev Valley-Bartlett, ~of Energy and Environmental Affhirs  
Ann G. Berwick, Chair of Masumhusetts Department of Public Utilities  
John R. Jenkins, Chair of Massachusetts Department of Transportation  
Groton Board of Selectmen  
Groton Board of Assessors  
Groton Conservation Commission  
Groton Planning Board  
Gmton Conservation Trust  
Nashoba Conservation Trust  
Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC

**20141112-0024(29915903).pdf**

November 3, 2014

BMB Land LLC  
500 Stewart Road,  
Franklin, NY 13775

Attn: Kimberly D. Bose,

I have written you in the past about our concerns' of Constitution's preferred route of the pipeline going through the property of BMB Land, LLC. [letter to you dated April 19, 2013]. I sent a map marked for a sensible pipeline reroute to along our back property line and away from our ponds and wet land. We had hoped to get this accomplished early in the planning so as not to cause any undo problems to any initial finalized agreements.

Since then, we have worked with Constitution, giving them full access to our property. We suggested they start at [our neighbor] Haney, and where they curved the line to the right, it could be curved to the left and go along our back property line, follow the ridge and join their original proposed route. Our neighbors on the other side, Decker and Buel, agreed that would be better for all and would add very little length over their original route and also do away with sharp bends in the line.

We belong to the Upstate Landowner Group Coalition. The coalition and Attorney Chris Denton have worked with Constitution to get a fair ay' cement for all. BMB Land pursued all possible negotiations with Constitution, to change the route, without success. Since Eminent Domain was rising on the horizon, we felt pressured to capitulate and decided we had no recourse but to finally sign the agreement that the coalition had worked out.

We signed the Right of Way Agreement and sent it to Attorney Denton on 10-24-14.

On 10-30-14 we received a notice that on 10/24 a Route Deviation has been recommended in the FEIS, to move the route to along our back property boundary, away from ponds, wetlands, and future building sites. The attached map showed the new [blue] line partially along our back boundary. We were pleased to have gained this much.

We smiled too soon. Between 10/24 and 10/31 Constitution apparently received our signed easement agreement from the lawyer and on 10/31 we received a notice that Constitution had notified FERC that since they had acquired our signed agreement they would like to go back to the Proposed Primary Route that we had been pressured to sign.

The Route Deviation recommended on 10/24, partially along our back boundary, while taking valuable timber, would not completely devalue our property and is far superior for us and the future of our land. We would be more than willing to work with Constitution for the proposed deviation.

Thank you for your consideration,

May Miller, member BMBLand LLC . (607) 829-3183

**20141112-0025(29915904).pdf**

November 5, 2014

BMB Land LLC

500 Stewart Rd..

Franklin, NY 13775

(607) 829-3183

Attention: Kimberly D.Bose,

This is a follow up letter to the certified letter, dated Nov. 3rd, that I sent you yesterday.

We have received, in the mail, a letter from Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company. Tennessee Gas is planning to expand their existing pipeline system, calling it "The Northeast Energy Direct Project [NED Project]. It will be regulated by FERC.

I was also visited by one of "Tennessee" representatives. This person mentioned that their plan was to stay along the same corridor as the Constitution Pipeline. If this is so, it is another reason to keep the "Constitution" placed along the BMB Land LLC back property line as the 10/24/2014 Route Deviation is marked, in turquoise, on the map.

Although Constitution has squeezed their Proposed Primary Route between our ponds, there is absolutely no room for another line. That means another whole hunk of our property will be GONE. The Route Deviation would somewhat alleviate this problem.

Again, we would work with Constitution on this Proposed Route Deviation Route..

Thank you once again for your consideration.

May Miller,

Member, BMB Land, LLC

**20141112-0041(29912938).pdf**

*originally "File 29910876\_1.tif cannot be converted to PDF"*

GROTON·DUNSTABLE REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

P.O. Box 729. Groton. MA 01450-0729. Tel.: 978.448.5505. Fax: 978.448.9402

Alison Manugian

School Committee Chair

November 5, 2014

Kimberly D, Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, NE - Room IA

Washington, DC 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas route crossing Public Land of Groton Dunstable Regional School District

Dear Ms. Bose:

We are writing in reference to Docket Number PFI4-22-000, The request to implement pre-filing was submitted by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC. on September 15,2014. The proposed project, referred to as the NED (Northeast Energy Direct) project is currently a 36” diameter natural gas transmission line running from New York State to Dracut, Massachusetts,

In their request to FERC to use the pre-filing procedures the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company references (Page 6 item number 3) that this process will “provide early receipt of stakeholder and participating agency input ... “ and asserts that “early identification and consideration of issues will result in the most expedient processing”,” We find this to be tremendously comforting as our perception to date is that Tennessee Gas has been unresponsive when concerns are raised by impacted parties, We are further heartened to see that page one of FERC’s Blanket Certificate Program Citizens’ Guide specifically states “Projects that could significantly affect rates, services, safety, security, competing gas companies or their customers, or the environment are not eligible for the blanket certificate program,” Certainly a project, utilizing 175 miles of greenfield sites, in a state where an existing easement and pipeline are in service, can not be eligible for the blanket certificate program,

While we share many of the concerns raised by others in our communities our specific concerns relate to 703 Chicopee Row (Book 11849, page 100), which is directly on the proposed pipeline path. Please see the sketch of the property on page two of this letter, The land and buildings constructed there are owned by the Groton Dunstable Regional School District and hence are public property, The parcel is home to our High School campus (completed in 2003) and is permitted for an additional school building should our enrollment demand additional facilities,

A Regional School District in Massachusetts functions as an entity legally independent from the municipalities it serves, The duties and responsibilities of a Regional School District and Regional School Committee are set out in Chapter 71 of the Massachusetts General Laws, Our Regional School Committee consists of 7 elected members serving three year terms.

We understand that the route of the proposed pipeline has been drawn with a wide brush and that further refinements will be forthcoming. The safety of our students, staff and general public is understandably foremost in our minds as we learn about the NED project and route, While it may be that the risk of a failure or leak is fairly low for a pipeline such as is proposed, we believe it is self-evident that the consequences could be calamitous, We request that the route be altered to pass further from our high school for many reasons:

- The pipeline route is proposed to bisect the conservation area on this parcel. The conservation land is intended to preserve wildlife corridors and habitat. To disturb this area and maintain a permanently cleared pathway would eliminate it’s use for wildlife preservation.
- The property was obtained and the high school built, using funding from the Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA). This program continues to reimburse our regional district for a portion of the capital project loans, These loans have approximately another decade prior to payoff and dissolution of this relationship with MSBA.
- To say that our high school serves as a public gathering place is to understate the frequency of events athletic events, fine arts productions, community meetings and the like are weekly events throughout the year. Town hased youth sports utilize our fields daily throughout the year for practice and competitions, Graduation takes place, weather permitting, within the oval of our track.
- The currently proposed route comes within 600’ of the track mentioned above. This puts significant parts of our facilities within the 950’ hazard area radius for a 36” diameter pipeline. Additional safety precautions and maximum transmission pressure should be considered.
- The currently proposed route divides our main site from our emergency secondary access, required by the fire and police departments to maintain public safety, The inability to use this emergency egress would limit us to a single access road approximately 20’ wide. This would be inadequate should we need to evacuate the

property or bring in multiple emergency vehicles,

- It is possible that the high school would serve as an emergency shelter for our towns should there be need in the communities. We have in the past used school buildings in emergency situations. Clearly this use would be infeasible if the high school parcel were impacted by an emergency due to the proposed gas pipeline,

*{MAP not reproduced here}*

We very much appreciate the time you've taken to review our concerns and the entire application of Tennessee Gas with respect to this project. There are numerous concerns and questions that we and others in the community have shared with Tennessee Gas. We look forward to learning more and working with the permitting authorities as this project moves forward, Please do not hesitate to contact me with questions or for clarification of our parcel or situation.

Regards,

Alison Manugian  
Chair - Groton Dunstable Regional School Committee  
amanugian@gdrsd.org  
978-448-2823

**20141112-0110(29919864).pdf**

**Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma**  
Historic Preservation  
PO. Box 1210 ~ Durant, OK 74702-1210

November 4, 2014

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

RE: OEP/DG2E/Gas Branch 3, Southern Natural Gas Company, LLC., North Main Lines Relocation Project, Docket No. PF14-12000

Dear Ms. Bose,

The Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma thanks the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for the Correspondence regarding the above referenced project. The Choctaw Nation has received the GIS shapefiles for this project from TerraXplorations, Inc. and we have viewed the project location in our GIS database. A portion of Jefferson Co., AL lies in the Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma's area of historic interest. This project, however, lies outside of that area. The Choctaw Nation Historic Preservation Department respectfully defers to the other Tribes that have been contacted. If you have any question, please contact our office at 580-924-8280 ext. 2631.

Sincerely,

Dr. Ian Thompson, Ph.D., RPA  
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer  
Tribal Archaeologist, NAGPRA Specialist

by: Lindsey D Billyeu  
Senior Section 106 Reviewer  
Ibilver@choctawnation.com  
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma  
P.O. Drawer 1210  
Durant, OK 74701

**THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS**  
**EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS**

Department of Agricultural Resources  
251 Causeway Street, Suite 500, Boston, MA 02114  
617-626-1700 fax: 617-626-1850 www.mass.gov/sgr

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

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.

Proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project (Docket No. PF14-22-000)

Dear Secretary Bose:

The Massachusetts Department of Agricultural Resources, hereby notifies both FERC and TGP of its intention to actively participate in the pre-filing process for the Northeast Energy Direct (“NED”) project proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company. The initial September 16, 2014 comments filed with FERC by the Secretary of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Executive Office of Environmental Affairs summarized the range of EOEAA agency interests and concerns associated with the proposed NED project and we intend to address our agency specific concerns in more detail during the pre-filing process. Thank you.

Gregory C. Watson

Commissioner

Department of Agricultural Resources

Cc: Martin Suuberg, Undersecretary EEA

Michael Letson, TGP

**20141112-5010(29910174).pdf**

Elizabeth Rodio, Sharon, MA.

I urge you to stop all new gas pipelines. They aren't needed or wanted.

Here are the reasons:

- 1) The proposed pipeline path runs through over a thousand private and public properties, including through some of the state's most sensitive eco-systems and lands set aside for conservation.
- 2) 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.
- 3) 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.
- 4) Looking into the CO2 emissions averaged over all sources of electric generation in MA, the average per source is 910 lb. per MWh. The average natural gas generation plant is 1,210 lb. per MWh. Natural gas has done its “bridge” work. With renewables phasing in at an unprecedented rate, adding more natural gas would now take us in the wrong direction for achieving the state's greenhouse gas emissions goals – based on CO2 output alone.
- 5) Natural gas is also primarily methane, a greenhouse gas over 86 times more powerful than CO2 in the first 20 years that it hits the atmosphere, 34 times more over a 100 year period. When a full accounting of methane's impact is taken into account from drill site to burner tip, studies show that it has no benefit over coal or oil in reducing greenhouse gas effects.

6) Investing billions into fossil fuel infrastructure commits our region to their increased and continuing use for decades. We are standing at the far end, having crossed the natural gas “bridge” to a clean energy economy. It’s time to step forward into that future we’ve been building.

**20141112-5016(29910191).pdf**

al wallace, carver, MA.

First of all I am opposed to this gas pipe line for many reasons # 1 safety I have Family who lives on conservation land which Kinder Morgan wants to put this Pipeline through. They cannot even use or do anything with 1 acre of their 2 acre parcel because it is protected land yet the goverment can just barnstorm their way through and think there will be no opposition. At 1400 p.s.i. if there is a gas leak and explosion on my family’s property there will be none found especially when they are within 250 of this proposed line. I only have 1 family and they can’t be replaced, elected leaders who would vote this in really do not care because it is probably not in their back yard, but you can be replaced. This line is going to run by schools and drinking water supplys (fish brook), Wood Hill Middle and High Plain Elem. Have we not had enough disasters at our schools with violence etc. and now to run this pipe line through these area’s is totally irresponsible if not criminal. #2 there earth quake fault lines that run through New England and that proposes a major problem (remember 1989 )San Fransisco Earth Quake the horrible gas explosions ran freely because they could not be isolated. I am a master Plumber in State Of Mass and work in Boston there 100’s of gas leaks under the streets and the pressures or no where near this proposed line. #3 climate changes in wetlands at 3’ below ground there is going to be movement and eventually a major disaster. #4 correct me if I am wrong this proposed gas line does not even benefit the U.S. from what I understand it is going to a site in the ocean to be Liquidfied and sent to Europe. # 5 values of homes sure won’t go up and you all know that and the people who live with this disaster staring them in the face sure be Majorally compensated for for putting their futures and lives on the line for what (GREED) CONSIDER A SAFER AND BETTER ROUTE FOR SAFETY SAKES

**20141112-5018(29910195).pdf**

Nicholas Krefting, Watertown, MA.

I urge you to stop all new gas pipelines. They aren’t needed or wanted.

Here are the reasons:

The proposed pipeline path runs through over a thousand private and public properties, including through some of the state’s most sensitive eco-systems and lands set aside for conservation.

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.

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.

Looking into the CO2 emissions averaged over all sources of electric generation in MA, the average per source is 910 lb. per MWh. The average natural gas generation plant is 1,210 lb. per MWh. Natural gas has done it’s “bridge” work. With renewables phasing in at an unprecedented rate, adding more natural gas would now take us in the wrong direction for achieving the state’s greenhouse gas emissions goals – based on CO2 output alone.

Natural gas is also primarily methane, a greenhouse gas over 86 times more powerful than CO2 in the first 20 years that it hits the atmosphere, 34 times more over a 100 year period. When a full accounting of methane’s impact is taken into account from drill site to burner tip, studies show that it has no benefit over coal or oil in reducing greenhouse gas effects.

Investing billions into fossil fuel infrastructure commits our region to their increased and continuing use for

decades. We are standing at the far end, having crossed the natural gas “bridge” to a clean energy economy. It’s time to step forward into that future we’ve been building.

**20141112-5019(29910197).pdf**

Joseph Lamoureux, Nashua, NH.

I am writing to express concern regarding Kinder Morgan’s Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company’s project, specifically: Docket # PF14-22

**PROBLEM.**

**SIGNIFICANT RISKS EXIST THAT COULD CAUSE SERIOUS INJURY OR DEATH DUE TO THE ROUTE OF THE GAS PIPELINE IN ANDOVER, MA. SEE BELOW:**

- 1.) **PROPOSED ROUTE IS NEAR A SCHOOL SYSTEM - WHICH WILL PUT CHILDREN AT RISK.** In the event of an explosion the heat radius could kill anyone within several hundred feet (of an explosion) due to the proposed high pressure gas pipeline. **CHILDREN COULD DIE.**
- 2.) **DISRUPTION OF DRINKING WATER QUALITY IN ANDOVER, MA:** The proposed route almost abuts Fish Brook, which supplies Andover’s drinking water, and in some locations passes under Fish Brook. This may disturb drinking water quality for town residents. **POLLUTED WATER COULD CAUSE CANCER.**
- 3.) **DISRUPTION OF DRINKING WATER QUALITY IN SEVERAL TOWNS THAT SURROUND ANDOVER, MA:** The pipeline is proposed to pass under the Merrimack River, which could disrupt drinking water quality for several towns near Andover, MA - as the Merrimack supplies water to several towns. **POLLUTED WATER COULD CAUSE CANCER.**
- 4.) **PROPOSED ROUTE RUNS THROUGH MILES OF ANDOVER’S CONSERVATION AND WETLANDS - WHICH WILL PUT ENDANGERED SPECIES AT RISK.** There are endangered species inhabiting these wetlands. **ENDANGERED ANIMALS COULD DIE.**

**SOLUTION.**

**CHANGE THE PROPOSED ROUTE AWAY FROM ANDOVER’S DRINKING WATER AND SCHOOL SYSTEM.**

**20141112-5021(29910201).pdf**

Emily Kirkland, Somerville, MA.

No new gas pipelines! Keep our climate livable!

**20141113-0007(29914764).pdf**

September 20, 2014

Chairwoman Cheryl A. LaFleur  
888 First Street NE  
Washington DC, 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Expansion Project

Dear Chairwoman Cheryl A. LaFleur,

I am writing to express my concern with and opposition to the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Direct project. (Docket No. pF14-22-000)

As a resident of Massachusetts, through which the proposed pipeline is routed, I am directly affected by its potential consequences, including the risk of gas leak-related explosion and contamination, as well as decline in property values and an increase in insurance costs. Furthermore, as currently planned, this project will cross sensitive conservation lands, wetlands, and rivers leaving a permanent scar through some of

Massachusetts' most picturesque open spaces and putting many of our towns' primary sources of drinking water at risk of contamination

The effort to meet Massachusetts' ongoing energy needs should not adversely impact residents' quality of life, nor come at the expense of open space benefiting 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, energy efficiency programs, and a policy to switch to renewable sources of energy generation now and in the future. I urge you to fully prioritize further investment in and deployment of these solutions, and to take any actions as are necessary to begin a public dialog to determine whether this project is necessary or advisable for our state.

Sincerely,

**20141113-0010(29914769).pdf**

**FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION**  
WASHINGTON, DC 2002

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

November 6, 2014

The Honorable Jeanne Shaheen  
United States Senate  
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Shaheen:

Thank you for your October 15, 2014, letter regarding Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.'s (Tennessee) proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project (Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Docket No. PF14-22-000).

Tennessee filed its pre-filing request letter for this project on September 15, 2014, and our staff approved Tennessee's request to enter into our pre-filing process 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. By engaging the public early in the process, we believe that we can conduct a more meaningful review of this project, and discuss potential solutions and route modifications before an application is filed. I can assure you that my staff will complete a thorough and comprehensive environmental review of this project, which will include attending Tennessee's open house meetings and holding Commission-sponsored scoping meetings in areas convenient for affected residents of New Hampshire. The staff's review will also consider the concerns of the New Hampshire Attorney General's office and the New Hampshire Department of Fish and Game regarding the potential project impacts on conservation lands and wildlife habitat.

Once Tennessee files its application, the Commission's environmental staff will prepare a draft environmental impact statement (EIS) for this project and the public will have additional opportunities to comment on the project and the adequacy of this document. I can assure you that the draft EIS will take into account impacts on private and public conservation lands and sensitive wildlife, and will consider alternative routes. The final EIS will address any comments received on the draft EIS, and the Commission will consider the findings of the final EIS before making its decision on whether or not to authorize this project.

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,

Cheryl A. LaFleur

Chairman

**20141113-0011(29914787).pdf**

**FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, DC 00400**

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

November 6, 2014

The Honorable Kelly Ayotte  
United States Senate  
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Ayotte:

Thank you for your October 15, 2014, letter regarding Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.'s (Tennessee) proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project (Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Docket No. PF14-22-000).

Tennessee filed its pre-filing request letter for this project on September 15, 2014, and our staff approved Tennessee's request to enter into our pre-filing process 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. By engaging the public early in the process, we believe that we can conduct a more meaningful review of this project, and discuss potential solutions and route modifications before an application is filed. I can assure you that my staff will complete a thorough and comprehensive environmental review of this project, which will include attending Tennessee's open house meetings and holding Commission-sponsored scoping meetings in areas convenient for affected residents of New Hampshire. The staff's review will also consider the concerns of the New Hampshire Attorney General's office and the New Hampshire Department of Fish and Game regarding the potential project impacts on conservation lands and wildlife habitat.

Once Tennessee files its application, the Commission's environmental staff will prepare a dry environmental impact statement (EIS) for this project and the public will have additional opportunities to comment on the project and the adequacy of this document. I can assure you that the draft EIS will take into account impacts on private and public conservation lands and sensitive wildlife, and will consider alternative routes. The final EIS will address any comments received on the draft EIS, and the Commission will consider the findings of the final EIS before making its decision on whether or not to authorize this project.

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,

Cheryl A. LaFleur  
Chairman

**20141113-0012(29914836).pdf**

**FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, DC 00400**

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

The Honorable Anne Kuster  
U.S. House of Representatives  
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Congresswoman Kuster:

Thank you for your October 15, 2014, letter regarding Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.'s (Tennessee) proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project (Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Docket No. PF14-22-000).

Tennessee filed its pre-filing request letter for this project on September 15, 2014, and our staff approved Tennessee's request to enter into our pre-filing process 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. By engaging the public early in the process, we believe that we can conduct a more meaningful review of this project, and discuss potential solutions and route modifications before an application is filed. I can assure you that my staff will complete a thorough and comprehensive environmental review of this project, which will include attending Tennessee's open house meetings and holding Commission-sponsored scoping meetings in areas convenient for affected residents of New Hampshire. The staff's review will also consider the concerns of the New Hampshire Attorney General's office and the New Hampshire Department of Fish and Game regarding the potential project impacts on conservation lands and wildlife habitat.

Once Tennessee files its application, the Commission's environmental staff will prepare a draft environmental impact statement (EIS) for this project and the public will have additional opportunities to comment on the project and the adequacy of this document. I can assure you that the draft EIS will take into account impacts on private and public conservation lands and sensitive wildlife, and will consider alternative routes. The final EIS will address any comments received on the draft EIS, and the Commission will consider the findings of the final EIS before making its decision on whether or not to authorize this project.

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,

Cheryl A. LaFleur  
Chairman

**20141113-0032(29915886).pdf**

**The Commonwealth of Massachusetts**  
William Francis Galvin, Secretary of the Commonwealth  
Massachusetts Historical Commission

November 5, 2014

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

RE: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LL.C., a Kinder Morgan Company, Northeast Energy Direct Project, PA, MA, CT, NH. MXC 1RC,56771.FERC Docket 1PF14-22-000.

Dear Secretary Bose:

The Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC), office of the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), received additional information on October 21, 2014 regarding the project referenced above. After review of the materials submitted, the MHC offers the following comments to assist the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) in its compliance with 36 CFR 800, the regulations implementing Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

The information submitted includes USGS topographic 'quadrangle locus maps with a "project area corridor" indicated across the state, a list of the federal and state agency permits anticipated to be required for the project, and a list of the Massachusetts municipalities in which the project is proposed.

To assist in avoiding and protecting areas within Massachusetts that are known to have or are sensitive for significant historic and archaeological resource, and to minimize the overall project effects to the Commonwealth's finite cultural resources, especially those on lands previously designated for conservation and preservation, feasible alternatives for routing the proposed project within areas that have been previously impacted, such as existing transportation and infrastructure corridors, should be considered.

Additional information is required by the MHC to understand the precise location and areas of potential effects, and the nature of the potential effects of the pipeline project within Massachusetts. A narrative description of the project components and methods of construction should be provided to the MHC, describing where open trench, directional drilling, ground disturbance activities, new construction, etc., are proposed. The location and boundaries of the project, including the new pipeline, new above-ground construction such as meter stations, valves, compressor stations, temporary and permanent construction easements, access ways, staging areas, equipment and materials storage areas, and all other related project work areas should be clearly indicated on USGS locus maps and on project plans and drawings. Appropriate sections of USGS topographic quadrangle locus maps, enlarged as necessary, and project plans and drawings, should be prepared which show all aspects of the project clearly identified and labeled with the project components. The locus maps, project plans and drawings submitted to the MHC should be no larger than 11"x 17."

The MHC will advise and assist FERC in carrying out its responsibilities to take into consideration the effects of the project on historic and archaeological resources and to provide consulting parties the opportunity to comment on its findings and determinations (36 CFR 800.2(c)(1)).

The MHC advises FERC that potential consulting parties may include, among others: (a) the local government historical commissions of the municipalities in which the project is proposed; (b) local historic district commissions of any local historic district (Mass. Gen. Laws [MGL] c. 9, s. 40C) in which the project is proposed; (c) Tribal Historic preservation Officers of the Stockbridge-Munsee Community, the Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head (Aquinnah), and the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe; and (d) the Massachusetts Board of Underwater Archaeological Resources (BUAR) for any submerged lands of the Commonwealth in which the project is located (36 CFR 800.2(cd), (3), dt (5)). The MHC advises that FERC should commence notification to these potential consulting parties to learn of their interest in participating in the Section 106 consultation process.

The MHC advises that FERC should contact the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) to learn if the ACHP will participate because of the multi-state project location and its potential to meet the criteria for ACHP involvement (see 36 CFR 800, Appendix A).

The MHC advises that FERC should develop a plan for public comment (36 CFR 800.2(d)).

The MHC looks forward to consultation with FERC on FERC's determination and documentation of the project's areas of potential effects (APE) for historical architectural and for archaeological resources (36 CFR 800.4(a)(1)).

The MHC looks forward to consulting with FERC in the development of an adequate scope for identification and evaluation efforts for historic and archaeological resources that may be affected by the project (36 CFR 800.4(b) to (c))

The MHC requests that a reconnaissance-level cultural resources survey for historic architectural and archaeological resources within the project areas of potential effects be conducted by a qualified cultural resources consulting firm with previous relevant experience in Massachusetts. The survey should be conducted in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation (48 Fed. Reg. 190 (1983)) and the Massachusetts State Archaeologist's field investigation regulations (950 CMR 70).

The research design and methodology of the survey should consider and evaluate previous cultural resources survey methods and results for linear project corridors located within the regions in Massachusetts in which the project is proposed. The research design and methodology should describe explicitly how relevant previous research findings, including locations and results of previous survey efforts and reported historical

and archaeological resources within the project areas of potential effects, will be considered, evaluated, and reported. The MHC's numbering systems for historic and archaeological properties and areas, and survey reports should be referenced.

As part of the reconnaissance-level identification effort in the areas of potential effects for historic architectural resources, a suitable and explicit survey methodology should be developed. The project's professional cultural resources consultants should produce new or updated MHC Historic Properties inventory Forms prepared in accordance with the MHC's Historic Properties Survey Manual. The archaeological reconnaissance survey should evaluate the locations of proposed project impacts and document archaeologically sensitive locations within the project areas of potential effects for archaeological resources. The archaeological sensitivity assessment models should be developed to consider ancient and historical period environmental attributes, the ancient and historical cultural archaeological resources. The archaeological sensitivity assessment models should be developed to consider ancient and historical period environmental attributes, the ancient and historical cultural geography of the Massachusetts regions in which the project is proposed, and any previous impacts of the project impact areas.

The MHC requests that FERC inform other involved federal, state, and municipal agencies, the project proponent, and consultants that the locations of archaeological resources should not be disclosed in documents prepared for public review (see 36 CFR 800.11(c) and MGL c. 9, s. 26A(1) & (5)).

A draft scope for the reconnaissance-level cultural resources survey should be submitted to MHC, and other interested consulting parties such as Tribal Historic Preservation Officers and the Massachusetts BUAR, for review and comment.

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 (950 CMR 70-71). If you have any 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

cc:

Eric Tomasi, FERC  
Charlene Dwin Vaughan, ACHP  
John Eddins, ACHP  
Karen Kirk Adams, US Army Corps of Engineers  
Kathleen Atwood, US Army Corps of Engineers  
Tim Timmerman, USEPA Region I  
Lois K, Adams, USEPA Region I  
Mike Stover, USEPA Region I  
Sherry White, Stockbridge-Munsee Community  
Bettina Washington, Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head (Aquinnah)  
Ramona Peters, Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe  
James A. Peters, Jr. Massachusetts Commission on Indian Affairs  
Elizabeth H. Muzzey, NH SHPO  
Ruth Pierpoint, NY DSHPO  
Dan Forrest, CT SHPO  
Serena Bellew, PA DSHPO

Secretary Maeve Vallely Bartlett, Massachusetts Executive Office of Energy & Environmental Affairs  
David W. Cash, Massachusetts DEP  
Lealdon Langley, Massachusetts DEP-Bureau of Resource Protection  
Ben Lynch, Massachusetts DEP-Bureau of Resource Protection  
Mary Griffin, Massachusetts Dept. of Fish & Game  
Jack Murray, Massachusetts Dept, of Conservation & Recreation  
Patrice Kish, Massachusetts Dept. of Conservation & Recreation  
Bruce K. Carlisle, Massachusetts Coastal Zone Management  
Victor T. Mastone, Massachusetts BUAR  
Deirdre Buckley, Massachusetts EEA/MEPA  
Mark Sylvia, Attn. Meg Lusardi, Massachusetts Dept. of Energy Resources  
Andy Green, Massachusetts Energy Facilities Siting Board  
Ann G. Berwick, Attn. Andrew Greene, Massachusetts Dept, of Public Utilities - Siting Division  
Mike Letson, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co. LLC, a Kinder Morgan Co.  
Eileen Banach, AECOM, Providence, RI  
AECOM, Chelmsford, MA  
Hope Luhman, Louis Berger

**20141113-5000(29913240).pdf**

Rodney Patterson, Canaan, NY.

November 8 2014.

Dear People at F.E.R.C.: I am a resident of the Berkshires for over thirty years. I can clearly see that “This fracked gas pipeline is not needed”. Kinder Morgan does not care about our beautiful Berkshires. I would like to hope and believe that the people running your agency, F.E.R.C., do care about our future here.

It sounds like Kinder Morgan company just wants to ruin our beautiful, protected land, and bulldoze over our seniors and families and children, and ruin our future here, all in the name of money and their own profit. They want to sell this dangerous fracked gas to countries outside the United States. It is a lie that it will make our fuel prices here go down. Kinder Morgan and the Tennessee Gas Companies will not be able to do this. There are already legal actions in motion.

I am asking F.E.R.C. to “do the right thing”, and show that you care about our children and grandchildren, and the future here. Please send this message to the appropriate legislators and people with whom you work.  
THANK YOU.

Sincerely,  
Rodney Patterson  
5 Miller Road  
Canaan NY 12029  
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.

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.

**20141113-5011(29913262).pdf**

Zoe Vanderschmidt, Jamaica Plain, MA.

The expansion of natural gas in Massachusetts is very likely to violate the Global Warming Solutions Act by making it impossible to meet the required greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction targets. This is in part because natural gas infrastructure leaks methane, a potent greenhouse gas.

The following points suggest that Massachusetts could have a future free of new natural gas pipelines, with investment directed toward clean energy that will help to preserve a livable planet:

Massachusetts is unlikely to suffer an energy deficit for a long time to come. With efficiency and conservation measures, energy demand could continue to drop. Furthermore, there is abundant power in the regional electric grid, which is itself well-connected to other regional grids (New York, PJM, Canada).

There are numerous solutions to the problem of load peaks. Demand response is very effective and cost-effective, while more costly options include efficiency improvements, transmission reinforcement (resources such as Cape Wind can relieve transmission constraints), and even various types of energy storage. There is already abundant natural gas generation capacity in Massachusetts that could be used to meet load peaks, leaving room for other energy sources.

While utilities have been balancing generation and load for many decades, today we have new challenges such as variable-output renewables and net metering. At the same time, we have a much larger and better-integrated grid with geographically-diverse resources, and we have far improved information and control technology that gives system operators much tighter control and more options for maintaining reliability.

In contrast, utilities and the ISO weigh traditionally-defined reliability extremely heavily, having neither cost nor the state's environmental policies as priorities. In general these entities tend to favor old solutions, such as building new peaking plants, even when these options may be more costly and unnecessary for maintaining reliability. Thus it is necessary for the state to push back and ensure that all options are considered—not to compromise reliability, but to weigh the costs and benefits of all strategies that can meet reliability criteria, with cost and the state's GHG reduction mandates given full weight in the analysis.

To settle this issue the state should thoroughly and critically review ISO studies of energy delivery - making sure that all options and their costs and benefits have been considered - in putting forward a comprehensive energy plan.

The most recent report from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change paints a stark, urgent picture of the threats that we face if we do not take rapid action to phase out greenhouse gas emissions. As one of the nation's intellectual centers, Massachusetts has the responsibility to show leadership at this moment of historic opportunity to transition to clean energy and avert catastrophic climate change

#### **20141113-5015(29913276).pdf**

Carolin vanderLaan, Newton, MA.

Two gas pipelines are proposed for Massachusetts - Kinder Morgan and Spectra. There are numerous reasons why these pipelines should not be approved. We do not need additional gas in Massachusetts. The infrastructure can be made more efficient without creating additional supplies. The lines carrying our gas supply have many leaks. Fixing the current leaks in our existing infrastructure will provide another 400 MW of power. Additionally, pipelines that are unused or partially unused can store gas during non-peak times and be used during peak times. On a yearly short-term basis, we can pay for expensive gas rather than building new pipeline capacity

#### **20141113-5028(29913415).pdf**

Holly Zeeb, Newtonville, MA.

New gas pipelines threaten fragile (and now protected) eco-systems and are a disincentive to create renewable energy sources. There is already unused capacity in present lines so there is no need for additional ones. Furthermore, leaks in the present pipelines, including class 3, if repaired, will insure that there is more than enough power for the state. The surplus power will undoubtedly be exported. Finally, methane emissions from gas do more to contribute to the greenhouse effect than CO<sub>2</sub>. For these reasons it is important not to allow new gas pipelines to be built in Massachusetts

Harold Naughton, Clinton, MA.  
HAROLD P. NAUGHTON, JR., Chairman  
12TH WORCESTER DISTRICT  
Joint Committee on Public Safety and Homeland Security  
200 HIGH STREET  
CLINTON, MA 01510  
TEL: (978) 365-1955  
ROOM 167, STATE HOUSE  
TEL: (617) 722-2230  
FAX: (617) 722-2846  
Harold.Naughton@MAhouse.gov

October 14, 2014

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, D.C. 20426

Dear Secretary Bose,

I am writing you to express my concerns regarding the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project. The area of landscape within Central Massachusetts selected for the potential pipeline route is called home to thousands, the source of livelihood for the large farming population, and offers some of the most cherished scenery and protected land in the Commonwealth. Specific to my district, the Towns of Berlin, Boylston, and Northborough are currently at risk to be environmentally and economically disrupted. These communities hold deep reservations that should this proposed pipeline project be approved, it would not only intrude upon their bucolic hometowns, but also streamline an inordinate amount of natural resources into Massachusetts, thus increasing our dependency to them.

Since the project's proposal earlier this year, I have received tremendous outcry from residents of these three towns. These hardworking men and women have expressed valid concerns centering on the negative effects this project will have on their personal property, local businesses and surrounding environment. Among these concerns is the fear that this pipeline will disrupt personal property and lead to the devaluation of land and scenery, as well as financially impact their mortgages and insurance premiums. Additionally, the creation of this pipeline will potentially destroy precious conservation land, aquifers, and require the obliteration of hundreds of privately owned homes

Kinder Morgan argues that this project is necessary due to the fact that the Northeast, including Massachusetts, is experiencing a shortage in natural gas. Should this be the case, I believe there are alternate options to delivering these resources to Massachusetts; options that do not require imposing a pipeline through the heart of the 12th Worcester District. As one of my constituents brought to my attention, the Wall Street Journal cited the owner of a gas-fired 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". This accusation renders me to believe Massachusetts does not require such an extensive natural gas supply system and other options can be explored.

As such, the ramifications that will result from this project will leave families, residents and businesses economically and emotionally ruined. The toll that the Kinder Morgan NED Project will take on the quality of life for members of the 12th Worcester District, specifically those of Berlin, Boylston and Northborough, will have a lasting and devastating effect.

I respectfully urge you to consider these concerns as we reach the final stages of deliberation on this project. I look forward to your response and hope to continue this conversation with you in regards to the scope of

this project, its credibility, and the implications it might have on the environment and members of the 12th Worcester District.

Sincerely,

Harold p. Naughton, Jr.

State Representative, 12th Worcester District

House Chairman, Joint Committee on Public Safety and Homeland Security

**20141113-5128(29915059).pdf**

James O Michel, Hyde Park, MA.

In the face of the impending climate crisis, the Kindred Morgan and Spectra pipeline projects are being described as a “bridge solution”.

This is not accurate. While natural gas is ‘cleaner’ than coal, it is still a greenhouse gas, and the fracking process itself is troublesome both in terms of the amount of the methane escaping into the atmosphere and the damage to the water table. Investing in infrastructure to support the long term use of a less egregious fossil fuel is not the solution, but is consistent with a business-as-usual/we have plenty of time to mentality. We have already frittered away the luxury of slow transition. The imperative to go green is urgent! Locally in Massachusetts, the proposed pipeline is being marketed as a solution/response to this winter’s predicted home heating price spikes.

This pandering to consumer’s fears is as cynical as it is misleading; the pipeline will not be completed for years, and would commit us for decades to purchasing gas derived from the heinous fracking process that despoils both the atmosphere and the water table. Furthermore financing of these projects will come at the expense of rate payers in the form of a surcharge. We need to be moving as fast as possible from a fossil fuel-based economy that is spending ever larger sums of money to extract dirtier, more difficult to use products, and recognize that the return on capital investment for renewables is trending upward. I strongly encourage you to reject both these projects.

**20141113-5154(29915391).pdf**

Shelly Gladstein, Andover, MA.

We are writing to express our concern with and opposition to the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline North-east Expansion project. As residents of Andover, through which the proposed pipeline is routed, we are 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 sensitive conservation land, leaving a permanent scar through some of Andover’s most picturesque open spaces and putting one of our primary sources of drinking water at risk of contamination.

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

Shelly Gladstein

Shelly and Marty Gladstein

7 Launching Rd

Andover, MA 01810

**20141114-5032(29916641).pdf**

Mira M Brown, Jamaica Plain, MA.

I oppose the building of both of these gas pipelines, for the following reasons:

- Contrary to popular opinion, increased use of natural gas is NOT a way to reduce our carbon footprint. While we do urgently need to reduce the green house gases emitted into the atmosphere, methane is a powerful greenhouse gas, and the gas leaks from pipelines of un-combusted natural gas far offset the minimal reductions in CO2 from switching from coal or oil to natural gas. Pipeline leaks, if taken into account, would dramatically alter any accurate environmental impact statement.
- The pipelines would pass through important ecological systems that should be preserved, some of them as increasingly important carbon sinks.
- The global scientific consensus is that if we are to keep global warming at or below the 2°C mark that might allow humanity and the rest of the species on Earth to escape the most catastrophic effects of climate change, we can only burn about 20% of the world's currently know fossil fuel reserves. Thus any significant new investment in fossil fuel infrastructure, including natural gas pipelines, is nothing but bad business, and one might be justified to characterize these new investments as "financial suicide" for us as a species.
- The need for more capacity has been cited using peak demand as the guideline. The conditions cited (cold weather when gas is needed both for heat and increased electrical demand) exist only for a few hours a day, for an average of 10-27 days per year. Despite even last winter's extreme cold, these conditions have never yet led to a use of our "electric generation buffer" (the extra electricity capacity the ISO-NE keeps on hand).
- 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 "Low Demand Scenario" created by current efficiency programs was never analyzed and the study in general were termed "flawed" during a recent meeting between pipeline opposition activists and the Governor and Sec. of Energy and Environmental Affairs. The Mass. Dept. of Energy Resources has undertaken a new study of cost benefits and risks of following the current trend of increased efficiency that is currently keeping demand for electricity flat, and how all-renewable solutions could factor into meeting our needs. Results of this new study are expected to be released Dec. 23, 2014. Approval of the pipelines without such a study would be irresponsible at best.
- 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. Making these repairs mandatory would reduce climate change AND reduce or eliminate the need for new pipelines

**20141117-5020(29919911).pdf**

Pamela A. Martin, Plymouth, NH.

I am opposed to importing or transmitting any further natural gas into or through New Hampshire for the following reasons:

1. The state of NH has defined renewable energy as "Energy that supplies present energy needs without permanently depleting resources, while considering environmental impacts and without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own energy needs." This bill was signed into law in 2009. Fracked gas does not meet the definition of renewable energy. The New Hampshire Department of Energy and Planning lists biomass, solar and wind as renewable energy. INH has a goal of 25% renewable energy by 2025. By building an expensive gas pipeline infrastructure through the state to import another fossil fuel, it will make it much more difficult to meet our renewable energy goals.
2. NH should focus more on energy efficiency than any new energy importations. Right now NH ranks

22nd in the country for energy efficiency and last among all the New England states. Importing fracked gas will make it much more difficult to focus on energy efficiency which should be our goal. Energy efficiency would provide long-term New Hampshire based jobs.

3. The production rates of fracked gas wells declines, on average, 85 percent over three years. We should not be developing a long-term energy policy based on the assumption that fossil fuel extraction will continue at current levels

**20141117-5109(29921893).pdf**

William FLagg, Allston, MA.

I am concerned about the expansion of gas lines in the state of Massachusetts. Not only has hydraulic fracturing not been studied enough to deem it environmentally safe, as well as emissions from Methane being low; we simply do not need to support gas line projects because all of the cleaner alternatives (i.e. solar, wind, biofuels, geothermal, etc...). Worse, nationwide incentives to promote natural gas production takes the wind out of renewables sails, so to speak, and slows down a transition to clean energy, which is vital at this point in time. Please reconsider these projects and think about the big

**20141117-5132(29922005).pdf**

Melissa Lowitz, Somerville, MA.

I'm writing to ask FERC to not approve new gas pipelines, especially the Kinder Morgan and Spectra Energy pipelines that will run through Massachusetts where I live. We do not need any more natural gas power generation in New England, we need more energy efficiency and renewable energy. More natural gas pipelines mean more greenhouse gas emissions from not just the power generation but also from methane leaks from the pipelines themselves. We need to reduce these emissions not increase them if we want to have any chance of decreasing the catastrophic effects of climate change. Also, these pipelines will be built on environmentally sensitive lands and across people's properties causing polluted water supplies and habitat degradation.

Please say NO to new natural gas pipelines for the good of the people and planet!!!

**20141117-5189(29922871).pdf**

robert wengronowitz, cambridge, MA.

Massachusetts is ALREADY too reliant on natural gas. In order to meet the Commonwealth's targets under the Global Warming Solutions Act, no new gas infrastructure of any kind should be built. ISO-NE and FERC need to understand we are heading towards a decentralized grid. They need to help us do that. They are currently playing an obstructionist role. Citizens of the Commonwealth will NOT let infrastructure be expanded or built. Go back to the drawing board and start all over. The capacity shortfalls are covered through efficiency and decentralized energy. Both of these efforts need to be expanded. Gas expansion has NO role in our Commonwealth's future. People will physically block these pipelines. Please reconsider or Tennessee Gas and Algonquin Gas and their parent companies will be forced to reconsider and will lose resources in the process

**20141117-5201(29922903).pdf**

Erin Sutton, Onset, MA.

Massachusetts is ALREADY too reliant on natural gas. In order to meet the Commonwealth's targets under the Global Warming Solutions Act, no new gas infrastructure of any kind should be built. ISO-NE and FERC need to understand we are heading towards a decentralized grid. They need to help us do that. They are currently playing an obstructionist role. Citizens of the Commonwealth will NOT let infrastructure be expanded or built. Go back to the drawing board and start all over. The capacity shortfalls are covered

through efficiency and decentralized energy. Both of these efforts need to be expanded. Gas expansion has NO role in our Commonwealth's future. People will physically block these pipelines. Please reconsider or Tennessee Gas and Algonquin Gas and their parent companies will be forced to reconsider and will lose resources in the process.

Erin

**20141117-5217(29923150).pdf**

Catherine MacKay, Rindge, NH.

I am opposed to this project on so many levels. I disapprove with the methods used to obtain this gas from the shale because of the pollution and destruction caused. I am sickened by the thought of ripping up hundreds of miles of habitats and communities to build a gas infrastructure that is not only unnecessary but detrimental to our future. We cannot continue to spew greenhouse gases into the atmosphere and expect to have a liveable planet. I am not willing to leave the safety of my region in the hands of an energy giant that is focused on profits rather than people. I will not have compressor stations that belch poisons into the air for our children to breathe, nor will I be willing to take the risk of having these same toxins leaking into the ground, mingling with the water we drink. I will not sell out my home so that a corporate behemoth can export gas via Canada, getting rich at our expense.

**20141118-5001(29923580).pdf**

T. Hall, Boxford, MA.

It makes me uncomfortable that you are looking for more ways to extract the fossil fuels that are harming more than the environment. They are harming our ability to adapt, our ability to eradicate poverty, our ability to live healthy for generations to come.

It might make you uncomfortable to realize that you are actually causing this harm.

But forget you and me. Uncontrolled fossil fuel emissions will continue to be uncomfortable for everyone around the globe if we continue a "business as usual" pathway.

I am trying to educate myself on how fossil fuels effect not only our environment, but our economic and social systems as well. The more I learn, the larger the problem appears to be. It won't be easy to make the transitions that are needed.

However, rather than spending money on creating more avenues for fossil fuels to flow, why not look for avenues that can capture and sequester carbon?

We are both uncomfortable. Let us both find real solutions that will have lasting positive effects. Our comfort depends on it.

**20141118-5003(29923609).pdf**

Leyana Dessauer, Bronxville, NY.

I strongly oppose the licensing of both the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company Northeast Energy Direct Project under PF14-22. and the Algonquin Gas Transmission Abbreviated Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity and for Related Authorizations re its proposed Algonquin Incremental Market (AIM) Project under CP14-96. The expansion of these gas infrastructure projects poses serious risks to bth human health and the environment.

First, the 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. 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. This occurs 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.

The proposed pipeline path runs through over a thousand private and public properties, including through some of the state's most sensitive ecosystems and lands set aside for conservation. How will these lands be protected from the disruption caused by pipeline construction and the potential leaks and explosions that may occur after construction? How will homes and schools be safeguarded against disruptive activity? How will threatened and endangered flora and fauna species be protected?

Additionally, there are currently enough leaks in the existing infrastructure to provide another 400 MW of power. Repairing Class 3 leaks (considered non-dangerous) is not mandatory, meaning that a large quantity of gas is wasted. 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. Given these facts, why is this pipeline necessary?

The gas in these pipelines, if approved, would exceed demonstrated need. The amount of additional pipeline capacity requested by NESCOE is 0.6 Billion cubic feet a day (Bcf/d), but the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline project proposed by KM/TGP is being planned for 2.2 Bcf/d. With nearly four times the capacity called for, where is the other three quarters of that capacity destined? The terminal hub in Dracut is also connection point to the Martimes & Northeast (M&NE) pipeline which has just applied to switch direction, bringing gas from Massachusetts, through Maine to the Maritimes of Canada, where two ports have just applied to switch from import to export. There is also new potential for export from facilities in Maine and Everett, MA. In board meetings across the state, KM representatives have repeatedly said that they have no control over who their customers are, so exports are on the table. Their own open season bidding memo called from LNG developers and customers in the Maritimes as well as local distribution and electric utilities. How will this gas be kept for domestic use?

Natural gas is also primarily methane, a greenhouse gas over 86 times more powerful than CO<sub>2</sub> in the first 20 years that it hits the atmosphere, and 34 times more over a 100 year period. When a full accounting of methane's impact is taken into account from drill site to burner tip, studies show that it has no benefit over coal or oil in reducing greenhouse gas effects.

Investing billions into fossil fuel infrastructure commits our region to their increased and continuing use for decades. Given the concerns over safety and economic problems resulting from climate change, why would FERC choose to permit a superfluous gas pipeline which will be used largely for export? What steps will be taken to prevent the leakage of methane, especially given the existing leaks in other pipelines, some of which have been ignored for decades? How will the future economic growth of the state be safeguarded, given the dangerous results of climate change?

#### **20141118-5005(29923613).pdf**

Paul Kelly, Worcester, MA.

Dear FERC Associate,

Neither America nor the state of Massachusetts is going to reduce our carbon footprint to zero tomorrow. Even the most avid green energy advocate realizes that SLOWING DOWN our use of fossil fuels is the only realistic option. That's why I feel that hundreds of thousands of Massachusetts residents who now disapprove of building more fossil fuel infrastructure, myself included, could easily be converted, if only Kinder-Morgan and /or Spectra could tell us how they plan to slow down our collective carbon emissions. What will they do to offset the obvious increase in fossil fuel consumption that building the pipelines will insure, for generations? Give us a conscientious 50-year plan, as citizens of the planet like the rest of us (but with singular impact on rate of climate change) and we will gladly give the pipeline project our allegiance

#### **20141118-5007(29923617).pdf**

Patricia A Martin, Rindge, NH.

I oppose the NED Pipeline project on the basis that it is a 100 year infrastructure project that will paint us, our children and grandchildren into a fossil fuel corner for the foreseeable future.

Moreover, our current coal plant in Merrimack just cost ratepayers nearly a half Billion \$ for a scrubber that was supposed to extend the life of the plant. We are still paying for that scrubber, but the plant is barely used. I understand that there is also an effort to not stock up on oil (now at the lowest price in years) for the oil fired generating plants. All of this starving of existing plants seems designed to help Kinder Morgan/TGP justify the need for more natural gas infrastructure. Natural Gas fired plants do burn with less carbon emissions, but the methane gas released during fracking and transmission is a much more destructive Greenhouse Gas than carbon...by several orders of magnitude.

This is the wrong direction for New Hampshire and our country.

The New England Governors stated that they needed 0.61 Billion Cubic Feet of Natural Gas per day to fill the gap during the Winter months in New England if all the planned shutdowns of existing plants were to occur. The KM/TGP proposal is for 2.2 Billion Cubic Feet, with most of it targeted to be shipped internationally without having to pay US tariffs. The New England Governors were scared into promising that they would find a way to make sure that the pipeline would be constructed at ratepayer expense. Massachusetts has since backed out of this agreement, but the other 5 States are still committed to this exploitation of ratepayers.

We do not need this pipeline and we ought to be investing in energy efficiency projects and renewable energy generation like bio-fuels and hydro plants to ensure the future of the planet.

Please don't approve this project

**20141118-5059(29924718).pdf**

Jennifer, Fitzwilliam, NH.

This Pipeline is a VERY BAD idea and a very dangerous idea. The proposed path of the alternate pipeline passes right next to the TROY MILLS Superfund site which is an active clean up. Not only was the soil contaminated there, but the ground water as well.

The construction and all of the disturbance involved with pipeline construction will disrupt what containment has been accomplished and release the chemicals back out into the land. The numbers in the containment wells at this site tend to fluctuate over the years as to the level of harmful chemicals and acceptable levels. This site is still not contained. Please do not approve this. Jennifer Hogan

Fitzwilliam,

**20141118-5101(29925882).pdf**

Maryann Harper, Rindge, NH.

I am writing to express my opposition to the Northern Energy Direct Project - Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Natural Gas Pipeline. There are many reasons that this project does not make good economic or environmental sense for ANY state in New England but I would like to touch upon the following:

- Kinder Morgan has not provided an economic analysis that indicates there would be an economic benefit from the pipeline at current gas and electricity usage levels
- The justification for this pipeline based on future demand is over inflated resulting in a massive overbuilding of infrastructure
- The surplus – as much as 75% - would be sold off to other international entities – so basically we, the ratepayers, are to pay for the construction of a gas super highway that will provide Kinder Morgan with the ability to reap enormous profits from off shore sales.
- The route(s) proposed will adversely affect many citizens directly and indirectly by destroying home sites, forests, wetlands and preservation land. It will rip open a vast hole in our beautiful New England and fill

it with toxins. We have chosen to live in a rural setting for clean air, clean water and peaceful living. The tradeoff we make is that we must travel, often great distances, to find employment and access services such as hospitals, cultural centers, and retail shopping. It is unfair and unconscionable to destroy our way of life by approving a project whose main purpose is the pursuit of corporate profits for Kinder Morgan.

- High pressure, high capacity natural gas pipelines such as the one proposed can and do explode, which mean significant human safety risks.
- All of the proposed pipeline routes cut through environmentally sensitive areas
- All of the proposed pipeline routes put residents at risk from the negative health impacts of toxins emitted purposefully or accidentally (through leakage.) Natural Gas Pipelines are classified as Minor Polluters when they are operating within their designated limits. Leakage, explosions and plain old sloppy operation can change them to Major Polluters in an instant.
- Using the PSNH corridor is not the answer as this easement also goes over private land, conservation land and closely (within 100') abuts many homes. It is a myth to think using the PSNH corridor is safer or less invasive. It appears widening the easement by an additional 100' would be necessary for co-location of the pipeline. In the event of a pipeline disaster (and Kinder Morgan's record speaks for itself here – see below) we would not only be dealing with a pipeline explosion but also the impact to the PSNH electric transmission lines. This does not make sense from a safety standpoint and is not something any rural community is prepared to deal with.
- As far as safety goes I think this quote from the Keene Sentinel newspaper is self explanatory “The Houston-based Kinder Morgan is the fourth largest energy company in North America, according to its website. The company has a history of accidents with its pipelines; since 2003 it was involved with 180 incidents including spills, evacuations, explosions, fires and fatalities across the United States, according to federal data.”
- There is no correct route location – as we don't want or need this pipeline in New England!
- This is the wrong direction for New England and for the United States of America to take in regards to Climate Change. The emissions from Natural Gas Pipelines pose a more serious threat in regards to Climate Change than traditional power plants.
- This is old technology. Why would you approve a project that increases our reliance on fossil fuels? This is not what the American People want and this is why the American People continue to fight these projects. A number of alternatives could be chosen to meet energy demands and these alternatives, especially those utilizing local companies and energy efficient models, would provide an economic benefit to the area in terms of jobs, and a better, cleaner future for our children. Recently an energy analyst at Deutsche Bank (source Bill Moyers.com) came to the startling conclusion that by 2016, solar power will be as cheap or cheaper than electricity from the conventional grid in every state except three. That's without any changes to existing policy. In other words, we're only a few years away from the point where, in most of the United States, there will be no economic reason not to go solar. If you care about slowing climate change or just moving toward cleaner energy, please don't tie us into this old, unsafe and toxic technology.

In summary, I oppose this project and ask you to not approve it because it is presently not needed and it is a bad choice for the future. It allows for community rights to be exploited by a private corporation intent on taking property by eminent domain to transport natural gas to LNG exporters. Please do not underestimate the citizens of New England. One only has to look back to the summer of 2014 at what happened with Market Basket. In the face of unfairness, the citizens of New England rallied and stood side by side, those with everything to lose and those with nothing to lose, to force the Board of a private corporation to recant their previous position and make the right decision. In the case of the Pipeline, the stakes are much higher, and we - the citizens of New England – have nothing to gain and everything to lose.

**20141118-5124(29926138).pdf**

Becky Romatoski, Cambridga, MA.

Massachusetts is ALREADY too reliant on natural gas. In order to meet the Commonwealth's targets under the Global Warming Solutions Act, no new gas infrastructure of any kind should be built. ISO-NE and FERC need to understand we are heading towards a decentralized grid. They need to help us do that. They are currently playing an obstructionist role. Citizens of the Commonwealth will NOT let infrastructure be expanded or built. Go back to the drawing board and start all over. The capacity shortfalls are covered through efficiency and decentralized energy. Both of these efforts need to be expanded. Gas expansion has NO role in our Commonwealth's future. People will physically block these pipelines. Please reconsider or Tennessee Gas and Algonquin Gas and their parent companies will be forced to reconsider and will lose resources in the process.

These pipelines are in direct conflict for a livable future. Do the right thing for you children and grandchildren and ban this fossil fuel infrastructure which can be replaced with low carbon energy

**20141118-5131(29926216).pdf**

Robyn Panciocco, Hollis, NH.

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

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

RE: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C, Docket # PF14-22-000

November 18, 2014

Dear Secretary Bose:

We appreciate the chance to submit our preliminary comments on the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline (Project) proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's (TGP), in conjunction with the pre-filing phase with FERC. With this, we are notifying both FERC and TGP of our intention to actively participate in the pre-filing phase of the proceedings in order to preserve our rights.

We are opposed to this Project as we are concerned about safety and the impact on our land, our town, and the environment. We do not believe TGP has been forthcoming in their communications with stakeholders. Furthermore, TGP has not given an adequate rationale, supported by valid scientific studies, that this Project is needed.

Impact on Our Land

The current maps indicate the Project would directly and adversely affect our private property in Hollis, New Hampshire. Installation will require extensive blasting, which could damage the foundation of our house and harm the quality of the water supply to our private well. Our property abuts Beaver Brook Conservation area on two sides, this installation process would irreparably disturb the environment. There are countless aspects to our property that cannot be assigned a monetary value. In the 5 years we have lived here, we have witnessed newborn deer learning to walk, bears gorging on the wild honeysuckle along our driveway, and a rare grey fox hunting for field mice in our front yard. These are only a few of the amazing events we have had the privilege of observing and there is no doubt this Project would irreversibly damage these aspects of our property.

We do not want a pipeline carrying highly compressed, flammable natural gas located on, or near, our property as we are concerned about safety and environmental disruption caused by this Project. Any company who deems something like pressurized natural gas as "safe" should be reminded of the definition of the word and advised to use it more wisely.

## Impact on Our Town and Environment

Allowing this Project to proceed will change the rural character of the town, essentially negating the \$11 million dollars the town's residents have spent to preserve it. Many communities in New Hampshire and Massachusetts are affected by this Project and nearly all have formally expressed opposition to this project. Installation would require blasting that could damage the aquifer that supplies water to Hollis, Nashua, Merrimack and other surrounding communities. Further, the Project would impact habitats that are home to rare and endangered species as well as permanently protected open space, farmland, and wetlands. If FERC is not willing to deny permit for this Project then at the very least, FERC must require TGP to complete a full and detailed environmental impact study conducted by an impartial and credentialed expert.

## Lack of Need

The need for this Project has not been adequately addressed by TGP. The data they have provided has been inaccurate, outdated or generated from poorly designed studies. It is the responsibility of FERC to carefully review this data and decide whether this Project is the only solution for the 0.6 bcf/day shortage which occurred for about 80 hours during the year of 2014 – one of the coldest winters in recent memory. In our opinion, this Project is short sighted and alternatives exist with current infrastructure to make up for this shortage while a cohesive long term energy solution is developed.

## Inadequate Communication from TGP

Despite being a private property owner directly affected by this Project, our communication with TGP has been minimal and insufficient. The information they have provided us lacks concise, current and detailed plans and is loosely supported by biased or anecdotal evidence. An example of this is their use of maps that are over 30 years old. Even as trained engineers, it took a substantial amount of time to determine where our property was and decipher the impact of the Project. Without the internet and skill-set we have, it would still be unclear as to the actual impact to our property and what our rights are as stakeholders. Hard working, private citizens should not have to spend hours analyzing data to gain insight into the impact to our property. Per the regulations, it is the responsibility of TGP to provide sufficient information to stakeholders. To us, TGP is negligent in this regard because they accepted inadequate work from their engineers to expedite filing. Their communications seem intentionally unclear in order to minimize challenges from stakeholders. Our local, state and federal government should not be endorsing private entities that show such carelessness for their impact on the people of this country.

We are responsible members of this community, business owners, taxpayers, and upstanding citizens of this country. We will not accept our lives and property being disregarded because TGP is too preoccupied with profits to communicate clearly and perform sufficient studies to ensure minimal impact on those they impose upon. FERC has been charged with evaluating these Projects to “promote the development of safe, reliable and efficient energy infrastructure that serves the public interest”. The public has overwhelmingly stated this Project is not in our best interest and we sincerely hope FERC reviews the information TGP provides as critically as countless citizen have.

Regards,

Patrick Hussey & Robyn Panciocco  
166 Proctor Hill Road  
Hollis, New Hampshire 03049

## **20141118-5142(29926744).pdf**

Susan Wessels, Rindge, NH.

I see no upside for the Town of Rindge, residents of Rindge, or New Hampshire to allow this pipeline to be built. It will pollute the air and water with noise and pollutants. It will destroy peoples' homes. It brings risks of enormous proportions in the form of leaks which will be another source of pollution and destruction of property. The pipeline brings increased costs to towns and residents who will have to pay higher insur-

ance premiums, higher taxes and an additional “tariff.” Towns with volunteer fire departments will have no resources to fight the nightmare scenario of a property or neighborhood explosion. All this for what? KM is the only beneficiary of this project. They count their profits, while we tally up our losses. Some people will lose their only asset or investment: their home. This is a terrible deal for the people and towns of New Hampshire

**20141118-5173(29927494).pdf**

Julie Taberman, Jamaica Plain, MA.

I ask that the permits to build new gas pipelines into Massachusetts be denied. We are facing an energy shortfall, but rather than spending billions of dollars to build new pipelines and gas plants over the next few years we would be better served, and have a better chance of meeting our carbon reduction goals, if we sank the same amount of money and effort into stepping up conservation and efficiency efforts and installed a lot more solar, wind, and other renewables.

Massachusetts has the know how and the workforce to meet our energy needs without investing further in fossil fuel infrastructure that commits us to continuing to destroy our climate.

Please deny the Spectra and Kinder- Morgan pipelines!

**20141119-0027(29931238).pdf**

**The Commonwealth of Massachusetts**

William Francis Galvin, Secretary of the Commonwealth  
Massachusetts Historical Commission

November 12, 2014

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., a Kinder Morgan Company, Northeast Energy Direct Project, PA, MA, CT, NH. MHC 1RC.56771.FERC Docket 1PF14-22-000.

Dear Secretary Bose:

The Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC), office of the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), noticed in an email from Jennifer M. McCoy of EDGE Engineering & Science, that Resource Reports for the project referenced above have been filed with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

Please have one paper copy of the unredacted (non-public) version of the Resource Reports pertaining ~only to (1) the project description and proposed locations within Massachusetts, and (2) cultural resources within the portion of the project located in Massachusetts mailed or delivered to the MHC to the address below.

The MHC does not accept email for review and does not review material posted on websites.

These comments are offered to assist in compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as amended (36 CFR 800). If you have any 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

cc:

Eric Tomasi, FERC  
Mike Letson, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co. LLC, a Kinder Morgan Co.  
Eileen Banach, AECOM, Providence, RI  
AECOM, Chelmsford, MA  
Hope Luhman, Louis Berger  
Jennifer M. McCoy, EDGE Engineering & Science

**20141119-0028(29931254).pdf**

Duplicate copy of above *20141119-0027(29931238).pdf*

**20141119-5008(29927848).pdf**

Michelle Russell, Hancock, NH.

To whom it may concern,

I am a Hancock, NH resident who is very much against the approval of a new natural gas pipeline in NH. I went to Colby College, and studied environmental science and environmental policy with a concentration in public health.

I am concerned about climate change, and consider it to be the foremost issue of our times. It is already affecting us all. I was fortunate in my college education to study in Costa Rica, and in India. In both places I saw that the weather changes were dramatic and causing major problems with washed out roads, changes in agricultural patterns, water availability (too much or too little), and generally creating havoc. I see these changes here too, but seeing them in other countries was informative. These experiences continue to compel me to do what I can to be a responsible global citizen by coming home and doing my part here in NH. This is why I am sending in a comment today.

Natural Gas is often called “clean” because the burning of methane is a cleaner process than oil. However, when natural gas is drilled the amount of methane released into the atmosphere is a huge climate problem, since the global warming potential of methane is so much greater than that of carbon dioxide.

More than anything else, I am concerned about fracking, because sourcing energy from a practice that contaminates groundwater with toxic chemicals has hazardous repercussions. It is too risky to poison our scarce water supply. We need water for life.

These concepts are fundamental to the conversation about natural gas, and make approving the pipeline a poor energy decision for our region. A NH pipeline is a short-term solution. We should invest in renewables and energy conservation and efficiency. Efficiency measures and renewables are better, longer-term alternatives. As a young person, in my twenties who grew up in NH, and who hopes to stay here, I care about building a healthy future. Renewable energy is a part of that future, a natural gas pipeline is not.

Thank you for considering my opinion and I urge you not to approve the NH natural gas pipeline.

Michelle Russell  
Hancock, NH

**20141119-5167(29931244).pdf**

**New York State Department of Environmental Conservation**

Office of General Counsel, 14th Floor  
625 Broadway, Albany, New York 12233-1500  
Phone: (518) 402-9185 Fax: (518) 402-9018  
Website: [www.dec.ny.gov](http://www.dec.ny.gov)

November 19, 2014

Secretary Kimberly D. Bose  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, NE  
Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

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

Dear Secretary Bose,

The New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) provides the following notice to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) and the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. of NYSDEC's intention to participate in the FERC National Environmental Policy Act Pre-Filing process for the proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project. Accordingly, please include Project Manager, Stephen Tomasik (Stephen.Tomasik@dec.ny.gov) and me on all correspondence during the pre-filing process.

Thank you and please feel free to contact me with any questions that you may have.

Very truly yours,

Patricia J. Desnoyers  
Patricia.Desnoyers@dec.ny.gov

**20141120-0045(29932644).pdf**

419 Main Road  
P.O. Box 276  
Chesterfield, MA 01012

November 17, 2014

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

Re: Northeast Energy Direct Docket 1 PF14-22

Connecticut Expansion Docket 1 CP14-529

Dear Secretary Bose:

This is written to express my strong objection to the Kinder Morgan pipeline across Massachusetts.

The pipeline would run through over a thousand private and public properties, including land set aside for conservation. Natural gas pipelines leak methane, which is a potent greenhouse gas contributing to climate change.

Sincerely,

Beverley F. Sunderland

**20141120-5108(29932577).pdf**

*Scanned letter from The Trustees of Reservations*

**The Trustees of Reservations**

200 High Street I Boston I MA I 02110

November 14, 2014

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, L L C,

Proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Secretary Bose,

The Trustees of Reservations preserve, for public use and enjoyment, properties of exceptional scenic, historic, and ecological value in Massachusetts. Since our founding in 1891, we have protected over 25,000 acres and have grown to an organization with over 100,000 members who care about the outdoors and the charms of New England.

The Trustees of Reservations notifies the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) of its intent to participate in the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pre-file process. The current preferred route as of the date of this letter crosses a portion of our 3,000 acre Notchview Reservation and adjacent protected land located in Windsor, MA. Notchview Reservation is over 3,000 acres of rolling hills and high elevation spruce/fir forest in the Hoosac Range, with wildlife habitat and Nordic ski trails. We have a responsibility to protect and steward our properties and to advocate for public conservation land, as a public charity and as consistent with our mission. The proposed NED Project would cross conservation land under our care and significantly fragment and devalue the network of public and private conservation land that we, along with other conservation organizations, municipalities, and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, have worked for decades to protect.

Need

The Trustees is supportive of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts ongoing study to determine if existing natural gas capacity is sufficient to meet need of the state, and if not, to determine what capacity is needed.

We respectfully request that the FERC fully consider the forthcoming Low Demand Analysis, to be released before the end of 2014, commissioned by the Massachusetts Department of Energy Resources when determining need.

Environmental Impact and Review Process

The Trustees has significant concerns regarding the proposed NED Project, which would be the largest natural gas pipeline to be built in Massachusetts, and strenuously objects to the placement of natural gas infrastructure on public or private conservation land or undeveloped areas with sensitive natural resources. The proposed Massachusetts section of the pipeline is over 127 miles in length, and includes three compressor stations. It is proposed to cross miles of unfragmented forests, wetlands, Priority Habitat for species protected by the Massachusetts Endangered Species Act, Areas of Critical Environmental Concern as designated by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Department of Fish and Game Wildlife Management Areas, active and prime agricultural lands some of which are protected by Agricultural Preservation Restrictions, and potentially archaeological and historic resources. Many of these acres have constitutional protections under Article 97 of the Massachusetts Constitution, which require a two-thirds vote by the legislature to undo. The proposed pipeline may cross conservation land protected with federal funds, including Land and Water Conservation Fund and Forest Legacy and therefore subject to additional restrictions. The protected lands which currently comprise a significant portion of the corridor were not protected to make it easier for new energy infrastructure to be built.

Information provided by the project proponent in the pre-filing application is insufficient for analysis of environmental impact. Maps are old and outdated and do not reflect the abundance of geographic and ecological data available in the Commonwealth. They are also of a scale where potentially affected landowners cannot with accuracy determine the route of the proposed pipeline.

The disturbed area during construction will be at least 100 feet wide and include extensive excavation and blasting, and going forward a 50 foot-wide swath would need to be kept cleared and accessible, causing permanent habitat fragmentation and creating a route for the well documented phenomenon of invasive plant species moving into disturbed habitats. A 50-foot corridor also presents challenges to habitat manage-

ment or forestry and attracts ATV use, which can cause severe erosion and habitat destruction.

The University of Massachusetts Center for Agriculture, Food and the Environment is compiling an inventory of the state's maps of rare species habitats, prime agricultural soils, wetlands, unfragmented forested lands, and other features. A full alternatives analysis and a robust mitigation analysis depend on full use of available data, including environmental resources. We request that the FERC will give this analysis close attention.

We request that FERC require a robust, full, and transparent analysis of need, project route and alternatives, and mitigation including full costs and meaningful mitigation for unavoidable impacts; that the relevant state authorities, including the Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs, Energy Facilities Siting Board, Department of Environmental Protection, Department of Fish and Game, Department of Public Utilities, Department of Energy Resources, and the Massachusetts Historical Commission be included in the review process; and that the project comply with, to the maximum extent practicable, all state laws, regulations, and policies including, but not limited to, the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act, Massachusetts Endangered Species Act, Wetland Protection Act, Global Warming Solutions Act. and Article 97 of the Massachusetts Constitution.

As survey for natural gas infrastructure can be destructive and may call for tree-clearing, drilling, or blasting, we request that the FERC not require that conservation landowners allow survey until after a full- need and alternatives analysis are performed.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment.

Sincerely,

Barbara Erickson  
CEO and President  
The Trustees of Reservations

cc: US Senator Elizabeth Warren  
US Senator Edward Markey  
US Representative James McGovern  
MA Senator Stanley Rosenberg  
MA Representative John Scibak  
Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs Secretary Maeve Vallely Bartlett  
Massachusetts Energy Facilities Siting Board

**20141121-0010(29934280).pdf**

*originally "File 29933724\_1.tif cannot be converted to PDF"*

**GROTON·DUNSTABLE REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT**

P.O. Box 729. Groton. MA 01450-0729. Tel.: 978.448.5505. Fax: 978.448.9402

Alison Manugian  
School Committee Chair

November 5, 2014

Kimberly D, Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE - Room IA  
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas route crossing Public Land of Groton Dunstable Regional School District

Dear Ms. Bose:

We are writing in reference to Docket Number PFI4-22-000, The request to implement pre-filing was submitted by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC. on September 15,2014. The proposed project, referred to

as the NED (Northeast Energy Direct) project is currently a 36” diameter natural gas transmission line running from New York State to Dracut, Massachusetts,

In their request to FERC to use the pre-filing procedures the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company references (Page 6 item number 3) that this process will “provide early receipt of stakeholder and participating agency input ... “ and asserts that “early identification and consideration of issues will result in the most expedient processing”,” We find this to be tremendously comforting as our perception to date is that Tennessee Gas has been unresponsive when concerns are raised by impacted parties, We are further heartened to see that page one of FERC’s Blanket Certificate Program Citizens’ Guide specifically states “Projects that could significantly affect rates, services, safety, security, competing gas companies or their customers, or the environment are not eligible for the blanket certificate program,” Certainly a project, utilizing 175 miles of greenfield sites, in a state where an existing easement and pipeline are in service, can not be eligible for the blanket certificate program,

While we share many of the concerns raised by others in our communities our specific concerns relate to 703 Chicopee Row (Book 11849, page 100), which is directly on the proposed pipeline path. Please see the sketch of the property on page two of this letter, The land and buildings constructed there are owned by the Groton Dunstable Regional School District and hence are public property, The parcel is home to our High School campus (completed in 2003) and is permitted for an additional school building should our enrollment demand additional facilities,

A Regional School District in Massachusetts functions as an entity legally independent from the municipalities it serves, The duties and responsibilities of a Regional School District and Regional School Committee are set out in Chapter 71 of the Massachusetts General Laws, Our Regional School Committee consists of 7 elected members serving three year terms.

We understand that the route of the proposed pipeline has been drawn with a wide brush and that further refinements will be forthcoming. The safety of our students, staff and general public is understandably foremost in our minds as we learn about the NED project and route, While it may be that the risk of a failure or leak is fairly low for a pipeline such as is proposed, we believe it is self-evident that the consequences could be calamitous, We request that the route be altered to pass further from our high school for many reasons:

- The pipeline route is proposed to bisect the conservation area on this parcel. The conservation land is intended to preserve wildlife corridors and habitat. To disturb this area and maintain a permanently cleared pathway would eliminate it’s use for wildlife preservation.
- The property was obtained and the high school built, using funding from the Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA). This program continues to reimburse our regional district for a portion of the capital project loans, These loans have approximately another decade prior to payoff and dissolution of this relationship with MSBA.
- To say that our high school serves as a public gathering place is to understate the frequency of events athletic events, fine arts productions, community meetings and the like are weekly events throughout the year. Town hased youth sports utilize our fields daily throughout the year for practice and competitions, Graduation takes place, weather permitting, within the oval of our track.
- The currently proposed route comes within 600’ of the track mentioned above. This puts significant parts of our facilities within the 950’ hazard area radius for a 36” diameter pipeline. Additional safety precautions and maximum transmission pressure should be considered.
- The currently proposed route divides our main site from our emergency secondary access, required by the fire and police departments to maintain public safety, The inability to use this emergency egress would limit us to a single access road approximately 20’ wide. This would be inadequate should we need to evacuate the property or bring in multiple emergency vehicles,
- It is possible that the high school would serve as an emergency shelter for our towns should there be need in the communities. We have in the past used school buildings in emergency situations. Clearly this use

would be infeasible if the high school parcel were impacted by an emergency due to the proposed gas pipeline,

*{MAP not reproduced here}*

We very much appreciate the time you've taken to review our concerns and the entire application of Tennessee Gas with respect to this project. There are numerous concerns and questions that we and others in the community have shared with Tennessee Gas. We look forward to learning more and working with the permitting authorities as this project moves forward, Please do not hesitate to contact me with questions or for clarification of our parcel or situation.

Regards,

Alison Manugian  
Chair - Groton Dunstable Regional School Committee  
amanugian@gdrsd.org  
978-448-2823

**20141121-5002(29932852).pdf**

Patty Woodbury, North Reading, MA.

My husband Steve and I have lived at 7 Damon St. North Reading, MA for 40 years. We also own the parcel known as 317 Park St. in the same town. This parcel has an easement from National Grid on it as there are high tension towers and wires there.

We love the wildlife that lives out there. We have dogs and walk them out there daily. We found out that there are Wampanoag artifacts out there when National Grid sent an archaeological team to investigate. Kinder Morgan is a multibillion company and has no right to intrude on an already instusive situation in order to save money.

I beg you to consider our abutter rights and deny the permit. With increased fuel efficiency and and technology there is no need for the common good. This will only fatten the pockets of multi-billionaires and will destroy our neighborhood, property values and our lives. Please look at all sides and understand what devastation this will bring to this area.

We bought the land knowing that there was an easement on it and have had to deal with that all these years. Isn't that enough? Thanks for considering my request to deny Kinder Morgan or any other company to further infringe on what we are already dealing with.

Sincerely,

Patty Woodbury

**20141121-5004(29932856).pdf**

John Schenk, Rindge, NH.

This stealth last-minute filing of the Southern New Hampshire is a poorly-chosen option which proposes to concentrate both our fuel supply and our electric transmission lines in the same narrow corridor, increasing the risk to both. It is clearly not intended to make our grid more dependable. Rather, it is a thinly veiled mechanism to market the company's gas to a world market and to force ratepayers to pick up the tab. In Rindge that route is proposed to pass over conservation and wet lands which will change its character and have huge environmental impact. It deserves a great deal more careful study than the current rush job is giving it. The route should not be granted approval

**20141121-5045(29933236).pdf**

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

November 21, 2014

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  
Supplemental Information

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 Tennessee’s Northeast Energy Direct Project (“Project”). By notice issued October 2, 2014, the Commission approved Tennessee’s request to use the pre-filing procedures in Docket No. PF14-22-000.

Tennessee has been actively working alongside affected stakeholders to provide them with information and respond to comments and inquiries in order to provide a clear and concise overview of the Project and to garner its support. Recently, Tennessee has received numerous letters of support from a variety of organizations that will be affected by the Project. In their letters, the organizations outline the many benefits that Tennessee’s Project will provide to the northeast region and clearly express their support for Tennessee’s proposal to expand its existing infrastructure in the northeast. Tennessee is enclosing copies of the support letters to be placed in the public record for the above-referenced docket.

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 Mr. Richard Siegel at (713) 420-5535.

Respectfully submitted,

TENNESSEE GAS PIPELINE COMPANY, L.L.C.

By: 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

Document Content(s)

NED\_Project\_support ltrs\_trnsmittl\_Nov\_21\_f.DOCX.....1-1  
9-5-14- IECG- NED Letter of Support.PDF.....2-2  
11 12 14 Business Council of NY State Support Letter.PDF.....3-4  
AIM support for gas capacity - final.PDF.....5-6  
Liberty Utilities- 7 14 14 Letter to Allen Fore (2).PDF.....7-7  
NE LIUNA NED Support Letter.PDF.....8-8  
NY LIUNA Support Letter 9.5.14.PDF.....9-9  
Trades Council July 30 Release.PDF.....10-10

**20141121-5046(29933237).pdf**

Emily DiCesaro, Andover, MA.

This pipeline project is misguided. Tennessee Gas has used 25 year old maps to determine the route of their pipeline and have not taken into consideration that in the last 25 years, schools, wildlife protection areas, and town water reservoirs have all been created right along this proposed route. But why would a company called Tennessee Gas care to use more recent maps? It's not their homes, or schools or drinking water that would be affected.

Building a pipeline is one thing, but building it without any regard for the community that you are adversely effecting is quite another. Why not build it right along the expressway?

We need to stop the creation of this pipeline because it will most certainly do more harm than good to the communities that it will go through. It's common sense not to put a natural gas pipeline right next to a towns drinking water. We saw all too clearly what happened in West Virginia when companies go unregulated and un supervised and peoples drinking water gets contaminated. Massachusetts is better and smarter than that.

**20141121-5077(29933634).pdf**

**Massachusetts PipeLine Awareness Network**

www.massplan.org info@massplan.org

November 21, 2014

Via eFiling

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

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., Docket No. PF 14-22

Comments in Opposition to Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Secretary Bose:

I am writing to inform the Commission that 40 New England municipalities have passed resolutions opposing Kinder Morgan's Northeast Energy Direct project ("NED") and other new interstate gas pipelines.<sup>1</sup> Thirteen of these municipalities are not along the originally proposed NED route, but all are acting with a unity of purpose. Many of these resolutions passed with unanimous or near-unanimous votes at town meetings, voted on by the community. The direct democratic tradition of New England town meeting is alive and well, and this self-determination persists as part of the way of life and community identity in our region.

Thousands of people living in the vicinity of multiple proposed routes face being asked to sacrifice their property, safety, and rural way of life, for a purported greater good – a "public necessity."

What, precisely, is the greater good?

The possibility, but not the promise, of cheap gas? Most signs point to the majority of the gas through this pipeline being exported as LNG. The US EIA has recently concluded, "Increased LNG exports lead to increased natural gas prices."<sup>2</sup> To the extent that any of this gas would be available for domestic electrical generators, it should be noted that the shift in New England towards heavy reliance on natural gas for our electrical generation has already made electric ratepayers beholden to the whims of the natural gas commodities market.<sup>3</sup>

Is the greater good "keeping the lights on?" Market reforms, demand-side solutions, and serious investments in renewables and renewable storage can keep the lights on without razing swaths through treasured New England landscapes, deforesting hundreds of acres, and resorting to massive eminent domain takings. If we are not ready to march across the bridge to a sustainable energy infrastructure today, there are less invasive fossil fuel "bridges" for the short term: increasing LNG storage to deal with peak demand periods would not require the investment in new infrastructure (the costs of which would be passed on to the ratepayers); nor

would keeping open a few of the oil plants that ISO New England deems “at-risk of retirement,” to be used only during times of peak demand.<sup>4</sup>

Is the greater good “switching to cleaner energy sources”? A pipeline that sends 2 billion cubic-feet of gas per day out of the Marcellus shale, to be burned somewhere or leak along the way, would further regional environmental destruction and climate change.<sup>5</sup> Preventing this pipeline, even if it means burning a bit more oil for a few more years, would be more likely to allow a transition to renewables. The studies keep pouring in concluding that (1) natural gas is not better than other fossil fuels from a climate-change perspective, and (2) accessibility to natural gas is impeding our transition to renewables. If natural gas has served as a bridge, at this point it’s a raised drawbridge. That said, Deutsche Bank recently predicted that solar energy will nonetheless achieve grid parity by 2016 across the U.S.<sup>6</sup> Storage technology for renewables is viable and constantly improving.<sup>7</sup>

Forty forward-thinking communities recognize that Kinder Morgan’s pipeline expansion proposal is a sales pitch for infrastructure that would be a huge step backwards. This pipeline is likely to be obsolete before it is built.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathryn R. Eiseman, Director  
Massachusetts PipeLine Awareness Network

-----  
1 A list is available at <http://www.massplan.org/local-governments-taking-action>.

2 “Effect of Increased Levels of Liquefied Natural Gas Exports on U.S. Energy Markets,” October 29, 2014, U.S. Energy Information Administration (<http://www.eia.gov/analysis/requests/fe/>).

3 “Wholesale Energy Prices Track the Price of Natural Gas,” chart on p. 12 of ISO New England Update: Consumer Liaison Group Meeting, September 24, 2014 ([http://www.iso-ne.com/static-assets/documents/2014/09/george\\_clg\\_9\\_24\\_14.pdf](http://www.iso-ne.com/static-assets/documents/2014/09/george_clg_9_24_14.pdf)).

4 See generally comments to the New England States Committee on Electricity from the Conservation Law Foundation ([http://www.nescoe.com/uploads/CLF\\_CommentsonIGER\\_30May2014.pdf](http://www.nescoe.com/uploads/CLF_CommentsonIGER_30May2014.pdf)) and GDF Suez ([http://www.nescoe.com/uploads/GDF-SUEZ\\_CommenstonIGER\\_30May2014.pdf](http://www.nescoe.com/uploads/GDF-SUEZ_CommenstonIGER_30May2014.pdf)).

5 “Using more cheap natural gas in future decades won’t slow global warming, new study projects,” U.S. News & World Report, October 15, 2014 (<http://www.usnews.com/news/science/news/articles/2014/10/15/study-natural-gas-surge-wont-slow-globalwarming>).

6 “Solar Is Starting To Win The Price War,” Aaron Levitt, Investopedia, November 4, 2014 (<http://www.investopedia.com/articles/markets/110414/solar-starting-win-price-war.asp>).

7 “Talking with \$1 Billion Battery Startup Alevo,” Zachary Shahan, Clean Technica, November 10, 2014, (<http://cleantechnica.com/2014/11/10/alevo-1-billion-battery-startup>).

## **20141121-5108(29934106).pdf**

Maryann Harper, Rindge, NH.  
Rindge

Residents up in arms about proposed natural gas pipeline

- Rindge residents protested the possibility of a natural gas pipeline running through town during the Select Board meeting Wednesday.

By Ashley Saari  
Monadnock Ledger-Transcript

Monday, November 17, 2014

(Published in print: Tuesday, November 18, 2014)

RINDGE — Rindge residents are gearing up to protest a proposed natural gas pipeline which could potentially run through Rindge, New Ipswich, Mason and Greenville, among other New Hampshire towns — with “Don’t FERC with Rindge” as their rallying cry.

Tennessee Gas Pipeline, Inc. and its parent company, Kinder Morgan, proposed a plan for a natural gas pipeline that was originally planned to run across the northern edge of Massachusetts. On Nov. 5, the company filed an alternative route that would follow the power line corridor in southern New Hampshire. Both routes are currently under consideration by Tennessee Gas Pipeline. The project will have to be approved by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, or FERC. During a packed Select Board meeting on Wednesday, many residents expressed opposition to a pipeline running through their town, with no proponents of the idea speaking up.

Residents brought up concerns of water impact, property values, concerns about blasting that might be needed to install the pipeline underground. Town Administrator Jane Pitt told the board and the gathered crowd that the process was in the too-early stages for the town to file as an intervenor in the process. In lieu of that, that board decided to start with some preliminary steps to show their displeasure with the prospect of a natural gas pipe. The board agreed to send letters to their individual state representatives and senators asking them to get involved. One state representative who represents both Rindge and Fitzwilliam, two of the towns potentially affected by the pipeline, has stated that he is in favor of the project.

In addition to contacting local legislators, the board also discussed the possibility of contacting other towns on the pipeline’s alternate path to start a cohesive defense and to pool resources.

Several residents suggested that the board not leave the discussion openended, but come up with a cohesive plan for moving forward. To that end, the board set a meeting date of Dec. 4 at 7 p.m., with a tentative meeting place of the Rindge Meetinghouse to continue to discuss the issue.

Ashley Saari can be reached at 924-7172 ex. 244, or [asaari@ledgertranscript.com](mailto:asaari@ledgertranscript.com). She’s on Twitter @AshleySaari.

#### **20141124-0027(29938113).pdf**

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

Northeast Energy Direct Docket 1PF14-22—Connecticut Expansion Docket 1CP14-529  
November 17, 2014

Dear Ms. Bose,

I am writing to ask you to deny Kinder Morgan permission to run a natural gas pipeline across the state of Massachusetts. This is gas obtained by “fracking,” a method that needs to be halted. The pipeline would not only endanger over a thousand private and public properties, including conservation areas; it would be another extension of a practice that needs to cease.

Please use your good judgment to ensure that this pipeline is not created. Our federal government needs to invest in alternative energy sources. Now!

Thank you for your consideration.

Laurel Gardner  
13 Plain Street  
Easthampton, MA 01027  
[lzgardner@msn.com](mailto:lzgardner@msn.com)

**20141124-0028(29938240).pdf**

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

Northeast Energy Direct Docket 1PF14-22—Connecticut Expansion Docket #CP14-529  
November 17, 2014

Dear Ms. Bose,

I am writing to ask you to deny Kinder Morgan permission to run a natural gas pipeline across the state of Massachusetts. This is gas obtained by “tracking,” a method that needs to be halted. The pipeline would not only endanger over a thousand private and public properties, including conservation areas; it would be another extension of a practice that needs to cease.

Please use your good judgment to ensure that this pipeline is not created. Our federal government needs to invest in alternative energy sources. Now!

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Todd Gardner  
13 Plain Street  
Easthampton, MA 01027

**20141124-0098(29938821).pdf**

Hand written card, name illegible, opposing

**20141124-0099(29938832).pdf**

Hand written card, Moly Hale, 96 Oak St, Florence, MA 01062, opposing

**20141124-0100(29938215).pdf**

Hand written card, Barbara Magnuson, opposing

**20141124-0101(29938843).pdf**

Hand written card, Lou Peugh, 43 Stilson St, Florence, MA 01062, opposing

**20141124-0102(29938844).pdf**

Hand written card, Michael Holroyde, 55 Golden Drive, Florence, MA 01062, opposing

**20141124-0103(29938865).pdf**

Hand written card, Alison Bowen, 250 S. Chesterfield Rd, Williamsburg, MA 01096, opposing

**20141124-0104(29938876).pdf**

Hand written card, John Bidwell, 76 High Street, Florence, MA 01062, opposing

**20141124-0105(29938897).pdf**

Hand written card, Deborah K?, opposing

**20141124-0106(29938898).pdf**

Hand written card, Suellen Walsh-Rother, 159 Elm St. Northampton, MA 01060, opposing

**20141124-0107(29938734).pdf**

Hand written card, Jon Sass, 131 Chestnut St, Florence, MA 01062, opposing

**20141124-0108(29938732).pdf**

Hand written card, Ellen Dickinson, 139 West St. #8, West Hatfield, MA 01088, opposing

**20141124-0109(29938733).pdf**

Hand written card, Ed Saylor, 151 Greenleaf, Northampton, MA 01060, opposing

**20141124-0110(29938788).pdf**

Hand written card, Sally Lawton, 12 Stage Rd, Westhampton, MA 01027 opposing

**20141124-0111(29938789).pdf**

Hand written card, ?, opposing

**20141124-0112(29938800).pdf**

Hand written card, Katherine Hay, 79 Olander Dr, Northampton, MA 01060, opposing

**20141124-0113(29938899).pdf**

Hand written card, Carol Abbe Smith, 40 ? Rd, Easthampton, MA 01027, opposing

**20141124-0114(29938949).pdf**

Hand written card, Julie E. Chandler, 20 Meadowbrook Dr, Easthampton, MA 01027, opposing

**20141124-0115(29938737).pdf**

Hand written card, Pat McGuinness, 97 La? St, Florence, MA 01062, opposing

**20141124-0116(29941391).pdf**

Hand written card, Sarah Metcalf, 93 Bancroft Rd, Northampton, MA 01060, opposing

**20141124-0117(29941401).pdf**

Hand written card, David Kl?, Deerfield, MA , opposing

**20141124-0118(29941412).pdf**

Hand written card, Kit Langdon, 51 Pilgrim Drive, Northampton, MA 01060, opposing

**20141124-0119(29939089).pdf**

Hand written card, Rica West, 157 Crescent St, Northampton, MA 01060, opposing

**20141124-0120(29939102).pdf**

Hand written card, Julianne Kinsman, 443 East St, Easthampton, MA , opposing

**20141124-0121(29940881).pdf**

Hand written card, Deborah Hass, 55 Grant Ave, Northampton, MA 01060, opposing

**20141124-0122(29941381).pdf**

Hand written card, Joan O'Brien, 6 Fort Hill Terrace, Northampton, MA 01060, opposing

**20141124-0123(29941380).pdf**

Hand written card, A. Ehrhart, 922 Montgomery Ave G1, Bryn Mawr, PA 19010, opposing

**20141124-0124(29941388).pdf**

Hand written card, ?, opposing

**20141124-0125(29941398).pdf**

Hand written card, Paul ?, Florence, MA 01062, opposing

**20141124-0126(29939135).pdf**

Hand written card, Margaret Humbak-Droz, opposing

**20141124-0127(29941408).pdf**

Hand written card, Nick Warren, 79 Olander, Northampton, MA 01060, opposing

**20141124-0128(29941411).pdf**

Hand written card, Flora Majumder?, 190 Crescent St, Northampton, MA 01060, opposing

**20141124-0129(29941410).pdf**

Hand written card, Ruth Barta, 85 Stone Ridge Lane, Florence, MA 01062, opposing

**20141124-0130(29941418).pdf**

Hand written card, M? Caughlin, 270 Whitney Ave, Holyoke, MA 01040, opposing

**20141124-0131(29941424).pdf**

Hand written card, Julie Kurose, opposing

**20141124-0132(29941429).pdf**

Hand written card, Davis Mix Bi?, 39 Pine St, Amherst, MA 01002, opposing

**20141124-0133(29941561).pdf**

Hand written card, Susan Lantz, 24 Neyman Rd, Northampton, MA 01060, opposing

**20141124-0134(29941559).pdf**

Hand written card, Rachel Hinkel, 251 Pleasant St, Apt 2A, Northampton, MA 01060, opposing

**20141124-0135(29941562).pdf**

Hand written card, Anne Lombard, 11 Allen Place, Northampton, MA 01060, opposing

**20141124-0136(29941563).pdf**

Hand written card, Benjamin Breton, Northampton, MA 01060, opposing

**20141124-0137(29941579).pdf**

Hand written card, William Diamond, 141 Grove, Northampton, MA 01060, opposing

**20141124-0138(29941537).pdf**

Hand written card, Georgia Pugh Howard, opposing

**20141124-0139(29941557).pdf**

Hand written card, Linden Adams, Amy Szlacheth, 27 Barton Ave, Belchertown, MA 01007, opposing

**20141124-0140(29941405).pdf**

Hand written card, Sharon Hall-Smith, opposing

**20141124-0141(29941539).pdf**

Hand written card, Barbara Allen, 64 Lilly St, Florence, MA 01062, opposing

**20141124-0142(29941613).pdf**

Hand written card, Katharine P. Nelson, 150 Rocky Hill Rd, Hadley, MA 01035, opposing

**20141124-0143(29941612).pdf**

Hand written card, Harriet Diamond, opposing

**20141124-0144(29941610).pdf**

Hand written card, R? Chobos, 135 Cow Path 40, Marlboro, VT, opposing

**20141124-0145(29941609).pdf**

Hand written card, Rina Skar, 10 Promenade Way, S. Hadley, MA 01075, opposing

**20141124-0146(29941601).pdf**

Hand written card, David Nelson, 150 Rocky Hill Rd, Hadley, MA 01035, opposing

**20141124-0147(29941602).pdf**

Hand written card, Laurel Foster-Moore, 147 Turkey Hill Rd, Florence, MA 01062, opposing

**20141124-0148(29941608).pdf**

Hand written card, Katherine Callaghan, 55 Golden Dr, Florence, MA 01062, opposing

**20141124-0149(29941615).pdf**

Hand written card, Cathy Luna, 43 Owen Dr, Amherst, MA 01002, opposing

**20141124-0150(29941614).pdf**

Hand written card, Cornelia Klimcrath, Deerfield, MA 01342, opposing

**20141124-5003(29934952).pdf**

Abbie Jenks, Pelham, MA.

I am writing in strong opposition to the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline in Massachusetts. As a resident of this state, and a citizen of the US, I must voice my dismay that this is being proposed. There is no valid proof this is necessary for our energy supply that it be built, yet it has been proven that the extraction and transportation of natural fracked gas is harmful to our environment and the health of individuals. In addition, our state has made a commitment to bring and utilize more renewable energy into our state. This pipeline proposal is in direct conflict with this mission. Our environmental, economic and personal health and well being are of utmost importance in this decision

**20141124-5009(29934962).pdf**

Roger Conant, Pelham, MA.

I urge you to oppose (do not allow) the Kinder Morgan/TGP Northeast Energy Direct project which is intending to pass a gas pipeline through northern Massachusetts.

The pipeline would pass through a number of environmentally sensitive areas, causing unsightly damage and ecological disruption.

The pipeline would primarily ship gas to the coast for shipment abroad, so it would not primarily serve the citizens of the Commonwealth who would bear the ecological cost of the project.

Current plans for the pipeline are to have citizens of the Commonwealth pay for creation of the pipeline (or part of it,) which is unreasonable for a project intended to benefit Kinder Morgan, a profit-making company.

The pipeline is another instance of continuing dependence on fossil fuels, when instead we should be expanding facilities for non-fossil-fuel energy supplies.

**20141124-5011(29934966).pdf**

Aaron Arsenault, Leominster, MA.

If FERC is the absolute authority in regards to allowing methane leaking shale gas pipelines through constitutionally protected conservation land and water, then what is as inevitable as the approval of NED is the further destruction of society rather than the facilitation of convenience, necessity or public good. There's also no amount of civil resistance that can be effective if those clamoring for delay in this process themselves create more demand by and large use of energy generated by conventional methods, as with this e-comment. No future regulation or change of or by government can undo the damage done to earth and humanity and so in the end, ironically, the actions of FERC may force us to make the final turn towards non-destructive renewables such as solar and wind. It's an inalienable right of health and peace that the FERC strips away by approval of fossil fuel pipelines and their compressor stations. Posterity on the whole may view this part of our history with as much frustration, shame and anger as environmentalists and the scientific community do today. If only we could fuel our capitalism with truly clean energy would we have a more moral society but if we cannot see our way collectively to take action on our shared interest of self-preservation and expansion of liberty then at least decrease the environmental damage and further societal degeneration as much as possible, increase capacity of existing pipelines and simultaneously take the opportunity to replace our existing infrastructure with less harmful, safer technology.

**20141124-5023(29934990).pdf**

**Ashby Board of Health, Ashby, MA.**

November 22, 2014

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC)

888 First Street, N.E.

Washington, DC 20426

RE: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., PF14-22-000

Dear Secretary Bose:

The Ashby Board of Health (ABOH) of the Town of Ashby MA, appreciates the opportunity to submit these preliminary comments in conjunction with the pre-filing phase of Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's (TGP) proposed Northeast Energy Direct pipeline (Project). ABOH hereby notifies both FERC and TGP of its intention to actively participate in the pre-filing phase of FERC's natural gas pipeline proceedings in order to preserve the rights of the Town and ABOH.

The proposed pipeline will extend across the full width of Ashby. Ashby is almost entirely served by private water supply wells, and the proposed project will alter hydrology and present threats to water supply quality and quantity. The proposed project also presents threats to public health associated with construction, operation and monitoring/maintenance of a large-diameter high-pressure pipeline in residential areas. The Project is not consistent with regional and State energy and sustainability plans that call for an increase in energy efficiency and renewable energy to meet electricity and heating demands rather than an increase in fossil fuel use.

Given the Board's charge to protect public health in Ashby, the ABOH intends to be an active participant in the pre-filing process and requests that the FERC require TGP to fully scope the environmental and public health issues that should be addressed in any future certificate application for this Project.

We also request that the FERC require a comprehensive analysis of alternatives to building the gas pipeline to address the short term winter reliability issues as part of the application process

Sincerely,

The Ashby Board of Health

Cedwyn Morgan   Scott Leclerc   William Stanwood

Member                      Member                      Member

cc: Governor Deval Patrick

US Senator Elizabeth Warren

US Senator Edward J. Markey

US Congresswoman Niki Tsongas

State Senator Stephen Brewer

State Representative Sheila Harrington

Maeve Vallely-Bartlett, Secretary of En

**20141124-5034(29935012).pdf**

Ken & Ethel Kipen, Ashfield, MA.

We are opposed to this pipeline project in general, not just because as proposed it would run through our town. Our primary objection is that it will not benefit the American people, as the gas is to be piped to southern coastal ports for shipment to other countries, while the projected cost of construction is to be borne by the people in the communities the pipeline traverses.

**20141124-5039(29935222).pdf**

**TOWN OF ASHBY**

Conservation Commission

895 Main Street

Ashby, Massachusetts 01431

November 22, 2014

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  
Request to Use Pre-filing Procedures for Proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Secretary Bose,

The Ashby Conservation Commission requests that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) consider some of the special aspects of the Town of Ashby in its review of the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's (TGP) proposed NED project.

The Town of Ashby has a population of 3,168. [1] Much of the town's soils consist of a thin layer of glacial till that was plastered down beneath the glacier in a thin veneer over the bedrock. [2] Except for a few public wells that service the elementary school, library, private pre-school, a private camp ground and a restaurant, the entire town is on private water supplies, almost all of which are wells.

Over the past 20 - 30 years, there have been a few projects in town that have required blasting to construct projects through ledge. Each time, surrounding wells were negatively affected by the blasting. The proposed pipeline route crosses many private properties with exposed and buried ledge.

All waters in Ashby have the designation of Outstanding Water Resource. As such, all require that a 401 Water Quality Certificate be issued before the start of any work that would fill, dredge or alter that water resource. The proposed route of the pipeline crosses many such waterways. The Ashby Conservation Commission is a volunteer board. Whether each of these crossings would require its own Notice of Intent and 401 Water Quality Certification Application or all of these crossings be included in one massive project, processing the project(s) within the DEP time requirements could present a challenge to the all-volunteer Ashby Conservation Commission. We would likely request that the project through Ashby be broken down into manageable chunks and submitted serially rather than all at once. We feel that the cumulative decades-long experience and knowledge of our Commissioners must be respected and included.

In addition to presenting an administrative nightmare, because all waters in Ashby are Outstanding Resource Waters, work could only be conducted during specific times of the year. Understanding the logistics of managing a project as large as this one, it seems unlikely that Tennessee Gas Pipeline would be able to comply with time and seasonal restraints on work that protection of our waters would require.

As Ashby lies in an area of Massachusetts that has not had its natural resources well documented, and, as noted in its exclusion of much of the town from the Petapawag Area of Critical Environmental Concern, is unlike most other areas of Massachusetts in its topology and natural resources, it would appear imperative to us that Tennessee Gas Pipeline be required to submit an Environmental Impact Study rather than an Environmental Assessment.

For all of these reasons, the Ashby Conservation Commission would object strongly to any attempt to expedite this project through the FERC Pre-filing Procedures. We believe strongly that this project should not go forward, but in the event that it does, in order for it to proceed with a minimum of permanent damage to the environment of Ashby all aspects of the project must be undertaken with the due diligence and care afforded through the standard review of a project submitted to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Very truly yours,

George Bauma Chair.

Robert Leary, Vice Chair

Roberta Flashman, Secretary

Cathy Kristofferson. Treasurer

cc: Governor Deval Patrick

Governor Elect Charles Baker

US Senator Elizabeth Warren

US Senator Edward J. Markey

US Congresswoman Niki Tsongas

State Senator Stephen Brewer

State Senator Elect Anne Gobi

State Representative Sheila Harrington

Maeve Vallely-Bartlett, Secretary of Energy and Environmental Affairs

Matthew Beaton, incoming Secretary of Energy and Environmental Affairs

[1] Town census completed in April. 2014

[21 Ashby Open Space Plan 2004

**20141124-5144(29937172).pdf**

**TOWN OF PEPPERELL  
BOARD OF SELECTMEN**

October 28, 2014

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street NE

Room 1 A

Washington, DC 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC, Docket No. PFI4-22-000

Dear Secretary Bose,

The Town of Pepperell adopted a resolution in opposition to the proposed Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Energy Direct Project. Pepperell's local legislative authority is vested in the traditional New England open Town Meeting whereby any registered voter may participate and vote on town matters. On May 23, 2014, the Town Clerk received a petition signed by several hundred registered voters. The petition directed the Board of Selectmen to call a Special Town Meeting at which time the petition would be discussed, debated, and voted. A Special Town Meeting was held on June 30, 2014. At said Special Town Meeting the voters of the Town voted unanimously to adopt a resolution in opposition to the project. A copy of the vote of the Special Town Meeting is attached. Please take this resolution into consideration when reviewing the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct project.

We appreciate your time and consideration.

Very truly yours,

John Moak

Town Administrator

cc: Governor Deval Patrick

U.S. Senator Elizabeth Warren

U.S. Senator Edward J. Markey

U.S. Congresswoman Niki Tsongas

State Representative Sheila Harrington

State Representative Eileen Donoghue

Secretary Maeve Vallely-Bartlett, EEA

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Middlesex, ss:

To either of the constables of the Town of Pepperell, in said county,

GREETINGS:

In the name of the Commonwealth aforesaid, you are hereby required to notify and warn the inhabitants of said Town qualified according to law to vote in state, county, district and town affairs to assemble at the NISSITISSIT MIDDLE SCHOOL, in said Town, on Monday, the 30th of June, A.D. 2014 at 7:00 PM to act on the following articles:

SPECIAL TOWN MEETING

June 30,2014

ARTICLE 1

By Citizens' Petition

NON-BINDING RESOLUTION

To see if the Town will vote to adopt the following non-binding resolution opposing the Northeast Expansion of the Tennessee Gas Pipeline in Massachusetts:

Resolution Opposing the Northeast Expansion of the Tennessee Gas Pipeline in Massachusetts

WHEREAS, a proposed High-Pressure Pipeline and a lateral pipeline carrying natural gas may come through Pepperell and our neighboring communities, en route to Dracut, Massachusetts and Nashua, New Hampshire; and

WHEREAS, said pipeline contravenes current Massachusetts commitments to renewable energies and combating global climate change; and

WHEREAS, the pipeline would transport natural gas obtained through hydraulic fracturing, a drilling method well known for its potential for ground water contamination, impact on air quality, and the harmful health effects of its chemical byproducts, among others; 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, said pipeline would destroy unknowable amounts of forest, wetlands, conservation land and farmland, and would pass beneath the Nashua and Nissitissit Rivers, and require maintenance in perpetuity of a 50 foot right-of-way through the possible use of herbicides; and

WHEREAS said pipeline would adversely affect property values, adversely affect residents' livelihood and otherwise negatively impact the integrity of the town's bucolic character; 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, 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, our energy challenges are better addressed through investments in energy conservation measures as well as green and renewable energy solutions.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the people of Pepperell, Massachusetts

1. Hereby call on our Selectmen to stand in opposition to Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.'s Northeast Expansion pipeline and not allow it within town borders;
2. Stand in opposition to all similar projects that may be later proposed;

3. Oppose any pipeline carrying natural gas obtained through hydraulic fracturing, within the borders of our Commonwealth; and

4. Hereby instruct our state and federal legislators and executive branch officials to enact legislation and take any 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 and subsidies for renewable energy sources.

or take any other action relative thereto.

And you will serve this warrant by posting a true and attested copy of same, in said Town, fourteen days prior to the time of said meeting. Hereof fail not and make due return of your doings herein to the Town Clerk on or before the time appointed for said meeting. Given under our hands this 6th day of June, A.D. 2014.

Michael L. Green, Chairman

Michelle R. Gallagher, Clerk

Stephien C. Themelis

PEPPERELL BOARD OF SELECTMEN

CONSTABLE of PEPPERELL

**20141124-5145(29937188).txt**

Steve Muzzy, Greenfield, MA.

The current proposed pipeline does not guarantee a single benefit to my community or the State of Massachusetts.

I am pragmatic about our future energy needs, but I think the real issue is the current proposal and the business as usual carte blanche expectations of the fossil fuel industry. It is not ok to take people's property, spread the cost of construction across the populace, and to not guarantee any allocation of fuel/power to the State that holds the infrastructure. I urge FERC to not approve this proposal in its current form.

You cannot base your decision on demand need when there's no guarantee that the fuel will be allocated to the State.

**20141124-5193(29937552).txt**

Christine Roy, Townsend, MA.

November 24, 2014

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC)

888 First Street, N.E.

Washington, DC 20426

Re: Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Energy Direct Project, Docket #PF14-22-000

Dear Secretary Bose,

We are writing to express our concern with and opposition to the proposed KM/TGP Northeast Energy Direct project.

We find ourselves in the path of a proposed project by an out-of-state, 125 billion dollar energy company that seeks to disrupt our neighborhoods by installing a 36-inch natural-gas pipeline within a couple hundred feet of our home. And with this pipeline, it is disturbing to learn that a 120,000 HP compressor station proposed to be sited in Townsend could possibly be sited directly behind our property and the Pheasant Ridge residential development.

As residents of Townsend, through which the proposed pipeline is routed, we are directly affected by this pipeline's potential consequences including the risk of gas leak-related explosion and chemical contamina-

tion to our soil and water supply, as well as a decline in property values and an increase in insurance costs. We are facing seizure of our private property through eminent domain, the anxiety of living near a natural gas transmission pipeline constructed and managed by a company with unacceptable safety records, noise and air pollution from compressor stations and the possibility of additional infrastructure build-outs.

As homeowners, we are alarmed to learn that an industrial land use of such scope and intensity could even be considered to be permitted in a residential zoning district. We rely on a town's zoning bylaws to restrict land-use to its respective zoning district.

We are gravely concerned about this proposed pipeline, compressor stations and the impact this project will have on the quality of life and the safety of our families. We are concerned of the adverse impact this gas infrastructure development will have on the sensitive conservation land, protected rivers, state and town forests, areas of critical environment concern (ACEC), wetlands and farmlands which it will cross. And we are concerned that as citizens of the U.S. we are being forced to defend our property rights from a 125 billion-dollar company so they can implement a business plan.

The gas industry needs to repair the leaks in existing pipelines. Massachusetts needs to continue moving forward with renewable energy and its energy efficiency programs.

41 Towns in the state of Massachusetts have passed non-binding resolutions opposing this pipeline. This project is not in the public's best interest. We oppose this Tennessee Gas Pipeline and urge you to disallow the KM/TGP Northeast Energy Direct project.

And lastly, we were disappointed to read that a homeowner in Townsend recently lost the sale of his property due to this planned pipeline project. Posted Nov 18, 2014 by Nashoba Publishing Community News. [http://www.nashobapublishing.com/community\\_news/ci\\_26960293/pipeline-1](http://www.nashobapublishing.com/community_news/ci_26960293/pipeline-1)

Sincerely,

Raymond & Christine Roy  
Townsend, MA

**20141124-5230(29938098).txt**

Fay H Bashaw, West Townsend, MA.

I live in West Townsend on a 4 acre lot that I bought in 1983. It is a long skinny lot, 200' wide and 800' deep. The front acre is open and is where my house is located. Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company is proposing a 36 inch high pressure gas pipeline running along my 800' boundary line. They want 140 feet for construction, 70 feet of this is into my 200' wide lot, and 70 feet into the neighboring lot which is an empty lot. So about 1/3 of my land is in the construction zone. The construction zone encompasses my backyard, my side yard, and my front yard. I guess that makes me a NIMBY, a NIMSY, and a NIMFY.

Thirty years ago I planted hundreds of various bare root seedling evergreen trees on my property including the border where the pipeline is targeted. It took me years to do this. I hauled water by hand in dry spells. Every year I walked the tree lines and replaced trees that had died. I mowed around them for years. Today those trees are beautiful and provide me with everything I wanted 30 years ago. They provide me with privacy from the road and my neighbors, and they give me protection from the north wind. But now a private company knocks on my door and they say this is where they want put a pipeline, and my trees are coming down. Also in the construction zone is my vegetable garden, stone walls, my driveway, and a portion of my septic leach field. The back 3 acres are all wooded, so a good portion of these will be clear cut and bulldozed along with the rest including my beloved evergreen trees. All so TGP can put in a pipeline. I'll then be left with a superhighway for off-road vehicles that will be snarling through my yard for the rest of my life.

TGP says they want to co-locate the pipeline with existing rights-of-way where possible. But I see little evidence they are actually doing this. They want to go east to Dracut, but they are going south on a north-south power line behind my property turning left at my property to head east again to bulldoze and blast through private and public property all the way through Townsend. Why they headed south down a power

line confused me until I learned the proposed site for the Townsend compressor station. It's located adjacent to that power line. So the detour is to bring the pipeline to the parcels TGP will acquire to build the pressure station. It's less than a half a mile from my house. So in addition to the horrors of construction and having a 36 " high pressure gas pipeline 100 feet from where I rest my head each night, my neighbors and I must now deal with the light pollution, noise pollution, and literally untold air pollution 24/7 from the compressor station.

This project threatens my land, my health and safety, my property value, and my pursuit of happiness where I've chosen to live for 30 years. So you understand then, why I'm opposed to this project in the strongest possible way. I stand with all the similarly affected landowners and other concerned citizens united in opposition to this pipeline project.

I have rescinded permission for Tennessee Gas Pipeline and their agents of all access to my property for surveying or any other purpose. The attached letter to that effect was sent to TGP on April 29, 2014.

Respectfully submitted for your consideration,

Fay H. Bashaw

**20141124-5231(29938107).txt**

Fay H Bashaw, West Townsend, MA.  
Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: April 29, 2014

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Rescinding property access

As the owner of the property located at:

127 Lunenburg Rd  
West Townsend, MA 01474

I am rescinding permission previously granted 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 from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Fay H Bashaw

**20141125-0006(29941532).pdf**

Hand written card, Kris Hollaway, 76 High St, Florence, MA 01062, opposing

**20141125-0007(29941555).pdf**

Hand written card, Alice J Zuvers, 48 Holy Family Rd. Apt. 303, Holyoke, MA 01040, opposing

**20141125-0008(29940884).pdf**

Hand written card, Kate K?, 62 ? Ave, Holyoke, MA 01040, opposing

**20141125-0009(29941556).pdf**

Hand written card, Kittangdon, 51 Pilgrim Drive, Northampton, MA 01060, opposing

**20141125-0010(29941578).pdf**

Hand written card, Marybeth Bridegan, 41 High Point Drive, Amherst, MA 01002, opposing

**20141125-0011(29941603).pdf**

Hand written card, Flora Majumder, 190 Crescent St, Northampton, MA 01060, opposing

**20141125-0012(29941530).pdf**

Hand written card, Edward D?, 43 S? Ave, Florence, MA 01062, opposing

**20141125-0013(29941604).pdf**

Hand written card, Alexis Ti?, 103 Bliss St, Florence, MA 01062, opposing

**20141125-0023(29941714).pdf**

(originally "File 29938541\_1.tif cannot be converted to PDF.")

**GROTON·DUNSTABLE REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT**

P.O. Box 729. Groton. MA 01450-0729. Tel.: 978.448.5505. Fax: 978.448.9402

Alison Manugian  
School Committee Chair

November 5, 2014

Philip Moeller, Commissioner  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington DC 02426

Re: Tennessee Gas route crossing Public Land of Groton Dunstable Regional School District

Dear Commissioner Moeller,

We are writing in reference to Docket Number PFI4-22-000. The request to implement pre-filing was submitted by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC. on September 15, 2014. The proposed project, referred to as the NED (Northeast Energy Direct) project is currently a 36" diameter natural gas transmission line running from New York State to Dracut, Massachusetts.

In their request to FERC to use the pre-filing procedures the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company references (Page 6 item number 3) that this process will "provide early receipt of stakeholder and participating agency input" and asserts that "early identification and consideration of issues will result in the most expedient processing." We find this to be tremendously comforting as our perception to date is that Tennessee Gas has been unresponsive when concerns are raised by impacted parties. We are further heartened to see that page one of FERC's Blanket Certificate Program Citizens' Guide specifically states "Projects that could significantly affect rates, services, safety, security, competing gas companies or their customers, or the environment are not eligible for the blanket certificate program." Certainly a project, utilizing 175 miles of greenfield sites, in a state where an existing easement and pipeline are in service, can not be eligible for the blanket certificate program.

While we share many of the concerns raised by others in our communities our specific concerns relate to 703 Cbicopee Row (Book 11849, page 100), which is directly on the proposed pipeline path. Please see the sketch of the property on page two of this letter. The land and buildings constructed there are owned by the Groton Dunstable Regional School District and hence are public property. The parcel is home to our High School campus (completed in 2003) and is permitted for an additional school building should our enrollment demand additional facilities.

A Regional School District in Massachusetts functions as an entity legally independent from the municipalities it serves. The duties and responsibilities of a Regional School District and Regional School Committee are set out in Chapter 71 of the Massachusetts General Laws. Our Regional School Committee consists of 7 elected members serving three year terms.

We understand that the route of the proposed pipeline has been drawn with a wide brush and that further refinements will be forthcoming. The safety of our students, staff and general public is understandably foremost in our minds as we learn about the NED project and route. While it may be that the risk of a failure or leak is fairly low for a pipeline such as is proposed, we believe it is self-evident that the consequences could be calamitous. We request that the route be altered to pass further from our high school for many reasons:

- The pipeline route is proposed to bisect the conservation area on this parcel. The conservation land is intended to preserve wildlife corridors and habitat. To disturb this area and maintain a permanently cleared pathway would eliminate its use for wildlife preservation.
- The property was obtained and the high school built, using funding from the Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA). This program continues to reimburse our regional district for a portion of the capital project loans. These loans have approximately another decade prior to payoff and dissolution of this relationship with MSBA.
- To say that our high school serves as a public gathering place is to understate the frequency of events - athletic events, fine arts productions, community meetings and the like are weekly events throughout the year. Town based youth sports utilize our fields daily throughout the year for practice and competitions. Graduation takes place, weather permitting, within the oval of our track.
- The currently proposed route comes within 600' of the track mentioned above. This puts significant parts of our facilities within the 950' hazard area radius for a 36" diameter pipeline. Additional safety precautions and maximum transmission pressure should be considered.
- The currently proposed route divides our main site from our emergency secondary access, required by the fire and police departments to maintain public safety. The inability to use this emergency egress would limit us to a single access road approximately 20' wide. This would be inadequate should we need to evacuate the property or bring in multiple emergency vehicles.

It is possible that the high school would serve as an emergency shelter for our towns should there be need in the communities. We have in the past used school buildings in emergency situations. Clearly this use would be infeasible if the high school parcel were impacted by an emergency due to the proposed gas pipeline.

*{map, not included here}*

We very much appreciate the time you've taken to review our concerns and the entire application of Tennessee Gas with respect to this project. There are numerous concerns and questions that we and others in the community have shared with Tennessee Gas. We look forward to learning more and working with the permitting authorities as this project moves forward. Please do not hesitate to contact me with questions or for clarification of our parcel or situation.

Regards,

Chair - Groton Dunstable Regional School Committee  
amanugian@gdrsd.org  
978-448-2823

**20141125-0030(29941733).pdf**

**The Trustees of Reservations**

200 High Street | Boston | MA | 02110

November 4, 2014

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, NE

Room IA

Washington, DC 20426

Re: Docket No. PF 14-22-000 - Tennessee Gas Pipe Company, L L C.,

proposed Northeast Energy Direct project

Dear Secretary Bose.

The Trustees of Reservations preserve, for public use and enjoyment, properties of exceptional scenic, historic, and ecological value in Massachusetts. Since our founding in 1891, we have protected over 25,000 acres and have grown to an organization with over 100,000 members who care about the outdoors and the charms of New England.

The Trustees of Reservations notifies the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) of its intent to participate in the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pre-file process. The current referred route as of the date of this letter crosses a portion of our 3,000 acre Notchview Reservation and adjacent protected land located in Windsor, MA. Notchview Reservation is over 3,000 acres of rolling hills and high elevation spruce/fir forest in the Hoosac Range, with wildlife habitat and Nordic sled trails. We have a responsibility to protect and steward our properties and to advocate for public conservation land, as a public charity and as consistent with our mission. The proposed NED Project would cross conservation land under our care and significantly fragment and devalue the network of public and private conservation land that we, along with other conservation organizations, municipalities, and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, have worked for decades to protect.

Need

The Trustees is supportive of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts ongoing study to determine if existing natural gas capacity is sufficient to meet need of the state, and if not, to determine what capacity is needed.

We respectfully request that the FERC fully consider the forthcoming Low Demand Analysis, to be released before the end of 2014, commissioned by the Massachusetts Department of Energy Resources when determining need.

Environmental Impact and Review Process

The Trustees has significant concerns regarding the proposed NED Project, which would be the largest natural gas pipeline to be built in Massachusetts, and strenuously objects to the placement of natural gas infrastructure on public or private conservation land or undeveloped areas with sensitive natural resources. The proposed Massachusetts section of the pipeline is over 127 miles in length, and includes three compressor stations. It is proposed to cross miles of unfragmented forests, wetlands, Priority Habitat for species protected by the Massachusetts Endangered Species Act, Areas of Critical Environmental Concern as designated by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Department of Fish and Game Wildlife Management Areas, active and prime agricultural lands some of which are protected by Agricultural Preservation Restrictions, and potentially archaeological and historic resources. Many of these acres have constitutional protections under Article 97 of the Massachusetts Constitution, which require a two-thirds vote by the legislature to undo. The proposed pipeline may cross conservation land protected with federal funds, including Land and Water Conservation Fund and Forest Legacy and therefore subject to additional restrictions. The protected lands which currently comprise a significant portion of the corridor were not protected to make it easier for new energy infrastructure to be built.

Information provided by the project proponent in the pre-filing application is insufficient for analysis of environmental impact. Maps are old and outdated and do not reflect the abundance of geographic and ecological data available in the Commonwealth. They are also of a scale where potentially affected landowners cannot with accuracy determine the route of the proposed pipeline.

The disturbed area during construction will be at least 100 feet wide and include extensive excavation and blasting, and going forward a 50-foot-wide swath would need to be kept cleared and accessible, causing permanent habitat fragmentation and creating a route for the well documented phenomenon of invasive plant species moving into disturbed habitats. A 50-foot corridor also presents challenges to habitat management or forestry and attracts ATV use, which can cause severe erosion and habitat destruction.

The University of Massachusetts Center for Agriculture, Food and the Environment is compiling an inven-

tory of the state's maps of rare species habitats, prime agricultural soils, wetlands, unfragmented forested lands, and other features. A full alternatives analysis and a robust mitigation analysis depend on full use of available data, including environmental resources. We request that the FERC will give this analysis close attention.

We request that FERC require a robust, full, and transparent analysis of need, project route and alternatives, and mitigation including full costs and meaningful mitigation for unavoidable impacts; that the relevant state authorities, including the Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs, Energy Facilities Siting Board, Department of Environmental Protection, Department of Fish and Game, Department of Public Utilities, Department of Energy Resources, and the Massachusetts Historical Commission be included in the review process; and that the project comply with, to the maximum extent practicable, all state laws, regulations, and policies including, but not limited to, the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act, Massachusetts Endangered Species Act, Wetland Protection Act, Global Warming Solutions Act, and Article 97 of the Massachusetts Constitution.

As survey for natural gas infrastructure can be destructive and may call for tree-cleaning, drilling, or blasting, we request that the FERC not require that conservation landowners allow survey and after a full-need and alternatives analysis are performed.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment.

Sincerely,

Barbara Erickson  
CEO and President  
The Trustees of Reservations

CC: US Senator Elizabeth Warren  
US Senator Edward Markey  
US Representative James McGovern  
MA Senator Stanley Rosenberg  
MA Representative John Scibak  
Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs Secretary Maeve Vallely Bartlett  
Massachusetts Energy Facilities Siting Board

**20141125-5000(29938176).txt**

Michael Hussin, PELHM, MA.  
November 24, 2014

I am writing to register my opposition to the Northeast Energy Direct project of the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. ("TGP"), the natural gas pipeline proposed to be built through Massachusetts.

I feel this pipeline is unnecessary, damaging to the environment, costly, and the wrong direction for our state which is attempting to become LESS reliant on fossil fuels. This pipeline is a step backwards..

My community of Pelham, Massachusetts while not in the direct path of the pipeline has firmly registered its opposition to siting this pipeline anywhere in our State by voting nearly unanimously in its Fall 2014 Town Meeting to support neighbor communities who refuse the project as well as any attempt to have Massachusetts utility ratepayers contribute financially to its construction.

The resolution Pelham passed is contained below:

Sincerely ,

Michael Hussin

October 15, 2014

TOWN OF PELHAM, MASSACHUSETTS

## Resolution To Ban “Fracked Gas” Pipeline and Any Proposed Utility Rate Tariffs for New Natural Gas Pipeline Infrastructure

WHEREAS, a proposed high pressure pipeline carrying gas obtained through hydraulic fracturing, the so-called Northeast Energy Direct project of the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. (“TGP”), would run through many communities in Western Massachusetts;

And WHEREAS, the Town of Pelham has a regional interest in protecting the environment in the Pioneer Valley and the public health generally;

And WHEREAS, it has been proposed that the cost of said pipeline would require Massachusetts citizens to pay a utility bill tariff as well as the environmental costs, making ratepayers bear financial risk for the endeavors of a private corporation;

And WHEREAS, instead of increasing our dependency on unsafe fossil fuels we are better served by embracing Massachusetts’ commitments to renewable energies and combating global climate change.

Therefore Be it Resolved That the Town of Pelham:

1. Opposes any tariffs imposed on Massachusetts ratepayers to fund TGP’s high pressured pipeline; and
2. Stands in solidarity with nearby communities working to disallow the Pipeline within their borders; and
3. Shall cause a copy of this resolution to be presented to our State representatives and the Governor, asking them to take action to oppose the TGP Pipeline and its related tariffs within the borders of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

### **20141125-5001(29938210).txt**

Jane Shaney, Ashfield, MA.

This is the statement I made June 23, 2014 at our special town meeting in Ashfield, Ma. We had two resolutions up for vote that evening; one was a community bill of rights, the other against the pipeline. Both passed unanimously.

This town, this community is a jewel. It’s not only gorgeous, it sustains us on so many levels. On any given Saturday morning from now through mid October we can go to the town common to the farmer’s market for our vegetables, bread, eggs, yogurt, meat, fruit, cheese. We get to watch amazing theater productions... there’s an incredible fall festival, a massive undertaking by innumerable volunteers, that not only provides entertainment, and good food, but a place that brings folks together to celebrate who we are and what we offer, which is considerable given the gifted artists in this community. It’s also a major fundraiser for scholarships to assist our young people in pursuing their dreams. There’s a hardware store that provides “practically anything and anything practical”...which came in particularly handy when we lost phone service during the ice storm and they managed to put together a variety of rotary phones for folks to borrow. There’s a film festival that provides an opportunity for any and all to bring to life what they imagine. We’ve even been known to hold inaugural balls. This is a community that nurtures the likes of a Lilly Wells and Violet Rawlings, who wrote an extraordinary Memorial Day speech, a speech that clearly reflects a value for our way of life... from 8th graders no less.

Kinder Morgan proposes to run a pipeline through this community. They don’t care about any of this. Their sole motivation is profit. We’re actually considered a “low impact” area in their eyes, suggesting whatever collateral damage there might be will be, what, no big deal? They can, through eminent domain, just take our property...for the “greater good”, they say. I ask, what greater good is there than the preservation of our natural resources; our water, our soil, our air...the preservation of our community, along with so many others across the country who are facing similar difficult challenges.

We are going to be asked to pay for this pipeline through a proposed tariff to the tune of 2.7 billion dollars... even as our state caps the amount of energy that can be sold back to the grid by customers with their own renewable systems. I think the caps need to be on fossil fuels, not renewables. If we are going to spend money, let’s spend it on exploring sources that don’t leave a wake of wreckage behind...and cease capping

renewables.

This vote is not just about us here today...this is about every child and those to come, in this town, and countless others across the country who will be left with what we leave behind. We are, ultimately, visitors here...we would like to make sure we leave it intact, so that others may too experience what we so value today.

Jane M. Shaney  
Ashfield, Ma.

#### **20141125-5002(29938232).txt**

Jane Shaney, Ashfield, MA.

This is an opinion piece I sent to the Greenfield Recorder as well as the individuals thanked at the end.

The pipeline. An awful lot has been written about it. I want to believe...I want to believe that the two resolutions that passed overwhelmingly in my town (one to ban the pipeline, one to put forth community rights) mean something. I want to believe that ALL of the resolutions passed in all of the towns along the proposed pipeline mean something. I want to believe that protected property, i.e. conservation land trusts, agriculturally protected, wetlands, etc., means something. I want to believe that we have an Environmental Protection Agency that protects the environment. I want to believe that economic development does not have to be at the expense of the environment: clean air, clean water, and healthy soil. I want to believe that the folks we have elected to represent our best interests BELIEVE can make a difference and WILL make a difference, no matter how challenging the obstacles. I want to believe that this country is governed through a democratic process that they that honors the voice of the people. I want to believe that the Constitution never meant for a corporation to be considered a person (though, since they are, that their singular interests don't magically have greater weight than those of thousands of real people). I want to believe that money was never meant to be a form of free speech (though since it is, that it can't be used to buy influence).

I write this and some may say it comes from a place of naive idealism. Nevertheless, I do maintain a sense of idealism about what I know this country can be all about; I know because I live in a community that personifies it.

So Kinder Morgan (Tennessee Gas Pipeline) took issue with Ashfield's pipeline ban and the directive from Ashfield's Selectboard to "cease and desist" surveying town-owned property; they stated we can't tell them they can't use our town roads and reminded us that a resolution has no legal weight. Well, we didn't tell them they couldn't use our roads; the Selectboard directed them to "cease and desist" from surveying town-owned property, in other words, that they not trespass. And we knew when we voted overwhelmingly as a town that the resolutions were non-binding. The resolutions are a statement however, loud and clear ones; there are many other communities across this Commonwealth that are doing, and have done, the same. Yes, making a statement, because the odds are against all of us legally since the shadow of pre-emptive law practically eclipses the moon as it's interpreted today. By the way, regarding Eminent Domain, what is the "fair market value" of a property that can no longer sustain life, i.e., water that is no longer potable, soil compromised by toxins, air unfit to breathe?

Please do read this article about the company (Kinder Morgan) that took issue with the decisions of a town (made through a democratic process) and ask yourself how much respect they have for the "rules" in their own practice. (Thank-you Erik Sherman)

Kinder Morgan, Gas Pipelines, And The Idiocy of Subsidies to Profitable Corporation

<http://www.forbes.com/sites/eriksherman/2014/08/24/kinder-morgan-gas-pipelines-and-the-idiocy-of-subsidies-to-profitable-corporations/>

They've recently asked FERC to "expedite" several segments for its planned expansion here in the northeast (in Massachusetts Sandisfield will be impacted), requesting that these segments be exempted from "pre-filing" with FERC. They are essentially asking that the segments be exempted from filing an environmental

impact statement. It is illegal to segment lines (Delaware Riverkeeper Network, et.al.v. Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company) and an outrageous disregard for the environmental oversight aspect of the process.

And so, I DO believe we can, and will, make a difference. That difference will be found in whether or not we all choose to stand up against this, and make our voices heard. For those of you who feel it is a done deal, well, only if you remain silent. Please check out the [massplan.org](http://massplan.org) and [nofrackedgasinmass.org](http://nofrackedgasinmass.org) websites for a wealth of information, including who to contact and how.

Thank-you Governor Deval Patrick for stepping back to take a closer look, Senators Edward Markey and Ben Downing, Representatives Paul W. Mark, Stephen Kulik, William "Smitty" Pignatelli, Gailanne Cariddi, and Denise Andrews for coming out strongly against this pipeline and for demonstrating that wanting to believe may not be so naïve after all. To Maura Healy, you have my vote; the Commonwealth will need a good lawyer. We need you all.

Jane Shaney  
Ashfield, Ma.

**20141125-5003(29938245).txt**

Richard Seelig, Pelham, MA.

We don't need more investment at this time in fossil fuels. At a time when global climate change is accelerating, we need to prioritize investment in energy conservation and renewables. Fracking has produced a great deal more of already-abundant fuels and it is counter-productive to create additional infrastructure to service this glut....unless the intention is to ship the fracked gas overseas where it would sell for a great deal more.

We have been assured that, without this pipeline, there is or will be a shortage of natural gas in Massachusetts; I would like to see the evidence for this claim.

**20141125-5006(29938257).txt**

Aryt Alasti, Cambridge, MA.

Installation of additional gas infrastructure at this time represents a major, long-term commitment to a fossil fuel which - as the international scientific consensus tells us - must be something we rely on only as minimally as possible during the transition to a radically lowered emissions scenario. Especially gas derived from fracking is going to have environmentally damaging impacts, including fugitive methane emissions both at sources of extraction as well as enroute to users, which renders its effects a malign legacy for future generations. Any substantial infrastructure projects from now onward must be supportive of renewable energy sources, rather than being of the sort which additionally takes us down the path toward irreparable catastrophe.

**20141125-5027(29938382).pdf**

November 23, 2014

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

Open House Delays

Dear Ms. Bose:

In the quote below from the letter addressed to you dated November 6th, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company,

L.L.C. stated the following as reason for public Open House delays.

