

Public FERC correspondence & comments received re Docket PF14-22 / CP16-21 (Kinder-Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline proposed Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline)

VOLUME 7: Comments from November & December, 2015

The most recent Volume is always at: http://www.Mason-NH.org/FERC_COMMENTS.pdf

The current Table of Contents is at: http://www.Mason-NH.org/FERC_Comments_TOC.pdf

Transcripts of Scoping Meetings at: http://www.Mason-NH.org/FERC_Scoping_Transcripts.pdf

Previous volumes (*links are also provided within the current volume*):

Vol 6 (pgs 3,591...4,735) October 2015	(4.5 MB)	http://www.Mason-NH.org/FERC_COMMENTS_vol_6.pdf
Vol 5 (pgs 3,281...3,590) September 2015	(1.3 MB)	http://www.Mason-NH.org/FERC_COMMENTS_vol_5.pdf
Vol 4 (pgs 1,885...3,280) August 2015	(5.4 MB)	http://www.Mason-NH.org/FERC_COMMENTS_vol_4.pdf
Vol 3 (pgs 1,140...1,884) June, July 2015	(2.7 MB)	http://www.Mason-NH.org/FERC_COMMENTS_vol_3.pdf
Vol 2 (r2) (pgs 580...1,139) March...May 2015	(2.1 MB)	http://www.Mason-NH.org/FERC_COMMENTS_vol_2.pdf
Vol 1 (r3) (pgs 1...579) ...February 2015	(2.2 MB)	http://www.Mason-NH.org/FERC_COMMENTS_vol_1.pdf

Editor's note:

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

A less well known function is to encourage the exchange of information between citizens, groups and local governments. In my view this exchange is as important as informing FERC, perhaps more important.

Unfortunately, while the comments sent to FERC are made part of the public record and are placed on-line, they can be rather hard to access through FERC's somewhat opaque eLibrary interface. In practice they essentially disappear from the public eye.

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

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

Most of the documents were scanned at FERC and then converted into text via OCR (Optical Character Recognition). While modern OCR can do a decent job, there always will be errors. The errors were compounded by the tendency of some FERC clerks to stamp the documents near to, often on top of, the text - which greatly confused the OCR and made it time-consuming to select and copy the remaining legible parts.

***Hand-written documents are not OCR compatible and could not be converted to text.** They are listed in sequence below but without text; where possible a note is made as to author and support or opposition.*

Maps and similar graphical material are also not included.

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

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

This project has been complicated by several factors:

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

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

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

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

G.Fletcher.

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

Comments received in Sep 2014	(2014 09 ...) begin on page	Volume 1: 3
Comments received in Oct 2014	(2014 10 ...) begin on page	Volume 1: 41
Comments received in Nov 2014	(2014 11 ...) begin on page	Volume 1: 106
Comments received in Dec 2014	(2014 12 ...) begin on page	Volume 1: 200
Comments received in Jan 2015	(2015 01 ...) begin on page	Volume 1: 281
Comments received in Feb 2015	(2015 02 ...) begin on page	Volume 1: 424
Comments received in Mar 2015	(2015 03 ...) begin on page	Volume 2: 582
Comments received in Apr 2015	(2015 04 ...) begin on page	Volume 2: 778
Comments received in May 2015	(2015 05 ...) begin on page	Volume 2: 965
Comments received in Jun 2015	(2015 06 ...) begin on page	Volume 3: 1142
Comments received in Jul 2015	(2015 07 ...) begin on page	Volume 3: 1439
Comments received in Aug 2015	(2015 08 ...) begin on page	Volume 4: 1887
Comments received in Sep 2015	(2015 09 ...) begin on page	Volume 5: 3283
Comments received in Oct 2015	(2015 10 ...) begin on page	Volume 6: 3593
Comments received in Nov 2015	(2015 11 ...) begin on page	Volume 7: 4738
Comments received in Dec 2015	(2015 12 ...) begin on page	Volume 7: 4,927

20151102-0006

20-A Duncan Dr.
South Deerfield, MA 01373

April 8, 2015

Commissioner of FERC, Philip D. Moeller
888 First St. NE
Washington, DC 20426

Dear Commissioner Moeller,

Thank you for being committed to such a responsible position for the well being of the citizens, a job which surely requires a huge portion of your day.

We are a married couple in our mid 70's. Joe was a military officer for 20 years, a prosecutor, a judge and an educator. Nancy was an elementary school teacher. Now we are the grandparents of our adored grandson.

We are writing you in opposition to the pipeline which will run through our area (Pioneer Valley) in western MA. The impact of the pipeline will probably not affect us but certainly will the generation of our grandson. If allowed it will help perpetuate this disastrous practice.

As we know, the fracking process to obtain the product pollutes. We still don't know the full repercussions of its residual underground poisons, how far the poisons reach at all levels of the soil, all of which contribute to global warming. The effects of a pipeline leakage could wipe out many of the locally owned farms.

Examining thoroughly our sources of renewable energy must be the only option! Our state is great at this!

So much of our beautiful state is in trust to preserve our forests and farmlands. Private companies should not be able to use Eminent Domain to seize them! Doing this builds huge credibility issues with the citizens toward our government!

Thank you for your attention to this heartfelt and vital matter.

Sincerely,

Nancy Durham
Joe Durham

20151102-0034

October 14, 2015

Mr. James D. Harman
Agent-Right of Way SR 11
Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC
1615 Suffield Street
Agawam, MA 01001

RE. Nonheast Eapausion Pxoject Request fox Survey
IJ#MA(4) 279.00
Franklin County, Ashfield
PL 4-0-87

Dear Mn Hartman,

As Life Tenant Owner with Life Estate Ownership of the property listed above, I am responding to your letter, dated September 9,2015, addressed to Stephen M. Wheeler, as I have to those so addressed dated April 29,2014 and March 5, 2014 Remainder Owners Stephen M. Wheeler, residing at 133 Hillcrest Avenue State College, PA 16803, and Amy E Wheeler-Hanson, residing at Styrboxdsgstan 12, 426-76 Vastra, Frolunda, Sweden, share joint tenancy vith right of survivorship to ownership of the pxoperty.

The decision to deny access to the property for survey for the reasons stated in my letter of May 21, 2014 (

enclosed) is reiterated. Permission to access the property to perform surveys or for any other purpose authorized by The Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company LLC, a Kinder Morgan Company, its representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates is denied. Any entry onto the property will be deemed unauthorized and reported as trespass.

Marion E. Wheeler

cc: Kimbely D, Bose, Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
The Honorable Charlie Baker, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Stephen M. Wheeler
Amy E Wheeler-Hansson

20151102-0137

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

Project Docket Number: PF14-22

October 28, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

RE: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

27 Cart Path 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 to perform surveys, or for any other purpose. Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized and treated as trespass.

Denise Valentin-Diaz

20151102-0138

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

Project Docket Number: PF14-22

October 27, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

RE: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

70 Cart Path 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 to perform surveys, or for any other purpose. Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized and treated as trespass.

Eric Allen & Andrea Allen

20151102-0139

TOWN OF DALTON
Town Hall
462 Main Street
Dalton, MA 01226-1601

October 28, 2015

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

Ret Northeast Energy Direct — Docket No. PF14-22-000

Dear Secretary Bose,

The **Town of Dalton Select Board** submits the following additional comments on the proposed Kinder Morgan Tennessee Gas Pipeline (TGP), Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline project (PF14-22-000). As stated in our originally submitted written comments to you dated, August 20, 2015, the proposed NED project would have significant impacts on the natural resources, public infrastructure, soctowconondcs and public health and safety within our region. The proposed NED project crosses through the Town of Dalton and would impact the town. Through the coordination of the Berkshire Regional Planning Commission (BRPC), the Town of Dalton has joined with the City of Pittsfield, Massachusetts; the towns of Cheshire, Hinsdale, Laneaboro, Lenox, Richmond, Washington and Windsor, Massachusetts; The Dalton Fire District and Lanesboro Vigage Fire and Water District; Rensselear County, New York; as well as the Towns of Nassau, Stephentown and Schodack, New York to identify common impacts and requested mitigation measures. Those items are specified in the comments submitted by the BRPC; their letter dated October 15, 2015. The Town of Dalton endorses, and incorporated herein by reference, the comments submitted by the Berkshire Regional Planning Commission.

Respectfully,

John Bartels, Chair Robert Bishop
Mary Cherry, Vice Chair Michael Szklask
John Boyle

20151102-0217

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

Project Docket Number: PF14-22

October 27, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

RE: Denying Property Access

As the owner ofthe property located at:

63 Cart Path 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 to perform surveys, or for any other purpose. Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized and treated as trespass.

Michael Petterson

20151102-0232

Card, Karen Miller: opposing

20151102-0234

Kimberly Bose, Secretary
FERC
888 First Street, N.E.
Washington, DC 20426

STOP THE NED PIPELINE!!

Protect NH land from Eminent Domain!

I oppose. the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) EXPORT pipeline. The pipelines, and compressor station will scar the NH landscape and put our water, wildlife, forests, agricultural lands and rural character at risk. These include health and safety risks from emissions, industrialization, pollution and the devastating effects of fire and explosions. Greed, not need is fueling this project. Say NO to this private company that will TAKE OUR LANDS with NO BENEFIT TO US.

Colleen Dolan
10 Londonderry Rd
Windham, NH 03087

20151102-0235

{same text as 20151102-0234, signed by}

Rick Dolan
10 Londonderry Rd
Windham, NH 03087

20151102-0236

{same text as 20151102-0234, signed by}

Kim Dionne
3 Karen Rd
Windham, NH 03087

20151102-0237

{same text as 20151102-0234, signed by}

Susan T. Newhall
1 Karen Rd
Windham, NH 03087

20151102-0239

{same text as 20151102-0234, signed by}

Dot Dionne
3 Karen Rd
Windham, NH 03087

20151102-0247

{same text as 20151102-0234, signed by}

John Kessler

5 Netherwood Rd
Windham, NH 03087

20151102-0268

{same text as 20151102-0234, signed by}

Richard A. Newhall
1 Karen Rd
Windham, NH 03087

20151102-0269

{same text as 20151102-0234, signed by}

Ron Dionne
3 Karen Rd
Windham, NH 03087

20151102-0270

{same text as 20151102-0234, signed by}

Karen M. Merchant
58 Gov. Dinsmore Rd
Windham, NH 03087

20151102-0271

{same text as 20151102-0234, signed by}

Jane Thorn Bassett
4 Netherwood Rd
Windham, NH 03087

20151102-0272

{same text as 20151102-0234, signed by}

Lillian A. Bailey
13 Glance Rd
Windham, NH 03087

20151102-0273

{same text as 20151102-0234, signed by}

Crokie Santerre
10 Karen Rd
Windham, NH 03087

20151102-5046

{ skip to end of 20151102-5046 }

Bowditch & Dewey
Attorneys

October 30, 2015
Kimberley D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE, Room 1 A

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.

Docket No. PFI4-22-000: Northeast Energy Direct Project

Comments of Northeast Energy Solutions, Inc. Regarding Draft Resource Reports Dated July 24, 2015

Mr. Secretary Bose:

Northeast Energy Solutions, Inc. (NEES) respectfully submits the following comments regarding the Tennessee Gas Pipeline (TGP) Draft Resource Reports, dated July 24, 2015 (July Report), for the proposed Northeast Energy Direct (NED) project. In addition to new analysis, NEES' comments continue to highlight defects and inaccuracies unremedied from the March Resource Reports, and include requests for clarifications of discrepancies and identification of information that remains missing and inaccurate in the July Reports.

Throughout this document, unless the July Report is specifically referenced or identified, "Report" shall mean the March 2015 draft Resource Reports.

NEES believes its comments must receive thorough and accurate responses before reviewers can prepare a draft environmental impact statement for the proposed project.

RESOURCE REPORT 2: Water Resources

Failure to present most recent data:

- 2.2.9.3: Report indicates that vernal pools are Outstanding Water Resources (ORWs) in Massachusetts, and that 77 certified pools exist within 750 feet of the project based on MassGIS data. This is a conservative estimate which does not take into account the availability of Mass GIS's potential vernal pools layer. Said layer should also be considered and used to inform surveying in spring 2015. (p. 2-85)
 - o The July Report's Section 2.2.1.3 indicates that 88 potential vernal pools (PVPs) exist within 750 feet of the project in the Massachusetts portion.
 - o Report indicates that spring field surveys will begin in 2015. At this time, most MA landowners have not granted access for survey. How will vernal pool condition be taken in to account without the survey consent of all impacted landowners?
 - Section 3.2.2.3.11 indicates that "qualified biologists performed vernal pool surveys on all properties where access was available" (p3-43). The July Report still does not indicate how vernal pool conditions will be taken into account without knowing of their presence on the remaining 90% of miles of un-surveyed land in Massachusetts (Tables 1.1-1, pl-18; 1.2-7, pl-73).

Inaccurate Information

- Table 2.2-2: TGP reports that the Wright-Dracut section will cross 36 perennial streams and 29 seasonal streams in Massachusetts. TGP likely uses USGS 1 :25,000 Hydrography data available from MassGIS for this analysis. While correct based on that data, NEES is aware of additional, un-mapped perennial streams on the Shallcross APR which will be impacted by the pipeline. It is understood among natural resource managers that large-scale datasets like the USGS 1 :25,000 hydrography do not describe the full range of relevant features in a given area. Such is especially true regarding conservation land, where more detailed information may be available from local, credible organizations. Certainly, finer scale data should be used. Plus, only drawing from a single 123 acre property illustrates that TGP is underestimating the impacts of their proposed pipeline on fragile resources like seasonal streams. (p. 2-30)
- This section of the July Report remains largely unchanged; however, in comparison to the March Report, Table 2.2-2 now cites different numbers of perennial stream crossings, intermittent stream crossings, and "Unknown/Other Crossings." The data sources for both tables remains the same, so it is unclear why these numbers have changed (USGS 2015). With such a small percentage of areas surveyed (approximately 10%, Tables 1.1-1, pl-18; 1.2-7, P 1-73), it is likely that the number of "unknown/other cross-

ings” in Massachusetts will substantially increase (Table 2.2-2, p2-30). As mentioned in NEES’ earlier comments, insufficient data is still being relied upon.

- Various (p. 2-34, 2-55, 2-63, 2-85): TGP remains inconsistent when describing the status of consultations with Massachusetts Division of Fisheries & Wildlife (MADFW) regarding fisheries that will be impacted by the pipeline. TGP sporadically reports on results of such consultations.
- Also, TGP uses un-referenced, inconsistent, and conflicting conjecture to arrive at certain determinations. Such noticeable inconsistencies make it difficult for a reviewer to determine actual impacts the proposed project may have on important cold-water streams, a fragile type of natural system, which could be disproportionately affected by the proposed project (see UMass Amherst’s 2015 pipeline impacts analysis).
 - o 2.2.1: Consultations with MADFW to determine impact to cold-water and other important fisheries listed as “initiated.” Status suggested to be “ongoing.” (p. 2-34)
 - o 2.2.1.3: Consultations to determine warm water and cold-water fisheries crossed by project listed as “pending at time of this report.” In MA, all waters are assumed to be warm water fisheries unless proven otherwise, and designated cold-water fisheries data is publically available. “Ongoing consultations” may be underway, but the data needed to make this determination was publically available at the time the report was written. (p. 2-55)
 - o Section 2.2.9.3 of the July Report indicates that “Tennessee is still awaiting consultation from MADFW to identify warmwater and coldwater fisheries crossed by the proposed project as of the date of the resource report and will provide updated information in the final ER.” As evidenced by figures now present in Table 2.2-6, data indicating the presence of coldwater and warmwater fisheries is publically available via GIS. The aforementioned quote appears to be outdated and is unclear (p2-55). This failure to provide consistent, clear information makes it difficult for readers to understand the impacts of the proposed project.
 - o 2.2.1.3: TGP indicates that fishery designations from its “pending” consultation with the Massachusetts Department of Fish & Game are listed in this report in table 2.2-6. (p.2-55)
 - Table 2.2-6: table lists most MA fisheries as class B water quality designation, and does not list cold-water designation for known cold-water streams. This data is presented in RR 3 and elsewhere in RR2, but no reference to RR 3 is made in the report, and the contradiction within is unaddressed. (p. 2-58 to 2-63)
 - Table 2.2-6: Notes: “water quality classification was available through a desktop review of available GIS data layers” (footnote 7). Coldwater fisheries data layers are available on MassGIS. The oversight here, especially in light of the inclusion of this data in RR 3 and other sections of this report, is inexcusable. The poor quality of analysis and attention to consistency here is discernable - even to a layperson. Table 2.2-6 lists the Deerfield River, Bear River, and Swift River as class B water quality streams lacking cold-water fishery resources. These streams are among the better known fishable trout streams in this part of the state. (p. 2-63)
 - o 2.2.9-3: Report belatedly notes that “MADFW has mapped cold-water fisheries at a scale of 1 :25,000. TGP then provides a list of 35 crossings in MA, but do not indicate stream name. This contradicts the list of impacted streams in table 2.2-6, which provides details on impacted water bodies but does not correctly identify the various cold-water streams in the path of the proposed project. (p. 2-85)
 - At this point, NEES would only speculate as to why TGP failed to provide publically available data, chiefly the names of cold-water streams crossed by the proposed project, in their belated treatment of this natural resource. The absence of this data from RR2 makes the considerable omission of cold-water classification for known cold-water streams in table 2.2-6 harder for a reviewer to notice, and could lead to the erroneous conclusion that few of the significant water bodies impacted by this project are cold-water streams.
 - The July Report’s Table 2.2-6 now indicates various classifications such as B, HQ, and CFR, but it

fails to indicate the meaning of these abbreviations. Such information is integral for a layperson to understand the types of resources being affected. Furthermore, footnote 7 only indicates “water quality classification as available through a desktop review of available GIS data layers,” but fails to cite specific data sources, which exist for each GIS data layer used (Table 2.2-6, p2b 29 through 2b-36). By failing to provide transparent information, TGP is failing to present clearly understandable information to the public.

Transparency

- 2.1.2: Report states that release valves (MLVs) will be built within the 50 foot buffer region to minimize impacts on groundwater resources. Further details on planned location for said valves are not provided. As such, it is nearly impossible to conduct review of potential impacts. (p. 2-14)
- In the July Report, p2-15, 2.1.2:
 - o “MLV assemblies will be installed entirely within the proposed permanent ROW. For this reason, the groundwater resources associated with the ML V s and the potential impacts of these facilities on groundwater resources will be the same as those associated with the corresponding pipeline segments.”
 - o “For the Project, Tennessee proposes that ML V s will generally be installed and operated within the proposed permanent right-of-way (“ROW”) associated with the applicable pipeline segment(s).”
 - o Therefore, the July Report is not consistent with regard to “entirely within” vs. “generally.” As such, it remains unclear whether MLVs will be installed within the proposed ROW or in the buffer region (as indicated in the March report).
 - o Further, in the July Report, Table 1.1-5 still indicates the proposed location (mileposts) for the ML V s, however, this table is not referenced in section 2.1.2 of RR2.
- P 2.2.1: Landowners who have granted survey rights to TGP can request an expert review of springs or seeps within 150 feet of the proposed construction area to determine if there could be negative impacts to groundwater. An affirmation should be made that landowners who do not grant survey rights will receive the same expert review. (p. 2-20)
- In the July Report, this section is now referenced as section 2.1.6, and states that “[n]o springs utilized for drinking water were specifically identified during initial landowner consultations or field surveys. Additional surveys and landowner contact to re-confirm the location of wells are ongoing. If requested by the landowner, any seeps or springs located within 200 feet of construction workspaces will be reviewed by an expert in the field to make a determination as to whether the normally planned construction activities will have any impact. If any impacts are anticipated to occur, the expert will recommend construction alterations to avoid impacting seep or spring areas.”
 - o It is still unclear whether review will be available contingent upon landowner’s granting survey rights. Note that the July Report cites “landowner consultations or field surveys” as yielding no known springs, it does not indicate whether seeps have been found. Furthermore, only 40% of Massachusetts landowners have granted survey access (Table 1.2-6, pl-63), and to date, 90.73 miles of 101.08 (Table 1.1-1, pl-18) remain non-surveyed. (Tables 1.1-1, pl-18; 1.2-7, pl-73)

Insufficient explanation

- 2.2.7: Details for sourcing and disposal of water for hydrostatic testing is vague. This makes it difficult to judge whether certain water bodies are at risk. TGP indicates that water will not be drawn from or released into high quality streams. Details on how high-quality designation will be determined are not provided. Are cold-water streams “high quality,” even if ranked as class B water quality resources? TGP’s inconsistent summary of water quality and ecological integrity measures for impacted water bodies renders unclear what factors determine a stream’s suitability for withdrawal of water. (p. 2-79)
- Section 2.2.7 of the July Report remains unclear regarding how discharge locations will be determined.

“In accordance with Sections VII.C.2 and VII.D.2 of the Procedures, hydrostatic test water will not be obtained from, or discharged to, designated HQ streams unless approved by the applicable state permitting agency” (p2-48). TGP still fails to define “HQ” designation.

- o The Report cites Appendix H for further details about hydrostatic testing water withdrawals and release. Appendix H (p. 19) indicates only that 48-hour notice will be given to state agencies in advance of drawing water from a specific stream. This is far too little notice for NEES and other reviewers to determine if waters, in which it has a direct interest, will be impacted by hydrostatic testing.
- o The July Report’s Appendix H remains sparse regarding the process of hydrostatic testing. Notification of state agencies remains 48-hour; notification/permission of private landowners is not addressed (H-14). Furthermore, Section VII.C.3 “Intake Source and Rate” only indicates that the process will “maintain adequate flow rates to protect aquatic life, provide for all waterbody uses, and provide for downstream withdrawals of water by existing users” (H -14). Furthermore, “adequate flow rates” is vague and fails to quantify the amount of water uptake used for hydrostatic testing and provides an unclear illustration of how testing will influence water flow for public, private, and ecological interests.
- 2.2.10.1: TGP lists a range of habitat manipulation activities which may be undertaken to facilitate crossing water bodies, which include diverting the flow of streams. Indication is not given on how stream diversion sites will be selected. Sites where significant habitat manipulation is to be undertaken should be identified by TGP, for review by interested parties, well in advance. (p. 2-89)
- The July Report continues the failure of not explaining the conditions that would warrant diverting stream flow during construction (2.2.10.1, p2-60).

RESOURCE REPORT 3: Fish, Wildlife, and Vegetation

Failure to present most recent data:

- Table 3.1-3 Representative Game and Commercial Fish Species That May Occur in the Project Area Water bodies in Massachusetts. (p. 3-7)
 - o The data cited for this table is outdated - Mugford 1969.
 - Why wasn’t more recent data used, such as that from BioMap2, Eastern Brook Trout Joint Venture, or Mass. Div. of Marine Fisheries Anadromous Fish Runs?
- The July Report has updated Table 3.1-3 has been; however, it is not evident that all available data was used.

Inaccurate Information:

- Table 3.1-3 Representative Game and Commercial Fish Species That May Occur in the Project Area Water bodies in Massachusetts. (p. 3-7)
 - o Tessellated darter is listed as a game species - this is not a game species.
 - o The July Report no longer includes tessellated darter as a game species in Massachusetts.
- 3.1.2.4 Fisheries of Special Concern: Massachusetts Programs. (p. 3-12)
 - o Citing UMass River and Stream Continuity Project Data (UMass 2010), I TGP states that the pipeline will include “21 crossings” of high-quality streams in segment G.
 - Based on NEES’ review of this same data, there are 31, not 21, instances in which the proposed pipeline crosses high-quality streams in segment G.
 - Citing this same data, TGP states that the pipeline will include “3 crossings” of high-quality streams in segment H.
 - Based on NEES’ review of this same data, there are 5, not 3, instances in which the proposed pipe-

line crosses high-quality streams in segment H.

- o Although the July Report cites the UMass data, in general, (“In addition to the Coldwater Fishery Resources designations, the University of Massachusetts [“UMass”] Amherst has developed a list ofHQ streams in Massachusetts [UMass 2010].), TGP fails to mention how this project impacts high-quality streams in MA. Instead of clarifying prior data about how the proposed project would affect high-quality streams, TGP, now, completely avoids addressing this data.
- 3.2.1.1 Wildlife Resources: Upland Forest. (p. 3-18)
 - o In describing tree ecoregions of the area, TGP states, without citation, that “Soils are usually moderately well to well-drained and often nutrient poor.”
 - o Data for Massachusetts soils indicates that, within a 100’ buffer of the pipeline, approximately 247 acres of the total 870 acres, or nearly one-third of soils, are considered Farmland of Statewide Importance or Farmland of Unique Importance.’
 - o Stating that soils are “often nutrient poor” without citing data is an overtly gross misrepresentation of the actual resource conditions.
- 3.2.2.3.11 Massachusetts BioMap2 Data. (p. 3-47)
 - o The Report states that 16 miles of Core Habitat are crossed and 20 miles of Critical Natural Landscape are crossed. This is inconsistent with available GIS data which shows that 18.6 miles of Core Habitat and 26.5 miles of Critical Natural Landscapes are crossed.’
 - o The July Report omits statements regarding soil quality.

Transparency:

- 3.1.2.4 Fisheries of Special Concern: Massachusetts Programs. (p. 3-12)
 - o Citing UMass River and Stream Continuity Project Data (UMass 2010),² TGP lists 29 high-quality streams crossings. This data source does not give unique identifiers to water bodies, so it is unclear whether TGP is counting the number of crossings or the number of unique water bodies crossed.
 - o The July Report includes a comprehensive table that outlines the specific location of each water body crossing in Massachusetts, including Class B and warm water fisheries crossings. Section 3.1.2.4 does not mention crossing high-quality streams, instead only mentioning cold water crossings. The discussion of the data is potentially misleading often confusing number of streams crossed and number of crossings. For example, the report cites “Coldwater Fishery Resources-designated streams are crossed a total of 34 times in Massachusetts” and then “The Project also crosses 31 streams that are tributaries to CWF streams” (Section 3.1.2.4, p3-13). By first quantifying stream crossings and later the number of streams crossed, the report misleads that the project has 31 crossings over tributaries to CWF streams, when in reality, this number may be much larger. Table 2.2-6 (p2b-29) does not clarify either.
 - o The July Report’s Table 2.2-6 Waterbodies Associated With the Project in Massachusetts uses a column to identify “Water Quality Designation/Fishery Classification.” While each waterbody is given a classification (B/HQ/CFR), the table endnote only notes that “Water quality classification was identified through a desktop review of available GIS datalayers.” It is unclear how these water bodies are assigned these designations. Prior sections of the July Report 3 also fail to explain how high-quality streams are defined and how many crossings there are in relation to the proposed project (p3-7).
- 3.1.3 Construction and Operation Impacts
 - o TGP cites several temporary impacts to fisheries that will depend on several factors, including “construction technique utilized.” In the subsequent paragraph, after discussing cases of a presumed dry crossing where continuous standing water with a discernable flow may be present, TGP states that “field determinations will be made at the time of crossing.” Further paragraphs state that “there is the potential that field conditions will not allow a dry crossing method and an open cut crossing will be

necessary.” (p. 3-14)

- Despite not knowing which type of crossing they will be utilizing, TGP assures FERC that “impacts will be temporary.” This presumptuous statement is indicative of TGP’s failure to obtain necessary information prior to making claims regarding project impacts. (p. 3-14)

o The July Report’s section 3.1.3, “Construction and Operation Impacts,” offers significantly less clarity than the March Report regarding the stream crossing methods that will be used in the project area. While the March Report identified that “field determinations will be made at the time of crossing,” the July Report fails to identify under what conditions each crossing method will be used and when the decision will be made on which method will be appropriate. By failing to identify the type of crossing to be used on each water body, TGP avoids addressing the actual impacts that may occur to these water bodies. The March Report mentions the potential for wet open cut crossings, which are not included in the July Report (p3- 15).

- 3.1.2.4 Fisheries of Special Concern: Massachusetts Programs. (p. 3-15)

o TGP states that “No direct impacts to wetland or water bodies containing fishery resources are expected to result from construction and operation of these project facilities [compressor stations, meter stations, ML V s, pig launcher/receiver facilities, and pipe-yards/contractor yards].”

o A subsequent sentence states that “impacts will be avoided and minimized by using existing roads.” The use of the word “minimized” implies that there will indeed be impacts that have not clearly been described in the aforementioned statement.

o The July Report’s section 3.1.3 “Construction and Operation Impacts” discusses the impacts of Project facilities, TGP states that “Impacts to wetlands, waterbodies and other sensitive areas will be avoided and minimized to the extent practicable during site evaluation” (p3-17). This statement inconsistent with a subsequent claim, which states that “no direct impacts to wetlands or waterbodies containing fishery resources are expected to result from construction and operation of these Project facilities” (p3- 17). The use of the word “minimized” in the prior statement indicates that there may indeed be some impacts generated by the proposed project.

o This section also notes that “A final selection of facility locations and ARs (access roads) will be provided in the final ER” (p3-17). By failing to provide sufficient data at the time of this draft submittal, TGP provides insufficient time for agencies, organizations, and landowners to evaluate the impacts to ecological resources.

- 3.2 Wildlife Resources. (p. 3-17, p. 3-34)

o TGP states that this section identifies several areas of conservation value, including “sensitive wildlife areas,” but does not provide information as to how “sensitive wildlife areas” are defined.

o The July Report’s section 3.2 also refers to “sensitive wildlife areas,” however, it still fails to adequately define this classification, only slightly expounding with “sensitive wildlife areas (e.g., Important Bird Areas [‘IBA’s’])” in lieu of providing a full definition (p3-19). In view of the comprehensive data covering sensitive habitats that is readily available (for example, BioMap2 and Natural Heritage Program), TGP’s failure to incorporate such into a clear definition of “sensitive wildlife areas” is objectionable.

o TGP reports of consulting several state and federal agencies, including “some private organizations” but fails to explain why certain organizations were or were not contacted.

- Therefore, it can be inferred from such a practice of selectively contacting private organizations is an intent to only provide data that supports a particular position.
- Unfortunately, the July Report’s section 3.2 still inadequately fails to explain why certain organizations were or were not contacted. This section states that “Consultations with federal, state, and local agencies, as well as the National Audubon Society (2013) (i.e., for information specific to IBAs) have been conducted to supplement the desktop analysis” (p3-19). It’s clear that thor-

ough analysis has not been conducted regarding local agencies, given the fact that the National Audubon Society is not relatively active in this sphere. In Massachusetts, the Important Bird Area program is carried out by Massachusetts Audubon Society, an organization that was not mentioned in TGP's classification of "sensitive wildlife areas." Furthermore, conservation organizations having sensitive habitat that may be directly affected by the proposed project _ such as the Franklin Land Trust, and Mount Grace Land Trust, among others _ have not been consulted regarding how the pipeline may affect wildlife resources.

- 3.2.1 Wildlife Resources: Existing Resources. (p. 3-17)

o "Wildlife species likely to occur in each habitat type were determined by direct observation during field surveys, consultations with local wildlife experts, regulatory agencies, and by literature review."

• TGP has failed to reference any correspondence with said experts and agencies,

o The July Report's section 3.2.1 now states that "Wildlife species likely to occur in each habitat type were determined by direct observation during field surveys and by literature review" (p3-20). This appears to be a more honest statement regarding the actual research that has been conducted. Also, it may now be deduced that the statement in the March Report ("wildlife species likely to occur in each habitat type were determined by ... consultations with local wildlife experts and regulatory agencies ... ") is a patently false statement since so many agency consultations were "pending" at that time.

- 3.2.1.8 Water Bodies. (p. 3-22)

o TGP indicates that the land use category of "Water Body/Open Water" includes those identified to be greater than 10 feet in width "as determined during field surveys." However, field surveys for the project only exist for 45% of Massachusetts landowners (Table 1.2-6), making it difficult to classify other properties. Publically- available GIS data exists that would further inform TGP's classification of water bodies and, yet, TGP continually refuses to cite it.

o The July Report's section 3.2.1.8 still fails to cite the use of GIS data to identify water bodies greater than ten feet. Updated orthoimagery does exist that GIS professionals are able to use to measure the width of open water. Despite the low percentage of field surveys that TGP has conducted throughout Massachusetts, TGP is still not utilizing available technology to further inform their efforts to understand the wildlife resources affected in the project area (p3-24).

- Table 3.4-2 Birds of conservation concern known to occur within the project area. (p. 3-84)

o Table should include common names.

o The July Report has been updated to include common names.

Insufficient explanation/Failure to provide available data

- 3.1.3 Construction and Operation Impacts. (p. 3-15)

o TGP states that "Removal of streamside trees and vegetation at the pipeline crossings may reduce the shading of a stream temporarily, eliminate escape cover, and potentially result in a locally elevated water temperature near, and downstream of the pipeline crossing" and, subsequently, states that "once installation activities for the pipeline segments are complete, disturbed areas will be restored to pre-construction condition. "

o This section (as well as Procedures) fails to describe how pre-construction conditions will be assessed, including the criteria under which a biological survey would be warranted. TGP fails to acknowledge restoration methods and time frames. How will TGP ensure that areas, where trees have been removed, stream shading and "locally elevated water temperatures," are restored to pre-construction conditions?

o The July Report's section 3.1.3 "Construction and Operation Impacts" still grossly fails to identify how the removal of streamside vegetation will impact coldwater fisheries. The July Report now

omits the March Report's assurance that "once installation activities for the pipeline segments are complete, disturbed areas will be restored to pre-construction condition," making it unclear whether pre-construction coldwater fisheries conditions will be assessed at all. The July Report provides the broad assurance that "Post-construction and operational impacts to fisheries will be minimal" (p3-17) without providing clear indication of what specific postconstruction activities will be conducted and how those activities are proven to be effective at restoring coldwater fisheries habitat once it has been degraded.

- o The July Report's section 3.1.3 notes that "During ROW vegetation maintenance activities, Tennessee will comply with Tennessee's Project-specific Procedures and will leave vegetation in place within 25 feet adjacent to a waterbody, as measured from the waterbody's high water mark, to allow for a riparian strip adjacent to the waterbody" (p3-16). The July Report is unclear as to whether the 25-foot buffer will be measured laterally or topographically, and thus fails to discuss how steep slopes along coldwater fisheries will be addressed.
- o The July Report's section 3.1.3 notes that "trees that are located within 15 feet of the pipeline that have the potential to compromise the integrity of the pipeline may be selectively cut and removed from the permanent ROW" (p3-16); it is unclear how the subsequent statement is related: "This will allow for the re-establishment of woody and herbaceous species along the stream banks that will provide needed shading and crucial cover habitat to sufficiently maintain CWF habitat characteristics" (p3-16). It is largely understood that trees provide shade that is necessary to maintain cool summer temperatures in coldwater streams. While selectively cutting trees may promote the re-establishment of woody species, success of this management practice is entirely species-specific, site-specific, highly influenced by the presence of invasive species/pests, and _ in order to sufficiently maintain CWF habitat characteristics _ is best conducted under the direction of a licensed forester. TGP does not provide any citation to support its claim that these broad management practices will ensure that coldwater fisheries habitat characteristics will be maintained.

- 3.1.4 Measures to Avoid, Minimize, and Mitigate Impacts. (p. 3-16)

- o TGP cites several measures to protect and minimize potential adverse impacts to streams, one of which is to restore "stream channels and bottoms to their original configurations and contours."
- o However, this section fails to describe how pre-construction, "original" conditions will be recorded.
- o The July Report's section 3.1.4 indicates that "All waterbody crossings will be photodocumented before and after construction" (p3-18). Subsequently, the July Report repeats the March Report's assurance that TGP will be "Restoring stream channels and bottoms to their original configurations and contours using original substrates" (p3-18). It is still unclear how, if at all, TGP plans to measure pre-construction conditions such that the configurations and contours of streams will be restored. Photo documentation of streams is a measure of aesthetics and fails to scientifically measure integral factors such as hydraulics and sediment transport patterns. Without incorporating such factors, TGP is failing to adequately assess the potential impacts of the proposed pipeline.

- 3.2.2.3.11 _ Massachusetts BioMap2 Data. (p. 3-46)

- o "The Core Habitats, Critical Natural Landscapes and all their individual components are an important source of spatially explicit data that Tennessee can incorporate into its assessment of impacts including avoidance, minimization, and mitigation."
 - Use of the word "can" instead of "will" implies that they have not committed to this. How will the data be incorporated into the assessment of impacts?
- o Although the July Report's 3.2.2.3.11 section does include numerous examples of how BioMap2 data will be incorporated into TGP's impact assessment, this explanation lacks sufficient description. Regarding Species of Conservation Concern, the report notes that "These data will be used to direct field surveys for state-listed species as directed by the NHESP. There are an additional 27 non-listed

species included in the BioMap2 Species of Conservation Concern mapping. Nearly half of these (i.e., 13) are BCCs whose habitats will be captured in wetland resource mapping and Tennessee’s Project-specific forest interior mapping” (p3-43). While TGP comprehensively explains the available data, the report fails to explain how it will be incorporated into the assessment of impacts. In discussing the Critical Natural Landscape BioMap2 data, TGP fails to adequately explain how impacts will be assessed.

- As noted on page 3-42 of the July Report, “Critical natural landscapes consist of the largest landscape blocks from within each of the eight ecoregions that provide habitat for wide-ranging species, support intact ecological processes, maintain connectivity among habitats, and enhance ecological resilience (Woolsey et al. 2010).” The Critical Natural Landscape data was created to delineate interactions among different habitats and how their integrated patchwork supports large-scale populations of wide-ranging species. As such, impact assessment should address all elements of this comprehensive data set. Instead, TGP notes that “The majority of habitats included in the critical natural landscape will be accounted for by impact assessment of Projects-specific forest interior mapping (Section 3.2.2.6), wetland buffer zones, 200- foot riverfront areas, and vernal pool critical terrestrial habitats” (p3-44). The broad use of “the majority of habitats” insufficiently explains how assessment will occur specific to this integrative and unique landscape-level dataset. It appears that TGP is under the assumption that by assessing the impacts to individual habitats, this will suffice to assess the impacts to the complex interactions among different habitats. This is a false assumption and the report fails to sufficiently explain how impacts to Critical Natural Landscapes will be addressed.

- o Massachusetts Association of Conservation Commissions (02/06/2015) requested that this data be indicated on maps and it was not included.

- o Although this data is now included in the July Report, the symbology of the BioMap2 data is unclear (Attachment 3a). In many cases, Core Habitats and Critical Natural Landscapes overlap, which should be evident on the map. Instead, TGP chooses to present this data as two distinct colors, with no evident overlap of the two sets of data. TGP’s maps of BioMap areas blatantly misrepresent the data.

- 3.3.2.3 Vegetation Communities of Special Concern: Massachusetts. (p. 3-74)

- o TGP indicates that they have not received response from the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and its sister agency in Massachusetts or the Natural Heritage & Endangered Species Program. While awaiting responses, TGP reports conducting internet-based searches “to identify potential natural communities of special concern in Massachusetts.” This section of the report fails to consider publically-available Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program’s BioMap2 data⁵.

- o The July Report’s section 3.3.2.3 includes information regarding correspondence with the appropriate agency, Massachusetts NHESP, however it appears that some correspondence is missing.

- First, when the July Report addresses correspondence with NHESP, TGP only notes species-specific details, stating that “No specific natural communities were identified in either correspondence” (p3-70, referring also to USFWS correspondence). While NHESP correspondence (French letter, March 3, 2015) primarily cites an attached list of specific species, the NHESP representative also emphasizes that “projects and activities located within Priority and/or Estimated Habitat must be reviewed by the Division,” closing with “Please note that the information contained in this letter addresses only the matter of state-listed rare species and does not pertain to other resources or wildlife habitat issues that may be pertinent to the project” (App B Agency Correspondence 2 of 2, no pages present; emphasis not added). App B Agency Correspondence 2 of 2 is unindexed and does not appear to include TGP’s request to NHESP for this information. Prior correspondence from NHESP (G Iorio, March 3, 2015) refers to an “attached letter regarding the Information Request form submitted to NHESP,” but this letter appears to be omitted from App B Agency

Correspondence 2. Because TGP's inquiry to NHESP is omitted/unclear, it is unclear whether TGP specifically inquired for species-specific information or whether TGP's request for information regarding natural communities was never made. Were "no specific natural communities" identified solely because TGP failed to inquire about them? NHESP's emphasis on Priority and/or Estimated Habitats appears to highlight the importance of habitats, which is also the emphasis of Section 3.3.2.3, entitled "Vegetation Communities of Special Concern: Massachusetts." TGP's correspondence with NHESP fails to sufficiently address vegetation communities of special concern.

- Second, in the July Report's section 3.3.2.3, TGP further indicates that "While awaiting further guidance from the NHESP and the USFWS on survey requirements, a desktop analysis using available GIS data and Internet-based searches was conducted to identify potential natural communities of special concern in Massachusetts. These are described in the following sections" (p3-71).
- In the July Report, it is unclear what GIS data TGP is using to determine communities of special concern; several datasets are available, most notably NHESP's publically available Priority Habitats of Rare Species 2008 layer, which TGP fails to acknowledge in this section of the report. Projects that fall within a designated Priority Habitat must be reviewed by NHESP for compliance with Massachusetts Endangered Species Act (MESA). TGP's updated report notes only four S2/S3 natural communities (p3-71), failing to note several that coincide with the proposed pipeline route, such as the S3 Rich, Mesic Forest Community. TGP fails to adequately identify and address potential impacts to all Priority Habitats within the proposed project area.
- Subsequently, the section explains four natural communities that are of, reportedly, special concern to the state (p. 3-75 to p. 3-77); however, TGP fails to identify Core Habitat and Critical Natural Landscapes that contain vital information about vegetation communities of special concern.
- Specifically, the report fails to mention Core Habitat 2943,6 which the proposed pipeline passes through on several occasions. In addition to containing vegetation of special concern, it is habitat to numerous state and federally-listed species, such as clubtail dragonflies, spring salamander, wood turtle, and the longnose sucker.

Suggestions to minimize environmental impact

- 3.3.4.1 Clearing. (p. 3-80)

- o On several occasions, TGP indicates that they will take specific action once a tree has been felled:
 - "Trees shall be felled into ROW"
 - "Trees that have inadvertently fallen into waterbodies or beyond the ROW will be removed immediately"
 - "Tennessee does not plan to use timber stacks as wildlife habitat"
- o Generally, removal and/or chipping of felled trees is not beneficial to improving wildlife habitat and should be considered on a case-by-case basis. Landowners should be entitled to receive education on what their potential options are and how each option would affect their remaining resources.
- o The July Report's section 3.3.4.1 (p3-79) has been revised to address this concern.

Table 3.4-7: Locations and Timing of Pending Species Specific Biological Surveys Associated with the Project

- o TGP cites, on several occasions, that the relevant table will be populated pending biological surveys in response to agency consultations. In order to gain the best understanding of the resources that TGP may encounter, NEES suggests contacting relevant NGOs that may have more accurate data, such as species sightings.
- o In the July Report, TGP has documented agency consultations and the Locations and Timing of Pend-

ing Species Specific Biological Surveys Associated with the Project (Table 3.4-8) has been populated, albeit it is still incomplete and does not contain information on survey timing (3b-19).

RESOURCE REPORT 4: Cultural Resources

Transparency

- Table 4.4-17: A list of historic sites within or adjacent to the pipeline corridor has been created for MA, and includes sites in Berkshire, Franklin, and Hampshire Counties. The methods by which these sites have been identified is not described, and the table headings are without key and essentially useless for determining precise areas and what they contain. This lack of transparency prevents NEES and other reviewers from determining possible impact on historic sites. (p. 4-18)
 - o Example: the heading “Site No.” follows an alphanumeric code for which no key is given, and no description of the resources corresponding to each “Site No.” is included in the report.
 - o Example: The heading “Parcel” likely relates to an assessors map parcel, but no reference map is listed, making it impossible to investigate the possible impacted properties.
- The July Report’s Table 4.4-17 (Previously Recorded Archaeological Sites in Franklin County) has not been clarified. The text of the corresponding section (4.4.1.3 Project Facilities in Massachusetts) and the previous section (4.4.1 Archaeological Research and Survey Methods) do not offer an explanation as to the characteristics these historic sites hold or where they are located. The terminus of section 4.4.1.3 notes that “Additional information regarding these known resources can be found in the Overview Report (Volume III, Appendix CC),” however this section is not available to the public (p4-21). Furthermore, the report does not explain why they TGP is withholding this information. Instead of providing further clarification, Table 4.4-17 now excludes the “Parcel” column and continues not to provide an explanation for the “Site No.” column (p4-21). Repeating the trend of the July Report, TGP has chosen to completely remove previously confusing information rather than clarification of the same.

Insufficient explanation

- 4.4: TGP indicates that a GIS model to predict areas where historic interests likely fall within the pipeline’s possible impact area has been created. However, TGP does not indicate whether this model has been deployed in MA, shared with the MA Historic Commission, or whether the possible areas of historic interest they later identify were selected using this rigorous tool or some less robust method. Such lack of information does not give NEES and other reviewers sufficient grounds to judge whether the historic interests are being duly considered. (p. 4-6)
- The July Report’s section 4.4.1 Archaeological Research and Survey Methods has not changed; however, the description does indicate that “The model produced archaeological site probability for the entire I-mile buffer, which was then clipped by the Project survey area” (p4-9). As written, TGP forces an assumption that the description also includes Massachusetts. It still appears that the data has not been shared with the Massachusetts Historic Commission or other stakeholders.
- 4.4: At the time this report was released, TGP indicated that no field surveys of historic resources have been undertaken in MA, and that determination of impacted historic resources would be primarily determined by field survey. This tardiness complicates review of the potential impacts of the pipeline on historic resources of interest, and prevents NEES from readily determining whether certain historic interests which lie in the proposed pipeline’s path have been duly considered. (p. 4-6)
- At the time of the July Report, TGP has still failed to conduct field surveys of historic resources throughout all of Massachusetts. Therefore, determination of impact to historic resources continues to be unknown.

RESOURCE REPORT 5: Socioeconomics

Transparency:

- 5.5 Socioeconomics: Agriculture. (p. 5-10)

- o TGP indicates that they will provide “just” compensation for loss of crop and timber production with each affected landowner; but, TGP does not explain how compensation will be calculated.
- o The July Report’s section 5.5 Agriculture (p5-16) has not changed. TGP still fails to explain how land-owners will be fairly reimbursed for loss of crop and timber production.

RESOURCE REPORT 7: Soils

Failure to present most recent data:

- 7.2 Aboveground Facilities and Prime Farmland Impacts. (p. 7-4)
 - o In a Massachusetts Association of Conservation Commission’s letter to TGP (2/4/2015), TGP was asked to indicate and show on maps the location of each land with a conservation or agricultural restriction that the pipeline would cross.
 - o The Report fails to do so. Although, it does state that TGP is consulting with USDA- NRCS to determine the locations of agricultural preservation restrictions. Up-to-date versions of this data is publicly available and there should be no excusable delay for including such information in the application 7•
 - o The July Report still fails to show locations of agricultural preservation restrictions (Resource Report 7 _ Soils Maps). TGP fails to incorporate publicly available data and related concerns.

APPENDIX H:

“PLAN” Commission’s Plans and Procedures (Upland Erosion Control, Revegetation, and Maintenance Plan)

Insufficient Explanation/Failure to Provide Sufficient Information

- I, Applicability. (p. 1)
 - o The Director can agree to a variance at the request of the project sponsor if the variance is necessary due to a portion of the Plan being “infeasible or unworkable based on project-specific conditions”
 - How are “infeasible” or “unworkable” defined? Is it possible that a proposed activity is infeasible due to financial or contractual considerations?
 - If a variance is issued, how is it ensured that there is not a potential for the changed activity to negatively impact a resource?
 - o The July Report entirely fails to answer the aforementioned questions. This omission implies that TGP may indeed deem a project “infeasible” because of its high cost. Should environmental conditions and public health be jeopardized because of potentially high costs of stringent erosion and revegetation plans that have been touted to the public and approved by FERC? The July Report remains unclear and does not clarify this concern.
- II.B. Responsibilities of Environmental Inspectors. (p. 3)
 - o Regarding temporary erosion control measures occurring within 24 hours of each 0.5 inch of rainfall: Communities in certain areas of the proposed pipeline often have micro-climates with isolated rain events; as such, where will rainfall be measured in relation to work sites and what is the maximum distance of measuring?
 - o The July Report fails to entirely answer the aforementioned questions. Suppose it rains 0.4 inches in Deerfield. In upstream Conway _ two miles away _ it rains 1.3 inches. Will the Environmental Inspector inspect temporary erosion control measures at both sites? Again, by failing to provide sufficient information, TGP leaves the public without enough knowledge to ensure that environmental conditions and public health will be sufficiently protected. Failure to check erosion control measures after rainfall events can lead to various negative impacts, including infrastructure damage, agricultural erosion, increased stream turbidity in sensitive fisheries, reduced water quality, and habitat

degradation.

- IIIA. Construction Work Areas. (p. 4)
 - o “Project sponsors are encouraged to consider expanding any required cultural resources and endangered species surveys in anticipation of the need for activities outside of authorized work areas.”
 - o Expanding the construction right-of-way is discussed in Section IV. A _ Installation _ Approved Areas of Disturbance _ but, it is not clear whether this refers to the broad “activities outside of authorized work areas” mentioned in section IIIA.
 - What is the process for conducting activities outside of authorized work areas? How are landowners/ APR/CR grantors notified of such an event? How does TGP ensure that there will be no impact to the property in such instances?
 - o The July Report fails to address the aforementioned questions.
- V.C. Restoration: Soil Compaction Mitigation. (p. 14)
 - o TGP states that they will plow “severely compacted agricultural areas with a paraplow or deep tillage implement.” “Severely” is not defined, and how can landowners ensure that their soil is restored if they have concerns?
 - o The July 2015 report fails to address the aforementioned questions. By failing to define “severely compacted agricultural areas,” TGP is not ensuring that the economic viability of agricultural soil will be restored to farmers.

Suggestions to reduce environmental impact:

- VILA. Post-Construction Activities and Reporting: Monitoring and Maintenance. (p. 17)
 - o TGP states that revegetation will be considered successful if upon visual survey the density and cover of non-nuisance vegetation are similar to, in density and cover, adjacent, undisturbed lands.
 - o With 83% of the proposed pipeline being purportedly co-located, it is likely that adjacent land that has previously been disturbed has a high proportion of nuisance vegetation, thus serving as a skewed benchmark for revegetation success. Success should be measured by the density and cover of restored, non-nuisance vegetation in comparison to pre-construction composition at the same site.
 - o The July Report fails to address the aforementioned.

APPENDIX H:

“PROCEDURES” Commission’s Plans and Procedures (Wetland and Waterbody Construction & Mitigation Procedures)

Inaccurate Information

- Appendix H, Wetland and water body construction mitigation procedures. (p. 13): TGP claims that the proposed pipeline has been routed to avoid wetlands to the maximum extent possible. This is not the case. The proposed project will cross wetlands which are small enough that a very minor jog in the pipeline would allow it to completely bypass these resources.
- The July Report does not offer additional clarity to this issue. The section in which it appears (VLA.2) is wholly unchanged.

Insufficient explanation

- Appendix H, Wetland and water body construction mitigation procedures. (p. 3): A designated environmental inspector for each region through which the pipeline passes will be engaged to review wetland and stream crossings. TGP does not discuss how said inspector will be selected; nor, are organizations in impacted areas offered an opportunity to review or suggest inspector-candidates. In short, landowners are left to trust that TGP will select a qualified and impartial inspector with no opportunity to participate

in the selection process.