“As part of the pre-filing process, Tennessee scheduled dates and locations for twelve open houses to be conducted in November and December 2014 (with the first open house to be held on November 12, 2014) for the portion of the Project located between Wright, New York and Dracut, Massachusetts. A list of the open house dates and locations was filed with the Commission on October 21, 2014. This information was also included in the notification letters that were sent to affected landowners and governmental officials. In order to provide affected stakeholders with adequate time to review the draft resource reports that Tennessee filed on November 5, 2014, Tennessee is postponing the open houses that had been scheduled for November and December 2014. This postponement is consistent with letters that Tennessee received from Representative Jim McGovern and Representative Niki Tsongas requesting a delay in the proposed outreach schedule in order to provide affected landowners and communities the necessary time to review the draft Resource Reports 1 and 10 submitted on November 5, 2014. Tennessee will work with the Commission Staff to establish revised dates and locations for the postponed open houses for the portion of the Project located between Wright, New York and Dracut, Massachusetts and provide notification of those rescheduled open houses to affected stakeholders.”

The following quote from Kinder Morgan’s Allen Fore was published in the NH Union Leader on Saturday November 22nd.

“We plan on or around Dec. 8 to file an amended resource report that will identify the New Hampshire power line corridor as our primary route,” said Allen Fore, vice president of public affairs for Kinder Morgan. “The early analysis from the available data and aerial surveillance is this looks like a very viable and preferable route for us. That’s why we are moving towards a formal reference to this plan when we amend our report in December.”

<http://www.unionleader.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20141123/NEWS05/141129641&source=RSS>

We request that the FERC fully investigate the original delay and determine if the purpose was indeed to offer more time for original stakeholders to review Report 1 and Report 10. If the primary reasons for the delay were to allow Tennessee Gas Pipeline to perform further analysis, notify new stakeholders and propose a different preferred route through a completely different state, then Tennessee has deceived the public through a filing to the FERC. Nowhere in their letter to the FERC does Tennessee mention the public was put on hold for additional analysis. Nowhere in the letter does Tennessee mention needing time to notify additional stakeholders. Nowhere in the letter does it mention Tennessee’s intention to change the preferred route.

If the reasons for the Open House delays stated in this letter are not genuine then it would represent a dishonorable practice. This deceitful behavior should be further scrutinized when the company involved intends to apply for a Certificate of Public Necessity to take often the most valuable assets of stakeholders through eminent domain. We hope you will address our concerns and fully investigate the authenticity of the Open House delay.

Sincerely,

Rob & Lynn Chesebrough

*{followed by copy of TGP letter to FERC, see 20141106-5033 above}*

#### **20141125-5068(29938939).txt**

Edward L. Loechler, Brookline, MA.

Because of concerns about climate change, Brookline Town Meeting voted overwhelmingly on Wednesday November 19 to oppose the building of the Kinder Morgan Northeast Direct pipeline, which would bring natural gas from fracking wells in Pennsylvania, across Massachusetts to Dracut.

Here is why.

Climate disasters (hurricanes, tornadoes, droughts, etc.) have been increasing, and are projected to continue increasing. According to NOAA, “billion-dollar climate events” in the U.S. have risen from about 2 per

year in the 1980s, to about 7.4 per year in the last ten years.

Ninety-seven percent of climate scientists say that climate change is real, is caused by humans, is serious and must be addressed, according to surveys (e.g., Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences (2010) 113: 1297). If 97% of oncologists told you to take a particular anticancer drug, you would take it. Right? And if 97% of engineers told you that a particular bridge was about to collapse, you would not drive over that bridge. Right?

So what are those 97% of climate scientists telling us: If we take steps now – serious but doable steps – we can avoid the worst impacts of climate change. Currently, fossil fuel burning is increasing about 3% per year. Climate scientists say that in the next few years, we must transition to burning about 6% less fossil fuels per year.

How does this relate to the Kinder Morgan pipeline?

New England governors commissioned a report about future energy needs. That report contained a “High Demand Scenario,” which led to the conclusion that we need more pipelines. The “High Demand Scenario” shows natural gas usage increasing about 3% per year, which is what climate scientists say we can no longer do. The New England governors’ report also had a “Low Demand Scenario,” which projected no natural gas increases. In the “Low Demand Scenario” future energy needs would be met via alternatives: energy efficiency, conservation, and renewable energy projects. Various studies show that this approach is viable.

But you may have heard that natural gas is a good fossil fuel in terms of climate change. Natural gas gives more energy output per CO<sub>2</sub> generated – CO<sub>2</sub> being the main greenhouse gas (GHG) responsible for climate change. However, natural gas is mostly methane, and methane is also a GHG that is at least 30-times worse than CO<sub>2</sub> at causing climate change. Furthermore, natural gas leaks at every point during extraction and distribution.

Whether natural gas/methane is actually better than coal/oil in terms of climate change depends on how much it leaks. Recent studies have come down on both sides of this issue. This raises the question: Does it make sense to commit to massive, expensive new infrastructure, given this uncertainty and the distinct possibility that natural gas is actually worse than coal/oil from a climate change perspective? Especially, given that natural gas/methane would only be ~30-40% better than coal/oil even if leakage were zero. And given that for roughly the same cost we can switch to renewables (etc.), which have no climate impact.

And remember: The Kinder Morgan pipeline would carry fracked natural gas from Pennsylvania. To release natural gas, fracking requires the pumping of a toxic water slurry deep into the earth. As a result, fracking generates about 300 million gallons of hazardous waste water – enough to fill the Quabbin Reservoir – every year. Now, if you are thinking, “Oh, I am sure it is being regulated and handled safely,” you would be wrong. Fracking was developed by the company Halliburton, and in 2005, then Vice-President Dick Cheney helped pass legislation to exempt fracking from the Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act, and from Super Fund jurisdiction. Hazardous waste water is now being stored in clay-lined open pits and toxic organics are being evaporated into the atmosphere. Plus, there is substantial evidence showing that some of the hazardous chemicals remain in the ground and contaminate ground water.

We are at a historic crossroads in the life of the planet. We have to start living our lives differently. It is not going to be easy. We must make the right decisions. There is no way that Massachusetts can both build that pipeline AND do its share to stem climate change. Massachusetts must set an example. No pipeline.

Ed Loechler

Brookline Town Meeting Member

Climate Action Brookline Member

Professor of Biology, Boston University

Loechler@bu.edu

617-543-8153

**20141125-5205(29940921).txt**

Joseph Desruisseaux, Rindge, NH.

I am writing to express my opposition to the NED Pipeline project from Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Gas Pipeline.

- 1) KM has overestimated demand in order to build a pipeline that is nearly four times larger than initial reports from ISO New England indicated.
- 2) Some reports suggest that demand over the next few years could easily be met by the existing energy grid and that it is currently underutilized.
- 3) The 2.2 billion cubic feet of gas per day from this proposal is destined for export. A telling indication of this is the fact that the Martimes & Northeast pipeline has applied for a change in direction to funnel gas north to Canada.
- 4) Solar technology is the wave of the future, so says Deutsche Bank. Grid parity is expected to occur in 2016 in 36 States. Solar installations are growing rapidly, on average, 66% per year. Solar industry jobs have grown by 50% since 2010. Foreign countries are also investing heavily in Solar because of declining costs and because it is a wiser choice in fighting carbon emissions.
- 5) The economic and environmental effect on the small NH towns would be devastating. The pipeline would destroy wetlands, contaminate our wells, contaminate our air and cause untold hardships for property owners. Decreased property values, higher fire insurance premiums and higher property taxes will result. Why? Because most of these towns do not possess the capabilities to handle the potential problems from pipeline leaks and explosions that will occur eventually with this pipeline. (See Kinder Morgan's safety record – it is terrible!) The result is that these towns will have to spend heavily to acquire equipment and train firefighters to handle such events. As one resident of Rindge put it, "It's like putting a bomb under our Electrical Power Grid." This also creates a Homeland Security issue in that NH would have miles of unprotected pipeline subject to attack by terrorists.
- 6) From my point of view, I would rather we invest in the future with Solar Installations than help provide huge corporations build pipelines that will be obsolete in the not too distant future.
- 7) NH is already cash strapped. I don't see how it could possibly help our towns cope with this monstrosity. Could it provide help with building municipal water supplies for residents with contaminated wells? Could it provide firefighting equipment and help pay for additional employees to fight forest fires? Could it provide insurance for those homeowners unable to get it for themselves? I don't think so!
- 8) The pipeline is a bad idea that needs to be studied thoroughly for its environmental and economic feasibility and its impact on NH. We will shoulder all of the costs and the pipeline will provide no benefits.

Very Truly Yours,

Joseph Desruisseaux  
122 Robbins Rd.  
Rindge, NH 03461

**20141125-5350(29941618).txt**

Jonathan Mark Haber, Warwick, MA.

I filed a formal complaint with the Massachusetts' Attorney General's office. I believe the proposal is fraudulent and for geopolitical purposes, and not to benefit US citizens in general. It continues to invest in fossil fuel that contribute to climate change and pollution. In transporting it across wetlands, under rivers, Moss Brook, this proposal is a threat to natural life. Ferc should understand that our future has to do with renewable clean energy systems. Investing in new infrastructure for a fossil fuel contributes exponentially to the crisis to the environment already experienced.

From: Jonathan Mark [mailto:noflyby@yahoo.com]

Sent: Monday, April 28, 2014 10:36 AM

To: Berwick, Ann (DPU)

Cc: Osborne, Paul (DPU); NoFracked GasInMass; info@DevalPatrick.com; Stan.Rosenberg@masenate.gov; denise.andrews@mahouse.gov

Subject: DPU and threat by TN Gas Pipeline CO. letter Energy Pollution's Impact On Environment

To: Ann G. Berwick, Chair  
Department of Public Utilities (est. 1861)  
One South Station; Boston, MA 02110  
Tel: 617-305-3653  
ann.berwick@state.ma.us

Dear Ms. Berwick,

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (TGP) sent me a letter (dated April 23, 2014) threatening to override my decision not to allow a survey for a pressurized gas pipeline through my land in Warwick, MA by petitioning the MA DPU 'as provided under Chapter 164, Sections 72A, 75B and 75D' Such a proposed pipeline across the northern section of Massachusetts would threaten our most important resources, state forests and all that live there, clean water, air, and community. All this is at risk by an energy policy that would increase the CO2 output from a non-sustainable fuel.

I complained to Attorney General Martha Coakley that TGP's claim of 'cleaner burning energy' has little to do with its distribution across our Commonwealth. The pipeline would also add more CO2 into our atmosphere from where its fracked, from where it will leak (or worse), and from where the end user will burn it into our atmosphere. There is no way that this proposed pipeline is for the public good.

Please, let Massachusetts be a leader for our nation that seems under the control of big money, and fuels supporting policies of a US military industrial complex. Since 1999 I have published Flyby News, an online journal reporting on issues critical for 'life's survival in the 21st Century.' One of the key resource links we offer is on Energy Pollution's Impact On Environment. Isn't it time to stop destroying our natural resources for temporary short gains? Conservation and renewable sources for real clean energy is where our future is headed, if there is a future. I sure hope the DPU will stop such surveys on our most precious land and wetlands for fracked gas transport.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Mark Haber

cc:

Paul E Osborne (water)  
Assistant Director  
Tel: 617-305-3669  
Governor Deval Patrick  
Senator Stanley Rosenberg  
Representative Denise Andrews

=====

I produced a video on youtube and broadcast through the facilities of Greenfield Community Television. The twenty-eight minute documentary is called "Moss Brook and TGP - No Fracking Way!" You can find it also from going to my web site [www.FlybyNews.com](http://www.FlybyNews.com) - which has extensive resources and information on my concerns and human rights to protect our environment, and not to threaten it.

**20141128-0009(29944040).pdf**

*{was "File 29943640\_1.tif cannot be converted to PDF."}*

Kimberly D. Bose  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First St. NE, Room IA  
Washington, DC 20426

Northeast Energy Direct Docket #PFI4-22 - Connecticut Expansion Docket #CP14-529

November 17, 2014

Dear Ms. Bose,

I am writing to ask you to deny Kinder Morgan permission to run a natural gas pipeline across the state of Massachusetts. This is gas obtained by “fracking,” a method that needs to be halted. The pipeline would not only endanger over a thousand private and public properties, including conservation areas; it would be another extension of a practice that needs to cease.

Please use your good judgment to ensure that this pipeline is not created. Our federal government needs to invest in alternative energy sources. Now!

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

David Gardlner  
13 Plain Street  
Easthampton, MA 01027  
davgardlner@gmail.com

**20141128-5009(29943246).txt**

Jennifer Hogan, Fitzwilliam, NH.

I do not support the proposed gas line through Southern New Hampshire. There are MANY Superfund sites along and near the newly proposed route which would be disturbed by the blasting required for construction of such a pipeline. This would further spread the contaminates.

Jennifer Hogan  
Fitzwilliam, NH

**20141201-0010(29946788).pdf**

**TOWN OF DALTON**  
Town Hall  
462 Main Street  
Dalton, MA 01226-1601

November 10, 2014

Cheryl A. LaFleur, Chairman  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
ATTN: Jeff C. Wright, Director  
Office of Energy Projects  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: Proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Chairman LaFleur and members of the Commission:

Please be advised that the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline project, above referenced, will cross the southern part of this community from west to east. The proposed project has been intensely debated here as to its merits and necessity.

To that end, residents of Dalton initiated a petition which culminated in a proposed Resolution taken up at

a Special Town Meeting held on June 30, 2014. At that meeting the voters of Dalton voted to approve the Resolution as presented and entitled, "RESOLUTION TO BAN NEW HIGH CAPACITY/HIGH PRESSURE PIPELINES AND TO CHAMPION SUSTAINABLE ENERGY. We have enclosed the Town Clerk's certified copy of the resolution for your information. Said Resolution called on the Dalton Select Board to "stand in opposition" to the project and to "instruct" state and Federal officials to "disallow such projects" Subsequently, the Green Dalton Committee at its meeting of September 17, 2014 voted unanimously to express their opposition to the pipeline and asked this Select Board to take action against this proposal as well. At the Dalton Select Board regular meeting on October 27, 2014, the five member board voted unanimously, to oppose the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline because of four main reasons. First, preliminary maps indicate that the pipeline will run close to or perhaps through our watersheds at Cleveland and Ashley Reservoirs. The potential for contamination of the water supply of the townspeople of Dalton, as well as Pittsfield served by these reservoirs is unacceptable. Further, we stand with the many townspeople who have indicated to us both in writing and in person at select board meetings their opposition to the taking of land by eminent domain should this project move forward. Furthermore, this proposed pipeline will cut a large swath of land through this small New England community thereby scarring the esthetics of land now used recreationally by residents and visitors alike. The Pipeline will therefore diminish the attractiveness and cause a potential financial strain due to less recreational traffic through the town. Lastly, we join our state representatives (State Representative Paul Mark and State Senator Benjamin Downing) who have spoken out as a coalition of the Berkshire County delegation against the pipeline's proposed route through protected State land. In summary, we, the Town of Dalton Select Board, urgently request that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission strongly considers the issues and impacts of Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company LLC's project on watershed infringement, the taking of land by eminent domain as well as the use and disturbance of protected state lands, not only within the borders of the Town of Dalton, but across the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. If these issues cannot be resolved, then the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission should deny Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company LLC's application to construct this project.

Sincerely,

The Dalton Select Board

Cc.

Senator Elizabeth Warren

Senator Edward Markey

Representative Richard Neal

Governor, Deval Patrick

State Senator Benjamin Downing

State Representative Paul Mark.

Governor Elect Charles Baker

Berkshire Regional Planning Commission

#### **20141201-5000**

Diane Garey, Florence, MA.

I would like to express my concern about and opposition to the Northeast Energy Direct natural gas pipeline project, and other proposed gas pipelines. My primary concern is the very real risk of dangerous methane leaks that comes with such pipeline projects. And I also believe that the state should be planning for an energy future that is safer and more sustainable than the one this pipeline project represents.

Thank you for your consideration/

#### **20141201-5017(29944115).txt**

Paola Hack, Rindge, NH.

We are completely against the pipeline in or around NH. The dangers involving a project like this makes no

sense to me. No one around here wants it or needs it. Our ecological value would be gone along with our property value!

**20141201-5018(29944117).txt**

Paola Hack, Rindge, NH.

We are completely against the pipeline in or around NH. The dangers involving a project like this makes no sense to me. No one around here wants it or needs it. Our ecological value would be gone along with our property value!

**20141201-5032(29944158).pdf**

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:

As FERC considers Kinder Morgan's Northeast Energy Direct proposal, I ask that you also consider the following from an affected homeowner along the pipeline path.

**Pipelines and Property Values**

Kinder Morgan is proposing to build a large, high pressure natural gas pipeline through dozens of towns in New England – and is planning to use eminent domain powers where necessary to secure easements for their desired route. For those of us who are directly in the path of any of the proposed pipeline routes or whose property abuts a pipeline route, a “potential” decrease in property values is often mentioned as one of the pipeline negatives.

I'm sorry, but I simply don't think that there's much “potential” involved – property values will drop. I expect that many of the properties along the proposed pipeline route will drop significantly and some will drop precipitously.

These are some of the reasons why I believe that lower property values are not just a likelihood, but a certainty in the event that this pipeline is built:

- 1.) Simple common sense tells us that property values will drop, especially for residential properties. In my semi-rural neck of the woods, residential properties are often partly or mostly wooded – and any trees in the clear-cut 100-foot easement will be very visibly missing if a pipeline is built. And who would choose to live on a property that is now partially under the control of a private energy company? If there are two equivalent properties for sale, one of which has an easement with a large high-pressure gas pipeline (and all of the baggage that goes with it) and one of which doesn't, why would anyone select the pipeline property at an equivalent price? Would you?
- 2.) An attorney who specializes in eminent domain cases presented to a group of Pepperell, MA homeowners affected by the proposed pipeline. This is an individual who specializes in eminent domain work and who knows the local towns well. This gentleman said that he would be willing to work with affected homeowners on a contingency basis. In other words, he believes that he will be able to convince a Federal judge or panel that not only did the pipeline cause a homeowner's property value to fall, but to fall by considerably more than the amount that Kinder Morgan offered in compensation. Please understand that by taking a case on contingency, he only gets paid if he in fact proves exactly that. So either he's just not too smart or he has a pretty good idea that property values will fall significantly and that Kinder Morgan will not offer full compensation. Which do you think is more likely to be true?
- 3.) Peter E. Flynn, another Boston area eminent domain attorney has written a public letter to the Chair-

man of the Groton, MA Board of Selectmen. In this letter, Attorney Flynn asserts that “I have had more Federal District Court trials involving gas pipeline valuation issues on behalf of landowners than anyone currently in the Commonwealth”. He states that all communities impacted by pipeline takings should be concerned about damages caused to property values by gas pipelines. “Significant damages result because of the numerous restrictions that come with recorded easements but also with the gas company’s unrecorded construction requirements ...”. The letter closes with this quote: “I had a case where a pipeline was installed on property where the taking authority was only willing to pay a nominal amount of \$400 to the landowner claiming that there was no direct damage nor consequential damage to the remainder property. In the end a jury heard the case and the ‘taking authority’ had to pay \$100,000! That is just one example of many.”

4.) This is one recent data point: A single family home in Pepperell, MA sold a few months back. According to the Kinder Morgan maps, this property abutted the pipeline route but the pipeline did not cross it. The property went on the market and was under agreement, but when the buyers were told of the proposed pipeline they renegotiated and the price dropped by \$17,500. And this was an abutting property, not one with an easement. And the pipeline is years away, if it ever does get built.

And here’s a note to all abutters of the proposed pipeline: Kinder Morgan will not negotiate with you or offer you any compensation if their pipeline does not actually cross your property. They don’t need to. I understand that if you try to sue them over a decrease in your property value, you are unlikely to even get in front of a judge. The fact that you used to look out at your neighbor’s trees and that you now look out at your neighbor’s pipeline scar (and whatever lies beyond it) is simply your tough luck.

Allen Fore, a Kinder Morgan Director of Public Affairs, states during his presentations that natural gas pipelines do not affect property values. Such blanket assertions do nothing to enhance Kinder Morgan’s credibility in light of the points made above. In fact, they call into question the veracity of their many other blanket statements trying to reassure us about pipeline safety, their remediation efforts, their intention to be a good neighbor, etc., etc.

Nick Miller Groton, MA

**20141202-0008(29949018).pdf**

**TOWN OF PEPPERELL  
BOARD OF SELECTMEN**

October 28, 2014

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

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

Dear Secretary Bose,

The Town of Pepperell adopted a resolution in opposition to the proposed Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Energy Direct Project. Pepperell’s local legislative authority is vested in the traditional New England open Town Meeting whereby any registered voter may participate and vote on town matters.

On May 23, 2014, the Town Clerk received a petition signed by several hundred registered voters. The petition directed the Board of Selectmen to call a Special Town Meeting at which time the petition would be discussed, debated, and voted. A Special Town Meeting was held on June 30, 2014. At said Special Town Meeting the voters of the Town voted unanimously to adopt a resolution in opposition to the project. A copy of the vote of the Special Town Meeting is attached. Please take this resolution into consideration when reviewing the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct project.

We appreciate your time and consideration.

Very truly yours,

John Moak

Town Administrator

cc: Governor Devel Patrick

U.S. Senator Elizabeth Warren

U.S. Senator Edward J. Markey

U.S. Congresswoman Niki Tsongas

State Representative Sheila Harrington

State Representative Eileen Donoghue

Secretary Maeve Vallely-Bartlett, EEA

1 Main Street, Pepperell, MA 01463  
(978) 433-0333 FAX: (978) 433-0335

## COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Middlesex, ss:

To either of the constables of the Town of Pepperell, in said county,

GREETINGS:

In the name of the Commonwealth aforesaid, you are hereby required to notify and warn the inhabitants of said Town qualified according to law to vote in state, county, district and town affairs to assemble at the NISSITISSIT MIDDLE SCHOOL, in said Town, on Monday, the 30th of June, A.D. 2014 at 7:00 PM to act on the following articles:

### SPECIAL TOWN MEETING

June 30,2014

#### ARTICLE 1

By Citizens' Petition

#### NON-BINDING RESOLUTION

To see if the Town will vote to adopt the following non-binding resolution opposing the Northeast Expansion of the Tennessee Gas Pipeline in Massachusetts:

Resolution Opposing the Northeast Expansion of the Tennessee Gas Pipeline in Massachusetts

WHEREAS, a proposed High-Pressure Pipeline and a lateral pipeline carrying natural gas may come through Pepperell and our neighboring communities, en route to Dracut, Massachusetts and Nashua, New Hampshire; and

WHEREAS, said pipeline contravenes current Massachusetts commitments to renewable energies and combating global climate change; and

WHEREAS, the pipeline would transport natural gas obtained through hydraulic fracturing, a drilling method well known for its potential for ground water contamination, impact on air quality, and the harmful health effects of its chemical byproducts, among others; 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, said pipeline would destroy unknowable amounts of forest, wetlands, conservation land and farmland, and would pass beneath the Nashua and Nissitissit Rivers, and require maintenance in perpetuity of a 50 foot right-of-way through the possible use of herbicides; and

WHEREAS said pipeline would adversely affect property values, adversely affect residents' livelihood and otherwise negatively impact the integrity of the town's bucolic character; 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, 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, our energy challenges are better addressed through investments in energy conservation measures as well as green and renewable energy solutions.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the people of Pepperell, Massachusetts

1. Hereby call on our Selectmen to stand in opposition to Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.'s Northeast Expansion pipeline and not allow it within town borders;
2. Stand in opposition to all similar projects that may be later proposed;
3. Oppose any pipeline carrying natural gas obtained through hydraulic fracturing, within the borders of our Commonwealth; and
4. Hereby instruct our state and federal legislators and executive branch officials to enact legislation and take any 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 and subsidies for renewable energy sources.

or take any other action relative thereto.

And you will serve this warrant by posting a true and attested copy of same, in said Town, fourteen days prior to the time of said meeting. Hereof fail not and make due return of your doings herein to the Town Clerk on or before the time appointed for said meeting. Given under our hands this 6th day of June, A.D. 2014.

Michael L. Green, Chairman  
Michelle R. Gallagher, Clerk  
Stephien C. Themelis  
PEPPERELL BOARD OF SELECTMEN  
CONSTABLE of PEPPERELL

20141202-0101(29950483).pdf

**Commonwealth of Massachusetts**

Fisheries and Wildlife Board  
251 Causeway Street, Suite 400  
Boston, Massachusetts, 02114

November 25, 2014

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

RE: Kinder-Morgan Company, Northeast Energy Direct Project, PA, MA, CT, NH

Dear Secretary Bose,

I am writing on behalf of the Massachusetts Fisheries and Wildlife Board concerning the proposed location of the Kinder-Morgan gas pipeline in our state. This Board has the statutory control and supervision of the Massachusetts Division of Fisheries and Wildlife (DFW). This includes the acquisition and management of land, wetlands, and waters in fee or lesser interests as wildlife habitat for outdoor passive recreation.

To date we have only seen generalized maps of the proposed pipeline route, which appear to indicate that Kinder-Morgan is considering a trajectory through open spaces, including many of the DFW's protected

holdings.

DFW has acquired these lands and waters using funds from license fees paid by purchases of hunting, fishing, and trapping licenses, federal aid funds, state open space bonds, private donations from individuals and public and private land trusts. Each acquisition carries with it a public trust and fiscal obligations. Some land acquisitions also entail legal obligations negotiated with public or private entities.

The location and extent of our lands and waters are recorded in County Registries of Deeds in the form of deeds, takings, restrictions, or easements. Additionally they are displayed on widely available paper and digital maps. The base for these maps is U.S. Geological Survey maps. Kinder-Morgan has access to these records and maps.

In addition to our land, wetland, and water acquisition and management responsibilities, the Massachusetts Endangered Species Act (MESA; M.G.L. Ch. 131A, Sec. 4) gives the DFW regulatory responsibilities (CMR 10.03) for protecting federal and state-listed plant and animal species, and their land, wetland and water habitats. The habitat-protection responsibility includes meeting our obligations under the federal Clean Water Act and the Massachusetts Wetlands and Waterways Act. Board-approved MESA regulations apply to both public and private property in Massachusetts. As part of this program DFW staff has invested over 30 years of scientific collection and analysis of the occurrence of each listed species and their habitats. This effort has produced an atlas for mapping Priority Habitat for each state-listed species. The atlas also uses U.S. Geological Survey maps as its base. Multiple copies are available to inspect at several offices in each municipality in the state as well as on-line from the DFW web site

(<http://www.mass.uov/eea/auencies/dfit/dfw/natural-heritaue/reaulatorvreview/reaulatorv-mans-nrioritv-and-estimated-habitats/>).

MESA requires the DFW to review and place appropriate legal restrictions on public and private construction affecting state-listed species in Massachusetts, with the exception of federal property, where we cooperate with the applicable federal agency. The MESA requirements extend our regulatory concern about the location of the pipeline where it potentially impacts state-listed-species habitat on private property.

Article 97 of the amendments to the Massachusetts Constitution extends the DFW's public obligations beyond management of wildlife and their habitats. This amendment requires that lands or easements that DFW acquires for public conservation purposes may not be used of other purposes without a two-thirds vote of each branch of the legislature. In addition, lands that we acquire (in fee or lesser interests) with funds from the state's environmental bond bills are legally required to be open to the general public for a wide variety of year-round outdoor passive recreation activities. Restrictions imposed by the operator on use of the gas line right of way will have the potential to conflict with this requirement.

Massachusetts is among the most developed states in the nation. Thus, lands acquired both for wildlife habitat and passive outdoor recreation have are of higher especially high public value than those in a state with a greater proportion of open space. This value of open space is repeatedly evidenced by the willingness of the legislature and private citizens to support DFW's land, wetland and water acquisition program, and their willingness to protect at-risk species through a state-wide regulatory program.

Over almost 400 years of development in Massachusetts means that we already have an extensive existing network of utility and transportation corridors that effectively communicate between communities and industrial sites. We encourage Kinder-Morgan to seriously consider using this existing network as a way to reduce adverse impacts to public environmental assets from pipeline construction and maintenance. We understand that Kinder-Morgan has an important fiscal responsibility to the shareholders of the firm that will own or use the pipeline. At the same time we look to your Commission to ensure that the established values and obligations that attach to the remaining open public and private land and waters of Massachusetts be upheld in your review of the Kinder-Morgan application.

This Board and DFW will vigorously use all means at our disposal to fulfill the obligations assigned to us by the legislature and the citizens of Massachusetts. At the same time, we are prepared to cooperate fully with

Kinder-Morgan in identifying a pipeline route that maximizes the use of existing transportation and utility corridors and minimizes adverse impacts to lands and waters indentified as valuable for wildlife habitat and public passive recreation.

Sincerely,

George L Darey, Chairman

**20141202-5008(29947064).txt**

Derek Pelotte, Lowell, MA.

I've lived in Lowell for 6 years completing my graduate degree at Umass Lowell. In 6 years I've fostered a deep rooted relationship with the State Forest that crosses into Lowell, Dracut and Tyngsboro. It was during college that I began a hobby of mountain biking and wild mushroom foraging. The state forest is now threatened with being developed in order to route a pipeline expansion into Dracut from the west. I'm thoroughly opposed to this for several reasons, some technical, and some personal.

On the technical side of my disagreement, I see a green light for the project as a long term investment in the opposite direction that science has shown for at least the last decade that our civilization should be going in. It has been shown in "Burden of Proof: The Case Against the Proposed Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Fracked Gas Pipeline (8/27/14)" that the same dollar investment required for a pipeline expansion would create more price stability in developing safer forms of alternative energy production, as well as upgrading the efficiently of already existing pipelines operated by the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co. From page 7 of the "Burden of Proof": "NESCOE's own study acknowledges that investments in energy efficiency and other measures could eliminate the economic case for the pipeline and that the research has not been done to evaluate these alternatives". If this is true, then genuine investment in the public good would be in those projects that shy away from harder and harder to obtain forms of energy, such as fracked gas and shale oil, the kinds that a pipeline expansion looks to transport.

As fossil fuel derived energy sources are more expensive to obtain and more destructive to the environments the come from, they do not represent a stable and dependable source of energy. The case is being pushed that the rate hikes Massachusetts residents are experiencing this year could be alleviated from these expansion projects. I do not grant this as true because the pipeline is proposed to come online in 2017 at the earliest and the rate hikes are coming into effect in 2014. However, even granting this as true, it's easy to see this is a short term fix to the longest term problem: How to power our industrial society? These rate reductions would represent a bubble that has to burst, a blip on the radar of historically more expansive energy. The source will run out. The time and money that will be put into this band-aid project will be unavailable as a resource later on. Better would be to muster the political and economic will power to create a decentralized energy network, a network that is not systemically susceptible to widespread outages, shortages, price hikes, and unforeseen price increases.

On the personal side of my disagreement, I have found the forest as profoundly necessary. It was a place of rejuvenation and recuperation. It was a place to hide from a busy campus and the even busier city of Lowell. The forest continues to be a place of contemplation and meditation, a place where the big questions of life can be pondered without distraction. The forest has become a place for my wonder to grow, much like the forest itself.

I met eco-minded people, both young and old, from all persuasion of life. My favorite people to randomly meet were fellow mountain bikers. Almost all bikers stop and chat about trail conditions and interesting places to ride, and sometimes we would merge our parties into a group ride on the spot. It was on those trails where my first sense of community was found. I found that I wasn't alone in my interest and there are interestingly weird people everywhere out there just waiting to be engaged.

The space was there for the community to gather. It is a commons in the truest sense of the word. When we as a society say we want to leave a better world for our children, what is it exactly we mean? I think at the minimum it means leaving those parts of our culture and environment that promote a holistic development

of the self. Those other parts include energy security, space for reflective contemplation and community interaction. Economic development is only one part providing for humans. As long as this project ignores research into providing energy security and how it will degrade the quality of protected land, this is a project solely about the economic development of a company. When economic development becomes destructive to those other parts of the whole human organism then it should be opposed totally and completely, and totally and completely is my objection to project.

**20141202-5012(29947072).txt**

Craig Jensen, Rindge, NH.

I am writing in regards to a proposed pipeline that would pass through my town, near to my property, in Rindge, NH. I am strongly opposed to this proposal. For the past several months I have seen the “Stop the Pipeline” signs in the yards and along the roadways of our close neighbors in Massachusetts. It seems that their opposition has been loud and clear enough that Kinder Morgan thinks it right to consider our land in New Hampshire to be an easier path. I believe our objections are equally strong and valid. The proposed pipeline puts the health of our land and our families at risk. The risk of a ruptured or leaking pipe is too high and the impact could be extreme. When compared to the danger of a serious accident or incident it seems small, but I do also worry that the proposed project would lower the value of my land. I have been living on this property since 2003, but just purchased the land last year. With two other families I am planning a small, intentional development here where neighbors can live close and share their lives. We aim to draw families from around New England but I worry that the proximity of this pipeline would be a significant deterrent to ecology/health minded families who might otherwise consider moving here. Currently I make my living as an organic farmer on land close to the proposed course and I plan to continue working with the land for years to come. I worry about the risk of my livelihood if the fragile local ecosystem where negatively impacted.

Finally and most importantly, significant further investment in fossil fuel technologies, when we know climate change to be real, human caused, and in need of immediate attention seems grossly irresponsible. My wife is pregnant with our first child. It feels unconscionable to allow further destruction of his future world for our current convenience. We know that methane is a potent greenhouse gas with destructive qualities in all stages of harvest and use. Maybe this pipeline is only a symbol, but I feel like it is a place that we can make a position clear. We want a better world than this pipeline proposes. We can make a better world possible and this pipeline, here or anywhere, has no place in it.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my comments.

Craig Jensen

**20141202-5064(29948208).txt**

Willow Cheeley, Andover, MA.

I am writing to oppose the pipeline proposed for construction through Conservation Land and our water supply in the Town of Andover, MA.

- Our Conservation Land is extremely important to us. It protects our drinking water, increases property values, gives our town a unique sense of place and promotes biodiversity. We live in a densely populated region and our Conservation Land is a critical resource as well as selling point for those choosing to move to Andover.
- Our town actively enjoys our Conservation Land by hiking its trails and traveling on its waterways on a daily basis; many private properties share their backyards with Conservation Land. Our quality of life, health, and tax base is better because of our Conservation Land.
- We have a Town Meeting government that has demonstrated how much we value our Conservation Land by consistently voting to fund land acquisitions and maintenance for the benefit of the public.
- We have a group of dedicated conservation volunteers that leads educational hikes, maintains trails,

monitors wildlife populations and works with community groups, including those from one of the poorest cities in the US, who might not otherwise have the opportunity to interact with nature.

1. The proposed pipeline would degrade our Conservation Land by fragmenting habitat, threatening our drinking water, promoting the establishment of invasive species, reducing property values, and impeding access to and control of our land in perpetuity.
2. The proposed pipeline would take away our Town's autonomy on its own Conservation Land. Kinder-Morgan's proposal demonstrates a clear disregard for our history and values.
3. Our Town has successfully participated in the Solarize Massachusetts program and continues to reduce our dependence on natural gas. The repair of already existing pipelines would further reduce our need for natural gas in this state. The value of our Conservation Land is greater than the value of this proposed pipeline. Our Conservation Land benefits many while the proposed pipeline only benefits Kinder-Morgan and its shareholders. By design, the proposed pipeline is carrying gas that will not be used in our Town or in any significant quantity by Massachusetts.
4. There are alternative routes available to Kinder-Morgan for the proposed pipeline, but they have ignored requests to explore these options.

I urge you to reject this proposed pipeline. It is unnecessary for the public good; it degrades a significant cultural and ecological resource; it is a dangerous liability that will reduce property values; it will have a negative impact on our Town and regional community with no mitigating benefits. Thank you.

**20141202-5065(29948228).txt**

Alice Swift, Amherst, MA.

I have a sign saying NO PIPELINE in front of my house, as do many others in Amherst. I have worked to combat climate change for several years, and tried to conserve energy personally for many years. We must wean ourselves off fossil fuels. Building more infrastructure for gas will commit us to using gas into the future when we should be using renewable energy. There will come a time when we cannot burn more fossil fuels because of the atmosphere warming beyond the point where life can continue. We must not hasten that day. I'm thinking of my grandchildren and great-grandchildren. I want a livable planet to be here for them.

Fracked gas is very dirty and pipelines have a history of leaking. Fracked gas spills will have long lasting effects on the soil. I believe we should focus on fixing leaks in the current pipes and using much more solar and wind power, as well as reducing our use of energy altogether.

I have lived in Amherst for 47 years. It has been my home for most of my married life. I appreciate the natural beauty of the state, especially its open land. Destruction of conservation land and other open space for the pipeline will change the character of the state. It will affect whether people choose to live here. My family has enjoyed hiking, picnicking, and swimming in areas that will be affected. Massachusetts is a nice place to live and this will change if wide swaths are taken by the pipeline. Those especially affected will be in places where the pipeline crosses a person's property. The pipeline will lower property values in the areas where the pipeline is but also across the state because of it being a less desirable place to live and visit.

**20141203-0013(29953675).pdf**

Harry L. Dodson  
56 South Street  
Ashfield, MA 01330

November 25, 2014

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

Re: Docket # PF14-22

Dear Ms Bose,

I am very concerned about the proposed Northeast Energy Direct (NED Project) pipeline proposed for a number of sensitive, protected landscapes in Massachusetts.

Building the pipeline in protected public or private non-profit land in Massachusetts requires a two thirds vote of the state legislature under Article 97 of the State Constitution. If the NED pipeline project is allowed to circumvent Article 97, an alarming precedent will be Set, undermining the foundation of land conservation in Massachusetts.

I urge you to ensure that the proposed NED project does not intrude on conservation lands in Massachusetts, particularly lands protected by Article 97. I also ask that you ensure that the NED project does not impact other sensitive conservation lands, agricultural lands and critical habitats.

Thank you for considering my concerns.

Harry L. Dodson

Founder, Franklin Land Trust

Fellow, American Society of Landscape Architects

cc: MA Representative Steve Kulik  
MA Senator Benjamin Downing  
US Representative Richard Neal  
US Senator Elizabeth Warren  
US Senator Edward Markey

**20141203-5000(29950372).txt**

Susan Donaldson, Cambridge, MA.

Understanding the wish to maintain “business as usual” with respect to energy availability, I suggest that in light of looming climate change, business as usual is no longer an option. We cannot be building new fossil fuel infrastructure! Natural gas is not “clean.” This is the wrong direction for the US to be going. Let’s imitate Germany.

**20141203-5012(29950566).txt**

Kristina Jacobs, Woburn, MA.

To Whom it may concern,

I am strongly against both the project to expand the Spectra pipeline and the project to construct the TGP pipeline. Both of these projects pose the great threat of increasing rates of climate change and of polluting our air and water supplies. The construction and expansion of these pipelines will cause the destruction of Massachusetts land and forest ecosystem. The hydraulic fractured gas that would be carried through these pipes contains cancer-causing toxins that cause great danger if the pipes leaked. As seen throughout the United States, pipe leakages are quite frequent, are handled poorly, and are extremely harmful for the surrounding communities. FERC needs to be approving projects that promote clean, renewable energy that will create green jobs, and not risk our planet’s future.

**20141203-5048(29950794).txt**

Shelby Meyerhoff, Cambridge, MA.

Climate change is the greatest crisis of our time. Not only is it already harming people and communities throughout the United States and around the world, but it is on course to make the world uninhabitable for human beings and many other forms of life. This course may soon be irreversible, but it is not yet. There’s still a small moment in time in which dramatic reduction of fossil fuel emissions could help us avoid the worst future impacts of climate change.

Stop authorizing new fossil fuel infrastructure, including gas pipelines, and instead facilitate the necessary widescale expansion of renewable energy.

20141204-0006(29955348).pdf

**TOWN OF ASHBY**  
Conservation Commission  
895 Main Street  
Ashby, Massachusetts 01431

November 22, 2014

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

RE: Tennesmx: Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., Docket No. PF14-22-000

Request to Use Pre-filing Procedures for Proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Secretary Bose,

The Ashby Conservation Commission requests that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) consider some of the special aspects of the Town of Ashby in its review of the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's (TGP) proposed NED prujeC.

The Town of Ashby has a population of 3,168.i”Much of the town's soils consist of a thin layer of glacial till that was plastered down beneath the glacier in a thin veneer over the bedrock. 1 1 Except for a few public wells that service the elementary school, library, private pre-school, a private camp ground and a restaurant, the entire town is on private water supplies, almost all of which are wells.

Over the past 20—30 years, there have been a few projects in town that have required blasting to construct projects through ledge. Each time, surrounding wells were negatively affected by the blasting. The proposed pipeline route crosses many private properties with exposed and buried ledge.

All waters in Ashby have the designation of Outstanding Water Resource. As such, all require that a 401 Water Quality Certificate be issued before the start of any work that would fill, dredge or alter that water resource. The proposed route of the pipeline crosses many such waterways. The Ashby Conservation Commission is a volunteer board. Whether each of these crossings would require its own Notice of Intent and 401 Water Quality Certification Application or all of these crossing be included in one massive project, processing the project(s) within the DEP time requirements could present a challenge to the all-volunteer Ashby Conservation Commission. We would likely request that the project through Ashby be broken down into manageable chunks and submitted serially rather than all at once. We feel that the cumulative decades-long experience and knowledge of our Commissioners must be respected and included.

In addition to presenting an administrative nightmare, because all waters in Ashby are Outstanding Resource Waters, work could ordy be conducted during specific times of the year. Understanding the logistics of managing a project as large as this one, it seems unlikely that Tennessee Gas Pipeline would be able to comply with time and seasonal restraints on work that protection of our waters would require.

As Ashby hes in an area of Massachusetts that has not had its natural resources well documented. and, as noted in its exclusion of much of the town from the Petapawag Area of Critical Environmental Concern, is unlike most other areas of Massachusetts in its topology and natural resources, it would appear imperative to us that Tennessee Gas Pipeline be required to submit an Environmental Impact Study rather than an Environmental Assessment.

For all of these reasons. the Ashby Conservation Commission would object strongly to any attempt to expedite this project through the FERC Pre-filing Procedures. Wc believe strongly that this project should not go

forward, but in the event that it does, in order for it to proceed with a minimum of permanent damage to the environment of Ashby all aspects of the project must be undertaken with the due diligence and care afforded through the standard review of a project submitted to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Very truly yours,

George Bauman, Chair

Robert Leary, Vice Chair

Roberta Flashman, Secretary

Cathy Kristoferson Treasurer

cc: Governor Deval Patrick

Governor Elect Charles Baker

US Senator Elizabeth Warren

US Senator Edward J. Markey

US Congresswoman Niki Tsongas

State Senator Stephen Brewer

State Senator Elect Anne Gobi

State Representative Sheila Harrington

Maeve Vallely-Bartlett, Secretary of Energy and Environmental Affairs

Matthew Beaton, incoming Secretary of Energy and Environmental Affairs

[1] Town census completed in April 2014

[2] Ashby Open Space Plan 2004

#### **20141204-5084**

Katie A Wallace, Andover, MA.

Dear Ms. Bose,

We are residents of Andover, Massachusetts, also on the proposed "Lynnfield Lateral" and are concerned about the safety of locating such a high pressure line in a highly populated part of Massachusetts. Given that this proposed Lynnfield Lateral is a 20 inch diameter high pressure pipeline of 1460 psi (pressure per square inch), the impact radius would effect approximately 527 feet from the source of the impact. According to Chapter 49, section 192.903 of the Code of Federal Regulations, the potential impact radius describes the region "within which the potential failure of a pipeline could have significant impact on people or property." This basically means that in the event of damage to the pipe including an explosion there is a real risk of death to all children and adults along the proposed route. The negative impact far outweighs any positive gain so how can one argue that this pipeline is in the public's best interest? Would you allow your family to live next to a pipeline project of this capacity??? Please help to keep New England safer. We ask that you do not allow the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company to perform this project!

Sincerely Eric & Kate Wallace

#### **20141204-5088(29954057).txt**

Robert E Higgins-Steele, ASHBY, MA.

**Town of Ashby**

Energy Efficiency Committee

Town Hall

Ashby, MA 01431

Ashby Energy Efficiency Committee, Ashby, MA.

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC)

888 First Street, N.E.

Washington, DC 20426

RE: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., PF14-22-000

Dear Secretary Bose:

The Ashby Energy Efficiency Committee (AEEC) of the Town of Ashby MA, appreciates the opportunity to submit these preliminary comments in conjunction with the pre-filing phase of Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's (TGP) proposed Northeast Energy Direct pipeline (Project). A AEEC) hereby notifies both FERC and TGP of its intention to actively participate in the pre-filing phase of FERC's natural gas pipeline proceedings in order to preserve the rights of the Town and AEEC).

The proposed pipeline will extend across the full width of Ashby.

The Project is not consistent with regional and State energy and sustainability plans that call for an increase in energy efficiency and renewable energy to meet electricity and heating demands rather than an increase in fossil fuel use.

Given the Committee's charge to promote energy efficiency in Ashby, the AEEC intends to be an active participant in the pre-filing process and requests that the FERC require TGP to fully define application for this Project.

We also request that the FERC require a comprehensive analysis of alternatives to building the gas pipeline to address the short term winter reliability issues as part of the application process

Sincerely,

The Ashby Energy Efficiency Committee

William Stanwood Alan Pease James Hubert Robert Higgins-Steele

Member Member Member Member

cc: Governor Deval Pstrick

Governor-Elect Charles Baker

US Senator Elizabeth Warren

US Senator Edward J. Markey

US Congresswoman Niki Tsongas

State Senator Stephen Brewer

State Representative Sheila Harrington

Maeve Vallely-Bartlett, Secretary of Energy

#### **20141204-5154(29954509).txt**

Hallel Parsons, Rindge, NH.

I am strongly apposed to a gas pipeline through Rindge, NH. New England consumes a lot of gas. It gets pretty cold up here. None of this changes the fact that climate change is a direct result of human behavior. Improved structural design (ie. insulation) may do a little to reduce gas energy needs. There is a commons whether our legal or economic structures recognize it or not!!! These are human constructs. We are able to adapt according to our empirical observations of the environment. There is no room for error. Violence and culture are at stake here.

A corporation is by definition a non-profit. A conservative is someone whose hands get numb in the cold because the heat's turned off.

The realities of life are changing. It may be raining in California now, but in five years will NE be a major vegetable producer for the nation.

Look, the gas flowing through the pipe-line means a heck ton of a lot of polluted water. Polluted water means more cancer, and a warmer climate equals all the more effort to survive extreme environmental con-

ditions.

It's time for a fee and dividend system. It's time for the United States of America God bless her soul to eat some humble pie!!! And as far as I'm concerned that's the most patriotic thing anyone could say.

Basically what it all boils down to is that we need to make it easier to not consume gas. We need to make it easier to be a true conservative.

**20141204-5168(29954700).txt**

James L. Giddings, Greenville, NH.

Dear FERC,

I assert that the proposed high-pressure gas pipeline is not needed to meet any predictable need for additional natural gas in New England, as shown in the excellent article by the Dracut/Tyngsborough Pipeline Awareness group in this article, which has already been supplied to you.

<https://www.scribd.com/doc/227298012/Questioning-the-Need-for-Northeast-Energy-Direct>

I happen to be a resident of Greenville, New Hampshire, one of the towns now targeted by the most likely pipeline route. Greenville and adjacent towns are the sources of water resources for much of the region, and blasting the ledge along the proposed pipeline route would surely damage water quality and availability for the future. I live a little more than a mile from the pipeline route. The herbicides used to keep pipeline rights-of-way free of plants would be disastrous for local farms, and the tourism industry, which is a staple of our economy, would be severely damaged.

Nevertheless, I object, not just to the route that would pass through Greenville, but also to all the other proposed alternatives, because developing excess capacity to transport natural gas from the fracking fields of Pennsylvania to and through New Hampshire and Massachusetts will doom the essential moves these states need to make to switch to renewable energy sources. The pipeline carves the future of New England's energy supply in granite, so to speak, forcing the future use of fossil fuels and stunting the growth of solar, wind, tidal, sustainable biomass, geothermal and other local sources of energy. The continued growth in the use of natural gas (and coal and oil) dooms the planet to undergo a climate catastrophe that will make our descendants' lives ever more difficult.

I ask you not to expedite the approval of this pipeline in any way, to require environmental impact statement in every town the pipeline would pass through and to let these factors, as well as the lives of the residents who will be displaced or injured by the project, weigh heavily in your deliberations. If you take all these factors into account, you will conclude that the public good is not served by this project and that it should not be approved.

Jim Giddings

**20141205-0020(29960775).pdf**

**FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20428**

December 2, 2014

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

The Honorable Richard E. Neal  
U.S. House of Representatives  
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Congressman Neal:

Thank you for your October 24, 2014, letter regarding Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.'s (Tennessee) proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project (Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's Docket No. PF14-22-000). I appreciate your concerns regarding groundwater, disruptions to local businesses, and other

impacts on western Massachusetts.

The Commission approved Tennessee's request to enter into our pre-filing process for the NED Project on October 2, 2014. The process is designed to engage stakeholders to identify and resolve environmental issues before the formal filing of an application with the Commission. The Commission's pre-filing process will include our staff's active participation with landowners, interested parties, and federal and state agencies (including the Massachusetts Energy Facilities Siting Board), to identify areas where impacts may be reduced or avoided. My staff will also attend Tennessee's planned open house meetings and hold scoping meetings throughout the project area. By engaging the public early in the process, we believe that we can conduct a more comprehensive and meaningful review of the project as part of our obligation under the National Environmental Policy Act.

Let me assure you that our environmental review will include a careful consideration of all of these concerns. Once Tennessee files its application, the Commission's environmental staff will prepare a draft environmental impact statement (EIS) for this project, and the public will have additional opportunities to comment on the project and the adequacy of this document. The draft EIS will take account of impacts on both private and public conservation lands, forest and water resources (including groundwater resources and nearby wells), traffic, impacts on local economies (including tourism), and will consider alternative routes through the diverse and historic Massachusetts landscape. The final EIS will address any comments received on the draft EIS, and the Commission will consider the findings of the final EIS before making its decision on whether or not to authorize this project.

Please be assured, as in any Commission matter 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,

Cheryl A. LaFleur  
Chairman

**20141205-4009(29957561).docx**

From: Sanjay Joshi [mailto:sanjaymjoshi@gmail.com]

Sent: Friday, December 05, 2014 11:29 AM

To: Cheryl LaFleur

Subject: Stop Kinder Morgan gas pipeline in New England!

Dear Chairman LaFleur,

I urge you to stop the proposed gas pipeline by Kinder Morgan in New England. After analyzing the arguments, I have come to the conclusion that the risks far outweigh rewards as follows:

High Risks:

- Intentional leaks and herbicides: The standard operating procedure of intentional leaks and spraying herbicides around the pipeline will damage our conserved land, including our drinking water supply.
- Accidental leaks near Schools: Disasters do happen, despite precautions. We don't want Andover, MA to become another infamous location of a gas leak or an explosion from one of the highest-pressure pipeline.
- Fracking: We should not encourage controversial fracking to feed our greed for energy.
- Housing prices: The gas pipeline will make our town less attractive for new home-buyers, reducing prices, and hence, affecting local economy.

Minimal rewards:

- Energy supply: Though the pipeline will bring new energy supply, we should be focusing on optimiz-

ing our energy usage, not expanding it. The US enjoys one of the lowest energy prices in the world and remains one of the highest contributor to global warming. Massachusetts is perceived as a leader on green energy. This pipeline will be a step back!

- Temporary jobs: The construction jobs brought by the pipeline will last less than two years. The maintenance jobs will add only minimally to Massachusetts, home of next-generation science and technology.

Therefore, I request you to do whatever you can to stop this project, publicize your efforts, and win our hearts!

Regards,

Dr. Sanjay M. Joshi  
12 Chandler Road, Andover, MA 01810

**20141205-4010(29957751).docx**

From: Sanjay Joshi <sanjaymjoshi@gmail.com>

Date: December 5, 2014 at 11:29:19 AM EST

To: tony.clark@ferc.gov

Subject: Stop Kinder Morgan gas pipeline in New England!

Dear Commissioner Clark,

I urge you to stop the proposed gas pipeline by Kinder Morgan in New England. After analyzing the arguments, I have come to the conclusion that the risks far outweigh rewards as follows:

High Risks:

- Intentional leaks and herbicides: The standard operating procedure of intentional leaks and spraying herbicides around the pipeline will damage our conserved land, including our drinking water supply.
- Accidental leaks near Schools: Disasters do happen, despite precautions. We don't want Andover, MA to become another infamous location of a gas leak or an explosion from one of the highest-pressure pipeline.
- Fracking: We should not encourage controversial fracking to feed our greed for energy.
- Housing prices: The gas pipeline will make our town less attractive for new home-buyers, reducing prices, and hence, affecting local economy.

Minimal rewards:

- Energy supply: Though the pipeline will bring new energy supply, we should be focusing on optimizing our energy usage, not expanding it. The US enjoys one of the lowest energy prices in the world and remains one of the highest contributor to global warming. Massachusetts is perceived as a leader on green energy. This pipeline will be a step back!
- Temporary jobs: The construction jobs brought by the pipeline will last less than two years. The maintenance jobs will add only minimally to Massachusetts, home of next-generation science and technology.

Therefore, I request you to do whatever you can to stop this project, publicize your efforts, and win our hearts!

Regards,

Dr. Sanjay M. Joshi  
12 Chandler Road, Andover, MA 01810

**20141205-4011(29957912).docx**

Non-Decisional

From: Sanjay Joshi [mailto:sanjaymjoshi@gmail.com]

Sent: Friday, December 05, 2014 11:30 AM

To: Philip Moeller

Subject: Stop Kinder Morgan gas pipeline in New England!

Dear Commissioner Moeller,

I urge you to stop the proposed gas pipeline by Kinder Morgan in New England. After analyzing the arguments, I have come to the conclusion that the risks far outweigh rewards as follows:

High Risks:

- Intentional leaks and herbicides: The standard operating procedure of intentional leaks and spraying herbicides around the pipeline will damage our conserved land, including our drinking water supply.
- Accidental leaks near Schools: Disasters do happen, despite precautions. We don't want Andover, MA to become another infamous location of a gas leak or an explosion from one of the highest-pressure pipeline.
- Frakking: We should not encourage controversial frakking to feed our greed for energy.
- Housing prices: The gas pipeline will make our town less attractive for new home-buyers, reducing prices, and hence, affecting local economy.

Minimal rewards:

- Energy supply: Though the pipeline will bring new energy supply, we should be focusing on optimizing our energy usage, not expanding it. The US enjoys one of the lowest energy prices in the world and remains one of the highest contributor to global warming. Massachusetts is perceived as a leader on green energy. This pipeline will be a step back!
- Temporary jobs: The construction jobs brought by the pipeline will last less than two years. The maintenance jobs will add only minimally to Massachusetts, home of next-generation science and technology.

Therefore, I request you to do whatever you can to stop this project, publicize your efforts, and win our hearts!

Regards,

Dr. Sanjay M. Joshi

12 Chandler Road, Andover, MA 01810

#### **20141205-5014**

Tyler Seppala, Rindge, NH.

I'm a direct abutter to the power lines where this pipeline is proposed. I pay taxes on this land which PSNH has a easement on. The pipeline could involve Kinder Morgan taking a easement 100' from the proposed pipeline which will take them halfway through my lawn. I'm also now in the blast zone with my wife and 2 month old son. Kinder Morgan has a history of not maintaining their pipelines which has resulted in leaking pipes. As the case with most NH residents I have a well and I wouldn't dare drink my tap water if this pipeline goes in. The pipeline is going to drastically affect my property values. As a blue collared worker and 1 income based home I cant afford to take a hit like that. I will take a major bath if I could even convince somebody to buy my home if this pipeline goes in. I have lived in NH my entire life and its so sad to see it comes to this. Especially after I built my beautiful home only 3 years ago on this parcel of land where I am today. This is not good for NH! We do not need this here. The cons outweigh the pros. My land will be destroyed along with any privacy I have once the trees are cut down and I'm left to look at the construction wasteland left behind.

#### **20141205-5092(29956670).txt**

Susan Moran, Dublin, NH.

I would like to voice my opposition to this project proposed for Southern NH into Dracut MA. This pipeline is proposed to cross two aquifers in Rindge NH effecting the entire Monadnock Region and Cheshire

County. This pipeline would not increase local jobs or deliver natural gas to NH while it will lower property values and disturb and/or destroy our environment. Although this docket has been filed no one from Tennessee Gas Pipeline, Northeast Direct Project or Kinder Morgan has met with the town of Rindge or it's residents who will be directly and/or indirectly effected. Please do not continue with this docket and listen to the people of NH who oppose this destructive project. Thank you.

**20141205-5264(29958455).txt**

Burky Chiang, Andover, MA.

I am a resident of Andover, MA and have been monitoring this issue arising in my town regarding a high-pressure pipeline going through Andover. My concerns are simple: safety. It is not clear to me that there is sufficient consideration for the residents of Andover that will be impacted by this project. My daughter's school for one.

I urge you to not allow this pipeline project to proceed.

Thank you.

Burky J Chiang  
Andover, MA 01810

**20141208-5012(29958665).pdf**

Julia Flood Page, Rindge, NH.

Julia J. Flood Page  
44 Mountain Road  
Rindge, NH 03461

December 5, 2014

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

Docket: PF14-22

Dear Secretary Bose:

I am writing regarding the pipeline proposed by Kinder-Morgan to run through our town, Rindge, New Hampshire. The proposed route runs through conservation land and aquifers. I also understand that it is likely that we rate payers will pay for this pipeline even though the main purpose of the line is to export gas to elsewhere in the world bringing profit to Kinder-Morgan but worry and headache to us. Our land up here is very rocky necessitating blasting to get any pipeline below the freezing point; blasting so close to so many homes would disrupt our wells and probably our septic systems. In addition, our roads will be impacted by the heavy machines needed to dig the trench; our town does not have the money to repair the roads. Further, as you know, Kinder-Morgan has a record of spills, leaks and explosions. We do not want this pipeline.

Please do not approve this pipeline; our gas should not be for export.

Sincerely,

Julia Flood Page

**20141208-5014(29958671).pdf**

Stephanie D Burns Leary, Rindge, NH.

We already export 1/2 the electricity we generate and DON'T NEED as a state for no compensation that we can find to other states in our region, enough is enough! We as a state do not need this pipeline and will not benefit from it and it will likely add more costs to OUR taxes as problems arise and devalue what we value

most about living our little lives in Rindge and our neighboring towns from here to far east NH

**20141208-5015(29958670).pdf**

Stephanie D Burns Leary, Rindge, NH.

We already export 1/2 the electricity we generate and DON'T NEED as a state for no compensation that we can find to other states in our region, enough is enough! We as a state do not need this pipeline and will not benefit from it and it will likely add more costs to OUR taxes as problems arise and devalue what we value most about living our little lives in Rindge and our neighboring towns from here to far east NH

**20141208-5037(29958715).pdf**

Carl Querfurth, Jaffrey, NH.

I believe that this is an ill-conceived project and should not be permitted to continue. The route impacts many acres of land that local citizens have spent much time and money conserving for future generations. This project also has little to no benefit to the local region and the nation as a whole. Many studies show that the Northeast region does not need or want more gas. The main beneficiary of this project seems to be only those directly involved in the export and sale of the gas to be piped. The dangers inherent in the piping of gas and the damage to the environment through burning of the gas are not worth the destruction and loss of personal property. Asking citizens to sacrifice their hard earned property for the benefit of a few is wrong and should not be permitted.

**20141208-5050(29958741).pdf**

Richard Crane, Groton, MA.

I am a homeowner living in Groton, Massachusetts directly affected by the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) project. The original pipeline route filed on September 15, 2014 goes through our property.

There has been a great deal of concern regarding this project and its affect on protected conservation land. I certainly share that concern. However, not much has been said about affected landowners. Kinder Morgan has not mentioned those properties that come within 50ft of the proposed pipeline route in their filings. The original proposed route is a "greenfield" pipeline that goes straight through 45 communities here in Massachusetts. This means that there are a significant number of homes that are directly impacted by this route.

Just in our neighborhood, the original pipeline route crosses 11 private properties (i.e. homes), 3 protected pieces of conservation land, and abuts 50+ homes. The entire route crosses 9 school properties, dozens of farms, and 100s, if not 1000s, of homes. These numbers do not even include the abutters to the pipeline or impacts to much needed resources such as water supplies. This route will have a devastating and lasting impact on communities throughout Massachusetts.

Up until this point, Kinder Morgan and the Tennessee Gas Pipeline have done nothing to consider the impact to landowners. We are very frustrated over their attempt to use eminent domain to take our land and homes. Because of this we have denied Kinder Morgan's request to survey our property.

We understand that Kinder Morgan is proposing a new route through Massachusetts and New Hampshire. This new route travels mostly along existing utility corridors. Certainly the change in the route significantly reduces the number of homeowners affected. It avoids many areas such as schools and farms where members of the public congregate. It minimizes the impact to protected conservation land here in Massachusetts.

This new route comes with mixed feelings for us. We understand the need for balance between the public need and those of landowners impacted by projects such as this. This new route is an excellent attempt by Kinder Morgan to provide balance. However, like many others, we question the need for this project. There is a significant amount of evidence that shows that this pipeline is not needed.

Currently there are five natural gas pipelines projects that are proposed for the New England market. These projects are the AIM, Constitution, Atlantic Bridge, Access Northeast, and Northeast Energy Direct projects.

Each of these pipeline projects promises to deliver enough energy to New England to meet our needs. Certainly five “new” natural gas pipelines are not needed. FERC recently approved the Constitution pipeline. This pipeline is one of the biggest of the pipeline projects mentioned above and is more than enough to meet New England’s energy needs.

New England utility companies are hard at work on clean renewable energy projects. Just in Massachusetts there are 51 major solar projects in construction and development. There is also a significant amount of effort improving 34 existing hydropower plants here in Massachusetts and building new hydropower plants throughout New England. These efforts are enough to meet the energy needs here in New England.

Natural gas pipelines have a history of leaking here in Massachusetts. The problem is so vast that our U.S. Senator Edward Markey championed legislation to address these leaks. It is estimated that these leaks cost consumers \$1.5 billion. It has been estimated that the amount of natural gas leaked is several times the energy needed for the region. Fixing these leaks is enough to address our needs here in New England negating the need for new natural gas infrastructure.

By the time the Northeast Energy Direct project is built there will be a significant amount of “new” energy from both natural gas and clean renewable energy sources such as solar, wind, and hydro. There will also be a significant amount of energy recovered by fixing Massachusetts’s aging natural gas infrastructure. These efforts are already underway and will address the energy needs of New England. This means that the Northeast Energy Direct project is obsolete before it has even started.

We ask that FERC look at all of the efforts to improve New England’s energy supply already underway and find that the NED project is not in the public interest or need.

#### REFERENCES:

Gas leaks cost consumers \$1.5 b, study says <http://www.bostonglobe.com/business/2013/07/31/gas-leaks-costing-massconsumers/5nIv3FsJaZRwscJ48jGMsI/story.html>

New Stockbridge hydropower plant planned [http://www.berkshireagle.com/news/ci\\_24056135/new-stock-bridgehydropower-plant-planned](http://www.berkshireagle.com/news/ci_24056135/new-stock-bridgehydropower-plant-planned)

Huge land-based wind power projects announced for northern New England <http://www.capecodtoday.com/article/2013/09/25/21829-huge-land-basedwind-power-projects-announced-northern-new-england>

Major Solar Projects in the United States Operating, Under Construction, or Under Development <http://www.seia.org/sites/default/files/resources/PUBLIC%20Major%20Projects%20List%202014-11-19.pdf>

The Natural Gas “Crisis:”, Dispelling the Myths [https://www.scribd.com/document\\_downloads/246802621?extension=pdf&from=embed&source=embed](https://www.scribd.com/document_downloads/246802621?extension=pdf&from=embed&source=embed)

#### **20141208-5062(29958765).pdf**

Nancy Parsons, North Reading, MA.

Please register my strong objections to the proposed Kinder Morgan project to lay a pipeline through eastern Massachusetts—and especially through North Reading. I attended an informational meeting sponsored by Kinder Morgan; although I am better informed, I am significantly more alarmed. Please protect our environment, our neighborhood and our homes by disallowing the project.

Thank you

Nancy L. Parsons

#### **20141208-5068(29958777).pdf**

Stella Walling, Rindge, NH

December 7, 2014

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC)

888 First Street, N.E.  
Washington, DC 20426

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company (TGP), L.L.C Docket PF14-22-000 Southern New Hampshire Potential Alternate Route: Northern Energy

Direct (NED) Project; Kinder Morgan (KM)/Tennessee Natural Gas Pipeline Dear FERC Representatives:

The Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company (TGP) plans to file a proposal on December 8, 2014 to construct a 71-mile pipeline route through southern New Hampshire. Please accept this letter as my request not to approve this proposal for a variety of reasons. For the sake of brevity, I've only included a few below:

1. This pipeline offers no reasonable benefit to New Hampshire: Most of the gas product is not meant for New Hampshire since it is meant for areas outside of the United States.
2. There are no valid economic indicators given at this time that this proposed pipeline is needed. The amount of cubic feet of natural gas to be proposed vs. the amount needed now or in the future are not in proportion to each other by any means. Again, most of the natural gas will be shipped to areas outside of the United States.
3. TGP/KM indicates that this pipeline will be constructed in or near existing utility lines which travel through private land and conservation land. That is not a positive point as TGP/KM claims it is by any means. Homeowners along these lines will be subject not only to eminent domain issues, but also to additional environmental and safety hazards. Possible negative impact to PSNH electric transmission lines may cause further damage.
4. TGP/KM's safety record should deter anyone from accepting this proposal. Offering to train local emergency response personnel to address leaks or explosions, and thus implying that additional employment opportunities exist is manipulative and insulting.
5. There are other alternatives we need to invest in that provide efficient and clean energy. A pipeline that will relatively soon be abandoned is not the answer.

While I may be persuaded that TGP/KM has every reason to follow its ultimate mission, which is to make money, there are nevertheless some boundaries it should not cross. Constructing something in New Hampshire that is not of reasonable benefit to New Hampshire's current and future citizens is one of those boundaries and should not be legal.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,  
Stella Walling  
Rindge, NH

**20141208-5184(29960094).pdf**

Shira Wolhberg, Williamstown, MA.

Please do not rubber stamp new fossil fuel infrastructure. We are interested in true long term conservation, efficiency and health. Extractive processes are too risky and disruptive as well as short-lived. Rather than investing in dying technologies, please commit fully to ninegeneration solutions immediately. Do not continue to steer us toward devastation. Would you honestly want to live with this in your neighborhood? Put an end to sacrifice zones at the expense of front-line communities, most often disempowered, impoverished minority communities.

We are better than this. More inventive, adaptable, energetic and "humane."

**20141208-5217(29960501).docx**

**Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.**

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

December 8, 2014

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

Supplemental Filing -- Adoption of Alternative Route as Part of Proposed Route (Wright, New York to Dracut, Massachusetts Pipeline Segment)

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 (“NED Project” or “Project”). By notice issued October 2, 2014, the Commission approved Tennessee’s request to use the pre-filing procedures for the Project. On November 5, 2014, Tennessee filed drafts of Resource Reports 1 and 10 and an updated stakeholder mailing list for the Project with the Commission.

In the November 5, 2014 draft Resource Report 10, Tennessee presented evaluations of several major route alternatives for portions of the Project. Among the route alternatives discussed in the draft Resource Report 10 for the Wright, New York to Dracut, Massachusetts Pipeline Segment (referred to as the Market Path Component of the Project) were the New York Powerline Alternative and the New Hampshire Powerline Alternative (see Sections 10.3.1.2 and 10.3.1.8 of draft Resource Report 10). These identified alternatives involved co-locating the pipeline along an existing electric transmission line corridor in eastern New York, western Massachusetts, and southern New Hampshire.

The New York Powerline Alternative deviates from the proposed route in New York at approximately MP 34.13 of the Wright to Dracut Pipeline Segment in New York. At that point the New York Powerline Alternative travels in a north/northeast direction, eventually turning east/southeast to interconnect with the mainline proposed route at approximately MP 69.91 in Massachusetts. The New Hampshire Powerline Alternative deviates from the proposed route in Massachusetts at approximately milepost (“MP”) 108.64, and travels in a northerly direction into New Hampshire. At that point, the pipeline would be co-located with an existing powerline corridor and will travel in an easterly direction before turning south and re-entering Massachusetts near Dracut, Massachusetts and rejoining the proposed route of the Wright, New York to Dracut, Massachusetts Pipeline Segment at MP 175.34.

In its ongoing effort to critically evaluate feasible alternatives for the Project, Tennessee has now determined that it will adopt both the New York Powerline Alternative and the New Hampshire Powerline Alternative as its proposed route. Therefore, Tennessee will modify the originally proposed route for the Wright, New York to Dracut, Massachusetts Pipeline Segment of the Project. Tennessee is adopting this revised route for the Project at this early date in the pre-filing process to permit transparent stakeholder/public consultation and the development of the additional resource reports reflecting the revised route as part of the Commission’s pre-filing process. The revisions reflected in this filing are the product of countless public outreach meetings conducted by Tennessee with stakeholders, as well as the environmental review process itself. This type of significant revision to the proposed Project in order to address numerous concerns with the original proposed route is a text book example of the merits of the Commission’s pre-filing and certificate procedures.

The Market Path component of the Project that is being revised originally consisted of approximately 177 miles of new and co-located mainline pipeline. With the adoption of the New York Powerline Alternative and the New Hampshire Powerline Alternative, the proposed revised route will now include approximately 188 miles of new and co-located mainline pipeline facilities as follows: (a) approximately 53 miles of pipeline generally co-located with Tennessee's existing 200 Line and an existing power utility corridor in eastern New York near the proposed Market Path Mid Station No. 1; (b) approximately 64 miles of pipeline generally co-located with an existing power utility corridor in western Massachusetts; and (c) approximately 71 miles of pipeline generally co-located with an existing power utility corridor in southern New Hampshire, extending east to the proposed Dracut, Massachusetts Market Path Tail Station. In addition, the Project originally included construction of eight new pipeline laterals (totaling approximately 73 miles), eight new compressor stations, and 16 new meter stations. As revised, the Project will now include nine laterals (totaling approximately 75 miles), nine new compressor stations, and 15 new meter stations.

One of primary reasons that led to Tennessee's decision to adopt the New York Powerline Alternative and New Hampshire Powerline Alternative for the Project is that they will enable a very substantial portion of the proposed new pipeline construction to be located adjacent to, and parallel with, existing utility corridors in the states of New York, Massachusetts and New Hampshire. By increasing the percentage of co-location for the proposed pipeline segment, the revised route will reduce the construction of new pipeline facilities in undeveloped portions of the Market Path region, thus reducing environmental impacts and avoiding habitat fragmentation. In addition, the proposed route change will enable Tennessee to avoid (in certain cases) and to minimize (in other cases) the crossing of Article 97 properties and Areas of Critical Environmental Concern in Massachusetts.

Through its significant outreach efforts for the Project, Tennessee has been attentive to the public response to the Project. This proposed route modification for the Market Path component of the Project is intended to address comments and concerns expressed by affected stakeholders across various areas of the Project. Additionally, the proposed route modification, which takes advantage of a greater percentage of co-located facilities with existing power utilities, will provide economic service to several areas in northern Massachusetts and southern New Hampshire that are not currently served by an interstate pipeline.

The NED Project is being developed to serve specifically the New England region. The New England region, as a whole, stands to benefit from the NED Project as it will enable New England to sustain its reliance on natural gas-fired generation and to lower energy costs by providing scalable transportation capacity attached to lower cost, near-by domestic natural gas. Access to significant, reliable and abundant quantities of lower priced natural gas will benefit New England consumers and will encourage capital investment in commercial and industrial ventures adding to the region's economy. The Project will provide regional confidence in competitively priced natural gas supplies for decades to come providing stability in a critical fuel source. Tennessee's fully integrated natural gas pipeline transportation system also will enable the Project to provide additional access to diverse supplies of natural gas to expansion customers in the New England region. As demand for natural gas in the region increases, Tennessee's LDC customers have expressed the need for additional firm transportation capacity to serve their growing markets. The proposed revision to the Market Path component of the Project does not result in any change to the proposed total incremental natural gas transportation capacity (up to 2.2 Bcf per day) to be provided by the Project.

In this filing, Tennessee submits a revised Resource Report 1 to reflect the adoption of the New York Powerline Alternative and New Hampshire Powerline Alternative as part of the proposed Project. To assist the Commission and affected stakeholders in their review of the revised Resource Report 1, Tennessee is providing clean and redlined versions of the revised report that reflect the revisions to the proposed Project facilities. Tennessee is also providing an updated overall Project map to show the new proposed route of the Project, and revised aerial photographic maps and U.S. Geological Survey topographic mapping for the pipeline route. In addition, Tennessee is submitting updated stakeholder lists (landowner, governmental officials, and regulatory agencies) for the Project. The enclosed stakeholder lists update the information that was provided as part of Tennessee's November 5, 2014 filing for (1) affected landowners (contained in

Volume III-Privileged and Confidential Information, Appendix AA), (2) representatives of affected federal, state, and local political jurisdictions (contained in Volume II-Public, Appendix C), and (3) applicable federal and state regulatory agencies (contained in Volume II-Public, Appendix A). All updates to the stakeholder lists are highlighted on the respective attachments. Due to privacy concerns, Tennessee, in accordance with Section 388.112 of the Commission's regulations, 18 C.F.R. § 388.112 (2014), is requesting privileged and confidential treatment of that portion of the updated stakeholder mailing list that includes information regarding affected landowners. Tennessee is also providing clean and redlined versions of the Public Participation Plan in Appendix D.

Tennessee notes that its development of the resource reports for the Project is an ongoing process, and that updated drafts of both Resource Reports 1 and 10 will be submitted when the first draft of the Environmental Report (consisting of Resource Reports 1 through 13) is filed with the Commission in March 2015. The first draft of the Environmental Report will reflect the proposed pipeline route as revised herein. The second draft of the Environmental Resource Report is anticipated to be filed with the Commission in June 2015. Tennessee plans to host open houses in the Project area, including in the area of the revised pipeline route during the period January 2015 through March 2015 to provide additional information and answer questions concerning the Project.

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 Mr. Richard Siegel at (713) 420-5535.

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

**20141208-5217(29960502).pdf**

*105 pages, 3.1MB: only Title, Table of Contents, List of Tables, and List of Attachments included below*

NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT PROJECT

DOCKET NO. PF14-22-000

DRAFT

ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT

RESOURCE REPORT 1

GENERAL PROJECT DESCRIPTION

PUBLIC

Submitted by:

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.

1001 Louisiana Street

Houston, Texas 77002

December 2014

-----  
 TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 GENERAL PROJECT DESCRIPTION .....1-1

1.1 PROPOSED FACILITIES.....1-7

1.1.1 Purpose and Need .....1-7

1.1.2 Location and Description of Facilities.....1-10

1.1.2.1 Pipeline Facilities .....1-11

1.1.2.2 Aboveground Facilities .....1-24

1.1.2.3 Compressor Stations.....1-24

1.1.2.4 Meter Stations .....1-29

1.1.2.5 Mainline Valves, Pig Launcher/Receivers and Cathodic Protection  
 Facilities (Appurtenant Aboveground Facilities).....1-35

1.1.3 Location Maps, Detailed Site Maps, and Plot/Site Maps .....1-37

1.2 LAND REQUIREMENTS .....1-37

1.2.1 Pipeline Facilities.....1-40

1.2.2 Aboveground Facilities.....1-44

1.2.3 Access Roads .....1-44

1.2.4 Additional Temporary Workspace.....1-52

1.2.5 Pipeyards and Contractor Yards .....1-52

1.2.6 Areas of No Access.....1-52

1.3 CONSTRUCTION PROCEDURES.....1-53

1.3.1 Pipeline Construction.....1-54

1.3.1.1 Marking the Corridor .....1-54

1.3.1.2 Erosion and Sediment Control .....1-54

1.3.1.3 Clearing, Grading, and Fencing .....1-55

1.3.1.4 Trenching .....1-56

1.3.1.5 Pipe Stringing.....1-57

1.3.1.6 Pipe Bending .....1-57

1.3.1.7 Pipe Assembly and Welding .....1-57

1.3.1.8 X-Ray and Weld Repair .....1-58

1.3.1.9 Coating Field Welds, Inspection and Repair.....1-58

1.3.1.10 Pipe Preparation and Lowering-In .....1-58

1.3.1.11 Tie-Ins .....1-58

1.3.1.12 Backfilling and Grade Restoration.....1-58

1.3.1.13 Clean-up and Restoration.....1-59

1.3.1.14 Hydrostatic Testing and Tie-Ins.....1-59

1.3.1.15 Alternating Current Mitigation and Cathodic Protection.....1-59

1.3.2 Specialized Construction Procedures.....1-60

1.3.2.1 Rugged Topography.....1-60

1.3.2.2 Residential Areas .....1-63

1.3.2.3 Agricultural Lands .....1-65

1.3.2.4 Road and Railroad Crossings .....1-65

1.3.2.5 Trenchless Construction Methods.....1-66

1.3.2.6 Rock Removal.....1-67

1.3.2.7 Wetland Crossing Construction .....1-68

1.3.2.8 Waterbody Crossing Construction .....1-69

1.3.2.9 Project Specific Alternative Measures or Modifications to  
 Commission’s Plan and Procedures .....1-70

1.3.3 Compressor Stations, Meter Stations, and Appurtenant Facilities  
 (Aboveground).....1-70

1.3.3.1 Clearing and Grading .....	1-70
1.3.3.2 Foundations .....	1-70
1.3.3.3 Building Design and Construction .....	1-71
1.3.3.4 High Pressure Piping.....	1-71
1.3.3.5 Pressure Testing .....	1-71
1.3.3.6 Infrastructure Facilities .....	1-71
1.3.3.7 Control Checkout and Engine Startup.....	1-71
1.3.3.8 Final Grading and Landscaping .....	1-72
1.3.3.9 Erosion Control Procedures .....	1-72
1.3.4 Timeframe for Construction .....	1-72
1.3.5 Supervision and Inspection.....	1-73
1.4 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE PROCEDURES.....	1-73
1.4.1 Cleared Areas.....	1-73
1.4.1.1 Erosion Control .....	1-74
1.4.2 Pipeline Facilities.....	1-74
1.4.2.1 Periodic Pipeline and ROW Patrols .....	1-75
1.4.3 Aboveground Facilities.....	1-76
1.5 FUTURE PLANS AND ABANDONMENT .....	1-77
1.6 PERMITS AND APPROVALS.....	1-78
1.7 NON-JURISDICTIONAL FACILITIES.....	1-84
1.8 LANDOWNER/AGENCY CONSULTATION.....	1-84
1.8.1 Landowner Consultation/Public Participation .....	1-85
1.8.2 Agency Consultation.....	1-91
1.8.2.1 Threatened and Endangered Species Consultations.....	1-91
1.8.2.2 Interagency and Other Review/Resource Agency Meetings.....	1-92
1.9 SUMMARY OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS.....	1-94

#### LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.0-1 Summary of NED Project Facilities .....	1-2
Table 1.1-1 Proposed Pipeline Facilities for the Project.....	1-14
Table 1.1-2 Areas of Pipeline Looping and Co-location for the Pipeline Facilities .....	1-20
Table 1.1-3 Proposed Compressor Stations for the Project .....	1-26
Table 1.1-4 Proposed Meter Stations for the Project .....	1-31
Table 1.1-5 Proposed Appurtenant Aboveground Facilities for the Project .....	1-36
Table 1.2-1 Summary of Land Requirements for the Project .....	1-38
Table 1.2-2 Proposed Construction ROW Widths for the Project Pipeline Facilities .....	1-41
Table 1.2-3 Land Requirements for the Project Pipeline Facilities .....	1-42
Table 1.2-4 Land Requirements for the Project Aboveground and Appurtenant Facilities.....	1-45
Table 1.2-5 Land Requirements for the Project Pipeyards and Contractor Yards.....	1-52
Table 1.2-6 Areas of No Access for the Project by State.....	1-53
Table 1.3-1 Tennessee Minimum Specifications for Depth of Cover (inches).....	1-56
Table 1.3-2 Steep Slopes (15-30 percent) Crossed by the Project.....	1-60
Table 1.3-3 Steep Slopes (>30 percent) Crossed by the Project.....	1-61
Table 1.3-4 Steep Side Slopes (15-30 percent) Crossed by the Project.....	1-62
Table 1.3-5 Steep Side Slopes (>30 percent) Crossed by the Project.....	1-62
Table 1.3-6 Horizontal Directional Drill Crossings for the Project .....	1-67
Table 1.3-7 Shallow Depth to Bedrock for the Project.....	1-68
Table 1.4-1 Cathodic Protection Areas Along the Project.....	1-75
Table 1.6-1 Permits, Licenses, Approvals, and Certificates Required for Construction, Operation, and Maintenance of the Project .....	1-79

Table 1.8-1 Libraries Within the Project Area.....	1-86
Table 1.8-2 Newspapers Within the Project Area.....	1-89
Table 1.8-3 Agency Meetings Conducted for the Project (As of December 8, 2014) .....	1-92

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

ATTACHMENT 1a – FIGURES

Project Location Map  
 USGS Topographic and Aerial Imagery Maps

**20141208-5217(29960504).pdf**

*from TGP:1 page document*

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.  
 Northeast Energy Direct Project  
 Docket No. PF14-22-000  
 Pre-Filing – Supplemental Filing Submittal  
 December 2014  
 Volume I - Public  
 Resource Report 1 - General Project Description  
 Attachment 1a – USGS Topographic and Aerial Imagery Maps  
 Project Maps  
 1. Pennsylvania to Wright Pipeline Segment  
 2. Wright to Dracut Pipeline Segment  
 3. Connecticut Loops & Project Laterals  
 4. Meter Stations

**20141208-5217(29960505).pdf**

*from TGP:20 page document - 27.5 MB, maps and areal photos*

TENNESSEEGASPIPELINECOMPANY,L.L.C.  
 NORTHEASTENERGYDIRECTPROJECT  
 WRIGHT TO DRACUT PIPELINE SEGMENT

**20141208-5217(29960506).pdf**

*from TGP: 32.8 MB: maps and areal photos*

**20141208-5217(29960507).pdf**

*from TGP: 31.4 MB: maps and areal photos*

**20141208-5217(29960509).pdf**

*from TGP: 29.6 MB: maps and areal photos*

**20141208-5217(29960510).pdf**

*from TGP:31.7 MB: maps and areal photos*

**20141208-5217(29960511).pdf**

*from TGP: 31 MB: maps and areal photos*

**20141208-5217(29960512).pdf**

*from TGP: 31.4 MB: maps and areal photos*

**20141208-5217(29960513).pdf**

*from TGP: 26.5 MB: maps and areal photos*

**20141208-5217(29960514).pdf**

*from TGP: 29.6 MB: maps and areal photos (Richmond to Rindge)*

**20141208-5217(29960516).pdf**

*from TGP: 24.7 MB: maps and areal photos (Rindge to Milford)*

**20141208-5217(29960517).pdf**

*from TGP: 29.4 MB: maps and areal photos (Milford to Londonderry)*

**20141208-5217(29960519).pdf**

*from TGP: 27.2 MB: maps and areal photos*

**20141208-5217(29960520).pdf**

*from TGP: 30.9 MB: maps and areal photos*

**20141208-5217(29960521).pdf**

*from TGP: 33.3 MB: maps and areal photos*

**20141208-5217(29960522).pdf**

*from TGP: 24.6 MB: maps and areal photos*

**20141208-5217(29960523).pdf**

*from TGP: 32.1 MB: maps and areal photos (Mason lateral Northern)*

**20141208-5217(29960524).pdf**

*from TGP: 32.9 MB: maps and areal photos (Mason lateral in MA)*

**20141208-5217(29960525).pdf**

*from TGP: 24.3 MB: maps and areal photos*

**20141208-5217(29960527).pdf**

*from TGP: 36.3 MB: maps and areal photos*

**20141208-5217(29960528).pdf**

*from TGP: 37 MB: maps and areal photos*

**20141208-5217(29960529).pdf**

*from TGP: 27.6 MB: maps and areal photos (METER STATIONS)*

**20141208-5217(29960530).pdf**

*from TGP: 31.5 MB: maps and areal photos (METER STATIONS)*

**20141208-5217(29960531).pdf**

*from TGP: 34.8 MB: maps and areal photos (METER STATIONS)*

**20141208-5217(29960532).pdf**

*from TGP: 18.1 MB: maps and areal photos (METER STATIONS)*

**20141208-5217(29960546).pdf**

*from TGP: Appendix B*

Appendix B

Updated Agency Correspondence will be provided  
in a subsequent filing of the Environmental Report.

**20141208-5217(29960547).pdf**

*from TGP: 47 page Appendix A*

Northeast Energy Direct Project: Federal and State Regulatory Agency Contact List

**20141208-5217(29960548).pdf**

*from TGP: 28 page Appendix C*

Government Officials/Non-Governmental Organizations Contact Lists and Town Presentations

**20141208-5217(29960549).pdf**

*from TGP: Appendix D : Public Participation Plan*

**PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT PROJECT**

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. (“Tennessee”), a subsidiary of Kinder Morgan, is committed to stakeholder communications and an effective public and landowner outreach plan to seek input into the Northeast Energy Direct Project (“Project”) and address issues that are of interest for the planning of this Project. The plan will be executed by Tennessee, and includes the following elements:

**I. INITIAL OUTREACH - Spring, 2014**

- **Correspondence:** Initial written correspondence was sent to applicable elected officials along the proposed route, including federal, state, county, and municipal government levels. The mailing contained an introductory letter and a Project narrative, which included a Project website address, contact telephone number, and contact email.
- **Elected Official briefings:** Provided in-person Project overview briefings to elected officials and members of their staff at the local, state, and federal level in Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, and Pennsylvania. These briefings included a general description of the Project, the proposed route including types of crossings, timeline for outreach, permitting, construction, in-service date, restoration, public outreach plan, and description of opportunities for public input.
- **Website /Email Address/Toll Free Telephone:** On February 24, 2014, a Project website was launched at: [http://www.kindermorgan.com/business/gas\\_pipelines/east/neenergydirect/](http://www.kindermorgan.com/business/gas_pipelines/east/neenergydirect/). The website has been, and will

continue to be updated as applicable throughout the duration of the Project. Among other information, the website will include a list of public repositories along the route where Project-related information will be available for inspection. A toll-free telephone number, (844) 277-1047, for Project / landowner inquiries has also been established along with a dedicated email address, [nedinfo@kindermorgan.com](mailto:nedinfo@kindermorgan.com). Incoming telephone calls and emails will be directed to the appropriate Project discipline to be returned as soon as possible.

- **Land Agent / Survey Crew Training:** Outreach training for land agents and land staff has occurred and will be provided to new Project participants who may be retained throughout the duration of the Project. Training for land agents and land staff includes oral and/or written material regarding landowner rights, expectations of courtesies to landowners, advanced notices to landowners for survey permission, as well as plans and procedures for landowner negotiations as the Project advances. Survey crews, staff, and contractors that are likely to interact with landowners also receive outreach training. A Project specific toll-free number that will receive landowner inquiries has been established at (844) 277-1047. Any calls received from landowners over this number are logged into the Project database, including the specific issue and resolution or action required.
- **Agency Meetings:** Preliminary meetings with applicable federal and state agencies and environmental departments have been held to provide a Project overview and contact information for applicable Tennessee Project participants. In addition, federal and state agency guidance has been sought regarding potential sensitivities along the Project route and an interactive dialogue will begin with applicable federal and state agency staff. Consultation letters inviting federal and state agency participation in the Commission's pre-filing process were mailed.

## II. PHASE ONE – Ongoing

- **Town Presentations:** Provided 42 public project presentations, totaling 85 hours, to over 4,100 local residents where Tennessee staff directly answered more than 1,375 questions. These briefings included a company overview and introduction, general description of the Project, the proposed route including preliminary maps, timeline for outreach, information on the permitting process, Project benefits, and description of opportunities for public input. Senior level Tennessee staff members were on hand to present and respond to questions from members of the audience before and after the presentation. Informal presentations will continue at the request of municipalities.
- **State Legislative Meetings:** In addition to the above-mentioned correspondence to state legislators, introductory meetings with 150 legislators in whose jurisdiction the proposed route is contained are occurring to provide a Project overview. Certain legislators are likely to provide additional stakeholder information regarding other interested parties, including nongovernmental organizations, which will be integrated into the outreach process, as appropriate. An ongoing communication path will be established to provide Project updates as well as to address constituent concerns should they occur and allow for information exchange.
- **Federal and State Agency Meetings – staff level:** Tennessee has begun contacting agencies to introduce the Project, explain that it intends to utilize the Commission's pre-filing process, and identify each agency's interest in participating in the Commission's process. Tennessee will utilize the early consultations built into the pre-filing process to revisit the anticipated approval timeframes and familiarize agency staff with the Project and overall Project schedule. Tennessee will also continue consultations with federal and state agencies as it develops the required Environmental Report for the Project.
- **Land Agents:** Land agents have contacted contact state and municipal police departments and local municipal governments, as applicable, to make them aware that agents are asking for survey permission from landowners along the proposed route, and that survey crews may be present on municipal roads. All land agents have Tennessee identification. Agents also gather local information regarding municipal concerns.
- **County / Municipal Meetings:** Informational meetings with county and municipal government representatives have begun to occur to provide a Project briefing, explain the public participation process that will be followed, and provide Project staff contact information for an ongoing exchange of information. Local

government representatives will be asked for potential development activity that may affect the route and to make Tennessee aware of local concerns, including those of local non-governmental organizations.

- **Local and Non-Governmental Organization Meetings:** Multiple sources will assist in the identification of specific groups and/or non-governmental organizations with an express interest in the Project. Contact with, and/or ad hoc meetings will be arranged to establish a dialogue or address particularly sensitive issues that these affiliated stakeholders may have as appropriate.

### III. PHASE TWO

- **Public Open Houses:** Publicly advertised open houses will be held with a density of approximately one per county along the proposed route. Input will be sought from state legislators and county and municipal government officials in determining the location and timing of each open house. Subject to consultation with Commission Staff, the expectation is to complete several open houses beginning in January 2015. The publicly-noticed open houses will provide a poster board – station format to include, but not be limited to: a description of Tennessee (company and pipeline system); an overview of the proposed Project; the basic pipeline construction process; pipeline safety; environmental precautions; alignment sheets for landowners and/or abutters to identify and discuss their property with land agents; informational handouts; an opportunity for one-on-one dialogue with Tennessee staff or appropriate consultants; and light refreshments. The open houses are expected to be held in the early evening to accommodate the schedule of people working during the day.

- **Follow Up:** If unanswered questions remain, or new issues arise subsequent to the open houses, every reasonable attempt to reply will be undertaken.

1. Subsequent meetings with public representatives and non-governmental organizations will occur as needed.
2. An ongoing dialogue and updates will occur with applicable federal and state legislators, county and municipal officials, and other stakeholder parties as needed.
3. An ongoing dialogue between Tennessee's land department and landowners will occur throughout the permitting, construction, and restoration processes.

### IV. PHASE THREE

- **Land Acquisition:** Discussions with landowners will commence as soon as specific plans are completed detailing the proposed impacts to each property. Land agents will meet with each landowner and discuss the nature of any easement rights. Tennessee already holds and the additional easements rights that may be needed. Any payments for such easement rights and compensation for other material losses will be negotiated at that time. Landowners will also have the opportunity to discuss the specifics of the crossing on their property and identify areas of concern. If appropriate, certain minor Project modifications may be made at this time to address specific local conditions, (such as a septic system, well or other item of concern) that were not previously identified. Land agents will provide landowners with the Commission's contact information, as well as important information about the Project and Tennessee's operations. All landowner concerns will be noted and logged into a database or retained in a hard file. Landowners will also be provided with the process to address any construction-related problems during this time. The Project's toll-free telephone number, (844) 277-1047, will remain active throughout permitting, acquisition, construction, and restoration processes.

- **Pre-construction Meetings and Communication:** Pre-construction meetings will be offered to local emergency departments to include, but not be limited to, fire, police, other emergency departments, elected officials, and road departments.

1. A pre-construction update correspondence will be provided to all applicable elected officials providing information regarding the commencement of construction.
2. Public notices will be provided for the commencement of construction where roads or crossings will be impacted. Police details will be secured as needed.

3. The Project website will be updated to reflect construction-related activities.

4. Ongoing communication with state legislators, county and municipal government officials, and non-governmental organizations as well as landowner interaction will continue through the construction and restoration processes.

• PHASE FOUR

Construction and Restoration Communication: Communication will continue with federal, state legislators, county and municipal government officials, interested stakeholders, and landowners during the construction and restoration processes.

• Operations and Maintenance: The Tennessee field operations staff will maintain ongoing communication with local government officials and emergency responders in an effort to enhance safety, emergency response, and pipeline awareness initiatives after the newly installed pipeline is operational. Tennessee participates in several federal and state organizations that actively promote safety, emergency response, and public awareness within the counties and states where its pipeline operates. Tennessee conducts and participates in meetings in each county that its pipeline crosses and conducts periodic training for contractors, first responders, and local officials. Tennessee supervisors are present at meetings to answer questions and provide additional information related to emergency response, safety, and local contact information.

**20141208-5217(29960550).pdf**

*from TGP:* Appendix D: updated Public Participation Plan

Appendix D

Public Participation Plan

Updates to this Plan from Tennessee's previous filing (November 5, 2014) have been highlighted in yellow

Deletions to this Plan from Tennessee's previous filing (November 5, 2014) are indicated by strikeout text

***Note: highlighting and strikeout text is NOT visible in this text-only version.***

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT PROJECT

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. ("Tennessee"), a subsidiary of Kinder Morgan, is committed to stakeholder communications and an effective public and landowner outreach plan to seek input into the Northeast Energy Direct Project ("Project") and address issues that are of interest for the planning of this Project. The plan will be executed by Tennessee, and includes the following elements:

I. INITIAL OUTREACH - Spring, 2014

• Correspondence: Initial written correspondence was sent to applicable elected officials along the proposed route, including federal, state, county, and municipal government levels. The mailing contained an introductory letter and a Project narrative, which included a Project website address, contact telephone number, and contact email.

• Elected Official briefings: Provided in-person Project overview briefings to elected officials and members of their staff at the local, state, and federal level in Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, and Pennsylvania. These briefings included a general description of the Project, the proposed route including types of crossings, timeline for outreach, permitting, construction, in-service date, restoration, public outreach plan, and description of opportunities for public input.

• Website /Email Address/Toll Free Telephone: On February 24, 2014, a Project website was launched at: [http://www.kindermorgan.com/business/gas\\_pipelines/east/neenergydirect/](http://www.kindermorgan.com/business/gas_pipelines/east/neenergydirect/). The website has been, and will continue to be updated as applicable throughout the duration of the Project. Among other information, the website will include a list of public repositories along the route where Project-related information will be available for inspection. A toll-free telephone number, (844) 277-1047, for Project / landowner inquiries has also been established along with a dedicated email address, [nedinfo@kindermorgan.com](mailto:nedinfo@kindermorgan.com). Incoming telephone calls and emails will be directed to the appropriate Project discipline to be returned as soon as pos-

sible.

- **Land Agent / Survey Crew Training:** Outreach training for land agents and land staff has occurred and will be provided to new Project participants who may be retained throughout the duration of the Project. Training for land agents and land staff includes oral and/or written material regarding landowner rights, expectations of courtesies to landowners, advanced notices to landowners for survey permission, as well as plans and procedures for landowner negotiations as the Project advances. Survey crews, staff, and contractors that are likely to interact with landowners also receive outreach training. A Project specific toll-free number that will receive landowner inquiries has been established at (844) 277-1047. Any calls received from landowners over this number are logged into the Project database, including the specific issue and resolution or action required.
- **Agency Meetings:** Preliminary meetings with applicable federal and state agencies and environmental departments have been held to provide a Project overview and contact information for applicable Tennessee Project participants. In addition, federal and state agency guidance has been sought regarding potential sensitivities along the Project route and an interactive dialogue will begin with applicable federal and state agency staff. Consultation letters inviting federal and state agency participation in the Commission's pre-filing process were mailed.

## II. PHASE ONE – Ongoing

- **Town Presentations:** Provided 4234 public project presentations, totaling 8572 hours, to over 43,100550 local residents where Tennessee staff directly answered more than 1,3751,100 questions. These briefings included a company overview and introduction, general description of the Project, the proposed route including preliminary maps, timeline for outreach, information on the permitting process, Project benefits, and description of opportunities for public input. Senior level Tennessee staff members were on hand to present and respond to questions from members of the audience before and after the presentation. Informal presentations will continue at the request of municipalities.
- **State Legislative Meetings:** In addition to the above-mentioned correspondence to state legislators, introductory meetings with 150 legislators in whose jurisdiction the proposed route is contained are occurring to provide a Project overview. Certain legislators are likely to provide additional stakeholder information regarding other interested parties, including nongovernmental organizations, which will be integrated into the outreach process, as appropriate. An ongoing communication path will be established to provide Project updates as well as to address constituent concerns should they occur and allow for information exchange.
- **Federal and State Agency Meetings – staff level:** Tennessee has begun contacting agencies to introduce the Project, explain that it intends to utilize the Commission's pre-filing process, and identify each agency's interest in participating in the Commission's process. Tennessee will utilize the early consultations built into the pre-filing process to revisit the anticipated approval timeframes and familiarize agency staff with the Project and overall Project schedule. Tennessee will also continue consultations with federal and state agencies as it develops the required Environmental Report for the Project.
- **Land Agents:** Land agents have contacted contact state and municipal police departments and local municipal governments, as applicable, to make them aware that agents are asking for survey permission from landowners along the proposed route, and that survey crews may be present on municipal roads. All land agents have Tennessee identification. Agents also gather local information regarding municipal concerns.
- **County / Municipal Meetings:** Informational meetings with county and municipal government representatives have begun to occur to provide a Project briefing, explain the public participation process that will be followed, and provide Project staff contact information for an ongoing exchange of information. Local government representatives will be asked for potential development activity that may affect the route and to make Tennessee aware of local concerns, including those of local non-governmental organizations.
- **Local and Non-Governmental Organization Meetings:** Multiple sources will assist in the identification of specific groups and/or non-governmental organizations with an express interest in the Project. Contact with, and/or ad hoc meetings will be arranged to establish a dialogue or address particularly sensitive issues that

these affiliated stakeholders may have as appropriate.

### III. PHASE TWO

- **Public Open Houses:** Publicly advertised open houses will be held with a density of approximately one per county along the proposed route. Input will be sought from state legislators and county and municipal government officials in determining the location and timing of each open house. Subject to consultation with Commission Staff, the expectation is to complete several open houses beginning in January 2015 a first set of approximately twelve open houses between November 10, 2014 and December 12, 2014. The second set of five open houses is expected to be completed between January 5, 2014 and February 28, 2014. The publicly-noticed open houses will provide a poster board – station format to include, but not be limited to: a description of Tennessee (company and pipeline system); an overview of the proposed Project; the basic pipeline construction process; pipeline safety; environmental precautions; alignment sheets for landowners and/or abutters to identify and discuss their property with land agents; informational handouts; an opportunity for one-on-one dialogue with Tennessee staff or appropriate consultants; and light refreshments. The open houses are expected to be held in the early evening to accommodate the schedule of people working during the day.

- **Follow Up:** If unanswered questions remain, or new issues arise subsequent to the open houses, every reasonable attempt to reply will be undertaken.

1. Subsequent meetings with public representatives and non-governmental organizations will occur as needed.
2. An ongoing dialogue and updates will occur with applicable federal and state legislators, county and municipal officials, and other stakeholder parties as needed.
3. An ongoing dialogue between Tennessee's land department and landowners will occur throughout the permitting, construction, and restoration processes.

### IV. PHASE THREE

- **Land Acquisition:** Discussions with landowners will commence as soon as specific plans are completed detailing the proposed impacts to each property. Land agents will meet with each landowner and discuss the nature of any easement rights. Tennessee already holds and the additional easements rights that may be needed. Any payments for such easement rights and compensation for other material losses will be negotiated at that time. Landowners will also have the opportunity to discuss the specifics of the crossing on their property and identify areas of concern. If appropriate, certain minor Project modifications may be made at this time to address specific local conditions, (such as a septic system, well or other item of concern) that were not previously identified. Land agents will provide landowners with the Commission's contact information, as well as important information about the Project and Tennessee's operations. All landowner concerns will be noted and logged into a database or retained in a hard file. Landowners will also be provided with the process to address any construction-related problems during this time. The Project's toll-free telephone number, (844) 277-1047, will remain active throughout permitting, acquisition, construction, and restoration processes.

- **Pre-construction Meetings and Communication:** Pre-construction meetings will be offered to local emergency departments to include, but not be limited to, fire, police, other emergency departments, elected officials, and road departments.

1. A pre-construction update correspondence will be provided to all applicable elected officials providing information regarding the commencement of construction.
2. Public notices will be provided for the commencement of construction where roads or crossings will be impacted. Police details will be secured as needed.
3. The Project website will be updated to reflect construction-related activities.
4. Ongoing communication with state legislators, county and municipal government officials, and non-governmental organizations as well as landowner interaction will continue through the construction and restoration processes.

tion processes.

- PHASE FOUR

Construction and Restoration Communication: Communication will continue with federal, state legislators, county and municipal government officials, interested stakeholders, and landowners during the construction and restoration processes.

- Operations and Maintenance: The Tennessee field operations staff will maintain ongoing communication with local government officials and emergency responders in an effort to enhance safety, emergency response, and pipeline awareness initiatives after the newly installed pipeline is operational. Tennessee participates in several federal and state organizations that actively promote safety, emergency response, and public awareness within the counties and states where its pipeline operates. Tennessee conducts and participates in meetings in each county that its pipeline crosses and conducts periodic training for contractors, first responders, and local officials. Tennessee supervisors are present at meetings to answer questions and provide additional information related to emergency response, safety, and local contact information.

**20141208-5335(29962621).pdf**

Arwen mellor, Rindge, NH.

Recently there has been a shift in the proposed route of a high pressure gas pipeline to our part of southern NH, Rindge. The town's surrounding are affected as well. We are holding meetings and the current reaction seems to be that we firmly reject this project. This would affect our housing values and our environmental safety. Our town is VERY interested in conservation efforts but this pipeline would blast through BOTH major aquifers that supply our town with water. We have no major rivers supplying us, so the aquifers is what we have for drinking water, if we contaminate them we are in trouble. The company hoping to build this pipeline has a less than stellar safety record I do not want to entrust my children's future water supply to them. Nor do I think that water contamination is the only problem. On the surface it seems like following the power lines would have minimal impact, but actually the pipeline would be more to the SIDE of the power lines effectively extending the easement zone. Many people are already living in homes directly adjacent to the setback area and this pipeline could actually displace them from their homes, as well as make it near impossible to sell their property. I cannot even get into the homeowners insurance issues this whole thing could cause. I that I for one have a mortgage since I do not have money to buy my home outright. Also would be upgrades in equipment and training to our local fire/rescue personnel. The Kinder-Morgan folks would not pay for these upgrades that would be required to ensure the ability to respond to high pressure gas leaks, explosions, or fires from the pipeline. This is not a good idea for our town or any town in our area. Please help us keep this pipeline out of our state. This pipeline is NOT for the good of the public. This gas isn't even going to GO to NH! NH does not need more energy, this is not for anything but to profit a Tennessee company, at the expense of our beautiful state. our state uses about 5% of new England's energy. We generate energy here and export about 50% if we DID need energy we would just export less. There must be less harmful ways to get energy to Canada and hence to Europe to make K-M huge profits than destroying our beautiful state. Even other, smaller proposed pipelines might be preferable. Thank you.

**20141210-5006(29968642).pdf**

Ron Berg, North Reading, MA.

I am writing to oppose a major high-pressure, large diameter gas pipeline proposed by the Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co. that would run through North Reading, MA and neighboring communities.

The proposed route would cross and affect protected wetlands, the Ipswich River watershed which supplies our town's drinking water, and several recently discovered Wampanoag Indian archeological sites.

This pipeline would damage the natural resources of our region and has the potential to cause serious and irrevocable harm to our town's water supply, the Ipswich River.

The pipeline would also affect homes and communities in North Reading. It which would run along power lines within a few yards of houses, shopping malls, and major roads. The community here is united in opposition to this pipeline.

I am not an “abutter” but I am greatly concerned about the impact of this major pipeline

**20141210-5010(29968647).pdf**

Lundy Bancroft, Florence, MA.

The proposed pipeline by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company is strictly for the private benefit of that company and will not bring any significant benefits to New England. It will come at a high environmental cost, however, and a high loss to landowners and communities along the pathway of the pipeline. We do not need this gas, and anyhow it is not intended for our use, but for sale elsewhere, including abroad.

The pipeline’s purpose is to carry fracked gas. The fracking of gas has been flagged as one of the greatest threats to our chances for staving off a climate disaster in the coming decades. Climate scientists are unified in their conclusions that we cannot afford (environmentally) to burn the fossil fuels already in our reserves, much less open up huge quantities of new fossil fuels.

The public does not want this pipeline, scientists don’t want it, nobody needs it. The only reason this pipeline is being forced down our throats is because huge profits can be made by selling fossil fuels elsewhere, primarily abroad, and the profit-makers can keep spreading enough of their money and influence around that decision-makers are willing to give them whatever they want.

It’s not worth committing planetary suicide over. Choose life for your grandchildren and great-grandchildren.

**20141210-5158(29971416).pdf**

Ira Grable, Dalton, MA.

I write to urge you to help your constituents affected by the proposed Kinder Morgan natural gas pipeline by taking a strong position against construction of the line.

I am a homeowner in Dalton, MA. The line will pollute the fragile ecosystem as well as the water in the aquifer supplying all of Dalton. My home is one of 59 in our subdivision.

Among other concerns, we are most concerned about:

1. The fact that the proposed line is not to be buried and will be subject to the frequent temperature swings. This represents an explosion, fire, and environmental hazard.
2. The water supply to all of our homes is derived from wells, all of which are sourced from the same well field. So, any contamination of the field puts all homes in peril.
3. Devaluation of our properties is inevitable. Our homes have a current value. The proposed “taking” will never compensate for the loss based upon the limited liability of Kinder Morgan for such compensation.

Please take a strong position against this pipeline, basing your position on the NESCOE study which concluded that anticipated power needs will be met by currently- incentivized renewable energy projects, and that this pipeline infrastructure is not.

**20141211-0016(29975057).pdf**

Hand written letter, Cindy Lou Dougherty, opposing

**20141211-0017(29975118).pdf**

Hand written letter, Francis Dougherty, opposing

**20141211-0018(29975119).pdf**

Hand written letter, Francis J. Dougherty, Jr., opposing

**20141211-0031(29975076).pdf**

*originally "File 29973620\_1.tif cannot be converted to PDF."*

hand written postcard, ??, opposing

**20141211-0032(29975078).pdf**

*originally "File 29973620\_1.tif cannot be converted to PDF."*

hand written postcard, ??, opposing

**20141211-0033(29975080).pdf**

*originally "File 29973620\_1.tif cannot be converted to PDF."*

hand written postcard, ??, opposing

**20141211-0034(29975117).pdf**

*originally "File 29973620\_1.tif cannot be converted to PDF."*

hand written postcard, opposing

**20141211-0035(29975079).pdf**

*originally "File 29973620\_1.tif cannot be converted to PDF."*

hand written postcard, Matthew Jacobs, opposing

**20141211-0036(29975074).pdf**

*originally "File 29973661\_1.tif cannot be converted to PDF."*

hand written postcard, Ben Strumpf, opposing

**20141211-0037(29975071).pdf**

*originally "File 29973665\_1.tif cannot be converted to PDF."*

hand written postcard, opposing

**20141211-0038(29975070).pdf**

*originally "File 29973669\_1.tif cannot be converted to PDF."*

hand written postcard, opposing

**20141211-0039(29975058).pdf**

*originally "File 29973673\_1.tif cannot be converted to PDF."*

hand written postcard, opposing

**20141211-0040(29975082).pdf**

*originally "File 29973677\_1.tif cannot be converted to PDF."*

hand written postcard, Jamall, opposing

**20141211-0041(29975088).pdf**

*originally "File 29973681\_1.tif cannot be converted to PDF."*

hand written postcard, opposing

**20141211-0042(29975090).pdf**

*originally "File 29973685\_1.tif cannot be converted to PDF."*

hand written postcard, Hannah Lewis, opposing

**20141211-0043(29975091).pdf**

*originally "File 29973689\_1.tif cannot be converted to PDF."*

hand written postcard, Maya Brinton, opposing

**20141211-0044(29975093).pdf**

*originally "File 29973693\_1.tif cannot be converted to PDF."*

hand written postcard, opposing

**20141211-0045(29975095).pdf**

*originally "File 29973697\_1.tif cannot be converted to PDF."*

hand written postcard, Maria Johnson, opposing

**20141211-0046(29975098).pdf**

*originally "File 29973701\_1.tif cannot be converted to PDF."*

hand written postcard, Oliva Dalnedo, opposing

**20141211-0047(29975116).pdf**

*originally "File 29973705\_1.tif cannot be converted to PDF."*

hand written postcard, opposing

**20141211-0048(29975086).pdf**

*originally "File 29973709\_1.tif cannot be converted to PDF."*

hand written postcard, opposing

**20141211-0049(29975101).pdf**

*originally "File 29973713\_1.tif cannot be converted to PDF."*

hand written postcard, Jason Dell, opposing

**20141211-0050(29976530).pdf**

Hand written letter, opposing

**20141211-0051(29976529).pdf**

Hand written letter, Gustavo E. Maldef, opposing

**20141211-0052(29976528).pdf**

Hand written letter, Sophie Spillmann, opposing

**20141211-0053(29976526).pdf**

Hand written letter, opposing

**20141211-0054(29976525).pdf**

Hand written letter, Sidney Katz, opposing

**20141211-0055(29976494).pdf**

Hand written letter, opposing

**20141211-0056(29976473).pdf**

Hand written letter, opposing

**20141211-0057(29976532).pdf**

Hand written letter, opposing

**20141211-0058(29976533).pdf**

Hand written letter, opposing

**20141211-0059(29976470).pdf**

Hand written letter, opposing

**20141211-0060(29976467).pdf**

Hand written letter, opposing

**20141211-0061(29976460).pdf**

Hand written letter, Sara Turner, opposing

**20141211-0062(29976458).pdf**

Hand written letter, opposing

**20141211-0063(29976452).pdf**

Hand written letter, ??, Dunstable, MA, opposing

**20141211-0064(29976422).pdf**

Hand written letter, Rainer ? Nathe, opposing

**20141211-0065(29976420).pdf**

Hand written letter, Amanda Litson, opposing

**20141211-0066**

Hand written card, opposing

**20141211-0067(29976451).pdf**

Hand written letter, opposing

**20141211-0068(29976459).pdf**

Hand written letter, opposing

**20141211-0069(29976463).pdf**

Hand written letter, Natalia Callaghan(?), opposing

**20141211-0070(29976466).pdf**

Hand written letter, opposing

**20141211-0071(29976464).pdf**

Hand written letter, opposing

**20141211-0072(29976465).pdf**

Hand written letter, opposing

**20141211-0073(29976627).pdf**

Hand written letter, Gabrielle Morell, opposing

**20141211-0074(29978022).pdf**

Hand written letter, Gabriel Shapiro, opposing

**20141211-0075(29976618).pdf**

Hand written letter, opposing

**20141211-0076(29976615).pdf**

Hand written letter, Jack Z., opposing

**20141211-0077(29976616).pdf**

Hand written letter, opposing

**20141211-0078(29976617).pdf**

Hand written letter, Sofia Arnold, opposing

**20141211-0079(29975728).pdf**

Hand written letter, opposing

**20141211-0080(29976620).pdf**

Hand written letter, Kai Shabalia, opposing

**20141211-0081(29976619).pdf**

Hand written letter, opposing

**20141211-0082(29978021).pdf**

Hand written letter, opposing

**20141211-0083(29976622).pdf**

Hand written letter, Sara Tulchinsky(?), opposing

**20141211-0084(29976623).pdf**

Hand written letter, opposing

**20141211-0085(29978009).pdf**

Hand written letter, O.J.S. Littman, opposing

**20141211-0086(29976626).pdf**

Hand written letter, opposing

**20141211-0087(29976611).pdf**

Hand written letter, Melissa Bragg, opposing

**20141211-0088(29975224).pdf**

Hand written letter, opposing

**20141211-0089(29976610).pdf**

Hand written letter, A. Needle, MA, opposing

**20141211-0090(29976624).pdf**

Hand written letter, opposing

**20141211-0091(29975114).pdf**

Hand written letter, Chris Porzenker(?), opposing

**20141211-0092(29976625).pdf**

Hand written letter, opposing

**20141211-0093(29975113).pdf**

Hand written letter, opposing

**20141211-0094(29975075).pdf**

Hand written letter, opposing

**20141211-0095(29975083).pdf**

Hand written letter, Sronia Josht, opposing

**20141211-0096(29976228).pdf**

Hand written letter, opposing

**20141211-0097(29976601).pdf**

Hand written letter, opposing

**20141211-0098(29976630).pdf**

Hand written letter, opposing

**20141211-0099(29976629).pdf**

Hand written letter, opposing

**20141211-0100(29976175).pdf**

Hand written letter, opposing

**20141211-0101(29976536).pdf**

Hand written letter, opposing

**20141211-0102(29976628).pdf**

Hand written letter, opposing

**20141211-5052(29972108).pdf**

Thomas W. Hutcheson, Conway, MA.

To Whom It May Concern:

The Town of Conway, Massachusetts approved the following resolution at its annual Town Meeting on May 12, 2014:

Whereas a High-pressure pipeline carrying natural (“fracking”) gas has been proposed to transit the Town of Conway and surrounding communities en route to Dracut Mass for export by The Tennessee Gas Company (see map); and

Whereas the construction of said pipeline would necessitate the destruction of woodlands, trails and wildlife habitat in the environmentally sensitive areas of Pine Hill and the South River State Forest; and

Whereas a high-pressure gas pipeline, by its nature, carries the potential for leak, rupture or other toxic environmental impacts; and Whereas mitigation of said impacts could constitute an undue burden on the Town Fire Department; and

Whereas insuring the security of said pipeline could also become an additional burden on the Town Police Department; and

Whereas the cost of the construction of said pipeline (by a private corporation) as currently proposed would be partially defrayed by Massachusetts ratepayers in the form of a utility bill tariff; and

Whereas we the Citizens of Conway have chosen to live here because we treasure our natural environment; be it resolved that:

We the citizens of Conway Massachusetts hereby call upon our Selectboard to convey our opposition to this project to all concerned (including our State and Federal legislators) on our behalf.

Thank you very much.

**20141211-5095(29974718).pdf**

**Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company**

December 11, 2014

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 -- November 2014

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 November 1 through November 30, 2014.

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 Mr. Richard Siegel at (713) 420-5535.

Respectfully submitted,

TENNESSEE GAS PIPELINE COMPANY

By: /s/ J. Curtis Moffatt

J. Curtis Moffatt

Deputy General Counsel and Vice President  
Gas Group Legal

Enclosure

cc: Mr. Rich McGuire  
Mr. Michael McGehee  
Mr. Eric Tomasi

**20141211-5095(29974703).docx**

**Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.** (“Tennessee”)

Northeast Energy Direct (“NED”) Project, Docket No. PF14-22-000

Pre-Filing Monthly Activity Report

(November 1, 2014 through November 30, 2014)

**Public Outreach**

•Tennessee has distributed the following NED Project notifications:

Notification that Tennessee filed draft Resource Reports 1 and 10, along with the draft resource reports, was emailed to impacted elected officials on November 5, 2014.

Notification of the postponement of the scheduled Project open houses was provided to applicable elected officials on November 6, 2014.

Preliminary information about the proposed New York powerline and New Hampshire powerline alternative routes was provided to New Hampshire elected officials on November 14, 2014.

Notice of upcoming survey activities were provided to applicable local elected officials in Massachusetts and New Hampshire on November 5, 2014, and in New York on November 21, 2014.

•Tennessee held or took part in the following stakeholder meetings and presentations:

Sanford, New York -- Sanford Town Board presentation on November 21, 2014

**Environmental**

Tennessee filed drafts of Resource Reports 1 and 10, and updated stakeholder list on November 5, 2014.

Notification of this filing was provided to applicable regulatory agencies.

Tennessee submitted a threatened and endangered species consultation letter to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (“USFWS”) Northeast Region on November 5, 2014.

Tennessee submitted a request to participate in the Commission's pre-filing process to the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation ("NYSDEC")-General Counsel's office on November 19, 2014. Tennessee continues to maintain and update the mailing list for applicable regulatory agencies and Native American Tribes in the NED Project area.

Tennessee submitted an application to the United States Army Corps of Engineers New York District, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation ("NYSDEC"), and the New York Department of State to permit geotechnical cores in the Hudson River (New York).

Tennessee is preparing an Indiana Bat survey strategy and protocol and intends to coordinate with the applicable USFWS offices as soon as possible.

Tennessee initiated surveys at the proposed Dracut Compressor station site in Massachusetts.

As of November 30, 2014, biological surveys have taken place over approximately 16.7 miles, or 10 percent, of the NED Project Supply Path route (Troy, Pennsylvania to Wright, New York) and approximately 32.4 miles, or 13 percent, of the NED Project Market Path route (Wright, New York to Dracut, Massachusetts). In addition, cultural resource surveys have taken place over approximately 14.5 miles, or 9 percent, of the route NED Project Supply Path route and approximately 30.4 miles, or 12 percent, of the NED Project Market Path route. Both biological and cultural resource surveys are expected to continue, weather permitting, through December 2014. Table 1 below summarizes the completion status of environmental and cultural surveys.

Table 1: Civil, Biological, and Cultural Surveys Performed

--- table omitted ---

### **Project Meetings**

- Subsequent to filing of the draft Resource Reports 1 and 10, and updated stakeholder list, on November 5, 2014, Tennessee filed a letter with the Commission on November 6, 2014 to postpone the scheduled open houses to provide stakeholders with additional time to review the information submitted on November 5, 2014. Tennessee will work with the Commission staff to establish the updated open house schedule for the NED Project.
- Tennessee met with the Native American Oneida Tribe of New York on November 13, 2014.
- Tennessee's environmental consultant met with the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection Commissioner on November 20, 2014 to discuss proposed changes to the route into New Hampshire. Representatives from other Massachusetts state agencies, including the Department of Fish and Game, Department of Conservation and Recreation, Natural Heritage, and Department of Agricultural Resources, also attended the meeting.
- A meeting with the Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection is scheduled for December 3, 2014.
- Tennessee coordinated with the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection to reschedule a pre-application meeting for January 7, 2015.

### **Right-of-Way**

Tennessee has obtained survey permission for approximately 27% of the NED Project Market Path area, and for approximately 55% of the NED Project Supply Path. The reason for the drop in the survey percentage for the Market Path is that Tennessee has yet to contact the landowners along the proposed re-route in New Hampshire.

Title work for the NED Project Market Path area is approximately 84% completed and for the NED Supply Path is approximately 34% completed.

Tennessee received notification from the Commission that a landowner in Canaan, New York had raised complaints regarding past restoration issues on the property. Tennessee's land representatives met with the landowner, and will provide a follow up report to the Commission.

## Engineering

- Tennessee continues to evaluate major and minor route deviations in order to accommodate environmental constraints, and requests from applicable regulatory agencies and landowner concerns. The major alternatives Tennessee engineers are evaluating include the Mass Pike Alternative, Route 2 Alternative, Massachusetts Power Line Alternative, New York Powerline Alternative, New Hampshire Powerline Alternative, Article 97 Avoidance Alternative, and Article 97 Co-Location Alternative. Tennessee filed to formally adopt the New York Powerline Alternative and the New Hampshire Powerline Alternative as part of the proposed route for the NED Project on December 8, 2014, including a revised version of Resource Report 1.
- Tennessee has identified potential sites for the Market Path Head Station and Tail Station, and site visits have been scheduled. Tennessee continues to evaluate locations for the remaining compressor stations.
- Tennessee continues to evaluate routing of laterals based on potential sites for the proposed Market Path Tail Station.
- Tennessee engineering supported the preparation of the draft Resource Reports 1 and 10, filed on November 5, 2014.
- Tennessee engineering supported the preparation and filing of the application to the United States Army Corps of Engineers New York District for performing geotechnical investigations in the Hudson River.
- Tennessee continues to evaluate proposed locations for horizontal directional drilling and determining access needed for geotechnical investigations. Once locations are identified, Tennessee will seek appropriate permits for the geotechnical investigations.
- Tennessee is scheduling aerial photography of the proposed primary route and all alternative routes for December 2014.
- Preparation of NED Project alignment sheets is anticipated to begin in December 2014.
- Tennessee is scheduling the Front End Engineering Design (FEED) for proposed compressor stations in late fourth quarter of 2014.

**20141211-5132(29975731).pdf**

### **New Hampshire Fish and Game Department**

December 11, 2014

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

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company. LLC

Proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project (Docket No. PF14-22)

Dear Secretary Bose:

The New Hampshire Department of Fish and Game, hereby notifies both FERC and TGP of its intention to actively participate in the pre-filing process for the Northeast Energy Direct project proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC. We intend to address our agency-specific interests and concerns in more detail during the entire process relative to the development of this project. Thank you for the opportunity to participate in this process.

Sincerely,

Glenn Normandeau  
Executive Director

**20141212-5034(29977548).pdf**

Terri O'Rorke, Richmond, NH.

Please seriously reconsider this route through Richmond, NH. I live on a fault line (as do many neighbors) What will all this earth disturbance do to our properties? I am VEHEMENTLY against this project!!! Find another route or work towards a better, cleaner, safer form of energy. Thank you,

Terri O'Rorke

**20141212-5046(29977740).pdf**

jodi macdonald, Andover, MA.

Regarding Kinder Morgan's alternate route proposal:

Although it is nice that KM is listening to protest over the pipeline route and has decided to propose an alternate and hopefully less destructive path, the truth is that ANY path is unacceptable. My opposition to pipeline expansion isn't a matter of where a pipeline goes, it's that new fossil fuel infrastructure isn't needed. Building it will commit our region to decades of increased dependency on fossil fuels, instead of moving forward toward the clean energy economy. Please listen to the discussions going on right now in Peru at the Lima Climate Change Conference. World leaders are finally acknowledging that the solution entails leaving fossil fuels in the ground. We must stop expanding production of green house gases NOW. Massachusetts has done an excellent job switching to renewable energy sources and adding more natural gas to the Massachusetts energy mix will result in increasing our GHG production.

NO NEED

The pipeline capacity constraints given as the reason for the need for more pipelines is a phenomenon that only happens a few hours on just a few days a year. There are many other options for meeting this need that do not involve disruptive, permanent infrastructure that further ties us to a fossil fuel economy. Solutions like the state-mandated expansions in solar and wind capacity, using increased efficiency to lower demand, and even bringing in LNG through already established means of distribution during peak demand can solve those brief, infrequent spikes in demand without committing our region to billions of dollars of infrastructure and destruction of property. With the proposed overbuild of capacity, the majority is most likely slated for export, especially since all 5 pipeline projects being proposed for New England are planned to connect to the M&NE pipeline and other export-terminal based projects. Competing with overseas markets paying 2-5 times as much will drive up our energy costs here. And increasing our dependence on gas, which already makes up over 60% of our electric generation, will only make us more susceptible to market price swings, and leave us stranded as gas drilling production starts to drop in the next few years.

No shift of pipeline path makes any of this any less true.

**20141215-0009(29989199).pdf**

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

Date: 12/8/2014

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access

As the owner of the property located at:

11 Ruonala Rd, Brookline NH 03033

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.

**20141215-4004(29986261).pdf**

From: Laura Putnam <mrsmt5606@gmail.com>

Date: December 14, 2014 at 8:37:25 PM EST

To: niki.tsongas@mail.house.gov, Elizabeth\_warren@warren.senate.gov, campaignmanager@teambarbara.com, Seth@sethmoulton.com, james.d.crowley@state.ma.us, env.internet@state.ma.us, Kathleen.polanowicz@house.gov, constituent.services@state.ma.us, Barry.finegold@masenate.gov, frank.moran@mahouse.gov, cheryl.lafleur@ferc.gov, tony.clark@ferc.gov, phillip.moeller@ferc.gov, norman.bay@ferc.gov

Subject: STOP THE KINDER MORGAN PIPELINE!!!!

To Whom It May Concern,

As a resident of Andover MA, I am very STRONGLY opposed to the Kinder- Morgan Tennessee Pipeline being proposed to run through Andover. I am PLEADING with you to STOP this project as there are too many risks involved and it is too close to my neighborhood, which is filled with children.

As I do more research on Kinder-Morgan, I am finding more and more evidence of their poor track record. One example can be found in this article, published by The Sightline Institute <http://www.sightline.org/download/2547/>.

Thank you for your time. I sincerely hope that you will make the choice to protect your constituents on this matter.

Thank You

Laura Putnam  
7 Newport Circle  
Andover MA 01810  
978-686-9820

**20141215-4005(29986358).pdf**

From: Sanjay Joshi [mailto:sanjaymjoshi@gmail.com]

Sent: Friday, December 05, 2014 11:30 AM

To: Norman Bay

Subject: Stop Kinder Morgan gas pipeline in New England!

Dear Commissioner Bay,

I urge you to stop the proposed gas pipeline by Kinder Morgan in New England. After analyzing the arguments, I have come to the conclusion that the risks far outweigh rewards as follows:

High Risks:

- \* Intentional leaks and herbicides: The standard operating procedure of intentional leaks and spraying herbicides around the pipeline will damage our conserved land, including our drinking water supply.
- \* Accidental leaks near Schools: Disasters do happen, despite precautions. We don't want Andover, MA to become another infamous location of a gas leak or an explosion from one of the highest-pressure pipeline.
- \* Fracking: We should not encourage controversial fracking to feed our greed for energy.
- \* Housing prices: The gas pipeline will make our town less attractive for new home-buyers, reducing prices, and hence, affecting local economy.

Minimal rewards:

- \* Energy supply: Though the pipeline will bring new energy supply, we should be focusing on optimizing

our energy usage, not expanding it. The US enjoys one of the lowest energy prices in the world and remains one of the highest contributor to global warming. Massachusetts is perceived as a leader on green energy. This pipeline will be a step back!

\* Temporary jobs: The construction jobs brought by the pipeline will last less than two years. The maintenance jobs will add only minimally to Massachusetts, home of next-generation science and technology. Therefore, I request you to do whatever you can to stop this project, publicize your efforts, and win our hearts!

Regards,

Dr. Sanjay M. Joshi  
12 Chandler Road, Andover, MA 01810

**20141215-5003(29980476).pdf**

Patrick J. Leary, Hancock, NH.

Patrick J. Leary  
Hancock, New Hampshire

December 8, 2014

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

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company(TGP) , L.L.C., Docket No. PF14-22- 000

Northeast Energy Direct Project Supplemental Filing -- Adoption of Alternative Route as Part of Proposed Route (Wright, New York to Dracut, Massachusetts Pipeline Segment)

Dear Ms. Bose:

According to the Energy Information Administration's State Electricity Profiles 2010 as published in January 2012, New Hampshire exported about 1/2 of the electricity it generated. This electricity went to Massachusetts where there is a dire need for it as Massachusetts only generates about 70% of the electricity it needs. Reading the TGP literature, the majority of the natural gas in this pipeline will be used to generate electricity. The idea of pushing the proposed pipeline north into New Hampshire is absurd as there are no promised direct benefits to the residents of New Hampshire. Please reject this proposed alternative and force TGP back to its original proposal to put the pipeline in Massachusetts where it belongs.

Sincerely,

**20141215-5008(29980486).pdf**

Janice Fiandaca, Rindge, NH.

When we bought our house in Rindge NH, over 10 years ago, we were aware that with the power line right of way through our property, we could expect snowmobilers, 4-wheelers and brush trimming by PSNH. We did not expect a 36" gas pipeline through our backyard. We are both over 60, our house is paid and we cannot afford to move. For this reason and others, we are strongly opposed to the NED Project

**20141215-5009(29980488).pdf**

Leonard Davolio, Andover, MA.

I am writing to oppose the installation of a gas line behind my home in Andover MA. The creation of this line will contribute to our reliance on fossil fuels, worsen the environment for our children, and help countries like China establish a firm lead in the race to dominate the green energy market.

Richard Crane, Groton, MA.

I am convinced that the energy market here in New England is being manipulated to push an agenda for natural gas. Here are facts:

- 1) New England experiences peak demands for electrical energy during the winter months. These peak demands last for just a short period of time, days or weeks.
- 2) There are both coal and nuclear power plants being retired from service in the region. We will need infrastructure to replace these plants.

Neither of these points suggest that new natural gas infrastructure is needed. We can easily say that new clean renewable energy such as solar, wind, geothermal or hydro is needed for the region. Yet our needs here in New England are characterized as a natural gas shortage. That is just not true.

What is true is that ISO-NE stopped using liquified natural gas (LNG) to supplement our energy needs during peak demands. The policy of using LNG to service peak demand needs has been in place for many years. Yet ISONE chose to stop using LNG and used more expensive oil. This drove up the prices of electricity in the region.

Also, there is the upcoming closing of power plants such as Vermont Yankee. Vermont Yankee is a nuclear power plant that services a large portion of the New England region. It is irresponsible to close existing infrastructure prior to new infrastructure coming online. All this does is create an artificial crisis for new energy sources. It would be best if we planned for our future energy needs and brought on new infrastructure prior to replace existing infrastructure being retired.

A proper plan to address future energy needs here in New England would NOT include new natural gas pipelines. The people just don't want it. We have commitments toward clean renewable energy that need to be met and projects such as Northeast Energy Direct do not meet those commitments. Yet we are being manipulated into a crisis situation that promotes natural gas.

One of the statements being used by Kinder Morgan and the Tennessee Gas Pipeline company is that there is a shortage of natural gas here in New England. That just is not true. We could easily say there is a shortage of solar, wind, geothermal, and hydro power. Yet electricity prices have increased by 37% due to natural gas campaigns characterizing our needs as a natural gas shortage.

New England benefits from a mix of energy sources which meet our electric generation needs. This includes nuclear, natural gas, coal, hydro, and renewables such as wind and solar. Natural gas is currently the #1 energy source here in New England. Nuclear is the #2 energy source here in New England. With the retirement of Vermont Yankee we will be creating a natural gas monopoly in the region.

This needs to stop! We don't want to be manipulated by companies wanting to take our land to sell us a fuel we don't want and then taking the excess natural gas and selling it aboard all while driving up the electricity prices. That is not only unfair, but wrong.

#### REFERENCES:

ISO-NE Inc., Docket No. ER13-\_\_\_\_-000, Winter 2013-14 Reliability Program <http://www.massplan.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/ISO-NEletter-to-FERC-6-2013.pdf>

The real story behind utility rate hikes

<http://www.massplan.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/Rate-Hikes-Handout-10-24-14.pdf>

Major Solar Project List

<http://www.seia.org/sites/default/files/resources/PUBLIC%20Major%20Projects%20List%202014-11-19.pdf>

Electric bills heading up this winter

<http://www.bostonglobe.com/business/2014/09/25/national-grid-projectspercent-increase-for-winter-elec->

**20141215-5019(29980508).pdf**

Shannon, Andover, MA.

To Whom it May Concern,

My name is Shannon Gath. I've spent my entire life growing up in the the New England area. I now live in Andover with my family with 2 small children and a dog. We've established a great life in Andover where we live within a mile of the power lines on the Tewksbury border where is one of the proposed locations for the pipeline to be constructed. Per my research through [www.nofrackedgasinmass.org](http://www.nofrackedgasinmass.org) it is quite clear that the pipeline is not necessary and is going to create a significant risk to my family. I am an advocate for harnessing solar energy to gain the power advantages we need to survive. Please accept these comments as my official opposition to building the pipeline in the hopes of protecting my family and preserving the great neighborhood that we've helped to create here in Andover.

Best regards,

Shannon

**20141215-5030(29980530).pdf**

Carleen Eicher, Rindge, NH.

Dear FERC,

We are very concerned about the Kinder Morgan pipeline coming into Rindge, New Hampshire, as we are very close to the proposed route. We are known as The Granite State and the amount of blasting for this pipeline will severely effect our aquifers, land, ponds, trees and everything else involved in a rural area. All of us in the proposed route have wells and septic systems that will be greatly effected by the work involved in constructing this pipeline, thereby making our homes susceptible to leakage, fires, and blast damage. We are NOT going to benefit from a pipeline that is going to export gas to other states or countries and NOT New Hampshire. The pipeline will effect ALL forms of life, the nature of which makes Rindge a beautiful rural area in which to live. The noise level from the actual construction will only be usurped by the jet-engine generators along the route itself once the pipeline is finished. It will also greatly effect our property value which negates any sale of homes or property. In additon, we - who will NOT benefit from this pipeline - will be taxed for the construction costs and our insurance rates will go up because of the unsatisfactory safety record of Kinder Morgan.

For all of the above reasons and more, we are one hundred percent (100%) opposed to this pipeline.

Sincerely,

Carleen and Charles Eicher

**20141216-5012(29986723).pdf**

Kevin M Haley, New Ipswich, NH.

I oppose this project on several fronts, not the least being that one of the proposed routes is on my property and I stand to lose an income generating maple sugar operation, and a small mixed apple and berry orchard. Additionally, a high pressure gas pipeline on or adjacent to my property would render it unsellable, uninsurable and unsuitable for use as collateral. This project does not meet the standards for the public good, the only people to benefit in the case of this pipeline would be the profiteers who own the pipeline. The proposed capacity far exceeds any shortfall in the region, and would be bringing dirty, frack produced gas to the region, thereby contributing to the pollution and destruction of the areas where the gas was produced. Fully one third of the "shortfall"; which only occurs on approximately 25 days a year; in gas supply for power generation in this region, could be made up by simply fixing existing leaks in the current supply infrastructure.

I, for one, promise to deny any access to any employees, contractors or agents of the company and will do everything in my power to convince my neighbors and elected representatives to oppose this project as well. Another blight on the landscape in this region, well renowned for its rural character, is not needed. Not only will individual land owners lose, the region loses as well, loses needed income from tourist dollars. Nobody travels to see high pressure gas pipelines, but they want to see bucolic scenes of old New England life, which this project will surely sully.

**20141216-5048(29986977).pdf**

Jacob Halbrooks, Mason, NH.

I am a homeowner in Mason, NH. I oppose the use of eminent domain to construct the proposed gas pipeline through our town. Many people in our town move here to be responsible stewards of the land and to live in a peaceful, rural environment. The proposed pipeline would aggress upon both our rights as property owners and our values as land stewards.

Please find a way to build your pipeline using rights of way that do not infringe upon our rights and values.

**20141216-5263(29991343).pdf**

Tory McCagg, Jaffrey, NH.

With the compelling amount of facts and data concerning climate change, it is stunning that the building of a pipeline that will move fracked gas through our country to be sent over seas is being taken seriously as something that could in any way be considered for the public good.

This pipeline, that failed to be placed in Massachusetts due to public outcry, is a travesty. It will not bring long-term jobs to the area. It is not necessary for the northeast; the gas will be exported. There are externalities that are not included in the costs, not least environmental degradation and population/community displacement. The project only promotes profits for a multi-billion dollar company and short-term goals. Too many times in the past, pipelines have been installed and the promises made of profits, jobs and reclamation of destroyed lands have not been met. (Please see Denton, Texas, Louisiana, North Dakota to name just a few places that are now in legal battles for restitution.)

FERC seems to have the reputation of being a rubber stamp for fossil fuel companies. I can only hope this is not true and that there is a serious consideration given to the public good, which means putting the time energy and money that would otherwise go to fighting this pipeline into creating a new national infrastructure. That this, or any pipeline, is being considered a viable option is an outrage against humanity and the environment.

Please refuse their application.

**20141217-5009(29991837).pdf**

Betty L Anders, Rindge, NH.

I am a resident of Rindge, NH who is concerned about the overall environmental impact this project will have on our natural resources, water supplies, wildlife and overall natural health of our community.

I feel that the country should be focused on renewable energy sources such as wind and solar and discontinue our reliance on non-renewable sources such as natural gas.

Southwestern NH will not benefit in any way from this project. Please do not allow Kinder-Morgan to destroy our community for their own profit

**20141217-5012(29991843).pdf**

Christopher M Anders, Rindge, NH.

I am writing this letter in opposition to the Northeast Energy Direct Project. I am concerned with the envi-

ronmental impacts this project will have on our region.

Our country should be focused on renewable energy solutions and not the profits of large corporations.

I can only hope that FERC will consider the impact on the entire region and not the growth of an already too-large company!

**20141217-5016(29991851).pdf**

Hiel Lindquist, Fitzwilliam, NH.

Questions related to the proposed Kinder Morgan natural gas pipeline through New Hampshire

**Questions of need**

(It would be great if all these comparisons include specific numbers, in the same unit of measure!)

- What is the current natural gas pipeline capacity in New England and what percentage of the current natural gas pipeline capacity is currently being utilized?
- What is the capacity of the existing liquefied natural gas storage facilities and what percentage of existing liquefied natural gas storage facilities in New England are currently being utilized?
- What is the capacity of existing liquefied natural gas import facilities in New England and what percentage of these existing liquefied natural gas import facilities are currently being utilized?
- What are the projections for natural gas usage in New England in the future? How does that compare to current usage? How does that compare to the capacity of the proposed pipeline?
- How does the size of the proposed pipeline compare to the increased capacity needs as projected by the New England States Committee on Electricity? If larger than required by the projected requirements, what is the additional capacity going to be used for?
- Are there additional proposed pipeline projects that would supply New England?
- How much gas is leaking from existing pipelines in New England (either through leaks in pipes or from pressure relief processes)? Project Construction
- What is the size of the proposed pipeline?
- How large a right-of-way will be required?
- How large a right-of-way will be purchased?
- If the pipeline will be buried, how big a trench will be required (length, width, depth)? How will the proposed pipeline be constructed (through, under, over) bodies of water and highways?
- If the proposed pipeline is built along existing electric power corridors, what percentage of the existing power corridor right-of-way will be used?
- How does the size of the proposed pipeline compare to other pipelines in the USA (diameter and pressure).
- What mitigation for destruction of wetlands will be completed?
- What ongoing methods are planned for maintenance of the proposed right-of-way?
- What access will be required for maintenance along the proposed right-of-way?
- What new “branch” pipelines are being proposed (where and what size)? Will these branch lines be financed as part of the overall project?
- Kinder Morgan has indicated that “Pre-filing is a time to review the scope of the project and have public meetings and open houses.... We won’t even apply for any permits until the fall 2015.” Yet the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission timeline for commenting on the proposed project is six months, which ends in March, 2015. Who is correct?
- The proposed pipeline will require pumping stations. The following questions relate to the pumping stations:

How many and where will they be located?

What size area will they require?

What is the probability that more pumping stations will be added in the future?

What is the size of the pumps?

What will the noise level be? At what distance?

What type of light pollution will result?

What type of security will be required? How will they be monitored?

### **Financial Questions**

- What are the projections for the cost of the proposed pipeline?
- How will the pipeline be financed?
- How much will of the proposed tariff on electric rates be? How will the tariff be collected? What companies will benefit from the tariff?
- If the proposed pipeline will be funded by an electric tariff, will there be a cap on the total cost or will the project receive a “blank check” for whatever the total cost is, wherever that may be?
- Where is the “robust cost benefit analysis to ensure that any infrastructure investments would provide net savings to electricity customers” that was promised by the New England States Committee on Electricity?
- Where is the analysis on future benefits of the proposed pipeline? What is the payback period?
- Why is the public being asked to fund a private venture of this nature?
- Kinder Morgan has indicated there will be possible additional tax revenue paid to towns along the route in the way of property taxes. How much will this be? What will be the net effect of the increased tax revenue less the reduced valuations on affected property? What is the likelihood that the projected tax revenue will be reduced in the future? (by how much?)

### **Safety issues**

- What is the safety record of Kinder Morgan in operating similar pipelines?
- What are the “worst case” disasters that could happen in operation of the proposed pipeline.
- What is the liability of Kinder Morgan in the event of a disaster? Is their liability capped in any way?
- What is the probability of a disaster in operation of the proposed pipeline?
- What is the life of the proposed pipeline? What happens when the proposed pipeline reaches its end-of-life?
- What additional emergency preparations (training, personnel, equipment, etc) will be required by communities located along the pipeline?

### **Alternatives**

- What are the alternatives to building the proposed pipeline?
- What are the alternatives to spending \$2 - \$6 billion (range of current estimates) on the proposed pipeline?
- Has the alternative of increasing the capacity of existing liquefied gas imports been considered?
- Is it possible to store additional natural gas in the region by using the 47 existing storage facilities (or building more) to meet energy shortfalls during peak times as proposed by the Conservation Law Foundation?

### **Public debate**

- Why has there been no public debate on the need for the proposed pipeline?
- Why is it that only the residents of the towns through which the pipeline travels are the only members of the public that are being informed concerning this project when every user of electricity in the state will pay

for the pipeline through an electric tariff?

· What is the current status of support of the New England Power Pool, and t

**20141217-5032(29992019).pdf**

Hiel Lindquist, Fitzwilliam, NH.

This project should not receive approval because the economics of it do not make sense. A pipeline that could supply 5 times the needed capacity of all of New England does not make sense. This pipeline would provide for the export of natural gas, and should be denied.

**20141217-5041(29992465).pdf**

William L Harper, Rindge, NH.

Dear FERC Commission Members:

It's common knowledge that the shortest distance between two points is a straight line. If you were paying for that distance by the foot, you would make it as straight as possible. That is unless the profits you reap at the end were so enormous that it didn't matter how long or straight the line was. Or if someone else was going to pay for that line - via tariffs on unsuspecting ratepayers, then the cost would be inconsequential.

And so it goes with the alternative route through New Hampshire proposed as the preferred solution to the problem faced by Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co. And what is their problem? Getting gas to Dracut, Mass to export overseas. All roads lead to Dracut. Doesn't matter if it's in Mass, or NH, or maybe the next one will go through (fill in the blank with any unsuspecting population) because the destination is the same and the motivation is the same – huge profits from overseas sales.

But so far they haven't been able to get there. Massachusetts launched such major opposition to the original route that Kinder Morgan decided to go north. After all, we're just a bunch of complacent folks up here. Our beautiful rural countryside is for sale – Right?

Dead wrong – You can't get there from here.

We will protect our private property rights now up for grabs, and sadly unprotected by our elected leaders. The myth of co-location along the PSNH corridor is just that – a myth. Another 50 feet will be cleared for the pipeline and an additional 100-125 feet will be cleared for construction. Does that sound like a new corridor to you? It sure does to me. It will take private land, homes, farms, forest, cut across our lakes, wetlands and streams. And why? Because Kinder Morgan has a grand plan to make huge profits from the sale of gas for export overseas. It's not for us, oh they may throw us a few dekatherms here and there for PR, but its real destination is the hub in Dracut, Massachusetts.

Kinder Morgan – you can't get there from here. Access to our properties will be denied. We will not cooperate in your scheme. And a grand scheme it is.

Please deny this project. It will ruin many private homes, farms and conservation land. It will devastate our rural communities. It's not needed and we will end up paying for it in more ways than one.

Very truly yours,  
William L. Harper

**20141217-5198(29994800).pdf**

*Scan of letter from TGP to landowners*

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

December 12, 2014

RE: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.

Dear Ms.

As you may be aware, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. (“Tennessee”) is planning to expand its existing pipeline system to serve the growing demand for interstate natural gas transmission service in the northeastern United States. The Northeast Energy Direct Project (“Project”) is being developed to serve specifically the New England region. The New England region, as a whole, stands to benefit from the NED Project as it will enable New England to sustain its reliance on natural gas-fired generation and to lower energy costs by providing scalable transportation capacity attached to lower cost, near-by domestic natural gas. Access to significant, reliable and abundant quantities of lower priced natural gas will benefit New England consumers and will encourage capital investment in commercial and industrial ventures adding to the region’s economy. The Project will provide regional confidence in competitively priced natural gas supplies for decades to come providing stability in a critical fuel source. As part of Tennessee’s fully integrated natural gas pipeline transportation system, the Project also will provide additional access to diverse supplies of natural gas to expansion customers in the New England region.

The Project is a federal undertaking that is regulated by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (“FERC”) under Section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act. On September 15, 2014, Tennessee requested authorization to use the FERC’s Pre-Filing Process (“Process”) for the Project. The FERC approved Tennessee’s request on October 2, 2014 in FERC Docket No. PF14-22-000. The Process is a mechanism that allows the involvement of all relevant agencies and interested stakeholders at an earlier stage of the Project development than the FERC’s traditional certificate process for review and approval of pipeline projects. By using the FERC’s Process, Tennessee and the FERC have the opportunity to identify and resolve issues by consulting with stakeholders, including affected landowners, and participating agencies through meetings, telephone calls, and/or written correspondence prior to Tennessee filing a formal certificate application for approval to construct the Project with the FERC.

On November 5, 2014, Tennessee filed with the FERC draft Resource Report I (General Project Description) and Resource Report 10 (Alternatives) and an updated stakeholder list for the Project. The draft of Resource Report 1 reflected the information available as of the date of that filing regarding the proposed Project facilities and anticipated land requirements, construction procedures, and permitting/clearance requirements for the Project. The draft of Resource Report 10 included the alternatives (system and routing) that Tennessee identified and a discussion of the evaluation of those identified alternatives as of the date of that filing. In the November 5, 2014 draft Resource Report 10, Tennessee presented evaluations of several major route alternatives for portions of the Project. Among the route alternatives for the Wright, New York to Dracut, Massachusetts Pipeline Segment (referred to as the Market Path Component of the Project) discussed in the draft Resource Report 10 were the New York Powerline Alternative and the New Hampshire Powerline Alternative (see Sections 10.3.1.2 and 10.3.1.8 of draft Resource Report 10). These identified alternatives involved co-locating the pipeline along an existing electric transmission line corridor in eastern New York, western Massachusetts, and southern New Hampshire.

In its ongoing effort to critically evaluate feasible alternatives for the Project, Tennessee has now determined that it will adopt both the New York Powerline Alternative and the New Hampshire Powerline Alternative as its proposed route. Therefore Tennessee will modify the originally proposed route for the Wright, New York to Dracut, Massachusetts Pipeline Segment of the Project. The Market Path component of the Project that is being revised originally consisted of approximately 177 miles of new and co-located mainline pipeline and eight new pipeline laterals totaling approximately 73 miles. With the adoption of the New York Powerline Alternative and the New Hampshire Powerline Alternative, the proposed revised route will now include approximately 188 miles of new and co-located mainline pipeline facilities as follows: (a) approximately 53 miles of pipeline generally co-located with Tennessee’s existing 200 Line and an existing power utility corridor in eastern New York near the proposed Market Path Mid Station No.1; (b) approximately 64 miles of pipeline generally co-located with an existing power utility corridor in western Massachusetts; and (c) approximately 71 miles of pipeline generally co-located with an existing power utility corridor in southern

New Hampshire, extending east to the proposed Dracut, Massachusetts Market Path Tail Station.

One of primary reasons that led to Tennessee's decision to adopt the New York Powerline Alternative and New Hampshire Powerline Alternative for the Project is that they will enable a very substantial portion of the proposed new pipeline construction to be adjacent to, and parallel with, existing utility corridors in the states of New York, Massachusetts and New Hampshire. By increasing the percentage of co-location for the proposed pipeline segment, the revised route will reduce the construction of new pipeline facilities in undeveloped portions of the Market Path region, thus reducing environmental impacts and avoiding habitat fragmentation. In addition, the proposed route change will enable Tennessee to avoid (in certain cases) and to minimize (in other cases) the crossing of Article 97 properties and Areas of Critical Environmental Concern in Massachusetts.

Tennessee submitted supplemental information to the FERC on December 8, 2014 to reflect the revisions to the proposed route for the Project. That filing included a full description of the revised route and the proposed facilities for the Project. Also included is an updated stakeholder list for affected landowners, regulatory agencies, and governmental officials in the Project area. You are receiving this notification letter as you have been identified as a landowner affected by the proposed Project, including the revised pipeline route.

Tennessee plans to host open houses in the Project area during the period January 2015 through March 2015 to provide additional information and answer questions concerning the Project. Tennessee will provide information regarding the open house schedule to you when the dates and locations for those open houses have been established. Tennessee also plans in January 2015 to start meeting with affected landowners on a one-on-one basis to discuss survey needs and additional details regarding the Project.

Tennessee strives to be a good neighbor and appreciates your ongoing interest in this Project. A toll-free telephone number, (844) 277-1047, for Project / landowner inquiries is available, along with a dedicated email address, [nedinfQ{V1indermorgan.com](mailto:nedinfQ{V1indermorgan.com). Incoming telephone calls and emails will be directed to the appropriate Project discipline to be returned as soon as possible.

Very truly yours,

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

**20141217-5198(29994804).pdf**

**Massachusetts PipeLine Awareness Network**  
[www.MassPLAN.org](http://www.MassPLAN.org)

December 17, 2014

VIA EMAIL

James D. Hartman  
Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

RE: Misleading letter to landowners

Dear Mr. Hartman:

I have been provided copies of your December 12, 2014 letter to landowners along the proposed route for the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline.

The second paragraph of your letter begins: "The Project is a federal undertaking." Mr. Hartman, the project is a private undertaking, and your company is seeking approval from the federal government. Your letter is crafted in such a way as to lead landowners to believe that the project has been approved, or even undertaken, by the federal government. One concerned citizen has written to me that, "Having been given the

impression by [TGP] that he had no choice,” her friend gave your company permission to survey his land. He now knows that he can rescind permission, but not everyone is so well-informed.

Either prior to or in conjunction with notifying landowners of the open house schedule, I ask that your company include an explicit correction of your misleading statements, making clear above all else: While FERC has authorized TGP to use the agency’s pre-filing procedures, neither FERC nor any other government agency has approved the project in any way. This project is a private undertaking, not a federal undertaking, as erroneously stated in a previous letter. Other misleading statements in your December 12th letter that warrant public correction by your company are outlined below.

In this letter, you assert that this project “is being developed to serve specifically the New England region” – even though your company’s letter to FERC seeking to use pre-filing procedures states, “Potential Atlantic Canada customers include LDCs, power generators, industrials, and liquefied natural gas (‘LNG’) export projects.”

You also state that the project “will enable New England ... to lower energy costs,” even though (1) you do not and cannot promise lower energy costs, (2) natural gas prices are established by highly volatile commodities markets, and (3) the US EIA has concluded, “Increased LNG exports lead to increased natural gas prices.”<sup>1</sup>

Additionally, your letter states that the originally proposed Market Path component of the project consisted of approximately 177 miles of mainline pipeline and eight lateral lines totaling approximately 73 miles, while “the proposed revised route will now include approximately 188 miles of ... mainline pipeline facilities,” with no mention of the laterals. This leaves the false impression that either there are no longer laterals proposed or that the proposed number and route of laterals has not changed.

Furthermore, I do not believe there is any factual basis for your assertion that the company’s new plan of widening utility corridor clearings, or putting clearings parallel to existing cleared corridors, would have the affect of “avoiding habitat fragmentation,” rather than exacerbating it.

It is also worth noting that the maps that your company has made available to the public are unwieldy and do not allow landowners to easily locate their own towns to see the proposed route; the files uploaded by your company to FERC’s website are not named by geographic location. Inasmuch as “Tennessee strives to be a good neighbor,” please consider remedying this situation as well, with maps filed at FERC that show town boundaries, including file names or descriptions that reference the towns depicted. Should this prove too much of an administrative burden prior to the holidays, please send me the GIS shape files for the proposed route so that we can help individuals access the information they seek.

Finally, on the third page of your letter, you state that your company plans “in January to start meeting with affected landowners on a one-on-one basis to discuss survey needs and additional details regarding the Project.” Kindly advise landowners that, should they choose to meet with TGP representatives, they may bring along an attorney.

Best wishes for the holiday season,

Kathryn R. Eiseman, Director  
Massachusetts PipeLine Awareness Network

Cc:

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
Senator Elizabeth Warren  
Senator Edward Markey  
Congressman Richard Neal  
Attorney General Martha Coakley  
Thomas Lesser, Esq.

<sup>1</sup> “Effect of Increased Levels of Liquefied Natural Gas Exports on U.S. Energy Markets,” October 29, 2014,

**20141218-0020(30003803).pdf**

Patrick J. Leary  
21 Weston Road  
Hancock, New Hampshire 03449  
43 Swan Point Lane  
Rindge, New Hampshire 03461  
P.O. Box 741  
Stoddard, New Hampshire 03464-0741

December 8, 2014

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

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

Supplemental Filing — Adoption of Alternative Route as Part of Proposed Route (Wright, New York to Dra- cut, Massachusetts Pipeline Segment)

Dear Ms. Bose:

According to the Energy Information Administration’s State Electricity Profiles 2010 as published in Janu- ary 2012, New Hampshire exported about ‘/2 of the electricity it generated. This electricity went to Mas- sachusetts where there is a dire need for it as Massachusetts only generates about 7IPio of the electricity it needs. Reading the TGP literature, the majority ofthe natural gas in this pipeline will be used to generate electricity. The idea of pushing the proposed pipeline north into New Hampshire is absurd as there are no promised direct benefits to the residents ofNew Hampshire. Please reject this proposed alternative and force TGP back to its original proposal to put the pipeline in Massachusetts where it belongs.

Sincerely,

**20141218-0064(29999359).pdf**

Hand written letter, Francis & Cindy Lou Dougherty, Brookline, NH, opposed

**20141218-0065(29999360).pdf**

Hand written letter, Francis & Cindy Lou Dougherty, opposed

**20141218-0066(29999362).pdf**

Hand written letter, Francis & Cindy Lou Dougherty, Jr., opposed

**20141218-0067(29999363).pdf**

Hand written letter, Francis Dougherty Jr., opposed

**20141219-5083(29999567).pdf**

Sam Fresina, Albany, NY.

I live in Albany-Colonie, this pipelines will create hundreds of good paying jobs, lower our already too high taxes, and improve the economy in the upstate NY area.

**20141219-5097(29999988).pdf**

Curt Cabrera, Marlboro, NY.

I live locally and this project will bring good paying jobs to our area. This project is good for our community through tax revenues that help our infrastructure and our schools.

**20141219-5099(29999990).pdf**

Paul Bochicchio, Marlboro, NY.

WE live here, we spend here, we pay taxes here. This project will utilize a highly trained and skilled union workforce, I support the NED project.

**20141219-5100(29999993).pdf**

Thomas Osiecki, Sparrowbush, NY.

This project is vital to our areas economy and promises to bring good paying jobs to our area. I support the NED project!!!

**20141219-5101(30000008).pdf**

Frank Mueller, Damascus, PA.

This would be great for our area. This project will provide good paying jobs and provide many benefits locally. I fully support the NED project

**20141219-5102(30000009).pdf**

Leroy Washington, Kingston, NY.

I live locally and feel this project will help our areas economy and allow local people to go to work on the NED pipeline!

**20141219-5103(30000012).pdf**

Stephen Balogh, Kingston, NY.

If the NED project is performed in an environmentally safe manner and will be built by local union labor- then I fully support it

**20141219-5104(30000010).pdf**

Richard C Miner, Coxsackie, NY.

Gentleman & Ladies,

I feel this is a worthwhile project. We need the work for our Laborer Brothers and Sisters and related unions. Also, this is good for the people of New York, Mass, and CT as they can receive the product.

Sincerely,

RC Miner

**20141219-5105(30000016).pdf**

Richard J. Porcoro, Slate Hill, NY.

I am a member of Laborers' Local 17. The 300+ mile pipeline is a great way to help our energy infrastructure. We are skilled tradesman who take great pride in helping build America.

Thank you,

Richard J. Porcoro

**20141219-5106(30000017).pdf**

Alex Rodriguez, Bloomingburg, NY.

I live locally and feel this project will create jobs and help the local economy. I support the NED project.

**20141219-5108(30000018).pdf**

Matthew Persons, Pine Hill, NY.

I feel the NED project will provide much needed revenue to help support our area schools and area roads and bridges. I support this project.

**20141219-5109(30000023).pdf**

Joseph Mazzone, Nassau, NY.

I have been a local 190 member for 50 years and worked in many areas in the Capital Region. As I drive through the Capital District and see all of the high quality projects that Local 190 has completed and I was involved with, it makes me proud to be part of this organization. The local unions can provide the LiUNA project with highly skilled workers, provide high quality workmanship, and deliver the completed project safely. I am supportive of Local 190 to continue its quality work for many generations to come

**20141219-5114(30000031).pdf**

Salvatore Malfa, New Windsor, NY.

The NED project would be extremely beneficial to our area in that it would provide much needed employment to local residents and union workers. In these trying times, any project that will provide an area with good paying jobs and greatly needed tax revenue to aid our schools is most welcome. The NED project needs to be a part of our future.

Thank you,

Salvatore F. Malfa

**20141219-5116(30000090).pdf**

Vincent J Easts, Albany, NY.

Many good paying local jobs.

**20141219-5118(30000086).pdf**

David Czierzek, Highland Lakes, NJ.

This project is about good paying jobs and keeping our skilled workforce working. Times are tough and a project of this size will help us support our families. I support the NED Pipeline

**20141219-5123(30000046).pdf**

Chris Carchidi, Newburgh, NY.

Union jobs are beneficial to the entire local economy. When do we start?

**20141219-5127(30000074).pdf**

Merlin Countryman, Wallkill, NY.

I am glad that this work will be done by local workers. This will help the areas economy and allow us to support our families. New York has a very high cost of living, this project will help!

**20141219-5128(30000076).pdf**

Chris Cerone, Marlboro, NY.

Jobs! Jobs! Jobs! Did I mention Jobs?

**20141219-5131(30000099).pdf**

Edward J Froehlich, Albany, NY.

We have skilled workers in Local 190. So let's bring jobs to New York State. So let's go for it! God bless America.

Ed Froehlich

**20141219-5134(30000105).pdf**

Mark Mackey, Highland, NY.

As a lifelong resident of New York, we must utilize our resources to become an energy independent nation. Projects today are not like the past, today's studies are performed well in advance to ensure minimal environmental impact.

Our state and our nation can all benefit from projects like this through employment and taxes that support our local communities and its residents. We must embrace progress not deter it. Our union workers are some of the most experienced and well trained professionals in the industry.

I hope you support this very important project.

Thank you,

Mark Mackey

**20141219-5137(30000116).pdf**

Nicholas J Marro, Winchester, NY.

This project would provide many good paying jobs. Union members are the best trainee workers in the construction field. The project would benefit communities by keeping gas and oil prices at bay. In N.H. our energy infrastructure is quite old and out of date.

**20141219-5138(30000121).pdf**

Miguel Rodriguez, Newburgh, NY.

We really need this work to keep us employed and to meet the energy demands for all the people that are moving into the area. Our population continues to go up and our energy prices are skyrocketing.

This project will help us bring those costs down.

**20141219-5139(30000149).pdf**

Nicholas F. Rizzo, Schenectady, NY.

Upstate NY needs jobs for a depressed area. Build it union and it will last.

**20141219-5141(30000151).pdf**

Steven Crowther, Wappingers Falls, NY.

It should be a well known fact that all union members, regardless of trade are highly skilled at their craft. This alone should be reason enough to ensure that these skills are utilized on any major construction project. Having worked on the Millennium Pipeline project I got to see firsthand hundreds of local workers being employed on this project. The surrounding communities also thrived throughout the entire project.

I surely hope this trend continues and I fully support the NED Pipeline

**20141219-5142(30000152).pdf**

Paul Martin, Delmar, NY.

I am very much in favor of this for the following reasons: good paying jobs, a lift for the local economy, and increased tax revenues.

**20141219-5143(30000155).pdf**

Carl Santana, Modena, NY.

I am a union Laborer who believes that the NED project will be great for union workers in my area. This project will provide jobs as well as helping meet energy needs throughout the Northeast.

**20141219-5144(30000156).pdf**

Louis Misasi, Saugerties, NY.

We can certainly use the jobs for the area and need help to meet our growing energy needs. I support the NED project

**20141219-5146(30000164).pdf**

Jospeh J Rappazzo Jr, Glenmont, NY.

The unions can put good men and women to work in these hard economic times.

**20141219-5148(30000158).pdf**

Darren Karmolinski, Walker Valley, NY.

Build this project with highly skilled union workers who take pride in what they do. Keep work local and provide good paying jobs to our area.

I also feel that this project can be performed with minimal environmental impact and provide much needed revenues to our area.

**20141219-5150(30000165).pdf**

Alfred Drygula, Amsterdam, NY.

GO FOR IT

**20141219-5151(30000167).pdf**

Frank Polacco Sr., Kingston, NY.

Although I am a retired Local 17 Laborer, I feel this project is a great opportunity for New York. I support the NED Pipeline!

**20141219-5152(30000168).pdf**

John Jaczko, New Windsor, NY.

As a local resident, I feel it is crucial to create family sustaining jobs in our area. This project promises to do that and to also provide much needed tax revenues to our cities and towns. I am in support of this project and I look forward to working on it.

Thank you,  
John Jaczko

**20141219-5153(30000170).pdf**

Pamil Danaj, Albany, NY.

We need good paying union jobs that help infrastructure and schools vital to our economy.

**20141219-5154(30000171).pdf**

Gilbert Davis, Kerhonkson, NY.

I live locally and not only would this create good paying jobs but it will help meet our growing energy needs. I believe this project can be performed with very little environmental impact on our beautiful part of this state.

This project is a win-win-win for all!

**20141219-5155(30000172).pdf**

Niko Danaj, Albany, NY.

We live locally, we want good paying UNION jobs.

**20141219-5156(30000173).pdf**

Agostinho Ribeiro, Albany, NY.

We need these jobs to support our economy.

**20141219-5157(30000174).pdf**

Matthew Persons, Pine Hill, NY.

YES

**20141219-5159(30000177).pdf**

Karl Wahrlich, Scotia, NY.

Along with creating jobs for my LiUNA brothers and sisters temporarily., the NED project helps to provide lower energy costs to a Northeast that becomes busier year after year and more energy is needed in that growth. I can honestly say that this project will be done by highly skilled and trained professionals and a hard working trained workforce who stand by the long term benefits in our communities, schools, and infrastructure

**20141219-5160(30000271).pdf**

Matthew Persons, Pine Hill, NY.

The Northeast Energy Direct Project will undoubtedly deliver much needed natural gas to the marketplace. The increased supply will help lower the energy costs of clean burning natural gas which releases up to 60% less emissions than other fossil fuels that are being used today. This project will help increase the availability of the gas and make it more affordable to use. This pipeline will also create many well paying jobs throughout its 344 mile route. Not only will this benefit those working on it, but it will also help communities along the route.

I am a strong environmentalist but feel that the environmental concerns will be met and this line should go forward without hesitation.

For years we have asked for a clean alternative energy source to crude oil and coal and this is that source. I strongly support the building of this pipeline.

Sincerely,

Matthew Parsons

**20141219-5162(30000208).pdf**

Christopher Biegel, Coeymans, NY.

I would like to see the NED be completed successfully so that it will create American jobs for American workers and to break our independence on foreign energy. It would also help with tax revenues to help out with other infrastructure projects and would boost both the US and NY economies.

**20141219-5210(30000663).pdf**

Marilyn S. Griska, Rindge, NH.

To the Editor, Ledger Transcript, Peterborough, N.H.

As a Rindge resident whose property directly abuts the preferred route for the 36 inch high pressure gas pipeline, I find a glaring discrepancy in the Ledger's article reporting on the Mason pipeline meeting. My husband and I attended that meeting, as well as the one in Rindge. The article states that the proposed pipeline is "36 inches around". The information provided at both the Mason and Rindge meetings states the pipe in the pipeline is 36 inches in diameter (one full yard). A pipe with a circumference of 36 inches would have a diameter of 11.4 inches, less than a foot across. There is a huge difference between the size of the pipe stated in the Ledger's article and the one proposed by Kinder Morgan.

Even a 11.45 inch pipe could be a problem for a company with the safety history of Kinder Morgan. The fact that the one yard in diameter pipe needs to be offset from the existing power lines due to the possible corrosion shows that the existing corridor will need to be widened considerably, affecting far more private property that will be taken by eminent domain.

The diameter of the 36 inch pipe and a pressure (1,400 pounds per square inch) have a direct bearing on the blast area should an accident happen. We were told the blast area would be over a 900 feet across. In Rindge, this would incinerate the homes of every abutter in our area. The proposed pipeline is bad for the safety of the residents of Rindge and all of the other impacted towns. Leakage in the line, noisy compressor and metering stations will have a negative impact on the residents, wildlife and the environment, not to mention the fact that the bulk of the gas from the pipeline will not be consumed in New Hampshire; it will be shipped offshore and sold in foreign markets because those markets are willing to pay more for the gas. This huge pipeline screams of corporate greed and a lack of interest in little else. We received a letter yesterday (12/16/14) from Kinder Morgan (Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co. L.L.C.). Don't allow these people to survey and take your property; make it difficult and costly to invade bucolic Rindge, as we intend to do.

Marilyn Griska

Rindge

CC: FERC (Federal Energy Regulatory Commission)

**20141219-5223(30001417).pdf**

Tammy Wertz, Hollis, NH.

To the degree that FERC is honestly responsive to a real definition of "need" for the TGP/KM NED project, I offer you this quote:

"Distrigas, New England's only liquefied natural gas import terminal, is just north of Boston. Tony Scaraggi, the company's vice president of operations, says even with last year's frigid winter, New England only hit its maximum pipeline capacity for 40 days.

"That's equivalent to like, two and a half to three LNG tankers coming in. So you gotta compare that to the cost of a \$2 to \$3 billion pipeline," Scaraggi says."

Remember that the 40 days isn't full days, just parts of days. Also remember that the cost of the NED project includes the destruction it will wreak on private property values, wilderness, conservation land, water bodies, wells, greenhouse gases, and very real health and safety risks.

The town of Hollis has voted loudly in opposition to this project. We will not back down from our stand against it

**20141219-5319(30001989).pdf**

Betty L Anders, Rindge, NH.

I am a resident of Rindge, New Hampshire and deeply concerned about the possibilities of a natural gas pipeline being placed in or around my community.

My biggest concern is that we, as a country, are expanding our reliance on fossil fuels versus using alternative renewable energy sources. I am further concerned by the immediate environmental impact this project would have on my town and all of the Southwestern New Hampshire community.

As I understand this project, the Kinder-Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline will be able to take our property or other residents' property through eminent domain or other coercion. The project would ravage our communities and expose us to danger of serious accidents.

Allowing a corporation to make decisions that affect my property and my community is unreasonable and should be unconstitutional.

Let the people decide what is best and needed for their energy needs!

Please consider our plea and help us prevent this Northeast Direct Energy natural gas pipeline from destroying our beautiful, rural community

**20141222-0094(30013563).pdf**

Hand written letter, Constance E. Lacasse, Mason, NH, opposed

**20141222-0095(30013564).pdf**

Hand written letter, Gerard Lacasse, Mason, NH, opposed

**20141222-0096(30013568).pdf**

Hand written letter, Sharon Rosenfelder, New Ipswich, NH, opposed

**20141222-0097(30013565).pdf**

Hand written letter, John Rosenfelder, New Ipswich, NH, opposed

**20141222-0098(30013569).pdf**

Hand written letter, Anna M. Faiello, Mason, NH, opposed

**20141222-0099(30014984).pdf**

Hand written letter, W. John Couture, Mason, NH, opposed

**20141222-0100(30015511).pdf**

Hand written letter, John Cooper, Mason, NH, opposed

**20141222-0101(30015510).pdf**

Hand written letter, Steve Wells, Mason, NH, opposed

**20141222-0102(30015509).pdf**

Hand written letter, Ann Louise Moser, Mason, NH, opposed

**20141222-5001(30002208).pdf**

Hiel Lindquist, Fitzwilliam, NH.

The New England natural gas “shortage” issue is based on the assumption that in the future there will be insufficient natural gas capacity to meet the needs of New England during a peak usage period. A peak usage period is projected to occur for a few hours in the evening on a limited number of days during the winter. Distrigas, New England’s natural gas import terminal, has noted that meeting the peak capacity natural gas needs of New England would only require a few additional LNG tankers worth of natural gas. Assuming that additional LNG facilities may be needed to meet this peak usage requirement, it would seem to me that building additional LNG facilities would be a lot less expensive and less environmentally intrusive than building a 3 foot diameter pipeline from Pennsylvania for Massachusetts. I would hope that FERC would request a through analysis of other alternatives for meeting the peak natural gas requirements of New England before any pipeline proposal is approved. I feel that the existing pipeline proposal is using the peak usage requirements as a disguise in order to build a pipeline facility which would expedite the export of natural gas to world

**20141222-5008(30003388).pdf**

Tyler W Seppala, Rindge, NH.

Kinder Morgan has stated that they have 0.5 to 0.7 billion cubic feet per day in LCD Contracts. The pipeline is designed for 2.2 billion cubic feet per day. This is so grossly over sized! Where is this remaining gas going to go? I just received a letter from the Tennessee Gas Pipeline company since the pipeline is coming through my lawn and they state that this pipeline is being developed to serve specifically the New England Region. But on their own website and now I have since been made aware in their letter to Kimberly Bose they state that indeed this gas is for Atlantic Canadian customers and export projects. Nowhere in my letter does it state that they will be selling natural gas to Canadian customers and overseas customers. Their letter to me is a misrepresentation of what this gas is really intended for.

Kinder Morgan’s whole argument is based off pipeline capacity constraints. Only on a few hours a day for a handful of days during the coldest weather do we ever hit peak capacity. They make it sound like this occurs 24 hrs a day when they try selling their pipeline. Simple solutions like constructing additional LNG storage tanks would be a noninvasive and a way simpler and cheaper solution to the problem. Massachusetts alone lost 1,725 million cubic feet of gas in their existing distribution lines in 2010 alone due to leaking pipes. Why wouldn’t we repair the leaking infrastructure we do have? Why don’t we change the market structure so electric generators can secure long term contracts in lieu of forcing them to buy on spot market? Massachusetts has mandated that 1,600 MW of solar and 2,000 MW of wind be online by 2020 all factors not taken into account by Kinder Morgan. I recently heard a gentlemen explain this pipeline in the perfect analogy and it went like this “Building this pipeline to meet peak requirements in New England is like building a six-lane freeway across Martha’s Vineyard to accommodate traffic on the Fourth of July”. You could not state it any better.

Kinder Morgan states in their studies that property values will not be affected in NH. I talked to an appraiser who told me that that depending on where the pipeline easement is situated that my property/home could lose up to 50 % percent of its value. I looked through the studies on their FAQ page in regards to property values. They were based off of states such as California, Oregon, Texas and a few others. To make comparisons based off of those states is doing us a clear injustice. On the issues of new jobs to the region. These are only temporary jobs and very few if any will be going to anybody in New England. They have shown that they will even use surveyors from southern states up here and that’s just for surveying.

The real intent of this pipeline is to sell their product elsewhere. It will also be sold to the highest bidder. On top of that the tariffs to pay for this thing will be passed onto us the ratepayers. They only need to get to Dracut so they can tap into the Maritimes & Northeast pipeline and will try step on and crush any property owner in their path. This property owner will be denying them permission to survey his property. I hope you deny this project seeing that this isn’t really for New England but instead to get their gas elsewhere.

Rosemary Wessel, Founder [nofrackegasinmass@gmail.com](mailto:nofrackegasinmass@gmail.com)

December 20, 2014

STATEMENT REGARDING THE NEW “PREFERRED PATH” SUBMITTED TO FERC BY KINDER MORGAN ON DECEMBER 8, 2014

Our opposition to pipeline expansion isn't a matter of where a pipeline goes, it's that new fossil fuel infrastructure isn't needed in this region. Building it will commit our region to decades of increased dependency on fossil fuels, instead of moving forward toward the clean energy economy.

The pipeline capacity constraints given as the reason for the need for more pipelines is a phenomenon that only happens a few hours on just a few days a year. There are many other options for meeting this need that do not involve disruptive, permanent infrastructure that further ties us to a fossil fuel economy. Solutions like the state-mandated expansions in solar and wind capacity, using increased efficiency to lower demand, and even bringing in LNG through already established means of distribution during peak demand can solve those brief, infrequent spikes in demand without committing our region to billions of dollars of infrastructure and destruction of property.

With the proposed overbuild of capacity, the majority is most likely slated for export, especially since all 5 pipeline projects being proposed for New England are planned to connect to the M&NE pipeline and other export-terminal based projects. Competing with overseas markets paying 2-5 times as much will drive up our energy costs here. And increasing our dependence on gas, which already makes up over 60% of our electric generation, will only make us more susceptible to market price swings, and leave us stranded as gas drilling production starts to drop in the next few years.

No shift of pipeline path makes any of this any less true.

The idea that utility corridors are a less impactful location for pipelines is a mischaracterization. Large, high-pressure gas transmission lines cannot be built directly within an existing power line easement. The electromagnetic fields from these power lines cause induction along the pipeline, interrupting its cathodic protection system and increasing the likelihood of corrosion and electrical charge. Pipelines need to be built alongside existing utility corridors, requiring an extra 100 ft. easement along the route. This is shown by survey flagging done recently in Plainfield, where the pipeline has been slated to follow WMECO's power lines since the initial pipeline proposal. The flags on the ground there clearly show a center line 50 ft. into private property from the edge of the existing power line corridor and the other side of the pipeline's construction easement another 50 ft. in.

This has been the reality for towns like Dalton, Windsor, Plainfield, Ashfield, Conway, Deerfield and others that have faced this intrusion into their properties and communities since the beginning, and continue now even with what Kinder Morgan refers to as an “improved” path.

In re-submitting Resource Report 1, Kinder Morgan has also added additional facilities to this new path. This new path

Members of the pipeline opposition movement that are no longer directly facing impact on their properties or in their towns are now assisting those newly affected with information and advice. A pipeline that isn't needed, isn't needed, regardless of where it's routed.

Hiel Lindquist, Fitzwilliam, NH.

My current comments on the proposed pipeline concern the whether or not Kinder Morgan, as a company, should be allowed to build and operate a pipeline.

As reported by Kinder Morgan, the proposed pipeline will cross 155 wetlands, 116 bodies of water in-

cluding 18 major rivers and also cross 8 miles of state forests and parks. I have to question whether or not Kinder Morgan is the right company for this proposed project.

For example, this story is from the Natural Gas Watch on 17 Aug 2011

“Kinder Morgan, Owner of Illinois Natural Gas Pipeline Co. Where Explosion Occurred, Has Lengthy Record of Pipeline, Workplace Safety Violations”. The article also states that Kinder Morgan “has a lengthy record of pipeline and workplace safety violations, according to federal records obtained by NaturalGas-Watch.org.”

Another article:

“In May 2012, Kinder Morgan was issued a Notice of Probable Violation that ordered the company to correct alleged safety violations along the Cortez Pipeline which would connect to the Lobos Pipeline.”

Other news reports seem to indicate Kinder Morgan has a history of reducing infrastructure support and routine maintenance on pipeline infrastructure acquired from other companies. I could copy and paste other pages of articles like this, but I assume that FERC has access directly to OSHA and other safety data. As a lay person it is difficult for me to determine the accuracy and importance of these violations. However, a search turns up so many articles that one has to question the statements from Kinder Morgan that they are “a good neighbor”.

Kinder Morgan has stated, “We outperform the industry averages in almost all safety related categories”. If this is the best the industry has to offer then I have to question the logic of building a pipeline that will expose so much of our environment to operations of this type

#### **20141222-5033(30005191).pdf**

Hope OShaughnessy, Stratham, NH.

Dear FERC:

I have serious reservations about the way in which this project is being managed. I do not see the transparency that is required to ensure that key stakeholders including industry oversight, state agencies are being invited into the process to ensure excellent mitigation and prevention of future costs and issues.

Most concerning is that the regulatory agency, PHSMA, that is charged with oversight, has admitted that it cannot handle its charge and recently lost its director due to resignation.

Good management principles dictate that this project needs to be suspended until it is clear that best practices are being used at the early planning and initiation stages.

Sincerely, Hope O’Shaughnessy

#### **20141222-5042(30006164).pdf**

**[nofrackedgasinmass.org](http://nofrackedgasinmass.org)**

Rosemary Wessel, Founder [nofrackegasinmass@gmail.com](mailto:nofrackegasinmass@gmail.com)

• 90 Trow Road, Cummington, MA 01026 • 413-634-5726

December 20, 2014

To the Acting Commissioner, Dept. of Energy Resources, Meg Lusardi and members of the Low Demand Study Team:

The current Low Demand Study, commissioned by the Department of Energy Resources (DOER) originated when a group of five of us representing various citizen’s groups met with Governor Patrick on July 30, 2014 about pipeline proposals and energy needs for the New England region.

Citing an earlier study by Black & Veatch for the New England States Council on Energy (NESCOE) that stated that no new pipeline would be necessary if the region were to continue to lower its energy demand with policies that were already producing notable results, we were told by the Governor and the Secretary

of Energy and Environmental Affairs that the study was flawed. When the Governor agreed to our suggestion of a new study, the DOER invited a large group of stakeholders to be involved in the process, including many conservation groups, environmental justice groups, and clean energy advocates, as well as energy industry and regulatory representatives. This inclusive approach was very much in line with our request for an open and transparent process - something that had been missing from the decision making process that led to NESCOE, ISO New England and the six New England Governors' request for more pipeline capacity.<sup>1</sup>

The original request for proposals drafted by the DOER to hire a consulting firm included these study goals:

- To determine, given updated supply and demand assumptions, whether or not new gas infrastructure is required
- If so, how to optimize for environmental, reliability, and cost considerations.
- When considering all energy resources, which resources offer the greatest net benefits when assessing for reliability needs, cost savings and reducing environmental effects including lower GHG emissions.
- In combination, how far can these alternative resources go in replacing retiring generation capacity

The meetings hosted by DOER for stakeholders to hear the progress of the study and offer feedback have been inclusive, open to the public by way of attendance or conference calling. Each meeting was followed by a brief comment period, during which stakeholders were encouraged to provide further specific feedback into the study. Although it was stated at the outset that this was not a consensus-building process, the initial proposal for the study and some of the issues addressed by stakeholders seemed to be taken into account as the process moved forward.

Then the third and final stakeholder meeting was postponed — not once but twice — pushing the final meeting back until just four days before the deadline for the study's release. What was ultimately presented at the December 18 meeting did not take the shape of the study that stakeholders had seen taking form during the development of the request for proposals and the previous stakeholder sessions. As one of the five who originally met with the Governor to request this study, the differences were stark and disappointing.

The final models used for the study, which were refined during the period of time when public participation was postponed, have many assumptions that are simply not rooted in the real world. Collectively, they render the study useless to anyone looking to this report for energy policy development and useless to the people of Massachusetts.

The following are just some of the most outstanding deficiencies in the Low Demand Study's modeling assumptions:

- None of the models are GWSA (Global Warming Solutions Act) compliant. This not only ignores state law, it ignores one of the key pieces of the RFP - how to meet our energy needs WHILE lowering ghg emissions.
- Building more pipeline would pull us further out of compliance with the GWSA, shifting the burden to meet GWSA compliance out of the electric generation sector to more expensive sectors of the economy.
- Offshore wind is discounted as not feasible, yet there are currently multiple projects moving ahead. This will be part of our energy system in the near future, yet it is not considered.
- Solar is dismissed as not being available during peak hours (the only times considered in the model). At the same time, peak storage systems using pumped or battery storage are also discounted as not feasible. Including both can provide peak demand relief.
- The study does not take into account the drastic drop in oil and LNG prices, making the study's results already obsolete.
- It does not appear to take into consideration emissions of methane released through normal operations of transmission pipelines (at compressor, pigging and valve stations).<sup>2</sup> Methane is currently rated by the IPCC to have 34 times the climate change impact of CO<sub>2</sub> over their first 100 years in the atmosphere; 86 times more over their first 20 years.<sup>3</sup>

— It does not include expansions of current energy efficiency programs or further incentives for distributed generation development, both of which are currently keeping electric demand flat in the state.

— The study uses ISO-New England’s energy forecasts as base model numbers. These forecasts have recently been criticized by NESCOE for not including current distributed generation (rooftop solar, etc), and utility scale wind and solar that are slated to come on line in the next few years, as well as energy efficiency incentives that are holding electric demand flat.<sup>4</sup>

— The study assumes optimal pipeline use (80% full and serving only domestic uses) which would not be the case if all or even most of the currently proposed pipelines are built. If they are built, and the market is flooded with excess capacity during the 325-350 days a year when demand is below peak, this would create a glut of gas capacity with nowhere to go but export to foreign markets. The significantly higher prices that natural gas captures overseas would raise prices here in New England.

— The study only marginally considers increasing the storage and/or importation of liquified natural gas (LNG) to meet the infrequent peak demands for natural gas in the current system. There are currently under-utilized facilities for storage in New England that could be used to store natural gas during the vast majority of the year when peak demand is not an issue. Also, our main importer in the region, Distrigas, has estimated that the peak constraints can be addressed by their company with no more impact than 2-1/2 to 3 extra tankers per year arriving at their facility. This is a solution that could bridge the current constraints while renewable capacity is boosted to address electric generation needs over the next few years. Unlike a pipeline, both of these solutions are immediately available and don’t require ANY new infrastructure to be built.

By recalibrating the study to such tight and unrealistic parameters, the study has been bent into a shape in which the only question to be answered was not “is more pipeline necessary”, but “how much pipeline is necessary”. The spirit of the study requested during our meeting with Governor Patrick was to determine if, and by what measures, peak demands could be met by means other than new pipelines. Given the unrealistic nature of so many of the assumptions in this study, its usefulness seems limited to showing how much distortion of study parameters it takes to show that more pipeline is indeed needed.

It’s my hope that the deficiencies in this study can help the incoming Administration understand how to achieve the original goals put forth by our citizen’s groups to determine what our actual energy needs are, and how far we can go toward meeting them using non-fossil-fuel means, before even considering resorting to adding to our already considerable over-reliance on natural gas. A study keeping in line with the original RFP seems crucial to moving forward in accurately re-defining our state’s energy policies in a way that will keep both our economy and our climate impact reduction goals on track.

It’s also my hope that in the brief time before he leaves office, Governor Patrick will require regulations to be put in place as mandated by the GWSA5, “establishing a desired level of declining annual aggregate emission limits for sources or categories of sources that emit greenhouse gases.” These regulations were due in 2012 and have still not been put in place. They would go a long way to helping the state achieve its goals, and are essential in establishing any future energy policy, since these regulations are mandated to be the law of the Commonwealth.

Sincerely,

Rosemary Wessel

Cc: Governor Deval Patrick

EEA Secretary Maeve Vallely-Bartlett Undersecretary for Energy, Mark Silvia Governor-Elect Charlie Baker

EEA Secretary-Elect Matthew Beaton Attorney General Elect Maura Healey

Senator Elizabeth Warren

Senator Edward Markey MA Senator Stanley Rosenberg

1- [http://www.ct.gov/deep/lib/deep/press\\_releases/2013/New\\_England\\_Governors\\_Statement-Energy\\_12-5-13\\_final.pdf](http://www.ct.gov/deep/lib/deep/press_releases/2013/New_England_Governors_Statement-Energy_12-5-13_final.pdf)

- 2- <http://www.epa.gov/gasstar/documents/redesignblowdownsystems.pdf>
- 3- <http://www.climatechange2013.org/report/full-report/>
- 4- [http://www.nescoe.com/uploads/ICR\\_Statement\\_October\\_2014.pdf](http://www.nescoe.com/uploads/ICR_Statement_October_2014.pdf)
- 5- <http://www.clf.org/blog/clean-energy-climate-change/global-warming-solutions-act/>

**20141222-5129(30007294).pdf**

*originally "Scanned letter, 2 separate letters from different individuals, both opposed"*

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA01001

Date: December 16, 2014

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access

As the owner of the property located at:

7 Candlelight 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 to perform surveys, or for any other purpose. Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Christopher M.Anders

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA01001

Date: December 16, 2014

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access

As the owner of the property located at:

7 Candlelight 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 to perform surveys, or for any other purpose. Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Betty L. Anders

**20141222-5189(30008213).pdf**

Christopher M Anders, Rindge, NH.

I am writing in opposition to TGP's NED project. The more I research this project, the more I learn about the deceptiveness and bending of the facts from Kinder Morgan. The current amount of information that they have provided does not even come close for anyone to know exactly where, how, or why this pipeline is to be constructed. It seems to me from reading document after document that Kinder Morgan will be able to do whatever they deem necessary to put this pipeline in

**20141222-5309(30010237).pdf**

Daein Ballard, Mason, NH.

I live in Mason NH and the currently proposed path of Fitchburg lateral will cut right through the middle of

my heavily forested property. I've been planting rare plants on my property in hopes of offering them for sale once they start to mature in a few years.

Beyond the outright destruction of the plants I've already planted, according to my calculations the proposed pipeline will reduce the capacity of my property by about \$500,000. Since things like trees and some under-story plants take years to mature I have yet to start making any sales, although I've already invested years of labor into it. Considering what point I'm at in my endeavor (lots of input with no output expected for another few years) I'm certain I will not be fairly compensated for my effort and the reduced capacity of my property.

The NH portion of the Fitchburg lateral is all new easement, crossing mostly private properties. None of whom (that I have spoken with) are willing to give anyone the rights to an easement for a gas pipeline on their properties. Considering the disregard for people's property rights by KM (Kinder-Morgan) and the TGP (Tennessee Gas Pipeline) company I'm opposed to the pipeline as it's currently proposed.

I strongly encourage KM and the TGP to consider an alternate route for the Fitchburg lateral that utilizes existing public ROWs, like collocating it with RT 31. I oppose use of eminent domain and encourage FERC to deny any permits which require it's use to build the pipeline.

- Daein Ballard  
Mason, NH

**20141222-5359(30010331).pdf**

### **Kestrel Land Trust**

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

Regarding: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., Docket# PF14-22-000

Dear Secretary Bose:

Kestrel Land Trust is dedicated to conserving the land that sustains the quality of life and ecological integrity of the Connecticut River Valley. Kestrel represents over 1,000 conservation minded citizens in the Connecticut River Valley. On behalf of our members and Board of Directors, I submit the following comments:

Kestrel Land Trust opposes Kinder Morgan's Northeast Energy Direct pipeline proposal to cross the western and northern tier of our Commonwealth and now into New Hampshire. There has been no convincing demonstration that New England needs more natural gas pipelines for its residences and businesses. Ecological connectivity does not recognize town or state boundary lines, so merely looking for a different route does not address the threshold question of whether there is a public need for more natural gas transmission lines.

We ask that the Commission carefully and thoroughly attend to the points made and questions raised by Massachusetts Audubon Society in their comments of October 6, 2014 to seek credible data and analysis of need for this project. We understand that the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is engaged in examining whether any pipeline expansion is needed, or whether other measures such as conservation, fixing all leaks in existing pipes, dramatically expanding the availability of improved solar and wind technologies, or market-based solutions and better management of existing lines would solve perceived problems. A meaningful, ongoing public assessment of our energy needs and goals that includes all stakeholders is critical for our future.

We also call upon the Commission to review the policies and processes that allow pipelines to gain approval in a piecemeal, segmented manner rather than through a comprehensive energy plan that considers long-term local and regional goals of sustainability.

Federal and state conservation areas, municipal watershed lands and privately held protected agricultural and forestlands are at risk of intrusion. Construction and disruptive activities on these lands pose an envi-

ronmental and existential threat to all land trusts. These activities also pose a threat to private landowners and to citizens who have entrusted their properties to legal protections afforded by contracts with land trusts and with state and federal entities. No matter where the pipeline is located, relieving one section of the Commonwealth's forests, parks and protected lands to the detriment of another area still damages the natural resources we depend on — clean air, water, soil and habitable climate.

More alarming than the various proposed routes, is the evidence that this expansion of gas infrastructure simply is not needed, but is being driven by the newly available shale gas from the Marcellus region and the need for gas in foreign markets. This pipeline is being marketed to our region as a way to “move product.” Lands which were conserved for the benefit of the public, should not be destroyed for the benefit of overseas consumers. If the proposed pipeline is built into the fabric of our forests, farms and fields, there will come a time when the Marcellus shale fuels will be depleted. At that time, the landowners in the Marcellus region will be left with contaminated soils and underground waters, and our citizens will be left with the toxic refuse of the pipeline, and the extraordinary and unnecessary loss of forest and wetland habitat inflicted on our precious lands by Kinder Morgan.

Moreover, there is convincing and alarming scientific evidence that worldwide climate changes caused by the emission of natural gas, methane and other fossil fuels and greenhouse gases will lead to ever-increasing occurrences of critically destructive extreme weather events, acidified oceans and life-destroying rising seas. As an organization whose very purpose is to protect land for the sake of ecological integrity, we vigorously object to the vast destruction of land and damage to water that is caused by extracting, distributing and burning natural gas as a solution to our long-term energy needs. Unnecessary expansion of natural gas capacity — wherever the pipeline route is proposed — threatens the quality of life that we work to sustain.

Thank you for considering these comments.

Sincerely,

Robert Jonas, Chairman of the Board

cc: (via email)

Governor Deval Patrick

Governor Elect Baker

EEOA Secretary-designate Beaton)

Congressman James McGovern

EEOA Secretary Maeve Vallye Bartlett

U. S. Senator Elizabeth Warren

U. S. Senator Edward Markey

Attorney General Martha Coakley

Attorney General Elect Maura Healey

State Senator Stanley Rosenberg

State Representative Ellen Story

Richard Hubbard, President, Massachusetts Land Trust Coalition

Jack Clarke, Legislative Director, Massachusetts Audubon Society

**20141223-0012(30015265).pdf**

Hand written letter, Jennifer Dale, Temple, NH opposed

**20141223-0013(30015260).pdf**

Hand written letter, C. Frades(?), Amherst, NH, opposed

**20141223-0014(30015228).pdf**

Hand written letter, Joni Lane, Mason, NH, opposed

**20141223-0015(30015221).pdf**

Hand written letter, Catherine MacKay, Rindge, NH, opposed

**20141223-0016(30015357).pdf**

Hand written letter, Guy A. Daniello, Mason, NH, opposed

**20141223-0017(30015220).pdf**

Hand written letter, Michael A. McGuire, P.E., Mason, NH, opposed

**20141223-0018(30015356).pdf**

Hand written letter, Michael A. McGuire, P.E., Mason, NH, opposed

**20141223-0019(30015212).pdf**

Hand written letter, Timothy Leak, Mason, NH, opposed

**20141223-0020(30015358).pdf**

Hand written letter, Sam Lafortune, Rindge, NH, opposed

**20141223-0021(30015359).pdf**

Hand written letter, ??, Fitzwilliam, NH, opposed

**20141223-0022(30015219).pdf**

Hand written letter, David G. Drouin, Rindge, NH, opposed

**20141223-0023(30015529).pdf**

Hand written letter, Nancy Goldsmith, New Ipswich, NH, opposed

**20141223-0024(30015373).pdf**

Hand written letter, Michael A. McGuire, P.E., Mason, NH, opposed

**20141223-0025(30015218).pdf**

Hand written letter, Michael A. McGuire, P.E., Mason, NH, opposed

**20141223-0026(30015217).pdf**

Hand written letter, Jon Bryan, Mason, NH, opposed

**20141223-0027(30015222).pdf**

Hand written letter, Stephanie Schell, Fitzwilliam, NH, opposed

**20141223-0028(30015230).pdf**

Hand written letter, Jeanne E. Sable, Fitzwilliam, NH, opposed

**20141223-0029(30015231).pdf**

Hand written letter, Nancy Brya(?), Mason, NH, opposed

**20141223-0030(30015232).pdf**

Hand written letter, Joseph McGuire, Mason, NH, opposed

**20141223-0031(30015374).pdf**

Hand written letter, Tamako(?) Cooper, Mason, NH, opposed

**20141223-0032(30015210).pdf**

Hand written letter, Michael A. McGuire, P.E., Mason, NH, opposed

**20141223-0033(30015216).pdf**

Hand written letter, Shirley A. Preston, Rindge, NH, opposed

**20141223-0034(30015372).pdf**

Hand written letter, Stephanie Syre-Hager, Mason, NH, opposed

**20141223-0035(30015211).pdf**

Hand written letter, William Preston, Rindge, NH, opposed

**20141223-0036(30015328).pdf**

Hand written letter, Elisa Benincaso(?), Rindge, NH, opposed

**20141223-0037(30015355).pdf**

Hand written letter, Tom Ventura, Amherst, NH, opposed

**20141223-0038(30015103).pdf**

Hand written letter, ??, Northfield, MA, opposed

**20141223-5014(30010471).pdf**

Courtney C Vore, Amherst, NH.

Courtney & Jon Michael Vore

23 Simeon Wilson Rad

Amherst, NH 03031

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC

1615 Suffield Street

Agawam, MA 01001

December 23, 2014

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access

To Whom It May Concern:

As the owner of the property located at: 23 Simeon Wilson Road, Amherst,

NH (although a letter was sent by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company in our names to the incorrect address of 25 Fairway Drive, Amherst, NH), we are denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter our land to perform surveys, or for any other purpose. Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Sincerely,

/s/ /s/

Courtney Curran Vore Jon Michael B. Vore

cc: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
Maggie Hassan, New Hampshire Governor  
Annie Kuster, US Representative (NH)  
Carol Shea-Porter, US Representative (NH)  
Jeanne Shaheen, US Senator (NH)  
Kelly Ayotte, US Senator (NH)

**20141223-5285(30015466).pdf**

Joseph & Kristin McCool  
21 Simeon Wilson Road  
Amherst, NH 03031

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

December 18, 2014

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

RE: Denying Property Access

As the owners of property located at 21 Simeon Wilson Road, Amherst, NH, we are denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter our land to perform surveys, or for any other purposes. Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Joseph D. McCool  
Kristin V. McCool

cc: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
Maggie Hassan, New Hampshire Governor  
Annie Kuster, US Representative (NH)  
Carol Shea-Porter, US Representative (NH)  
Jeanne Shaheen, US Senator (NH)  
Kelly Ayotte, US Senator (NH)

**20141224-0006(30017630).pdf**

Hand written letter, Pamela Shuet-Sargent, Rindge, NH, opposing

**20141224-0007(30017631).pdf**

Hand written letter, Carol Mannarino, Wilton, NH, opposing

**20141224-0009(30017797).pdf**

Hand written letter, Nick Miller, Groton, MA, opposing

**20141224-0010(30017807).pdf**

Hand written letter, Keith B. Williams, Mason, NH, opposing

**20141224-0011(30017490).pdf**

Hand written letter, Patricia A. Martin, Rindge, NH, opposing

**20141224-0012(30017629).pdf**

Hand written letter, Cheri Grovesteen, Mason, NH, opposing

**20141224-0013(30022193).pdf**

Hand written card, Theresa Garcia, 175 Collins Pond Rd, Fitzwilliam, NH 03447, opposing

**20141224-0014(30017776).pdf**

Hand written letter, Wiltrud(?) R. Mott-Smith, Louden, NH, opposing

**20141224-0015(30017775).pdf**

Hand written letter, Betty Anders, Rindge, NH, opposing

**20141224-0016(30017788).pdf**

Hand written letter, Amy Ladner, Brookline, NH, opposing

**20141224-0017(30017793).pdf**

Hand written letter, Michael A. McGuire, P.E., Mason, NH, opposing

**20141224-0018(30017795).pdf**

Hand written letter, Katharine Gregg, Mason, NH, opposing

**20141224-0019(30017796).pdf**

Hand written letter, William Anders, Rindge, NH, opposing

**20141224-0020(30017777).pdf**

Hand written letter, Alism(?) Jaskiewicz, Mason, NH, opposing

**20141224-0021(30017781).pdf**

Hand written letter, Barbara H. Roberts, Worcester, MA, opposing

**20141224-0022(30017782).pdf**

Hand written letter, Patricia A Martin, Rindge, NH, opposing

**20141224-0023(30017784).pdf**

Hand written letter, Karen Couture, Mason, NH, opposing

**20141224-0024(30017785).pdf**

Hand written letter, Christine Bemis, Amherst, NH, opposing

**20141224-0025(30017786).pdf**

Hand written letter, Melinda Hildret Honkala, Richmond, NH, opposing

**20141224-0026(30017787).pdf**

Hand written letter, Elaine M Nelson, New Ipswich, NH, opposing

**20141224-0027(30017789).pdf**

Hand written letter, Donald Hodges, Mason, NH, opposing

**20141224-0028(30017794).pdf**

Hand written letter, Lawrence DeVito, Mason, NH, opposing

**20141224-5003(30015554).pdf**

Jason Iannuzzo, Mason, NH.

As the owner of the property located at 318 Townsend Road Mason NH 03048, I am denying permission to Tennessee Gas Pipeline 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 will be considered unauthorized and treated as trespass.

**20141226-5003(30017829).pdf**

Dale Newman, Stephentown, NY.

I am a concerned homeowner in a town near the proposed North East Energy Direct Pipeline . I am a health care worker also and have grave health concerns.

There are serious concerns about the safety record of gas pipelines in general and Kinder Morgan in particular. Gas leaks threaten sensitive aquifers, soil, and plant life. Explosions involving pipelines of this size and pressure actually occur and are catastrophic, with the fire being fed by many miles of fuel between shut-off stations, leading to prolong, extremely high-temperature burn. Our communities' emergency response facilities are not equipped to deal with such occurrences. I believe are communities would be better served by investing our time and money in alternative energy sources.

Thank you,

Dale Newman

**20141229-0011(30027271).pdf**

Handwritten letter from Justin Ingrassia, New Ipswich, NH, opposing

**20141229-0012(30027300).pdf**

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

Date: December 17,2014

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Rei Denying property access

As the owner of the property located at:

568 Warwick Rd., Northfield, MA

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.  
Signed



pre-filing process for the proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project (“Project” ). Consistent with statements by the City that the pipeline, as currently proposed, will run through the City’s watershed property, the City intends to participate in the public input process in order to discuss the watershed concern as well as any other concern that is identified through the public input process.

Very truly yours,  
Kathleen E. Degnan, Esq.  
City Solicitor

**20141229-5022(30018212).pdf**

Mark, Milford, NH.

Proposed pipeline location running up and over Federal Hill in Milford, NH is a concern to the neighborhood encompassed between Ponemah Hill Road and Federal Hill Road. The most concerning issue is that since topsoil is very limited on the hill, that Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company will need to use explosives to meet the proposed depth of the pipeline. This blasting may have a negative impact on the aquifer and residential wells in the area. Several residents including myself have had to replace existing wells due to the underlying structure of the hill and any blasting may further endanger existing sources of water. Town services do not include water and sewer and if any of the homes loose existing sources of water it will be very expensive to have new wells dug.

Furthermore though houses were purchased with the knowledge of PSNH Power Corridor Easement, the builder was extremely careful to leave a screening of both mature and immature foliage that mostly hide the lines from direct view from the homes adjacent to the lines. If Tennessee Pipeline is looking to further clear the corridor, lines of sight will be greatly increased and quality and value of the homes will be greatly impacted.

**20141229-5112(30019464).pdf**

Alfio Zappala, Wallkill, NY.

I am commenting in favor of the NED project. It is vital to our community through tax revenues that help infrastructure and our schools. It can benefit our economy and help meet energy demands with minimal environmental impact.

**20141229-5113(30019466).pdf**

Jeffrey Czeck, Godeffroy, NY.

The proposed energy line will be vital to the welfare of many union employees.

1. It provides local employment
2. Better paying jobs
3. Help with the tax revenues to enforce our economy therefore providing better infrastructure to our schools, hospitals, highways, etc. The lesser the overhead.

**20141229-5138(30019625).pdf**

Lawrence G Papule Jr, Marlboro, NY.

This project will provide good paying jobs to local residents. It will also provide tax revenues for local communities. I support this project 100%.

**20141229-5161(30019848).pdf**

Andrew McRell, Livingston, NY.

I support this project.

**20141229-5163(30019871).pdf**

Richard Messina, New Paltz, NY.

I support this project as we have a highly trained workforce available for it and it will create good paying jobs.

**20141230-0019(30023344).pdf**

Handwritten letter, Erik Durmer(?), Fitzwilliam, NH, opposing

**20141230-5022(30020558).pdf**

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:

I do not support this pipeline project. Even the most pro-pipeline studies do not justify the need for the amount of additional natural gas that this pipeline would deliver to the region. The excess gas would undoubtedly be exported as LNG, putting upward pressure on our natural gas prices. And this pipeline would further our dependence on fossil fuels and worsen our greenhouse gas emission problems.

I object to the idea that this project would bring with it “lots of good paying jobs”. These are temporary jobs and the work being done would involve violating the rights of hundreds of New England property owners whose land would be taken from them for the pipeline. Is this really the type of job that we want to foster here? Many of the skilled construction jobs (and the higher wages that go with them) would go to transient workers who would depart (along with their wages) once construction was complete. And these jobs cannot hold a candle to the permanent jobs that would go to New Englanders if this type of investment were made in furthering our renewable energy programs.

The jobs argument simply does not hold up. And it certainly does not justify the approval of a pipeline that is unneeded and unwanted by the citizens of New England. The pipeline continues to be a bad idea for many reasons and the jobs argument does nothing to make it a better one.

Nick Miller

**20141231-0016(30026058).pdf**

Handwritten letter, James Vannatta(?), Northfield, MA, opposing

**20150102-5000(30026325).pdf**

Emily Kirkland, Somerville, MA.

It's clear that Massachusetts citizens are against the Kinder Morgan pipeline and the Spectra pipeline expansion -- the grassroots movement against new gas infrastructure is big, and it's only continuing to grow

**20150102-5079(30026965).pdf**

Thomas G. DeVenuto, Lake Lure, NC.

A skilled and trained workforce is available for this project. It will help with tax revenue and create good paying jobs. We need good domestic energy

**20150102-5081(30026971).pdf**

Ida Veles, Goshen, NY.

I am a great supporter of the Northeast Energy Direct Project and I hope that I will be great on this project and work on the pipeline.

**20150102-5086(30027209).pdf**

Michael Byrne, Greenwood Lake, NY.

Keep us working. We need the U.S. gas and the money in the U.S.

**20150102-5087(30027225).pdf**

Charles Spilletta, Monroe, NY.

It's going to create a lot of jobs for many and we need energy sources in the U.S. so aren't so dependent on importing fuel from other countries

**20150102-5088(30027272).pdf**

Willard Meade, Owego, NY.

I am a landowner in the center of the start of hydraulic fracturing once Cuomo gets off his environmental ass. I have two gas lines running through my property w/ zero environmental impact, a hunter's paradise and I continue to remove crops from the land that covers the pipelines. Only positive good can be achieved by constructing the NED project. Let's drill, baby drill.

**20150102-5091(30027376).pdf**

Michael W. Popp, Yorktown Heights, NY.

This project will provide many positive attributes - jobs and positive tax revenue that are much needed. There will be minimal environmental impact and it will bring JOBS, JOBS, JOBS to our struggling, local economy.

**20150102-5092(30027539).pdf**

Peter Kennedy, Waterbury, CT.

Being a Local 17 Laborer, I know we offer the most skilled and hardest working individuals a job of this magnitude needs to be profitable and completed on time, safely.

**20150102-5093(30027562).pdf**

William Hosford, Kingston, NY.

Aside from the many jobs created from the construction of the pipeline, it is hoped that it will also bring affordable energy to the Northeast

**20150102-5095(30027588).pdf**

Daniel J. Daly Jr., Accord, NY.

I think this is good for the community and will provide good paying jobs. I am all for it.

Thank you,

Daniel J. Daly Jr.

**20150102-5098(30027731).pdf**

Thomas Lewis Sr., New Windsor, NY.

It's a good project for the union and for the local area

**20150102-5129(30028640).pdf**

Carol Powley, Swanzey, NH.

I am writing on behalf of myself, and also on behalf of my 84 year old mother who lives in Rindge, NH where the proposed TGP/Kinder Morgan gas transmission pipeline is planned to go through. It is my understanding that the residents of Cheshire County have been given a very short period of time in order to voice their opposition, and this is not acceptable. I am asking you to extend this period.

I grew up in Rindge, and my mother and my step-father still live there. This pipeline will destroy the inherent beauty of our region, will negatively impact the environment, will destroy our ground water, wetlands, rivers, ponds and lakes. Many people have worked for many years to conserve and preserve the land here. And we want to keep it that way. We do not want, by any stretch of the imagination, an ugly pipeline to destroy all that we have known and loved for our entire lives.

The gas being transported is not going to be used for our benefit and we do not want the dangers associated with a pipeline like this. People's lives and property, not to mention the environment and the other denizens of the forests and waterways in the region where we live, will be negatively impacted, and I am respectfully writing to say I am firmly dead set against it!!

**20150102-5134(30029088).pdf**

Nancy Woodward, Fitzwilliam, NH.

The southern New Hampshire pipeline is about exporting gas for profit, having the local rate payer pay for it with a tariff increase to our monthly electricity bills, and decreasing land values wherever the pipeline goes. Why would anyone want to invest in old, outdated, polluting energy systems? Vermont Yankee just closed and now we have to worry about pipeline explosions?!

New Hampshire needs to invest in renewable energy and explore more economical ways to see us through our peak usage times. We don't need a scar ripped across southern New Hampshire, when this project is for building the profits of Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Gas Pipeline and no one else. The gas is not for us.

We need economic choices that benefit New Hampshire.

**20150102-5135(30029090).pdf**

James L. Giddings, Greenville, NH.

I feel uncomfortable submitting multiple comments, since one comment should have been sufficient to express my objections to the siting of this pipeline through my town, Greenville, NH, or through any of the rural towns Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas propose to run it in New Hampshire or Massachusetts.

The reasons for denying this permit are:

1. The pipeline is not needed to provide for any foreseeable "demand" in New England. New England electric utilities need excess supplies of fuel only during brief periods of high demand; this pipeline would provide something like four times as much as could conceivably be needed. The capacity of the pipeline implies that it would primarily provide gas for export via LNG ports in the US and Canada. If a corporation has agreed to buy and distribute some of the gas in New England, there is no contract that would enforce this deal. If demand in India, Lithuania or China is the true reason for building this pipeline, it is unfair to the US citizens whose lives will be made worse by its building. If your rules do not allow you to weigh the harms created domestically against the "demand" that may exist elsewhere, your rules need to be changed.
2. Pipeline accidents are happening more frequently since the fracking boom began, and the infrastructure of these small rural towns is inadequate to deal with the devastating results.
3. The pipeline takes people's land, lives and livelihoods away using threats and eminent domain.

4. The pipeline endangers protected areas and watersheds, etc.

5. The methane emissions caused by the fracking, pipeline leaks, compressors, pigging stations, etc. will contribute greatly to climate catastrophe, and, wherever it is burned, the natural gas will contribute to the CO2 pollution.

It has come to my attention that “proponents” of the pipeline now post hundreds of comments per day. I suspect that those with a large financial interest in having the pipeline built are either paying or otherwise rewarding proponents for posting these. Those of us opposing the pipeline are volunteers, unpaid, and acting on behalf of ourselves and our communities. We are flesh and blood human beings, not corporate entities with slush funds. If the sheer number of comments for and against the pipeline are all that counts, we are at an unfair disadvantage. Those of us in New Hampshire did not even learn of the plans to invade our towns until months after the announcement was made in Massachusetts.

**20150102-5153(30029757).pdf**

Jon Michael Vore, Amherst, NH.

Public Opposition to Proposed Natural Gas Pipeline

I am writing to urge FERC to reject the proposed Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline proposed by Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline (Docket# PF14- 22).

We were recently informed by Kinder Morgan (in a letter dated December 12th 2014) that the “Northeast Energy Direct Project was a federal undertaking regulated by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission”. Previously they had proposed that the entire project be located in Massachusetts. When heavy resistance was met, the proposed route moved north into New Hampshire where they felt there’d be less resistance. Initially, they routed the line through Hollis and Brookline, where once again significant resistance was found from those citizens. Kinder Morgan once again changed the route avoiding some of those communities.

Kinder Morgan states that they decided to move the proposed gas line northward so they could collocate with high voltage electrical lines already in existence. Information contained within Kinder Morgan’s documentation shows this is not the case. They state that they will use 15’ of existing power line right of way but will still need an additional 85’ of temporary construction space, and that 50’ of this will be allowed to regrow. However, their documentation clearly states that 0’ of existing right of way will be used in the final path. Their documentation is misleading in that they will not be using the existing right of way at all but running a new parallel corridor.

In addition, the proposed path deviates from the main power lines and goes directly over my well, down my driveway and through my neighbors’ yards. It then crosses over the Souhegan River 4 times in the span of 1/2 of a mile. This river contains 28 threatened or endangered species that inevitably would be negatively affected by the project. The route deviates from the power line route to avoid our high school and middle school. Kinder Morgan claims that natural gas is a safe technology and does not negatively affect our environment, water supply or even property values. If this technology is so safe then why can’t the pipeline continue to collocate with the power lines and bisect the schools? If they are concerned with the possibility of a catastrophic failure then why is it ok if this disaster occurs within feet of my house and children?

My neighborhood is located along the Souhegan River and we have shallow, point driven wells. Our wells only extend about 35 feet into the ground into a local aquifer. Blasting and construction associated with this project could interfere with our water supply. Furthermore we are concerned that the proposed gas pipelines, which have been known to leak small amounts of their content, may contaminate our drinking supply for years to come.

Kinder Morgan posts a number of articles on their website alleging that property values are not negatively affected when a gas pipeline is placed on private property. Other articles show a 30-40% decrease in the value of a property that contains a natural gas pipeline. Some mortgages even have clauses that nullify the agreement if hazardous material is placed on that property. Technically the mortgage company could request

that the remaining loan be paid in 30 days. Most of us do not have the entire amount of our mortgage saved in a bank account waiting to be paid. Additionally, my homeowner's insurance is likely to increase. Not only will I have to deal with the aesthetic changes that come with the pipeline, but I would have to bear a larger financial burden than even the other residents of my town. I have considered selling my home but honestly, who would buy a home that has a high pressure gas line buried through it especially if getting a mortgage was uncertain and homeowner's insurance is significantly higher? Kinder Morgan would compensate us for the land they use, but the financial compensation that they provide would nowhere near compensate us for the economic loss that we would experience.

Kinder Morgan states that we need this pipeline to help meet an energy shortfall in New England. This pipeline is proposed to carry 2.2 billion cubic feet of natural gas on a daily basis. Current estimates show that only 0.7 billion cubic feet per day of natural gas is needed to meet our needs. Further, this only occurs during extreme cold spells (10-27 days per year for only a few hours each day) when gas is used to create heat as opposed to electricity. More importantly 1/3 of the energy shortfall could be found by repairing older pipelines in order to fix leaks. The other 2/3 could be made up by expanding current energy efficiency and energy conservation programs. Where does the excess 1.5 billion cubic feet per day go? Kinder Morgan's website suggests that all of the gas, not just the excess, could be exported to Canada and overseas and will not even benefit New England. Kinder Morgan states it is not in the business of local distribution of gas and a local distributor in New England would need to step in for New Hampshire to benefit from this natural resource.

As a potentially affected landowner I ask that you reject Kinder Morgan's proposed project (Docket# PF 14-22). This project has little to no benefit for the residents of New England and puts the affected individuals at great personal and financial risk. The upside will be experienced by Kinder Morgan and its shareholders with increased profits. We should not spend millions and billions of dollars on increasing an out-of-date technology that harms our environment and does not provide us with a long term solution to our energy needs. We need to invest that money in fixing the current infrastructure we have, as well as exploring newer, cleaner forms of energy production. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Jon Michael Vore  
Amherst, NH 03031

**20150102-5159(30029825).pdf**

Betty L Anders, Rindge, NH.

The current proposed route of the pipeline has it coming within 800 feet of my property. I am growing concerned with the possibility of gas leakage and well contamination as seen in other projects taken on by Kinder-Morgan. Please take into consideration the environmental impact over investing in a resource that does not have a long life... soon, there will be no more LNG and hopefully fracking will be banned throughout the country. The devastation that these projects leave behind are shameful.

Why are we not investing our resources into more sustainable energy projects?

**20150105-0028(30034533).pdf**

Handwritten letter, D. Sullivan, New Ipswich, NH 03071, opposing

**20150105-0029(30034534).pdf**

Hand written letter, Laurel Cameraon, Rindge, NH 03461, opposing

**20150105-0030(30034529).pdf**

Hand written letter, K. Sullivan, New Ipswich, NH, 0371, opposing

**20150105-0031(30034530).pdf**

Hand written letter, Kay Sullivan, Kings Park, NY, 11754, opposing

**20150105-0032(30034531).pdf**

Hand written letter, Sullivan Family, New Ipswich, NH 03071, opposing

**20150105-0033(30034532).pdf**

Hand written letter, Kerry P. Gagne, Fitzwilliam, NH 03447, opposing

**20150105-5006(30030594).pdf**

Ruth Joan Unger, Tewksbury, MA.

Date: January 3, 2015

To: FERC

I am writing to make you aware that my fiancé and I are adamantly opposed to the pipeline. We have attended various informational meetings and have found out that:

1. There is already in existence viable route through the southern part of Massachusetts. There is no need for a second path through the northern part of the state. Google the maps, you will see them. The existing southern path ends at the same point and can be upgraded for less cost to the users than this new route. Face it, if this new pipeline is approved, we users are going to be forced to pay for this one-way or the other... We do not need it!
2. The proposed pipeline would impose a tremendous safety issue. These lines operate under extremely high pressure and are highly volatile and flammable. When they rupture, they create a blast zone of over 300-600 feet, the flying burning debris creates fires wherever it lands. Homes and lives will be lost
3. Energy needs are actually DECREASING and the pipeline is of such a large volume it is clear this line is intended to deliver gas overseas. The Solarize Mass program has had tremendous success in causing homeowners throughout the state to "solarize" and get off the grid. There are also competing Hydroelectric and Nuclear supplies applying to come down from NH and Canada. Great options to Fossil Fuels...
4. My neighbors and I love the conservation areas and protected wetlands and do NOT want them disturbed. The tract of wild land between Cardigan and Brown is an uninterrupted wildlife habitat . The KM plan will clear cut it and prevent trees from ever growing over it again. Herbicides will be sprayed on a regular basis. The Wildlife Habitat will be lost forever, Our Town is in a watershed area for 3 Rivers.
5. A Kentucky judge ruled AGAINST the pipeline stating that the project was not for the common good but to make a multi-billion dollar company even more lucrative.
6. The Merrimack River watershed, Shawsheen River Watershed and Ipswich River watershed would be involved and this supplies water to over 1,000,000 residences. It also supports the wildlife and flora in our area. We cannot allow the 30-50 foot clear cut of trees to be allowed, nor ongoing maintenance herbicides to be sprayed. The trees and vegetation here play an integral role in filtering pollutants out and providing clean drinking water into those rivers. Herbicides cannot be allowed. Those trees should not be cut down. This would only result in pollution of the Clean water which needs to be fed to the 3 vital rivers- Merrimack, Shawsheen and Ipswich...
7. Western MA has been extremely pro-active and their legislators and officials are behind them. To date 41 Towns through which this Company threatened to pass their pipeline have opposed this pipeline.
8. If you "Google" Kinder Morgan you will see about all of the deaths, illegal dealings, explosions, felonies, fatalities, spills, fires, and hospitalizations that have occurred because of this companies practices. You can also check this link: [http://www.sightline.org/wpcontent/uploads/downloads/2012/02/Coal-Kinder-Morgan-April-12\\_final.pdf](http://www.sightline.org/wpcontent/uploads/downloads/2012/02/Coal-Kinder-Morgan-April-12_final.pdf)

9. My neighbors and I were literally harassed by Kinder Morgan trying to get permission to survey our properties on Cardigan Road. They came in as Bullies and tried to intimidate us with threats of eminent domain. When my Lawyer asked them for more information about their intended path beyond my yard, through my immediate neighborhood, Kinder Morgan Agents refused to provide it. Clearly, they did not want homeowners to have informed discussions with each other.

10. If you look at a map of the pipeline route proposed through my back yard, you will see how narrow the area between the Cardigan Road and Brown Street Properties actually is. This is a highly developed, highly assessed residential area of valuable single family homes on 1 acre lots. Installation of the pipeline requires certain setbacks and room that does not exist here. This pipeline will also diminish the value of the homes in the area, depriving owners of their equity. The land where TGP works needs to support large and heavy equipment, and room to excavate and remove trees in the process. This “room” that they need does not exist and therefore this pipeline should NOT be allowed.

11. I recognize the Town of Tewksbury already has numerous gas lines to service many of our residences, but those are smaller and run at a much lower pressure than the line now being proposed. This new line is not intended to service Tewksbury. There is no benefit to Tewksbury. Even if it was, the pressure is so great that it would pose a tremendous danger to our residents and should be denied even in that case. There is a great risk here, with no benefit to weigh against it. No benefit whatsoever.

12. Kinder Morgan has chosen our Town as a path because they see it as the least expensive route for them, no matter what the cost to the homeowners here.. There is no proof this line is necessary. Even if more gas is needed there are adequate alternatives which can be developed at a far lesser expense, to fill any energy void..

Please consider these things and oppose the pipeline!

Sincerely,

Joan Unger and Jim Harmon  
Tewksbury, MA

**20150105-5036(30031194).pdf**

Catherine Hayes, Townsend, MA.

As a resident of a one of the towns impacted by the application, I strongly urge it be denied. Primarily, studies commissioned by NESCOE show 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. Slated to run through over a thousand private and public properties, the environmental disruption this application will cause is not acceptable, particularly with the poor record of infrastructure management for existing pipelines. Finally, this application is requesting a far larger project than the projected need, guaranteeing that while Massachusetts bears the brunt of the ecological and financial penalties of the pipeline, the bulk of the gas will be exported elsewhere. We do not need this or any project that is a disincentive for developing renewable energy sources or poses a health and environmental risk.

**20150105-5098(30032568).pdf**

Cheryl A. Barret, Dracut, MA.

January 5,2015

I want to voice my opposition to the Kinder Morgan Tennessee Gas Pipeline being expanded through the town of Dracut, Massachusetts. I feel this pipeline being proposed to run through the residential neighborhood of Pelczar Road and Sesame Street endangers human life and safety. There is a quarry in close proximity to this residential area which carries out frequent blasting increasing the probability of a catastrophic occurrence. In addition there is a named brook which runs through several of the properties very close to the Mass Electric power lines running behind and through many of these properties. The power lines don't pose

the danger of venting poisonous, flammable gases as the pipeline does. We get our drinking water from a well on the property. The drinking water and the brook would both be contaminated by a pipeline.

I've seen the most current map of the proposed areas affected, and read reports which indicate to me that the acreage necessary for them to even begin work would claim my entire property. They propose to run this pipeline through many other areas within close proximity to, or right through, established residential areas, valuable farmlands, churches, and conservation areas which shows just how willing they are "to minimize the project's impact." Instead of their supposed good will toward the Northeast they show a complete disregard for life and safety, and no concern for the stewardship of the land.

Please do not approve this project.

Cheryl Barret  
Dracut, MA.

**20150105-5101(30032626).pdf**

Cheryl A. Barret, Dracut, MA.

January 5, 2015

I want to voice my opposition to the Kinder Morgan Tennessee Gas Pipeline being expanded through the town of Dracut, Massachusetts. I feel this pipeline being proposed to run through the residential neighborhood of Pelczar Road and Sesame Street endangers human life and safety. There is a quarry in close proximity to this residential area which carries out frequent blasting increasing the probability of a catastrophic occurrence. In addition there is a named brook which runs through several of the properties very close to the Mass Electric power lines running behind and through many of these properties. The power lines don't pose the danger of venting poisonous, flammable gases as the pipeline does. We get our drinking water from a well on the property. The drinking water and the brook would both be contaminated by a pipeline.

I've seen the most current map of the proposed areas affected, and read reports which indicate to me that the acreage necessary for them to even begin work would claim my entire property. They propose to run this pipeline through many other areas within close proximity to, or right through, established residential areas, valuable farmlands, churches, and conservation areas which shows just how willing they are "to minimize the project's impact." Instead of their supposed good will toward the Northeast they show a complete disregard for life and safety, and no concern for the stewardship of the land.

Please do not approve this project.

Cheryl Barret  
Dracut, MA.

**20150105-5157(30034315).pdf**

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

January 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

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. On November 5, 2014, Tennessee filed drafts of Resource Report 1 and Resource Report 10. Among the route alternatives discussed in the November 5, 2014 draft Resource Report 10 for the Market Path component of the Project (Wright, New York to Dracut, Massachusetts) were the New York Powerline Alternative and the New Hampshire Powerline Alternative (see Sections 10.3.1.2 and 10.3.1.8 of draft Resource Report 10). These two alternatives involved co-locating the pipeline along an existing electric transmission line in eastern New York, western Massachusetts, and southern New Hampshire.

Tennessee, on December 8, 2014, submitted a filing in which it adopted the New York Powerline Alternative and the New Hampshire Powerline Alternative as its proposed route as part of the Market Path component of the Project. In the December 8, 2014 filing, Tennessee noted that it was adopting this revised route at an early date in the pre-filing process to permit transparent stakeholder/public consultation and the development of the additional resource reports reflecting the revised route that would be submitted during the pre-filing process. Tennessee submitted a revised Resource Report 1 to reflect the adoption of the New York Powerline Alternative and the New Hampshire Powerline Alternative as part of the proposed Project, as well as providing updated mapping and stakeholder lists). In the filing, Tennessee discussed the ongoing development of the resource reports for the Project and the schedule for submitting the remaining resource reports.

Although a revised Resource Report 10 was not included in the December 8, 2014 filing, Tennessee will submit a revised Resource Report 10, along with a revised Resource Report 1, in March 2015 as part of the first draft of the Environmental Report (Resource Reports 1 through 13). This draft Environmental Report will reflect the revised route for the Market Path component of the Project, including in a revised Resource Report 10 identification of system and routing alternatives and evaluation of those identified alternatives in comparison to the proposed Project facilities. Tennessee will be hosting open houses throughout the Project area in the first quarter of 2015 to provide additional information about the Project and to answer questions from interested stakeholders concerning the Project. Following submittal of the first draft of the Environmental Report that will include the revised route and the open houses, affected landowners and members of the public are encouraged to file comments on the identified alternatives and analysis of those alternatives that will be included in the revised Resource Report 10, rather than commenting at this time on the alternative analysis submitted in November 2014.

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 this filing to the Office of Energy Projects. A copy of this letter will also be sent to all affected stakeholders. 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

cc: Mr. Rich McGuire (Commission Staff)  
Mr. Michael McGehee (Commission Staff)  
Mr. Eric Tomasi (Commission Staff)

**20150106-0006(30036775).pdf**

*{File 30034868\_1.tif cannot be converted to PDF.}*

Hand written card, Eric Hannett, 990 W Coach Rd, Fitzwilliam, NH 03447, opposing

**20150106-0007(30036774).pdf**

Hand written card, John M. Poltrack, 47 Fox Farm Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, opposing

**20150106-0008(30036773).pdf**

Hand written card, Valerie Gill, 299 Upper Troy Rd, Fitzwilliam, NH 03447, opposing

**20150106-0009(30036776).pdf**

Hand written card, Thomas & Vivian Thompson, 211 Timbertop Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, opposing

**20150106-0010(30036777).pdf**

Hand written card, Coni Porter, 35 Sunset Rd, Fitzwilliam, NH 03447, opposing

**20150106-0012(30036763).pdf**

December 27, 2014

To: Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, N.E. Room 1A  
Washington, D.C. 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company. LLC, Docket No. PF14-22  
In Opposition to Proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project

Accompanying letters from Mason NH Conservation Commission Document that this Project is a threat to the integrity of New Hampshire Conservation Easements and Conservation Lands.

From: **Mason Conservation Commission**  
Robert B.Larochelle, Chairman

December 24, 2014

Dijit Taylor  
Executive Director  
LCHIP  
13 West Street, Suite 3  
Concord, NH 03301

Dear Dijit,

Mason Conservation Commission would like to ask LCHIP for assistance in dealing with a serious threat to the integrity of the Fifield Tree Farm Conservation Easement. This threat arises from the recently announced NH route for Northeast Energy Direct Project's large high-pressure gas pipeline. Kinder Morgan and its subsidiary Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co. propose to locate this project adjacent to the PSNH right-of-way crossing 17 southern NH towns. Construction of this pipeline would involve clearing a swath up to 150 feet wide across the northern part of the Fifield Tree Farm, crossing Spaulding Brook. Fifty feet of this would never be allowed to grow back. Herbicides could be used here, even in wetlands, to prevent the growth of anything other than grasses and other shallow-rooted species.

Kinder Morgan plans further violation of the Fifield Tree Farm Conservation Easement by extending a smaller gas pipeline, the Fitchburg Lateral, southward across Spaulding Brook in the western part of the Tree Farm on Black Brook Road. Our 2014 easement monitoring includes photographs of both these proposed pipeline routes.

The Spaulding Brook corridor and nearly all of the Fifield Tree Farm lying north of this brook is mapped as Highest Ranked Habitat in New Hampshire by the NH Wildlife Action Plan. Recognizing its significant natural quality, LCHIP invested in permanently protecting this outstanding habitat. And the Fifield family generously enabled this investment by granting the Fifield Tree Farm Conservation Easement at a very reduced price. Through this donation, the family sought to secure the natural values of their land in perpetuity. A conservation easement creates a public trust forever.

No private company should be allowed to violate this public trust for a project of dubious need. Mason Conservation Commission has voted to oppose this pipeline project because it poses a threat to Mason's natural resources. The extensive blasting involved in construction would imperil water supplies — all Mason's residents depend on their own groundwater wells. The subsequent herbicide use would menace aquatic habitat — Craig Fifield remembers dead fish appearing in Spaulding Brook after PSNH applied herbicide to the powerline corridor in the 1970s. For the past two decades PSNH has used physical means to control vegetation. But the gas pipeline company includes herbicides in its vegetation control plan, citing the practice as the preferred method of control in wetlands.

Mason Conservation Commission urges you and LCHIP staff to take whatever steps you can to preserve the integrity of the Fifield Tree Farm Conservation Easement. We fear threats like this can undermine people's confidence in conservation easements, leading to a loss of faith in this tool among potential future contributors. We strongly encourage you to express LCHIP's concern to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC), and to all state officials and legislators who should be concerned.

Below is FERC's mailing address, with the project docket number. FERC's website can be difficult to navigate. At [www.nhpipelineawareness.org](http://www.nhpipelineawareness.org) there is helpful information on accessing the FERC comment process.

Many thanks for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Robert B. Larochelle  
Chairman, Mason Conservation Commission

FERC mailing address:  
Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, N.E.  
Washington, D.C. 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
Proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project (Docket No. PF14-22)

Copies of this letter have been sent to the following:

Governor Maggie Hassan  
Senator Kelly Ayotte  
Senator Jeanne Shaheen  
Representative Annie Kuster  
Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
State Senator Kevin Avar  
State Representative Jack Flanagan  
State Representative Christopher Adams  
Glenn Normandeau, Executive Director, NH Fish and Game  
Tom Burack, Commissioner, NH Dept. of Environmental Services (NHDES)  
Eugene Forbes P.E., Director, NHDES Water Division  
Tracey Boisvett, Director, NH Conservation Land Stewardship Program  
Meredith Hatfield, Director, NH Office of Energy and Planning (NHOEP)  
Karen Cramton, NHOEP Deputy Director and Administrator of Energy Programs

Craig Fifield  
Mason Board of Selectmen

**20150106-5000(30034412).pdf**

Rachel Eckles, Boston, MA.

Commissioners of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, I ask of you to realize the power of the authority you have in the decision to allow construction of this new natural gas pipeline project. By denying the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company the right to build yet another destructive and disruptive pipeline, you would be giving the energy industry a desperately needed wake up call. Massachusetts needs to get more creative and not rely on the exploitation of other state's resources. I am not affected by this pipeline's construction directly but I spent my summer helping the people who would be and they care more than just about themselves and their property, they have the biggest hearts and want to ensure well-being for humanity. There are alternative solutions that need to seriously be considered and the long run effects should be the number one determinant of this pipeline's construction.

**20150106-5004(30034434).pdf**

Tanya Chesnell, Mason, NH.

To allow eminent domain in order to build this pipeline is theft of NH land owners. The pipeline will not only destroy the character of NH's first town, the historical birthplace of Uncle Sam, but it will destroy undisturbed habitats of many wildlife species, including wetlands, which ought to be protected from disgraceful construction such as this pipeline. There are other options for energy, and the government should be looking into developing more eco-friendly options, rather than take the lazy way out and allow this pipeline to plow through our natural resources. The disturbance area is enormous, and it would be devastating to a town that prides itself on its woodland, rural nature. Listen to the people, not the money grubbing gas companies. The small town residents need to be heard. We will not stand for this.

**20150106-5006(30034438).pdf**

tanya chesnell, Wilton, NH.

Because the pipeline project proposed by Kinder Morgan and associated companies furthers the nation's investment in and reliance on natural gas obtained through hydrofracking, an environmentally destructive and unsustainable practice,

Because the pipeline by virtue of excessive capacity is clearly intended to supply gas primarily for export and is therefore only incidentally of benefit to NH citizens,

Because the pipeline plan calls in part for herbicide use, even within wetlands, to keep the right-of-way clear, such protracted use being potentially harmful to the environment in general and Mason's water supply in particular,

Because burying the pipeline will in Mason required extensive blasting that could adversely affect private wells, the town's only source of drinking water,

Because of the potential loss of or disturbance to designated conservation lands and known uncommon wildlife habitat along the pipeline route,

Because the pipeline extends New Hampshire's use of fossil fuel with the potential to further degrade the planet's atmosphere through carbon and greenhouse gas emission,

And because further investment in fossil fuel infrastructure directly contradicts the course of action outlined in "The New Hampshire Climate Action Plan" aimed at reducing carbon emissions in the state by 80% compared to 1990 levels by the year 2050

**20150106-5201(30036675).pdf**

William R. Steele, Painted Port, NY.

Many Local 785, 1358 people live in the path of this gas pipeline, our locals will do the very best job possible. We need good paying jobs, our energy bills are too high. We high a great and highly trained workforce. We need this project.

Thank you,  
William R. Steele

**20150106-5202(30036677).pdf**

Louis Falank, Binghamton, NY.

Families have struggled due to lack of jobs in our area for many years. What a great opportunity for families, local businesses, tax revenue, and growth for our areas.

**20150106-5203(30036678).pdf**

Joseph A. Felice, Waterloo, NY.

I support this project.

**20150106-5204(30036679).pdf**

Heidi Allen, Apalachin, NY.

Our community needs the work this project will provide.

**20150106-5210(30036706).pdf**

Rex M Bleck, Cortland, NY.

I support the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project because it will create good paying jobs.

**20150106-5219(30036687).pdf**

Duane R. Whitehead, Deposit, NY.

This pipeline would help keep unemployment down, would help build our economy from workers spending money in our area.

**20150106-5224(30036700).pdf**

Chris Bushnell, Cortland, NY.

As a field representative for Laborers' Local 785, the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline will provide well paying union jobs for our members. It will also supply much-needed low cost domestic energy to Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New Hampshire. This pipeline job will also inject money into many local economies.

**20150107-4011(30039939).pdf**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
**FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION**  
PRE-FILING PROCESS CONFERENCE CALL NOTES

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC

Docket No: PF14-22-000

NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT PROJECT

December 4, 2014

2:00PM EST/1:00 PM CST

Attendees:

- > Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC)
  - o Eric Tomasi
  - o Paul Friedman
  - o Jenny McCoy (EDGE, contractor for FERC)
  - o Louise Holley (EDGE, contractor for FERC)
- > Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (Tennessee Gas)
  - o Mike Letson
  - o Scott Long
  - o Harold (Howdy) McCracken

Meeting Summary

FERC and Tennessee Gas held a conference call to discuss the proposed Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project. Tennessee Gas updated the FERC regarding the status of land access and surveys, the proposed Project route, and the status of Tennessee Gas's Environmental Resource Report 1. In addition, FERC and the applicant discussed Native American tribal concerns.

**20150107-4012(30039940).pdf**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
**FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION**  
 PRE-FILING PROCESS CONFERENCE CALL NOTES

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC

Docket No: PF14-22-000

NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT PROJECT

December 18, 2014

2:00PM EST/1:00 PM CST

Attendees:

- > Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC)
  - o Eric Tomasi
  - o Jenny McCoy (EDGE, contractor for FERC)
  - o Louise Holley (EDGE, contractor for FERC)
- > Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (Tennessee)
  - o Mike Letson
  - o Perry Luu
  - o Harold (Howdy) McCracken
  - o Hope Luhman (Louis Berger)
  - o Dell Gould (Louis Berger)
  - o Doug Gibbons (Hatch Mott McDonald)

Meeting Summary

FERC and Tennessee held a conference call to discuss the proposed Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project. Tennessee updated the FERC regarding the status of land access and surveys, the proposed Project route, outreach, and the schedule for Tennessee's open houses. In addition, FERC and the applicant discussed timing of Environmental Information Request 1.

**20150107-5000(30036716).pdf**

Michael Ponzi, Endicott, NY.

The Northeast Energy Direct Project will help revitalize the economy as well as create numerous jobs for local, hardworking people. It is time to support the project and support the working class.

**20150107-5002(30036725).pdf**

DuSegrue, Kirkwood, NY.

We would like to be supplied with local energy without jeopardizing our wonderful environment. Local labor can provide quality, safe, work on the pipeline. Jobs and domestic energy are very important and the NED project will provide them.

**20150107-5003(30036728).pdf**

Trevor Meyers, Andover, NY.

The NED Project will bring good paying jobs to our area.

**20150107-5012(30036781).pdf**

Susan Silverman, Fitzwilliam, NH.

Concerns of the Town of Fitzwilliam, NH and residents regarding the construction of the natural gas pipeline by Kinder Morgan and the TGP as part of the NED project:

- Water: the adverse effects of potential blasting along the pipeline corridor that may contaminate private water wells, streams and water bodies
- Headwaters: Fitzwilliam contains the headwaters for 4 watersheds, and the disruption of any of these may have far-reaching consequences
- Conservation Land: the taking of conservation land that has been set aside over a long period of years with the support of the town to be preserved in pristine condition for the future of the town. To use this for commercial purposes is antithetical to the concept of conservation.
- Herbicides: The projected extensive use of herbicides on the pipeline corridor would be devastating to the wetlands, water supplies, and water bodies, including the watersheds and cause health and safety problems.
- Contaminants: The effect of construction materials, dust and potential hazardous contaminants in environmentally sensitive areas would be problematic

The Tennessee Natural Gas pipeline proposal put forward by Kinder Morgan is inconsistent with the Town of Fitzwilliam's goal of preserving the Town's rural character as stated in the master plan.

The proposal is inconsistent with the Town's goal of protecting and preserving the water quality of the Town's lakes, rivers, streams, brooks, estuaries, wetlands and groundwater.

The proposal would have an adverse impact on property values within the town thereby reducing tax revenues and impairing the tax base of the town. The tax revenue from the pipeline would not make up for the loss of quality of life and property values.

The proposal would adversely affect the aesthetics within the town by disturbing pristine wetlands, forestlands, recreational and conservation areas, as well as hunting and animal habitats due to the wide swath of cleared corridor, access and maintenance roads.

The proposal would adversely affect health and safety within the town by causing construction materials, dust and hazardous contaminants to enter wetland areas, groundwater or aquifers.

The proposal would adversely affect the town as it would traverse large tracts of conservation land and would involve economic uses inconsistent with other uses such as silviculture and agriculture.

The town opposes the approval of the pipeline because the town lacks the required equipment or personnel for emergency services to adequately address potential health and safety risks that the proposal presents.

**20150107-5014(30036809).pdf**

Tom Wilder, Merrimack, NH.

Dear Sirs,

As a concerned New Hampshire citizen, I am writing to urge you to oppose, publicly and forcefully, the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline proposed by Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline. Energy planning for New Hampshire should have a vision of energy sources of the future. Current renewable resources like solar, wind and hydro should be considered for our future path. Investments in the development of these technologies and newer ones would support New Hampshire's energy needs well beyond the lifetime of depleting fossil fuels.

The natural gas industry proposes a future of new pipeline projects. They ignore that the gas in the pipelines is not sustainable for the future. NY State recently introduced a ban on fracking for gas after seeing the damage it has caused to the residents and land of both Pennsylvania and W. Virginia. New pipelines will destroy scenic New Hampshire as easement swaths are cleared of everything but grasses. They put our precious natural water supply at risk during construction and later in operation as they leak. They put our residents at risk from contaminated water in their private home wells and explosions occurring on what once was their "private" property. Claims of "clean burning" gas puts our children at risk by ignoring that methane gas is released during the drilling, transportation and distribution of natural gas causing far more greenhouse gas than burning either oil or coal.

The New England concerns of natural gas "shortages" are based on a few high demand hours during a few weeks of the coldest months of the year. The remainder of the hours in the day and the remaining days of the year our pipeline capacity is more than adequate. This means our gas "shortages" could be solved with planning and storage of fuel during less than high demand periods.

Large projects such as the proposed Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Energy Direct project would trample the hard earned and wellpreserved properties of smaller communities in southwest and south-central New Hampshire. Residents and local governments are told of a New England need for 600 million cubic feet/day by ISO New England. The Northeast Energy Direct pipeline project proposed by KM/TGP is being planned for 2.2 Bcf/d. With nearly four times the capacity called for, where is the other three quarters of that capacity destined? The terminal hub in Dracut is also connection point to the Maritimes & Northeast (M&NE) pipeline which has just applied to switch direction, bringing gas from Massachusetts, through Maine to the Maritimes of Canada, where two ports have just applied to switch from import to export. Bear Head LNG Corporation is planning to spend \$2.2 billion of LNG Ltd.'s money on a proposed LNG compression and export facility in Nova Scotia, which will process 4 million tons per year, for starters, "and expand as gas becomes available at Bear Head." Without the NED Pipeline, there isn't a currently viable supply route for natural gas from the Marcellus Shale Gas play into Nova Scotia. LNG Ltd. claims to be in discussions with somebody who will soon be able to provide their facility with a lot of natural gas capacity. Those discussions must be pretty well along if LNG Ltd. is willing to put aside the billions of dollars necessary to get their export site approved, built, and operational by 2019.

My reasonable conclusion is that the proposed NED Pipeline was never meant to serve New England's energy needs. From the start, that's been a pretense to get natural gas from the fracking fields of Marcellus to the export terminals in Canada. Yes, as the natural gas whooshes through our forests, conservation lands, and neighborhoods subjecting property owners and their families to unnecessary risks, we will have an opportunity to buy some of it for the 30 days out of the year that we may actually need it. However, we will have to stand in line behind Europe, Central America, and Asia so it won't exactly be bargain priced, if there's any left over at all.

In selectman board meetings across the state of Massachusetts and now New Hampshire, KM representatives have repeatedly said that they have no control over who their customers are, so exports are on the table. Their own open season bidding memo called from LNG developers and customers in the Maritimes as well as local distribution and electric utilities. Natural gas is an important "bridge" fuel but future investment in new pipeline infrastructure would be a mistake. The temporary nature of a "bridge" fuel means funds committed to this effort would be better spent on research and renewable sources.

Investment in energy efficiency and conservation is also a key to New Hampshire's energy future. Continu-

ation of these types of programs already in place would reduce our energy demand. New Hampshire should also continue investment in more local power sources. Large centralized sources require transportation of the energy and therefore require destructive easements through our scenic landscape. Local power sources like solar and wind could connect to the grid allowing energy flow on existing power lines without sacrificing more of our forests, residential properties and conservation lands to utility easements.

Please focus future energy plans on renewable energy sources that will be available in the future. Please avoid projects that would increase the infrastructure and dependency on limited fossil fuels. Please consider local power alternatives so that our treasured New Hampshire landscape can be preserved and enjoyed by generations to come.

Thank you,  
Tom Wilder

**20150107-5079(30038497).pdf**

Timothy Brogan, Clifton Park, NY.

Our training is heads and shoulders above the rest. Our energy needs are for real. We also need these good paying jobs. All good infrastructure projects are needed for our towns. Thank you very much

**20150107-5098(30039059).pdf**

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Lisa M Senus under PF14-22-000.

Submission Date: 1/7/2015 12:04:23 PM

Filed Date: 1/7/2015 12:04:23 PM

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 lisa.senus@gmail.com

Basis for Intervening:

MOTION TO INTERVENE OF LEON E. SENUS and LISA M. SENUS

LEON E. SENUS and LISA M. SENUS are residents of the Town of Mason, Hillsborough County, New Hampshire. The proposed right-of-way of the Tennessee Pipeline Company's NED project runs across the Senus property. As a result, approximately 25% of the Senus' property is subject to condemnation if a certificate is granted.

Pursuant to Commission Rules 385.214(b) and 157.10, Leon E. Senus and Lisa M. Senus move to intervene in the above captioned proceeding. This intervention is timely filed.

The Senus' are directly impacted by the proposed pipeline. Their land lies within the right-of-way for the NED pipeline, thus exposing the property to condemnation if the certificate is granted. The pipeline would traverse their property, causing loss of use of approximately 25% of their land, and would cause irreparable damage to the property. Further, their residence will be directly adjacent to the right-of-way, well within the "incineration zone" in the event of an explosion. The residence also relies on a drilled well as its sole water source. Construction activities would jeopardize the integrity of the well. Additionally, there will be ongoing

safety hazards after the project is completed.

Mr. and Mrs. Senus are OPPOSED to the proposed project. They have no further comments at this time. However, by intervening in this proceeding, Mr. and Mrs. Senus will have access to Tennessee Pipeline Company's filings, which will enable them to provide more detailed comments as the application proceeds.

**20150108-0027(30043396).pdf**

September 20, 2014

Chairwoman Cheryl A. LaFleur  
888 First Street NE  
Washington DC, 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Expansion Project

Dear Chairwoman Cheryl A. LaFleur,

I am writing to express my concern with and opposition to the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Direct project. Docket No. PF14-22-000

As a resident of Massachusetts, through which the proposed pipeline is routed, I am directly affected by its potential consequences, including the risk of gas leak-related explosion and contamination, as well as decline in property values and and increase in insurance costs. Furthermore, as currently planned, this project will cross sensitive conservation lands, wetlands, and rivers leaving a permanent scar through some of Massachusetts' most picturesque open spaces and putting many of our towns' primary sources of drinking water at risk of contamination.

The effort to meet Massachusetts' ongoing energy needs should not adversely impact residents' quality of life, nor come at the expense of open space benefiting 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. I

Massachusetts has a strong track record promoting renewable energy, energy efficiency program and a policy to switch to renewable sources of energy generation now and in the future: I urge you to fully prioritize further investment in and deployment of these solutions, and to take any actions as are necessary to begin a public dialog to determine whether this project is necessary or advisable for our state.

Sincerely,

**20150108-0028(30043397).pdf**

September 20, 2014

Chairwoman Cheryl A. LaFleur  
888 First Street NE  
Washington DC, 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Expansion Project

Dear Chairwoman Cheryl A. LaFleur,

I am writing to express my concern with and opposition to the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Direct project. Docket No. PF14-22-000

As a resident of Massachusetts, through which the proposed pipeline is routed, I am directly affected by its potential consequences, including the risk of gas leak-related explosion and contamination, as well as decline in property values and and increase in insurance costs. Furthermore, as currently planned, this project will cross sensitive conservation lands, wetlands, and rivers leaving a permanent scar through some of Massachusetts' most picturesque open spaces and putting many of our towns' primary sources of drinking water at risk of contamination.

The effort to meet Massachusetts' ongoing energy needs should not adversely impact residents' quality of life, nor come at the expense of open space benefiting 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, energy efficiency programs, and a policy to switch to renewable sources of energy generation now and in the future. I urge you to fully prioritize further investment in and deployment of these solutions, and to take any actions as are necessary to begin a public dialog to determine whether this project is necessary or advisable for our state.

Sincerely,

**20150108-0029(30043398).pdf**

September 20, 2014

Chairwoman Cheryl A. LaFleur  
888 First Street NE  
Washington DC, 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Expansion Project

Dear Chairwoman Cheryl A. LaFleur,

I am writing to express my concern with and opposition to the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Direct project. Docket No. PF14-22-000

As a resident of Massachusetts, through which the proposed pipeline is routed, I am directly affected by its potential consequences, including the risk of gas leak-related explosion and contamination, as well as decline in property values and an increase in insurance costs. Furthermore, as currently planned, this project will cross sensitive conservation lands, wetlands, and rivers leaving a permanent scar through some of Massachusetts' most picturesque open spaces and putting many of our towns' primary sources of drinking water at risk of contamination.

The effort to meet Massachusetts' ongoing energy needs should not adversely impact residents' quality of life, nor come at the expense of open space benefiting 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, energy efficiency programs, and a policy to switch to renewable sources of energy generation now and in the future. I urge you to fully prioritize further investment in and deployment of these solutions, and to take any actions as are necessary to begin a public dialog to determine whether this project is necessary or advisable for our state.

Sincerely,

**20150108-0030(30043399).pdf**

September 20, 2014

Chairwoman Cheryl A. LaFleur  
888 First Street NE  
Washington DC, 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Expansion Project

Dear Chairwoman Cheryl A. LaFleur,

I am writing to express my concern with and opposition to the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Direct project. Docket No. PF14-22-000

As a resident of Massachusetts, through which the proposed pipeline is routed, I am directly affected by

its potential consequences, including the risk of gas leak-related explosion and contamination, as well as decline in property values and and increase in insurance costs. Furthermore, as currently planned, this project will cross sensitive conservation lands, wetlands, and rivers leaving a permanent scar through some of Massachusetts' most picturesque open spaces and putting many of our towns' primary sources of drinking water at risk of contamination.

The effort to meet Massachusetts' ongoing energy needs should not adversely impact residents' quality of life, nor come at the expense of open space benefiting 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, energy efficiency programs, and a policy to switch to renewable sources of energy generation now and in the future. I urge you to fully prioritize further investment in and deployment of these solutions, and to take any actions as are necessary to begin a public dialog to determine whether this project is necessary or advisable for our state.

Sincerely,

**20150108-0031(30043394).pdf**

September 20, 2014

Chairwoman Cheryl A. LaFleur  
888 First Street NE  
Washington DC, 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Expansion Project

Dear Chairwoman Cheryl A. LaFleur,

I am writing to express my concern with and opposition to the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Direct project. Docket No. PF14-22-000

As a resident of Massachusetts, through which the proposed pipeline is routed, I am directly affected by its potential consequences, including the risk of gas leak-related explosion and contamination, as well as decline in property values and and increase in insurance costs. Furthermore, as currently planned, this project will cross sensitive conservation lands, wetlands, and rivers leaving a permanent scar through some of Massachusetts' most picturesque open spaces and putting many of our towns' primary sources of drinking water at risk of contamination.

The effort to meet Massachusetts' ongoing energy needs should not adversely impact residents' quality of life, nor come at the expense of open space benefiting 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, energy efficiency programs, and a policy to switch to renewable sources of energy generation now and in the future. I urge you to fully prioritize further investment in and deployment of these solutions, and to take any actions as are necessary to begin a public dialog to determine whether this project is necessary or advisable for our state.

Sincerely,

**20150108-0032(30043331).pdf**

September 20, 2014

Chairwoman Cheryl A. LaFleur  
888 First Street NE  
Washington DC, 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Expansion Project

Dear Chairwoman Cheryl A. LaFleur,

I am writing to express my concern with and opposition to the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Direct project. Docket No. PF14-22-000

As a resident of Massachusetts, through which the proposed pipeline is routed, I am directly affected by its potential consequences, including the risk of gas leak-related explosion and contamination, as well as decline in property values and an increase in insurance costs. Furthermore, as currently planned, this project will cross sensitive conservation lands, wetlands, and rivers leaving a permanent scar through some of Massachusetts' most picturesque open spaces and putting many of our towns' primary sources of drinking water at risk of contamination.

The effort to meet Massachusetts' ongoing energy needs should not adversely impact residents' quality of life, nor come at the expense of open space benefiting 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, energy efficiency programs, and a policy to switch to renewable sources of energy generation now and in the future. I urge you to fully prioritize further investment in and deployment of these solutions, and to take any actions as are necessary to begin a public dialog to determine whether this project is necessary or advisable for our state.

Sincerely,

**20150108-5033(30040838).pdf**

Mark Stec, Milford, NH.

The proposed route of the pipeline infringes on land that was set aside during the construction of the Federal Point Subdivision on Federal Hill in Milford, NH. The property is owned and maintained as open space by the 41 homeowners of the development. The deed and covenant of the property prohibit the construction of any structure on the property. Also prohibited is the removal of any material, disturbance of soil, rock or water above or below ground. Under current covenants no one person can permit Kinder Morgan or Tennessee Pipeline Company to survey that property.

Pipeline route should be shifted west of the proposed route after crossing Coburn Rd in Milford. Pipeline could use power line corridor that runs north along Federal Hill and cross Rte 101 at the intersection of RT13. Pipeline could then run northeast crossing Powers St and Nashua St adjacent to cemetery. The pipeline could then cross the Souhegan River into farmland and cross golf course in Amherst avoiding Ponemah Bog Conservation Area. This proposed route would keep pipeline further away from the private homes along the current proposed route

**20150108-5097(30042067).pdf**

Thomas Marcellino Sr., Amsterdam, NY.

I believe a project like this would be very good for the area because it will create good paying jobs, it will help our school systems and most likely simulate our economy big time!

**20150108-5098(30042071).pdf**

Dale B. Emiglo, Greenfield Center, NY.

I support the NED project because it means jobs. We need all the union jobs we can get. Just because of all the benefits that we get from the union right until we die. Also, we need that pipeline to bring the price of fuel down which will make more jobs so we can live better.

**20150108-5112(30042119).pdf**

Stanley A. Loose, Johnstown, NY.

I am 100% for it. We need good paying jobs for people who live locally.

Our union needs work to build up our pension funds.

Stanley Loose

**20150108-5114(30042126).pdf**

Martin & Kimberly Bullard, Queensbury, NY.

The NED Project will help meet energy demands and it will create good paying jobs. That's why we support it.

**20150108-5116(30042132).pdf**

Harold S. Gifford, Northville, NY.

We would like to have the work in our area, we are a highly skilled workforce and it will be great for our economy. We support this project

**20150108-5117(30042134).pdf**

Paul Lang, Corinth, NY.

I am in support of this pipeline. We need to encourage domestic energy production in our country. This project would provide local jobs for our geographic area and increase tax revenue for our local communities as well. Thank you for your support.

Paul Lang.

**20150108-5122(30042142).pdf**

Pearle B. Stearns, Johnstown, NY.

I believe this project is one more step towards our nation achieving energy independence from foreign countries

**20150108-5127(30042170).pdf**

George Blair, Nassau, NY.

I think it would be a good improvement and help the people. Thank you all for everything that you do. This project would also help create lots of tax revenue for our town locally

**20150108-5128(30042175).pdf**

Edward Richmond, Saratoga Springs, NY.

We have a highly skilled and trained workforce that is ready to go on this project.

**20150108-5129(30042181).pdf**

Patrick Skaarup, Scohairie, NY.

I think the NED Project will have minimal environmental impact and it will provide employment while boosting the local economy

**20150108-5130(30042208).pdf**

Eugene E. Eagle, Fultonham, NY.

This project will help meet energy demands and bring more jobs into our area.

**20150108-5131(30042206).pdf**

Josue O. Ortiz, Albany, NY.

Good hard workers deserve good paying jobs. We also need cheaper ways to heat our homes during this cold weather. People need to remember this is not fracking. These are lines that we need to transport gas from other states to meet our needs in the Northwest.

**20150108-5132(30042212).pdf**

Thomas Marcellino Jr., Amsterdam, NY.

I think a project like this would create some nice paychecks while building it. IT would also help raise money for schools, possibly lowering some taxes in communities that are strapped already with high taxes and a low tax base. I'm for it.

Thomas Marcellino Jr.

**20150108-5133(30042235).pdf**

Anthony Crisorio, Delmar, NY.

I am in complete support of the NED project. I believe that this pipeline will bring new clean energy to our area. I also believe in highly skilled trained workforce that the Unions can provide and good livable wages for all the great Union workers of New York State. Thank you for your support and concerns. God Bless America.

**20150108-5134(30042240).pdf**

Ronald Atkinson, Hudson Falls, NY.

I support the NED Project based on the long term energy needs of New York State and it providing an efficient, cost-effective source of energy. I am especially encouraged by the minimal impact on our environment which will ensure public safety.

Since NYS currently has a skilled and trained (union) workforce in place to complete this project, a highly efficient, safe, and timely completion is expected. Please approve.

**20150108-5145(30042312).pdf**

Willie Reid, Cohoes, NY.

What ever! Its the Unions job to get me one and its mine to keep it! Please give me the opportunity to help build this country into the next generation. We really need all these potential jobs that are out there.

Thank you!

**20150108-5149(30042412).pdf**

Ronald F Smail, E Greenbush, NY.

I believe this energy project will be very important in this state. This project will give better service and crate more jobs and help the economy. Thank you for your support!

**20150108-5150(30042418).pdf**

John L Fuller, Albany, NY.

Ive worked with the Union and Non Union workers for twenty years. The Union guys are by far the most skilled and knowing workers in the business. Please help us to attain these well needed jobs for our families. Thank you for youjr support and help

**20150108-5154(30042643).pdf**

John R Connolly, Bronx, NY.

The Northeast energy project should use Union manpower because it is a proven fact that Union construction workers are much more skilled and diligent. Also they are trained in all aspects of safety. Thank you all

**20150108-5160(30042681).pdf**

Thomas Fretas, Middletown Springs, VT.

A trained workforce is a key to quality motivated crews. any job no matter how big or small is worked with dedicated trained personel. Unions have pride in their work that non union guys just don't have

**20150108-5171(30042795).pdf**

Thomas R Frietas, Middletown Springs, VT.

Trade work force Union is a quality motivated crew. Any job no matter how gig or small is worked with dedicated trained personel. Unions have that pride in their work in every trade

**20150108-5175(30042856).pdf**

Guisseppe Panetta, Albany, NY.

If a project like this brings good paying Union jobs and it will be really good for the economy. I am all for it. Thanks

**20150108-5177(30042891).pdf**

Mr John Cary, Salem, NY.

This is great for the economy. We have many highly skilled work force people to do these jobs.

Thank you very much!

**20150108-5179(30042915).pdf**

Shawn Crawford, Gansevoort, NY.

This project sounds very good. I look forward to the new project. Thanks for your support.

**20150108-5181(30043009).pdf**

Wilson Cutright, Ravena, NY.

I live in Ravenue Ny and I am in favor of this gas line coming through the area to help impact and create jobs. It will also help domestic energy and tax revenues. Thank you for listening to my comments.

Wilson Cutright.

**20150108-5189(30043090).pdf**

Terry Ford, Stillwater, NY.

I have lived in this area of the Capital District my whole life and made my career in construction. I believe this project will create good paying jobs and help cut the cost of energy by increasing our supply. and to do this without affecting the environment very minimally with the help of our superb workforce.

**20150108-5193(30043101).pdf**

Leonard C. Bennett, Johnstown, NY.

Good jobs for union members & benefits so they can can enjoy retirement as much as me.

**20150108-5196(30043110).pdf**

Giovanni Tirino, Albany, NY.

I support this discussion because I believe the work opportunities will benefit hard working individuals. This in turn will be good for our community members to improve our economy!

Sincerly, John Tirino

**20150108-5197(30043111).pdf**

Wayne Jack Hladik, Gloversville, NY.

The economy in our area can use good steady employment, and the project needs trained and skilled workers that the unions will provide to complete on time.

Jack Hladik

**20150108-5200(30043168).pdf**

Martin E. Teabout, Johnstown, NY.

The NED project will help the economy of the area and give jobs to our Laborers.

**20150108-5204(30043188).pdf**

Peter Schietromo, Rotterdam, NY.

Let's tap into this energy source now. With minimal environmental impact and the benefits in revenue to be reaped- it's a win-win situation! Sooner or later, we will be at a point where we will have to do this, it's inevitable. Let's have foresight into the future and do it now

**20150109-0018(30047994).pdf**

September 20, 2014

Chairwoman Cheryl A. LaFleur  
888 First Street NE  
Washington DC, 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Expansion Project

Dear Chairwoman Cheryl A. LaFleur,

I am writing to express my concern with and opposition to the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Direct project. Docket No. PF14-22-000

As a resident of Massachusetts, through which the proposed pipeline is routed, I am directly affected by its potential consequences, including the risk of gas leak-related explosion and contamination, as well as decline in property values and and increase in insurance costs. Furthermore, as currently planned, this project will cross sensitive conservation lands, wetlands, and rivers leaving a permanent scar through some of Massachusetts's most picturesque open spaces and putting many of our towns' primary sources of drinking water at risk of contamination.

The effort to meet Massachusetts' ongoing energy needs should not adversely impact residents' quality of life, nor come at the expense of open space benefiting 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, energy efficiency programs, and a policy to switch to renewable sources of energy generation now and in the future. I urge you to fully prioritize further investment in and deployment of these solutions, and to take any actions as are necessary to begin a public dialog to determine whether this project is necessary or advisable for our state.

Sincerely,

**20150109-0019(30047993).pdf**

September 20, 2014

Chairwoman Cheryl A. LaFleur  
888 First Street NE  
Washington DC, 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Expansion Project

Dear Chairwoman Cheryl A. LaFleur,

I am writing to express my concern with and opposition to the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Direct project. Docket No. PF14-22-000

As a resident of Massachusetts, through which the proposed pipeline is routed, I am directly affected by its potential consequences, including the risk of gas leak-related explosion and contamination, as well as decline in property values and and increase in insurance costs. Furthermore, as currently planned, this project will cross sensitive conservation lands, wetlands, and rivers leaving a permanent scar through some of Massachusetts's most picturesque open spaces and putting many of our towns' primary sources of drinking water at risk of contamination.

The effort to meet Massachusetts' ongoing energy needs should not adversely impact residents' quality of life, nor come at the expense of open space benefiting 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, energy efficiency programs, and a policy to switch to renewable sources of energy generation now and in the future. I urge you to fully prioritize further investment in and deployment of these solutions, and to take any actions as are necessary to begin a public dialog to determine whether this project is necessary or advisable for our state.

Sincerely,

**20150109-0020(30047992).pdf**

September 20, 2014

Chairwoman Cheryl A. LaFleur  
888 First Street NE  
Washington DC, 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Expansion Project

Dear Chairwoman Cheryl A. LaFleur,

I am writing to express my concern with and opposition to the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Direct project. Docket No. PF14-22-000

As a resident of Massachusetts, through which the proposed pipeline is routed, I am directly affected by its potential consequences, including the risk of gas leak-related explosion and contamination, as well as decline in property values and and increase in insurance costs. Furthermore, as currently planned, this project will cross sensitive conservation lands, wetlands, and rivers leaving a permanent scar through some of Massachusetts's most picturesque open spaces and putting many of our towns' primary sources of drinking water at risk of contamination.