- The July Report does not clarify the aforementioned whatsoever.
- Appendix H, Wetland and water body construction mitigation procedures. (p. 11-12): TGP outlines promising restoration measures for impacted streams, but does not offer any explanation as to how the success of these efforts will be measured. Several high quality streams could be impacted by the proposed project. NEES does not believe that a complete restoration effort could be carried out on impacted streams without a thorough preconstruction assessment and careful monitoring.
- The July Report does not clarify this concern either. There is not further explanation of how TGP Morgan plans to ensure that restoration measures at stream crossings will be successful. The July Report's Appendix H does offer additional information regarding how stream crossings will be determined _ "In accordance with consultations with state regulatory agencies, Tennessee is proposing to cross streams with discernible flow at the time of construction via fluming or dam and pump, regardless of fisheries or critical habitat designation. Following this guidance provides greater resource protection than the Commission's Procedures, as discussed in more detail in Resource Report 2" (pH-7). However, TGP fails to cite correspondences to which it refers _ specifically, it is unclear whether "state regulatory agencies" include all states within the project area or whether this only applies to specific states.

Suggestions to minimize environmental impact

- Appendix H, Wetland and water body construction mitigation procedures. (p 2): Site specific justifications for work areas or construction ROWs within 50 or 75 feet, respectively, of a wetland or water body must be filed with FERC. If impacted areas occur on conservation land, NEES suggests that the primary conservation interest holder be invited to review the plan.
- The July Report's Appendix H still does not offer acknowledgement of conservation land. Appendix H, Wetland and water body construction mitigation procedures. (p. 3): FERC must be notified in advance of blasting or trenching plans that fall within an intermediate or major water body, CWFR, or habitat of threatened or endangered species. Again, when such activities are planned, the landowner should be party to them.
- The July Report's Appendix H still does not acknowledge how blasting will be treated on conservation land (pH-2, Part 2, Procedures).
- Appendix H, Wetland and water body construction mitigation procedures. (p. 5): The window for construction within cold-water fisheries is from June through September. Rationale for this window is not provided and, in fact, NEES believes that the proposed window encompasses a time of year when fisheries will be under greatest stress due to high water temperatures and low water levels.
- The July Report's Appendix H also fails to provide justification for having chosen the June through September span for construction within waterbodies. Failure to cite substantiating information implies that TGP has arbitrarily chosen this span without having conducted research on coldwater fisheries resource requirements (pH-4, Part 2, Procedures). Scientific research on stream flow in the project area of Western Massachusetts has been recently conducted and can be easily accessed by TGP; however it appears that TGP is choosing to avoid using this highly relevant data.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit these comments. NEES reserves it right to amend and add to these comments. NEES is submitting this filing with the Commission's Secretary through the eFiling system. Any questions concerning these comments should be addressed to Vincent DeVito at (202) 465-8785.

Respectfully submitted,
NORTHEAST ENERGY SOLUTIONS, INC.
Vincent DeVito
Bowditch & Dewey, LLP
300 New Jersey Avenue NW, Suite 900

Washington, DC 20001
vdevito@bowditch.com

cc: Mr. Rich McGuire (Commission Staff)
Mr. Michael McGehee (Commission Staff)
Mr. Eric Tomasi (Commission Staff)

Footnotes:

- 1 https://www.streamcontinuity.org/assessing_crossing_structures/prioritizing_streams.htm
- 2 <http://www.mass.gov/anf/research-and-tech/it-serv-and-support/application-serv/officeof-geographic-information-massgis/datalayers/soi.html>
- 3 https://ag.umass.edu/sites/ago.umass.edu/files/researchreports/pipeline_natural_resources_assessment_mainline_april_2015.pdf
- 4 http://www.mass.gov/anf/research-and-tech/it-serv-and-support/application-serv/officeof-geographic-information-massgis/datalayers/depwetlands_112000.html
- 5 <http://maps.massgis.state.ma.us/dfg/biomap2.htm>
- 6 http://maps.massgis.state.ma.us/dfg/biomap/pdf/town_core/Ashfield.pdf
- 7 <http://www.mass.gov/anf/research-and-tech/it-serv-and-support/application-serv/officeof-geographic-information-massgis/datalayers/osp.html> {end of 20151102-5046}

20151102-5183

Katharine Gregg, Mason, NH.

On November 20 Kinder Morgan Inc. will file a certificate of need with FERC for its Northeast Energy Direct project through southern New Hampshire. However, there have recently been articles in respected financial publications showing that KMI is experiencing financial difficulties.

On October 28 David Alton Clark at “Seeking Alpha” wrote that KM would pursue an alternative source of financing because using common equity to fund growth has gotten significantly more expensive and the company’s debt level is already high. Although Clark says this does not seem the best decision on KM’s part, he feels that if the company issues more debt it most likely would lose its investment grade rating.

Andrew Bary of Barrons wrote on October 31 that Kinder Morgan is down 36% this year and could lose another 20% or more because Wall Street has lost confidence in limited partnerships tied to pipelines and other energy infrastructure.

Please give these reports serious consideration as you evaluate Kinder Morgan’s project. Southern New Hampshire opposes NED, but how much worse would our situation be if the company used inferior material and maintenance procedures in order to contain costs? What would happen to our scarred communities if the company went bankrupt?

Sincerely,

Katharine Gregg

20151103-0009

United States Senate
WASHINGTON, DC 20510

October 23, 2015

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

Dear Chairman Bay,

We write to you with significant concerns regarding the impact from the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline (NED) (Docket No. PF14-22-000) project on the residents of Rensselaer County, New York. Kinder Morgan

proposes to build a 41,000 horsepower compressor station in Nassau, NY to support an expansion of the NED Pipeline from Pennsylvania, through New York, to service New England area customers. Due to the significant number of concerned citizens that we have heard from regarding this compressor station, we urge you to insist on alternatives to the current proposal. The impacts of a compressor station proposed on Clarks Chapel Road are certain to have profound consequences on the communities that will surround it. Currently, this is a quiet neighborhood filled with families and small farms, one that offers open space and recreational opportunities on nearby Burden Lake. The introduction of a compressor station into this community will forever alter this quiet landscape.

Over the course of the past several months, hundreds of residents, concerned citizens and elected officials throughout Rensselaer County, NY and the surrounding area have contacted our offices and many attended the two Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) public scoping meetings on this project in July of 2015 to voice opposition to this proposal. In these meetings, residents conveyed concerns regarding the effects of this project on their community, noting the potential negative environmental and health impacts associated with a compressor station. In addition, residents have raised concerns about the level of emissions, noise and light the compressor could produce. The compressor station would stand alone as a large industrial use in the middle of this existing residential community. Many residents fear its scale and close proximity to families, farms and other neighborhoods pose an imminent threat to the health and quality of life currently being enjoyed in this area.

It is our hope that Kinder Morgan and FERC will entertain alternatives to this proposal, as the current proposed location of this compressor station presents considerable potential negative impacts that could not be mitigated in this location. The concerns that have been voiced to us with regard to the proposed site are compelling, and we cannot support the current proposal as we do not believe at this time that the potential environmental and health impacts to the community outweigh the potential benefits.

Charles Schumer
United States Senator

Kirsten Gillibrand
United States Senator

20151103-0012

**The Unitarian Universalist
Society of Amherst**

The Rev. Alison Wohler, Minister
Kelly Aiken, Clerk
Norman C. Bay, Chairman
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, DC 20426

October 20, 2015

RE: CONGREGATION VOTES TO OPPOSE PIPELINE; FIRST IN REGION

Dear Chairman Bay:

On Sunday, October 18, 2015, the congregation of the Unitarian Universalist Society of Amherst (MA) voted to oppose the installation of a gas pipeline in Massachusetts, specifically the New England Direct pipeline. This is believed to be the first such vote by a faith based body. The vote was 50-0 with one abstention. As the clerk for the congregation I am charged with informing you of this vote.

Sincerely,

Kelly Aiken

The resolution reads as follows:

The Unitarian Universalist Society of Amherst Resolution to Oppose the Installation of a Gas Pipeline in

Massachusetts

WHEREAS, the Unitarian Universalist Society of Amherst (the “Society”), a Unitarian Universalist Congregation, has covenanted to affirm and promote seven principles, including “justice, equity, and compassion in human relations,” and “respect for the interdependent web of all existence of which we are a part;

WHEREAS, a proposed high pressure pipeline carrying natural gas obtained through hydraulic fracturing (“fracked gas”) currently called the Northeast Energy Direct project, of Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., would run through many communities in Western Massachusetts;

WHEREAS, in addition to the inherent risks of high pressure gas pipelines (possible ruptures, fires and explosions, and possible impacts to sensitive areas along the pipeline route) fracked gas may carry additional risks of pollution by hydraulic fracturing chemicals as well as the added environmental burdens for communities that are the site of the fracking;

WHEREAS, there is a growing concern regarding the impact of methane, the main component from gas leaks at drilling sites and along pipelines, in addition to the impact of the carbon dioxide produced when the gas is burned;

WHEREAS, instead of increasing our dependency on fossil fuels like natural gas, we are better served by embracing and strengthening the Commonwealth of Massachusetts’ commitment to combating global climate change through increased efficiency and renewable energy; and

WHEREAS, the Unitarian Universalist Society of Amherst has an interest in protecting public health, public land, and the environment in the Pioneer Valley, the Commonwealth, New England, and our shared world;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Unitarian Universalist Society of Amherst, that the Society:

1. Opposes the construction of the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline and any such new or expanded pipelines carrying gas in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts;
2. Opposes any tariffs that may be imposed on Massachusetts ratepayers to fund the Tennessee Gas Pipeline or other such new or expanded gas pipelines;
3. Stands in solidarity with communities opposing the Tennessee Gas Pipeline and other such pipelines;
4. Asks that our state and federal representatives and the governor oppose the Tennessee Gas Pipeline and any other such new or expanded pipelines carrying gas in the Commonwealth and oppose any tariffs or taxes that may be imposed on the ratepayers; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the clerk of the Board of Trustees shall, within 30 days of the vote of the congregation, forward a copy of this resolution and the vote thereon to Gov. Charlie Baker, president of the Senate Stanley Rosenberg, state representative Ellen Story, Sen. Elizabeth Warren, Sen. Edward Markey, Congressman James McGovern, and the chair and commissioners of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

Respectfully,

Kelly Aiken
Clerk

121 North Pleasant Street, P.O. Box 502, Amherst, MA 01004-0502
(413)253-2848 office@uusocietyamherst.org www.uusocietyamherst.org

20151103-0073

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426
Project Docket Number: PF14-22

Date: 10/28/15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access

As the owner of the property located at:

57 Cart Path Rd

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. Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Cecilia M. Mancini

Robert J. Mancini

20151103-0077

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, NE

Room 1A

Washington, DC 20426

Project Docket Number: PF14-22

Date: 10/22/15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access

As the owner of the property located at:

10 Cart Path Rd

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. Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Debbie Bernard

20151103-0078

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, NE

Room 1A

Washington, DC 20426

Project Docket Number: PF14-22

Date: 10/22/15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access

As the owner of the property located at:

50 Cart Path Rd

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. Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.
Ullisa Benoit

20151103-0079

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426
Project Docket Number: PF14-22
October 27, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access

As the owner of the property located at:
86 Cart Path Rd
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. Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Robert J. Sims III Ashley Simms

20151103-0086

Kimberly Bose, Secretary
FERC
888 First Street, N.E.
Washington, DC 20426

STOP THE NED PIPELINE!!

Protect NH land from Eminent Domain!

I oppose. the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) EXPORT pipeline. The pipelines, and compressor station will scar the NH landscape and put our water, wildlife, forests, agricultural lands and rural character at risk. These include health and safety risks from emissions, industrialization, pollution and the devastating effects of fire and explosions. Greed, not need is fueling this project. Say NO to this private company that will TAKE OUR LANDS with NO BENEFIT TO US.

Tom Trally
78 Marblehead Rd
Windham, NH 03087

20151103-0102

{same text as 20151103-0086, signed by: }

? G. Hill
100 Karen Rd
Windham, NH 03087

20151103-0103

Hand written card, Mary Judith Parker: opposing

{58 separate cards each signed by an individual, all bundled under this single accession number}

{same text as 20151103-0086, signed by: }

Donna Witte 14 Autumn St Windham, NH 03087	Mikayia Segueira 209 Garland Drive Pelham, NH 03076	Bruce M. Witte 14 Autumn St Windham, NH 03087
Lawrence V. Armstrong 100 Karen Road Windham, NH 03087	Donald F. Miller 100 Karen Rd Windham, NH 03087	Abrey Pervier 100 Karen Road Windham, NH 03087
Brett L. Armstrong 100 Karen Road Windham, NH 03087	Greg Holt 100 Karen Road Windham, NH 03087	Helena Kory 17 Hardwood Rd Windham, NH 03087
Josot Maria Leal 209 Garland Dr Pelham, NH 03076	Dalila Sequeira 209 Garland Drive Pelham, NH 03076	Elaine Boles 14 Grafton Dr Bedford, NH 03110
J. Cat? 151 Brady Ave Salem, NH 0307?	Kate Fisher 130 Garland Dr Pelham, NH 03076	Jason Corbett 9 Econumou Ave Pelham, NH 03076
Susan Mollay 35 Patriot Drive Pelham, NH 03076	Thomas Mirley 8 Almas Road Windham, NH 03087	Lauro Spottiswood 64 Webster Ave Pelham, NH 03076
Richard K? 23 Greeley Rd Pelham, NH 03076	Cayce Marks 8 Almas Road Windham, NH 03087	Deana Corbett 9 Econumou Ave Pelham, NH 03076
Mackenzie Cawthron 348 Shrburne Rd Pelham, NH 03076	Paul Fisher 130 Garland Dr Pelham, NH 03076	Zach Lebel 36 Nashua Rd Pelham, NH 03076
Mary Ellen Myers 164 Bush Hill Rd Pelham, NH 03076	Brady Kowalcheck 23 Cridg Rd Pelham, NH 03076	Lindsey Niemaszyk 9 Sandy Circle Pelham, NH 03076
Miranda Labonte 197 Wyndriag Cir Pelham, NH 03076	Sean McMurier 164 Bush Hill Rd Pelham, NH 03076	Faye Thiffault 9 Economou Ave Pelham, NH 03076
Marissa Langlois 81B Dutton Road Pelham, NH 03076	Robert Molloy 62 Janice Ave Dracut, MA 01826	Cassidy Corbett 9 Economou Avenue Pelham, NH 03076
Jen Fisher 130 Garland Dr Pelham, NH 03076	Laura Marks 8 Almas Rd Windham, NH 03087	Julia Brau 164 Bush Hill Rd Pelham, NH 03076
Steve Sequeira 209 Garland Drive Pelham, NH 03076	Robert Molloy 35 Patriot Drive Pelham, NH 03076	John Spattiswood 64 Webster Ave Pelham, NH 03076
? 3 Misty Meadow Rd Windham, NH 03087	George Banakos 17 Whisteria Way Pelham, NH 03076	Joey Pantaleo 64 Webster Ave Pelham, NH 03076

?
?
Pelham, NH 03076
Julie Molloy
35 Patriot Drive
Pelham, NH 03076
Frankie Rozzi
208 Windham Rd
Pelham, NH 03076
Sharon Deacon
21 Lincoln St
Pelham, NH 03076
Christy Paquin
81B Dutton Road
Pelham, NH 03076
Jacob Cormier
13 Mt Vernon Dr
Pelham, NH 03076

Judy Paquin
377 Nashua Road
Dracut, MA 01826
Sophia ?
17 Scenic View Dr
Pelham, NH 03076
Donna Niemaszyk
102 Old Bridge St
Pelham, NH 03076
Mike Pantaleo
42 South Shore Rd
Salem, NH 03079
Sara Fisher
130 Garland Dr
Pelham, NH 03076

Jeanette Fisher
17 Scenic View Dr
Pelham, NH 03076
Lisa Tracy
48 Marblehead Rd
Windham, NH 03087
Chris Hwu
17 Scenic View Dr
Pelham, NH 03076
Karen Banakos
17 Whisteria Way
Pelham, NH 03076
Kyle Frank
18 Heather Lee Land
Pelham, NH 03076

20151103-5045

Town of Amherst, New Hampshire

P.O. Box 960, 2 Main Street
Amherst, NH 03031

1.(603).673.6041 | www.amherstnh.gov

October 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. (“TGP”)
Docket No. PF14-22-000: Proposed Northeast Energy Direct (“NED”)

Dear Ms. Bose:

On Wednesday, September 16, 2015, the Town of Amherst Pipeline Taskforce held a meeting with representatives of the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company I Kinder Morgan to discuss the alternative options for the pipeline route through Amherst currently under analysis by Kinder Morgan. This served as a follow up to two earlier meetings during which sensitive areas were identified by the Amherst Pipeline Taskforce as priority areas to be avoided.

In subsequent weeks, the Town has evaluated the direct impacts of the September 16, 2015 proposed route in comparison with the alternative route proposed in the December 2014 pre-filing. Attached please find a memorandum prepared for our Board of Selectmen providing a preliminary summary analysis of the impacts of the originally proposed and the revised alternate routes within the Town of Amherst.

I respectfully ask that this letter and the accompanying memorandum be included as part of the public record.

Thank you for your consideration of this information.

Sincerely,

James M. O’Mara, Jr.

Town Administrator

Cc:

Website

File w/attachments

Town of Amherst, New Hampshire

Office of Community Development

Building · Code Enforcement · Planning · Zoning · Economic Development

TO: Board of Selectmen
Jim O'Mara, Town Administrator

FROM: Colleen Mailloux, Community Development Director

RE: Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline - Preliminary Analysis - KM Alternate Route through Amherst versus Original Proposed Route

DATE: October 22, 2015

As the Board of Selectmen is aware, the original route for the proposed NED pipeline through Amherst severely impacted homeowners and sensitive environmental areas. The ACC's Preliminary Environmental Assessment described the environmental risks in some detail, and formed the basis for the Board's first letter to the FERC in March of 2014. In addition to environmental impacts, the original route, while roughly paralleling the Eversource Transmission lines, cut through numerous residential properties, crossed cul-de-sacs, and included two potentially disruptive Horizontal Directional Drills (HDDs) in order for the pipeline to cross under the Souhegan River in four separate locations.

During its initial meetings, the volunteer Amherst Pipeline Task Force identified and pursued multiple strategies to respond to the proposed project. One of the approaches undertaken by the Task Force was to identify densely populated residential neighborhoods and sensitive environmental areas to be avoided. To that end, the Task Force developed a set of criteria and recommended that Kinder Morgan consider alternate routes that would avoid workforce and senior housing developments, schools, residential cul-de-sacs, threatened and endangered species habitat, the Souhegan River, Ponemah Bog, and land held in conservation easements.

These "avoidance areas" were presented to Kinder Morgan representatives at a meeting in April of this year. At a subsequent meeting in June, Kinder Morgan presented an alternate route that addressed some of the issues identified. On September 16, 2015, Kinder Morgan presented a revised alternate route to the Task Force and indicated that this revised alternate route would be what was proposed when the NED Pipeline application was filed with the FERC, currently expected in November, 2015.

At the request of Vice Chairman D'Angelo, I have prepared the attached preliminary summary table identifying the impact of the originally proposed route through Amherst and the currently proposed alternative Route. The impacted properties identified are only those directly impacted by a proposed route located on their property.

From the preliminary analysis, it appears that the revised alternate route identified in September 2015 substantially avoids the areas of concern identified by Pipeline Task Force. While the proposed route still impacts 6 residential properties (2 of which are undeveloped) in the Town of Amherst, it avoids impacts to significant environmental resources and sensitive populations and reduces the overall length of the route in Amherst by over 1 mile.

While the Amherst Pipeline Taskforce and Town of Amherst do not endorse the NED pipeline project, the September 2015 revised proposed route appears to significantly reduce the potential impacts in our community.

As the FERC and NHSEC review processes commence, the Town of Amherst and the Pipeline Task Force

will continue to work to ensure that appropriate construction methods and impact mitigation are incorporated into any project proposals.

	Original Route (12/8/2014)	Alternate Route (9/16/2015)
Total Length of Pipeline in Amherst	4.1 miles	2.8 miles
Total Number Impacted Properties	45	24
Total Impacted Residential Zone Properties	37 (8 undeveloped)	6 (2 undeveloped)
Total Impacted Commercial / Industrial Properties	5 (2 undeveloped)	18 (7 undeveloped)
Total Impacted Conserved Properties	3 (Scott Conservation Land- 2 parcels, Ponemah Bog/NH Audubon Society)	0
Other Impact Areas of Note	Souhegan River, Lot 1-13 (Workforce Housing Development), Amherst Christian Church, Bon Terrain Water Tower	--

20151103-5180

**Connecticut Department of
ENERGY &
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION**

Robert J. Klee, Commissioner

November 3, 2015

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

RE: Northeast Energy Direct Project
Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC
Resource Report Comments
Docket No. PF 14-22-000

Dear Secretary Bose:

Thank you for the opportunity to submit these comments on the pre-filing Resource Reports 1-13 submitted by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC for the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project. Project components within Connecticut include 14.8 miles of 24" pipeline from East Granby to Farmington, referred to in the Reports as the Connecticut Loop, and modifications to an existing metering station in Easton.

Southern Connecticut Gas Company and Connecticut Natural Gas are the two local distribution companies which will receive supplies from the NED project. As a matter of both public policy and economics, the use of natural gas as an energy source has been increasing in Connecticut and additional supply capacity is needed to meet the increased demand and to mitigate against volatility in natural gas and electricity prices.

Permits

The Resource Reports acknowledge the need for several permits from Connecticut DEEP. These include a Section 401 Water Quality Certificate, and permits for the discharge of both hydrostatic test water and for

storm water from the construction activities associated with the installation of the pipeline. Many of the site-specific design and resource issues not specifically addressed at the Resource Report stage will be evaluated in these reviews, particularly in the Section 401 Water Quality Certificate review.

Farmington River Crossing

The Resource Reports are not completely consistent as to the crossing technique for the Farmington River. Resource Report 1 says (p. 88) that horizontal directional drilling (HDD) will be used for the pipeline's crossing of the Farmington River, while Resource Report 8 says (p. 89) that the use of HDD is being investigated for this crossing. DEEP would strongly encourage that HDD be employed at this site to minimize impacts including impacts to the endangered dwarf wedgemussel.

DEEP's understanding of the status of the Farmington River at this location relative to Wild and Scenic River status is consistent with that expressed in the Resource Reports. The Upper Farmington River has been so designated while the Lower Farmington River remains proposed, but not officially designated, for Wild and Scenic River status. However, the specific location of the pipeline crossing lies within an exclusion area related to the Farmington River Power Company Rainbow Dam, and would not be part of the Wild and Scenic River designated segment for the Lower Farmington River even if that proposal is ultimately adopted.

Page 87 of Resource Report 8 mentions that the south bank of the Farmington River is owned by the Town of Bloomfield at the crossing location. According to the USGS topographic map, the south bank of the river at the crossing location falls in Windsor, not Bloomfield, so the ownership status mentioned on page 88 might merit re-checking.

Listed Species

Fourteen listed plant species and eleven animal species have been identified as potentially present along the pipeline corridor. Coordination with biologists for Tennessee is ongoing. Survey procedures have been specified. Much of the survey work has not been completed during appropriate survey windows for 2015 and will continue into 2016. Biologists of DEEP's Natural Diversity Database Program continue to work with the applicant's biologists.

Blasting

Resource Report 6 says (p. 34) that two miles of the Connecticut Loop pipeline will occur in bedrock. A field review of the Connecticut Loop corridor reveals that many of the outcrop or shallow to bedrock areas occur at the higher elevations of the corridor, along ridges and other high ground but, for the bedrock areas near watercourse crossings, DEEP's Inland Fisheries Division strongly discourages the use of blasting and urges that it be avoided if at all possible. Should blasting be necessary at any watercourse crossing, Tennessee should contact the Inland Fisheries Division in advance to advise of the impending blasting so that a field inspection by Division staff can be performed to insure the proper mitigation measures have been taken to prevent mortalities. Peter Aarrestad should be the contact for the project in regard to any blasting work and can be reached at 860-424-4171.

Invasive Species Control Plan

The development of an Invasive Species Control Plan is mentioned at several points in the Resource Reports. DEEP has worked with Spectra Energy and the Corps of Engineers on other gas pipeline projects to develop acceptable language which has been incorporated into the Section 401 Water Quality Certificate for the recent Algonquin Incremental Market pipeline project. This approach distinguishes between control of invasive species that occur solely within the pipeline ROW and are, thus, more easily isolated and controlled, and those which occur both on and adjacent to the ROW where control may be more difficult and more temporary in terms of its success. A field review of the Connecticut Loop alignment showed most invasive species occurrences to fall within the former category, i.e., confined to the pipeline right-of-way rather than being more extensive.

Talcott Mountain State Park

Three minor points and corrections are noted within the discussion of Talcott Mountain State Park in Resource Report 3. On page 3-29, the report states that the administering agency for Talcott Mountain State Park is 'TBD'. It is DEEP that owns and administers the park. The sectional heading on page 3-48 mistakenly refers to that property as a state forest. Also, on page 3-48, the pipeline crossing of the park is listed as 120' but the mileposts for the crossing are shown as from MP 4.83 to MP 4.99, which is 0.16 miles 01' 845'. In either case, no impacts to the activities or facilities of the state park are anticipated as a result of this project.

New England National Scenic Trail

Resource Report 8, page 87, says the pipeline crosses the New England National Scenic Trail at milepost 5.40. The field review of the corridor showed the trail to cross the pipeline much farther to the south, at approximately MP 0.6 01' MP 0.7. This crossing was very well marked. Unless the Trail crosses the Connecticut Loop in more than one location, the milepost figure given on page 8-87 is incorrect.

DEEP Flood Control Property

A similar comment is raised concerning a milepost crossing given in Table 8.3-3 011 page 8-84 concerning the pipeline access road crossing of DEEP flood control property for the South Branch Park River Flood Control Project. Page 8-84 lists the pipeline access road as crossing this DEEP property at milepost 0.65, which would be just north of the Farmington/West Hartford town border. The flood control property owned by DEEP is adjacent to and just south of U.S. Route 44, which would be at approximately MP 3.3. DEEP does not own any property at milepost 0.65 which is on MDC land.

Diversion from Existing Pipeline Alignment

The proposed Connecticut Loop alignment diverts from following the existing Tennessee Gas Pipeline between mileposts 4.35 and 5.46 in West Hartford, and instead follows an existing electric transmission line corridor for this 1.11 mile segment. While the new alignment does avoid crossing almost one mile of Talcott Mountain State Park, the topography along the powerline corridor is much more challenging than that along the existing pipeline alignment. The proposed alignment does offer the advantage of being a very slightly shorter route. However, it would cross at least three steep basalt slopes, the first just south of CL&P structure 8106, the latter two on either side of a hollow between structures 8100 and 8099. The southern outcrop at this hollow, in particular, is a 30-35' cliff and will represent a significant constructability challenge.

There are also significant stands of Phragmites in the transmission line corridor, with a vigorous stand of plants to 10' in height between structures 8100 and 8099 and a second stand of even taller plants south of structure 8099. These stands present more of a threat for the spread of invasive species than does use of the existing pipeline segment in this section which does not support any Phragmites.

Topographically, the existing alignment is less challenging between mileposts 4.35 and 5.46. To the extent that it is a relevant concern, the existing pipeline corridor is incrementally farther from MDC Reservoir No.6, by 800-900 feet, than is the transmission line ROW. As the owner of Talcott Mountain State Park, DEEP appreciates the fact that the proposed new alignment almost completely avoids crossing that park, but the existing pipeline corridor is well maintained, shows no signs of erosion, and would represent a much less disruptive alignment choice. We are not aware of the reasons Tennessee selected the new alignment over the existing one in this segment, but, if it is of interest to Tennessee, we would be willing to entertain discussions to allow the new pipeline to follow the existing alignment in this area in the interest of minimizing overall environmental impact.

Observations from the Field

A field review of the Connecticut Loop corridor was undertaken on October 23, 26 and 27. The existing 14.83 mile pipeline right-of-way is well maintained and does not evidence any signs of erosion, even in some very steep segments from Route 185 in Bloomfield south into West Hartford. Vegetative cover is well

established throughout the pipeline corridor. Stands of Phragmites and Japanese knotweed were encountered in a few locations but overall the right-of-way was surprisingly devoid of these species, in particular when compared to transmission line rights-of-way. The alignment crossed a series of about a dozen residential lawns on Harvest Lane and Habitat Lane in northern Bloomfield, some of which have landscaping which may be at risk from the pipeline construction. Other than this location, residential impacts are more scattered and not as direct.

Corrections and Updates

Several minor corrections are noted in the Resource Reports, some of which simply reflect that they were not updated with the most current information. In this latter category are the references on pages 2-129, 2-152, and 8-146 to the Glastonbury Loop pipeline segment as being part of Spectra's Atlantic Bridge Project. The 7-mile Glastonbury Loop was deleted from Spectra's Atlantic Bridge Project. Another example is the reference on page 2-59 to the Rippowam River floodplain crossing. This crossing was eliminated when Tennessee removed the Stamford Loop from the NED project.

References on pages 8-39, 8-59 and elsewhere refer to Tennessee initiating correspondence with county agencies in Connecticut or not receiving any responses from them. Connecticut has no county level government and, therefore, no county agencies.

The reference to Ashfield County on page 8-112 is apparently a reference to the Town of Ashfield, Massachusetts. There is no Ashfield County in Massachusetts.

Thank you again for the opportunity to submit these comments on the Resource Reports for the Northeast Energy Direct Project. Should FERC staff have any questions concerning any points herein, feel free to contact me at (860) 424-4110 or at frederick.riese@ct.gov.

Respectfully yours,

Frederick L. Riese

Senior Environmental Analyst

cc: Connecticut Siting Council

20151104-0052

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, DC 20426

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

The Honorable Jeanne Shaheen

United States. Senate

Washington, D.C. 20510

November 3, 2015

Dear Senator Shaheen:

Thank you for your October 19, 2015, letter regarding Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.'s (Tennessee Gas) planned Northeast Energy Direct Project (Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Docket No. PF14-22-000).

During the pre-filing process, numerous environmental surveys and studies are being performed concurrently by the applicant. Additionally, Commission staff is reviewing the information and requesting additional information from Tennessee Gas. The purpose of the pre-filing process is to increase the applicant's and Commission's understanding of the issues that should be addressed in the formal application and in the subsequent EIS for the project. Your comments and those of your constituents are an important part of ensuring the impacts of the project are fully assessed.

Ultimately, Commission staff's review of the project will be comprehensive and a final environmental impact statement (EIS) will not be issued for the project without the Commission having all of the information

necessary to determine the potential impacts associated with constructing and operating the project. Accordingly, the EIS will analyze the concerns identified by your constituents, as well as environmental issues such as impacts on drinking water, air and noise impacts on local and regional air quality, public safety, and alternative pipeline routes. In addition, Commission staff is in weekly contact with the New Hampshire state agencies and conducted a meeting in Concord, New Hampshire with several agencies on July 30, 2015.

As in any Commission matter, please be assured that we strive to make our review of energy proposals both accessible and transparent to the public. If I can be of further assistance in this or any other Commission matter, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Norman C. Bay
Chairman

20151105-0007

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE

Room 1A

Washington, DC 20426

Project Docket Number: PF14-22

Date: October 27, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access

As the owner of the property located at:

461 Methuen Rd

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. Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Margaret Brox

20151105-0008

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE

Room 1A

Washington, DC 20426

Project Docket Number: PF14-22

Date: October 22, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access

As the owner of the property located at:

221 Parker 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. Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.
Steven M. DeSimone

20151105-0024

MEMORANDUM TO: Office of the Secretary
 FROM: Paul Friedman, FERC staff
 SUBJECT: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company LLC
 Northeast Energy Direct Project (NED)
 Docket No. PF14-22
 DATE: November 5, 2015

Please place the attached document in the public files for the project proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company LLC (TGP) in Docket No. PFI4-22-000:

- Notes from a October 9, 2015 meeting between TGP, FERC staff, and representatives of various Indian tribes, held at the Mohegan Sun Conference Center, Uncasville, Connecticut

The notes were taken by Cardno, the FERC’s environmental contractor for the NED Project, and edited by FERC staff. The document is NOT confidential.

TENNESSEE GAS PIPELINE (TGP)
 NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT (NED) PROJECT
 FERC Docket No. PF14-22-000

Pre-filing Meeting with Representatives of Interested
 Pre-filing Meeting with Representatives of Interested Indian Tribes
 and Staff of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC)

Friday, October 9, 2015 (9 a.m. - 5 p.m.)

Mohegan Sun Conference Center (Schaghticoke Room)
 Uncasville, Connecticut

Meeting Minutes

Attendees:

Paul Friedman, FERC	James Quinn, Mohegan Tribe Elaine Thomas, Mohegan Tribe
Steven Brann, Cardno	David Weeden, Mashpee Wampanoag Roddy Smith. Shinnecock Tribe
Mike Letson, Kinder Morgan	Bettina Washington. Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head (Aquinnah)
Jacquelyne Rocan, Kinder Morgan	Bryan Printup, Tuscarora Nation
Hope Luhman, Louis Berger	Christine Abrams, Tonawanda Seneca Nation Marissa Turnbull, Mashantucket Pequot Tribal Nation
Nakai Northup, Mashantucket Pequot Tribal Nation	Ed Gehres. Van Ness Feldman Dell Gould, Louis Berger
Doug Harris, Narragansett Tribe	
Eva Gibavic, Ceremonial Landscapes Research	Attended by Phone:
Jay Levy, Mohegan Tribe	Jesse Bergevin. Oneida Nation
Autumn Cholewa, Mohegan Tribe	Arnold Printup, Saint Regis Mohawk Tribe
Rebecca Brodeur, Louis Berger	

Becky Wetzel, Ceremonial Landscapes Research	
Mark Andrews, Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head (Aquinnah)	

Meeting Summary

9:00 am to 9:30 a.m. - Breakfast

9:30 a.m. - Meeting opens with welcome, introductions, and invocation by Mohegan Tribe.

9:30 a.m. to 9:45 a.m. - Mike Letson, Project Manager for TGP, gave an update on the NED Project

Discussion Points:

- TGP is continuing with environmental surveys along alignment in all states.
- Have begun pedestrian surveys to confirm archaeological probability.
- TGP is still working on Federal and State permitting.
- Have completed bat surveys where access permission has been obtained.
- Still developing protocols for threatened and endangered species surveys.
- Continuing to make route changes as surveys progress.
- Have obtained 35-40% of survey permissions from landowners along alignment.
- Intent for rest of year is to continue surveying rest of areas with permission, including areas in New Hampshire where permission was recently obtained.
- Start surveys and permit process with high resolution aerial imagery.
- Have held scoping meetings in NH and MA.
- Would like to file formal application with FERC as soon as possible.

9:45 a.m. to 11 :30 a.m. - Tribal caucus (without FERC or TGP representatives)

11 :30 a.m. to 11 :45 a.m. - Paul Friedman (FERC) gave a project update.

Discussion Points:

- Project is still in pre-filing so FERC staff can continue to communicate informally with all stakeholders. Once application is filed, FERC ex-parte rules kick-in and all staff communications with company must be formal and in writing. There are NEPA exemptions to the FERC ex-parte rules, but if used, notes still need to go in the record.
- Scoping meeting was held September 29 in Rindge, NH. Because of this meeting, the comment period was extended to October 16.
- Data request to TGP issued by FERC on October 8.
- After scoping, FERC will send formal letters to tribal leaders as part of government-to-government Consultation process.

11:45 a.m. to 12:15 p.m. - Group discussion of Unanticipated Discovery Plans (UDP).

Discussion Points:

- Rebecca Brodeur (Louis Berger) began the discussion by stating that there have been several comments about the UDP and that comments will continue to be accepted.
- Tribes request that representatives of the tribe be contacted as soon as burials are encountered. Betina Washington (Wampanoag of Gay Head) also requested that tribal representatives in Massachusetts be notified in addition to the Massachusetts Commission on Indian Affairs.
- Tribes requested that no photographs be taken if burials are encountered unless required for forensic study. Drawings could be done instead of photographs. Tribal representatives should be present before documentation begins.

- Tribes also requested that information such as the burial depth, orientation, and environmental surroundings be recorded in documentation of burials.
- Process for determining ethnicity needs to be clarified. If ethnicity is undetermined, remains need to be treated as Indian. UDP should specify individuals who determine ethnicity. Consult tribes on reinternment/disposition even if ethnicity is undetermined.
- Phone number for Mashpee Wampanoag is wrong in the UDP. Updated numbers were provided.
- Tribes may need more than two days to respond to notification of a discovery. Not sure how long but will let TGP/Louis Berger know.
- Include language in the section on Native American burials that is similar to the statement that the preference for non-native burials is "preservation in place."
- Doug Harris (Narragansett) asked, "Under what circumstances can a burial not be avoided?" Mike Letson (TGP) answered, "Very few situations arise where the pipeline can't avoid a burial but there may be constraints such as at a stream or road crossing." TGP would prefer to leave burial in place and can use entire surveyed corridor to move the pipeline. After a Certificate is issued by the FERC, TGP could use variance procedures to relocate the pipeline outside of the right-of-way (ROW) to avoid a burial if needed. Doug Harris asked if the company could use a horizontal directional drill (HDD) to go under a burial for avoidance. Mike Letson said TGP would rather not use an HDD to go under a burial because there may be future maintenance on the pipe. Doug Harris asked how far away the pipeline should be from a burial. Mike Letson replied that it would depend on the situation, landowner permissions, variances, and recommendations of the tribes.
- Tribes requested that language be added to the UDP to ensure that unless there is a law enforcement issue, the discovery should be kept confidential and no news media should be notified.

12:15 p.m. to 1:00 p.m. - Lunch

1 :00 p.m. to 1 :30 p.m. - Dell Gould, Archaeologist from TGP contractor Louis Berger (Berger), provided an update on the cultural resources studies. Survey results were presented in slides. Print outs of the slides were handed out to those in attendance.

Discussion Points:

- Doug Harris is concerned that not many Ceremonial Stone Landscapes (CSL) were identified in Franklin-Dearfield areas. Dell Gould responded that access in those areas is limited.
- Information regarding the status of project findings/documentation for each state was discussed.
- Much of the progress information is also covered during regular project status calls between TGP, Berger, and tribes.
- Tribes expressed concern about what happens if a CSL is identified after the Certificate is issued. Mike Letson responded that TGP can get variances to go outside of Certificated ROW. Paul Friedman added that the project agreement document can have provisions for post-Certificate phased investigations.
- Doug Harris asked how CSL have been recorded and evaluated to-date. Dell Gould indicated that so far Berger has just documented the location of stone features. but has not done any evaluations of those features.
- Berger can provide GIS data for identified stone features to the tribes.

1:30 p.m. to 2:00 p.m. - Tribal representatives, David Weeden (Mashpee Wampanoag) and Mark Andrews (Wampanoag of Gay Head) commented on tribal involvement with archaeological surveys todate.

Discussion Points:

- David Weeden - Survey activities were somewhat disorganized at the beginning however, once got

going made good process with the pedestrian survey. He would like to have the same mapping given to the field crews because it was sometimes difficult to document locations that were of higher concern.

- Mark Andrews - has previous experience doing survey work on pipelines and has noticed that the survey methods for the NED pipeline are somewhat different. Because of the lack of landowner permissions the surveyors have to move around more and didn't feel like they were always getting enough support from the land agents. Mark also noted that he is not used to the round shovel test pits being dug on some sections of the pipeline.
- Mark Andrews and David Weeden both noted that the centerline is not always marked. Perhaps because pedestrian surveys are sometimes occurring before the civil surveys.
- Doug Harris asked how much of the ROW is surveyed. Dell Gould clarified that a 400- foot-wide corridor was inspected.

2:00 p.m. to 2:30 p.m. - Discussion of near future tribal participation.

Discussion Points:

- David Weeden asked for anticipated stop date for surveys. Mike Letson answered that the near future schedules are in the weekly reports from Berger along with the contact information for the crew chiefs. Berger would like to continue field work where there is access until it snows and/or ground is frozen.
- Doug Harris raised concerns about compensation for tribes participating in the surveys.
- Doug Harris is also concerned about the time-frame for conducting CSL investigations.
- TGP representatives would need to have an internal company discussion about contracts with tribes, and the timing of CSL investigations within the context of their continuing cultural resources investigations.

2:30 p.m. - Other Topics Of Issues - none were raised for discussion.

2:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. - Second tribal caucus (without FERC or TGP representatives)

3:30 p.m. - Additional Comments and Meeting Close

Discussion Points:

- Doug Harris will provide documents to TGP from U.S. Army Corps of Engineers regarding tribal recording of CSL, and tribes will continue to work with TGP about agreements for field work.
- Paul Friedman will research past FERC projects to find model language to be included in letters that request that tribes work with the applicant.
- The FERC is sponsoring a conference on tribal energy Issues at Foxwood Resort on October 21 - and all are invited. Liz Maloy, FERC Tribal Liaison. is point-of-contact for the meeting and the information is on the FERC website events calendar.

3:30 p.m to 5:00 p.m.

TGP had a pipeline corridor presentation to update the tribal representatives on the current safety procedures for participating in surveys.

20151106-0027

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426
Project Docket Number: PF14-22

Date: October 21, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access

As the owner of the property located at:

13 Cart Path 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. Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Wendy Geraci

20151106-0028

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

Washington, DC 20426

Project Docket Number: PF14-22

Date: October 26, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access

As the owner of the property located at:

7 Barn Rd
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. Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Lynne Rourke

20151106-0031

PROPERTY ACCESS DENIED

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

Date: 10-27-15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

RE: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

Street Address: 72 Jaffrey Rd
Town & Zip: Fitzwilliam, NH 03447
Map & Lot Number(s) (if known) 15-51-1, 15-52-1, 34-22-0

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.

Tracie Loock (?)

CC:

FERC

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, NE, Room 1A

Washington, DC 20426

20151106-0032

{same text as 20151103-0086, signed by: }

Cheryl & Rob Haldy

19 Fletcher Dr

Pelham, NH 03076

20151106-5003

Kaela Law, Pelham, NH.

Regarding Induction of Current Studies to help site the pipeline appropriately in relation to the overhead transmission lines: I was extremely disappointed this summer while I watched surveyors conduct their soil tests. They ran a resistivity test a foot away from the main road in “soil” that is essentially just plow-sand kicked over to the edge. They also conducted these tests before the powerlines are upgraded to their higher voltage as a result of the Merrimack Valley Reliability Project (particular to a few towns along the route only). Why have they bothered to run these tests now, before the big upgrade? I hope this isn’t the best we can expect. I do not want to rely on the company using a mathematical equation to design their cathodic protection coating system. I want them to have hard physical evidence they have gathered from actual physical field soil resistivity tests, and those cannot be performed until after the new 345 kv line is erected. Seems to me that the anticipated Nov 20th application filing is a bit premature. Their project design cannot be completely laid before you in full until after they take the appropriate reading from the transmission wires in Pelham and various other eastern NH towns once the Merrimack Valley Reliability Project has been completed. Anything less is willing negligence.

20151106-5004

Kaela Law, Pelham, NH.

PART 1:

Earlier this evening I attended a Tennessee Gas Pipeline open-house style forum in Dracut, MA with one of my town’s Selectmen.

I live in Pelham, NH. In Pelham, regarding pipelines, we are experiencing a bit of a unique situation. We are home to a portion of the Concord Lateral pipeline system. It is comprised of two pipes lying side by side. The first is a 12-inch pipe that runs from Dracut, through Pelham, Windham, Londonderry and on up to Concord. The second pipe is a 20 inch pipe through Pelham, Windham and Londonderry until it hits Granite Ridge power plant, and then it tapers off to an 8-inch pipe and tapers off again to a 6-inch pipe by the time it reaches Concord. There is a lateral off this pipeline as well, called Nashua Lateral that is 8-inches in diameter. The maximum operating pressure of these pipes is between 400 – 750 psi. That is the background. This is what Tennessee Gas Pipeline’s footprint looks like in NH.

Liberty Utilities has signed on to contract with the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline. Recently the NH PUC, despite a caution by the Office of Consumer Advocates, granted approval for Liberty to contract with the Northeast Energy Direct for 115,000 dekatherms (measure of units) per day. With this measure, they would replace all of the gas currently running through the Concord Lateral with gas from the Northeast Energy

Direct, about 50,000 dekatherms a day, and would use the additional 65,000 dekatherms to try to grow their business. During the hearing for this precedent agreement, William J. Clark of Liberty Utilities was asked a question to help validate their gas requirements. He was asked: “Is Liberty exploring potential new franchise territories that could create additional conversion opportunities?” To which he replied: “Yes, Liberty is currently exploring franchise opportunities in two communities contiguous to our existing franchise area. Liberty has had discussion with local officials in those communities as well as potential customers.” To me, this reads like the two communities in question are helping to build the case for the Northeast Energy Direct ... except that both communities are officially opposed to the N.E.D. After Liberty was given approval to contract on N.E.D they opened another docket with the Public Utilities Commission for franchise agreements in Pelham and Windham (the two communities). When they came to both Pelham and Windham, Liberty assured our selectmen that these distribution projects had nothing to do with the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline, that they were completely different and unrelated things. Pelham, however, sees how the two projects are directly correlated, that Liberty is using distribution in Pelham to justify building the N.E.D, and is intervening in the PUC proceedings. Remember that all the gas from the Concord Lateral and therefore all distribution in New Hampshire would come from the N.E.D. This situation in Pelham is a microcosm to the Northeast Energy Direct in New England. About 100 of us homeowners here in town are meant to endure eminent domain property seizure in order that three streets be presented with the OPTION to heat with gas. I’m sorry, but that is not enough to justify the issuance for the use of eminent domain. I do not think that a single person in my town would ask me to accept an eminent domain land grab so ten years from now they MIGHT get hooked up with gas.

After speaking with one of the reps from TGP tonight at the Open House it became very clear the N.E.D pipeline, as it is now being billed, is to expand home-heating service area in New England. I had asked about the Spectra pipeline. Why do we need the N.E.D pipeline, I asked, when the Spectra Access Northeast seems to be answering the power generating “fix” the New England governors are seeking and Kinder Morgan still hasn’t signed up a power generating plant? The rep started to tell me that their pipeline served northern New England and Spectra’s pipeline served southern New England. I told him that was an inaccurate statement because we are all on the same New England Power Grid and the energy wouldn’t stop at state lines or divide off the region into north and south. He said, “Well, for home-heating ...” and I cut him off right there. You mean to tell me that Kinder Morgan (which is NOT a public utility) is seeking permission to use Eminent Domain to take our private properties in order that Liberty Utilities can have the OPTION to try to expand their home-heating service area? You can’t use eminent domain for something like that. That is not for the “greater good” of us all. That is taking away property from one set of citizens in order to bring a different set of citizens the OPTION to heat with gas or not. That is not a responsible decision, and I hope that all of our state leaders (and FERC) can see that clearly. If this pipeline is simply about home-heating now, since Kinder Morgan failed to sign up the power generators, their case to use eminent domain against us is torn to shreds. In New Hampshire, many of us heat with oil, which right now is dirt cheap compared with gas. The use of eminent domain for something so incredibly speculative as expanding pipeline gas service for home-heating in the state of New Hampshire, with oil so cheap right now, is not justifiable. I was told this evening, by the company rep, that the Compressor Station in Pelham is not ever used. Apparently it was constructed for some kind of expansion plan National Grid had that never came to fruition. Expansion plans are just plans and they might not pan out. You don’t use eminent domain to help heat some homes. Give me a break. Kinder Morgan is trying to switch their marketing pitch now since this pipeline will not “Lower our energy rates,” as they have been so long trying to make us believe.

20151106-5005

Kaela Law, Pelham, NH.

Part 2: .

Tonight I was also told that Granite Ridge power plant in Londonderry, when it shut down for a few days in 2014, wasn’t forced to shut down because there wasn’t ENOUGH gas, but they chose to shut down because

they didn't want to buy the gas at those particular spot market prices. Earlier in the year when Kinder Morgan came to Pelham Town Hall they were crying "energy crisis" to get us to buy their bum deal. There is not an energy crisis. We aren't on the brink of rolling blackouts because we don't have enough energy. We are looking for a way to stabilize pricing during the winter months. New England has an issue with Winter Pricing Reliability. Forcing eminent domain upon New England citizens because power plants have occasional shoddy management does not seem warranted. And keep in mind that Kinder Morgan was unsuccessful to get a power generator signed up for a 20 year contract. Power generators do not seem to want to get locked in to pricing. The Northeast Energy Direct pipeline will not fix New England's Winter Pricing Reliability. And for home-heating? The fact Kinder Morgan wants to bring a high pressure 1400 psi 30-inch pipeline through NH to expand home-heating, when our biggest cities are served just fine by 8-inch, 12-inch and 6-inch pipes with a maximum operating pressure of 400-750 psi makes absolutely zero sense. I believe Liberty signed up for the highest amount of any anchor shipper. Why is this pipeline so big?

Here is a Reuters article that helps make the case: this gas is for export.

<http://mobile.reuters.com/article/idUSKBN0L80DG20150204>

New Hampshire is not a pass-through. Eminent Domain is not acceptable.

20151109-0008

Kimberly Bose, Secretary
FERC
888 First Street, N.E.
Washington, DC 20426

STOP THE NED PIPELINE!!

Protect NH land from Eminent Domain!

I oppose. the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) EXPORT pipeline. The pipelines, and compressor station will scar the NH landscape and put our water, wildlife, forests, agricultural lands and rural character at risk. These include health and safety risks from emissions, industrialization, pollution and the devastating effects of fire and explosions. Greed, not need is fueling this project. Say NO to this private company that will TAKE OUR LANDS with NO BENEFIT TO US.

Jena Matthews
12 Deer Run Rd
Windham, NH 03087

20151109-0009

{same text as 20151109-0008, signed by: }

Kristina Gile
339 Harvard St
Manchester, NH 03103

20151109-0010

{same text as 20151109-0008, signed by: }

Jan Krefling
6 Magnolia
Windham, NH 03087

20151109-0011

{same text as 20151109-0008, signed by: }

Jake Matthews
12 Deer Run Rd
Windham, NH 03087

20151109-0012

{same text as 20151109-0008, signed by: }

Jared Matthews
12 Deer Run Rd
Windham, NH 03087

20151109-0013

{same text as 20151109-0008, signed by: }

Aleece Pappas
27 Green Acre Dr
Salem, NH 03079

20151109-0014

{same text as 20151109-0008, signed by: }

MSW Noyles
11 Briar Rd
Windham, NH 03087

20151109-0015

{same text as 20151109-0008, signed by: }

Liane Bourques
12 Westview Dr
Litchfield, NH 03052

20151109-0016

{same text as 20151109-0008, signed by: }

Katherine Goodwin
124 Main St
Plaistow, NH 03865

20151109-0017

{same text as 20151109-0008, signed by: }

Holmes Tracy
315 Gage Hill Rd
Pelham, NH 03076

20151109-0018

{same text as 20151109-0008, signed by: }

Terry Maddox
80 Nashua Rd
Pelham, NH 03076

20151109-0019

{same text as 20151109-0008, signed by: }

Barbara Tracy
315 Gage Hill Rd
Pelham, NH 03076

20151109-0020

{same text as 20151109-0008, signed by: }

Joan Matthews
12 Deer Run Rd
Windham, NH 03087

20151109-0022

Hand written letter, Roberta Flashman, 339 South Rd, Ashby, MA 01431: consider alternate routes, also impact on public lands, conservation, article 97...

20151109-0076

Mason School District
School Administrative Unit #89
13 Darling Hill Rd. Mason, NH 03048
(603) 878-2962 (603) 878-3439 (fax)

September 17, 2015

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

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (“TGP”)
Docket No. PF14-22-000: Proposed Northeast Energy Direct (“NED”)

Dear Ms. Bose:

The Mason Elementary School also serves as a community center for both our students and our surrounding families. We fear that the school would be gravely unprepared to provide for the needs of the community in the face of a gas explosion or related natural disaster, especially given that our town is served by a volunteer Fire Department with limited resources and without training in how to handle such an emergency. From reports of previous disasters related to gas pipelines and the potential requirement for blasting during construction of the proposed project, we believe that there is a significant risk for reduction in the air quality within the district and for the contamination of our local drinking water.

In a referendum earlier this year, the town of Mason voted overwhelmingly to oppose the proposed Northeast Energy Direct project, citing numerous concerns over the potentially adverse social, economic, and environmental effects of the proposed pipeline. The Mason School Board shares these concerns and feels that the pipeline project would substantially and unnecessarily increase the risks to health and well-being of our students and faculty, their families, and to the local residents of our district.

Please include this letter as part of the public record for the docket referenced above.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Doyle,
Chairman, Mason School Board, SAU 89

cc:

Gov. Maggie Hassan
Sen. Jeanne Sh'sheen
Sen. Kelly Ayotte
Rep. Ann Kuster
State Rep. Jack Flanagan
State Rep. Chris Adams
State Rep. Kevin Avard
Executive Councilor David Wheeler
Kinder Morgan Public Affairs, Allen Fore
Chairman, Mason Selectmen, Bernard O'Grady

20151109-0124

{duplicate copy of 20151102-5046 above}

20151109-0127

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

Project Docket Number: PF14-22

Date: 11/2/2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access

As the owner of the property located at:

11 Barn Road, Dracut, MA 01626

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC, (a 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.

Greg Donald

20151109-0128

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

Project Docket Number: PF14-22

Date: 11/2/2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access

As the owner of the property located at:

11 Barn Road, Dracut, MA 01626

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC, (a Morgan Company), its repre-

sentatives, contractors, sub-contractors or associates to enter my land to perform surveys, or for any other purpose. Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Heather Donald

20151109-0131

**Board of Health
Town of Dracut**
62 Arlington Street
Dracut, Massachusetts 01826
Tel: (978) 453-8162 | Fax: (978) 987-9685

JILL LAFFIN
PUBLIC HEALTH AGENT
JLAFFLIN@DRACUTMA.GOV

CYNTHIA CAMPBELL
PUBLIC HEALTH NURSE
CCAMPBELL@DRACUT-MA.US

November 2, 2015

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

Ref: Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline Proposal (dncket 1PF-14-22-000)

Dear Ms. Bose;

We are writing in regard to your notice of intent for the above listed project. As the Town of Dracut Board of Health the health and safety of the residents of Dracut is our main concern. After reviewing all of the paper-work, listening to Q &A sessions and doing our own research, we have questions/concerns listed below that we still have not received answers to.

1. Air Quality (what is the current baseline)
2. Water Quality; how will this compressor station affect artesian wells, aquifers, streams, tributaries and wetlands in the area?
3. Noise Levels:
 - a. What will the noise level be during blasting/installation of the compressor station
 - b. What will the noise level be during normal operations?
 - c. What will the noise level be during cleaning events (“pigging” & “blow downs”)
4. What toxic emissions will be emitted from the Compressor station?
5. How are leaks handled before, during and after installation of the compressor station?
6. Toxic Chemicals:
 - a. Can they be identified?
 - b. What is the percentage of them being emitted?
 - c. What is the impact of those toxic chemicals that are being emitted on the general public?
7. What is the lubricating agent used in the pipes to propel the gas through the lines?
8. After cleaning processes are performed how will the toxic waste that has been removed be contained and disposed of?
9. What is the process for identifying and reporting health issues?
10. Will the current health regulations be re-reviewed?
11. What recourse will residents have should Kinder Morgan ignore reported health concerns?

As stated above the health and well-being of the residents of Dracut are our first and foremost concern. We

need these questions and concerns answered because to date we have not received any concrete answers to the questions and concerns that are listed. We look forward to your reply.

Sincerely,

Evan Themeles, Chairman
Paul Enis, Clerk

Dr. Lous Rousseau, Vice Chairman

Cc:Town of Dracut Board of Selectmen, Town Manager, James A. Ouggan, Conservation Agent, Lori Cahill, Building Inspector, Daniel Mctauglin, Town Engineer, Mark Hamel

Curt Spaulding, Regional Administrator of the United States Environmental Protection Agency

20151109-5001

katharine Gregg, mason, NH.
November 6 2015

As you surely know, President Obama today rejected the Keystone pipeline project. His decision shows that he feels the environmental and residential risks outweigh the benefits the United States might accrue in world trade. The same can be said for Kinder Morgan's proposed pipeline from the Marcellus shale fields through New York, Massachusetts and southern New Hampshire. The hoped-for benefits and enticements to business do not outweigh the environmental damage that would certainly follow.

In its November 4 newscast the PBS NewsHour ran a story on the problem of methane leaks at wells and along pipelines. Although natural gas burns cleaner than coal and oil, Manvendra Dubey of the Los Alamos National Laboratory reported, "Methane is about 25 times more potent a greenhouse gas on a 100-year horizon than CO2."

Please give these thoughts very careful consideration as you review Kinder Morgan's certificate of need, which they plan to file on November 20. It is dangerous and not needed.

Sincerely,

Katharine Gregg
243 Valley Road
Mason, NH 03048

20151109-5009

Marilyn Learner, Hollis, NH.

I am requesting that you grant the request of Congresswoman Anne Kuster, NH, in a letter dated September 29, 2015, and consider and assess the value of the proposed NED pipeline project in the context of all the planned energy projects proposed to serve the entire New England region. New England is on a regional grid and it makes sense that we should site projects that impact the grid as a region.

Given the several massive gas pipelines proposed for our region which could commit New England to decades of dependence on fracked gas for power generation, it is sound regulatory oversight for FERC to consider all the New England projects in the aggregate, including environmental impacts upstream and downstream, public health impacts, and the potential overbuilding of infrastructure.

Additionally, FERC studies need to acknowledge alternative sources of power generation that are now available before recommitting New England to last century's fossil fuel dependency with a different fossil fuel. Replacing one fossil fuel with another fossil fuel is not a clean energy solution. As the New England regional grid transitions to 21st century distribution and clean energy generation, it is poor policy to over-commit to last century's technologies. These should be used judiciously and sparingly, as they are interim efforts, not permanent solutions.

It only makes sense to consider a regional grid issue REGIONALLY, not with a series of competing, segregated, segmented projects, but with a coordinated, regional plan.

All gas pipeline projects competing to bring fracked shale gas to New England should be reviewed together, and only the best of the bad should be permitted to proceed.

20151109-5031

KEENE SENTINEL

Some Winchester residents skeptical of plan to expand natural gas

Posted: Friday, November 6, 2015 12:00 pm | Updated: 4:01 pm, Fri Nov 6, 2015.

By Meghan Foley Sentinel Staff

WINCHESTER — Some Winchester residents and opponents of a proposed natural gas pipeline sought to depict a not-so-rosy picture of insider knowledge, back-door dealing and corporations teaming together to profit on the backs of rural communities during a hearing Wednesday.

Liberty Utilities officials were in Winchester Wednesday to present a plan to selectmen to bring natural gas service to the town via the proposed and controversial Northeast Energy Direct pipeline.

Cheshire Medical Center: 2015 Seasonal Flu Shots - ROS - MB - instory

In December, Liberty Utilities filed a petition with the N.H. Public Utilities Commission seeking approval of an agreement to buy natural gas off the proposed pipeline.

A month later, in January, the company signed a deal to purchase N.H. Gas Corp. in Keene, with plans to convert its more than 100-year-old propane-air mixture distribution system to carry compressed or liquefied natural gas.

Nine months later, Liberty Utilities filed a petition with the state Public Utilities Commission for rights to own and operate natural gas distribution systems in Winchester, Swanzey, Jaffrey and Rindge.

Two of the four towns — Rindge and Winchester — are along the proposed route of the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline, while the other two are nearby. None of the towns have natural gas distribution systems.

According to the petition, Liberty plans to tap into the pipeline to supply natural gas to the towns, but would look at other options if the pipeline project is delayed or doesn't happen.

Liberty Utilities is a subsidiary of Algonquin Power and Utilities Corp. And Algonquin, which has its headquarters in Ontario, Canada, is participating in the development of the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline with Kinder Morgan through that company's subsidiary, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co.

Liberty officials repeatedly said Wednesday the series of events leading up to the company's filing this fall to expand natural gas service was a coincidence.

However, Michael Licata, director of government and community relations for Liberty Utilities, acknowledged — when put on the spot by Winchester Conservation Commission member John H. Hann — that a diagram being circulated by anti-pipeline activists showing Liberty Utilities having a relationship to the project was “essentially accurate that we have an unregulated affiliate with investment in the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline.”

The document, created by Susan L. Durling (Sue Durling) of the activist group Winchester Pipeline Awareness, shows Kinder Morgan and Algonquin partnering to form Northeast Expansion LLC to build and own the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline, with Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co. being brought in as Kinder Morgan's subsidiary to operate it.

The diagram then shows Algonquin's connection to Liberty Utilities, which is also known in New Hampshire as EnergyNorth Natural Gas Inc.

Liberty Utilities signed an agreement with Tennessee Gas Pipeline to purchase 115,000 dekatherms of natural gas per day at a fixed rate from the pipeline.

The N.H. Public Utilities Commission approved that agreement last month. The decision has since been appealed.

Hann noted to Licata and two other Liberty Utilities officials in attendance Wednesday that for Kinder Morgan to have its application for the pipeline approved by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, the company must show there is a need.

“So by you contracting with Kinder Morgan, you’re enabling them to prove the need even though (Richard G. MacDonald) pointed out that there are no customers here,” he said, referencing Liberty Utilities’ director of gas operations.

Licata responded that Liberty officials would send out mailings to potential customers to gauge interest, and they understand there has to be customer interest for the N.H. Public Utilities Commission to award gas franchise rights to an area.

“We’re not coming forward with this proposal as part of a way to validate Kinder Morgan or the Northeast Energy District pipeline. It’s not about us or creating a need for a pipeline,” Licata said.

He said Liberty Utilities officials understand there is local concern and opposition to the pipeline project, and they weren’t asking selectmen, or anyone else at the meeting, to change their view on the project because of Liberty’s proposal.

“What we’re proposing here is the town get some direct benefit from the pipeline,” he said.

That would be done by installing a station where the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline intersects Richmond Road (Route 119) to depressurize the natural gas and feed it into the smaller pipe that will be part of the local distribution system, he said.

The system’s route would follow Richmond Road west to Main Street (Route 10), where it would then turn south to the intersection of Main Street, General James Reed Highway (Route 119) and Warwick Road (Route 78). Along the way, a line would branch off on Parker Street to serve that neighborhood and the school, according to a map Licata presented.

At the intersection of Routes 10, 119 and 78, the distribution pipeline would follow Warwick Road southeast and then turn onto Snow Road, ending at Applewood Rehabilitation Center, according to the map.

William J. Clark, business development professional for Liberty Utilities, said there are breaks in the map to show that it would take more than one construction season to build the local distribution system. Residents and businesses connected to the system would pay the same rates as Liberty Utilities’ natural gas customers in other parts of the state, he said.

Multiple construction seasons would also be needed to build the portion of pipeline proposed to run north along Route 10 in the N.H. Department of Transportation right-of-way from the intersection of Richmond Road and Main Street to bring natural gas to Swanzey and Keene, he said. The line, which is also being referred to as the Keene lateral, would then tie into Keene’s gas infrastructure.

The proposed Northeast Energy Direct pipeline is a 30-inch diameter, high-pressure line bringing natural gas from shale fields in Pennsylvania through upstate New York, parts of northern Massachusetts and into southern New Hampshire before going to a distribution hub in eastern Massachusetts.

The route would cross about 70 miles of southern New Hampshire, including Fitzwilliam, Richmond, Rindge, Troy and Winchester and would carry up to 1.3 billion cubic feet of natural gas per day. The amount could provide electricity to 886,162 households.

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co. is in the pre-filing stages with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, which has the power to approve or deny the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline.

Tennessee Gas Pipeline officials plan to file the full application for the project with FERC this fall. Company officials anticipate it will take a year for the pipeline to receive federal approval, if it does.

Many people attending Wednesday’s meeting were quick to pepper Liberty Utilities officials with questions about its proposal to build a natural gas distribution system in town, including how it would affect the town’s existing water and sewer infrastructure — some of which isn’t mapped — who would pay for the build-out of the system, and if town residents and business owners really want the option to tie into natural

gas.

“Does Winchester or any other town have the ability to say ‘no?’ “ Conservation Commission member Bonnie G. Leveille asked.

Licata said Winchester officials and residents can voice their opposition to Liberty Utilities’ proposal to the N.H. Public Utilities Commission, but company officials would like to partner with the town on the project. “We want to work with municipal officials on the location of the system and identify and address any concerns on the build-out,” he said.

After the presentation concluded, the four Winchester selectmen present voted unanimously to send a letter to the N.H. Public Utilities Commission about their concerns with Liberty Utilities’ proposal.

Selectman Theresa G. Sepe was absent.

Besides Winchester, Liberty Utilities officials have scheduled a presentation for next week about the expansion plans in Swanzey. That meeting will be held Tuesday at Swanzey Town Hall during the selectmen’s meeting, which begins at 6 p.m.

Licata said Wednesday that presentation dates in Jaffrey and Rindge have yet to be finalized. http://www.sentinelsource.com/.../article_0024e111-3bea-5355-...

20151109-5033

{sound file, 2 min 20 sec of testimony, see transcript in 20151109-5034 below}

20151109-5034

TRANSCRIPTION OF .WAV FILE

(20151109-5033 above)

FROM WINCHESTER, NH SELECTBOARD MEETING 11/4/2015

John Hann: Let’s get to the crux of this then. So you have an unregulated subsidiary, and that subsidiary has an affiliation with Kinder Morgan?

Liberty Utilities Spokesperson: so the the unregulated affiliate or it’s a subsidiary of Algonquin Corporation um has an ownership stake ahh an investment in the NED pipeline.

John Hann: So, by extension or Boolean algebra you, Liberty, is an investor in Kinder Morgan or NED?

Liberty Utilities Spokesperson: (unintelligible) ahh Liberty Utilities the regulated entity that’s before you um is not an investor in the NED pipeline ahh that’s okay. I’ve seen the diagram as well, and it’s actually pretty accurate, yeah that’s that’s essentially accurate there there’s an unregulated, as I said, unregulated affiliate that has an investment ahh interest in the NED pipeline ahh you know I’m not making a secret of that. But I don’t think that really changes uhm, you know sort of the very real needs of our customers for additional gas capacity, which is why we have to go to the Public Utilities Commission, they review that contract and make a determination as to whether or not that’s in the public interest.

John Hann: All right, but you DO have an affiliation with Kinder Morgan. So the answer is, YES.

Liberty Utilities Spokesperson: Yes okay but sure

John Hann: It just took a while to get there. Uh, so referencing back to Rick’s question, uh, in order for Kinder Morgan to have their application approved by FERC, they have to prove need, so by contracting with Kinder Morgan, you enable them to prove need, even though as Rick has pointed out, there are no customers here.

20151109-5035

{.bmp image file, diagram of Liberty Utilities relationship with Kinder Morgan}

20151109-5036

NH PUC knew Liberty Utilities relationship to Kinder Morgan and approved LIBERTY UTILITIES requests anyway. From pg 8 of this NH PUC document:

MOTION TO COMPEL RESPONSES

Re: Liberty Utilities (EnergyNorth Natural Gas) Corp.

Docket DG 14-380

The extent of EnergyNorth's parent and affiliate relationships are relevant, a fact the Commission itself identified in its Order of Notice, stating: "Although not mentioned in the filing, EnergyNorth's affiliate, Algonquin Power & Utilities Corp. ("APUC") announced on November 24, 2014, that it plans to invest in the development of the NED pipeline project through Liberty Utilities (Pipeline & Transmission) Corp., a wholly owned subsidiary of APUC and Kinder Morgan Operating L.P."

20151109-5037

**BEFORE THE NEW HAMPSHIRE
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

Re: Liberty Utilities (EnergyNorth Natural Gas) Corp.

Docket DG 14-380

**MOTION TO COMPEL RESPONSES
TO THE INTERVENOR PLAN'S SECOND SET OF DATA REQUESTS**

Pursuant to N.H. Code Admin. Rules Puc 203.07(a) and 203.09(i), PLAN hereby moves the New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission (the "Commission") to compel Liberty Utilities (EnergyNorth Natural Gas) Corp. ("EnergyNorth" or the "Company") to fully respond to data requests Nos. 2-26, 2-27, 2-28, 2-29, 2-30, 2-31 and 2-32[1] of the Pipeline Awareness Network of the Northeast ("PLAN").

In support of its Motion, PLAN states as follows:

I. Introduction

A. Energy North

In its Petition for Approval, EnergyNorth "seeks approval to enter into a 20 year contract with Tennessee" and "determination that the Company's decision to enter into the agreement is prudent and consistent with the public interest." *Id.*, p. 1. EnergyNorth asserts, inter alia, that: (a) "the Company needs this long-term firm transportation capacity"; (b) "it is the best cost resource to meet the capacity needs of the Company's customers"; (c) "the Company determined that the 'best cost' capacity option for its customers was the purchase of additional capacity from Tennessee through its NED project." *Id.*, pp. 1-3 (emphasis added). PLAN's data requests are appropriately directed to EnergyNorth's testimony on these elements as filed.

B. PLAN

The Commission granted PLAN permission to intervene and participate as a party in this proceeding, allowing PLAN to focus on the "interests of its EnergyNorth-customer members in the prudence, justness and reasonableness of the Precedent Agreement and its associated costs, to EnergyNorth and its customers." Order 25,767, at 4.

C. Scope of Review

In its Order of Notice, the Commission established a broad scope of review and specifically "whether EnergyNorth reasonably investigated and analyzed its long term supply requirements and the alternatives for satisfying those requirements, and whether EnergyNorth's entry into the Precedent Agreement with TOP for additional pipeline capacity is prudent, reasonable and otherwise consistent with the public interest." *Id.* at 3. Accordingly, the Company has the burden to demonstrate that its decision to negotiate and execute the

Precedent Agreement at issue here was the subject of reasonable investigation by the Company, including alternatives, and is prudent, reasonable and in the public interest. As set forth below, PLAN's data requests are designed to elicit, consistent with the broad discovery allowed by the Commission, relevant information relating to whether the Company reasonably investigated its contract with TOP

II. Standard Of Review

The Commission, when addressing a motion to compel discovery responses, "consider[s] whether the information being sought is relevant to the proceeding, or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence." Investigation Into Purchase of Receivables, Customer Referral and Electronic Interface Programs, Order No. 25,439 (2012) at 2. The scope of permitted discovery under Commission Rules is interpreted in a manner "[c]onsistent with Superior Court Rule 35(b)" [now Super. Ct. Civ. R. 21(b)]. City of Nashua, Order No. 24,681 (2006) at 2. Discovery is considered "an important procedure for probing in advance of trial the adversary's claims and his possession or knowledge of information pertaining to the controversy between the parties." Johnston v. Lynch, 133 N.H. 79, 84 (1990) (internal citation omitted). "Absent a claim of privilege or irrelevance, a party may not limit the scope of an adverse party's discovery request." Breagy v. Stark, 138 N.H. 479, 482 (1994) (citations omitted).

Due to the importance of "wide-ranging discovery," the Commission will deny discovery requests only when it "can perceive of no circumstance in which the requested data would be relevant." Re Lower Bartlett Water Precinct, 85 NH PUC 371, 372 (2000). Additionally, "[t]he Commission weighs 'the effort needed to gather [the requested information], the availability of the information from other sources, and other relevant criteria.'" Investigation of Scrubber Costs and Cost Recovery, Order No. 25,646 (2014) at 4 (citing Public Service Co. of NH, Order No. 24,342 at 23).

III. Requests In Dispute[2]

A. PLAN Request No. 2-26-Regarding Local Development Groups

1. The Request and EnergyNorth's Response

Request No. PLAN 2-26 states:

With respect to the LDC Consortium please provide the following information:

- a) all documentation and other materials relating to correspondence with and documentation received from the LDC Consortium with respect to the KM Pipeline and/or preparation of filing in this proceeding.
- b) the identity of the 10 individuals in the working group from the various member LDC Consortium as referenced in PLAN 1-3b.
- c) a complete description of the LDC Consortium negotiation process as referenced in PLAN 1-9. Please provide any documentation relating to the negotiations including minutes of meetings, handouts and notes.

To parts a) through c),[3] EnergyNorth has objected on the following grounds:

- "the request seeks production of information regarding negotiation of the Precedent Agreement that is not relevant to the Commission's determination of whether the proposed transaction is in the public interest," and "information about non-EnergyNorth participants in the LDC Consortium negotiation process is similarly not relevant";
- "the request seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege";
- "the request is overly broad and unduly burdensome and seeks voluminous documents to the extent that it seeks all documents received by EnergyNorth as a member of the LDC Consortium with respect to the pipeline that it is the subject of the Precedent Agreement and/or the preparation of this filing"; and

- “PLAN’s inquiry in this request ... is .. beyond the scope of its limited intervention.” None of EnergyNorth’s objections withstand scrutiny.

2. The Request Seeks Relevant Information.

The requested information is relevant to this proceeding. Numerous references are made in Mr. DaFonte’s testimony to a consortium of New England Local Distribution Companies (LDC’s), of which EnergyNorth is a part. See DaFonte Testimony, BATES, p. 19, 11.6-15; BATES p. 23, 11. 1-3. Mr. DaFonte explains that “[t]he terms and conditions of the PA were negotiated within the context of a broad consortium of New England Local Distribution Companies (LDCs),” which LDCs “together made up the anchor shippers on the NED project.” Id., BATES, p. 19, 11. 6-7, 9 (emphasis added). According to Mr. DaFonte, “[t]his consortium approach allowed the LDCs to leverage their aggregate capacity commitment in the NED project to negotiate a deeply discounted anchor shipper rate as well as other key terms and conditions discussed later in [his] testimony.” Id., BATES, p. 19, 11. 9-12 (emphasis added). By including and relying upon the information provided by LDCs, EnergyNorth cannot now deny that this information constitutes either “facts relied upon,” “other relevant facts,” or “policy arguments in support of the result sought,” and is therefore relevant. Puc 203.06(d).[4]

3. The Information Sought Is Not Subject To Any Privilege.

The requested information is not privileged. The Commission “shall give effect to the rules of privilege recognized by law.” Puc 203.23(e). There has been no showing by EnergyNorth that it and the other LDC’s were subject to joint representation or shared a common interest sufficient to trigger the attorney-client privilege. And even if there was some commonality in the lay sense, the content of the communication sought would have related to business advice, which communication would not be “for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services” as required to trigger the protections of N.H. R. Evid. 502(b). Even if a privilege did apply, though, “[t]he attorney-client privilege is not absolute.” *Petition of Dean*, 142 N.H. 889, 890 (1998). EnergyNorth has placed those communications at issue and therefore waived any privilege. See *Desclos v. Southern New Hampshire Med. Ctr.* 153 N.H. 607, 614-15 (2006) (New Hampshire’s “rule on waiver of the attorney-client privilege . . . is that the holder of the privilege waives it when he has injected privileged material into the case, such that the information is actually required for resolution of the issue.”).

4. EnergyNorth’s Burden and Breadth Objections Should be Rejected.

EnergyNorth’s complaints about the burden of producing, and the breadth and volume of, responding information are unsupported. The lack of any explanation warrants a rejection of their protests.[5]

5. PLAN, As An Intervening Party, Is Entitled To This Information.

PLAN is entitled to propound Request No. 2-26, which is well within the scope of its permitted intervention. It is difficult to understand how PLAN could either understand “the context of” the consortium in which “the terms and conditions of the PA were negotiated,” or assess whether the negotiated anchor shipper rate was “deeply discounted,” without the requested information. EnergyNorth has put these points at issue willingly and should be compelled to provide additional information. All the requested information would assist in any evaluation of the “prudence, justness and reasonableness of the Precedent Agreement and its associated costs, to EnergyNorth and its customers” as required by the Commission.

B. PLAN Request No. 2-27

Request No. PLAN 2-27 states:

In the technical session of March 17, 2015, Mr. DaFonte discussed the relative environmental impacts of the KM Pipeline with respect to the other competing pipeline proposals. Please provide any analyses or other documentation that EnergyNorth considered, prepared, and/or reviewed with respect to the environmental impacts of the KM pipeline and/or other pipelines proposed in New England, including the

C2C and Spectra proposals.

EnergyNorth has objected, without providing any response, on the stated grounds that:

- “the request seeks information that is not relevant to the proceeding or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence,” because “[t]he purpose of this docket is to determine whether EnergyNorth’s Precedent Agreement with Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC is in the public interest, not an examination of environmental impacts associated with the construction of the NED natural gas pipeline”; and
- PLAN’s inquiry in this request is beyond the scope of its limited intervention. Mr. DaFonte’s assertions at the March 1st technical session are both relevant and subject

to further inquiry. The Commission will “compel answers to data requests directed toward the party if the requests are related to the testimony of its sponsored witness.” Investigation of Scrubber Costs and Cost Recovery, Order No. 25,646 (2014) at 5. Moreover, environmental implications are considered in the Precedent Agreement. See Confidential, BATES, pp. 51, 98- 99. Environmental implications have been raised in this case by EnergyNorth at the Technical Conference and in the Precedent Agreement itself and accordingly are relevant for discovery.

C. PLAN Request Nos. 2-28, 2-29, 2-30, 2-31 and 2-32 - Company Relationships

1. The Requests And EnergyNorth’s Responses

These requests generally seek information concerning the corporate relationships among Energy North and other corporate entities (Request Nos. 2-28, 2-29, and 2-31), as well as inter- business documentation, correspondence and communications regarding the Kinder Morgan NED natural gas pipeline project (Request Nos. 2-30 and 2-32).[6] EnergyNorth has objected to these requests on the asserted grounds that these requests seek irrelevant information, and that PLAN is not allowed to make such inquiries under the terms of the Commission’s permitted intervention.

2. These Requests Seek Relevant Information.

The extent of EnergyNorth’s parent and affiliate relationships are relevant, a fact the Commission itself identified in its Order of Notice, stating: “Although not mentioned in the filing, EnergyNorth’s affiliate, Algonquin Power & Utilities Corp. (“APUC”) announced on November 24, 2014, that it plans to invest in the development of the NED pipeline project through Liberty Utilities (Pipeline & Transmission) Corp., a wholly owned subsidiary of APUC and Kinder Morgan Operating L.P.” Thus, PLAN is allowed to inquire about the interrelationships among the parties, and the various parties’ contributions or considerations in entering the Precedent Agreement (or a variation thereof).

In this respect, discovery directed at evaluating whether EnergyNorth undertook an arms length negotiation or acted at the behest of its parent or some other affiliated entity is certainly relevant. Any influence by parent company and/or affiliate certainly bears upon the prudence of the costs which EnergyNorth seeks to incur. Cf Appeal of Sinclair Machine Products, Inc., 126 N.H. 822, 835 (1985) (“allegations related to the parent/subsidiary relationship existing between Central Vermont and CVEC ... that CVEC breached a fiduciary duty to its customers by not objecting to Central Vermont’s wholesale rate in the ratemaking proceeding before the FERC. Such matters, while reflecting upon the prudence of CVEC in incurring wholesale power costs, are within the FERC’s domain of fixing the wholesale rate between these parties.”) (emphasis added). PLAN (and other parties) are entitled to probe the corporate relationship between the various entities that may have an interest in the transaction under review, to investigate bias and self dealing and to assess whether the interaction between affiliates and/or parent and subsidiary companies was an arms length transaction in the public interest. See generally Pub. Serv. Co. of NH v. New Hampton, 101 N.H. 142, 152 (1957) (rejecting utility company’s assertion that net book cost was the proper measure of valuation based on prior sales of electric utility property in New Hampshire; “it was findable on the record that many of these sales were between affiliates or parent and subsidiary companies and were not actual arms-length transactions”).

Furthermore, the questions seek additional information presented by an EnergyNorth affiliate, Algonquin Power and Utilities Corp. (“APUC”), in its Press Release (“Company Release”) as set forth in PLAN 2-28 (d)-(f) which Company Release was specifically referenced in the Commission’s Order of Notice in this case. These questions seek discovery of information presented by APUC promoting its investment in the NED project and the viability of the project, including other contracts, LDCs and benefits of the pipeline. It is fair, relevant and appropriate in discovery to evaluate statements made by the APUC (and cited by the Commission) directly relating to matters under review in the instant case.

WHEREFORE, in accordance with Puc 203.05(a)(2), PLAN respectfully requests that the Commission:

- (A) Overrule the objections lodged by the Petitioner to PLAN’s Second Set of Data Requests, Nos. 2-26 through and including 2-32;
- (B) Order the Petitioner to fully respond to Petitioner’s Requests Nos. 2-26 through and including 2-32;
AND
- (C) Grant PLAN such other and further relief as the Commission may deem just and equitable under the circumstances.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 30th day of April, 2015.

PLAN,
By its attorneys,
Richard Kanoff
Zachary R. Gates (NH Bar# 17454)
Bums & Levinson LLP
125 Summer Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 345-3000
Email: rkanoff@bumslev.com
Email: zgates@bumslev.com

Puc 203.09(i)(4) Certification

I hereby certify that PLAN has made a good-faith effort to resolve the dispute informally, without success. I served EnergyNorth’s counsel with a letter on April 29, 2015, requesting that EnergyNorth drop its objections to the disputed requested.

Richard Kanoff

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that on April 30, 2015, pursuant to Puc 203.02 & 203.11, I served an electronic copy of this Motion to Compel on each person identified on the Commission’s service list for this docket and with the Office of the Consumer Advocate, by delivering it to the email address specified on the commission’s service list for the docket/

Richard Kanoff

Footnotes:

1 PLAN received Liberty Utilities’ responses to PLAN second set of data requests on April 10, 2015. Therefore, this motion is timely filed, pursuant to Puc 203.09(i)(2). PLAN submitted a good faith communication to counsel as required by Puc 203.09(i)(4), attached as Appendix A, with the Company’s response.

2 The Data requests in dispute and related responses are attached as Appendix B.

3 EnergyNorth has provided a partial response, but only as to part b), and then only to answer, subject to its objections: “Representatives from the following utilities developed the pricing forecast on behalf of the LDC Consortium: Connecticut Natural Gas, Eversource, National Grid, NiSource, Unitil and Westfield Gas and Electric.” Such a broad description is not “the identity of the 10 individuals in the working

group,” and amounts to gamesmanship. “A party is obligated to respond to requests for discovery honestly, fully and responsively.” *Bronson v. The Hitchcock Clinic*, 140 N.H. 798, 808 (1996) (citing 4 R. Wiebusch, *New Hampshire Practice, Civil Practice and Procedure* 811 (1994)).

4 Energy North’s three cited orders - Pub. Serv. Co. of N.H., Order No. 25, 174 (DE 10-195), Pub. Serv. Co. of N.H., Order No. 24,895 (DE 08-077), and City of Nashua, Order No. 24,671 (DW 04-048)- are neither binding nor persuasive. The Order in City of Nashua was predicated on the “expectation” that there would be “ample other ways of discovering” information about contract negotiations, and expressly noted that the Commission had “not rule[d] that cost information about the cost of the services covered (or not covered) by the contracts is irrelevant.” Order No. 24,671, at 3. In Pub. Serv. Co. of N.H. (DE 08-077), the Commission did not require PSNH “to provide in minute detail a record of its contacts and negotiations with Lempster [a renewable energy producer],” but made that ruling on breadth grounds, not on relevance grounds. Order No. 24,895, at 5. Lastly, the Order in Pub. Serv. Co. of N.H. merely adopted the conclusion of an earlier decision (89 N.H. PUC 226, 230 (2004)) that “[i]n contrast to the results of any such negotiations, we can conceive of no circumstances in which we would deem information about the negotiations themselves admissible.” Order No. 25,174, at 18. None of these cases involve approval of a contract that was negotiated by a group of LDCs, where the joint efforts of the group and analysis by the group were submitted as part of the case in chief and presented in support of the contract. Clearly, as part of discovery, further consideration of the LDC process is warranted.

5 See, e.g., *N.H. Speedway, Inc. v. Motor Racing Network, Inc.*, Business and Commercial Dispute Docket No. 2008-EQ-099 (Merrimack Super. Ct. Jul. 17, 2014) (granting motion to compel; “MRN recites that production would be unduly burdensome but does not explain why. If the documents are maintained in the ordinary course of business, the request can be satisfied by simply allowing access to the documents, which would not ordinarily require undue expense. If the documents are in electronic format, the parties should be able to meet and confer, and subsequently determine whether the cost of production outweighs any potential benefit, or whether the cost of production should be shifted.”).

6 Given their length, the full text of Request Nos. 2-28 through 2-32 is being provided at Appendix A hereto.

20151109-5053

janet, townsend, MA.

I have great concerns about the proposed kinder morgan pipeline slated to come through north central Ma. particularly Townsend. Property owners will lose their home equity and will move out od town. Their abutters will undoubtedly move out also since their real estate value will decrease also. The remaining taxpayers will have to pick up the slack in taxes. Townsend will lose it’s natural beauty and become an unattractive place to live. We have recently just begun to attract people of higher means and education. Now we will be attractive to welfare recipients. Please don’t put your stamp od approval on this project

20151109-5080

Erica Walz-Sparrow, Averill Park, NY.

Dear folks of the Regulatory Commission,

I am writing to express my wish that the Tennessee Gas Northeast Direct Pipeline project be denied permission to build. The proposed pipeline route and compressor stations will be built in communities where the residents’ health will be jeopardized. The process of creating the pipeline will also put the clean well water of local citizens at risk. In addition, the route travels through the Rensselaer Plateau, the fifth largest contiguous forest in New York State and a recognized area of valuable habitat. In these days of environmental stress and habitat fragmentation, the construction of a pipeline which would degrade this natural resource for the sake of Kinder Morgan’s profits seems short-sighted and ill-advised. The Governor of New York, Andrew Cuomo, took a great step in protecting the lands and people of New York State when he banned hydraulic fracturing statewide. Please do not undermine his work by allowing this construction. Please continue to explore, develop, and encourage renewable, clean, and sustainable energy sources.

Thank you for your time.

Best wishes,

EW Sparrow

20151110-0032

Hand written letter, Taylor Lindsay, 15 Evergreen Ave, Keene, NH 03431: opposing.

20151110-0048

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

Project Docket Number: PF14-22

October 26, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

RK: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

49 Cart Path 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 to perform surveys, or for any other purpose. Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized and treated as trespass.

Best,

Ivy Soberanis
Policarpio Soberanis

20151110-5081

Patricia R Pina, Mason, NH.

The Historical commission voted and has great concern about this home of Pete LeCounts on Starch Mill Road Mason New Hampshire that will be effected by the pipeline.

20151112-0010

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

Date: 8/18/2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access:

As the owner of the property located at:

12 Hickory Hill Rd
Pelman

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

Ann S. Snide

20151112-0011

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

Date: 8/18/2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access:

As the owner of the property located at:

7 Lemere Drive
Pelman

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

Mark Getty

20151112-0012

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

Date: 8/18/15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access:

As the owner of the property located at:

10 Mallard Court
Litchfield, NH

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

Richard Husband

20151112-0013

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

Date: 8/18/2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access:

As the owner of the property located at:

23 Winterberry Rd
Pelham NH

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

Paul Jones

20151112-0014

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

Date: 8/15/15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access:

As the owner of the property located at:

21 Dutton Rd
Pelham, NH 03076

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

Alice Symonovit, David Hennesy?

20151112-0015

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

Date: 7/18/15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access:

As the owner of the property located at:

36 Heather Lee Lane
Pelham, NH 03076

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

Lindsey Sargent

20151112-0016

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE

Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426

Date: 8/30/15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access:

As the owner of the property located at:

168 Tobey Hwy
New Ipswich, NH

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

Katherine L. Belanger

20151112-0017

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE

Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426

Date: 8/28

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access:

As the owner of the property located at:

105 Barrett Road, Greenville, NH

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

Kathleen Washburn

20151112-0018

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE

Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426

Date: 8/30/15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access:

As the owner of the property located at:

731 Wilton Road,
Mason, NH

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

Linda Cotter-Cranston

20151112-0019

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

Date: 8/30/15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access:

As the owner of the property located at:

17 NH Route 119 E
Fitzwilliam, NH 03447

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

Kevin Woolley

20151112-0020

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

Date: 8-30-15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access:

As the owner of the property located at:

102 Elm St.
Milford, NH

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

Michael J. Conley

20151112-0021

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

Date: 8/30/15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access:

As the owner of the property located at:

60 A? Rd
Merrimack, NH

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

Debra Huffin

20151112-0022

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

Date: 8/30/15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access:

As the owner of the property located at:

275 Turnpike Rd
New Ipswich, NH

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

Holly Lyons, David Lyons

20151112-0023

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

Date: 8/25/2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access:

As the owner of the property located at:

201 Temple Rd
New Ipswich, NH 03071

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

Steven D. Riggs

20151112-0024

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, NE
Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426

Date: 8/30/15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access:

As the owner of the property located at:

39 Radcliffe Drive
Milford, NH 03055

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

Elise A. Demichael

20151112-0025

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

Date: 8/30/15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access:

As the owner of the property located at:

5 Abbey Rd
Merrimack, NH

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

Marc and Susan Courchesne

20151112-0026

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

Date: 8/30/2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access:

As the owner of the property located at:

5 Heron Marsh Ln
Brookline, NH

I am denying permission to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its

representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land or to perform surveys, or for any other purpose. Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Louise Eldridge

20151112-0027

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

Date: 8/30/2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access:

As the owner of the property located at:

168 Tobey Highway
New Ipswich, NH

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

Joseph L Belanger, Jr.

20151112-0028

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

Date: 8/29/2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access:

As the owner of the property located at:

271 Old Country Road
New Ipswich, NH

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

{signature illegible}

20151112-0029

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

Date: August 30, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access:

As the owner of the property located at:
20 Larch Road
Milford, NH

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

Leslie Minassian

20151112-0030

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

Date: 8/30/15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access:

As the owner of the property located at:
139 Old Country Rd
New Ipswich, NH

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

David L. Brower

20151112-0034

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

Date: 11/4/15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access:

As the owner of the property located at:
52 Cart Path Rd
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. Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass.

Caroline D'Agostino

20151112-0035

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

Date: 8/18/2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access:

As the owner of the property located at:

167 Hobbs Rd

Pelham, NH

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

Jane Singleton

20151112-0036

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, NE

Room 1A

Washington, DC 20426

Date: 18 Aug 15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access:

As the owner of the property located at:

428 Mammoth Rd

Pelham, NH 03076

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

Harriet St.Onge

20151112-0037

888 First Street, NE

Room 1A

Washington, DC 20426

Date: 8-18-15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access:

As the owner of the property located at:

1241 Brookline Rd

Mason, NH 03048

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

Diane K. Varney-Parker

20151112-0043

To: Kimberly D. Bose, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

From: Julia Steed Mawson. 17 South Shore Dr. Pelham, NH

Re: Docket 1 PF 14—22

Date: October 30, 2015

I am writing relative to my concerns regarding the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Dimct (NED) pipeline and compressor statiaas- sn intrastrucnae which will caay lacked gas for export snd for the ultimate profit of a private company at my and my southern NH neighbors expense. I urge you to recommend “NO Build”.

My parents moved to Pelham NH in 1947 because it reminded my father, a WWII command pilot, of the wooded hills ofhis childhood home in Tennessee while giving my Chicago mother also a WWII veteran fmm the Army Nurse Corps, the snows that she loved. As time progressed into the 1950’s Pelham grew, aad my parents watched the rural character of this town begin to change. My mother used to say that she wished that she was a “land baroness” so that she could buy up large tracts of land to save it While they never had a lot of money in the first place, my father’s disability secondary to a flying accident made that sn impossibility. However, though he had to retire from the Air Force, he did become a realtor aad thugh that, by accident, found 18 acres of land available thugh a tax sale. So, my mother became a “land baroness” with 18 acres —his gift to her on Valeatines Day.

And now they are gone and I am the guardian of that property —which I am trying to protect to the best ofmy ability. Abit under half of it is under the power-lines aad the other half is forested —a faiest that I value as they did far the ecosystem services that it provides. It provides contiguous habitat for wildlife, mitigating erosion through it’s caaopy and roots and sequestering carbon as one more step in slowing climate change.

I also value the soil and the bedrock beneath that support it all ...

These soils are vital pieces of the puzzle of this forest ecosystem, providing a place for water, animals, bacteria and fungi, nutrients, aad leaf litter to interact in a complex system of interactions that ultimately support the forests above it, the groundwater in and around it, and the reptiles, amphibians and macm-invertebrates that live in it, migrate through it and need it for winter hibernation. I am concerned about the destruction of this vital resource pmvided by these soils on my property and on the properties all along the path ofthis propoaxl pipeline corridor.

I request therefore that studies be done on existing pipelines regarding the long and short term impacts on soils and bedrock due to construction in northern regions. This should focus on the impacts of soil compaction aad the loss of fertility by the destruction of “native” soil layering and loss of it’s organic tructuie, as well ss the effects ofthe loss ofwater pnetratian and diversion of water flow due to compaction ...all of which ultimately effects the viability of these soils along the route. Studies should also be done to determine the effects of herbicides and pesticides used to keep these corridors flae oftrees and shrubs aa soil invertebrates, as well as the effects of compaction on migration of soil fauna and the effects of that in turn on the microhabitats ofthe flora that function in interactions with them.

I also request that plans be shared with me snd others regarding what the protocols and methods are followed regarding assaying pipeline leaks and the time frame for repair. Finally I want to know what happens when pipelines such as these ma decommissioned and landscapes and forest cover restored. (as is required for mining operations). I fail to understand how my NH bedrock, (which I value, aad which must be blasted to create tamches for these pipelines) asavell as the soil structures that these NH bedrock formations contribute to, csn be put back as you found them during remediation. I would look forward to hearing these explanations.

Again, I urge you to recommend “No Build”. Thank you.

20151112-0051

Kimberly Bose, Secretary
FERC
888 First Street, N.E.

STOP THE NED PIPELINE!!

Protect NH land from Eminent Domain!

I oppose. the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) EXPORT pipeline. The pipelines, and compressor station will scar the NH landscape and put our water, wildlife, forests, agricultural lands and rural character at risk. These include health and safety risks from emissions, industrialization, pollution and the devastating effects of fire and explosions. Greed, not need is fueling this project. Say NO to this private company that will TAKE OUR LANDS with NO BENEFIT TO US.

Joni Matthews
12 Deer Run
Windham, NH 03087

20151112-3038

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20426

OFFICE OF ENERGY PROJECTS

In Reply Refer To:
OEP/DG2E/Gas Branch 3
Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company LLC
Docket No. PF14-22-000

November 12, 2015

Edwina Butler-Wolfe, Governor
Absentee-Shawnee Tribe of Indians in Oklahoma
2015 S. Gordon Cooper Dr.
Shawnee, OK 74801

Re: Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Governor Wolfe:

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC or Commission) invites the Absentee-Shawnee Tribe of Indians in Oklahoma (Absentee-Shawnee Tribe) to participate in our review of the Northeast Energy Direct Project planned by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company LLC (TGP). TGP plans to construct and operate approximately 412 miles of new natural gas transmission pipeline and associated facilities in Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Connecticut.

On October 2, 2014, the FERC approved TGP's request to begin the Commission's pre-filing process, which enables review of the project to begin before an application is filed with the Commission. The purpose of the pre-filing process is to seek public, agency, and tribal input early in the FERC's review phase, and encourage involvement by interested stakeholders in a manner that allows for the identification and resolution of environmental issues prior to the filing of a formal application.

On June 30, 2015, the FERC issued a Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the Planned Northeast Energy Direct Project, Request for Comments on Environmental Issues, and Notice of Public Scoping Meetings (NOI). The NOI included a brief description of the project and the Commission's decision-making process. It was published in the Federal Register and placed in the Commission's public record under docket number PF14-22-000.[1] In addition, your Tribal Historic Preservation Officer participated in a meeting with FERC staff and TGP.

While the Commission does not delegate government-to-government consultations with Indian tribes to regulated companies or their representatives, they can assist us in completing the process of complying with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act by gathering information, in accordance with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation's implementing regulations at 36 CFR 800.2(a)(3). To involve your

tribe early in the planning process, we encourage the Absentee-Shawnee Tribe to freely communicate with TGP and its consultant (Louis Berger) to identify properties of traditional, religious, or cultural importance to your tribe that may be affected by the project. Your timely engagement is important, so that TGP can modify its research designs and survey strategies to take your concerns into account.

We are interested in receiving your comments on the project to ensure that issues of concern to your tribe are properly considered in our environmental analysis. We will keep any sensitive tribal information strictly confidential, as discussed below.

You may file a response either electronically or with a paper copy; however, with either method please reference the project docket number (PF14-22-000) with your submission. For electronic submissions through the internet, go to the FERC's web page at www.ferc.gov, click on "Documents & Filings," and use either the eComment or eFiling feature. To file a paper copy, send a letter addressed to: Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary; Federal Energy Regulatory Commission; 888 First Street NE, Washington DC 20426. Please note, if you file sensitive tribal information it should be marked "Contains Privileged Information - Do Not Release."

We would very much appreciate receiving your response within 30 days of the date of this letter. If you would like to discuss our process, get further information, or meet with Commission staff, contact either the Environmental Project Manager, Eric Tomasi (at 202-502-8097 or eric.tomasi@ferc.gov), or the Project Archaeologist, Paul Friedman (at 202-502-8059, or paul.friedman@ferc.gov).

Sincerely,
Terry L. Turpin, Director
Division of Gas-Environment
and Engineering

cc: Public File, Docket No. PF14-22-000

Joseph Blanchard
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
Absentee-Shawnee Tribe
2015 S. Gordon Cooper Dr.
Shawnee, OK 74801

1 Project information is available on the FERC website (www.ferc.gov) using the eLibrary link. Click on the eLibrary link, click on "General Search" and enter the docket number, excluding the last three digits in the Docket Number field (i.e., PF14-22). Be sure you have selected an appropriate date range. For assistance, please contact FERC Online Support at FercOnlineSupport@ferc.gov or toll free at (866) 208-3676, or for TTY, contact (202) 502-8659. The eLibrary link also provides access to the texts of formal documents issued by the Commission, such as orders, notices, and rulemakings.

20151112-3039

{largely identical to 20151112-3038 above, only differences are noted}

To: Edward Peter Paul, Chief
Aroostook Band of Micmacs in Maine
7 Northern Rd.
Presque Isle, ME 04769

¶3 does **not** mention "...Tribal Historic Preservation Officer participated in a meeting with FERC staff and TGP."

cc: Jennifer Pictou
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
Aroostook Band of Micmacs
7 Northern Rd.

Presque Isle, ME 0476

20151112-3040

{largely identical to 20151112-3038 above, only differences are noted}

To: Clint Halfon, Representative
Cayuga Nation of New York
P.O. Box 803
Seneca Falls, NY 13148

¶3 does **not** mention "...Tribal Historic Preservation Officer participated in a meeting with FERC staff and TGP."

cc: - none -

20151112-3042

{largely identical to 20151112-3038 above, only differences are noted}

To: Cleanan Watkins, President
Delaware Nation of Oklahoma
P.O. Box 825
Anadarko, OK 73005

¶3 does **not** mention "...Tribal Historic Preservation Officer participated in a meeting with FERC staff and TGP."

cc: Jason Ross
Section 106 Program Manager
Delaware Nation
P.O. Box 825
Anadarko, OK 73005

20151112-3043

{largely identical to 20151112-3038 above, only differences are noted}

To: Chester Brooks, Chief
Delaware Tribe of Indians in Oklahoma
5100 Tuxedo Blvd.
Bartlesville, OK 74006

¶3 **does** mention "...Tribal Historic Preservation Officer participated in a meeting with FERC staff and TGP."

cc: Brice Obermeyer, THPO
Delaware Tribe Historic Preservation Office
Roosevelt Hall, Rm 212
1 Kellog Dr.
Emporia, KS 66801
Susan Bachor
Delaware Tribe Historic Preservation Representative
Department of Anthropology, Gladfelter Hall, Rm. 207
Temple University
1115 W. Polett Walk
Philadelphia, PA 19122

20151112-3044

{largely identical to 20151112-3038 above, only differences are noted}

To: Glenna Wallace, Chief
Eastern Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma
5100 Tuxedo Blvd.
Bartlesville, OK 74006

¶3 **does** mention "...Tribal Historic Preservation Officer participated in a meeting with FERC staff and TGP."

cc: Robin Dushane
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
Eastern Shawnee Tribe
70500 E 128 Rd.
Wyandotte, OK 74370

20151112-3045

{largely identical to 20151112-3038 above, only differences are noted}

To: Brenda Commander, Chief
Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians in Maine
88 Bell Rd.
Littleton, ME 04730

¶3 **does not** mention "...Tribal Historic Preservation Officer participated in a meeting with FERC staff and TGP."

cc: - none -

20151112-3046

{largely identical to 20151112-3038 above, only differences are noted}

To: Rodney Butler, Chair
Mashantucket Pequot Indian Tribe
P.O. Box 3060
Mashantucket, CT 06338

¶3 **does** mention "...Tribal Historic Preservation Officer participated in a meeting with FERC staff and TGP."

cc: Marissa Turnbull
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
Mashantucket Pequot Tribe
P.O. Box 3202
Mashantucket, CT 06338

20151112-3047

{largely identical to 20151112-3038 above, only differences are noted}

To: Cedric Cromwell, Chair
Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe
483 Great Neck Rd. S.
Mashpee, MA 02649

¶3 includes "In addition, your Tribal Historic Preservation Officer participated in meetings with FERC staff and TGP, and tribal representatives conducted limited on-the-ground field surveys."

cc:Ramona Peters
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
483 Great Neck Rd. S.
Mashpee, MA 02649

20151112-3048

{largely identical to 20151112-3038 above, only differences are noted}

To: Paul Thompson, Chief
Saint Regis Mohawk Tribe of New York
412 State Route 37
Akwesane, NY 13655

¶3 includes “In addition, representatives of your Tribal Historic Preservation Office have participated in meetings with FERC staff and TGP”

cc: Arnold Printup
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
Saint Regis Mohawk Tribe
412 State Route 37
Akwesane, NY 13655

20151112-3049

{largely identical to 20151112-3038 above, only differences are noted}

To: William Nichols, Chief
Passamaquoddy Tribe of Maine – Indian Township
P.O. Box 301
Princeton, ME 04668

¶3 does **not** mention “...Tribal Historic Preservation Officer participated in a meeting with FERC staff and TGP.”

cc:Donald Soctomah
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
Passamaquaddy Tribe
P.O. Box 159
Princeton, ME 04668

20151112-3051

{largely identical to 20151112-3038 above, only differences are noted}

To: Matthew Thomas, Chief
Narragansett Indian Tribe
P.O. Box 268
Charleston, RI 02813

¶3 includes “In addition, your Tribal Historic Preservation Officer participated in meetings with FERC staff and TGP, and tribal representatives conducted limited on-the-ground field surveys.”

cc:John Brown
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
Narragansett Tribe
215 Fenner Hill Rd.
Wyoming, RI 02832
Doug Harris

Deputy THPO
Narragansett Tribe
44425D S. County Trail
Charleston, RI 02813

20151112-3052

{largely identical to 20151112-3038 above, only differences are noted}

To: Ray Halbritter, Representative
Oneida Nation of New York
5218 Patrick Rd.
Verona, NY 13421

¶3 includes “In addition, representatives of your Tribal Historic Preservation Office participated in meetings with FERC staff and TGP, and conducted limited on-the-ground field surveys.”

cc: Jesse Bergevin
Historic Resources Specialist
Oneida Nation
2037 Dream Catcher Plaza
Oneida, NY 13421

20151112-3053

{largely identical to 20151112-3038 above, only differences are noted}

To: Cristina Danforth, Chair
Oneida Tribe of Indians in Wisconsin
P.O. Box 365
Oneida, WI 54155

¶3 does **not** mention “...Tribal Historic Preservation Officer participated in a meeting with FERC staff and TGP.”

cc: Corina Williams
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
Oneida Tribe
P.O. Box 365
Oneida, WI 54155

20151112-3054

{largely identical to 20151112-3038 above, only differences are noted}

To: Irving Powless, Chief
Onondaga Nation
P.O. Box 319-B
Nedrow, NY 13120

¶3 includes “ In addition, representatives of your Tribal Historic Preservation Office participated in meetings with FERC staff and TGP.”

cc: Tony Gonyea, Faithkeeper
Onondaga Nation
RR#1 Box 245
Nedrow, NY 13120

20151112-5016

Paul E Breen, AMHERST, NH.