The effort to meet Massachusetts' ongoing energy needs should not adversely impact residents' quality of life, nor come at the expense of open space benefiting 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, energy efficiency programs, and a policy to switch to renewable sources of energy generation now and in the future. I urge you to fully prioritize further investment in and deployment of these solutions, and to take any actions as are necessary to begin a public dialog to determine whether this project is necessary or advisable for our state.

Sincerely,

**20150109-5003(30043405).pdf**

Diane K Varney-Parker, Mason, NH.

I am concerned about the possibility of a pipeline coming through Mason and NH in general. Kinder Morgan's proposed plan is set to dig through both conservation land and private properties (with a threat of eminent domain). No matter what Kinder Morgan states this will be disruptive on many levels that can't be denied (there are environmental, safety, as well as quality of life issues that will be factors). This route especially hits my town making 2 routes (east/west and north/south) through our beautiful town. On top of this there is no plan that includes Mason to even have direct use of this gas. We would take on all the risk w/ none of the benefit. We do not want this pipeline!!!

Besides this there is no proof that it is even necessary for our state. The amount coming in is more than we need as a state and it is bringing in more fossil fuels when our state had a law instated on May 11, 2007 by Governor John Lynch. He signed into law: HB 873, the Renewable Energy Act, establishing a renewable energy portfolio standard for the state. This pipeline is in the wrong direction for us and causing so much destruction to bring energy to our state is just not right!!!

**20150109-5046(30044472).pdf**

James Moore, Unadilla, NY.

We do need jobs badly. I believe this is at a low risk to the environment. We need to make progress on energy. The economy is not that strong here so we really need to additional revenue. Thank you

**20150109-5049(30044471).pdf**

Mark Stec, Milford, NH.

During information meeting on 1/5/15 in Milford, NH Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Gas Pipeline Representative stated that if they received FERC approval they would reserve the right pursue eminent domain against any property owner who did grant an easement, since FERC would have granted permission for construction of the project.

Though FERC is a Federal Agency and overrides State Government and Laws the NH Constitution clearly states that the taking of property for private use is unconstitutional. The implicit threat of taking easements by Eminent Domain is not only an insult to landowners potentially impacted but a direct attack on the liberty and freedom guaranteed under the US and NH Constitutions.

NH Constitution:

[Art.] 12-a. [Power to Take Property Limited.] No part of a person's property shall be taken by eminent domain and transferred, directly or indirectly, to another person if the taking is for the purpose of private development or other private use of the property

**20150109-5050(30044657).pdf**

Steven B. Smith, Highland Falls, NY.

A positive thing for our area that will help out our economy big time. Please allow us to get this work to help provide for our families

**20150109-5051(30044690).pdf**

Daniel Karmolinski, Westbrookville, NY.

Our area needs good paying jobs. This will also allow us to help meet demands with domestic energy. Low impact on environment help through tax revenues and help our schools and infrastructure. It seems like a win, win situation for all. I would like to see this become a reality. Thanks

**20150109-5052(30044695).pdf**

Mark Silinovich, Saugerties, NY.

This project as proposed will bring good paying jobs to our region. With the promise of staying 100% union workforce. It will boost the moral of our locals and showcase the talent and work ethic of all the union tradesman involved. It will promote domestic energy use and supply which has been a longtime coming. I join with LIUNA in welcoming this opportunity. Thank you.

**20150109-5053(30044717).pdf**

William D young JR., Livingston Manor, NY.

We need to keep local monies in the local area. We need well trained people to do the jobs so the environment and animals and reptiles are protected. Thank you. Do it right and do it Union. Thanks for you support.

**20150109-5057(30044778).pdf**

Gerald C. Minckler Sr., Long Eddy, NY.

I am all for revenues and work that this project will bring to this area. and knowing that they will have minimal impact to the environment and will also use highly skilled and trained help

**20150109-5062(30044924).pdf**

Joe Cherny, Kingston, NY.

I believe this project will bring good paying jobs for our area and we really need them badly. It will also have minimum impact on the environment. Thanks

**20150109-5067(30044941).pdf**

Alexander J Ricci, Midway, GA.

This project would be really good for our country. It would help us to be more energy independent. It would add many jobs in the area which in turn would help the economy and add money to the tax base

**20150109-5068(30045033).pdf**

Ed McConmell, Pine Bush, NY.

This project should be done by local Union workers. These highly trained people will put the money earned back into the local economy. therefore helping with the taxes.

**20150109-5069(30045128).pdf**

Micheal Cicione, Saugerties, NY.

More jobs and a better economy. As long as our wetlands are un disturbed. Weather or not people understand that. We do not need them!! Thank you

**20150109-5071(30045162).pdf**

Angelo Rivera Jr., Livingston Manor, NY.

I think its vital to our area economy, and good paying jobs with good highly trained Union workforce.  
Thanks

**20150109-5082(30045197).pdf**

Daniel Martin, Pine Bush, NY.

This will good paying jobs for the local work force and that will provide domestic energy along with help our infrastructure

**20150109-5083(30045272).pdf**

Wallace Hale, Hunter, NY.

We need the pipeline. We need the work! Most of my life I have seen the flow of money not going to the working man. we really need these jobs so that we can provide for our families and pay our bills. please help us to get this work.

**20150109-5086(30045487).pdf**

John Santillo, Chatham, NY.

I am very much in support of this project. It would certainly be a big plus for some much needed work in our area. We have some of the best trained work force and leadership in Local 17. It would be a big boost to our economy. I definatley give my full support to this project. Thank you Much.

John A. Santillo

**20150109-5245(30047701).pdf**

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

January 9, 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:

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 originally scheduled dates and locations for twelve open houses to be conducted in November and December 2014 for the portion of the Project located between Wright, New York and Dracut, Massachusetts. A list of the open house dates and locations was filed with the Commission on October 21, 2014. On November 6, 2014, Tennessee submitted a filing stating that these open houses would be postponed in order to provide affected landowners and communities the necessary time to review the draft Resource Reports 1 and 10 submitted on November 5, 2014.

Tennessee has worked with Commission Staff to establish revised dates and locations for the postponed open houses for the portion of the Project located between Wright, New York and Dracut, Massachusetts, and with this filing submits the updated schedule of open houses for this portion of the Project. Tennessee

will provide notification of this updated open house schedule to affected stakeholders. Tennessee will also work with the Commission Staff to establish the open house dates and locations for the portion of the Project located between Troy, Pennsylvania and Wright, New York.

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 this filing to the Office of Energy Projects. A copy of this letter will also be sent to all affected landowners and the governmental officials that received the open house list in prior notification letters. 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. Rich McGuire (Commission Staff)  
Mr. Michael McGehee (Commission Staff)  
Mr. Eric Tomasi (Commission Staff)

NED Open House Dates/Locations

\*\*All Open Houses are 6pm – 8pm

> January 27: Milford, NH

o Hampshire Dome; 50 Emerson Road, Milford, NH 03055

> January 28: Berlin, MA

o Berlin Memorial Elementary School Gymnasium; 34 South St., Berlin, MA 01503

> January 29: Fitchburg, MA

o Fitchburg Memorial Middle School Gymnasium; 615 Rollstone St., Fitchburg, MA 01420

> February 3: Rindge, NH

o Four Star Catering; 18 Lisa Drive, Rindge, NH 03461

> February 4: Winchester, NH

o Winchester High School Gymnasium; 85 Parker St, Winchester, NH 03470

> February 5: Greenfield, MA

o Greenfield Community College Cafeteria; 1 College Drive, Greenfield, MA 01301

> February 9: New Lebanon, NY

o New Lebanon Junior-Senior High School - 14665 New York 22, New Lebanon, NY 12125

> February 10: Pittsfield, MA

o Berkshire Community College Cafeteria; 1350 West St., Pittsfield, MA

> February 11: Farmington, CT

o Farmington High School Cafeteria; 10 Montieth Dr., Farmington, CT

> February 12: New Scotland, NY

o Colonie Country Club; 141 Maple Rd., Voorheesville, NY 12186

> February 17: Andover, MA

o Wyndham Hotel; 123 Old River Rd., Andover, MA 01810

> February 18: Londonderry, NH

o Londonderry High School Cafeteria; 295 Mammoth Road, Londonderry, NH 03053

> February 19: Hudson, NH

o White Birch Banquet Hall; 222 Central St., Hudson, NH 03051

**20150112-0007(30050379).pdf**

Hand written letter, Jeanne Daniello, Mason, NH 03048, opposing

**20150112-0008(30050398).pdf**

Hand written letter, Karen Hulette, Rindge, NH 03461, opposing

**20150112-0009(30050400).pdf**

Hand written letter, Ronald E. Hulette, Rindge, NH 03461, opposing

**20150112-0010(30055349).pdf**

hand written letter, Deborah A. Chipman, Fitzwilliam, NH, opposing

**20150112-0011(30055505).pdf**

hand written letter, Russell Brown, Mason, NH, opposing

**20150112-0012(30055508).pdf**

hand written letter, G(?) Brown, Mason, NH, opposing

**20150112-0013(30055512).pdf**

hand written letter, Michael & Cecile Tandus, New Ipswich, NH, opposing

**20150112-0014(30055513).pdf**

hand written letter, Carey Bluhm, Fitzwilliam, NH, opposing

**20150112-0050(30060454).pdf**

**Warwick Conservation Commission**

Town Hall

12 Athol Rd.

Warwick, MA 01378

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.

Proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project, FERC Docket No. PF14-22-000

Dear Secretary Bose,

The Town of Warwick (MA) Conservation Commission hereby notifies FERC and TGP of its intention to actively participate in the pre-filing process for the Northeast Energy Direct project proposed by the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company.

The Warwick Conservation Commission is the local body charged with administering the Massachusetts Wetland Protection Act and its associated regulations. Some of the Conservation Commission's jurisdiction overlaps interests that are subject to review under several federal laws including the Clean Water Act, Clean Air Act, and the Endangered Species Act. In particular, the Conservation Commission reviews projects that also require the issuance of a 401 water quality certificate by the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection as part of its administration of the federal Clean Water Act. The Conservation Commission

also reviews projects that require review by the Massachusetts Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program under provisions of the Massachusetts Endangered Species Act.

TGP has proposed two different routes for the project that would pass through the Town of Warwick. The Conservation Commission believes that TGP has not, to date, done due diligence in evaluating either of the two proposed routes for its project in the Town of Warwick. The Commission believes that any adequate evaluation must include actual, detailed on-the-ground observation and study by qualified professionals.

We do know that the proposed TGP activity will affect wetland resource areas, riverfront areas, streams (both perennial and intermittent) and their banks, freshwater wetlands, vernal pools, and groundwater resources used by the public.

The Conservation Commission wishes to inform FERC of its experience that many wetland resource areas in the Town of Warwick are not mapped or catalogued in generally available map layers and databases. From our point of view both proposed pipeline routes are being developed based on generally available information but without careful consideration of specific wetland, water and endangered species habitats in the Town of Warwick.

Based upon prior experience, the Conservation Commission believes that there are populations of species listed under the federal Endangered Species Act and the Massachusetts Endangered Species Act in the Town of Warwick.

The Conservation Commission also believes that frequency and magnitude of, flash flooding events on streams in the Town of Warwick should be re-estimated with consideration of possible damage to projected pipeline structures. In the last decade, the town has experienced several extreme weather events of the type that might damage an operating pipeline and create catastrophic threats to residents and natural systems.

According to state law, all projects planned to take place in wetland resource areas and their statutory buffer zones in the Town of Warwick are subject to prior review by the Conservation Commission. In the case of TGP's Northeast Energy Direct Project, work subject to such review would include all preliminary survey work, construction, ongoing operation and maintenance, as well as any dismantling or abandonment of the project.

The Conservation Commission is also concerned about the fragmentation of legally protected natural habitat that would result from TGP's proposed project. Over half the land area of the Town of Warwick is comprised of mostly contiguous lands under public and private ownership — including State Forests, Wildlife Management Areas; and land under conservation restrictions held by state agencies, towns, and public land trusts — all of which are protected under Article 97 of the Massachusetts Constitution. The majority of this land was conserved in perpetuity using federal and state funds. This large landscape, which stretches into adjacent towns and beyond, provides unbroken habitat for wildlife and provides a corridor for species migration and diffusion.

In addition, this non-fragmented protected land is relatively free of non-native invasive plant species that are so pervasive in most developed areas of this region. TGP's proposed project risks creating unforested rights-of-way that could be seeded with invasives by construction and maintenance equipment, and illegally operated off road vehicles.

The Conservation Commission also has concerns that a large compressor station proposed by TGP for the Town of Northfield, very close to the border with the Town of Warwick, should receive adequate review under the federal Clean Air Act. We are concerned that residents and wildlife may be subject to adverse health impacts from air pollution and noise pollution.

The Conservation Commission also believes that TGP has not, to date, done due diligence in thoroughly evaluating the no-build alternative to its proposed project.

Sincerely,

Gregory Brodski, Co-Chair

Warwick (MA) Conservation Commission

cc: Governor Charlie Baker  
Attorney General Maura Healey  
Senator Stanley Rosenberg  
Representative Susannah Lee  
Maev Bartlett, MA Executive Office of Energy k, Environmental Affairs  
Ann Berwick, MA Dept. of Public Utilities  
David Cash, MA Dept. of Environmental Protection  
Mary Griffin, MA Dept. of Fish & Game  
Jack Murray, MA Dept. of Conservation & Recreation  
U.S. Senator Elizabeth Warren  
U.S. Senator Edward Markey  
U.S. Representative James McGovern  
Northfield (MA) Conservation Commission  
Erving (MA) Conservation Commission  
Winchester (NH) Conservation Commission  
Orange (MA) Conservation Commission  
Royalston (MA) Conservation Commission  
Athol (MA) Conservation Commission  
Winchester (NH) Conservation Commission  
Richmond (NH) Conservation Commission  
Eugene Benson, Executive Director of MACC  
Leigh Youngblood, Mount Grace Land Conservation Trust  
Millers River Watershed Council

**20150112-5004(30048013).pdf**

Diane K Varney-Parker, Mason, NH.

The following is from a source summarizing NH's energy profile.

**QUICK FACTS:**

- New Hampshire was the ninth lowest per capita consumer of energy among the states in 2011.
- The transportation sector accounted for 35% of New Hampshire's energy consumption in 2011.
- The Seabrook nuclear power reactor, the largest in New England, provided 55% of New Hampshire's 2013 net electricity generation.
- Natural gas accounted for 21% of New Hampshire's net electricity generation in 2013, down from a record-high of 37% in 2012.
- New Hampshire's Renewable Portfolio Standard requires 24.8% of electricity sold to come from renewable energy resources by 2025; 16% of
- New Hampshire's 2013 net electricity generation came from renewable energy.

Last Updated: March 27, 2014

This clearly shows that a high pressure pipeline is not needed for NH and it does not help us reach our goal in expanding renewable energy. Our state needs the opportunity to use our time and money to pursue energy resources that help our state residents and environment (along w/ the rest of the country in following our Clean Power Plan). We do not want this pipeline!!!!

above info cited from: <http://www.eia.gov/state/?sid=NH>

**20150112-5023(30048051).pdf**

Paula Dyer, Hollis, NH.

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.

Putting forward a proposal for NH/MA having a need for this gas for their energy needs is like putting a proposal together to build a six lane freeway across Martha's Vineyard to accommodate traffic on the 4th July ! The new route is cited as "utility co-location", but not all of it is contained within current utility corridors. In most places along the path from Wright to Dracut, the pipeline is slated to run alongside existing cleared easements, requiring further deforestation and impact on public and private lands.

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.

#### OVERSIZED SOLUTION TO PROPOSED "PROBLEM" – LIKELY EXPORT

Even if the Low Demand Scenario was not proven, the amount of additional pipeline capacity requested by NESCOE is 0.6 Billion cubic feet a day (Bcf/d), but the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline project proposed by KM/TGP is being planned for 2.2 Bcf/d.

With nearly four times the capacity called for, where is the other three quarters of that capacity destined? Clearly, it is going to export through Canada. New England residents and Conservation areas are to be decimated, so a private company can make huge profits by exporting gas, it's not being done for New England. Please can FERC hear all the facts from New England residents, and act appropriately in refusing the approval of this pipeline.

#### **20150112-5025(30048055).pdf**

Maureen Morine, Pepperell, MA.

There are many reasons why the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Project infrastructure and increased natural gas capacity is not needed for New England. 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.

There are currently enough leaks in the existing infrastructure to provide another 400 MW of power, natural gas pipeline leaks cost consumers billions and 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.

With nearly four times the capacity called for, where is the other three quarters of that capacity destined? The terminal hub in Dracut is also a connection point to the Maritimes & Northeast (M&NE) pipeline which has just applied to switch direction, bringing gas from Massachusetts, through Maine to the Maritimes of Canada, where two ports have just applied to switch from import to export. There is also new potential for export from facilities in Maine and Everett, MA. We should not be left holding the bag, the environmental damage, and the cost so Kinder Morgan and his investors can reap the rewards of economic gain at our expense.

The proposed pipeline path runs through thousands of private and public properties, some of the state's most sensitive eco-systems and lands set aside for conservation and aquifers. This pipeline infrastructure would be a super-gas-highway across the most pristine lands in the state. The pipeline also poses risks to water, safety, human life and health, from leaks, ruptures, explosions. Pipeline safety incidents are being reported across the country because existing pipelines aren't being maintained or monitored routinely and will force affected landowners to monitor pipeline safety.

Those in the path of the proposed pipeline should not be forced to aid and abet in this dangerous and short-sighted exploitation of our nation's natural resources. It's not clean, cheap, safe or even necessary. Our signature assets of picturesque towns, rolling hills, small farms, verdant forests and protected wetlands would be destroyed if Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company is allowed to carve a permanent scar into our landscape and destroy our natural resources. We have the right to safe and clean environments and future generations deserve the same opportunities we have today.

As you consider Tennessee Gas Pipeline request to use the pre-filing process, please also take into account the deficiencies in the Company's maps used, it's downplaying of the environmental impact, withholding and evading sensitive questions from the public, ignoring legitimate public concerns, and promised answers that we and our elected officials are still waiting on.

**20150112-5029(30048063).pdf**

Andrew Vernon, Northfield, MA.

WITH REGARDS TO THE TGP NORHEAST EXPANSION:

Approving this pipeline would be a mistake for quite a few reasons. Some fit the "not in our backyard category", but most reasons benefit the larger community and of course humanity as a whole.

Small towns in western MA have been orienting their economies toward ecotourism. In Northfield, we rely on our substantial wooded ridges and State forestland to draw hikers, bikers, etc. This pipeline AND compressor station will threaten that here and in other towns on the route. Further, if eminent domain requires the taking of protected or personal lands, it will undermine the basic trust of government agreements and set a terrible precedent. In our town specifically the noise and off-gassing from an 80,000 h.p. compressor will likely affect a large part of our cherished valley. Then of course there is the everpresent threat of fires and explosions.

Beyond the threat to our local area lie the bigger reasons to deny this pipeline. We know enough as a society to move AS FAST AS POSSIBLE toward energy sources that do not emit CO2 or Methane. Although gas burns cleaner than other fossil fuels, the hidden emissions from the extraction process and transport neutralize that advantage. Lastly, I see these pipelines as a Hail Mary pass from a fracking industry that knows it is short-lived: "How can we make the most profit before we have to fold?" The process is already proving to be more trouble than it is worth, with issues like earthquakes and waste toxins. As fracking becomes banned by more communities, where will we be then? Stuck with an energy shortage...and we will finally invest in the alternative energy sources and conservation measures we know we need.

There are economic considerations as well. Most evidence suggests that this pipeline is oriented to export a significant amount of the gas it transports, providing a private company profit at the expense of ratepayers, towns, and property owners. Export would likely lead to increased gas prices here. Another question that worries our town is how would property values be affected with a compressor station? This would affect several towns along the route in NY, MA and NH. Job creation? It's temporary for pipeline construction and research shows that long term investment in alternative sources would be better in that regard. With the TGP, alternative sources will lose incentives as well, making the inevitable transition harder.

I am definitely not alone in thinking we should make that leap now. With existing infrastructure improvements, gas storage, and conservation measures, the northeast could weather the spikes in demand long enough to make the transition to alternatives. I've been polite long enough... NO new PIPELINES!

Thank you,

Andrew Vernon  
Northfield, MA  
Social Studies teacher  
Keene NH

**20150112-5030(30048065).pdf**

Emily Monosson, Montague, MA.

Northeast Energy Direct Docket#P14-22

Connecticut River Expansion Docket #CP14-529

Dear Sir or Madam: I am opposed to the Natural Gas Pipeline proposed to run through Massachusetts and through my home town of Montague MA. I am very concerned for several reasons, primarily if we are to be in the business of creating new energy – then we ought to be putting it renewable energy clean energy and conservation of energy rather than natural gas. I realize that there is an argument that gas is clean; but relative to wind, solar and geothermal it certainly is not (nor is the extraction process – and even if methane issues are resolved it is a very short-sighted solution to a long term problem. Another argument which I believe should not even come into play in such important decisions is the number of temporary jobs building a pipeline will bring to the region. Those who would work on this project would be better served by training and employment in the renewables sector. Our country is quickly falling behind others as an energy innovator. Relying as we have and as this pipeline would, on “the same old thing” is surely a disservice to those who are in need of jobs in the very near future. As the energy agency in charge of regulating our country’s energy future you are in a key position at a critical time. You have the opportunity to help turn the US into an energy leader. Please do not allow the development of a shortsighted new pipeline to transport natural gas – particularly gas gained through fracking across our state. Thank you

**20150112-5031(30048067).pdf**

Stuart Besnoff, Windsor, MA.

Please do not approve this pipeline. If approved it will contribute to environmental damage where the gas is obtained, along the pipeline route, and where the gas is burned at the destination. We can meet our energy needs with existing pipelines and additional renewable energy

**20150112-5032(30048069).pdf**

Christopher M Anders, Rindge, NH.

Browsing the comments for this project I see many people touting jobs, jobs, jobs. Here is the reality: Kinder Morgan has stated that this entire project will create less than 600 TEMPORARY jobs. They have not stated where the people who will fill these jobs will be from. I have heard most of these jobs will be specialized pipeline construction jobs with the workers arriving from states like Oklahoma and Texas along with other states outside of the Northeast. On another subject, the information about the project that we have from Kinder Morgan is riddled with mis-information and inaccuracies. For example, co-location of the pipeline with existing utility corridors. Definition of collocate: “to locate together, to place close together so as to share common facilities”. It seems that KM’s definition is a whole new utility corridor somewhere in the same county. This project is wrong for New Hampshire, wrong for New England, wrong for the United States of America

**20150112-5033(30048071).pdf**

Vickie L Lane, Mason, NH.

As a resident of Mason I am quite concerned with the environmental impact this proposed pipeline in my town. This is a very rural town with 100% drilled wells. The proposed pipeline will require blasting because of the large amount of ledge in town and will upset water tables and damage wells and property. What is FERC doing with regard to environmental studies?

**20150112-5034(30048073).pdf**

Tanya Chesnell, wilton, NH.

If FERC correctly follows its own guidelines, this project absolutely should not go through.

It will require excessive eminent domain. The people of NH DON'T want this, and won't just hand over their land.

It is excessive, and the need isn't great enough.

It is harmful to the environment (pollution, leaks, destroying wetlands, wildlife habitats).

It disrupts headwaters to vital drinking water bodies of several towns, and it crosses well head protection areas.

The required blasting will disrupt wells that supply drinking water to almost all southern NH town residents.

If this project goes through, the government and FERC are not doing their jobs to protect the environment or their US citizens. The need is not enough for this to be worth the damage and destruction it will cause. Most of New Hampshire does not use natural gas, and natural gas is a primitive energy source. We should be concentrating our efforts on solar, wind, and other energy sources.

### **20150112-5035(30048075).pdf**

Betty L Anders, Rindge, NH.

As a resident of Rindge with a small alpaca farm only 900' from the existing power lines, I am extremely concerned about our water quality should blasting be necessary to run the pipeline. All of us here in Rindge and most of the communities in Southern NH where the pipeline is proposed operate off of private wells. We are not called the Granite State for no reason, they will have to cause a major disruption in order to get a pipeline underground.

Why are we considering this non-renewable energy source in the first place? Is the plan to let all of the United States implode and become a sink hole in order for a couple of companies to earn a profit?

Can we please look at the truth in this matter - the only reason for this pipeline is to export natural gas out of the Dracut, MA hub.... there is no way New England could use all the gas that is proposed to be transported.

Please do not let a private companies ruin whole communities

### **20150112-5038(30048081).pdf**

Jon Michael Vore, Amherst, NH.

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

Dear Secretary Bose:

I am writing in response to the January 9 letter filed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline (TGP) for inclusion with docket no. PF14-22-000, regarding the rescheduling of Open Houses in communities affected by the proposed Northeast Energy Direct pipeline project. We first learned of Kinder Morgan's proposed pipeline about 4 weeks ago in a letter dated December 12th, 2014. We actually didn't receive the letter until 4 days later because Kinder Morgan addressed the letter to the wrong address in Amherst that isn't even affected by the pipeline. Since receiving the letter, we have been trying to educate ourselves on the proposed pipeline and how it will affect ourselves as well as our town. Many residents of Amherst are still unaware of the proposed pipeline that may come through our town.

My understanding is that individuals on the original route were notified

between February and April of 2014 with open houses being scheduled between November and December of 2014. This gave towns and communities 7- 10 months to educate themselves on the pipeline and whether it was needed before any of the open houses were to take place. The current timeline shows that residents of Amherst and surrounding communities were first informed of the pipeline in December and that the first open house has been scheduled for January 27th. The final open house is slated to occur February 19th which

is only 2 1/2 months from when we were first notified. At this point, we have only had 6 weeks to really educate ourselves on what Kinder Morgan is proposing as well as trying to educate our fellow citizens on how it potentially may affect them.

In their letter, Kinder Morgan claims that they want to be a “good neighbor” and work with us yet all of the interactions we have had with Kinder Morgan seem contrary to that. They seem more concerned with pushing their agenda rather than truly trying to be a “good neighbor”. I believe that they are concerned that if individuals have more time to educate themselves, on their proposal, that residents will realize that we do not want nor need this pipeline in our town or any other community.

For this reason and many others, I strenuously object to the prospect of having FERC grant eminent domain over any part of my property, my environment, or the property and environment of my fellow citizens. Do not approve the Northeast Energy Direct project. We do not want or need this project.

Sincerely,

Jon Michael Vore  
23 Simeon Wilson Rd  
Amherst, NH 03031

**20150112-5066(30048485).pdf**

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:

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

**Kinder Morgan Continues to Torture the Truth and Abuse the Public**

As Kinder Morgan pursues a project to build a high-pressure natural gas pipeline across northern Massachusetts and southern New Hampshire (the Northeast Energy Direct or NED project), they are continuing a now familiar pattern of torturing the truth (and thereby abusing the public) in their pipeline presentations.

Kinder Morgan held a public presentation of their pipeline plans in Milford, NH on January 5, 2015. Allen Fore, a Kinder Morgan vice president, presided over the presentation. A video of the event is available here. At 10:58 into the presentation, a slide with this picture of the existing 270B1 compressor station in Pelham, NH was displayed (their slide was in color). This is a 6,130 horsepower (HP) compressor station on a much smaller pipeline than the one being proposed for the NED project.

*{photo of small compressor station}*

With this slide on display, Allen Fore states:

*“We expect there will be a compressor station similar in size and scope to other compressor stations we have on our system. Not exactly what we have in Pelham, but you can get an idea of what compressor stations look like.”*

There is one small problem with Mr. Fore’s characterization of Kinder Morgan’s plans. What he didn’t share with the audience is that according to their recent FERC filing, Kinder Morgan plans to construct these six compressor stations as part of their proposed pipeline (“Market Path” refers to the NED pipeline from Wright, NY to Dracut, MA):

1 Market Path Head Station 20,000 HP	4 Market Path Mid Station 3 80,000 HP
2 Market Path Mid Station 1 90,000 HP	5 Market Path Mid Station 4 80,000 HP

3 Market Path Mid Station 2 80,000 HP

6 Market Path Tail Station 23,000 HP

These HP numbers indicate that Kinder Morgan is proposing four gigantic compressor stations with up to 15 times the capacity of the 6,130 HP Pelham compressor station that they chose to display so that we could “get an idea of what compressor stations look like”. Mr. Fore might as well have held up a 21/2-inch diameter pipe so that we could “get an idea” of what a 36-inch diameter high pressure pipeline looks like.

Below are a satellite view and a street view of a large, existing Kinder Morgan compressor station.

*{photos of large compressor station}*

Is this what the four huge Kinder Morgan compressor stations proposed for the NED pipeline might look like? We don't know – only they know. And they have chosen not to share realistic information with the public. But Mr. Fore was no doubt being truthful when he said “Not exactly what we have in Pelham...”.

This is exactly the sort of torturing of the truth that causes people to mistrust Kinder Morgan. In this case it was possible to fact check their assertions and to call them on it. But they make many other statements that are more difficult to cross check because there aren't any hard numbers associated with them. But as people realize how willing Kinder Morgan is to bend and distort the truth in cases like that described above, the less willing anyone is to believe their other blanket reassurances to the public about pipeline safety, their remediation efforts, that they will offer fair compensation for the land they will take, that they intend to be a good neighbor, etc., etc.

And this begs the question - if this is how Kinder Morgan behaves now, before they have gained FERC approval for their project (when they have some reason to be on their best behavior), what can we possibly expect of them if FERC does provide approval? Does anyone think that they will suddenly become more forthcoming and truthful? If given approval by FERC, thousands of New England land owners, conservation trustees, town government officials and other residents would be forced to interact closely with Kinder Morgan and to trust them to provide timely and accurate information about their pipeline plans. Do they seem worthy of that trust?

Nick Miller Groton, MA

**20150112-5068(30048489).pdf**

32 Fletcher Lane  
Hollis, NH 03049

January 11, 2015

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

Dear Secretary Bose:

I am writing in response to the January 9 letter filed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline (TGP) for inclusion with docket no. PF14-22-000, regarding the “rescheduling” of Open Houses in communities affected by the proposed Northeast Energy Direct pipeline project. My use of quotation marks is deliberate and important, because although TGP's filings represent its new list of dates and locations as a rescheduling of events that were previously postponed, this is by no means the case with respect to the New Hampshire segment of the proposed pipeline route. All of the New Hampshire communities where the Open Houses are now scheduled to be held are located on the revised “preferred path” that TGP filed with FERC on December 9, 2015; none was on the original route that was filed on November 5, 2015. Residents of the newly affected New Hampshire communities were not even informed of the project's potential impact to them prior to December 9, much less given a schedule of Open Houses.

Thus, TGP asserts that scheduling a series of Open Houses for the supposed benefit of a whole new body of

citizens in an entirely new geographical location represents an appropriate “postponement” of the canceled events.

At issue here is much more than a matter of semantics or technicalities; it is a matter of honesty and fairness. Stakeholders along the original route were notified of the potential impact roughly between February and April 2014, and in October 2014 were given a schedule of Open Houses to be held during November and December 2014. Subsequently, in response to requests from Massachusetts lawmakers (as acknowledged in TGP’s letter to the FERC of November 6, 2014), TGP canceled those events, ostensibly to give the affected communities more time to study and understand the project. Now, TGP proposes to hold Open Houses for New Hampshire citizens in January and February 2015, with the last such event scheduled only two and a half months after the revised route was announced.

Is TGP intentionally disingenuous, incompetent, or both? I don’t know the answer to that question. I do know, however, that the correct answer is not “none of the above.”

For this reason and many others, I strenuously object to the prospect of having the FERC grant to this company any control over my property, my environment, or the property and environment of my fellow citizens. Do not approve the Northeast Energy Direct project.

Sincerely,  
Stephen J. Spaulding

**20150113-0066(30058350).pdf**

**Town of Fitzwilliam. NH**  
13 Templeton Turnpike  
PO. Box 725  
Fitzwilliam, NH 03447

December 27, 2014

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose  
Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, N.E. Room 1A  
Washington, D.C. 20426

RE: Comment on Docket PF 14-22.

Dear Ms. Bose,

Please file the attached document from The Board of Selectmen of Fitzwilliam, New Hampshire with Docket PF 14-22. This letter is to inform you of the intent of the Town of Fitzwilliam, New Hampshire to actively participate in the pre-Sling process for the Northeast Energy Direct Project under PF 14-22.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Susan Silverman, Chairperson, Board of Selectmen  
Nancy Carney, Board of Selectmen  
Christopher, Holman Board of Selectmen

**BOARD OF SELECTMEN**  
P.O. BOX 725  
FITZWILLIAM, NH 03447  
(603) 585-7723 FGK: (603) 585-7744  
email: fitzwilliamnh(@wivalley.net

Concerns of the Town of Fitzwilliam, NH and residents regarding the construction of the natural gas pipeline by Kinder Morgan and the TGP as part of the NED project:

\* Water: the adverse effects of potential blasting along the pipeline corridor that may contaminate private

water wells, streams and water bodies

\* **Headwaters:** Fitzwilliam contains the headwaters for 4 watersheds, and the disruption of any of these may have far-reaching consequences

\* **Conservation Land:** the taking of conservation land that has been set aside over a long period of years with the support of the town to be preserved in pristine condition for the future of the town. To use this for commercial purposes is antithetical to the concept of conservation.

\* **Herbicides:** The projected extensive use of herbicides on the pipeline corridor would be devastating to the wetlands, water supplies, and water bodies, including the watersheds and cause health and safety problems.

\* **Contaminants:** The effect of construction materials, dust and potential hazardous contaminants in environmentally sensitive areas would be problematic

The Tennessee Natural Gas pipeline proposal put forward by Kinder Morgan is inconsistent with the Town of Fitzwilliam's goal of preserving the Town's rural character as stated in the master plan.

The proposal is inconsistent with the Town's goal of protecting and preserving the water quality of the Town's lakes, rivers, streams, brooks, estuaries, wetlands and groundwater.

The proposal would have an adverse impact on property values within the town thereby reducing tax revenues and impairing the tax base of the town. The tax revenue from the pipeline would not make up for the loss of quality of life and property values.

The proposal would adversely affect the aesthetics within the town by disturbing pristine wetlands, forestlands, recreational and conservation areas, as well as hunting and animal habitats due to the wide swath of cleared corridor, access and maintenance roads.

The proposal would adversely affect health and safety within the town by causing construction materials, dust and hazardous contaminants to enter wetland areas, groundwater or aquifers.

The proposal would adversely affect the town as it would traverse large tracts of conservation land and would involve economic uses inconsistent with other uses such as silviculture and agriculture.

The town opposes the approval of the pipeline because the town lacks the required equipment or personnel for emergency services to adequately address potential health and safety risks that the proposal presents.

**20150113-0086(30062250).pdf**

**BOARD OF SELECTMEN**

P.O. BOX 725

FITZWILLIAM, NH 03447

(603) 585-7723 Fax: (603) 585-7744

email: fitzwilliamnh(RWivalley.net

December 22, 2014

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC

1615 Suffield Street

Agway, MA 01001

Re: Denying access to Fitzwilliam town property located at Map 12 Lot 58, Fullam Hill Road, Fitzwilliam, New Hampshire.

The Board of Selectmen of the Town of Fitzwilliam, New Hampshire have voted to deny permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, and all associates, access to any town land to perform surveys, or for any other purpose. Any physical entry onto town property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespassing.

Sincerely,

Susan Silverman, Chairman

Nancy Camey  
Christopher Holman  
Board of Selectmen

cc: Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

**20150113-5001(30050524).pdf**

Diane K Varney-Parker, Mason, NH.

NH does not want this pipeline. Residents do not want it to go through their property and many people are concerned about how it will affect the environment. I started a petition in my town of Mason, NH and we have 350 signatures (so far) opposing this pipeline. There are many factors from safety to the environment to personal liberties to the fact that this is a fossil fuel and our state is working to move to cleaner sources of energy as outlined in the NH's climate action plan. This pipeline does work with our state's ideals.

**20150113-5064(30053553).pdf**

Gina Weaver, New Ipswich, NH.

I have been quite concerned about the possibility of Kinder Morgan building a pipeline and more importantly a compressor station in my town near my property. On the latest map available it now shows that the compressor station will be built directly on my property and most importantly where my home is located. The first home I have purchased with my husband in the hopes to start a family in the beautiful Monadnock region that will no longer be beautiful with a giant compressor station being built in the middle of it.

This proposal to build the pipeline has come out of nowhere and most people have not been informed about how close to home the pipeline would be. Residents just thought that the pipeline would be built along the power lines. We did not know they would need more land and we certainly did not know of the compressor stations. NH needs more time to respond to this proposal.

Please postpone the approval process for this pipeline so that the towns have a chance to respond. And most importantly please do not approve of this pipeline. It will not be good for NH and NH residents will not even see a benefit of receiving natural gas. Kinder Morgan will just be using NH as a highway to send gas to Canada.

**20150113-5070(30053682).pdf**

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

January 13, 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 -- December 2014

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 December 1 through December 31, 2014.

In accordance with the Commission's filing requirements, Tennessee is submitting this filing with the Com-

mission’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.

J. Curtis Moffatt  
Deputy General Counsel and Vice President  
Gas Group Legal

Enclosure

cc: Mr. Rich McGuire

Mr. Michael McGehee

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  
(December 1, 2014 through December 31, 2014)

**Public Outreach**

- Tennessee has distributed the following NED Project notifications:
- Provided the updated draft Resource Report 1 that was filed with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (“Commission”) to impacted elected officials in Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Connecticut, and Pennsylvania on December 8, 2014.
- Provided notice of upcoming survey activities to impacted elected officials in New York and Pennsylvania on December 8, 2014.
- Tennessee held or took part in the following stakeholder presentation:
- Amherst, Massachusetts – Presentation to the Massachusetts Farm Bureau’s Annual Meeting on December 4, 2014.

**Environmental**

- Tennessee filed an updated draft Resource Report 1 on December 8, 2014, and continues to work on the preparation of draft Resource Reports 1 through 13 for the anticipated filing of these reports in early March 2015.
- As of December 31, 2014, biological surveys have taken place over approximately 31.8 miles, or 20 percent, of the Project Supply Path component route and approximately 38.3 miles, or 15 percent, of the Project Market Path component route. In addition, cultural resource surveys have taken place over approximately 31.2 miles, or 20 percent, of the Project Supply Path component route and approximately 30.9 miles, or 12 percent, of the Project Market Path component route. Both biological and cultural resource surveys have been suspended for the field season due to winter weather conditions. Table 1 below summarizes the completion status of environmental and cultural surveys.

Table 1: Civil, Biological, and Cultural Surveys Performed

{table}

Area*	Survey Survey Completed (miles)		
	Segment (miles)	Civil**	Environmental Cultural

NED Project (Supply Path) 159	C: 67.60 D: 45.59	31.8	31.2
NED Project (Market Path) 253	C: 78.58 D: 53.27	38.3	30.9
% Complete	C: 35.48% D: 23.99%	17%	15%

\*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 Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection on December 3, 2014 to discuss the Project.
- A pre-application meeting with the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection is scheduled for January 7, 2015.

### **Right-of-Way**

- Tennessee has obtained survey permission for approximately 27% of the NED Project Market Path area, and approximately 36% of the NED Project Supply Path area.
- Title work for the NED Project Market Path area is approximately 82% completed and the NED Supply Path is approximately 57% completed.
- Tennessee received notification of approximately fifty calls made to the Commission's Hotline regarding the recent mailing to all landowners concerning the amended draft Resource Report 1.
- On January 8, 2015, Tennessee anticipates beginning to request survey permission from landowners in New Hampshire on the modified preferred route (as filed with the Commission on December 8, 2014).

•

### **Engineering**

- Tennessee continues to evaluate sites for potential compressor stations and pipeyards.
- Tennessee continues to develop preliminary proposed crossing methods for waterbody crossings, including evaluating proposed locations for horizontal directional drilling and determining access needed for geotechnical investigations. Once locations are identified, Tennessee will apply for the appropriate permits to conduct the geotechnical investigations. Tennessee anticipates scheduling geotechnical investigations for Spring 2015.
- Tennessee is in the process of scheduling aerial photography for the Project route. Scheduling will be dependent on the snow cover receding. The Project corridor will be flown with high resolution photography to allow for preliminary environmental interpretation of resources on tracks where survey access is currently not available.
- Tennessee is working with power line companies to determine easements for co-location.
- Tennessee is currently surveying in the areas of the Constitution Pipeline Project's certificated route to determine opportunities for co-location.

### **20150114-0006(30057444).pdf**

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Sui5eld Street  
Agawam, MA 01001  
Date: 1-9-14

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access

As the owner of the property located at:  
37 Delton Drive  
Rindge, NH 03462

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.  
Tyler Seppala

**20150114-0010(30059788).pdf**

At a meeting of the **Town Board of the Town of Berne, Albany County, New York** held on December 17, 2014 at the Town Hall located on 1656 Helderberg Trail, Berne, New York, 12023, the following resolution was considered.

**RESOLUTION REQUESTING THAT TENNESSEE GAS PIPELINE COMPANY, L.L.C HOLD A PUBLIC FORUM IN ALBANY COUNTY, NEW YORK TO PROVIDE THE PUBLIC WITH INFORMATION ABOUT THE PROPOSED PIPELINE EXPANSION PROJECT AFFECTING THE TOWNS OF BERNE, NEW SCOTLAND, KNOX AND BETHLEHEM**

By the Town Board of the Town of Berne:

WHEREAS, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., a subsidiary of Kinder Morgan Energy Partners, L.P., has proposed a project, entitled the Northeast Energy Direct Project, to upgrade the Company's existing pipeline system in New York, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, New Hampshire and Connecticut, and

WHEREAS, four Albany County municipalities, including the Towns of Knox, Berne, New Scotland and Bethlehem, 'are hosts to existing Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C rights-of-way that represents the currently-intended route of the Albany County portion of the Northeast Energy Direct Project, and

WHEREAS, some landowners in the aforementioned towns have been contacted by representatives of Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C soliciting property access for the purpose of survey work and potential for acquisition of land and/or easements to establish an expanded right-of-way for the Northeast Energy Direct Project, and

WHEREAS, landowners in these towns have expressed long-standing concerns about ongoing impacts related to the existing Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C gas transmission right-of-way, including soil erosion, alleged trespassing, unauthorized off road recreational vehicle use—e.g. dirt bikes, ATVs, snowmobiles —and resulting property damage, and

WHEREAS, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C has since April of 2014 hosted in Massachusetts and eastern New York thirty nine public information sessions concerning the proposed project, none of which included a forum within Albany County, and

WHEREAS, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C had announced plans for a series of additional public information sessions in New York and Pennsylvania in December, January and February, but the Company did not plan any of the forums in Albany County, and

WHEREAS, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. has now postponed hosting additional Northeast Energy Direct Project open houses to allow the public, municipal officials and other stakeholders along the proposed route to have additional time to examine information and materials submitted to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, now, therefore, be it

**RESOLVED, BY THE TOWN BOARD OF THE TOWN OF BERNE**, that the Town of Berne hereby requests that Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C hold (and host) a public forum in Albany County within 60 days of the date of this Resolution to answer questions and present the company's plans relating to the

proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project, and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, that a copy of this resolution shall be transmitted to Senator Chuck Schumer, Senator Kristen Gillibrand, Congressman Paul Tonko, State Senator Cecelia Tkaczyk, Assemblywoman Patricia Fahy, Senator-elect Amedore, Albany County Executive Dan McCoy, and County Legislators Michael Mackey and Herb Reilly to solicit their support for the Town of Berne's request that Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. host a public forum in the Albany County, and

BEIT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to: (A) the Supervisors of the Towns of Knox, New Scotland and Bethlehem, and (B) staff at the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC).

On motion by Councilmember Jordan, seconded by Councilmember Schimmer, to adopt this resolution with the following Councilmembers voted in favor of the resolution.

In favor: Supervisor Crosier, Councilmembers, Golden, Emory, Schimmer and Jordan.

Opposed: None

The Resolution was unanimously adopted at a meeting of the Town Board of the Town of Berne duly conducted on December 17, 2014.

Anita C. Clayton, Berne Town Clerk

#### **20150114-0011(30060061).pdf**

John Lewicke  
928 Starch Mill Road  
Mason, New Hampshire 03048  
9 January 2015

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

re. Docket PF 14-22

Dear Ms. Bose,

Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Valley Pipeline is being less than straightforward in their attempt to put a pipeline through New Hampshire and Western Mass: They keep using the term "co-locating" in reference to the existing power line right of way. This is deceptive because what KMI wants is not "colocation" they want to take a new right of way adjacent to the existing powerline ROW.

Construction of a pipeline right of way would be orders of magnitude more invasive/destructive of environment than a powerline ROW. Construction of the powerline required only landclearing, and minimal disturbs of the ground to put up poles every 1/4 mile or so. Construction of a new pipeline ROW would require major disturbance of the terrain. Much of the terrain being crossed is ledge which would require blasting and consequent alteration of aquifers and sub-surface water flows.

This may be less of an issue where a pipeline would be crossing granite quarries. However, unused doesn't describe most of the proposed route. Since the powerline was constructed, the area adjacent to and nearby to the powerline has seen a great deal of construction. Most of the residential construction has included a wooded buffer between houses and the powerline ROW. Construction of a pipeline would destroy 1/2 of those buffer zones exposing landowners to traffic & trespassers, and destroying their view and quality of life.

When the powerline was constructed the route was chosen to keep it away from residential and other inhabited property. Forty years later, there is no possible route for a pipeline in New England that can avoid populated areas. This, and the fact that pipeline construction is orders of magnitude more invasive than powerline

construction says that this is ‘the wrong place and the wrong time for a new pipeline in New England’. In KMI/TGPs letter to me, they cite one reason for dropping their original route and proposing the route through New Hampshire: ...”the proposed route change will enable Tennessee to avoid (in certain cases) and minimize (in other cases) the crossing of Article 97 properties and Areas of Critical Environmental Concern in Massachusetts.”

Those same concerns apply equally if not more so to the proposed route through New Hampshire. The route that they propose goes through the same forests and same environment as in Massachusetts. The only difference is a few miles. Within Mason, NH the proposed route would cross publicly owned conservation land and other land held in conservation easements. It would also cross privately owned land that is currently open to recreational and conservation uses. There is no new route within New England that will not have the same issues. KMI/TGP is simply hoping that they will take less heat for siting a utility facility that may benefit Massachusetts in New Hampshire. Whether a pipeline would benefit Mass. consumers is questionable.

If additional pipeline capacity is needed to serve New England, the best solution is to expand existing pipelines. Even better may be to ship LNG from Great Lakes to New England ports. Both of these solutions will avoid the problems involved in a new pipeline route.

Sincerely,

**20150114-0017(30060349).pdf**

**Town of Merrimack, NH**

6 BABOOSIC LAKE ROAD MERRIMACK, NH 03054 ~ WWW.MERRIMACKNH.GOV

January 8, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr., Deputy Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: Request for Extension of Comment Period - Kinder Morgan Gas Pipeline

Docket No. PF14-22-000

Dear Sir:

On behalf of the residents of Merrimack, NH, the Town Council respectfully requests an extension of 90 days for the comment period for the proposed Kinder Morgan gas pipeline project.

This project was originally proposed to be largely in Massachusetts. However, several months into the application process, Kinder Morgan realigned the route to be predominantly in New Hampshire. The retention of the original end date for public comment based on the original route, places our residents at a disadvantage because of the truncated time they now have to respond to an amended route. While a pipeline project appears to be straight-forward, the technical issues involving the proposed route, affected properties, local environments and wildlife, and water quality are complex and take time for the affected agencies and property owners to review, assess and prepare cogent comments. In addition, the public meeting schedule being coordinated with Kinder Morgan further shortens the time available to respond in the original comment period.

Please feel free to contact the Town of Merrimack should you have any questions or need clarification.

Thank you for your attention in this matter.

Sincerely,

The Merrimack Town Council  
Nancy M. Harrington, Chairman  
Thomas J. Mahon, Vice Chair

William W. Boyd, III, Councilor  
Finlay C. Rothhaus, Councilor  
Lon S. Woods, Councilor  
Daniel Dwyer, Councilor  
Thomas P. Koenig, Councilor

**20150114-0020(30060383).pdf**

LETTER FROM THE MEMBERS OF THE NORTHEAST CONNECTICUT CHAPTER  
OF THE CITIZENS CLIMATE LOBBY TO THEIR REPRESENTATIVES IN THE  
CONNECTICUT GENERAL ASSEMBLY AND TO THE FEDERAL ENERGY  
REGULATORY COMMISSION

December 20, 2014

Dear Representative, Senator and Secretary of the FERC,

We are writing to you in regard to the gas pipeline expansion project:  
Spectra's AIM (Algonquin Incremental Market) project, docket 1CP14-96;  
TGP's Connecticut Expansion project, docket 1CP14-529;  
TGP's NED (Northeast Energy Direct) project, docket 1PF14-22;  
Spectra's Atlantic Bridge project (no docket 1 yet);  
Spectra and Northeast Utilities Access Northeast project (no docket 1 yet).

To members of the Connecticut General Assembly: we respectfully ask that you look into why these high pressure, large diameter pipelines are being built. The need for power is not a reason to build these enormous projects; in fact, the power being brought to the region already exceeds demand. The purpose of these risky pipelines carrying dirty fracked fuel is to export gas overseas at great profit to the gas industry. We do not support dangerous pipelines being built anywhere close to our homes, our towns or our neighborhoods. We do not support drilling beneath the Connecticut or Still Rivers, which put both of them at risk of fracked gas pollution. We do not support the use of public land for pipeline construction. At this point in history, with the climate heating up and becoming more disruptive, we must phase out the use of fossil fuels, which are all bad for the environment, and move toward a non-carbon, sustainable energy future.

To FERC officials: We believe that the environmental assessment/impact statement for these projects is wholly inadequate. The EA/EIS fails to take into account the effect of methane on air quality or on the overall environment. Methane is a climate change gas which is 86 times more potent than carbon dioxide at trapping heat in the atmosphere in the first 20 years of release. That means that switching from coal to gas for electrical power has the potential to MAKE CLIMATE CHANGE WORSE, yet the AS/EIS completely ignores the factor of methane's harmful effects. FERC is presently the ONLY agency in the U.S. which has the ability to regulate methane, as methane is unregulated by the EPA. Since FERC is the agency which is approving dozens of pipeline projects all across the country, it has the responsibility to be sure that its many approvals are not putting the American people at risk of increasing climate disruption and worsening air pollution. Independent environmental assessments should be done for all of the pipeline projects. FERC has issued numerous approvals which serve to benefit industry at the expense of the health of our country and the American people.

We request that you inform us of what steps you are taking to insure that the real dangers of fracked gas pipelines are publicly revealed before these pipeline expansions are approved.

Thank you for your concern and assistance.

Sincerely,

MEMBERS OF THE NORTHEAST CONNECTICUT CHAPTER OF THE CITIZENS CLIMATE LOBBY

**20150114-0030(30060451).pdf**

hand written letter, Lucy Humphrey, Fitzwilliam, NH, opposing

**20150114-0031(30060452).pdf**

hand written letter, Stephen P. Humphrey, Fitzwilliam, NH, opposing

**20150114-5043(30056303).pdf**

From: info@NHPipelineAwareness.org

January 14, 2015

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

Dear Secretary Bose:

The citizens' group NH Pipeline Awareness requests that the FERC direct Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline to postpone the recently announced Open Houses to be held in Milford, Rindge, Winchester, Londonderry, and Hudson, New Hampshire, between January 27 and February 19, 2015. Tennessee Gas Pipeline (TGP) submitted this schedule on January 9 in a filing for inclusion with docket no. PF14-22-000.

Although TGP refers to its list of dates and locations as a rescheduling of events that were previously postponed, this not the case. All of the New Hampshire communities where the Open Houses are now scheduled to be held are located on the revised "preferred path" that TGP filed with FERC on December 9, 2015; none was on the original route that was filed on November 5, 2015. Residents of the newly affected New Hampshire communities were not even informed of the project's potential impact to them prior to December 9, much less given a schedule of Open Houses.

Contrary to TGP's statements, scheduling a series of Open Houses for the supposed benefit of a whole new body of citizens in an entirely new geographical location is not a "postponement" of the canceled events. The TGP/KM pre-filing was for a 30-36" pipeline across Massachusetts, yet the Open Houses scheduled are for a proposed 30-36" pipeline in a different state.

TGP announced its original schedule of Open Houses for Northeast Energy Direct project stakeholders in mid-October. Subsequently, in a letter to the FERC dated November 6, TGP Deputy General Counsel and Vice President J. Curtis Moffatt submitted the revised schedule and cited requests from Massachusetts elected officials that the events be delayed: "This postponement is consistent with letters that Tennessee received from Representative Jim McGovern and Representative Niki Tsongas requesting a delay in the proposed outreach schedule in order to provide affected landowners and communities the necessary time to review the draft Resource Reports 1 and 10 submitted on November 5, 2014." Stakeholders along the original route were notified of the potential impact roughly between February and April 2014, and in October 2014 were given a schedule of Open Houses to be held during November and December 2014. Subsequently, in response to requests from Massachusetts lawmakers (as acknowledged in TGP's letter to the FERC of November 6, 2014), TGP canceled those events, ostensibly to give the affected communities more time to study and understand the project. Now, TGP proposes to hold Open Houses for New Hampshire citizens in January and February 2015, the last of which is scheduled only two and a half months after the revised route was announced.

The citizens of New Hampshire must be given the same consideration as our neighbors in Massachusetts. We request that the FERC instruct TGP to hold New Hampshire Open House events beginning no earlier than November 2015.

A petition seeking support for this delay is being delivered to the New Hampshire Governor and congressional delegation today, January 14, 2015. Copies of this petition and accompanying cover letter are attached to

this comment.

Respectfully submitted,  
NH Pipeline Awareness

To: Governor Margaret Hassan; Senator Kelly Ayotte; Senator Jeanne Shaheen; Congresswoman Ann McLane Kuster; Congressman Frank Guinta

From: New Hampshire citizens concerned about the Kinder Morgan pipeline

Subject: Petition to delay timetable for final decision on NED project

Summary request: Restart the clock from Dec. 8th, 2014, with Open Houses to be held around November, 2015

Address responses to: [contact@nhpipelineawareness.org](mailto:contact@nhpipelineawareness.org)

Please respond by: We respectfully request your response no later than Feb 1, 2015; time is of the essence  
On December 8th, 2014, 17 towns across southern New Hampshire suddenly and involuntarily found themselves in the path of the proposed Northeast Energy Direct (NED) natural gas pipeline.

As you may know, the original NED proposal from Kinder Morgan was for a gas transmission project originating in Wright, New York, and cutting eastward across Massachusetts. In late January 2014, Kinder Morgan started knocking on individual homeowners' doors and the Montague Reporter printed the first published article in Massachusetts on these proceedings. A statewide petition began to circulate in February 2014, and the first town resolution was passed by March 1, 2014.

Demanding more information, citizens had their first presentation night on the pipeline project in Cummington, MA, on March 8th. An overflow audience attended, including interested parties from Berkshire, Hampshire, Franklin, Worcester, and Middlesex counties. One Massachusetts representative expressed outrage at learning of the project at that very meeting, with no effort by Kinder Morgan to contact him or other officials. The Montague select board was the first to be asked for survey permission, but the board found the information provided by Kinder Morgan so nebulous that it denied the request. This led to the first of many local-awareness presentations by Kinder Morgan, who was pressured into conducting similar meetings over the following six months throughout the affected areas of Massachusetts. The first date set by Kinder Morgan on the original pipeline route for a formal Kinder Morgan-sponsored Open House was North Reading, MA on November 12, 2014 and was to culminate with a final Open House in Shelburne, MA on December 10th, 2014.

Thus, nearly one year separated the first public notification and inquiry and the last Massachusetts Open House event. The 17 affected townships of New Hampshire along the new preferred route and their 400 property owners deserve no less of an opportunity to conduct meetings, gather information, consult legal counsel, hold similar special town meetings, and gather task forces to assess the unique impact on each community. Many New Hampshire residents and their town leaders are only now receiving letters from Kinder Morgan informing them of the impact to their properties and communities. Predictably, as in Massachusetts, outrage from uninformed officials has ensued.

Kinder Morgan has just announced a schedule of Open Houses to be held in four New Hampshire communities between January 28 and February 18 of this year. This is unacceptable. While such a hurry-up schedule undoubtedly suits Kinder Morgan's agenda, it is patently unfair to New Hampshire citizens.

Many leaders and residents are still unaware of the project, and new populations gain awareness each day. Each person and each community requires time to absorb relevant information as well as to assess the ramifications of this project for themselves, their communities, their state, their regional energy policies, and their obligations to the federal government.

This petition is a formal request to New Hampshire lawmakers that they demand a postponement of formal proceedings related to the NED project such as Open Houses, drafting of impact statements, and ultimate

decisions. New Hampshire residents deserve the same time and courtesies as those afforded to Massachusetts residents. Conducting Open Houses in November 2015 would grant ample and comparable time to those living along the newly proposed route. Please represent the interests of your constituents by demanding that New Hampshire be provided equal opportunity to assess this project.

In your response, please outline your strategy, including any steps you have already taken, for restarting the formal timetable of the New Hampshire preferred route.

Thank you,

We Need Time! Dear Senators Ayotte and Shaheen, Representatives Guinta and Kuster, and Governor Hassan: We, the undersigned constituents, request that you take action to postpone the imminent decision regarding the building of the natural gas pipeline known as NED. This project needs careful consideration by our towns and citizens. The decision whether or not to build this pipeline will have far-reaching consequences for our lives, health, safety, finances, and commitment to energy sources for a very long time to come. The impact on our New Hampshire environment will be enormous.

The clock began ticking on this project months—if not years—before the NH Power Line Route through Southern NH towns was actually filed as the preferred route on December 8th, 2014, and long before we in the affected towns even knew that such a pipeline was planned for our communities. We are being forced to adhere to a gas-company-imposed timeline, leaving us almost no time to inform our citizenry so that informed judgments regarding potential costs and benefits can be made. Elected officials are also indicating that a lack of information from the pipeline developers is delaying their taking a position for or against the pipeline.

We ask that you defend our right to know the full story before a final decision is rendered; that you assist us in slowing down this process so that we may understand the proposed pipeline's impact to our lives, our homes, and our land; in short, that you make the process more reasonable by allowing time for study and exploration of this very complex and critical matter.

Please allow us more time.

Sincerely,

**20150115-0025(30064960).pdf**

From: Thurman, Kari (Shaheen) <Kari\_Thurman@shaheen.senate.gov>

Sent: Monday, January 12, 2015 10:38AM

To: John Peschke

Cc: Diznoff, Robert (Shaheen)

Subject: Request for Extension of Comment Deadline for Kinder Morgan Gas Pipeline

Hi John—

Please see the attached letter from the town of Merrimack. They are requesting an extension of the comment deadline for the Kinder Morgan project.

Please confirm that you have received this letter and don't hesitate to reach out with any questions, I hope that we are able to connect very soon.

Many thanks,

Kari

Kari Thurman

Senator Jeanne Shaheen

(603) 647.7500

Kari.Thurman@Shaheen.Senate.gov

THE INFORMATION IN THIS MESSAGE IS CONFIDENTIAL.

**TOWN OF MERRIMACK, NH**

6 BABOOSIC LAKE ROAD MERRIMACK, NH 03054 WWW.MERRIMACKNH.GOV

January 8, 2015

The Honorable Jeanne Shaheen  
United States Senate  
60 Main Street  
Nashua, NH 03060

RE: Request for Extension of Comment Deadline for Kinder Morgan gas pipeline  
Docket No. PF14-22-000

Dear Senator Shaheen:

Attached is a letter the Merrimack Town Council is sending to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) requesting an extension of the comment period for this project.

The Town Council would sincerely appreciate your support for this request.

Thank you for your attention in this matter.

Sincerely,

Nancy Harrington

Town Council Chair

Cc: Senator Kelly Ayotte

Congressman Frank Guinta  
Congresswoman Ann McLane Kuster  
Executive Councilor David Wheeler  
Senator Gary Daniels  
Representative John Balcom  
Representative Richard Barry  
Representative Chris Christensen  
Representative Richard Hinch  
Representative Josh Moore  
Representative Jeanine Notter  
Representative Anthony Pellegrino  
Representative Phillip Straight

**TOWN OF MERRIMACK, NH**

6 BABOOSIC LAKE ROAD MERRIMACK, NH 03054 WWW.MERRIMACKNH.GOV

January 8, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr., Deputy Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

RE: Request for Extension of Comment Period - Kinder Morgan Gas Pipeline  
Docket No. PF14-22-000

Dear Sir:

On behalf of the residents of Merrimack, NH, the Town Council respectfully requests an extension of 90 days for the comment period for the proposed Kinder Morgan gas pipeline project.

This project was originally proposed to be largely in Massachusetts. However, several months into the application process, Kinder Morgan realigned the route to be predominantly in New Hampshire. The retention of the original end date for public comment based on the original route, places our residents at a disadvantage because of the truncated time they now have to respond to an amended route. While a pipeline project appears to be straight-forward, the technical issues involving the proposed route, affected properties, local environments and wildlife, and water quality are complex and take time for the affected agencies and property owners to review, assess and prepare cogent comments. In addition, the public meeting schedule being coordinated with Kinder Morgan further shortens the time available to respond in the original comment period.

Please feel free to contact the Town of Merrimack should you have any questions or need clarification.

Thank you for your attention in this matter.

Sincerely,

The Merrimack Town Council

### **20150115-5129(30062704).pdf**

Amy Glowacki, Mason, NH.

I am opposed to the NED project for the Environmental Injustice it forces on the residents of NH. The people of New Hampshire are being unfairly exposed to increased known toxins and our drinking water sources are being endangered for the profit of outside investors that are not regulated. Information is sparse and often lacking from Kinder Morgan with many TBD statements. Property owners cannot make informed decisions with a lack of information while being pressured with a short time-line.

1. The proposed pipeline delivers more than 6x the amount of gas needed in New England. The excess 84% will be exported to Canada. No gas will be available for residents of Mason who will carry the burden of the 36" pipeline, the 12" lateral and the compressor station. KM states they have 0.5 Bcf/day in LDC contracts. Pipeline target capacity is 2.2 Bcf/day. Kinder Morgan do not deny they will accept export contracts and export terminals are coming online in Canada.
2. The compressor station is the largest ever planned at 80,000 HP. This pollutes with over 300 toxins up to a 2 mile radius. President Obama just issued a new strategy to decrease methane emissions the compressor increases them.
3. In 2011 NH Governor Lynch issues a NH Climate Action Plan for no more investment in fossil fuel infrastructure. Green energy alternatives need to be explored and promoted ahead of more fossil fuel infrastructure for private business gain.
4. The KM maintenance plan includes the use of pesticides. This threatens our drinking water. We are 100% dependent on well water. KM representatives repeatedly deny that pesticides are used in maintenance.
5. Kinder Morgan has known safety deficiencies in testing pipeline safety, maintaining equipment, and inspection lapses leaving the people and the environment at risk for gas leaks that contaminate water, air and soil and potential fires and explosions.
6. Kinder Morgan repeatedly submits outdated maps showing the location of houses impacted thus underestimating the impacts of their pipeline construction.
7. A pipeline of 1,200 - 1,400 psi creates a blast zone of up to 1,000 feet. This is a superhighway of gas transport and endangers those living in the zone.
8. Major blasting projects are proposed for portions of the pipeline in Mason. The aquifers in Mason are poor at best. Water problems already exist. Blasting projects in Mason have disturbed private wells rendering them dry and the property uninhabitable.

**20150115-5173(30063305).pdf**

Tim Kelly, Mason, NH.

I urge you not to approve the NED pipeline project. This project will have a devastating impact on the communities that are affected. Specifically; violation of property rights, threat to health, safety, environment and clean water (most of us get our water from private wells which can be seriously compromised from blasting).

Key points:

The proposed volume of 2.2 Bcf/day of gas far exceeds current or projected needs for the Northeast.

This project is NOT for the greater public good.

This project IS for corporate profit at our expense. The bulk of the gas is for overseas export to be sold on the world market.

Expanded use of fossil fuels is NOT in the best interests of the U.S. Methane is a strong Greenhouse Gas, far worse than Co2.

This project does a gross injustice to property owners in Mass. and New Hampshire.

This project should NOT be approved by FERC! Ask yourselves, “would I want this pipeline on my property?”

Answer honestly.

**20150116-0020(30071692).pdf**

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC

1615 Suffield Street

Agawam, MA 01001

December 30, 2014

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

RE: Denying property access - Sunridge Road, Rindge, NH

Representing the undivided interest of the owners of Sunridge Development Open Space parcels located off of Sunridge Road, Ridge, NH and more specifically described as:

1. Sunridge Open Space Parcel “B” 14.8 acres and shown on the Town of Rindge, ~Tax Maps as Map 1—Lot ‘11-14-B
2. Sunridge Open Space Parcel “D” — 4.593 acres and shown on the Town of Rindge, NH Tax Maps as Map 1 —Lot 11-14-D

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

John B. Hunt

**20150116-0021(30073092).pdf**

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC

1615 Suffield Street

Agawam, MA 01001

Date: 1-9/2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access

As the owner of the property located at:

22 Sunridge 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.

**20150116-0022(30073091).pdf**

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC

1615 Suffield Street

Agawam, MA 01001

December 30, 2014

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

RE: Denying property access — 5 parcels located on Sunridge Road, Rindge, NH4

Regarding the following properties located on Sunridge Road, Rindge, NH and more specifically described as:

1. 154 Sunridge Road, Rindge, NH Land and buildings of William L. and Maryann B. Harper 131,517sf ( 3.019acres) and shown on the Town of Rindge, NH Tax Maps as Map 1 —Lot 11-10
2. Land —264,411 sf ( 6.070 acres) land of William L. and Maryann B. Harper and shown on the Town of Rindge, NH Tax Maps as Map 1—Lot 11-11
3. Land:-; 149,695pf ( 3 A37 acres) land of William L. and Maryann B. Harper and shown on the :.Town of,Riridge, NH Tax Maps as Map 1—Lot 11-12, ‘-: ~ .
4. Land — 149,560 sf (approx 3.43 acres) land of William L. and, Maryann B. Harper and shown on the Town of Rindge, NH Tax Maps as Map 1—Lot 11-7
5. Land — 160,784 sf (3.691 acres) land of William L. and Maryann B. Harper and shown on the Town of Rindge, NH. Tax Maps as Map 1 —Lot 11-14

We are denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter the above referenced land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto the above referenced property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

William L Harper, Maryann B. Harper

**20150116-5002(30064987).pdf**

Diane K Varney-Parker, Mason, NH.

I am concerned about the possibility of this pipeline coming through Mason and NH in general. Kinder Morgan’s proposed plan is set to dig through both conservation land and private properties (with a threat of eminent domain). This is all contrary to the NH spirit of liberty, justice and care of our state land and neighbors!! No matter what Kinder Morgan states this will be disruptive on many levels (there are environmental, safety, and quality of life issues that can’t be denied).

I also think that this is the wrong direction for our energy needs. Causing so much destruction to bring energy to our state is wrong. I believe we can create energy in a cleaner way leading our country to a better future instead of getting more dependent on fossil fuels and polluting our earth. I also know that I am not

alone. My petition against this pipeline now has 654 signatures. The people and towns of NH do not want this pipeline.

**20150116-5035(30065284).pdf**

*9 page letter from Mass Audubon, Advocacy Department, scan not OCR text*

**MassAudubon**

Advocacy Department

Six Beacon Street, Suite 1025 • Boston, Massachusetts 02108

tel 617.962.5187 • fax 617.523.4183. email [jclarke@massaudubon.org](mailto:jclarke@massaudubon.org)

January 15, 2015

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

Re: Docket No. PF 14-22-000

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.c. (TGP), Proposed Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project  
Objection to Information Request Issued to Municipal Boards by AECOM on Behalf of TGP

Dear Secretary Bose:

It has come to Mass Audubon's attention that AECOM, the authorized agent and consultant acting on behalf of Tennessee Gas Pipeline (TGP), has issued a series of letters to Massachusetts municipalities, styled as either a federal Freedom of Information Act (FOIA); 5 U.S.C. § 552; or a Massachusetts Public Records Law (MPRL) (G.L. c. 4, § 7(26) request. These letters (example attached) appear to direct municipal officials to gather, interpret, and provide information to AECOM/TGP regarding the proposed Northeast Energy Direct (NED) gas pipeline corridor.

As a landowner that will be specifically and materially affected by these letters, we request that you require Kinder Morgan (KM)/TGP/AECOM to clarify to all parties who received these letters that these requests are NOT authorized by statute nor are municipalities required to expend time or staff resources to provide the requested information, which would need to be developed as new documentation by these municipalities.

To the extent existing information is required to be disclosed under FOIA or MPRL (<http://www.sec.state.ma.us/pre/prepdf/guide.pdf>). clarification should be required regarding the applicable limits of such requests and provisions for municipalities to charge reimbursement for reasonable costs incurred in providing copies of public records.

Disclosure of some of the information AECOM/TGP has directed municipalities to review and to develop comments about may actually violate the requirements of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) concerning the disclosure of Critical Energy Infrastructure Information (CEII).

Communities and other interested parties may of course submit comments to FERC or other agencies (e.g. Massachusetts Energy Facility Siting Board) on the project, including any information or concerns they may have regarding resources or impacts in the vicinity of the \ proposed pipeline corridor. This is separate and distinct, however, from responding to the letters from AECOM, which essentially are asking local officials to conduct due diligence information gathering, and to interpret and generate comments on behalf of a private company.

**Background**

The letters from AECOM to municipal officials begin with "Subject: Information Request." These letters may be construed to be a valid information request proffered under either FOIA or the MPRL, yet no legal basis exists for imposing several of the obligations on municipal boards directed by AECOM/TGP.

The so-called “Information Request” reads, in relevant part, as follows:

*As part of the FERC NEPA review, it is necessary to identify whether the proposed facilities will cross or be within 0.25-miles of the following sensitive environmental areas:*

- 
- 
- *Any known existing or proposed public or private drinking water wells, reservoirs, or springs in or within 300 feet of the proposed alignment*
- 
- *Locally significant roads, scenic areas, or rivers*

*Or within 0.50-miles of the following areas:*

- *Planned residential subdivision developments*
- *Planned commercial or industrial developments*

*On behalf of Tennessee, AECOM respectfully requests that the Planning Board review its records relative to any of the above-referenced areas and provide written comments [emphasis added] pertaining to the identified resources. We have enclosed for your review a series of US Geological Survey (USGS) location maps depicting the proposed Project facilities to the extent that the locations have been identified. For mapping purposes, the Wright to Dracut Pipeline Segment has been divided into sections with each section beginning at Milepost O. Please reference milepost and county name to indicate any known resource locations or environmental concerns [emphasis added]. Exact locations for construction of the new compressor stations and meter stations have not been determined at this time, therefore, a subsequent consultation request [emphasis added] will be issued once these locations are finalized if they fall outside of the requested 0.25 mile buffer (Pages 2 and 3, AECOM/TGP).*

Eligibility to Request Disclosure; Disclosure Requirements under federal Freedom Of Information Act and Massachusetts Public Documents Act

Despite any suggestion made by the AECOM/TGP directive that the above actions are required by either FOIA of the MPRL, neither the FOIA statute nor the MPRL statute require any municipal entity acting on behalf of the public interest of its residents to identify and review records in order to generate comments (or any new documents at all) on behalf of a private party for its exclusive benefit or profit. The obligation on the municipality is to identify records not subject to legal exemptions that are responsive to a lawful request and allow the requestor to examine and to make copies of that information at the requestor’s time and expense.

No matter how described by AECOM/TGP as an “Information Request,” this directive does not appear to be a valid FOIA or MPRL request, as demonstrated by the following language contained in the December 30, 2014 Information Request:

*Exact locations for construction of the new compressor stations and meter stations have not been determined at this time, therefore, a subsequent consultation request [emphasis added] will: be issued once these locations are finalized if they fall outside of the requested 0.25 mile buffer (Page 3).*

Some of the topics about which AECOM/TGP has directed municipalities to identify, pull, and examine their records about may include information subject to protection from public disclosure under FERC’s CEII requirements. CEII was developed following 9111, in order to limit access to infrastructure information attendant to or supporting energy infrastructure that could be vulnerable to terrorist activities. For example, the directive concerning review and comment about any known existing or proposed public or private drinking water wells, reservoirs, or springs in or within 300 feet of the proposed alignment and locally significant roads, scenic areas, or rivers could, in fact, violate CEII.

This AECOM/TGP directive is not a FOIA/MPRL request. This is one of two consultation requests made by AECOM/TGP. A consultation is NOT required to be performed without compensation to the applicable

board for its time and resources.

For example, any municipal authority that has adopted its own regulations under G.L. c. 44, § 53G is authorized, prior to providing “consultations” for assistance to a developer, to request and receive payment from the developer for such efforts, which includes staff time and resources as well as the hiring of external technical reviewers to assist in such reviews.

The AECOM/TGP directive appears to be seeking the assistance of municipal staff and unpaid volunteers, to provide information, both public and potentially protected from disclosure, by misrepresenting its “Information Request” as a valid FOIA or MPRL request. Compliance with this request could subject these local officials to unintentionally violating federal CEII requirements. It also appears to have been written in order to avoid the Massachusetts statutory authority prescribing compensation to be paid for expending public resources for the exclusive benefit of a private party.

With regard to the intersection between federal FOIA requirements and obligations and FERC CEII requirements, FERC Guidance provides in relevant part as follows:

The federal FOIA exempts nine categories of information from disclosure:

- *Classified national defense and foreign relations information;*
- *Internal agency rules and practices;*
- *Information that is prohibited from disclosure by another federal law (e.g. CEII);*
- *Trade secrets and other confidential business information;*
- *Inter-agency or intra-agency communications that are protected by legal privileges [emphasis added],*
- *Information involving matters of personal privacy;*
- *Certain types of information compiled for law enforcement purposes;*
- *Information relating to the supervision of financial institutions; and*
- *Geological information on wells [emphasis added].*

FOIA broadly provides that no right of public access exists for disclosure of either inter-agency or intra-agency communications protected by legal privileges (e.g. advice of counsel, draft orders, policies, communications) or geological information on wells, both of which could fall into the categories of the information that are prohibited from disclosure (e.g. CEII). In the event that the local officials, in attempting to respond in good faith, did violate CEII requirements, Commission enforcement could potentially be directed at the officials.

Finally, FOIA does not provide a right of access to the records of state or local government agencies (Massachusetts includes municipal boards in this exemption) or to private businesses, organizations, or individuals.

The Commission describes CEII information as specific engineering, vulnerability, or detailed information about proposed or existing critical infrastructure (physical or virtual) that:

1. Relates details about the production, generation, transmission, or distribution of energy;
2. Could be useful to a person planning an attack on critical infrastructure (i.e. water supply infrastructure or sources like wells);
3. Is exempt from mandatory disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act; or gives strategic information beyond the location of the critical infrastructure (e.g. planned residential subdivision development or planned commercial or industrial developments).

The AECOM/TGP directive would appear to request these municipalities disclose information that violates CEII limits on information production and disclosure. .

Prior to authorizing such disclosures and/or performing the unpaid work directed by AECOM/TGP, it would be appropriate for officials to discuss this “Information Request” with local municipal counsel. Any response to AECOM/TGP should be drafted with these considerations in mind.

In addition, both FOIA and the MPRL provide that a response to the request must be provided within ten days, but there is no requirement that the substantive information be provided within that time frame. A response seeking clarification about the requested information, a response that requests pre-production payment by the requester to offset public time and resources dedicated to responding to the request, or a response pointing out some of the issues described here would suffice to satisfy the ten-day requirements. Thank you for your considerations of these issues. We respectfully request that you order KM/TGP/ AECOM to clarify their requests to municipalities and to comply with all applicable laws and directives.

Sincerely,

John J. Clarke  
Director

cc: Lori Ferry, AECOM  
Planning Boards of Massachusetts communities along NED corridor

Attachments: December 30, 2014 letter from AECOM to Shelburne, MA Planning Board  
FERC FOIA Guide relative to CEII

*Mass Audubon works to protect the nature of Massachusetts for people and wildlife. Together with more than 100,000 members, we care for 35, 000 acres of conservation land, provide school, camp, and other educational programs for 225,000 children and adults annually, and advocate for sound environmental policies at local, state, and federal levels. Founded in 1896 by two inspirational women who were committed to the protection of birds, Mass Audubon is now one of the largest and most prominent conservation organizations in New England. Today we are respected for our science, successful advocacy, and innovative approaches to connecting people and nature. Each year, our statewide network of wildlife sanctuaries welcomes nearly half a million visitors of all ages, abilities, and backgrounds and serves as the base for our work. To support these important efforts, call 800-AUDUBON (283-8266) or visit [www.massaudubon.org](http://www.massaudubon.org).*

#### Freedom of Information Act Guide

The Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), outlined in Title 5 of the United States Code, Section 552 (m), as amended in 2007, was enacted in 1966 and became law on July 4, 1967.

Under FOIA any person has the right to request public access to federal agency records or information. The agency must release the records upon receiving a written request unless the records fall within the nine exemptions and three exclusions outlined in the Act. This right of access is enforceable in court.

1. Classified national defense and foreign relations information;
2. Internal agency rules and practices;
3. Information that is prohibited from disclosure by another federal law;
4. Trade secrets and other confidential business information;
5. Inter-agency or intra-agency communications that are protected by legal privileges;
6. Information involving matters of personal privacy; .
7. Certain types of information compiled for law enforcement purposes;
8. Information relating to the supervision of financial institutions; and
9. Geological information on wells.

Exclusions;

The three exclusions pertain to especially sensitive law enforcement and national security matters. Even if the information may be withheld under FOIA, the Commission still may disclose it as a matter of adminis-

trative discretion under some circumstances. However, the Commission is not legally obligated to do so.

Limltatlons:

FOIA does not provide a right of access to the following records:

1. Records held by Congress;
2. The Federal courts;
3. State or local government agencies; and
4. Private businesses, organizations or individuals.

Contact state authorities for further information regarding their own laws governing public access to state and local government records.

Updated: June 28, 2010

AECOM AECOM

10 Orms Street, Suite 405  
Providence, RI 02904

401.274.5685 tel  
401.521.2730 fax

December 30,2014

Shelburne Planning Board  
John Wheeler - Chair  
51 Bridge Street  
Shelburne, MA 01370

Subject: Information Request

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.

Northeast Energy Direct Project, FERC Docket No. PF14-22

Berkshire, Hampshire, Franklin, Middlesex, Worcester, and Essex Counties, Massachusetts

Dear Mr. Wheeler,

In response to the increased demand for Interstate natural gas transmission in the Northeast United States (U.S.), Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. (Tennessee) is proposing the construction and operation of the Northeast Energy Direct Project (Project or NED) which will modify its existing pipeline system in Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New Hampshire. The NED Project will provide up to 2.2 billion cubic feet per day (Scfd) of new firm natural gas transportation capacity to meet the growing energy needs in the Northeast U.S., particularly in New England. Tennessee will file an application seeking the issuance of a certificate of public convenience and necessity from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission or FERC) for the Project. Tennessee submitted a request to enter the FERC's National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Pre-Filing Process on September 15, 2014 and FERC approved this request under FERC Docket No. PF14-22.

The Project facilities in Massachusetts include the following:

- Approximately 64 miles of new (greenfield) pipeline in Massachusetts (extending from the Massachusetts/New York border, through New Hampshire, to Dracut, Massachusetts);
- Approximately 52 .rnilles of pipeline laterals co-located with existing Tennessee pipeline rights-of-way;
- Construction of three new compressor stations;
- Construction of eleven new meter stations and modifications to two existing meter stations; and
- Construction of minor appurtenant facilities, including mainline valves, cathodic protection, and pig launcher/receivers throughout the Project area.

The table below summarizes the proposed pipeline mileage within each county crossed by the Project within

Massachusetts.

*{TABLE not reproduced here}*

An Environmental Report (ER) which is required as part of the FERC Section 7(C) application and review process is currently being prepared for the Project. As part of the FERC NEPA review, It is necessary to identify whether the proposed facilities will cross or be within 0.25-1)1iles of the following sensitive environmental areas:

- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), State, or Municipal designated aquifers
- State or municipal designated aquifer protection areas
- Surface waters that provide public drinking water supplies
- State or municipal designated surface water protection areas
- Any known existing or proposed public or private drinking water wells, reservoirs, or springs in or within 300 feet of the proposed alignment
- Open space/natural areas
- Locally significant roads, scenic areas, or rivers
- Schools, parks, ballfields, trails

Or within 0.50-miles of the following areas:

- Planned residential subdivision developments

On behalf of Tennessee, AECOM respectfully requests that the Shelburne Planning Board review its records relative to any of the above-referenced areas and provide written comments pertaining to the identified resources. We have enclosed for your review a series of U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) location maps depicting the proposed Project facilities to the extent that the locations have been identified. For mapping purposes, the Wright to Dracut Pipeline Segment has been divided into sections with each section beginning at Milepost 0. Please reference milepost and county name to indicate any known resource locations or environmental concerns. Exact locations for construction of the new compressor stations and meter stations have not been determined at this time, therefore, a subsequent consultation request will be issued once these locations are finalized if they fall outside of the requested 0.25 mile buffer. If you have any questions or comments regarding the Project, please do not hesitate to. contact me at 630-839-5392 or via email at 10rLferry@aecom.com. Thank you for your consideration.

Yours sincerely,

Lori Ferry

AECOM Project Manager

cc: Michael Letson, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C

Attachment: USGS Location Maps

Z:\KIM-NED 6032B7631300-Communications\1330 External\Agency  
Consultation\2 All State Consultations December 2014\1 Massachusetts  
County and Local\Shelburne Planning letter 121014 Information  
request\ldocx

**20150116-5135(30069593).pdf**

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

January 16, 2015

Ms. Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, N.E.  
Washington, D.C. 20426

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

Response to Request to Delay Open Houses

Dear Ms. Bose:

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. (“Tennessee”) filed its Request to Use Pre-filing Procedures (“Pre-filing Request”) for the Northeast Energy Direct Project (“NED Project” or “Project”) with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (“Commission”) on September 15, 2014, in the abovereferenced docket. By notice issued October 2, 2014, the Commission approved Tennessee’s Pre-filing Request for the Project.

Tennessee’s original proposed route for a portion of the NED Project included approximately 177 miles of new and co-located pipeline facilities extending from Wright, New York to Dracut, Massachusetts (referred to as the Market Path Component of the Project). The proposed path of the Market Path Component extended across the northern part of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. At that time, Tennessee proposed to host approximately twelve open houses for the Market Path Component during the months of November and December 2014, between Wright, New York and Dracut, Massachusetts. After filing an updated stakeholder list and the draft Resource Reports 1 and 10 on November 5, 2014, Tennessee notified the Commission on November 6, 2014 that it was postponing the scheduled open houses, to provide stakeholders with additional time to review the information submitted on November 5, 2014.

On December 8, 2014, Tennessee modified the proposed route of the Market Path Component of the Project, officially adopting the so-called New York Powerline Alternative and the New Hampshire Powerline Alternative, rather than the originally-proposed Market Path Component. This new route involves co-locating the pipeline along an existing electric transmission line corridor in eastern New York, western Massachusetts, and southern New Hampshire. With the adoption of the New York and New Hampshire Powerline Alternatives, the proposed revised route of the Market Path Component now includes approximately 188 miles of new and co-located mainline pipeline facilities. This new route follows existing utility rights-of-way for more than 90 percent of the proposed route. In the December 8, 2014 supplemental filing, Tennessee also explained that it planned to host open houses in the Project area, including in the area of the revised pipeline route during the period of January 2015 through March 2015, to provide additional information and answer questions concerning the Project.

Tennessee filed with the Commission on January 9, 2015, a revised schedule and locations for the open houses it is hosting in New York, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire for the Project. Tennessee will host 13 open houses across the length of the proposed Market Path Component between January 27 and February 19, 2015. In response to the schedule, on January 14, 2015, a citizens’ group in New Hampshire requested that the Commission direct Tennessee to postpone the open houses to be held in New Hampshire. Tennessee believes its open house schedule is appropriate, and respectfully requests the Commission to deny this request.

The open houses are sponsored by Tennessee as part of its Public Participation Plan required by the Commission during the pre-filing process. The open houses are intended to allow the public to hear from representatives of Tennessee in person, learn more about the Project, ask questions, and provide their feedback. Significantly, open houses are just the first of many opportunities for interested members of the public to participate in the Commission’s review of the NED Project. During the administrative review process, members of the Commission’s staff will hold their own Commission-sponsored scoping meetings in the Project area to aid the Commission in defining and refining the scope of the environmental impacts of the Project. The scoping process and meetings are another important opportunity for affected property owners and other stakeholders to provide detailed comments about issues pertaining to their properties, including the existence of sensitive environmental features, potential alternatives, and construction constraints.

Even after Tennessee files its formal certificate application for the NED Project, members of the public still have multiple opportunities to participate in the Commission's review process. The Commission will issue public notice of Tennessee's application and officially open the scoping period for the Project, soliciting comments and motions to intervene. Since the Commission is almost certain to prepare an environmental impact statement ("EIS") for the NED Project, the Commission will first prepare a draft EIS. Upon issuance of the draft EIS, the Commission will open up a new comment period, allowing interested members of the public to comment on the findings in the draft EIS on the record. In addition, members of the Commission's staff will hold another round of public meetings in the Project area to hear public comments, on the record, on the draft EIS, before considering the comments and issuing a final EIS.

This process, including pre-filing and the Commission's consideration of Tennessee's application for the NED Project, is likely to take approximately two years. Tennessee's open houses are just the first opportunity for the public to hear from representatives of the company in person during this lengthy process. There are multiple, significant opportunities for affected landowners, communities, and stakeholders to participate and provide comments on the record over the course of the Commission's extensive review process. Consequently, Tennessee does not believe that it is appropriate to postpone the open houses. In fact, doing so would eliminate an immediate opportunity for the public to hear directly from Tennessee representatives early in the process. Simply holding the open houses as scheduled does not foreclose any of the other opportunities for interested members of the public to participate in the proceeding. However, postponing the open houses, and effectively slowing down the Commission's review, would only prolong and exacerbate the pipeline capacity constraints driving the high cost of energy in New England. Therefore, Tennessee respectfully requests that the Commission deny the request to postpone the open houses.

Any questions concerning the letter should be addressed to the undersigned at (713) 420-4544.

Respectfully submitted,

TENNESSEE GAS PIPELINE COMPANY, L.L.C.

By: /s/ Jacquelyne M. Rocan  
Jacquelyne M. Rocan  
Assistant General Counsel

**20150120-0006(30082882).tif**

letter to TGP denying survey access, Lynette H. Croteau, Winchester, NH 03470

**20150120-0078(30079981).pdf**

hand written letter, Gloria C. Foster, New Ipswich, NH, opposing

**20150120-0082(30080002).pdf**

**BOARD OF SELECTMEN  
TOWN OF TEWKSBURY  
TOWN HALL  
1009 MAIN ST  
TEWKSBURY & MASSACHUSETTS 01876**

TODD R. JOHNSON, ESQ. CHAIRMAN  
SCOTT WILSON, VICE CHAIRMAN  
BRUCE PANILAITIS, Ph.D. CLERK  
DAVID H. GAY  
JAMES D. WENTWORTH

December 19, 2014

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
BBBFirst Street, NE  
Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20146  
Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LLC—Docket No. PF14-22-000  
Proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Secretary Bose:

The Board of Selectmen and the administrative staff of the Town of Tewksbury have closely followed the pre-filing and subsequent updates related to the proposed Northeast Energy Direct project by Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Gas Pipeline. We have a number of concerns related to the impact that the proposed pipeline will have on both private and town-owned property within our community. Our residents are appropriately concerned about the safety implications of this pipeline installation as well as the significant impact the necessary right of ways would have on the aesthetics of our community.

Without addressing the more global questions related to the necessity of the entire project in the context of a growing alternative energy infrastructure, we would like to comment on the proposed alternative routes for the Lynnfield Lateral. Specifically, we would like to comment on the proposed alternative routes for the Lynnfield Lateral as outlined in Section 10.3.2.2 and Figure 10.3-12 of the November 5<sup>th</sup> Draft Environmental Report filed by Kinder Morgan. If the pipeline project is ultimately approved, we would favor the Alternative Route 1 proposed, as this will eliminate all direct impacts on Tewksbury residents. The siting of the pipeline along the interstate highway is a significantly more preferable alternative to routing the pipeline through dense residential areas. The proposed Alternative Routes 2 and 3 would be strenuously opposed by the Town given the significant impact to our residents.

The Town of Tewksbury remains committed to working with Kinder Morgan to establish the most reasonable route for the Lynnfield Lateral if this project is eventually approved. We appreciated the informational session held by Kinder Morgan in June of 2014 in our community and look forward to the subsequent sessions that were promised to our residents at that time.

Thank you for your time and consideration of our comments and concerns related to this proposed project.

Sincerely,

TODD R. JOHNSON, ESQ. CHAIRMAN  
SCOTT WILSON, VICE CHAIRMAN  
DAVID H. GAY  
JAMES D. WENTWORTH  
BRUCE PANILAITIS, Ph.D. CLERK

**20150120-0092(30083377).tif**

*page 1 of ?, typed, scanned not OCR converted, opposing*

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426  
Ref: Docket PF 14-22

As a concerned New Hampshire citizen, I am writing to urge you to publicly oppose the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline project proposed by Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline (Docket PF 14-22) and for you to allow the citizens of New Hampshire additional time to study the impacts of this pipeline on our properties and environment. The NED project as proposed by Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline would trample the well-preserved properties of smaller and larger communities in southwest and south-central

New Hampshire and take private property from landowners by eminent domain. In addition, their proposal flies in the face of recommendations made in the New Hampshire Climate Action Plan of March 2009 that have us decreasing our use of fossil fuels.

Kinder Morgan/TGP is not the only alternative if we have to increase our natural gas supply to the New England market. Spectra Energy proposes expanding its Algonquin and Maritimes & Northeast systems, pipelines that already directly connect to about 60 percent of New England's natural gas-fired electric generation. The pipeline expansions will be available in up to 1 billion cf/d (1.5 billion cf/d including AIM and Atlantic Bridge), and could be in service as early as November 2018, depending on the schedule set by the states. Importantly, the expansions can occur on their existing footprint to minimize environmental impact.

Residents and local governments are told of a New England need for 600 million cubic feet/day by ISO New England. The Northeast Energy Direct pipeline project proposed by KM/TGP is being planned for 2.2 Bcf/d. With nearly four plus times the capacity called for, where is the other three quarters of that capacity destined? The terminal hub for this project in Dracut Ma. is also a connection point to the Maritimes & Northeast (M&NE) pipeline which has just applied to switch direction, bringing gas from Massachusetts, through Maine to the Maritimes of Canada, where two ports have just applied to switch from import to export. Bear Head LNG Corporation is planning to spend \$2.2 billion of LNG Ltd.'s money on a proposed LNG compression and export facility in Nova Scotia, which will process 4 million tons per year, for starters, "and expand as gas becomes available at Bear Head." Without the NED Pipeline, there isn't a currently viable supply route for natural gas from the Marcellus Shale Gas play into Nova Scotia. LNG Ltd. claims to be in discussions with somebody who will soon be able to provide their facility with a lot of natural gas capacity. Those discussions must be pretty well along if LNG Ltd. is willing to put aside the billions of dollars necessary to get their export site approved, built and operational by 2019.

My reasonable conclusion is that the proposed NED Pipeline was never meant to serve New England's energy needs. From the start, that's been a pretense to get natural gas from the fracking fields of Marcellus to the export terminals in Canada. As the natural gas whooshes through our forests, conservation lands, wetlands and neighborhoods, we property owners and our families get to assume all the risk with no reward except for a tariff on our electric bill.

On December 8th, 2014, 17 towns across southern New Hampshire suddenly and involuntarily found themselves in the path of the proposed Northeast Energy Direct (NED) natural gas pipeline. The original NED proposal from Kinder Morgan was for a gas transmission project originating in Wright, New York, and cutting eastward across Massachusetts. Beginning in late January 2014, Kinder Morgan started knocking on individual homeowners' doors and the Montague Reporter printed the first published article in Massachusetts on these proceedings. A statewide petition began to circulate in February 2014, and the first town resolution was passed by March 1, 2014.

Demanding more information, citizens had their first presentation night on the pipeline project in Cummington MA, on March 8th. An overflow audience attended, including interested parties from Berkshire, Hampshire, Franklin, Worcester, and Middlesex counties. One Massachusetts representative expressed outrage at learning of the project at that very meeting, with no effort by Kinder Morgan to contact him or other officials. The Montague select board was the first to be asked for survey permission, but the board found the information provided by Kinder Morgan so nebulous that it denied the request. This led to the first of many local-awareness presentations by Kinder Morgan, who was pressured into conducting similar meetings over the following six months throughout the affected areas of Massachusetts. The first date set by Kinder Morgan on the original pipeline route for a formal Kinder Morgan-sponsored Open House was North Reading, MA on November 12, 2014 and was to culminate with a final Open House in Shelburne, MA on December 10th, 2014.

Thus, nearly one year separated the first public notification and inquiry and the last Massachusetts Open House event. The 17 affected townships of New Hampshire along the new preferred route and their 400 property owners deserve no less of an opportunity to conduct meetings, gather information, consult legal

counsel, hold similar special town meetings, and gather task forces to assess the unique impact on each community. Many New Hampshire residents and their town leaders are only now receiving letters from Kinder Morgan informing them of the impact to their properties and communities. Predictably, as in Massachusetts, outrage from uninformed officials has ensued.

Kinder Morgan has just announced a schedule of Open Houses to be held in five New Hampshire communities between January 28 and February 18 of this year. This is unacceptable. There are 17 towns affected and we get 5 open houses? While such a hurryup schedule undoubtedly suits Kinder Morgan's agenda, it is patently unfair to New Hampshire citizens. Many leaders and residents are still unaware of the project, and new populations gain awareness each day. Each person and each community requires time to absorb relevant information as well as to assess the ramifications of this project for themselves, their communities, their state, their regional energy policies, and their obligations to the federal government.

NH Pipeline Awareness created a petition to Senators Ayotte and Shaheen, Representatives Guinta and Kuster, and Governor Hassan titled, "We Need More Time". The petition requests a postponement of formal proceedings related to the NED project. The petition gathered over 1900 signatures in just 2 weeks.

I feel New Hampshire residents deserve the same time and courtesies as those afforded to Massachusetts residents. Conducting Open Houses in November 2015 would grant ample and comparable time to those living along the newly proposed route to perform their due diligence. I look forward to cooperation from our town and public officials in helping the citizens of New Hampshire in this matter.

Sincerely,

Tom Wilder  
Merrimack, NH 03054

**20150120-0118(30094628).pdf**

*{was File 30080395\_1.tif cannot be converted to PDF.}*

**Town of Wilmington**  
Office of the Town Manager  
121 Glen Road  
Wilmington, MA 01887-3597  
PHONE: (978)658-3311  
FAX: (978)658-3334  
TTY: (978)694-1417  
WWW:WILMINGTONMA.GOV

January 15, 2015

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

RE: Kinder Morgan Lynnfield Lateral Pipeline Proposal through Wilmington, MA

Project's Docket Number: PF 14 - 22

Dear Secretary Bose:

Following a thorough review of all available information on the Kinder Morgan Tennessee Gas Pipeline proposal for a natural gas pipeline through Wilmington, Massachusetts the Town, through its elected Board of Selectmen, has voted unanimously to strongly oppose the project as currently defined. Administrative staff from the Town met with Kinder Morgan representatives to review and understand their plan and met a second time to point out areas of critical concern. The attached map illustrates the proposed pipeline and its proximity to sensitive areas within the community. I am seeking to schedule another meeting with representatives from Kinder Morgan to pursue alternate routes for the portion of the Lynnfield Lateral extending

through Wilmington.

Kinder Morgan has proposed an approximate 1.5-mile corridor through Wilmington to locate a lateral that would impact very environmentally sensitive areas. Specifically, the lateral extends through the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection designated Zone I Area for both the Browns Crossing and Salem Street well fields. Zone I is a designated area that is a 400 foot radius around the wellhead that directly affects the water quality of the well. Both these well fields are shallow, overburdened gravel-packed wells. Browns Crossing is the oldest (1927) and most productive of the remaining active well fields in Wilmington. In 1990, the Town purchased 14 acres adjacent to this well for aquifer protection and the proposed pipeline passes through this parcel. These two well fields account for 64% of the remaining local drinking water supply.

The term “remaining active water supply” is used due to the fact that two-thirds of the Town of Wilmington’s public drinking water supply was lost in 2008 from contamination emanating from EPA’s designated Olin Super Fund Site. This disaster placed significant health and economic stress on the 22,000 citizens of Wilmington. As a result of this contamination, the Town has a heightened sense of concern and desire to protect its remaining drinking water supply.

In addition, four of the eight Town-owned impacted parcels are designated conservation land with fragile ecosystems. Impacts to resource areas such as wetlands, buffer zones, riverfront areas and three (3) certified vernal pools should be avoided and alternatives should be sought that do not degrade water quality and the environment.

Another area of concern is the potential impact of this pipeline on historic Town-owned property. The Colonel Joshua Harnden Tavern is a late 18th century tavern that services as the Town’s museum. The property, including a carriage house, has been designated on the National Register of Historic Places and is the centerpiece for much of Wilmington’s collection of historical documents and artifacts. The Harnden Tavern and carriage house are less than 800 feet from the proposed lateral. This cherished museum and its contents are irreplaceable. Should an accident occur in this section of the pipeline, the Town would lose much of its historical collection.

Above and beyond the impacts to Town resources noted above, there is concern regarding the close proximity of the proposed route of the natural gas pipeline to residents along Salem Street/Route 62 and in the neighborhoods around Charlotte Road and Lucaya Circle. The Winchester Hospital Family Medical Center, a walk-in urgent care center open seven days per week, is less than 150 feet from the proposed lateral.

After reviewing the proposal, it is evident that the route of the proposed pipeline was designed without an understanding of the environmentally sensitive and civically important areas. In fact, there is an existing large utility right of way that is less than 2500 feet at its furthest point that runs nearly parallel to the proposed route. We believe the pipeline should be located in more appropriate areas such as this existing utility corridor, not through a Town’s public drinking water supplies.

The Lynnfield Lateral routing through Wilmington as proposed is simply unacceptable based on the degradation of our water supply, negative influence on susceptible wetlands and potential impacts on important historic structures, a health care facility and residential neighborhoods.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey M. Hull  
Town Manager

cc: Board of Selectmen

John C. Foskett, Town Counsel  
Senator Elizabeth Warren  
Senator Edward Markey  
Congressman Seth W. Moulton  
Governor Charles D. Baker

Senator Bruce E. Tarr  
Representative James R. Miceli  
Representative Kenneth I. Gordon  
Allen Fore, Vice President Public Affairs, Kinder Morgan  
Beverly Woods, Executive Director, Northern Middlesex Council of Governments

*{map, not included here}*

**20150120-0132(30094823).pdf**

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

Date Jan 13, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access

As the owner of the property located at

138 Pleasant Street  
Plainfield, MA 01070

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

John P. Nelson, Jr. Jeanne A. Sargent

**20150120-0133(30094848).pdf**

Emily Cavin and Michael A. Petrilli  
108 Summit Street  
Plainfield MA 01070

01/13/15

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

Dear Ms. Bose,

Below is the text of the letter we sent to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC denying permission to perform surveys on the land we own in Plainfield Massachusetts:

As the owners of the properties located at:

108 Summit Street and 110 Summit Street  
Plainfield MA 01070

We are denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company,) its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter our land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto our property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Emily Cavin  
Michael A. Petrilli

**20150120-0134(30094847).pdf**

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield St  
Agwan, MA 01001

Date: 12/31/14

RE: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at 88 Firetower Road in Stephentown NY 12169, we are denying permission to Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company LLC (a Kinder Morgan company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter our land to perform surveys, or for any other purposes whatsoever.

We are strongly opposed to the pipeline proposition as it is disrespectful and an abuse of American landowners, wildlife, and the environment, as well as hazardous to the heqltg and we[loess of American families within its path.

As such, any physical entry onto our property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespassing.

Phillip and Ashley Bertorelli

**20150120-0138(30094855).pdf**

**Town of Washington**  
8 SUMMIT HILL ROAD, P (413) 623-8878  
WASHINGTON, MASSACHUSETTS 01223 F (413) 623-2116  
Town Offices/Selectman

January 12, 2015

LIST—Governor Baker, Reps Kulik & Pignatelli, Sen Downing, Rep Neal, Sen Warren & Markey, FERC, and MA Sec’y of Energy&Environnmentsl Affairs

The voters of the Town of Washington have overwhelmingly passed a resolution directing this Board to take any and all legal measures to block the construction of high pressure gas pipelines and specifically the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline being proposed by Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Gas.

The resolution also directs us to support public policy at all levels of government that encourages renewable energy and bans. the practice known as “fracking” with special concern for the storage, treatment and disposal of hydraulic fracturing fluids and byproducts..

This Board concurs wholeheartedly with our voters and requests that you take any and all actions in support of this resolution. A.full text is appended.

Thank you,

James A Huebner	Shaun Lennon	Michael Case
Chair, Select Board	Select Board	Select Board

CC Nat Kames - BRPC  
Tom Matusko - BRPC

Article 3: To see whether the Town will vote on the following NON-BINDING RESOLUTION TO BAN KINDER MORGAN’S PROPOSED GAS PIPEUNE EXPANSION IN WASHINGTON, MASSACHUSETTS as submitted by a resident of the town.

WHEREAS, Kinder Morgan Energy Partners and its subsidiary Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co. have proposed to build a new high-pressure pipeline, also known as the Northeast Energy Direct project (NED), from Richmond to Dracut, Massachusetts for the transport of natural gas obtained through the use of hydraulic fracturing (“fracking”) in New York and Pennsylvania, a drilling method that contaminates ground water,

and harms human health through its chemical byproducts;

WHEREAS, natural gas is a non-renewable fossil fuel which generates significant carbon emissions and other pollutants when burned, and Kinder Morgan has not denied that there may be some fracking chemicals present in the gas to be transported by the NED pipeline;

WHEREAS, natural gas is primarily composed of methane, which can be lethal, is highly flammable, and leaks at every step of production and distribution where it is at least 30times more potent than carbon dioxide in terms of climate change;

WHEREAS, Kinder Morgan's preferred route for the NED pipeline would cut across Washington MA, passing very close to a private residence requiring a permanent 50 foot wide right of way that would be denuded of all vegetation except grass and maintained through the use of herbicides, and any alteration to the preferred route may effect other residences and environmentally sensitive areas;

WHEREAS, said NED pipeline route through Massachusetts would divide and destroy large amounts of forest, conservation land, wetlands, and farmland, which may be obtained through eminent domain, potentially harming drinking water and personal health and infringing on personal property rights;

WHEREAS, high pressure pipelines of this kind carry inherent risks such as leaks and ruptures, and as conveyors of flammable gas, can and have caused accidents resulting in explosions and major fires that have been occurring across the US with greater frequency;

WHEREAS, town taxpayer money would pay for emergency response in the event of explosions, fires or other accidents since Kinder Morgan (as a gas utility) is exempt from liability in addition to being exempt from the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, the Safe Drinking Water Act, and the Superfund Act;

WHEREAS, the cost of said pipeline could require Massachusetts citizens to pay a utility bill tariff to fund the uncapped cost of constructing and maintaining the NED pipeline (estimates range. from 1.2to 6 billion dollars), making ratepayers subsidize fossil fuel infrastructure and bear financial risk for the endeavors of a wealthy private corporation;

WHEREAS, said expansions of natural gas represent a new, long-term commitment to fossil fuels that does not honor state and local commitments to renewable energy and reducing greenhouse gas emission levels, nor our responsibility to future generations;

WHEREAS, our energy challenges are better addressed through investments in energy efficiency and renewable energy solutions.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the people of Washington, Massachusetts

1. Hereby call on our Board of Selectmen to stand in opposition to Kinder Morgan's pipeline expansion or any similar projects that may be proposed later, within our Town borders, and stand in solidarity with nearby communities working to disallow the pipeline within their borders..
2. Call on the Board of Selectmen to discuss, consider and use any legal means available to prevent the construction of the NED or any other high pressure gas pipeline within the borders of the Town of Washington.
3. Affirms the need for public policy at the local, state and federal levels to encourage renewable energy and combat climate change, and supports legislation to ban or impose a long-term moratorium on hydraulic fracturing as well as storage, treatment or disposal of hydraulic fracturing fluid or byproducts within the Commonwealth.
4. Shall Cause a copy of this resolution to be presented to the Town's state and Federal legislative representatives, the Governor and Governor - elect, Massachusetts Secretary of Energy and Environmental Affairs, and Federal Energy Regulatory Commission asking them to take action to prevent the construction of the Pipeline within the borders of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

SHAWN M. MORSE  
CHAIRMAN

COUNTY LEGISLATURE  
112 State Street, Room 710  
ALBANY, NEW YORK 12207  
PHONE: (518) 447-7168 FAX (518) 447-5683  
www.albanycounty.com

PAUL T. DEVANE  
CLERK  
RANDY S. KONIOWKA  
FIRST DEPUTY CLERK

December 30, 2014

To whom it may concern:

Enclosed is a copy of a certified resolution adopted by the Albany County Legislature on December 8, 2014.

Sincerely,

Paul T. Devane

Clerk of the Albany County Legislature

RESOLUTION NO. 504

REQUESTING TENNESSEE GAS PIPELINE COMPANY, LLC TO HOLD PUBLIC FORUMS IN ALBANY COUNTY, NEW YORK TO PROVIDE PUBLIC INFORMATION REGARDING A PROPOSED PIPELINE EXPANSION PROJECT AFFECTING SEVERAL ALBANY COUNTY MUNICIPALITIES

Introduced: 12/8/14

By Messrs. Beston, Bullock, Ms. Chapman, Messrs. Clay, Clenahan, Commisso, Ms. Connolly, Messrs. Corcoran, Dawson, Domalewicz, Ethier, Feeney, Higgins, Jacobson, Joyce, Mss. Kinsch, MafEa-Tobler, Mr. Mayo, Mss. McLean Lane, McKnight, Messrs. Morse, Nichols, O'rien, Rahm, Reilly, Simpson, Ward and Stevens:

WHEREAS, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (Tennessee Gas) has proposed a project, entitled the Northeast Energy Direct Project that will have an impact on the Company's existing pipeline system in New York, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, New Hampshire and Connecticut, and

WHEREAS, Four Albany County municipalities: the Towns of Knox, Berne, New Scotland and Bethlehem are hosts to existing Tennessee Gas rights-of-way that represents the currently-intended route of the Albany County portion of the project, and

WHEREAS, Some landowners in the Town of New Scotland have been contacted by representatives of Tennessee Gas soliciting property access for the purpose of survey work and potential for acquisition of land and/or easements to establish an expanded right-of-way for the project, and

WHEREAS, Tennessee Gas has hosted thirty-nine public information sessions in Massachusetts and eastern New York since April 2014, none of which included a forum in Albany County, and

WHEREAS, Tennessee Gas announced plans for a series of additional public information sessions in New York and Pennsylvania in December, January and February, but the Company has not planned a forum in Albany County, and

WHEREAS, Tennessee Gas has now postponed hosting additional Northeast Energy Direct Project public information sessions to allow the public, municipal officials and other stakeholders along the proposed route to have additional time to examine information and materials submitted to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, now, therefore be it

RESOLVED By the Albany County Legislature that Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC is requested to hold a public forum in the County of Albany to answer questions and present the company's plans relating to the proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project, and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the Clerk of the Legislature is directed to forward a certified copy of this resolution to Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC, Senator Charles Schumer, Senator Kristen Gillibrand, Congressman Paul Tonko, State Senator Cecelia Tkaczyk, Assemblywoman Patricia Fahy, Assemblyman Phillip

Stack, Senator-elect Amedore, as well as the Supervisors of the Towns of New Scotland, Knox, Berne and Bethlehem, and the appropriate staff at the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

Adopted by unanimous vote. 12/8/14

State of New York  
County of Albany

This is to certify that I, the undersigned, Clerk of the Albany County Legislature, have compared the foregoing copy of the resolution and/or local law with the original resolution and/or local law now on file in the office, and which was passed by the Legislature of said County on the 8 day of December, 2014 a majority of the members elected to the Legislature voting in favor thereof, and that the same is a correct and true unscripted copy of such original resolution and/or local law and the whole thereof.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and the official seal of the County Legislature this 9 day of December, 2014

Clerk, Albany County Legislature

**20150120-5005(30073378).pdf**

Gina Weaver, New Ipswich, NH.

I just heard that Kinder Morgan has told FERC to disregard the letter from the NH US Senators asking for more time with the approval process. I as a New Ipswich, NH resident am outraged. Massachusetts had a year and a half. Why should New Hampshire have less time? Kinder Morgan is trying to railroad the town selectmen as well as the residents. They have also been sending out letters to residents saying they have already been approved by FERC and that the residents must let them survey their land. Those residents who have been receiving these letters have sent rejection letters via certified mail telling Kinder Morgan that they do not have permission to survey. However I have just heard that Kinder Morgan has been surveying residents property anyways and leaving a note saying they have done so. And when that resident calls Kinder Morgan their response is the letter fell through the cracks.

This company is lying about the approval process and they are committing fraud. This company is dishonest and has no business being in NH. Please do the right thing and Do Not Approve this Pipeline. Otherwise my next step when I get the letter from Kinder Morgan is to sue them and I will make sure my neighbors do the same when they try to take our homes.

**20150120-5006(30073379).pdf**

Arthur Cunningham, Hopkinton, NH.

January 16, 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

Dear Ms. Bose:

The Town of Fitzwilliam, 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 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 Powerline Alternative and the accompanying Tables and Maps do not adequately detail the precise route and impacts on the Town of Fitzwilliam 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 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 power transmission lines; and,
3. 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,
4. The construction, operation and maintenance of the Project threatens injury and damage to the irreplaceable historical and rural character of the Town and the aesthetics of the Town, in violation of the letter and spirit of the 2012 Fitzwilliam Master Plan, and Town Planning and Zoning Ordinances; and,
5. The construction, operation and maintenance of the Project threatens adverse impacts on Town lakes, rivers, streams, brooks, estuaries, wetlands, surface and ground waters; and,
6. The construction, operation and maintenance of the Project threatens adverse impacts to Town forest lands, recreational and conservation areas; and,
7. 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,
8. The construction, operation and maintenance of the Project threaten the economic well-being and aggregate tax base of the Town.

The Town of Fitzwilliam, New Hampshire, requests that:

1. The Company provide a full and comprehensive analysis of the impacts of the project on the Town;
2. The Company provide a precise description of the route of the pipeline through the Town;
3. The Company precisely identify each environmental impact the project will have on the Town;
4. The Company address the threats to the Town identified at items 1-8 above.
5. A time certain be entered that will permit the Town and each citizen and property owner of the Town of Fitzwilliam 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.

Please address filings, communications and correspondence to the undersigned and to:

Sandra Gillis, PO Box 725, Fitzwilliam, NH 03447, 603-585-9119,  
fitzlanduse@wivalley.net

Respectfully submitted,

Arthur B. Cunningham,  
Attorney for the Town of Fitzwilliam  
PO Box 511, 79 Checkerberry Lane  
Hopkinton, NH 03229  
603-746-2196 (O); 603-219-6991 (C)  
gilfavor@comcast.net

**20150120-5037(30073443).pdf**

Hiel Lindquist, Fitzwilliam, NH.

Here is a link to the Sunday Jan 18, 2015 Concord Monitor, Concord, NH article on the pipeline:

<http://www.concordmonitor.com/news/politicalmonitor/15267230-95/capbeatpoliticians-getting-gassed-up-about-pipeline>

Here is one of the statements made in the article: “Kinder Morgan for its part said: “There will be considerable opportunity for public input this year and in succeeding years. A decision by the FERC is not anticipated until early 2017.”

Yes, a decision may be made sometime in 2017, and yes, the public can continue to comment on the project into the foreseeable future, but, for purposes of this project, the pre-filing period ends in March, 2015, unless it is somehow extended as requested by a recent public petition. This is another example of Kinder Morgan continuing to disseminate information, while true, twists the facts in such a way as to give false impressions to the public. In this case, the statement by Kinder Morgan clearly is intended to give the impression that there will be plenty of time to provide comments to FERC in regards to the project approval, when this is clearly no the case.

**20150120-5038(30073445).pdf**

James Markham, Plainfield, MA.

No new gas pipeline! No further investment in new fossil fuel infrastructure!

I urge the Commission to strongly consider the overwhelming scientific evidence that humans are altering the global climate in a way that threatens the health, safety and welfare of future generations. We have a moral responsibility to make choices that preserve the rights of future generations to a healthy environment. All human ventures rely upon the health and balance of the natural world that supports us. So energy production, transmission and efficiency questions should adhere to the following guidelines:

--We should strive for carbon neutrality in all energy production.

--Strong investment should be put into renewable energy sources such as solar photovoltaic and wind (where appropriate).

--No new investment should be put into infrastructure that creates and/or transmits fossil fuels in any form. Specifically no new gas pipelines should be built.

--Recycling, energy conservation and energy efficiency measures (both residential and industrial) should be broadly instituted.

In summary, we need to stop delaying the wholehearted investment into renewable energy sources. Building new infrastructure to facilitate the movement and consumption of fossil fuels (particular natural gas from “fracked” sources) is denying our moral imperative to safeguard the natural world for all its inhabitants and future generations of humans.

The time is now and no responsible person/organization/government can ignore the need to act to accelerate the transition to renewable energy sources. Thank you for considering my input.

Sincerely,

James Markham

**20150120-5041(30073451).pdf**

Diane K Hewitt, Groton, MA.

Cheryl A. LeFleur, Chairman

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, NE

Washington, DC 20426

Dear Chairman LaFleur,

I respectfully request that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) provide the residents of Massachusetts and New Hampshire with sufficient time to fully understand the scope of the proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project, Docket # PF14-22-000 prior to initiating the Kinder Morgan Open Houses slated to begin on January 27th, 2014.

As you know, Kinder Morgan filed an alternative route with FERC on December 8th, 2014. This change now impacts new communities in both states and it is abundantly clear that neither the newly affected municipalities nor individual landowners have had an opportunity to learn about or comment on this major infrastructure project. Until Kinder Morgan provides all affected citizens written notification of their request to survey property, residents can review parcel level maps, and participate in a Kinder Morgan sponsored information session, then MA and NH property owners, town officials, and their state and federal legislative leaders are unable to engage in a meaningful and open dialogue in regard to this controversial and complex energy proposal.

As a directly impacted homeowner on the prior route, I can assure you it took months for our town officials and citizens to connect with Kinder Morgan, whether it was to facilitate an information session or to receive adequate maps—to date, they still haven't provided Groton with current GIS, parcel level maps. Most importantly, it simply took time to understand and appropriately respond to the numerous impacts that this massive infrastructure would have on our town properties, rivers, agricultural, conservation land, and private property.

Now that an alternative route has been identified, it is critical that newly affected communities be afforded the same opportunity to gain information and participate in a full, deliberative, open and transparent process. To this end, I would strongly encourage FERC to request that Kinder Morgan extend its timeline for the upcoming Open Houses.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Diane K. Hewitt,  
Groton, MA

**20150120-5045(30073459).pdf**

Patricia A Martin, Rindge, NH.

Dear Ms. Bose,

I sent the following Letter to the Editor to the Concord Monitor today:

“While our US Congressional delegation has plainly asked the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) and Kinder Morgan to give New Hampshire towns and constituents more time to learn about the pipeline costs and benefits, Kinder Morgan has proceeded to take the next step in the approval process by scheduling the Open Houses, which take them one step closer to gaining FERC approval. We DO need more information from Kinder Morgan and believe that such information should be shared in informal, open meetings, where residents have the benefit of hearing the questions and concerns of their neighbors; just as happened in Massachusetts over a 9 month period. It is in all of our best interest to hear Kinder Morgan's responses to these questions which would go “on the record.” Instead, Kinder Morgan is pushing up the schedule of Open Houses, which are organized like “Science Fairs” with booths so they are only talking to a few people at a time, do not go “on the record” and which satisfies another formal step in the FERC approval process. This is in open defiance of our petition and the request of our Congressional delegation. I sincerely hope that Governor Hassan puts the brakes on this abuse of New Hampshire's people and demands the Open Houses be rescheduled for late summer. Sincerely,

Pat Martin”

**20150120-5053(30073475).pdf**

Diane K Varney-Parker, Mason, NH.

My town and much of NH is against this pipeline. It is going to disturb 800+ residences plus beautiful natural areas, even conservation land. It has many unknown and unproven “benefits”. These seem to be few compared to the number of risks involved from safety to the environment to property liberties. There are too many issues with this plan!! Also a number of alternatives could plausibly be chosen to meet energy demands, either singly or in combination, including allowing natural market pricing effects to impact demand, reforming natural gas market mechanisms, increasing investment in energy efficiency, fixing leaky pipelines, and increasing investment in renewable energy. These alternatives have not been adequately studied. We look to you to do the right thing and deny this pipeline rights to harm our beautiful state.

Thank you!!

**20150120-5057(30073483).pdf**

Gina Frey, Amherst, NH.

Dear Ms. Bose,

I'm writing to express my fervent opposition to the Northern Energy Direct Project - Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Natural Gas Pipeline. We are concerned about safety and the impact on our land, our town, and the environment of New Hampshire. We do not believe TGP has been forthcoming in their communications with stakeholders. Furthermore, TGP has not given an adequate rationale, supported by valid scientific studies, that this Project is needed.

**1. Lack of Need and Lack of Economic Benefit**

This pipeline will not improve NH's energy prices and we will pay in additional tariffs, taxes, and with decreased property values. <http://www.nofrackedgasinmass.org/notgp/wpcontent/uploads/2014/09/BurdenOfProof.pdf>

**2. Safety Impact**

Pipelines leak, explode, contaminate water supplies and threaten life. They are exempt from the Safe Drinking Water Act and pose a significant environmental danger.

<http://www.nofrackedgasinmass.org/what-could-go-possibly-wrong/> The quote from the Keene Sentinel newspaper is self explanatory “The Houston-based Kinder Morgan is the fourth largest energy company in North America, according to its website. The company has a history of accidents with its pipelines; since 2003 it was involved with 180 incidents including spills, evacuations, explosions, fires and fatalities across the United States, according to federal data.”

**3. Environmental Impact**

What's at stake: Thousands of acres of preservation and protected wetlands, protected rivers, over 28 endangered species in the Souhegan River alone, schools and businesses within 2 miles of the blast zone along Rte 101A and public and private water supply in six counties and the following towns, Amherst, Merrimack, Milford, Londonderry, Hudson, Brookline, Windham, Pelham, Salem, Hudson, Mason, Greenville, Mason, New Ipswich, Rindge, Fitzwilliam, Troy, Winchester, and Richmond. Not to mention the neighboring towns and cities and farms that could be impacted by an explosion or spill into the Souhegan and Merrimack Rivers.

4. Decisions in late 2014, found the pipeline was the wrong decision for Hollis, NH and neighboring Massachusetts ranging from as little as 2-10 miles south and the same rational and decision should apply to Our Towns just 2-10 miles north.

5. The development is directly at odds with the character of our towns, quality of life in rural NH, years of preservation and conservation investments, and the town's governing master plans. Just one example is the Amherst, NH Town Master Plan, <http://amherstnh.gov/master-plan/>

Lighting the Future

Executive Summary vii

1. Ensure that new development and redevelopment respect Amherst’s natural resources and complement the Town’s existing character.
2. Preserve and protect historic and cultural resources throughout Amherst.
3. Continue to preserve Amherst’s natural resources and rural landscapes including aquifers, prime agricultural soils, forests, scenic vistas, wildlife habitats, and water and air quality for the sustainable health, safety and welfare of current and future generations.
4. Protect Amherst’s extensive water resources for the benefit of residents and the environment, including surface water features, groundwater, and aquifer areas.
5. Save open space in residential development.
6. Encourage redevelopment that enhances the appearance of existing commercial and industrial areas.
7. Improve the ease and convenience with which residents can walk and use bikes for recreation, shopping, commuting and going to school.
8. Provide educational facilities that support quality education for the town’s students.
9. Recognize the importance of recreation for health by providing needed facilities.
10. Continue to develop greenways and trails in order to provide a town-wide and inter-town system of recreational trails.

7. NH Fish and Game and Society for the Protection of NH Forests agree that the use of protected conservation lands for such facilities can and should be avoided.

8. The residents of these So. New Hampshire towns are expressing opposition just like in Massachusetts and in Hollis, NH. Public sentiment widely opposes this pipeline.

In New Hampshire, we care deeply about our beautiful state, natural resources, clean air, clean water and preserving this precious ecology. A big part of our state’s unique character and tourism depends on preserving the environment. It’s is unconscionable to ignore the safety of the residents and allow any business to threaten the water we need for survival. Ultimately, this pipeline brings more more harm than benefit.

Please do not allow this pipeline to be built in New Hampshire

**20150120-5058(30073485).pdf**

Garth Fletcher, Mason, NH.

January 18, 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

Dear Ms. Bose:

Tennessee Pipeline Company (TGP) is using the terms “colocation” and “colocated” extensively in its proposals, public presentations and promotional material to describe the relationship of its proposed pipeline to existing power-lines.

“Colocation” implies that two items share the same space or facility, in this instance a pipeline and a power-line. Merriam Webster’s definition of “colocate” is “to locate together; especially : to place (two or more

units) close together so as to share common facilities.” However, legal and engineering considerations (e.g., corrosion enhancing induced currents), require that the new pipeline occupy a separate corridor.

This new corridor would be created through new takings of private or public lands. It might be described as “parallel but separate” or in some cases as “adjacent but separate” when the two corridors can be close enough to actually touch, but never as “colocated”.

Thus TGP’s use of “colocation” or “colocated” is deceptive. It suggests to the public that no additional takings of private or public property will be needed since the pipeline will simply be installed in the existing corridor.

This seems equivalent to dismissing a person’s broken leg because it was “colocated” with a previously broken arm. I think the victim would find the sum of his pains, and their expense, to be greater than that of either single broken bone.

We know it is the norm for private companies to employ highly skilled experts to manipulate public perceptions to its advantage. TGP’s pervasive misuse of “colocation” and “colocated” is likely pursuant to such skilled advice.

However, I would expect a Federal agency, such as FERC, to insist on a higher level of technical accuracy and honesty. FERC would certainly reject a proposal which incorrectly specified a pipeline as 24” when in fact it was 36”. A proposal which describes separate corridors as “colocated” is equally inaccurate.

Therefore I request that FERC reject the use of such deceptive words and require that accurate and honest descriptions - such as “parallel to, but separate from, existing easements” - be used in any proposals it is willing to consider. I suggest a ruling that deceptive and misleading descriptions in an application are grounds for summary rejection; I think you would find it would greatly improve the technical accuracy and transparency of the documents your staff needs to study.

Cordially,  
Garth Fletcher

**20150120-5064(30073497).pdf**

Betty L Anders, Rindge, NH.

In a recent petition filed with the NH Governor’s office and the US Delegation, the citizens of New Hampshire are asking for more time to process and understand the scope and severity of the NED project. Please grant us this small request.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts had well over a year to process all the information with regard to this project and in New Hampshire we deserve the same amount of time. The Open Houses are already scheduled and many citizens of the affected towns are still not fully aware of this project. I have approached a number of Rindge residents who were unaware of the project and live very close to the affected properties.

It has also come to my attention that Kinder Morgan representatives are going door to door in some communities to try to gain access to their properties for surveys. If the landowners are unaware of the scope of this project, they could easily be persuaded to allow access to their properties before they understood the severity of the request.

This project is not going to benefit the citizens of NH as many are promising. The NED project will benefit Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Gas Pipeline’s bottom lines tremendously and devastate our properties, our water and our way of life beyond repair

**20150120-5066(30073501).pdf**

Jon L Bryan, Mason, NH.

COPY OF COMMUNICATION WITH KINDER MORGAN

January 13, 2015

Kinder Morgan  
9 Park Street, Suite 200  
Boston, MA 02108 VIA E-Mail:  
nedinfo@kindermorgan.com  
Re: FERC File PF14-22-000 NED

Dear Sir or Madam:

I am in receipt of your unsigned “Dear Landowner” letter of January 7, 2015. In the letter you state that you “appreciate” my ongoing interest and that you will respond “as soon as possible.” That is interesting in that you’ve failed to reply to my earlier questions for approximately one month.

Please respond to the following questions within a reasonable time frame, stipulated as 7 days:

1. Your high pressure gas pipeline, with an incineration span to human beings, animals, and property of up to 2,000 feet, will devastate the Town of Mason. Yet, you have excluded Mason from your town meetings. That appears to be a violation of FERC rules. Do you intend to hold such a meeting in Mason in the immediate future, or are you avoiding Mason due to its near-total, vigorous objection to your dangerous, devastating, and unnecessary project?
2. While no portion of your private-company-profit-driven scheme to take our land is essential for energy needs, with myriad environmentally sound methods to meet future consumption, the so-called “Fitchburg Lateral” is especially destructive to Mason and entirely unnecessary. Do you affirm or deny knowledge of the Fitchburg Power & Light filed sworn statements with the Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities noting slow or shrinking demand (e.g., heating)? Do you affirm or deny that large users, which are supposedly to be supplied by the Fitchburg Lateral, are attempting to jetison their currently unused natural gas onto the market? Please explain why this lateral, which will destroy our town and the lives of citizens, should be granted a certificate of convenience and necessity when, in the face of facts, is neither convenient nor necessary?
3. Please state whether or not, and if approved, you intend to fully compensate hundreds of property owners in New Hampshire who may own property immediately adjacent to your explosive pipeline, thus within the explosion zone but outside of the eminent domain taking, in a manner that would fully pay for their property and allow them to move their families to safe locations?
4. Do you intend to fully compensate the New Hampshire cities and towns, for the duration of the pipeline’s existence within their jurisdictions, for the many millions of dollars in additional fire, police, and public services needed as a result of this dangerous pipeline?
5. Please confirm that a significant portion of the funding of this pipeline could be paid by all electric rate-payers in New England? If so, please provide your economic forecasts for the loss of businesses, employment, and population in New England due to migration away from the pipeline-instigated rate increases?
6. Please confirm that Kinder Morgan could use this pipeline to export natural gas to international markets?
7. Will Kinder Morgan continuously maintain liability insurance to fully cover losses of life and property from a catastrophic explosion of your pipeline? If so, will you provide all towns and impacted residents with an ongoing, sworn “certificate of insurance”?
8. Please further confirm in writing that you are hereby in receipt of my refusal to allow you to survey my property. I’m confident that most other residents will be joining me in that refusal, and the further refusal to enter into any easement agreements with Kinder Morgan for this dangerous proposal that will cause existential damage to our community.

I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Dr. Jon L. Bryan  
154 Morse Road

**20150120-5068(30073505).pdf**

Jon L Bryan, Mason, NH.

Re: White House Council on Environmental Quality, Renewable Energy and Greenhouse Gas Initiative Pertaining to FERC

Dear Sir or Madam:

I am writing in support of President Obama's initiative of December 18, 2014, requiring federal agencies to consider emissions and renewable energy in their rulings. My comments in this document are focused on the need for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) to place significantly-greater importance on emissions and renewable energy options when granting a "Certificate of Convenience and Necessity" to pipeline operators.

This initiative will require FERC to focus on the beneficial and renewable options available to U.S. citizens rather than to continue the Commission's seemingly-slavish deference to the profit goals of privately-held gas pipeline companies. FERC's nearly 100% approval of pipeline applications, regardless of the harm caused to the environment, property owners, and communities – and despite the clear alternatives – is evidence that FERC must be compelled to change their fossil fuel predilections.

I will list just a few of the myriad reasons that FERC's rules should change in deference to this clean energy initiative:

1. FERC's predisposition to fracked, fossil fuel pipeline transmission of energy products deters our nation's transition to renewable energy. There is no need to repeat the numerous environmental concerns about fracked gas, as they are well-publicized and profound. The FERC process that currently fails to require a proper weighting of renewable energy alternatives to fossil fuel pipelines serves the interest of profitdriven pipeline companies while deterring national, state, and local renewable energy policies.
2. The harm to citizens and communities caused by these fracked gas pipelines is permanent while the purported benefits are fleeting. Already, extraction costs are increasing as fracked wells are drilled deeper, requiring more water pollution and dangerous chemicals for the pressurized extraction. The human risk is also potentially lethal. The taking of land by private pipeline companies by eminent domain not only furthers environmental risks, but needlessly places our families in harm's way with pipeline incineration zones of up to 2000 feet along the entire length. Note that citizens can't even drive an RV with a small propane tank on portions of U.S. highways, while FERC approves gas pipelines adjacent to our homes. Permanent, explosive pipelines within our communities and in proximity of our children should not merely be the last choice of U.S. policy makers; they should never be a choice.
3. Without the implementation of new clean energy rules at FERC, pipeline certifications could worsen the economies of some states. If, for example, electric ratepayers in New England are forced to subsidize the construction of privately owned gas pipelines, the escalation of electricity costs would indubitably lead to the further exodus of businesses and a hemorrhaging of jobs.
4. The renewable alternatives are readily available, and other nations have taken the lead while current FERC policy overtly deters renewable initiatives. Germany, for example, has increased its electric generation by nearly 30% in less than three years; that is less time that it would take to construct a costly pipeline intended to stimulate the use of fossil fuels and the production of greenhouse gasses.
5. As a result of the president's initiative, FERC must also consider environmentally-sound protocols such as energy conservation programs, insulation, and the repair of leaking natural gas pipelines prior to any new pipeline approvals. It is counterintuitive that FERC would approve the construction of a new gas pipeline under the guise of its purported "convenience and necessity" when the environmentally-sound alternatives are clear. Stuningly, U.S. Senator Markey's August 2013 report entitled "America Pays for Gas Leaks" noted that "gas distribution companies in 2011 reported releasing 69 billion cubic feet of natural gas to the

atmosphere, almost enough to meet the state of Maine's gas needs for a year and equal to the annual carbon dioxide emissions of about six million automobiles." This dangerous problem must be addressed in FERC's approval process.

Again, these are but a few of the issues that support the president's environmental initiative to change approval rules at entities such as FERC.

Thank you for your consideration.

c: FERC Commissioners

**20150120-5073(30073515).pdf**

Phoebe Bushway, Cummington, MA.

Phoebe Bushway

Residence:

224 West St.

Plainfield, MA 10170

Mailing:

224 Wet St.

Cummington, MA 01026

To officials at FERC,

Regarding PF 14-22-000

As a long time land and homeowner of Plainfield MA as well as Windsor MA I protest the building a new gas pipeline through this relatively pristine area of our Commonwealth. Scientific knowledge should instead focus on using sustainable and renewable energy sources and reducing energy use.

With the newest energy producing alternatives and energy saving measures there is very questionable need for such a large pipeline through this area. Homeowners are using less and less fossil fuels. Our consumption of propane gas has plummeted since we installed a more energy efficient hot water heater. More and more home owners like us are installing solar hot water heaters and solar panels to produce electricity. It has been presented to us at local meetings that the gas going through this pipeline would not even be readily accessible to local gas companies. In fact there is every reason to believe that that the real reason for wanting to build the pipeline is to reach an area where fuel can be exported over seas. If there is a need to augment being sent to the eastern part of the state then the present, existing line should be reinforced or restructured to carry the gas.

Measures should be taken to reduce greenhouse gases not find ways to make more fossil fuels available.

It is unconscionable to disrupt the environmentally sensitive areas of Western MA.

A pipeline with the enormous proposed compressor stations at regular intervals would make living in this area untenable due to the ensuing air, water, noise and light pollution from the pipeline. I have heard the word 'sacrifice zone' in reference to this area I live in, as any leak from the pipeline and ensuing fire would not be able to be fought by our local volunteer fire departments. With automatic shut off valves only every 10 miles our only option to save our lives would be to evacuate to where? The proposed pipeline would run across the roads in our area in effect trapping us in the event of a leak and fire. Having a pipeline built in this area would devalue our property to the point that we could not even sell our land and home that has been in our family for over 50 years.

I urge you consider the health and wellbeing of citizens of the Commonwealth and the planet itself and stop the pipeline altogether.

Respectfully,

Phoebe Westwood Bushway RN MS NCSN

**20150120-5080(30073529).pdf**

Marilyn Learner, Hollis, NH.

As one of 1900+ NH residents who signed a citizens petition requesting an extension of the pre-file period for NED, docket PF 14-22-000, I am writing in response to Kinder Morgan's FERC comment dismissing our valid request for more time as unnecessary.

In NH, NED is essentially a brand new project with an old name. Kinder Morgan's newest "preferred" route was made public in a FERC posting on December 9, 2014, just before the distractions of the holiday season. Open Houses have been scheduled to begin in Milford NH on January 27, 2015, even though as of January 5 41 property owners had neither been identified nor notified about the impact of the route on their properties. This late notification gives those property owner less than THREE WEEKS to understand the impact the project could have on their homes, yards, wells, town before they have to meet 1:1 with KM representatives to "discuss" the project in a trade show setting. This is unfair.

Throughout NH people have not had enough time to research the complicated issues they could face: eminent domain, insurance liability, mortgage terms and cancellation, water quality compromise, incineration zone, safety concerns, and for Mason NH, a town slated to house the 90,000KW compressor station and a lateral pipeline in addition to the main pipeline, air quality compromise, sound pollution, light pollution to mention a few. These issues affect peoples' lives in fundamental ways. Open Houses are not adequate venues for initial information dissemination because they place property owners in individual discussions with KM representatives who have been trained in "soft sell" and data collection techniques while discussing the project. There is no public record of statements or promises made. This puts NH property owners at a distinct disadvantage in a process that has presumably been designed to be fair. Fair treatment of NH property owners would look similar to the process that was followed for the initial "preferred" route. In NH we request that KM hold public overview meetings which enable affected and interested property owners to hear the same information at the same time, ask questions, and benefit from the public discussion and debate. Additionally, these sessions should be recorded for future reference. As was done for the first route, Open Houses should be delayed until sufficient time has passed so that interested parties can research learn, study, and understand the ramifications of this proposed project. In the original route that study period lasted at least six months. NH property owners are entitled to a similar timeline.

Many people in NH, myself included, believe that Kinder Morgan is attempting to steam roll this process through - to the detriment of NH property owners. Kinder Morgan appears to be attempting to co-opt and manipulate this process to its advantage in order to adhere to a corporate timeline. They are complying with components on the checklist, but not the intent of the components.

Please protect NH citizens on the new "preferred" route and re-set the clock. Informational sessions should begin immediately and Open Houses should be delayed until summer 2015. It's the fair thing to do.

Marilyn Learner Hollis NH January 19, 2015

**20150120-5085(30073540).pdf**

Maryann Harper, Rindge, NH.

Dear Commissioners

Citizens of the United States of America rest easy knowing we are protected by certain rights bestowed upon us in our constitution and amendments. We know many of them by heart – the right to free speech, the right to bear arms and so forth.

I am perplexed, however, that we seem to have very few protected rights when it comes to the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline proposed by Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company LLC.

Our right to make an informed decision is at stake.

On December 8th, 2014 Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company LLC announced the NH alternative route would now become the preferred route. On December 15th letters were received by affected prop-

erty owners, but at least in Rindge, NH, the list was incomplete. One month later, Tennessee Gas Pipeline agents appeared in the towns along the route to gain permission to survey. At the same time, Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co LLC refused to attend public hearings requested by many Municipal Select Boards along the route. Instead “Open Houses” that utilized sales techniques have been scheduled quickly - the first one not even two months - after the official announcement.

Many NH residents are learning about the project for the first time when they receive a knock on the door from a TGP agent asking to access their private property. What many of these residents don't know is that the corridor for the proposed pipeline is not under the PSNH power easement, but on their very own land. Small rural towns contain many individuals who are not connected to the internet, cable TV and other technology taken for granted in larger towns and cities. Our elderly and poor, in particular, are being put at risk by this extremely rushed push into New Hampshire.

The Rindge Select Board submitted a series of questions about the proposed project to Kinder Morgan/ Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company LLC in early December expecting they would receive answers to share with their residents. They also requested representatives from the company appear at a Public Meeting. There has NEVER been a response to the questions and the tentative meeting was CANCELED.

This is not occurring just in Rindge, NH. Frustrated New Hampshire residents from across the proposed route united and presented a petition to State and Federal elected officials asking for more time and a complete and transparent process. Is this not our right? This request has now been made, on our behalf, by our US Senators and Congressional Representatives to both FERC and Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company LLC. Suddenly, Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company LLC knows how to respond to a letter! They said NO.

Please grant us the additional time needed to make an informed decision. If this pipeline was truly the necessity that is claimed, there would be no need to try and push it through. We are relying on you, the Commissioners, to ensure that a fair, complete and transparent process is utilized as our rights are at stake.

I am deeply appreciative of your attention to this matter.

Very truly yours,

Maryann B. Harper

#### **20150120-5092(30073553).pdf**

Ann Goldman, Merrimack, NH.

I am writing in regards to the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline proposed by Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company LLC.

Last Spring the pipeline came to light in our local newspaper when it was a different route. Throughout the Spring, Summer and Fall residents were given time to digest information about the proposed route. Suddenly in December the route changed and now the affected towns have very little time to educate themselves on this new route. I live in Merrimack, NH and from what I've read the pipeline will be 1.5 miles from my neighborhood.

I have just recently begun educating myself and I feel very rushed. From what I can see there will be a 100 foot swath going through 17 towns in Southern New Hampshire. Much of the route is going through pristine rural areas which I consider inappropriate. In Merrimack it is proposed to go through a nature preserve and through private property in a wealthy neighborhood which will erode our tax base when property values will plummet. The proposed route is also slated to go behind the Merrimack Premium Outlets and just north of Anheuser-Busch. I consider this a safety issue. Then it will cross the Merrimack River which is another safety issue.

Many of us live in New Hampshire because of its rural/suburban character.

We love the woods and wildlife. This is in direct contrast to the proposed pipeline as the 100 foot swath has to be free of trees.

Please grant us the additional time needed to make an informed decision.

Sincerely,

Ann Goldman

**20150120-5098(30073565).pdf**

Marlene A Genovese, ANDOVER, MA.

I am an Andover resident. I live here and drink the town water. I live minutes away from Haggetts Pond, a lovely place to walk and our town water reserve. My oldest son, Dorian, attends the elementary school that the gas pipeline is proposed to be built to close to. My two other children will also eventually attend this school and then the adjoining middle school. Please do not grant Kinder Morgan eminent domain in our town. Do not give them access to disturb and destroy our conservation land and our water. Please stop this pipeline and allow Andover to preserve its conservation land, its town drinking water and allow the families here to raise their children safely, without added herbicides, or danger to our drinking water, or unlimited danger due to possible explosion so close to our schools.

**20150120-5105(30073590).pdf**

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Jon L Bryan under PF14-22-000.

Submission Date: 1/19/2015 11:08:31 AM

Filed Date: 1/20/2015 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 jonlbryan@gmail.com

Basis for Intervening:

I hereby request to become an intervenor in Docket PF14-22-000.

Thank you,

Jon L Bryan

154 Morse Road

Mason, NH 03048

jonlbryan@gmail.com

702-703-7170

**20150120-5194(30074670).pdf**

Cheryl A. LeFleur, Chairman

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, NE

Washington, DC 20426

RE: Northeast Energy Direct proposal, Docket # PF14-22-000

Chairman LaFleur,

Please add my voice to the many others you are hearing from asking that Kinder Morgan be required to delay the impending Open Houses for the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) project. Affected towns and residents have not had anywhere near enough time to be notified and to educate themselves about this proposal. As you know, Kinder Morgan radically changed its preferred pipeline route in early December 2014, directly impacting not just a new set of residents and towns - but in fact a new state! How can the January start date for the Open Houses possibly be considered adequate for all impacted parties to be notified and alerted to the seriousness of the Kinder Morgan proposal?

I believe that Kinder Morgan should be required to notify all affected parties of their plans in writing before Open House scheduling can even be contemplated.

I am a homeowner who was directly affected by the earlier preferred pipeline route that included Groton, MA - and I can attest that it took months for my family, my neighbors and the town itself to grasp the scope of the project that was being proposed.

Kinder Morgan claims that affected citizens will have adequate time to comment on the project beyond the Open Houses. For a project of this size and impact, it is only fair to fully involve all stakeholders at the earliest possible time – and that time is right now. Please don't allow this crucial process be rushed.

Nick Miller Groton, MA

**20150120-5265(30075564).pdf**

K Sullivan, New Ipswich, NH.

I do not want the Morgan Kinder pipeline to run through New Hampshire. I do not want any pipeline regardless of the company involved with it.

I have a house and unimproved land in the town of New Ipswich.

I have well water. I do not want my water contaminated.

I do not want my air contaminated.

I do not want my land contaminated.

I do not want the pipe line running through New Hampshire at all. No pipe line is safe.

I have sent letters to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC in Agawarm, MA, via certified letter and via first class mail denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land (all ten acres) or to perform surveys or for any other purpose in relation to a pipeline.

I have sent a copy of this letter via certified mail and via first class mail to Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission as well.

My land is posted and I will be prosecuting any trespasser to the fullest extent of the law.

I want the FERC to deny any application for any reason filed by the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC. I want the FERC to deny any application from any company who proposes any type of pipeline through the state of New Hampshire.

K Sullivan

155 Old Wilton Road

New Ipswich, New Hampshire 03071

603-291-0636

e-mail: ceramicfeet@yahoo.com

**20150120-5315(30075765).pdf**

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of John Cooper under PF14-22-000.

Submission Date: 1/20/2015 11:09:21 AM

Filed Date: 1/20/2015 11:09:21 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 ferc@third-harmonic.com

Basis for Intervening:

After careful consideration and upon legal consultation I hereby declare I am opposed to the Northeast Energy Direct Project, Docket No. PF14-22-000, which Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. has indicated is proposed to extend into my property. I oppose this intrusion onto my property for (but not limited to) the following reasons:

- 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 material and would violate provisions in my mortgage, put me in default and expose me to foreclosure.
- A natural gas transmission pipeline is considered storage of hazardous materials and would 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 subdivision of the property due to the potential inability of the buyer to obtain a mortgage.

**20150120-5365(30079140).pdf**

Jennifer C. Markens, Ashfield, MA.

January 20, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC)

888 First Street, N.E.

Washington, DC 20426

Re: Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Energy Direct Project,

Docket #PF14-22-000

Dear Secretary Bose,

We are writing in opposition to the proposed pipeline.

This is an export driven plan with very little of the gas intended for New England. Even the seriously flawed

study bought by the industry shows a worst-case need for only 0.6 bcf per day for only a handful of days per year. This project will supply over 2.2 bcf per day, every day, all year. FERC should not allow any capacity expansion for export to be given carte-blanche eminent domain power.

Given the state of the energy market today, we read every day about the cost structure of the shale gas being non-competitive with oil from the Middle East. When the industry realizes that they cannot afford to extract this gas, this pipeline won't be needed or used – even if you have already agreed to allow it to be constructed. One day soon, FERC will approve the last pipeline ever to be constructed in America because the fossil fuel structure makes no sustainable economic or environmental sense. We don't want you to approve this one because it may, in fact, be the last. If so, this environmental nightmare will have then been created for no benefit to the industry, leaving only devastating consequences for citizens.

There are many concerns about safety and that PHMSA, the agency responsible to oversee such operations is so underfunded and by their own statements unable to keep citizens safe.

We are concerned about lower property values and higher insurance costs.

Kinder Morgan should not be trusted with a project this serious and with such grave consequences. They have a well-documented history of deception during the process: not answering questions – both by parsing and with outright false statements, posting outdated maps, lying to citizens about having their neighbors agreements, many reports of surveying even after landowners have denied permission, and hurry-up meetings to deny New Hampshire citizens time to adequately prepare. Most recently, we call your attention to a letter posted to FERC this week (on or around January 15) from Mass Audubon detailing deceptive and possibly illegal requests for information from towns. Kinder Morgan is devious, deceitful and disingenuous and should not be trusted with this project.

We have heard it attributed to officials at the FERC that the route primarily affects summer homes. Wrong! Most homes in our town and neighboring towns are primary residences. We, and almost all our neighbors, live here full-time and do not own another home.

We don't believe that the framers or the legislators who wrote the current regulations ever considered using eminent domain for a project like this one --where the lion's share of the gas transported will be exported for profit by corporations at the expense of landowners. It is neither "necessary or convenient" for the benefit of citizens as a whole, but rather decidedly and substantially for a corporation or corporations' bottom line. This is patently unfair and was certainly not the intention when eminent domain was included in the laws and regulations.

Our town and (as of now) more than forty other towns have passed resolutions opposing the pipeline. Many of these towns do not have the pipeline traversing their boundaries. Citizens should be listened to.

Members of our Federal delegation, leaders of our State government and many State legislators are opposed to the pipeline. FERC should listen to the people and their elected officials.

While we understand that FERC has powers that supersede state and local authority, you should consider the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Constitution which among other things includes the following about its citizens of which we, and almost all the affected landowners, are: "born free and equal, and have certain natural, essential, and unalienable rights; among which may be reckoned the right of enjoying and defending our lives and liberties; that of acquiring, possessing, and protecting property." As citizens we should enjoy the rights granted us and under which we made decisions about where we chose to live and raise our families. The proposed pipeline runs contrary to the spirit and letter of our Constitution and should be prohibited.

Sincerely

Jennifer and Bennett Markens  
Ashfield, MA

**20150120-5378(30079364).pdf**

Jon Michael Vore, Amherst, NH.

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

Dear Secretary Bose:

I am writing in response to the January 16 letter filed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline (TGP) for inclusion with docket no. PF14-22-000, regarding the rescheduling of Open Houses in communities affected by the proposed Northeast Energy Direct pipeline project.

On December 8th, 2014 Tennessee Gas Pipeline modified the proposed route of the Market Path Component and officially adopted the New York and New Hampshire Powerline alternatives. Four days later Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline notified affected homeowners of the proposed project. Kinder Morgan chose to only notify a small number of landowners in Amherst because those were the people they felt would be affected by the pipeline. Even abutters or those within only a few hundred feet from the proposed pipeline were not notified because Kinder Morgan did not consider them affected individuals. Six weeks following the proposed revised path, Kinder Morgan/TGP has scheduled open houses to educate citizens on the project. Kinder Morgan has done an extremely poor job of notifying residents of these events. In Amherst many residents are still unaware of the proposed pipeline, nevermind the scheduled open houses. Kinder Morgan has left it up to us, the affected landowners, to notify and educate our fellow neighbors about the project and the open houses, which unfortunately takes a significant amount of time. Even to date, Kinder Morgan has yet to schedule one meeting in our town to focus specifically on what this means for Amherst and its citizens. Kinder Morgan should be required, as part of the pre-filing process to meet with each affected town, in a public setting, to discuss what the project means for the affected landowners as well as that of the rest of the town. Our Board of Selectmen rely heavily on the affected landowners and people who are concerned about this project to provide them with the information it needs regarding the pipeline. Our town needs more time to be educated so they can go to the open houses with good, well thought out questions. We need to understand what this project could mean for our town, state and region.

In letters sent to affected homeowners, Kinder Morgan claims that they want to be “good neighbors” and work with towns to make this a successful project, yet all of their actions so far have been to the contrary. When the initial path was still slated to go entirely through Massachusetts, those individuals were given 7-10 months to research the project before any open houses were scheduled. New Hampshire only learned of the proposed path 6 weeks ago and the final open house will occur a mere 2 1/2 months after the initial announcement. Kinder Morgan claims it is important to have the open houses early because it allows citizens to become educated. If they felt it was important to educate the masses early, why did they not educate Massachusetts so quickly? In Massachusetts they waited 7-10 months before open houses were scheduled.

Why was it appropriate to wait in that situation and not appropriate to wait for NH?

Kinder Morgan wants to push their agenda forward before people really understand what this project means for our community. If this project is good for New Hampshire and New England, Kinder Morgan should feel comfortable giving us the time that we need to reach that decision ourselves. Kinder Morgan is hesitant about giving the residents of New Hampshire more time because they realize that we will come to the same conclusion that the residents of Massachusetts did. We don't want this project or need this project. Instead of focusing on technologies that are becoming outdated and destroy our environment, we need to focus on supporting renewable technologies that will truly lead to a solution for our energy needs in the future.

For this reason and many others, I strenuously object to the prospect of having FERC grant approval and eminent domain for this project over any part of my property, my environment, or the property and environment of my fellow citizens. Do not approve the Northeast Energy Direct project. We do not want or need this project. Help our voices be heard.

Sincerely,

Jon Michael Vore  
23 Simeon Wilson Rd

Amherst, NH 03031

**20150120-5519(30080451).pdf**

Gina Rosati, Merrimack, NH.

January 20, 2015

TO: FERC Commissioners

RE: Docket # PF14-22

I'm writing to voice my concern about the Kinder Morgan NED gas pipeline proposed to run through parts of Massachusetts and much of southern New Hampshire.

My primary concerns are:

1. Safety. Explosions from high pressure gas pipelines happen, and when they do, they are devastating to both lives and land.
2. New Hampshire is the Granite State, which means there will be much blasting through ledge along the route, which will contaminate our groundwater and damage our homes.
3. Where is this gas going? I've heard much, if not all of it will be exported.
4. Minor earthquakes in New Hampshire happen more frequently than people realize. Combined with the below freezing temperature we experience during the winter, this will hasten deterioration of the pipes and add to the danger of explosions and gas leaks.
5. Speaking of gas leaks, you know fracked gas contains many carcinogens that will be leaked into the air. Since the gas in high pressure pipes is not scented, we won't know if there is a leak until damage has been done.
6. This gas pipeline will go through wetlands and nature preserves, which have been protected by New Hampshire residents because we care about our environment. If it is not already unconstitutional for a for-profit company to take this land by eminent domain, it should be.
7. Property values will go down, and in some cases it will be impossible to sell property in the areas where this gas pipeline goes through.
8. Why isn't FERC looking towards renewable resources such as solar and wind instead of encouraging another high pressure gas pipeline? Please do the right thing for the environment and for the people of New England.

Thank you.

Gina Rosati – Merrimack, NH Resident

**20150121-5004(30080723).pdf**

Stephen Bushway, Cummington, MA.

1/19/15

Thank you for reading:

I built our house on the Plainfield/Windsor town line in 1989 after clearing the land on the edge of our field. When I stand in the yard outside our house at night in Spring time, I can hear the water from winter's snow melt rushing through Windsor Jamb's. We raised 2 kids here. One of them may raise his kids here to in this fragile, quiet country – if it remains quiet.

Please stand with us now to prevent the environmental destruction called the Kinder Morgan Pipeline and it's noise and air polluting compressor station!

How can a corporation be allowed to endanger our lives and rob us of the quality of life we have worked to create and sustain for ourselves, in the name of what? Accelerated climate change? Private profit at public

expense?

Please do your part. Show us the leadership to stop this insanity!

Please stand with us!

Stephen Bushway

**20150121-5008(30080733).pdf**

HOMER D SHANNON, Windham, NH.

This pipeline seems like a massive overbuild. The entire state of NH could never use the 2.2BCF/day that would be available with this line. A smaller, safer pipeline seems like a more reasonable answer. Here in NH we are not to anxious to have this thing just because the people in MA, who need significantly more gas than we in New Hampshire do, don't want the pipeline in their state. Move this line back to Massachusetts or cancel it

**20150121-5012(30080756).pdf**

January 20, 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

Fair and Equal Time for New Hampshire

Dear Ms. Bose:

Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LLC (Tennessee) notified Massachusetts (MA) stakeholders along the route of a proposed 30-36" pipeline of the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) project in February 2014. Subsequently nearly a year later, on January 9th, 2015, Tennessee filed a schedule of Open Houses. However, these Open Houses are to include a completely different state, New Hampshire (NH). Tennessee has scheduled the first of these Open House events to occur January 27th, 2015 in Milford, NH. This is a short 3 weeks after Tennessee held their first informational presentation in the same community on January 5th, 2015. The affected towns in NH know little about the 30-36" pipeline, valve stations, compressor stations, meter stations, pipeline facilities, above-ground facilities, access roads, and temporary work spaces.

Many NH residents were shocked to receive NED notification letters in December 2014 as prior reports were of an alternate route which was described as collocated within or following a PSNH power line right-of-way (ROW). Suddenly NH property owners and their respective representatives are forced to unravel the confusion of why terms like collocation and existing ROW are being used when Tennessee's Resource Report 1 shows 90% of the construction easement would be outside of the existing ROW and 100% of the permanent easement would be outside of the existing ROW. Clearly this route would not be confined to existing PSNH easements, but rather destroy additional properties outside of the PSNH ROW. The NH impact would be multiple times the width of the existing ROW for the entire NH portion. Additionally, stakeholders of these properties are confused by why a pipeline traveling from western MA to eastern MA would take a longer route north into NH and then south back into MA.

The relocation of the proposed NED project from MA to NH justifies additional time for the new list of stakeholders. This would include ample time for interaction with representatives and their constituents which are not being allowed due to Tennessee maintaining the original MA based NED pre-file timeline. Consequently residents and representatives of NH have not had adequate time for research, to hold open and public meetings, and general informational events about the newly-proposed route. These documented interactions are important for weighing public need vs. environmental impact which we understand to be an

important consideration for the FERC.

We would expect Tennessee to offer NH the same fair and equal amount of time awarded to MA residents. If Tennessee does not, we request that the FERC instruct Tennessee to do so on behalf of a new list of affected stakeholders in NH.

We ask that the FERC consider that the route change Tennessee has recently recommended is not a slight modification but rather a massive change where a major portion of the proposed project has been relocated to a completely different state. Maintaining the pre-existing NED timeline would be unfair to the NH communities just learning of this project this month. Substantial interstate changes are also an alarming signal that the NED project as a whole may be preceding ahead of thorough analysis.

Sincerely,

Rob & Lynn Chesebrough

**20150121-5014(30080747).pdf**

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room LA  
Washington, DC20426

Dear Secretary Bose:

As a 14 year resident of Windsor, MA I'm writing this letter to state my opposition of the Kinder Morgan 36" high pressure gas pipeline project (also known as the Tennessee Gas Pipeline, or Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project, FERC Docket #PF74-22) including any compressor stations planned as part of this project. (Note that this pipeline will border my property and an 80,000 horse power compressor station is being planned in Windsor, MA approximately 1 mile from my property). I know that you are well aware of what is being proposed by Kinder Morgan, so I'll spare you a reiteration of the proposal. What I'm asking of you today is when it comes time to make a decision on whether to allow or decline any part of this project that you not only review the facts about what this project will do to our environment and the health of individuals who surround it, but to also consider the moral and legal obligations that you will be violating as a federation who has been put in place to protect our environment and the people that live in it.

Kinder Morgan is a company that is known for its lies, for being involved in illegal activity such as theft and felony, as well as polluting and bribing. Why would anyone want to support a company with this kind of a reputation? Please reference the attachment for details.

The proposed NED pipeline path runs through thousands of private and public properties, some of the state's most sensitive eco-systems and lands set aside for conservation and aquifers. The pipeline poses risks for contamination of water, soil, vegetation, air, human life and animal life. It can result in leaks, ruptures, explosions and fires which the Windsor, MA "volunteer" fire department is not equipped to contain. Pipeline safety and health incidents are constantly reported across the country because existing pipelines are not being maintained or monitored routinely, especially pipelines installed by Kinder Morgan and its subsidiaries. Massachusetts residents should not be forced to pay (via tax tariff) or aid and assist in this dangerous and shortsighted exploitation of our nation's natural resources. Our picturesque towns, rolling hills, small farms, vast forests and protected wetlands will be forever changed if Kinder Morgan and the Tennessee Gas Pipeline companies are allowed to carve a permanent scar into our landscape, causing destruction and pollution. We have the right to a safe and clean environment and future generations deserve the same opportunities we have today.

When the time comes, please do the right thing and reject the Kinder Morgan, Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Project and start putting an end to the devastation that is currently plaguing our country due to the negative health and environmental impacts of fracking. If you do approve this project please let it be contingent upon Kinder Morgan offering to purchase properties at pre-pipeline appraisal prices that are considered

within an explosive or evacuation zone, as determined by the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) and / or the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health (NIAOSH). This is only fair to give affected families an opportunity to move to a safer location.

Thank you for your consideration,

The Wandrei Family (Rebecca, Michael and Nathan)

Windsor, MA 01270

{NOTE: a 23 page PDF entitled “The Facts about Kinder Morgan”; Sightline Institute, December 2014 was included in the FERC copy, but can not be included here. It can be downloaded from the page at: <<http://www.sightline.org/research/the-facts-about-kinder-morgan-2/>>, click on “Download Report”}

**20150121-5079(30083234).pdf**

KELLY IANNUZZO, MASON, NH.

1/21/15

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to you on behalf of my family, my Mason community and surrounding towns. I have lived here in Mason for 10+ years. This is MY home. This is where my husband and I started our life together. This is where we had our children and are raising our family. We want our children to enjoy the beauty of our land and all that Mason has to offer. We want them to be SAFE, and most importantly, to live a long HAPPY and HEALTHY life. Isn't that what we all want for our children?

The way I see it, Kinder Morgan is a bully. They are picking on our small community, threatening to take private property such as mine by eminent domain. They are proposing to build two pipelines along with a compressor station in this community. I find it appalling that such a thing can even be considered in this town, or anywhere for that matter. How can Kinder Morgan justify disrupting our beautiful state when the gas pipeline will not benefit any of the affected towns or the majority of NH?

I am curious if you have ever visited this beautiful town? It is rich in history. It has beautiful stone walls that were built years ago. We have beautiful nature trails, ponds, streams and wetlands. The wildlife here is nothing short of amazing. It would be an insult to see our surroundings be ruined because of an unnecessary pipeline. We all live and love Mason for many reasons. We have beautiful nature surrounding us, we have privacy, and peace and quiet. Please don't let them take that away from us.

As parents and landowners we also have safety concerns. First, there is the possible contamination of our drinking water. Secondly, the water table being altered due to blasting. Our town is dependent on wells, what if they were to run our wells dry? What about our foundations? What if the blasting was to alter the state of the houses and property in which we live in? What about explosions? What about property owners that are in the path of the blasting zones, or the property owners that are in the incineration zones? In the event of a catastrophic failure, are residents of the town of Mason considered an acceptable loss? How will Kinder Morgan guarantee our safety?

Please tell me what would you think of the government taking your property and handing it over to a private company for a profit? This is not only our life, but our livelihood we are talking about. We really need your support on this issue. We need you to fight for the people, not these big businesses that are out for a profit without any consideration of the citizens of NH.

Please help support us. Mason and the surrounding towns effected by this need your help to keep the pipeline out of our communities.

Sincerely yours,

Kelly and Jason Iannuzzo  
318 Townsend Road  
Mason NH 03048

**20150121-5157(30084793).pdf**

Tyler W Seppala, Rindge, NH.

Dear Secretary Bose,

We are asking that FERC postpone the Open Houses scheduled in the upcoming weeks for all the newly affected landowners here in NH. We received our letter from Kinder Morgan right before Christmas and many landowners in our region still didn't know about this project until the surveyor knocked on some of their doors just this past week. Kinder Morgan only filed this route change as of December 8th and we should be afforded the same timeline that the communities on the original route were given. Kinder Morgan has refused to attend many of our town's requests for informational meetings. These Open House schedules should be postponed as residents need time to research and learn about this massive pipeline coming through their properties so that they can make their own informed decision. Giving people 2 weeks or less in some cases is clearly not enough time to digest so much info. This Open House schedule was originally scheduled during this time for the original route stakeholders and when they just recently caught most of NH off guard with the route switch we are not being afforded the same time frame as our friends in Massachusetts. We have talked to numerous fellow residents many of them distraught about this as they have had no time to let this major impact to one of their most import assets sink in. We are asking that you delay the Open Houses and Kinder Morgan should have to come to each and every town on the new route for informational meetings where we can collectively as a group ask Kinder Morgan questions and get a large amount of the residents familiar with all aspects of this pipeline. Frankly 2 months of Open Houses does not give us a fair shake at all and they should only follow the informational meetings. The Open Houses should be rescheduled for a later date. To Kinder Morgan this is a business and the sooner they get the pipe into the ground the sooner it starts making them money. To us it's still our property and the last time we checked Kinder Morgan isn't paying our taxes or mortgage and as property owners of our particular piece of land that they want to take from us we should be afforded simple rights such as a reasonable time table to defend what's rightfully ours.

Thanks,

Tyler & Tahnee Seppala  
Rindge, NH

**20150122-0006(30087655).pdf**

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

Date: January 16, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Rcqsted

Re: Denying property access

As the owner of the property located at:  
169 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 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.

Karen Sullivan

**20150122-0007(30088684).pdf**

*per FERC: "File 30087280\_1.tif cannot be converted to PDF."; OCR converted with ease by fgf*

Dear Ms. Bose, Secretary

We came home Thursday 1/15/15 to a card on our front door from Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co., LLC to contact Rob Naramore 1-802-673-9325 to survey for Kinder Morgan.

You received certified mail from Francis & Cindy Lou Dougherty Jr. (delivered 12/15/14 9:40am) denying permission to Tennessee Gas Pipeline CO.,LLC(Kinder Morgan Co.) of any entrance to our 'and to perform surveys or for any other purpose in the matter of pipeline infrastructure project. Also Tennessee Gasline Co. Agawam, Mass received there's on 12/10/14 11:22am. Rob Naramore told Francis that our letter must have fallen thru the cracks. We are strongly in opposition to this project for many reasons. How many other property owners are having their property trespassed upon due to Tennessee Gas not supplying there agents with the proper information or are they just ignoring our letter of denial.

1 Family and everyday living safety

2 Property and home value loss.

3 Our well (pipeline 25ft near)

4 Environmental impacts on our 400 acres of conservation land across the street from us that we all use on a regular basis.

5 Tariff on future PSNH bills.

6 Most of all giving up our freedom to live in this home of ours of 30+ years and financial not losing value of our home and land and our precious conservation land and also be in fear of a leak or something much more devastating and life changing to all of us affected by this project.

Thank you Francis & Cindy Lou Dougherty Jr.

**20150122-0014(30087730).pdf**

grassroots  
capital management

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,

Best wishes to you and your family for the new year!

I am writing today to express my strong opposition to the North East Direct natural gas pipeline project, and urge FERC to deny permits for the project to proceed.

My opposition reflects two considerations. First, the proposed pipeline route will cross parts of western Vermont that has some great assets and a lot of challenges. Among its assets are its natural beauty, recreational activities, agricultural potential and cultural activities. There are many efforts underway to develop these assets to address some of the challenges we face including unemployment and lack of opportunities for youth.

The North East Direct pipeline project devalues all these assets and undermines these efforts. The damage to scenic vistas, the air, noise and light pollution generated by multiple large scale compression stations, and the remote but real danger of catastrophic accidents all combine to degrade some of the most accessible and beloved natural areas in New England. To take just one example, the Notchview Reservation in Windsor, MA, owned by the Trustees of Reservations, attracts thousands of hikers, snowshoers and cross country skiers from around the region, some driving two hours or more from neighboring States for an afternoon. The proposed route takes the project across the southernmost leg of Notchview and noise, waste gas releases and visual degradation will largely destroy what is a unique regional asset. In this and many other cases where

the pipeline would cross and devastate private and public conservation land, streams, rivers and wetlands these assets would be devalued or destroyed for the benefit of what is a private project, to the benefit of a private corporation.

But while concern over the impact of the pipeline on the natural assets of western Massachusetts is a solid basis for opposing the proposed route, I believe there is a strong argument against the pipeline no matter what route it takes. Investing in an expansion of fossil fuel infrastructure at this late date in the development of the science and politics of climate change puts us on the wrong side of the critical issue of our times.

The United States faces a choice: we can invest further in an energy system that is severely endangering the present and future of ourselves and our children, locking in a dependence on fossil fuels for decades. Or we can commit ourselves to transforming our energy system, investing in technologies that are cost competitive, employment generating and that safeguard our children's future. The transformation is a radical but real option. It is being pursued by other countries and many U.S. States setting ambitious but attainable targets for innovation and renewables.

This is not a time for combining major new fossil fuel investments with symbolic support for renewables. Rather the U.S. should be among the global leaders, and help build the momentum at the global level for real progress, building on the recent U.S.—China agreements and building towards the Paris Climate Summit in December.

Please share these views with your colleagues, and I look forward to following the FERC process closely in the months ahead and continuing to advocate for a rejection by FERC of the NED application.

Sincerely,

Paul DiLeo

President

Grassroots Capital Management, PBC

POB 70

Plainfield, MA 01070

[www.grassrootscap.com](http://www.grassrootscap.com)

(o) +1 413.634.5040 (e) [pdileo@grassrootscap.com](mailto:pdileo@grassrootscap.com)

**20150122-0016(30087733).pdf**

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC

1615 Suffield Street

Agawam, MA 01001

Date: January 14, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access

As the owners of the property located at:

110 Gloyd Street

Plainfield, MA 01070

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 W. Walker, Jr.

Darlene A. Graham

20150122-0042(30088832).pdf

LAW OFFICE OF CRISTOBAL BONIFAZ  
180 Maple Street P. O. Box 180 Conway, Massachusetts 01341  
Telephone 413-369-4263  
Fax 413-369-0076  
Electronic Mail:cbonifaz@comcast.net

January 14, 2015

Lori Ferry Project Manager  
Aecom Technology Corporation  
10 Oms Street, Suite 405  
Providence, RI 02904

In Re: Order Dated October 22, 2014 of the Board of Health of Deerfield Regarding Kinder Morgan and all its Subsidiaries and/or Affiliated Companies.

Dear Lori Ferry:

This office represents the **Town of Deerfield Massachusetts** in all matters concerning the Kinder Morgan and all its subsidiaries and/or affiliated companies' proposed fracked gas pipeline designed to cross the Town of Deerfield Massachusetts (hereinafter jointly KM). Please direct all future communications to my attention.

The Town of Deerfield is in receipt of your letters dated December 30, 2014 directed to the Board of Health of Deerfield and the Planning Board of Deerfield.

Aecom Technology Corporation (AECOM) needs to be aware that the construction and installation of the proposed KM pipeline was banned by the Board of Health of Deerfield after an extensive adjudicatory hearing on October 23, 2014.

KM has taken the position on this ban that they plan to request an "appropriate" authority to overturn the ban. KM has failed to respond to my request as to why Massachusetts does not have joint jurisdiction with FERC on the proposed pipeline given that a great portion of the fracked gas projected to be transported through Massachusetts is for export.

The Town of Deerfield will provide the information you requested under the Freedom of Information Act it falling outside the October 23 ruling of the Board of Health of Deerfield.

Sincerely,

Cristóbal Bonifaz

Cc: Cheryl A. LaFleur Chairperson Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
Representative Stephen Kulik  
Senator Elizabeth Warren  
James L. Messenger, Esq. Attorney for Kinder Morgan  
CB/mj

LAW OFFICE OF CRISTOBAL BONIFAZ  
180 Maple Street P. O. Box 180 Conway, Massachusetts 01341  
Telephone 413-369-4263  
Fax 413-369-0076  
Electronic Mail:cbonifaz@comcast.net

December 30, 2014

James L Messenger, Esq.  
laClair Ryan

One International Place  
Eleventh Floor  
Boston, Massachusetts 02110

RE: In the Matter of the Deerfield BOH Regarding Kinder Morgan and Affiliated Companies and/or Subsidiaries.

Dear Mr. Messenger:

Please allow me to first wish the best for you and your family for the New Year.

I am responding to your letter to me dated December 24, 2014. The BOH of Deerfield has asked me to forward to you the enclosed Op-Ed provided in draft form to BOH by David Gilbert Keith a well-known environmental researcher. The piece concludes after a detailed analysis that the inescapable conclusion is that most of the gas to be transported through Massachusetts by Kinder Morgan is for export to foreign countries rather than for exclusive use in the North East of the United States.

If this is correct I would appreciate any legal citations to the effect that FERC has exclusive jurisdiction over the installation and operation of the pipeline as you have asserted in your previous two letters. I believe it is uncontested that if all the gas to be transported was exclusively for export to foreign countries the installation and operation of such a pipeline would fall outside FERC's jurisdiction. The question BOH wants to raise with you is whether or not Massachusetts has joint jurisdiction with FERC on the proposed pipeline given that a portion of the gas projected to be transported through the pipeline is for export.

I thank you in advance for the attention you will give to this letter.

Sincerely,

Cristóbal Bonifaz

41 Old Main St. (Box 304)  
Deerfield, MA 01342  
PHONE: 413/773-8235  
dbukeith@comcast.net  
December 30, 2014

Justin Abelson, Editorials Editor  
Greenfield Recorder  
Greenfield, MA 01301

#### Pipeline's Public Cost for Private Profit

Kinder Morgan, Inc., is proposing to build a pipeline to transport "fracked" natural gas from the New York border to Dracut in eastern Massachusetts, all to be paid for by us. The gas, however, is not intended for us. New England cannot use that much gas. For Kinder Morgan pretending the region needs so much more natural gas is crucially important to government mandated increases in utility rates and takings by eminent domain.

Kinder Morgan is, if I may risk being honest, lying about the purpose of the pipeline. It is really about getting a glut of gas to foreign markets—and the destination matters.

As proposed, the pipe will carry 2.2 billion cubic feet per day (bcf/day). The "net inflow" capacity of natural gas to the state (amount coming into the state minus what we send back out) is about 2.1 bcf/day, so this single pipeline could more than double the amount of gas available, far more than we have ever used.

We are told Kinder Morgan's pipeline will prevent costly power shortages during prolonged cold spells or heat waves. But it really wouldn't take more gas to prevent such flow-rate problems. We could, as an industry study notes, buy electricity from Hydro-Quebec or revert to other fuels. Massachusetts already has a gas inflow capacity that is more than double the amount of gas we consume.

Then we are reminded that past use does not include the new demand created by power plants converting to

gas to generate electricity. The consulting firm ICF International has reported: “The projected deficits in gas supply apply only to the power sector; gas supply capabilities are adequate to meet non-power, firm [residential and industrial] gas demand.” Demand for more gas relates only to electrical generation.

In Massachusetts, however, the “repowering” change at power plants has largely already happened and, thanks in part to conservation and green energy efforts, it has had only marginal effect on total gas use. Furthermore, 2.2 bcf/day of gas is simply a huge amount of energy — enough to produce twenty times the average annual output of the Vermont Yankee nuclear power plant. Using conservative conversion factors that include energy loss in power generation, the pipeline will deliver enough fuel to produce more than twice the combined power generated in all of New England by coal, petroleum and nuclear fuels in 2012. If residential/ industrial use and power generation cannot use all that gas, where will it go?

Not coincidentally, the owners of the Maritimes /k Northeast Pipeline, which has been bringing fuel to Dracut from Canada, have asked permission to reverse its flow to take fuel from Massachusetts to the port of St. John in Brunswick, Canada. There the gas may be liquefied for shipping. The US Energy Information Agency is not hiding the conclusion: “Increased natural gas production would meet most demand from added LNG [Liquefied Natural Gas] exports,” meaning the oversupply will meet its need for demand through exports to other markets. <http://www.eia.uov/todavineruv/detail.cfm?id=187711>

Kinder Morgan is proposing to profit from government authority to take private property under the guise of public gain. But fuel for export is about private gain, not the greater good of the Commonwealth. If Massachusetts is not going to be even the main recipient of the benefits of this pipeline, why should its citizens — and regional electric rate-payers — bear all the multibillion dollar cost? We will pay through takings of private and public property as well as through government mandated increases in electric rates to pay this private company for building its own money-making infrastructure. Why should we be made to pay Kinder Morgan for the greater good of Kinder Morgan?

Massachusetts cannot use 2.2bcf/day of gas. Neither can New England. Prices in Europe are much higher than here. Kinder Morgan and the companies it will serve want to get their gas to the more lucrative market. But if they admit that goal, they lose the excuse for taking private property by eminent domain. If the good is not public, people’s land should stay private. Let Kinder Morgan pay for its own pipe and pay reasonable royalties to landowners for what goes through it on its way overseas.

David Gilbert Keith is an independent researcher and co-author of “The Hidden Cost of Oil : New Orleans to Indonesia” for Environmental Rights International. He lives in Deerfield, MA.

## **20150122-5001(30085319).pdf**

Joan Geary, Fitzwilliam, NH.

Kimberly D. Bose

Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street NE

Washington, DC 20426

RE: Comment-Docket PF14-22, Proposed Kinder Morgan/TGP NED gas pipeline

Dear Secretary Bose:

The proposed NED gas pipeline route, which spans 17 southern New Hampshire communities, is not responsibly sited. It would permanently harm or obliterate countless deliberately and consciously preserved wetlands, conservation and recreational lands, state forests, aquifers and waterways. Those include many of the region’s most pristine lakes, ponds, rivers and streams. It also would disrupt hazardous Superfund sites, and directly impacts about 800 New Hampshire property owners.

The costs, both financial and otherwise, far outweigh the benefits. To impose a tariff on ratepayers to underwrite the cost of a private project is legally questionable. There are also health and safety risks.

For example, many communities on the proposed route do not have municipal water systems, only private wells. The smallest pipeline leak or emissions would contaminate ground water, thus poisoning drinking water supply. Additionally, these same communities rely only on very small volunteer fire departments with minimal equipment and small budgets. They don't have the manpower, equipment or training to handle any gas pipeline explosions, malfunctions or accidents. Or the monies to repair communities in the aftermath. The NED project isn't for the greater public good. It won't provide New England with an abundant, secure, reliable and cost-effective energy supply for both the short term and the long term. Instead it has serious negative ramifications for now and future generations.

This oversized project will make the region, and New Hampshire in particular, overly dependent on natural gas as a fuel source. Natural gas may be suitable as a bridge fuel, but this project, if approved, shuts the door on other possible energy resources for decades, including alternative energy projects.

Years ago, Kinder Morgan first announced its intention to export most of its natural piped gas to Canada, Asia and other global destinations. That goal remains. Because of this, the NED pipeline holds us and future generations of New England residents hostage to the variances of a global marketplace. While Kinder Morgan may pass their sizable profits on to stakeholders, they'll pass their losses on to us – making the NED pipeline financially prohibitive in the long run.

Finally, the driving force behind this project is Kinder Morgan's desire to be the world leader in the energy industry. Many politicians agree. But is it smart for Americans to allow a corporation to determine the fate of the planet – particularly in light of pressing issues like climate change?

Sincerely,

Joan Geary  
Fitzwilliam, NH

**20150122-5009(30085335).pdf**

Michele Napolitano, Nashua, NH.

The following comments are addressed to ferc in response to permit application cp14-497-000 filed 6/2/2014 by dominion transmission, inc of Richmond, Va. The Madison county department of health has concerns that impacts to public health have not been adequately addressed in the permit, specifically in regard to the compressor station in Madison county. Has our health department given any thought on the matter of health risks. There are also documented correlations between health impacts and residential proximity to unconventional gas development facilities including compressor stations. What plans are in place to monitor air emissions and monitor things such as formaldehyde also will they monitor the wells in the area the soil, the crops within one mile from compressor stations. During blowdown a gas plume extends upward of 30 to 60 meters it can last up to three hours. These are some of the health risk damage to liver, kidneys, brain cancer, lung cancer, leukemia. How can this be a good thing for New Hampshire Please turn down this project it is not in the best interest of this state. Thank You

**20150122-5049(30087221).pdf**

Frank Gullotto: Wilmington, Massachusetts (Docket #PF14-22)

I want to state my opposition to the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Pipeline Project. Specifically, Kinder Morgan's proposed plan in Wilmington, Massachusetts is to have the new Lynnfield Lateral pipeline run alarmingly close to or even through the town's drinking water supply. The route will also run through conservation land, wetlands and private property. While many of the KMTGP employees have told local residents that this is a federal project that cannot be stopped, it's obvious that this is a private project and they are using FERC's authority before it has been granted.

The risk to the town's well fields is clearly unacceptable and I ask that FERC take the logical step and reject the Kinder Morgan\Tennessee Gas Pipeline plan.

Robert Wallick, Windsor, CT.

I am writing to register my objection to the NED/ Kinder Morgan/ Tennessee Natural Gas Pipeline. I am asking that you (FERC) decline the requested permission now. You are required to review all of the documents and verify that everything presented is accurate.

TGP/Kinder Morgan has failed to show objective evidence that this pipeline is needed. The documents that they have provided do not take into account the projections of the EIA showing that there may be flat or negative increases in the call for Natural Gas after 2015. The idea that the pipeline would reduce the cost of energy for the people of New England is flawed. The current cost for Natural Gas is lower than it has been since 2011.

The use of alternative energy for heating (Bio Bricks, Pellet Stoves and Geothermal Technology) along with increased use of solar panels (and Solar Shingles) by home owners for environmental and budgetary concerns. The use of green technology such as LED lighting and energy management tools by industry to reduce their costs and demand. The use of Opower® by Connecticut Light and Power to save 50GWh (energy equal to that generated by nine wind turbines annually) shows what the residents and industries in the Northeast are doing right now to keep demand flat.

The NESCOE (New England States Committee on Electricity) study acknowledged that investments in energy efficiency and other measures could eliminate the economic case for the pipeline and that the research has not been done to evaluate the alternatives. If the research has not been done; how can Kinder Morgan objectively prove that the pipeline is needed? Perform the research and determine a logical path forward, not determine what path you want and “find” the data to support it.

The next issue that I have is in regards to the safety of the residents that would pipe the fracked gas from Marcellus into their homes. Pennsylvania DEP commissioned the “Technologically Enhanced Naturally Occurring Radioactive Materials (TENORM) Study. The study failed to address impact of RADON in our homes but it did show an average RADON level in the gas from Marcellus of 48.847 pCi/L. To put this in perspective the average home in the US has 1.3 pCi/L of RADON in indoor air. The actionable quantity according to the US DEP is 4.0 pCi/L of RADON in indoor air. Since RADON is not changed during burning anyone who heats their home or cooks their meals with this natural gas is pumping large quantities of RADON into their home. If you look at how RADON decays and the byproducts of the decay you will find several other forms of radiation and lead.

If you look at the RADON levels in the gas from the Marcellus Shale field and understand that many apartments and houses do not directly vent ovens/cook tops to the outside then you will see the potential to exponentially increase the 21000 people that die from lung cancer every year in the US. If you perform a true environmental impact study you will need to include our homes as part of it since our homes are our environment.

Before you approve this pipeline consider what you would do if the RADON would be pumped into your homes, for your children and loved ones to inhale. Consider the cost of the pipeline with no financial benefit for the towns or residents but a lot of risk and environmental damage.

Loss of protected lands, potential to contaminate water supplies and damage wells while blasting. The fact that many of the town have only volunteer fire departments and are not trained or equipped to handle a gas explosion. In my town of Windsor, CT. the proposed pipeline comes within approximately 420 feet of the 1,000,000 (1 million) square feet, \$100,000,000.00 (100 million dollar) Dollar Tree Distribution Center. This is just 1 building, what is the potential loss here? The next building on the line is the 800,000 square feet Walgreens distribution Center. That is over 40 Acres of buildings (not land) within a few feet of the proposed Connecticut portion of the pipeline.

There is no definitive proof that it is needed, the only thing that is without question is the concern from the residents. It is better to err on the side of safety than to place millions of people at risk. You cannot undo the

damage this will create and until ALL of the research is done and the data evaluated there is no clear path forward.

our local industries.

Robert Wallick  
782 Stone Rd  
Windsor, CT 06095

### **20150122-5184(30088770).pdf**

New Hampshire needs more time

Kinder Morgan has made the claim that construction of a greenfield market path through rural, co-located areas of New Hampshire will create smaller impacts than in areas of higher population densities. Since the NED market path in New Hampshire is NOT a co-located path, their description of the benefits is inaccurate. In fact, only when feasible, new earth will be permanently scarred alongside an existing, barren power line easement. When obstacles make it infeasible to cite the market path adjacent to power lines, segmented islands of growth will be carved out of the landscape creating random pockets and patterns of habitat unsuitable for most indigenous species. Perhaps this kind of disregard for local impact is hopelessly embedded into the lens through which private profiteers are capable of devaluing rural character and land conservation. But the people of New Hampshire place the highest of premiums on such things and do not believe that citing in rural areas is of any lesser impact than elsewhere. Our natural surroundings are part of our state heritage, our way of life, to some it is livelihood and, to most visitors, it is the reason they recreate within our state borders.

There is much that Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Gas Pipeline need to learn and understand about New Hampshire and its stakeholders, things that are learned only through dialogue. Since the time when their preferred route was formally post on Dec. 8, 2014, Kinder Morgan has had exactly one (“1”) informational meeting in our state -- a single opportunity for dialogue afforded to 17 affected communities and their stakeholders. In measured outrage, One thousand Nine Hundred and Twenty citizens signed a petition to both FERC and statehouse demanding more time. Kinder Morgan has posted a recommendation to the FERC that this petition be denied. It appears that Kinder Morgan does not believe new stake holders deserve a new clock. As well, they have bypassed the stakeholder population choosing to deal only with select boards while presumptuously imposing a highly expedited timeline for Open Houses and draft ER’s on newly affected populations. It is disturbing to learn that the year-long engagement Kinder Morgan underwent to vet the concerns of citizens in Massachusetts is somehow insignificant to the same process as it is prescribed for the state of New Hampshire.

I have taken three excerpts from the following PDF on the Kinder Morgan website ([http://www.kindermorgan.com/content/docs/NED\\_Competition.pdf](http://www.kindermorgan.com/content/docs/NED_Competition.pdf)) to help explain why there is such confusion and consternation over Tennessee’s current posture toward affected populations. In the following discussion where Tennessee contrasts the NED proposal with that of a competing Algonquin pipeline system, they expound upon the importance and efficacy of public outreach in defining project scope:

“Ultimately, until the competing company proposes specific pipeline facilities, shows where these facilities will be installed, what land will be required, what resources will be impacted and starts to conduct public outreach, it is impossible to provide a meaningful comparison”

We in New Hampshire can understand why Tennessee would be concerned that Algonquin be forthcoming and transparent with its project planning details. In the document, Tennessee nevertheless proceeds to make presumptuous accusations as to the inferiority of their competitor’s project as compared to NED. The stakeholders of New Hampshire do not wish to engage in similarly tenuous arguments. The merits or shortcomings of the NED proposal should not be derived upon through speculation. Rather, we insist on access to information and the necessary time to absorb it such that our local judgments are based upon sound reasoning and analysis.

Factually, we know that Tennessee has sent notices to some but not all affected residents in New Hampshire. We know that the common deed of an entire community was overlooked in Milford, NH. This implies that Tennessee has not considered the benefit of title searches in locating stakeholders. Since we also know that the zone being studied in search of acceptable citing can be 400 feet, or further if necessary, from the proposed route, it can also be argued that the route itself is superficial and somewhat arbitrarily as currently cited. Since Tennessee would have no prior knowledge of private, un-surveyed terrain, it may be that well known obstacles and subsequent adjustments to the cited path could be easily obtained and potentially rectified as stakeholders become aware of project details through an open dialogue. Neighboring property owners who have not likely been served notice may continue to be unaware. They could more readily anticipate the implications as potential stakeholders or anticipate the impact of sudden route adjustments if their candidacy were known in advance. In towns with conservation easements, land trusts, shared water basins, common views, etc., the full breadth of stakeholder candidacy may not be known for some time. The original Nashua Lateral through Hollis, NH, for instance, produced stakeholders as far away as Massachusetts due to shared water resources.

The fact is that even if this developer were to afford transparency and open dialogue to the affected, there are still incomplete filings for this project. Open discourse and clarification become essential as the public considers the ramifications of the following FERC filing on January 5th, 2015 by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.:

“Although a revised Resource Report 10 was not included in the December 8, 2014 filing, Tennessee will submit a revised Resource Report 10, along with a revised Resource Report 1, in March 2015 as part of the first draft of the Environmental Report (Resource Reports 1 through 13). This draft Environmental Report will reflect the revised route for the Market Path component of the Project, including in a revised Resource Report 10 identification of system and routing alternatives and evaluation of those identified alternatives in comparison to the proposed Project facilities.”

The limited number of New Hampshire stakeholders and citizens who have been made aware of the NED project are still being unfairly asked to make imminent assessments under the current timeline without the benefit of a fully decomposed initial filing. In the following excerpt, Tennessee gives a seemingly prideful delineation of their attendance to stakeholders in Massachusetts:

“In contrast, Tennessee announced its market solution in March 2014 and has been conducting outreach for the Northeast Energy Direct Project for more than six months, including holding 35 public meetings through late September 2014, in addition to other meetings throughout the region with local, county, state, federal and other interested stakeholders.”

There is a needed addendum to the above statement. For the record, Tennessee’s market solution announcement in March of 2014 was not the altruistic expression of transparency that is implied. Rather, it was an embarrassing afterthought as citizens slowly informed fellow citizens and local officials of the disturbing private notifications arriving unannounced throughout the state of Massachusetts from as early as January, 2014. Tennessee’s 35 public meetings were in reaction to a public relations crisis, not a proactive measure to serve the public. As more than 50 percent of the new preferred route cuts through newly affected regions of New Hampshire, Kinder Morgan should be required to conduct no less than half of the informational meetings in New Hampshire that it conducted in Massachusetts and over the course of many months including at least one month from the end of its public meetings until the announcement of its first Open House, just as had occurred in Massachusetts. In many public statements, Kinder Morgan has prided itself in listening to the people of Massachusetts as they proposed their new preferred route. Now they must listen to the people of New Hampshire who will continue to shout until they have been heard.

Kinder Morgan seems to be going out of its way to misinform, panic, confuse, divide and then conquer the communities it wishes to exploit. According to FERC guidelines, Open House events are to be conducted in the service of stakeholders. Until such time that the majority of citizens have been alerted of their potential stakeholder status, Open House meetings designed to serve them cannot reasonably and representatively be

conducted.

I would also suggest members of the FERC navigate to Tennessee's NED home page on the Kinder Morgan site:

<[http://www.kindermorgan.com/pages/business/gas\\_pipelines/east/neenergydirect/default.aspx](http://www.kindermorgan.com/pages/business/gas_pipelines/east/neenergydirect/default.aspx)>

where they can select any link to get information on Kinder Morgan's business plans or its regulatory proceedings. The only link for which you will not find content occurs halfway down the right hand side in a column link labeled "Community/Information/Notices". To the few New Hampshire citizens who are now acutely aware of the indifference and negligence of Tennessee's outreach to our citizenry, this blank page comes as no surprise.

On behalf of my fellow New Hampshire citizens and myself, please provide a significant temporary reprieve upon the advancement of FERC proceedings on the NED project so New Hampshire can assess the full impact of this project.

David Moloney Hollis NH January 20, 2015

**20150123-0022(30092000).pdf**

Teresa Shatzer  
Amy Glowacki  
660 Sand Pit Road - Lot D24-1  
Mason, NH 03048

Tennessee Gas Pipeline. Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawa,, MA 01001

January 14, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying Property Access

As the owners of the property located at: 660 Sand pit Road, Lot 0 24 1 in Mason, NH 05046 we are denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, subcontractors, or associates to enter our land to perform surveys, or for any other purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such entry onto our property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized and treated as trespass.

Teresa D. Shatzer 01/14/2015

Amy E.Glowacki 01/14/2015

CCs: Town of Mason Select Board

Town of Mason Police

Town Of Mason Conservation Commission

**20150123-0024(30091980).pdf**

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

Date: January 16, 2015

Via Ccrtified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access

As the owner ot the property located at:  
155 Old Wilton 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 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.

Karen Sullivan

**20150123-0027(30091984).pdf**

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

Date: 1/16/15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access

As the owner of the property located at:  
27 South Union St  
Plainfield, MA 01070

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.

Laurie Israel  
Elaine Sidney

**20150123-0030(30091967).pdf**

Hand written letter, Marilyn Delongchamp, 123 Bowkerville Rd, Fitzwilliam, NH 03447, opposing

**20150123-0031(30091983).pdf**

*per FERC: "File 30091674\_1.tif cannot be converted to PDF." separate TIF file shows:*  
hand written letter, Trevor S. Croteau, 121 Scotland Rd, Winchester, NH 03470, opposing

**20150123-0032(30092147).pdf**

Hand written letter, Marilyn Delongchamp, 123 Bowkerville Rd, Fitzwilliam, NH 03447, opposing

**20150123-5013(30088937).pdf**

Michele DeJohn, Milford, NH.

While I understand the need for natural gas, I do not agree with Kinder Morgan using New Hampshire as a pass thru. This pipeline will not benefit NH and will only cause harm the way of life so many of us have worked to achieve. I moved here to enjoy nature and conservation land, in fact I own a small portion of it with 40 other homeowners, which KM intends to pass thru and has yet to formally notify us of. Their lack of due process is appalling.

This pipeline doesn't benefit us, it benefits Kinder Morgan and their bottom line. Please do not let them scar NH with a pipeline that doesn't bring gas to the State. It was intended for Massachusetts and the pipeline should stay in Massachusetts. We should not be the path simply because we like to reside in small town.

January 21, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.,

Docket No. PF14-22

Dear Ms. Bose:

Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline's NED pipeline is a classic snake in the grass. Its stated purpose is to provide New England with natural gas to support our energy needs, yet from every angle of study it's plain that this endeavor is largely about export. In the process of winding through New England on its way to Nova Scotia it would seize portions from scores of private properties and conservation lands, usurping from citizens and communities their rights of ownership in order to feed its profiteering objective. FERC owes the citizens of New England vigorous oversight of the methods by which KM/TGP attempts to succeed in its enterprise.

At this juncture in KM/TGP's pre-filing, FERC is asked to consider a "new preferred route" through New Hampshire, planned to run parallel to existing utility rights of way. There are two egregious practices in KM/TGP's application process which call for immediate corrective action:

\* KM/TGP's specious and misleading use of the term "collocation."

o In TGP's Environmental Report, "Resource Report 1," Tables 1-22 and 1-23 state that only 15 feet of existing rights of way would be used during construction of the project, and Zero feet would be used for the operation of the pipeline. For all practical purposes this means the pipeline would create a new right-of-way parallel to the existing utility corridor, scraping away hundreds of properties along its path.

o Few stakeholders know of the existence of these tables. In more widely disseminated statements KM/TGP has used the term "collocation" without addressing these specific dimensions, leaving many stakeholders under the impression that the pipe itself would run under the power lines and within the power line easements. This is a crucial misapprehension, often repeated by elected officials and the media, which KM/TGP has allowed to proliferate without publicizing corrections.

o If FERC's application process is genuinely designed to protect citizens from opportunistic business practices, then FERC should at the very least require KM/TGP to accurately describe these critically important parameters in all documents and statements.

\* KM/TGP's accelerated Open House schedule stampedes property owners and town governing agencies.

o Many residents of New Hampshire's small towns live in rural settings specifically to avoid constant exposure to the 'information superhighway.' Those residents are only now discovering from recently placed KM/TGP door tags or neighbors' yard signs that their lands and communities are in harms' way. Despite this information lag and with overt disregard for the letter of request by New Hampshire's U.S. senators and representatives, KM/TGP has persisted in scheduling the first Open House along the new preferred route for next week, with the remainder following in short order.

o KM/TGP 's proposed Open House schedule for these towns would allow the company to quickly satisfy FERC's checklist without accomplishing the presumed objective of open houses -

\* Informing all stakeholders of the company's intentions. Public informational presentations in which KM/TGP reveals its plans in an open meeting must be the first step in an honest process to educate towns and property owners about the pipeline enterprise. In many New Hampshire towns these meetings are broadcast over public access television as well as live streamed and archived.

Such meetings have not been scheduled along the new preferred route, although they were carried out along the original route many months in advance of open houses.

\* Leveling the playing field between company representatives and community stakeholders. The open house format gives KM/TGP one-on-one access with property owners, members of governing bodies, stewards of conservation lands, and other stakeholders, allowing KM/TGP representatives to speak discreetly to each person without public record or witness. As with any sales pitch, KM/TGP is likely to tell whatever story benefits its undertaking. This puts stakeholders at a substantial disadvantage. With no publicly vetted information presented in advance, stakeholders at Open Houses may not appreciate the consequences or be aware of the alternatives and resources available to them, leaving them vulnerable to life-altering damages and losses.

\* If FERC's application process is genuinely designed to protect citizens from opportunistic business practices, then FERC should at the very least require KM/TGP to postpone its Open Houses until summer 2015 at the earliest, and in the meantime schedule public information meetings as many towns have requested without reply.

The NED pipeline purports to supply New England with a needed resource, but plainly this is untrue. New England does not need this gas. Multiple analyses have convinced me that our occasional energy issues can be managed efficiently with the development of sustainable resources, allowing us to tailor-fit diversified energy portfolios to our fiscal and environmental priorities.

KM/TGP'S NED pipeline - with its methane-based natural gas cocktail, dirty technologies, and documented pattern of underfunded maintenance and frequent "incidents" - would supply New England with little more than liabilities and losses while the company makes off with our treasure and degrades our heritage.

FERC owes New England enforcement of the spirit of its regulations to ensure that KM/TGP clarifies to all stakeholders the true scope of its enterprise and provides the fullest opportunity for citizen education and response.

Tammy Fareed  
Hollis, NH

#### **20150123-5063(30089683).pdf**

Kathy Pitten, Merrimack, NH.

I strongly oppose the Kinder Morgan pipeline that is proposed to go through the town of Merrimack, NH for several reasons.

- Potential for a deadly explosion
- Lack of safety record of Kinder Morgan
- Contamination of our water source
- Devastating environmental impact of Horse Hill Nature Preserve
- Loss of property values
- Health risks associated with pesticides used to maintain vegetation growth

The citizens of Merrimack and the state of NH do not want the proposed pipeline. Thanks you for your consideration.

Kathy Pitten, RN, BSN, MEd

#### **20150123-5082(30090191).pdf**

Mark Kennedy, Wilmington, MA.

I want to state my opposition to the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Project. Specifically, Kinder Morgan's proposed plan in Wilmington, Mass is to have the new Lynnfield Lateral pipeline

run alarmingly close to or even through the town's drinking water supply. The route will also run through conservation land, wetlands and private property. While many of the KMTGP employees have told local residents that this is a federal project that cannot be stopped, it's obvious that this is a private project and they are using FERC's authority before it has been granted.

The risk to the Wilmington's well fields is clearly unacceptable and I ask that FERC take the logical step and reject the Kinder Morgan\Tennessee Gas Pipeline plan.

**20150123-5097(30090372).pdf**

Courtney C Vore, Amherst, NH.

Thomas S. Burack, Chairman  
NH Site Evaluation Committee  
29 Hazen Drive, PO Box 95  
Concord, NH 03302-0095

January 23, 2015

Dear Mr. Burack:

At the Site Evaluation Committee (SEC) meeting at the Milford Town Hall on January 14, 2015, Attorney Iocopino stated that no application or any indication of filing with the SEC has been received from Kinder Morgan in connection with the Northeast Energy Direct natural gas pipeline (NED) proposed to come through New Hampshire.

Please explain why Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas is being permitted to bypass NH SEC's review and approval process, whether you have recourse planned to force them to participate in the process and whether you are prepared to take action against Kinder Morgan to ensure that they complete the SEC's approval process.

Thank you for your prompt response to this matter.

Sincerely,

Courtney Vore, Esquire

cc: Peter Roth, Assistant Attorney General  
FERC

**20150126-0023(30095928).pdf**

James D. Hartman TGP,LLC  
1615 Suffield St  
Agawam, MA 01001  
phone 603-672-0687  
cell 603-320-0622 or 603-030- 7163

Date: 1/15/15

RE: Denying property access

As the owner of the property located at  
7 Patricia Lane, Amherst, NH 03031

I am denying (except if specific written permission is given by us and we escort personnel at all times) permission to TGP- Kinder Morgan, 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 (without meeting the noted conditions) will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Kenneth J. Bury / Alice P Bury

CC: Chairman Cheryl A. LaFluer  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

**20150126-0028(30096178).pdf**

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:

235 North Main Street  
Lanesborough, MA 01237

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.

Joseph M. Jacques

**20150126-0030(30096196).pdf**

*{File 30093623\_1.tif cannot be converted to PDF.}*

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

Date: 1/11/15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access

As the owner of the property located at:

30 Settlement Ln  
Milford, NH 03055

I, Corey & Laura Dutton, deny 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.

Corey Dutton    Laura Dutton

**20150126-0169(30096341).pdf**

hand written letter, Nancy Nye, 89 Bowkerville Rd, Fitzwilliam, NH 03447, opposing

**20150126-0170(30096340).pdf**

hand written letter, Lois Walen, 174 Red Gate Lane, Rindge, NH 03461, opposing

**20150126-0171(30096343).pdf**

hand written letter, Winnie Crouse, PO Box 660, Hollis, NH, opposing

**20150126-0172(30096333).pdf**

hand written letter, Paul R. & Norma P. Niemi, 309 Fullam Hill Rd., Fitzwilliam, NH 03447-3209, opposing

**20150126-0173(30096345).pdf**

hand written letter, Michael Goen, 48 Russell Road, Mason NH 03048, opposing

**20150126-0174(30096344).pdf**

hand written letter, Karen Sullivan, 155 Old Wilton Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, opposing

**20150126-0175(30096342).pdf**

hand written letter, Sullivan Family, 155 Old Wilton Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, opposing

**20150126-0176(30096338).pdf**

hand written letter, Sullivan Family, 155 Old Wilton Rd, New Ipswich, NH 03071, opposing

**20150126-0183(30101188).pdf**

January 19, 2015

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

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Expansion Project

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to express my concern with and opposition to the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Expansion project.

As a resident of Northfield, Massachusetts, through which the proposed pipeline is routed, I am directly affected by its potential consequences, including the risk of gas leak-related explosion and contamination, as well as decline in property values and increase in insurance costs. Furthermore, as currently planned, this project will cross sensitive conservation lands, wetlands, and rivers leaving a permanent scar through some of Massachusetts' most picturesque open spaces and putting many of our towns' primary sources of drinking water at risk of contamination.

The effort to meet Massachusetts' ongoing energy needs should not adversely impact residents' quality of life, nor come at the expense of open space benefiting 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, energy efficiency programs, and a policy to switch to renewable sources of energy generation now and in the future. I urge you to fully prioritize further investment in and deployment of these solutions, and to take any actions as are necessary to begin a public dialog to determine whether this project is necessary or advisable for our state.

Sincerely,

Jonathan A. Whitcomb

**20150126-4001(30094865).pdf**

From: Amanda Gasse <gasseboston@verizon.net>

Date: January 25, 2015 at 11:07:55 AM EST

To: <tony.clark@ferc.gov>

Subject: Help Stop the Pipeline

Dear Tony,

I would like your help in stopping the planned Kinder Morgan pipeline in Andover, MA. I moved to Andover eleven years ago from the city of Boston in order for my three children to attend the Andover Public School. It did not take long for my husband, myself, and our three boys to fall in love with the town of Andover. All three boys were part of Cub Scouts Pack 79 and they are now in Boy Scout Troop 79. Through the scouting program we have explored the trails and AVIS land in Andover. Many of the Eagle Scout projects in Andover are done in conjunction with AVIS property. Just a few weeks ago, my three boys and husband did a winter camping trip on land that is proposed to be part of the gas pipeline. In fact, the camping site was developed by an Eagle Scout about ten years ago and is used for districtwide Boy Scout events on a regular basis. The impact of taking away this municipally-owned land would be devastating for not just our Scout organization but our community. The pipeline crosses large amounts of conservation land protected by Article 97 of the Massachusetts Constitution. A two-thirds majority of both houses of the Massachusetts state government is required to release land from Article 97 protection.

Two of my children attend Wood Hill Middle School which is significantly close to the pipelines pathway. This greatly concerns me as a parent and as a resident of Andover. As a resident of Massachusetts I have the right to clean, safe and sustainable energy solutions. Natural gas is composed primarily of methane. Methane is a greenhouse gas 86 times more powerful than CO<sub>2</sub>. While natural gas "burns" more cleanly than oil and coal, it is often leaked during drilling, transmission and distribution and has significant global warming impacts that are just recently being fully recognized. In accordance with section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act, the United States is expected to significantly reduce carbon emissions in order to meet global standards. Allowing this pipeline would not only be a step backwards for government, but a huge step in the wrong direction for Massachusetts, a state heralded for its energy efficiency and renewable energy contributions.

The pipeline will destroy both treasured open spaces and private property across the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, put the safety of residents at risk, jeopardize the ability of Massachusetts to lower emissions that contribute to climate change, and place an unfair burden on electric ratepayers to pay for the cost of its construction.

I respectfully request that you pledge to oppose the building of this pipeline.

Sincerely,

Amanda Gasse  
500 DBrookside Drive  
Andover, MA 01810  
978-394-1307  
gasseboston@verizon.net

**20150126-4002(30094898).pdf**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
**FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

PROJECT UPDATE INFORMATION  
Weather Related Open House Cancellation

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC

Docket No: PF14-22-000

**NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT PROJECT**

January 26, 2015

On January 26, 2015, Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LLC (Tennessee Gas) gave the following information to

Commission staff.

“Due to severe winter storm conditions in the northeast U.S. and safety considerations for open house attendees, Tennessee Gas is canceling the three open houses scheduled for January 27 through 29 for the Northeast Energy Direct Project. Tennessee Gas will be notifying state and local officials, as well as the media, regarding these cancellations. These open houses, to be held in Milford, New Hampshire; Berlin, Massachusetts; and Fitchburg, Massachusetts, will be rescheduled and notice will be provided to the Commission as well as to affected stakeholders regarding the rescheduled dates.

**20150126-4004(30095589).pdf**

From: Amanda Gasse [mailto:gasseboston@verizon.net]

Sent: Sunday, January 25, 2015 11:09 AM

To: Norman Bay

Subject: Help Stop the Pipeline

Dear Norman,

I would like your help in stopping the planned Kinder Morgan pipeline in Andover, MA. I moved to Andover eleven years ago from the city of Boston in order for my three children to attend the Andover Public School. It did not take long for my husband, myself, and our three boys to fall in love with the town of Andover. All three boys were part of Cub Scouts Pack 79 and they are now in Boy Scout Troop 79. Through the scouting program we have explored the trails and AVISland in Andover. Many of the Eagle Scout projects in Andover are done in conjunction with AVIS property. Just a few weeks ago, my three boys and husband did a winter camping trip on land that is proposed to be part of the gas pipeline. In fact, the camping site was developed by an Eagle Scout about ten years ago and is used for districtwide Boy Scout events on a regular basis. The impact of taking away this municipally-owned land would be devastating for not just our Scout organization but our community. The pipeline crosses large amounts of conservation land protected by Article 97 of the Massachusetts Constitution. A two-thirds majority of both houses of the Massachusetts state government is required to release land from Article 97 protection.

Two of my children attend Wood Hill Middle School which is significantly close to the pipelines pathway. This greatly concerns me as a parent and as a resident of Andover. As a resident of Massachusetts I have the right to clean, safe and sustainable energy solutions. Natural gas is composed primarily of methane. Methane is a greenhouse gas 86 times more powerful than CO<sub>2</sub>. While natural gas “burns” more cleanly than oil and coal, it is often leaked during drilling, transmission and distribution and has significant global warming impacts that are just recently being fully recognized. In accordance with section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act, the United States is expected to significantly reduce carbon emissions in order to meet global standards. Allowing this pipeline would not only be a step backwards for government, but a huge step in the wrong direction for Massachusetts, a state heralded for its energy efficiency and renewable energy contributions.

The pipeline will destroy both treasured open spaces and private property across the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, put the safety of residents at risk, jeopardize the ability of Massachusetts to lower emissions that contribute to climate change, and place an unfair burden on electric ratepayers to pay for the cost of its construction.

I respectfully request that you pledge to oppose the building of this pipeline.

Sincerely,

Amanda Gasse  
500 DBrookside Drive  
Andover, MA 01810  
978-394-1307  
gasseboston@verizon.net

**20150126-4005(30095869).pdf**

From: Amanda Gasse <gasseboston@verizon.net>

Date: January 25, 2015 at 11:07:12 AM EST

To: <cheryl.lafleur@ferc.gov>

Subject: Help Stop the Pipeline

Dear Cheryl,

I would like your help in stopping the planned Kinder Morgan pipeline in Andover, MA. I moved to Andover eleven years ago from the city of Boston in order for my three children to attend the Andover Public School. It did not take long for my husband, myself, and our three boys to fall in love with the town of Andover. All three boys were part of Cub Scouts Pack 79 and they are now in Boy Scout Troop 79. Through the scouting program we have explored the trails and AVISland in Andover. Many of the Eagle Scout projects in Andover are done in conjunction with AVIS property. Just a few weeks ago, my three boys and husband did a winter camping trip on land that is proposed to be part of the gas pipeline. In fact, the camping site was developed by an Eagle Scout about ten years ago and is used for district-wide Boy Scout events on a regular basis. The impact of taking away this municipally-owned land would be devastating for not just our Scout organization but our community. The pipeline crosses large amounts of conservation land protected by Article 97 of the Massachusetts Constitution. A two-thirds majority of both houses of the Massachusetts state government is required to release land from Article 97 protection.

Two of my children attend Wood Hill Middle School which is significantly close to the pipeline's pathway. This greatly concerns me as a parent and as a resident of Andover. As a resident of Massachusetts I have the right to clean, safe and sustainable energy solutions. Natural gas is composed primarily of methane. Methane is a greenhouse gas 86 times more powerful than CO<sub>2</sub>. While natural gas "burns" more cleanly than oil and coal, it is often leaked during drilling, transmission and distribution and has significant global warming impacts that are just recently being fully recognized. In accordance with section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act, the United States is expected to significantly reduce carbon emissions in order to meet global standards. Allowing this pipeline would not only be a step backwards for government, but a huge step in the wrong direction for Massachusetts, a state heralded for its energy efficiency and renewable energy contributions.

The pipeline will destroy both treasured open spaces and private property across the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, put the safety of residents at risk, jeopardize the ability of Massachusetts to lower emissions that contribute to climate change, and place an unfair burden on electric ratepayers to pay for the cost of its construction.

I respectfully request that you pledge to oppose the building of this pipeline.

Sincerely,

Amanda Gasse  
500 Brookside Drive  
Andover, MA 01810  
978-394-1307  
gasseboston@verizon.net

**20150126-4007(30096218).pdf**

From: Ashley Seto [mailto:ashley.b.seto@gmail.com]

Sent: Monday, January 26, 2015 4:12 PM

Subject: Kinder-Morgan Pipeline

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to express my concern over the proposed Kinder-Morgan and Tennessee Gas Pipeline that is being proposed. I am asking you to do whatever you can to stop this project as it poses potential risk to our

community.

I am an Andover, MA resident and I am very concerned about the pipeline that is being proposed to cross through Andover. The most recent filing brings the pipeline very close to my home and neighborhood causing great concern for myself and my family.

The risk of explosion and the poor track record of Kinder-Morgan are great cause for concern. The Sight-line Institute, a think-tank in Seattle just published a report detailing environmental and other problems that Kinder Morgan has caused in other parts of North America. The report is attached here: <http://www.sight-line.org/download/2547/>.

I respectfully request your support in opposing the Kinder-Morgan pipeline.

Sincerely,

Ashley Seto

**20150126-5000(30092354).pdf**

Kristi Margaritis Bradshaw, Merrimack, NH.

To Whom it May Concern,

I have learned in recent days that my home where I live with my husband and 2 young children is in the INCINERATION ZONE. Our home and NINETY other homes of our neighbors and friends in a 1/2 mile radius are all in the INCINERATION ZONE. I am horrified and frightened. Please DO NOT ALLOW this pipeline to proceed.

Kristi Bradshaw

**20150126-5002(30092365).pdf**

Carol M DiPirro, Merrimack, NH.

I am very concerned about the lack of information on this Pipeline Company. With some information, I hear this is a high pressure transmission gas line that would run right through our towns water supply. Not only that, they are looking to go through a wildlife preserve in Merrimack NH. And run it right by a neighborhood and a mall. The risk to wildlife, the digging under a river, the blasting of granite will endanger wells. This sounds like they are using us as a pass through and want to destroy parts of town, put our water supply at risk along with many natural and possibly historic spots. Please give us time to further investigate this plan b. I was at a town hall meeting and sounds like many citizens are unaware and those that are , are mostly against it.

Please do not let this giant company just build in our town and just push it through.

Risk of damage to people's wells right next to the line, damaging a wildlife preserve, and possibly contaminating the town's main water source are enough to concern me. Let alone recent stories of explosions and lack of safety measurements by Kinder Morgan make me oppose this project

**20150126-5013(30092387).pdf**

Susan L Durling, Harrisville, NH.

I am writing to register my opposition to the Northeast Energy Direct project proposed by Kinder-Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company. I have many concerns:

- The depth and construction requirements for rural pipelines are not sufficient to ensure the safety of NH residents
- It will decrease property values in a state where the town's primary funding is derived from property taxes
- In many cases Kinder Morgan has promised grossly overinflated annual tax income to localities that did not materialize

- Kinder Morgan has a poor safety record
- There is negligible benefit to NH
- The collapsed time frame for open houses and public comment is too short for NH residents, who are only now becoming aware of the pipeline plans
- Environmental impact, which is my greatest concern: In U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY WATER-RESOURCES INVESTIGATIONS REPORT 95-4100, there are maps of NH aquifers. It is clear to me that the proposed route of the pipeline crosses extremely important areas. Specifically, the proposed route intersects with major stratified-drift aquifers which supply fresh water to the lower Connecticut River basin in southwestern New Hampshire and to the Nashua area in south-central New Hampshire. In southwestern NH, “municipal public-supply wells withdraw water from stratified-drift aquifers to supply parts of Charlestown, Hinsdale, Keene, Marlborough, Newport, Plainfield, Chesterfield, Troy, Walpole, and Winchester”. “The Nashua Regional Planning Commission area has...more than 30 municipal public supply wells in stratified-drift aquifers in Amherst, Hollis, Hudson, Litchfield, Merrimack, Milford, Nashua, Pelham, and Wilton withdraw at least 100 gallons of water per minute (0.14 Mgal/d); many of these pump at a rate of more than 500 gallons of water per minute.” In addition, there are thousands of private homes that draw water from these aquifers. Given Kinder Morgan’s safety record, this pipeline poses an unacceptable risk to NH drinking water reservoirs. Combined with the lack of evidence supporting the area’s need for such a natural gas transport system, my conclusion can only be that this project is wrong for New Hampshire.

Susan L Durling  
Harrisville, NH

**20150126-5015(30092391).pdf**

Sabrina Hewitt, Wilmington, MA.

I am writing pertaining to #PF14-22. I am a lifetime Wilmington resident. I know the woods and waterways very well. I am also an activist, and have been fighting these pipelines across the country for a while. There are many reasons, ecological first, next, these pipelines benefit the Rich, other countries, and we see zero return from these sacrifices we are being asked to make, thirdly, when there have been spills, and there have been many, there is zero accountability, which ties into our ecology. These pipes are also dangerously bordering on our water wells. Go elsewhere, you aren’t wanted, at all

**20150126-5027(30092415).pdf**

Tania Centra, Merrimack, NH.

I would like to express my concerns regarding the proposed NED pipeline through my community, and 17 other communities in southern NH. Recently Kinder Morgan decided to reroute the pipeline through southern NH instead of its original route through northern MA. This pipeline’s purpose is to supply natural gas to the people Massachusetts (and possibly other countries by port) and is only being rerouted through NH because of fierce opposition by the residents of Massachusetts. We are Plan B for Kinder Morgan. Will the revenue generated from the construction of this pipeline offset the safety risks and decreased property value for the residents of NH who will be affected by the NED pipeline? We need more time to study the risks and benefits of this project and I am requesting a delay in FERC approval slated for March 2015.

If I can give you a little background on my family. We have lived in the same home in Merrimack for 6 years, I work as a RN and my husband is a family physician, we have 3 children. We heat and cook with natural gas. We have made upgrades to our home to make it more energy efficient, we had the attic re-insulated and sealed several years ago. We have a contractor who will be starting to replace our windows with Energy Star Harvey windows this spring. Our house is less than 20 years old, but we feel it is important to reduce our energy needs as much as possible as a family. Many neighbors I have talked to are working on improving their homes in the same manner. In the presentation at the Merrimack Town Hall meeting on January 22nd, research on the current and future energy use by the residents of NH was presented, it was

done by the state of NH. It demonstrated that for only a few days to a few weeks of the coldest NH weather, was there a shortage of natural gas. This shortage could be relieved with liquid natural gas or other alternative sources of electricity such as solar & wind, as well as improving the energy efficiency of our homes as I have discussed above. You can refer to the presentation by watching the meeting yourself, there will be a link on the town of Merrimack website.

The proposed NED pipeline will not cross our property but I still have many concerns for my community. It would pass within very close proximity to 2 of the 3 well heads that supply the town of Merrimack with drinking water, which is protected land. It would cross directly through Horse Hill Nature Preserve. It will pass beside Whittier Circle in Merrimack. There are dozens of families living in that neighborhood, when you drive by, there are always children playing outside and parents socializing. They live in the incineration zone and I know several families who are very concerned for their safety and for their property value. These are just a few examples of how this pipeline will affect the town of Merrimack. How many other residents of NH will be affected by a pipeline that we may not need? We do need more time to study the risks and benefits of the NED pipeline, I am requesting a delay of FERC approval slated for March 2015. Thanks you very much for your time.

Tania Centra

**20150126-5029(30092419).pdf**

Richard Crane, Groton, MA.

I am a Massachusetts resident directly affected by the original proposed route by Kinder Morgan.

On October 4, 2014 I received a letter [dated October 2, 2014] from Kinder Morgan informing me that I am a landowner impacted by the Northeast Energy Direct project. This was more than two weeks after Kinder Morgan filed officially with FERC. Approximately three weeks later I received another letter informing me about the upcoming open house meetings in the beginning of November. All told, my family and I were informed that our property was impacted less than 5 weeks prior to the scheduled open house meetings.

Many NH residents and legislators seem to think that Massachusetts had a significant amount of time to give feedback to Kinder Morgan regarding this project. Certainly I was not given ample time to respond and I know many other Massachusetts residents in the exact same situation. I still meet other Massachusetts residents that were not appropriately informed about this project.

Kinder Morgan needs to do a better job giving all residents, whether they live in Massachusetts or New Hampshire, the needed time to prepare and respond. It is only fair given the significant impact to our quality of life.

**20150126-5030(30092421).pdf**

Kristi Margaritis Bradshaw, Merrimack, NH.

There are over 200 residential dwellings in Merrimack, NH that are in the incineration zone of the proposed pipeline route. That's several hundred people in one town alone that will be forced to live within a hazardous blast zone with a ticking time bomb. PLEASE do not let this get approved. PLEASE

**20150126-5037(30092435).pdf**

Michele Watson, Merrimack, NH.

To whom it may concern,

I am a resident of Merrimack NH and live within 1000 feet of the site of the Kinder Morgan proposed route for the 3ft natural gas pipeline. Please do not allow this pipeline to come through our town. My concerns are for the community, my neighborhood, my family's safety and the value of my home.

Regarding the community, the proposed route of the pipeline could impact our town's water supply. The area in question supplies approximately 60% of our town's water. The blasting alone could impact the

watershed, and if there was an explosion, we would be severely impacted. I'm not sure how the community could quickly recover from that. The proposed route also goes through areas of conservation land. New Hampshire prides itself on its open space, outdoor activities and natural beauty. Keeping an area clear for the pipeline does nothing to contribute to the beauty of our state.

Regarding my neighborhood, most of my neighborhood (of approx. 60 homes) as well as a portion of the adjacent neighborhood is within the 1000 feet incineration zone. What happens to this community? The fear of living so close to such a large pipeline is almost unbearable. We do so much to protect ourselves, our children, our families and friends and we would be completely vulnerable to an accident. There would be nothing we could do to protect ourselves or our property. And with the recent explosion in Mississippi, it only confirms that the fear is real!

Regarding my family's safety, the concerns are the same as above – the fear of an accident. How quickly could the gas company shut off the gas? How quickly could the fire department put out a spreading fire? How could our emergency services help everyone?

Regarding the value of my home, it is a known fact that being within close proximity will decrease the value of a home. I can't imagine that buyers would be willing to purchase a home for any reasonable amount of money of the pre-pipeline value when the pipeline's location is disclosed. Home owners have problems with power lines; the risk of a 3 foot diameter pipeline is unimaginable. If we are unable to sell our home, how would we ever be able to refinance, how would we be able to get a home equity loan, how would we ever be able to afford to retire?

The concerns of this community are real! Please, please, please do not allow this pipeline to go through the town of Merrimack NH or through any of the proposed towns within our state. If there are any benefits to this pipeline, the risks far outweigh them.

Michele Watson

#### **20150126-5045(30092452).pdf**

Garth Fletcher, Mason, NH.

In an earlier comment I expressed my concerns that the public would be misled by Kinder Morgan's repetitive and consistent misuse of the terms "colocated" and "colocation" with existing power line easements to imply that no further easements or land takings would be required.

It is now clear that even experienced reporters can be fooled by this clever abuse of language. The appended quotes are from today's New Hampshire Union Leader, one of the largest newspapers in the state. Please note the completely incorrect statements about placing the pipeline inside the existing power line right of way in 72.21 miles of the 80.03 total NH length!

It is long past time for FERC to insist on honest and accurate descriptions of proposed projects. FERC's subservient acceptance of misleading language in proposals it considers, and in the public presentations required as part of the proposal process, does a grave disservice to the public and severely damages FERC's reputation.

The following quotations are from: "Pipeline basics: the players, the project" By PAUL FEELY New Hampshire Union Leader January 24, 2015 8:14PM

"...the New Hampshire Sunday News has put together a "Pipeline Primer" to answer some of the questions residents and officials in affected communities might have about the proposal."

...

"The 36-inch-wide pipeline would span 80.03 miles across southern New Hampshire, according to Kinder Morgan filings with the Federal Energy Regulation Commission (FERC). Of that route, 72.21 miles would run in existing Public Service of New Hampshire rights-of-way, following the path of power transmission lines, while 7.82 more miles would need to be acquired by the company."

...

“There are ways Kinder Morgan could acquire the land needed to build the gas pipeline. The first is to place the route strictly along the existing right-of-way for public utilities. The second involves the company claiming property by eminent domain...”

**20150126-5056(30092474).pdf**

Cynthia White, Windsor, MA.

Date January 25,2015

Dear Secretary Bose:

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 show 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.

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. Massachusetts had prided itself on being in the forefront of alternative energy development. This project is not only a terrible step backwards but has major consequences to the future of our planet. I would like to think that future generations would be able to enjoy this earth. 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,

Cynthia White

**20150126-5057(30092476).pdf**

MATTHEW RAFUSE, AMHERST, NH.

I am writing to urge FERC to reject the proposed Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline proposed by Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline (Docket# PF14- 22).

We were recently informed by Kinder Morgan (in a letter dated December 12th 2014) that the “Northeast Energy Direct Project was a federal undertaking regulated by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission”. Previously they had proposed that the entire project be located in Massachusetts. When heavy resistance was met, the proposed route moved north into New Hampshire where they felt there'd be less resistance. Initially, they routed the line through Hollis and Brookline, where once again significant resistance was found from those citizens. Kinder Morgan once again changed the route avoiding some of those communities. Kinder Morgan states that they decided to move the proposed gas line northward so they could collocate with high voltage electrical lines already in existence. Information contained within Kinder Morgan's

documentation shows this is not the case. They state that they will use 15' of existing power line right of way but will still need an additional 85' of temporary construction space, and that 50' of this will be allowed to regrow. However, their documentation clearly states that 0' of existing right of way will be used in the final path. Their documentation is misleading in that they will not be using the existing right of way at all but running a new parallel corridor.

In addition, the proposed path deviates from the main power lines and goes directly over my well, through mine and my neighbors' yards. It then crosses over the Souhegan River immediately behind my house 4 times in the span of 1/2 of a mile. This river contains 28 threatened or endangered species that inevitably would be negatively affected by the project. The route deviates from the power line route to avoid our high school and middle school. Kinder Morgan claims that natural gas is a safe technology and does not negatively affect our environment, water supply or even property values. If this technology is so safe then why can't the pipeline continue to collocate with the power lines and bisect the schools? If they are concerned with the possibility of a catastrophic failure then why is it ok if this disaster occurs within feet of my house and children?

My neighborhood is located along the Souhegan River and we have shallow, point driven wells. Our wells only extend about 35 feet into the ground into a local aquifer. Blasting and construction associated with this project could interfere with our water supply. Furthermore we are concerned that the proposed gas pipelines, which have been known to leak small amounts of their content, may contaminate our drinking supply for years to come.

Kinder Morgan posts a number of articles on their website alleging that property values are not negatively affected when a gas pipeline is placed on private property. Other articles show a 30-40% decrease in the value of a property that contains a natural gas pipeline. Some mortgages even have clauses that nullify the agreement if hazardous material is placed on that property. Technically the mortgage company could request that the remaining loan be paid in 30 days. Most of us do not have the entire amount of our mortgage saved in a bank account waiting to be paid. Additionally, my homeowner's insurance is likely to increase. Not only will I have to deal with the aesthetic changes that come with the pipeline, but I would have to bear a larger financial burden than even the other residents of my town. I have considered selling my home but honestly, who would buy a home that has a high pressure gas line buried through it especially if getting a mortgage was uncertain and homeowner's insurance is significantly higher? Kinder Morgan would compensate us for the land they use, but the financial compensation that they provide would nowhere near compensate us for the economic loss that we would experience.

Kinder Morgan states that we need this pipeline to help meet an energy shortfall in New England. This pipeline is proposed to carry 2.2 billion cubic feet of natural gas on a daily basis. Current estimates show that only 0.7 billion cubic feet per day of natural gas is needed to meet our needs in New Hampshire. Further, this only occurs during extreme cold spells (10-27 days per year for only a few hours each day) when gas is used to create heat as opposed to electricity. More importantly, 1/3 of the energy shortfall could be found by repairing older pipelines in order to fix leaks. The other 2/3 could be made up by expanding current energy efficiency and energy conservation programs. Where does the excess 1.5 billion cubic feet per day go?

Kinder Morgan's website suggests that all of the gas, not just the excess, could be exported to Canada and overseas and will not even benefit New England. Kinder Morgan states it is not in the business of local distribution of gas and a local distributor in New England would need to step in for New Hampshire to benefit from this natural resource.

As a potentially affected landowner I ask that you reject Kinder Morgan's proposed project (Docket# PF 14-22). This project has little to no benefit for the residents of New England and puts the affected individuals at great personal and financial risk. The upside will be experienced by Kinder Morgan and its shareholders with increased profits. We should not spend millions and billions of dollars on increasing an out-of-date technology that harms our environment and does not provide us with a long term solution to our energy needs. We need to invest that money in fixing the current infrastructure we have, as well as exploring newer, cleaner forms of energy production.

If FERC does approve this pipeline, I will refuse to let it pass through my property. Since there is no benefit to me and my fellow Southern New Hampshire citizens of this pipeline, I cannot possibly see how the Federal Government can take my land so that privately held companies like Kinder Morgan's and their affiliated gas distributors can profit.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Matthew Rafuse  
28 Simeon Wilson Rd  
Amherst, NH 03031

**20150126-5073(30092532).pdf**

January 24, 2015

Julia Wertz  
9 Winding Valley Road  
Hollis, New Hampshire 03049

Governor Margaret Wood Hassan  
107 North Main Street, State House – Room 208  
Concord, New Hampshire 03301

Dear Governor Hassan:

I was reading the letter my mother received from Mariann White, Director of Citizen Services, regarding the natural gas pipeline intended for southern New Hampshire. In it, Ms. White says that you believe we must "protect our natural beauty, environment, and rural charm". That confused me. How are you planning to do that if a giant gas pipeline is allowed to run through New Hampshire? I don't see how habitat destruction can be avoided at all.

Sincerely,

Julia Wertz  
Hollis Brookline High School

**20150126-5083(30092550).pdf**

The proposed NED pipeline through MA and NH has serious shortcomings. The need to improve our short-term energy outlook and reduce high energy prices does not mean that we should rush to support every energy infrastructure project, no matter the consequences, and the consequences to the environmentally sensitive areas and private landowners included in the current plan are significant and potentially dangerous. I do not support this plan, and encourage the commission to cancel it in its current form.

**20150126-5111(30092680).pdf**

Distrigas opinion piece is the Eagle Tribune (Merrimack Valley & Southern NH):

[http://www.eagletribune.com/opinion/column-liquified-natural-gasoffers-alternative-to-costly-pipeline-plans/article\\_170f00c8-7e8f-5f41-9b95-2570056a1d99.html](http://www.eagletribune.com/opinion/column-liquified-natural-gasoffers-alternative-to-costly-pipeline-plans/article_170f00c8-7e8f-5f41-9b95-2570056a1d99.html)

Column: Liquified natural gas offers alternative to costly pipeline plans

Posted: Friday, January 23, 2015 1:00 am

Frank Katulak

What's the one phrase that can quickly change the mood from festive to foul for any child opening a brand new, shiny toy? "Batteries not included!"

Or how about that product featured on a home shopping channel or infomercial -- you know, the one that'll

make you happy, solve all your problems, and is a great deal. It certainly looks like a bargain until you realize that there are a bunch of hidden costs. Suddenly the final price tag is a lot more than the advertised price. And when it finally arrives, you don't even use it every day like the commercial said you would. In fact, you only use it a few days a year. So when you consider the price per usage, the cost is really high.

Would you still consider the purchase a bargain? In hindsight, would you have chosen to buy it at all? That would probably depend on a number of factors, including the other options available.

On a much larger scale, this situation mirrors the pipeline proposals into New England that have been widely publicized recently. Various proponents claim that the projects will deliver cheap natural gas from the Marcellus Shale region in Pennsylvania into New England, solving everything from supply constraints on very cold days to high electricity prices year round. But state officials from across New England are proposing to pay for these projects, totaling some \$5 billion to \$6 billion collectively, through rate increases borne totally by homeowners and businesses across New England 365 days a year for 15 to 20 years.

With consumers picking up the tab for these new pipelines, what incentive is there to control costs -- or to build only what's really necessary?

One might then also ask if these pipelines, built and paid for by consumers in New England, would ever be used to transport natural gas that would then be exported out of the country, adding profit for the pipeline companies but not the ratepayers who financed the infrastructure. One proponent recently confirmed that these pipeline projects proposed for New England could indeed be attractive conduits for export opportunities.

So when the cost of this "cheap gas" is finally delivered to consumers and shows up on their utility bills, will it still be a bargain? Will it be any less expensive than the energy that is now being purchased by power plants, which includes liquefied natural gas (LNG) that supplements pipeline supplies on cold winter days? No promises are being made.

New England needs supplemental natural gas to meet peak demand during the coldest winter days. There's no doubt about it. But shouldn't a solution that addresses only peak demand be preferable to one involving an enormous expansion of costly pipelines? Why does it make sense to build and scale pipelines to meet demand peaks 30-40 days of the year? It only would if pipeline companies don't have to assume financial risk, but rather have consumers pay the costs.

Natural gas pipelines have historically been financed on a "pay as you grow" basis. Much of the local natural gas demand growth has resulted from natural gas utilities signing on additional heating customers. But this growth is already being accommodated by previously announced incremental pipeline capacity projects that will be placed into service over the next few years.

Beyond this, future load growth is uncertain or minimal due in large part to renewable energy, conservation, and energy efficiency efforts. In addition, more homes and businesses are choosing to generate their own power rather than purchasing it from a utility, which will further temper future demand. At a minimum, consumers should require that all existing natural gas infrastructure -- be it pipelines, on and off-shore LNG vaporization facilities, or local utility LNG storage -- be fully utilized, and all practical and affordable alternatives brought to bear, before their consumer dollars are spent on subsidized, overbuilt, and expensive new pipelines. The worst-case scenario is that large new pipelines will be built, and they quickly prove to be "white elephants."

The fact is that no one currently talking about these issues has a crystal ball. No one anticipated that crude oil prices would plummet as they have. Similarly, no one can predict future Marcellus shale gas prices, or even where those prices will be on the coldest days of the year when New Englanders need natural gas the most. But we do know that gas prices in Pennsylvania have spiked on the coldest winter days in the past -- including last winter -- just as they have here. And they've spiked for one simple reason: supply and demand. A better solution? Continue to supplement existing pipeline gas with LNG to satisfy the demand peaks that occur 30-40 days of the year. It will be less costly and less disruptive than building expensive

pipelines that consumers would pay for year round and for many years to come. With the LNG alternative, the ships are built, and the infrastructure in New England already in place. In other words, all components come in the LNG package -- including the batteries.

*Frank Katulak is the president and chief executive officer of Distrigas of Massachusetts, a leading LNG supplier and distributor based in Everett.*

**20150126-5337(30096200).pdf**

Hiel Lindquist, Fitzwilliam, NH.

I must continue to strenuously object to the Kinder Morgan Company's continued submission of half-truths and omission when speaking to the news media in the southern New Hampshire area. In the latest article, from: "Pipeline basics: the players, the project" By Paul Feely New Hampshire Union Leader January 24, 2015, the reporter again stated that Kinder Morgan's new pipeline would be "collocated with existing power line easements, which implies that no further easements or land takings would be required.

If this is the case, then I expect no need for Kinder Morgan to even consider taking more property or right-of-ways by the eminent domain process. However, their own filings and project reports for this project clearing indicate that Kinder Morgan will require a new right-of-way over the majority of the pipeline route. This is NOT Co-location.

Furthermore, in the same news article, the reporter states the following:

"For the period 2010 through 2014, in the five states that would be affected by the proposed NED Project, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company experienced three reportable events in the states of Pennsylvania (1) and New York (2); and there were no PHMSA-reportable events in New Hampshire, Massachusetts and Connecticut".

WHAT A NICE ARGUMENT by Kinder Morgan. Why is Kinder Morgan only referring to the northeast, and especially New Hampshire when touting their safety statistics? Certainly it is to showcase a better safety record than Kinder Morgan actually has. Again, no outright lie, but wouldn't the public be better served by knowing the Kinder Morgan accident rate for their pipelines and not just the rates in New Hampshire (do they even have pipelines in New Hampshire)? It leaves us to wonder what they have to hide?

The following information is taken from the Kinder Morgan web site. They report a reportable accident rate of .02 per 1,000 miles of natural gas pipeline. If, as Kinder Morgan claims, they have 68,000 miles of pipeline, then there were around 25 reportable accidents last year! By the way, there were also 3 or 4 major ruptures (it is hard to determine actual numbers as Kinder Morgan has a way of disguising information).

Certainly, in the articles in the news media in southern New Hampshire there has been a significant amount of mis-information, much of which was supplied by Kinder Morgan. Kinder Morgan company continues to duck and dodge questions so that, while they do not outright lie, they certainly push the envelop.

Where is this "open and honest" review process that the public was promised? These are just a few of the examples that have shown up in the news in the last month. I do not believe the public is being served by FERC when FERC allows the present Kinder Morgan marketing campaign to continue.

**20150127-0015(30100541).pdf**

hand written letter, Robert & Priscilla Borden, 199 Fullam Hill Rd, Fitzwilliam, NH 03447, opposing

**20150127-0016(30100539).pdf**

hand written letter, the Robbitts Family, 122 Jaffrey Rd, Fitzwilliam, NH 03447, opposing

**20150127-0017(30100545).pdf**

hand written letter, Maren E. Gagne, 64 Holman Rd, Fitzwilliam, NH 03447, opposing

**20150127-0028(30100652).pdf**

January 16, 2015

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

Re: Northeast Energy Direct Docket PF14-22

Dear Secretary Bose,

I am writing to express my vehement opposition to the proposed Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct pipeline. It is my understanding that the final decision on whether this pipeline is built rests with you.

There are many reasons for my opposition. It is my understanding that if we continue to develop efficiency programs there is no need for additional natural gas infrastructure. The pipeline as proposed runs through some of the state's most sensitive erxi-systems and lands set aside for conservation. Further deforestation would be required even if it runs alongside existing cleared utility easements. The amount of additional pipeline capacity the new line would provide is much more than is needed. So where would the rest be destined? Pipeline leakage is a known problem. Methane is a greenhouse gas that further contributes to climate change (according to today's New York Times, "2014 now surpasses 2010 as the warmest year in a global temperature record that stretches back to 1880") And the leakage of chemicals including benzene compounds is another serious health risk.

The peace, health, safety of all of us in this quiet, rural area would be severely damaged. I therefore ask that you do not approve the building of this pipeline.

Sincerely,

Christine Brandon  
189 Prospect St.  
Plainfield, MA 01070  
hilltown189Overizon.net

**20150127-0058(30101174).pdf**

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

Date: Jan 22, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access

As the owner of the property located at:

34 Dale Farm Rd.  
Rindge, 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 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 & Joyce Dale

**20150127-0061(30104989).pdf**

Colette D. Honorable

From: Amanda Gasse &gasseboston@verizon.net&  
Sent: Sunday, January 25, 2015 11:10AM  
To: Colette D. Honorable  
Subject: Help Stop the Pipeline

Dear Colette,

I would like your help in stopping the planned Kinder Morgan pipeline in Andover, MA. I moved to Andover eleven years ago from the city of Boston in order for my three children to attend the Andover Public School. It did not take long for my husband, myself, and our three boys to fall in love with the town of Andover. All three boys were part of Cub Scouts Pack 79 and they are now in Boy Scout Troop 79. Through the scouting program we have explored the trails and AVISland in Andover. Many of the Eagle Scout projects in Andover are done in conjunction with AVIS property. Just a few weeks ago, my three boys and husband did a winter camping trip on land that is proposed to be part of the gas pipeline. In fact, the camping site was developed by an Eagle Scout about ten years ago and is used for district-wide Boy Scout events on a regular basis. The impact of taking away this municipally-owned land would be devastating for not just our Scout organization but our community. The pipeline crosses large amounts of conservation land protected by Article 97 of the Massachusetts Constitution. A two-thirds majority of both houses of the Massachusetts state government is required to release land from Article 97 protection.

Two of my children attend Wood Hifi Middle School which is significantly close to the pipeline's pathway. This greatly concerns me as a parent and as a resident of Andover. As a resident of Massachusetts I have the right to clean, safe and sustainable energy solutions. Natural gas is composed primarily of methane. Methane is a greenhouse gas 86 times more powerful than CO<sub>2</sub>. While natural gas "burns" more cleanly than oil and coal, it is often leaked during drilling, transmission and distribution and has significant global warming impacts that are just recently being fully recognized. In accordance with section 108(d) of the Clean Air Act, the United States is expected to significantly reduce carbon emissions in order to meet global standards. Allowing this pipeline would not only be a step backwards for government, but a huge step in the wrong direction for Massachusetts, a state heralded for its energy efficiency and renewable energy contributions.

The pipeline will destroy both treasured open spaces and private property across the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, put the safety of residents at risk, jeopardize the ability of Massachusetts to lower emissions that contribute to climate change, and place an unfair burden on electric ratepayers to pay for the cost of its construction.

I respectfully request that you pledge to oppose the building of this pipeline.

Sincerely,

Amanda Gasse  
500 D Brookside Drive  
Andover, MA 01810

**20150127-5027(30096940).pdf**

Melanie Patterson, Fitzwilliam, NH.

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

RE: Comment-Docket PF14-22, Proposed Kinder Morgan/TGP NED gas pipeline

Dear Secretary Bose:

I have a home on a lake in NH that is in the direct path of the proposed NED pipeline. I am writing to ask you to stop Tennessee Pipeline and Kinder Morgan from tearing through this delicate wetland habitat. The

proposed path is less than 1/4 mile (maybe even less than 1/8) from my home and highly visible. I have never been contacted by Kinder Morgan and only found out about this on Jan. 6th, from friends, while I was on vacation.

The lake/pond is pristine and quiet, no street lights, and minimal to no noise pollution. If this project is approved, it will disrupt both humans and the environment. The pipeline construction will stir up sediment, polluting our land and water. The residents on this lake get their drinking water from groundwater wells that are fed from the lake. This puts our health, and the health of the critters that depend on this body of water, at risk. There is a lot of built up natural silt and sediment that many creatures depend on, exactly where they want to dig through and locate the pipeline.

My grandchildren swim and play here. I kayak all season. There most likely are federally protected threatened and endangered species – flora and fauna-- in this richly diverse wetland habitat.

Property values in the region are still suffering in this economic recession, and have not even begun to recover. Many of us are still underwater on our mortgages. This WILL tank our already struggling property values and impede any chance of recovery. The pipeline carries with it a valid social stigma that will stay for decades to come, halting families from moving into the region. Young people are much more environmentally savvy now, and this would deter them from coming to live here, adversely impacting our region's economy.

Just like with the stock market, emotion drives the real estate market. No one wants to buy property where a gas pipeline exists. The lake where my home is, property values already perform lower than typical NH waterfront because of the existence of power lines, and the shallow depths, limit certain types of recreation on the 175 acre pond/lake.

If the NED pipeline is approved, it is projected to run adjacent to preexisting PSNH power lines. The power lines cut a large swath of land and cross over this navigable body of water. Within the last couple of years, a second set of power lines were erected right beside the existing ones, and land needed to be cleared to put them up, creating a larger clearing, disturbing this rich habitat. When you kayak under the power lines, you can hear them sizzle. There is risk of explosion positioning liquid gas near electric power lines. If there is ever a leak in the pipeline, it can wipe out some of the species that live in this water. We have snapping turtles that are potentially 50 to 70 years old living in here that may not survive development. We watch these massive creatures swim through all spring and summer.

Allowing Tennessee/Kinder Morgan to run adjacent to the PSNH power line route is severe overdevelopment of the already over developed land, and will have a serious environmental impact, as well as economic, to NH citizens and the state. The residents of this lake will receive no benefits from the pipeline. Only the associated cost, loss, and risk. We chose this lake to have a home, because it was so pristine. There are no power boats, and it is not utilized much, except for residents and occasional visitors. We don't want it.

Please do not approve this project for NH.

Sincerely,

Melanie Patterson M.A.

**20150127-5029(30096943).pdf**

Melanie Patterson, Fitzwilliam, NH.

Kimberly D. Bose

Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street NE

Washington, DC 20426

RE: Comment-Docket PF14-22, Proposed Kinder Morgan/TGP NED gas pipeline

Dear Secretary Bose:

I have a home on a lake in NH that is in the direct path of the proposed NED pipeline. I am writing to ask you to stop Tennessee Pipeline and Kinder Morgan from tearing through this delicate wetland habitat. The proposed path is less than 1/4 mile (maybe even less than 1/8) from my home and highly visible. I have never been contacted by Kinder Morgan and only found out about this on Jan. 6th, from friends, while I was on vacation.

The lake/pond is pristine and quiet, no street lights, and minimal to no noise pollution. If this project is approved, it will disrupt both humans and the environment. The pipeline construction will stir up sediment, polluting our land and water. The residents on this lake get their drinking water from groundwater wells that are fed from the lake. This puts our health, and the health of the critters that depend on this body of water, at risk. There is a lot of built up natural silt and sediment that many creatures depend on, exactly where they want to dig through and locate the pipeline.

My grandchildren swim and play here. I kayak all season. There most likely are federally protected threatened and endangered species – flora and fauna-- in this richly diverse wetland habitat.

Property values in the region are still suffering in this economic recession, and have not even begun to recover. Many of us are still underwater on our mortgages. This WILL tank our already struggling property values and impede any chance of recovery. The pipeline carries with it a valid social stigma that will stay for decades to come, halting families from moving into the region. Young people are much more environmentally savvy now, and this would deter them from coming to live here, adversely impacting our region's economy.

Just like with the stock market, emotion drives the real estate market. No one wants to buy property where a gas pipeline exists. The lake where my home is, property values already perform lower than typical NH waterfront because of the existence of power lines, and the shallow depths, limit certain types of recreation on the 175 acre pond/lake.

If the NED pipeline is approved, it is projected to run adjacent to preexisting PSNH power lines. The power lines cut a large swath of land and cross over this navigable body of water. Within the last couple of years, a second set of power lines were erected right beside the existing ones, and land needed to be cleared to put them up, creating a larger clearing, disturbing this rich habitat. When you kayak under the power lines, you can hear them sizzle. There is risk of explosion positioning liquid gas near electric power lines. If there is ever a leak in the pipeline, it can wipe out some of the species that live in this water. We have snapping turtles that are potentially 50 to 70 years old living in here that may not survive development. We watch these massive creatures swim through all spring and summer.

Allowing Tennessee/Kinder Morgan to run adjacent to the PSNH power line route is severe overdevelopment of the already over developed land, and will have a serious environmental impact, as well as economic, to NH citizens and the state. The residents of this lake will receive no benefits from the pipeline. Only the associated cost, loss, and risk. We chose this lake to have a home, because it was so pristine. There are no power boats, and it is not utilized much, except for residents and occasional visitors. We don't want it.

Please do not approve this project for NH.

Sincerely,

Melanie Patterson M.A.

**20150127-5074(30098083).pdf**

Hiel Lindquist, Fitzwilliam, NH.

This is a follow up my comment yesterday (26 Jan 2014) concerning the continuing obfuscation of information by the Kinder Morgan Company associated with the proposed NED Kinder Morgan natural gas pipeline.

In documentation from Kinder Morgan, the Kinder Morgan Company claims, with studies purporting to be by reputable experts, that a natural gas pipeline will not effect property values in an area.

Although I am not an expert, I do know what the tax structure and property assessment rates are here in New Hampshire. Much of the land that will be taken if the NED pipeline is built (probably by eminent domain) is productive forest land. While the Kinder Morgan Company may see the forests as a nuisance that must be eliminated, land owners here in New Hampshire see the forest as our natural “farmland”. Since the land in this part of New Hampshire is not suitable for other crops, it is very productive in growing trees. A typical 10 acre plot of forest will produce a volume of over 5 cords of wood, every year in perpetuity, if properly managed. You see, unlike natural gas, the forest is a renewal resource that will not be eventually depleted. Once clear cut and maintained as clear cut, as proposed by Kinder Morgan Company, that land in the pipeline right-of-way will no longer be productive in growing forests. In fact, the land will no longer be produce in growing anything of value is this area.

The following are the property tax assessment rates, as set by the State of New Hampshire (these rates are as of 2013):

### Section 3: Assessed Values for Current Use

Assessed Values: Once the Town accepts a property into Current Use, an adjusted assessment value is placed on the land. These values are provided to the Town by the State of New Hampshire’s Current Use Board, and can change annually. The sales ratio also affects these assessments. For 2012/2013, the Current Use Value ranges per acre are:

#### Without Stewardship:

- Forest Land – Pine \$ 125 - \$ 188
- Forest Land – Hardwood \$ 57 - \$ 85
- Forest Land – All Other \$ 47 - \$ 71
- Unproductive (Wetland) \$ 20

#### With Stewardship:

- Forest Land – Pine \$ 91 - \$ 137
- Forest Land – Hardwood \$ 31 - \$ 46
- Forest Land – All Other \$ 22 - \$ 34

Farmland and Unproductive are assessed at the same rate as above.

As can be seen by the rates in this table, clearly land that is unproductive is assessed and valued at a much lower rate than productive land. Certainly land owners along the pipeline will be lining up at the rate adjustment boards at town offices once pipeline construction begins. Make no mistake about it, there is a considerable amount of land in a 125 wide right-of-way the runs for 80 miles.

While the above information is for forest land, I also find it hard to believe that any sane person would value a building, house, or other property along a natural gas pipeline as equal in value to another property that does not have a natural gas pipeline through their backyard. While I do not have a “study” to prove this, I do expect an ongoing battle with our town’s assessment boards if this pipeline is built.

And speaking of property assessments, it would be great to have a study as to how often the Kinder Morgan Company seeks their own property tax abatements once their pipelines are in production. You see, the Kinder Morgan Company touts the tax benefits of their proposed NED pipeline. It would be useful for the public to understand if the tax numbers Kinder Morgan uses are before or after their tax abatements, which I am sure are to come.

Again, the Kinder Morgan Company continues to use whatever information they can obtain to paint their company and their processes in the best light. Of course, they do not outright lie about the information, but certainly they continue to bend the truth whenever possible.

Again, I ask that FERC insure the public receives the “fair and honest” debate that was promised.

From: Sheila Ames (mel-sheila@myfairpoint.net)

January 27, 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

Dear Ms. Bose,

Please review the facts about the magnitude of the environmental impact the proposed NED pipeline would have and the health and safety of the people who live nearby.

Kinder Morgan is a company that has had many many safety violations and accidents. The risks for explosions and leaks are a big concern here. This company has sent me three separate letters about the pipeline and they are confusing. As a homeowner I am appalled at how brazen and unconcerned they are about people.

This proposed NED pipeline would run through hundreds and hundreds of private properties, wetlands, rivers, state forests, and sensitive ecosystems. It poses risks for contamination of surface water, groundwater, soil, vegetation, and air. Leaks, ruptures, and explosions can happen and have happened in the past.

New Hampshire residents will receive no benefits from this pipeline and should not have to pay (via tax tariff) or help this company in any way. We have a right to a safe and clean environment. A place where our children and grandchildren might like to live.

If the NED pipeline is approved it would cut a giant swath of trees right next to our neighbor's house eliminating a buffer zone between the house and the power lines. It would also run (within 500ft.) near a EPA Superfund Site that is approximately a half mile from my house. Construction of the pipeline could disperse contaminants from the Superfund Site through land, water, and air.

Please do the right thing and reject the Kinder Morgan, Northeast Direct Pipeline Project. It is time for this country to take a stand on what is good for its people, land, and water and reject projects that offer profits for big companies.

Please do not approve this project for NH!

Sincerely,

Sheila Ames

**20150127-5295(30101157).pdf**

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

January 27, 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  
Response to Comments Regarding Information Request Letters

Dear Ms. Bose:

On September 15, 2014, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. (“Tennessee” or “TGP”) 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. On November 5, 2014, Tennessee filed drafts of Resource Report 1 and Resource Report 10. An updated Resource Report 1 that adopted two route alternatives (the New York Powerline Alternative and the New Hampshire Powerline Alternative) as its proposed route as part of the Market Path component of the Project was filed on December 8, 2014. In that filing, Tennessee discussed the ongoing development of the resource reports for the Project and the schedule for submitting the first and second drafts of the Environmental Report (Resource Reports 1 through 13) for the Project. Tennessee will submit the first draft of the Environmental Report in March 2015, with the second draft of the Environmental Report anticipated to be filed with the Commission in June 2015.

As part of the preparation of the resource reports for the Project, Tennessee’s environmental consultant, AECOM, has sent information request letters to affected townships, counties, and planning boards to gather information to determine if the proposed Project facilities cross or would be within 0.25 miles of sensitive environmental areas, including federal, state or local designated aquifers or aquifer protection areas; surface waters that provide public drinking water supplies; surface water protection areas; public or private drinking water wells, reservoirs or springs in or within 300 feet of the proposed alignment; open space/natural areas; locally significant roads, scenic areas or rivers; and schools, parks, ballfields, and trails. In addition, the information request letters sought information regarding planned residential subdivision developments and planned commercial or industrial developments within 0.5 miles of the proposed Project facilities. The letters requested that the townships, counties, and planning boards review their records relative to these areas and provide written comments to AECOM’s attention for use in the development of the Environmental Report for the Project. These information request letters are a commonly used tool to gather this important information from townships, counties, and planning boards that will be used as part of the Commission’s National Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”) review of the Project.

On January 22, 2015, a letter from Cristobal Bonifaz, an attorney representing the Town of Deerfield, Massachusetts, addressed to AECOM, Tennessee’s environmental consultant for the Project, was submitted in the pre-filing proceeding for the Project. In the letter, dated January 14, 2015, Mr. Bonifaz discusses the information request letter sent by AECOM to the Deerfield Board of Health and the Deerfield Planning Board and states that the Town of Deerfield will be providing the requested information to Tennessee under the Freedom of Information Act as it falls outside the October 23, 2014 order of the Deerfield Board of Health under which the construction and installation of the Project facilities was banned by the Deerfield Board of Health. The letter also discusses Tennessee’s position that it plans to request an appropriate authority to overturn this ban and Tennessee’s failure to respond to Mr. Bonifaz’s request regarding agency jurisdiction over the Project.

Over the past several months, Tennessee has been in communication with the Town of Deerfield and Mr. Bonifaz regarding the Deerfield Board of Health’s October 2014 order. As noted in correspondence previously directed to the Town of Deerfield (see attached), Tennessee has denied the claims and allegations asserted by Deerfield, disputed the validity of the Order issued by the Deerfield Board of Health and has reserved the right to challenge the Order in an appropriate forum. While this issue remains to be resolved, Tennessee acknowledges that the Town of Deerfield will be providing the information requested by AECOM to assist in the ongoing development of the record in this proceeding. Tennessee has encouraged the Town of Deerfield to participate in the review of the NED Project in the pre-filing process and the certificate application process by submitting comments to the Commission and attending open houses hosted by Tennessee and scoping meetings conducted by the Commission and continues to encourage the town’s participation in the Commission’s process.

In separate comments filed on January 16, 2015 in the pre-filing proceeding, MassAudubon filed a letter regarding the information request letters submitted by AECOM on behalf of Tennessee to gather information

from Massachusetts municipalities. MassAudubon objects to these letters as appearing “to direct municipal officials to gather, interpret, and provide information to AECOM/TGP regarding the proposed Northeast Energy Direct (NED) gas pipeline corridor,” and claims that these requests may violate the Commission’s regulations regarding disclosure of Critical Energy Infrastructure Information (“CEII”).

As discussed above, Tennessee is seeking the requested information in order to develop the Environmental Review for the Project, which will be submitted to the Commission in the pre-filing and certificate processes to assist in the NEPA review of the Project. Tennessee, through its environmental consultants, is not requesting Massachusetts municipalities to interpret data or to provide information that would violate CEII requirements, but is requesting information, as is done for all Commission-regulated interstate natural gas pipeline projects, regarding the sensitive environmental areas identified above. The information provided by Massachusetts municipalities will be used by Tennessee and AECOM for evaluating the potential impact of the Project on these resources and in assessing potential cumulative impacts on these resources of the Project with other identified projects in the area of impact. If any Massachusetts municipality or other entity that received an information request letter from AECOM on behalf of Tennessee has any concerns regarding the letter, Tennessee requests that the entity contact Tennessee or the AECOM contact identified in the information request letter.

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 this filing to the Office of Energy Projects. A copy of this letter will also be sent to all affected stakeholders. 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

Enclosures

cc: Mr. Rich McGuire (Commission Staff)

Mr. Michael McGehee (Commission Staff)

Mr. Eric Tomasi (Commission Staff)

*{Note: this is followed by 32 pages which are included only as scans and thus cannot be included here. The entire original submission has been made downloadable from:*

*<[http://www.Mason-NH.org/Docs/Pipel/FERC\\_com/20150127-5295\(30101157\).pdf](http://www.Mason-NH.org/Docs/Pipel/FERC_com/20150127-5295(30101157).pdf)> (1.8 MB)}*

**20150128-0006(30103617).pdf**

January 22, 2015

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street NE

Washington, D.C. 20426

To Whom It May Concern:

We are landowners in Stephentown, New York, adjacent to the proposed TGP / Kinder Morgan pipeline.

We are very opposed to this pipeline for many reasons, including safety and the detrimental impact on our environment.

We are asking that you deny this company a FERC Certificate.

Docket No. PF 14-22.

Thank you.

Hugh and Louise Meyers  
16092 NY 22  
Stephentown  
New York 12168

**20150128-0025(30104816).pdf**

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

Date: 1/19/2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access

As the owner of the property located at:

80 Pelizan Road, Dracut, MA 01826

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.

Cheryl Barret

**20150128-0034(30105076).pdf**

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

Date: Jan 23, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access

As the owner of the property located at:

333 Middle Winchendon Rd, Ringe, NH 03461  
Town Map #2, Lot # 49

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.

Edwin P. Callahan

**20150128-0035(30105080).pdf**

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

Date: 1-23-14

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access

As the owner of the property located at:

24 Perry Rd, Ringe, 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.

Janice Fiandaca

Leo Rheame

**20150128-0037(30105088).pdf**

**Town of Wilmington**  
Water & Sewer Department  
121 Glen Road  
Wilmington, Massachusetts 01887

Water & Sewer Commission  
115 Andover Street  
Wilmington, MA 01887

Telephone (978) 658-4711  
Fax (978) 694-2017  
TTY(978) 694-1417

January 22, 2015

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

Re: Kinder Morgan Lynnfield Lateral Pipeline Proposal through Wilmington, MA  
Project's Docket Number - PF 14 - 22

Dear Secretary Bose:

This letter is written in response to the Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Natural Gas Pipeline (KM/TGP) proposal to install a natural gas pipeline through the Town of Wilmington, MA. As members of the Town of Wilmington Water & Sewer Commission, it is our responsibility to represent the best interest and safety of the Town as it relates to Water and Sewer issues. In this particular case, the Water & Sewer Commission has reviewed the (KM/TGP) proposal and has determined that that the proposed lateral extends through the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP) designated Zone I Area for both the Browns Crossing (approximate mile marker 1.1) and Salem Street well fields (approximate mile marker 11.9). These are the primary drinking water sources for the Town. Therefore, the Wilmington Water & Sewer Commission formally opposes the project as currently defined.

Zone I is a MassDEP designated area that constitutes a 400 foot radius around the wellhead. According to MassDEP regulations 310 CMR 22.21, current and/or future land uses within the Zone I wellhead protection area are limited to those directly related to the provision of public gas pipeline and perpetual maintenance (i.e. vegetation clearing, weed growth control) of a 50' FT corridor will certainly adversely impact these extremely sensitive Zone 1 areas.

Maintaining the integrity and productivity of both Browns Crossing and Salem Street Wells is vital to supplying the Town of Wilmington with local drinking water. Due to aquifer contamination from EPA designated Olin Super Fund Site, five other drinking water wells were shut down in 2002-2003. As a result, the Town lost a substantial supply of local drinking water. Without these wells, the need to keep Browns Crossing and Salem Street wells operating safely only increases. As two of the four active remaining wells in Wilmington, Browns Crossing and Salem Street account for approximately 64% of local drinking water supply. Both these wells are shallow overburden gravel pack wells.

In addition to the encroachment through the Zone 1 area, please see that from approximately mile marker

10.2 to mile marker 12.3 (2.1-miles) the proposed pipeline is also located within the Watershed Protection District Zone II area. A Zone II area represents a wellhead protection area that has been determined by hydro-geologic modeling and approved by the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP).

Please refer to the enclosed map entitled "Proposed Kinder Morgan Gas Pipeline". This map illustrates the proposed route (with 0.25-mile offset on each side), along with all pertinent parcel information, Town landmarks, resource areas, wellhead protection areas (Zone I and Zone II), roadways, trails and conservation controlled land that are within the requested 0.5-mile corridor.

As currently proposed, the Kinder Morgan Lynnfield Lateral Pipeline Proposal is of great concern to the Wilmington Water 4 Sewer Commission. Upon completing our review of the proposal, it is evident that Kinder Morgan failed to take into account the sensitive nature of the Town of Wilrnington's drinking water supply.

Sincerely,

Joseph Balliro, Chairman

George Allan

Robert LaVita

CC: Wilmington Board of Seiectmen

Jeffrey M. Hull, Wilmington Town Manager

Massachusetts DEP — Martin Suuberg, Commissioner

Massachusetts DEP — NERO — Thomas Mahin

**20150128-5019(30101252).pdf**

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, NE

Washington, DC 20426

Rose Knight

127 Perry Road

Rindge, NH 03461

To whom it may concern; The pipeline project is an absolute invasion!! Of my privacy. Land I have loved, and cared for (not to mention paying taxes on) for more than 50 years will be devastating!! My property is a 28 acre lot that is natural, peaceful, space. It is a haven for all types of birds, and wild-life. The thought of "big business" being allowed to trespass onto my land and destroy it's natural beauty without my permission feels kind of "rape- y!" It's absolutely horrible!! Thias project will ruin the value of my property. The project will ruin quiet peaceful bliss. The project will contribute to pollution, of many types. This is NOT the direction I see our pristine little town taking. I feel utilizing our natural resources is the best path to follow!! Haven't we learned that "going green" is our only choice for the future!?? I am against the pipeline project!!! It is clear to me it's only benefit is to make big money for big business!! It's irresponsible!! Private citizens assaulted, and land being rapped for money hungry GREED!!

Sincerely;

Rose Knight

**20150128-5052(30102290).pdf**

HOMER D SHANNON, Windham, NH.

Eminent Domain Invalid for This Project

Eminent domain should not be allowed for this project for the following reasons:

1. Only 5% of the line's capacity has been contracted for by a New Hampshire utility.

2. The total requirement for all regional needs has been estimated to be only 30% of the capacity of the proposed pipeline.
3. There are four other pipelines already permitted and being built that will meet the regional demands for natural gas. This line is superfluous.
4. The capacity of this line will likely be used to fill LNG tankers for international export.
5. This pipeline does not meet the requirement of being built in the public interest. It is being built for corporate profits alone.

**20150128-5055(30102575).pdf**

HOMER D SHANNON, Windham, NH.

You want to put one of these less than 50' from my house?

<http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2015/01/27/3615805/west-virginia-gaspipeline-explosion/>

Seems like a very bad idea.

**20150129-0032(30110191).pdf**

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

Date: January 24, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access

As the owner of the property located at:

14 South Main St., Lanesborough, MA 01237

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.

Joan L. Devoe  
Lyndon Moors

**20150129-0033(30110259).pdf**

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

Date: January 24, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access #PF14-22-00

As the owner of the property located at:

6 South Main St., Lanesborough, MA 01237

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.

Lyndon Moors

**20150129-0034(30110185).pdf**

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

Date: Jan 24, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access #PF14-22-00

As the owner of the property located at:

56 Bridge St., Lanesborough, MA 01237

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.

Lawrence Spatz

Alice Spatz

**20150129-0035(30110256).pdf**

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

Date: 1-20-2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access #PF14-22-00

As the owner of the property located at:

721 Williamstown Rd., Lanesborough, MA 01237

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.

Ronald P. Armstrong, Jr.

**20150129-4002(30106672).pdf**

2 Langley Lane  
Andover, MA 01810

January 29, 2015

Chairman Cheryl LaFleur

Dear Chairman LaFleur

I am writing this letter to express my opposition to the proposed Kinder Morgan Pipeline to be run through various cities and towns in Massachusetts. This pipeline will destroy both open space and private property across the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, put the safety of residents at risk, jeopardize our ability to lower emissions that contribute to climate change, and place an unfair burden on electric ratepayers to pay for the cost of construction.

Kinder Morgan has not and cannot promise this pipeline will result in lower gas and electric prices in New England. The proposed pipeline will provide Kinder Morgan with the ability to export natural gas. Higher gas prices on the international market will result in increased domestic gas prices.

The proposed pipeline will not bring a significant number of new jobs to Massachusetts. Most of the jobs associated with the pipeline will be temporary and likely filled by out of state of Kinder Morgan. This proposed pipeline will deliver far more capacity than is needed for to meet projected energy or power generation in New England. This pipeline is not about meeting the energy needs of Massachusetts and the other New England States. It is actually planned primarily to increase the profits of this private company.

There are existing gas pipelines in Massachusetts that are not being used to 100% capacity. Using these pipelines to capacity to store natural gas during non-peak times can keep enough gas in reserve to cover the few days each winter when peak demand drives up prices. Fixing leaks in existing pipelines can substantially improve energy efficiency.

Please work with your colleagues to defeat the plan for this pipeline.