Paul E. Breen

3 Patricia Lane

Amherst, NH 03031

FERC

Washington D.C. 20426

Reference PF14-22-000

As a property owner of 3 Patricia Lane, in Amherst, NH I'm very concerned about the proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline PF14-22-000 which would pass through my property.

Much of the materiel produced discusses the environment impact of this project, but seem to ignore and disregard the human impact of this project. Listed below are some of my concerns and arguments regarding the planning and propose pipeline.

1. Your plan doesn't address the negative impact on the home owner's property values
2. Your plan doesn't address the insurance cost increases to the easement property owner
3. Your plan doesn't address monetary payments for the taking of private land for your project use
4. Your plan doesn't discuss safety boundaries required in case of an explosion (large pipe)
5. Your plan doesn't discuss proposed evacuation routes for homes along the route
6. Your plan doesn't evaluate the number of elderly and handicapped home owners adjacent to the proposed pipeline route which leaves them extremely vulnerable if an evacuation was required

20151112-5103

The ongoing record of scientific data collected and recorded since the late 19th century, as part of ongoing climate research conducted by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), demonstrates a steady rise in global temperatures, which is distinctly and definitively correlated with human industrial activities. This has been accepted in the scientific community as solid and incontrovertible scientific fact. The dramatic evidence that can currently be seen in the receding and disappearance of polar ice, mountain snowcaps and glaciers, which represent the vital reserves of water in many countries whose lakes and rivers are now drying up, stands as stark confirmation of the global climatic impact of anthropogenic fossil fuel emissions and other industrial activities, such as deforestation, the first precursor to industrial development and construction projects ~ including the proposed Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's "Northeast Energy Direct" pipeline expansion project.

Climate scientists made the clear and unanimous point back in the early 1970s that even if anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gases ~ at their existing rate over four decades ago ~ were brought to a complete halt, the 'ripple effect' would continue to have a serious impact on Earth's climatic conditions, such that global temperatures would continue to rise, resulting in major significant changes in the geographic locations and availability of arable land, as well as significant rise in sea levels, with critical implications on global socioeconomic factors as fundamental to human survival as availability of and access to food supplies and fresh water. **And yet, even though the urgency of global climate change has been made drastically clear, the industrial extraction, refinement, transport and combustion of fossil fuels has continued to escalate unabated.**

President Barack Obama has joined with global leaders, scientists, and citizens worldwide in calling for the reduction in fossil fuel emission and other industrial activities contributing to changes in global atmospheric temperatures, water supplies, and oceanic thermohaline circulation patterns, all of which are critical to the very capacity of this planet to sustain life. The development and availability of environmentally safer alternatives to fossil fuel, such as solar and wind power to supply much of our energy demand, has proceeded to

the point where a transition to sustainable energy in both ‘developed’ and ‘underdeveloped’ countries alike has long been possible.

As an environmental biologist, and as a member of the civilian population in the region where this project is targeted to be constructed, I am and will remain vehemently and actively opposed to the construction of Kinder Morgan’s proposed NED pipeline in our region ~ and to the entire scenario entailed in extracting, processing and transport of ‘natural’ gas supplies in the United States, Canada, or any other country. Climate scientists ~ i.e., those acting independently of fossil fuel industrial corporations ~ are urgently calling for the total cessation of dirty fuel extraction, refinement and usage. The global scientific research community, climate assessment experts, and citizens in the United States and worldwide are united in a common cry for environmental sanity: **LEAVE FOSSIL FUELS IN THE GROUND!!!**

Our quality of life, our pursuit of global harmony, our very survival is at stake.

The residents and public officials in the townships and communities that would be most directly impacted by the construction and operation of Kinder Morgan’s proposed Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline, including the Town of Leverett, of which I am a resident, have unanimously stated their opposition to this pipeline proposal. These towns are all part of a region of Massachusetts renowned for the pristine beauty of its meadows, woodlands, and farmland, clear ponds and lakes, streams and rivers, recreational and conservation land, family owned and operated farmland, and historically significant sites ~ all of which would be put at certain risk of destruction and contamination by the construction and operation of this pipeline. Our unique wildlife habitat areas, our value as an attraction to tourists and visitors, our local food production, our educational resources, our communities, our homes, our very health ~ all stand to be devastated by the impacts of the activities entailed in Kinder Morgan’s proposal.

The clearcutting of forested land would from the outset not only cause the direct and immediate destruction of critical forest habitat and essential wildlife corridors. It would also disrupt the vital role of forested land in maintaining the integrity of local and regional watershed areas, resulting in siltation, flooding, and freshwater habitat in brooks, streams, and ultimately, the Connecticut River, the receiving water body for the entire affected area. I have witnessed these effects of forest cover removal first hand. My sister and her husband live in Pratt Hollow, on Miller’s Brook, less than a mile from the proposed compressor station. Their home and property were seriously impacted by indiscriminate clearing of trees further up Gulf Mountain, which happens to be the proposed site for the location of a compressor station as part of the the pipeline project. The noise, traffic, emissions of air pollutants from combustion, and light pollution associated with the construction process would destroy the characteristics of the lovely, scenic, rural areas in and around the impacted towns, turning the quiet lives of residents into a horrific scenario of emotional and physiological stress, with deleterious effects on the health of individuals and families.

But the impacts of the actual operation of the pipeline, especially in the areas that would be directly affected by construction and operation of the proposed compressor stations along the path of the NED pipeline path, pose far more serious risks to human health, water systems, wildlife habitat and farmland. The chemicals used in fracking, as well as the ‘natural’ gas itself, i.e., methane, are known to include a horrific list of toxic, carcinogenic chemicals, known to cause serious endocrine, immunological, and developmental disorders. These include such extremely dangerous and volatile compounds as benzene, ethyl benzene, toluene, xylene, formaldehyde, methanol, hydrochloric acid, and heavy metals. The release of these chemicals as a result of accidental leakage or routine operation, including the intentional venting of gas known as “blow down” from compressor stations, pigging stations and shut-down valves, would inevitably result in the the contamination of the inextricably interrelated networks of air, water, and soil in residential, agricultural, and conservation areas. The effects on our health and our productivity would be devastating. The medical systems in the region would be overwhelmed ~ as would the legal resources, which would be inevitably drawn in ~ as they have been already ~ to handle the inevitability of lawsuits pertaining to the resulting health issues, lost capacity for employment, and destruction of property value.

All of the myriad of human activities in this and any other habitable region require the availability of clean,

safe air, water, and soil.

All plant life, animal life, and human life depend upon a healthy, dynamically interactive system of air, water, and soil ~ not only to thrive, but even to exist. The network of lakes, ponds, vernal pools, brooks, streams, and rivers that supports our lives and all forms of life, is in essence the circulation system of a healthy, thriving ecosystem ~ very much like the circulatory and metabolic systems within our own bodies: essential for the maintenance, purification, and sustainability of life processes. **Once this life-support system has been disrupted, damaged, and contaminated by toxic anthropogenic pollutants, there is little hope of restoring the natural, healthy balance of conditions that sustain life.** The air, water, and soil are inseparably interconnected by physical, chemical and biological processes through time: the toxic chemicals that contaminate any one element of the living ecosystem will inevitably be introduced into the rest of the system. **Kinder Morgan's proposed construction and operation of this pipeline, quite plainly, is a very real and literal threat to poison our land, water, soil, our wildlife, and our very bodies.** And Kinder Morgan considers these rural areas to be nothing more than "sacrifice zones."

The very real possibility of accidental leaks, ruptures, and/or explosions would be completely beyond the capacity of local emergency response teams and medical facilities. Kinder Morgan has no plan for emergency response ~ or for remediation in the case of such events.

I will not attempt to cite statistics concerning the escalating frequency of accidents, leaks, spills, and explosions, resulting from the activities of dirty fuel and mining industries in the last five years alone, since the Gulf Oil Spill ~ or the number of communities where the quality of life and human health have been destroyed as a result. The health effects on the populations in these contaminated areas are devastating, though not necessarily immediately apparent ~ although the drastic, horrific health effects of fracking activities and fossil fuel accidents are becoming more and more glaringly obvious in affected communities. The typical protocol of the companies responsible for such catastrophic events is to deceive the public about the magnitude of the environmental damage, block access to information to investigators from news media, and deny responsibility and accountability for compensation ~ as has been the case in the population affected by the Exxon Valdez oil spill over twenty-five years ago, where many of those awaiting compensation have died as a result of the debilitating and deadly medical conditions resulting from their exposure to the oil ~ while the contaminated area itself remains a point source of contamination, saturated as it was and remains by the oil spilled in the Exxon Valdez disaster. More recently, the alarming abnormalities in marine life forms seen in the Gulf Coast since the 2010 Deepwater Horizon disaster continue to be denied by 'scientists' with a clear conflict of interest, while the populations in that area have not received due compensation for the immediate effects on their livelihoods or the incipient impacts on their health. Meanwhile, medical facilities in areas of Pennsylvania where residents have been suffering devastating illnesses as a result of fracking were put under orders not to respond to any calls about health symptoms related to fracking. Never in my life did I think to see such flagrant violation of and disregard for our health, our safety, and our Constitutional rights.

I need hardly point out that the miserably inadequate and unsuccessful half-measures taken by way of "remediation," such as those seen when the town of Mayflower, Arkansas was ruined by ExxonMobil's oil spill in that community, leave little doubt that the fossil fuel extraction industries are woefully unprepared to deal with the outcome of accidents that are entirely too likely, in light of the events which we have witnessed, and which have devastated human lives and habitat in recent years. The emergency response capacity in these towns along the NED pipeline path, which would be impacted in the event of an accident or deliberate act of terrorism, could not possibly handle such a disaster. Kinder Morgan has NO emergency response plans, and no proposed measures for remediation.

So when I have heard people ~ representing but a minute percentage of the population ~ talk about how Kinder Morgan's proposed pipeline project will increase employment and income and save on energy costs, I want to ask: What exactly do you think you might do with the supposed income generated or expenditure saved, if there were any reality to the expectations of such unlikely benefits? What would you do with the money hypothetically saved or earned? **Could you buy back your health? Or the health of your children? Can you buy back the cleanliness of contaminated water? Of locally grown food? Of lost habi-**

tat and wildlife? Can you buy back the health of an environment irrevocably damaged by the impacts of the construction and operation of this fossil fuel transport system that stands to provide no energy resources whatsoever to American citizens? You won't even be able to buy back you own backyard. You will not be able to live there. Can you buy back your right to Democratic Process?

The townspeople of this region that Kinder Morgan proposes to sacrifice in its greed and mania to profit from the extraction of every last possible reserve of fossil fuel, and from the perpetuation of a dependency on dirty fuel that should have been ended a very long time ago, **are unanimously opposed to Kinder Morgan's proposed NED pipeline. WE DO NOT WANT THIS PIPELINE. Not here ~ Not Anywhere.**

It is the responsibility of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to REGULATE the every industries ~ not to promote their activities by suppressing the voices and the Constitutional rights and freedoms of American citizens.

In summation, the 20th century has been characterized by an exponential increase in corporate-driven industrial dependency on and exploitation of resources whose extraction, processing, and utilization have created a legacy of devastation in terms of environmental damage: disrupted ecosystems, contaminated conservation land and farmland, polluted air, poisoned waterways, even extreme and alarming changes in our global oceanic systems.

It has also been a time of increased understanding ~ based on sound scientific research and investigation ~ of the environmental, societal, and economic costs in terms of loss of unique landscapes, habitat, and species, and more ~ our own ruined health, lives, and communities. Tragically, these advances in scientific knowledge and information, together with public concern on the part of American citizens and the global community, have not been manifested in real, meaningful changes in industrial practices.

The beginning of the 21st century has seen the radical escalation of corporate industrial depredation and ~ commensurate with industrial activities, most significantly those of dirty fossil fuel companies ~ catastrophic impacts on our environment and on our health, as a nation and as a species. The chronicle of damages resulting from both routine fossil fuel extraction activities, and from the skyrocketing occurrence of serious accidents, with no real remediation or corporate accountability in sight, presages a grim and frightening scenario of global environmental devastation of near-apocalyptic proportions. We are not only seeing a horrific increase in catastrophic effects on human health ~ we are now locked into a global chain reaction of military and societal conflict over fossil fuels, and worse: diminishing access to dwindling supplies of clean water, arable land, and healthy food.

This proposed NED pipeline represents yet another link in the network of national/international regional fossil fuel industry projects that are systematically and inexorably poisoning our life support systems, as well as threatening global political relations and any real possibility of international peace. **We are both witnesses to and victims of environmentally suicidal insanity on the part of the dirty fuel industry.**

This hellbent pattern of destructive corporate activity MUST STOP!!!

WE THE PEOPLE ARE SAYING NO. WE DEMAND THAT F.E.R.C. DENY KINDER MORGAN'S PIPELINE PROPOSAL. THIS PROJECT WILL NOT STAND. AND WE THE PEOPLE WILL NOT BACK DOWN.

20151112-5149

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

Pre-Filing Monthly Activity Report

(Reporting Period: October 1, 2015 through October 31, 2015)

Public Outreach

- Tennessee provided the following NED Project notifications:

- o On October 12, 2015, provided applicable elected officials with details about three public community meetings scheduled for Windsor, Northfield and Lynnfield, Massachusetts.
- o On October 15, 2015, provided stakeholders with a press release announcing Tennessee’s intention to file the formal certificate application for the NED Project on November 20, 2015.
- o On October 19, 2015, provided applicable elected officials with the details of the scheduled public community meeting in Dracut, Massachusetts.
- Tennessee conducted the following public community meetings:
 - o October 7, 2015: West Hartford, Connecticut
 - o October 27, 2015: Windsor, Massachusetts
 - o October 28, 2015: Northfield, Massachusetts
 - o October 29, 2015: Lynnfield/Peabody, Massachusetts

Environmental

- Tennessee continued to work on revising Resource Reports 1 through 13 for the final Environmental Report, to be included with the certificate application filing.
- Tennessee continued field surveys during the reporting period, including cultural, environmental, and threatened and endangered species surveys. Surveys are being conducted at proposed NED Project areas, including compressor station sites, meter station sites, contractor yards, and along proposed access roads.
- As of October 31, 2015, biological surveys have taken place over approximately 104.17 miles, or 61 percent, of the proposed NED Project Supply Path Component route included in the July 2015 second draft Environmental Report, and approximately 93.48 miles, or 37 percent, of the NED Project Market Path Component route included in the July 2015 second draft Environmental Report. In addition, cultural resource surveys have taken place over approximately 97.81 miles, or 57 percent, of the NED Project Supply Path Component route included in the July 2015 second draft Environmental Report, and approximately 52.17 miles, or 21 percent, of the NED Project Market Path Component route included in the July 2015 second draft Environmental Report. Table 1 below summarizes the completion status of environmental and cultural surveys.

Table 1: Civil, Biological, and Cultural Surveys Performed

Segment	Survey Area* (miles)	Survey Completed (miles)	Environmental	Cultural
		Civil**		
NED West (Supply Path)	171	C: 95.9 D: 89.0	104.17	97.81
NED East (Market Path)	248	C: 80.8 D: 76.5	93.48	52.17
% Complete		C: 42% D: 40%	48%	36%

*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.

NED Project Meetings

- Tennessee met with the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (“NYSDEC”) on October 1, 2015.
- Tennessee participated in a meeting with the New Hampshire Fish and Game Department on October 7, 2015.
- Tennessee met with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New England District, on October 8, 2015.
- Tennessee attended a meeting with Native American tribes scheduled by the Commission on October 9, 2015.
- Tennessee attended a meeting with the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection on October 15, 2015.
- Tennessee attended a joint meeting with the NYSDEC and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers on October 28, 2015.

Right-of-Way

- Tennessee has obtained survey permission for approximately 40% of the NED Project Market Path Component area, and approximately 55% of the NED Project Supply Path Component area.
- Title work is approximately 97% completed for the NED Project Market Path Component area and approximately 98% completed for the NED Supply Path Component area.
- Tennessee has received 262 calls as of the date of this report on the toll-free phone number established for the NED Project.
- Tennessee is continuing to assemble permit application criteria for federal, state, county, and town road permit applications. This includes initial personal consultations with state and town officials across the entire NED Project.
- Tennessee is continuing to communicate with and seek survey permission from affected landowners.
- Tennessee is initiating document preparation and plat generation in anticipation of right-of-way acquisition, anticipated to commence in the first quarter of 2016.

Engineering

- Tennessee continues to evaluate the proposed route for the NED Project. Deviations to the proposed route are being reviewed to accommodate construction constraints, and requests from landowners, towns, and applicable regulatory agencies. For deviations that Tennessee has adopted, these revisions to the proposed route will be reflected in the final Environmental Report to be submitted with the certificate application filing. Tennessee anticipates that it will continue to review requests for deviations, and that any additional adjustments to the route that Tennessee determines are appropriate will be filed with the Commission in supplemental filings, as well as with other appropriate permitting agencies.
- Tennessee continues to evaluate the proposed major river crossings, including potential Horizontal Directional Drill (“HDD”) locations. Tennessee is conducting environmental surveys where access is available at these potential locations, and will seek appropriate permits, as needed, for geotechnical investigations.
- Tennessee contracted for aerial photography of the proposed primary route for the NED Project and for several alternative routes that were discussed in the draft Resource Report 10 submitted on March 13, 2015. The primary route was flown to a one-mile corridor and the imagery continues to be processed. LiDAR information as well as high resolution photography has been acquired and is currently being processed, and will be included in the final Environmental Report to be submitted with the certificate application filing. It is anticipated that additional areas where re-routes have occurred, as identified in the July 24, 2015 second draft Environmental Report, will be flown in November 2015 after the leaves are

off the trees.

- Compressor station layouts are being developed and will be provided in the certificate application filing. Tennessee is continuing to work on scheduling for geotechnical investigations for structural and permeability analysis at the sites of the proposed compressor stations. Environmental and cultural field studies are continuing at the proposed compressor station sites.
- Environmental field surveys for the sites of the proposed meter stations have been initiated where site permissions have been obtained. Site layout plans will be submitted as part of the certificate application filing.
 - Tennessee field engineers continued to identify available access roads, contractor yards, and other areas proposed for use during construction. An updated list will be provided in the certificate application filing.
 - Survey activities, including identifying and staking the centerline along all routes on accessible land, continued during the reporting period. Work being performed includes staking and detailed survey along the pipeline route and surveys of supporting sites such as contractor yards and compressor stations. Tennessee continues to conduct survey activities on additional available areas where survey access has been granted.
 - Tennessee continued discussions with electric utility companies regarding the co-location of proposed NED Project facilities with existing utility corridors. These electric utility companies have provided Tennessee with property information for their facilities and have entered into agreements with Tennessee to allow for surveys to be conducted on their property. These surveys were initiated during the previous reporting period and are continuing.
 - Preliminary construction spreads have been determined.
 - A preliminary hydrostatic test plan has been developed, including depicting potential water supplies and discharge locations. Tennessee will be meeting with jurisdictional agencies to review areas and gain feedback.
 - Residential figures were provided based on public information for residences within 50 feet of the proposed workspace with the July 24, 2015 second draft Environmental Report. These drawings are being updated, utilizing the flown imagery for structure locations, and will be included with the final Environmental Report to be included with the certificate application filing.
 - Based on discussions with the NYSDEC, an updated template used for a waterbody crossing analysis is being developed.
 - Tennessee has developed routing for an I-88 alternative in New York. This route was reviewed for constructability issues and will be presented in the Resource Report 10 included in the final Environmental Report. Mapping has been developed to illustrate this route and this routing has been presented to the NYSDEC. Tennessee conducted a follow up meeting with NYSDEC and received feedback. The route is being presented to the New York State Department of Transportation (“NY-DOT”) to provide feedback. Tennessee committed to meet with the NYSDEC to discuss the NY-DOT feedback.
 - Aboveground appurtenance drawings are being developed for metering, main line valve, and launcher/receiver sites. These drawings will be provided as part of the certificate application.
 - Site-specific drawings are being developed for major waterbody crossings (waterbody crossings greater than 100 feet wide at the NED Project crossing location).

20151112-5163

**BOARD OF SELECTMEN
BERLIN, MASSACHUSETTS 01503
Phone: (978) 838-2442**

November 9, 2015

Commissioner Cheryl A. LaFleur
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First St., N.E.
Washington, DC 220426

RE: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co., LLC
Docket No. PF-14-22-000
Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Commissioner LaFleur:

On November 20, 2015, Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline has indicated it will me an application for a permit that would allow Kindel' Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline to proceed with the proposed New England Direct (NED) pipeline through Massachusetts, Docket No. PF14-22.

As part of the evaluation requited by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) for a pen-nit to' be issued for this project, we submit the following comments and request that they be admitted into consid-eration in opposition for issuance of a permit.

This proposed pipeline project would have many adverse impacts for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. We understand that FERC primarily examines the need of Public Convenience & Necessity. When all of the adverse impacts are carefully and thoroughly evaluated they will fat outweigh any need for public conve-nience and necessity and a permit will NOT be approved for this project.

Among the adverse impacts are:

- This proposed pipeline would adversely impact the lands and waters of Massachusetts. There are many acres of conservation land protected under Article 97 of the Massachusetts Constitution, other pro- tected lands, farmlands, wetlands and private lands. Pipeline construction would forever alter these lands.
- Water is another concern. What steps will be taken to protect the ggroundwatet which ultimately flows into private wells and underground aquifers, streams, rivers, wetlands, swamps, and ponds? How will these waters be protected from the toxic chemicals that will be emitted by the pipeline compo- nents as the pipeline is constructed?
- Will-horizontal drilling be employed to install the pipelin-e under aqueducts, railroad crossings, streams and ponds? Horizontal drilling can have adverse impacts on land and water through which the drill passes. What measure will be taken to protect the water, and the land and the propetty above?
- Methane is much more harmful to the environment than either oil or coal. Methane will bereleased along the pipeline, especially at pigging stations and compressor stations. How will nearby residents be protected from the harmful effects of methane emissions as well as other toxic chemicals in the gas transmitted through the pipeline? What measures will be taken for noise abatement, especially at compressor stations?
- Has the alleged need for a pipeline been thoroughly analyzed? Massachusetts has legislative mandate to reduce its dependence on fossil fuels in favor of sustain renewable and sustainable energy. In Mas- sachusetts, the use of fossil fuels is declining and the use of alternative energy sources, such as solar is rising. Why is this . not being taken into account?
- There is much evidence which indicates that most of the natural gas to pass through these proposed pipelines is for export to international markets. More natural gas than New England could ever use is projected to flow through this pipeline. This would cause the pipeline to be overbuilt and who will benefit from that?

- In addition, it has been proposed to pass the cost of constructing the pipeline on to electric ratepayers. This is a boon to the pipeline companies and a financial burden for ratepayers for decades to come with no benefit to the New England states.
- Natural gas pipelines have high accident rates, many resulting in death and serious injury. The pipeline will pass through many densely populated Massachusetts towns. What measures will be taken to ensure public safety and very quick response to problem areas. How will the public be protected from the noise of pigging and compressor station?

Until all of these questions have been thoroughly analyzed and answered, we believe that FERC should not approve any certificate for any pipeline in Massachusetts. No certificate should be issued until an honest and thorough analysis has been completed for any need for natural gas in Massachusetts.

In closing, we believe that the potential adverse effects of a pipeline far outweigh any alleged need for natural gas in Massachusetts and that no permit should be issued.

Sincerely,

BERLIN BOARD OF SELECTMEN

Judy Booman
Clerk

cc: Massachusetts Governor Charles Baker, Senate Chait Joan Lovely, Senator Jennifer Flanagan, House Chait Peter Kocot, Representative Harold Naughton, Jr.

20151113-0019

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, DC 20426

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

Representative Bradley H. Jones
Minority Leader
State House
Room 124
Boston, MA 02133

November 10, 2015

Dear Representative Jones:

Thank you for your August 10, 2015, letter regarding Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's (Tennessee) proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project (Docket No. PF14-22- 000).

On June 30, 2015, Commission staff issued the Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the Planned Northeast Energy Direct Project, Request for Comments on Environmental Issues, and Notice of Public Scoping Meetings, which initiated the formal public scoping period and indicated the locations, dates, and times for the public scoping meetings. Commission staff has conducted 14 public scoping meetings for the Northeast Energy Direct Project and met with many local planning agencies as well as state agencies. The scoping meeting locations were selected to be convenient for the greatest number of people who might be interested in the project. While we do not plan to conduct an additional scoping meeting, a meeting was held in Dracut, Massachusetts, at the start of the Lynnfield Lateral which runs about 16 miles through Middlesex and Essex Counties and terminates in Lynnfield, Massachusetts.

While scoping meetings are a valuable tool for us to receive comments from the public, they are only one of several ways for interested parties to bring their concerns to the attention of the Commission. Interested residents or other stakeholders may file written comments with the Commission. Those comments will receive the same attention and scrutiny as comments received at the public meetings. In addition, we accept and will address comments made after the end of the extended scoping comment period. I encourage you and your

constituents to continue to participate in the review of the project, and to file any comments that you believe will help the Commission consider this planned project.

Ultimately, Commission staff's review of the project will be comprehensive and a final environmental impact statement (EIS) will not be issued for the project without the Commission having all of the information necessary for staff to determine the potential impacts associated with constructing and operating the project. Accordingly, the EIS will address environmental issues, including those identified by the public, such as impacts on waterways, wetlands, public safety, and property values.

As in any Commission matter, please be assured that we strive to make our review of energy proposals both accessible and transparent to the public. All landowners on the planned route and any alternative routes have been included on the environmental mailing list for the project and will receive any Commission issuances or updates.

If I can be of further assistance in this or any other Commission matter, I hope you will not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely,
Norman C. Bay
Chairman

20151113-3054

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20426

OFFICE OF ENERGY PROJECTS

In Reply Refer To:
OEP/DG2E/Gas Branch 3
Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company LLC
Docket No. PF14-22-000

November 13, 2015

Kirk Frances, Chief
Penobscot Nation of Maine
12 Wabanski Way
Indian Island, ME 04468

Re: Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Chief Francis:

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC or Commission) invites the Penobscot Nation of Maine (Penobscot Nation) to participate in our review of the Northeast Energy Direct Project planned by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company LLC (TGP). TGP plans to construct and operate approximately 412 miles of new natural gas transmission pipeline and associated facilities in Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Connecticut.

On October 2, 2014, the FERC approved TGP's request to begin the Commission's pre-filing process, which enables review of the project to begin before an application is filed with the Commission. The purpose of the pre-filing process is to seek public, agency, and tribal input early in the FERC's review phase, and encourage involvement by interested stakeholders in a manner that allows for the identification and resolution of environmental issues prior to the filing of a formal application.

On June 30, 2015, the FERC issued a Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the Planned Northeast Energy Direct Project, Request for Comments on Environmental Issues, and Notice of Public Scoping Meetings (NOI). The NOI included a brief description of the project and the Commission's decision-making process. It was published in the Federal Register and placed in the Commission's public record under docket number PF14-22-000. [1]

While the Commission does not delegate government-to-government consultations with Indian tribes to regulated companies or their representatives, they can assist us in completing the process of complying with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act by gathering information, in accordance with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation's implementing regulations at 36 CFR 800.2(a)(3). To involve your tribe early in the planning process, we encourage the Penobscot Nation to freely communicate with TGP and its consultant (Louis Berger) to identify properties of traditional, religious, or cultural importance to your tribe that may be affected by the project. Your timely engagement is important, so that TGP can modify its research designs and survey strategies to take your concerns into account.

We are interested in receiving your comments on the project to ensure that issues of concern to your tribe are properly considered in our environmental analysis. We will keep any sensitive tribal information strictly confidential, as discussed below.

You may file a response either electronically or with a paper copy; however, with either method please reference the project docket number (PF14-22-000) with your submission. For electronic submissions through the internet, go to the FERC's web page at www.ferc.gov, click on "Documents & Filings," and use either the eComment or eFiling feature. To file a paper copy, send a letter addressed to: Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary; Federal Energy Regulatory Commission; 888 First Street NE, Washington DC 20426. Please note, if you file sensitive tribal information it should be marked "Contains Privileged Information - Do Not Release."

We would very much appreciate receiving your response within 30 days of the date of this letter. If you would like to discuss our process, get further information, or meet with Commission staff, contact either the Environmental Project Manager, Eric Tomasi (at 202-502-8097 or eric.tomasi@ferc.gov), or the Project Archaeologist, Paul Friedman (at 202-502-8059, or paul.friedman@ferc.gov).

Sincerely,
Terry L. Turpin, Director
Division of Gas-Environment
and Engineering

cc: Public File, Docket No. PF14-22-000

Christopher Sockalexis
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
Penobscot Nation
12 Wabanaki Way
Indian Island, ME 04468

1 Project information is available on the FERC website (www.ferc.gov) using the eLibrary link. Click on the eLibrary link, click on "General Search" and enter the docket number, excluding the last three digits in the Docket Number field (i.e., PF14-22). Be sure you have selected an appropriate date range. For assistance, please contact FERC Online Support at FercOnlineSupport@ferc.gov or toll free at (866) 208-3676, or for TTY, contact (202) 502-8659. The eLibrary link also provides access to the texts of formal documents issued by the Commission, such as orders, notices, and rulemakings

20151113-3055

{largely identical to 20151113-3054 above, only differences are noted}

To: William Fisher, Chief
Seneca-Cayuga Nation in Oklahoma
23701 S. 655 Rd.
Grove, OK 74344

cc: Paul Barton
Tribal Historic Preservation Office
Seneca Cayuga Nation

23701 S. 655 Rd/
Grove, OK 74344

20151113-3056

{largely identical to 20151113-3054 above, only differences are noted}

To: November 13, 2015
Maurice John, President
Seneca Nation of Indians in New York
P.O. Box 231
Salamanca, NY 14779

J3 adds: “In addition, representatives of your Tribal Historic Preservation Office have participated in meetings with FERC staff and TGP.”

cc:Melissa Bach
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
Seneca Nation
90 Ohi:yo’ Way
Salamanca, NY 14779

20151113-3057

{largely identical to 20151113-3054 above, only differences are noted}

To: Ron Sparkman, Chief
Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma
P.O. Box 189
Miami, OK 74354

cc: Kim Jumper
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
Shawnee Tribe
P.O. Box 189
Miami, OK 74354

20151113-3058

{largely identical to 20151113-3054 above, only differences are noted}

To: Bryan Polite, Trustee
Shinnecock Indian Nation in New York
P.O. Box 5006
Southampton, NY 11969

J3 adds: “In addition, representatives of your Tribal Historic Preservation Office have participated in meetings with FERC staff and TGP.”

cc: -none-

20151113-3059

{largely identical to 20151113-3054 above, only differences are noted}

To: Tribal President Wallace Miller
Stockbridge-Munsee Band of the Mohican Nation
N8476 Mo He Con Nuck Road
Bowler, WI 54416

¶3 adds: “In addition, your Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, Bonney Hartley, has participated in meetings with FERC staff and TGP, and has conducted limited on-the-ground surveys“

cc: Bonney Hartley
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
Stockbridge-Munsee Band of the Mohican Nation
65 1st Street
Troy, NY 12180

20151113-3060

{largely identical to 20151113-3054 above, only differences are noted}

To: Roger Hill, Chief
Tonawanda Band of Seneca Nation in New York
7027 Meadville Rd.
Basom, NY 14013

¶3 adds: “In addition, representatives of your Tribal Historic Preservation Office have participated in meetings with FERC staff and TGP.“

cc: Christine Abrams, Chair
Haudenosaunee Burial Committee
Tonawanda Seneca Nation
7027 Meadville Rd.
Basom, NY 14013

20151113-3061

{largely identical to 20151113-3054 above, only differences are noted}

To: Leo Henry, Chief
Tuscarora Nation in New York
2006 Mt. Hope Rd.
Lewistown, NY 14092

¶3 adds: “In addition, representatives of your Tribal Historic Preservation Office have participated in meetings with FERC staff and TGP.“

cc: Bryan Printup
Tribal Historic Preservation Office
Tuscarora Nation
5226 Walmore Rd.
Lewiston, NY 14092

20151113-3062

{largely identical to 20151113-3054 above, only differences are noted}

To: Tobias Vanderhoop, Chair
Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head (Aquinnah) in Massachusetts
20 Black Brook Rd.
Aquinnah, MA 02535

¶3 adds: “In addition, representatives of your Tribal Historic Preservation Office have participated in meetings with FERC staff and TGP, and have conducted limited on-the-ground field surveys.“

cc: Bettina Washington
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head

20 Black Brook Rd.
Aquinnah, MA 02535

20151113-3063

{largely identical to 20151113-3054 above, only differences are noted}

To: Kevin Brown, Chairman
Mohegan Tribe
13 Crow Hill Rd.
Uncasville, CT 06382

J3 adds: “Your Tribal Historic Preservation Officer has already participated in several meetings with FERC staff and TGP.”

cc: James Quinn
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
Mohegan Tribe
13 Crow Hill Rd.
Uncasville, CT 06382

20151113-5001

Robert Farrell, LUNENBURG, MA.

Property owners received solicitation (dated November 6, 2015) from Gordon Rees, LLP, legal counsel to Tennessee Gas Pipeline, L.L.C. that stated “Tennessee reserves all rights to seek an order from the Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities to access your property for surveys.”

Property owner stated that no one would be allowed to survey the property on a voluntary basis, and dismissed the solicitation by asking “Why would I?” Said property owner is an Engineer with high competency of comprehension; the present status of Tennessee Gas Pipeline, L.L.C’s cumulative efforts to educate landowners regarding the Project is critically deficient.

Please consider the capacity of the Courts to handle opposition from landowners following an order from the Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities. My understanding is that the majority of landowners will remain in silent opposition until a direct opportunity to formally contest an order in Court presents itself.

20151113-5006

Maryanne MacLeod, Sterling, MA.

Docket(s): PF14-22-000

Lead Applicant: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.
Direct Project under PF14-22.

Commissioner Cheryl A. LaFleur
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First St., N.E.
Washington, DC 220426

RE:Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co., LLC
Docket No. PF-14-22-000
Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Commissioner LaFleur:

On November 20, 2015, Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline has indicated it will file an application for a permit that would allow Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline to proceed with the proposed New England Direct (NED) pipeline through Massachusetts, Docket No. PF14-22..

As part of the evaluation required by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) for a permit to be issued for this project, we submit the following comments and request that they be admitted into consideration in opposition for issuance of a permit.

This proposed pipeline project would have many adverse impacts for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. We understand that FERC primarily examines the need of Public Convenience & Necessity. When all of the adverse impacts are carefully and thoroughly evaluated, they will far outweigh any need for public convenience and necessity and that a permit will NOT be approved for this project.

Among the adverse impacts are:

- This proposed pipeline would adversely impact the lands and waters of MA. There are many acres of conservation land protected under Article 97 of the MA constitution, other protected lands, farmlands, wetlands and private lands. Pipeline construction would forever alter these lands.
- Water is another concern. What steps will be taken to protect the groundwater which ultimately flows into private wells and underground aquifers, streams, rivers, wetlands, swamps, and ponds? How will all these waters be protected from the toxic chemicals that will be emitted by the pipeline components as the pipeline is constructed?
- Will horizontal drilling be employed to install the pipeline under aqueducts, railroad crossings, streams and ponds? Horizontal drilling can have adverse impacts on land and water through which the drill passes. What measure will be taken to protect the water, and the land and the property above? .
- Methane is much more harmful to the environment than either oil or coal. Methane will be released along the pipeline, especially at pigging stations and compressor stations. How will nearby residents be protected from the harmful effects of methane emissions as well as other toxic chemicals in the gas transmitted through the pipeline? What measures will be taken for noise abatement, especially at compressor stations?
- Has the alleged need for a pipeline been thoroughly analyzed? Massachusetts has legislative mandate to reduce its dependence on fossil fuels in favor of sustain renewable and sustainable energy. In Massachusetts, the use of fossil fuels is declining and the use of alternative energy sources, such as solar is rising. Why is this not being taken into account?
- There is much evidence which indicates that most of the natural gas to pass through these proposed pipelines is for export to international markets. More natural gas than New England could ever use is projected to flow through this pipeline. This would cause the pipeline to be overbuilt and who will benefit from that?
- In addition, it has been proposed to pass the cost of constructing the pipeline on to electric ratepayers. This is a boon to the pipeline companies and a financial burden for ratepayers for decades to come with no benefit to the New England states.
- Natural gas pipelines have high accident rates, many resulting in death and serious injury. The pipeline will pass through many densely populated Massachusetts towns. What measures will be taken to ensure public safety and very quick response to problem areas. How will the public be protected from the noise of pigging and compressor station?

Until all of these questions have been thoroughly analyzed and answered, we believe that FERC should not approve any certificate for any pipeline in Massachusetts. No certificate should be issued until an honest and thorough analysis has been completed for any need for natural gas in Massachusetts.

In closing, we believe that the potential adverse effects of a pipeline far outweigh any alleged need for natural gas in Massachusetts and that no permit should be issued..

Berlin Pipeline Study Committee

Maryanne MacLeod, Chair
45 Swett Hill Rd.,

Sterling, MA 01564

Committee Members:

Marsha Johnston

Baker Rd.

Berlin, MA 01503

Paul Keleher

35 Barnes Hill R d.

Berlin, MA 01503

Philip Rainville

115 Barnes Hill Rd.

Berlin, MA 01503

A printed, signed copy has been mailed.

cc: Senator Jennifer Flanagan

Representative Harold Naughton

Governor Charles Baker

Secretary Beaton

20151116-0079

Wilton, NH Conservation Commission

P.O. Box 83

Wilton, NH 03086

November 9, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First St. NE, Room IA

Washington, DC 20426

Re: Docket Number PF 14-22

Dear Secretary Bose,

The Wilton, NH Conservation Commission wishes to go on record as opposing the NED pipeline proposed by Kinder Morgan.

On October 12, 2015, the Wilton Conservation Commission passed the enclosed Statement of Position. In doing so, we join the 35 (st last count) New Hampshire conservation commissions who have publicly objected to this proposal.

Jeffrey R. Stone

for the Wilton, NH Conservation Commission

encl: Wilton NH Conservation Commission Position on NED Pipeline

**Wilton NH Conservation Commission Position
On Proposed NED Pipeline**

The Wilton, NH Conservation Commission strongly opposes the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Pipeline proposed by Kinder Morgan:

1. A compressed gas pipeline, especially one put underground, out of sight and out of reach, puts plants, wildlife, and aquifers; thus, people's health - at risk. The WCC notes that all of Wilton's drinking water is pumped from wells in Wilton, from aquifers that know no man-made boundaries.
2. The size and proximity of the proposed compressor station poses significant health, safety and envi-

ronmental hazards due to routine as well as accidental discharges of, compounds that have known health risks and unregulated, compounds into the atmosphere. These discharges have the potential for fire and/or explosion in close proximity ('li mile) to the Temple elementary school and to lands now being conserved by Wilton, Temple, Greenville, and Mason, among others.

3. The noise impact of a compressor station of the proposed magnitude is entirely out of keeping with the rural, natural character of the area surrounding the proposed site; This will severely degrade the quality of life for people within earshot. In addition, it will degrade the surrounding wildlife habitat the Wilton Conservation Commission is charged with protecting.
4. The proposed pipeline will transport gas obtained by Hydraulic Fracturing (HF).HF is process we re-ject for the same reasons and for their similar consequences: the injection of unspecified and unregu-lated compounds into the environment regardless that the process may take place "somewhere else". The WCC reminds FERC, Kinder Morgan, and the public, that the price of a fuel does not necessar-ily reflect its cost, and that the real costs are seldom home by the end users.
5. We do not support efforts, especially "dirty" ones, to extend the existing fossil fuel infrastructure at the cost of distracting effort and dollars from, and thus delaying the search for, and development of cleaner and more sustainable energy sources.

Bart Hunter 10/12/15
for the Wilton, NH Conservation Commission

20151116-0148

METHUEN HISTORICAL COMMISSION
CITY OF METHUEN, MASSACHUSETTS
THE SEARLES BUILDING
41 PLEASANT STREET, METHUEN, MA 01844

RE Docket No. PF14-22-000

November 8, 2015

Dear Ms. Bose,

I am writing you regarding the proposed Kinder Morgan project to increase the size ofthe present pipeline in my city from 10"to 20",thus causing two historical areas in the community to be severely impacted by this proposal. Although the pipeline in question was installed previously, I feel any more further activity at the two areas in question, would again cause 'irreparable damage. The two historical areas in danger are as follows: Cross Street just before Hampshire Roads which was the birthplace of Major Robert Rogers, born here November 7, 1731.The site is under consideration by the ~usetts Historical Commission for a future ar-cheological survey. Robert Rogers, with his Sunous Rogers Rangers, helped defend New England's northern frontier between 1755 and 1763 during the French and Indian War period. Author Kenneth Roberts wrote a novel of Roger's fame titled Northwest Passage, which was also made into a movie in 1939and starred Spencer Tracy. The other historical site is the Sand's Bridge, named sitar a local family named Sands. This bridge was built in 1835, and is the last stone bridge remaining in it's original condition, without cement, on the abandoned section of Hampshhe Road which was located over the old channel ofthe Spicket River. Any type of ground disturbance will most certainly impact this particular historic bridge. The Commission feels that this proposal to increase the size ofthe pipeline would be most rlsm~mng to these two sites.

Thank you for anything that you can do to stop this project fmm happening.

Sincerely,

Joseph G. Bells, Chairman, Methuen Historical Commission

20151116-0160

Hand written card, Lesley Finlayson, 167 Heald Road, Wilton, NH 03086: opposing.

20151116-0163

Kimberly Bose, Secretary
FERC
888 First Street, N.E.
Washington, DC 20426

STOP THE NED PIPELINE!!

Protect NH land from Eminent Domain!

I oppose. the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) EXPORT pipeline. The pipelines, and compressor station will scar the NH landscape and put our water, wildlife, forests, agricultural lands and rural character at risk. These include health and safety risks from emissions, industrialization, pollution and the devastating effects of fire and explosions. Greed, not need is fueling this project. Say NO to this private company that will TAKE OUR LANDS with NO BENEFIT TO US.

David Kenneth Ogden
8 Cider Mill Way
Billerica, MA 01821

20151116-0164

{same text as 20151116-0163 above, signed by: }

Melissa Durant
3 Lucille Ave
Salem, NH 03079

20151116-0165

{same text as 20151116-0163 above, signed by: }

Mary Ashburn
3 Misty Meadow Rd
Windham, NH 03087

20151116-0166

{same text as 20151116-0163 above, signed by: }

Robert Souza
17 Harwood Rd
Windham, NH 03087

20151116-0167

{same text as 20151116-0163 above, signed by: }

Mark Daly
2 Karen Road
Windham, NH 03087

20151116-0168

{same text as 20151116-0163 above, signed by: }

Sarah Snyder
373 Pembroke St
Pembroke, NH 03275

20151116-0169

{same text as 20151116-0163 above, signed by: }

Christine Houle
6 Shirley St
Hampstead, NH 03841

20151116-0170

{same text as 20151116-0163 above, signed by: }

Brighid Dugan
300 N. River Rd, Apt. 410
Manchester, NH 03104

20151116-0171

{same text as 20151116-0163 above, signed by: }

Lisa Kennedy
48 Waterford Dr
Sandown, NH 03873

20151116-0172

{same text as 20151116-0163 above, signed by: }

David Kennedy
48 Waterford Dr
Sandown, NH 03873

20151116-0173

{same text as 20151116-0163 above, signed by: }

Bill Dillon
7 Wendell Dr
Brentwood, NH 03833

20151116-0174

{same text as 20151116-0163 above, signed by: }

Karen Hatch
29 Lancaster Crossing Rd
Salem, NH 03079

20151116-0175

{same text as 20151116-0163 above, signed by: }

Siobhan Tully
2 Karen Road
Windham, NH 03087

20151116-0191

**Court of Common Council
City of Hartford, Connecticut**

November 6, 2015

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

RE: Resolution in Opposition to the Construction of a Pmposed Gas Pipeline through Connecticut River/
Park River Watershed

Dear Secretary Bose:

Please find attached to this cover letter a copy of a resolution I will be introducing before the City of Hartford's Court of Common Council meeting on November 23, 2015 in opposition to the construction of a proposed gas line through the Connecticut River/Park River Watershed from which the City of Hartford draws its drinking water.

I urge you to contact the Court of Common Council so that we can work together to find an alternative solution to this problem.

Sincerely,

Cynthia R. Jennings, Councilwoman
Telephone: 860.757.9565
Email JENNC002@hartford.gov

INTRODUCED BY:
Councilwoman Cynthia R. Jennings

Court of Common Council
City of Hartford, November 23, 2015

Resolution in Opposition to the Construction of a Proposed Gas Pipeline through the Connecticut River/Park River Watershed

Whereas, the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company ("TGPC"), a subsidiary of Kinder Morgan Energy Partners, has proposed the expansion of a gas pipelirie in response to increased demand for natural gas in Connecticut; and

Whereas, the proposed project includes 14.8miles of pipeline from East Granby to Farmington, including 5.7 miles routed through Metropolitan District Commission property; and

Whereas, TGPC hosted a public forum on the project in West Hartford on October 7, 2015; and;

Whereas, TGPC has failed to host any public forums on this project with Hartford elected officials, residents of Hartford, or environmental leaders; and

Whereas, the proposed expansion of a gas pipeline in our Watershed, may have an impact on water for Hartford residents; and

Whereas, TGPC acknowledged that it has had safety incidents and pipeline spills at sites throughout the country; and

Whereas, Hartford environmental leaders and Hartford residents have been made aware that discussions are currently taking place that will require that the ratepayers pay for this construction by private developers for this pipeline, and

Whereas, many members of the public have expressed concern about the proposed gas pipeline project, including representatives of the Metropolitan District Commission ("MDC"), Connecticut Sierra Club, the Connecticut Coalition for Environmental Justice (CCEI), the Advisory Commission on the Environment (ACOTE), Mitchell Environmental Health Associates, and the Connecticut Forest and Park Association; and

Whereas, Harfford environmental leaders have numerous concerns relative to this proposed gas pipeline, including the long term need for the pipeline and its cost, given the trend of increasing energy conservation, the falling price and increasing availability of renewable energy, and the trend toward distributed generation; and

Whereas, members of the City of Hartford Court of Common Council Committee on the Environment, and other council members, share similar concerns about the potential impact of the project on Hartford’s drinking water; and

Whereas, it is apparent that TGPC has not done due diligence relative to meeting with towns impacted by the reservoir ‘n question, Hartford elected officials, environmental leadership, Hartford residents and environmental organizations sited within the City of Hartford, an environmental justice city as well as the Capital City of this State, with a predominantly Black and Latino population; and

Whereas, any disruption to the drinking water of any municipalities in this region, will ultimately affect the drinking water of all of the municipalities in this region; and

Whereas, TGPC’s proposal will be officially filed with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (“FERC”) in the near future, with Hartford elected officials, Hartford environmental leadership, and Hartford residents having been excluded from any public comment related to this proposed gas pipeline; and

Whereas, FERC’s acceptance of public comments on the proposed gas pipeline ended on October 16, 2015 **without** any comments being solicited or received from the Capital City, elected leaders, environmental leaders, or Hartford residents; and

Whereas, the proposal will be officially filed with the FERC in the near future, and FERC’s acceptance of public comments on the proposal ended on October 16, 2015.

Now, Therefore, Be it Resolved, that the City of Hartford Court of Common Council hereby expresses its opposition to the TGPC project in its current form based on the fact that Hartford leadership and its residents were not engaged in the planning and comment process; and

Be it Further Resolved, that the City of Hartford Court of Common Council requests that TGPC representatives conduct additional public forums and public information sessions in advance of any FERC filing, and include Hartford elected leadership, Hartford environmental leadership, and Hartford residents in any future public comment relative to the gas pipeline project; and

Be it Still Further Resolved, that this and any other proposed project affecting Hartford drinking water, either directly or indirectly, will include participation of Hartford residents, elected officials, and environmental leadership; and

Be it Finally Resolved, that this resolution be communicated to TGPC, Kinder Morgan Energy Partners, FERC, MDC, the Connecticut Congressional delegation and the office of the Governor.

20151116-5137

Timothy Leak, Mason, NH.

September 17, 2015

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

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (“TGP”)

Docket No. PF14-22-000: Proposed Northeast Energy Direct (“NED”)

Dear Ms. Bose:

The Mason School Board (SAU 89) wishes to speak against approval of the construction and operation of the proposed Northeast Energy Direct natural gas pipeline outlined in the aforementioned docket.

Mason is a small, rural town of approximately 1,400 residents. However, our town is currently being sited for parts of both the main 30” high-pressure gas pipeline running to Dracut, MA and the 12” spur to Fitchburg, MA. Our school district maintains two major bus routes, both of which cross over the proposed pipeline routes multiple times during each run of the route. In fact, just the two buses alone would be required

to cross over the pipelines a total of ten times each day. We feel that this constitutes an undue and inappropriate risk for our students.

The Mason Elementary School also serves as a community center for both our students and our surrounding families. We fear that the school would be gravely unprepared to provide for the needs of the community in the face of a gas explosion or related natural disaster, especially given that our town is served by a volunteer Fire Department with limited resources and without training in how to handle such an emergency. From reports of previous disasters related to gas pipelines and from the potential requirement for blasting during construction of the proposed project, we believe that there is a significant risk for reduction in the air quality within the district and for the contamination of our local drinking water.

In a referendum earlier this year, the town of Mason voted overwhelmingly to oppose the proposed Northeast Energy Direct project, citing numerous concerns over the potentially adverse social, economic, and environmental effects of the proposed pipeline. The Mason School Board shares these concerns and feels that the pipeline project would substantially and unnecessarily increase the risks to health and well-being of our students and faculty, their families, and to the local residents of our district.

Please include this letter as part of the public record for the docket referenced above.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Doyle,
Chairman, Mason School Board, SAU 89

cc:

Gov. Maggie Hassan
Sen. Jeanne Shaheen
Sen. Kelly Ayotte
Rep. Ann Kuster
State Rep. Jack Flanagan
State Rep. Chris Adams
State Rep. Kevin Avard
Executive Councilor David Wheeler
Kinder Morgan Public Affairs, Allen Fore
Chairman, Mason Selectmen, Bernard O'Grady

20151116-5217

P • L • A • N
PIPE LINE AWARENESS NETWORK
for the NORTHEAST, Inc
www.plan-ne.org

November 16, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street NE, Room 1A
Washington, DC 20216

Re: Docket No. PF14-22, TGP Northeast Energy Direct – Setting Deadline for Intervention

Dear Secretary Bose:

We write in anticipation of Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. (“TGP” or the “Company”) filing an application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity for the proposed Northeast Energy Direct (“NED”) pipeline project. The Company has announced that it will submit this application to the Commis-

sion on this Friday, the 20th of November.

We of course expect that the Commission will thoroughly review the Company's filing and reject it pursuant to 18 C.F.R. 157.8 if the Commission determines that TGP's application is not in full compliance with, among other things, the Minimum Filing Requirements under 18 C.F.R. 380, Appendix A. We understand that the Commission has ten business days to make this determination.