Thank you,

James D. Rawlinson

**20150129-4003(30106801).pdf**

2 Langley Lane  
Andover, MA 01810

January 29, 2015

Commissioner Tony Clark

Dear Commissioner Clark,

I am writing this letter to express my opposition to the proposed Kinder Morgan Pipeline to be run through various cities and towns in Massachusetts. This pipeline will destroy both open space and private property across the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, put the safety of residents at risk, jeopardize our ability to lower emissions that contribute to climate change, and place an unfair burden on electric ratepayers to pay for the cost of construction.

Kinder Morgan has not and cannot promise this pipeline will result in lower gas and electric prices in New England. The proposed pipeline will provide Kinder Morgan with the ability to export natural gas. Higher gas prices on the international market will result in increased domestic gas prices.

The proposed pipeline will not bring a significant number of new jobs to Massachusetts. Most of the jobs associated with the pipeline will be temporary and likely filled by out of state of Kinder Morgan. This proposed pipeline will deliver far more capacity than is needed for to meet projected energy or power generation in New England. This pipeline is not about meeting the energy needs of Massachusetts and the other New England States. It is actually planned primarily to increase the profits of this private company.

There are existing gas pipelines in Massachusetts that are not being used to 100% capacity. Using these pipelines to capacity to store natural gas during non-peak times can keep enough gas in reserve to cover the few days each winter when peak demand drives up prices. Fixing leaks in existing pipelines can substantially improve energy efficiency.

Please work with your colleagues to defeat the plan for this pipeline.

Thank you,

James D. Rawlinson

**20150129-4008(30109834).pdf**

*per FERC: "File 1-29-15.DOCX cannot be converted to PDF." which would be farcical if it did not demonstrate such incompetence - the original was a normal .docx file! Converted to PDF by fgf.*

From: jimmy seto <jimmyseto@gmail.com>

Date: January 29, 2015 at 1:44:13 PM EST

Subject: Kinder-Morgan and Tennessee Gas Pipeline

Hi --

I am writing to express my concern over the proposed Kinder-Morgan and Tennessee Gas Pipeline that is being proposed. I am asking you to do whatever you can to stop this project as it poses potential risk to our community. The pipeline will destroy both treasured open spaces and private property across the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, put the safety of residents at risk, jeopardize the ability of Massachusetts to lower emissions that contribute to climate change, and place an unfair burden on electric ratepayers to pay for the cost of its construction. The residents of Massachusetts have the right to clean, safe and sustainable energy solutions. The residents also have the right to have a say in the policies that will determine our energy future.

Massachusetts' state-, county- and municipally-owned open spaces funded with state resources are entitled to full protection under Article 97 of the Massachusetts Constitution. The pipeline crosses large amounts of conservation land protected by Article 97 of the Massachusetts Constitution. A two-thirds majority of both houses of the Massachusetts state government is required to release land from Article 97 protection. I respectfully request that you pledge to oppose the release of any Article 97 land for the building of this pipeline.

Sincerely,

Jimmy Seto

**20150129-4009(30110173).pdf**

From: Amanda Gasse <gasseboston@verizon.net>

Date: January 25, 2015 at 11:08:33 AM EST

To: <philip.moeller@ferc.gov>

Subject: Help Stop the Pipeline

Dear Philip,

I would like your help in stopping the planned Kinder Morgan pipeline in Andover, MA. I moved to Andover eleven years ago from the city of Boston in order for my three children to attend the Andover Public School. It did not take long for my husband, myself, and our three boys to fall in love with the town of Andover. All three boys were part of Cub Scouts Pack 79 and they are now in Boy Scout Troop 79. Through the scouting program we have explored the trails and AVIS land in Andover. Many of the Eagle Scout projects in Andover are done in conjunction with AVIS property. Just a few weeks ago, my three boys and husband did a winter camping trip on land that is proposed to be part of the gas pipeline. In fact, the camping site was developed by an Eagle Scout about ten years ago and is used for district-wide Boy Scout events on a regular basis. The impact of taking away this municipally-owned land would be devastating for not just our Scout organization but our community. The pipeline crosses large amounts of conservation land protected by Article 97 of the Massachusetts Constitution. A two-thirds majority of both houses of the Massachusetts state government is required to release land from Article 97 protection.

Two of my children attend Wood Hill Middle School which is significantly close to the pipeline's pathway. This greatly concerns me as a parent and as a resident of Andover. As a resident of Massachusetts I have the right to clean, safe and sustainable energy solutions. Natural gas is composed primarily of methane. Methane is a greenhouse gas 86 times more powerful than CO<sub>2</sub>. While natural gas "burns" more cleanly than oil and coal, it is often leaked during drilling, transmission and distribution and has significant global warming impacts that are just recently being fully recognized. In accordance with section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act, the United States is expected to significantly reduce carbon emissions in order to meet global standards. Allowing this pipeline would not only be a step backwards for government, but a huge step in the wrong direction for Massachusetts, a state heralded for its energy efficiency and renewable energy contributions.

The pipeline will destroy both treasured open spaces and private property across the Commonwealth of

Massachusetts, put the safety of residents at risk, jeopardize the ability of Massachusetts to lower emissions that contribute to climate change, and place an unfair burden on electric ratepayers to pay for the cost of its construction.

I respectfully request that you pledge to oppose the building of this pipeline.

Sincerely,

Amanda Gasse  
500 D Brookside Drive  
Andover, MA 01810  
978-394-1307  
gasseboston@verizon.net

### **20150129-5007(30105232).pdf**

Joseph Cigna, Wilmington, Massachusetts (Docket #PF14-22-000)

I want to state my opposition to the Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline (KM/TGP) Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Project. Specifically, Kinder Morgan's proposed plan in Wilmington, MA is to have the new Lynnfield Lateral pipeline run through the town's drinking water supply, through conservation land, wetlands and private property. The pipeline will border an active quarry which weekly uses explosives to remove stone materials. While many of the KM/TGP employees have told local residents that this is a federal project that cannot be stopped, it's obvious that this is a private project and they are using FERC's authority before it has been granted. The Wilmington, MA town Selectman have voted unanimously to OPPOSE the KM/TGP due to the potential for significant damage to town property and drinking water supplies.

The risk to the Wilmington residents is clearly unacceptable and I ask that FERC take the logical step and reject the Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline plan and not grant them licenses to build the pipeline through Wilmington, MA

### **20150129-5108(30107226).pdf**

elizabeth wedge, Stephentown, NY.

SUBJECT: Proposed Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Co. high-pressure fracked gas pipeline through Stephentown

Dear Stephentown Town Board: Mr. Larry Eckhardt, Christopher Demick, William Jennings, PJ Roder), I'm a resident of Stephentown and am very concerned about the high pressure fracked-gas pipeline that Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Gas Cos. want to put through our area.

I oppose this pipeline for the following reasons:

- It's not needed locally, regionally or nationally. The fuel it will carry is intended mainly for export; none is slated for New York. Only the private corporations Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Gas will benefit.
- Financial burdens and risks for local homeowners.
- Health and safety hazards. These companies have very poor track records in this regard. Fracked gas contains hundreds of chemicals, many of which are dangerous to health.
- Catastrophic explosions and fires happen – could our SVFD handle that?
- I want to have a say in what happens to my property and in my community.
- Damage to the environment (soil, air and water) from construction and pipeline leakage. What about our wells, gardens, farms, and animals?
- Expanding fossil fuel infrastructure in this way is a step backward from national and state goals of developing renewable energy resources.

I request that the Stephentown Town Board pass a resolution opposing the pipeline and file a copy of that

resolution with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC).

I hope you realize how significant this is for the quality of our lives and there are many, many members of our community NOT just in Massachusetts either ! whose voices need to be heard and registered. I urge you to act, and know that your constituents oppose this pipeline.

**20150129-5176(30108271).pdf**

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

January 29, 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:

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 originally scheduled dates and locations for twelve open houses to be conducted in November and December 2014 for the portion of the Project located between Wright, New York and Dracut, Massachusetts. A list of the open house dates and locations was filed with the Commission on October 21, 2014. On November 6, 2014, Tennessee submitted a filing stating that these open houses would be postponed in order to provide affected landowners and communities the necessary time to review the draft Resource Reports 1 and 10 submitted on November 5, 2014. On January 9, 2015, Tennessee submitted a list of the revised dates and locations for the postponed open houses for the portion of the Project located between Wright, New York and Dracut, Massachusetts.

Due to inclement weather and subsequent school activity rescheduling, Tennessee has moved the location for the February 9, 2015 open house to the Green Meadow Elementary School in Schodack, New York, and has rescheduled the open houses scheduled for the week of January 26, 2015 (Milford, New Hampshire; Berlin, Massachusetts; and Fitchburg, Massachusetts) to the week of February 23, 2015. An updated schedule of open houses for the portion of the Project located between Wright, New York and Dracut, Massachusetts is included with this filing. Tennessee will provide notification of this updated open house schedule to affected stakeholders. Tennessee will also work with the Commission Staff to establish the open house dates and locations for the portion of the Project located between Troy, Pennsylvania and Wright, New York.

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 this filing to the Office of Energy Projects. A copy of this letter will also be sent to all affected landowners and the governmental officials that received the open house schedule in prior notification letters. 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. Rich McGuire (Commission Staff)  
Mr. Michael McGehee (Commission Staff)  
Mr. Eric Tomasi (Commission Staff)

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

NED Open House Dates/Locations

\*\*All Open Houses are 6pm – 8pm

- \* February 3: Rindge, NH
  - o Four Star Catering; 18 Lisa Dr., Rindge, NH 03461
- \* February 4: Winchester, NH
  - o Winchester High School Gymnasium; 85 Parker St., Winchester, NH 03470
- \* February 5: Greenfield, MA
  - o Greenfield Community College Cafeteria; 1 College Dr., Greenfield, MA 01301
- \* February 9: Schodack, NY
  - o Green Meadow Elementary School Cafeteria; 234 Schuurman Rd., Castleton-on-Hudson, NY 12033
- \* February 10: Pittsfield, MA
  - o Berkshire Community College Cafeteria; 1350 West St., Pittsfield, MA 01201
- \* February 11: Farmington, CT
  - o Farmington High School Cafeteria; 10 Montieth Dr., Farmington, CT 06032
- \* February 12: New Scotland, NY
  - o Colonie Country Club; 141 Maple Rd., Voorheesville, NY 12186
- \* February 17: Andover, MA
  - o Wyndham Hotel; 123 Old River Rd., Andover, MA 01810
- \* February 18: Londonderry, NH
  - o Londonderry High School Cafeteria; 295 Mammoth Rd., Londonderry, NH 03053
- \* February 19: Hudson, NH
  - o White Birch Banquet Hall; 222 Central St., Hudson, NH 03051
- \* February 24: Milford, NH
  - o Hampshire Dome; 50 Emerson Rd., Milford, NH 03055
- \* February 25: Berlin, MA
  - o Berlin Memorial Elementary School Gymnasium; 34 South St., Berlin, MA 01503
- \* February 26: Fitchburg, MA
  - o Fitchburg Memorial Middle School Gymnasium; 615 Rollstone St., Fitchburg, MA 01420

**20150130-0021(30113634).pdf**

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: 1/20/15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access #PF14-22-00

As the owner of the property located at:

9 South Main St.  
Lanesboro, MA 01237

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.

Nancy Tunncliffe

**20150130-4003(30111759).pdf**

2 Langley Lane  
Andover, MA 01810

January 30, 2015

Commissioner Norman Bay

Dear Commissioner Bay,

I am writing this letter to express my opposition to the proposed Kinder Morgan Pipeline to be run through various cities and towns in Massachusetts. This pipeline will destroy both open space and private property across the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, put the safety of residents at risk, jeopardize our ability to lower emissions that contribute to climate change, and place an unfair burden on electric ratepayers to pay for the cost of construction.

Kinder Morgan has not and cannot promise this pipeline will result in lower gas and electric prices in New England. The proposed pipeline will provide Kinder Morgan with the ability to export natural gas. Higher gas prices on the international market will result in increased domestic gas prices.

The proposed pipeline will not bring a significant number of new jobs to Massachusetts. Most of the jobs associated with the pipeline will be temporary and likely filled by out of state of Kinder Morgan. This proposed pipeline will deliver far more capacity than is needed for to meet projected energy or power generation in New England. This pipeline is not about meeting the energy needs of Massachusetts and the other New England States. It is actually planned primarily to increase the profits of this private company.

There are existing gas pipelines in Massachusetts that are not being used to 100% capacity. Using these pipelines to capacity to store natural gas during non-peak times can keep enough gas in reserve to cover the few days each winter when peak demand drives up prices. Fixing leaks in existing pipelines can substantially improve energy efficiency.

Please work with your colleagues to defeat the plan for this pipeline.

Thank you,

James D. Rawlinson

**20150130-4007(30113686).pdf**

From: jim.rawlinson@comcast.net [mailto:jim.rawlinson@comcast.net]

Sent: Thursday, January 29, 2015 8:39 AM

To: Philip Moeller

Subject: Kinder Morgan Pipeline

Please review the attached letter regarding the proposed Kinder Morgan Pipeline.

Thank you,

James Rawlinson

2 Langley Lane  
Andover, MA 01810

January 29, 2015

Commissioner Philip Moeller

Dear Commissioner Moeller,

I am writing this letter to express my opposition to the proposed Kinder Morgan Pipeline to be run through various cities and towns in Massachusetts. This pipeline will destroy both open space and private property across the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, put the safety of residents at risk, jeopardize our ability to lower emissions that contribute to climate change, and place an unfair burden on electric ratepayers to pay for the cost of construction.

Kinder Morgan has not and cannot promise this pipeline will result in lower gas and electric prices in New England. The proposed pipeline will provide Kinder Morgan with the ability to export natural gas. Higher gas prices on the international market will result in increased domestic gas prices.

The proposed pipeline will not bring a significant number of new jobs to Massachusetts. Most of the jobs associated with the pipeline will be temporary and likely filled by out of state of Kinder Morgan. This proposed pipeline will deliver far more capacity than is needed for to meet projected energy or power generation in New England. This pipeline is not about meeting the energy needs of Massachusetts and the other New England States. It is actually planned primarily to increase the profits of this private company.

There are existing gas pipelines in Massachusetts that are not being used to 100% capacity. Using these pipelines to capacity to store natural gas during non-peak times can keep enough gas in reserve to cover the few days each winter when peak demand drives up prices. Fixing leaks in existing pipelines can substantially improve energy efficiency.

Please work with your colleagues to defeat the plan for this pipeline.

Thank you,

James D. Rawlinson

**20150130-5028(30110590).pdf**

Beth Burns, Merrimack, NH.

January 29, 2015

To whom I hope it concerns,

My name is Beth Burns and I am a Merrimack, New Hampshire resident living on Spruce Street. As a resident I have worked hard to protect my home and OUR town. My home was purchased for my two sons and our dog. Merrimack has been a safe and pleasant town to be a part of. The Merrimack Outlets being approved after years of concern from neighbors, including myself, was enough for us to cope with. The blasting did cause some cracks in some of our homes. The traffic has increased. It has not increased the values of our homes. It has been the opposite. The pipeline would NOT increase the values of our homes either. That is wrong. I am a single mother with two sons and this house is all I have been able to provide them other than love. I pay the mortgage, the taxes, pay for the upkeep of this house, the yard care and everything else

that comes with having a home. The Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company LLC ( a Kinder Morgan Company) is not doing any of those things for us. This pipeline would be taking those things away from us. They would be taking our homes. I beg of you to please take into account what is really on the table for us as Merrimack, New Hampshire residents, as well as any other New Hampshire resident. WE make this state what it is and should be, not the big gas companies.

Please do not let our homes become an incineration zone. This is a danger. We deserve the disapproval of this pipeline. We deserve the protection from something that has no safety, no money saving, no real worth to us as residents. It will not only harm us, but our children. Please show your support for US and do not approve this. Please do not allow it to happen. Your disapproval will strengthen our state. It will strengthen our homes, their worth and what WE are worth to the beautiful state of New Hampshire and the beautiful town of Merrimack.

Thank you for taking the time to hear me and listen at the same time.

Let's work together.

Sincerely,

Beth Burns

**20150130-5261(30113609).pdf**

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

January 30, 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  
Updated Open House Schedule -- New Location for February 4, 2015 Open House

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 originally scheduled dates and locations for twelve open houses to be conducted in November and December 2014 for the portion of the Project located between Wright, New York and Dracut, Massachusetts. A list of the open house dates and locations was filed with the Commission on October 21, 2014. On November 6, 2014, Tennessee submitted a filing stating that these open houses would be postponed in order to provide affected landowners and communities the necessary time to review the draft Resource Reports 1 and 10 submitted on November 5, 2014. On January 9, 2015, Tennessee submitted a list of the revised dates and locations for the postponed open houses for the portion of the Project located between Wright, New York and Dracut, Massachusetts. A revised open house schedule was submitted on January 29, 2015 to reflect the dates of the open houses that had been rescheduled due to inclement weather and subsequent school activity rescheduling.

Tennessee now submits a further updated schedule of open houses for the portion of the Project located between Wright, New York and Dracut, Massachusetts in this filing. This updated schedule reflects the new location for the February 4, 2015 open house in Winchester, New Hampshire. Tennessee will provide notification of this updated open house schedule to affected stakeholders. Tennessee will also work with the Com-

mission Staff to establish the open house dates and locations for the portion of the Project located between Troy, Pennsylvania and Wright, New York.

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 this filing to the Office of Energy Projects. A copy of this letter will also be sent to all affected landowners and the governmental officials that received the open house schedule in prior notification letters. 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. Rich McGuire (Commission Staff)

Mr. Michael McGehee (Commission Staff)

Mr. Eric Tomasi (Commission Staff)

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

#### NED Open House Dates/Locations

\*\*All Open Houses are 6pm – 8pm

\* February 3: Rindge, NH

o Four Star Catering; 18 Lisa Dr., Rindge, NH 03461

\* February 4: Winchester, NH

o Winchester Town Hall; 1 Richmond Rd., Winchester NH 03470

\* February 5: Greenfield, MA

o Greenfield Community College Cafeteria; 1 College Dr., Greenfield, MA 01301

\* February 9: Schodack, NY

o Green Meadow Elementary School Cafeteria; 234 Schuurman Rd., Castleton-on-Hudson, NY 12033

\* February 10: Pittsfield, MA

o Berkshire Community College Cafeteria; 1350 West St., Pittsfield, MA 01201

\* February 11: Farmington, CT

o Farmington High School Cafeteria; 10 Montieth Dr., Farmington, CT 06032

\* February 12: New Scotland, NY

o Colonie Country Club; 141 Maple Rd., Voorheesville, NY 12186

\* February 17: Andover, MA

o Wyndham Hotel; 123 Old River Rd., Andover, MA 01810

\* February 18: Londonderry, NH

o Londonderry High School Cafeteria; 295 Mammoth Rd., Londonderry, NH 03053

\* February 19: Hudson, NH

- o White Birch Banquet Hall; 222 Central St., Hudson, NH 03051
- \* February 24: Milford, NH
  - o Hampshire Dome; 50 Emerson Rd., Milford, NH 03055
- \* February 25: Berlin, MA
  - o Berlin Memorial Elementary School Gymnasium; 34 South St., Berlin, MA 01503
- \* February 26: Fitchburg, MA
  - o Fitchburg Memorial Middle School Gymnasium; 615 Rollstone St., Fitchburg, MA 01420

**20150202-0067(30119322).pdf**

**Northfield Open Space Committee**  
69 Main Street  
Northfield, MA 01360

January 26, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room IA  
Washington, DC 20216

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

Dear Secretary Bose:

The Northfield Open Space Committee (OSC) requests that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission consider some of the special aspects of the Town of Northfield, Massachusetts in its review of the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's proposed Northeast Energy Direct project. The OSC's causes for concern include loss of permanently protected land that is environmentally and economically important to Northfield and impact on recreational use of Northfield's trail system.

Although the proposal currently follows an existing utility corridor through Northfield, the cleared area would be widened for the pipeline, impacting important conservation areas owned by the town, including the Brush Mountain Conservation Area and/or the Northfield Town Forest. Encroaching into the forest area on either side of the existing utility corridor would damage at least one of these properties and violate its conservation contract. In addition, privately owned conservation lands and state forest lands that abut the corridor would be affected by the proposed pipeline.

The OSC is concerned that clearing the forest would make way for invasive species and result in erosion during construction. About 21% of Northfield is quite steep, with slopes of over 25%, and thus very sensitive to erosion; much of the proposed route is within the steepest parts of Northfield.

The proposed pipeline route crosses the New England National Scenic Trail (NET) twice between Alexander Hill Road and Old Turnpike Road. The NET goes within 100' of the existing utility easement in several other places. This highly scenic section of a nationally-significant facility should not be disrupted for the construction of a pipeline. Many additional town-maintained trails would also be affected.

TGP's December 8 filing indicates that a compressor station (Market Path Mid Station 3) is proposed for somewhere between Four Mile Brook Road and Alexander Hill Road. This part of Northfield has many hiking and skiing trails (including the NET), the value of which would be significantly degraded if subjected to compressor noise. The OSC urges that a compressor station not be sited within ear-shot of this trail-dense area.

Northfield recently completed a Master Plan. The very first goal is "to promote preservation of open space and natural features" and the second is "to promote opportunities for recreation and community gathering." Tourism, especially outdoor recreation and appreciation of scenic vistas, is a major economic factor in Northfield. The Master Plan states that "care should be taken to avoid development that would promote soil

erosion or detract from the visual appeal of the ridges” (p. 11).A list of “What makes Northfield Unique” (p. 27) includes: dark night skies, open spaces, clean air, hiking trails, views and varied vistas, natural beauty, quiet, safe, rural. The construction of this pipeline and especially the presence of a compressor station would compromise the synergistic combination of these qualities and threaten the character of the town.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment.

Sincerely,

Jarrold Wagener, Chair. Northfield Open Space Committee

**20150202-0068(30119323).pdf**

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

Date: 1/25/15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access

As the owner of the property located at:

279 Abel Rd., Rindge, 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 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.

Albert Miller

**20150202-0083(30119278).pdf**

Hand written letter, Jeanne E. Bennett, 37 Sugar Bush Rd, Hancock, NH, opposing

**20150202-0084(30118782).tif**

Hand written letter, Denise Ginzler, 105 Old Mason Center Rd, Greenville, NH 03048, opposing

**20150202-0085(30118784).tif**

Hand written letter, Emily Gavin, 108 Summit St., Plainfield, MA 01070, opposing

**20150202-0086(30118773).tif**

Hand written letter, Suzanne Connors, 24 E Monononac Rd, Rindge, NH 03461, opposing

**20150202-0103(30119301).pdf**

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

Date: 1/23/15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access

As the owner of the property located at:

340+350 North Main St.

Lanesboro, Mass

I am denying permission to the Tenner Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, 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 forward will be considered unlawful, and treated as trespass.

James K. Barnes

**20150202-5019(30113814).pdf**

Jill L Manfield, Merrimack, NH.

I am very concerned with pipeline that is planned for Merrimack. I strongly believe this will be a problem and cause ill effects in the neighborhood! I am extremely concerned with the conservation area we paid 4 million in community tax money that will have depreciated and will compromise, I am concerned with the depression of my property value, I am concerned with the safety of the chemicals being used and the long term effects to my child and the water supply, I am concerned with potential effects of the water supply that will be impacted, and the fact this will not benefit NH. I am told we will have to pay taxes on this and we get nothing in return but major concerns for safety and our land. Our community is having huge concerns and I urge you to deny this project. I would like to do all I can to prevent this project and would like to hear from our state representative on what I could do to help disseminate information and work get the proper people engaged.

**20150202-5025(30113826).pdf**

Ellen, Merrimack, NH.

My husband and I are totally against this pipeline proposal. It is not safe for New Hampshire or my neighborhood, as our home is in the "incineration zone." We have cared for and maintained our home for over 30 years, raised our family here, raising our grandchildren. We have supported our state, our town, our schools and local businesses for 30+ years. This proposed gas line, besides posing a potential fatal danger to ourselves, as well as our home, will also make the value of our home become \$0. You couldn't give our home away if this pipeline goes through. No one has the right to decide our life's work and home are expendable.

**20150202-5035(30113846).pdf**

Jan A. Griska, Rindge, NH.

Barring Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co. from my property:

Please be advised that I have legally barred Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline etc. from my property. I sent them a Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested document that states that I am denying them access to my property. It was sent by the USPS on December 22nd 2014. The Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co. acknowledged receipt of the document on December 29th 2014. All of my neighbors on Atlantic drive have gone through the same procedure. We will treat any entry on our property as unauthorized, and it will be considered trespassing.

Jan A. Griska  
18 Atlantic Drive  
Rindge, N.H. 03461

**20150202-5064(30113934).pdf**

I am writing to state my opposition to the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Pipeline Project. I have many concerns. The environmental impact is one of my greatest concerns; specifically, the proposed route intersects with major stratified-drift aquifers which supply fresh water to the lower Connecticut River basin in southwestern New Hampshire and to the Nashua area in south-central New Hampshire.

The route will also run through conservation land, wetlands and private property. While many of the KM TGP employees have told local residents that this is a federal project that cannot be stopped, it's obvious that this is a private project and they are using FERC's authority before it has been granted. The risk is clearly unacceptable and I ask that FERC take the logical step and reject the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Pipeline Project plan.

Cheryl Barlow  
Harrisville, NH

**20150202-5108(30114197).pdf**

Joan Geary, Fitzwilliam, NH.

To: Kimberly Bose  
Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC

Dear Ms. Bose:

Among other reasons, I am opposed to the NED gas pipeline project because it would be funded by ratepayers.

Concurrent with FERC consideration of the Kinder Morgan TGP NED gas pipeline project, ISO-NE is about to launch a project to expand electricity transmission in New England.

No matter which vendor they choose, that project will run \$1 billion dollars, and be paid for through a ratepayers tariff.

So will the NED pipeline, if approved by FERC.

Two ratepayer tariffs, simultaneously imposed, are exorbitant. Electric bills will go through the roof in the region.

How will this then benefit residents and businesses in NH and Mass? It's more likely businesses will go elsewhere where they will pay less.

The double whammy of these tariffs will hurt the regional economy, not help it.

Please look into this situation.

Thank you,  
Joan Geary

**20150202-5163(30117998).pdf**

Jan A. Griska, Rindge, NH.

eminent domain

n.

The power of a government to take private property for public use without the owner's consent, provided just compensation is given.

American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Fifth Edition. Copyright © 2011 by Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Publishing Company. Published by Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Publishing Company. All rights reserved

It takes further digging to uncover where lawyers and money have complicated the definition. The primary concern from my point of view is that there is legal precedence for the legislative delegation of this power to private persons or corporations when they are authorized to exercise functions of public character.

When you boil all of the above down, "our" government can and has let corporations define what is "public good" and in the bulk of the cited instances the public they are talking about are the officers and stock hold-

ers of said corporations.

Now why would one feel that Kinder Morgan, Tennessee Pipeline Co. etc. is defining “public good” as benefiting stock holders and officers of their company. Let me count the ways:

1. The over kill size of the pipeline in question. The 36 inch diameter pipe carrying gas at 1,400 PSI (Pounds per Square Inch pressure). This pipeline I’m told will move billions of cubic feet of gas a day. One geologist has stated that flowing gas at that rate would deplete the shale fields in Pennsylvania and New York in 30 years. Kinder Morgan makes their money moving gas...

2. Northern New England’s daily gas requirements (even if expanded beyond the public utilities wildest dreams) wouldn’t put a dent in the capacity of that pipeline. Where do you think all of that excess capacity will be used? Why, it will be liquefied at LNG terminals on the coast and in Canada. The LNG will then be shipped to Europe and Asia where the consumers are willing to pay a great deal more per cubic foot than the gas consumers in the U.S. are willing to pay.

3. At 1,400 PSI, there is no simple way for local home owners to get access to the gas carried by the NED pipeline. No one is talking about building the infrastructure to get gas to the households in the 17 towns impacted by the NED project. Even if there were plans for building the infrastructure, who is willing to pay for it and how long would it take to build it? I would venture to say it won’t happen in my life time because of the huge cost and low housing density in the areas in question. So why would the people who run/own Kinder Morgan want to build NED under these circumstances, I bet an MBA could tell you.

Please don’t let “our” government and FERC delegate the definition of public good to Kinder Morgan.

Jan A. Griska  
Rindge, N.H.

#### **20150202-5170(30118015).pdf**

Jan A. Griska, Rindge, NH.

eminent domain

n.

The power of a government to take private property for public use without the owner’s consent, provided just compensation is given.

American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Fifth Edition. Copyright © 2011 by Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Publishing Company. Published by Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Publishing Company. All rights reserved

It takes further digging to uncover where lawyers and money have complicated the definition. The primary concern from my point of view is that there is legal precedence for the legislative delegation of this power to private persons or corporations when they are authorized to exercise functions of public character.

When you boil all of the above down, “our” government can and has let corporations define what is “public good” and in the bulk of the cited instances the public they are talking about are the officers and stock holders of said corporations.

Now why would one feel that Kinder Morgan, Tennessee Pipeline Co. etc. is defining “public good” as benefiting stock holders and officers of their company. Let me count the ways:

1. The over kill size of the pipeline in question. The 36 inch diameter pipe carrying gas at 1,400 PSI (Pounds per Square Inch pressure). This pipeline I’m told will move billions of cubic feet of gas a day. One geologist has stated that flowing gas at that rate would deplete the shale fields in Pennsylvania and New York in 30 years. Kinder Morgan makes their money moving gas...

2. Northern New England’s daily gas requirements (even if expanded beyond the public utilities wildest dreams) wouldn’t put a dent in the capacity of that pipeline. Where do you think all of that excess capacity will be used? Why, it will be liquefied at LNG terminals on the coast and in Canada. The LNG will then be

shipped to Europe and Asia where the consumers are willing to pay a great deal more per cubic foot than the gas consumers in the U.S. are willing to pay.

3. At 1,400 PSI, there is no simple way for local home owners to get access to the gas carried by the NED pipeline. No one is talking about building the infrastructure to get gas to the households in the 17 towns impacted by the NED project. Even if there were plans for building the infrastructure, who is willing to pay for it and how long would it take to build it? I would venture to say it won't happen in my life time because of the huge cost and low housing density in the areas in question. So why would the people who run/own Kinder Morgan want to build NED under these circumstances, I bet an MBA could tell you.

Please don't let "our" government and FERC delegate the definition of public good to Kinder Morgan.

Jan A. Griska  
Rindge, N.H.

#### **20150202-5185(30118147).pdf**

Jill L Manfield, Merrimack, NH.

I wanted to add to my previous comment. I am also extremely concerned with the blasting that will have to be done. We just had blasting for the Prime outlets but this proposed site is even closer. The last time they blasted our structure was compromised and many people in our neighborhood had issues. Considering this may be 100 feet I imagine that will be much worse. I am also concerned about the pond and animals in the pond. The last blasting displaced many animals but we still have a bunch. I fear the ill effects of the pipeline will cause problems for these animals in our backyard like beavers, wild turkey, bats, turtles, frogs, etc

#### **20150202-5206(30118520).pdf**

February 2, 2015

I urge the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) to look at the totality of proposed pipelines designed to provide New England with access to the Marcellus shale fields; recognize the shortsighted, foolish Northeast Energy Direct (NED) proposal for what it is a plan to sell as much capacity as possible, likely to the highest bidder overseas, in order to deplete the existing supply of inground Natural Gas without directly benefitting the American consumer; and either urge Kinder Morgan to withdraw their proposal, or failing that, to reject it outright..

It is clear the the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) proposal is is the oversized, unwanted elephant in the room. In comparison Spectra Energy's Access Northeast project, a competing proposal, is perfectly sized and far better sited than is Kinder Morgan's NED proposal.

1. Access Northeast will be constructed within existing natural gas pipeline rightofway; while NED will be placed adjacent to, but not within, existing hightension electrical rightofway. The Access Northeast proposal wins the day.
2. The Access Northeast project is sized to handle the future projected Natural Gas requirements of the region, rather than being a thinly veiled stab at exporting our fossil fuels to the highest bidder.
3. The earlier completion date of the Access Northeast project will bring more timely relief to the current capacity bottleneck that constrains supply and dramatically increases spot prices for Natural Gas in New England and the northeast during infrequent highdemand situations.
4. NED is a poor choice because of Kinder Morgan's horrible pipeline safety record.

Even the construction of a LNG storage facility, or reliance on LNG imports, is preferable to the NED proposal, which will rapidly drain away our natural gas supply by sending it overseas, likely on one of the five LNG tankers already owned by Kinder Morgan, or on one of the additional five currently under construction in California.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Regard,  
David Lister  
Rindge, New Hampshire

**20150202-5255(30119183).pdf**

Jeff Wells, Milford, NH.

The proposed natural gas pipeline, to be run through Milford NH, by Kinder Morgan runs through a residential neighborhood. The proposed pipeline is 36 inches in diameter and operates at 1460 psig. In the event of a pipeline detonation the area of high consequence (“Incineration Zone”) can extend nearly 1000 feet on both sides of the pipeline. Such a detonation could have horrific consequences to scores or families, both in terms of property damage and human life.

Operating a pipeline, with such destructive capabilities, through residential neighborhoods is beyond irresponsible and borders on insane. The emotional distress placed on families knowing that every second of everyday could result in the detonation of a potential incendiary bomb running through their yard is ludicrous.

The potential destruction goes beyond the immediate area of high consequence. In the event the resulting fires are not contained, more property could be destroyed and more lives could be lost. NH towns are neither ready nor equipped to deal with the potential impact of a pipeline, of this size, detonating

**20150202-5282(30119257).pdf**

Garth Fletcher, Mason, NH.

On January 14, 2015, our entire Congressional delegation (2 Senators and 2 Representatives) co-signed a letter to Cheryl A. LaFleur, Chairman, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

In that letter they requested that TGP/Kinder Morgan extend the scheduling to provide the same amount of time for public education of New Hampshire residents along the revised Southern New Hampshire pathway (announced Dec 8, 2014) as was provided to Massachusetts residents for the previous Northern Massachusetts pathway.

There are references to this letter in rather dismissive replies from TGP.

HOWEVER, I can find no record of this important Congressional letter in FERC’s eLibrary database.

To keep the record reasonably complete I am appending a copy of that letter. This was OCR converted by me from scans, hence may contain errors. It would be better if FERC included the original in its eLibrary, but until then this effort will have to suffice.

**Congress of the United States**  
Washington, DC 20515

January 14, 2015

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

Dear Chairman LaFleur:

We request that Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) provide New Hampshire stakeholders a full opportunity to meaningfully express their views regarding Kinder Morgan’s proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project, Docket N. PF14-22-000, before any final or binding decision is made regarding the route for this pipeline project.

On December 8, 2014, Kinder Morgan filed a New Hampshire Powerline Alternative route with FERC. The

new proposal shifts much of the pipeline out of northern Massachusetts - where it was originally planned - to southern New Hampshire. Specifically, the new proposed route would impact the following towns and cities in New Hampshire: Winchester, Richmond, Troy, Fitzwilliam, Rindge, New Ipswich, Greenville, Mason, Milford, Brookline, Amherst, Merrimack, Litchfield, Londonderry, Hudson, Windham, Pelham, and Salem.

The citizens and municipalities along the initial proposed route benefited from several months to receive and review information, to analyze and deliberate, and to ask questions and express concerns. We strongly believe the citizens and municipalities in New Hampshire, many of whom have just learned that they may be directly impacted by this pipeline project, deserve an equal opportunity.

It is imperative that the proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project go through a thorough federal review that provides affected stakeholders in New Hampshire with a meaningful opportunity to participate and express their views.

This requires both FERC and Kinder Morgan to conduct an open and transparent process. Therefore, we request that FERC provide the public, municipal officials in potentially affected municipalities, and our offices with additional information on the timeline for the current pre-filing phase, and we urge you to extend that timeline to ensure that New Hampshire's residents have a full and equal opportunity to understand, assess, and comment on this project before any decisions are made finalizing the project or its route.

Please note that a similar correspondence has been sent to Kinder Morgan requesting their timely cooperation to ensure the application and review process moves forward in a thorough and deliberate manner.

CC:

Commissioner Philip D. Moeller, FERC

Commissioner Tony Clark, FERC

Commissioner Norman C. Bay, FERC

Commissioner Colette D. Honorable, FERC

Mr. Allen Fore, Kinder Morgan

Sincerely yours,

Jeanne Shaheen, U.S. Senator

Kelly Ayotte, U.S. Senator

Ann McLane Kuster, Member of Congress

Frank Guinta, Member of Congress

**20150203-0010(30120070).pdf**

**The Commonwealth of Massachusetts**

William Francis Galvin, Secretary of the Commonwealth  
Massachusetts Historical Commission

November 5, 2014

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., a Kinder Morgan Company, Northeast Energy Direct Project, PA, MA, CT, NH. MHC 1RC.5677k FERC Docket 1PF14-22-000.

Dear Secretary Bose:

The Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC), office of the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), received additional information on October 21, 2014 regarding the project referenced above. After review of the materials submitted, the MHC offers the following comments to assist the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) in its compliance with 36 CFR 800, the regulations implementing Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

The information submitted includes USGS topographic quadrangle locus maps with a “project area corridor” indicated across the state, a list of the federal and state agency permits anticipated to be required for the project, and a list of the Massachusetts municipalities in which the project is proposed.

To assist in avoiding and protecting areas within Massachusetts that are known to have or are sensitive for significant historic and archaeological resources, and to minimize the overall project effects to the Commonwealth’s finite cultural resources, especially those on lands previously designated for conservation and preservation, feasible alternatives for routing the proposed project within areas that have been previously impacted, such as existing transportation and infrastructure corridors, should be considered.

Additional information is required by the MHC to understand the precise location and areas of potential effects, and the nature of the potential effects of the pipeline project within Massachusetts. A narrative description of the project components and methods of construction should be provided to the MHC, describing where open trench, directional drilling, ground disturbance activities, new construction, etc., are proposed. The location and boundaries of the project, including the new pipeline, new above-ground construction such as meter stations, valves, compressor stations, temporary and permanent construction easements, access ways, staging areas, equipment and materials storage areas, and all other related project work areas should be clearly indicated on USGS locus maps and on project plans and drawings. Appropriate sections of USGS topographic quadrangle locus maps, enlarged as necessary, and project plans and drawings, should be prepared which show all aspects of the project clearly identified and labeled with the project components. The locus maps, project plans and drawings submitted to the MHC should be no larger than 11”x 17.”

The MHC will advise and assist FERC in carrying out its responsibilities to take into consideration the effects of the project on historic and archaeological resources and to provide consulting parties the opportunity to comment on its findings and determinations (36 CFR 800.2(c)(1)).

The MHC advises FERC that potential consulting parties may include, among others: (a) the local government historical commissions of the municipalities in which the project is proposed; (b) local historic district commissions of any local historic district (Mass. Gen. Laws [MGL] c, 9, s. 40C) in which the project is proposed; (c) Tribal Historic Preservation Officers of the Stockbridge-Munsee Community, the Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head (Aquinnah), and the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe; and (d) the Massachusetts Board of Underwater Archaeological Resources (BUAR) for any submerged lands of the Commonwealth in which the project is located (36 CFR 800.2(c)(2), (3), & (5)). The MHC advises that FERC should commence notification to these potential consulting parties to learn of their interest in participating in the Section 106 consultation process.

The MHC advises that FERC should contact the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) to learn if the ACHP will participate because of the multi-state project location and its potential to meet the criteria for ACHP involvement (see 36 CFR 800, Appendix A).

The MHC advises that FERC should develop a plan for public comment (36 CFR 800.2(d)).

The MHC looks forward to consultation with FERC on FERC’s determination and documentation of the project’s areas of potential effects (APE) for historical architectural and for archaeological resources (36 CFR 800.4(a)(1)).

The MHC looks forward to consulting with FERC in the development of an adequate scope for identification and evaluation efforts for historic and archaeological resources that may be affected by the project (36 CFR 800.4(b) to (c)).

The MHC requests that a reconnaissance-level cultural resources survey for historic architectural and archaeological resources within the project areas of potential effects be conducted by a qualified cultural resources consulting firm with previous relevant experience in Massachusetts. The survey should be conducted in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation (48 Fed. Reg. 190 (1983)) and the Massachusetts State Archaeologist’s field investigation regulations (950 CMR 70). The research design and methodology of the survey should consider and evaluate previous cultural resources survey methods and results for linear project corridors located within

the regions in Massachusetts in which the project is proposed. The research design and methodology should describe explicitly how relevant previous research findings, including locations and results of previous survey efforts and reported historical and archaeological resources within the project areas of potential effects, will be considered, evaluated, and reported. The MHC's numbering systems for historic and archaeological properties and areas, and survey reports should be referenced.

As part of the reconnaissance-level identification effort in the areas of potential effects for historic architectural resources, a suitable and explicit survey methodology should be developed. The project's professional cultural resources consultants should produce new or updated MHC Historic Properties Inventory Forms prepared in accordance with the MHC's Historic Properties Survey Manual. The archaeological reconnaissance survey should evaluate the locations of proposed project impacts and document archaeologically sensitive locations within the project areas of potential effects for archaeological resources. The archaeological sensitivity assessment models should be developed to consider ancient and historical period environmental attributes, the ancient and historical cultural archaeological resources. The archaeological sensitivity assessment models should be developed to consider ancient and historical period environmental attributes, the ancient and historical cultural geography of the Massachusetts regions in which the project is proposed, and any previous impacts of the project impact areas.

The MHC requests that FERC inform other involved federal, state, and municipal agencies, the project proponent, and consultants that the locations of archaeological resources should not be disclosed in documents prepared for public review (see 36 CFR 800.11(c) and MGL c. 9, s. 26A(1) & (5)).

A draft scope for the reconnaissance-level cultural resources survey should be submitted to MHC, and other interested consulting parties such as Tribal Historic Preservation Officers and the Massachusetts BUAR, for review and comment.

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 (950 CMR 70-71). If you have any 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

xc: see attached

XC;

Eric Tomasi, FERC  
Charlene Dwin Vaughan, ACHP  
, John Eddins, ACHP  
Karen Kirk Adams, US Army Corps of Engineers  
Kathleen Atwood, US Army Corps of Engineers  
Tim Timmerman, USEPA Region I  
Lois K. Adams, USEPA Region I  
Mike Stover, USEPA Region I  
Sherry White, Stockbridge-Munsee Community  
Bettina Washington, Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head (Aquinnah)  
Ramona Peters, Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe  
'ames A. Peters, Jr. Massachusetts Commission on Indian Affairs  
Eli'zabeth H. Muzzey, NH SHPO

Ruth Pierpoint, NY DSHPO  
Dan Forrest, CT SHPO  
Serena Bellew, PA DSHPO  
Secretary Maeve Vallely Bartlett, Massachusetts Executive Office of Energy & Environmental Affairs  
David W. Cash, Massachusetts DEP  
Lealdon Langley, Massachusetts DEP-Bureau of Resource Protection  
Ben Lynch, Massachusetts DEP-Bureau of Resource Protection  
Mary Griffin, Massachusetts Dept. of Fish & Game  
Jack Murray, Massachusetts Dept. of Conservation & Recreation  
Patrice Kish, Massachusetts Dept. of Conservation & Recreation  
Bruce K. Carlisle, Massachusetts Coastal Zone Management  
Victor T. Mastone, Massachusetts BUAR  
Deirdre Buckley, Massachusetts EEA/MEPA  
Mark Sylvia, Attn. Meg Lusardi, Massachusetts Dept. of Energy Resources  
Andy Green, Massachusetts Energy Facilities Siting Board  
Ann G. Berwick, Attn. Andrew Greene, Massachusetts Dept. of Public Utilities-Siting Division  
Mike Letson, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co. LLC, a Kinder Morgan Co.  
Eileen Banach, AECOM, Providence, RI  
AECOM, Chelmsford, MA  
Hope Luhman, Louis Berger

**20150203-0013(30122284).pdf**

**State of New Hampshire**  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
CONCORD

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Nathaniel J Davis, Sr., Deputy Secretary  
888 First St. NE  
Washington, DC20426

January 21, 2015

Re: Request for extended Comment Period on the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline

Dear Secretary,

Kinder Morgan, Inc. through its subsidiary, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co., LLC is planning expansion of its interstate pipeline system into New Hampshire, including segments that are currently planned to be constructed in our district in Merrimack, NH.

We, and our constituents have many questions and concerns about this project. Kinder Morgan has established a schedule for related open informational meetings. However, we believe it is necessary for us to do our own Investigations into the advisability of this project. Part of this project involved a re-routing into our area that was not part of the original plan. This should have resulted in a new schedule for the application process, but apparently this did not occur. The result is diminished opportunity for public comment.

On behalf of our constituents, we hereby request that the comment period be extended no less than ninety (90) days.

Thank you. We look forward to your favorable response to this request.

Cordially,

Representative John L. Bralcom  
Representative Richard W. Barry  
Representative Chris Chirstensen

Representative Richard W. Hinch  
Representative Josh Moore  
Representative Jeanine M. Notter  
Representative Anthony J. Pellegrino  
Representative Phillip N. Straight

**20150203-0021(30123268).pdf**

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

Date: 1/26/15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access #PF14-22-000

As the owner of the property located at:

732 North Main St.

Lanesboro, MA 01237

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 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 E Cohen

Cheryl R. Sacks

**20150203-0022(30123269).pdf**

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

Date: 1/26/15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access #PF14-22-000

As the owner of the property located at:

732 North Main St.

Lanesboro, MA 01237

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 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 E Cohen

\* copy sent to Kimberly Dose.

FERC 888 First St, N.E. Rm. 1A

Washington, D.C. 20426

**20150203-0030(30123729).pdf**

THOMAS 8 DONNA SHERMAN

16140 ROUTE 22- PO BOX 548  
STEPHENTOWN, NY 12168  
(518) 733-6183

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield St  
Agwam, MA 01001

January 23, 2015

Docket #PF14-22

RE: Denying property access

As the owner of the property located at 16146 Route 22, Stephentown, NY.

I am denying permission to Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company I.LC (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.

Thomas E. Sherman

Donna Sherman

cc: Stephentown Town Supervisor  
Stephentown Town Board  
FERC

**20150203-0034(30124346).pdf**

Hand written letter, John & Darlene Palmer, 124 Timbertop Road, New Ipswich, NH 03071

this project will destroy watershed, springs and tributary to the Gridley River.

Where is the EPA on this matter???

the only Need is Corporate GREED!!!

**20150203-0048(30127136).pdf**

January 25, 2015

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

Dear Chairman LaFleur:

Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Gas Pipeline have proposed to run a natural gas pipeline through several towns in Southern New Hampshire that are part of the Souhegan River Watershed. In June 2000, the Souhegan River was approved to be one of 21 protected rivers in the NH Rivers Management and Protection Program, (RMPP). As part of this program, the Souhegan River receives special considerations for protection of water quantity and water quality from the state of NH. The Souhegan is a multiple-use river that has water withdrawals for business and drinking water, waste assimilation, swimming, fishing, and canoeing. It also has a permanent committee made up of representatives from each of the six corridor towns; Amherst, Greenville, Merrimack, Milford, New Ipswich, and Wilton. This local advisory committee (SoRLAC: Souhegan River Local Advisory Committee) is responsible for making recommendations to the state and watershed communities for improvements and permits to the river. As part of the RMPP, SoRLAC wrote a Master Plan for the entire river. This has been presented to the watershed communities with the hope and expectation that it will result in changes to the towns' master plans, and planning regulations in order to further protect the river and its tributaries. The major underlying theme of the "Master Plan" for Amherst was written to protect the future development needs, carefully guide and preserve the town's character, and to assure that while

providing human needs it must preserve the town's natural resources and avoid or minimize negative impact to the ecosystem.

As a resident of Amherst, and as a property owner that will be directly impacted by this natural gas pipeline, we are against the proposed route. Construction alone will add an additional load to non-source point pollution that has already made the Souhegan River an impaired waterway. The greatest area of wetlands lay within the corridor towns of Amherst and Milford. These wetlands provide important functions such as flood, erosion, and sedimentation control, water purification, while providing nursery grounds and habitat for various species of threatened or endangered wildlife such as the Fowler's Toad and Wood Turtle, the Pied-Billed Grebe, the Common Loon, and Osprey. From our backyard, our family watches Herons nesting in the large old trees. We see parents and their young in the shallows feeding on fish and aquatic life. In our opinion, the ecosystem is already challenged without this additional potential threat.

We are seeking guidance to divert the route from our town's major resource and conservation wetlands and to mitigate the severe impact to the ecosystem. Granite Stators live in a quality of life to nurture the future of our families that is safe from environmental hazards. As we understand it, New Hampshire receives no benefit from the proposed transmission line, only that the line goes through New Hampshire with a capacity that far exceeds the current regional demand on any level.

Respectfully submitted,

Mare and Jil Romano  
23 Thornton Ferry Road II  
Amherst, NH 03031

cc: Amherst, NH Board of Selectmen  
Maggie Hassan, Governor of New Hampshire  
Kelly Ayotte, U.S. Senator  
Jeanne Shaheen, U.S. Senator  
Ann McLane Kuster, Member of Congress  
Frank Guinta, Member of Congress

**20150203-0049(30126644).pdf**

January 25, 2015

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

Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Gas Pipeline have proposed to run a natural gas pipeline through several towns in Southern New Hampshire that are part of the Souhegan River Watershed. In June 2000, the Souhegan River was approved to be one of 21 protected rivers in the NH Rivers Management and Protection Program, (RMPP). As part of this program, the Souhegan River receives special considerations for protection of water quantity and water quality from the state of NH. The Souhegan is a multiple-use river that has water withdrawals for business and drinking water, waste assimilation, swimming, fishing, and canoeing. It also has a permanent committee made up of representatives from each of the six corridor towns; Amherst, Greenville, Merrimack, Milford, New Ipswich, and Wilton. This local advisory committee (SoRLAC: Souhegan River Local Advisory Committee) is responsible for making recommendations to the state and watershed communities for improvements and permits to the river. As part of the RMPP, SoRLAC wrote a Master Plan for the entire river. This has been presented to the watershed communities with the hope and expectation that it will result in changes to the towns' master plans, and planning regulations in order to further protect the river and its tributaries. The major underlying theme of the "Master Plan" for Amherst was written to protect the future development needs, carefully guide and preserve the town's character, and to assure that

while providing human needs it must preserve the town's natural resources and avoid or minimize negative impacts to the ecosystem.

As a resident of Amherst, and as a property owner that will be directly impacted by this natural gas pipeline, we are against the proposed route. Construction alone will add an additional load to non-source point pollution that has already made the Souhegan River an impaired waterway. The greatest area of wetlands lay within the corridor towns of Amherst and Milford. These wetlands provide important functions such as flood, erosion, and sedimentation control, water purification, while providing nursery grounds and habitat for various species of threatened or endangered wildlife such as the Fowler's Toad and Wood Turtle, the Pied-Billed Grebe, the Common Loon, and Osprey. From our backyard, our family watches Herons nesting in the large old trees. We see parents and their young in the shallows feeding on fish and aquatic life. In our opinion, the ecosystem is already challenged without this additional potential threat.

We are seeking guidance to divert the route from our town's major resource and conservation wetlands and to mitigate the severe impact to the ecosystem. Granite Stators live in a quality of life to nurture the future of our families that is safe from environmental hazards. As we understand it, New Hampshire receives no benefit from the proposed transmission line, only that the line goes through New Hampshire with a capacity that far exceeds the current regional demand on any level

Respectfully submitted,

Marc and Jil Romano  
23 Thornton Ferry Road II  
Amherst, NH 03031

cc: Amherst, NH Board of Selectmen  
Maggie Hassan, Governor of New Hampshire  
Kelly Ayotte, U.S. Senator  
Jeanne Shaheen, U.S. Senator  
Ann McLane Kuster, Member of Congress  
Frank Guinta, Member of Congress

**20150203-4002(30119742).pdf**

From: l baker <lmbaker\_2002@yahoo.com>

Date: February 1, 2015 at 11:29:05 AM EST

To: Elizabeth\_warren@warren.senate.gov, Kathleen.polanowicz@mail.house.gov, Seth.moulton@mail.house.gov, Constituent.services@state.ma.us, Governor.malloy@ct.gov, Governor@governor.ri.gov, governor@maine.gov, governorvt@state.vt.us, governorhassan@nh.gov, barbara.l???italien@masenate.gov, james.lyons@mahouse.gov, frank.moran@mahouse.gov, Peter.Lorenz@state.ma.us, cheryl.lafleur@ferc.gov, tony.clark@ferc.gov, philip.moeller@ferc.gov, norman.bay@ferc.gov, colette.honorable@ferc.gov

Cc: lmbaker\_2002@yahoo.com

Subject: High Pressure Gas line

Dear Government Officials,

We am strongly opposed to the high pressure gas line being proposed by Kinder Morgan. Please vote against the construction of the High Pressure Gas line.

Thanks you,

Len and Maureen Baker  
23 Avery Lane  
Andover, MA 01810

**20150203-4003(30119767).pdf**

2 Langley Lane  
Andover, MA 01810

January 30, 2015

Commissioner Colette Honorable

Dear Commissioner Honorable,

I am writing this letter to express my opposition to the proposed Kinder Morgan Pipeline to be run through various cities and towns in Massachusetts. This pipeline will destroy both open space and private property across the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, put the safety of residents at risk, jeopardize our ability to lower emissions that contribute to climate change, and place an unfair burden on electric ratepayers to pay for the cost of construction.

Kinder Morgan has not and cannot promise this pipeline will result in lower gas and electric prices in New England. The proposed pipeline will provide Kinder Morgan with the ability to export natural gas. Higher gas prices on the international market will result in increased domestic gas prices.

The proposed pipeline will not bring a significant number of new jobs to Massachusetts. Most of the jobs associated with the pipeline will be temporary and likely filled by out of state of Kinder Morgan. This proposed pipeline will deliver far more capacity than is needed for to meet projected energy or power generation in New England. This pipeline is not about meeting the energy needs of Massachusetts and the other New England States. It is actually planned primarily to increase the profits of this private company.

There are existing gas pipelines in Massachusetts that are not being used to 100% capacity. Using these pipelines to capacity to store natural gas during non-peak times can keep enough gas in reserve to cover the few days each winter when peak demand drives up prices. Fixing leaks in existing pipelines can substantially improve energy efficiency.

Please work with your colleagues to defeat the plan for this pipeline.

Thank you,

James D. Rawlinson

**20150203-5014(30119383).pdf**

Kaela Law, Pelham, NH.

My name is Kaela Law. I live in Pelham, NH. I am proud to call New England my home. I am proud to raise my daughter in the northeast. It is, in my humble opinion, the most historic and beautiful region of the United States.

I live on the newly proposed route of the Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Energy Direct Project. Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline has put word out that this pipeline route will “co-locate with an existing power line utility corridor,” leading the public to believe this new route eliminates the concerns that pipeline tract would cut across private property and conservation lands.

This statement is misleading at best. At worst it is false and manipulative because there is no room in the existing power line corridors for pipeline construction.

In fact, the pipeline construction is set to run alongside the corridors where private properties and conservation lands and streams that travel into lakes will be temporarily ripped apart just as before and then stand at risk of contamination and worse into perpetuity.

Unquestionably, the proposed 36-inch pipeline would disrupt everyday quality of life. Most terrifyingly, it would place many homes and families within what is called an incineration zone – which is precisely what it sounds like: Our homes and anyone in them would be incinerated should the gas in the pipeline happen to ignite. If this pipeline goes in, we will be forced to live under imminent risk of terrible injury or death.

Even pipes that do not explode may leak. Long term gas leaking from the pipeline into the air can cause health problems. Gas and chemicals leaking into the groundwater can cause health problems. It is unthinkable to ask that we live in risk of feeding our children contaminated well water.

Pipes also freeze. Add 2.2 billion cubic feet of gas per day to these pipes running under 1,460 pounds per square inch of pressure and conditions can become volatile (to put things in perspective, note that normal atmospheric pressure is 14.7 pounds per square inch, one-tenth of the pressure in the proposed pipeline). It is not my intention to sound pessimistic, but this is dangerous. Are there additives to the gas through these pipes to prevent freezing? If so, are the additives poisonous?

At this point, there are too many questions to make an informed and ethical decision as to whether this natural gas pipeline is really the best solution to support New England's energy needs. New England infrastructure is very different from most other parts of the country. What may work adequately in the larger southern states may not be compatible to the northeast.

Nor is it clear why the scope of this project seems so much in excess of what New England's actual energy needs are. Will this natural gas find its way onto ships to be exported overseas to benefit Kinder Morgan et al – at the expense of those of us trapped in the pipeline incineration zone?

Unfortunately, it is not in the hands of the New England consumer to decide. Who better to make this life-altering decision for our region than the local communities who would directly feel the impact of such a large-scale undertaking? This decision rests with the you, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, and all we can do as New England residents is hope that you will take our safety and well being into consideration above all else.

We exist along the power line corridor. Families live here. To bring this danger less than a football field length away from our homes is unacceptable.

So what are our options? To move? No for-profit company should be able to force loyal, law-abiding, tax-paying, New Hampshire citizens to leave their homes for their own health and safety. My life is here.

So what are our options? Demand better from our elected representatives at all levels, from our local boards of selectmen to the people we have granted the privilege of speaking for us in Concord and Washington, DC, to the judges who determine the limits of eminent domain.

So what are our options? Pursue an energy policy that is focused on fuel diversity, rather than relying on a single fuel source.

A Pipeline Modernization and Consumer Protection Act died in Congress, but the reasoning was sound. Before we invest in new pipeline infrastructure, we ought to upgrade old pipelines and make them both safer and more economical. Maximizing the efficiency of already existing pipes could be a push in the right direction for New England energy; as could maximizing New England's local natural resources, such as solar power as well as our coastline and the significant potential there for offshore wind farms.

On an even more local level, all of our household appliances and light bulbs are trending toward energy efficiency. Pellet stoves are being installed in homes across the northeast by consumers looking to shift to more environmentally responsible ways to heat their homes. Prices for purchase and installation of residential and commercial solar panels are down dramatically since 2000, making solar energy a more viable option for many homeowners and office buildings. There are other free-market solutions out there in response to the supply-and-demand concerns raised during peak seasons in New England. We have a responsibility to pursue all of these renewable energy sources in order to make New England a better, safer place for ourselves, our children, and future generations.

Opposition to the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline is a necessary measure to ensure a future for job growth in New England. While a pipeline will bring a handful of temporary construction jobs to the region, concerted local efforts to create sustainable energy alternatives could produce numerous permanent jobs for New England residents, not to mention opportunities for the kinds of new small businesses that fuel our nation's and our region's economic growth.

Our options are many.

**20150203-5039(30119634).pdf**

Roger Wellington, Concord, NH.

Dear FERC Staff:

Re the natural gas pipeline planned for southern NH by Kinder-Morgan (PF 14-22), I live in Concord NH and am strongly in favor of building this project.

The not-in-my-backyard folks are organizing and advancing the usual arguments. Their chief complaint appears to be that there is not a demonstrated public need. Hogwash. I get my heat from natural gas. Gas prices have fluctuated wildly the past couple of years due to uneven supplies. Right now I am paying a gas supply charge of \$1.29 per therm. Last summer it was \$0.55. That's a 134% swing. Clearly there's a bottleneck if winter rates have to be that much higher than summer.

I also like to hike and enjoy wild land in New Hampshire as much as anyone. I doubt that pipeline construction would despoil the land as some residents claim. Of course things get torn up during construction but then nature takes its course. I doubt if anyone can identify the route of an existing pipeline. And I write as someone who formerly lived in Amherst, NH, one of the towns that will be affected by pipeline placement.

You will get lots of public input from local people in the path of the pipeline and probably little from among the thousands of residents in Nashua, Manchester, and Concord that stand to benefit in the long-term. I am one of those residents and urge you to view this pipeline as a vital piece of infrastructure for NH's future.

Sincerely,

Roger Wellington

**20150203-5055(30119789).pdf**

Richard Crane, Groton, MA.

I am writing regarding the previously proposed route through Northern Massachusetts. This route crosses the towns of Warwick, Orange, Athol, Royalston, Winchendon, Ashburnham, Ashby, Townsend, Pepperell, Groton, Dunstable, and Tyngsborough.

It is important to understand the impact of the previous route. The route does not run along side power lines and isn't a football field's length away from people's homes. It does not make attempts to avoid populated areas such as schools and churches. It does not make attempts to avoid water supplies and farms. It makes every attempt to be a straight line without regard for the communities it goes through.

Just in my neighborhood, it runs through our property impacting our backyard including our shed, water well, and geothermal wells. It directly crosses mine and 9 of my neighbor's properties. It comes significantly less than a football field length away from 100s of homes. It crosses a local farm where many buy their produce. Along the way through town it crosses the regional high school, many more homes, and multiple parcels of conservation land. In the adjacent towns it crosses even more homes, town centers, water supplies, churches, farms, schools and conservation land.

Each day when we go to our homes or schools we will be going to this pipeline. When we pray at our churches or buy our produce we will do so with this pipeline. The pipeline will be an uninvited guest at our community events. There will be no escaping the impact of this pipeline with the previously proposed route. The impact to our communities is devastating.

The facts are simple. The previously proposed route has no concern for populated areas. It doesn't run near people's home and along power lines. It goes straight through our homes.

The new preferred route goes along power lines in Massachusetts and Southern New Hampshire. Yes, the impact to the public is less than the previous route. Unfortunately it doesn't make it any less of an issue because the impact is still significant.

The fact remains that this pipeline is not for the benefit of those here in New England. This pipeline is clearly an oversized pipeline for the export of natural gas overseas. This pipeline is not in the public's best interest.

We ask that you deny this project.

**20150203-5061(30120059).pdf**

HOMER D SHANNON, Windham, NH.

Closing Date for Pre-File Comments Must Be Extended

The closing date for The Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company (AKA Kinder Morgan) pre-file period must be extended. According to the current schedule, the pre-file period closes March 18, 2015. This is grossly unfair the citizens of NH who will be impacted by this pipeline. Consider these dates:

September 15th, The Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company files its pre-file plan with FERC. A six month clock begins ticking. At this time only the residents in Hollis, NH are impacted by the proposal as the bulk of the pipeline route is in New York and Massachusetts.

December 8th, The Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company modifies its route plans and moves the eastern most section of the main pipeline from Massachusetts to New Hampshire. (This was done as a result of a huge outcry in Massachusetts that important, environmentally sensitive, areas would be impacted.)

December 12th, Right of way owners in New Hampshire receive a two and a half page letter that is a combination of marketing fluff and dense legal jargon, that in no way implies the truth – **THAT A MASSIVE PIPELINE IS BEING PLANNED AND IT WILL REQUIRE YOU TO RELENGUISH YOUR PROPERTY.** At this point, half the time frame for commenting on the project has already passed.

Early January, 2015, Presentations to the various town boards of selectmen are held. It is only at this time that citizens and right of way owners begin to fully realize the impact of this project. At these meetings, no actionable information about the project was provided; just an overview.

February, 2015, The Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company is scheduled to hold 5 "Open House" meetings in New Hampshire. The first of these was originally scheduled for January 27th, in Milford, NH, but it was cancelled due to a snow storm. That meeting has now been rescheduled to February 24th, making it the last of these meetings. Now the Rindge meeting scheduled for 2/3 has been cancelled.

No one knows what kind of information is really going to be provided at these meetings because the first two were cancelled due to snow. Will there be actionable information, such as how the right of way setbacks are going to be arranged? What about payment for easements? What are the rules if a home is less than 50' from the right of way (the alleged minimum easement distance). Will these homes need to be condemned? Will Tennessee Gas provide information on road closures and other issues relative to the construction phase?

The Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company could provide this kind of actionable information or they may just be providing cooking lessons on how to cook on a gas stove. We don't know. When it is found out what information really will be provided, there will be a scant 15 to 42 days to respond to FERC through the eComment, Pre-File process.

Considering the enormity of this project on all of the citizens in its path, **THIS IS NOT NEARLY ENOUGH TIME TO REACT AND RESPOND.** The pre-filing period must be extended to June 18th, 2015 at a minimum.

**20150203-5121(30123340).pdf**

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

February 3, 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:

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”), and the Commission approved Tennessee’s request to use the pre-filing procedures for the Project by notice issued October 2, 2014.

As part of its pre-filing request letter, Tennessee included its anticipated schedule for pre-filing activities for the Project, including the hosting of public open houses by Tennessee to be held throughout the Project area,<sup>1</sup> the Commission’s hosting of public scoping meetings, and the filing of draft environmental resource reports. All of these events and actions will occur prior to the actual filing of the formal certificate application for the Project, currently anticipated to be September 2015. Tennessee has contemplated an extended pre-filing process of one year for the Project prior to the filing of the certificate application and the Commission’s review process.

Through comments filed in this proceeding as well as inquiries submitted directly to Tennessee, individuals have raised concerns that the pre-filing period will close on March 18, 2015 and have requested extensions of that date. Tennessee is not aware of any March 18, 2015 deadline that has been set for closing of the pre-filing process and any limitations on the acceptance of comments from interested stakeholders. As noted above, Tennessee expects the pre-filing process to extend until September 2015. To date, the Commission has not yet established a scoping period and scoping meetings for the Project. Although Tennessee does not speak for the Commission, Tennessee understands that the scoping period and scoping meetings will be scheduled by the Commission once the public open houses have been held by Tennessee. Although there are specific time periods that the Commission will establish for receipt of comments throughout the pre-filing and certificate processes, interested stakeholders may choose to file comments with the Commission at any point throughout the processes.

<sup>1</sup> The original anticipated dates for the public open houses have been rescheduled several times, most recently due to severe weather through the northeast U.S. The public open houses for the Market Path Component of the Project are scheduled to start on February 4, 2015 and to continue through February 2015, with the public open houses for the Supply Path Component to then be scheduled.

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 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: /s/ J. Curtis Moffatt

J. Curtis Moffatt

Deputy General Counsel and Vice President Gas  
Group Legal

cc: Mr. Rich McGuire (Commission Staff)  
Mr. Michael McGehee (Commission Staff)  
Mr. Eric Tomasi (Commission Staff)

**20150204-0006(30127160).pdf**

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.  
165 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Date: 01/15/15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access

As the owner of the property located at:

32 North Central Street  
Plainfield, MA 01070

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. (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.

Jeff Prost

**20150204-0011(30130130).pdf**

*note: this is the letter identified as missing from the FERC eLibrary in my earlier comment posted Feb 2, 2015, entered above as 20150202-5282(30119257).pdf*

**Congress of the United States**

Washington, DC 20515

January 14, 2015

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

Dear Chairman LaFleur:

We request that Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) provide New Hampshire stakeholders a full opportunity to meaningfully express their views regarding Kinder Morgan's proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project, Docket N. PF14 22.000, before any final or binding decision is made regarding the route for this pipeline project.

On December 8, 2014, Kinder Morgan filed a New Hampshire Powerline Alternative route with FERC. The new proposal shifts much of the pipeline out of northern Massachusetts — where it was originally planned — to southern New Hampshire. Specifically, the new proposed route would impact the following towns and cities in New Hampshire: Rochester, Richmond, Troy, Fitzwilliam, Rindge, New Ipswich, Greenville, Mason, Milford, Brookline, Amherst, Merrimack, Litchfield, Londonderry, Hudson, Windham, Pelham, and Salem.

The citizens and municipalities along the initial proposed route benefited from several months to receive and review information, to analyze and deliberate, and to ask questions and express concerns. We strongly believe the citizens and municipalities in New Hampshire, many of whom have just learned that they may be directly impacted by this pipeline project, deserve an equal opportunity.

It is imperative that the proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project go through a thorough federal review that

provides affected stakeholders in New Hampshire with a meaningful opportunity to participate and express their views. This requires both FERC and Kinder Morgan to conduct an open and transparent process. Therefore, we request that FERC provide the public, municipal officials in potentially affected municipalities, and our offices with additional information on the timeline for the current pre-filing phase, and we urge you to extend that timeline to ensure that New Hampshire's residents have a full and equal opportunity to understand, assess, and comment on this project before any decisions are made finalizing the project or its route.

Please note that a similar correspondence has been sent to Kinder Morgan requesting their timely cooperation to ensure the application and review process moves forward in a thorough and deliberate manner.

CC:

Commissioner Philip D. Moeller, FERC  
Commissioner Tony Clark, FERC  
Commissioner Norman C. Bay, FERC  
Commissioner Colette D. Honorable, FERC  
Mr. Allen Fore, Kinder Morgan

Sincerely yours,

Jeanne Shaheen  
U.S. Senator  
Ann McLane Kuster  
Member of Congress

Kelly A. Ayotte  
U.S. Senator  
Frank Guinta  
Member of Congress

**20150204-0030(30130262).pdf**

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

Re: NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT PROJECT DOCKET NO. PF 14-22-000  
Tennessee Gas Pipehne Company, L.L.C. 100 I Louisiana Street Houston, Texas 77002

Dear Ms. Bose,

As members of Hilltown Community Rights in Ashfield Massachusetts, Susan and I write to implore FERC to properly and fairly execute its role. In addition to the applicants, FERC must, by legal obligation, consider and account for local and state government interests and desires as well as those of the private land owners.

As a litmus test for your efficacy, a quick web review demonstrates that there may not be a sineJle FERC denial of a pipeline application. The message at minimum is: FERC very rarely denies an application!

As an organization with the ultimate and dreaded eminent domaine power over vast numbers of private and public properties, this record is unbelievable and virtually impossible. Your decisions are almost certainly contaminated by heavy handed corporate and associated governmental influence. [http://pstrust.org/docs/PST\\_Briefing\\_Paper\\_09\\_1.pdf](http://pstrust.org/docs/PST_Briefing_Paper_09_1.pdf)

Alternatively, what you have denied again by web review, are dozens if not hundreds or even thousands of requests for re-hearings, and review of your basic policies, for standing at your hearineJs, for sufficient time to present. In other words your track record of denial of riolhtful public involvement 15 abysmal.

In Massachusetts environmental regulations are stringent and they have been taken seriously for private and public lands alike. Everyone must abide includinoI Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Gas. This pipeline has no chance of beinoJ approved by the necessary State Legislative overturning of 5tate Controlled Conservation Easements, and Chapter 97 Recreational Lands proposed within the current routes of this pipeline.

You must hear the considered and wise collective citizen voice, “This unnecessary pipeline is not wanted.” If insulated from our collective protest, FERC can easily discover that this civic unrest and outrage rivals any other 155 years in decades.

The need for gas in MA and New England is miniscule proportional to the proposed pipeline and calculations are only fantastical corporate self-promotions.

There are four additional pipelines already permitted and being built that will meet the modest regional demands for natural gas. This proposed line is simply superfluous.

We all know this pipeline is primarily for LNG export to be leveraged in a “political chess game.” You must realize, as is true across this great country, that the people are rightfully rising up! This pipeline shall not be out of our pocket books and energy bills or found disrupting of our long protected and fragile conserved and otherwise productive landscapes.

This pipeline has no possible minimal impact route. It is as damaging in its proposed co-location segments as for any new route. The damage is not a narrow strip and even in a so-called “co-location” it disrupts landscape and properties severely. This is in part because of the need to reasonably separate high tension lines and isolate easily flammable gas. It is damaging because of required new lateral pipes and lateral upgrades in addition to the proposed main line. The local surveying reveals that the pipeline is 15 feet parallel to, separated from and not within, the power line right of way.

FERC must review the impacts of these enormous prospects as cumulative projects not as segments; as you appear to have been considering in other applications. Your review must somehow consider the enabling of fracking that such pipelines facilitate, no matter what constraints you believe you have. It's simply a matter of conscience! Our suggestion is that FERC should not review another pipeline until and unless you have been on the ground to see and hear first-hand from some of those affected. Especially you must inspect newly existing pipelines in landscapes as rugged as those on this proposed Massachusetts route.

By industry studies and standards, the absolute minimum right of way length size for the proposed 30-36 inch pipe in normal stable soils (Type B) and not too steep a terrain, is 110 feet with a strong stated preference for 125 ft. width or greater. That means all vegetation within the 110 to 125 ft. will be cut. That equates to 13.3 to 15.15 acres of cut per mile. Steep terrain and other soils generally require substantially greater width of clearing, dramatically and exponentially increasing these totals.

The impacts are not restricted to the Right of Way. Most people don't know that within three years the majority of all trees growing within 20 feet of each edge of the right of way will decline, then die, due to forest condition root damage, wind throw and sun scald. They will additionally be weakened for insect-related death.

Forest trees spread roots very widely to remain stable and insure competitive survival. So in steep terrain (Ashfield) the unavoidable beyond the ROW impacts are at least another twenty, and most often, another forty feet or more of width. That means another two and one half to five acres per mile of desecrated land. If three quarters of the proposed 127 mile pipeline (100 miles and probably more) in MA is going through woodlands, as it is, the impacts easily exceed three or even four square miles in MA alone. This is one of the largest prospects ever considered under Massachusetts environmental review.

The industry touted “fifty-foot-wide-after-installation-grassy-pipeline” is thus, in reality, an impressive 175, and often 200 ft. wide corridor of disruption and destruction.

We thus may have a permanent aggregated impact of sixteen to twenty acres per mile or up to four square miles of clearing and unavoidable residual habitat damage in Massachusetts. That would ordinarily not be allowed and subject the prospect to the greatest environmental regulation imaginable, again in a state with known stringent regulations. If the impacts are seen as a single prospect involving impacts on other states, NY, NH and CT (possibly ME) the aggregated impacts are onerous and largely unsurpassed by any prospect excepting perhaps the interstate highways.

Eminent domain is to be a last resort and rarely used power, and should not and cannot be allowed as the

standard practice for this project or any other prospect of this scale.

The adoption and uncritically reviewed practice of fracking, and suggestion that gas is a so called bridge fuel, is now known to be a concocted fallacy perpetuated only by those to whom you give substantial access, the corporate cabal. Uncontrollable methane escape, earth quakes, drinking and other water contamination, health issues, property value and tax base diminishment and wildlife impacts abound, as you must know. To foster fracking is as big an impact on climate change as any including Co2.

Then comes the issue of minimum thickness, thin walled, class I pipe proposed for such a large diameter pipeline. Such pipe has proven no match for the corrosive, high pressure gas and oil. Like nuclear power, this is a risk not in the best interest of people, community, place or planet. The incineration zone covers vast areas, far greater than any easement or ROW. In January 2015 alone there have been four substantial leaks or explosions, including in West Virginia Just yesterday.

Please examine your consciences and conclude for the first time that this Massachusetts and multi state pipeline does not meet the requirement of being built in the public interest. It is being built for corporate profits almost exclusively. Become sane heroes for once and vote for your children and grandchildren.

You can be assured that many wise people across this country, in New England and Massachusetts are watching your actions and unrelenting in our resolve to stop this pipeline and undaunted by FtRC's, in the end, citizen derived authority.

While not anticipating sanity from your upcoming decisions, we do harbor a sliver of hope.

Walter and Susan Cusky  
Ashfield, Massachusetts

**20150204-0033(30130280).pdf**

**Town of Mason**

Board of Selectmen/Mason Conservation Commission

16 Darling Hill Road

Mason, NH 03048

(603) 878-2070

January 27, 2015

Lisa M. English, Director, Charitable Trusts Unit  
Office of the Attorney General, NH Department of Justice  
33 Capitol Street, Concord, NH 03301-6397

Dear Attorney English:

The Mason Board of Selectment and the Mason Conservation Commission would like to ask your assistance to prevent potential violations of Mason's conservation easements and threats to conservation lands posed by the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project's planned gas pipeline routes in Mason. Kinder Morgan and its subsidiary Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co. are proposing to cross five (5) of Mason's conservation lands with the large east-west 36" high-pressure line and the smaller 12" Fitchburg lateral line.

The 508-acre Fifield Tree Farm Conservation Easement is at risk of being violated by both pipelines. This outstanding Tree Farm was recognized in 2003 when Woodie Fifield received the Hillsborough County Tree Farmer of the Year award. After Woodie died, his family honored his desire to protect the Tree Farm permanently. In 2008 they granted the Fifield Tree Farm Conservation Easement to the town, with the assistance of a grant from the NH Land and Community Heritage Investment Program (LCHIP). In addition to its forest resources, the Fifield Tree Farm Conservation Easement protects nearly 2 miles along Spaulding Brook, a high-quality trout stream. The NH Wildlife Action Plan maps this brook corridor and nearly all of the Fifield Tree Farm lying north of this brook as Highest Ranked Habitat in New Hampshire. The conservation ease-

ment allows for public access for hunting and fishing and non-motorized trail recreation on the Tree Farm's 6 miles of trails. The Fifield Tree Farm is one of Mason's most significant open spaces.

Construction of these pipelines would involve clearing a swathe up to 150 feet wide across the northern and western parts of the Fifield Tree Farm, crossing Spaulding Brook at least twice. Fifty feet of this corridor would never be allowed to grow back. Herbicides could be used here, even in wetlands, to prevent the growth of anything other than grasses and other shallow-rooted species. Although Kinder Morgan says they plan to collocate the main pipeline along the existing power line right-of-way, it has to be sited at least 100 feet from the power lines due to electrical interference. This will create a whole new corridor of disturbed land.

These pipelines would violate Conservation Easement Sections 4.7 Topography and Mineral Resources, 4.8(a) Preservation of Existing Water Resources, 4.11(a) Prohibited Uses, Construction, General, 4.11(e) Roads, and 4.17 Utilities. The Fifield Tree Farm Conservation Easement was carefully crafted to protect in perpetuity an outstanding wildlife habitat, high quality water resources, a working forest, and a scenic place of quiet outdoor recreation. The statewide significance of the Fifield Tree Farm has been recognized through LCHIP's participation in its permanent protection. Please take all necessary steps to protect the integrity of this public trust.

Three other Mason conservation lands that would be impacted by the pipelines have also been recognized at the state level as worthy of protection. Two of these are upstream of the Fifield Tree Farm along Spaulding Brook: the town's 163-acre Spaulding Brook Conservation Land and the adjoining 12.5-acre Doonan Conservation Easement. Both were protected in 1991 through a grant from the NH Land Conservation Investment Program (LCIP). The deed for Spaulding Brook refers to the public trust in accordance with RSA 221-A.

The Doonan Conservation Easement was a gift from Frank Doonan to help the town match the LCIP grant for acquiring the Spaulding Brook Conservation Land. It adds significantly to the conservation value of the town land by completing the protection of Spaulding Brook Pond's wild shoreline. This pristine 15.8-acre pond is the crown jewel of both conservation lands. It's a vital wildlife habitat — otter and osprey are seen here, attracted by its fish. The NH Wildlife Action Plan maps this pond and the Spaulding Brook corridor as Highest Ranked Habitat in New Hampshire.

If the proposed large gas pipeline is located north of the power line right-of-way, the wildlife habitat value of the Doonan Easement and the Spaulding Brook Conservation Land would be seriously harmed. Wherever it is located on these lands, gas pipeline construction and maintenance would damage the conservation values that the Doonan family, the town and the state have protected. Specifically, it would violate the Use Limitation provisions of the Doonan Conservation Easement, Sections 1.A, C, D, and F. The town's Spaulding Brook Conservation Land is subject to similar limitations. LCIP requires the town to monitor and report on both conservation lands annually to assure that their management upholds the conservation values for which they were protected.

Another Mason conservation property that would be severely affected by both gas pipelines is the Mason Railroad Trail, including its associated historic quarry land. Preserved for outdoor recreation in 1985 through a state Land and Water Conservation grant, this 6.7 mile trail runs from Townsend State Forest in MA, through New Hampshire's Russell Abbott State Forest. It is the spine of a significant trail network. The RR Trail has received 3 major grants from the NH Recreational Trails Program — in 1997 for grading and clearing the full length of the trail corridor, in 2008 for building the Black Brook bridge, and in 2012 for repairing the historic Jackson Road trestle. For all these projects, snowmobile club members, horseback riding club members, and Conservation Commission members contributed many hours of volunteer labor. The Mason Railroad Trail is a recreational resource benefiting the whole region. It was one of the first railroads in New Hampshire to become a recreational trail.

In both locations where the gas pipelines are proposed to cross the RR Trail and its associated historic quarry, there are sizable areas of exposed bedrock. Blasting to install the pipelines is likely to obliterate the

historic quarry and heavily damage these parts of the RR Trail. Considering the many investments of public funds and volunteer labor in the Mason Railroad Trail, this seems a breach of the public trust.

Last but not least is Mason's 93-acre Mitchell Hill Conservation Land, abutting the Fifield Tree Farm Conservation Easement, and lying along Spaulding Brook and Black Brook. Both these brooks are mapped as Highest Ranked Wildlife Habitat in NH. The uplands and wetlands of Mitchell Hill Conservation Land are fine moose habitat. This land was acquired in 1999 with town conservation funds, thanks to the significant bargain sale agreed to by the late Reginald Lyons. Mr. Lyons' contribution to conservation, along with the people of Mason's conservation investment establishes that this land is an important public asset, though no state funds were involved here. Yet the fact that this land was already conserved may have enhanced LCHIP's favorable consideration of the Fifield Tree Farm Conservation Easement. Together these 601 acres form an outstanding unfragmented natural environment that should have its conservation status respected forever.

Now Kinder Morgan proposes to lacerate these protected natural areas by two gas pipelines — a violation of both the donors' and the town's goals and intentions.

Land conservation has long been a goal of the town of Mason. The town's 1981 Comprehensive Plan set forth these policies:

- to preserve, protect and improve, where appropriate, the historic, recreational and scenic resources of the town;

- to provide for the recognition, management and protection of agricultural, forest and water resources that are vital to an overall land use plan and the well-being of the community;

- to provide for the preservation of those natural resources which give the town much of its beauty and rural atmosphere;

- to provide opportunities for recreation commensurate with the developing needs of the town by encouraging gifts of private land or the public use of open spaces by private owners. (Vol. II, pages 5,7)

These goals were re-affirmed in the 2007 Mason Master Plan Update, in particular the goal to "encourage the use of conservation easements with willing landowners to protect high priority lands." (page 6) Mason Conservation Commission, together with the Board of Selectmen, fear that threats like these gas pipelines can undermine confidence in conservation easements, leading to a loss of faith in this very important land protection tool. New Hampshire citizens who have long supported conserving land may lose trust in public land protection programs. New Hampshire people cherish our heritage of public lands, as evidenced by HB227, an act relative to eminent domain on public lands, now moving through the Legislature. The Selectmen and Commission appeal to you to defend these lands that serve as charitable trusts for the benefit of the public.

A list of Mason's conserved lands that are in peril is below, along with deed numbers for your reference.

Thank you very much for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Charles V. Moser, Chairman, Mason Board of Selectmen

Robert B. Larochelle, Chairman, Mason Conservation Commission

Affected Conservation Land (references to Hillsborough County Registry of Deeds Book/Page):

Fifield Tree Farm Conservation Easement	508.1 acres	Book 7992 page 0276 (page 1 of 57 pages)
Spaulding Brook Conservation Land	163.3 acres	Book 5301 page 0868 - 73
Mason Railroad Trail	94.4 acres	Book 3438 pages 0422- 26
Mitchell Hill Conservation Land	93 acres	Book 6188 page 0843
Doonan Conservation Easement	12.5 acres	Book 5301 pages 0874 - 82

Cc: Attorney General Joseph A. Foster  
Dijit Taylor, Director, NH Land and Community Heritage Investment Program (LCHIP)  
Tracey Boisvert, Director, NH Conservation Land Stewardship Program  
Governor Maggie Hassan  
Senator Kelly Ayotte Senator Jeanne Shaheen Representative Annie Kuster  
Representative Frank Guinta  
State Senator Kevin Avarad State Representative Jack Flanagan State Representative Christopher Adams  
Craig Fifield  
William Doonan  
FERC- Docket # PF14-22

**20150204-4001(30126652).pdf**

From: Alice Friedenson [mailto:aef7@cornell.edu]

Sent: Monday, February 02, 2015 9:43 AM

To: Alice Friedenson

Subject: Andover pipeline

Please stop the Kinder Morgan pipeline from going through private property. I am writing to challenge the plan to go through Bailey Road and other surrounding neighborhoods but am equally concerned with any other plans to go through private or public property. As a homeowner, I have learned to conserve energy by reducing house temperature at night, using a heat pump for the swimming pool, increasing house insulation, replacing old windows with modern energy efficient ones. Having a pipeline go through one's property would significantly and unfairly reduce the value of the house which is a large percentage of lifetime savings. Families move to Andover to have personal and public lands for safe passive and active recreation.

- The residents of Massachusetts have the right to clean, safe and sustainable energy solutions. The residents also have the right to have a say in the policies that will determine our energy future.
- In Andover alone, recent commercial and residential solar projects have added the capacity to generate 10,000 MWh of electricity per year, thereby saving nearly 80 billion cubic feet of natural gas per year.

**ARTICLE 97**

- Massachusetts' state-, county- and municipally-owned open spaces funded with state resources are entitled to full protection under Article 97 of the Massachusetts Constitution.

**“NEED” FOR THE PIPELINE**

- There are ways to address peak energy needs in both the summer and the winter, including: (1) using Electric Thermal Storage powered by air source heat pumps;(2) switching to smart meters to create a market incentive for homes to run appliances during non-peak hours; (3) increasing storage of liquefied natural gas (LNG) at power generation facilities; (4) implementing innovations in the future such as distributed storage using electric batteries; (5) expanding use of solar installations, weatherization and green construction; and (6) lifting the cap on the amount of energy that customers with renewable energy systems can sell back to the grid.
- No private company should be allowed to take either private land or protected public land for its own private gain in a project of dubious need.

Alice Friedenson  
109 Bellevue Road  
Andover, Ma 01810

**20150204-5029(30124786).pdf**

Hiel Lindquist, Fitzwilliam, NH.

Last night's (3 February) cancellation? postponement? "rescheduled? Open House in Rindge displays the idiocy of trying to meet Kinder Morgan's short deadline in completing the public comment period of their proposed NED Pipeline. I, like many of the public, only heard about the cancellation of the Rindge open house at the last minute. I am sure other people went ahead and tried to attend a meeting that was never going to be held. This is the second time a meeting has been canceled, the first being in Milford, I believe. As it is, I reworked by schedule so that I could attend the Rindge meeting. Now I have to determine when, and if, there is another planned open house nearby that I can attend (I cannot attend Winchester).

While the open house events were canceled due to weather and beyond Kinder Morgan's control, it does point out the Open Houses in the area will never be held in time to meet the rapidly approaching deadline for public comment. As cancelled and postponed open houses continue to pile up there will not be sufficient time for the public to attend any of these meetings. February is the snowiest month of the year here in New England and Kinder Morgan should have expected that planned events would need to be canceled. Why Kinder Morgan did not schedule alternate dates for the meetings in the event of bad weather I do not know. Again, we ask that the NED pipeline review period be extended to provide adequate time for the public to be informed.

As stated in a letter from our representatives in Congress: It is imperative that the proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project go through a thorough federal review that provides affected stakeholders in New Hampshire with a meaningful opportunity to participate and express their views. This requires both FERC and Kinder Morgan to conduct an open and transparent process. Therefore, we request that FERC provide the public, municipal officials in potentially affected municipalities, and our offices with additional information on the timeline for the current pre-filing phase, and we urge you to extend that timeline to ensure that New Hampshire's residents have a full and equal opportunity to understand, assess, and comment on this project before any decisions are made finalizing the project or its route.

**20150204-5052(30126274).pdf**

Courtney C Vore, Amherst, NH.

To Kinder Morgan (& others) who claim that property values will not be affected by the pipeline... I was asked yesterday for a copy of the proposed pipeline map for someone moving in Amherst so she could avoid buying in the incineration zone. Not only would I say my property value will be negatively affected - my property is bisected by the pipeline - but I may never be able to sell my house. Rendering it virtually worthless.

**20150204-5057(30127375).pdf**

Tracy A Miller, Fitzwilliam, NH.

Perhaps even more alarming than the destruction of property values that this new pipeline would cause.... I live on Scott Pond Road in Fitzwilliam, NH. The incineration zone stops just before my property. However, it does cut right across the only exit road that my neighbors and I would have should an accident occur. So even if our homes were spared in the initial incident, we would be trapped in a heavily wooded area with no escape route. With so many one-way roads in our part of the state, I wonder how many others would be in this situation as well?

**20150204-5062(30127724).pdf**

Melinda Hildreth Honkala, Richmond, NH.

This is a formal request to register my comments about the proposed pipeline considered by Morgan Kinder running through Richmond, NH. I oppose this pipeline completely because of the environmental impact it

would have to my town and region in New Hampshire

20150204-5085(30128260).pdf

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

February 4, 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

Updated Open House Schedule -- New Location for February 4, 2015 Open House

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 originally scheduled dates and locations for twelve open houses to be conducted in November and December 2014 for the portion of the Project located between Wright, New York and Dracut, Massachusetts. A list of the open house dates and locations was filed with the Commission on October 21, 2014. On November 6, 2014, Tennessee submitted a filing stating that these open houses would be postponed in order to provide affected landowners and communities the necessary time to review the draft Resource Reports 1 and 10 submitted on November 5, 2014. On January 9, 2015, Tennessee submitted a list of the revised dates and locations for the postponed open houses for the portion of the Project located between Wright, New York and Dracut, Massachusetts. Revised open house schedules were submitted on January 29 and 30, 2015 to reflect the dates of the open houses that had been rescheduled due to inclement weather, subsequent school activity rescheduling, and a location change.

Tennessee is now submitting a further updated schedule of open houses for the portion of the Project located between Wright, New York and Dracut, Massachusetts in this filing. This updated schedule includes the rescheduled date of February 23, 2015 for the open house in Rindge, New Hampshire previously scheduled for February 3, 2015 that was canceled due to inclement weather. Tennessee will provide notification of this updated open house schedule to affected stakeholders. Tennessee will also work with the Commission Staff to establish the open house dates and locations for the portion of the Project located between Troy, Pennsylvania and Wright, New York.

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 this filing to the Office of Energy Projects. A copy of this letter will also be sent to all affected landowners and the governmental officials that received the open house schedule in prior notification letters. 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. Rich McGuire (Commission Staff)  
Mr. Michael McGehee (Commission Staff)  
Mr. Eric Tomasi (Commission Staff)

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

NED Open House Dates/Locations

\*\*All Open Houses are 6pm – 8pm

- \* February 4: Winchester, NH
  - o Winchester Town Hall; 1 Richmond Rd., Winchester NH 03470
- \* February 5: Greenfield, MA
  - o Greenfield Community College Cafeteria; 1 College Dr., Greenfield, MA 01301
- \* February 9: Schodack, NY
  - o Green Meadow Elementary School Cafeteria; 234 Schuurman Rd., Castleton-on-Hudson, NY 12033
- \* February 10: Pittsfield, MA
  - o Berkshire Community College Cafeteria; 1350 West St., Pittsfield, MA 01201
- \* February 11: Farmington, CT
  - o Farmington High School Cafeteria; 10 Montieth Dr., Farmington, CT 06032
- \* February 12: New Scotland, NY
  - o Colonie Country Club; 141 Maple Rd., Voorheesville, NY 12186
- \* February 17: Andover, MA
  - o Wyndham Hotel; 123 Old River Rd., Andover, MA 01810
- \* February 18: Londonderry, NH
  - o Londonderry High School Cafeteria; 295 Mammoth Rd., Londonderry, NH 03053
- \* February 19: Hudson, NH
  - o White Birch Banquet Hall; 222 Central St., Hudson, NH 03051
- \* February 23: Rindge, NH
  - o Four Star Catering; 18 Lisa Dr., Rindge, NH 03461
- \* February 24: Milford, NH
  - o Hampshire Hills; 50 Emerson Rd., Milford, NH 03055
- \* February 25: Berlin, MA
  - o Berlin Memorial Elementary School Gymnasium; 34 South St., Berlin, MA 01503
- \* February 26: Fitchburg, MA
  - o Fitchburg Memorial Middle School Gymnasium; 615 Rollstone St., Fitchburg, MA 01420

**20150205-5052(30131526).pdf**

Gerald & Tracy Bull, Merrimack, NH.

Request for Extension of Comment Period – Kinder Morgan Gas Pipeline Docket No. PF 14-22-000

We are writing in support of our Town Council's request for a 90 day extension to the comment period for

the proposed Kinder Morgan gas pipeline project.

This pipeline was originally proposed to be constructed largely in Massachusetts, however, recent developments have redirected the project across much of southern New Hampshire, which includes traversing our community of Merrimack. Awareness of this project and its potential impacts on property owners, natural resources, etc., are just beginning to come to light. While the Town Council, local Conservation Commission, and various local citizens have begun working diligently to provide factual information and properly raise awareness so that community members may comment appropriately as afforded by process, there are aspects of the proposal (ex: impact upon conservation areas, municipal water supply, landowners, etc.) which require thorough assessment and understanding in order to yield genuinely valuable and insightful commentary.

In addition, our Town Council has respectfully requested (on multiple occasions) that Kinder Morgan conduct a public meeting regarding this pipeline project for the benefit of Merrimack residents, including a question and answer session. To date, Kinder Morgan has not responded with a firm date, having only indicated the likelihood of a meeting sometime in March, which might not occur until after the existing comment period expires on March 18, 2015.

We genuinely believe extending the comment period by an additional 90 days will yield valuable input from Merrimack community members, property owners and agencies that might otherwise not be available by mid-March.

Respectfully submitted,

Gerald & Tracy Bull

**20150205-5062(30132427).pdf**

Carol Iodice, Mason, NH.

February 5, 2015

Cheryl A. LaFleur, Chairman

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, NE

Washington, DC 2042

re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., Docket No. PF14-22-000 Request to Use Pre-filing Procedures for Proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Ms. LaFleur,

Do you remember the story of, Little Red Riding Hood? Deep in the woods of Mason, New Hampshire grandmother's house still exists. If you enter this old house built in 1786, you will see the wolf sound asleep, in grandmother's bed, with a smile on his face. The big old Ash tree as seen in the Little Golden book still stands in front of the cottage. It is the biggest white ash in NH. Grandmother's house is now called Pickity Place. It is a wonderful restaurant with a gift shop, a greenhouse and garden shop. It is surrounded by acres of walking trails through old English gardens filled with flowers and herbs that are used in the restaurant. It is a tranquil, picture perfect place, often the site for special occasions and weddings.

KinderMorgan/Tennessee Gas did not do their homework when they chose to become neighbors with this wonderful restaurant. They have proposed to put a 36" pipeline and a compressor station near this historical site. KinderMorgan /Tennessee Gas claims they will be helping the economy by providing jobs. These are temporary jobs for out of state workers. If a compressor station is put anywhere near Pickity Place, it will go out of business and 25 local employees will lose their jobs. 350 local vendors will be affected.

Compressor stations are extremely noisy. They are not safe for our environment. They spew out huge amounts of toxins. These toxins include benzene, toluene, sulfuric oxide, formaldehyde and other carcinogens. Residents living 1500 feet away from compressor sites have suffered from nose bleeds, rashes,

headaches, sore throats, dizziness and nausea. Please do not grant KinderMorgan's Petition. Please do not awaken the sleeping wolf.

Sincerely,  
Carol Iodice  
Mason, NH

**20150205-5067(30133230).pdf**

Andrew R Dominski, Albany, NY.

We are in need of good paying union jobs. Lower energy cost that will improve our economy and restore America to its fullest

**20150205-5068(30133313).pdf**

Robert D Bucci, albany, NY.

I think this job opp would be great for jobs for our local unions.I'm all for it!!!

**20150205-5071(30133787).pdf**

Ronald B Disher Jr, Craryville, NY.

This will create jobs for our local union and boost the economy.

**20150205-5073(30133917).pdf**

Robert D Bucci, Clifton Park, NY.

The opportunity to have domestic energy available. More JOBS. Needed tax revenue. This pipeline has so much promise and keep for our future that we must insure its being built for our children and theirs.

**20150205-5074(30133923).pdf**

Manuel Lopez, Latham, NY.

I am all for this pipeline. It will give jobs and boost our economy.

**20150205-5075(30133935).pdf**

Thomas Makuch, Albany, NY.

I'm retired but I want to come back to work for this pipeline. I am all for this pipeline and the great jobs it will create for our local union members.

**20150205-5078(30133945).pdf**

Love Coor, Albany, NY.

JOBS!! I'm all for the pipeline. This is a great opp for our local unioin and the capital city. This will create jobs for many of us that have been out of work.

**20150205-5079(30133946).pdf**

Joseph B Buono, Rensselaer, NY.

Work needed for our state and our area. I approve this pipeline.

**20150205-5080(30133947).pdf**

William J Herald, Troy, NY.

This will be good for our laborers. Jobs for our men and keep the economy going. Build a better business for

all and a stronger union

**20150205-5081(30133955).pdf**

Salvatore Gioeni, Albany, NY.

I approve this pipeline and the Jobs that it will create.

**20150205-5082(30133981).pdf**

Nicholas Buono, Albany, NY.

I think that this is great! Jobs lower taxes and helps our schools. I am all for it.

**20150205-5084(30134371).pdf**

Thomas L Stadler, Amsterdam, NY.

Good paying jobs are what we need. We are skilled working people that live locally. We want to help build this pipeline.

**20150205-5085(30134383).pdf**

Salvatore A. Antinucci, Albany, NY.

Good paying jobs, help meet energy demands with domestic energy, minimal environmental impact, higher skilled and trained workforce. Great for our community through tax revenues that help infrastructure and our schools. VITAL to our areas economy.

**20150205-5089(30134564).pdf**

Richard DeSong, Albany, NY.

The NED project is a must. Just think of how many jobs it will produce and how many dollars will brought in the community for taxes, schools, businesses, not to mention work for many union laborers who are skilled and waiting to get to work. Lets Go For It!!!

**20150205-5090(30134582).pdf**

Michael A Prestipino Jr, East Greenbush, NY.

I agree as long as it brings UNION jobs in our area.

**20150205-5091(30134588).pdf**

Kathlean D Neil, Voorheesville, NY.

I would like to see the NED project go through, because I live and work in this area. I think the NED project will be a great project for our local Union withj great pay.

**20150205-5102(30134662).pdf**

Sal Schipano, Colonie, NY.

This is a very good thing for Union workers. Yes I agree.

**20150205-5106(30134781).pdf**

George Lyman, Waterford, NY.

I watch C-span, and Fox news a lot...all I hear is more energy self dependence. I am all for fracking and oil and gas pipelines! U Labor Unions have WELL QUALIFIED and EXPEIRENCED members. They have very good training.

I SAY YES!!

**20150205-5107(30134822).pdf**

Matthew D Stewart, Gansevoort, NY.

This project is critical to insuring that good paying jobs are available to local union members as well as providing the best skilled labor to do the job.

**20150205-5111(30135121).pdf**

Shira, Williamstown, MA.

Jobs related to the construction and maintenance of infrastructure that threatens the long-term health of our communities (homes, watersheds and air purity) are not jobs with integrity -- especially when safer, less expensive, more forward-thinking directions are available and possible. Please lead us away from jobs in the name of jobs and from fuel-based energy. Make the transition NOW and immediate. PLEASE, no new fossil fuel infrastructure. We are better than this as a nation.

**20150205-5112(30135126).pdf**

Esteban Sanes, Albany, NY.

First of all we need to understand what is the northeast energy direct. This is a pipeline expansion(addition to the existing one) project being proposed by Kinder Morgan Energy Subsidiary. Tennessee Gas Pipe Co. This project would increase the capacity of the transportation of Natural gas between hubs in order to supply communities.

This project include many benefits...such as scalable up to 1.2 BCT/ol(30") and 22.BCT/ol(36") also liberates costly bottlenecks and lowers gas/electric prices for consumers. Supplies Northeast US and Eastern Canada with incremental and direct access to prolific and regional LOW COST abundant natural gas, and no less important, replaces detecting Historical gas sources for NYC areas Long Island and New England. New supplies and infrastructure will help to ease those constraints, and should help improve the regional price.

This project is designed to help further increase regional natural gas capacity, deliverability flexibility and reliability, as well as provide economic and environmental benefits to this region.

In early 2013 several pipeline additions in the New York/New Jersey areas did go into service. As the US EIA observed on Nov 14, these expansions happened on schedule increasing access for consumers in NYS metropolitan areas to natural gas produced in the Appalachian Basins Marcellus shale play. This has resulted in lower gas prices for NY consumers and has eased supply backup in the Marcellus Basin.

I APPROVE THIS PIPELINE ANF GOD BLESS AMERICA!!!!

**20150205-5133(30135787).pdf**

Richard Crane, Groton, MA.

I am writing regarding unions and others touting the benefit of job creation. The NorthEast Energy Direct project is about the need for natural gas for supplying energy to the region, specifically for electric generation. Job creation is not a reason to approve this project

**20150205-5134(30135788).pdf**

Gina Weaver, New Ipswich, NH.

Hello,

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company has been unresponsive to towns and government officials. Towns such as New Ipswich NH have been trying to get them to confirm a date for a public meeting and they have received no response. There have been questions from state representatives as well as town selectmen to Kinder Mor-

gan and they have received no response to their questions.

This company is completely uncooperative. They were told by the governor that they are to have public meetings with all of the towns involved and this is just not what they are doing. They are also being secretive and having private meetings with selectmen which they were told they couldn't do. This private meeting has already happened in New Ipswich NH. They have not been answering questions that are asked of them by our government officials.

This company does not belong in NH. Please allow more time in the approval process since Kinder Morgan refuses to cooperate. Most importantly Do Not Approve of this pipeline. Do Not destroy peoples homes and livelihood all for money. Because if you read about Kinder Morgan online they like to find ways to avoid taxes. Thank you!

**20150205-5174(30136347).pdf**

Julia Blyth, Northfield, MA.

Dear Secretary Bose:

When I heard about Tennessee Gas' proposed Northeast Energy Direct pipeline a year ago, the proposed route was about a mile from my home in Northfield, MA. I strongly objected to this project mostly because I was concerned about the environmental damage a pipeline corridor would do to the our region's large tracts of forest and wetlands—I worried about the spread of invasive species, erosion on our steep slopes during construction and because of likely increased ATV use, and damage to wetlands.

I opposed this project because I am aware of climate change and feel strongly that increasing fossil fuel infrastructure is detrimental to the health of our planet, and because I know that between available technologies to produce renewable energy, updates in efficiency, and fixing leaks and market problems in existing natural gas systems, we can meet our needs. I am also concerned about the instability of our electric grid caused by over-reliance on a single source of fuel.

On December 8th, TGP's updated resource report re-routed the pipeline closer to my home, and especially because that stretch also includes an 80,000 HP compressor station, I now oppose this project out of fear for my lifestyle in addition to the reasons stated above. When my husband and I purchased our home, our primary consideration was to move to a rural place where we could grow our own food and enjoy quiet woodlands and dark night skies. The noise, light, and fumes associated with compressor stations would destroy our way of life, and that of many other people.

In addition to purchasing a home with passive solar potential, adding insulation to our attic, replacing lightbulbs with LEDs, and heating with fallen trees from our land, we are in the process of installing solar panels to cover our remaining electricity requirements. It is hard to see how this pipeline constitutes a public necessity when the \$4 billion price tag could be used to help others invest in energy efficiency and renewable technologies, eliminating any need for additional gas capacity.

I am furious that Kinder Morgan/ TGP could be allowed to impact my life and the lives of so many others for corporate gain—and without even giving us the courtesy of a personal warning. Neither I, nor many neighbors closer to the pipeline route and the stretch indicated for a compressor station, have been contacted by this company to notify us of their plans. My house is about 1800 feet from the proposed route, and most of my land is closer. The Pipeline Safety Trust state that for a 36" diameter pipe at 1460 psi, the incineration zone is approximately 900 feet. Numerous accidents around the country have illustrated that their estimations are well-founded. I think it would be reasonable to expect TGP to notify all people who own property within this zone of their plans. In areas where compressor stations are proposed, people within likely earshot of the loudest operations or the evacuation zone ought to be notified at this stage—and the town should be informed with honesty.

I am dumbfounded that in his presentation to the Northfield Selectboard on August 19th, Kinder Morgan Vice President for Public Affairs Allen Fore showed a 2,000 HP compressor station, 40 times smaller than

the one now proposed for Northfield. How could our town have an accurate perception of this with such deception? The town has been given a map of the proposed route, with no compressor station indicated, with the text: “Impacted landowners: 31. Estimated annual property tax payments to town: \$3,385,855”. This is misleading by making it seem as if the town would gain significant revenue for just the pipeline, no compressor station, and as though only a few people will be affected by this — when in fact compressor noise and light pollution will likely bother many people, as well as residents and visitors who use the many hiking trails throughout the area. In fact, all 2,883 residents of Northfield are affected as the proposed route (including the section designated for the compressor site) passes through town-owned conservation land. Oddly, the town has not been formally asked for permission to survey this land (as of Jan 26, 2015). Further, in towns with existing pipelines, the value of the pipe and supporting facilities have depreciated rapidly, making the tax income less, and pipeline companies often ask for major tax abatements.

Company representatives misled landowners who were unaware of the project by knocking on their doors and saying they were “with the gas company,” implying a relationship with gas distributors who were expected to carry out routine maintenance. In other cases, land agents visited landowners without warning during dark winter evenings; this was frightening for several who were alone and unaccustomed to strangers at the door. These people were not even provided with parcel maps that indicate exactly where on their property TGP is interested in surveying! These are not the acts of a company that intends to have a good relationship with the people in this area.

In addition to this, many people, myself included, have given up a year to learning about this project, and expect to give up another year. We have better things to do — working regular jobs, raising children, tending our gardens, volunteering on town boards, promoting renewable energy and energy efficiency. Instead, we were reading TGP’s resource reports and towns’ comments to FERC, or about how the electric grid operates, or about TGP and Kinder Morgan’s abysmal environmental and safety records; we were creating websites and meeting with neighbors, figuring out how state and local politics work. Not a day goes by that I do not think about Tennessee Gas’ proposed pipeline. I am deeply saddened and angry that a compressor station could destroy my — or my neighbors’ — peace and quiet. I urge your Commission to discourage Kinder Morgan from pursuing this project.

Sincerely,  
Julia Blyth

**20150205-5186(30136417).pdf**

Brooke Coleman, Athol, MA.

Please say “NO” to this unnecessary project with hazardous drawbacks. We need to find energy solutions that do not cause irreparable harm through fracking and potentially devastating explosions and leaks in communities throughout the northeast. All of us and our families and the world we are a part of are worth us taking time to really look at this case. We have the opportunity to make a good decision for the long term well being of us all. Please do vote NO. As I understand it, very few long term jobs would be created and much of the gas could be slated to go over-seas and we would be left with the all of the risk and none of the gain. Thank you for considering this from a human perspective, not just an economic one.

Sincerely,  
Brooke COleman, RN, CNM

**20150205-5213(30136455).pdf**

deborah a. pomerleau, parker, CO.

I am from NH. I spent the first 20 years of my life in Mason. This is a beautiful pristine area. Please don’t ruin it. This pipeline is for profit for KM and not to help New England. Please Please don’t allow this to happen.

**20150206-0018(30140908).pdf**

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

Date: 1-28-2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

274 North Main St, Lanesborough Mass 01237

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.

Raymond H. Bushey, Jr.

CC

Kimberly Dose

FERC

888 First St., N.E.

Rm. 1A

Washington, D.C. 20426

**20150206-0019(30141093).pdf**

copy of letter sent to TGPCo, LLC

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

Date: 1/18/15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

183 Summit St.

Plainfield, MA 01070

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.

James Markham

**20150206-0020(30141104).pdf**

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

Date: 1/30/15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access

As the owner of the property located at:

13 Autumn St.  
Windham, NH 03087

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.

Gail S. Gumbel

**20150206-5009(30136507).pdf**

Edward Reece, Richmond, NH.

The people of New Hampshire will see zero benefit from this 36" diameter high-pressure gas pipeline. Three separate aquifers will be subject to blasting across the southern tip of the state, not to mention the destruction and habitat interruption from trenching and drilling across countless waterways, wetlands, conservation lands, and private properties.

Kinder Morgan promises jobs to the shortsighted souls who can only think 18 months into the future, when the fact is that only 5 jobs will be on a permanent basis.

Projected future needs of LNG for the state are estimated to be at 0.6 billion cu/ft per day on the coldest night of the coldest month of the year. Using this figure to estimate usage is equivalent to saying your family eats the equivalent of a full Thanksgiving feast every day of the year. What could New Hampshire possibly need, now or in the remotest of futures, with a pipe capacity of 2 billion cubic feet of LNG per day? At that rate, it is projected that the shale fields will be entirely depleted within 30 years. This is not sustainable energy, nor is it clean energy.

This is NOT the right decision for the future energy needs of New Hampshire.

**20150206-5043(30137261).pdf**

Dear FERC,

I am writing again my concerns about the proposed Kinder Morgan NED Pipeline. This time my concern is again over the pipeline approval process.

While Kinder Morgan continues to utilize rhetoric about a "fair and open" process, I am finding this to be far from the case.

Of special concern is a statement made by Timothy Drew of the New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee. Here is the quote from the 5 Feb 2015 Keene Sentinel "The Site Evaluation Committee has not yet received communication from Kinder Morgan about the pipeline. Drew said the state process for evaluating the project must take into account the concerns of individual towns, as well as state departments such as N.H. Fish and Game and the Department of Environmental Services."

A search of the NH Site Evaluation Committee website shows no record of the Kinder Morgan NED pipeline project. I refer to the paragraph attached to the end of this letter, from the NH Site Evaluation Committee website. Of special note is this statement "expand public participation by providing interested parties with the information needed".

I fail to see how the NH Site Evaluation Committee can do the job it was designed for if companies like Kinder Morgan fail to include the NE Site Evaluation Committee in its approval process.

Perhaps it is because Kinder Morgan sees no requirement or advantage to contacting the NH Site Evaluation Committee? I note that the NED Kinder Morgan schedule calls for submission of approval for the NED pipeline to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission in September 2015. I also note that Kinder Morgan

does not plan to submit the plan to the NH Site Evaluation Committee until December, 2015. I find it hard to understand how the NH Site Evaluation Committee can make any decision other than to approve the NED project as is, when it will have already been sent for federal approval.

I have also talked to other state departments and they make a similar statement concerning the lack of contact from Kinder Morgan on the NED project. FERC need only contact the NH DRED, NH Parks, or NH DOT or any other agency to determine how extensive the Kinder Morgan “fair and open” process really is.

I see the same situation here at the local level in Fitzwilliam. Kinder Morgan approached Fitzwilliam town officials in December, 2014 requesting a meeting with town officials. Fortunately our town officials, in order to provide a “fair and open” discussion, communicated to Kinder Morgan that Fitzwilliam needed to provide a meeting with Kinder Morgan that was open to the public. Fitzwilliam town officials wanted no part in “secret meetings held behind closed doors”, as proposed by Kinder Morgan. Once this was clear to Kinder Morgan, Fitzwilliam has not heard from Kinder Morgan again. Perhaps that is the reason there is no “open house” scheduled for the town of Fitzwilliam ?

I again call for FERC to require Kinder Morgan to improve the current process by being more open and forthcoming in regards to the public and NH state agencies. Kinder Morgan should at least be required to communicate with state agencies that should be active in the current phase of this project.

Regards

Hiel Lindquist  
Fitzwilliam, NH

The following is from the NH Site Evaluation Committee website: All pertinent information, data, and direction necessary to successfully address the requirements of RSA 162-H are posted and mentioned for that purpose. It was also created to provide parties who may be potentially affected by specific proposals with direct and timely access to meeting notices, procedural schedules, a means of contact with the Counsel for the Public and with members of the SEC, identification of participating State agencies, and access to key reports and important data sources. Finally, it was designed to supplement a key recommendation of the 1990 Energy Facility Committee which was to expand public participation by providing interested parties with the information needed to more effectively participate in public informational hearings, to determine how, when, and to whom direct testimony and reports should be submitted, and to prepare for cross-examination of witnesses at adversarial hearings. Through the ongoing use of this Web page, it is expected that company officials, agency representatives, attorneys, legislators, energy professionals, community organizations, concerned citizens, and other interested parties will benefit by becoming more informed participants in the proceedings of the SEC.

**20150206-5067(30138819).pdf**

Doug Starr, Forestburg, NY.

The NED project is a definite win win situation as far as I am concerned. We need energy, definitely need the jobs, and its a positive boost for our economy, that’s for sure. Lets do this project, put our people to work. Thank you very much!!

**20150206-5075(30138833).pdf**

Joeseeph Bronzino, Mt. Kisco, NY.

Neb Project is a very important project for the entire region. We really need this work. Thank you all very much for everything.!

**20150206-5095(30139091).pdf**

Phyllis Hinkley, Yorktown Hgts, NY.

I sure hope that this will be a Union Job. We all really need this work to pay our bills and support our fami-

lies. Thank you!

**20150206-5100(30139100).pdf**

Roger DuBois JR, Highland, NY.

I have worked on many pipeline jobs before this week and the work is done safely and efficient. There is very little environmental impact and these pipelines are very vital to the infrastructure of this country. Please pass this project quickly so we can pay our bills and spend some money! Thank you very much.!

**20150206-5103(30139123).pdf**

Raymond Dewitt, Milton, NY.

I live in the Hudson Valley. This job would help the economy by providing jobs for all the trades in this area as well as around the state. My fellow workers are well trained in all aspects of the construction. This would not be the first pipeline in the area so local #17 Has people that already have experience in the field ready to provide immediately. Thank you very much!

**20150206-5106(30139169).pdf**

Timothy Riley, Highland, NY.

NED Project will help meet energy demands with domestic energy. Also it will bring good paying jobs with skilled and trained work force. Thank you for youe Time and concerns. Tim Riley!!!

**20150206-5109(30139177).pdf**

Pasquale Destio, Jefferson, NY.

As a Union worker I promote the NED project fully for the various reasons. It will bring in good jobs for the local communities involved, as well as the energy consumption is growing every year and ww lill eventually need more and more resources to power our ever growing country.

**20150206-5113(30139186).pdf**

Thomas Sacco, Middletown, NY.

I live locally and good paying jobs are vital to our areas economy. Thank you!

**20150206-5115(30139213).pdf**

Ryan Dinger, Kerhonkson, NY.

Local 17 has a highly skilled workforce that will get the job done in a timely manner and safe. We all live locally so give back to the communitiity. Thank you for all you time and concerns!

**20150206-5116(30139220).pdf**

John V. Marullo JR, New Windsor, NY.

Unions provide good wages and health benefits. I have been a member for 60 years. Thank you

**20150206-5166(30140678).pdf**

February 6, 2014

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20216

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

Dear Secretary Bose:

I am re-submitting this comment from yesterday because I find the .txt file that resulted from the eComment form extremely difficult to read as a docket subscriber.

When I heard about Tennessee Gas' proposed Northeast Energy Direct pipeline a year ago, the proposed route was about a mile from my home in Northfield, MA. I strongly objected to this project mostly because I was concerned about the environmental damage a pipeline corridor would do to the our region's large tracts of forest and wetlands—I worried about the spread of invasive species, erosion on our steep slopes during construction and because of likely increased ATV use, and damage to wetlands.

I opposed this project because I am aware of climate change and feel strongly that increasing fossil fuel infrastructure is detrimental to the health of our planet, and because I know that between available technologies to produce renewable energy, updates in efficiency, and fixing leaks and market problems in existing natural gas systems, we can meet our needs. I am also concerned about the instability of our electric grid caused by over-reliance on a single source of fuel.

On December 8th, TGP's updated resource report re-routed the pipeline closer to my home, and especially because that stretch also includes an 80,000 HP compressor station, I now oppose this project out of fear for my lifestyle in addition to the more general reasons stated above. When my husband and I purchased our home a little less than two years ago, our primary consideration was to move to a rural place where we could grow our own organic food and enjoy quiet woodlands and dark night skies. The noise, light, and fumes associated with compressor stations would destroy our way of life, and that of many other people in this area.

In addition to purchasing a home with passive solar potential, adding insulation to our attic, replacing light-bulbs with LEDs, and heating with downed wood from our land, we are in the process of installing solar panels to cover our remaining electricity requirements. It is hard to see how this pipeline constitutes a public necessity when the \$4 billion price tag could be used to help others invest in energy efficiency and renewable technologies, as we have, eliminating any need for additional gas capacity.

I am furious that Kinder Morgan/ TGP could be allowed to impact my life and the lives of so many others for corporate gain—and without even giving us the courtesy of a personal warning. Neither I, nor many neighbors closer to the pipeline route and the stretch indicated for a compressor station, have been contacted by this company to notify us of their plans. My house is about 1800 feet from the proposed route, and most of my land is closer. The Pipeline Safety Trust state that for a 36" diameter pipe at 1460 psi, the incineration zone is approximately 900 feet. Numerous accidents around the country have illustrated that their estimations are wellfounded. I think it would be reasonable to expect TGP to notify all people who own property within this zone of their plans. In areas where compressor stations are proposed to be sited, all people within likely earshot of the loudest operations or within the evacuation zone in the case of a disaster ought to be notified at this stage— and the town should be informed with honesty.

I am dumbfounded that in his presentation to the Northfield Select Board on August 19th, Allen Fore, Kinder Morgan Vice President for Public Affairs showed a 2,000 HP compressor station, 40 times smaller than the one now proposed for Northfield. How could our town hope to have an accurate perception of this monstrosity with such deception? The town has been given a map of the proposed route, with no compressor station indicated or mentioned on the map, with the text: "Impacted landowners: 31. Estimated annual property tax payments to town: \$3,385,855". This is misleading to residents by making it seem as if the town would gain significant revenue for just the pipeline, no compressor station, and as though only a few people will be affected by this— when in fact compressor noise and light pollution will likely bother many more than 31 people, as well as all residents and visitors who use the many hiking trails throughout the area. In fact, all 2,883 residents of Northfield are affected as the proposed route (including the section designated for the compressor site) passes through town-owned conservation land. Oddly, the town has not been formally asked for permission to survey this land (as of Jan 26, 2015). Further, in towns with existing pipelines, the value of the pipe and supporting facilities have depreciated rapidly, making the tax income much less, and pipeline companies often ask for significant tax abatements.

A TGP land agent told a landowner near us that she could picture what a pipeline easement would look like by imagining a cross-country ski trail through her woods. A 50 foot wide permanently cleared swath that is routinely inspected weekly by company representatives in a helicopter is not what I picture when I imagine a cross-country ski trail in the woods. Company representatives misled landowners who were unaware of the project by knocking on their doors and saying they were “with the gas company,” implying a relationship with gas distributors who were expected to come and carry out routine maintenance. In other cases, land agents visited landowners without warning during dark winter evenings; this was frightening for several people who were alone and unaccustomed to strangers at the door. Impacted landowners are sent letters threatening eminent domain. These people are not even provided with parcel maps that indicate exactly where on their property TGP is interested in surveying! These are not the acts of a company that intends to have a good relationship with the people in this area.

In addition to this, many people, myself included, have given up a year to learning about this project, and expect to give up another year. We have better things to do—working regular jobs, raising children, tending our gardens, volunteering on town boards, promoting renewable energy and energy efficiency. Instead, we were reading TGP’s resource reports and towns’ comments to FERC, or about how the electric grid operates, or about TGP and Kinder Morgan’s abysmal environmental and safety records; we were creating websites and meeting with neighbors, figuring out how state and local politics work. Not a day goes by that I do not think about Tennessee Gas’ proposed pipeline. I am deeply saddened and angry that this project and specifically a compressor station could destroy my—or my neighbors’—peace and quiet. I urge your Commission to discourage Kinder Morgan from pursuing this project.

Sincerely,

Julia Blyth

Cc:

Senator Elizabeth Warren

Senator Edward Markey

Representative James McGovern

Governor Charlie Baker

Secretary Matthew Beaton, Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs

Senator Stan Rosenberg

Representative Paul Mark

Northfield Board of Selectmen

**20150206-5238(30142109).pdf**

**Massachusetts Association of Conservation Commissions**

*protecting wetlands, open space and biological diversity through education and advocacy*

Electronically filed with FERC

February 6, 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. We have reviewed Re-

source Reports 1 and 10 filed by Kinder Morgan with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) in November 2014 and the revised Resource Report 1 filed by Kinder Morgan in December 2014. We have also read Kinder Morgan's January 5, 2015, letter to you in which it reported that it would file newly revised Resource Reports 1 and 10 with the FERC in March 2015. In that letter, Kinder Morgan also encouraged affected landowners and members of the public to file comments on the revised Resource Report 10 it would file in March 2015, rather than on the alternative analysis in the November 2014 Resource Report 10.

The purpose of this letter is to point out serious methodological flaws in the alternatives analysis included in Kinder Morgan's November 2014 Resource Report 10 and to request that Kinder Morgan correct those flaws before it files revised Resource Reports. If Kinder Morgan does not correct those flaws, it will file reports in March 2015 that fail to include an adequate alternatives analysis of routes and siting, thus violating the standard required for such a report and the review of alternatives required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). We also request that revised Resource Reports 1 and 10 include maps, charts, and data reflecting that cities and towns, not counties, are the primary unit of local government in Massachusetts.

For background, MACC is the professional association of Massachusetts conservation commissions.

Each of the 351 cities and towns in Massachusetts has a conservation commission and almost every conservation commission is a dues-paying voting member of MACC. 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's mission is to protect Massachusetts natural resources by supporting conservation commissions through education and advocacy. We have been doing that work since 1961. More than 2,000 conservation commissioners are members of MACC.

Because Kinder Morgan will file revised Resource Reports 1 and 10 in March 2015, we do not comment on the factual details and routing options found in the earlier Resource Reports or on its choice of a preferred alternative. As Kinder Morgan suggested in its January 5, 2015, letter, we will comment on the revised reports it will file in March 2015. Our comments in this letter instead are focused on the analytical shortcomings of the earlier Resource Reports for the portion of the pipeline, including laterals and compressor stations, which would be located in Massachusetts.

First, the reports fail to discuss or analyze the ecological quality, value, and services of the lands and waters the pipeline would cross. Instead, the reports compare bare numbers of acres, streams, or wetlands the pipeline would cross. For example, Table 10.3-5 in Resource Report 10 simply adds up the total number of wetland complexes, water bodies, or forested acres, etc., crossed without any analysis of the ecological qualities, values, and services provided by each of those resources. Kinder Morgan has resorted to bean counting rather than determining that wetlands, rivers, and streams, and conservation lands have ecological qualities and values that may differ from parcel to parcel and crossing to crossing. For example, instead of any analysis, Kinder Morgan reported at page 10-34 in Resource Report 10 that a reason for rejecting an alternative route included a "greater number of stream and wetland crossings." Kinder Morgan did no analysis whatsoever of the ecological quality, value, and services of those streams and wetlands as compared to other potential routes. It also made the conclusory statement of "significantly more extensive cultural and environmental impacts" without any analytical support for such statement.

There are resources available in Massachusetts that should be consulted and referred to in determining and reporting the ecological value of the lands and waters a pipeline would cross. BioMap 2, a project of the Massachusetts Department of Fish and Game and the Nature Conservancy, combines thirty years of rigorously documented rare species and natural community data with special data identifying wildlife species and habitats, and is integrated with an assessment of large, well-connected, and intact ecosystems and landscapes across Massachusetts, incorporating concepts of ecosystem resilience.<sup>1</sup> BioMap 2 identifies

1,242,000 acres of Core Habitat, key areas that are critical for the long-term persistence of rare species and other species of conservation concern as well as a wide diversity of natural communities and intact ecosystems across Massachusetts. It also identifies 1,783,000 acres of Critical Natural Landscape, large natural landscape blocks that provide habitat for wide-ranging native species, support intact ecological processes, maintain connectivity among habitats, and enhance ecological resilience, as well as buffering land around coastal, wetland, and aquatic Core Habitats to help ensure their long-term integrity. BioMap 2 explains that, “protection and stewardship of BioMap 2 Core Habitat and Critical Natural Landscape is essential to safeguard the diversity of species and their habitats, intact ecosystems, and resilient natural landscapes across Massachusetts.”

Another resource that should be consulted and referred to in determining and reporting the ecological value of the lands and waters a pipeline would cross is the Conservation Assessment and Priority System (CAPS) developed at the University of Massachusetts.<sup>2</sup> CAPS is an ecosystem-based approach for assessing the ecological integrity of lands and waters and subsequently identifying and prioritizing land for habitat and biodiversity conservation. It defines ecological integrity as the ability of an area to support biodiversity and the ecosystem processes necessary to sustain biodiversity over the long term. CAPS is a computer software program that offers an approach to prioritizing land for conservation, based on the assessment of ecological integrity for various ecological communities (e.g., forest, shrub swamp, headwater stream) within an area. CAPS combines principles of landscape ecology and conservation biology with the capacity of modern computers to compile spatial data and characterize landscape patterns. This process results in establishing an Index of Ecological Integrity for each point in the landscape based on models constructed separately for each ecological community. The approach is landscape-oriented and focused on a comprehensive valuation of the entire landscape. It attempts to combine many complex spatial relationships in the landscape that drive ecological processes, including population persistence and community dynamics. The CAPS approach seeks to evaluate the ecological integrity of the entire landscape mosaic, not just the rare species and community locations. It assumes that by conserving intact, ecologically-defined communities of high integrity, we can conserve most species and the ecological processes that shape and maintain ecosystems over time.

That Kinder Morgan’s analyses and reports have been exceedingly and unacceptably coarse and lacking in adequate detail is shown by the January 22, 2015, letter to you from the Town of Wilmington, MA, Water & Sewer Department. In that letter, the Water & Sewer Department explained that the lateral Kinder Morgan has proposed for Wilmington would pass through Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection designated Zone I Areas for two town well fields, the primary drinking water sources of the town, as well as a Watershed Protection District Zone II, a drinking water wellhead protection area. As the town explained, current and future land uses within Zone I areas are limited to those directly related to the provision of public drinking water or will have no significant adverse impact on water quality. It is simply unacceptable for Kinder Morgan to have chosen a pipeline route through public drinking water supply protected areas without providing information in its Resource Reports about the public drinking water supply resources the pipeline would cross and without a comparison of that route to alternative routes that would not cross or impact public drinking water supply protection areas.

In addition, Massachusetts designates lands as Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) for special recognition because of the quality, uniqueness, and significance of their natural and cultural resources; those lands are worthy of a high level of concern and protection. 301 CMR 12.00. Massachusetts also affords special protection to state and municipal conservation land under Article 97 of the Massachusetts Constitution, allowing a change in use or removal of such land from protection only with a two-thirds vote of each house of the state legislature. The Article 97 land disposition policy is that there be no net loss of Article 97 land and that land be removed from Article 97 protection only in extraordinary circumstances.<sup>3</sup> A proposal to place a pipeline, lateral, compressor station, etc., on or through Article 97 land would trigger the Article 97 requirements. Massachusetts also allows conservation and agricultural restrictions to be placed on land to maintain such lands in conservation or agricultural use. Resource Report 10, at 10.3.3.2, acknowledged that such lands have ecological value and stated that Kinder Morgan would look at alternative routes to avoid or

minimize traversing ACECs within or adjacent to Article 97 lands or lands with conservation restrictions. Resource Report 10, however, failed to analyze the ecological qualities and values of the protected lands the pipeline would cross. Also, Kinder Morgan inexplicably made no commitment to avoid or minimize traversing Article 97 lands or lands with conservation or agricultural restrictions without ACEC designation, even though the ACEC designation often is not sought for lands already protected by Article 97 or conservation restrictions.

Second, and related to the first point above, the Resource Reports failed to analyze the impact of construction and long-term maintenance of the pipeline and right of way, including laterals and compressor stations, on the areas the pipeline would cross. Such analysis would require analyzing the current ecological qualities, values, and services of the lands and waters the pipeline would cross (as explained above) and the impacts expected on those ecological qualities, values, and services. For example, there is no analysis of the impact of cutting and maintaining a right of way through previously intact ecosystems that are core habitat. As another example, there is no analysis of the impact of the noise that would be generated from compressor stations on preexisting noise-sensitive areas such as schools, hospitals, or residences, or on wildlife. BioMap 2 and CAPS are available resources for completing those analyses.

Kinder Morgan also failed to assess the impact of constructing and maintaining a pipeline and right of way on greenfield land<sup>4</sup> as compared to on previously disturbed lands. In most circumstances, a pipeline crossing conservation land, wetlands, or rivers in greenfield land would have a greater impact on the ecosystem than would the same crossing in already disturbed lands and waters. Interestingly, Kinder Morgan acknowledged as much in its December 8, 2014, letter to you that accompanied revised Resource Report I, where it wrote,

One of primary reasons that led to Tennessee's decision to adopt the New York Powerline Alternative and New Hampshire Powerline Alternative for the Project is that they will enable a very substantial portion of the proposed new pipeline construction to be located adjacent to, and parallel with, existing utility corridors in the states of New York, Massachusetts and New Hampshire. By increasing the percentage of co-location for the proposed pipeline segment, the revised route will reduce the construction of new pipeline facilities in undeveloped portions of the Market Path region, thus reducing environmental impacts and avoiding habitat fragmentation. In addition, the proposed route change will enable Tennessee to avoid (in certain cases) and to minimize (in other cases) the crossing of Article 97 properties and Areas of Critical Environmental Concern in Massachusetts.

One would thus expect Kinder Morgan to do the same review and analysis of alternatives for the entire pipeline route, including laterals and compressor stations. Yet, it failed to do so in comparing the preferred route to the Massachusetts Turnpike (I-90) alternative, instead defaulting to bean counting the number of stream, wetland, and forest crossings, without any analysis of the ecological impact of putting the pipeline on a major highway right of way as compared to through greenfield lands.

We do not express an opinion in this letter about the ecological impacts of the New Hampshire Powerline Alternative or of other areas where Kinder Morgan may choose to co-locate the pipeline with an existing utility right of way. We will review the Resource Reports that Kinder Morgan will file next month and comment thereafter. We do note, however, that in some locations there could be substantial ecological impacts of widening an existing right of way or building parallel to an existing right of way, depending on the ecological qualities, values, and services of the lands being crossed as well as any resources that are adjacent to or nearby the right of way, such as drinking water wells or archeological or historical resources.