If the Commission does accept the NED application, please allow a minimum of 45 days for stakeholders to intervene, rather than the typical 21 days. Under 18 C.F.R. 157.10, the Commission has the discretion to fix the time in which stakeholders may intervene, and the facts warrant longer than 21 days in this case. While the specific contours of this proposed project continue to shift, the NED project has been proposed to involve over 400 miles of pipeline to be installed in five states, with nine compressor stations and numerous meter stations, pigging stations and valves. Thousands of landowners have been contacted as potentially impacted by the Company's preferred route or alternate routes. Changes to the proposed route have been issued on an ongoing basis, so that many landowners are only recently learning that they may be directly impacted by the project.

With the anticipated filing date, a 21-day time period would end right in the middle of the holiday season. Twenty-one calendar days would include days when municipal offices of impacted communities are closed by law or custom. There is simply no need to disrupt thousands of lives during this busy time of year with arbitrary deadlines when people are trying to enjoy the holidays and time with their families.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathryn R. Eiseman, President
17 Packard Road
Cummington, MA 01026
eiseman@plan-ne.org

20151117-0006

Hand written letter, Juanita L. Powell: opposing.

20151117-0008

Hand written card, Herb Kimsey, 44 Walnut St, Arlington, MA 02476: opposing

20151117-0009

{same text as 20151116-0163 above, signed by: }

Priscilla Duvernay
4 Wallace Street
Antrim, NH 03440

20151117-0010

{same text as 20151116-0163 above, signed by: }

Martha Prizio
PO Box 3
Windham, NH 03087

20151117-0011

{same text as 20151116-0163 above, signed by: }

Susan Ellsworth
17 Summer Street
Antrim, NH 03440

20151117-0012

{same text as 20151116-0163 above, signed by: }

David J. Ogden
8 Cider Mill Way
Billerica, MA 01821

20151117-0013

{same text as 20151116-0163 above, signed by: }

Ann E. Ogden
8 Cider Mill Way
Billerica, MA 01821

20151117-0014

{same text as 20151116-0163 above, signed by: }

Allyson Ogden
202 Halls Village Rd
Chester, NH 03036

20151117-0015

{same text as 20151116-0163 above, signed by: }

Priscilla Wells
40 Bridge St
Milford, NH 03055

20151117-0016

{same text as 20151116-0163 above, signed by: }

Denise Wells
102 Cheney Ave #2
Peterborough, NH 03458

20151117-0017

{same text as 20151116-0163 above, signed by: }

Cheryl O'Brien
17 Glance Rd
Windham, NH 03087

20151117-0018

{same text as 20151116-0163 above, signed by: }

Candace Bergstrom
PO Box 371
Stoddard, NH 03464

20151117-0019

{same text as 20151116-0163 above, signed by: }

Sarah J. Wells
2 Haven Lane

Exeter, NH 03833

20151117-0020

{same text as 20151116-0163 above, signed by: }

Marie Wells
128 Savage Rd,7-B
Milford, NH 03055

20151117-0021

{same text as 20151116-0163 above, signed by: }

Jordan Duvernay
4 Wallace Street
Antrim, NH 03440

20151117-0022

{same text as 20151116-0163 above, signed by: }

Jessica Paquette
2 Haven Lane
Exeter, NH 03833

20151117-0023

{same text as 20151116-0163 above, signed by: }

Catherine Wells
PO Box 174
Newbury, NH 03255

20151117-0024

{same text as 20151116-0163 above, signed by: }

Leah Wells
128 Savage Rd,7-B
Milford, NH 03055

20151117-0046

**FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, DC 20426**

November 16, 2015

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN
The Honorable Chris Gibson
U.S. House of Representatives
P.O. Box 775
Kinderhook, NY 12106

Dear Congressman Gibson:

Thank you for your October 15, 2015, letter regarding Tennessee Gas' proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project (Docket No. PF14-22-000).

The Project is currently in the Commission's pre-filing process, during which numerous environmental surveys and studies are being performed concurrently by the applicant. Commission staff is reviewing the in-

formation gathered by the applicant and requesting additional information from Tennessee Gas. The purpose of the pre-filing process is to increase the applicant's and Commission staffs understanding of the issues that should be addressed in the formal application and in the subsequent environmental impact statement (EIS) for the project. The EIS will analyze the environmental issues, public safety, socioeconomic impacts, and alternative pipeline routes and compressor station locations. I assure you the document will not be issued without the Commission having all of the information necessary to determine the potential impacts associated with constructing and operating the Project.

On June 30, 2015, Commission staff issued the Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the Planned Northeast Energy Direct Project. Request for Comments on Environmental Issues, and Notice of Public Scoping Meetings. This initiated the formal public scoping period and indicated the locations, dates, and times for the public scoping meetings. The Commission subsequently extended the comment period until October 16, 2015. During the pre-filing process, Commission staff has attended Tennessee Gas' public open house meetings and conducted 14 scoping meetings along the project route. In addition, Commission staff has attended numerous community meetings. To date, we have received more than 6000 individual comment letters on the Project. Once the draft EIS is issued, there will be an additional comment period, as well as another round of public meetings to obtain public input on the draft EIS. All of the comments received during the review process will be carefully considered before the Commission makes a decision on the Northeast Energy Direct Project.

I encourage you and your constituents to continue to participate in the review of the Project, and to file any comments that you believe will help the Commission consider this matter.

As in any Commission matter, please be assured that we strive to make our review of proposals both accessible and transparent to the public. If I can be of any further assistance in this or any other Commission matter, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Norman C. Bay
Chairman

20151118-0014

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

Project Docket Number: PF14-22

October 17, 2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access

As the owners of the property located at 30 Burbank Rd., Londonderry, NH 03053, and partial owners of adjacent lot 29B-8 we have and 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. Any physical entry onto our property will be considered unauthorized, and treated as trespass. Thank you.

Kevin Ruppel
Roxanne Ruppel

20151118-0016

Hand written letter, 3 pages, Andrea Allen, 70 Cart Path Rd, Dracut, MA 01826: opposing.

20151118-5003

Evelyn Taylor, New Ipswich, NH.

I am calling for an immediate HALT to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's (TGP) pursuit of the Northeast Energy Direct Project pipeline as the route has been constantly changing and we have received inaccurate information and no response to many of our questions to Kinder Morgan and TGP thus we have not been offered a fair and just process of researching and responding to the impacts of this pipeline. This is a very serious matter that demands an immediate halt and a thorough investigation into the deceptive practices that have been used by Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Gas Pipeline, such as:

In March 2015 Kinder Morgan told us at Mascenic High School that New Hampshire was not getting any of this gas. We contested the need and public good of that expectation and only then did they make attempts to try to disguise their true intended use of this pipeline. The primary use of this pipeline is not to service the United States.

Kinder Morgan published a statement that all impurities will have been removed from this gas in the pipeline and that it is safe. It is now proven by scientists and doctors that people exposed to the emissions, particularly from compressor stations, are suffering serious and life threatening illnesses.

Many other deceptive events have also occurred and repeatedly occurred.

This demands a full investigation and an immediate halt to this project.

20151118-5058

{ skip to end of 20151118-5058 }

**THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
ONE ASHBURTON PLACE
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02108**

MAURA HEALEY
ATTORNEY GENERAL

TEL:(617)727-2200
www.mass.gov/ago

November 18, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, DC 02426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., Docket No. PF 14-22-000
Northeast Energy Direct Project; Submission of Massachusetts Attorney
General Maura Healey's Study of New England Electric Reliability Options

Dear Secretary Bose:

The Office of Massachusetts Attorney General Maura Healey (AGO) is pleased to submit our study of New England electric reliability options. Power System Reliability in New England: Meeting Electric Resource Needs in an Era of Growing Dependence on Natural Gas, prepared by Analysis Group, Inc. (the "Study"). The Study evaluates options to address regional electricity reliability in New England, including natural gas capacity needs, through 2030.

This submission is offered pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act, as part of the pre-filing process for the Northeast Energy Direct interstate gas pipeline project ("NED Project"). In the AGO's detailed comments on the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for the NED Project, we indicated that we would be filing the Study with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) upon the Study's completion. See Scoping Comments of Massachusetts Attorney General Maura Healey, PF 14-22-000 (Oct. 16, 2015) (hereafter, AGO Scoping Comments), at 8-9. The AGO further requests that this submission be included and considered as part of the full FERC administrative record for the NED Project's application for

a certificate of public convenience and necessity.

The Study's findings fundamentally call into question any reliability-based need for the NED Project, as proposed by applicant Tennessee Gas Pipeline, L.L.C. (Tennessee Gas).¹

We provide below a brief summary of the Study's conclusions and their relevance to the above-docketed proceeding:

First, the Study finds that, under status quo conditions and using very conservative assumptions, **the reliability of New England's power system can and will be maintained over time without new interstate natural gas pipeline capacity, including at the time of winter peak demand.** The Study utilizes a conservative reliability planning perspective—namely, with every judgment and assumption the Study errs on the side of overstating the need for electricity generation, and understating the level of resources available to meet that need. The Study models the need for gas-fired generation to meet the region's electrical load requirements in each year through 2030, and compares that to a forecast of gas that could actually be available for electricity generation. The Study finds that under existing market conditions, we can expect no electric sector reliability deficiency through 2030, and that no additional pipeline gas capacity is needed to meet electric reliability needs. This finding reflects the combination of declining winter peak demand and the success of new ISO-NE market initiatives that provide strong financial signals for resource developers and operators of existing assets to ensure unit reliability during periods of winter gas scarcity.

Second, the Study goes beyond conservative reliability planning assumptions and assesses a “stressed system” case in which New England becomes even more reliant on natural gas-fired power than anticipated, and experiences a short-term disruption in other fuels—causing the electric system to be more stressed than expected on very cold days. In the “stressed system” case, the Study finds a maximum reliability deficiency of roughly 2,400 MW by 2030, with deficiencies in no more than 26 hours over 9 winter days.

Third, the Study assesses “solution sets” to meet the reliability need identified in the “stressed system” case by comparing their respective ratepayer costs and effects on regional greenhouse gas [GHG) emissions. These approaches include market-driven solutions (including oil backup (dualfuel) capability at natural gas power plants and firm contracts for liquefied natural gas (LNG) delivery to power plants), natural gas pipeline expansion, and renewable/distributed resource investments (including energy efficiency, demand response, and low carbon imports from neighboring areas with and without new transmission lines). The Study uses the market-oriented dual-fuel solution set as the baseline for assessment of other solution sets. Based on modeling of New England's electric prices and through 2030, the Study finds with respect to:

(1) Market-driven solutions:

- a. electricity markets would likely meet any deficiency need through the addition of dual-fuel capability at existing facilities, and/or by contracting for LNG;
- b. however, market-based solutions fail to offer outcomes consistent with the climate change programs and goals of the New England states and would not necessarily achieve the states' mass-based GHG emission goals under EPA's Clean Power Plan (CPP goals).

(2) Electric ratepayer investment in new interstate natural gas pipeline capacity:

- a. the construction of additional gas capacity could address the identified stressed system deficiency, provided such capacity was fully reserved for delivery to electricity generators under coincident winter peak conditions for heating and electricity generation;
- b. investment in new gas capacity would generate significant wholesale electricity price benefits but would also require up-front ratepayer commitments; and
- c. investment in new interstate natural gas pipeline capacity fails to offer outcomes consistent with the climate change programs and goals of the New England states or with the states' CPP goals.

(3) Renewable/distributed investments:

- a. additional investment in energy efficiency and demand response measures is the most cost-effec-

tive and clean option for meeting any future electric reliability need, fully addressing the stressed system reliability deficiency, delivering the most wholesale electricity price benefits, and significantly reducing GHG emissions;

- b. firm imports of low-carbon resources from outside New England on existing transmission lines, when combined with energy efficiency and demand response measures, provide the greatest GHG emissions reductions of the reliability solutions studied;
- c. firm imports of low-carbon resources from outside New England on new transmission lines could address future reliability needs and reduce GHG emissions, but would result in net costs to electric ratepayers; and
- d. while these reliability solutions, which are sized and timed to meet the stressed system reliability deficiency, would meet the states' CPP goals, they fail to achieve state climate change goals, meaning that the states must take yet more aggressive actions to reduce GHG emissions.

Fourth, the Study examined the cost and GHG emission impacts of two large infrastructure projects: (1) new natural gas pipeline capacity that is larger than the stressed system reliability deficiency and installed earlier than needed; and (2) firm imports of distant low-carbon resources on new and existing transmission lines that are installed earlier than needed. These infrastructure scenarios demonstrate cost, risk, electricity price, and GHG emission impacts that are similar in nature but larger in size than like infrastructure that is sized and timed to meet the reliability need. Notably, the oversized natural gas pipeline infrastructure scenario would deliver less customer savings than are achievable with investment in energy efficiency and demand response. The firm imports infrastructure scenario was the most expensive option analyzed in the Study, but it provides the deepest GHG emission reductions and would achieve the New England states' current climate goals.

The Study underscores the critical importance of FERC's own rigorous evaluation of the nature and extent of the regional need for new gas capacity as part of its review of the NED Project. See AGO Scoping Comments at 5-13. In particular, and as discussed in the AGO's detailed scoping comments, Tennessee Gas intends to finance most of the NED Project's capacity [up to 0.8 Bcf/day] with long-term contracts with electric utilities paid for by electric ratepayers to serve natural gasfired electric generators. See AGO Scoping Comments at 7. In light of market conditions that will promote alternatives to new pipelines, the Study demonstrates that, under the status quo, there is no electric reliability deficiency that would justify electric ratepayer investment in the NED Project.²

Furthermore, the Study shows that electric ratepayer-funded gas pipeline investments like the proposed NED Project are more costly to ratepayers than comparable investments in cleaner alternatives, including energy efficiency, demand response, and firm low-carbon imports over existing transmission lines (when paired with energy efficiency). In this regard, the Study provides relevant data and analysis for FERC's use in analyzing the reasonable non-pipeline and non-gas alternatives to the NED Project. See AGO Scoping Comments at 15-16.

In fact, the Study finds that, unlike these alternatives, natural gas pipeline investments like the NED Project that seek to serve the power sector will increase regional GHG emissions relative to status quo market conditions. In light of this finding, FERC's NEPA-required analysis of the incremental GHG emissions in New England should determine that the NED Project, as proposed, cannot meet the New England states' climate goals or applicable federal CPP goals. See AGO Scoping Comments at 23-25.

The AGO requests that FERC fully consider the findings of the Study in the Environmental Impact Statement for the NED Project, including in the EIS's analysis of reasonable alternatives.

FERC also should take the findings of the Study into account as part of its overall review of the NED Project's application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity.

Attorney General Healey appreciates the Commission's willingness to consider the Study as part of its review of the NED Project and would also welcome the opportunity to discuss its Findings with the Commis-

sioners in other appropriate venues.

Respectfully submitted,
Melissa A. Hoffer,
Chief, Energy and Environment Bureau,
Christophe Courchesne,
Chief, Environmental Protection Division,
Matthew Ireland,
Assistant Attorney General,
Environmental Protection Division

Footnotes

- 1 .See AGO Scoping Comments, Section I, at 5-11 (“FERC should undertake a robust assessment of the need for additional natural gas capacity as the starting point for the EIS”).
- 2 The Study does not seek to address gas customer needs. As discussed in the AGO’s scoping comments, FERC should consider whether the gas capacity amounts under Tennessee Gas’s precedent agreements with New England local gas distribution companies (LDCs)—the only transportation service commitments currently supporting the NED Project’s development—are justified not only by the LDCs’ needs but also in absence of reasonable alternatives. See AGO Scoping Comments at 9-10.

Power System Reliability in New England

Meeting Electric Resource Needs in an Era of Growing Dependence on Natural Gas

Analysis Group, Inc.

Paul J. Hibbard
Craig P. Aubuchon

November 2015

Acknowledgments

This Report presents a review of winter electric resource needs in New England and compares the potential ways to meet those needs, considering both ratepayer cost and regional carbon emissions. This is an independent report by Analysis Group, Inc. (AGI) on behalf of the Massachusetts Office of the Attorney General (AGO), with funding from the Barr Foundation.

Throughout the project, AGI received input from the Office of the Attorney General, a Study Advisory Group comprising a wide spectrum of the region’s electric and gas industry stakeholders (listed on the next page), and Dr. Jonathan Raab of Raab Associates (who facilitated the Advisory Group process). The authors wish to thank the Barr Foundation, the AGO, the Study Advisory Group, and Dr. Raab for their input on the analysis presented in this report. The authors also would like to recognize the significant contributions of Pavel Darling, Christopher Llop, Justin Metz, and Dana Niu of AGI for their assistance with this project.

The analytic method, views and observations described in this study, however, are solely those of the authors, and do not necessarily reflect the views and opinions of AGI, the Office of the Attorney General, Dr. Raab, or any members of the Study Advisory Group.

About AGI

AGI provides economic, financial, and business strategy consulting to leading law firms, corporations, and government agencies. The firm has more than 700 professionals, with offices in Boston, Chicago, Dallas, Denver, Los Angeles, Menlo Park, New York, San Francisco, Washington, D.C., Montreal, and Beijing.

AGI’s energy and environment practice is distinguished by expertise in economics, finance, market analysis, regulatory issues, and public policy, as well as significant experience in environmental economics and energy infrastructure development. The practice has worked for a wide variety of clients including energy pro-

ducers, suppliers and consumers; utilities; regulatory commissions and other public agencies; tribal governments; power system operators; foundations; financial institutions; and start-up companies, among others.

Study Advisory Group

The Attorney General’s Office and AGI would like to thank the Advisory Group (listed below) for their invaluable feedback and input. The Advisory Group members served as a sounding board for the AGO and AGI throughout the modeling process. However, all of the modeling related decisions (including the modeling framework, assumptions, data choices, analysis, and conclusions) are the sole responsibility of the authors using their best professional judgment. Listing the Advisory Group members is not indicative of their concurrence or support for anything contained in this Report, and they may disagree with inputs, analysis, and observations set forth in it.

Study Advisory Group Members, Listed Alphabetically by Organization

- Peter Shattuck (Acadia Center)
- Bob Rio (Associated Industries of Massachusetts)
- Greg Cunningham (Conservation Law Foundation)*
- N. Jonathan Peress (Environmental Defense Fund)*
- James Daly (Eversource)
- Tony Scaraggi (LNG Importers)
- Michael Altieri (Massachusetts Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs)
- Charlie Harak (National Consumer Law Center, Inc.)
- Marcy Reed (National Grid Massachusetts)
- Dan Dolan (New England Power Generators Association, Inc.)
- Peter Rothstein, Janet Besser (alternate) (Northeast Clean Energy Council)
- Sue Coakley (Northeast Energy Efficiency Partnerships, Inc.)
- Tom Kiley (Northeast Gas Association)
- Cynthia Arcate (PowerOptions)
- Marc Hanks (Retail Energy Supply Association)
- David Littell (The Regulatory Assistance Project)

*shared seat

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Executive Summary	i
II. Introduction and Purpose	1
A. Emerging Challenges to Winter Power Supply	1
B. Purpose of the Study	4
C. Overview of Analytic Method	5
III. Power Supply Deficiency Analysis	6
A. Power Supply Deficiency Analysis	6
B. Deficiency Statement Results	14
IV. Potential Electric Sector Pathways to Ensure Reliability under “Stressed” System Conditions	16
A. Solution Sets	16
B. Infrastructure Scenarios	24
V. Assessment	25
A. Method	25
B. Results	30
VI. References	45

VII. Glossary	47
VIII. Appendices	49

FIGURES AND TABLES

Figure 1: Historical Relationship of Weather and Gas Demand, 2012-2015	9
Figure 2: Historical Weather Years, 2004-2015	10
Figure 3: Deficiency Duration Curve (2024-25 and 2029-30)	15
Figure 4: Pipeline Utilization and Natural Gas Prices, Winters 2012-2015	27
Figure 5: Forecasted Natural Gas Prices, By Solution Set	29
Figure 6: Evaluation of Electric Reliability Solution Sets, Annualized Impacts	33
Figure 7: Annualized Cost and Emission Impacts, By Solution Set	34
Figure 8: Annual CO2 Emissions and Potential ISO-NE Climate Goals	38
Figure A1: Scheduled Natural Gas Demand and Total Capacity, ISO-NE System	50
Figure A2: Total Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Potential Targets, New England	69
Table 1: Electric Sector Reliability Deficiency Analysis, 2020-2030	15
Table 2: Summary of Solution Sets	23
Table 3: Evaluation of Electric Reliability Solution Sets, Annualized (\$2015, mil)	31
Table 4: Evaluation of Additional Infrastructure Scenarios, Annualized (\$2015 mil)	36
Table 5: Risk Factors and Other Considerations Associated with Solution Sets	44
Table A1: Electric Sector Reliability Deficiency Analysis Sensitivity, 2020-2030	52
Table A2: Existing Liquefied Natural Gas Capability	56
Table A3: Unit Retirements	66
Table A4: Unit Additions	66
Table A5: Summary of State GHG Goals	68

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Context

The New England region currently relies on natural gas to produce 44 percent of its net electricity needs and its total generating capacity, a figure that could exceed 50 percent by 2024.[1] Our region’s dependence on natural gas for electricity generation raises concerns about the reliability of electricity supplies during winter peak conditions, when the region’s interstate pipeline system is largely committed for heating needs. It also raises concerns about costs. In years when there are frequent constraints with high utilization on interstate pipelines, prices within the region for spot purchases of natural gas often spike, leading to cost increases for electricity consumers. As generation from new, efficient natural gas plants drives down the output from legacy coal, oil, nuclear, and older natural gas generating facilities, the region may in the future become even more reliant on natural gas fired generation to meet peak electric demand. Increased reliance on natural gas and gas-fired generators that operate without firm natural gas transportation capacity has led to concerns about whether, on the coldest winter days, the region will have enough generating resources to maintain system reliability. As a result, some have suggested that additional gas pipeline capacity is needed in the region for power system reliability and price benefits.

At the same time, this transition away from legacy coal, oil and older natural gas units and towards new, efficient natural gas plants has driven down the greenhouse gas (GHG) emission intensity of the system and lowered total GHG emissions, consistent with regional policies. As discussed further in this Report, however, this trend is not sufficient to meet the region’s long-run climate objectives.

Study Purpose

The Massachusetts Attorney General’s Office retained Analysis Group, Inc. (AGI) to conduct an independent assessment of the region’s power system out to 2030 to determine the following:

1. *Could the region experience power system “deficiencies” – periods during peak winter demand when*

the electric system may not be able to meet peak electric demand?

- 2. If any such deficiencies are identified, what is the full suite of practical options for maintaining power system reliability – particularly during winter months – including but not limited to electric ratepayer funding for natural gas infrastructure?*

Then, considering the practical options identified for maintaining power system reliability:

- 3. What would be the relative costs to electric ratepayers associated with these options – both to implement the options and as a result of how they affect wholesale electric prices?*
- 4. To what extent do various options help achieve or impede New England states' obligations and goals with respect to GHG emission reductions?*
- 5. What other factors not captured in the quantitative analysis are relevant for consideration?*

This Report systematically reviews these questions to gain an understanding of whether the current system can maintain reliability and what the economic costs and benefits (to electric ratepayers) and GHG emission implications would be of either staying the course or pursuing a new path to meet the region's energy needs.

The purpose of this Report is to provide New England's policymakers and stakeholders with an independent and transparent assessment of the potential benefits and drawbacks associated with the various approaches to addressing the region's dependence on natural gas for electricity generation. We recognize that this is but one of many studies related to the region's dependence on natural gas, and that all studies require forecasting and judgment on highly variable and uncertain future market conditions. It is incumbent on policy makers and stakeholders to consider carefully the purpose, analytic method, and outcomes of all such analyses.

Study Method

Our analysis is focused on the New England region, reviewing system conditions through 2030. We forecast the need for gas-fired generation to meet the region's electrical load requirements in each year and compare that to a forecast of available natural gas supply, after subtracting out firm demand for gas by local gas distribution companies. Combined, we use these forecasts to estimate any potential "deficiencies" – or periods when the electric system may not be able to meet peak electric demand given constraints in natural gas transportation capacity. We model a "base case," which reflects severe winter conditions, the capability of non-gas fired generation, and market incentives that increase the availability of generation to help meet peak electric demands. We also model "stressed system" scenarios that assess the impact of varying increases (over our base case assumptions) in dependence on natural gas for electricity generation that may arise due to changes in the electric generation resource mix.

We then identify several "solution sets" that represent different approaches to meeting any identified reliability needs going forward, including market-driven ("status quo") solutions, natural gas pipeline expansion, and energy efficiency/renewable energy investments. We compare the solution sets from the perspective of electric ratepayers, reviewing both the up-front costs to implement the solutions and the potential benefits of the solutions due to their impact on wholesale energy market prices. We also compare the solutions with respect to their impact on states' abilities to meet GHG reduction obligations and targets.

Additionally, we review two "infrastructure scenarios" that involve the development of natural gas or transmission infrastructure projects that are either larger and/or brought into service earlier than needed to meet power system reliability. These scenarios capture a wider range of impacts above and beyond just electric reliability needs.

We carry out our analysis from a conservative reliability planning perspective – namely, with every judgment and assumption we err on the side of overstating the need for electricity generation, and understating the level of resources available to meet that need.

Key Findings

Under the base case analysis, power system reliability can and will be maintained over time, with or without additional new interstate natural gas pipeline capacity.

New England's existing market structure, including recent changes to address reliability during challenging system conditions at the time of winter peak demand, will provide the resources and operational practices needed to maintain power system reliability. The region will continue to rely on natural gas as the dominant fuel of choice, but we find that under existing market conditions there is no electric sector reliability deficiency through 2030. This result reflects both the declining long-term forecast of peak winter demand and the increasing availability of new non-gas resources, including dual-fuel capable units that can generate on oil during peak winter periods.

Under the stressed system sensitivities we modeled, power system reliability deficiencies emerge by the winter of 2024/2025.

We also modeled the impact of an increase (over our base case assumptions) in dependence on natural gas for electricity generation. We assume approximately 1,200 megawatts (MW) of additional non-gas fired capacity retirements (beyond our base-case assumptions) are replaced with gas-only resources, and further assume that approximately 20 percent of existing oil-fired resources in the region do not have oil at the time of winter peak demand (this represents approximately 1,800 MW of generation). Under this stressed system scenario, an electric reliability deficiency of approximately 1,675 MW arises in 2024, growing to approximately 2,400 MW in 2029/30. From the perspective of natural gas transportation capacity, this deficiency is the equivalent of approximately 0.42 billion cubic feet per day (Bcf/d). There are 26 hours of deficiency spread out over 9 total days, with only 2 days and 4 hours with a total deficiency greater than 2,000 MW in the 2029/30 winter in any scenario.

To meet this stressed system deficiency need, we considered five “solution sets” that could plausibly emerge given economics and currently-known technological capabilities, and/or that are specifically under consideration by the region's states and stakeholders. The impact of each solution set depends on how it affects price setting in wholesale power markets and also the required costs to implement each solution set. Each solution set also affects the ability of the region to meet its climate goals going forward. Reliability solution sets that reduce GHG emissions provide an incremental economic benefit by potentially lowering the cost of future compliance strategies.

Dual-fuel and/or Firm Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) Solution Sets

Absent any action by states, electricity markets would likely meet any deficiency need through the addition of dual-fuel capability at existing facilities, and/or by contracting for LNG.

New England has significant potential new dual-fuel capability at existing gas-only resources, and underutilized LNG storage and vaporization capacity that could be relied on by gas-fired generators. Absent any action by states to promote alternative solutions, reliability will most likely be maintained through a combination of these resources. This pathway may continue to experience periods of elevated winter prices, but will also require the least cost investment from ratepayers. Specifically, these two “market outcome” solution sets reviewed – involving the conversion of gas-only generation to dual-fuel capability, or the specific contracting on a multi-year basis of storage and delivery as needed of LNG by or for electricity generators – involve minimal up-front investment by consumers. Instead, these solutions would increase costs to the owners of generating assets to meet capacity and energy market obligations, and associated implementation costs would partly or fully flow through to ratepayers over time through existing wholesale market mechanisms.

Market-based solutions fail to offer outcomes consistent with the climate change programs and goals of the New England states.

These market outcome solution sets offer trajectories of GHG emissions that exceed the region's potential GHG reduction objectives. This level of excess potentially represents a failure to meet the region's climate goals and could increase GHG emission-reduction compliance costs for electric ratepayers over time.

Additional Natural Gas Pipeline Capacity Solution Set

The construction of additional natural gas pipeline capacity could address the identified stressed system deficiency, provided such capacity was fully reserved for delivery to electricity generators under coincident winter peak conditions for heating and electricity generation.

Long-term investment in firm interstate pipeline capacity would enable sufficient gas-fired electricity generation to meet winter peak needs under the stressed system scenario. Specifically, the reservation of approximately 0.3 Bcf/d or more by 2024, with an incremental 0.12 Bcf/d for a cumulative total of 0.42 Bcf/d or more by 2029 would be sufficient, provided the capacity is guaranteed for delivery to electricity generators at the time of winter peak, and could not be diverted (e.g., to meet unexpectedly high heating needs of natural gas local distribution company (LDC) customers).

Investment in new interstate pipeline capacity generates significant wholesale electricity price benefits but would require up-front and long-term ratepayer commitments.

Increasing natural gas transportation capacity in New England would lower wholesale electricity costs by lowering natural gas prices at times when the interstate pipeline system would otherwise face greater constraints, and thus higher natural gas price basis differentials. The annual average price suppression benefit is likely large enough to exceed the annualized cost to implement the solution set. However, this solution set places up-front costs and risk on ratepayers through significant long-term commitments to pay for the associated infrastructure.

The pipeline solution fails to offer outcomes consistent with the climate change programs and goals of the New England states.

The pipeline solution set offers a trajectory of GHG emissions that exceeds the region's potential GHG reduction objectives. This level of excess potentially represents a failure to meet the region's climate goals and could increase GHG emission-reduction compliance costs for electric ratepayers over time.

Energy Efficiency (EE), Demand Response (DR), and Renewable Energy (RE) Solution Sets

Increased investment in various combinations of EE, DR, and RE resources could address the identified stressed system deficiency, provided actions were taken to increase such investments beyond existing programs and their current trajectories.

There are many options to meet any identified deficiency need through expanded investment in EE, DR, and RE (through distant low-GHG resources transmitted across existing or new transmission capacity). We modeled three solution set combinations: 1) EE and DR sufficient to meet the need; 2) EE with imports of distant low-GHG energy using existing transmission lines, and 3) EE with imports of distant low-GHG energy using new transmission lines. The cost of low GHG imports reflects the fact that the capacity and energy must be guaranteed to be available at the time of, and for the duration of, winter peak conditions in order to address the region's reliability needs.

Investment in EE/DR represents the best solution from the perspective of ratepayer costs.

Sustained investment over time in EE and DR, above and beyond investment currently committed and expected due to existing state policies, has the greatest potential net consumer benefit. Further, this solution set represents a lower-risk pathway for ratepayers, since it involves flexible annual investments that can be altered over time in response to changing expectations around natural gas supply and demand, EE/DR technology development and resource cost, power system demand growth, and the addition and attrition of electric generating resources. That is, this effort also offers the potential to meet long term climate goals beyond 2030 with lower up-front capital investments. However, increased EE installations would require sustained commitment and action by New England states over the next decade.

Increased EE combined with new transmission and/or commitments to purchase firm capacity from distant low-carbon resources generates significant potential electricity price benefits but also involves significant ratepayer up-front investment obligations.

An EE solution set that includes the transmission of low-carbon and/or renewable resources to New England markets instead of DR could generate substantial wholesale electricity price savings, to the extent that imports displace higher-priced marginal generating resources. However, in order to represent a solution to meet reliability deficiency needs, such imports would need to be backed by firm capacity commitments, including delivery at the time of winter peak. The cost of such a capacity commitment, if combined with the cost of transmission investments, could exceed the electricity price suppression benefits associated with this solution. While imports of low-carbon resources that are not backed by firm commitments may be more economic and help the region meet climate goals, they do not represent a solution to any winter reliability need.

EE combined with firm imports of distant low-carbon resources on new or existing transmission lines provides the greatest benefits from the standpoint of GHG emissions.

Meeting winter system reliability deficiency needs through EE and firm imports of low carbon resources would achieve significant reductions in the emissions of GHG associated with electricity generation in the New England region relative to the status quo outcome. It would also provide increased flexibility to meet longer-term climate policy targets.

Infrastructure Scenarios

“Infrastructure scenarios” – involving major pipeline or transmission investments sooner and/or larger than needed to address reliability needs – amplify the impacts of similar solution sets.

In addition to reviewing solution sets designed to address the reliability need, we reviewed major infrastructure investments in natural gas transportation capacity that is larger and sooner than needed and transmission capacity that comes into operation sooner than needed. These infrastructure scenarios demonstrate cost, risk, electricity price, and GHG emission impacts that are similar in nature but larger in size than the pipeline and transmission solution sets sized and timed to address stressed system deficiencies.

Summary of Observations

Based on our analysis, we find that power system reliability will be maintained with or without electric ratepayer investment in new natural gas pipeline capacity. This outcome is consistent with the current and expected future conditions facing our region. New England has maintained reliability through cold winter conditions over the past few years, and going forward, the regional grid operator forecasts declining peak demand for electricity during winter months.[2] Further, recent changes to wholesale markets provide strong financial signals for resource developers and operators of existing assets to ensure unit reliability during periods of winter scarcity. In short, the combination of declining demand and the success of new market initiatives will likely accomplish intended results: power system reliability will be maintained going forward, including at the time of winter peak demand. However, the region may want to consider pathways that provide additional certainty of meeting identified deficiencies that may exist under a “stressed system” perspective.

Importantly, the different solution sets that meet the stressed system deficiency vary in fundamental ways from both ratepayer cost and climate policy perspectives. Certain options offer long-term price reducing benefits, but require major up-front investments by ratepayers; others require more measured investments, but also provide fewer price reductions for consumers. Thus there may be additional value that should be attributed to the “incremental” approaches to address the stressed system deficiency. This is particularly true given our finding that, under our base case assumptions, we find no deficiency over the forecast horizon.

This option value may also be important given the region’s GHG goals and commitments. With little to replace in the way of higher-emitting resources, solution sets that continue our growing dependence on natural gas for electricity generation do not appear sustainable relative to our region’s and our Nation’s evolving GHG emission reduction requirements and goals. Reliability solution sets that reduce GHG emissions provide an incremental economic benefit by potentially lowering the cost of future compliance strategies. In contrast, solution sets that fail to do so could require more significant investments at a later date.

As Figure ES1 (below) shows, only the EE/DR and EE/Firm Import (Existing Transmission) solution sets

solve the stressed system reliability deficiency in a way that both reduces ratepayer costs and reduces GHG emissions relative to the current market outlook of relying on dual-fuel capability. Both the pipeline solution set and the firm LNG solution sets can reduce total ratepayer costs but do not reduce total GHG emissions. Finally, a solution set that includes EE and the firm import of distant low-GHG energy over new transmission lines provides substantial GHG emission reduction benefits, but would lead to a net increase in total ratepayer costs after accounting for both the cost of firm energy supply and new transmission capacity. In general, however, imports without a firm capacity commitment may be available at a lower cost, which could help the region meet its climate goals independently of a focus on reliability needs.

Figure ES1: Annualized Cost and Emission Impacts, By Solution Set (\$2015 mil)

{Figure omitted}

Infrastructure scenarios that are larger and/or installed sooner than needed to meet the deficiency amplify the impacts of similar solution sets, but do not change the relative ranking of each option. These infrastructure scenarios demonstrate cost, risk, electricity price, and GHG emission impacts that are similar in nature but larger in size than the pipeline and transmission solution sets.

Executive Summary footnotes:

1 ISO-NE, Resource Mix. Available: <http://isone.org/about/what-we-do/key-stats/resource-mix>.

2 ISO-NE Capacity, Energy, Load and Transmission (CELT) Report, System Planning, May 1, 2015.

{Body of report omitted. Full 83 page report can be downloaded at: }

{ <http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/opennat.asp?fileID=14048326> }

{end of 20151118-5058}

20151118-5105

Marilyn S. Griska, Rindge, NH.

Who's land?

Without an actual civil engineering study it is difficult to determine exactly where personal property lines end and the Right of Way for the electrical power corridor begins. KM/TGP has been surveying any ROW that is not legally posted. It is a well known fact that the concept of collocation of the proposed natural gas pipeline is a true fantasy and marketing game. The pipe carrying the gas would corrode quickly if it were collocated under the existing electrical lines. This pipeline will require a significant enlargement of the ROW that now exists. It is indeed difficult to obtain a clear answer on just how much land it will entail; anywhere from 50 feet to 150 feet depending on which KM representative you happen to ask. Numerous letters were sent to FERC describing our concerns for aquifers, wells, wetlands and vernal pools.

There are vernal pools/ponds on three of the four properties on our street. All the pools are registered with the Harris Center in Hancock. All properties are adjacent to the ROW, and all the properties are posted to deny KM surveyors access. In spite of this mandate, two of the vernal pools have been flagged by surveyors. Many tags indeed surround this wetland complex. One tag in particular is disturbing in that it mentions a center line..of the pipe?

In a meeting with the NH State DES and SEC representatives on Monday, November 2 in Temple , Tim Drew of NH DES spoke of the States' concern for these essential bodies of water. The salamanders and frogs which breed in these pools are site specific, meaning they return year after year to the same site/pool. If the pool is gone, they often perish.

These are the "Good Neighbors" of KM. Our properties seem to be in the way of their plans and profits. When did we lose our essential right to own our lands?

You can be sure if KM/TGP files a NH application for this pipeline, "we the people" will fight for the protection of our lands and all the precious things they contain.

Eminent domain is the word that comes to mind; we'll fight for every tree, leaf and creature !

Marilyn Griska,
Rindge, NH.

20151119-0018

{same text as 20151116-0163 above, signed by: }

Carol Niewola
295 E. Deering Rd
Deering, NH 03244

20151119-0025

Dear Ms. Bose,

I am writing once again opposing the Kinder Morgan NED Pipeline Project. I am an affected land owner in the 1/2 mile "incineration zone" of the compressor station that is being proposed in new Ipswich NH. I am appalled at the fact that complete strangers in Washington feel they have the right to allow Kinder Morgan to occupy, pollute and render my home and property worthless. Where is the compensation, and the accountability? My family and I have worked hard and honestly to purchase and maintain our home and you have the audacity to take it away from us?

How are you going to sleep at night with the knowledge that YOU are poisoning children, and will also be personally responsible for future birth defects?

For the first time ever I am ashamed of my government I Have you added your names to the Kinder Morgans recipient of thirty pieces of silver?

Shame on You! /ORIGINAL

Mrs. Katherine Belanger
168 Tobey Hwy.
New Ipswich NH.
(Mailing address: PO Box 133, Greenville NH 03048)

20151119-4003

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
INTERAGENCY PRE-FILING CONFERENCE CALL

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC

Docket No: PF14-22-000

NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT PROJECT

October 29, 2015

Agencies in Attendance (list of attendees is attached):

- Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC)
 - o Cardno (FERC 3rd Party Contractor)
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
- National Park Service (NPS)
- PA Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (PADCNR) Forestry
- NY Department of Agriculture (NY Dept of Ag)
- NY State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC)
- NY Department of Transportation (NYDOT)

- MA Department of Conservation and Recreation (MA DCR)
- MA Department of Public Utilities (MA DPU)
- NH Public Utilities Commission (NH PUC)
- NH Department of Environmental Services (NH DES)
- NH Division of Historical Resources (NH SHPO)
- CT Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (CT DEEP)
- Berkshire Regional Planning Commission
- Southwest Region Planning Commission
- Franklin Regional Council of Governments
- Northern Middlesex Council of Governments

Meeting Summary

The conference call was conducted to review the general status of the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project, including the Project's schedule, field surveys, landowner coordination, and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process. Topics discussed included:

- Status
 - o Last data request was sent to Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LLC (Tennessee Gas) a couple of weeks ago. All agency representatives invited to this call should have received a copy of the data request from FERC.
 - o FERC drafting request for Tennessee Gas to respond to selected comment letters received after formal scoping period ended. Request will also include additional alternatives analysis and alternatives for compressor station locations. The request may or may not be submitted to Tennessee Gas before the application is submitted to FERC.
 - o Application anticipated to be submitted on November 20th. Tennessee Gas is not on the call today because they are completing a final page turn this week.
 - o Cooperating Agencies
 - Email Mr. Tomasi as soon as possible to request to be a cooperating agency.
 - Cooperating agencies cannot speak to Intervenors about the project, even if they are represent the same state.
 - Cooperating agencies will be listed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). May also be in the Scheduling Notice.
 - A new Scoping Notice may be issued based on changes (reroutes) made by Tennessee Gas anticipated in the application. Additional landowners may be affected by these reroutes. Cooperating agencies would be listed in a new Notice of Intent (NOI) if one is issued.
 - If FERC decides to issue another NOI, the scoping period could be opened for the whole project or just the area of the project that has been rerouted. FERC will have to wait until the application is reviewed to make that decision.
 - o Compressor Station Alternative Sites
 - FERC identified alternative locations for compressor stations in Dracut, MA. Also a few alternative compressor station locations were identified by FERC in NY and around New Ipswich, NH for additional analysis by Tennessee Gas.
 - Market Path Mid-3 Compressor Station, Franklin County, MA – FERC is still looking at alternatives for this site. NPS identified an overnight shelter on the New England Trail located 3/4 of a mile from this compressor station site. The shelter sleeps up to 16 people and does not have phone service. If there was an emergency, someone would have to physically go to the shelter to notify individuals potentially using it.
 - If the landowner is not willing to sell property identified as a potential site for a compressor

station, FERC does not typically require the company to use that alternative site.

- o Alternative Routes
 - I-90 Route Corridor – FERC identified micro-siting changes along this route
 - FERC identified a hybrid route west of Springfield, MA, directly south of existing Line 200, and adjacent to an existing pipeline. Alternative compressor station locations not yet identified along this route. FERC will identify these locations once the application is submitted.
 - A hybrid route alternative identified by FERC would follow original line 200 in Rensselaer County, NY.
 - FERC may create a map with identified alternative routes and compressor station locations to send to agencies.
- o Environmental Assessment (EA) for Dominion New Market Pipeline Project (CP14-497) recently issued by FERC contains substantial air quality text and rigorous air toxins analysis. Hazardous air pollutants and other air toxins from compressor stations and station blowdowns were modeled and compared to existing air quality for human health impacts. The human health assessment is an appendix in the EA. Issued October, 20, 2015.
- Tennessee Gas status update:
 - o All field surveys for areas accessible to Tennessee Gas anticipated to be complete by December 1, 2015. Additional species surveys will need to be continued next year.
 - o Surveys
 - Landowner approval for access is 55% for Supply path and 40% for Market path.
 - Eversource and National Grid approved survey access on their properties along the powerline.
- Miscellaneous
 - o FERC, NY State Agency Representatives, and Tennessee Gas had a meeting earlier in the week regarding permitting for compressor stations in NY.
 - o NY Dept. of Ag received a complaint from landowner in Albany County that Tennessee Gas claimed to be surveying on the National Grid right-of-way and actually flagged areas of his property. FERC received emails on this issue and they are considering how to address it.
 - o Once the application is submitted, FERC has up to 10 business days to review and issue the Notice of Application (NOA). If the minimum filing requirements are not met and/or a critical issue is missing it may take longer to issue the NOA.
 - o FERC Division of Pipeline Certificates issues the NOA in the Federal Register and the docket. The NOA is not sent to the public. Mr. Tomasi will send the NOA to agency contacts invited to this call.
 - o The NOA opens the 21-day window to register as an intervenor for the project. FERC's Office of General Council has accepted requests to intervene after the 21-day window, but strongly recommends filing requests within the stated timeframe.
 - o FERC will send additional data requests to Tennessee Gas after reviewing application
 - o The Interagency Conference calls will cease after the NOA is issued. FERC will only hold calls with Cooperating Agencies. All other agencies will have to get information on the project through the docket.
 - o FERC will issue a Notice of Schedule when they determine enough information has been provided to develop the DEIS. If additional scoping is necessary, an additional NOI will be available on the docket.
 - o Comments submitted during scoping will be collated and answered/addressed in the DEIS. Some

comments are grouped together and answered generally, some are specifically addressed in the DEIS.

- o CT Loop
 - Tennessee Gas does not have to survey alternative alignments unless FERC requires them to.
 - CT DEEP will submit comments on alternatives to CT Loop.
- o NED project is a conglomeration of several projects proposed by Tennessee Gas. The project is being proposed this way to avoid segmentation issues. It will either be approved or denied as a whole project, not just parts approved or denied by FERC.

Next Call

- Agency call will be held every 2 weeks.
- Next call scheduled for November 12, 2015.

List of Attendees

Organization	Name
FERC	Eric Tomasi
FERC	Elaine Baum
FERC (Cardno)	Wayne Kicklighter
FERC (Cardno)	Jennifer Wallace
FERC (Cardno)	Lorraine Woodman
FERC (Cardno)	Jackie Layton
USACE	Brad Sherwood
USACE	Amy Gitchell
USEPA	Tim Timmerman
USEPA	Bill Walsh-Rogalski
USFWS	Tim Sullivan
USFWS	Maria Tur
NPS	Mary Kruger
PA DCNR Forestry	David Mong
NY Dept of Ag	Matthew Brower
NYSDEC	Stephen Tomasik
NYSDEC	Mark Wythall
NY DOT	Unnamed Representative
MA DCR	Jennifer Howard
MA DPU – Siting Board	Stephen August
NH PUC	Bob Wyatt
NH DES	Owen David
NH SHPO	Edna Feighner
CT DEEP	Fred Riese
Berkshire Regional Planning Commission	Tom Matuszko
Southwest Region Planning Commission	Henry Underwood
Southwest Region Planning Commission	Tim Murphy
Northern Middlesex Council of Governments	Beverly Woods
Franklin Regional Council of Governments	Peggy Sloane

20151119-4007

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
 FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
INTERAGENCY PRE-FILING CONFERENCE CALL

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC

Docket No: PF14-22-000

NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT PROJECT

November 12, 2015

Agencies in Attendance (list of attendees is attached):

- Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC)
 - Cardno (FERC 3rd Party Contractor)
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)
- NY State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC)
- NY State Department of Parks and Recreation
- NY Department of Transportation (NY DOT)
- MA Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs (EEA) – MA Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) Office
- MA Attorney General’s Office
- MA Department of Public Utilities (DPU) – Siting Board
- NH Department Resources and Economic Development
- Nashua Regional Planning Commission
- Berkshire Regional Planning Commission
- Southwest Region Planning Commission
- Franklin Regional Council of Governments
- Northern Middlesex Council of Governments
- Tennessee Gas Pipeline (Tennessee Gas)
 - Hatch Mott (Contractor for Tennessee Gas)

Meeting Summary

The conference call was conducted to review the general status of the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project, including the Project’s schedule, field surveys, landowner coordination, and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process. Topics discussed included:

- Status
 - Alternatives Analysis
 - FERC is continuing alternatives analysis. They will be sending a comment letter to Tennessee Gas regarding compressor station alternative site locations and alternative routes after the Application is submitted.
 - A data request from FERC should be sent to Tennessee Gas soon after the Application is submitted.
 - Anticipated Application filing date is November 20th.
 - There will be one additional interagency call before Application is formally noticed by FERC. The call will be scheduled for December 3rd
- Tennessee Gas status update:
 - Tennessee Gas recently held Open Houses to inform the public about changes in the route and compressor station locations. They will hold additional meetings in support of its NH state permit application the 1st week of December 2015.
 - Dracut Compressor Station
 - The location for this compressor station has been moved to a former Exxon facility brown-field site.
 - The site is located further away from private residencies and noise sensitive areas than the previous Dracut compressor station location.
 - The site was proposed as an alternative location in earlier versions of the draft Resource

Reports, but was removed from consideration due to uncertainties associated with the status of site remediation. Since then Tennessee Gas learned that the site was remediated to comply with industrial standards.

- Moving the Dracut compressor station to this location allows Tennessee Gas to reroute the project mainline so that it is paralleling the powerline corridor for a longer length and will reduce the length of one of the laterals by approximately one mile.
- Address of the site is 970 Broadway Road, Dracut, MA.
- Exxon used to have a truck loading facility on the site with tanks. This site was where the contamination was found. Tennessee plans to construct the compressor station away from the remediated area, only using the remediated portion of the site for access to the compressor station.
- o Surveys
 - Preparing Federal permits which will likely be filed after November 20th.
 - Surveys for cultural resources, Threatened and Endangered species, and wetlands are ongoing where they have access
 - Eversource property surveys on fee land in New Hampshire have been initiated. Surveys have also been initiated on National Grid fee property.
 - Most of the information generated in surveys after October 1st surveys will not be included in the application on November 20th; however, this information will be filed with FERC as soon as possible.
 - Tennessee had a meeting in New Scotland, NY last week regarding the Wright compressor station and nearby bat hibernaculum. They discussed acoustical, noise, and vibration surveys at the known hibernaculum sites near the Iroquois station and the previous location for the Wright compressor station. These surveys will start next week.
 - Continuing to prepare State permits and Site Evaluation Committee (SEC) permits. They will be holding public pre-filing information sessions at the beginning of December for the NH SEC process. NH SEC filing will be in the first Quarter 2016 for NH. Tennessee has been reaching out to towns to identify wetland mitigation projects as part of the SEC process. They have had meetings with four towns thus far.
 - Waiting on permit from MA to conduct cultural surveys. They have completed Phase I walk-over surveys and sensitivity modeling.
 - Tennessee will continue to survey as weather permits in locations where they have access. They are hoping to have all surveys completed by December 1st.
 - Tennessee is planning to finalize aerial photography by Thanksgiving depending on weather.
 - No changes to report on survey access, still around 40%.
- Miscellaneous
 - o Process:
 - FERC has 10 business days to accept/reject the Application once it is filed.
 - If it is accepted, then a Notice of Application (NOA) will be issued on the docket only. The NOA is not sent to mailing list. FERC staff will email the NOA to the agencies on this call.
 - Intervenor – 21 day (calendar days) clock to register as an Intervenor begins when the NOA is issued.
 - FERC will draft and submit another data request to Tennessee within several weeks of the application being filed. Tennessee will have 20 days to respond formally to FERC in a separate filing.

- FERC may send a Project Update to all landowners after the NOA is issued to inform them of the status of the project.
- FERC will review the application and identify how the routes and other project facilities have changed since the draft Resource Report submittal. Based on this information, FERC will decide if a new Supplemental Notice of Intent (NOI) should be sent out to landowners so they have appropriate notice of the project and can comment on the project.
- Once FERC determines they have enough information to develop the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), they will send a Notice of Schedule to the project mailing list. The Notice of Schedule will include the date by which FERC will issue the Final EIS.
- FERC expects to complete a Draft EIS (DEIS), at earliest mid-year 2016. There will be a minimum 45 day comment period associated with the DEIS, which includes public comment meetings along the pipeline route. The number of meetings has not been identified at this time.
- After the DEIS comment period has ended FERC will start preparing the Final EIS and preparing comment responses.
 - o The docket number for this project will change when Tennessee files the Application. The project will be issued a CP16-XXX docket number. Eric Tomasi will attach the PF and CP docket numbers to every filing from Tennessee throughout the EIS process.
 - o After the application is submitted, FERC and MA will coordinate and communicate on NEPA and MEPA requirements so that the information included in both documents is consistent.

Next Call

- Next call scheduled for December 3, 2015. This will be the last Interagency call.
- Calls with FERC after this date are only open to agencies registered as a cooperating agency for this project.