Our comments in this letter are informed in part by our meeting last year with representatives of Kinder Morgan concerning their pipeline proposal. During that meeting they said Kinder Morgan chose the most direct route for the pipeline from its entrance into Massachusetts to its connection into the existing pipeline in Dracut, Massachusetts, and would consider changes to the route only within a narrow geographic band in northern Massachusetts. Kinder Morgan expanded that band with the New Hampshire Pipeline Alternative but has yet to do so for the entire pipeline. It appears to us that Resource Reports 1 and 10 were written to justify the pipeline routing chosen by Kinder Morgan without the serious, detailed, and fact based alterna-

tives analysis required by FERC and NEPA.

To facilitate public and government review of the project, and in addition to requesting that Kinder Morgan provide the information and analyses we discuss above, we request that the revised Resource Reports and Environmental Analyses:

- Indicate and show on maps the location of each Article 97 land that the pipeline, including laterals and compressor stations, would cross.
- Indicate and show on maps the location of each ACEC that the pipeline, including laterals and compressor stations, would cross.
- Indicate and show on maps the location of each wetland and wetland resource area that the pipeline, including laterals and compressor stations, would cross.
- Indicate and show on maps the location of each Core Habitat and Critical Natural Landscape that the pipeline, including laterals and compressor stations, would cross.
- Indicate and show on maps the location of each land with a conservation or agricultural restriction that the pipeline, including laterals and compressor stations, would cross.
- Indicate and show on maps the location of wellhead protection areas, reservoirs, and other public drinking water supplies through which the pipeline, including laterals and compressor stations, would cross.
- For each of the above areas, an analysis of alternative routes and siting that would avoid those areas.
- For each area where the pipeline would be located adjacent to, and parallel with, existing utility corridors, a description of any widening or additional right of way that would be required and the location of that widening or additional right of way.
- Recognizing that municipal governments, not counties, are the primary local government in Massachusetts, include a map of each municipality that the pipeline, including laterals and compressor stations, would cross, showing the precise proposed location of the pipeline, lateral, compressor station, etc., in that municipality, as well as the location of the lands and waters noted above. Similarly, charts, graphs, and other details that are provided should be at the municipal as well as county and state level.

Our understanding is that such information is available in GIS data layers maintained by the State of Massachusetts.

The proposed pipeline is a major project that will have significant short and long term impacts on the environment, even using standard construction techniques and other mitigation. Those impacts will be exacerbated by the amount of greenfield land, wetlands and wetland resource areas, conservation lands, and other protected lands the pipeline will cross. It is incumbent upon Kinder Morgan to provide the information and analyses necessary to evaluate the proposed preferred route and alternatives as well as its proposed mitigation. It has not done so yet.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide these comments and look forward to our further participation in the process.

Sincerely,

Eugene B. Benson

Executive Director

Email: eugene.benson@maccweb.org

Copy:

United State Senator Elizabeth Warren

United State Senator Edward Markey

Massachusetts Secretary of Energy and Environmental Affairs Matthew A. Beaton

Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection Commissioner Martin Suuberg

---

1 <http://www.mass.gov/eea/agencies/dfg/dfw/natural-heritage/land-protection-and-management/biomap2/> (accessed February 3, 2015).

2 <http://www.umasscaps.org/> (accessed February 3, 2015).

3 <http://www.mass.gov/eea/agencies/mepa/about-mepa/eea-policies/eea-article-97-land-disposition-policy.html> (accessed February 3, 2015).

4 Greenfield land is undeveloped land in a city or rural area used for agriculture, landscape design, or left to evolve naturally.

**20150206-5293(30142403).pdf**

Maryann Frisella  
39 Valewood Circle  
Tewksbury, MA. 01876

Date: February 6, 2015

To: FERC I am writing to make you aware that my family and I are adamantly opposed to the pipeline.

We have attended various informational meetings and have found out that:

1. There is already in existence viable route through the southern part of Massachusetts. There is no need for a second path through the northern part of the state. Google the maps, you will see them. The existing southern path ends at the same point and can be upgraded for less cost to the users than this new route. Face it, if this new pipeline is approved, we users are going to be forced to pay for this oneway or the other... We do not need it!
2. The proposed pipeline would impose a tremendous safety issue. These lines operate under extremely high pressure and are highly volatile and flammable. When they rupture, they create a blast zone of over 300-600 feet, the flying burning debris creates fires wherever it lands. Homes and lives will be lost
3. Energy needs are actually DECREASING and the pipeline is of such a large volume it is clear this line is intended to deliver gas overseas. The Solarize Mass program has had tremendous success in causing homeowners throughout the state to "solarize" and get off the grid. There are also competing Hydroelectric and Nuclear supplies applying to come down from NH and Canada. Great options to Fossil Fuels.
4. My neighbors and I love the conservation areas and protected wetlands and do NOT want them disturbed. The tract of wild land between Valewood Circle and the Shawsheen River is an uninterrupted wildlife habitat . The KM plan will clear cut it and prevent trees from ever growing over it again. Herbicides will be sprayed on a regular basis. The Wildlife Habitat will be lost forever, Our Town is in a watershed area for 3 Rivers.
5. A Kentucky judge ruled AGAINST the pipeline stating that the project was not for the common good but to make a multi-billion dollar company even more lucrative.
6. The Merrimack River watershed, Shawsheen River Watershed and Ipswich River watershed would be involved and this supplies water to over 1,000,000 residences. It also supports the wildlife and flora in our area. We cannot allow the 30-50 foot clear cut of trees to be allowed, nor ongoing maintenance herbicides to be sprayed. The trees and vegetation here play an integral role in filtering pollutants out and providing clean drinking water into those rivers. Herbicides cannot be allowed. Those trees should not be cut down. This would only result in pollution of the Clean water which needs to be fed to the 3 vital rivers Merrimack, Shawsheen and Ipswich.
7. Western MA has been extremely pro-active and their legislators and officials are behind them. To date 41 Towns through which this Company threatened to pass their pipeline have opposed this pipeline.
8. If you "Google" Kinder Morgan you will see about all of the deaths, illegal dealings, explosions, felonies, fatalities, spills, fires, and hospitalizations that have occurred because of this companies practices. You can

also check this link: <http://www.sightline.org/wpcontent/uploads/downloads/2012/02/Coal-Kinder-Morgan-April->

9. My neighbors and I were literally harassed by Kinder Morgan trying to get permission to survey our properties on Valewood Circle. They came in as Bullies and tried to intimidate us with threats of eminent domain.

10. If you look at a map of the pipeline route proposed through my back yard, you will see how narrow the area between the Valewood Circle and US Rt. 93 Properties actually is. This is a highly developed, highly assessed residential area of valuable single family homes. Installation of the pipeline requires certain set-backs and room that does not exist here. This pipeline will also diminish the value of the homes in the area, depriving owners of their equity. The land where TGP works needs to support large and heavy equipment, and room to excavate and remove trees in the process. This "room" that they need does not exist and therefore this pipeline should NOT be allowed.

11. I recognize the Town of Tewksbury already has numerous gas lines to service many of our residences, but those are smaller and run at a much lower pressure than the line now being proposed. This new line is not intended to service Tewksbury. There is no benefit to Tewksbury. Even if it was, the pressure is so great that it would pose a tremendous danger to our residents and should be denied even in that case. There is a great risk here, with no benefit to weigh against it. No benefit whatsoever.

12. Kinder Morgan has chosen our Town as a path because they see it as the least expensive route for them, no matter what the cost to the homeowners here. There is no proof this line is necessary. Even if more gas is needed there are adequate alternatives which can be developed at a far lesser expense, to fill any energy void. Please consider these things and oppose the pipeline!

Sincerely,

Maryann and Salvatore Frisella

**20150209-0007(30145410).tif 20150209-0007(30148375).pdf**

James D. Hartman TGP LLC

1615 Suffield St

Agawam. MA 01001

phone: 603-672-7677

Date: 1-31-2015

RE: Denying property access

As the owner of the property located at:

15 Patricia La - Amherst NH 03031

I am denying permission to TGP- Kinder Morgan, 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

CARMEL M. BOISSONNEAU

CC: Chariman Cheryl A. LaFluer

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, NE

Washington, DC 20426

**20150209-0009(30153591).pdf**

**STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE  
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR**

MARGARET WOOD HASSAN  
Governor

January 23, 2015

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

Dear Chairman LaFleur,

Please see the attached letter Governor Hassan sent to Kinder Morgan regarding the proposed Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project — Docket No. PF14-22-000.

Sincerely,

Kerry McHugh  
Policy Advisor

**STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE**  
**OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR**

MARGARET WOOD HASSAN  
Governor

January 23, 2015

Mr. Allen Fore  
Vice President, Public Affairs  
Kinder Morgan, Inc.  
Enfield, CT 06082

RE: Proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project (NED Project) Outreach to New Hampshire Communities

Dear Mr. Fore,

I am writing to encourage Kinder Morgan to schedule additional open houses concerning its proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project before it files an official proposal with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC).

While Kinder Morgan has scheduled open houses in January and February as part of the FERC's pre-filing process, continued community engagement is vital to these discussions. Therefore, I ask that you plan for additional open houses that will provide critical, continuing dialogue about the NED Project — before filing with FERC.

In December, Kinder Morgan announced that the New Hampshire Powerline Alternative is now its preferred route for the NED Project. Since then, numerous citizens have raised concerns with me about not having enough time to learn about the proposed pipeline before the official FERC filing. Concerned citizens want to learn about the nature of the NED Project's energy benefits to New Hampshire, as well as understand the potential safety and environmental impacts the project may have.

The questions and concerns raised by our residents indicate that an extensive and open public-input process at every stage of this proposal, including pre-filing, is necessary. It is important that our residents have the opportunity to fully understand the impacts and potential benefits of the proposed NED Project so that they may fully participate in the federal and state review processes.

Outreach to our local communities should begin promptly with the currently scheduled open houses. But citizens should have additional opportunities — after they have had an initial chance to learn more about the NED Project- to speak with the company about the NED Project. That is why I ask that you schedule addi-

tional open houses later in the year and prior to the official submission to FERC.

In addition, I urge you to continue to work closely with the communities and residents along the proposed route in an effort to reduce impacts and to only propose 8 project that brings significant energy benefits to the people and businesses of our state— reducing costs to ratepayers while respecting state siting requirements and protecting our natural resources. The best way to achieve a sensible solution that works for New Hampshire is through ongoing, open lines of communication and the sharing of information between Kinder Morgan and local communities.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. I look forward to continuing to work with you to ensure the concerns of our residents are thoroughly addressed. With every good wish,

Margaret Wood Hassan  
Governor

**20150209-0021(30147509).pdf**

**CONSERVATION COMMISSION**  
30 PAYSON HILL ROAD, PO BOX 163  
RINDGE, NH 03461

Tel. (603) 899-5181 Fax (603) 899-2101 TDD 1-800-735-2964

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield St.  
Agawam, MA 01001

January 27, 2015

RE: FERC Docket 1 PF14-22

Dear Sirs,

The Rindge Conservation Commission is responsible for the management of the Converse Meadow conservation area in Rindge (Map 7, Lot 85). A portion of this property is in the proposed path of your NED pipeline project. This parcel is public land, owned by the Town of Rindge, with a conservation easement held by the Monadnock Conservancy. It is restricted to individual recreational use only, unless another sort of activity is approved by affirmative vote of the Conservation Commission.

It has been our practice, when we receive a request for any other sort of activity, to require submission of a written plan of such activity, as well as an appearance before the Commission to discuss the proposal. Please be advised that we expect that procedure to be followed if your representatives plan to access the Converse Meadow property to conduct any survey work. Our meetings are held in the Rindge Town Office at 7:00PM on the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> Thursday of each month. We look forward to your response.

Sincerely yours,

David G. Drouin  
Chairman, Rindge Conservation Commission

cc. Federal Energy Regulatory Commission,  
Rindge Board of Selectmen  
Rindge Police Dept.  
Monadnock Conservancy

**20150209-0033(30153646).pdf**

**STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE**  
**OFFICE OF ENERGY AND PLANNING**  
107 Pleasant Street, Johnson Hall  
Concord, NH 03301-3834

Telephone: (603) 271-2155

Fax: (603) 271-2615

MARGARET WOOD HASSAN  
GOVERNOR

January 30, 2015

Dwight Brew, Chairman  
Amherst Board of Selectmen  
PO Box 960  
Amherst NH 03031-0960

RE: Town of Amherst Conservation Land (aka Scott Parcel) - Northeast Energy Direct Project, FERC  
Docket No. PF 14-22

Dear Mr. Bre:

It has come to our attention that the natural gas pipeline route, proposed by the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company (TGP) in their recent FERC Pre-Filing, proposes to cross the Town of Amherst's Scott Conservation Land. As you may be aware, the Scott Conservation Land was acquired through the State's Land Conservation Investment Program (LCIP) and, as such, the State maintains an interest in the land to ensure that its investment in this conservation property is protected. Attached is a copy of the Scott Parcel Conservation Project Description from the LCIP Final Report, which provides additional background information about the acquisition. More information about the LCIP program is also available at <http://www.nh.ttov/oen/Dlanina/nrotuams/clsn/index.htm>.

The lands and interests in lands (such as easements) acquired through the LCIP are held in public trust and by law, the sale, transfer, conveyance, or release of any such land or interest in land from public trust is prohibited. In addition, there may be land use restrictions contained in the deed of this conservation property that could be in conflict with construction of a pipeline. We hope to work with the Town of Amherst and TGP to ensure that impacts to this conservation land are avoided or mitigated.

We request that our office be included in any discussions between the Town of Amherst and TGP and copied on any correspondence that relates specifically to the Scott Conservation Land.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

Tracey Boisvert, Program Director  
Conservation Land Stewardship Program

Enclosure: Scott Parcel, Town of Amherst Project Description from LCIP Final Report

cc: Mary Maloney, Assistant Attorney General, DOJ

Amherst Conservation Commission

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.

√ FERC

*{enclosure is multi-column + map, not reproduced here}*

**20150209-0035(30148060).pdf**

**The Commonwealth of Massachusetts-**  
William Francis Galvin, Secretary of the Commonwealth  
Massachusetts Historical Commission

January 26, 2015

Hope Luhman  
Louis Berger  
20 Corporate Woods Boulevard

Albany NY 12211

RE: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., a Kinder Morgan Company, Northeast Energy Direct Project, PA, MA, CT, NH. FERC Docket 1PF14-22-000.MHC 1RC.5677L

Dear Ms. Luhman:

Staff of the Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC), office of the State Historic Preservation Officer, have received the Project Notification Form (950 CMR 71) submitted for the project referenced above.

Because the project involves federal agency permitting, the Section 106 review under the federal regulations (36 CFR 800) will fulfill the requirements of compliance with M.G.L. c. 9, ss. 26-27C (950 CMR 71) and with the MHC's commenting in compliance with MEPA (see 950 CMR 71.04(2)a (3)).

Please continue to submit project information to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) for their review, findings, and determinations, so that FERC can consult with the MHC and with other consulting parties.

The MHC previously commented to FERC on November 5, 2014, which comments pertaining to the Section 106 review process generally also apply to the currently proposed project route.

These comments are offered to assist in compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as amended (36 CFR 800) and MGL c. 9, ss. 26-27C (950 CMR 70-71). If you have any 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

xc:

Secretary Kimberly D. Bose, FERC  
Eric Tomasi, FERC  
Mike Letson, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co Kinder Morgan

220 Morrissey Boulevard, Boston, Massachusetts 02125  
(617) 727-8470 ~ Fax: (617) 727-5128  
[www.sec.state.ma.us/mhc](http://www.sec.state.ma.us/mhc)

**20150209-0066(30148392).pdf**

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

Date: 12 Jan 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access # PF14-22-000

As the owner of the property located at:

115 Prospect Street  
Lanesborough, MA 01237

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 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.

Harold S.R. Byrde, M.D.

Paula C. Byrde

copy sent to: FERC

**20150209-0081(30148094).pdf**

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

Date 2/1/2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access

As the owner of the property located at

311 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 or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose. Any such physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Richard L. Szmauz

**20150209-0082(30148079).pdf**

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

Date 2/1/2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access

As the owner of the property located at

311 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 or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose. Any such physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Maria T. Szmauz

**20150209-0083(30148113).pdf**

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

Date: Jan 30, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access # PF14-22-000

As the owner of the property located at:

101 Silver St.  
Lanesboro, MA 01237

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 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.

Judith Nishman

copy sent to: FERC

**20150209-4005(30145422).pdf**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
**FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

PROJECT UPDATE INFORMATION  
Weather Related Open House Cancellation

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC

Docket No: PF14-22-000

**NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT PROJECT**

February 9, 2015

On February 9, 2015, Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LLC (Tennessee Gas) gave the following information to Commission staff.

Due to weather conditions and safety considerations, the open house for the NED Project scheduled for February 9 in Schodack, New York [Green Meadow Elementary School] has been canceled. Information has been provided to governmental officials and local media.

Tennessee will advise when this open house is rescheduled.

**20150209-5017(30142160).pdf**

Susan L Durling, Harrisville, NH.

I am writing again to express my concern regarding the Northeast Energy Direct project proposed by Kinder-Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company.

In an article in the Keene Sentinel on February 5th, Mr. Drew of the New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee was quoted as saying "the Site Evaluation Committee has not yet received communication from Kinder Morgan about the pipeline". It is my understanding that the New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee must oversee and approve projects like the new Northeast Energy Direct gas pipeline. My curiosity peaked, I researched this area.

The Northeast Energy Direct pipeline passes directly through Loring Field in Winchester. It is also less than a mile from Richmond Wildlife Management Area, Morgan Reserve Open-Space and Barden State Wildlife Management Area in Richmond. NED is within a mile of Foskett Wildlife Refuge and Annett State Forest in Rindge. This pipeline passes less than half a mile from Rhododendron State Park in Fitzwilliam. In Mason, It passes through Russell Abbott State Forest and less than a mile from Coyne Wildlife Sanctuary, Beck Lot, and the Elliott Parcel and within a mile of the Lucy Lawrence Lot. In Milford it passes directly through the Dadoly-Fox Run, within a mile of Heritage Way Open Space, Gbi and Gavin Lot, Colburn Acres Park, Rotch Wildlife Preserve, the Federal Hill Fire Tower land, and the Ames Lot. In Hollis it's less than a mile from Big Dickerman Town Forest, J Woods Meadow and the Parker land. In Amherst it skirts the edge of

the Ponemah Bog Wildlife Refuge, is less than a mile from the Sherburne and Glover Lots and passes alarmingly close to Souhegan High School. In Merrimack it passes directly through Horse Hill Wildlife Refuge and within one mile of White Pine Swamp and Blueberry Island in Naticook Lake. In Litchfield it passes within one mile of Litchfield School Conservation Area (again, very close to a school), Parker Park, Duck Pond Lot, Rocky Hill Pond Lot, Saw Mill Brook conservation land and less than a mile and a half from Litchfield State Forest. In Londonderry it is less than a mile from the Lourdes Parcel, D'Angelo Tract and Ralston Tract. In Nashua it runs along the edge of the Leslie C Bockes Memorial Forest, and close to Robinson Pond Park and the Hudson Town Forest. In Windham it's less than a mile from Andrews Town Forest and the London Bridge Road Forest. In Pelham it cuts through the Peabody Town Forest and is less than a mile from the Pelham School's Natural Area.

Is anyone at the New Hampshire Department of Resources and Economic Development aware? Not that I can ascertain. How about Parks and Recreation? Or the Division of Forests and Lands? The Water Well Board? The Conservation Committee?

The NED pipeline crosses New Hampshire state routes 78, 119 three times, 32, 12, 202, 124, 123, 45, 31, 13, 122, 101A, 101, 3, 3A, 102, 111, 128, 111 A, and 38. I can find no one at the state Department of Transportation who can tell me they been notified of such by Kinder Morgan. Is anyone at the New Hampshire Department of Safety aware?

On the website for NH SEC I found information stating that it was created to expand public participation, "to provide parties who may be potentially affected by specific proposals with direct and timely access to meeting notices, procedural schedules, a means of contact with the Counsel for the Public and with members of the SEC, identification of participating State agencies, and access to key reports and important data sources."

Kinder Morgan's schedule calls for submission of approval for the NED pipeline to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission in September 2015. Kinder Morgan does not plan to submit the plan to the NH Site Evaluation Committee until December, 2015. How can NH SEC or any of the other New Hampshire divisions and departments fulfill their obligations to the public if Kinder Morgan does not communicate its intention to build this massive project until after its been approved by FERC?

**20150209-5020(30142166).pdf**

Margaret M Ford, Nassau, NY.

February 7, 2015

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

FROM: Margaret and James Ford

RE: COMMENTS Tennessee Gas Pipeline PF 14-22 Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Ms. Bose:

We are property owners along the proposed route of the Kinder Morgan fracked gas pipeline to New England. (107 Jordan Lane, Nassau NY 12123) There will be over 13 miles of industrial gas lines going through our mostly rural/wooded/residential community of Schodack if this project is approved.

We are opposed to this pipeline for many reasons. New York State has recently banned fracking due to inadequate data on health effects. Some states such as California are finding they are using another precious resource, water, at alarming rates in the hydraulic fracturing process. There are also concerns about seismic events, and storage of the fracked water. Therefore, we are compelled to view fracking negatively and would not willingly facilitate its use. We acknowledge that there are periodic constraints on the gas supply in New England. However, the capacity of this pipeline far exceeds the amount needed to remedy these shortfalls.

Much of this gas may eventually be liquefied for export to Europe, thus pushing up prices and profits. This pipeline as proposed does not support a declaration of public need, but rather one of private greed.

Use of our private land by a private company for a purpose we are philosophically opposed to is very disturbing, especially since we will not reap mitigating benefits. This pipeline is a conduit which we cannot tap into. Although we appreciate the siting of this industrial project near the existing National Grid electric corridor, it means there will be an even larger swath of cleared land bisecting our property, further reducing its use and value. Knowledgeable buyers have already asked real estate agents to keep them away from the proposed route, having been spooked by the term "kill zone". We will suffer the loss of trees, animal habitat, viewshed, and peace of mind. Most importantly, the more pipelines, the easier it will be to abandon goals for renewable energy. This pipeline preserves the status quo of using fossil fuels over conservation, solar, wind, geothermal, biomass or any future cleaner technologies.

In addition to 13 miles of pipeline, a large compressor may be located in our community, less than a mile from our property. Periodic venting of fracked gas would occur, along with other constant requisites of an industrial installation: noise, light and view pollution. Again, we see only a devaluation of our property and lessening of the quality of rural life with no mitigating positive effects.

One final comment: While Kinder Morgan has complied with mandates for public meetings, most of them have been scheduled during January and February, a time when weather is a factor and many retirees head South. Some have already been cancelled due to weather. These meetings are in no way public hearings, as they are one-sided industry presentations, complete with refreshments. We can't fault Kinder Morgan for trying to present its best case, but would prefer it be in a more open forum.

Sincerely,

James and Margaret Ford

Copy:

United States Senator Charles Schumer

United States Senator Kirsten Gillibrand

Governor Andrew Cuomo

United States Representative Paul Tonko

State Senator Kathleen Marchione

Town of Schodack Supervisor Dennis Dowds

**20150209-5039(30142204).pdf**

Barbara OConnor, Pelham, NH.

This comment is to express my concerns for the pipeline coming through the town of Pelham, NH. This project will not benefit our town in ANY way. This will cause, already rising costs of electricity to increase more, possible dangers that come with this pipeline is something the residents of Pelham are not willing to chance. Please stop this pipeline from coming through our town

**20150209-5065(30142379).pdf**

Kimberly D Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street NE

Room I A

Washington, DC 20426

Date February 7, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company

As the owner of the property located at

18 Autumn Street, Windham NH, Lot #905

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 or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose. Any such physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Homer Shannon

**20150209-5074(30142400).pdf**

David Smith  
Percheron Field Services  
Land Agent for Tennessee Gas Pipeline  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, Ma. 01001

Feb. 8, 2015

Pelham NH lot 5-179-1

Dear Mr. Smith,

I have received the information packet that includes a Survey Permission form. Since I have not yet been able to attend an information session and none have been scheduled in Pelham NH your request is premature. Hudson or Londonderry dates are not until the 18th and 19th of Feb. I am not yet able to grant any permission and do hereby deny access to my property by Tennessee Gas pipeline co. , Kinder Morgan Co. its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors or associates to enter my land to perform any survey or for any other purpose. Please insure that no unauthorized entry or trespass takes place.

I am not a person that is dead set against the pipeline, as a mechanical engineer that has operated a co-gen facility in my career, I agree that natural gas has benefits to the region and until alternative green power is more practical I believe natural gas is the best fuel choice.

I am concerned and require answers to several issues:

- 1) I have already had one mortgage underwriter deny a refinance (from the same company that was holding my mortgage for the previous 10 years) because of the existing power line easement. Natural gas is considered hazardous and I fear that my current mortgage could be called.
- 2) I fear that future financing for me or for a future buyer will be negatively impacted by the presence of the pipeline. A byproduct of financing problems and the pipeline's location will be a reduction to my property value.
- 3) Will the transportation of natural gas through my yard (especially at 36" and 1500psi) be grounds to deny me homeowners insurance?
- 4) Will the pipeline expose me to future litigation risk because I own the property?
- 5) My land is currently developable. I have considered a subdivision project but, that would need to wait for house lot prices to recover. Will the pipeline negatively impact this potential project intended for my retirement years? What happens to utilities and driveways that need to cross MY land with your pipeline in it? Can pipeline depth be negotiated to allow additional safety? Especially near homes?

Can the routing be along the rear lot line?

Where do I go to get independent, honest answers to these questions? Do I need to face the expense of hiring representation to get a fair shake?

Obviously these questions pertain to my circumstances. But I also am trying to learn why the pipeline has to be so big? Why taking my private land is allowed for transportation of gas for capacity closer to the gas source and upgrading power lines is not considered.

When I have learned the answers to these questions I will then be more willing to grant access.

Thank you.

Sal Perruccio  
34A Tallant Rd  
Pelham, NH 03076

CC :

Town of Pelham, Board of Selectmen

Mr. Allen Fore VP, Public Affairs, Kinder Morgan, 8 Anngina Dr. Enfield , Connecticut 06082

FERC docket # PF14-22-000 by way of eFiling

Governor Hassan C/O Paxton Delano Special assistant

**20150209-5080(30142410).pdf**

Richard Crane, Groton, MA.

New England did not have an energy issue until ISO-NE stopped using liquified natural gas to address peak demands during winter months. A peak demand that lasts 5-10 days a year. Instead of natural gas they used oil which drove up the price of electricity in the region.

People of New England are being coerced into accepting this pipeline. We are not stupid. We know that we don't need this pipeline. There are better and easier ways to address our energy needs.

All this pipeline will do is allow Kinder Morgan to export its natural gas. The result will be much higher electric prices for the region. This project will not help us whatsoever. The US Department of Energy has already said that exports of natural gas will lead to higher energy prices here at home.

<http://www.hellenicshippingnews.com/us-Ing-exports-would-boost-economy-but-lead-to-higher-energy-prices-says-eia/>

Wages are not increasing. In my case, our wages have decreased significantly. We cannot afford this pipeline. It will cause energy costs in the region to significantly increase.

Please deny this pipeline.

**20150209-5083(30142576).pdf**

**TOWN OF WINDSOR**

Berkshire County Massachusetts

BOARD OF SELECTMEN

1890 Route 9, Suite 1

Windsor. Massachusetts 01270

Telephone 413-684-381 I Fax 413-684-3806

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

January 26, 2015

RE:Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC, Docket #PF14-22

Pre-filing Procedures for Proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Chairman LaFleur and members of the Commission:

On May 19, 2014 at the Annual Town Meeting, residents of the Town of Windsor voted to adopt a resolution in opposition to the Kinder Morgan Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LLC, Northeast Energy Direct Project. The resolution was passed by majority vote.

A certified copy of the adopted resolution is enclosed. Please consider our citizens' vote when reviewing the Kinder Morgan Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LLC, Northeast Energy Direct Project (Docket No. PF14-22)

We appreciate your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Peter Fusini (Chairman)  
Windsor Select Board

Brian Koczela

cc:

Governor Charles Baker  
Senator Elizabeth Warren  
Senator Edward Markey  
Senator Richard Neal  
State Senator Benjamin Downing  
State Representative Paul Mark  
Nathan Karns, Berkshire Regional Planning Commission

**TOWN OF WINDSOR**

1890 Route 9, Suite 2  
Windsor, MA 01270

Office of the Town Clerk

February 3, 2015

At the Annual Town Meeting of the qualified voters of the Town of Windsor held on May 19, 2014, the following business was transacted under Article 16.

ARTICLE 16 was moved, seconded and voted that the Town accept the following resolution:

**RESOLUTION TO BAN NEW HIGH CAPACITY HIGH PRESSURE PIPELINES AND TO CHAMPION SUSTAINABLE ENERGY**

To see if the town will vote to accept the following resolution to ban “fracked gas” pipelines and to champion sustainable energy:

Whereas a proposed High-Pressure Pipeline carrying natural gas obtained through hydraulic fracturing may come through Windsor, 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 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, L.L.C. CTGP”, 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 Windsor, Massachusetts choose not to participate in such encumbrances to the life, vibrancy, economic stability, and general wellbeing to our neighbors in New York and elsewhere, wherever hydraulic fracturing is occurring and the pressurized pipeline is running; now, therefore, be it

Be it **Resolved**, that the people of Windsor, 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;
2. Oppose said pipeline, and any pipeline carrying natural gas within the borders of our Commonwealth or

our Nation; and

3. Hereby instruct our state and federal legislators and executive branch officials 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 wellbeing and our bodily safety, and, instead, to legislate more stringent energy efficiency and further exploration of and subsidies for renewable energy sources.

CARRIED. DECLARED MAJORITY.

Madeline W. Scully  
Windsor Town Clerk

**20150209-5086(30142924).pdf**

Richard Crane  
95 Overlook Drive  
Groton, MA 01450

October 4, 2013

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

RE: Northeast Energy Direct Project  
LL#: MA (4) 917.02  
Middlesex Co. Groton  
PL 200-4

To Whom It May Concern:

We received your letter dated October 2, 2014 requesting to survey our property at 95 Overlook Drive, Groton, MA 01450. We deny your request.

In your letter you refer to information regarding the project and a survey permission form previously sent to us. We have never received any such correspondence from the Tennessee Gas Pipeline or Kinder Morgan prior to October 4, 2014.

We have been aware of this project since May 2014. On May 17, we sent an email to Becky Mack at Kinder Morgan informing her that we should be notified about the pipeline. She put us in touch with John Gavin who told us that we were not close enough to the project to be informed or affected by the pipeline.

In May, we informed John Gavin and Becky Mack that our property was the closest property to the proposed project in our immediate area and that SGC had made a mistake not including us. They ignored the information we provided them. Since that time we have made multiple requests of Kinder Morgan and the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company to address our specific concerns. We have yet to receive any answers to these concerns. As property owners who are directly affected by this project we deserve answers to our specific concerns.

Your pre-filing with FERC contained a change to your route through Groton. This route change was made to accommodate residents on Longley Road only to affect a similar number of residents, if not more, on Overlook Drive. This change requires the taking of conservation land from the Groton Conservation Trust and Meadowbrook Conservation. We do not understand why this change was made since it has a greater impact on the area. This change benefits no one, not even Kinder Morgan and the Tennessee Gas Pipeline. We want to know the exact reason for this change.

The Meadowbrook Conservation was created for the benefit of homeowners in the Meadowview neighborhood. Many of my neighbors and I have deeded property in the Meadowbrook Conservation that surrounds our neighborhood. For example, my postand- beam shed is on the Meadowbrook Conservation. Unfortunately the maps and information that you have do not include these details. My property and those of my

neighbors are more impacted than you realize.

Regarding our property, we searched for our home for over 10 years. When we saw it for the first time we realized that this was our dream home and that we needed to risk everything to obtain it. Having saved for well over 10 years we were still short the needed down payment. We risked everything financially to obtain this home. This was an easy decision for us knowing that our kids would have a better life and that we would be making a financial investment for our future with the purchase of this home.

We have spoken to experts who have informed us that our home's value would not only significantly decrease, but the character of the home and property could never be reclaimed if your project were to go through as-is.

Like many others we do not support this project. We urge you to change the project in such a way that it does not destroy our lives and community. Fossil fuel projects such as this are hard to justify already given the strides made by the New England states, and especially Massachusetts, in clean sustainable energy. We recommend that any corporation looking to put in a fossil fuel project that they look to upgrade existing infrastructure and use existing rights-of-way.

Sincerely,

Richard Crane

**20150209-5132(30145966).pdf**

LEO & LISA SENUS  
594 SAND PIT ROAD  
MASON, NEW HAMPSHIRE 03048

Mr. James D. Hartman  
Agent - Right of Way SR II  
Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

January 12, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
Northeast Energy Direct Project, Docket No. PF14-22-00

Denial of Property Access

Dear Mr. Hartman:

We are the owners of the property located at 594 Sand Pit Road, Town of Mason, Hillsborough County, New Hampshire.

As such, we are denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter our land to perform surveys, or for any purpose in furtherance of the above-referenced pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto our property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact us.

Leo Senus  
Cell: 908-552-1156  
leo.senus@gmail.com

Lisa Senus  
Cell: 908-246-0098  
lisa.senus@gmail.com

*{certified mail receipt appended}*

**20150209-5135(30146396).pdf**

Denise Ginzler, Greenville, NH.

Dear FERC,

I am a resident of Greenville, NH, and I am writing to express my opposition to Tennessee Gas Pipeline's proposed Northeast Energy Direct pipeline (PF 14-22). The projected pipeline consists of approximately 70 miles in New Hampshire of 36-inch mainline, and a compressor station probably located in Greenville, New Ipswich or Mason, NH.

Here are my reasons for asking that you deny this request from Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline. There is no real need for this amount of natural gas in New Hampshire, or even in the New England region as a whole. It appears that a pipeline of this size, ending in Dracut, MA, is actually destined for export through the Maritimes & Northeast connection there. There is no provision for local connections to supply LNG to the towns that it passes through. There will be no permanent jobs, and very few short-time jobs created, due to Kinder Morgan's union contracts and history of bringing its own construction crews.

What will happen is a serious disruption of the earth, the water and the lives of those of us who live in the pipeline's path. Even without accidents or spills, the proposed construction, including blasting through NH granite, will do irreversible harm. And the communities damaged will get no benefits. Those directly in the pipeline "incineration zone" will see their property values drop, and their insurance rise or become unavailable. I am speaking of friends of mine. Those living near the compressor station (which could be me) will be subjected to serious noise pollution; not just the normal mechanical background noise, but the truly ear-splitting sounds of releasing gas pressure.

I am also concerned that an investment of this size in LNG infrastructure will keep this part of the country firmly tied to fossil fuels. I believe we should be transitioning to renewables, and building for clean energy use. We need to go forward to the 21st century, not backward to heavy reliance on fossil fuels.

For the above reasons, I urge you to deny this request by Northeast Energy Direct. I have lived in Greenville for 30 years, and worked in Mason for 18 years. Both are small, quiet towns set in the woods and hills of southern New Hampshire. Please let us continue living in a clean, unpolluted, rural environment. This is my home.

Denise Ginzler

**20150209-5168(30147512).pdf**

Jacquelynn M Elliott, Stephentown, NY.

I strongly oppose the pipeline. I live within the incineration zone of this pipeline, along with 14 other of my family members. Besides the environment being negatively effected, my property decreasing in value, I have the far to real fear of the pipeline exploding and injuring, or worse killing, me and my family. Please don't allow this pipeline to incase my family in its incineration zone and adding us to the many significant incidents listed under the Tennessee Pipeline on Wikipedia

**20150209-5176(30147591).pdf**

Christine Erb, LANESBORO, MA.

I am strongly opposed to Kinder Morgan's TGP Northeast Energy pipeline, and ask you to do everything you can to prevent it. It is unnecessary, expensive, and unsafe.

Kinder Morgan's irresponsible history of accidents threatens our water supply and clean air. The periodic venting of more than 60 cancercausing chemicals—and other additives that fracking companies refuse to identify—endangers us all. There are pipeline explosions nearly every week in the US. Here in Lanesborough, a "low-population area", the pipeline—carrying 3 times the volume of other lines—needs to meet only the lowest industry safety standards.

Its proposed route runs through land protected under our state constitution, as well as huge areas of public and private land that enhance our lives, protect wildlife and forests, and make us a tourist destination. Its compressor stations—60 acres, constant bright lights and noise—will destroy our rural area.

Less than 25% of the gas is slated to go to New England's energy needs— the rest will be exported. Why should we have to pay—in every way, through electricity surcharges and environmental degradation—for a private company's profit? We can meet New England's energy needs through energy efficiency, solar, wind, and other long-term solutions. These solutions, which do not contribute to global warming, generate many more long-term jobs than pipeline construction.

I have denied Tennessee Gas Pipeline access to my property, by certified mail. I urge you to oppose this project as well

**20150210-0040(30154811).pdf**

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

Date: 1/30/15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access

As the owner of the property located at:

Map 13, Lot 3, Rindge, 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 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 Sundstrom

**20150210-0057(30156118).pdf**

From: Richard Crane

Submitted: 2/2/2015 2:10PM EST

Email:

Phone:

Address: 95 Overlook Drive, Groton, Massachusetts 01450

Message: Correspondence

Cover

Sheet

Richard Crane 95 Overlook Drive Groton, MA 01450 November 1, 2013

The President The White House

1600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW Washington, DC 20500

RE: FERC Docket No. PFI4-22-000

Dear Mr. President:

My name is Richard Crane and I am a supporter of the Obama administration having voted for your presidency twice. I am also a landowner in Massachusetts directly affected by the Northeast Energy Direct Project being proposed by Kinder Morgan and the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC. As currently proposed the Northeast Energy Direct Project is a "greenfield" pipeline that will cross Massachusetts having a devastating affect on homeowners, conservation land and the environment. There is no natural gas pipeline that has this level of impact and devastation that I could ever support. Please help the people of Massachu-

setts by getting Kinder Morgan to change their route so that pipeline goes through existing rights of way designated for public use.

I come from a poor working class upbringing. At the age of 11 I took several jobs to help support my mother, a single parent who raised three boys on just a secretary's salary. I have worked hard all my life to get an education and build a career to support my family. The culmination of my life's effort was to find our dream home where my wife and I could raise our kids in a healthy and safe environment. It took us over 10 years from the time that we started looking to find our home. It is the perfect home in a neighborhood of homes surrounded by conservation land located in the Town of Groton Massachusetts, a quaint New England town. We risked everything financially to get our home. By some miracle we were able to purchase our home. It is our primary investment for our kids' well being and our eventual retirement. This pipeline will significantly decrease our property value and devastate us financially. There are many other families throughout Massachusetts in the exact same situation. All of us are concerned about the devastating impact this pipeline will have on our families' financial wellbeing and financial future.

On February 6, 2011 we held our first Super Bowl party at our new home. This day was a disaster for both the Pittsburgh Steelers and our air conditioning system. Ice rains - destroyed our back deck and air conditioning system. Fortunately we had insurance that paid for the repairs. After seeing the massive repair costs we realized that this was a blessing in disguise and replaced our air-conditioning with geothermal. Geothermal is a clean renewable energy solution. This was easy to do in Massachusetts since our state leads the way in clean renewable energy solutions. This pipeline impacts many things on our property including our geothermal wells. It is unimaginable that a fossil fuel solution such as a natural gas pipeline can take precedence over a clean renewable energy solution such as geothermal. We need to continue to be leaders in clean renewable energy and reject this project. Our kids enjoy the benefits of living in a neighborhood bordered by conservation land. Often they walk the conservation land behind our homes to get exercise and enjoy nature. During the summer months they venture over to Wattles Pond to go fishing where they have always caught a fish. Then there is the "Save the Bullfrog" campaign my kids embark upon every year. For about a month at the start of summer they fish bullfrogs out of our pool that migrate from the wetlands behind our house. As parents we enjoy sitting on the back deck looking out at the trees and watching the deer and turkeys traverse our property. Of course there is the occasional porcupine, fisher cat, or bear, but we like seeing them too. If this pipeline project were to continue as-is all of the wetlands and conservation land that surround our neighborhood will be gone forever. The residents of Groton will have lost something precious that can never be replaced.

Conservation land is scarce in Massachusetts. Ours is just a piece of the conservation land that remains in our state. Massachusetts passed Article 97 in our state constitution to protect conservation land and open space from being developed. This pipeline is a "greenfield" project that affects conservation land throughout the state. It also impacts wetlands, priority habitats, core habitats, farmland, water supplies, protected water resources, scenic rivers, and wellhead protection areas all while going through people's homes. It is imperative that Massachusetts be able to preserve what conservation land and open space they have left. Kinder Morgan knows that this project would never be approved as-is if it were brought directly to Massachusetts. That is why they are using federal eminent domain to push through a project that the public would never agree to.

I have attended many of the public meetings held by elected officials and by Kinder Morgan regarding this pipeline. Contrary to what Kinder Morgan would like us to believe this is not for the benefit of people in New England. The reason for developing this pipeline is for corporate profit through the export of natural gas. We are more than willing to work with Kinder Morgan to help them achieve their goals, but it cannot be a detriment to the public as it is now. Thank you for taking the time to read my letter. Any attention you can give this matter is greatly appreciated.

Richard Crane 95 Overlook Drive Groton, MA 01450

The President The White House 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW Washington, DC 20500

**20150210-5004(30148402).pdf**

Herbert E Hafley, III, Merrimack, NH.

As a homeowner in Merrimack, NH and specifically Whittier Rd., we are 100 % against the proposed pipeline. This pipeline is going to cause more damage to the town of Merrimack, NH and its residents than any benefit that is currently being presented by the people who are proposing this plan. My property value will decrease and our town will be affected in a negative way. Please stop this pipeline.

**20150210-5011(30148416).pdf**

Christina Miller, Pelham, NH.

I would like to make known my opposition to the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. Pipeline/NED project.

I feel it this an unnecessary as the company does not currently completely utilize their existing pipeline and are seeking to build a pipeline much larger than required to service the New England States energy needs.

Although this is their stated intentions, I believe they are being disingenuous and instead plan on using this pipeline to export natural gas out of the US for sale on the World Market. I also believe there is collusion between TGPC/KM with the NE Energy Producers to force this project through with no benefit to the surrounding communities.

I also feel this project will destroy habitat, ruin quality of life, cause a reduction in property values, and harm all the citizens of the communities that are impacted by the construction and presence of the pipeline.

There are significant concerns with the quality of workmanship of other pipelines built and maintained by Kinder Morgan, as well as other pipeline built by other companies, and a significant probability of the failure of this pipeline and possible destruction of property and loss of life based on the numerous accidents recorded in the past 10 years of projects such as the one being proposed

**20150210-5046(30149716).pdf**

Jacqueline Elacqua, Stephentown, NY.

FROM: Jacqueline Elacqua RE: COMMENTS Tennessee Gas Pipeline PF 14-22 Northeast Energy Direct Project

CC: United States Senator Charles Schumer, United States Senator Kirsten Gillibrand, Governor Andrew Cuomo, United States Representative Paul Tonko, State Senator Kathleen Marchione

I am a property owner in the Town of Stephentown, N.Y., a town along the proposed route of the Kinder Morgan fracked gas pipeline to New England (Atlantic Canada? Europe?). If this project is approved there will be miles of industrial gas lines going through our community.

The proposed gasoline would also be going through part of the Rensselaer County Plateau.

FYI: "The Plateau is estimated to be the fifth largest forested region in New York State. Its forests still exist in relatively large continuous blocks with few dividing roads. The Plateau's forests are valuable in providing cleaning air and clean water and ground water recharge. They also provide healthy habitat for many native plants and wildlife. The large unbroken forest is essential to the populations of fisher, bobcat, bear, moose, porcupine, hermit thrush, and black-throated blue warbler. Many birds are experiencing declining population numbers in the Northeast due in part to loss of large blocks of forest.

The Plateau is home to numerous plants that are rare to the regions, and some that are at the global scale. Some examples of rare plant species include: Allegheny vine, Anderson's Peat Moss, Farwell's milfoil, Purple bladderwort and Wood Lily

The ecological distinctiveness of the Rensselaer Plateau has led it to be included in the New York State's Open Space Plan and recognized as an Important Bird Area by Audubon New York, and the focus of conser-

vation efforts of the Rensselaer Land Trust and The Nature Conservancy.”

I am very opposed to this pipeline. This pipeline as proposed has nothing to do with public need and will only benefit a very wealthy private company. The possibility that our community members may be forced to allow this company the use of their land leading to the devaluation of their property, possible destruction of their homes and land, and detrimental effects on their health is terrifying.

This year my husband and I spent thousands of dollars putting in a solar array. As retirees we have saved, and borrowed, money to be able to do this. We made this a goal because we know that continuing to depend on fossil fuels will result in continuing ecological damage, pollution and human health risks. This pipeline preserves the status quo of using fossil fuels over solar, wind, geothermal, etc.

In addition to miles of pipeline, a large compressor may be located in our county. This will also result in pollution to water and air, a devaluation of property and declining quality of rural life with no positive benefits. Kinder Morgan has announced that they are holding public meetings.

Initially there was not going to be a meeting held in our community, then there was one scheduled and the previously scheduled one was cancelled.

Last night the meeting to be held in our community was also cancelled.

I was hoping to attend this meeting to ask one specific question. The question is: I know of many, many reasons why this pipeline is VERY bad for our community. Is there even one thing that would make it positive for OUR COMMUNITY (not Kinder Morgan).

**20150210-5093(30150826).pdf**

**Heritage Commission  
Town of Richmond**  
105 Old Homestead Highway  
Richmond, NH 03470  
www.richmond.nh.gov  
(603) 239-4232

February 6, 2015

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

Re: Comments of the Richmond Heritage Commission in opposition to the proposed Tennessee Gas Northeast Energy Direct pipeline project, Docket No. PF14-22

Dear Ms. Bose:

I am writing in my capacity as chairman of the Heritage Commission of the Town of Richmond, NH to express the views of the Richmond Heritage Commission in opposition to the proposed Northeast Energy Direct pipeline project, Docket Number PF14-22.

Richmond, NH is a small rural community located in the southwestern corner of New Hampshire. It was first chartered in 1735 and incorporated in 1752.

The Richmond Heritage Commission is a town body, organized under NH state statutes (RSA 673 4-a and 674:44-b) and constituted by the voters of Richmond at Town Meeting in March 2014. Its mission is to identify, preserve and protect resources that have historical or cultural significance to Richmond. The formation of the Richmond Heritage Commission is consistent and in furtherance of the vision of the town as identified in the Richmond 2010 Master Plan, namely Section VIII “to preserve and protect historic structures and sites throughout the town”. The text of the Richmond Master Plan is available on the town website, www.richmond.nh.gov.

As currently proposed, the pipeline route will bisect Richmond, disturbing many sites that have been identified by the Richmond Heritage Commission as having historical and cultural significance to the town. These include, among others, historic cellar holes, historic brickyard sites, historic homes, and local areas of scenic beauty. In addition, the route travels through environmentally sensitive wetlands and major aquifers. It traverses conservation lands and will interrupt wildlife corridors and habitat.

Further, its construction and maintenance through our town is contrary to our ideals and vision as expressed in our town Master Plan. See for example the summary of the Town's vision (Section I of the Richmond Master Plan), entitled "Vision":

"The Town of Richmond New Hampshire's Master Plan is a vision of life in a small southwestern rural town that endorses green living through sustainability and transportation, utilities and public services, community and recreation"...

'Sustainability refers to a policy and action which holds up and supports the environment through agriculture, land use, and overall planning that helps communities and individuals therein to participate in an economy that is environmentally and socially friendly, resulting in the reduction and eventual elimination of a distinctive footprint left on Planet Earth globally, regionally and locally.'

Construction of the pipeline through Richmond is therefore contrary to our stated vision for land use within our community, as well as being against our vision of energy development as a whole, since the pipeline is being designed for furtherance of the world's reliance on nonsustainable resources such as fossil fuels, and more particularly for the furtherance of reliance on fracked fossil fuels from the Marcellus Shale.

Town Master Plans are developed under NH state law, see especially NH RSA 674:2. They express the overall guiding principles by which a town seeks to operate, to be further implemented by forms of local regulation and law making in furtherance of these principles. The Master Plan is developed by the town itself, through a lengthy and thought intensive, time intensive democratic process. Federal preemption of a town's ability to legislate local law and regulation in furtherance of the town's master plan makes a travesty of New Hampshire's concept of democracy. In addition to the many ways in which the proposed NED project violates our land and our sense of place, to the extent it is in clear violation of our Master Plan, it is contrary to any notion of local rule under New Hampshire state law.

In summary, the Heritage Commission of the Town of Richmond, NH opposes the proposed pipeline through the Town of Richmond for the negative impact it will have on the town's historic and cultural sites, because it is contrary to the vision of the town as expressed in its Master Plan, because it is contrary to the town's stated position against increased development and reliance on unsustainable energy sources, and because of the negative impact it will have on our community through, among many other aspects, the disruption of open land, aquifers and watersheds, wildlife corridors and natural habitat.

Sincerely,

Carol Jameson

Chairman, Heritage Commission, Town of Richmond NH

Cc: Senator Jeanne Shaheen

Senator Andy Sanborn, NH Senate

Senator Kelly Ayotte

Representative Jim McConnell, NH House

Governor Maggie Hassan

Representative Benjamin Tilton, NH House

Congresswoman Ann M. Kuster

**20150211-0019(30163202).pdf**

HOLLY HIGINBOTHAM  
ROBERT R. WOOD  
300 HIGH STREET HILL ROAD  
WINDSOR, MA 01270  
EMAIL: HIGINBO@HOTMAIL.COM

February 5, 2015

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

RE: Northeast Energy Direct Docket 1PF14-22

Dear Secretary Bose,

We are greatly disturbed about the Kinder Morgan plans for a pipeline and numerous compressor stations in Massachusetts, as well as the way that the concerns of the public appear to be disregarded through the process,

We live in Windsor, where such plans would, if completed, destroy the quality of life we have in this rural town and for no good reason. In fact, most of the information that we have read suggests that the pipeline and its compressor stations will destroy the quality of life everywhere they are located, emitting toxic chemicals into the air, the groundwater and land, as well as creating noise and light pollution. All of this will be harmful to all living beings, animal and vegetative. We further understand that Massachusetts has absolutely no need for the fuel that is proposed to be transported through the state. This is purely for the profit-making endeavor of a private company, Kinder Morgan, and whatever related interests to which it is connected. This is not for the benefit of the citizenry.

We ask that you, as a member of our Government, take into account the interests and health of the Town of Windsor and its residents, as well as the whole of Massachusetts and our nation, to contest the ability of a private company to destroy our natural resources for the pure benefit of its profit-making endeavor. This may be a nation founded on the principles of capitalism, but surely you do not believe that such principles entitle companies to destroy our land, the health of our people, and the animals and plant life with which we share life?

Sincerely,

Holly Higinbotham and Robert R. Wood

**20150211-0024(30163797).pdf**

**STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE**  
OFFICE OF ENERGY AND PLANNING  
107 Pleasant Street, Johnson Hall  
Concord, NH 03301-3834  
Telephone: (603) 271-2155  
Fax: (603) 271-2615

Charles Moser, Chairman CR)  
Mason Board of Selectmen  
16 Darling Road-Mann House  
Mason NH 03048

RE: Town of Mason Spaulding Brook Conservation Area (aka Fletcher) and Doonan CE Properties  
Northeast Energy Direct Project, FERC Docket No. PF 14-22

Dear Mr. Moser:

It has come to our attention that the natural gas pipeline route, proposed by the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company (TGP) in their recent FERC Pre-Filing, proposes to cross the Town's Doonan Conservation Easement property and its Spaulding Brook Conservation Area (a.k.a. Fletcher Parcel). As you may be aware, these two conservation properties were acquired through the State's Land Conservation Investment Program

(LCIP) and, as such, the State maintains an interest in these lands to ensure that its conservation investment is protected. Attached is a copy of the Town of Mason Conservation Project Description from the LCIP Final Report, which provides additional background information about these properties. More information about the LCIP program is also available at <http://www.nh.gov/oeo/Dlannina/Droarams/ciso/index.htm>.

The lands and interests in lands (such as easements) acquired through the LCIP are held in public trust and by law, the sale, transfer, conveyance, or release of any such land or interest in land from public trust is prohibited. In addition, there may be land use restrictions contained in the deeds of these conservation properties that could be in conflict with construction of a pipeline. We hope to work with the Town of Mason and TGP to ensure that impacts to these conservation lands are avoided or mitigated.

We request that our office be included in any discussions between the Town of Mason and TGP and copied on any correspondence that relates specifically to these two conservation properties.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

Tracey Boisvert, Program Director  
Conservation Land Stewardship Director

Enclosure: Town of Mason Conservation Project Description from LCIP Final Report

cc: Mary Maloney, Assistant Attorney General, DOJ  
Mason Conservation Commission  
Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.  
FERC

*{multi-column text and maps not included here}*

**20150211-0032(30162527).pdf**

Hand written letter, Many Tighe, Washington St, Keene, NH, opposing

**20150211-5096(30154951).pdf**

Antonio Robustiano, Albay, NY.

Will help bring in Union jobs in our area. Keep the union strong and in the future for our economy. I approve

**20150211-5100(30155312).pdf**

Walter F Wood, Corinth, NY.

As a union laborer I believe that this is a great opportunity to bring jobs, economy, and better living to the people this state, and the towns and counties in this area. I strongly hope that this project materializes soon for the better of this state and our people.

**20150211-5101(30155315).pdf**

William Purcell, Malta, NY.

I approve this pipeline with Union skilled workers.

**20150211-5102(30155318).pdf**

Edward Mcneff, Waterford, NY.

These jobs will be filled by highly trained local union laborers, that will ease dependence upon foreign energy sources while providing a much needed boost to our local economy

**20150211-5105(30155393).pdf**

Theodore Baltis, Voorheesville, NY.

This is important for union members and their families to live better lives. Also to help energy needs. I approve this pipeline

**20150211-5106(30155406).pdf**

philip kramek, troy, NY.

I approve this pipeline.

**20150211-5108(30155488).pdf**

Ronalo Iorinella, Schenectady, NY.

The NED project has been greatly anticipated for some time now. The positive economic effects that this would bring to the area can not be ignored. There's numerous of benefits that can help tax payers, employ skilled union workers. I embrace the opportunity that this pipeline will provide for my family and others out there

**20150211-5111(30155644).pdf**

Donald A McNeil, Lake George, NY.

The NED will bring good paying, high skilled jobs that will not only support my union 190, but also my other unions in our area. I AM DEFINATLEY A SUPPORTER OF THE NED PROJECT.

**20150211-5112(30155647).pdf**

Paul M Vroman, troy, NY.

I think the pipeline is a good idea because it will bring people jobs that are skilled in our local union. Provide food for families that desperately need it.

**20150211-5115(30155774).pdf**

Robert Hazel, Albany, NY.

- . live locally
- . good paying jobs and long term longevity
- . good for the community through tax revenues
- . lower unemployment rates
- . NED project should be fully supported
- . I APPROVE

**20150211-5127(30155914).pdf**

Robert L Ferrier, South Cario, NY.

We need jobs in this country and NOT send our money all over the world.

Its time we take our country back, and TELL THIS TO WASHINGTON!!

**20150211-5128(30156231).pdf**

Willie Seabrooks, Albany, NY.

I think the NED project will Bring much needed jobs for our union members in the Albany area.

**20150211-5130(30156284).pdf**

Jeff Pock, Selkirk, NY.

This will bring well paying jobs in our community and boost the economy. The possibility of cheaper gas prices and cleaner burning fuels.

**20150211-5139(30156304).pdf**

James G Jones, Amsterdam, NY.

I've worked on every pipeline that came through this area in the years past and let me tell you it is the best thing for our communities. I approve this project.

**20150211-5143(30156370).pdf**

M K Young, Averill Park, NY.

I approve this project!!!

**20150211-5144(30156379).pdf**

Robert F Salamida, Albany, NY.

Help keep workers In the area working.

**20150211-5149(30156520).pdf**

Gary Myers, Loundiville, NY.

I support this project which will create good paying jobs in my area and help meet energy demands safely and efficiently.

**20150211-5150(30156527).pdf**

James M Demarest Jr, Stuyvesent, NY.

this will help provide local union jobs and give a boost to our economy. I approve this project.

**20150211-5152(30156575).pdf**

Glen E. Pepper Jr, Northville, NY.

I think its good. It opens up work for so many union brothers and sisters.

**20150211-5155(30156656).pdf**

Camillo Ferraro, Delmar, NY.

The Energy project proposed would be an asset. It would bring employment to the local area and help incoming revenue in the area as well. I think it is a great idea.

**20150211-5156(30156674).pdf**

James Jordan Jr, Albany, NY.

This work would create great paying jobs for our local union who are trained and skilled I n these areas. This will help tax revenue, local businesses, and also help our schools and infrastructures

**20150211-5160(30156683).pdf**

James J Jordan III, Albany, NY.

This work will create good paying jobs which will create paychecks for our local 190 union. Tax revenues generated by spending can be used to benefit our local schools and infrastructure

**20150211-5161(30156776).pdf**

Alfred C Olsen, Schenectady, NY.

I am looking forward for this large union job to come to the upstate NY area. It will do so much for our economy and put many highly trained man and women to work. I live here, work here, and spend my money here. This job will help NY in every way.

**20150211-5162(30156879).pdf**

Kenneth Stevens, Wynantskill, NY.

I am a retired union member, with 2 sons currently working as union members. We need the good paying jobs, and the clean domestic energy. Our community needs the revenue to help our schools and local government. We need the pipeline.

**20150211-5167(30156941).pdf**

Michael W. Mueller, Glenmont, NY.

For my family this job will certainly help my security in the union. For my union it will help my fellow brothers and sisters as well. I am totally for this project and look forward to the implementation and success of this pipeline.

**20150211-5168(30156944).pdf**

Joseph Vumbaca, Albany, NY.

I would encourage FERC to approve the NED pro[posed project for a 334 mile gas line through our area to help bring good paying union jobs and through tax revenue will help our schools and infrastructure vital to our economy.

**20150211-5169(30157067).pdf**

Bruce Barringer, Scotia, NY.

FERC please consider the many positive results from approving the NED project. As a union member of many years, it is my Opinion after looking at both sides of the agreement, that this pipeline is a win, win, even when considering the negative views from opponents of the project. There's always some sacrifice to be made for a positive gain

**20150211-5193(30157272).pdf**

Jeff Lajoie, Fitzwilliam, NH.

There's no need for a new pipeline. The proposed pipeline is 3-4 times larger then what is needed for the regions need. This is a bad idea that puts natural gas exports above the lives of every day people. This will not lower energy costs. In fact if this pipeline is built it will increase the cost of energy for us in the northeast due to the tariff being charged to consumers of the natural gas.

This project needs to be rejected.

**20150211-5202(30157925).pdf**

Joshua Corl, Homer, NY.

This job will bring good paying jobs to the highly skilled and trained workforce in our area and will be very good for our economy. Thank you

**20150211-5203(30157951).pdf**

Yvonne M Hewitt, Davenport Ctr, NY.

I do live locally and am willing to travel. This project is going to bring good paying jobs which is desperately needed in this area. Not only the jobs but having the domestic energy available as stated above is very important. How can this be a bad thing all the way around it is going to be good jobs and create lots of revenue.. Thank you

**20150211-5216(30158027).pdf**

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

February 11, 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 – January 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 January 1 through January 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. Rich McGuire  
Mr. Michael McGehee  
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  
(January 1, 2015 through January 31, 2015)

Public Outreach

• Tennessee has distributed the following NED Project notifications:

\* Provided the January/February 2015 open house schedule (Market Path component) to impacted elected officials in Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, and Connecticut on January 9, 2015.

\* Notice of upcoming survey activities was provided to impacted elected officials in New Hampshire, New

York, and Massachusetts on January 20, 2015.

\* Provided impacted elected officials in New Hampshire and Massachusetts with notice that the open houses scheduled for January 27 through January 29, 2015 were postponed on January 26, 2015 due to inclement weather.

\* Provided impacted elected officials in New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New York with an updated open house schedule on January 30, 2015.

• Tennessee held or took part in the following stakeholder presentation:

\* Londonderry, New Hampshire -- Presentation to the Londonderry Town Council on January 5, 2015.

\* Milford, New Hampshire -- Presentation to the Milford Board of Selectmen on January 5, 2015.

\* Windham, New Hampshire -- Presentation to the Windham Board of Selectmen on January 5, 2015.

#### Environmental

• Cardno, Inc. has been selected by the Commission as the new third-party contractor to work under the direct supervision and control of the Commission staff for the Project.

• Tennessee re-issued the threatened and endangered (“T&E”) species consultation letters to incorporate the updated preferred Project route.

• Tennessee continued to work on the preparation of draft Resource Reports 1 through 13 for the anticipated filing of these reports by mid-March 2015.

• As of January 31, 2015, biological surveys have taken place over approximately 32.6 miles, or 21 percent, of the NED Project Supply Path component route and approximately 42.4 miles, or 17 percent, of the NED Project Market Path component route. In addition, cultural resource surveys have taken place over approximately 31.2 miles, or 20 percent, of the NED Project Supply Path component route and approximately 30.9 miles, or 12 percent, of the NED Project Market Path component route. Both biological and cultural resource surveys have been suspended for the field season due to winter weather conditions. Table 1 below summarizes the completion status of environmental and cultural surveys.

Table 1: Civil, Biological, and Cultural Surveys Performed

Area*	Survey Survey Completed (miles)		
	Civil**	Environmental	Cultural
Segment (miles)			
NED Project (Supply Path) 159	C: 78.85 D: 71.11	32.6	31.2
NED Project (Market Path) 253	C: 83.10 D: 63.55	42.4	30.9
% Complete	C: 39.31% D: 32.68%	18%	15%

\*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

• The open houses scheduled for January 27 through 29, 2015 were canceled due to inclement weather. These open houses have been re-scheduled for February 24 through 26, 2015.

of Environmental Protection.

• Tennessee met with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service on January 30, 2015 to discuss T&E con-

sultations for the entire Project.

#### Right-of-Way

- Tennessee has obtained survey permission for approximately 29% of the NED Project Market Path component area, and approximately 45% of the NED Project Supply Path component area.
- Title work for the NED Project Market Path component area is approximately 85% completed and the NED Supply Path component area is approximately 52% completed.
- Tennessee received notification of 39 calls made to the Commission's Hotline.
- On January 8, 2015 Tennessee started requesting survey permission from landowners in New Hampshire on the modified preferred route (as filed with the Commission on December 8, 2014). Tennessee has also started to request survey permission for select compressor station sites in New Hampshire, Massachusetts and New York.

#### Engineering

- Tennessee continues to evaluate the proposed route for the Project. Deviations to the proposed route are being made to accommodate construction constraints, and requests from landowners and applicable regulatory agencies. Tennessee engineers are evaluating proposed alternatives, as identified in the draft Resource Report 10 submitted on November 5, 2014, as discussed above, including options to avoid Article 97 properties in Massachusetts on the mainline and the laterals.
- 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 filed and are expected to be received by April 2015. 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 begun aerial photography of the proposed primary route for the Project and for several alternative routes discussed in the draft Resource Report 10 submitted on November 5, 2014. Winter weather has delayed completion of this work until Spring 2015.
- Tennessee is continuing to evaluate locations for proposed compressor stations and meter stations along the proposed route, and site visits are being scheduled.
- Tennessee continues to evaluate routing of laterals based on potential sites for the proposed Market Path Tail Station.
- Tennessee field engineers continue to identify available access roads, pipe/construction yards, and other areas proposed for use during construction

#### **20150211-5227(30158192).pdf**

Kenneth N Forsyth Jr., Elmira hqts, NY.

It would be nice to have this project have a positive impact on our Local economy. Im all for it.

#### **20150211-5252(30158439).pdf**

### **Commonwealth of Massachusetts**

#### **MASSACHUSETTS SENATE**

STATE HOUSE  
BOSTON, MA 02133-1054  
TEL: (617) 722-1612  
FAX: (617) 722-1058  
BARBARA.L'ITALIEN@MASENATE.GOV  
www.MASENATE.GOV

SENATOR BARBARA A. L'ITALIEN

February 5, 2015

Mr. Allen Fore  
Vice President, Public Affairs  
Kinder Morgan, Inc.  
8 Anngina Drive  
Enfield, CT 06082

Dear Mr. Fore:

We are writing to request that Kinder Morgan's Open House on February 17th at the Wyndham Hotel in Andover be rescheduled to a time that does not conflict with the upcoming school vacation week. As you know, the Town Managers of Andover and Tewksbury have already submitted formal requests of a similar nature in separate letters dated on January 13th and January 29th, respectively.

We are concerned that many of our constituents will not be able to attend this important Open House as a result of conflicts associated with February vacation. Furthermore, in review of the list of the other scheduled Open Houses, we feel that none of the dates and locations are convenient to our constituencies and will deprive them of this valuable opportunity to interact with company representatives about the proposed pipeline. After consulting with our municipal governments, we suggest changing the date of the upcoming Open House to Wednesday February 25th or Wednesday March 4th to avoid the current vacation conflict. If these two dates are not available, please contact our offices with other possible dates outside of February vacation week.

We hope you will consider rescheduling this upcoming event so that citizens of our communities may be afforded the opportunity to ask questions and learn more about this proposed project and its impact on our region.

Sincerely,

Barbara A. L'Italien, State Senator  
Colleen M. Garry, State Representative  
James J. Lyons, Jr., State Representative  
James R. Miceli, State Representative  
Frank A. Moran, State Representative

Commonwealth of Massachusetts

MASSACHUSETTS SENATE

STATE HOUSE

BOSTON, MA 02133-1054

TEL: (617) 722-1612

FAX: (617) 722-1058

BARBARA.L'ITALIEN@MASENATE.GOV

www.MASENATE.GOV

SENATOR BARBARA A. L'ITALIEN

February 5, 2015

Mr. Steve Keady  
Kinder Morgan, Inc.  
Consultant, Public Affairs  
9 Park Street, Suite 200  
Boston, MA 02108

Dear Mr. Keady:

We are writing to request that Kinder Morgan's Open House on February 17th at the Wyndham Hotel in Andover be rescheduled to a time that does not conflict with the upcoming school vacation week. As you know,

the Town Managers of Andover and Tewksbury have already submitted formal requests of a similar nature in separate letters dated on January 13th and January 29th, respectively.

We are concerned that many of our constituents will not be able to attend this important Open House as a result of conflicts associated with February vacation. Furthermore, in review of the list of the other scheduled Open Houses, we feel that none of the dates and locations are convenient to our constituencies and will deprive them of this valuable opportunity to interact with company representatives about the proposed pipeline. After consulting with our municipal governments, we suggest changing the date of the upcoming Open House to Wednesday February 25<sup>th</sup> or Wednesday March 4<sup>th</sup> to avoid the current vacation conflict. If these two dates are not available, please contact our offices with other possible dates outside of February vacation week.

We hope you will consider rescheduling this upcoming event so that citizens of our communities may be afforded the opportunity to ask questions and learn more about this proposed project and its impact on our region.

Sincerely,

Barbara A. L'Italien, State Senator  
Colleen M. Garry, State Representative  
James J. Lyons, Jr., State Representative  
James R. Miceli, State Representative  
Frank A. Moran, State Representative

**20150212-0023(30165388).pdf**

**FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

WASHINGTON, DC 20426

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

February 10, 2015

The Honorable Jeanne Shaheen  
United States Senate  
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Shaheen:

Thank you for sending me the January 8, 2015, letter from the Merrimack Town Council, 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).

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 more comprehensive and meaningful review of the project as part of our obligation under the National Environmental Policy Act.

I appreciate the concerns of the Town of Merrimack, New Hampshire, regarding an extension of the comment period. Let me assure you that this planned project is still early in our environmental review process and we have not issued the formal public comment period to date. After the completion of the Tennessee Gas-sponsored open house meetings for the planned project scheduled in January and February 2015, my staff will issue our Notice of Intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the project, which will initiate the formal public comment period. In order to conduct a thorough and comprehensive environmental review, my staff will also hold scoping meetings throughout the project area during the public comment period. 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.

Please be assured, as in any Commission matter, 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,

Cheryl A. LaFleur  
Chairman

**20150212-0044(30166385).pdf**

36 Old New Ipswich Rd.  
Rindge, NH 03461

January 30, 2015

Tennessee Gas Pipelinc Company. LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Rcquested

Rc: Denying Property Access

To Whom It May Concern:

As the owners of the property located at:

36 Old New Ipswich Rd, Rindge, New Hampshire 03461  
Map/Parcel 007-071-0000

we are denying permission to thc Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, I.LC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter our land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose in furtherance of a pipeline infrastructure project. Any such physical entry onto our property from the date of this letter forward will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Donald J. Lawrence  
Beverly F. Lawrence

**20150212-0049(30166495).pdf**

January 30, 2015

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

We, the undersigned residents of Windham, NH and right of way owners wish to express our opposition to the proposed Kinder Morgan, Northeast Energy Direct (NED) natural gas pipeline (KMI/TGP FERC docket 1 PF14-22-000).

Background:

Little concrete information has been provided by KMI/TGP to towns or stakeholders who will bear the burden of this project. One would expect that a plan of this magnitude (transporting natural gas from frack-ing fields in NY tk PA to MA) would take years for reviews and approvals, and it has....in Massachusetts! However in December the route was changed to southern New Hampshire. In part, KMI/TGP cited one reason for dropping the original route, "to avoid (in certain cases) and minimize (in other cases) the crossing of Article 97 properties and areas of critical environmental concern in Massachusetts". We suggest that the residents of all 17New Hampshire towns affected have similar concerns.

While the route has changed, the original planning timeline has not. Massachusetts's residents have had a couple of years to review the proposal, New Hampshire residents have only months to review the potential impact of this project before a formal proposal will be presented to the Federal Energy Commission early this fall.

On January 5th, KMI/TGP representatives provided the selectman with a sanitized depiction for the bucolic state West Windham will have after the construction of this massive pipeline. "Collocation of pipeline with the power line ROW' ....Minimal impact to only 46 homeowners over the 2 miles proposed through Windham...Ready willingness to negotiate with homeowners over compensation. "

#### Issues Concerning Us:

- o Collocation does not mean under or with the power lines. It means beside the power line ROW. The 50'OW now becomes a 100' to 200'OW. This means that not just backyards will be taken, but porches, and probably houses. In fact nearly the entire western side of Autumn Street and numerous homes on Mammoth Road will be in the path of the pipeline ROW.
- o High Consequence Area - The volume and pressures associated with this pipeline create an HCA with a radius of 1,000 feet. If an explosion occurred, mortality within the HCA is calculated at 90% with 90 seconds. This zone extends the impact of the pipeline from the 47 directly impacted ROW owners to over a hundred homes.
- o KMI/TGP's apparent willingness to negotiate is basically a 'take it or leave it' offer prior to a filing of eminent domain. These offers will only be available to the "lucky" 47 homeowners. HCA owner receive nothing. At this time, there is no real knowledge of what these "offers" will be. The rumored payment is \$36 per linear foot of easement - a payment so small that in most cases it would hardly cover the legal fees to have the final deed adjustment reviewed by a lawyer. In no way does this payment cover the true devaluation of any property with a gas line easement on it.

#### Our Position:

What we have is a for-profit, international corporation worth billions, proposing a pipeline that will provide billions more in revenue. KMI/TGP claims energy needs in the Northeast as the driving force for the need of the pipeline. Numerous energy experts dispute their findings and there is strong evidence that ultimately the natural gas sent through this pipeline will be exported. As New Englanders, we are naturally skeptical that a for-profit corporation is doing us a favor. In fact, we believe that this private corporation is using energy demands as a wedge issue to divide opposition while using regulations and politics against private citizens for corporate profit.

#### Call to Action:

As residents of Windham we require further information on the following....

- o An open discussion of the NED plan and its anticipated impacts upon the citizens of Windburn.
- o The timeline proposed by Kinder Morgan is unrealistic and that pre-filing period must be extended & from the current closing date of 3/18/2015 to 6/18/2015 or later.
- o Windham residents feel that Kinder Morgan is misrepresenting the nature of this project in the following ways:
  - ~ Kinder Morgan's information is insufficient and misleading.
  - ~ The construction phase of this project will be a massive build out on the scale of new highway and while representing it as a simple "cut and cover" project.
  - ~ 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 natural gas adjacent to high voltage power lines and very close to residences.
  - ~ The project threatens injury and damage to the 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 &om

leaching into surface and ground water.

~ The project will have an adverse impact on Beaver Brook and associated wetlands.

~ The project threatens injury and damage to irreplaceable rural character of the town and the aesthetics of the town, in violation of the letter and spirit of the 2005 Windham master plan, and town planning and zoning ordinances.

~ The project violates the NH State Constitution Article 12a which states... “no part of a person’s property shall be taken by eminent domain and transferred, directly or indirectly, to another person if the taking is for the purpose of private development or other private use of the property.”

~ Finally our enjoyment and continued residence in Windham is in jeopardy. Our ability to buy or sell real estate...to make retirement and future plans has been totally upended in the last 90 days. It is expected that property value will plummet during the planning and construction phase with a slight rebound over the next decade.

We the undersigned stand firm in our opposition to the pipeline and want to ensure that Federal regulators are aware of the citizen concerns.

Sincerely, the undersigned.

(Signatures attached on separate page)

Paul Sullivan

3 Autumn St

Windham, NH. 03087

psullivan@unitedglass.com

603-303-6227

*{15 names signed}*

**20150212-5028(30158664).pdf**

LEO & LISA SENUS  
594 SAND PIT ROAD  
MASON, NEW HAMPSHIRE 03048

February 11, 2015

Mr. Robert Naramore

Percheron LLC

Contract Land Agent to TGP

1180 Cheney Road

Lowell, VT 05847

Via e-mail: rob@robnaramore.com

Re: Northeast Energy Direct Project

LL# NH FLE 5.00

Hillsborough Co/Mason

PL 900-1

Dear Mr. Naramore:

We are in receipt of your letter dated January 30, 2015, regarding denial of access to our property.

Please be assured that we have an excellent understanding of the subject project and its impact to our property directly, and to the Town of Mason generally. Our decision to deny access is not a knee-jerk reaction. Rather, it is a considered and thoughtful decision based on experience, both personal and professional. Having survived one gas pipeline explosion (Edison, NJ in April 1994), we do not care to repeat the experience.

We reiterate that we are denying access to Kinder Morgan, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, its contractors, and agents for any purpose in furtherance of the NED project. This includes any and all survey activities, and visits by any KM/TGP representative or agent to discuss the project. Any such entry will be considered trespass, and the Mason Police will be contacted.

We trust that we have made ourselves clear and that our request will be honored.

Sincerely,

Leo Senus  
908-552-1156  
Leo.Senus@gmail.com

Lisa Senus  
908-246-0098  
Lisa.Senus@gmail.com

PS: Your letter references enclosures (project fact sheet, hand-out about field work, and survey permission form). None were enclosed.

cc: FERC Docket No. PF14-22-00  
Mason Police Department

**20150212-5052(30160379).pdf**

David Lister, Rindge, NH.

I respectfully request that the open house scheduled for February 23 in Rindge, New Hampshire be rescheduled, as it currently falls during the school district's winter vacation week, and many families will be vacationing and unable to attend.

**20150212-5119(30162293).pdf**

Jeanne E. Sable, Fitzwilliam, NH.

I oppose the Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline's NED pipeline and its proposed route through 17 New Hampshire communities, including Fitzwilliam. Here's why.

The "granite state" is so named for a reason. The plan to bury nearly 80 miles of high-pressure gas pipeline in New Hampshire translates to a thoroughfare of blasting through granite boulders and ledge all along the route. Our small New Hampshire towns rely almost exclusively on private wells for drinking water. The toxic chemicals used in blasting could easily contaminate all these natural resources. Herbicides applied to vegetation along the corridor would have similar negative impacts.

In Fitzwilliam alone, this plan would disrupt at least 88 acres of town lands and violate deed restrictions on property that was set aside strictly for hiking, open space and conservation. The proposed route traverses a state park, future conservation areas identified in our town's Open Space Plan, and important lakes, streams, wetlands and stratified drift aquifers.

Ugly industrial compressor stations have no place in a scenic, rural tourist state such as New Hampshire. Besides the constant loud, jarring noises from these facilities, they are harshly lit and spew foul smelling gasses that can include the carcinogens formaldehyde, benzene, sulfuric oxide, or toluene. Other unknowable toxins may also be emitted. Neighbors to these stations have complained of nosebleeds, rashes, headaches, sore throats, dizziness and nausea. Their lives are ruined, but they can't move because they can't sell their homes. And despite KM's assurances that these compressor stations are few and far between, additional facilities are commonly added as time goes on. The residents of the Monadnock Region of New Hampshire have no desire to live in an industrialized area. This is clearly stated in our town master plans and zoning ordinances lawfully voted on and passed by local citizens.

KM/TGP claim that burying this 36-inch high-pressure natural gas pipeline adjacent to high voltage electric transmission corridors is ideal for NH because an infrastructure is already in place. But knowledgeable electrical engineers and emergency responders alike consider this co-location a recipe for disaster. Ruptures occur even at pressures much lower than the 1400-1500 p.s.i. anticipated for NED. The gas industry itself has documented numerous explosions resulting in human fatalities, burn injuries, structure fires, and acres

of charred land up to more than 900 feet from pipeline ruptures. Regardless of how state-of-the-art this proposed pipeline might be, accidents such as the Walnut Creek Pipeline Blast of 2004 do happen. (A Mountain Cascade backhoe operator accidentally punctured a high-pressure Kinder Morgan pipeline because “Kinder Morgan had failed to mark a bend in the Walnut Creek line,” according to reports.) Small mistake. Large consequence. Here in the densely populated Northeast, FERC would be subjecting countless more citizens to such hazards by permitting this project.

New Hampshire would not benefit from this pipeline. Kinder Morgan has already hired out of state workers for preliminary work in Massachusetts. Any job opportunities for our state would be for short-term, unskilled positions.

Even our need for NED’s fracked gas has not been demonstrated. Our state actually exports surplus electricity during all but rare peak demand periods. In NH, there is much room for improvement in energy conservation, which could help meet those peak demands. So could renewable energy such as wind and solar, which are growing and will very likely outlive rapidly dwindling fracked gas supplies which have shown an average decline of 85 percent over three years. The construction of this pipeline would only extend New Hampshire’s dependence on fossil fuels, contrary to the goals of reduced carbon emissions outlined in the “New Hampshire Climate Action Plan” (NHCAP). It would contribute to global warming, degrading the earth’s atmosphere through methane, carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions. Investment in this fossil fuel infrastructure is also contrary to New Hampshire’s agreement in the “Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative” (RGGI) plan.

KM/TGP has failed to make a case that anything but a small token amount of gas from this large capacity high pressure pipeline would actually serve NH. The cost to run lower pressure distribution lines to rural neighborhoods is financially unfeasible and very unlikely to happen in our cash-strapped small towns. Add to that, the cost to homeowners to hook up, and it becomes clear that this gas will never reach the vast majority of NH households and businesses.

Promised tax revenues would be offset significantly by the loss of revenue from property devaluations, loss of tourism and related businesses—restaurants, inns, antique shops, motels, resorts—and the increased cost of emergency services, road maintenance, and other municipal needs arising from this pipeline. Real estate agents say property values will plummet and our ability to sell, mortgage, or insure our homes would be greatly compromised by this project. Yet, we would be paying for it through tariffs on our electric bills.

Applications filed with the DOE show conclusively that the bulk of any gas carried by NED is intended for shipment to foreign shores. KM/TGP are marketing an infrastructure. KM officials have said their company would profit from this pipeline regardless of whether any product flows through it. It is in no way justifiable that land be taken by eminent domain for this private business venture. It is clearly NOT for the public good. In fact, this pipeline would harm the public. If FERC has never before denied a permit, KM/TGP’s NED pipeline is an excellent place to start. I urge you to reject this plan. It’s not clean, not cheap, not for us.

**20150213-0018(30167422).pdf**

*{originally “File 30166539\_1.tif cannot be converted to PDF.”}*

Ernest Andre Kirslis

The Calhoun Pasture, 220 Goddard Road, Rindge, New Hampshire  
(Mailing address: P.O. Box 6, Central Village, Connecticut 06332)

January 23, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Regulatory Energy Commission  
88 First Street, ND, Room 1A  
Washington, DC20426

Docket: PF14-22

Dear Secretary Bose:

I am writing regarding the Tennessee Gas Pipeline (TGP) Company's planning to bring a pipeline system through or immediately adjacent to land I own in Rindge, New Hampshire. This letter is to notify both the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) and TGP of my intention to actively participate in the pre-filing process for the Northeast Energy Direct project proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC. In considering the environmental impact and other factors weigh'd by you, I would like to ask you and the FERC to carefully consider the impact upon both historical and agricultural aspects of the land through the pipeline "C04Id permanently" of the town of Rindge. The Calhoun Pasture is a parcel of historical and agricultural significance to myself, the Town of Rindge, and the State of New Hampshire. It is specifically mentioned by name in many of the archived town's annual reports held "as historic records kept at the Ingalls Memorial Library. It has also remained an un-subdivided land tract since before colonial times, and is completely surrounded by the early American stone walls that are an integral part of its history. Over the centuries the Calhoun Pasture has been looked after and preserved by the families who have owned it. Among them are specific individuals noted in the town's historic book "History of the Town of Rindge, New Hampshire" to include the revolutionary war era soldier and later Second Ridge Meetinghouse deacon, Hezekiah Hubbard, who marched from Rindge in Captain Samuel Stone's company in colonial times in answer to the request of the men of Rindge for assistance in hopes of holding Ticonderoga after Ethan Allen and Benedict Arnold's capture of the fort. The parcel received its name after the ownership of it traces directly back to the very 'father' of the town, Abel Platts, sold to the Hubbard family. It was also Hezekiah's eldest son Otis Hubbard, who had the property passed to him by his father and with his own death was the individual who bequeathed in trust to the town of Rindge six hundred dollars in 1895, a great sum of money at that time, for a clock for the town that to this day graces Rindge's historic meeting house originally built in the late 1700's when Samuel Stone was on the committee for its construction. Rindge's Second Meetinghouse is one of the largest in New England, and is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The Calhoun Pasture is a land tract in the town of historic significance.

New England towns and their identities come from our colonial past, a past rich in history, and one that some sense of protection for must be acknowledged. Otherwise, the disregard of our past history, segmentation and elimination of our historic land features and agricultural lands will surely lead to the day when farms are far and few between, and the absence of preservation of our heritage will be looked upon as an unfathomable tragedy. The TGP route need not cross and permanently destroy this parcel of land when land in the existing utility corridor owned by the Public Service Company of New Hampshire adjacent to it can be used for the pipeline route if the TGP project is granted.

During the 1960's eminent domain allowed the creation of the electric utility corridor by the Public Service of New Hampshire through the town of Rindge, and a portion of the property, a .45 acre triangular corner of it had a right of way established across it with the creation of what today is the current 345kV high voltage utility corridor. At present this portion extends part way into the corridor with power lines overhead that area. In spite of the current PSNH easement, use of my land within the corridor for the growing of Christmas trees and orchard is possible as long as the trees are maintained so as not to grow to such a height as to interfere with the power lines far overhead. Above a pipeline route, such is strictly prohibited. Now the utility corridor is targeted by TGP for widening, and representatives of Kinder-Morgan have stated to me they are seeking a four hundred foot (400') wide path centered on the existing utility corridor for surveying. This is to meet their needs to accommodate an additional one hundred foot wide corridor outside the existing corridor affording the ability to switch back and forth outside either side of it as TGP deems necessary, but preferably construct the pipeline south of, adjacent to the existing PSNH corridor.

It is unreasonable to establish a wider utility corridor and take private land outside the existing corridor when land in the existing corridor is owned by a utility company, or already has a right of way upon it and may be used. I am requesting the pipeline not cross my land within the corridor as it need not, and crossing it would require the permanent removal of its historic stone walls when the pipeline can be routed around

the Calhoun Pasture in the existing corridor. Preferably, I would rather the pipeline not be permitted at all. Regardless, the existing PSNHeasement also acknowledges in its language the significance of the parcel's historic stone walls, an irreplaceable part of history that have stood since colonial times. Specifically it notes the grantee's (PSNH's) rights, "shall not include the right to remove demolish, destroy, or disrupt in any way the stone walls or rock boundaries" further requiring PSNH "to replace and restore said boundaries to its original condltlon" even if opened accidentally. It also acknowledges that "Said walls and boundaries are essential and mandatory to the security of the property" and long "existed before the grantee's arrival. N The land in the corridor that abuts this northern boundary of the Calhoun Pasture along the 380' of the property's northern stone wall boundary from its northeast corner is a four acre parcel completely within the corridor that Is owned by the Public Service Company of New Hampshire. Both the Calhoun Pasture easement triangle and the four acre PSNHowned parcel each within the corridor also each have approximately one hundred feet of frontage on the west side of Goddard Road allowing the pipeline route to be placed on PSNHland. For the pipeline route to cross the Calhoun Pasture, its historic stone walls would be removed and destroyed, the easement on the land taken would permanently prevent any trees from being grown on it. If the pipeline is approved I ask you require the route not to cross my land parcel. There is adequate room on the PSNHland for the accessto build and construction of the pipeline.

Logic does not dictate for the taking and use of private, historic, and agriculturally important and zoned for such use land when the land adjacent to the Calhoun Pasture is available for such use. USDAsoil maps and use studies that overlay my land where TGP has requested survey permission targeted for the pipeline are shown by USDAas areas if deforested that would not have future prospects for agricultural use for pasture or hay, the only use possible in cleared swaths, and others as "farmland of local importance" which depend on the parcel's northern boundary tree line as a wind break. In addition, for many past years, the careful planning and development of the property as a developing permaculture based forest garden organic farm has been underway to include discussion with residents of the town and its selectmen in addressing current use requirements and other issues. The loss of agricultural land that will permanently prevent portions of this hlstorlc, stone wall enclosed property from ever being utilized for any sort of silviculture to include native species or orchard is unreasonable when the existing utility corridor possessesadequate land. Use instead of that land owned by a utility company would allow the boundary walls, vital to the property's security, and an important part of the Town's and State's history to remain undisturbed.

Tile soils on the north boundary of the property are predominantly Berkshire and Monadnock, or Berkshire type soils, 365 on the northwest corner, and Berkshire type 73 and 77 soils moving eastward. Should the pipeline be given an easement on my property to the south of the corridor the clear cutting in the 365 and 73 type areas which support white pine and all varieties of Christmas trees would leave no future prospects for it as each is not suitable to farming, or not suited to cultivated crops or hay as noted in the USDACHeshire County Soil Survey. On the northeast corner and remainder of the property are 77 type soils classified as 'farmland of local importance by the USDANatural ResourcesConservation Service. With the open space of the utility corridor, loss of the tree line to the north due to further widening of the corridor to accommodate the pipeline would eliminate the property's only windbreak needed for use of much of the remainder of the land with the ongoing farming planning and development. In such a wide swath to the south ofthe corridor regarding the Calhoun Pasture lies the property's driveway, stands of century old white pine trees which survived the Category 3 Great Hurricane of 1938, and in separating the property from the visual scar upon the landscape of the utility corridor the presence of which in no way whatsoever justifies the widening of. Further widening of the corridor place the exposed timber lines in it at greater risk of storm damage in the future, and pose a greater burden on PSNHregarding 'danger trees' as well as land owner timber at greater peril to wind exposure with future severe storms and hurricanes Inevitable. The 1938 Hurricane is documented as causing forest damage in 35 percent of New England's land area, and over 10,000,000 board feet down in Rindge alone, an extreme fire hazard. The TGPcannot provide an emergency action plan in response to a pipeline accident in the same way PSNH can for hazards for its own infrastructure to Include forest fire hazards, especially following natural disasters such as hurricanes, or acts of terrorism.

The Kinder-Morgan preferred southern side of the corridor path for their one hundred foot wide cleared swath of land, and taking of a permanent fifty foot wide swath would deforest approximately two acres of the Calhoun Pasture, leaving much of that land area permanently deforested, and necessitate removal of the property's stone walls, while leaving the Public Service of New Hampshire company owned four acre land area within the corridor unused. This makes absolutely no sense to me.

The Northeast Energy Direct Project pipe capacity is sized to accommodate well in excess of two billion, 2,000,000,000, cubic feet of gas per day. If authority is granted to this project, in the immediate future the pipeline, such a quantity of gas, along with the possible or inevitable future transport of "liquefied natural gas" as well in any right-of-way for such a pipeline and its required substations will pass through my land or through land adjacent to my property impacting it. As a result the impact the pipeline would have on my property, its value, on the future use of the property, and upon the town is extremely negative. My concerns also include, though are not limited to, the environmental impacts, habitat fragmentation, soil compaction, and the permanent impact upon land due to grave severance or stigma factors. Residents of the town and county are broadly against the pipeline. Having such a pipeline on or adjacent to my property would discourage them from coming to it as an organic farm and purchase fruits and vegetables from it. There is a very limited amount of land within Rindge that is zoned specifically for agricultural use and my property is zoned as such. A right of way for a pipeline across my property would effectively bring to an end in my lifetime the ability to use it for existing as well as future planned silviculture, and organic farming. Furthermore, just east of Goddard road, the entire corridor makes an abrupt turn northeastward, and routing of the pipeline on the south side of the corridor near my property serves no advantage over within the corridor as the pipeline as a whole must cross the lake to the east of Goddard Road which is wider on the south side of the corridor, and the pipeline route must shift northward regardless thereafter.

I intend to address these and other specific interests and concerns in more detail during the entire process relative to the development of this project. Thank you for the opportunity to participate in this process

Sincerely,

Ernest Andre Kirslis

Enclosures (21:

Calhoun Pasture easement to PSNH, 3 pages

Great Hurricane of 1938 "Blowdown" Timber and Forest Fire Hazard map, 1 page

*{maps, deed copies, etc., not included here}*

**20150213-0019(30167431).pdf**

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

Date: February 9, 2015

Re: Denial of access to my property

As the owner of property located at  
231 Madden Road, Stephentown, NH 12168

I hereby deny to Kinder Morgan and its subsidiaries and all its 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 contract or propose to 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 wgl be considered unauthorized and treated as trespass.

Gordon Kuster, MD Sandra S. Kuster

*{followed by hand written letter of concern}*

**20150213-0020(30167432).pdf**

**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

February 3, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20146

RE: Request for Reschedule of Kinder-Morgan's Open House

Dear Secretary Bose:

Please find enclosed a letter to Mr. Steve Keady, Kinder-Morgan dated January 29, 2015 regarding their Open House for your records.

Sincerely,

Richard A. Montuori

**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

January 29, 2015

Mr. Steve Keady  
Kinder-Morgan  
Consultant, Public Affairs  
9 Park St., Suite 200  
Boston, MA 02108

Dear Mr. Keady:

As you know, the Town of Tewksbury requested that Kinder-Morgan's Open House scheduled for February 17 at the Wyndam Hotel in Andover be rescheduled. The reasons for the request was because the date chosen by Kinder-Morgan falls during the school vacation week and many residents will not be able to attend and the other dates and locations are not convenient to our residents and residents of sunounding communities. I would once again ask that the open house scheduled for February 17 be rescheduled to a

time that does not conflict with school vacation and instead to a time and location that provides residents the best opportunity to attend and take part in discussing this very important issue. I would hope you agree that informing residents and answering their questions or concerns is vital to the integrity of this process and the current date of the Open House does not afford that opportunity to many citizens of our community. I would appreciate strong consideration to this request.

Sincerely,

Richard A. Montuori

RAM/jmt

**20150213-4001(30165367).pdf**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
**FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

PRE-FILING CONFERENCE CALL

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC

Docket No: PF14-22-000

NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT PROJECT

February 10, 2015

Attendees:

- Tennessee Gas Pipeline (TGP):
  - o Jacquelyne Rocan
  - o Bob Letson
  - o Allen Fore
  - o Howdy McCracken
  - o Adrienne Mason
  - o Kasia Ingram
- FERC
  - o Eric Tomasi
  - o Wayne Kicklighter (Cardno)

Meeting Summary

The conference call was conducted to discuss the schedule of open houses for the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project relative to the near-term weather forecast and longer term winter weather conditions in the Project area. Topics discussed included:

- Open houses the week of February 16: FERC staff strongly recommended that TGP postpone the open houses for the week of February 16. TGP responded that it would assess the weather forecast for the coming week and make a determination by February 13 as to whether to postpone its open houses scheduled for the week of February 16. If the meetings were not postponed on February 13, TGP would continue to assess the forecast to determine whether some or all meetings scheduled that week should be postponed associated with the possibility of a mid-week storm.
- Open houses the week of February 23: TGP would proceed with conducting its open houses scheduled for the week of February 23, and similarly monitor the weather forecast to assess whether those meetings postponed based on the weather forecast February 20 and beyond.
- Open houses tentatively schedule in March: Upon recommendation by FERC staff, TGP agreed that it would not conduct open houses in March, and wait until April to hold any remaining open houses.

[NOTE]

On February 12, 2015, TGP notified FERC staff that it would continue with open houses for the week of February 16.

**20150213-5052(30164251).pdf**

David Akers, Merrimack, NH.

First of all I cannot understand why any politician or public servant that is elected by the citizens would be in favor of this pipeline in Merrimack. I will find each and every elected official in favor of this and cast my vote against them.

I see nothing about this pipeline that benefits the citizens of Merrimack. This will threaten local species like the Peregrine Falcon and Blanding's turtle (which are endangered). Our town water comes from the ground through wells which is unique to Merrimack. The pipeline poses an undetectable risk to this ground water that we would not realize until people actually become ill and have to file a law suite.

Merrimack is also home to a large number of game hunters many of which will be in close proximity to the pipeline. A stray bullet could easily pierce the pipeline producing potentially catastrophic results. Local businesses such as Budweiser and the Premium Outlets will be affected during the construction phase and if potential problems arise, this could cause these business to leave or reduce their work forces hurting Merrimack's already fragile economy.

Why would any public official be in favor of this? You work for us and we do NOT want this. Do your job an honor your duty to the citizens of Merrimack

**20150213-5159(30166595).pdf**

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:

**TGP ignores "strong recommendation" from FERC**

Below are two quotes from a 1-page comment just published by FERC. It concerns a recent conference call between Tennessee Gas Pipeline personnel and FERC staff regarding the scheduling of TGP Open Houses in light of the record amounts of snowfall in New England and the continuing storms that are forecast for the coming week:

**"Open houses the week of February 16:** FERC staff strongly recommended that TGP postpone the open houses for the week of February 16. TGP responded that it would assess the weather forecast for the coming week and make a determination by February 13 as to whether to postpone its open houses scheduled for the week of February 16."

And then at the bottom of the page was this note:

"[NOTE] On February 12, 2015, TGP notified FERC staff that it would continue with open houses for the week of February 16."

Perhaps I'm just not understanding who's in charge of the pre-filing process here. FERC staff "strongly recommended" that TGP reschedule open houses for the week of February 16, presumably to allow the maximum number of affected residents to be able to attend the open houses . And TGP simply thought it over and refused to delay the meetings?

Is it within FERC's power to do something beyond a strong recommendation? Is there any sanction on TGP for not complying with FERC's strong recommendations? If not, why would TGP ever bother to comply with FERC's "strong recommendation" about any matter concerning this pipeline proposal? It seems that TGP is not very concerned about FERC's opinions regarding the public's right to be informed about TGP's pipeline plans and it feels free to ignore FERC as it wishes.

What other strong recommendations from FERC can we look forward to TGP ignoring in the future?

Nick Miller Groton, MA

**20150217-5006(30168031).pdf**

Stephen Pentak, Stephentown, NY.

I am a steward for a Rensselaer Land Trust conservation easement that is on the Black River in Stephentown NY, and a resident of Stephentown.

I am writing to protest the planned Kinder Morgan fracked gas pipeline that is proposed to run through Stephentown NY. You will find a number of compelling arguments against this will be sent to you from the many people opposed to this proposal who feel their homes and property values and peace of mind are threatened. I will comment on one aspect alone that may not be offered by others.

Just recently The Rensselaer Plateau was ranked 5th nationally in a competition for Legacy Forest funding. This all but assures the funding of a project to set aside over 12,000 acres from any future development. This is one of New York's largest intact forests totaling just over 100,000 acres. It is a bitter irony that a high pressure gas line should traverse the plateau, the construction of which threatens to disturb at least six native brook trout spawning streams and the presence of such a pipeline would be a ticking time bomb that could devastate them. Read an article in The Eastwick NY Press of this week (February 13) that outlines an issue of a dam that feeds Black River, the failure of which would be catastrophic should it damage the pipeline. ("Black River Pond Dam poses Risk".)

This pipeline does not serve our energy needs but only enhances the opportunity to export natural gas. And for this we are asked to scar and threaten a remaining natural treasure. NO!

**20150217-5062(30168153).pdf**

deborah a. pomerleau, parker, CO.

This pipeline will damage the environment, damage the water supply system, have long term health effects, give terrorists a way to destroy key communities, and it does not provide long term jobs. Please please do not approve this.

I am extremely worried about what terrorists could do with this pipeline

**20150217-5066(30168161).pdf**

Steve Tirrell, Litchfield, NH.

Comments to FERC on PF14-22

64 Nesenkeag Drive

Litchfield NH

I live on a lot on Nesenkeag Drive in Litchfield NH very close to the proposed pipeline installation. Obviously I am very biased against this since it ruins my property and myself financially, only to benefit an out of state corporation's shareholders. Like Northern Pass and Seabrook Station this pipeline only costs residents and benefits out of state concerns. Seabrook by itself is enough of a sacrifice for the residents of the state of NH to have made for the region, this second punch in the throat is just over the top. In their statement of benefits made to the town they list the proposed tax impact and it is nothing compared to the costs involved in having the pipeline pass through as well as the lost tax revenue from all the neighborhoods in the path. Two other points are worth mentioning. A recently built high school is not that far from the installation, less than two miles. A middle school is about an equal distance in the opposite direction. The site involved passes through an aquifer that leads directly to the Merrimack river, which it crosses as well. But the greatest impact is on the residential end. The vast majority of homes near the proposed site become undervalued in terms of the loans that their owners have taken against them. So a lot of them get turned into zombie listings and that drives the values nearby even lower. A New England version of Detroit is created. And this

benefits no one from NH, the benefits that they talk about in lowered electrical costs are thin to the point where they're almost strictly theoretical.

Litchfield is a residential community with some farming activities and a couple small businesses to contribute to the tax base. Land and houses are a little on the pricey side and the tax rate is on the higher side. Because it's a small town you won't get that many comments from residents, typically when something like this happens people hear about it after the window for comments has closed. If the tax base here deteriorates then the town will slowly fade out, families that can't afford the tax bills will leave, as well as families that don't want to live near the incineration zone. In general, this land is worth much more left as is. In closing, I am hoping that you can expect many comments such as mine in response to this proposal, it's a bald faced attempt at an indirect land grab that should infuriate residents. The sad truth, however, is that people are so jaded by the recent exploits of federal agencies ranging from FEMA to the IRS that you will probably not see the kind of response that you should. So I hope this can be thought of as a statement not only from myself and family but from the neighborhood and town. New Hampshire is sick of land grabs and out of state hucksters coming in trying to suck us into supporting their proposals by waving some tax revenue at us.

I'm sure you'll hear more from my neighbors in the path of this mess.

Sincerely

Steve Tirrell

**20150217-5069(30168167).pdf**

Don Ogden, Florence, MA.

The Kinder Morgan/TGP Northeast Energy Direct (NED) gas pipeline proposed to go through northern Massachusetts, southern New Hampshire and culminating in Dracut, MA creates more problems than it will solve.

Tariff - Publicly subsidizing a gas pipeline is unprecedented, unnecessary and poor public policy. Ratepayers should not be expected to cover the costs of a multi-billion dollar, for-profit corporation, and certainly not without a voice in the process.

The NED pipeline project would increase Massachusetts greenhouse gas emissions from current levels making compliance with the goals the people set in the MA Global Warming Solutions Act impossible. .

Protected Lands, MA Constitution Article 97 – MA has made an environmental and financial choice/commitment to protect the lands this project will disrupt.

Energy Security – sole reliance on gas for heat and electricity makes us extremely vulnerable to any price fluctuations and supply issues with this single resource. Diversity makes us much more resilient.

Green Jobs – growing our green economy will provide many more, and local, jobs than the same investment in fossil fuel infrastructure.

Pipeline Capacity/Export – recent applications for export terminals in Maine and Nova Scotia clearly indicate the plan to use the NED to transport gas for export. FERC's mandate is to act in the public's interest, but this project acts in the interest of a corporation's quest for private profit.

FERC should be focusing on the issues around repair and upkeep of existing gas pipelines that are leaking dangerous methane into the atmosphere and endangering the public rather than paving the way for yet more infrastructure.

**20150217-5072(30168173).pdf**

Robert Wallick, Windsor, CT.

Kimberly D. Rose

Re: Docket No. PF14-22-000

According to 2015 FY FERC Congressional Performance Budget Request (<http://www.ferc.gov/about/strat->

docs/fy15-budg.pdf); The FERC has three primary goals. Goal number 2 is Promote the development of safe, reliable, secure and efficient energy infrastructure that serves the public interest.

I am questioning the FERC's ability to justify that the development and transportation of Natural Gas from the Marcellus Shale field is safe, efficient and in the best interest of the public.

The Pennsylvania TENORM study shows that the gas from this specific location has an extremely high concentration of Radon. Exposing the public to higher quantities of Radon (and other radioactive materials) does NOT serve the public interest and is of great safety concern.

Before the FERC can allow the construction of any additional pipelines or operations involving the Marcellus Shale you must perform independent studies to show objective evidence that this High Radon content is not a risk to public safety.

You must develop a method to determine the quantity of methane that is released at every wellhead, pumping station and any other place that is or may leak. This must be done to determine the impact that this method of acquiring and transporting natural gas has on meeting the Greenhouse Gas and Ozone targets of the states that produce, transport or use the gas (including residential uses).

I would also question the FERC's ability to differentiate between the public interest and the political or financial interests involved with these actions. How can you operate in the best interest of the public if there is even a hint of bias in your decisions? There is currently more than a hint of bias based on the quantity of projects approved compared to the number rejected. To further the question of actual or perceived bias is the fact that the entire FERC budget is based on the fees collected from the industry that they are regulating. It is hard to reject requests from the people that are essentially signing your paycheck. The Federal Power Act and the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1986 have allowed and even fostered bias (real or perceived) for the industry that the FERC is supposed to be regulating.

There have been significant disasters involving natural gas pipelines in the last few years. You continue to approve the same companies involved in these disasters to build more pipelines without any additional oversight, changes in construction techniques or improved maintenance programs. This shows bias towards the pipeline industry over public interest and public safety.

Before FERC approves the Tennessee / Kinder Morgan NED pipeline please provide

1. Objective evidence of need for the people of New England,
2. Justification for the excess quantity and associated excess risk
3. Objective evidence of safety evaluations from wellhead to consumers homes,
4. Objective evidence that this is the most fiscally responsible method of bridging any energy short falls (spikes twice a day for 3-27 days per year historically),
5. Evaluation of alternative energy infrastructure impact (increased use of pellet stoves, solar panels and energy efficiency at home and business)
6. Re-evaluation on the cost projections and usage of Natural Gas (considering the current reduced demand and lowest prices since 2011)
7. Environmental impact study that evaluates methane leaks and compliance to existing state and federal greenhouse gas and ozone depleting substance reductions
8. Evaluation of fiscal impact on Cities and Towns regarding new training and equipment investments surrounding emergency management related to having a natural gas pipeline inside their borders
9. Impact on local medical services to deal with large casualty counts in the case of a natural gas incident
10. Loss of property value and tax base for Cities and Towns
11. Loss of property value for residents (who wants to live next to a pipeline or pump station?)
12. Potential contamination of wells from leaks or damage caused during construction (blasting and vibration from heavy equipment disturbing ground water/aquifers)

13. Impact in lands set aside for conservation and public use in clear violation of local laws
14. Evaluation of federal laws ability to override State laws regarding conservation and eminent domain. I do believe that the constitution was originally set up to give more rights to the states than the federal government.
15. Evaluation of the existing infrastructure for optimization through better energy management software and sealing of leaks to meet new projected demands.
16. EIS for gas from cradle to grave (wellhead to cook top)

There have been no studies to fully evaluate the future needs that included all of the available options and until you have all of the data you cannot make an informed decision.

Until there is sufficient objective evidence of need, fiscal viability, safety and benefit of public interest you cannot approve this or any pipeline project.

This is a bell that cannot be un-rung, there will be no method to undo the damage this pipeline will cause. It is better to err on the side of safety and reject this pipeline than to look back in a year or two....see the damage, destruction and loss...then realize we didn't need it, shouldn't have done it and the only reason it's here I so that a hand full of billionaires can add several more billions to their bank account from exporting our natural resources.

Again the Black and Veatch report that TGP and Kinder Morgan use as justification for the proposed pipelines in New England is no longer valid. The report indicated that the cost of Natural Gas would rise steadily over the next twenty years, but in fact the price of Natural Gas is lower than it was in 2011. If the report cannot be accurate over two years how can it be considered accurate over 20 years? The Report also lacked any evaluation of how alternative/renewable

#### **20150217-5079(30168190).pdf**

John J Serio, Stephentown, NY.

This pipeline should not be approved.

Our energy needs must be met by a combination of the cleanest energy generation methods such as wind, solar, geo thermal, small hydro and tidal. The more we invest in dirty energy infrastructure the more we delay clean energy alternatives developing as the major source of our energy needs.

As the federal energy regulatory agency, you should know this beter than anyone. So please do not approve this pipeline.

Among my many concerns if this pipeline is developed, is that the construction may impact my shallow well and the streams it will run under and along near and on my property. I hereby request that baseline yield, chemical analysis and function testing of my well and the streams be conducted at the pipeline company's expense prior to its construction.

#### **20150217-5082(30168202).pdf**

thomas, stephentown, NY.

Dear FERC Commissioners,

It is my strong belief that the continued buildup of U.S. natural gas pipeline infrastructure is to the detriment of the public at large and our "national best interest".

The expenditures on these mammoth corporate projects - commonly subsidized with tax breaks, utility rate increases and tariffs - would be more effectively spent by subsidizing electric generation by renewable energy. The benefits of encouraging additional renewable energy generation are varied and numerous.

First, in this age of information mobility and terrorist threats from foreign entities, our safety is ever more vulnerable as we continually increase our dependence on single source energy suppliers and conduits. Supporting a balanced and diverse distributed energy portfolio, such as photovoltaics , reduces the potential

impacts of terrorist threats to our energy distribution channels.

Second, continued support of goliath energy corporations simply exacerbates the issues of income inequality. Supporting distributed energy such as photovoltaics at individuals' homes and small business helps preserve the financial status of lower and middle income individuals.

Third, the continued burning of carbon based fuel, especially with the added chemical cocktail inherent with fracked gas, further pollutes our air and water, exposing us and the biosphere to the impacts of the resulting contaminants.

There are so many more reasons to support renewable energy instead of fossil fuels. Implementing more incentives for renewable energy will help further our national safety, help preserve the health of individuals and the environment, and help combat wealth inequity.

In addition, we have a very well developed energy infrastructure. There is NO REASONABLE JUSTIFICATION to violate individuals' property rights for the purpose of constructing new, privately owned natural gas pipelines. There is NO RATIONAL JUSTIFICATION, in view of our individual property rights and the general well-being of the common person to issue a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity.

Northeast Energy Direct pipeline project.

Thank you.

**20150218-0044(30173384).pdf**

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

RE: 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. Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.

February 9, 2015

Dear Ms. Bose,

I am a cancer survivor who is doing everything I can to keep myself cancer-free. Therefore, I am extremely concerned about the proposed natural gas pipeline that Kinder Morgan plans to run through our state. This pipeline will be right down the street from my house. The pipeline will run through conservation land, our wetlands, and under the Cheshire reservoir. This type of energy is so last century. It is NOT clean, safe, or sustainable. Also, Kinder Morgan has a well documented track record of pollution, lawbreaking, and cover-ups. Recently, people are no longer interested in buying houses in our area now that they have heard that the pipeline might be running through it. This project threatens our property, our land values, air, water supply, wildlife, and ecosystem. I urge you to please do everything in your power to oppose having a natural gas pipeline in Massachusetts. Our state needs to put its resources into developing more clean, sustainable energy such as wind, water, and solar. Our planet, as well as my health and the health of our children's children are at stake here. The Berkshires in Western Massachusetts is a beautiful, dean, bucolic place. We would like to keep it that way. Please I urge you not to approve this pipeline. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Joan L. devoe  
14 South Main St.  
Lanesborough, MA 01237  
413-443-6421

**20150218-0046(30173391).pdf**

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

February 11, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying Property Access

As the owners of the property located at:

2 Fields Farm Road  
Merrimack, NH 03054

Tax Map 3A, Lot 45

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 surveys, or for any other purpose. Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Stuart Moncrieff                      Kimberly Moncrieff

cc: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co., LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company)

**20150218-0048(30173390).pdf**

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

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Date: February 10, 2015

Re: Denying Property Access

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

As the owner of the property located at:

26 Blueberry Lane, Mason, NH 03048  
Mason, NH Tax Lot A-24

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.

Lawrence A. DeVito

CC TO:

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426  
re: Docket No. PF14-22-000

**20150218-0067(30173115).pdf**

From: Christine Erb  
PO Box 1625

729 N. Main St.  
Lanesborough MA 01237

February 8, 2015

To:

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

Northeast Energy Direct Docket 1PF14-22

Dear Secretary:

I am strongly opposed to Kinder Morgan's TGP Northeast Energy pipeline, and ask you to do everything you can to prevent it. It is unnecessary, expensive, and unsafe.

Kinder Morgan's irresponsible history of accidents threatens our water supply and clean air. The periodic venting of more than 60 cancer-causing chemicals—and other additives that Facking companies refuse to identify—endangers us all. There are pipeline explosions nearly every week in the US. Here in Lanesborough, a “low-population area”, the pipeline—carrying 3 times the volume of other line~eeds to meet only the lowest industry safety standards.

Its proposed route runs tbmugh land pmtected under our state constitution, as well as huge areas of public and private land that enhance our lives, protect wildlife and forests, and make us a tourist destination. Its compressor stations—60 acres, constant bright lights and noise—will destroy our rural area.

Less than 25% of the gas is slated to go to New England's energy needs—the rest will be exported. Why should we have to pay—in every way, through electricity surcharges and environmental degradation—for a private company's profit? We can meet New England's energy needs through energy efficiency, solar, wind, and other long-term solutions. These solutions, which do not contribute to global warming, generate many more long-term jobs than pipeline construction.

I have denied Tennessee Gas Pipeline access to my property, by certified mail. I urge you to oppose this project as well.

Sincerely,  
Christine Erb

**20150218-0088(30173442).pdf**

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

Date: Feb 10, 2015

Via Certi&d Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access #PF14-22-000

As the owner of the property located at:

102 Silver St  
Lanesborough, MA 01237-0840

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.

Judith Volin

**20150218-0102(30174493).tif**

February 9, 2015

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

Re: Northeast Energy Direct Project Docket No. PF14-22-000  
Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., 1001 Louisiana St, Houston, TX 77002

Dear Ms. Bose,

I live in Ashfield, Massachusetts, a town that is under siege as Kinder Morgan (KM) considers running a massive pipeline through parts of this little town. My property is not impacted by this Kinder Morgan proposal. However I am opposed to the concept that a company can push through a project of this huge magnitude with numerous false claims that, in the end, profit only KM and will be to the detriment of all local property owners, taxpayers, the states, the environment, climate change, renewable energy focus, and so much more.

First of the claims is that this pipeline is needed to supply gas to New England. This is NOT true; there are already plans, permitted plans, to supply New Englanders with plenty of gas. And this suggestion by KM completely disallows for the fact that New Englanders are actively working on supporting and implementing alternative, green sources of energy for it's needs and are actively working on reducing demands for any energy supplies.

Second, related to the paragraph above, KM has falsely claimed that this gas coursing through these proposed pipelines is for New England use. Instead, it is known that the gas is intended for export, FOR THE PROFIT OF KM only.

Third, the KM proposal minimalizes the environmental impact of this pipeline running over hundreds of miles of land, scouring the area, destroying natural habitats that have been set aside, willingly, by citizens of Massachusetts and other states of New England. As well, abutters will forever have to live with the fear that a disaster could very likely happen in their "backyards. H

Those are just a few of the improper KM reasons for the proposed gas pipeline wending its destructive way through New England. Beyond this KM proposal, I begin at the beginning. so to speak I am adamantly opposed to the "Fracking" of gas, a most environmentally disastrous practice. It is then proposed to transport that "(racked" gas through pipelines for another, most environmentally disastrous practice.

I ask that you and your committee, the FERC, REALLY look at this proposal, not as another corporate proposal that, under the guise of "national necessity" is, in fact, not needed for the necessity of the people living in New England and is another natural disaster in the making.

Sincerely,

Beverly Duncan  
37 Baptist Corner Road  
Ashfield, MA 01330

**20150218-0105(30174504).tif**

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
TENNESSEE GAS PIPELINE COMPANY'S  
NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT PROJECT  
(DOCKET No. PF14-22-000)

Comments can be: (1) left with a FERC representative; (2) mailed to the addresses below (3)  
Please send two copies referenced to Docket No. PF14-22-000 to the addresses below

For Official Filing (send 2 copies):  
Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Another copy (send 1 coPY):  
Gas Branch 3, PJ-11.3  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

COMMENTS: (PLEASE PRINT) [attach an additional sheet if necessary]

Letter to property owners from pipeline co. stated this is a “federal undertaking” - this is not true. All property owners who received this letter need to receive a correcting letter.

John Serio  
290 Newton Rd  
Stephentown, NY 12169

Attachments: 2 pages, Tennessee Gas Pipeline documents, {*not included here*}:

“System Flows - 2016, 2017, Beyond” (page 57)

- 100/800 Legs catch up
- South flow expansions complete
- Z1/0 Market driven by Exports, Industrial, and South East Demand

“Changes Beyond Border” (source: KM Aug 2014 Macro Forecast, p 58)

**20150218-0106(30174508).tif**

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
TENNESSEE GAS PIPELINE COMPANY’S  
NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT PROJECT  
(DOCKET No. PF14-22-000)

Comments can be: (1) left with a FERCrepresentative;(2) mailed to the addressesbelowor (3)  
Please send two copies referenced to Docket No. PFI4-22-000 to the addresses below

For Official Filing (send 2 copies):

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

Another copy (send 1 coPY):

Gas Branch 3, PJ-11.3  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

COMMENTS: (PLEASE PRINT) [attach an additional sheet if necessary]

*Hand printed letter, recommending solar panels in ROW; opposing natural gas extraction...*

Judy Abbott  
1103 Delaware Tpke  
Delmar, NH 12054

**20150218-0107(30174510).tif**

FERC comment form, hand written contents, Mike Smith

**20150218-0108(30174512).tif**

FERC comment form, hand written contents, Larry Marton, Farmington, CT 06032, requesting open Town Hall style meetings

**20150218-0109(30189681).pdf**

FERC comment form, hand written contents, Ben Martin, 329 Ward St, Wallingford, CT 06402, opposing

**20150218-0110(30189978).pdf**

David & Patricia Flint  
89 Calvin Cole Road  
Stephentown, NY 12169

February 8, 2015

John Proulx TGP, LLC  
1615 SuNeid Street  
Agawam, MA. 01001

Re: Denial of access to our property

As the owners of property located at 89 Calvin Cole Road, Stephantown, NY, 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 our property identified above, to perform surveys or for any other purpose (other than for access by our utility company directly related to the supply of electricity to our property) without prior written notice specifying the purpose of such access and my express consent.

Any entry on our property without our consent will be considered unauthorized and treated as trespass.

Sincerely yours,

David L. Flint  
Patricia A. Flint

cc: General Counsel, National Grid  
General Counsel, NYSEG

**20150218-0116(30189776).pdf**

FERC comment form, hand written contents, John P. Cevasco, 586 Millers Falls Rd. PO Box 78, Northfield, MA 01360-0078, e-mail: johncevasco@comcast.net, opposing

**20150218-0142(30179379).pdf**

Hand written letter, 2 pge, L. Marcus DeVito, 26 Blueberry Ln, Mason, NH 03048, opposing

**20150218-0144(30179381).pdf**

Hand written card, James K. Belt, 37 Hayward Drive, Gilsum, NH 03448, opposing

**20150218-0145(30179373).pdf**

Hand written card, Laurel Facey, 47 Davis Road, Millers Falls, MA 03149, opposing

**20150218-0147(30179383).pdf**

Hand written card, Suzanne Fournier, 9 Woodward Drive, Milford, NH 03055, opposing

**20150218-0148(30179384).pdf**

Hand written card, Michael Goen, 48 Russell Road, Mason, NH 03048, opposing

**20150218-0149(30179385).pdf**

Hand written card, Bettie Goen, 48 Russell Road, Mason, NH 03048, opposing

**20150218-5069(30170209).pdf**

Adam Lupino, Cranston, RI.

I support this pipeline project and others that will increase natural gas to our region. New England pays the highest energy prices in the country due to constraints in our pipeline infrastructure. We need the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline project to secure our energy future as this project will also create jobs that will help our local economy

**20150218-5127(30171367).pdf**

Chris Tucker, winterport, ME.

Hello

I would like to take the time to show my support for this project, this project is well needed to help Maines supply of Natural Gas, Maine Needs more gas to be able to provide a cheaper energy source and to help all Mainers lower there heating cost. It is very cold up here we need more capacity in the lines and need more lines to reverse the flow coming from Canada. Mainers are poor with workers making around \$10 per hour, please help us by passing this project

I would like to urge you to support and pass this project Please.

Thank You

Chris Tucker

**20150218-5195(30172401).pdf**

James and Laurel Higgins, Stephentown, NY.

We are writing to express our strong opposition to construction of the Northeast Energy Direct Project PF14-22 carrying gas from the fracked shale wells in Pennsylvania to Wright, NY, and then to Dracut, Ma.

We are property owners and fulltime residents at 304 East Road, Stephentown, NY, and the proposed pipeline would cross our road one mile from our home. It would bisect our small rural town, causing temporary disruption, and permanent loss of property values, of our rural esthetics, as well as loss by some residents of homes and property through eminent domain taking, and loss of agricultural productivity. Environmental damage would be permanent.

Having researched the history of pipeline accidents which have caused property loss and loss of life, we and other residents are afraid to have this very large high pressure pipeline in our town. We are afraid of the effects of toxic substances in the gas on our health by pollution of the air and the water in our wells, which are our only source of drinking water. We are afraid of the potential for explosion and fire.

We doubt the claims of need for the gas which this pipeline would carry. There is documentation of limited need for additional gas in New England for only a few days in the year. The potential for conservation measures of currently available gas, including reduction of leaks and storage of liquified gas, and the development of alternative energy sources could easily make up this limited current shortfall of natural gas.

The proposed pipeline would not begin delivering gas until 2018, and since all of the states which might benefit from this source of gas have enacted mandates for development of renewable source energy supplies, it is likely that by 2018 these sources will be producing an amount of energy equivalent to or even exceeding what they might derive from the new pipeline. We ourselves have built a highly efficient passive solar house, have for years obtained our electricity from a supplier of 100% renewable source energy, and have contracted to have photovoltaic panels installed on our roof which will supply nearly 100% of our electricity. We see more and more solar installations on homes, businesses, farms and municipal buildings around us.

We feel strongly that our community will pay dearly for the construction and operation of this pipeline, the need for which is doubtful, and which will bring us no benefit. We urge you to deny permission to the

Northeast Energy Direct Project #22-14.

**20150218-5226(30172732).pdf**

Pamela and Jeffrey McCumber, stephentown, NY.

We are writing to express our strong opposition to construction of the Northeast Energy Direct Project PF14-22 carrying gas from the fracked shale wells in PA to Dracut, MA.

We are property owners and full time residents at 16162 NY 22 and the proposed pipeline will be within 600' of our property and home. We are just shy of the "kill zone" but are we really. we are afraid of the effects of toxic substances in the gas on our health by pollution and the water in our wells. Our property and county boast of having one of the largest aquifer in Rensselaer county and the Kinderhook creek butts up against our property. Our well is only 180' deep with over 10 gals per minute. this is our only source of drinking water.

we are fearful of potential explosion and fire. We also house livestock on our property as well as our neighbors. we are doubt the claims of need for the gas which this pipeline would carry. there is documentation of limited need for additional gas in New England for a few days in the year. The potential for conservation measure of currently available gas, including reduction of leaks and storage of liquefied gas, and the development of alternative energy sources could easily make up this limited current shortfall of natural gas.

we feel strongly that our community will pay dearly for the construction and operation of this pipeline, the need for which is doubtful and will bring us no benefit. We strongly urge you to deny permission to Northeast Energy Direct Project #22-14

**20150218-5240(30172874).pdf**

Pamela and Jeffrey McCumber, stephentown, NY.

We would like to share a letter that my father sent to the Eastwick Press to be published in opposition to the Northeast Energy Direct Project.

In 1962 a horrific event occurred the the Town of Berlin, NY and made national news when a propane tanker truck lost his brakes on the Plank Road. Today in the Town of Berlin's firehouse there is a sample piece of the propane tanker truck that shows the faulty welding of the tank wall, this sample is part of several that were taken to Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute metallurgical lab for testing to determine why the propane tank ruptured. The tank was supposed to be ultra-safe and was guaranteed to (Failsafe) however with human error, poor quality control, no serious government oversight, the impossible occurred, the tank ruptured. Part of the town of Berlin was instantaneously filled with a giant fog blossom of explosive propane gas. it was supertime in this community and someone cooking supper on a gas stove or burning papers or any open flame set this gas cloud off. It had filled every nook and cranny including the residents homes, when it blew it laid all four walls of some of the houses on the ground and killed some of the residents. both of my parents perished in this devastation, one living for two days and the other three, they were in horrific pain and a memory that has never left me. to my knowledge including the driver eleven or twelve people were also killed.

anyone who wishes to view the sample at the firehouse should contact Ivan Wager he was in the Berlin fire department when this occurred and is in charge of the display.

The proposed Stephentown liquefied fracked gas line under a very high pressure of 1460 PSI if were to rupture would create a similar cloud of gas many times larger with devastating results. Most of the new jobs will be for morticians picking up the bodies. Our rural volunteer fire departments and resucue squads if anyone survived would be over whelmed. These gigantic foreign owned corporations, plans to ship their gas product thru Stephentown on its way to Boston to sell to overseas buyers. Stephentown is considered a wasteland to them. We will have to wait and see if they, the citizens of Stephentown have enough courage and community spirit to defeat this threat. My personal concern even though i no longer live in Stephen-

town is for two of my sons, their wives and my granddaughter who all live in a very close proximity to this proposed pipeline. we should ban together and not let this giant corporation determine what should be done with our beautiful valley.

Sincerely,

Daniel McCumber  
Petersburgh, NY

**20150219-0058(30179355).pdf**

Hand written card, John K. Silander, 29 Fitzwilliam Rd, Troy, NH 03465, opposing

**20150219-0062(30177298).tif**

Hand written card, James K Rodger, 160 Dunton Road, Fitzwilliam, NH 03447, opposing

**20150219-0063(30179348).pdf**

Hand written card, Iris P. Fleischman, 307 Hayward Drive, Gilsum, NH 03449, opposing

**20150219-0064(30179349).pdf**

Hand written card, Cynthia Lawton-Singer, 2110 Roaring Brook Rd, Conway, MA 01341, opposing

**20150219-0066(30179354).pdf**

Hand written card, Marcus McCarroll, 21 Woodbarn, Keene, NH, opposing

**20150219-0075(30179342).pdf**

Certified mail, Kiuchul Hwang, 89 Seaverns Bridge Rd., Amherst, NH 03031, denying access

**20150219-0076(30179344).pdf**

February 11, 2015

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

Re: Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Secretary Bose:

My wife and I and our four young children moved into our 1774 farmhouse 45 years ago. At the end of a dirt road, fields, pond, seasonal streams, natural wetlands, privacy, and a gorgeous view, it was perfect. A house to be called home.

All that is threatened by the Northeast Energy Direct Project, a natural gas pipeline from the fracked fields of Pennsylvania being proposed by Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Gas Pipeline that would be diverted from Massachusetts and run through 17 towns and cities of southern NH, including Mason, to its destination in Dracut, Massachusetts. It places us in the incineration zone.

In addition to the pipeline, what is under consideration is a compressor station to be located in Mason, with two preferred sites in our neighborhood, one 1600' way north of us, or 1 600't the end of our property. The location of the station would seriously threaten the neighborhood's water source which is thought to be its origination.

In the best case scenario we could lose 10 acres, part of a hay field, the pond, our water sourrx:, and our private road frontage. In the worse case scenario we could lose all that plus approximately 30 additional acres,

the natural wetlands, 4 seasonal streams, and the view, which would become the compressor station.

In addition to our property being taken away, the pipeline/compressor station would be built on NH Forest land - Abbot Forest, a forest to have been preserved for the protection and enjoyment for its citizens.

The 24/7/365 noise, pollution, and danger, would make our property valueless and no one would want to live here, much less try to get financing and insurance.

Gone is our home and the desire of our children, grandchildren, and future family to live in and enjoy the old homestead.

This natural gas pipeline and all of the dangers and upheaval of hundreds of homes and families that come with it is something that NH did not ask for, nor is it needed. A visit to the U.S. Energy Information Administration web site identifies the generation, use, surplus and deficits of all New England states. Massachusetts is the only NE state that is running a deficit.

I believe that this project is nothing more than corporate greed at the expense of the residents of NH. At open presentations and meetings with local officials, with Kinder Morgan personnel in attendance, it was brought out that it's possible that as much as 75-85% of the gas to be sent to Dracut, MA, will be held for sale to the highest bidder for exportation.

This pipeline project is a disaster waiting to happen.

Very truly yours,

Lawrence A. DeVito  
26 Blueberry Lane  
Mason, NH 03048  
603-878-1094  
larrydevito@gmail.com

**20150219-5001(30173409).pdf**

Lewis Overlock, Hermon, ME.

Hi I'm in support of Kinder Morgan's Northeast Energy Direct Project.

This project secures clean low-cost energy to Maine. As infrastructure grows, this can be supplied to me for use. This project also creates good jobs for our future. Gas is here we should just make sure it's done right.

Thanks

**20150219-5004(30173441).pdf**

Diane K Varney-Parker, Mason, NH.

The proposed NED pipeline through NH is frankly ridiculous. Why would the line go up into NH and then back down into MA when most pipelines are designed from 'the shortest distance between two points is a straight line' perspective. If this was a great project then the straight line method would work. Obviously it is not a good plan and is now trying to wind its way and ideas into new territory - a Huge issue in terms of digging and getting easements since this is all new territory that doesn't even have any natural gas use set up. I hope you are smarter than this silly reroute idea! So many other options make sense if a pipeline is necessary (like fixing and improving existing lines). Please do what makes sense and prevent the NED from going through

**20150219-5005(30173478).pdf**

Jan A. Griska, Rindge, NH.

To whom it may concern:

I'm objecting to the NED project (docket # PF14-22) in my case, the pipeline will destroy a pond and wetland on my property that is a breeding area for American Wood Frogs, American Toads, Gray Tree Frogs,

various Salamanders and Spring Peepers.

Jan A. Griska  
18 Atlantic Drive  
Rindge, N.H. 03461

**20150219-5147(30179141).pdf**

HOMER D SHANNON, Windham, NH.

My home is 100' from the edge of the power line right of way. If they put a pipeline through this space they will need to clear cut the treed buffer that separates my home from the power line. Doing this will destroy the esthetics of my yard and severely depreciate the value of my home. (The pipeline itself, of course will devalue the home further.) Cutting these trees will also expose me to late afternoon summer sunshine and howling northwest winter winds. Both of these impacts will drive up my energy costs to heat and cool my home.

I certainly hope that KM is prepared to compensate me for these issues

**20150220-0008(30183488).tif**

Certified mail, Richard A French, Anne E Thidemann French, 81 Adams Road, Hinsdale, MA, denying access to TGP

**20150220-0009(30183492).tif**

February 11, 2015

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

FROM: Bruce Allardice and Victoria Abrash

RE: COMMENTS Tennessee Gas Pipeline PF 14-22 Northeast Energy Direct Project

We are property owners along the proposed route of the Kinder Morgan fracked gas pipeline to New England. (43 Gardner Hill Road Stephentown NY 12168) There will be over 10 miles of industrial gas lines going through our mostly rural/wooded/residential community if this project is approved. The proposed pipeline would run within a thousand feet of our town's volunteer fire station.

We are opposed to this pipeline for many reasons. New York State has recently banned fracking due to inadequate data on health effects. Some states such as California are finding they are using another precious resource, water, at alarming rates in the hydraulic fracturing process. There are also concerns about seismic events, and storage of the fracked water. Therefore, we are compelled to view fracking negatively and would not willingly facilitate its use. We acknowledge that there are periodic constraints on the gas supply in New England. However, the capacity of this pipeline far exceeds the amount needed to remedy these shortfalls. Much of this gas may eventually be liquefied for export to Europe, thus pushing up prices and profits. This pipeline as proposed does not support a declaration of public need, but rather one of private greed.

Use of our private land by a private company for a purpose we are philosophically opposed to is very disturbing, especially since we will not reap mitigating benefits. This pipeline is a conduit which we cannot tap into. Although we appreciate the siting of this industrial project near the existing National Grid electric corridor, it means there will be an even larger swath of cleared land bisecting our property, further reducing its use and value. Knowledgeable buyers have already asked real estate agents to keep them away from the proposed route, having been spooked by the term "kill zone". We will suffer the loss of trees, animal habitat, view, and peace of mind. Most importantly, the more pipelines, the easier it will be to abandon goals for renewable energy. This pipeline preserves the status quo of using fossil fuels over conservation, solar, wind, geothermal, biomass or any future cleaner technologies.

In addition to miles of pipeline, a large compressor may be located in our community, less than a mile from our property. Periodic venting of fracked gas would occur, along with other constant requisites of an industrial installation: noise, light and view pollution. Again, we see only a devaluation of our property and lessening of the quality of rural life with no mitigating positive effects.

Bruce Allardice and Victoria Abrash

CC:

United States Senators Charles Schumer United States Senator Kirsten Gillibrand

Governor Andrew Cuomo

United States Representative Paul Tonko State Senator Kathleen Marchione

**20150220-5005(30179407).pdf**

RUTH POTE, NORTHFIELD, MA.

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing as a citizen, hiker, biker, skier, and parent in Northfield, Massachusetts. Kidder-Morgan's Tennessee Gas Pipeline is slated to pass through our beautiful town in Western Massachusetts. The pipeline with track along the high tension wires two miles east of my family's solar panels.

Based on the capacity of this pipeline, this gas is likely intended for export to Europe and other money-making markets outside of the United States. Our town has over one thousand solar panels and we are working hard to become a community that is not reliant on carbon-based fuel.

Although some may argue that this decision is already made, I believe that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission has the best interest of the environment and the local citizens when evaluating a potential project of this scope and impact. I urge you to NOT APPROVE the application of Tennessee Gas Pipeline. New England is working hard to avoid being ensnared in the time-limited and destructive natural gas distribution business.

Thank you for your consideration.

Ruth A. Pote, MD

**20150220-5166(30184659).txt**

Donald R Colewell, Susquehanna, PA.

I am writing in regards to the Northeast Energy Direct Project. I feel the great need for the cheap energy and local jobs it will create. I am a laborer 785 worker. I know it will be put in an environmental friendly way. We have trained and highly skilled workforce to install and maintain it. There is a lot of community and schools depending on this infrastructure to be built, plus it will also help the economy. Please pass this on as soon as possible. Thank you!

**20150220-5167(30184810).txt**

Edward Conry, Kirkwood, NY.

I think that the pipeline project is a well needed for this area to bring loads of Union work to our area. Plus the energy that is needed here for our schools and factories and other projects. Thank you very much!

**20150220-5170(30184824).txt**

Kevin Ewain, Hancock, NY.

Sounds great!! More work for future Demands. We need it. Lets git r Done!!!. Especially in our territory. We want and need the work.

**20150220-5172(30184907).txt**

Sean Richard Dickenson, Berkshire, NY.

If this were to happen it will put so many people to work. Many will bring home good money to stimulate the economy. Paying off overdue bills. Better food on the table and help the economy and our country. People being happy, families being together and doing great in school. Living life to the fullest. Not working. Please make this happen for all of us.

**20150220-5175(30185080).txt**

Irvin T. Mower, Millport, NY.

With our locals help our members will be an asset on getting the job done safely and cut the building time by 95% with their skill and training and their years of doing the work. Plus wages will keep our towns and our country on their feet. Thanks

**20150220-5182(30185087).txt**

Alexander Taylor, Greene, NY.

I live in the Binghamton area. It would be nice to have good paying jobs. Our economy I this area is very poor. We need these jobs to raise more taxes and to fix the roads and bridges. It would be nice to be able to use the natural gas for fuel instead of expensive fuel oil. Thank you for you concerns and the forum to be able to use this to let you know what we would like to do and our feeling towards this subject. Thanks

**20150223-0006(30188188).tif**

February 16, 2015

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

RE: Docket # PF14-22

Dear Ms. Bose:

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed Kinder Morgan Tennessee Gas Pipeline project. My concerns regarding this project are many and include the proposed pipeline route ( underneath the Cheshire Reservoir and the Ashuwillticook Rail Trail ), the related construction activity and the damage that will occur to both our roads and the natural environment and the high pressure under which the tracked gas would need to travel through this pipeline, thus increasing the likelihood of leaks, spills and in the worst case scenario, an explosion.

The safety record of Kinder Morgan along with their response to spills is also a concern. In a report filed last year with the Canadian Government, Kinder Morgan was quoted as saying that " Pipeline spills can have both positive and negative effects on local and regional economies, both in the short and long term. Spill response and cleanup creates business and employment opportunities for affected communities, regions and cleanup service providers". I find this statement to be outrageous and I think it raises some serious questions about the ethics of Kinder Morgan.

I am strongly opposed to any project that would be paid for by new tariffs on our electric bills, particularly when there is ample evidence that our energy needs here in Massachusetts can be met through existing pipeline capacity ( let's fix the pipelines that leak) combined with renewable sources and increased energy efficiency. I believe that the Kinder Morgan Tennessee Gas Pipeline project is not in the best interests of the residents of Massachusetts and I ask that you deny Kinder Morgan the necessary permits to go forward with this project.

Sincerely,  
GlennShalan  
33 Howard St., Apt. 2  
Pittsfield, MA. 01201  
glennshalan@gmail.com

**20150223-0008(30188192).tif**

Certified mail, Jane M. Stevens, 21 Olsen Road, Lanesborough, MA 01237, denying access to TGP

**20150223-0009(30190245).tif**

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

To whom it may concern,

The attached documents concerns docket: PF 14-22

We are the residents of Atlantic Drive, Rindge, New Hampshire 03461.

We are opposed to the Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co. (NED) project. We have officially Denied Property Access to Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co. etc. Any physical entry on to our property will be considered unauthorized and treated as trespass.

Thank you,

Jan A. Oriska  
18 Atlantic Drive  
Rindge, N.H. 03461

{3 separate letters denying access to addresses below, with copies of Certified Mail Receipt}

18 Atlantic Drive, Jan A. Oriska  
12 Atlantic Drive, Lynn Quade  
26 Atlantic Drive, ?

**20150223-0021(30190217).tif**

Certified mail, David K Pemble, Silver Street, Lanesboro, MA , Lot #G224-8 (37 acres) & Lot #E224-9 (32 acres), denying access to TGP

**20150223-0022(30190219).tif**

Certified mail, Dharma & Tammy Lim, 11 Fairview Drive, Pelmam, NH 03076, denying access to TGP

**20150223-0023(30190241).tif**

Certified mail, Peter L. LeCount, 236 Starch Mill Rd, Mason, NH 03048, Lots D-18 & D-19, denying access to TGP

**20150223-0025(30189965).tif**

Hand written card, Alen Singer, 210 Roaring Brook Rd, Conway, MA 01341, opposing

**20150223-0026(30189967).tif**

Hand written card, Laurie Boosalda, 193 North Main St., S.Deerfield, MA 01373, opposing

**20150223-0032(30190229).tif**

Certified mail, Jon Law, 7 Old Lawrence Rd, Pelham, NH 03076 and 27 Briarwood Rd, Pelham, NH 03076, denying access to TGP

**20150223-0033(30190252).tif**

Certified mail, Kim A. Dufour, 56 Ocean Street, Rt #44, Pittsfield, MA 01201, denying access to TGP

**20150223-0038(30190335).tif**

**TOWN OF MILFORD**  
Board of Selectmen

February 9, 2015

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

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

Dear Kimberly,

The Board of Selectmen for the Town of Milford, Milford NH is concerned that potential historic resources have not been identified along the proposed route of the Northeast Energy Direct (“NED”) Project pipeline in our town. Therefore, we request to be granted “Consulting Party Status” for matters related to the project’s mandated Section 106 Review.”

With Consulting Party Status,. a town will be notified of relevant meetings; additional time could be required, but only if the town decides to be involved.

Should you have any questions concerning the forgoing, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards,

Gary Daniels, Chairman  
Board of Selectmen

Cc: Elizabeth Muzzey, Director - NH Division of Historic Resources

**20150223-5000(30185639).txt**

Julia Steed Mawson, Pelham, NH.

Dear Sir or Madam,

Included here is my correspondence to Kinder Morgan re denying access to survey my property in Pelham NH, which is located on the proposed pipeline corridor in Pelham, NH. I do not approve of this proposal and request that FERC deny it.

Thank you,

Julia Steed Mawson

Julia Steed Mawson  
Mawson Living Trust  
17 South Shore Dr.  
Pelham, NH 03076

February 18, 2015

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
1615 Suffield Street  
Agawam, MA 01001  
(Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)

Re Property Access Denial

Dear Sir or Madam,

As the owner of the property identified as:

Mawson Living Trust, Birch Lane off, Pelham, NH, Map/Block/Lot 36-10-14

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.

Correspondence re this matter should be sent to my residential address:

Julia Steed Mawson,  
Mawson Living Trust  
17 South Shore Dr.  
Pelham, NH 03076

Julia Steed Mawson  
February 18, 2015

cc: FERC, Limberly D. Bose  
Town of Pelham, NH, Brian McCarthy, Town Administrator  
Town of Pelham, NH, Paul Gagnon, Conservation Commission  
NH Governor Maggie Hassen  
NH Congresswoman Ann Kuster  
NH Senators Jeanne Shaheen and Kelley Ayotte  
NH State Representatives and Senators

**20150223-5001(30185640).txt**

Julia Steed Mawson, Pelham, NH.

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am writing to request that FERC deny the request initiated by Kinder Morgan (Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co LLC) to develop a natural gas pipeline in southern New Hampshire.

I am a resident of Pelham New Hampshire and live on Little Island Pond, which is two miles from the projected pipeline. I also own property off Birch Lane, property that is located directly on the potential route of the pipeline. Further, I am also a life long resident of NH and understand the natural resource, cultural and community values of our other beautiful southern NH communities along the projected route.

While there are no easy answers to these complex issues relative to energy, I feel that this proposal is not good for NH or the region.

This is based on several concerns. These include:

1. Safety and health ... relative to our inclusion in an "incineration zone" and issues relative to methane release as well as the lack of clear plans concerning evacuation, emergency procedures and effective monitoring for vandalism and destructive acts
2. Water pollution ... secondary to fuel and methane leaks, leaching of herbicides, and pesticides needed to build and keep the corridors clear, as well as sedimentation during and after construction
3. Habitat loss and impacts on wildlife and forests ... due to fragmentation of habitat and impacts due to

clear cutting and corridor maintenance

4. Risks to major river systems ... endangerment of major water supplies for drinking, recreation and wildlife, due to plans to place the pipeline under the Merrimack River and the Souhegan River and near other water and wetland resources

5. Cultural loss ... due to impacts that will change the rural nature of our communities as large clear cuts and development to support the pipeline destroy and divide vistas, historic stone walls, agricultural areas and forest tracts.

6. Diversion of resources and attention away from the development of renewable resources ... dollars spent on this project could be better used in research and development of renewable resources

7. Diversion of resources and attention away from energy conservation ... dollars, community energy and leadership can be better used for education, research and implementation of conservation practices on both an individual and a community scale

8. Fracking ... Our communities, and the industry itself, does not yet have a true understanding as yet concerning the dangers and impacts of fracking (the process used to produce the fuel). As a community we need to do all we can to not enable the continuation and growth of this potentially dangerous and disastrous process.

9. Lack of benefit to NH residents ... most of this fuel will be for export

10. Loss of property value ... because of the above issues

11. Lack of clearly defined need ... because of the possibilities of other alternatives.

Further ... Massachusetts citizens and legislators voted not to have this pipeline in their communities and as our nearest, "neighbors," who share similar topographies and resources, that speaks volumes to me.

This is a complex problem with no easy answers. The problem is tied not only to our local situations relative to economics, social structures and environmental issues, but to those as they relate to much larger regional and global concerns. These include climate change, the development of alternative energy sources, and our own efforts at conservation.

This proposal is NOT a good one for NH and the town of Pelham. I am writing to ask the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to deny this project for New Hampshire, proposed by Kinder Morgan. (Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co LLC)

Thank you for your time. I know that the Commission is busy and must listen to many voices, so your attention to my comments are all the more appreciated.

Please let me know if you have any questions concerning my comments.

Regards,

Julia Steed Mawson  
17 South Shore Dr.  
Pelham, NH 03076  
603-315-4642

**20150223-5005(30185645).txt**

Kaela Law, Pelham, NH.

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

To Kimberly D. Bose,

There is a big inaccuracy found during the pre-filing process of Kinder Morgan. At the Open Houses, many

of my town's and neighboring town's residents noticed the maps KM are working from seemed to be around 25 years old. This would explain why not all of my neighbors on the proposed route have been notified or visited by Kinder Morgan and affiliates. Our region has seen significant population growth since the 1980s, even during the last ten years. Before Kinder Morgan and affiliates are allowed to move onto the next phase of their project we DEMAND that they start using up to date maps and put in a real and conscious effort to notify ALL of the affected landowners along this route, also re-hosting the initial round of Open Houses after all of the affected landowners have been notified. They must start from scratch and they must proceed accurately or not at all.

Over the last two nights I have attended two separate Kinder Morgan Open Houses regarding the transmission pipeline they intend to bring through Pelham, NH. The level of real information that KM reps were able to provide to affected landowners was sub-par. The pictures on their poster boards were gross misrepresentations of this proposed 36" pipeline and its components. For example, they are showing us a picture of a valve station that is a 25 square-foot chain linked pen, fencing in a 'pig receiver.' They are telling me there is no guarantee that they try to place these in undeveloped areas, so essentially I could have a dangerous cage in my backyard for my daughter to climb on. As it was explained to me by a KM rep, for safety reasons they have to be spaced at precise intervals along the pipeline. My heart sank. This is a very big above-ground structure that workers would routinely visit. Once I got home I looked for more images online to show my husband. What Kinder Morgan failed to tell me was that the picture they had shown to me was actually for a 12" diameter pipeline. What in the world will a 36" diameter pipeline valve station look like, and why aren't they presenting us with those pictures?

After attending the open house forum, which was as unorganized an event as I have ever attended, I am left with more questions than when I arrived. How a KM representative at an informational session could utter the words "I don't know," in response to a simple and pointed question is beyond my comprehension, and I heard it frequently. Also, different representatives were giving different answers to the same questions. One rep told me the depth of pipeline burial on this project was 4-6 feet regardless of ledge or rock found below ground. I overheard another rep telling a fellow information seeker that in the instance of ledge or rock found below ground the pipeline would only be buried 24 inches. How can it be okay for the representatives to give conflicting information?

At the Open House, in answer to my question about how they keep the easement corridors clear I was told by a Kinder Morgan rep, "We don't use herbicides on our pipeline easements, despite what the opposition wants you to think, we use mowing." I was looking over my town's website, where our Board of Selectmen are putting up information about this project, and I simply typed "Kinder Morgan," into the search bar. Up popped an attachment for meeting minutes where one of our Selectmen read a letter to the town about "Tennessee Gas Pipeline Notice of Routine Maintenance of Pipeline with Herbicide 56 Applications Notices sent out to affected areas" If a resident does not want the herbicide 57 applied on their property, contact Carey Diehl directly at 508-271-8935 or email at 58 Carey\_diehl@kindermorgan.com by October 2, 2014." My jaw just dropped when I read those meeting minutes on my town's website. I had been told a flat-out lie about Kinder Morgan process and procedures by a company representative. Now I am loath to believe anything they might have to say in future. How can we be expected to deal with people like this in order to come to settlements over our property values. Then we actually have to place our trust in them for the safety and wellbeing of our families? It is impossible.

Please consider what I have said, especially regarding the maps and having Kinder Morgan notifying all of the affected landowners along the proposed route, before making decisions about this project.

Thank you,

Kaela Law

**20150223-5010(30185655).txt**

John Serio, Stephentown, NY.

This pipeline should not be approved.

We need well paying, long term jobs all along the pipeline path. Many new jobs in the growing solar, wind, geo-thermal and small hydro field will only be delayed or lost to foreign competitors if this pipeline is approved.

We cannot put off implementing policies that will support new employment. Experts agree that these alternative energy industries will create many more jobs than the antiquated, dirty fossil fuel industry.

Do not approve this pipeline.

**20150223-5018(30185671).txt**

HOMER D SHANNON, Windham, NH.

Here in southern New Hampshire, it is common to build neighborhoods with cul-de-sac streets instead of through roads. There are a number of points in the proposed pipeline route that would create “marooned, Àù areas should there be some kind of a pipeline fire.

People on the far side of these areas would have no where to run, other than bushwacking through dense forests, possibly with deep snow and in the night, if they needed to escape from a fire. This creates a significant safety risk for these people.

**20150223-5024(30185683).txt**

Carol M DiPirro, Merrimack, NH.

I have learned that Eversource and National Grid and Spectra Energy are considering a project using existing paths. I would think this would be preferred - an upgrade to an existing line rather than cutting swaths into nature in addition to what is already there.

**20150223-5032(30185995).pdf**

February 21, 2015

RE: Docket No. PF14-22-000

Kimberly D. Bose

Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

My wife and I have become deeply and increasingly concerned about the proposed Kinder Morgan (KM) Northeast Energy Direct (NED) high pressure, fracked natural gas pipeline project, its potential co-location with the National Grid electric transmission ROW as a whole, and also the proposed route through Rensselaer County and Stephentown, NY in particular.

It appears from our research that KM’s larger plan for this NED project is to transport a very high percentage of this fracked/radon bearing gas, extracted from the Marcellus Shale region of Pennsylvania to Dracut, Massachusetts. The volume of natural gas projected for transmission and storage using this new infrastructure seems far beyond any near term “New England” demand and therefore the largest percentage would be shipped from the US to Canada and subsequent re-export as liquefied natural gas (LNG). None of the NED natural gas would be marketed to consumers in New York State, although some would be consistently consumed to fuel compressor station (CS) turbines; aside from inadvertent system leaks, this application would also produce significant volumes of hazardous emissions, any of which will degrade both air and water quality in the immediate area of CSs and beyond, depending on prevailing weather conditions.

The following comments address the potentially negative consequences likely if this for-profit project is built and placed in service. In this context the extremely poor safety history that KM demonstrates only serve to intensify the urgent need to prevent the construction of the NED project or any alternative.

In Pittsfield, MA we have already attended one of the FERC mandated “Open Houses” hosted by KM. (The one scheduled for Rensselaer County was cancelled due to bad weather.) Although each of KM Representatives with whom we spoke was pleasant and courteous, NOT ONE of the questions we posed to various

members of the KM team at this event was answered to our satisfaction.

Although not direct quotes, here are a few examples that summarize some of our conversations at the Pittsfield KM Open House event.

ME: How will 'SCADA' data be transmitted to the monitoring locations? [Note: Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA)]

KM Rep: WiFi.

ME: Where will these data be monitored?

KM Rep: Houston. There's a guy down there that keeps an eye on everything.

ME: What about system control and data security?

KM Rep: Everything is password protected. They'll never get through that!

ME: What about system redundancy? Is there any alternative if these communications are hacked or go down? One layer? Two, three...? (I'm not asking "how", but "IF" ...)

KM Rep: The system can't be hacked.

ME: What about compressor station security?

KM Rep: There are fences around them and they are padlocked.

ME: ...and valves?

KM Rep: They are chained and padlocked. No way anyone can cut through those with bolt cutters, they're cobalt steel!

ME: So, someone with an abrasive blade and a cordless electric drill can't cut that material?

KM Rep: I'd like to see that....

[COMMENT: SCADA use is cited on the KM web site. The KM Rep mentioned nothing of automated valve or data driven control system security. In my opinion such "remote" control systems (which require active device/system polling and analysis) may be one of the most cyber-vulnerable aspects of the NED project. Given the pipeline's proposed placement in low-population areas and adjacency to other energy-critical infrastructure, physical damage and "attack" are also of great concern. The "One Call 811 / Dig Safe" innovation offers a best practice strategy for contractors and homeowners, but criminals or terrorists will typically have an alternative agenda. Dialing "811" is not a panacea. Here is a case not of safety redundancy, but risk amplification -- potentially under partial management of National Grid (NG). If this is the case, it is surely the tip of a much larger set of related concerns, especially considering both data and physical asset security.]

ME: I'd like to hear more about co-location of this pipeline along the right of way.

KM Rep: What do you want to know?

ME: Given the proposed 36" diameter line, roughly 1450 pounds per square inch maximum operating pressure (MAOP), the height of the power lines, their maximum and minimum voltages, and so on -- what is the projected distance of the pipeline from the centerline of the NG ROW?

[COMMENT: I already knew (but didn't mention) that these considerations and also the factor for natural gas (0.69) drive the size of the potential impact radius (PIR) and potential impact area (PIA).]

KM Rep: That depends.

ME: Given the variables, the distance can be calculated right?

KM Rep: There are standards, which we meet.

ME: So what is the formula for determining if these standards will be met?

KM Rep: Depends on the voltage in the transmission line.

ME: What is the assumed voltage range for this line?

KM Rep: We don't know.

ME: So, wouldn't these "standards" determine where the pipeline path could be located in the NG ROW?

KM Rep: It's not going to be there.

ME: So, it will be located in a series of easements?

KM Rep: We'll only need 5 feet of the NG ROW.

[COMMENT: Here perhaps the implication is that pipeline monitoring and control data infrastructure will be located within this narrow path in the NG ROW. There are many sectors along the proposed/co-located ROW that are subject to a variety of "natural" forces (e.g. potential washouts, freeze/thaw cycles, & related geologic realities -- placing both the pipeline and its related infrastructure at potential risk.)]

ME: How will the data from the requisite cathodic mitigation system rectifiers be transmitted?

KM Rep: It's monitored all the time.

[COMMENT: This exchange helped to focus part of my security critique regarding the NED project. There appears to be growing attention to the security and resilience of the electric power grid and bulk power infrastructure. (See cited REFERENCES section) and my related Questions below.)

However, is there parallel concern about or (any sort of) action plan to address asset resilience in the present or emergent regulations for natural gas transmission? The "public" version of the Northeast Energy Direct Project Draft Environmental Report 1 mentions nothing of this sort.

REFERENCES: 146 FERC ¶ 61,166 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION Before Commissioners: Cheryl A. LaFleur, Acting Chairman; Philip D. Moeller, John R. Norris, and Tony Clark. Reliability Standards for Physical Security Measures Docket No. RD14-6-000 ORDER DIRECTING FILING OF STANDARDS (Issued March 7, 2014)

*"...vulnerabilities and the security plan should also be reviewed by the North American Electric Reliability Corporation (NERC), the relevant Regional Entity, the Reliability Coordinator, or another entity with appropriate expertise. Finally, the Reliability Standards should require that the identification of the critical facilities, the assessment of the potential risks and vulnerabilities, and the security plans be periodically reevaluated and revised to ensure their continued effectiveness. NERC should establish a timeline for when such reevaluations should occur..."*

*"8. In the second step, the Reliability Standards should require owners or operators of the identified critical facilities to evaluate the potential threats and vulnerabilities to those identified facilities. The threats and vulnerabilities may vary from facility to facility based on factors such as the facility's location, size, function, existing protections and attractiveness as a target. Thus, the Reliability Standards should require the owners or operators to tailor their evaluation to the unique characteristics of the identified critical facilities and the type of attacks that can be realistically contemplated. NERC should also consider in the standards development process requiring owners and operators to consult with entities with appropriate expertise as part of this evaluation process.*

*9. Third and finally, the Reliability Standards should require those owners or operators of critical facilities to develop and implement a security plan designed to protect against attacks to those identified critical facilities based on the assessment of the potential threats and vulnerabilities to their physical security. The Reliability Standards themselves need not dictate specific steps an entity must take to protect against attacks on the identified facilities. However, the Reliability Standards need to require that owners in an adequate level of protection against the potential physical threats and vulnerabilities they face at the identified critical facilities."*

QUESTIONS / related concerns:

- Perhaps NG has addressed these matters already and KM therefore will be exempted by virtue of

the proposed “co-location”?

- Perhaps neither the existing NG transmission lines nor the proposed KM NED pipeline are considered critical infrastructure and therefore do/will not require a significant level of resilience, security, maintenance, and supervision. (Do “chains and padlocks” actually meet the existing standards?)

I am not aware of any public KM statements regarding “if” or “how” security standards will be met or who will determine the stringency of the systems and methods employed. Consequently, there appears to be a huge security gap that is left for the gas transmission industry to “self-regulate.” This is another example of the fox being allowed and encouraged to design the henhouse. Given the profit motives evident in KM’s business plan, it seems highly unlikely that “expensive” or time consuming security initiatives will ever be developed and employed, unless they are Federally mandated and ultimately paid for by others outside the industry itself. This is a typical business-as-usual model and promotes both near and long-term injustices for consumers, taxpayers, and landowners that include revenue stream enhancements driven by rate hikes, tariffs, &c.

If KM cannot show publically that their own cost-benefit analysis reasonably, comprehensively, and FAIRLY ameliorates stakeholder risk-benefit realities, the NED project should not be allowed to proceed.

To summarize: Strategic corporate (for profit) assets placed in easements (whether negotiated or seized by eminent domain) still – in my opinion – must be managed responsibly and assiduously (i.e. Fully safe-guarding the health, safety, and individual rights of stakeholders).

The NED pipeline promises to create – at the very least – an “attractive nuisance” that will continuously generate at least a half century of unnecessary and increasingly intolerable risk exposures, while offering NO long-term benefits for stakeholders.]

#### RESUMING CONVERSATIONS at KM Open House

(“Maps Table”):

ME: (having indentified my NG ROW/abutting property, just over the western border of Massachusetts) Is this parcel in an area where you are seeking easements?

KM Rep: (actively trying to establish a friendly relationship, hoping to come make a home visit and to make a deal) We hope you’ll work with us and that we can meet your needs.

ME: We have filed a “denial of access” letter. At this point, I would prefer to have my land taken by eminent domain than to negotiate a deal now. KM Rep: Tell us about your special concerns. If there’s an important tree or something, we could move the pipeline path to the other side of the NG ROW.

ME: ...and impact our neighbors who live extremely close to the ROW?

ME: My entire property will be in the potential impact area... right out to State Rte 43.

KM Rep (pointing to a location on the map): Oh, this property?

ME: No, that’s my neighbors’.

KM Rep: I’d like to come by and visit... I haven’t had chance to get over to your side of town yet.

ME: I’d prefer contact by mail.

WIFE: How exactly will this pipeline benefit me and/or any of my neighbors? It will negatively impact our property values, pose health/safety threats, and mean that we still need to pay taxes on land that someone else is using to turn large, unshared profits.

KM Rep: Ah... “You’ll be on the energy forefront!”

## End of KM Open House section. ##

KM’s description of “regular” safety inspections (including air and ground patrols) appears to be based on statutorily mandated schedules that are actually infrequent and rely primarily on remote monitoring.

The extent to which natural gas leaks are actively monitored and promptly repaired is impossible for the

average citizen to assess.

(By contrast, the EPA seems more proactively concerned about methane, citing (among other sources) green house gas discharges from landfills (See below for site reference)

*{figure, not included here}*

If only for a similar response to unregulated and/or avoidable methane gas releases, the gas transmission industry and KM specifically, should be far more proactive in maintaining and upgrading existing facilities before being permitted to construct additional infrastructure. KM's proposed new pipeline(s) should be models for environmental stewardship, not profit engines.

It doesn't matter if private sector pipeline developers proudly assert their track record to be better than most in their industry or proclaim their deep awareness of associated responsibilities. Such "responsibilities" are ultimately informed by the financial goals of owners, shareholders, investors, and hedge funds – not the near or long-term safety of residents in communities like our own.

Health and safety issues are very complex and I do not claim to be an expert in these matters. However, any average citizen, who takes time to evaluate the publicly available data and to review the recent and historic track records of the gas pipeline industry as a whole and KM in particular, will recognize the primary motive is financial profit. No further longitudinal study is necessary in this regard.

However, if we are individually or collectively inviting or (by default) planning to tolerate this long-term pipeline presence in Stephentown (or anywhere along the proposed NED route), what are the specific, positive benefits that will improve our collective lives as citizens, all of whom do pay taxes, care deeply about neighbors, children, grandchildren, seniors, quality of life, and more?

A newly donated fire truck, access to a new pipeline "ATV trail", or a donation to the already well-endowed Clark Art Museum in Williamstown, MA – individually or cumulatively – ultimately would not make day-to-day life healthier, safer, or less expensive in our rural community.

If the NED project is built and placed in service, water- and airborne environmental pollution stemming from 24x7x365 day compressor station operations, related blowdowns, system-wide fracked gas VOC/ methane leaks, and equipment failures (from whatever cause) WILL cumulatively contribute significantly to negative health exposures and the acceleration of global warming. We already know the hazardous radon and VOC payload that fracked (especially Marcellus) natural gas carries. As mentioned previously, the same transported NG product is used to fuel compressor station turbines, each of which will emit or produce hazardous exhausts and filtration by-products.

However, when I asked one KM Rep about these VOCs and other hazardous components of the natural gas being transported, I was told, "Our gas is filtered and clean! It's got to be, or else it could damage our equipment." The same rep, when I asked about radon content in the Marcellus-sourced natural gas, replied, "You have radon in your cellar!"

The existing NG electric transmission ROW is already an attractive playground for ATV and snowmobile traffic, some of which regularly moves across the nearby border New York State shares with Massachusetts. Riders from our own community, as well as from Pittsfield, MA and the Town of Lanesborough, MA frequently utilize this existing NG ROW.

It seems NYS Police are unwilling or not allowed to actively pursue ATV traffic using the travel lanes (or breakdown lanes or margins) of secondary and major public roads (such as NY Rte 43). Police patrol of the NG ROW, which has become a recreational "secondary highway system", appears highly unlikely – particularly in this rural and "under-populated" area of Rensselaer County. Even if there is a budget for such patrols, the response time can be much too long to be effective, because the nearest Rensselaer County State Police barracks is more than 15 winding miles away (by car) in Sand Lake, NY. County Sheriff patrols are also spread thin, due to limited resources. Stephentown has no "Police Department", leaving the formidable work of first responders largely to members of the volunteer Fire and Rescue Department. Commercial drones won't work well given present F.A.A. guidelines, because there's no line-of-sight option from Hous-

ton, TX.

Is this a call for more or intensified NED surveillance? NO. The extensive and appropriate levels monitoring, patrolling, aerial inspection, &c. would not be required if the NED project is not built. Such endeavors come at great hidden cost to taxpayers and product consumers. However, personal and “community” financial burden is only one dimension of “public inconvenience”. Further erosion of privacy and individual rights will also come with KM’s NED project. The demand for easements is just the tip of an individual/personal rights nightmare. Why does the adjective “Titanic” seem relevant?

Consequently, the proposed addition of more energy-critical infrastructure to this, “our” utility ROW, and similar “rural/urban” community-linking, open access “recreational” routes -- seems both unwise and potentially very risky, given the present climate of concern surrounding energy security. KM has not offered to bond any near or long term expenses stemming from such realities and or potential risks. It is far more likely that “delivery charges” would be added to fund such incidentals.

What about other types of direct impact on the so-called 99%? Perhaps there will be 50 years (expected useful life of the pipeline) of property tax credits or offsets, proportionately based on the ever-escalating loss of property values along the proposed NED route, particularly in the yet-to-be acknowledged Potential Impact Areas (“hazard” or “incineration” zones) flanking both sides of the proposed corridor? Will we need to retain legal counsel – at our own expense – to help negotiate an easement agreement that doesn’t include long-term personal and property liability?

[NOTE: It appears our entire property and home would be in such a hazard zone, based on the proposed 36” dia. natural gas pipeline and its maximum allowed operating pressure (MAOP)].

Perhaps our local citizens, who MUST and/or WANT to live in Stephentown, will receive shares of KM stock in compensation?

The preceding narrative details many issues that must be addressed, before the NED project is permitted or certified in any way. Although far from a complete case study of KM’s corporate misrepresentations and misleading statements -- there still needs to be much wider and focused public discussion and debate on such realities, typically wrapped in the flag of “public convenience and necessity.”

Full disclosure must be accomplished, before KM is encouraged directly or indirectly to invest more on a project that then becomes too big for investors to abandon. The NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT PROJECT / DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT / RESOURCE REPORT 1 (public version) is a start, but totally inadequate. This document offers only a shallow overview, addressing broad topics and in little depth; this public “position” makes a genuine critique and review of the NED project almost impossible for citizens who are not versed in such matters, because (in part) the carefully crafted morass of political and legal implications, spanning multiple State and Federal agencies and their respective policies, are far too complex to decode without the retention of a knowledgeable and experienced legal team. KM can afford such teams; most members of the general public, who are now forced to address the implications of the NED project, do not have the requisite resources or time to confront and rebut a project that has been “unilaterally” set in motion, with some help and guidance from FERC. In our view, the stated need for this project has not been fully justified by cited “increasing demand” for natural gas in the New England states. Every state is deeply concerned with the associated environmental issues, New York, being no exception.

With the present “glut” of available energy, we have a small window of R&D time to stress and expedite alternative energy sources that will be cleaner and which will contribute less-active greenhouse gases than natural gas, but also help diminish the continuing dependence on oil, coal, and nuclear sources. At present, natural gas may offer a transitional opportunity, but not a long-term solution.

In an effort to “do no harm” FERC permit applicants should be mandated to provide adequate funding (via project-specific performance bonds and/or other instrument of deposit) to insure that the transported product (e.g. natural gas, extracted and gathered by ANY means) and ANY related product or system by-products and emissions will meet stringent air and water quality standards defined by NYS Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC).

KM (in this and other future cases), along with similar producers and transporters of natural gas, should (at a minimum) adhere to the environmental laws of each state in which they seek to do business and not be guided by the presently authorized EPA oil and gas exemptions and exclusions for environmental quality. The taxpayers of New York and all other impacted states should not be forced to “go without” strict environmental assessments of such projects (due to underfunding) or regulation. Environmental review or subsequent regulation of KM’s project should not be subsidized with public funds.

Specifically, the expenses for necessary tests, staffing, or facilities required to perform appropriate and comprehensive analysis and subsequent regulation of transported products (particularly when substantial methane/VOC losses and deliberate industry releases are already substantial and actually known to occur on a regular basis) must not be absorbed by the taxpayers.

In New York, these responsibilities fall to NYSDEC, which presently defers too much of its authority to the gas industry itself on grounds of insufficient funds, lack of laboratories, equipment, and staffing.

We cannot assume that the gas transport industry will perform or subcontract appropriately objective and comprehensive sampling and testing of its shipped product(s). Furthermore, as presently structured, the transport industry can easily assert such responsibilities are those of the gas producers. This clever division of labor and responsibility is ripe for abuse.

I have shown that even KM’s typical “Open House” strategies include glossovers that help sidestep environmental realities, while simultaneously painting a benevolent abstraction of corporate good will, epitomized by Richard Kinder’s \$1.00 annual salary (the amount one KM Rep proudly reported to a visitor at the New Scotland, NY event).

We are in an era when some efforts to reform the “next generation” public school science curricula. (See: Schwartz article below)

*{figure, not included here}*

A state ban on “teaching climate change” in Wyoming (now an energy production capital) is indicative of how readily profit motives can undermine long-term common sense and academic integrity. How in fact should curricula be developed and taught, without being increasingly shaped by the self-serving interests of a booming energy sector?

Why is this “news” relevant to this commentary? If the KM Open Houses are to serve as educational outreach programs, it remains to be shown that NED (KM’s answer to the alleged New England demand for more NG capacity) is being proposed in an unbiased, credible, and environmentally responsibly way; or that KM can ever genuinely serve the best interests of domestic markets, market path abutters, the general public, or the long-term needs global populations.

Can corporations like KM guiltlessly serve their industry as mere transporters, not co-polluters? One can hope KMs market position is now or will soon become remain squeaky clean; but so far it appears their stunning corporate profitability relies in part on public ignorance, enhanced by a curriculum of friendly misrepresentations and distortions, such as those we experienced first-hand at the recent Pittsfield Open House.

Perhaps – according to some standard – “too few” citizens will register their concerns on this web site. But low numbers of citizen comments do not absolve FERC of its civic and ethical responsibilities in this matter. Furthermore, even if citizens can easily be or become marginalized as a result of the permitting and certification decisions made by FERC, the causes of low citizen awareness, understanding, or active participation cannot be viewed or ignored as a means to help justify and/or promote the intentions of a for-profit corporation whose publically promoted goals are falsely framed as the best means to achieve ends that will serve the near or long term environmental interests of this country or the global community. Kinder Morgan and its subsidiaries are privately owned, for-profit corporations. From our perspective, the NED project does not yet demonstrate best practices or environmental transparency.

Respectfully submitted,

William D. and Lucy S. Jackson (National Grid ROW / co-location abutters)

PO Box 278  
Stephentown, NY 12168

COPIES:

National Grid / Office of Counsel  
40 Sylvan Road  
Waltham, MA 02451

Michal DiAcetis, Manager  
Customer and Community Management  
National Grid Corporation  
1125 Broadway  
Albany, NY 12204

National Grid Customer Service Center C-3  
300 Erie Boulevard  
West Syracuse, NY 13202-4250

"...reducing the causes and impact of climate change, the promotion of the local environment around our operational sites, the delivery of energy efficiency and alleviating fuel poverty."

NYS Governor  
Governor Andrew Cuomo  
<http://gov.cuomo@chamber.state.ny.us>

US Senate

Senator Charles E. Schumer  
<http://www.schumer.senate.gov/contact/email-chuck>

Senator Kirsten Gillibrand  
<http://www.gillibrand.senate.gov/>

New York State Department of Environmental Conservation / Division of Environmental Permits  
c/o New York State Department of Environmental Conservation  
Deputy Commissioner Office of Air & Waste Management  
625 Broadway /14th Floor  
Albany, New York 12233-1010

NYS DEC Office of General Counsel  
625 Broadway 14th Floor  
Albany, New York 12233-1500

Office of Communication Services  
625 Broadway  
Albany, NY 12233-4500

Dale Desnoyers, General Counsel  
Stephen Tomasik, Project Manager  
NYSDEC 1130 North Westcott Rd.  
Schenectady, NY 12306-2014

William Clarke  
NYSDEC  
1130 North Westcott Rd.  
Schenectady, NY 12306-2014  
<http://dep.r4@dec.ny.gov>

US Representatives

Chris Gibson, District 19

2 Hudson Street  
PO Box 775  
Hudson, NY 12106

Paul Tonko, 20th District  
2463 Rayburn HOB  
Washington, DC 20515

State Senators

Kathleen Marchione (43rd district)  
Albany Office  
188 State Street Legislative Office Building - Room 918  
Albany, NY 12247  
Fax: (518) 426-6985

John Bonacic (42nd District)  
Albany Office  
188 State Street Room 509 Legislative Office Building  
Albany, NY 12247

Neil Breslin (44th District)  
Albany Office  
188 State Street Room 509 Legislative Office Building  
Albany, NY 12247

Cecilia Tkaczyk (46th District)  
Albany Office  
311 Legislative Office Building Empire State Plaza  
Albany, NY 12247

James Seward (51st District)  
<http://seward@nysenate.gov>

Tom Libous (52nd District)  
[www.senatorlibous.tel](http://www.senatorlibous.tel)

State Assemblymen

Steven McLaughlin  
(Assembly District 107)  
[mclaughlins@assembly.state.ny.us](mailto:mclaughlins@assembly.state.ny.us)

Angelo Santabarbara (Assembly District 111)  
[SantabarbaraA@assembly.state.ny.us](mailto:SantabarbaraA@assembly.state.ny.us)

Peter Lopez (Assembly District 102) [LopezP@assembly.state.ny.us](mailto:LopezP@assembly.state.ny.us)

Rensselaer County Executive  
Kathleen M. Jimino  
<http://www.rensco.com/execoffice.asp>

Rensselaer County Legislators  
Stan Brownell (Vice Chairman)  
[sbrownell@rensco.com](mailto:sbrownell@rensco.com)

Lester Goodermote  
[lgoodermote@rensco.com](mailto:lgoodermote@rensco.com)

Alexander A. Shannon  
[ashannon@rensco.com](mailto:ashannon@rensco.com)

Martin Reid, Chairman

mreid@renesco.com

...

and Local Officials

**20150223-5034(30186055).docx**

*{TGP Co Plot Plan: Typical Compression Station, not reproduced here}*

The image pictured above has been filed by the pipeline company as a “typical” compressor station. The one proposed for Rensselaer may be take even more than 75 acres, and there is no guarantee that it will not be expanded further sometime in the future.

At a Kinder Morgan Open House, the pipeline company stated that a padlock would secure the gate! This must not be acceptable. This pipeline project should not be approved. I hereby request that an effective, comprehensive security plan be developed and funded by the pipeline company covering the pipeline and all its related infrastructure before FERC seriously considers allowing this pipeline to proceed.

In addition, our energy needs must be met by a combination of the cleanest energy generation methods such as wind, solar, geo-thermal small hydro and tidal. The more we invest in dirty energy infrastructure, the longer we delay development and widespread use of cleaner energy alternatives. So here is FERC’s opportunity to take a leadership role toward a healthier, more secure future for all of us. Do not approve this pipeline.

John Serio  
seriojj@gmail.com  
Stephentown, NY

**20150223-5069(30187431).txt**

Frank Gullotto, Wilmington, MA.

Many residents of Wilmington and North Reading Massachusetts are concerned about the Lynnfield Lateral pipeline project that is being planned by Kinder Morgan. The proposed path will impact drinking water supplies, private property, wetlands and conservation land.

Residents had hoped to get many of the project details at the February 17 Kinder Morgan open house in Andover, Massachusetts, but unfortunately, most of the answers were vague. Kinder Morgan told many of us that the route through the area is still being looked at and may change. However, again, they could provide no details or guarantees.

I spent some time speaking with a Kinder Morgan rep about the risk of running gas pipelines through a town’s drinking water supply and he said it is safe to drink water that has been contaminated with gas. This was a stunning answer. Rather than attempt to assure me that there would be no leaks or that any potential leak would be fixed, the rep said that we would just need to let the gas dissipate before drinking the water. I did eventually get him to agree with me that this was not the best option. He said that Kinder Morgan is aware of Wilmington resident’s concerns about the water supply and will be looking at re-routing the line away from the town wells.

I ask that FERC not approve any project that allows routing gas lines through a drinking water supply. This would be an irresponsible risk.

I also ask that FERC not allow Kinder Morgan or any other company to take land by eminent domain since it would be done as a means of increasing profits for the company and shareholders. The intent of eminent domain is for the good of the people, not the good of private company bottom lines.

Thank you,  
Frank Gullotto  
Wilmington, MA

**20150223-5296(30199156).txt**

Frank Gullotto, Wilmington, MA. Many residents of Wilmington and North Reading Massachusetts have expressed concerns about Kinder Morgan's Lynnfield Lateral pipeline that will route through water supplies, private property, wetlands and conservation land. Our hope was to get some project details from Kinder Morgan at their recent open house in Andover Massachusetts. However, answers were vague and Kinder Morgan said they are still working on changing the planned route. When I questioned routing a gas line through a public water supply, Kinder Morgan's rep said that it's safe to drink water if gas is leaking into the wells. He said we just need to let the gas dissipate before drinking. I'm stunned by such a response and the KM rep did agree this may not be the best option. I ask that FERC not allow any route that includes gas pipelines running through drinking water supplies. This would be an irresponsible risk. The people of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and other states ha

**20150224-0025(30195233).pdf**

James D. Hartman TGP,LLC

1615 Suffield St

Agawam, MA 01001

phone: 603-325-1232

cell: 603-325-1222

Date: 1-6-15

RE: Denying property access

As the owner of the property located at

21 Thorntons Ferry Rd 2

Amherst NH 03031

I am denying permission to TGP- Kinder Morgan, 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.

Clint Ellsworth Brittany Ellsworth

**20150224-0026(30194572).pdf**

February 7, 2015

Attn: Patty Quinn

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC

Kinder Morgan

1615 Suffield Street

Agawam, MA 01001

Re: Denying Property

As the owner of the property located at 11 Rhodora Drive, Amherst, NH, I am denying permission to TGP- Kinder Morgan, 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.

Tammy T. Mondor Roger R. Mondor

CC: Chairman Cheryl A. LaFluer

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, NE

Washington, DC 20426

Amherst, NH Police Department

**20150224-0028(30194610).pdf**

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC

1615 Suffield Street

Agawam, MA 01001

Date: January 21, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access

As the owner of the property located at:

130 ORE Beed Rd Maps/Block/lot = 223 31

Lanesborough, MA

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.

David J. Plaza

Nathaniel M. Plaza

Carol E. Plaza

*{unsigned copy of letter titled: }*

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.-Northeast Energy Direct  
SURVEY PERMISSION

Commonwealth of Massachusetts  
County of BERKSHIRE  
Town of LANESBOROUGH

LL#:MA WD 29.00  
Total # of tracts: 1  
Map/Block/Lot: 2 31

*{ with contents crossed out }*

**20150224-0031(30195219).pdf**

**State of New Hampshire**  
**House of Representatives**  
Concord

February 12, 2015

Sent via Registered Mail

Cheryl A LaFleur, Chair

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, NE

Washington, D.C. 20426

RE: Kinder Morgan proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project  
Docket N.PF14-22-000

Dear Chairwoman LaFleur:

I am the current Majority Leader of the New Hampshire House of Representatives, however I am sending you this letter as the Representative serving District 26 of Hillsboro County.

After concerns from my constituents, review of documents from Kinder Morgan and discussions with

Eversource New Hampshire (formerly Public Service of New Hampshire), I am providing you the following input regarding the referenced project being reviewed by your commission.

If the project is approved, 17 communities will be affected. This proposal includes provisions of eminent domain, access roads and pumping stations. This is above and beyond the blasting, construction and environmental impact to install the pipeline. This pipeline is considered needed due to the increased price and demand for natural gas for electricity production for the region. I assume the natural gas will provide energy to the existing power generating facilities in the region. They in turn, provide electricity for ISO-NE, located in Connecticut.

Additionally, in discussions with Eversource New Hampshire, they plan on proposing to your commission an enlarging of an EXISTING natural gas pipeline, the Spectra Pipeline. This pipeline services generating facilities in Connecticut, Massachusetts and New Hampshire. All of these power generating facilities provide power to ISO-NE.

In light of the aforementioned facts and the attempt to minimize the impact of resolving the energy needs in the New England Region, I am encouraging you to deny the Kinder Morgan Proposal and approve the enlarging of the Spectra Pipeline upon its submission.

Furthermore, for your information, when either of these projects comes to the New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee (SEC), I will be supporting the enlarging of the Spectra Pipeline.

I am sure you can understand the benefits of utilizing an existing pipeline over constructing a new one. Furthermore, with the power sold through the New England Grid (ISO-NE), having a pipeline that already provides natural gas to those power generators makes the most sense.

If you have any questions, feel free to contact me at the number listed below. I hope you view this information helpful and concur with the conclusions I have made and suggested outcome.

Sincerely Yours,

Rep Jack Flanagan  
Serving the Towns of Brookline and Mason, NH  
603-271-3665  
NH House of Representatives  
107 No. Main Street  
Concord, NH 03301

cc: Rep. Shawn Jasper, Speaker  
Sen. Charles Morse, Senate President  
Governor Maggie Hassan  
Sen. Kelly Ayotte  
Sen. Jeanne Shaheen  
Rep. Frank Guinta  
Rep. Anne Kuster  
William Quinlan, President of Eversource New Hampshire  
Allen Fore, Kinder Morgan

**20150224-0039(30195834).pdf**

Joanne McGee  
9 Main St.  
Northfield MA 01360  
413-498-5022

February 10, 2015

Kimberley Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

8\$B First Stnset NE, Room IA  
Washington DC 20216

RE: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC. Docket No. PF14-224100, Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Secretary Rose,

I am writing to express my oppositiim to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline's revised route for the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline project in western Massachusetts. The new route enters Northfield at our southern boundary and follows a tnmssmission line all the way tu our northern boundary. Plans call for an 80,000 megawatt compressor alcmg the route in the midst of our mcmational tmil network. Co-locating the pipeline with the transmission line means that both the construction and the eventual location ofthe pipeline will intrude on permanently conserved parcels in the woodland used for recreation, open space and wikgife habitat.

One ofthese areas is Brush Mountain Conservation Area, a 46-acre parcel which is the tndlhead for the New England National Scenic Trail, formerly the Metacomet-Monadnock Historic trail. This part ofthe trail is considered the most scenic in Western Massachusetts and attracts hundreds of both day and thru hikers. The Brush Mt. Parcel is also the historic homestead site of Calvin Swan (1799-1875), a fice black man who was a well-regarded carpenter and sawmill owner and who founded two anti-abolitionist societies. Cellar holes and the original well attest to his life in this mountain community.

Nearby, our new Northfield Town Forest, a Forest Legacy project, is the site of a carefully detailed forest stewardship plan whose goals include wildlife management and forest management. Both the Brush Mt. Parcel and the Town Forest are the result of years ofvolunteer effort including fund raising, BioBlitzes, and town meetings. It would be a staggering blow to the residents ofNorthfield to site a pipeline and compressor in this unique wea.

The proposed pipeline and compressor also intrude on another permanently conserved parcel - the Richardson conservation restriction at the summit of Alexander Hill Road. Our hiking trails, including the New England National Scenic Trail, converge at this point at a trailhead with the Northtield State Forest giving hikers, skiers, and snowshoers access to a large network of possibilities. Atter all our work, including newly-installed kiosks with trail maps, it would be a travesty to have it ruined by a pipeline and a compressor.

The results ofthe 2012 Open Space survey and the 2014 Master Plan showed that Nortbfield residents overwhelmingly appiuciate the quiet, rural, scenic qualities ofthe town and many of them chose Northfield because of its recreational possibilities.

I urge that the pipeline and the compressor be relocated to avoid these conservation and hiking areas.

Sincerely,  
Joanne McGee

**20150224-0042(30195862).pdf**

Certified mail, Wendy Carron, 151 South Main Street, Lanesboro, MA 01237, denying access to TGP

**20150224-5031(30193567).txt**

Hiel Lindquist, Fitzwilliam, NH.

What I learned at the Rindge, NH Kinder Morgan open house.

As a homeowner with a residence within a 1,000-foot distance of the proposed Kinder Morgan NED natural gas pipeline I have a concern as to the dangers associated with any rupture of the pipeline. When I asked a specific question to Kinder Morgan as to whether or not my residence was within the danger zone of the pipeline in the event of a rupture I did not receive any answer, other than the statement "there will not be a rupture". Furthermore, I was told that even if the pipeline went through my back yard, I would not be in any danger because "there would not be a rupture".

OK, I admit that it is highly unlikely that there will be a rupture, but ruptures do occur on natural gas pipelines. I still wanted to know the answer to my question so I did some searching when I returned home. I

did find a hint of the information that I was searching for on the U.S. DOT website. This information is for natural gas pipelines:

An equation has been developed based on research and experience that estimates the distance from a potential explosion at which death, injury or significant property damage could occur. This distance is known as the “potential impact radius” (or PIR), and is used to depict potential impact circles.

OK, that seems straight forward enough. I still don’t know the answer to my “1,000 foot question”, but at least I know the information must be available somewhere. I can only assume that the Kinder Morgan person I was speaking to (he said he was an engineer), either is not familiar with the regulations or he was not willing to share that information with me. In either case I find the Kinder Morgan response disconcerting.

I had heard about how some areas might be designated as High Consequence Areas (HCA’s), so I asked some of the Kinder Morgan reps what HCA’s were all about. They didn’t know the answer and so I talked to the Kinder Morgan engineer again. He gave me some nebulous answer and said that FERC establishes HCA’s and Kinder Morgan is responsible for meeting the requirements in an HCA. Since FERC establishes the HCA’s he couldn’t tell me where they would be on the NED. While researching the information on my “1,000-foot” question I find the following (on the same U.S. DOT website):

Operators must calculate the potential impact radius for all points along their pipelines and evaluate corresponding impact circles to identify what population is contained within each circle.

Potential impact circles that contain 20 or more structures intended for human occupancy; buildings housing populations of limited mobility; buildings that would be hard to evacuate (e.g., nursing homes, schools); or buildings and outside areas occupied by more than 20 persons on a specified minimum number of days each year, are defined as HCA’s.

OK, that seems straightforward as well. If I understand the HCA issue correctly, the operator is responsible for identifying HCA’s. Hmmm, then why the statement that FERC dictates HCA’s and that Kinder Morgan has no idea where they will be?

Next, I went over to one of the easels where a Kinder Morgan rep was “explaining” why New England needs the NED pipeline. The Kinder Morgan rep claimed, “most of the coal based electric power generating facilities in New England will be closing soon”. Among the nebulous “many power plants statements” was a specific statement that the “Seabrook, NH nuclear station would be closing soon”, so New England needed the pipeline and new natural gas generation facilities to replace the Seabrook electric output. This was all news to me, so I tried to find some information that supported the statements from Kinder Morgan. I did find some information on “Coal Plant Retirements”. However, it didn’t seem to indicate, “most of the plants would be retired soon”. I couldn’t find any information on Seabrook station. Perhaps FERC can shed some light on that?

I also had a lengthy conversation with a Kinder Morgan rep concerning Kinder Morgan’s safety record. While Kinder Morgan claims they like to be “transparent” on their safety record and they are “proud of their safety record and put the information on their website. This shows how transparent they are”. I am sure they are a proud company, but I find the information far from transparent. I specifically asked how many reported pipeline incidents Kinder Morgan had last year. The rep didn’t seem to know the answer, other than to say the Kinder Morgan safety record is on their website. In a search I found that they claim there were something like 0.22 incidents per 1,000 miles of pipeline. That is not really the answer I was looking for, as I want to know how many reportable incidents there were. I suppose I could “back into” that number using the Kinder Morgan supplied miles of pipeline. However, I find they claim 68,000 miles in their annual report and 80,000 miles on their website. There was a chart at the open house that said they had 70,000 miles. I suppose the number of incidents is around 25, but who knows?

Time leave and still had more questions than answers. I also wanted to talk to FERC about the project timeline and approval process. Unfortunately no one from FERC.

I must admit that I had a negative view of the NED project before attending the open house. Still, I tired

to have an open mind about the project. I find that I am even more distrustful of Kinder Morgan after the event. Every answer I received from Kinder Morgan didn't sound correct to me. When I verified and fact-checked the answers I found that, in fact, most of the answers were incomplete or at worst, outright lies.

This is not the type of company I would want to be associated. I laugh at Kinder Morgan statement "Doing business the right way, every day, is paramount at Kinder Morgan". If Kinder Morgan is "proud to outperform the industry averages" I would hate to see what the rest of the industry is like.

**20150224-5036(30193827).txt**

Hiel Lindquist, Fitzwilliam, NH.

The amount of misinformation provided by Kinder Morgan is getting ridiculous. I would have included the following on my last comment, but I just received more information.

At the Rindge, NH Open House last night (Feb 23, 2015) I told a Kinder Morgan rep that I had seen many statements as to how big a right-of-way Kinder Morgan would require for the NED. I said I had heard numbers such as 400 feet, 150 feet, 125 feet and 100 feet. It was confusing and I wanted to hear from Kinder Morgan exactly what they would require. He told me quite specifically that they would need a 50-foot right of way. He said that the 400 feet was probably referring to the "scooping" requirements of the project. He didn't know where those other numbers I referred to came from.

OK, fair enough, finally some factual information. However, I was just speaking with a property owner impacted by the pipeline. He told me the Kinder Morgan letter he received is asking for a 100 foot right-of-way for construction and 50 foot for the pipeline.

I went away from the meeting believing there would be a 50 foot clear-cut for the pipeline. Now I find out it will be 100 feet. I wonder how many other people went away from the meeting with the same impression?

Why is it that I never get a straight answer from Kinder Morgan? Why didn't the rep say it was 100 feet? OH, because I didn't ask the question the right way, therefore he wasn't about to provide any more information than what was actually required. Transparent? Fair and open? Not Kinder Morgan, that is for sure !

**20150224-5138(30195558).txt**

Jan A. Griska, Rindge, NH.

The NED Pipeline and Rhododendron State Park:

Kinder Morgan is misrepresenting the NED pipeline's impact on the Rhododendron State Park. Their map of the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline and related incineration zone shows the park as only existing in Fitzwilliam, New Hampshire, well south of the pipeline.

Let me set the record straight. My JIMAPCO New Hampshire Road Atlas, maps 132 and 133 clearly show a much larger park that is located in Fitzwilliam, Troy and Richmond. The proposed route of the pipeline cuts through the park. If the scale of the map is correct, we are looking at them cutting a swath through the park that is two miles long and 100 to 400 feet wide. The width of the swath varies from Kinder Morgan representative to representative. It is just like getting them to tell you the number of compressor stations that they will need to run the pipeline.

Rhododendron State Park exists because wild Rhododendrons are extremely rare in New England, especially Northern New England. Most people would tell you their northern range is Western Pennsylvania.

I spoke to a Tennessee Pipeline Company Representative last evening at the Rindge, New Hampshire Kinder Morgan show and tell. He admitted that their map was wrong, but he avoided using words like misrepresentation etc. What they are doing is minimizing the impact this pipeline will have on Southern New Hampshire and it's quality of life.

Thank you,

Jan A. Griska

Rindge, N.H. 03461

**20150224-5139(30195562).txt**

Rosemary Wessel, Cummington, MA.

Upon finding that FERC was not in attendance at last night's Open House for Kinder Morgan's Northeast Energy Direct project in Rindge, NH, one community member called FERC to inquire why. She was told by staff there that they were not notified by Kinder Morgan of the dates and locations of this week's Open Houses, which had been rescheduled due to bad weather a few weeks ago.

The absence of FERC officials is not acceptable and a great disservice to the people of the region. Kinder Morgan needs to follow up on its changes in schedule with all parties.

This Open House and any others for which FERC is not prepared to attend need to be rescheduled. Also, the Open House for Castleton-on-Hudson, NY was cancelled because of weather and has not yet be rescheduled. This is the closest one to the intended location of a 90,000 Horsepower compressor station. Leaving this off the schedule should not be allowed.

**20150224-5169(30195857).pdf**

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:

Where Is FERC?

I attended the Kinder Morgan Open House in Rindge, NH last evening (2/23/2015). I had several issues and questions that I had wanted to raise with FERC staff members and was very disappointed that there were no FERC personnel in attendance. I believe that FERC should insure that they have representatives available at all such Open Houses. There are further Open Houses scheduled for 2/24 (today), 2/25 and 2/26. I can only hope that FERC personnel will be in attendance.

Kinder Morgan employees often respond to pipeline questions with answers like "We are only making a proposal to FERC. They are the ones who are in charge and will have the final decision on this". It seems only reasonable then that FERC insure that its own representatives are available at all Open Houses.

It has been stated that Kinder Morgan did not inform FERC of this week's rescheduled Open Houses. If this is so, it seems an intolerable situation. First FERC's "strong recommendation" to Kinder Morgan that it reschedule Open Houses planned for the week of February 16th is ignored by the company hoping to gain approval for this huge and disruptive project. And then Kinder Morgan does not inform FERC of another set of Open Houses rescheduled for this week? Just how is it that all affected residents will be afforded a chance to raise questions and misgivings about this planned pipeline?

The proper question to FERC at this point seems to be "Who is in charge of this process?". I thought it was FERC, but the answer seems to be coming back more and more as "Kinder Morgan".

Is this what we can expect to continue to occur as this project progresses through the pre-filing stage?

Nick Miller  
Groton, MA

**20150224-5172(30195874).txt**

Eileen Quinn, Cheshire, MA.

I must make a comment about this proposed pipeline. After listening to presentations opposing the pipeline and attending an open house with Kinder Morgan, and reading many articles about this project, I firmly believe it is completely unnecessary and the enormity of the project does not justify the benefit. It is obvious this project is being set up for export to other countries, thus making it much more of a money maker than filling a genuine need. There are other options to filling whatever energy shortage there may be for short windows of time during the year. Let's continue to focus on alternative energy sources that are much more sustainable and do not disrupt, invade and put the residents of the commonwealth and our beautiful earth at risk. Thank you

**20150224-5198(30196005).txt**

Matthew Goldsmith, Boston, MA.

To Whom it May Concern,

I am writing today to advocate for the denial of the proposed Northeast Direct Gas Pipeline by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co, LLC (docket # PF14-22).

I believe this project should be denied for 2 main reasons. The first is the environmental impact of this project. Running this gas pipeline through the communities in NY, MA, and NH will cause a negative impact throughout the pipeline route. The installation of the pipe itself will cause destruction of the environment. In addition, there are venting stations which then impact air quality and noise quality in surrounding communities. Finally the production of natural gas itself is extremely damaging to the environment. Rather than using our public and private lands and resources on this type of project, we should be investing in clean, renewable power alternatives that are more sustainable and far less disruptive to our environment and the population.

The second reason for my opposition is the impact on people. This pipeline will run through many privately held lands that will be taken by eminent domain. In addition to the taking of the land, the residents in these communities will be subjected to the noise and disruption associated with the building of the pipeline, they will be subjected to the subsequent noise and pollution associated with maintaining the pipeline, and they will be subjected to the constant worry and fear of a pipeline accident. Many homeowners will see their home insurance rates go up, their home resale values go down, and will experience other negative impacts to their properties or wells as a result of blasting and clearcutting, none of which will they be compensated for.

My parents live along the pipeline route. They are both retired in their 60's and built their own house about 35 years ago in a rural community in NH. Having this gas pipeline threaten their property and well-being at this point in life has already caused them immeasurable stress. They have put their house on the market... but they don't want to move. They simply cannot live with the idea that this pipeline will destroy their yard, potentially destroy their well water through blasting, and potentially make their house uninsurable and unsaleable. I have heard many others in their community share these same sentiments, and I am sure that is replicated across the impacted communities. This is not the way we should treat our citizens in this country... there are better ways of doing business and we should be working to find those ways, not clinging to the methods of the past.

This intrusion into the private lives of citizens and the negative impact on American communities demands that an extremely high bar be set for necessity – in fact, the bar should be that the necessity is absolutely critical to the survival or well-being of the impacted areas. It should not be a question of prices or money. I don't believe this pipeline project can meet that high bar, and therefore the cost to people's lives, and the well-being of everyone in the region should not be put at risk.

Sincerely,

Matthew Goldsmith

**20150225-0020(30199301).pdf**

**FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

WASHINGTON, DC 20408

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

February 24, 2015

The Honorable Frank Guinta  
U.S. House of Representatives  
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Congressman Guintar:

Thank you for your January 14, 2015, email regarding Kinder Morgan subsidiary, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.'s (Tennessee Gas) planned Northeast Energy Direct Project (Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Docket No. PF14-22-000).

I appreciate the concern that your constituents in New Hampshire need to have adequate time to meaningfully review the Tennessee Gas project before any final decision is made on the pipeline route. While the Commission staff began the pre-filing process for this project on October 2, 2014, let me assure you that it is still early in our environmental review process and we have not yet established the formal public comment period. 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.

After the completion of the Company-sponsored open house meetings for the project (that began in February 2015) my staff will issue a Notice of Intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the project, which will initiate the formal public comment period. In order to conduct a thorough and comprehensive environmental review, my staff will also hold scoping meetings throughout the project area, including New Hampshire, during the public comment period. Should Tennessee Gas file an application, which is projected to occur in September 2015, our staff will comprehensively analyze the project issues in the EIS. During the process of preparing the EIS for the project, your constituents in New Hampshire will have numerous opportunities to meaningfully comment on the project and the adequacy of the EIS.

Please be assured, as in any Commission matter, that we strive to make our review of project 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,

Cheryl A. LaFleur  
Chairman

**20150225-0021(30199307).pdf**

**FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

WASHINGTON, DC 20428

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

February 24, 2015

The Honorable Ann Kuster  
U.S. House of Representatives  
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Congresswoman Kuster:

Thank you for your January 14, 2015, email regarding Kinder Morgan subsidiary, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.'s (Tennessee Gas) planned Northeast Energy Direct Project (Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Docket No. PF14-22-000).

I appreciate the concern that your constituents in New Hampshire need to have adequate time to meaningfully review the Tennessee Gas project before any final decision is made on the pipeline route. While the Commission staff began the pre-filing process for this project on October 2, 2014, let me assure you that it is still early in our environmental review process and we have not yet established the formal public comment period. 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.

After the completion of the Company-sponsored open house meetings for the project (that began in February 2015) my staff will issue a Notice of Intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the project, which will initiate the formal public comment period. In order to conduct a thorough and comprehensive environmental review, my staff will also hold scoping meetings throughout the project area, including New Hampshire, during the public comment period. Should Tennessee Gas file an application, which is projected to occur in September 2015, our staff will comprehensively analyze the project issues in the EIS. During the process of preparing the EIS for the project, your constituents in New Hampshire will have numerous opportunities to meaningfully comment on the project and the adequacy of the EIS.

Please be assured, as in any Commission matter, that we strive to make our review of project 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,

Cheryl A. LaFleur  
Chairman

**20150225-0022(30199311).pdf**

**FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION**  
WASHINGTON, DC 20426

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

February 24, 2015

The Honorable Kelly Ayotte  
United States Senate  
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Ayotte:

Thank you for your January 14, 2015, email regarding Kinder Morgan subsidiary, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.'s (Tennessee Gas) planned Northeast Energy Direct Project (Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Docket No. PF14-22-000).

I appreciate the concern that your constituents in New Hampshire need to have adequate time to meaningfully review the Tennessee Gas project before any final decision is made on the pipeline route. While the Commission staff began the pre-filing process for this project on October 2, 2014, let me assure you that it is still early in our environmental review process and we have not yet established the formal public comment period. 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.

After the completion of the Company-sponsored open house meetings for the project (that began in February 2015) my staff will issue a Notice of Intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the

project, which will initiate the formal public comment period. In order to conduct a thorough and comprehensive environmental review, my staff will also hold scoping meetings throughout the project area, including New Hampshire, during the public comment period. Should Tennessee Gas file an application, which is projected to occur in September 2015, our staff will comprehensively analyze the project issues in the EIS. During the process of preparing the EIS for the project, your constituents in New Hampshire will have numerous opportunities to meaningfully comment on the project and the adequacy of the EIS.

Please be assured, as in any Commission matter, that we strive to make our review of project 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,

Cheryl A. LaFleur  
Chairman

**20150225-0023(30199312).pdf**

**FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION**  
WASHINGTON, DC 20428

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

February 24, 2015

The Honorable Jeanne Shaheen  
United States Senate  
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Shaheen:

Thank you for your January 14, 2015, email regarding Kinder Morgan subsidiary, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.'s (Tennessee Gas) planned Northeast Energy Direct Project (Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Docket No. PF14-22-000).

I appreciate the concern that your constituents in New Hampshire need to have adequate time to meaningfully review the Tennessee Gas project before any final decision is made on the pipeline route. While the Commission staff began the pie-filing process for this project on October 2, 2014, let me assure you that it is still early in our environmental review process and we have not yet established the formal public comment period. 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.

After the completion of the Company-sponsored open house meetings for the project (that began in February 2015) my staff will issue a Notice of Intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the project, which will initiate the formal public comment period. In order to conduct a thorough and comprehensive environmental review, my staff will also hold scoping meetings throughout the project area, including New Hampshire, during the public comment period. Should Tennessee Gas file an application, which is projected to occur in September 2015, our staff will comprehensively analyze the project issues in the EIS. During the process of preparing the EIS for the project, your constituents in New Hampshire will have numerous opportunities to meaningfully comment on the project and the adequacy of the EIS.

Please be assured, as in any Commission matter, that we strive to make our review of project 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,

Cheryl A. LaFleur  
Chairman

**20150225-0030(30199577).pdf**

Docket 1 PF14-22

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, NE

February 18, 2015

Re: Denying Property Access

As the owners of our private road and the individual lots located at:

Delton Drive, Rindge NH 03461

We are denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter our land or private road to perform surveys, or for any other purpose. Any physical entry onto our private road or properties will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass. 26 Delton Drive: Keith Hodgman

29 Delton Drive: Jered Sauvola

37 Delton Drive: Tyler Seppala

43 Delton Drive: Matt Sauvola

44 Delton Drive: Dane Sauvola

Map 5 Lot 1 4-7: Aaron Rosenlund

**20150225-0031(30199576).pdf**

Docket PF14-22

February 18, 2015

Tyler Seppala  
37 Delton Drive  
Rindge, NH 03461

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

Dear Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company,

I'm writing this letter on behalf of ag property owners on Delton Drive located in Rindge, NH. I arrived back in town on February 12, 2013 after being out of the state. I was informed by a fellow resident and also saw for myself that a survey stake had been placed on our road. The stake was placed approximately 18(y down Delton Drive on the left-hand side of the road and was placed in a snowbank. As you should know from your research Delton Drive is a private road and is not a public road. At the front of the road and clearly visible are multiple "No Trespassing" signs. Your suiveyors were trespassing on our private property. Your stake didn't make it through the plowing of the road in the last snow storm and any attempt to install a new stake will result in us being forced to take necessary legal action against your company. Please find attached our letter denying permission to survey on any portion of Dalton Drive from all of us landowners. Your company couldn't have chosen a more destructive path for your pipeline location as it goes through our neighborhood.

Tyler Seppala

Enclosure: Denying Survey Permission for Delton Drive

Cc: Town of Rindge Select Board  
Town of Rindge Police Department  
Kimberley Bose FERC

**20150225-5057(30196431).txt**

David Yachnin, Andover, MA.

My name is David Yachnin, I abut the proposed pipeline in Andover (5 Ellsworth Road) and I am writing to notify FERC of the misinformation provided by Kinder Morgan at the “open” house held in Andover on February 17th.

When Kinder Morgan representatives were asked direct questions about the pipeline they knowingly and consciously lied. As the Kinder Morgan representatives were all well briefed and trained for this meeting, their lies and misinformation were conscious and deliberate acts.

We have documented the individuals names and their answers to questions. For example, when asked about the safety record of Kinder Morgan the response was it was “impeccable”. When the same representative was asked to clarify and comment on the documented accident rate, he remained silent and would not comment further. Another example is when a representative was asked about the co-location of the pipeline with existing utility corridors; the response was that the pipeline would be “within the existing corridor”. When pressed by the fact the survey teams are surveying 150 from the corridor the same representative stated that “Kinder Morgan” was doing their best efforts where it was feasible”. When pressed about the actual facts, and that Kinder Morgan was not making best efforts the representative again remained silent. We have several other documented cases.

I submit to FERC that not only did Kinder Morgan not comply with the required public awareness through open houses with the community (they intentionally scheduled the open house to coincide with the school vacation week to minimize attendance) but during the open house they knowingly misled the public.

I was unaware of any FERC officials at the open house in Andover.

Now that FERC has knowledge of these alleged infractions and potentially illegal acts, FERC should thoroughly investigate these allegations and concerns as part of Kinder Morgan’s application. FERC should request and make available all internal communications within Kinder Morgan and their representatives, employees and staff (including e-mail, instant messaging, text messaging, meeting notes, written correspondence) regarding open houses and information that will made available to the public to investigate their actions and instructions. This includes all written and verbal instructions, guidelines covering the creation of the instructions, drafts, copies, notes and recollections.

Notice of their actions will also be submitted to the State Attorney Generals office for investigation.

**20150225-5084(30196963).txt**

Frederik and Judtih Rusch, EastNassau, NY.

Please do what you can to stop the construction of the Kinder Morgan gas pipeline that is planed for Scho-dack, Nassau, and Stephentown. The dangers to air, quietness, water, and land are considerable. The pipeline provides no local benefit and portends major liabilities and disasters.

Thank you,

Judith Marcus Rusch  
Frederik L. Rusch  
East Nassau, NY 12062

**20150225-5098(30197169).txt**

Nick Caruso, Castleton, NY.

I have some serious concerns about an expanded NED pipeline that Kinder Morgan is proposing. This line

would be within 1000 feet of my house. Recent pipeline explosions have decimated homes and people within this zone. Our neighborhood has 20 homes with many children, all who would be killed in an accident. Another major concern we have is that every home in our neighborhood has extremely high levels of radon and very poor water quality. The constant vibration from a larger system will disrupt the ground and potentially worsen our water and increase radon levels. All 20 of our homes are new within a year and we all paid a fortune for them. There is serious concern that this pipeline will decrease the value of our homes. All of the concerns above are due to a pipeline that will not benefit New York. This pipeline will create extreme danger with no benefit to our area. There is no need for this pipeline. Please do not allow this to proceed so natural gas companies can get rich while the rest of us suffer. This pipeline is also proposed to run directly through the Gould Orchard apple farm. All fall there are thousands of people there a day. The danger of an explosion is just too great and the fact that this gas is going to be exported for profit and not used by the US makes this risk unacceptable.

**20150225-5148(30197741).txt**

Maryann Harper, Rindge, NH.

Dear FERC:

Where were you on February 23, 2015?

I, along with many other residents of Rindge, NH and nearby communities, braved sub-zero temperatures for a chance to talk with FERC about our concerns regarding the Tennessee Gas proposed NED pipeline project. ( PF-14-22-000)

While we were subjected during the evening to a variety of vague statements from TGP and given no real answers to our questions, many of us attended and waded through this mire of sleazy sales tactics by TGP for a chance to talk with FERC.

We were told that representatives from FERC attend the Open Houses and are available to answer questions. The Open House was scheduled during the week of school vacation, perhaps you had a similar scheduling conflict.

When are you coming to Rindge? We have questions that need answers. We will help to arrange a venue for you.

Respectfully,  
Maryann Harper

**20150225-5222(30198332).txt**

Kathleen Padden, Warwick, MA.

This proposed pipeline would be disastrous for my town and my region. The many jobs that it would be taking away by destroying farms and businesses far outweigh the few temporary jobs it would create. Do not approve this pipeline, it is not in the best interests of the people in any way.

**20150225-5230(30198502).txt**

Frank Edelblut, Wilton, NH.

My understanding is that there are two additional FERC filings that seek to do the same thing as the Kinder Morgan filing, namely to increase the supply of PA natural gas to New England to be used for power generation, among other uses. These alternative project proposals use existing pipeline easements. As a result, other than the possibility of some small "work-arounds" there would be very little need for eminent domain taking of property and any disturbance would follow the existing right-of-way. Alternatively, the Kinder Morgan proposal is a new pipeline that will require miles of new eminent domain taking and disturbance along the entire route.

Can you confirm which projects these are so that I can compare the FERC applications? Thank you.

**20150225-5292(30199135).txt**

David S Beach, Amherst, NH.

Kinder Morgan NED Project (PF14-22) Open House Comments

In order to become more informed about the proposed Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct project I attended the open house in Milford, NH on February 24th, 2015. At that meeting I had the opportunity to pose several questions to Kinder Morgan employees and company representatives. Some of the answers were informative, others were clearly evasive. Some answers conflicted with prior information from KM, and some responses seemed to be intentionally misleading.

The primary purpose of this note however, is to show my appreciation for FERC's attendance at the meeting and John Peconom's performance in particular. John's title at FERC Office of Energy Projects is Environmental Biologist, but he spent the entire evening fielding questions on the full spectrum of the proposed project and FERC's role and processes. His answers were well thought out, frank, and easy to understand. It is extremely unfortunate that FERC representation is not available at all open houses. I believe that all of us who asked questions or just listened to John's responses benefited from his knowledge and candid answers.

I strongly encourage FERC to provide representatives at all Kinder Morgan open house meetings as well as other public meetings arranged by local and regional authorities. While FERC's presence is guaranteed at scoping meetings, I can assure you that the dialog around the FERC table last night was nothing like what I've read in the transcripts of scoping meetings on other projects. At last night's meeting questions were asked, and answers were given. Whether attendees liked the responses or not we all benefitted from the information provided. That is a significant departure from the format of scoping meetings whose stated primary purpose is apparently nothing more than "to give the public the opportunity to provide specific environmental comments".

Again, my thanks go to FERC and John for the information provided at last night's meeting.

David Beach

**20150226-0011(30203578).pdf**

Via: Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested, denying TGP access from RONALD and LENORA LA-BRECQUE, Town of Rindge Map/Parcel 001-011-08-1, Sunridge Road, Rindge, NH

**20150226-0033(30203555).pdf**

**County of Cheshire**

12 Court Street, Keene, NH 03431

[www.co.cheshire.nh.us](http://www.co.cheshire.nh.us)

February 18,2015

Lori Ferry, AECOM Project Manager

10 Orms Street, Suite 405

Providence, Rhode Island 02904

Re: Information Request: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Cov LLC

Northeast Energy Direct project, FERC Doc. PF14-22

County of Cheshire, New Hampshire

Dear Ms. Ferry:

The Cheshire County, New Hampshire, Board of County Commissioners has received your letter of January 26, 2015 and offer you the following response to your inquiries.

According to the information contained in your letter, the proposed gas pipeline will pass through five (5) towns within the boundaries of Cheshire County, those towns being Winchester, Richmond, Troy, Fitzwilliam and Rindge.

Your letter poses a number of questions and requests information relative to aquifers, protected aquifer zones, surface waters used for drinking water supply, open space issues, locally significant roads, scenic areas or rivers, locations of schools, parks, ball fields and trails. It also inquires about planned residential, industrial and commercial developments.

The requested information is not the type of information that is normally acquired by Cheshire County government although there are undoubtedly other agencies within the County that have all, or part of the requested information.

Although we do not have records of that information, we are aware that your proposed pipeline does cross a major aquifer that underlies the affected area of the county. A brief review of the maps that accompanied your letter also reveals that the proposed path crosses many streams, both perpetual and vernal, and shows it crossing major ponds, wet lands, and other water ways in all five (5) towns.

The areas through which the pipeline will pass is a major habitat for wildlife and is used for hiking, walking and for hunting. It is substantially a wilderness area. Although an electric power line right of way occupies some of the space through which your pipeline passes, that power line is not disruptive of wildlife habitat in that zone. We understand that your pipeline will entail considerable widening of the existing right-of-way and substantial excavation that will require blasting of underlying granite formations. This anticipated work could have major effect upon the aquifer underlying this work zone and adversely affect our citizens that live there and the wildlife that relies upon that environment. We are also concerned for the long term safety of those that will be living in its proximity and of the cost to those communities for fire and safety protection.

We also understand that similar requests for information have been, or will be, made directly to the affected towns. The scope of this project will require significant effort to develop the information that you have requested and that we will need to properly evaluate this project and its short and long term effect upon this county and its people.

We anticipate that the cost of developing the requested information will be very high and feel that it should not be done at the expense of the property tax payers of this County. We would appreciate it if you would let us know what arrangements AECOM and its associated companies plan to make to allow us to engage the experts that will be required to develop the information that you have requested and that we will need to properly evaluate this project and its effect upon the people of Cheshire County.

Stillman Rogers, Chairman  
Cheshire County Commissioners

Cc: Southwest Regional Planning Commission  
County of Cheshire Conservation District  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

**20150226-0037(30203559).pdf**

February 10, 201

Dear Secretary Beaton,

I am writing in regard to the proposed Kinder Morgan compressor station and pipeline now set to run through the northwest corner of the state, FERC project 1 pF14-22-000. This project poses a serious threat not only to those of us that live here but to Massachusetts as a whole. This is the part of the state where people come to hike the trails, climb the waterfalls and see the stars. Thoreau hiked here. It is the last wild part of our state. The pipeline is projected to cross through an Audubon sanctuary and just in western Mass, through 26 streams and rivers. If you haven't had the joy of being here, please accept my very sincere invitation to walk it with you.

My husband and I live on the western boundary of Plainfield, Massachusetts in a lovely small home surrounded by woods and streams. We are presently paying off a debt for major investments in energy efficien-

cy including a new wood stove to replace the old Franklin, solar panels in our field and a new heat pump water heater along with energy efficient windows, added insulation and energy efficient appliances and light bulbs.

I tell you this because we have recently learned that Kinder Morgan ( Kinder is formerly of Enron) is planning a very large compressor station in Windsor about a mile or so from our home and a pipe line right at our property boundary to move fracked gas from Pennsylvania to foreign markets. In Kinder Morgan literature they refer to us as a “sacrifice zone” and this is exactly true. The decibel level of much smaller plants goes as high 90 decibels, the lights around the site are always on and they discharge gas at regular intervals. I am told that in the winter the discharged, highly toxic gas that is not burned will pool in low lying areas. Here that would be in the little village of West Cummington and the Westfield River that runs through it. As far as the pipeline goes if there is a leak we would be in the evacuation zone. There is only Route 9 for most residents. We could flee using either Rte 9 or Rte 116, both two lane roads. The burn zone, should there be a fire, is apparently 1000 feet from the pipeline and would take our house in that eventuality. All of these Hilltowns rely on volunteer fire fighters. Can you imagine? Sacrifice zone indeed.

I am writing to appeal to you to help protect us from this needless project. It is a manifestation of the worst of corporate greed, dishonesty, and disregard for the environment. My understanding is that in his campaign, Governor Baker has proposed improving infrastructure that already exists (it’s unclear if that is even needed) that won’t destroy this part of the state often called “the lungs of Massachusetts”.

Thank you for your personal attention to this vital concern.

Sincerely yours,

Sebern Fisher 268 West Street, West Cummington, MA 01026

Cc: FERC 1PF14-22-000

**20150226-0038(30203561).pdf**

February 10, 2015

Dear Congressman McGovern,

My husband, John and I live on the western boundary of Plainfield in a lovely small home surrounded by woods and streams. We are presently paying off a debt for major investments in energy efficiency including a new wood stove to replace the old Franklin, solar panels in our field and a new heat pump water heater along with energy efficient windows, added insulation and energy efficient appliances and light bulbs.

I tell you this because we have recently learned that Kinder Morgan (“good corporate citizen” - I am told that good corporate citizen, Kinder was once at Enron and wholly involved in that ongoing corporate scandal) is planning a very large compressor station in Windsor about a mile or so from our home and a pipe line right at our property boundary to move fracked gas from Pennsylvania to foreign markets. The pipeline as planned goes through an Audubon sanctuary and across 26 rivers and streams just in western Massachusetts. This project will devastate this area most directly but it will devastate Massachusetts as a whole. This is the part of our state where people come to hike and visit waterfalls and see the stars. They come here to breathe. In Kinder Morgan literature they refer to us as a “sacrifice zone” and this is exactly true. The decibel level of much smaller plants goes as high 90 decibels, the lights around the site are always on and they discharge gas at regular intervals. I am told that in the winter the discharged, highly toxic gas that is not burned will pool in low lying areas. Here that would be in the little village of West Cummington and the Westfield River that runs through it. As far as the pipeline goes if there is a leak we would be in the evacuation zone. There is only Route 9 for most residents. We could flee using either Rte 9 or Rte 116 both two lane roads. The burn zone, should there be a fire, is apparently 1000feet from the pipeline and would take our house in that eventuality. All of these Hilltowns rely on volunteer fire fighters. Can you imagine? Sacrifice zone indeed.

I am writing to appeal to you to help protect us from this needless project. It is a manifestation of the worst of corporate greed, dishonesty, and disregard for the environment. Governor Baker has proposed improving

infrastructure that already exists (it's unclear if that is even needed) that won't destroy the part of this state often called the lungs of Massachusetts, the only part left that is truly wild.

Thank you for your personal attention to this vital concern.

Sincerely yours

Sebern Fisher  
268 West Street, West Cummington, MA 01026

Cc: FERC 1PF14-22-00

**20150226-0039(30203560).pdf**

January 15 2015

Dear Senator Warren,

We met briefly when you spoke so lovingly to my 6 year old granddaughter at a fundraiser for Ed Markey in Northampton. She is now 8 and remembers meeting you because you said, "All you need to know Emily is that the Senate is for girls." She says it with the same enthusiasm that you did and do.

I live in Plainfield Massachusetts in a lovely small house. We are presently paying off a debt for major investments in energy efficiency including a new wood stove to replace the old Franklin, solar panels in our field and a new heat pump water heater along with energy efficient windows, added insulation and energy efficient appliances and light bulbs.

I tell you this because we have recently learned that Kinder Morgan ("good corporate citizen" I) is planning a very large compressor station in Windsor about a mile or so from our home and pipe line right at our property boundary to move fracked gas from Pennsylvania to foreign markets. In Kinder Morgan literature they refer to us as a "sacrifice zone" and this is exactly true. The decibel level of much smaller plants goes as high 90 decibels, the lights around the site are always on and they discharge gas at regular intervals. I am told that in the winter the discharged, highly toxic gas that is not burned will pool in low lying areas. In our area that would be in the little village of West Cummington and the Westfield River that runs through it. As far as the pipeline goes if there is a leak we would be in the evacuation zone. There is only Route 9 for most residents. We could flee using either Rte 9 or Rte 116 both two lane roads. The burn zone, should there be a fire, is apparently 1000feet from the pipeline and would take our house in that eventuality. All of these Hill-towns rely on volunteer fire fighters. Can you imagine? Sacrifice zone indeed.

I am also told that good corporate citizen Kinder was once at Enron and wholly involved in that ongoing corporate scandal.

I am writing to appeal to you to help protect us from this project. It is a manifestation of the worst of corporate greed, dishonesty, and disregard for the environment. Governor Baker has proposed improving infrastructure that already exists- it's unclear if that is even needed- that won't destroy the part of this state often called the lungs of Massachusetts.

Thank you for your personal attention to this vital concern.

Sincerely yours,

Sebern Fisher 68 West Street, West Cummington, MA 01026

Cc: FERC 1PF14-22

**20150226-0056(30205078).pdf**

Letter denying access to TGP, Julia Steed Mawson,, Mawson Living Trust, Birch Lane off Pelham, NH,  
Map/Block/Lot 36-10-14

cc:FERC, Kimberly D. Bose

Town of Pelham, NH, Brian McCarthy- Town Admimstrstor

Town of Pelham, NH, Paul Gagnon- Conservation Commission

**20150226-5000(30199605).txt**

Jan A. Griska, Rindge, NH.

A gas pipeline project that makes sense:

Eversource Energy (Northeast Utilities), National Grid and Spectra Energy are proposing a gas pipeline expansion project. The project is called Access Northeast. It isn't getting much press because of the Kinder Morgan NED project is causing so much heat, smoke and mirrors.

I've looked into the Access Northeast proposal, the closer look has led me to believe that this pipeline expansion project makes sense for New Hampshire and the rest of northern New England. The following are the key reasons for my supporting the Access Northeast project:

1. Eversource and National Grid supply 70 percent of the electricity consumed by New England users. They have a strong local presence here in New Hampshire.
2. The proposed pipe line will replace an existing pipeline using the existing pipeline's Right Of Way, so it will have negligible environmental impact.
3. All of gas supplied by the replacement pipeline will go to electric utility companies as well as distributors of gas heating for homes and commercial enterprises unlike the NED project.

It should be noted that Eversource Energy owns Eversource in New Hampshire (formally Public Service of New Hampshire).

Thank you,

Jan A. Griska

Rindge, New Hampshire 034

**20150226-5005(30199618).txt**

Brandie Shydo, Pelham, NH.

I am commenting regarding the proposed Kinder Morgan pipeline in Pelham, NH. My family and I are adamantly opposed to this proposal. Our home lies within the 1000' incineration zone. Given the poor safety record of Kinder Morgan, combined with the proposed size and location of the pipeline (very close to high tension power lines) I am gravely concerned for the safety of my family, as well as our neighbors. We have an infant son who also attends daycare within the incineration zone in Windham, NH. In addition, it is my understanding that pesticides will be sprayed to keep the area of the pipeline free of vegetation. The health and environmental impact of this is also extremely concerning. Given these risks, our family would be severely impacted. It is also highly unlikely we would be able to move as the property values and sales potential for those homes in the incineration zone are sure to be negatively impacted. Finally, we have not been shown any evidence of a benefit to my family or our town. We are being asked to assume the risk of loss of property and even death. I urge you to reject this proposal.

**20150226-5007(30199622).txt**

Beth Burns, Merrimack, NH.

I am a resident of Merrimack, New Hampshire continuing to be in deep concern regarding the proposed Kinder Morgan pipeline traveling through the town of Merrimack. There is a list of accidents that have occurred with this company over the last eleven years. They were supposed to have corrected this in 2004. There is a list of accidents going up through the year 2013! Please help protect the Horse Hill Nature Preserve, which is located right near the proposed pipeline area. It is a danger to wildlife, our water, and our homes. It is shown to be an incineration zone. The people of the town deserve the protection from such things as this pipeline. Spectra is enough. We do not need Kinder Morgan coming in and using our town of Merrimack as a transportation sight. There is no reason for it to be allowed. I cannot fathom how anyone would feel this should be allowed. It is a danger zone no matter how Kinder Morgan chooses to word things in their favor. NO sense in allowing this pipeline to be built in the town of Merrimack. The residents, their

children, the water and the wildlife are what make this town whole. Please do not allow the pipeline the freedom of building something that is of NO benefit to the town, or state, for that matter.

Sincerely,  
Beth Burns

**20150226-5008(30199624).txt**

Joseph Cigna, Wilmington, MA.  
FERC: Docket PF14-22

I am a resident of Wilmington Massachusetts and I am concerned about the Lynnfield Lateral pipeline project that is being planned by Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company. The proposed path will impact drinking water supplies, private property, wetlands and conservation land.

I had hoped to get many of the project details at the February 17 Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company open house in Andover, Massachusetts. Unfortunately, most of the answers were vague or Kinder Morgan representatives told us the route might be changed but could provide no details or guarantees.

I had expected to speak with FERC Representatives but unfortunately they were absent from the February 17th meeting. We in Wilmington are faced with a pipeline proposal which will go through our town's drinking water supply (2 wells supply nearly 70% of our water supply), past a quarry with active blasting and will take private property by eminent domain if granted the license by FERC.

I ask that FERC NOT approve any project that allows routing gas lines through a drinking water supply and our conservation land. This would be an irresponsible risk. I also ask that FERC not allow Kinder Morgan or any other company to take land by eminent domain since it would be done as a means of increasing profits for the company and shareholders. We in Wilmington do not get any extra gas lines. We get the construction of a pipeline that will export the bulk of the gas transported and potentially ruin water supplies, private property and conservation land on its way through our town.

Thank you,  
Joseph Cigna  
48 Hathaway Rd.  
Wilmington, MA 01887

**20150226-5013(30199634).txt**

Phoebe Bushway, Plainfield, MA.  
Phoebe Westwood Bushway  
Residence:  
224 West St.  
Plainfield, MA 01070  
Mailing:  
224 West St.  
Cummington MA 01026

February 17, 2015

Re: Docket # PF14-22-000

Dear FERC.

At the recent open house Tennessee Gas Pipeline and KinderMorgan held at Berkshire Community College in Pittsfield, MA I observed maps of the proposed pipeline through Windsor and Plainfield MA. Please be aware that this pipeline route would cross at least two cemeteries in Plainfield, come in close proximity to drinking water supplies, and pose a threat to numerous plant and animal species.

West St. Cemetery c. 1829 is located about 150 feet from the intersection of West St. and Windsor Bush

Rd. in Plainfield. The pipeline map shows this area being within the pipeline route. Also within the pipeline route and adjacent to the West St. Cemetery is wetlands.

The Hilltop Cemetery is closer to the center of Plainfield and is adjacent on the north side, to the existing power line. I understand this cemetery is the only 'open' cemetery in town.

Our household and drinking water supply is from a natural spring approximately 100 feet from the edge of West St. I am concerned that water, soil and air pollutants from the pipeline and pipeline construction, proposed within several hundred feet of our spring, would negatively affect the quality of our water.

On our property in Plainfield and Windsor we tend and harvest wild low bush cranberries and upwards of 40 wild high bush blueberries, as well as wild blackberries. We also tend and harvest cultivated raspberries, apples and peaches as well as a large vegetable garden. I am concerned that air, soil and water pollutants from the pipeline and pipeline construction would negatively impact the growing of these native species and the cultivated plants we use to feed ourselves throughout the year. Our neighbors to the south also have a large garden and grow grapes.

There are a number of threatened plant species including the pink lady slipper, wild pink azalea and wild cotton that grown close to the proposed pipeline that would be further threatened with construction of a gas pipeline.

In addition, there is an increasing threat to amphibians and reptiles in particular painted turtles and frogs. The construction of a gas pipeline through this relatively undisturbed part of the Commonwealth would be a further threat to numerous animal and plant species and interfere with a wildlife corridor through this area. There is in addition a Bog in close proximity – a few hundred feet (north) of the proposed pipeline off of West St., owned by Massachusetts Audubon Society. Construction of any sort anywhere near this ancient bog would have negative consequences to the native threatened species that live in and near there.

It is my advice to stop construction of a gas pipeline through the Commonwealth and instead use resources to harness the free power of the sun to produce electricity and other energy needs.

If a pipeline must be built it should be built through urban areas to minimize impact on wild habitat.

Sincerely,

Phoebe W. Bushway RN MS NCSN

**20150226-5041(30199950).txt**

Kathleen Murtagh Rose, Merrimack, NH.

2/28/2015

Ferc,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed Kinder Morgan Pipeline as it concerns New Hampshire.

As of today, Kinder Morgan has yet to meet with the residents of Merrimack, NH in a public forum. They have provided 'meet and greet' meetings in some local towns but that is about it. They appear to be resisting any type of discussion that might be confrontational especially to the abutters of the project, of which I am one.

My property is historic in that it is one of the oldest homes in Merrimack, having been built in 1730-1740. My barn, almost as old, is situated along a boundary line which will be impacted by this pipeline. Other than a request to survey, Kinder Morgan has yet to contact me with anything other than a form letter sent to all abutters.

This proposed pipeline construction was 'booted' out of Massachusetts for environmental and political reasons and I believe that the same reasons apply to the southern New Hampshire route. This pipeline will directly and negatively impact wetlands, conservation lands and wildlife while providing a modicum of benefit to New Hampshire as natural gas service to local cities and towns is located along the narrow Nash-

ua-Concord corridor. No additional extension of gas service has been proposed by Liberty Utilities. While natural gas will be used to supply electric generating plants, any decrease in electric rates will be offset and perhaps increased by the proposed tariff that will be levied. Our cost for energy will increase.

In my opinion, Massachusetts will be the largest purchaser of this natural gas supply and the remainder will be exported and will overfill the coffers of Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Gas. Kinder Morgan stands to reap a windfall from New Hampshire while we stand to give up the most. There is no benefit to the people of New Hampshire and I for one do not want to live on top of a potential environmental disaster.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Murtagh Rose

83 Peaslee Rd

Merrimack, New Hampshire 03054-4511

### **20150226-5118(30201752).pdf**

I am filing this comment in reference to Kinder Morgan Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's Northeast Energy Direct Project Docket No. PF14-22-000. I attended several Open Houses for this Project in February 2015. My understanding is that the FERC pre-filing and filing processes are intended to help the Commission assess whether a project meets the appropriate thresholds to justify issuance of a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity. I found that these processes omit some important policy issues that have relevance far beyond this particular proposal. I'll share my observations from the Open Houses, describe where the current FERC review policy falls short, and why it is critical that FERC address this situation without delay.

#### **Open House Observations**

It was easy to find information at the Open Houses about how the public can participate in Scoping Sessions where environmental considerations to determine "public convenience" will be addressed. But, when I asked about a process for the public to participate in and challenge the "public necessity" test, there was no such information forthcoming. In fact, several FERC representatives encouraged me to file a comment on that very question. A Kinder Morgan representative implied the question of "need" would be determined in a black box of private conversations among Kinder Morgan, natural gas capacity seekers, and state Departments of Public Utilities.

From these discussions, it appears that the process which FERC has established to give the public an opportunity to raise comments and concerns about a proposal addresses only the "public convenience" aspect, in the form of environmental issues and mitigation. There appears to be no such opportunity for the public to review and comment on the question of "public necessity."

#### **FERC's Current Certificate Policy Statement**

Literature at the Open House referred citizens to 88 FERC ¶ 61,227 (with clarifications in 90 FERC ¶ 61,128 and 92 FERC ¶ 61,094) for FERC's "criteria for determining whether there is a need for a proposed project and whether the proposed project would serve the public interest." This Policy Statement was adopted over 15 years ago. The nation's energy picture has changed significantly since then, and even more dramatically in the past 5-7 years. Domestic fossil fuel production has increased substantially, and controversially. At the same time, technological advances in solar, wind, battery storage and conservation have radically shifted the public's view of what is possible in the near future. Global warming is increasingly acknowledged as a threat, environmental impacts of shale gas are under question, and many states have adopted their own legislation to address these issues. Yet, FERC policy remains unchanged since 1999.

Page 25 of 88 FERC ¶ 61,227 describes whom FERC viewed as primary stakeholders whose interests should be protected in 1999: "Depending on the type of project, there are three major interests that may be adversely affected by approval of major certificate projects, and that must be considered by the Commission. These are: the interests of the applicant's existing customers, the interests of competing existing pipe-

lines and their captive customers, and the interests of landowners and surrounding communities. There are other interests that may need to be separately considered in a certificate proceeding, such as environmental interests. “ Most of the Policy Statement focuses on those three “major interests,” and implied that all other interests with potentially adverse affects would be covered by the NEPA Environmental Review Process. If this policy were to be rewritten today, the Commission would surely receive comments to challenge this narrow definition of interests to include renewable energy interests and climate change, at a minimum. It would be hard to argue in this environment that a new pipeline would have NO adverse impact on either of these.

As the current Policy Statement shows a 1999 view of “major interests,” it also gives a 1999 view of “public benefit” against which the adverse impacts must be weighed. It gives a proponent wide latitude: “ The types of public benefits that might be shown are quite diverse but could include meeting unserved demand, eliminating bottlenecks, access to new supplies, lower costs to consumers, providing new interconnects that improve the interstate grid, providing competitive alternatives, increasing electric reliability, or advancing clean air objectives.” Understandably perhaps in 1999’s world, anything that advances use of natural gas appears to be presumed as “public benefit.” Once again, if this policy were to be rewritten today, it would be subject to extensive public debate, particularly when the gas industry seeks to profit from exporting gas overseas, something not envisioned in 1999.

FERC’s 1999 definitions of “need” and “public interest” no longer actually serve the public interest. Changed circumstances of our time demand new approaches. Fortunately, FERC has the authority to create new processes to address the changed landscape of today. In 1999, FERC expressed its intent to be all inclusive in its review of projects. From the same Policy Statement: “ In deciding whether a proposal is required by the public convenience and necessity, the Commission will consider the effects of the project on all the affected interests; this means more than the interests of the applicant, the potential new customers, and the general societal interests. “ From this statement, FERC not only has the authority to create a new process, it has an obligation to do so.

#### FERC’s Critical Challenge

If FERC does not address the inadequacies of its current review policies, it continues to leave citizens out of the most fundamental question which must be addressed: what is the need for and benefit of a proposal? This is a grave omission if the Commission intends to make decisions which are appropriate and enforceable in the energy, environmental and political landscape of our time. Lacking a revised and transparent process, FERC can expect that activists will continue to disrupt FERC meetings. This unrest reflects an underlying frustration that our government’s regulatory systems, processes and strategies have not been updated to address the 21st century landscape.

Although the 1999 Policy Statement may suit the needs of traditional energy interests in the FERC process, larger citizen interests demand a more thorough review of a larger scope of issues than seemed relevant in 1999. These include climate change, shale gas extraction, the potential impact of natural gas exports on the American energy prices, and the efficacy of conservation and renewable technologies to address the nation’s energy needs.

In the face of these uncertainties, the failure of the Commission to address “public necessity” in a public and transparent process is a recipe for frustration, disruption, and increased litigation. But worse than that, the failure to address these new realities as part of the FERC process puts the Commission at risk of setting the country on a course which may indeed be AGAINST the public interest, and at great cost.

#### What the Public Needs Immediately

The Commission would be well-advised to initiate its own rulemaking process to ensure its policies address the energy issues of this century rather than wait for litigation to demand such action. As rulemaking is a lengthy endeavor, the Commission must also act now to clarify the standards used in its current practice to establish public need and benefit. This is a critical step to enable meaningful public participation in the need and benefit question for projects currently under review. There are at least three areas where clarification for the public is essential.

1. The Commission should clarify how it currently assesses “the effects of the project on all the affected interests” as established in 88 FERC ¶ 61,227. Many public activists perceive that FERC does not consider environmental impacts beyond those in the immediate geography of the pipeline itself, nor does it consider any larger issues of energy policy. This perception is reinforced by statements by officials, and appears to be in conflict with the current Policy Statement above. FERC should present evidence of how it reviews adverse impacts on “all affected interests,” and spell out what the public process currently is for that review, beyond the narrowly focused EIS.
2. The Commission must do a better job of describing whether and how any set of adverse public impacts can ever outweigh a corporate profit opportunity using today’s Policy Statement. As stated above, 88 FERC ¶ 61,227 gives proponents wide latitude in establishing “need” for a project. Indeed, it appears that under the current Policy Statement a project could be approved if it shows it would meet an “unserved market” anywhere in the world, so long as it mitigates local environmental damage. Is this truly what FERC intended in 1999? Is this truly what FERC intends in 2015? In addition, the ten year old pre-filing process presupposes need by requiring extensive use of federal, state, and local government resources in advance of need being established.
3. The Commission must make the process for establishing need more open to public challenge. The impression from the Kinder Morgan representatives at NED Open Houses is that private negotiations between Kinder Morgan and potential customers are adequate to establish need, and that there is no public role. If this is indeed the case, FERC should instruct project proponents to spell out the process they use to establish commitments, specifying the role of state public utility commissions and other entities which have oversight. Although FERC environmental consultants at the Open Houses say that the public can make specific comments on need as part of Scoping, it is not at all clear what type of information the public could provide which would counterbalance a set of precedent agreements. The current Policy Statement describes at some length how a proponent can establish need, but gives no guidance as to how the public can present a challenge. FERC should specifically lay out the standards it uses to determine whether a proponent has met a need threshold, and how the public can influence a decision.

In the 1970’s, Congress replaced the 40 year old Federal Power Commission (FPC) with FERC to address the changing energy landscape of that time. Now, another 40 years has passed. The Commission and its staff must immediately find a way to work within its current mission and authority to make decisions in the best public interest of the nation in our 20th Century energy environment. If FERC does not rise to this challenge and address the changing needs of the country, it will find itself subject to increasing public protests, increasing scrutiny by congress, and eventual irrelevance.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

Elaine Mroz, Lunenburg, MA

#### **20150226-5193(30202530).txt**

Anonymous, Londonderry, NH.

I’d like to comment that I disapprove of the proposed gas pipeline installation route. The route of this pipeline will directly impact my property. I own a portion of the powerlines that this pipeline is planned to be inserted. Not only does this affect me, but it should be noted that this section of the powerlines is used widely by residents in the area. Even in this freezing cold snowy weather, you can see people walking or riding their bikes along and in created trails off of these powerlines. My husband and I are one of the many that use these powerlines as a trail to walk our two dogs. On many occasion we’ve encountered wild animals such as deer, many birds, beavers and one time a black bear. The construction required to insert this pipeline would disturb this lovely hidden gem. Although I understand the construction would be some what temporary, I do feel this time would be inconvenient, troubling and potentially hazardous to my family, other residents of the area and the wild inhabitants. Those are my immediate concerns. My long term concerns are the environmental impact this may cause. Could this pipeline leak hazard gas during or after installation? Could

this affect the quality of my resources such as my well water? Will this affect the value of my home and the homes in my neighborhood? For something that is going to disrupt our land, lives and have potential future hazards, I vote in opposition.

**20150227-0012(30208732).pdf**

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
TENNESSEE GAS PIPELINE COMPANY'S  
NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT PROJECT  
(DOCKET NO. PF14-22-000)

Hand printed comment, opposing.

James Van Natia  
403 S. Mountain Rd  
Northfield, MA 01360

**20150227-0026(30230632).pdf**

PO Box 275  
Haydenville, MA 01039

Federal Energy Regulatory Agency  
Kimberly Bose, Secretary  
888 First St., NE, Room 1A  
Washington, DC 20426

Dear Secretary, staff, and consultants:

I am an advocate of renewable sources for energy needs, and I request you give strong focus and evaluation to mitigating ongoing activities of fossil fuel extraction from residential lands, farms, native species habitats, wilderness, watershed areas. and lands deeded to conservation trusts.

Massachusetts does not want the Kinder Morgan pipeline coming through the state. We do not want to be a transit area for exports, nor a source of methane and CO2 releases into the already carbon overloaded atmosphere.

Tax-payers need not be harnessed into paying for this project. Please consider the large numbers of people who are for a new direction of alternative sustainable energy research and production; think about the generations to come and the beautiful resourceful earth we leave for them.

Sincerely,

Linda Babcock

**20150227-3025(30206773).pdf**

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20426

OFFICE OF ENERGY PROJECTS

In Reply Refer To:  
OEP/DG2E  
Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC  
Northeast Energy Direct Project  
Docket No. PF14-22-000  
§ 375.308(z)

February 27, 2015

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

Re: Comments on Draft Resource Reports 1 and 10

Mr. Moffat:

The enclosure contains the comments of the FERC staff on Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC's (Tennessee Gas) draft environmental resource reports (RRs) 1 and 10 for the planned Northeast Energy Direct Project (Project). The comments ask for clarifications of discrepancies and identify missing information that we believe necessary to begin substantive preparation of the draft environmental impact statement for the project.

Due to the large number of public comments and the complexity of the Project, we are requesting that Tennessee Gas incorporate the requested information in the revised RRs. In addition, when Tennessee Gas files its full set of draft RRs please ensure that the comments identified in the enclosure are fully addressed. To facilitate review of the draft RRs, Tennessee Gas should include a matrix that identifies the specific locations in the RRs (i.e., section and page number) where the information requested in these comments may be found.

When filing documents and maps, prepare separate volumes as outlined on the Commission's website at <http://www.ferc.gov/help/filing-guide/file-ceii/ceiiguide/lines.asp>. Any plot plans showing equipment or piping details or other Critical Energy Infrastructure Information should be filed as non-public and labeled "Contains Critical Energy Infrastructure Information – Do Not Release" (18 CFR 388.112). Cultural resources material containing location, character, or ownership information should be marked "Contains Privileged Information – Do Not Release" and should be filed separately from the remaining information, which should be marked "Public."

Thank you for your attention to this matter. If you have any questions, please contact me at (202) 502-8097.

Sincerely,

Eric Tomasi  
Environmental Project Manager  
Office of Energy Projects  
Enclosure

cc: Public File, Docket No. PF14-22-000

ENCLOSURE

Northeast Energy Direct Project (Project)  
Docket No. PF14-22-000

### **Comments on Draft Resource Reports 1 and 10**

#### **General Comments**

1. For information noted as being filed at a later date or upon completion, provide an estimated date for submittal. Draft copies of all noted mitigation plans should be included in the Application when filed.
2. Upon provision of the Environmental Construction Plans (ECPs), provide a summary table of how each State ECP differs from one another, and from the FERC Upland Erosion Control, Revegetation, and Maintenance Plan (Plan) and Wetland and Waterbody Construction and Mitigation Procedures (Procedures).
3. Identify if odorization facilities would be constructed in conjunction with the Project facilities. If so, identify the locations where odorization equipment would be located and discuss any mitigation to reduce odors.

4. Identify any additional delivery points and provide information on any associated metering and regulation facilities.

### **Draft Resource Report 1**

1. File alignment sheets as “privileged” that include landowner names above each parcel, or file a public version of the alignment sheets with tract numbers and provide a separate list of tract numbers with the landowner of the tract as “privileged”.
2. Update Table 1.0-1 and the associated text to reflect each facility by specific mileposts including compressor stations. Include the specific compressor station mileposts in Table 1.1-3. Milepost numbers should include an indicator identifying the pipeline segment (example MP SP1.0 = milepost Supply Path 1.0, etc.)
3. For each planned compressor station, provide a large scale (1:3,600 or greater) plot plan identifying the proposed engine/compressor units, buildings, piping and other equipment, site property line, and nearby noise-sensitive areas (such as residences, farms, or schools).
4. In Section 1.1.2.1, clarify why certain pipelines or laterals have a maximum allowable operation pressure (MAOP) equal to the maximum operating pressure (MOP), and others are designed to have a MOP of approximately half of the MAOP.
5. In Table 1.1-2, specify the distance between the existing and proposed permanent rights-of-way and indicate the potential for further overlap that would allow abutting of the permanent rights-of-way in the associated text. In addition, specify the maximum overlap of existing rights-of-way allowable by the law, as stated throughout Resource Report 1.
6. In Section 1.1.2.1.3, expand the text in the bullets to clarify what other states the laterals would extend into if they would not be wholly located in Massachusetts.
7. In Section 1.1.2.4.2, clarify in the bullet list that the Granite/Pleasant St. and Cranston-Providence meter stations are existing meter stations that would be modified to increase flow.
8. In Section 1.2.3, provide a table listing the new and modified access roads that are proposed for use, including the location by milepost, the size, and the type of modification required on existing roads. If this information is not available, identify when it will be provided. Indicate whether Tennessee would use temporary or permanent access roads proposed for the Constitution Pipeline Project where it is co-located.
9. Update Table 1.2-6 to indicate the percentage of landowners where access has not been requested and add a footnote indicating how many landowners granted, then rescinded, survey permission, as well as how rescinded landowner permissions were accounted for in the table.
10. In Section 1.3.1.4, discuss when the results of any scour analysis will be incorporated in to the Resource Reports and provide a cross-reference to where a detailed discussion is provided.
11. Regarding the construction procedures listed in Section 1.3.2:
  - a. discuss the procedures and depth of burial for crossing railroads, foreign pipelines, and utilities; and
  - b. provide a table listing all known foreign pipelines, utilities, railroads, and roads that would be crossed, by milepost.
12. In Section 1.3.2.2, include a cross-reference as to the section of the Resource Reports that fully describe the criteria for whether groundwater wells and springs within 200 feet of the construction right-of-way will be tested, the testing procedures for water quality and quantity, the timeframe for testing, and measures that would be implemented in the event that water testing indicates an impact on a well.
13. In Section 1.3.2.2.2, discuss the circumstances under which the stove-pipe construction method would be used instead of the drag-section construction method.
14. Include discussion and consideration of direct pipe trenchless pipeline installation technology in section 1.3.2.5.
15. In Section 1.3.2.9, ensure that the forthcoming table listing and justifying deviations from the FERC

Plan and Procedures, if applicable, include the section of the Plan or Procedures for the requested deviation, the deviation itself, justification for the deviation, and how the deviation would provide equal or greater mitigation. If major modifications to the FERC Plan and Procedures are proposed, Tennessee should provide its own modified versions of the documents that would be used during construction and operation of the Project.

16. In Section 1.3.3.3, update the text to include New Hampshire in the list of states where air quality impact modeling will be conducted, and associated applications will be filed.

17. In Section 1.3.4:

- a. provide the expected construction start date for each segment of pipeline, pipeline lateral, and compressor station, when known;
- b. discuss the number of spreads and workers per spread required for the proposed laterals;
- c. clarify whether the construction workers and timeframes provided for compressor and meter stations are those required for each individual facility, or for each type of facility combined;
- d. provide the number of permanent staff anticipated during operation; and
- e. provide locations for the new operations offices or district offices that would be required for operation, or clarify that none would be needed.

18. In Section 1.3.5, provide a more detailed discussion on the environmental training that would be conducted for construction personnel if the Project were approved. Specify which construction personnel would receive training, when and how often the training would occur, and what documents would be provided (e.g., the FERC Plan and Procedures, or the Tennessee Plan and Procedures, as appropriate). In addition, discuss measures to ensure contractor compliance with the required mitigation.

19. In Section 1.4.1, clarify that the proposed annual vegetation maintenance in uplands would only occur over a 10-foot-wide corridor centered on the pipeline, and that edge-to-edge maintenance would only occur once every three years, as specified in the FERC Plan.

20. Update Table 1.6-1 to include all required permits/consultations for New Hampshire as no Section 106, state listed species, or air quality permits/consultations are listed.

21. In Section 1.7, specify whether power, water, or other utility lines would be constructed for the proposed aboveground facilities.

22. Include contact information in the Stakeholder List for the libraries and newspapers identified in Tables 1.8-1 and 1.8-2.

23. Consult with land managing agencies, state and local planning agencies, and other appropriate entities to identify past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects (e.g., roads, bridges, mining, utility projects, other pipelines and compressor stations, large commercial/industrial/residential developments, etc.) in the potential resource area of impact that could be affected by the Project. Tennessee should describe how it defines the area of impact for each resource, and include a table that identifies:

- a. the project(s) type/name and county;
- b. approximate distance and direction of the project(s) from the proposed Project facilities;
- c. a description of the project(s); and
- d. the current status and schedule of the project(s) (e.g., proposed for October 2015, under construction, completed).

Include a description of cumulative and/or overlapping impacts these projects and the planned Project would have on each environmental resource. Also include descriptions of the measures that would be implemented to minimize these impacts. Lastly, include a map showing the identified projects in relation to the planned Project.

## **Draft Resource Report 10**

1. Update Resource Report 10 to:
  - a. clarify which alternatives and deviations are still being considered and which have been incorporated into the proposed route;
  - b. provide representative figures and tables detailing the locations of incorporated alternatives and deviations, as well as comparisons of impacts for relevant resources and the ultimate reason for its incorporation;
  - c. include at least one alternative for each segment of the proposed Project, including the laterals;
  - d. specify and evaluate any reasonable route alternatives that were suggested by the public or agencies, as well as the feasibility of those alternatives. List and describe the rationale for any alternatives that were determined to be unreasonable and dismissed without evaluation; and
  - e. specify and evaluate system alternatives that were suggested by the public or agencies, as well as the feasibility of those alternatives. Include pipeline system alternatives, conservation alternatives, as well as renewable energy alternatives. List and describe the rationale for any alternatives that were determined to be unreasonable and dismissed without evaluation.
2. Provide a table of the proposed and/or estimated capacities of the pipeline systems reviewed in Section 10.2.2, based on the sources reviewed by Tennessee. In addition, provide a tabular comparative analysis of system alternatives as presented in table 10.2-1 of the FERC's Guidance Manual for Environmental Report Preparation. Depict on maps the locations of the all potential system alternatives, including Portland Natural Gas Transmission System and Granite State Gas Transmission, which appear to be missing from the mapping provided. Consider whether pipeline segments or facilities from different system alternatives could be combined into a hybrid system alternative.
3. Existing and proposed pipelines, such as the proposed Constitution Pipeline, may be routed along ridge lines in steep terrain. Evaluate the constructability of the proposed NED route where it would be collocated with existing pipelines in steep terrain and where the most suitable location for construction may already be encumbered. Further, identify and describe any other potential constraints associated with collocation with other pipelines or electrical transmission lines including side slopes, urbanized areas, or other factors.
4. Evaluate whether the lift and lay construction method could be used at any looped pipeline segments operated by Kinder Morgan, and along any existing pipeline segment besides the Haverhill Lateral.
5. Include data categories in all alternatives comparison tables for miles or feet of expected side-slope construction (including data for both moderate and severe side slope), shallow bedrock, karst geology, landslides, numbers of landowners affected, residences located within 125 and 250 feet of a proposed work area, and miles or acres of interior forest.
6. Where the proposed route deviates significantly away (at least 0.5 mile) from the original Northeast Exchange Alternative for a substantial length (at least 1 mile), provide an analysis and comparison of the two routes with particular emphasis regarding the avoidance of potential constraints associated with collocation with the Constitution Pipeline.
7. For each major alternative in Section 10.3.1, clarify whether modification, addition, or removal of laterals along the proposed route would be required.
8. Regarding the Constitution Route 1 Alternative:
  - a. specify whether any laterals or aboveground facilities would be required along this alternative at the interconnection with the potential shipper identified in Section 10.3.1.1.1;
  - b. identify the location of the potential project shipper connection with Route Alternative 1 in Figure 10.3-1; and
  - c. clarify the discrepancy in the total length of co-located pipeline in Section 10.3.1.1.1 and Table 10.3-1.
9. Provide comparison tables for the Article 97 Avoidance and Co-location Route Alternatives and list and

describe the subject properties in Resource Report 10, as and depict them in mapping as well.

10. In Section 10.3.3.2, provide documentation of consultation with Massachusetts agencies to identify and evaluate agency requested minor route deviations and provide alternatives comparison tables. List and describe the Areas of Critical Environmental Concern in Resource Report 10, as and depict them in mapping as well.

11. Provide a table similar to table 10.3-10 containing all of the landowner requested and agency-requested minor route deviations and include an additional data column indicating whether the stakeholder's concerns have been resolved. Provide updates of this table as appropriate throughout the course of the project.

12. Once alternative compressor station locations are available, provide in Section 10.4:

- a. details on the sizing, locations, limitations, and environmental impacts (including noise and visual impacts) of each alternative;
- b. an assessment of technology alternatives for compression equipment, providing sufficient data to identify the alternative(s) with the lowest emissions; and
- c. a specific examination of the feasibility of installing waste heat recovery systems at proposed new and modified compressor units.

13. Provide an alternatives analysis for all of the compressor stations and for all other permanent, above-ground facilities such as meter stations and mainline valves where appropriate, such as where there could be visual or noise impacts to sensitive receptors.

14. Provide a discussion of the feasibility of using electric-motor-driven compressors at the proposed compressor stations. Provide the rate of electricity required and the number of electric motors required. Compare the size of the electric transmission line necessary under the current proposal with what would be required for the electric motors.

15. Provide a discussion regarding the feasibility of using waste heat electric generation (cogeneration) for the proposed turbines at the proposed compressor stations. Provide the rate of electricity potentially generated on a kilowatt/month basis and compare this with the amount of electricity used by the compressor station(s) per month. Describe the average load factor of the facility and any impediments that would prevent the operation of the compressor station continuously at 60% minimum load. Compare the size of the electric transmission line necessary under the current proposal with what would be required under a cogeneration system with return to the electric grid.

**20150227-5010(30203700).txt**

Robert Maciorowski, Milford, NH.

To whom it may concern,

I am writing in reference to the proposed Kinder Morgan Pipeline proposed to run through Milford NH.

I am very concerned as this will run with in a few hundred feet of my home. We live in a unique neighborhood that is surrounded by wet lands and forest, which is home to several species of wild life, and is jointly owned by the local home owners. We also border a historic and protected village.

I am very concerned as our home is inside the so called "Incineration Zone" of this pipeline. I am a Fire Fighter and I am familiar with the potential loss of property and life in the event of a pipe line explosion.

This gas line will not benefit NH residents as Kinder Morgan tells us it will simply pass through to Massachusetts for export.

From what I am told, there are already gas lines in place that could be constructed to handle a higher volume, and if done this line would not be needed.

Putting this pipeline along a power line tract, and through populated neighbor hoods is not something I can support. This is a direct threat to our environment, our safety, and the values of our property.

I ask this organization to please deny the construction of this pipeline and force these gas suppliers to use

and invest in growing infrastructure already in place to meet the needs of their for profit business.

**20150227-5012(30203705).txt**

Carol M DiPirro, Merrimack, NH.

The proposed Kinder Morgan Pipeline will go right through the wellhead that serves 60% of the town. One leak and the majority of town does not have water. I am a taxpayer and pay for the town water. Please protect my water!!

**20150227-5157(30204985).txt**

Lauren R Mann, mason, NH.

the NE Energy Direct Project through Mason, NH has the potential of destroying the bucolic life we so desperately cling to in Mason, NH. kinder Morgan's safety record is far from stellar and puts our wells, rivers and aquifers in jeopardy. Mason is a small town of 1400 people that sits on a great deal of ledge which will most assuredly require blasting before pipelines can be buried. Blasting puts our wells and the water supplying those wells in great danger. Without our wells, we cannot live here on our land.

The potential for a compressor station in the north part of town will destroy the one of two public businesses in town, Pickity Place. The house at Pickity Place was built in the 1700's and houses a charming restaurant and herb gardens drawing people from near and far. That business and the employees working there are at risk of losing their livelihood. Mason is known for Pickity Place which is nestled in the woods and acted as the visual setting for the pictures in the Golden Book, Little Red Ridinghood, a children's classic, which was painted by Caldecott medal winner Elizabeth Orten Jones (known in town by friends and neighbors as 'Twig'). Twig passed on several years ago but would be horrified to learn of the nightmare facing our town.

Our town as well as the entire region would be best served by expanding existing pipelines as proposed by Eversource, National Grid and Spectra Energy. The pipeline proposed by Kinder Morgan in no way benefits our town. Most of that gas will be shipped out of the country for distribution and profits elsewhere.

Please do not give this project the go ahead.

**20150227-5184(30205135).txt**

Dale Bonham, Corning NY 14830, NY.

This project would be built and would build up our economy to give more work to people. it would also help a lot of other businesses in the area. Thank you!

**20150227-5190(30205154).txt**

William Cochran, Bath, NY.

I am 65 years old and have been a union member Laborer since the fall of 1968, I have lived and paid taxes in NYS. This project is very important to our future and to keep the working class living and staying I NY State. Please let this project become a reality. God Bless William Cochran

**20150227-5193(30205161).txt**

Melvin L Gay, Hornell, NY.

All of the Above in an Economically depressed arear which desperately needs work.

**20150227-5196(30205170).txt**

Randy J. Bartlett Jr., Erin, NY.

This project would be very vital to our economy, to be able to work locally, to provide good paying jobs, highly trained and skilled workforce, minimal impact on the environment, good for the community through tax revenues and to help our schools and infrastructure. Thank you very much.

**20150227-5198(30205181).txt**

Michelle Ward, Painted Post, NY.

I live locally & it will bring jobs to our area. We need these jobs very much or I will be moving out of state like a lot of other people that I know. Its getting to hard to live here with all the expenses NY State has imposed on us and no work. Thank you.

**20150227-5199(30205183).txt**

Blane Ward, Painted Post, NY.

I also live locally and would like to see these jobs. We really need this now or we are going to go under. Thank you for your support!

**20150227-5201(30205207).txt**

Samantha Weyravch, Fichs Eddy, NY.

I live locally and we are fortunate to have good paying jobs, minimal environmental impact and a highly skilled workforce which is vatal to our area and economy. Thank you!

**20150227-5202(30205212).txt**

Loan W Wenzel, Elmira NY 14905, NY.

This important project which will improve gas and oil prices through out the country. We really need this project badly.

**20150227-5203(30205220).txt**

Ronald Faulkner, Wellsville, NY.

Demand for energy will increase with the population and technology failure to plan for the future is a catastrophe waiting to happen. Not using domestic energy is an economical nightmare with no control over the energy costs. The Union provides well trained workforce to do the job safe and efficient. You get what you pay for.

**20150227-5207(30205285).txt**

David Newman, Little Meadows, PA.

We need to prepare for the future. Passing this project will have a paying it forward effect on the economy and provide much needed benefits to everyone for years to come.

**20150227-5212(30205313).txt**

Roger Rotunno, Endwell, NY.

We need to prepare for the future. Passing this project will have great effect on the economy. It will provide many benefits for all of us for many years to come.

**20150227-5214(30205398).txt**

Richard Lacey, Downsville, NY.

We need good paying jobs and can provide a highly skilled trained workforce that will be good for the community through the tax revenues that will be generated. It will also help fund infrastructure for our schools which is vital to the areas development.

**20150227-5218(30205429).txt**

Wessley Uitos, Trumansburg, NY.

To have good paying jobs and putting people back to work and be able to pay taxes. Also to be able to support the local economy.

**20150227-5224(30205441).txt**

Anthony Corsi, Elmira, NY.

I really think we need these jobs to help stimulate our economy. We are in very bad need of good paying jobs or we will be forced to move from this area. I have taxes to pay and its not cheap in friggin NY as if you don't know already. Please allow us to get these jobs.

**20150227-5228(30205459).pdf**

**The Greater Northfield Watershed Association**

P.O. Box 44 Northfield, MA 01360

February 23, 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:

The Greater Northfield Watershed Association (GNWA) is a nonprofit organization that serves as a steward of the watershed, working to spread awareness about watershed issues to the community and to protect the quality of local water resources, including by engaging in activities that keep the streams free from trash, pollution and invasive plants. The watershed is the heart of Northfield. We are the only Massachusetts town bisected by the Connecticut River—the town's close ties to this American Heritage River provides GNWA with its mission to monitor its health and that of its tributaries.

The Greater Northfield Watershed Association intends to participate in the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) pre-file process for the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) project. The current route preferred by the Tennessee Gas Pipeline company (TGP) crosses watersheds of three principal tributaries to the Connecticut River in Northfield: Four-mile Brook, Millers Brook, and Mill Brook, in addition to crossing the Connecticut River to the south of us in Deerfield/ Montague. 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.

We understand that to lay pipe across a wetland or water body, TGP will either make an open cut or a directional bore. Of particular concern is the likelihood of erosion and run-off caused by clearcutting an easement and digging of a trench. The aforementioned brooks and their smaller tributaries could become clogged with construction-related sediment. TGP has a history of environmental violations; after numerous Notices of Violations were reported in Pike County, PA, including "17 instances of dirt and sediment being discharged into water bodies, 7 violations for worksite conditions, and 21 instances of failure to properly institute Best Management Practices for erosion and sediment control"<sup>1</sup>, Pennsylvania DEP announced, on Dec 22, 2014, an \$800,000 settlement against TGP for violations in pipeline construction, part of which is a penalty and funding for clean-up of illegal dumpsites<sup>2</sup>.

The water table is close to the surface in much of Northfield and other parts of New England; open trenches even across areas not considered wetland will certainly fill with water quickly. The GNWA is concerned that deep trenches and the difference in soil compaction in the working area will change the path of surface water. We are concerned that efforts to keep this trench solid and clear of water and will result in muddy water, possibly contaminated with construction equipment oils, being drained downhill. The majority of homes and wells in Northfield's watershed overly districts are directly downhill and downstream of the pipeline route.

Parts of the proposed route are very steep and rocky, necessitating blasting to bury a 36" diameter pipeline.

The GNWA is concerned that blasting could change the course of groundwater flow, and cause private wells to become unusable.

The GNWA has become aware that pipelines are tested by pushing water at high pressure through the pipeline and releasing this water further down the pipeline. The discharge of this water could move plants or animals between watersheds that would not naturally exchange species. As a compressor station has been proposed to be sited in Northfield, we are concerned about the possibility of the discharge of foreign water along with its biological contaminants into our watersheds during this type of testing. Invasive species can also move by clinging to construction equipment. New species could be brought to the area or moved around, and enabled to spread due to disturbed soil and newly opened canopy.

Northfield has been chosen as the site of an 80,000 horsepower compressor station. The GNWA is aware that trace hydrocarbons other than methane, including PCBs, could be travelling in the pipeline and condense into liquid form, which could be released along with the gas in blowdown events, or captured and disposed of. The GNWA is concerned about keeping these contaminants out of the environment. Kinder Morgan has been fined and has paid settlements for numerous violations involving improper disposal of chemical waste<sup>3</sup>.

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. 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. We ask that FERC discourage TGP from continuing with their application.

Thank you for this opportunity to provide comment.

Sincerely,

Julia Blyth, on behalf of the Board of Directors of the Greater Northfield Watershed Association

-----  
1 Delaware River Keeper, "Tennessee Gas Pipeline- Northeast Upgrade Pipeline Project" <http://www.delawariverkeeper.org/river-action/ongoing-issue-detail.aspx?Id=43>

2 Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Department of Environmental Protection. "DEP Announces \$800,000 Settlement against Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company for Violations in Pipeline Construction" <http://www.portal.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/community/newsroom/14287?id=20661&typeid=1>

3 Sightline Institute. "The Facts about Kinder Morgan: Coal Shipper has a track record of pollution, law-breaking, and cover-ups." [http://www.sightline.org/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2012/02/Coal-Kinder-Morgan-April-12\\_final.pdf](http://www.sightline.org/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2012/02/Coal-Kinder-Morgan-April-12_final.pdf)

Officers: Jennifer Tufts, President; Andrew Vernon, VP; Jerrold Wagener, Treasurer; Meagan Sylvia, Clerk  
Directors: Julia Blyth, William Copeland, Susan Ross, Kate Rossiter, Nathan Tufts

**20150227-5229(30205461).txt**

Clarence Beach, Newfield, NY.

We need to get this pipeline done. we need to keep the economy going and in the right direction. Please pass this project so that we may be able to provide our families with decent things and pay our bills instead of having to move out of state. Thank you!

Alice and Kenneth J Bury  
7 Patricia Lane  
Amherst, NH 03031  
Email: kenjbury@comcast.net  
Phone: 603-672-0687 (H), 603-930-7163 (C)

February 27, 2015

Ref: Docket No. PF14-22-000

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

Madam Chairman:

We are stake holders in the proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project (NEDirect) natural gas pipeline planned to pass through our section of New Hampshire. While we are not convinced of the need for this or in any case the need for such a large pipeline we are not addressing this issue in this correspondence.

Our immediate concern is the pipeline route proposed for my immediate area. As I believe the attachments show although this pipeline routing is planned to co-locate with an existing electrical power right of way it still will require easements to access abutting property. Also unlike a high voltage electrical line any problem such as leakage and or fire and explosion would have a major impact on a much wider surrounding area than an electrical power line catastrophe.

We have attached what we consider a fair analysis of the impact of following the existing route proposed by Kinder Morgan as well as (3) alternative routes that we have identified.

We believe the comparison shows it is worth investigating and refining these proposed alternate routes rather than following the Kinder Morgan proposed route. We feel that a better routing for this pipeline in our area can be found and in any case the routing must be changed from what has been proposed by Kinder Morgan.

Please feel free to contact us at any time to discuss our proposal.

Thanks for your time.

Alice and Kenneth J. Bury, Trustees

CC:

James D. Hartman TGP,LLC  
1615 Suffield St  
Agawam, MA 01001

Jorg Dreusicke, Pelham, NH.

I support the construction of the pipeline to boost our overall national energy production.

It would be nice if the Town of Pelham and the other localities had the option to tap into this abundant energy source and be able to purchase and use that gas locally.

Thank you

*Intentionally blank page*