List of Attendees

Organization	Name
FERC	Eric Tomasi
FERC	Elaine Baum
FERC (Cardno)	Wayne Kicklighter
FERC (Cardno)	Jennifer Wallace
FERC (Cardno)	Lorraine Woodman
FERC (Cardno)	Jackie Layton
USACE	Brad Sherwood
USEPA	Tim Timmerman
NYSDEC	Stephen Tomasik
NYSDEC	Patty Desnoyers
NYS Parks and Recreation	Diana Carter
NY DOT	Unidentified Representative
MA EEA – MEPA Office	Alexander Strysky
MA Attorney General’s Office	Matt Ireland
MA DPU – Siting Board	Stephen August
NH Department of Resources and Economic Development	Sabrina Stanwood
NH Department Resources and Economic Development	Amy Lamb
Berkshire Regional Planning Commission	Tom Matuszko
Southwest Region Planning Commission	Henry Underwood
Nashua Regional Planning Commission	Sara Siskavich
Northern Middlesex Council of Governments	Beverly Woods
Franklin Regional Council of Governments	Peggy Sloane
Tennessee Gas	Michael Letson
Tennessee Gas	Scott Long
Tennessee Gas	Mark Hamarich
Hatch Mott	John Quinlisk
Hatch Mott	Douglas Gibbons

20151119-5003

Holly B Koski, Rindge, NH.

I am just writing to express my disappointment about the “planned outage” for November 20th, 2015. The Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas “planned filing” must be expected to be very long.

I hope that the Interruptions will be will be fixed before the end of day - and that computer difficulties do not “suddenly - unexpectedly” happen.

from fercs notices-

Outage Notice: FERC.gov, FERC Online and eLibrary will experience brief service interruptions from 11:00 p.m. ET, Friday, November 20, 2015 to 3:00 a.m. ET, Saturday, November 21, 2015.

Thank You in Advance for making sure that the Online System will be up and running.

Holly Koski

20151119-5068

Meghan Stanley Bernier, Hudson, MA.

We want CLEAN ENERY NOW. I just want to say that people will remember if you do not oppose the

Kinder Morgan Pipeline North East Expansion project.

If you approve it will be a tragedy. My family lives in New Ipswich, New Hampshire and when you drive through there and the surrounding towns affected by the proposed pipeline route, you can clearly see that a large majority of people do not want the pipeline. We feel like it's being shoved down our throats.

No person in their right mind would be in favor of such a dangerous and destructive prospect.

As citizens we entrust you to represent our interests. Please push for clean energy now. Will you ever become a responsible, responsive regulatory agency? By which we mean regulate? As opposed caving in to corporate profiteering?

I urge you to speak up and oppose all aspects of the Kinder Morgan Tennessee Gas Pipeline project.

A concerned citizen,

Meghan Stanley Bernier

20151119-5184

**Municipal Coalition Against the Pipeline
NH Municipal Pipeline Coalition
Northeast Municipal Gas Pipeline Coalition**

November 20, 2015

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

Dear Chairman Bay:

Northeast Municipal Gas Pipeline Coalition, Municipal Coalition Against the Pipeline, and NH Municipal Pipeline Coalition are regional groups of municipal officials who meet to review and assess the potential impacts of Tennessee Gas/Kinder Morgan's Northeast Energy Direct (NED) project. Our communities represent thirtyeight (38) municipalities, home to over 375,000 people in Massachusetts^[1] and New Hampshire. We write today to ask the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) to combine the proposals for additional gas pipeline capacity in New England into one consolidated FERC review. This should include, but not be limited to:

- Tennessee Gas/Kinder Morgan's Northeast Energy Direct (NED),
- Tennessee Gas/Kinder Morgan's Connecticut Expansion,
- Spectra's Atlantic Bridge,
- Spectra's Access Northeast,
- Portland Natural Gas Transmission System Continent to Coast (C2C) projects,
- existing and planned LNG infrastructure,
- and any other natural gas infrastructure proposal currently before FERC, whether in the pre-filing, or formal application phase, or being considered at the same time as the above pipeline proposals.

These projects constitute alternative solutions to the same potential need and must be reviewed collectively. Combining the projects in one consolidated review would foster an open and transparent process for the needs analysis critical for FERC's decision on which projects, if any, may warrant the eminent domain authority associated with the Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity. Public need cannot be evaluated without consideration of other projects attempting to fill the same or similar need. Cities and towns cannot be forced to host a pipeline solely because an energy company would like to build one. Need must be evaluated taking into account competing projects as well as nonfossil fuel solutions such as solar, wind, small

scale hydro, conservation, accelerated repair of leaks, and efficiency improvements. As we've already seen in Connecticut, gas demand projected by local gas companies is not being borne out by actual demand.^[2]

Kinder Morgan acknowledges that the alleged need met by NED could be met by the competing projects,^[3] so it makes sense that all the projects be analyzed together to see which one, if any, or which combinations of projects, would satisfy any demand with the least impact to the environment and affected communities. Evaluating transmission projects without taking into consideration the other proposed projects is counter to the competitive model that is essential to American success. Only by comparing competing lines and the history of those companies do we get improvement through competition. In our estimation, these projects are redundant. This is clearly evident with existing projects such as the offshore LNG facilities that FERC determined were necessary but now sit underutilized.

FERC may think that the Commission does not plan or encourage various infrastructure projects, but that is not our perception. From an affected community's viewpoint, it appears the FERC deck is stacked very much in favor of the pipeline companies. Taken together, these five projects would nearly double the gas pipeline capacity in New England at the very time federal and state policies such as the U.S. Clean Power Plan, Northeast Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative, MA Global Warming Solutions Act and NH Ten Year Energy Strategy are calling for drastic reductions in fossil fuels use.

Allowing the various proposals to go through the FERC process separately and then letting the "markets decide" is not in the best interest of our communities, states or the nation.

A letter sent by the Board of Selectmen in Townsend, MA^[4] describes the analysis we are requesting in more detail as do scoping comments submitted by the Massachusetts Attorney General^[5] and Conservation Law Foundation^[6], as well as NH U.S. Representative Kuster's^[7] recent letter to you.

We understand that our call for a consolidated review is not "business as usual" for FERC, but "business as usual" is unlikely to help us solve the very real energy issues facing our nation. We have seen, in our region, competing pipeline proposals result in a single pipeline with a Dracut terminus,^[8] so we understand a consolidated approach is not unprecedented. We know we face some tough energy choices. We also know FERC is facing a crisis in public trust. A decision by FERC to undertake the consolidated review we are requesting would go a long way to addressing both those issues.

Thank you for your time and consideration. We look forward to hearing your response.

The undersigned coalitions,

Jed Proujansky, Selectman, Northfield and Municipal Coalition Against the Pipeline, including Ashfield, Conway, Deerfield, Gill, Montague, New Salem, Northfield, Orange and Wendell MA.

Tad Putney, Brookline Town Administrator, Chair of New Hampshire Municipal Pipeline Coalition, including Amherst, Brookline, Fitzwilliam, Greenville, Litchfield, Mason, Merrimack, Milford, New Ipswich, Pelham, Richmond, Rindge, Temple, Troy and Winchester.

Stephen C. Themelis, Pepperell Board of Selectmen, cochair of Northeast Municipal Gas Pipeline Coalition,

Stuart Schulman, Groton Board of Selectmen, cochair of Northeast Municipal Gas Pipeline Coalition, and

Andrew Sheehan, Townsend Town Administrator, cochair of Northeast Municipal Gas Pipeline Coalition, including Andover, Ashby, Dracut, Dunstable, Groton, Littleton, Lynnfield, North Reading, Peabody, Pepperell, Tewksbury, Townsend, and Wilmington MA, and Brookline, NH.

Footnotes:

- 1 In Massachusetts, Andover, Ashby, Ashfield, Conway, Deerfield, Dracut, Dunstable, Gill, Groton, Littleton, Lynnfield, Montague, New Salem, North Reading, Northfield, Orange, Peabody, Pepperell, Tewksbury, Townsend, Wendell, and Wilmington; in New Hampshire, Amherst, Brookline, Fitzwilliam, Greenville, Litchfield, Mason, Merrimack, Milford, New Ipswich, Pelham, Richmond, Rindge, Temple, Troy, Winchester.
- 2 "Falling Oil Prices Undermine Malloy's Gas Expansion Plan," Hartford Courant, Nov. 10, 2015. The Connecticut gas companies are over 25% short of their gas conversion goals under their approved expansion plans, despite the gas companies' ongoing efforts to convince residences and businesses to convert from oil to gas heating systems.
- 3 http://elibrary.FERC.gov/idmws/file_list.asp?accession_num=201507245061 Northeast Energy Direct Project,

Docket No. PF1422000, Draft Environmental Report, Resource Report 10, Alternatives, July 2015, page 102.
4 http://elibrary.FERC.gov/idmws/file_list.asp?accession_num=201510050053
5 http://elibrary.FERC.gov/idmws/file_list.asp?accession_num=201510195375
6 http://elibrary.FERC.gov/idmws/file_list.asp?accession_num=201510165317
7 <http://kuster.house.gov/mediacenter/pressreleases/kustersendslettertoferccallingforreviewofallenergyprojectsin>
8 http://elibrary.FERC.gov/idmws/file_list.asp?accession_num=199702130004 Abbreviated Joint Facilities Application of Maritimes & Northeast Pipeline, LLC and Portland Natural Gas Transmission System, Docket No. CP97238, pp. 610.

CC:

Senator Elizabeth Warren
Senator Edward Markey
Senator Jeanne Shaheen
Senator Kelly Ayotte
Representative Richard Neal (MA1)
Representative Jim McGovern (MA2)
Representative Niki Tsongas (MA3)
Representative Seth Moulton (MA6)
Representative Frank Guinta (NH1)
Representative Anne Kuster (NH2)
Governor Charlie Baker
Governor Maggie Hassan
Attorney General Maura Healey
Attorney General Joseph Foster

20151119-5210

MILLERS RIVER WATERSHED COUNCIL, INC.

100 Main Street, Athol, MA 01331
978-248-9491 * council@millersriver.net

November 19, 2015

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

Re: Docket No. PF14-22-000 - Additional Comments from MRWC and Erving Conservation Commission to re Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Secretary Bose,

These comments are being filed jointly by the **Erving Conservation Commission**, which previously filed comments on August 28, 2015, and the **Millers River Watershed Council**, which filed comments on October 16, 2015. The additional information provided below bears significantly on the potential siting and impacts of the proposed pipeline through the Town of Erving in Massachusetts and the adjacent Millers River. The proposed path of the pipeline, exiting Montague and crossing under the Millers River into the Town of Erving, would pass within half a mile of a brownfield sludge dump perched on the banks of the Millers River. This dump is several acres in size and primarily contains sludge from the Erving Paper Company mill. Both the Erving Conservation Commission and MRWC have grave concerns that the extensive blasting that would be required through the basalt formation adjacent to the sludge dump would compromise the integrity of the dump's liner and the stability of the dump's contents, causing them to leak and/or move down the bank to the Millers Miller—located just 100 feet away.

Additionally, one mile upriver of the sludge dump, on the opposite bank of the Millers River in the Town of Wendell, is a construction demolition waste dump that has been plagued with problems over the years and is slowly migrating downhill to the nearby Millers.

Shock waves and tremors caused by the blasting required for pipeline construction have significant potential to destabilize both dump sites, creating a hazardous situation for the Town of Erving and extremely negative impacts on the river's quality, flora and fauna, and recreational value.

We thank you for accepting the above comments for consideration in the preparation for the EIS proceedings.

Sincerely,

David Brule
President, Millers River Watershed Council
Chairman, Erving Conservation Commission

Ivan Ussach
Director
Millers River Watershed Council

20151119-5237

Town of Conway, Massachusetts

Department or Committee

Email · P.O. Box 240, Conway, MA 01341

Town Office: 32 Main St. · Town Hall: 5 Academy Hill Rd.

Phone (413) 369-4235, ext. 3 · (413) 369-4237 Fax

www.townofconway.com

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr., Deputy Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, DC 20426

Members of FERC,

Regarding docket # PF 14-22: As the **Agricultural Commission of Conway MA**, it is our role to advocate on behalf of agricultural interests in our town. We have grave concerns about the impact of Kinder Morgan's proposed NED natural gas pipeline on our town's agriculture.

Our four primary concerns include:

- **Air:** The health risks associated with the venting of gas and related chemicals at the remote blowoff valve, planned to be located near Shelburne Falls Rd. The periodic release of chemicals into the air directly threatens the health of residents and farm workers as well as livestock and threatens to contaminate the food supply on which our community depends.
- **Water:** The likely disturbance of subterranean aquifers and the potential for the contamination of ground water and private water wells. This would jeopardize not only residents' drinking water supplies, but water for livestock and agricultural production as well.
- **Soil:** The massive disturbance of soils during construction would result in significant changes to soil substrata, soil erosion, and an invitation to invasive species. Clearing of a continuous swath through our town and region would also have a significant impact on numerous species in our local ecosystems. All of these impacts could have negative effects on our local agricultural production.
- **Earth:** We feel that it is critical to consider the significant emissions of methane and carbon that would result from this project. To invest in large-scale fossil fuel infrastructure when we are at a tipping point of climate catastrophe, in our opinion, is ludicrous. Climate change is already affecting our local agricultural economy with devastating weather events. Climate change poses the largest threat to the viability of agriculture in Conway and to life on Earth.

We feel that the proposed Kinder Morgan NED pipeline poses a direct threat to viability of one or more of our farms in Conway and an indirect threat to all of our farms. We depend on the viability of our farms to maintain our local economy and the quality of life for our residents.

We implore you to prioritize the health and wellbeing of local agriculture as well as that of residents, economies, and communities in your ruling on the proposed NED pipeline.

Regards,

Jason Silverman

Co-chair

Will Cote

Co-chair

20151120-5038

{167 page submission consisting of the following 4 documents: }

Pages 1...43

Report on compressor stations

Madison County Department of Health, Madison County, New York

October 15, 2014

Comments to the Federal Energy Regulatory Committee

Concerning Docket No. CP14-497-000, Dominion Transmission, Inc.

Pages 44...61

Air concentrations of volatile compounds near oil and gas production: a community-based exploratory study

Macey et al. Environmental Health 2014, 13:82

Pages 62...145

Potential health risks from “natural” (fracked) gas pipelines

Curtis Nordgaard, MD Msc, Pediatrician, DotHouse Health

PowerPoint style slides

Pages 146...167

United States Department of the Interior

National Park Service

National Register of Historical Places

Determination of Eligibility Comment Sheet

Property Name: Turner Falls Sacred Ceremonial Hill Site

Franklin County, Massachusetts

Secretary of the Interior Findings: Eligible, Criteria A and D

Scanned redacted text

{The full submission (4 documents, 167 pages, 5.2 MB) can be downloaded at: }

{ <http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/opennat.asp?fileID=14050247> }

{Download links for each individual document are listed in the following summaries: }

Madison County, New York

Department of Health

Comments to the Federal Energy Regulatory Committee

Submitted by
Madison County Department of Health
Madison County, New York
October 15, 2014

Executive Summary

The following comments are addressed to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission in response to the permit application (Docket No. CP14-497-000) filed June 2, 2014, by Dominion Transmission, Inc. of Richmond, Virginia. The Madison County Department of Health has concerns that impacts to public health have not been adequately addressed in this permit, specifically in regard to the Sheds compressor station in Madison County. The National Environmental Policy Act requires that FERC take into account potential environmental impacts and that FERC address public concerns in its permit review. The Madison County Department of Health's concerns are based in part on the report from the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) Inspector General that documents a lack of emissions data from oil and gas facilities which, in turn, casts doubt on the accuracy of projected air quality impacts. This brings into question the appropriateness of using the National Ambient Air Quality Standards to establish health safety risk near the Sheds compressor station. There are also documented correlations between health impacts and residential proximity to unconventional natural gas development facilities, including compressor stations.

Section II of these comments reviews what is known from the literature about compressor station emissions. Information specific to compressors is very limited. The types of chemicals that have been identified include VOCs, carbonyls and aldehydes, HAPs, aromatics and particulate matter. In particular, there is a lack of information on the intensity, frequency and duration of emission peaks that occur during blowdowns and large venting episodes that are a normal part of compressor operations. Blowdowns, on average, release 15 Mcf of gas into the atmosphere. Fugitive emissions and accidents are also of concern. One study from Fort Worth, Texas reported 2,126 fugitive emission points from a set of compressor stations. Radioactive chemicals are present in natural gas pipelines and can be released into the atmosphere, though little is yet known about exposure profiles for communities near compressor stations.

Section III reviews known health risks from known chemicals emitted, while acknowledging that there are data gaps in both chemicals emitted and potential health effects. Health risks from VOCs in the short term include eye and respiratory tract irritation, headaches, dizziness, visual disorders, fatigue, loss of coordination, allergic skin reaction, nausea, and memory impairment. Effects from long-term exposure include loss of coordination and damage to the liver, kidney, and central nervous system as well as elevated risk of cancer. Health effects from particulate matter affect both the respiratory and cardiovascular systems. Inhalation of PM_{2.5} can cause decreased lung function, aggravate asthma symptoms, cause nonfatal heart attacks and high blood pressure. Diesel emissions from truck traffic (primarily during construction of the compressor) can irritate the eyes, nose, throat and lungs, and can cause coughs, headaches, lightheadedness and nausea. Short-term exposure to diesel exhaust also causes inflammation in the lungs, which may aggravate chronic respiratory symptoms and increase the frequency or intensity of asthma attacks. Long-term exposure can cause increased risk of lung cancer. Chemical exposure to vulnerable populations is a particular concern. The problem of chemical mixtures and how these might affect health needs further research.

Health effects associated with compressor stations are summarized in section IV. This set of research relies primarily on self-reported data from public health surveys. The symptoms identified are associated with health impacts on respiratory, neurological and cardiovascular body systems. These health effects correlate with the impacts associated with many of the chemicals emitted from compressor stations.

Madison County residents have reported numerous concerns to FERC and to the MCDOH (Section V). Primary concerns are for health safety and food/crop safety. Concerns about the safety record of compressors and pipelines, impact on community character and home values, emergency response preparedness, air quality and other environmental impacts were also raised.

Recommendations for framing and scoping public health issues (Section VI) includes information on relevant health data sources. Methods for assessing environmental health determinants include baseline data collection on air emissions, soil, and water quality.

Data gaps and other challenges to the implementation of a public health analysis are identified in section VII. These are: a lack of previous health studies that address compressor stations; limited data on chemical constituents of compressor air emissions including intensity, frequency and duration; the problem of poorly identified chemical mixtures and potential health effects; unidentified related emissions from metering stations and pipelines; the lack of data on potential radioactive chemical emissions; inadequate assessment of the effect of local weather patterns on dispersal of air pollutants (air dispersion modeling); and very limited information on the exposure pathway of air pollutants entering soil and food crops, and the potential for human health impacts.

Recommendations are also provided in the event that the permit is granted, as follows:

- Perform a baseline health study to establish population health status before the compressor station is built.
- Require best practices to ensure that effective emissions control measures are kept up to date.
- Establish an alert system for blowdowns or other large emissions and/or noise events.
- Put Emergency Plans in place.
- Institute a monitoring strategy at the Sheds compressor station and surrounding locations.
- Institute a health registry

{ Document can be downloaded at: }

{ <http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/opennat.asp?fileID=14050235> }

Macey et al. Environmental Health 2014, 13:82

Air concentrations of volatile compounds near oil and gas production: a community-based exploratory study

Gregg P Macey¹, Ruth Breech², Mark Chernaik³, Caroline Cox⁴, Denny Larson², Deb Thomas⁵ and David O Carpenter^{6*}

Abstract

Background: Horizontal drilling, hydraulic fracturing, and other drilling and well stimulation technologies are now used widely in the United States and increasingly in other countries. They enable increases in oil and gas production, but there has been inadequate attention to human health impacts. Air quality near oil and gas operations is an underexplored human health concern for five reasons: (1) prior focus on threats to water quality; (2) an evolving understanding of contributions of certain oil and gas production processes to air quality; (3) limited state air quality monitoring networks; (4) significant variability in air emissions and concentrations; and (5) air quality research that misses impacts important to residents. Preliminary research suggests that volatile compounds, including hazardous air pollutants, are of potential concern. This study differs from prior research in its use of a community-based process to identify sampling locations. Through this approach, we determine concentrations of volatile compounds in air near operations that reflect community concerns and point to the need for more fine-grained and frequent monitoring at points along the production life cycle.

Methods: Grab and passive air samples were collected by trained volunteers at locations identified through systematic observation of industrial operations and air impacts over the course of resident daily routines. A total of 75 volatile organics were measured using EPA Method TO-15 or TO-3 by gas chromatography/mass spectrometry. Formaldehyde levels were determined using UME_x 100 Passive Samplers.

Results: Levels of eight volatile chemicals exceeded federal guidelines under several operational circum-

stances. Benzene, formaldehyde, and hydrogen sulfide were the most common compounds to exceed acute and other health-based risk levels.

Conclusions: Air concentrations of potentially dangerous compounds and chemical mixtures are frequently present near oil and gas production sites. Community-based research can provide an important supplement to state air quality monitoring programs.

Keywords: Benzene, Community monitoring, Formaldehyde, Grab and passive samples, Hydraulic fracturing, Hydrogen sulfide, Oil and gas

* Correspondence: dcarpenter@albany.edu

6 Institute for Health and the Environment, University at Albany, Rensselaer, New York, USA

Full list of author information is available at the end of the article

© 2014 Macey et al: licensee BioMed Central Ltd. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly credited. The Creative Commons Public Domain Dedication waiver (<http://creativecommons.org/publicdomain/zero/1.0/>) applies to the data made available in this article, unless otherwise stated.

{ Document can be downloaded at: }

{ <http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/opennat.asp?fileID=14050236> }

Potential health risks from “natural” (fracked) gas pipelines

Curtis Nordgaard, MD Msc, Pediatrician, DotHouse Health

What is emitted

Health risks from emissions

How much is emitted

Health effects near compressors

{Set of 84 PowerPoint style slides in PDF format}

{ Document can be downloaded at: }

{ <http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/opennat.asp?fileID=14050237> }

United States Department of the Interior National Park Service National Register of Historical Places

Determination of Eligibility Comment Sheet

Property Name: Turner Falls Sacred Ceremonial Hill Site
Franklin County, Massachusetts

Secretary of the Interior Findings: Eligible, Criteria A and D

{Scanned redacted text, omitted}

{ Document can be downloaded at: }

{ <http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/opennat.asp?fileID=14050238> }

20151120-5039

November 19, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC)

888 First Street NE

Room 1A

Washington, DC 20426

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., Docket Nos. CP14529000 and PF1422000

Dear Secretary Bose,

I am writing, as suggested at scoping hearings, to report on the unending stream of falsehoods and misinformation Kinder Morgan Tennessee Gas Pipeline continues to put forth. This comment is regarding their existing and proposed compressor stations. From the early days of their Northeast Energy Direct (NED) proposal (PF1422) right up to days before their promised formal filing they continue to deceive the public.

The shedsized outbuilding of their Pelham, NH compressor station #270B1 which Kinder Morgan presented to many audiences at the early info meetings to “give an idea of what a compressor station looks like” purposeful misrepresentation has been well documented[1].

At the recent “community forums” in Northfield and Lynnfield, MA the charade continued. I brought the FERC comment submitted on 10/22/2015 by Judith Conti, an abutter to the Agawam, MA TGP compressor station #261[2]. To refresh, these are some of the comments she made:

“The loud noise and release of gas currently is alarming and offensive to residents as well as the unhealthy nature of the gas being released into the environment.”

“At this time we experience blowoffs periodically, and the noise and odor are not only unpleasant and disturbing, but are alarming and unhealthy, and at times we are not given notice of planned blowoff events.”

Also, following the FERC comment filing, Judith Conti was interviewed by local press[3] and quoted:

“...residents who live there say they hear blow offs sometimes at 1 AM. ‘Just the other night there were loud noises in the middle of the night. It sounded like gunshots,’ said Conti.”

At both recent community forums I attended, I was told that Ms. Conti could not be telling the truth because TGP compressor stations only “blowoff” in emergency situations. TGP staff, after reading the FERC comment and news article for themselves, then told me that the new compressor stations they will be installing for the NED project will be of “newer technology” so will not exhibit the documented issues occurring in Agawam. I asked if the Agawam station, which is slated for upgrades as part of the TGP Connecticut Expansion Project (CEP) CP14529, will be brought up to date with this “newer technology” I was told “No.”

The question I have for you FERC is: Why is Kinder Morgan Tennessee Gas Pipeline being allowed to not only illegally segment the two NED and CEP projects, but also to upgrade an existing compressor station to accommodate their desired capacity increase as proposed in their CEP project, but not required to bring it up to grade so that the neighbors do not have to contend with its “alarming and unhealthy” operation? Why do you allow old polluting equipment to continue polluting while giving permission to increase that level of known pollution with the installation of equipment of old, likely cheaper, technology? Why is an upgrade to the latest equipment, purported to be less damaging to the environment, not a requirement when existing infrastructure is enhanced to the satisfy the pipeline company’s desires?

And why does FERC continue to allow Kinder Morgan to mislead the public with impunity?

Respectfully submitted,

Cathy Kristofferson

Ashby, MA 01431

cathy.kristofferson@gmail.com

footnotes:

1 http://elibrary.FERC.gov/idmws/file_list.asp?accession_num=201501125066

2 http://elibrary.FERC.gov/idmws/file_list.asp?accession_num=201510225230

3 <http://www.westernmassnews.com/story/30440640/agawamresidentsvoiceconcernsaboutcompressorstation>

20151120-5227

{ skip to end of 20151120-5227 }

Northeast Energy Direct Project November 20, 2015 APPLICATION

Docket No. CP16-21-000 (was PF14-22 during PreFiling)

{notes re the 193 files (4 GB total) contained in this application : }
{the names of all downloaded files begin with 20151120-5227 followed by 8 digits in () }
*{ they are listed below using an abbreviated format : *-5227(31035490) }*
{however, the download links use a numbering scheme based on a different fileID number}
{ so I have provided the corresponding download URLs for each file as a link}
{note: names of downloaded files were corrected 02dec15; download links are unchanged}

TGP NED APPLICATION

Transmittal letter

<i>{downloaded file name</i>	<i>title used in the FERC index</i>	<i>size KB}</i>
*-5227(31035490).pdf	01_NED Project-Application_TransLtr (Nov20).PDF	40
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051117		

Application

*-5227(31035491).pdf	02_2015-11-20 NED Project Application Final.PDF	464
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051118		

Notice

*-5227(31035492).docx	03_NED_Form_of_Notice(Final)_112015.DOCX	25
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051119		

Attachment A: Tennessee's Responses to Scoping Comments June 30, 2015 through October 1, 2015

*-5227(31035493).pdf	04_AttachA_ScopingSummaryMatrix_Responses_FINAL.PDF	239
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051120		

Attachment B: Tennessee's Responses to Comments on Draft Resource Reports, February 27, 2015; May 15, 2015; October 8, 2015

*-5227(31035494).pdf	05_AttachB_Responses to FERC Comments_FINAL.PDF	384
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051121		

Exhibit I: Summary of Precedent Agreements

*-5227(31035495).pdf	06_Exhibit I_SummaryTables_NED_112015.PDF	106
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051122		

Exhibit I: Firm Gas Transportation Agreements (Redlined and Redacted)

*-5227(31035496).pdf	07_Exhibit I_GasTransAgmts(Redacted)_NED.PDF	1,542
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051123		

Exhibit I: Precedent Agreements - Redacted

*-5227(31035497).pdf	08_Exhibit I_Precedent Agmts(Redacted)_NED_Pt1of3.PDF	31,437
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051124		

Exhibit I: Precedent Agreements - Redacted

*-5227(31035498).pdf	Exhibit I_Precedent Agmts(Redacted)_NED_Pt2of3.PDF	36,635
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051125		

Exhibit I: Precedent Agreements - Redacted

*-5227(31035499).pdf	Exhibit I_Precedent Agmts(Redacted)_NED_Pt3of3.PDF	24,675
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051126		

Exhibit J: Federal Authorizations		
*-5227(31035500).pdf	11_Exhibit J_FedAuthorizations_NED_112015.PDF	57
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051127	
Exhibit K : Cost estimates		
*-5227(31035501).pdf	12_Exhibit K_Costs_NED_112015.PDF	129
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051128	
Exhibit L: Financing		
*-5227(31035502).pdf	13_Exhibit L_Financing_NED_112015.PDF	29
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051129	
Exhibit N: Revenues		
*-5227(31035503).pdf	14_Exhibit N_Revenues_NED_112015.PDF	123
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051130	
Exhibit O: Depreciation		
*-5227(31035504).pdf	15_Exhibit O_Depreciation_NED_112015.PDF	91
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051131	
Exhibit P: Tariff		
*-5227(31035505).pdf	16_Exhibit P_Tariff_112015.PDF	102
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051132	
Exhibit V: Abandonment		
*-5227(31035506).pdf	17_Exhibit Y_Abandonment_NED_112015.PDF	25
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051133	
Exhibit Z-1: Appurtenances		
*-5227(31035507).pdf	18_Exhibit Z-1_Appurtenances_NED_112015.PDF	92
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051134	
Exhibit Z-2: Protective Agreement		
*-5227(31035508).pdf	19_Exhibit Z-2_Protective Agmt_NED_112015.PDF	601
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051135	
Exhibit Z-3: Open Season		
*-5227(31035509).pdf	20_Exhibit Z-3_OpenSeason_NED_112015.PDF	1,370
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051136	
Exhibit Z-4: Economic Studies		
*-5227(31035510).pdf	21_Exhibit Z-4_EconStudies_NED_112015.PDF	1,490
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051137	
Exhibit Z-5: Analysis		
*-5227(31035511).pdf	22_Exhibit Z-5_Analysis_NED_112015.PDF	109
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051138	

Exhibit Z-6:

*-5227(31035512).pdf	23_Exhibit Z-6_NonConformingProv_NED_112015.PDF	25
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051139		

Exhibit Z-7: Fuel Study

*-5227(31035513).pdf	24_Exhibit Z-7_FuelStudy_NED_112015.PDF	411
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051140		

Table of Contents - {expanded and annotated below}

*-5227(31035514).pdf	NED Table of Contents_112015 Public.PDF	53
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051141		

Table of Acronyms and Abbreviations

*-5227(31035515).pdf	NED AcronymsAbbreviations_112015_Public.PDF	202
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051142		

TABLE OF CONTENTS {based on *-5227(31035514).pdf above}

Volume I – Public RESOURCE REPORTS

RESOURCE REPORT 1 GENERAL PROJECT DESCRIPTION

RR-01-1a – Figures

RR-01-1b – Tables

RR-01-1c – List of Sources Describing the Need for Additional Pipeline Infrastructure in the Northeast U.S.

RR-01-1d – List of Sources for Projects Potentially Contributing to Cumulative Impacts

*-5227(31035516).pdf	NED VolI RR 01_112015_Public.PDF	26,553
----------------------	----------------------------------	--------

<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051143>

RESOURCE REPORT 2 WATER USE AND QUALITY

RR-02-2a – Figures

RR-02-2b – Tables

RR-02-2c – Inventory and Delineation of Wetlands and Watercourses along the Pennsylvania Portion of the Northeast Energy Direct Project

RR-02-2d – Inventory and Delineation of Wetlands and Watercourses along the New York Portion of the Northeast Energy Direct Project

RR-02-2e – Inventory and Delineation of Wetlands and Watercourses along the Massachusetts Portion of the Northeast Energy Direct Project

RR-02-2f – Inventory and Delineation of Wetlands and Watercourses along the New Hampshire Portion of the Northeast Energy Direct Project

RR-02-2g – Inventory and Delineation of Wetlands and Watercourses along the Connecticut Portion of the Northeast Energy Direct Project

RR-02-2h – Inventory of Vernal Pools along the Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Connecticut Portions of the Northeast Energy Direct Project

*-5227(31035517).pdf	NED VolI RR 02_112015_Public_01of08.PDF	35,390
----------------------	---	--------

http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051144	
*-5227(31035518).pdf	NED VolI RR 02_112015_Public_02of08.PDF 45,849
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051145	
*-5227(31035519).pdf	NED VolI RR 02_112015_Public_03of08.PDF 23,428
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051146	
*-5227(31035520).pdf	NED VolI RR 02_112015_Public_04of08.PDF 37,641
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051147	
*-5227(31035521).pdf	NED VolI RR 02_112015_Public_05of08.PDF 31,195
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051148	
*-5227(31035522).pdf	NED VolI RR 02_112015_Public_06of08.PDF 21,983
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051149	
*-5227(31035523).pdf	NED VolI RR 02_112015_Public_07of08.PDF 22,141
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051150	
*-5227(31035524).pdf	NED VolI RR 02_112015_Public_08of08.PDF 27,032
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051151	

RESOURCE REPORT 3 FISH, WILDLIFE AND VEGETATION

RR-03-3a – Figures

RR-03-3b – Tables

*-5227(31035525).pdf	NED VolI RR 03_111515_Public.PDF 26,331
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051152	

RESOURCE REPORT 4 CULTURAL RESOURCES

RR-04-4a – Plan for Unanticipated Discoveries of Cultural and Paleontological Resources and Human Remains

RR-04-4b – Historical Commissions

*-5227(31035526).pdf	NED VolI RR 04_112015_Public.PDF 5,244
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051153	

RESOURCE REPORT 5 SOCIOECONOMICS

RR-05-5a – Tables

*-5227(31035527).pdf	NED VolI RR 05_112015_Public.PDF 751
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051154	

RESOURCE REPORT 6 GEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

RR-06-6a – Figures

RR-06-6b – Tables

*-5227(31035528).pdf	NED VolI RR 06_112015_Public_01of02.PDF 19,197
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051155	

*-5227(31035529).pdf NED VolI RR 06_112015_Public_02of02.PDF 26,605
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051156>

RESOURCE REPORT 7 SOILS

RR-07-7a – Figures

RR-07-7b – Tables

RR-07-7c – Soil Map Descriptions

*-5227(31035530).pdf NED VolI RR 07_112015_Public_01of04.PDF 39,345
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051157>

*-5227(31035531).pdf NED VolI RR 07_112015_Public_02of04.PDF 41,989
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051158>

*-5227(31035532).pdf NED VolI RR 07_112015_Public_03of04.PDF 40,123
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051160>

*-5227(31035534).pdf NED VolI RR 07_112015_Public_04of04.PDF 30,235
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051161>

RESOURCE REPORT 8 LAND USE, RECREATION AND AESTHETICS

RR-08-8a – Figures

RR-08-8b – Tables

*-5227(31035535).pdf NED VolI RR 08_112015_Public_01of02.PDF 34,321
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051162>

*-5227(31035536).pdf NED VolI RR 08_112015_Public_02of02.PDF 25,160
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051163>

RESOURCE REPORT 9 AIR AND NOISE QUALITY

RR-09-9a – Figures

RR-09-9b – Emission Calculations

RR-09-9c – Air Permits

RR-09-9d – Report: Acoustical Assessment of Station 319 Modification

RR-09-9e – Report: Acoustical Assessment of Supply Path Head Station

RR-09-9f – Report: Acoustical Assessment of Supply Path Mid Station

RR-09-9g – Report: Acoustical Assessment of Supply Path Tail Station

RR-09-9h – Report: Acoustical Assessment of Market Path Head Station

RR-09-9i – Report: Acoustical Assessment of Market Path Mid Station 1

RR-09-9j – Report: Acoustical Assessment of Market Path Mid Station 2

RR-09-9k – Report: Acoustical Assessment of Market Path Mid Station 3

RR-09-9l – Report: Acoustical Assessment of Market Path Tail Station

RR-09-9m – Report: Acoustical Assessment of Market Path Mid Station 4

RR-09-9n – Report: Acoustical Assessment of Meter and Regulation Stations

*-5227(31035537).pdf NED VolI RR 09_112015_Public_01of08.PDF 9,937

http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051164		
*-5227(31035538).pdf	NED VolI RR 09_112015 Public_02of08.PDF	38,050
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051165		
*-5227(31035539).pdf	NED VolI RR 09_112015 Public_03of08.PDF	43,888
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051166		
*-5227(31035540).pdf	NED VolI RR 09_112015 Public_04of08.PDF	40,413
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051167		
*-5227(31035541).pdf	NED VolI RR 09_112015 Public_05of08.PDF	29,491
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051168		
*-5227(31035542).pdf	NED VolI RR 09_112015 Public_06of08.PDF	35,944
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051169		
*-5227(31035543).pdf	NED VolI RR 09_112015 Public_07of08.PDF	34,649
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051170		
*-5227(31035544).pdf	NED VolI RR 09_112015 Public_08of08.PDF	38,345
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051171		

RESOURCE REPORT 10 ALTERNATIVES

RR-10-10a - Figures

*-5227(31035545).pdf	NED VolI RR 10_112015_Public.PDF	21,018
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051172		

RESOURCE REPORT 11 RELIABILITY AND SAFETY

RR-11-11a – Tables

*-5227(31035546).pdf	NED VolI RR 11_112015_Public.PDF	289
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051173		

RESOURCE REPORT 12 PCB CONTAMINATION

*-5227(31035547).pdf	NED VolI RR 12_112015_Public.PDF	145
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051174		

RESOURCE REPORT 13 ADDITIONAL INFORMATION RELATED TO LNG PLANTS

*-5227(31035548).pdf	NED VolI RR 13_112015_Public.PDF	73
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051175		

Volume II – Public APPENDICES

Appendix A : Federal and State Regulatory Agency Contact List

*-5227(31035549).pdf	NED VolII App A_112015_Public.PDF	337
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051176		

Appendix B : Agency Correspondence (as of October 1, 2015)

*-5227(31035550).pdf	NED VolII App B_112015_Public_01of09.PDF	46,913
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051177	
*-5227(31035551).pdf	NED VolII App B_112015_Public_02of09.PDF	38,105
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051178	
*-5227(31035552).pdf	NED VolII App B_112015_Public_03of09.PDF	26,732
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051179	
*-5227(31035553).pdf	NED VolII App B_112015_Public_04of09.PDF	40,928
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051180	
*-5227(31035554).pdf	NED VolII App B_112015_Public_05of09.PDF	39,540
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051181	
*-5227(31035555).pdf	NED VolII App B_112015_Public_06of09.PDF	23,423
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051182	
*-5227(31035556).pdf	NED VolII App B_112015_Public_07of09.PDF	44,367
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051183	
*-5227(31035557).pdf	NED VolII App B_112015_Public_08of09.PDF	41,461
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051184	
*-5227(31035558).pdf	NED VolII App B_112015_Public_09of09.PDF	42,293
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051185	

Appendix C : Government Officials/Non-Governmental Organizations Contact List/List of Town Presentations

*-5227(31035559).pdf	NED VolII App C_112015_Public.PDF	195
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051186	

Appendix D : Public Participation Plan

*-5227(31035561).pdf	NED VolII App D_112015_Public.PDF	49
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051188	

Appendix E : USGS 7.5 Minute Topographic Map Excerpts

*-5227(31035562).pdf	NED VolII App E USGS_112015_Pub_01_of_01.PDF	11,399
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051189	
*-5227(31035563).pdf	NED VolII App E USGS_Mkt_112015_Pub_01_of_01.PDF	28,642
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051190	
*-5227(31035564).pdf	NED VolII App E USGS_Lat_112015_Pub_01_of_01.PDF	36,176
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051191	
*-5227(31035565).pdf	NED VolII App E USGS_Sup_112015_Pub_01_of_01.PDF	42,279
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051192	

Appendix F : Aerial Alignment Sheets

Segment L

<i>Name</i>	<i>D"</i>	<i>St</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Town</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>End</i>	<i>Leng</i>
<i>Marit</i>	30	MA	Middlesex	Dracut	0	0.75	0.75

*-5227(31035566).pdf NED VolII App F A_Lat_SegL_112015_Pub_01_of_01.PDF 6,798
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051193>

Segment N

<i>Name</i>	<i>D"</i>	<i>St</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Town</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>End</i>	<i>Leng</i>
<i>Lynn_L</i>	24	MA	Middlesex	Dracut	0	1.33	1.33
<i>Lynn_L</i>	24	MA	Essex	Andover	1.33	2.34	1.01
<i>Lynn_L</i>	24	MA	Middlesex	Tewksbury	2.34	2.54	0.2
<i>Lynn_L</i>	24	MA	Essex	Andover	2.54	3.26	0.72
<i>Lynn_L</i>	24	MA	Middlesex	Tewksbury	3.26	3.7	0.44
<i>Lynn_L</i>	24	MA	Essex	Andover	3.7	4.01	0.31
<i>Lynn_L</i>	24	MA	Middlesex	Tewksbury	4.01	4.2	0.19
<i>Lynn_L</i>	24	MA	Essex	Andover	4.2	4.3	0.1
<i>Lynn_L</i>	24	MA	Middlesex	Tewksbury	4.3	4.97	0.67
<i>Lynn_L</i>	24	MA	Essex	Andover	4.97	5.92	0.95
<i>Lynn_L</i>	24	MA	Middlesex	Tewksbury	5.92	6.63	0.71
<i>Lynn_L</i>	24	MA	Essex	Andover	6.63	7.92	1.29
<i>Lynn_L</i>	24	MA	Middlesex	Wilmington	7.92	10.16	2.24
<i>Lynn_L</i>	24	MA	Middlesex	North_Reading	10.16	13.45	3.29
<i>Lynn_L</i>	24	MA	Middlesex	Reading	13.45	13.83	0.38
<i>Lynn_L</i>	24	MA	Essex	Lynnfield	13.83	14.28	0.45

*-5227(31035567).pdf NED VolII App F A_Lat_SegN_112015_Pub_01_of_03.PDF 45,575
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051194>

*-5227(31035568).pdf NED VolII App F A_Lat_SegN_112015_Pub_02_of_03.PDF 45,320
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051198>

*-5227(31035572).pdf NED VolII App F A_Lat_SegN_112015_Pub_03_of_03.PDF 12,591
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051199>

Segment O

<i>Name</i>	<i>D"</i>	<i>St</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Town</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>End</i>	<i>Leng</i>
<i>Peab_L</i>	24	MA	Essex	Lynnfield	0	2.46	2.46
<i>Peab_L</i>	24	MA	Essex	Middleton	2.46	2.8	0.34
<i>Peab_L</i>	24	MA	Essex	Peabody	2.8	4.6	1.8
<i>Peab_L</i>	24	MA	Essex	Danvers	4.6	5.32	0.72

*-5227(31035573).pdf NED VolII App F A_Lat_SegO_112015_Pub_01_of_01.PDF 39,130
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051201>

Segment P

<i>Name</i>	<i>D"</i>	<i>St</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Town</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>End</i>	<i>Leng</i>
<i>Haver_L</i>	20	MA	Middlesex	Dracut	0	2.77	2.77
<i>Haver_L</i>	20	MA	Essex	Methuen	2.77	6.95	4.18
<i>Haver_L</i>	20	NH	Rockingham	Salem	6.95	8.99	2.04
<i>Haver_L</i>	20	MA	Essex	Methuen	8.99	9.27	0.28

*-5227(31035575).pdf NED VolII App F A_Lat_SegP_112015_Pub_01_of_02.PDF 46,433
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051202>

*-5227(31035576).pdf NED VolII App F A_Lat_SegP_112015_Pub_02_of_02.PDF 19,214
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051203>

Segment Q

<i>Name</i>	<i>D"</i>	<i>St</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Town</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>End</i>	<i>Leng</i>
<i>Fitch_L</i>	12	NH	<i>Hillsborough</i>	<i>Mason</i>	0	5.08	5.08
<i>Fitch_L</i>	12	NH	<i>Middlesex</i>	<i>Townsend</i>	5.08	10.37	5.29
<i>Fitch_L</i>	12	MA	<i>Worcester</i>	<i>Lunenburg</i>	10.37	13.97	3.6

*-5227(31035577).pdf NED VolII App F A_Lat_SegQ_112015_Pub_01_of_02.PDF 46,365
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051204>

*-5227(31035578).pdf NED VolII App F A_Lat_SegQ_112015_Pub_02_of_02.PDF 22,333
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051205>

Segment S

<i>Name</i>	<i>D"</i>	<i>St</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Town</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>End</i>	<i>Leng</i>
<i>300_CT</i>	24	CT	<i>Hartford</i>	<i>Farmington</i>	0	0.15	0.15
<i>300_CT</i>	24	CT	<i>Hartford</i>	<i>West_Hartford</i>	0.15	0.34	0.19
<i>300_CT</i>	24	CT	<i>Hartford</i>	<i>Farmington</i>	0.34	0.37	0.03
<i>300_CT</i>	24	CT	<i>Hartford</i>	<i>West_Hartford</i>	0.37	0.51	0.14
<i>300_CT</i>	24	CT	<i>Hartford</i>	<i>Farmington</i>	0.51	0.73	0.22
<i>300_CT</i>	24	CT	<i>Hartford</i>	<i>West_Hartford</i>	0.73	4.28	3.55
<i>300_CT</i>	24	CT	<i>Hartford</i>	<i>Bloomfield</i>	4.28	11.19	6.91
<i>300_CT</i>	24	CT	<i>Hartford</i>	<i>Windsor</i>	11.19	14.2	3.01
<i>300_CT</i>	24	CT	<i>Hartford</i>	<i>East_Granby</i>	14.2	14.8	0.6

*-5227(31035579).pdf NED VolII App F A_Lat_SegS_112015_Pub_01_of_03.PDF 46,882
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051206>

*-5227(31035580).pdf NED VolII App F A_Lat_SegS_112015_Pub_02_of_03.PDF 45,376
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051207>

*-5227(31035581).pdf NED VolII App F A_Lat_SegS_112015_Pub_03_of_03.PDF 17,878
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051208>

Segment F

<i>Name</i>	<i>D"</i>	<i>St</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Town</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>End</i>	<i>Leng</i>
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	30	NY	<i>Schoharie</i>	<i>Wright</i>	0	4.1	4.1
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	30	NY	<i>Albany</i>	<i>Knox</i>	4.1	9.05	4.95
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	30	NY	<i>Albany</i>	<i>Berne</i>	9.05	13.58	4.53
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	30	NY	<i>Albany</i>	<i>New_Scotland</i>	13.58	20.79	7.21
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	30	NY	<i>Albany</i>	<i>Bethlehem</i>	20.79	28.19	7.4
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	30	NY	<i>Rensselaer</i>	<i>Schodack</i>	28.19	39.34	11.15
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	30	NY	<i>Rensselaer</i>	<i>Nassau</i>	39.34	45.99	6.65
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	30	NY	<i>Rensselaer</i>	<i>Stephentown</i>	45.99	53.61	7.62

*-5227(31035582).pdf NED VolII App F A_Mkt_SegF_112015_Pub_01_of_08.PDF 43,803

	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051209	
*-5227(31035583).pdf	NED VolII App F A_Mkt_SegF_112015_Pub_02_of_08.PDF	46,662
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051210	
*-5227(31035584).pdf	NED VolII App F A_Mkt_SegF_112015_Pub_03_of_08.PDF	42,473
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051211	
*-5227(31035585).pdf	NED VolII App F A_Mkt_SegF_112015_Pub_04_of_08.PDF	30,779
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051212	
*-5227(31035586).pdf	NED VolII App F A_Mkt_SegF_112015_Pub_05_of_08.PDF	35,454
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051213	
*-5227(31035587).pdf	NED VolII App F A_Mkt_SegF_112015_Pub_06_of_08.PDF	36,633
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051214	
*-5227(31035588).pdf	NED VolII App F A_Mkt_SegF_112015_Pub_07_of_08.PDF	44,235
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051215	
*-5227(31035589).pdf	NED VolII App F A_Mkt_SegF_112015_Pub_08_of_08.PDF	43,682
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051216	

Segment G

<i>Name</i>	<i>D"</i>	<i>St</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Town</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>End</i>	<i>Leng</i>
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>MA</i>	<i>Berkshire</i>	<i>Hancock</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>2.53</i>	<i>2.53</i>
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>MA</i>	<i>Berkshire</i>	<i>Lanesborough</i>	<i>2.53</i>	<i>7.51</i>	<i>4.98</i>
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>MA</i>	<i>Berkshire</i>	<i>Cheshire</i>	<i>7.51</i>	<i>9.44</i>	<i>1.93</i>
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>MA</i>	<i>Berkshire</i>	<i>Dalton</i>	<i>9.44</i>	<i>12.85</i>	<i>3.41</i>
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>MA</i>	<i>Berkshire</i>	<i>Hinsdale</i>	<i>12.85</i>	<i>15.8</i>	<i>2.95</i>
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>MA</i>	<i>Berkshire</i>	<i>Peru</i>	<i>15.8</i>	<i>16.64</i>	<i>0.84</i>
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>MA</i>	<i>Berkshire</i>	<i>Windsor</i>	<i>16.64</i>	<i>21.39</i>	<i>4.75</i>
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>MA</i>	<i>Hampshire</i>	<i>Plainfield</i>	<i>21.39</i>	<i>26.94</i>	<i>5.55</i>
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>MA</i>	<i>Franklin</i>	<i>Ashfield</i>	<i>26.94</i>	<i>32.67</i>	<i>5.73</i>

*-5227(31035590).pdf	NED VolII App F A_Mkt_SegG_112015_Pub_01_of_05.PDF	44,179
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051217	
*-5227(31035591).pdf	NED VolII App F A_Mkt_SegG_112015_Pub_02_of_05.PDF	46,051
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051218	
*-5227(31035592).pdf	NED VolII App F A_Mkt_SegG_112015_Pub_03_of_05.PDF	28,503
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051219	
*-5227(31035593).pdf	NED VolII App F A_Mkt_SegG_112015_Pub_04_of_05.PDF	47,207
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051220	
*-5227(31035594).pdf	NED VolII App F A_Mkt_SegG_112015_Pub_05_of_05.PDF	45,466
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051221	

Segment H

<i>Name</i>	<i>D"</i>	<i>St</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Town</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>End</i>	<i>Leng</i>
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	30	MA	Franklin	Ashfield	0	1.41	1.41
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	30	MA	Franklin	Conway	1.41	4.82	3.41
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	30	MA	Franklin	Shelburne	4.82	6.08	1.26
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	30	MA	Franklin	Deerfield	6.08	11.44	5.36
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	30	MA	Franklin	Montague	11.44	16.1	4.66
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	30	MA	Franklin	Erving	16.1	18.3	2.2
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	30	MA	Franklin	Northfield	18.3	19.53	1.23
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	30	MA	Franklin	Erving	19.53	20.13	0.6
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	30	MA	Franklin	Northfield	20.13	27.48	7.35
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	30	MA	Franklin	Warwick	27.48	28.61	1.13
*-5227(31035595).pdf	NED VolII App F A_Mkt_SegH_112015_Pub_01_of_05.PDF						45,858
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051222							
*-5227(31035596).pdf	NED VolII App F A_Mkt_SegH_112015_Pub_02_of_05.PDF						39,874
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051224							
*-5227(31035598).pdf	NED VolII App F A_Mkt_SegH_112015_Pub_03_of_05.PDF						45,735
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051225							
*-5227(31035599).pdf	NED VolII App F A_Mkt_SegH_112015_Pub_04_of_05.PDF						47,211
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051226							
*-5227(31035600).pdf	NED VolII App F A_Mkt_SegH_112015_Pub_05_of_05.PDF						20,866
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051227							

Segment I

<i>Name</i>	<i>D"</i>	<i>St</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Town</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>End</i>	<i>Leng</i>
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	30	NH	Cheshire	Winchester	0	4.81	4.81
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	30	NH	Cheshire	Richmond	4.81	11.48	6.67
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	30	NH	Cheshire	Troy	11.48	12.59	1.11
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	30	NH	Cheshire	Fitzwilliam	12.59	12.73	0.14
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	30	NH	Cheshire	Troy	12.73	13.13	0.4
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	30	NH	Cheshire	Fitzwilliam	13.13	14.13	1
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	30	NH	Cheshire	Troy	14.13	14.21	0.08
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	30	NH	Cheshire	Fitzwilliam	14.21	19.78	5.57
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	30	NH	Cheshire	Rindge	19.78	28.76	8.98
*-5227(31035601).pdf	NED VolII App F A_Mkt_SegI_112015_Pub_01_of_05.PDF						46,122
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051228							
*-5227(31035602).pdf	NED VolII App F A_Mkt_SegI_112015_Pub_02_of_05.PDF						45,528
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051229							
*-5227(31035603).pdf	NED VolII App F A_Mkt_SegI_112015_Pub_03_of_05.PDF						46,296
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051230							
*-5227(31035604).pdf	NED VolII App F A_Mkt_SegI_112015_Pub_04_of_05.PDF						46,259
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051231							

*-5227(31035605).pdf NED VolII App F A_Mkt_SegI_112015_Pub_05_of_05.PDF 26,151
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051232>

Segment J

<i>Name</i>	<i>D"</i>	<i>St</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Town</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>End</i>	<i>Leng</i>
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>NH</i>	<i>Hillsborough</i>	<i>New Ipswich</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>6.33</i>	<i>6.33</i>
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>NH</i>	<i>Hillsborough</i>	<i>Greenville</i>	<i>6.33</i>	<i>8.01</i>	<i>1.68</i>
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>NH</i>	<i>Hillsborough</i>	<i>Mason</i>	<i>8.01</i>	<i>11.92</i>	<i>3.91</i>
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>NH</i>	<i>Hillsborough</i>	<i>Milford</i>	<i>11.92</i>	<i>13.1</i>	<i>1.18</i>
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>NH</i>	<i>Hillsborough</i>	<i>Brookline</i>	<i>13.1</i>	<i>15.83</i>	<i>2.73</i>
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>NH</i>	<i>Hillsborough</i>	<i>Milford</i>	<i>15.83</i>	<i>17.75</i>	<i>1.92</i>
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>NH</i>	<i>Hillsborough</i>	<i>Amherst</i>	<i>17.75</i>	<i>20.6</i>	<i>2.85</i>
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>NH</i>	<i>Hillsborough</i>	<i>Hollis</i>	<i>20.6</i>	<i>20.87</i>	<i>0.27</i>
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>NH</i>	<i>Hillsborough</i>	<i>Merrimack</i>	<i>20.87</i>	<i>26.19</i>	<i>5.32</i>
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>NH</i>	<i>Hillsborough</i>	<i>Litchfield</i>	<i>26.19</i>	<i>28.85</i>	<i>2.66</i>
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>NH</i>	<i>Rockingham</i>	<i>Londonderry</i>	<i>28.85</i>	<i>31.42</i>	<i>2.57</i>
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>NH</i>	<i>Hillsborough</i>	<i>Hudson</i>	<i>31.42</i>	<i>33.89</i>	<i>2.47</i>
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>NH</i>	<i>Rockingham</i>	<i>Windham</i>	<i>33.89</i>	<i>36.16</i>	<i>2.27</i>
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>NH</i>	<i>Hillsborough</i>	<i>Pelham</i>	<i>36.16</i>	<i>41.69</i>	<i>5.53</i>

*-5227(31035606).pdf NED VolII App F A_Mkt_SegJ_112015_Pub_01_of_07.PDF 33,519
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051233>

*-5227(31035607).pdf NED VolII App F A_Mkt_SegJ_112015_Pub_02_of_07.PDF 32,989
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051234>

*-5227(31035608).pdf NED VolII App F A_Mkt_SegJ_112015_Pub_03_of_07.PDF 33,959
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051235>

*-5227(31035609).pdf NED VolII App F A_Mkt_SegJ_112015_Pub_04_of_07.PDF 38,007
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051236>

*-5227(31035610).pdf NED VolII App F A_Mkt_SegJ_112015_Pub_05_of_07.PDF 36,479
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051237>

*-5227(31035611).pdf NED VolII App F A_Mkt_SegJ_112015_Pub_06_of_07.PDF 47,972
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051240>

*-5227(31035614).pdf NED VolII App F A_Mkt_SegJ_112015_Pub_07_of_07.PDF 19,327
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051241>

Segment K

<i>Name</i>	<i>D"</i>	<i>St</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Town</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>End</i>	<i>Leng</i>
<i>Wr-Dra</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>MA</i>	<i>Middlesex</i>	<i>Dracut</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>2.44</i>	<i>2.44</i>

*-5227(31035615).pdf NED VolII App F A_Mkt_SegK_112015_Pub_01_of_01.PDF 19,074
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051242>

Segment A

<i>Name</i>	<i>D"</i>	<i>St</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Town</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>End</i>	<i>Leng</i>
<i>L317-3</i>	<i>36</i>	<i>PA</i>	<i>Bradford</i>	<i>Troy</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.57</i>	<i>0.57</i>

L317-3	36	PA	Bradford	Granville	0.57	8.51	7.94	
L317-3	36	PA	Bradford	West_Burlington	8.51	10.1	1.59	
L317-3	36	PA	Bradford	Burlington	10.1	14.28	4.18	
L317-3	36	PA	Bradford	Towanda	14.28	16.67	2.39	
L317-3	36	PA	Bradford	Monroe	16.67	16.71	0.04	
L317-3	36	PA	Bradford	Towanda	16.71	16.83	0.12	
L317-3	36	PA	Bradford	Monroe	16.83	20.18	3.35	
L317-3	36	PA	Bradford	Asylum	20.18	24.67	4.49	
L317-3	36	PA	Bradford	Wyalusing	24.67	30.98	6.31	
*-5227(31035616).pdf	NED VolII App F A_Sup_SegA_112015_Pub_01_of_05.PDF						27,751	
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051243								
*-5227(31035617).pdf	NED VolII App F A_Sup_SegA_112015_Pub_02_of_05.PDF						27,402	
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051244								
*-5227(31035618).pdf	NED VolII App F A_Sup_SegA_112015_Pub_03_of_05.PDF						38,362	
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051245								
*-5227(31035619).pdf	NED VolII App F A_Sup_SegA_112015_Pub_04_of_05.PDF						42,402	
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051246								
*-5227(31035620).pdf	NED VolII App F A_Sup_SegA_112015_Pub_05_of_05.PDF						18,048	
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051247								

Segment B

<i>Name</i>	<i>D"</i>	<i>St</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Town</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>End</i>	<i>Leng</i>	
L319-3	36	PA	Bradford	Wyalusing	0	0.17	0.17	
L319-3	36	PA	Bradford	Tuscarora	0.17	4.77	4.6	
L319-3	36	PA	Susquehanna	Auburn	4.77	9.96	5.19	
*-5227(31035621).pdf	NED VolII App F A_Sup_SegB_112015_Pub_01_of_01.PDF						36,347	
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051248								

Segment C

<i>Name</i>	<i>D"</i>	<i>St</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Town</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>End</i>	<i>Leng</i>	
PA_Wr	30	PA	Susquehanna	Auburn	0	3.27	3.27	
PA_Wr	30	PA	Susquehanna	Dimock	3.27	10.61	7.34	
PA_Wr	30	PA	Susquehanna	Bridgewater	10.61	12.35	1.74	
PA_Wr	30	PA	Susquehanna	Brooklyn	12.35	15.83	3.48	
PA_Wr	30	PA	Susquehanna	Harford	15.83	17.23	1.4	
PA_Wr	30	PA	Susquehanna	New_Milford	17.23	26.32	9.09	
PA_Wr	30	PA	Susquehanna	Jackson	26.32	28.99	2.67	
PA_Wr	30	PA	Susquehanna	Oakland	28.99	29.95	0.96	
PA_Wr	30	PA	Susquehanna	Harmony	29.95	37.48	7.53	
*-5227(31035622).pdf	NED VolII App F A_Sup_SegC_112015_Pub_01_of_06.PDF						41,039	
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051249								
*-5227(31035623).pdf	NED VolII App F A_Sup_SegC_112015_Pub_02_of_06.PDF						43,589	
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051250								

*-5227(31035624).pdf	NED VolII App F A_Sup_SegC_112015_Pub_03_of_06.PDF	42,108
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051251	
*-5227(31035625).pdf	NED VolII App F A_Sup_SegC_112015_Pub_04_of_06.PDF	43,787
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051252	
*-5227(31035626).pdf	NED VolII App F A_Sup_SegC_112015_Pub_05_of_06.PDF	44,260
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051253	
*-5227(31035627).pdf	NED VolII App F A_Sup_SegC_112015_Pub_06_of_06.PDF	23,919
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051254	

Segment D

<i>Name</i>	<i>D"</i>	<i>St</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Town</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>End</i>	<i>Leng</i>
<i>PA_Wr</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>NY</i>	<i>Broome</i>	<i>Sanford</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>16.29</i>	<i>16.29</i>
<i>PA_Wr</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>NY</i>	<i>Chenango</i>	<i>Afton</i>	<i>16.29</i>	<i>18.75</i>	<i>2.46</i>
<i>PA_Wr</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>NY</i>	<i>Delaware</i>	<i>Masonville</i>	<i>18.75</i>	<i>23.34</i>	<i>4.59</i>
<i>PA_Wr</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>NY</i>	<i>Delaware</i>	<i>Sidney</i>	<i>23.34</i>	<i>35</i>	<i>11.66</i>
<i>PA_Wr</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>NY</i>	<i>Delaware</i>	<i>Franklin</i>	<i>35</i>	<i>44.18</i>	<i>9.18</i>
*-5227(31035628).pdf	NED VolII App F A_Sup_SegD_112015_Pub_01_of_07.PDF	48,561					
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051255						
*-5227(31035629).pdf	NED VolII App F A_Sup_SegD_112015_Pub_02_of_07.PDF	48,372					
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051256						
*-5227(31035630).pdf	NED VolII App F A_Sup_SegD_112015_Pub_03_of_07.PDF	28,807					
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051257						
*-5227(31035631).pdf	NED VolII App F A_Sup_SegD_112015_Pub_04_of_07.PDF	26,375					
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051258						
*-5227(31035632).pdf	NED VolII App F A_Sup_SegD_112015_Pub_05_of_07.PDF	28,624					
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051259						
*-5227(31035633).pdf	NED VolII App F A_Sup_SegD_112015_Pub_06_of_07.PDF	28,885					
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051260						
*-5227(31035634).pdf	NED VolII App F A_Sup_SegD_112015_Pub_07_of_07.PDF	12,379					
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051261						

Segment E

<i>Name</i>	<i>D"</i>	<i>St</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Town</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>End</i>	<i>Leng</i>
<i>PA_Wr</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>NY</i>	<i>Delaware</i>	<i>Franklin</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.29</i>	<i>0.29</i>
<i>PA_Wr</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>NY</i>	<i>Delaware</i>	<i>Davenport</i>	<i>0.29</i>	<i>15.68</i>	<i>15.39</i>
<i>PA_Wr</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>NY</i>	<i>Delaware</i>	<i>Harpersfield</i>	<i>15.68</i>	<i>20.28</i>	<i>4.6</i>
<i>PA_Wr</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>NY</i>	<i>Schoharie</i>	<i>Summit</i>	<i>20.28</i>	<i>20.6</i>	<i>0.32</i>
<i>PA_Wr</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>NY</i>	<i>Schoharie</i>	<i>Jefferson</i>	<i>20.6</i>	<i>20.89</i>	<i>0.29</i>
<i>PA_Wr</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>NY</i>	<i>Schoharie</i>	<i>Summit</i>	<i>20.89</i>	<i>22.71</i>	<i>1.82</i>
<i>PA_Wr</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>NY</i>	<i>Schoharie</i>	<i>Jefferson</i>	<i>22.71</i>	<i>23.23</i>	<i>0.52</i>

<i>PA_Wr</i>	30	NY	<i>Schoharie</i>	<i>Summit</i>	23.23	23.67	0.44
<i>PA_Wr</i>	30	NY	<i>Schoharie</i>	<i>Jefferson</i>	23.67	25.69	2.02
<i>PA_Wr</i>	30	NY	<i>Schoharie</i>	<i>Summit</i>	25.69	31.78	6.09
<i>PA_Wr</i>	30	NY	<i>Schoharie</i>	<i>Richmondville</i>	31.78	36.67	4.89
<i>PA_Wr</i>	30	NY	<i>Schoharie</i>	<i>Cobleskill</i>	36.67	38.8	2.13
<i>PA_Wr</i>	30	NY	<i>Schoharie</i>	<i>Middleburgh</i>	38.8	42.27	3.47
<i>PA_Wr</i>	30	NY	<i>Schoharie</i>	<i>Schoharie</i>	42.27	50.64	8.37
<i>PA_Wr</i>	30	NY	<i>Schoharie</i>	<i>Wright</i>	50.64	50.89	0.25
*-5227(31035635).pdf	NED VolII App F A_Sup_SegE_112015_Pub_01_of_08.PDF						44,387
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051262						
*-5227(31035636).pdf	NED VolII App F A_Sup_SegE_112015_Pub_02_of_08.PDF						45,353
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051263						
*-5227(31035637).pdf	NED VolII App F A_Sup_SegE_112015_Pub_03_of_08.PDF						44,543
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051264						
*-5227(31035638).pdf	NED VolII App F A_Sup_SegE_112015_Pub_04_of_08.PDF						46,195
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051266						
*-5227(31035640).pdf	NED VolII App F A_Sup_SegE_112015_Pub_05_of_08.PDF						44,470
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051267						
*-5227(31035641).pdf	NED VolII App F A_Sup_SegE_112015_Pub_06_of_08.PDF						45,511
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051268						
*-5227(31035642).pdf	NED VolII App F A_Sup_SegE_112015_Pub_07_of_08.PDF						48,821
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051269						
*-5227(31035643).pdf	NED VolII App F A_Sup_SegE_112015_Pub_08_of_08.PDF						6,259
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051270						

Appendix G : Typical Construction Drawings

*-5227(31035644).pdf	NED VolII App G TypConstDwgs_112015_Pub.PDF						561
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051271						

Appendix H : Tennessee's Plan and Procedures

*-5227(31035645).pdf	NED VolII App H_112015_Public.PDF						240
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051272						

Appendix I : National Wetland Inventory Maps

*-5227(31035646).pdf	NED VolII App I NWI_112015_Pub_01_of_01.PDF						12,004
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051273						
*-5227(31035647).pdf	NED VolII App I NWI_Lat_112015_Pub_01_of_01.PDF						16,836
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051274						
*-5227(31035648).pdf	NED VolII App I NWI_Mkt_112015_Pub_01_of_01.PDF						45,010
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051275						

Appendix J : Environmental Construction Plan for Pennsylvania

Attachment J1 Aerial Alignment Sheets (Included Under Separate Cover – Appendix F)
Attachment J2 Typical Construction Drawings (Included Under Separate Cover – Appendix G)
Attachment J3 Spill Prevention and Response Plan
Attachment J4 Waste Management Plan
Attachment J5 Horizontal Directional Drill Contingency Plan
Attachment J6 Plan for Unanticipated Discoveries of Cultural and Paleontological Resources and Human Remains (Included Under Separate Cover- Resource Report 4, Attachment 4a)
Attachment J7 Unanticipated Discovery of Contamination Plan
Attachment J8 Blasting Management Plan
Attachment J9 Invasive Species Management Plan for Pennsylvania
Attachment J10 Soil Protection and Subsoil Decompaction Mitigation Plan
Attachment J11 Organic Farm Protection Plan
Attachment J12 Winter Construction Plan
Attachment J13 General Trail Crossing Plan
Attachment J14 Tennessee’s Upland Erosion Control, Revegetation, and Maintenance Plan (Included Under Separate Cover – Appendix H)
Attachment J15 Tennessee’s Wetland and Waterbody Crossing Construction and Mitigation Procedures (Included Under Separate Cover- Appendix H)
*-5227(31035650).pdf NED VolII App J_112015_Public_rev2.PDF 17,214
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051278>

Appendix K : Environmental Construction Plan for New York

Attachment K1 Aerial Alignment Sheets (Included Under Separate Cover – Appendix F)
Attachment K2 Typical Construction Drawings (Included Under Separate Cover – Appendix G)
Attachment K3 Spill Prevention and Response Plan
Attachment K4 Waste Management Plan
Attachment K5 Horizontal Directional Drill Contingency Plan
Attachment K6 Plan for Unanticipated Discoveries of Cultural and Paleontological Resources and Human Remains (Included Under Separate Cover – Resource Report 4, Attachment 4a)
Attachment K7 Unanticipated Discovery of Contamination Plan
Attachment K8 Blasting Management Plan
Attachment K9 Invasive Species Management Plan for New York
Attachment K10 Soil Protection and Subsoil Decompaction Mitigation Plan
Attachment K11 Organic Farm Protection Plan
Attachment K12 Winter Construction Plan
Attachment K13 Karst Mitigation Plan
Attachment K14 General Trail Crossing Plan
Attachment K15 Tennessee’s Upland Erosion Control, Revegetation, and Maintenance Plan (Included

Under Separate Cover – Appendix H)

Attachment K16 Tennessee’s Wetland and Waterbody Crossing Construction and Mitigation Procedures
(Included Under Separate Cover – Appendix H)

Attachment K17 NYSDAM’s Fertilizing, Lime and Seeding Recommendations for Restoration of Construction Projects on Farmland in New York State

Attachment K18 NYSDAM’s Specialty Crop Productivity Monitoring Procedures

*-5227(31035652).pdf NED VolII App K_112015_Public_01 of 05.PDF 9,123

<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051279>

*-5227(31035653).pdf NED VolII App K_112015_Public_02 of 05.PDF 27,251

<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051280>

*-5227(31035654).pdf NED VolII App K_112015_Public_03 of 05.PDF 38,917

<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051281>

*-5227(31035655).pdf NED VolII App K_112015_Public_04 of 05.PDF 46,053

<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051282>

*-5227(31035656).pdf NED VolII App K_112015_Public_05 of 05.PDF 25,421

<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051283>

Appendix L : Environmental Construction Plan for Massachusetts

Attachment L1 Aerial Alignment Sheets (Included Under Separate Cover – Appendix F)

Attachment L2 Typical Construction Drawings (Included Under Separate Cover – Appendix G)

Attachment L3 Spill Prevention and Response Plan

Attachment L4 Waste Management Plan

Attachment L5 Horizontal Directional Drill Contingency Plan

Attachment L6 Plan for Unanticipated Discoveries of Cultural and Paleontological Resources and Human Remains (Included Under Separate Cover- Resource Report 4, Attachment 4a)

Attachment L7 Unanticipated Discovery of Contamination Plan

Attachment L8 Blasting Management Plan

Attachment L9 Invasive Species Management Plan for Massachusetts

Attachment L10 Soil Protection and Subsoil Decompaction Mitigation Plan

Attachment L11 Organic Farm Protection Plan

Attachment L12 Winter Construction Plan

Attachment L13 Karst Mitigation Plan

Attachment L14 General Trail Crossing Plan

Attachment L15 Tennessee’s Upland Erosion Control, Revegetation, and Maintenance Plan (Included Under Separate Cover – Appendix H)

Attachment L16 Tennessee’s Wetland and Waterbody Crossing Construction and Mitigation Procedures
(Included Under Separate Cover – Appendix H)

*-5227(31035657).pdf NED VolII App L_112015_Public.PDF 22,498

<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051284>

Appendix M : Environmental Construction Plan for New Hampshire

Appendix O : Site-Specific Horizontal Directional Drill Plans

*-5227(31035660).pdf	NED VolII App O HDD Plans_112015_Pub.PDF	26,388
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051287		

Appendix P : Residential Construction Plans

*-5227(31035661).pdf	NED VolII App P R_Lat_SegL_112015_Pub_01_of_01.PDF	83
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051288		
*-5227(31035662).pdf	NED VolII App P R_Lat_SegN_112015_Pub_01_of_01.PDF	1,469
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051289		
*-5227(31035663).pdf	NED VolII App P R_Lat_SegO_112015_Pub_01_of_01.PDF	823
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051290		
*-5227(31035664).pdf	NED VolII App P R_Lat_SegP_112015_Pub_01_of_01.PDF	1,853
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051291		
*-5227(31035665).pdf	NED VolII App P R_Lat_SegQ_112015_Pub_01_of_01.PDF	322
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051292		
*-5227(31035666).pdf	NED VolII App P R_Lat_SegS_112015_Pub_01_of_01.PDF	622
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051293		
*-5227(31035667).pdf	NED VolII App P R_Mkt_SegF_112015_Pub_01_of_01.PDF	3,441
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051294		
*-5227(31035668).pdf	NED VolII App P R_Mkt_SegG_112015_Pub_01_of_01.PDF	1,545
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051295		
*-5227(31035669).pdf	NED VolII App P R_Mkt_SegH_112015_Pub_01_of_01.PDF	1,183
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051296		
*-5227(31035670).pdf	NED VolII App P R_Mkt_SegI_112015_Pub_01_of_01.PDF	903
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051297		
*-5227(31035671).pdf	NED VolII App P R_Mkt_SegJ_112015_Pub_01_of_01.PDF	811
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051298		
*-5227(31035672).pdf	NED VolII App P R_Mkt_SegK_112015_Pub_01_of_01.PDF	178
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051299		
*-5227(31035673).pdf	NED VolII App P R_Sup_SegA_112015_Pub_01_of_01.PDF	1,703
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051300		
*-5227(31035674).pdf	NED VolII App P R_Sup_SegB_112015_Pub_01_of_01.PDF	759
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051301		
*-5227(31035675).pdf	NED VolII App P R_Sup_SegC_112015_Pub_01_of_01.PDF	1,140
http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051302		

*-5227(31035676).pdf	NED VolII App P R_Sup_SegD_112015_Pub_01_of_01.PDF	1,963
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051303	
*-5227(31035677).pdf	NED VolII App P R_Sup_SegE_112015_Pub_01_of_01.PDF	1,042
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051304	

Appendix Q : Site-Specific Waterbody and Wetland Plans

*-5227(31035678).pdf	NED VolII App Q WB_112015_Pub.PDF	13,057
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051306	

Appendix R : Compressor Station Drawings (Public)

*-5227(31035680).pdf	NED VolII App R_CS_112015_Pub_Mkt Path 1.PDF	2,796
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051307	
*-5227(31035681).pdf	NED VolII App R_CS_112015_Pub_Mkt Path 2.PDF	2,158
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051308	
*-5227(31035682).pdf	NED VolII App R_CS_112015_Pub_Mkt Path 3.PDF	3,722
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051309	
*-5227(31035683).pdf	NED VolII App R_CS_112015_Pub_Mkt Path 4.PDF	2,656
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051310	
*-5227(31035684).pdf	NED VolII App R_CS_112015_Pub_Mkt Path HS.PDF	1,345
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051311	
*-5227(31035685).pdf	NED VolII App R_CS_112015_Pub_Mkt Path TS.PDF	1,433
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051312	
*-5227(31035686).pdf	NED VolII App R_CS_112015_Pub_Sup 319 Mod.PDF	1,420
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051313	
*-5227(31035687).pdf	NED VolII App R_CS_112015_Pub_Sup HS.PDF	7,013
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051314	
*-5227(31035688).pdf	NED VolII App R_CS_112015_Pub_Sup MS.PDF	3,502
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051315	
*-5227(31035689).pdf	NED VolII App R_CS_112015_Pub_Sup TS.PDF	2,290
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051316	

Appendix S : Meter Station Drawings

*-5227(31035690).pdf	NED VolII App S_MS_112015_Pub_01_of_02.PDF	42,996
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051317	
*-5227(31035691).pdf	NED VolII App S_MS_112015_Pub_02_of_02.PDF	35,586
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051318	

Appendix T : Mainline Valve and Pig Facility Drawings

*-5227(31035692).pdf	NED VolII App T_Fac_Sup_112015_Pub_01_of_01.PDF	18,793
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051319	

*-5227(31035693).pdf	NED VolII App T_Fac_Lat_112015_Pub_01_of_01.PDF	17,914
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051320	
*-5227(31035694).pdf	NED VolII App T_Fac_Mkt_112015_Pub_01_of_01.PDF	23,216
	http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14051321	

Volume III – Privileged and Confidential Information – Do Not Release APPENDICES

Appendix AA: List of Affected Landowners

Appendix BB: Rare Species Agency Consultation (as of October 1, 2015)

Appendix CC : Interim Progress Reports (Cultural Resources)

Appendix CC-1 : Interim Progress Report, Phase I Archaeological Reconnaissance Survey, Northeast Energy Direct Project: Bradford and Susquehanna Counties, Pennsylvania

Appendix CC-2 : Interim Progress Report, Architectural Reconnaissance Survey, Northeast Energy Direct Project: Bradford and Susquehanna Counties, Pennsylvania

Appendix CC-3 : Interim Progress Report, Phase I Archaeological Survey, Northeast Energy Direct Project:

Appendix CC-11 : Interim Progress Report, Architectural Resource Survey, Northeast Energy Direct Project: Hartford County, Connecticut Direct Project: Broome, Chenango, Delaware, Schoharie, Albany, and Rensselaer Counties, New York

Appendix CC-4 : Interim Progress Report, Historic Resources Survey, Northeast Energy Direct Project: Broome, Chenango, Delaware, Schoharie, Albany, and Rensselaer Counties, New York

Appendix CC-5 : Interim Progress Report, Archaeological Reconnaissance Survey, Northeast Energy Direct Project: Berkshire, Hampshire, Franklin, Middlesex, Essex, and Worcester Counties, Massachusetts

Appendix CC-6 : Interim Progress Report, Architectural Resources Survey, Northeast Energy Direct Project: Berkshire, Hampshire, Franklin, Middlesex, Essex, and Worcester Counties, Massachusetts.

Appendix CC-7 : Phase IA Archaeological Sensitivity Assessment, Northeast Energy Direct Project: Cheshire, Hillsborough, and Rockingham Counties, New Hampshire

Appendix CC-8 : Interim Progress Report, Phase IB Intensive Archaeological Investigations, Northeast Energy Direct Project: Cheshire, Hillsborough, and Rockingham Counties, New Hampshire

Appendix CC-9 : Interim Progress Report, Project Area Form, Northeast Energy Direct Project: Cheshire, Hillsborough, and Rockingham Counties, New Hampshire

Appendix CC-10 : Interim Progress Report, Phase I Archaeological Reconnaissance Survey, Northeast Energy Direct Project: Hartford County, Connecticut

Appendix CC-11 : Interim Progress Report, Architectural Resource Survey, Northeast Energy Direct Project: Hartford County, Connecticut

Appendix DD : Agency Correspondence and Workplans (Cultural Resources)

Appendix EE : Tribal Government Correspondence (Cultural Resources)

Appendix FF : Rare Species Reports

Volume IV – CEII – Do Not Release APPENDICES

Appendix AAA : Compressor Station Drawings

{end of 20151120-5227}

20151123-0054

Stanton Family Farm, LLC
3241 State Route 145
Schoharie, NY 12157

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

Re: PF14-22

November 14, 2015

Dear Ms. Bose,

We are writing once again to express our opposition to the proposed NED Pipeline. This pipeline is slated to traverse 130 acres of farmland that we own and/or rent. This amount represents slightly less than 10% of the land we work for our dairy farm. We are good stewards of the land and follow stringent guidelines in place by DEC through our CAFO plan. With this pipeline proposed to be collocated with the Constitution pipeline, our business could be impacted for up to 6 years (growing seasons) during construction of the two pipelines. This has the potential to destroy our business. Without the 130 acres, we will be out of compliance with both our manure management and crop rotation plans outlined in our CAFO permit. This will place additional, undue hardship on our business as we will incur additional feed, manure management, and fertilizer costs just to name a few. (If we cannot use land during construction, we will have to pay to purchase feed, have manure trucked off our farm, and then after construction, purchase additional fertilizer to compensate for the manure that was not spread on the land.) All of the land we have available to us is already part of our crop rotation and manure management plans — we do not have extra land lying around to substitute.

Recently we had the privilege to listen to Agriculture and Markets Commissioner Richard Ball speak at a local Rotary Club meeting. Commissioner Ball commented that farmers are now approximately only 1% of the world's population. He stated that as he has traveled across NYS and visited colleges that have agriculture training programs, approximately half of the students do not have farms to go back to. He acknowledged that farmland is very valuable and expensive. Young farmers cannot afford to start their own farms. If these things are not addressed — there will be no farmers. Who will feed our people?

Commissioner Ball, Governor Cuomo, and the State Legislature are working very hard to try and improve the state of agriculture in NY. They have several new initiatives that are proving to be very promising and successful since Commissioner Ball took office. In addition, Governor Cuomo has placed a abate-wide moratorium on “fracking” for the natural gas that would be transported in this pipeline.

With this being stated, how in good conscience can the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission continue to approve natural gas pipelines that destroy prime working farms/farmland in scenic Schoharie County?

Again, please seriously consider denying a “Certificate of Public Necessity and Convenience” to Kinder Morgan for the NED pipeline.

Respectfully Submitted,

Stanton Family Farms, LLC

Kenneth G. Stanton
Richard W. Stanton
Lisa Ann Stanton
Kayla Stanton

20151123-0078

Kimberly Bose, Secretary

FERC
888 First Street, N.E.
Washington, DC 20426

STOP THE NED PIPELINE!!

Protect NH land from Eminent Domain!

I oppose. the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) EXPORT pipeline. The pipelines, and compressor station will scar the NH landscape and put our water, wildlife, forests, agricultural lands and rural character at risk. These include health and safety risks from emissions, industrialization, pollution and the devastating effects of fire and explosions. Greed, not need is fueling this project. Say NO to this private company that will TAKE OUR LANDS with NO BENEFIT TO US.

Ruth Barkunshaw
18 Misty Meadow Rd
Windham, NH 03087

20151123-0079

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

Project Docket Number: PF14-22

11/17/15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

RK: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:
6 Tina Avenue
Pelham, NH 03076

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.

Best,

Alma Healey

20151123-0081

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

Project Docket Number: PF14-22

11/15/2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

RK: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:
63 Regency Drive

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 to perform surveys, or for any other purpose. Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized and treated as trespass.

Best,

Charlie Qing Wang

20151123-0082

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

Project Docket Number: PF14-22

11/15/2015

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

RK: Denying Property Access

As the owner of the property located at:

63 Regency Drive
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 to perform surveys, or for any other purpose. Any physical entry onto my property will be considered unauthorized and treated as trespass.

Best,

Wenjun Chen

20151123-0133

50 Timberpond Drive, #1104
Peterborough, NH 03458

November 15, 2015

Dr. Norman Bay
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First St. NE
Washington, DC. 20426

Dear Dr. Bay,

I am writing to urge you to take action against climate change by opposing the building of a natural gas pipeline across many towns in the southern part of our state. The docket number for this project is PF 14 -22.

Residents of the towns through which it will pass are understandably concerned about the disruption it will cause to their land, the dangers it may pose to their well-being, the effect it may have on their property values, and the unfairness of the use of eminent domain. I support them in their opposition to the pipeline.

However, I want to express two broader concerns that I hope you already understand.

First, the methane that would be coming through the pipeline is a very potent greenhouse gas, much more potent than carbon dioxide. Recent investigations have revealed that, during the fracking process that will produce most of this methane, a lot of methane is released into the atmosphere. It happens that there are also

many places along the pipelines through which the methane travels where leaks release even more to the atmosphere. When the process of producing and delivering methane is considered from start to finish, and all of the methane leaks are taken into account, natural gas turns out to be more damaging to the atmosphere than coal. It is not a desirable fuel source for New Hampshire.

Second, if we humans are going to have any success in slowing climate change, we are going to have to stop the use of fossil fuels for energy production as rapidly as possible. It makes no sense to invest in natural gas infrastructure now, when we know that we must convert to other energy sources immediately. It would be much better to invest in renewable energy more aggressively than we have been doing. We also know that most New Hampshire towns and citizens have been working diligently to reduce their energy use. That means we will not need as much energy as we did at our peak.

Natural gas will contribute to a difficult future for our children and grandchildren. Please do not encourage its use! Instead, please encourage investment in renewable energy to keep climate change from escalating out of control.

I am enclosing a copy of a peer reviewed article to back up my claims about methane. I hope you will give it serious attention. Please put a stop to the pipeline plans.

Sincerely yours,

Anne E. Huberman

PERSPECTIVE

A bridge to nowhere: methane emissions and the greenhouse gas footprint of natural gas

Robert W. Howarth

Department of Ecology & Evolutionary Biology, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14853

Keywords

Greenhouse gas footprint, methane emissions, natural gas, shale gas

Correspondence

Robert W. Howarth,

Department of Ecology & Evolutionary Biology,

Cornell University,

Ithaca, NY 14853.

Tel: 607-255-6175;

E-mail: howarth@cornell.edu

Funding Information

Funding was provided by Cornell University, the Park Foundation, and the Wallace Global Fund.

Received: 4 March 2014; Revised: 18 April 2014; Accepted: 22 April 2014

doi: 10.1002/ese3.35

Abstract

In April 2011, we published the first peer-reviewed analysis of the greenhouse gas footprint (GHG) of shale gas, concluding that the climate impact of shale gas may be worse than that of other fossil fuels such as coal and oil because of methane emissions. We noted the poor quality of publicly available data to support our analysis and called for further research. Our paper spurred a large increase in research and analysis, including several new studies that have better measured methane emissions from natural gas systems. Here, I review this new research in the context of our 2011 paper and the fifth assessment from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change released in 2013. The best data available now indicate that our estimates of methane emission from both shale gas and conventional natural gas were relatively robust. Using these new, best available data and a 20-year time period for comparing the warming potential of methane to carbon dioxide, the conclusion stands that both shale gas and conventional natural gas have a larger GHG than do coal or oil, for any possible use of natural gas and particularly for the primary uses of residential and commercial

heating. The 20-year time period is appropriate because of the urgent need to reduce methane emissions over the coming 15–35 years.

{body of report omitted; full 14-page report can be downloaded at: }

http://www.eeb.cornell.edu/howarth/publications/Howarth_2014_ESE_methane_emissions.pdf

20151123-4007

{duplicate copy of 20151116-5217 above}

20151123-5004

Amy Conrad, Quincy, MA.

I live on the other side of the bridge with construction going on daily. Since I work nights it's a huge inconvenience, construction noise occurs daily which for me is extremely early hours, I have not had uninterrupted sleep since the bridge construction started. I do not want to deal with additional construction especially since the bridge project is going for the foreseeable future.

Due to construction/weather/budget concerns, the Harbor Express Ferry service no longer runs out of the Quincy Shipyard. This is an inconvenience and a benefit that should be returned to the neighborhood BEFORE the neighborhood takes on further inconvenience.

I'm not willing to support anything that has to do with the dangerous environmental practice of fracking. It's my understanding this will aid in transporting fracked gas through my region. I would rather time and effort go into developing environmentally friendly alternatives not in increasing production of fracking gas.

I also don't know how this compression station will smell once it's constructed. I already have to deal with horrid smells, depending on which way the wind blows, from the plants and shipyard located behind and around my home, any possibility of additional odors would be unacceptable for me.

Would this "necessary" compressor station become a possible target for a domestic or foreign terrorist? Especially if it is conveniently located next to a bridge?

Please do not allow this to go in my backyard!

20151123-5008

Kathleen Batcheller, Portsmouth, NH.

I am strongly opposed to this project for the following reasons:

1. It promotes the use of fossil fuels, and in particular, fracked gas. The process to procure fracked gas is devastating to the environment. We should be using less fossil fuels, not more. Our tax dollars should be spent on clean, renewable energy.
2. The gas being pumped in this pipeline far exceeds the needs of the residents of NH. Most of it will be exported, to the sole benefit of the pipeline owners. Why should NH residents fund a private, for-profit company's project?
3. The pipeline requires a large swath of land to be cleared and kept permanently clear of vegetation. This will become a visual blight on rural land, including wetlands and conservation land. Further, toxic chemicals will be used to prevent vegetation from growing in this cleared path. These chemicals will leach into soil and groundwater, rendering some wells to be contaminated and unusable.
4. Underground pipelines can leak and explode, causing permanent damage to property and potential loss of life.
5. Digging and blasting can spread toxins to water supplies and permanently damage/contaminate wells.
6. Property values near the pipeline will plunge, while insurance will go up, if owners are even able to obtain insurance.

7. Compressor stations pose serious health risks to residents within a several mile radius.
8. Quality of life for residents affected by the pipeline will plummet.
9. My Dad is 81. His property abuts this proposed pipeline. He's been living there for over 50 years. He is very anxious and worried about his future with regard to the pipeline. He's worried about health impacts, property value, months of noise and pollution while the pipeline is being installed. If he eventually needs to go into assisted living, he'll never be able to sell the house. And he doesn't want to have to look at a permanent ugly scar on the land when he walks out of his house each day. He doesn't want to see this ugly mess when he is outside, enjoying his yard. Is this how an elderly man should live out the remaining few years he has left to enjoy?

20151123-5013

Kaela Law, Pelham, NH.

During a conservation commission meeting in Pelham on 11/18/15 Kinder Morgan company reps mentioned that their November 20 filing would NOT be complete and that "a subsequent April filing" would be more complete. Can somebody from F.E.R.C please explain what that particular Kinder Morgan Tennessee Gas Pipeline rep was talking about? Is there going to be a subsequent April filing? We were under the assumption that if and when Kinder Morgan was prepared to file for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity they must do so with a complete project plan. If they are telling us already their November 20 filing is NOT complete, wouldn't the F.E.R.C's decision to deny this application be an easy one? I read an article from the Keene Sentinel in which F.E.R.C spokesperson Tamara Young-Allen said "FERC staff will now go through the filing to make sure it is complete." - We have Kinder Morgan themselves telling us that it is not.

20151123-5014

Kaela Law, Pelham, NH.

I have a procedural question. What happens to the docket pf14-22-000 ? Will all of those comments and concerns be carried over into this new docket? Or will this new docket be looked separately from the pre-filing one? If we want all of our pre-filing concerns to count towards "the official filing" will we have to re-state them all here in CP16-22-000?

Thanks,

Kaela Law - Pelham NH

20151123-5017

Kaela Law, Pelham, NH.

I read "response to scoping"

Very unimpressed. I thought Kinder Morgan would have had to answer our specific questions. I didn't see any of mine on there. I should have known better, but I was expecting FERC to hold Kinder Morgan accountable for answering each one we asked.

Did Kinder Morgan only have to answer those generic clumping mash-ups of all our concerns and well thought out questions? Or are they only phrased that way for the reporting? It seems like Kinder Morgan was only asked about those generic "ISSUES"

Just an example:

Issue: General comments regarding impacts to conservation lands.

KMs Response: Pipelines are a compatible use for conservation areas as they restrict development on permanent easements.

Give me a break. First of all, I'm certain nobody got up to the microphone at those FERC scoping sessions and said, "I have general concerns about impacts to conservation lands." Our questions were specific. Secondly, is Kinder Morgan really not acknowledging that a pipeline is a development through a conservation

area? Are they trying to say that their development will restrict further development on an area that is NOT supposed to be developed, and that's why it makes such perfect KM sense?

If FERC accepts that answer – well really, how do we hold this whole process accountable?

20151123-5019

Don Ogden, Florence, MA.

Secretary Bose:

I am writing with regard to Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. filing an application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity for the proposed Northeast Energy Direct (“NED”) pipeline project.

The filing date would end right in the middle of the holiday season. Twenty-one calendar days would include weekends when impacted communities and individuals are distracted by the holidays. There is simply no need to disrupt thousands of lives during this busy time of year with unnecessary deadlines as people engage with the holidays and spend time with their families.

Should the Commission accept the NED application, please give a minimum of 45 days for stakeholders to intervene, rather than the typical 21 days. Under 18 C.F.R. 157.10, the Commission has the discretion to fix the time in which stakeholders may intervene, and the facts warrant longer than 21 days in this case.

Thank you for your attention in this matter.

20151123-5020

Don Ogden, Florence, MA.

Secretary Bose:

I am writing with regard to Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. filing an application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity for the proposed Northeast Energy Direct (“NED”) pipeline project.

The filing date would end right in the middle of the holiday season. Twenty-one calendar days would include weekends when impacted communities and individuals are distracted by the holidays. There is simply no need to disrupt thousands of lives during this busy time of year with unnecessary deadlines as people engage with the holidays and spend time with their families.

Should the Commission accept the NED application, please give a minimum of 45 days for stakeholders to intervene, rather than the typical 21 days. Under 18 C.F.R. 157.10, the Commission has the discretion to fix the time in which stakeholders may intervene, and the facts warrant longer than 21 days in this case.

Thank you for your attention in this matter.

20151123-5022

Lori Mattheiss, andover, MA.

The Kinder Morgan pipeline is a BAD idea! Massachusetts does not need this pipeline which will export gas. It would be much better to put money towards retrofitting homes & businesses to be more energy efficient! Wind, solar and tidal options are much better for Massachusetts!

20151123-5023

Charles Hanes, Andover, MA.

I am in support of the pipeline going through our town. we need the additional capacity to drive down costs.

That the pipeline company came up with a way to use it all year round is remarkable.

Please support this effort.

20151123-5024

Ronald H. Berg, North Reading, MA.

As a long-standing resident of North Reading, MA, I would like to register my strong opposition to this project. The local impact of the pipeline will be severe, and can include damage to the Ipswich River which supplies drinking water to North Reading and other communities. The pipeline would cross the Ipswich River in several places and would run through the watershed and protected conservation land.

As to the “necessity” of this pipeline - actually a number of recent studies contradict the supposed need for this gas pipeline. While Massachusetts has short term shortages of natural gas sometimes in the Winter, it has been shown that it would be more economical to buy LNG during the rare times that this is needed, rather than investing in this pipeline.

Another point is that if the pipeline is built, it could be done using existing routes (pipeline rights-of-way), which may be more expensive but would avoid the social and environmental impact of the current proposed route through North Reading and the Ipswich River watershed. Thank you for considering the serious, long-term, local and environmental impact of this project.

20151123-5025

Katie A Wallace, Andover, MA.

I continue to express my strong opposition to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company’s Northeast Energy Direct project. The Attorney General’s recent report has confirmed that this pipeline infrastructure is unnecessary to maintain the energy demands leading into 2030.

Our representatives should be working to stop Kinder Morgan from taking Article 97 land. This land has been protected for a reason and should not be altered for the good of one company that is primarily looking to export gas for their own personal gain.

Studies haven proven that the demand for electricity as speculated by Kinder Morgan, in fact does not exist. Our representatives should be pursuing clean renewable energy measures. What happened to the climate-related goals? As stated many times in the past, there are cheaper energy options. The question is....why are some of our elected officials not making the effort to address more cost effective and safer energy measures???

20151123-5031

Amy Glowacki, Mason, NH.

I am asking that the deadline for filing Motions to Intervene be set for after the holidays meaning after January 4, 2016. The length of time allowed to file as an intervenor has varied from project to project, and given the timing of this filing close to the busiest holiday season, it stands to reason that this one have an extended filing period. Thank you

20151123-5035

Laura lynch, Temple, NH.

There is nothing more to the future of the USA and the planet than extremely wise, well-considered consideration of the implications of human action on the environment. We do not need more natural gas nor petroleum extracted from the Earth and certainly do not need more pipelines to move those toxic products. We can not survive if we are forced to drink toxic water or breathe toxic air. Our fetuses and children are being damaged by the actions of human’s who failed to think long-term. FERC, the EPA, and similar government entities at local, state and national levels are supposed to act first and foremost to protect the US citizens from activities that damage our health and safety in the long as well as short term. Jobs can be had merely from maintaining the existing infrastructure so that all that is extracted reaches the customer. The cost of doing that long overdue maintenance would decrease the consumption by consumers because they would have to pay for this and they would conserve, if not for the sake of the environment, but because they would not

want to pay the true cost of the energy. More jobs would be created in the alternative energy sector because those cutting back on costly toxic energy sources would be willing to pay for the renewable energy source technology. We would all win because we would be healthier. And very important to most of us, there would be fewer toxins in the water and air our children would drink and inhale. This pipeline and gas is not needed. Please stop the NED Pipeline.

20151123-5065

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Eric Socha under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 11/23/2015 4:25:33 AM Filed Date: 11/23/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project) of Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	Esocha@riseup.net	

Basis for Intervening:

I am an individual looking to make notice my interest to assist in the intervention and prevention of the Tennessee gas pipeline in massachusetts. As a resident of the town of Cheshire I am in deep concern both locally as well as globally of the impact such a pipeline (or any other transport of gas across the state and elsewhere) could create.

20151123-5069

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Amy Glowacki under CP16-21-000.

Abutter of main 30" line and Fitchburg Lateral line.

Submission Date: 11/22/2015 7:45:33 PM Filed Date: 11/23/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project) of Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	Amy.glowacki2@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

Abutter to the main 30" line and 12" Fitchburg lateral line.

20151123-5072

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Leslie J Carey under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 11/22/2015 5:11:44 PM Filed Date: 11/23/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project) of Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	Leslicarey123@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

Please disregard my last submission and accept this as my formal motion to intervene.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC) Docket No. CP16-21-000
North East Direct Pipeline Project)
MOTION FOR LEAVE TO INTERVENE

Pursuant to Rules 212 and 214 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's ("Commission") Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 385.212 and 385.214 (2007), I, Leslie Carey file this motion to intervene in this proceeding.

On November 20, 2015, the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC ("TGP") filed its application under § 7 of the Natural Gas Act, 15 U.S.C. § 717f, and § 157 of FERC's regulations, 18 C.F.R. § 157.1 et seq., for the proposed North East Direct Project (NED), FERC Docket No. CP 16-21-000

I. COMMUNICATIONS AND SERVICE

All communications, pleadings, and orders with respect to this proceeding should be sent to the following individual:

Leslie Carey
34 Reno Rd.
Averill Park, NY
518-461-2664
Lesliecarey123@gmail.com

II. INTEREST OF PETITIONER

Construction, operation and maintenance of the Pipeline would adversely impact me.

This proposed pipeline would abut my property. It is proposed to be placed 300 feet from my water supply, and my water would be contaminated both during construction and operation, especially when the inevitable leaks occur. The chemicals from fracked gas are known carcinogens. Both of my parents died of cancer. I moved to the country in 8/2104 to further my commitment to healthy living and to improve my physical and mental health. Yet with this proposed pipeline, my water supply would be made carcinogenic.

I own property on both sides of the National Grid right of way. I have the right to cross over to use my property. Not only would we be barred from using our property during potential construction, I would fear to cross over the pipeline due to the possibility of explosion. Kinder Morgan has an abysmal safety record, has demonstrated unethical practices, and I have no confidence in their ability to do this safely. Therefore, the pipeline would render 12 acres of my property off limits because of concerns for the health and safety of myself, my family, and my animals. In addition, the pipeline would abut my yard and a stream, rendering the enjoyment of this natural resource unsafe, because it would be in the incineration zone if the large, shallowly buried pipe blows up. So again, I can't use my own property if this proposed pipeline is placed.

The proposed pipeline has already devalued my home. If it is approved, then the value of my home will plummet further. And because of the health and safety issues, it is doubtful that I could sell this home, thus I would be trapped with carcinogenic chemicals in my air, water, and soil, greatly increasing the likelihood that I will contract cancer. So between the possibility that the pipeline would explode and kill me or my family or animals, and the toxic pollution that we would be exposed to, this pipeline would contribute to our deaths.

The proposed compressor station is only four miles from my house. Air pollution from these stations has been recorded to travel ten miles, so again, I would be exposed to carcinogenic chemicals. In addition, I purchase organic eggs, meat, poultry, and maple syrup from a lovely farm that is one quarter mile from the proposed compressor station. That farm is in the incineration zone. So not only would I not want the products produced by this farm, I wouldn't want to go there and risk death by incineration.

This kind of industry, when placed in residential areas such as ours, causes depression and anxiety. These conditions severely impact a person's ability to cope and function. We are finding that it is a struggle to

work, pay bills, attend to activities of daily living, and participate in life. I am self employed and if I miss work, I don't get paid. This proposed pipeline has caused depression and anxiety for both my husband and I. If this pipeline is approved, our depression and anxiety will worsen and our ability to work and economically sustain ourselves will be further damaged.

I have important information and perspectives to bring to this process, consideration of which will serve the public interest.

III. CONCLUSION

Wherefore, I, Leslie Carey, respectfully requests that the Commission grant my Motion to Intervene as a party with full rights to participate in all further proceedings.

Respectfully submitted this 22 day of November, 2015.

Leslie Carey
34 Reno Rd.
Averill Park, NY
518-461-2664
Lesliecarey123@gmail.com

20151123-5073

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Mary C McKinney under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 11/21/2015 3:41:01 PM Filed Date: 11/23/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project) of Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	colleenmckinney@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

The Northeast Energy Direct/Tennessee Gas Pipeline would run alongside my property in Sidney, New York. The NED would parallel the "Constitution" pipeline, which, if built, would run 10 feet from my property line. Both of these pipelines would affect my property's value and my family's health, safety and quality of life.

20151123-5074

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Robert J Ricardelli under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 11/22/2015 5:04:34 PM Filed Date: 11/23/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project) of Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	Bricardelli@hotmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

Robert J. and Bonnie S. Ricardelli, of Dunstable, Massachusetts. are potential abbutters to the proposed gas pipeline. If the pipeline goes through the Town of Dunstable, as previously planned, it will be within 50 feet of our residence.

20151123-5079

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Donald Clendaniel under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 11/21/2015 6:37:09 PM Filed Date: 11/23/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project) of Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	clendaniels@juno.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I am a land owner who owns property on both sides of the proposed pipe line for the NED project. This planed pipeline would bisect water sources and streams that are on my property. I also request that the filing time be extended until after the holidays.

20151123-5080

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Leslie J Carey under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 11/21/2015 6:43:16 PM Filed Date: 11/23/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project) of Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	Lesliecarey123@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I am land abutter to this proposed project as I own land on both sides of the proposed pipeline. My water, soil, air, physical health, and mental health would be damaged by this pipeline. Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas have comported themselves thus far unethically by trespassing and lying. Their safety record is abysmal. There is no public good with this proposed pipeline; the gas isn't needed. I stridently object to NYS being used as a gas superhighway to garner this wretched company further billions of dollars. I am reserving my right to intervene. In addition I would like the time frame to file a motion to be extended until after the holidays.

20151123-5097

Town of LYNNFIELD

CHRISTOPHER J. BARRETT
 PHILIP B. CRAWFORD
 THOMAS D. TERRANOVA, JR.
 JAMES M. BOUDREAU
 Town Administrator

BOARD OF SELECTMEN

Resolution in Support and Vote by the Lynnfield Board of Selectmen to become an Intervenor in the Tennessee Gas Pipeline for a new natural gas pipeline known as the Northeast Energy Direct

WHEREAS: The Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company has proposed a new natural gas pipeline known as the Northeast Energy Direct Project ("Project") to be constructed in Pennsylvania, New York, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire. In Massachusetts, the Project would include approximately 101 miles of new pipeline, plus additional facilities in this region; and

WHEREAS: We, the Lynnfield Board of Selectmen do hereby strongly oppose the aforementioned pipeline as previously voted and evidenced by our joining in the “Northeast Municipal Gas Pipeline Coalition”; and

WHEREAS: Once Tennessee Gas files its formal application with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, the Board of Selectmen resolve to become an “Intervenor” which is an official party to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission’s proceeding. Intervenors play a more formal role in the process and are able to file briefs, appear at hearings, and be heard by the courts if they choose to appeal the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission’s final ruling.

WHEREAS: As an “Intervenor”, the Board of Selectmen can formally participate in the proceeding by filing a request to intervene within the required twenty-one (21) day window, if it is deemed needed by the Chairman of the Board of Selectmen;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Lynnfield Board of Selectmen do hereby resolve and vote to become an “Intervenor”, once Tennessee Gas files its formal application with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. Further, the Board of Selectmen resolve to become an “Intervenor” which is an official party to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission’s proceeding, and/or any other actions deemed necessary by the Chairman of the Board of Selectmen. Additionally the Lynnfield Board of Selectmen do hereby instruct the Town Administrator to stand ready to file a motion to Intervene. In witness whereof, We the Lynnfield Board of Selectmen do hereby set our hands and affix the Great Seal of the Town of Lynnfield this 9th day of September, 2015.

Philip B. Crawford, Chairman
Thomas D. Terranova, Jr., Vice-Chair
Christopher J. Barrett, Clerk

20151123-5102

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Susan L Durling under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 11/23/2015 8:57:58 AM Filed Date: 11/23/2015 8:57:58 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project) of Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	sueldu@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

reside on property that abuts market path 30” line at 215 Scotland Rd, Winchester, NH 03470

20151123-5105

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Susan Sedlmayr under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 11/23/2015 9:18:31 AM Filed Date: 11/23/2015 9:18:31 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project) of Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	Chebo33@yahoo.com	

Basis for Intervening:

This new fracked gas pipeline and new compressor station is just a few miles north of my home. I am extremely concerned about the health and welfare of my family and my community.

20151123-5127

Submission Description: Motion to Intervene of Dwight L Mott under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 11/23/2015 10:07:58 AM

Filed Date: 11/23/2015 10:07:58 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project) of Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party	Signer (Representative)	Other Contact (Principal)
Individual	dwrightmott@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I am the property owner of the parcel identified as NY TW 354.00 in Davenport, NY in Delaware County. The proposed NED pipeline would cross my property, immediately beside the already FERC-certified Constitution Pipeline. Since the pipeline is “open-access,” it will encourage industrial development, including natural gas extraction, which will drastically alter the organic integrity of my property and the rural character of the community and area where my father’s grandfather’s grandfather first settled and which I have called home for most of my 50 years. My property is currently being managed as a permaculture homestead, edible forest garden, and organic market farmstead.

The Massachusetts Attorney General has already determined that the applicant’s claim of public necessity is without merit. In granting a Certificate of Public Necessity and Convenience, as evidenced by the recent example of the Constitution Pipeline, the Commission would unduly limit my ability to negotiate a good faith settlement for an easement across my property with the applicant. Fair Market Value is defined as “the price at which the property would change hands between a willing buyer and a willing seller, neither being under any compulsion to buy or to sell and both having reasonable knowledge of relevant facts.” United States v. Cartwright, 411 U. S. 546, 93 S. Ct. 1713, 1716-17, 36 L. Ed. 2d 528, 73-1 U.S. Tax Cas. (CCH) ¶ 12,926 (1973) (quoting from U.S. Treasury regulations relating to Federal estate taxes, at 26 C.F.R. sec. 20.2031-1(b)).

In the case of the Constitution Pipeline, under threat of condemnation, the party from which I purchased my property (said easement not having been disclosed to me by the seller, the seller’s agent, the seller’s attorney or my own attorney prior to the sale), as well as my neighbors, were unduly compelled to settle on a value of less than \$25.00 per linear foot, while recently, in modifying it’s route, the Constitution Pipeline negotiated a settlement with my neighbor \$1,000 per linear foot without the benefit (to the company) of a Certificate of Public Necessity and Convenience. Thus, granting the applicant’s request in this case could demonstrably have the effect of devaluing my property and the properties of all landowners by an unconscionable 99.25%.

It would seem reasonable that, in granting a Certificate of Public Necessity and Convenience in this case, The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission could be perceived by members of the general public as being complicit in Racketeering and Extortion on a massive scale. In addition, with the Applicant in this case filing prior to a Notice to Proceed being granted to Constitution Pipeline, any EIS for either docket that does not account for the cumulative effects of both pipelines represents incomplete Environmental Impact Studies for both pipelines, and thus illegal segmentation.

As no one else can represent my interests in this matter, and on its face I stand to suffer significant damages and irreparable harm from an affirmative outcome in this application, I am filing this motion to intervene.

20151123-5156

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Stuart Anderson under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 11/23/2015 10:54:41 AM

Filed Date: 11/23/2015 10:54:41 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project) of Ten-

nessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	andersonboatworks@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I am a resident of the Village of Otego in Otsego County, NY, approximately one and one half miles from the compressor station proposed in the Town of Franklin in Delaware County, NY. As the prevailing winds will often carry the compressor station emissions to my home, and as no one else can represent me, I am filing this motion to intervene.

20151123-5179

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of FMR LLC under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 11/23/2015 12:20:46 PM Filed Date: 11/23/2015 12:20:46 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project) of Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
FMR LLC	mark.kalpin@wilmerhale.com	mark.kalpin@wilmerhale.com
FMR LLC		david.gold@wilmerhale.com

Basis for Intervening:

Basis for Intervening: Pursuant to Sections 212 and 214 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (“FERC” or “Commission”), 18 C.F.R. § 385.212 and § 385.214, FMR LLC (“FMR”) respectfully moves to intervene in the above-captioned proceeding.

Filing Party: FMR LLC is the parent company for the various financial services and related businesses more commonly known as “Fidelity Investments.” This intervention is submitted on behalf of FMR LLC and its related affiliates and subsidiaries (collectively, hereinafter “FMR”).

Grounds for Intervention: A subsidiary of FMR owns a 554-acre campus in Merrimack, New Hampshire (the “Merrimack Campus”). At the Merrimack Campus, more than 5,400 FMR employees provide asset management and financial services to various institutional and individual clients, including retirement services and investment and customer support, as well as corporate services to FMR’s enterprise. The proposed pipeline route for the Northeast Energy Direct Project runs through and/or alongside the Merrimack Campus. As owners of property on/along the proposed pipeline route, FMR has a direct and substantial interest in the outcome of this proceeding, and FMR’s interests cannot be represented adequately by any other party. FMR’s participation in this proceeding is in the public interest and FMR respectfully requests that the Commission accept this filing and grant its motion to intervene.

20151123-5195

Lynnfield Center Water District
83 Phillips Road
Lynnfield, Massachusetts 01940
Phone: 1-781-334-3901
Fax: 1-781-334-3013
nfo@LCWD.US • www.LCWD.US

Commissioners:

John M. Roberto, Chairman
Constance E Leccese

Superintendent:
Kenneth H. Burnham

John H. Kimball Jr., Esq.

**Resolution in Support and Vote by the Lynnfield Center Water District
Board of Water Commissioners**

**to become an Intervenor in the Tennessee Gas Pipeline for a new natural gas pipeline known as the
Northeast Energy Direct**

WHEREAS: The Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company has proposed a new natural gas pipeline known as the Northeast Energy Direct Project ("Project") to be constructed in Pennsylvania, New York, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire. In Massachusetts, the Project would include approximately 101 miles of new pipeline, plus additional facilities in this region a portion of which is proposed to cross land owned by the Lynnfield Center Water District upon which public drinking water supply wells are located; and

WHEREAS: We, the Lynnfield Center Water District Board of Water Commissioners are charged with safeguarding the District's clean and potable public water supply from all threats or dangers thereto; and

WHEREAS: Once Tennessee Gas files its formal application with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, the Board of Water Commissioners resolve to become an "Intervenor" which is an official party to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's proceeding. Interveners play a more formal role in the process and are able to file briefs, appear at hearings, and be heard by the courts if they choose to appeal the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's final ruling.

WHEREAS: As an "Intervenor", the Board of Water Commissioners can formally participate in the proceeding by filing a request to intervene within the required twenty-one (21) day window, if it is deemed needed by the Board of Water Commissioners;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Lynnfield Center Water District Board of Water Commissioners do hereby resolve and vote to become an "Intervenor", once Tennessee Gas files its formal application with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. Further, the Board of Water Commissioners resolve to become an "Intervenor" which is an official party to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's proceeding, and/or any other actions deemed necessary by the Board of Water Commissioners. Additionally, the Board of Water Commissioners stands ready to file to intervene.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, We the Lynnfield Center Water District Board of Water Commissioners do hereby set our hands and affix the Great Seal of the Lynnfield Center Water District this 16TH day of September 2015.

John M. Roberto, Chairman

Constance E. Leccese, Commissioner

John H. Kimball, Jr., Esq., Commissioner

20151123-5220

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Society for the Protection of NH Forests under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 11/23/2015 1:26:28 PM

Filed Date: 11/23/2015 1:26:28 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project) of Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____

Society for the Protection of NH Forests mleahy@forestsociety.org

Basis for Intervening:

Basis for Intervening: The Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests (SPNHF) owns several forest reservation parcels in southern NH that are in the route of the proposed Northeast Energy Direct natural

gas pipeline construction: the 55 acre Heald Tract parcels in Greenville and Mason, NH and the 45 acre Bockes Forest in Hudson, NH.

As owners of such properties, SPNHF has a direct and substantial interest in the outcome of this proceeding. Therefore, pursuant to Commission rules at 18 CFR 157.10 and 18 CFR 385.214, the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests moves to intervene and file comments in the above captioned proceeding. This motion is timely filed.

20151123-5267

**Mass Audubon
Advocacy Department**

Six Beacon Street, Suite 1025 • Boston, Massachusetts 02108
tel 617.962.5187 • fax 617.523.4183 • email jclarke@massaudubon.org

November 23, 2015

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

Re: **Docket No. CP14-529-000 – Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.**

Environmental Assessment (EA) for Connecticut Expansion Project and Objection to Segmentation of Review from Docket No. CP16-21-000 (formerly PF14-22-000), Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Secretary Bose:

On behalf of Mass Audubon, I submit the following comments on Tennessee Gas Pipeline's application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity for over 13 miles of new pipeline facilities and associated equipment in southeastern New York, southwestern Massachusetts and northern Connecticut known as the Connecticut Expansion Project (CEP). The CEP would impact over 216 acres of land for construction, with 52.8 acres being permanently converted for pipelines and associated facilities. The EA does not adequately address the purpose and need, environmental impacts, alternatives, and mitigation for this project. It also does not adequately consider the cumulative effects of this project in conjunction with other planned gas transmission projects in the region, particularly the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project planned by the same company. Mass Audubon requests that a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) be prepared and that the review of the CEP be combined with the review of the NED Project. The need for these projects should be carefully and objectively evaluated, particularly in light of the *Power System Reliability in New England* study released by the Massachusetts Office of the Attorney General on November 8, 2015[1].

The project as proposed crosses two miles within the Otis State Forest, impacting 29 acres of state-owned parklands, including six acres of permanent impact where new permanent easements are sought. Mass Audubon assisted the Massachusetts Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR) in protecting the affected state forest lands and surrounding land, and we object to the proposed conversion of land permanently dedicated to park and conservation purposes to a pipeline easement. This diversion of use is contrary to the intended purposes of this land acquisition. While Mass Audubon's direct land acquisition costs were reimbursed by the state, associated costs incurred including staff time and due diligence costs estimated in value at \$100,000 were not reimbursed.

Mass Audubon has submitted comments to FERC previously under these dockets (Docket PF14-22-000: October 6, 2014, January 15, 2015, July 22, 2015, and September 10, 2015; Docket CP14-529-000: September 4, 2014, November 7, 2014, and April 10, 2015; combined comments on both dockets, October 16, 2015). We request that the following comments be considered in addition to previously filed comments.

Purpose, Need, and Project Segmentation

Tennessee and its parent company, Kinder Morgan, are proposing other gas transmission pipeline projects in the region, including the NED project that would traverse Massachusetts from the New York border to Dra-cut, Massachusetts. These projects are physically connected and the NED project includes an additional loop segment on the 300 line immediately south of the proposed CEP project. We request that the FERC carefully consider whether the application for the CEP improperly segments project review, including in light of the Delaware Riverkeeper case (DC Circuit Court of Appeals, No. 13-1015). That decision noted that FERC may not segment review under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) when “it divides connected, cumulative or similar federal actions into separate projects and thereby fails to address the true scope and impact of the activities that should be under consideration.”

The Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) filed with the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act office this year on the CEP project contains contradictory statements claiming on the one hand that it is a stand-alone project serving only three specific customers in Connecticut, but then also stating, “Construction of the Project will help to alleviate the natural gas pipeline constraints in the northeast United States by in-creasing capacity in these high-demand markets.[2]” The physical and temporal proximity of these projects along with the cumulative impacts to the environment within the region all point to a need for combined, cumulative review.

Alternatives Analysis

Further review should be required of alternatives to avoid, minimize, and mitigate the impacts of the CEP and NED. This analysis should consider the potential roles of increased energy efficiency programs, modifi-cations to gas marketing and sales mechanisms, alternative energy sources including renewables, and alter-native routes that further avoid and minimize impacts to land and water resources. The AG’s Energy Reli-ability Study found that energy efficiency and demand management would meet the reliability needs of the system at the lowest costs to the customers. As noted in previous comments, FERC should also address the impacts of expanded gas transmission pipelines on state, regional, and national goals for reducing Green-house Gas emissions. Alternatives should be pursued to meet those targets as well as energy needs.

Impacts and Mitigation – Additional Information Needed in an EIS

The EA summarizes the impacts of the CEP to various categories of resources such as wetlands, but does not adequately address site-specific impacts and mitigation. For example, at specific locations there may be particular features such as trees with cavities, stream banks supporting animal burrows, or locations within wetlands that are particularly productive for breeding of amphibians or as fish habitat. The Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act recognizes fish and wildlife habitat as public interests. The state regulations pro-mulgated under that law and the associated *Massachusetts Wildlife Habitat Protection Guidance for Inland Wetlands*[3] produced by the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection call for site-specific identification and protection of specific habitat features. Similar site-specific analyses and planning are also applicable under the federal Clean Water Act and 401 Water Quality Certification permitting. The standard-ized construction methodologies referenced in the EA are an inadequate substitution for site-specific plan-ning.

Several studies have documented a high failure rate for wetlands mitigation in Massachusetts, New England, and nationwide. Recently, the University of Massachusetts and Department of Environmental Protection conducted a review of wetlands replication in Massachusetts that confirmed little progress has been made in the success rate of wetlands replication compared to previous studies (*Compensatory Wetland Mitigation in Massachusetts* by Stephen Brown and Peter Veneman, 1998). Less than half of the replication projects meet minimal standards, while even fewer produce wetlands of similar size and vegetative character of the area lost. While gas pipelines may claim that the construction impacts are temporary, factors such as the long period of time (often decades) required to re-grow woody vegetation in wetlands, as well as introduction of invasive species, indicate that the impacts are much more widespread and long-lasting.

For state and federally-listed rare species, avoidance, minimization and mitigation are highly sensitive to site-specific planning, and again the EA is incomplete and inadequate in that regard.

The EA requires the company to conclude consultations with state and federal environmental agencies including the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection and Massachusetts Division of Fisheries and Wildlife prior to construction. Mass Audubon objects to this procedure for addressing additional detailed planning required for the project. Deferring those details to future consultations with individual agencies deprives the public of the opportunity to review and comment. It also has the potential for creating conflict between protection of one resource vs. another – for example a proposed rare species mitigation measure approved by wildlife officials may have additional water quality impacts. Coordinated review, with public input, is important and is an essential function of the NEPA process.

The EA inadequately addresses cumulative environmental impacts. In describing impacts to rare species, for example, the EA repeatedly states that the impacts at a specific location will not cause a species to trend toward federal listing, or that impacts will be local and temporary. The cumulative effects of impacts across multiple sites should be considered in the context of other existing and planned projects (including projects by others) that will also impact the same species. If a species is already in decline and state-listed, any impact should be taken seriously and avoided if at all possible. One example of inadequate consideration of impacts to rare species is the proposed mitigation for American Bittern and Wood Turtle at the Tyringham pipeyard. The EA states that the Bittern habitat will be covered in construction matting before the bird breeding season begins, and turtles will be excluded from the area by construction fencing. This may prevent direct harm to individual animals, but also excludes them from necessary habitat during important points in their lifecycle. This may impact their survival and/or breeding success, and will at a minimum have some temporary effect on the local population. More should be done to avoid impacting such sensitive habitats, or if the impacts are truly unavoidable, mitigation should include positive measures such as creation and protection of additional habitat to benefit the affected local populations.

The cumulative impacts of the CEP and NED projects taken together are very significant and warrant combined review through a comprehensive EIS.

Conservation Lands and Article 97 of the Massachusetts Constitution

The project as proposed would traverse two miles within the Otis State Forest, impacting 29 acres of state-owned parklands, including proposed acquisition by the company of a new easement across 6 acres of parkland. Disposition of permanently protected parklands in Massachusetts requires approval by both branches of the state Legislature under Article 97 of the state constitution.

In 2007, Mass Audubon assisted DCR in protecting over 900 acres of land at Otis State Forest, including areas around Lower Spectacle Pond that include an old growth hemlock forest stand, intact large blocks of forest, cold water fishery habitat, and other important natural resources. The Lower Spectacle Pond property is part of an interconnected area of protected open space encompassing more than 8,500 acres. It includes *BioMap2* Core Habitat mapped by the Massachusetts Division of Fisheries and Wildlife, and supports myriad plants and animals including rare turtles and dragonflies. The property includes diverse intact natural communities that contain features such as bedrock outcrops, large cavity trees, mature forest, and numerous seeps and springs in addition to the perennial streams mentioned in the FERC filing. Mass Audubon transferred its interests in land affected by this project to the state with the understanding that the land would be permanently protected under Article 97. The Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs (EEA) Article 97 Land Disposition Policy states that EEA may only consider supporting Article 97 dispositions when several conditions are met including: “the disposition of a parcel is not contrary to the express wishes of the person(s) who donated or sold the parcel or interests therein to the commonwealth.” **Mass Audubon objects to and opposes the proposed Article 97 disposition.**

The assessment of impacts as described in the FERC filing are superficial and incomplete. Fragmentation of mature forest and associated habitat will occur, impacting the ecosystem well beyond the footprint of impact. Disturbances of plants and soils will promote the spread of invasive species, and the impacts are far

more than temporary. The company should be required to undertake further detailed analysis of alternatives to avoid and minimize impacts to these precious parklands. Any unavoidable impacts should be fully mitigated, including ongoing (permanent) commitments to invasive species management and enforcement of Off-Road Vehicle (ORV) restrictions. DCR does not have adequate resources to manage or prevent existing ORV violations let alone take on new responsibilities for keeping vehicles off a private company's expanded easement.

In the event that proposed construction is allowed in Otis State Forest, mitigation should include specific commitments to protection of land of comparable natural resource and scenic value. The mere payment of money into a land acquisition fund does not ensure that land with similar, diverse, old forest characteristics and other natural and recreational values will be protected.

Ongoing Maintenance – Habitat and Invasive Species Control

In addition to routine mowing and vegetation control, access by maintenance vehicles along the easement will continually disturb soils, present hazards to wildlife such as turtles, and facilitate the spreading of invasives through seeds and propagules adhering to vehicles. Alternatives analysis, project cost estimates, and mitigation commitments should include the cost to the public of lost or degraded ecosystem services, along with permanent, ongoing commitments to manage invasive species and ORVs.

The Invasive Species Management Plan for this and other gas pipeline projects should include permanent, ongoing provisions for monitoring and control of all invasive plants[4] along the pipeline corridor and at associated facilities. A five year program of limited management for a few species, as proposed, is grossly inadequate considering the role of utility rights-of-way as vectors for the spread of invasive plants across Massachusetts and the region.

In conclusion, Mass Audubon requests that a full EIS be prepared, and that the CEP and NED project reviews be combined and coordinated. If the project proceeds, Mass Audubon reiterates its request that it be re-routed outside of Otis State Forest.

Sincerely,

John J. Clarke

Director of Public Policy & Government Relations

footnotes:

- 1 <http://www.mass.gov/ago/doing-business-in-massachusetts/energy-and-utilities/regional-electric-reliability-options-study.html>
- 2 P. 1-3 Purpose and Need Statement, CEP FEIR, March, 2014
- 3 <http://www.mass.gov/eea/docs/dep/water/laws/i-thru-z/wldhab.pdf>
- 4 <http://www.mass.gov/eea/agencies/agr/farm-products/plants/massachusetts-prohibited-plant-list.html>

cc (via email):

DCR
NHESP
DEP

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 has grown to become a powerful force for conservation 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.

20151124-0028

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, DC 20426

November 20, 2015

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

The Honorable Edward A. Bettencourt, Jr.
Mayor
City of Peabody
24 Lowell Street
Peabody, MA 01960

Dear Mayor Bettencourt:

Thank you for your August 27, 2015, letter regarding Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project (Docket No. PF 14-22-000).

On June 30, 2015, Commission staff issued the Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the Planned Northeast Energy Direct Project, Request for Comments on Environmental Issues, and Notice of Public Scoping Meetings, which initiated the formal public scoping period and indicated the locations, dates, and times for the public scoping meetings. Commission staff has conducted 14 public scoping meetings for the Northeast Energy Direct Project. The meeting locations were selected to be convenient for the greatest number of people who might be interested in the project, including one in Dracut, Massachusetts, which is in proximity to Peabody.

While scoping meetings are a valuable tool for us to receive comments from the public, they are only one of several ways for interested parties to bring their concerns to the attention of the Commission. Stakeholders may also file written comments with the Commission. Those comments will receive the same attention and scrutiny as comments received at the public meetings. In addition, we are accepting and will address comments made after the close of the extended scoping comment period that ended October 16, 2015. I encourage you and your constituents to continue to participate in the review of the project, and to file any comments that you believe will help the Commission consider this planned project.

In addition, your letter raises concerns regarding the project's impacts on aquifers, drinking water supply, the New Ipswich River, public safety, and the Peabody Independence Greenway. The forthcoming environmental impact statement (EIS) for this project will consider these comments and concerns. Once Tennessee Gas files its certificate application for this project, the Commission staff will begin preparing a draft EIS, which will be published and distributed for a 45-day public review and comment period. Commission staff will hold additional public comment meetings on the draft EIS in the project area and in the vicinity of Peabody.

As in any Commission matter, please be assured that we strive to make our review of proposals both accessible and transparent to the public. If I can be of any further assistance in this or any other Commission matter, please let me know.

Sincerely
Norman C. Bay
Chairman

20151124-5003

Evelyn Taylor, New Ipswich, NH.

I am writing to the FERC to request you demand investigations into the negative health impacts to people

living even 1-2 miles from compressor stations as part of the review of this Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's Northeast Energy Direct filing. Large livestock (cattle and horses) have DIED from exposure to the chemicals released around fracking well sites. These toxins and other harmful events associated to compressor station and pipeline operations are being linked to serious illness and bodily harm to men, women, children and unborn babies. Some states have fetal assault laws whereby a mother can be arrested for causing harm to her unborn child through drugs or other substances. How is it that the NED fracked gas pipeline has not been condemned and rejected outright until Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. funds reliable and accurate independent scientific studies to research these claims? How is it that anyone can allow this urgent concern to go unnoticed and unaddressed? Failing to provide a total disclosure of the chemicals and the amounts of each and failure to include ALL emissions (including blow downs and fugitive emissions) in the impact assessment to land, air, water and biological processes is a deliberate avoidance of admitting a problem exists. Legislation may have made an effort to conceal but this world is now equipped to look through those actions and find the truth. I have raised these concern multiple times before in the previous docket and I am now raising them again. Failure to take action to these reports and warnings is an irresponsible and inexcusable act. My home is near the New Ipswich, NH, proposed large compressor station site. I will not succumb to the torture of toxins covering my home, by body, my clothing, my food, my everything. I will fight this until changes are made to end this torture.

20151124-5017

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Edward C. Dow, Jr under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 11/23/2015 9:14:44 PM Filed Date: 11/24/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____

Individual edwarddow2014@gmail.com

Basis for Intervening:

The Kinder Morgan North East Direct (NED) pipeline application proposes to place a pipeline through the middle of my family's property and to use our hay fields for staging and storage of equipment. The plan also proposed to cut across Willard Brook disrupting the ecology, remove trees which prevent erosion and flooding, cause noise impacting the ability to live on the property, and create a permanent chemical and explosive hazard which impacts property value.

20151124-5115

Patty Woodbury, North Reading, MA.

Hi,

I am writing to oppose the Kinder Morgan pipeline in MA. This is an unneeded pipeline. What IS needed is updating of the current infrastructure. This will disrupt communities, towns, watersheds, conservation land and with the current energy-saving measures, is NOT needed.

A Kentucky judge ruled that a pipeline to make a billion dollar company more lucrative was not in the realm of eminent domain. I expect MA to rule the same way.

Sincerely,

Patty Woodbury

20151124-5173

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of HOMER D SHANNON under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 11/24/2015 12:16:59 PM Filed Date: 11/24/2015 12:16:59 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____
Individual homerdshannon@hotmail.com

Basis for Intervening:

I am an affected property owner in Windham, New Hampshire, lot 19-B-905. This project will take approximately 10,000 square feet of land as a permanent easement. It will destroy roughly 50 large trees on my lot. It will damage the aesthetics of my property. It will devalue my home and land.

20151124-5211

CP16-21-000

I am filing a motion for intervention status on FERC docket 16-21 based on my residence at 215 Scotland Road, Winchester, New Hampshire 03470 . This property abuts property through which the pipeline passes. My interest will be directly affected by the outcome of the proceeding and I am participating in the public interest as a consumer.

As stated in Title 18: Conservation of Power and Water Resources

PART 385—RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE

Subpart B—Pleadings, Tariff and Rate Filings, Notices of Tariff or Rate Examination, Orders To Show Cause, Intervention, and Summary Disposition

20151125-0007

November 10, 2015

Commissioner Cheryl A.LaFleur
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First St.,NE
Washington, DC 20246

Re: Docket No. PF-14-22-000
Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Commissioner LaFleur:

On November 20, 2015, Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline has indicated it will file an application for a permit that would allow Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline to proceed with the proposed New England Direct (NED) pipeline through Massachusetts, Docket No. PF14-22..

As part of the evaluation required by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) for a permit to be issued for this project, we submit the following comments and request that they be admitted into consideration in opposition for issuance of a permit. This proposed pipeline project would have many adverse impacts for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. We understand that FERC primarily examines the need of Public Convenience dt Necessity When all of the adverse impacts are carefully and thoroughly evaluated, they will far outweigh any need for public convenience and necessity and that a permit will NOT be approved for this project.

Among the adverse impacts are:

- This proposed pipeline would adversely impact the lands and waters of MA. There are many acres of conservation land protected under Article 97 of the MA constitution, other protected lands, farmlands, wetlands and private lands. Pipeline construction would forever alter these lands.
- Water is another concern. What steps will be taken to protect the groundwater which ultimately flows

into private wells and underground aquifers, streams, rivers, wetlands, swamps, and ponds? How will these waters be protected from the toxic chemicals that will be emitted by the pipeline components as the pipeline is constructed?

- Will horizontal drilling be employed to install the pipeline under aqueducts, railroad crossings, streams and ponds? Horizontal drilling can have adverse impacts on land and water through which the drill passes. What measure will be taken to protect the water, and the land and the property above? .
- Methane is much more harmful to the environment than either oil or coal. Methane will be released along the pipeline, especially at pigging stations and compressor stations. How will nearby residents be protected from the harmful effects of methane emissions as well as other toxic chemicals in the gas transmitted through the pipeline? What measures will be taken for noise abatement, especially at compressor stations?
- Has the alleged need for a pipeline been thoroughly analyzed? Massachusetts has legislative mandate to reduce its dependence on fossil fuels in favor of sustain renewable and sustainable energy. In Massachusetts, the use of fossil fuels is declining and the use of alternative energy sources, such as solar is rising. Why is this not being taken into account?
- There is much evidence which indicates that most of the natural gas to pass through these proposed pipelines is for export to international markets. More natural gas than New England could ever use is projected to flow through this pipeline. This would cause the pipeline to be overbuilt and who will benefit from that?
- In addition, it has been proposed to pass the cost of constructing the pipeline on to electric ratepayers. This is a boon to the pipeline companies and a financial burden for ratepayers for decades to come with no benefit to the New England states.
- Natural gas pipelines have high accident rates, many resulting in death and serious injury. The pipeline will pass through many densely populated Massachusetts towns. What measures will be taken to ensure public safety and very quick response to problem areas. How will the public be protected from the noise of pigging and compressor station?

Until all of these questions have been thoroughly analyzed and answered, we believe that FERC should not approve any certificate for any pipeline in Massachusetts. No certificate should be issued until an honest and thorough analysis has been completed for any need for natural gas in Massachusetts.

In closing, we believe that the potential adverse effects of a pipeline far outweigh any alleged need for natural gas in Massachusetts and that no permit should be issued..

Berlin Pipeline Study Committee

Maryanne MacLeod. Chair
45 Swett Hill Rd.,
Sterling, MA 01564

Committee Members:

Marsha Johnston
Baker Rd.
Berlin, MA 01503

Paul Keleher
35 Barnes Hill Rd.
Berlin, MA 01503

Philip Rainville
115 Barnes Hill Rd.
Berlin, MA 01503

A printed, signed copy has been mailed.

cc: Senator Jennifer Flanagan
Representative Harold Naughton
Governor Charles Baker
Secretary Beaton

20151125-0008

{duplicate copy of 20151103-0012 above}

20151125-5088

Arnold Piacentini

•••

PO Box 454 • Richmond, MA 01254
Tel 413-698-2057 • Email symptrad@nycap.rr.com

November 25, 2015

Ms. Kimberly Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC)
888 First Street NE, Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426

via: Electronic Submission

Re: Conclusions of my work evaluating fracked gas public policy, applicable to the following FERC docket numbers, as well as others:

FERC Docket Numbers, as follows:

CP14-529 ... KMI/TGP CT Expansion Proposal
PF14-22 ... KMI/TGP NED Proposal
CP13-499 ... Williams/Cabot Constitution Proposal
CP14-96 ... Spectra AIM Proposal
PF15-12 ... Spectra/Northeast Pipeline Atlantic Bridge Proposal
PF16-01(?) ... Spectra/Eversource Access Northeast Proposal

Dear Ms. Bose;

Please refer to my October 15, 2015 filing with FERC:

http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/file_list.asp?accession_num=20151015-5172

My conclusions from the work that I have done so far are as follows:

- The gas model excludes significant costs and personal burdens transferred to society. These are detailed in the above-referenced filing with FERC.
- Burning fracked gas is worse than burning coal or oil from a climate change viewpoint as methane and nitrous oxide releases are vast and not fully accounted for.
Toxicologically, one set of contaminants is replaced by another, and worse with fracked gas we are distributing such contaminants into our water, air, soil and at the burned tip.
- Fracking has failed both financially and technically.
- The worldwide divestment and keep-it-in-the-ground movements are making significant progress. This trend will continue.
- Shale and pipeline, as well as other fossil fuel companies, are becoming financially distressed.
- It is logical to expect that production of oil and gas from fracking will decline at a greater rate than currently forecasted by the EIA.
- The export of liquefied fracked gas does not make sense. The US is a net importer of LNG. Exported liquefied fracked gas is the marginal cost source on the world market. Currently, there is no incentive

to export. Should exports occur in the future, this would increase domestic gas prices.

- The intersection of action to address climate change and the profit motive has been reached. Unsubsidized onshore wind and utility-scale PV now cost less than the cost of subsidized fossil fuels. Some of the fossil fuel subsidies would need to be used to get offshore wind off the ground. The potential here is vast.
- Pipeline companies use deceptive and unscrupulous practices.
- FERC does not follow legal requirements and is negligent in their procedures. In its current state FERC is one big conflict of interest.
- FERC by ignoring the big picture is putting our nation's energy security at risk. To put energy security at risk is to put economic security at risk.
- More gas pipeline capacity would not serve New England's needs for reliability enhancement or cost reduction (1).
- Economic activity and job growth can be stimulated significantly more by investing in energy efficiency and renewable energy sources than by a misallocation of capital to gas pipelines. This would have the added benefits of reducing and stabilizing energy costs and increasing reliability.
- The people want to replace this fracked gas policy with one that expedites investments in energy efficiency and renewable energy sources.

In view of the change in our knowledge of the technical, economic and financial factors, I request that FERC cease issuing "Certificates of Public Convenience and Necessity" and tolling orders for all of the above-referenced Docket Numbers, as well as others. And, I request that FERC rescind such orders where issued.

Thank you for studying the current fundamentals for this policy and for giving serious consideration to my requests.

Signed: Arnold Piacentini, Pro Se

Arnold Piacentini, BS, MS and PhD in ChE

Note (1): The regional study commissioned by the Office of the Massachusetts Attorney General was issued on November 18, 2015 and has concluded that additional gas pipeline capacity would not serve New England's future energy needs.

See: <http://www.mass.gov/ago/docs/energy-utilities/reros-study-final.pdf>

20151125-5138

The Greater Northfield Watershed Association
P.O. Box 44 Northfield, MA 01360

BEFORE THE UNITED STATES
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

KinderMorgan) Docket No. CP 16-21
Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline)

**MOTION TO INTERVENE OF GREATER NORTHFIELD WATERSHED ASSOCIATION (GNWA)
in opposition to Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline**

Pursuant to Rule 214 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. §385.214, GNWA files this Motion to Intervene in the above-captioned proceeding. The GNWA opposes the construction of NED and the proposed compressor station in Northfield on the grounds that it directly threatens private and public water supplies and the surrounding watershed ecosystems. The GNWA also opposes new energy infrastructure that contributes to climate change. Therefore, the GNWA seeks party

status to protest the proposed NED project to fully protect Northfield's interests.

I.STATEMENT OF INTEREST

A. Description of INTERVENOR

The Greater Northfield Watershed Association (GNWA) represents approximately 60 contributing members. 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 construction and operation of the pipeline and especially the compressor station located in our town present a serious threat to the watersheds, public wells and reservoirs, and private water sources.

B. Description of Impacts

GNWA will be directly impacted and harmed by the proposed project as follows:

1. The geology and topography of the area makes this a poor choice for this proposed pipeline and compressor station by jeopardizing the water supply of the whole town east of the Connecticut River . The ROW runs along bedrock hilltops with very shallow soils. From the moment trees are cleared there will be significant run-off that will become more concentrated as it heads downstream. We know the company claims that they use best practices, but experiences elsewhere lend credence to our concerns. Most likely due to the many steep slopes along the ridge, construction will require “two-toning” to create a work zone ; that implies more blasting and disruption. The Miller's Brook watershed directly below the proposed compressor station has three main tributaries that begin near the ROW, and they in turn are fed by many tiny runs. It would be highly unlikely that during pipeline installation horizontal boring would be used for these numerous small waterways, which means trenching and more blasting in addition to the large area that will need to be cleared and flattened for the station. Digging and blasting the trench to bury the pipe, and backfilling with gravel and sand will likely change preferred groundwater pathways, which means that the entire flow of water off the mountain will be significantly altered. The quantity of public and private well water supplies downhill could be affected in addition to the quality of the water.
2. Another resource is water district 4 in the north end of the town. In this case surface waters feed Grandin Reservoir, an unfiltered water source which serves the north end of town as well as the Northfield campus with potential service for thousands of people. Surface waters are particularly open to contamination, and the MA DEP SWAP report for this zone recommends that no herbicides be used for clearing the transmission line ROW already in place. We believe the installation of pipeline would also put this district at risk.
3. The GNWA recognizes that trace hydrocarbons other than methane, including PCBs, are a concern as they can be released in blowdowns, pigging operations, and the disposal of liquid condensates that could be removed from the pipeline. We have no sure way to know our water supply is safe with a compressor station/pigging station. Again, our water supplies all begin near the proposed site.
4. The disturbance of soils in the ROW, station area, staging areas, and temporary construction access points will seriously increase the risk of invasive plant species in core habitat areas.
5. As steward of the natural environment of the watersheds of Northfield, the GNWA is extremely concerned that fragile habitats documented on MA GIS maps, connected to some of the few remaining intact wildlife corridors, will be changed permanently by the Kinder Morgan NED project.

C. GNWA's Motion to Intervene Must Be Granted

GNWA satisfies the standard for intervention under the Commission's regulations. As discussed above, GNWA is directly impacted by the proposed project, and no other individual or organization can adequately represent GNWA's unique interest in this proceeding. Accordingly, GNWA respectfully requests that the Commission grant this Motion to Intervene.

II. CONTACT INFORMATION

The following individuals should be added to the Official Service List, with all notice and communications in this proceeding addressed to the contacts listed below:

Name: Andrew Vernon
Address: PO BOX 44
Northfield MA 01360
Phone: 413 498 5416
Email: avernon@sau29.org

III. PROTEST/COMMENTS

The GNWA intends to watchdog the watershed and insist upon the utmost adherence to regulations. However, TGP and their parent company, Kinder Morgan, have a large budget for paying fines for environmental violations, and have a record of committing violations and paying the minimal fines without complaint, rather than adhering to laws. We therefore feel that the only way to ensure the protection of our watershed is to prevent TGP from having a presence to begin with. The GNWA holds that there are ways to provide power to the Northeast that will not negatively affect our watershed or our climate. We feel that this project will diminish incentives to invest in renewable energy. We first ask that FERC discourage TGP from continuing with their application.

IV. CONCLUSION

Wherefore, in light of the foregoing, the GNWA respectfully requests that the Commission grant this motion to intervene and allow GNWA to participate in this proceeding with full rights of party status, including the right to request a hearing, cross examine witnesses and seek rehearing and appeal.

Respectfully submitted,
Andrew Vernon

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Wherefore on this November 25, 2015, I caused to be served the foregoing Motion to Intervene electronically on all parties on the Commission's electronic service list in this proceeding, in accordance with Commission regulations.

Andrew Vernon

Officers : Andrew Vernon, President ; Kate Rossiter, VP ; Jerrold Wagener , Treasurer; Meagan Sylvia, Clerk
Directors: Julia Blyth, William Copeland, Susan Ross , Jennifer Tufts, Nathan Tufts

20151125-5311

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Gail S LaGoy under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 11/25/2015 1:36:58 PM Filed Date: 11/25/2015 1:36:58 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____

Individual glagoy@verizon.net

Basis for Intervening:

I am a directly impacted landowner. The proposed NED pipeline route would cross my property in Montague, MA. In addition, the proposed pipeline route would cross my state certified Chapter 61 managed forest. I am also a Massachusetts electricity ratepayer.

20151125-5323

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Michael F LaGoy under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 11/25/2015 1:56:48 PM Filed Date: 11/25/2015 1:56:48 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	mflagoy@verizon.net	

Basis for Intervening:

I am a directly impacted landowner/homeowner. The proposed NED pipeline route would cross my property in Montague, MA. The proposed NED pipeline route would also cross my state certified Chapter 61 forest, and come in close proximity to a granite quarry on my property. Mine and my spouse's personal and financial well being and interests would be directly, permanently, and adversely impacted. I am a Massachusetts electricity consumer and also a producer.

20151125-5400

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene -re TGP -of Robert Lidsky under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 11/25/2015 4:21:44 PM Filed Date: 11/25/2015 4:21:44 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	boblidsky@yahoo.com	

Basis for Intervening:

The FERC 888 First Street NE, Room 1A
Washington, D.C. 20426

Re: Docket No. CP16-21

I own land in Davenport, NY on Dutch Hill Road, Tax ID 24.-1-41. The proposed Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LLC (TGP) pipeline would cross my property, near the already FERC permitted Constitution Pipeline (CP). Since both pipelines are "open-access," it will encourage industrial development, including natural gas extraction, which will drastically alter the integrity and value of my property and the rural character of the community.

The property is quite hilly and has beautiful views. There is one small area near the top, which has a gradual enough slope to build a home. The TGP pipeline if built would render my property, un-buildable, difficult and more expensive to insure, and nearly worthless.

On June 3, 2014, TGP asked for permission to survey. Their map shows the pipeline running directly through the only area suitable for building, siting a septic field, driveway and home. I did not and will not grant such permission.

The Massachusetts Attorney General has determined that TGP's claim of public necessity is without merit. Therefore TGP's application should be denied.

Previously under Constitution Pipeline's (CP) threat of using eminent domain, I was unable to negotiate a good faith settlement. CP then received The FERC's approval and condemned my property. Almost a year later, I still have not have not been paid, and I cannot sell or build on my land.

With CP, under threat of condemnation, I was offered less than \$22.00 per linear foot, while recently, without being able to use the bludgeon of eminent domain; CP negotiated a settlement of about \$1,000 per linear foot on a reroute of the pipeline nearby.

The greater issue here is that The FERC is well known for permitting virtually every gas pipeline project. If TGP is permitted, I will face the same situation, that is, being unable to negotiate fair market value. The use of Eminent Domain by for-profit energy companies like TGP and CP is not only undemocratic; it is government-sanctioned theft of private property.

As no one else can represent my interests in this matter, and I stand to suffer significant damages and irreparable harm from an affirmative outcome in this application, I am making this motion to intervene.

Robert Lidsky
622 Ridge Road
Andes NY 13731
boblidsky@yahoo.com

20151130-0013

DOCKET No. PF14-22-000 Northeast Energy Direct Project

Hancock Historical Commission

P. O. Box 1042
Hancock, MA 01237
November 18, 2015

Hope Luhman, Ph.D.
Vice President
The Louis Berger Group, Inc.
20 Corporate Woods Boulevard
Albany, New York 12211

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.: Proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project in Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Connecticut

Dear Vice President Lubman:

Considering the length of time that Kinder Morgan has had the current route laid out for the proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project pipeline, it is unconscionable that the Hancock Historical Commission is being asked at this late date, just before Kinder Morgan's submission for approval to FERC, for input and comments regarding any potentially significant sites and/or historic properties that the Commission believes could be affected by the proposed project. This has not left much time for research.

A look at settlement in the rural town of Hancock, MA, using the U. S. Geological Survey map, reveals that within 1/2 mile of the proposed route lies the closest concentration of homes in town — the whole village, including 72 dwellings, the town library and the town's only church. Many of these buildings, including the church, date back to the nineteenth century and are listed on the Massachusetts Register of Historic Places. Three historic houses within just yards of the proposed pipeline are outstanding examples of early architecture and most likely are eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Properties.

Our concerns about historic properties that could be affected by the proposed NED Project:

- Contamination of individual water wells and springs and gas leaks
- Possible explosions, especially since thinner-gauge pipe would be used in rural towns
- Disturbance of nearby building foundations from vibrations caused by heavy equipment removing soil

aud rock during construction

In addition to the historic buildings, there is a town cemetery near the pipeline corridor and a slave or Native American burial site just over the border in the town of Stephentown, NY.

It is important to the Hancock Historical Commission that our concerns be considered by FERC when deciding whether to grant approval for the NED pipeline project.

Yours truly,
Marjorie Feathers, Chairman

Copy to FERC

20151130-0017

{duplicate copy of 20151119-5237 above}

20151130-0018

Frank Skidmore
358 Poor Farm Rd

New Ipswich, NH 03071 November 14, 2015 Phone: 603 291 0572

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

Reference: Docket 1 PF14-22 (Kinder Morgan Pipeline Application)

Ferc Commissioners,

After review of the presidents recent decision on the Keystone pipeline, I Concluded his decision has created a “prima Fascia” case for Denial of PD14-22 (Kinder Morgan application), A cease and desist order on futare construction activities should be served. (EPA)

****Operating Authority should not be granted.**

Rationale:

1. Inadequate environmental review.
2. Will have catastrophic adverse effects on the environment.
3. Will present unnecessary risks to local communities.
4. Endangerment of wildlife.
5. Health risks to the residents of the towns.
6. Undermines the adequate review process.
7. NO SOCIAL BENEFIT!!!!

PS:

In my 50+ years in Transportation / Logistics management I have gone to school on my experiences.

1. Working in the 1970's with the ICC to uncover irregularities with the co-ops.
2. Finding job applicants were careless with the truth.
3. Many transportation companies were also careless with the truth.

All of the above are SAD but TRUE

Respectfully submitted

Frank Skidmore E-Mail frankskidmorecomcast.net

Retired Corporate Transportation / Logistics Mgr, FCI, Versailles, France

20151130-0047

Kimberly Bose, Secretary
FERC
888 First Street, N.E.
Washington, DC 20426

STOP THE NED PIPELINE!!

Protect NH land from Eminent Domain!

I oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) EXPORT pipeline. The pipelines, and compressor station will scar the NH landscape and put our water, wildlife, forests, agricultural lands and rural character at risk. These include health and safety risks from emissions, industrialization, pollution and the devastating effects of fire and explosions. Greed, not need is fueling this project. Say NO to this private company that will TAKE OUR LANDS with NO BENEFIT TO US.

Mike O'Brien
17 Glance Rd
Windham, NH 03087

20151130-0068

Hand colored card, A Family Action Petition:

Keep Our Neighborhoods, Farms, Woods, Water, Wildlife and Air Clean and Safe. We say ... "NO Pipeline!". Please say "No" to the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Pipeline" too.

The Keane Family
63 South Shore Dr
Pelham, NH 03076

20151130-0071

{duplicate copy of 20151130-0013 above}

20151130-5002

Patricia Beffa-Negrini, Nelson, NH.
November 27, 2015
Norman C. Bay, Chairman
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
88 First Street NE
Washington, DC 20426
RE: Docket No. PF14-22-000
Dear Chairman Bay.

I am writing to request that the FEFC reject the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) project proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC. It has come to my attention that the proposed pipeline and compressor station are to be located in an area that will have significant detrimental effects on the environment, wildlife, and particularly on the people living nearby. Included are religious sisters living at Our Lady of Good Hope; Newfoundland ponies, an endangered species; raptors who migrate through the area; children attending school in the vicinity; the area watershed; and area parks and conservation land.

I understand that FERC has already approved another pipeline. My understanding is that pipeline is sufficient, particularly as we turn to filling our energy needs with renewable sources. In addition, the type of gas to be carried in the proposed pipeline could be high in toxins and radiation, which could cause devastating negative outcomes to humans and animals. Please reject this pipeline so that these risks can be avoided and

acres of permanently protected land can remain clean and sustainable for us and future generations.

Thank you for your work to oversee environmental matters related to natural gas and hydroelectricity projects, and safely regulate the interstate transmission of our electricity, gas, and oil. I hope you will continue to work with a sustainable future in mind.

Respectfully yours,

Patricia Beffa-Negrini, PhD, RD

20151130-5008

Dane Rota, Mason, NH.

I am an affected property owner of the NE Energy Direct Project filed under PF14-22. During the past year, I have granted access to my property to Kinder Morgan's agents to conduct environmental impact surveys. KM's agents have not responded to my requests for feedback pertaining to these surveys.

20151130-5012

Sullivan Family, New Ipswich, NH.

I am within the 1/2 mile incineration blast zone from the proposed New Ipswich Compressor Station.

I am very concerned about a lot of things with this pipeline & compressor station.

This comment is about my well water.

The proposed compressor station in New Ipswich is going to be placed in/on one of the water aqua filters for our well water.

There is an official state sign notifying the public or anyone coming into the area that this is a water shed area. There is a phone number to report hazard spills. This is with feet of the proposed compressor station. I consider the proposed compressor station a hazard condition.

I want to know if Kinder Morgan/Tn Gas Pipeline Company/NED people are going to be paying to have my well water tested on a quarterly routine at the water testing company of my choice.

I want to know what Kinder Morgan/TN Gas Pipeline Company/NED is going to do when my water goes bad. I want to know what Kinder Morgan/TN Gas Pipeline Company/NED is going to do when my well goes dry.

Is Kinder Morgan/TN Gas Pipeline Company/NED going to supply me & my family, my heirs, my descendants or anyone who may buy my properties with clean potable water to the end of time or until this planet we now call earth & home is no longer in existence?

Just what is Kinder Morgan/TN Gas Pipeline Company/NED responsibility to keep my home supplied with clean, non contaminated water as I have now? Is Kinder Morgan/TN Gas Pipeline Company/NED going to give me a base water report from the water testing company of my choice before they start the construction to put in the pipeline & proposed compressor station and disrupting the aqua filter, water shed areas of the whole of New Ipswich?

Without clean, non contaminated water there is no life.

I have a right to know. The people of the towns along the route of the pipeline, the people of New Ipswich have the right to know what is, who is responsible to keep our water clean & non contaminated & what happens when our water goes bad or dries up.

New Hampshire will not benefit from this Kinder Morgan/TN Gas Pipeline Company/NED project. New Ipswich will not benefit from this pipeline nor the compressor station. It is not wanted. It is not needed. FERC, please just say NO to the Kinder Morgan/TN Gas Pipeline Company/NED project and just SAY YES to the people of New Ipswich & deny this application.

20151130-5013

Karen Sullivan, New Ipswich, NH.

I am very concerned about the added air pollution that me & my family will face when the compressor station slated for New Ipswich, NH is in operation. There is NO WAY the compressor station is going to be able to be in compliance with the EPA standards for air pollution control. You will be condemning my family to an early certain death.

Below, included in this e comment, is an article about the study published on-line in June 2015. It takes far less pollution particles than previously known to affect our health.

Please take this into consideration and just say NO to the Kinder Morgan/NED/TN Pipeline application for the pipeline & compressor station in Southern New Hampshire.

Air pollution below EPA standards linked with higher death rates

Boston, MA – A new study by researchers at Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health found that death rates among people over 65 are higher in zip codes with more fine particulate air pollution (PM2.5) than in those with lower levels of PM2.5. It is the first study to examine the effect of soot particles in the air in the entire population of a region, including rural areas. The harmful effects from the particles were observed even in areas where concentrations were less than a third of the current standard set by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

“Most of the country is either meeting the EPA standards now, or is expected to meet them in a few years as new power plant controls kick in,” said senior author Joel Schwartz, professor of environmental epidemiology. “This study shows that it is not enough. We need to go after coal plants that still aren’t using scrubbers to clean their emissions, as well as other sources of particles like traffic and wood smoke.”

The study appears online June 3, 2015 in Environmental Health Perspectives.

Previous studies have linked both short- and long-term exposure to PM2.5 with increased mortality, through mechanisms such as heart disorders, increased blood pressure, and reduced lung function.

The researchers used satellite data to determine particle levels and temperatures in every zip code in New England. This allowed them to examine the effects of PM2.5 on locations far from monitoring stations, and to look at the effects of short-term exposures and annual average exposures simultaneously. They analyzed health data from everyone covered by Medicare in New England – 2.4 million people – between 2003 and 2008 and followed them each year until they died.

They found that both short- and long-term PM2.5 exposure was significantly associated with higher death rates, even when restricted to zip codes and times with annual exposures below EPA standards. Short-term (two-day) exposure led to a 2.14% increase in mortality per 10 µg/m³ increase in PM2.5 concentration, and long-term (one-year) exposure led to a 7.52% increase in mortality for each 10 µg/m³ increase.

“Particulate air pollution is like lead pollution, there is no evidence of a safe threshold even at levels far below current standards, including in the rural areas we investigated,” said Schwartz. “We need to focus on strategies that lower exposure everywhere and all the time, and not just in locations or on days with high particulate levels.”

First author of the study was Liuhua Shi, a doctoral student in the Department of Environmental Health.

This study was funded by NIEHS ES000002, and by EPA grant RD-83479801.

“Low-Concentration PM2.5 and Mortality: Estimating Acute and Chronic Effects in a Population-Based Study,” Liuhua Shi, Antonella Zanobetti, Itai Kloog, Brent A. Coull, Petros Koutrakis, Steven J. Melly, and Joel D. Schwartz, Environmental Health Perspectives, online June 3, 2015, doi: 10.1289/ehp.1409111

Visit the Harvard Chan website for the latest news, press releases, and multimedia offerings.

20151130-5014

John Leoutsacos, Temple, NH.

Filed by Kinder Morgan / TGP on November 20, 2015 (received by FERC on November 19) a certificate of public convenience and necessity docket number CP16-21-000

Just days before the above stated filing, Massachusetts Attorney General Maura Healey, submitted a comprehensive report to FERC concluding that there is no need for a natural gas pipeline in New England for at least the NEXT 15 YEARS.

FERC's own project manager Eric Tomasi has stated on more than one occasion to myself and several others that no one knows our part of the country better than those of us who live here. If he was speaking on behalf of and for The FERC, Attorney General Healey's report provides SUBSTANTIAL proof that the NED pipeline is neither NEEDED nor convenient for New England

20151130-5015

John Leoutsacos, Temple, NH.

Filed by Kinder Morgan / TGP on November 20, 2015 (received by FERC on November 19) a certificate of public convenience and necessity docket number CP16-21-000

Just days before the above stated filing, Massachusetts Attorney General Maura Healey, submitted a comprehensive report to FERC concluding that there is no need for a natural gas pipeline in New England for at least the NEXT 15 YEARS.

FERC's own project manager Eric Tomasi has stated on more than one occasion to myself and several others that no one knows our part of the country better than those of us who live here. If he was speaking on behalf of and for The FERC, Attorney General Healey's report provides SUBSTANTIAL proof that the NED pipeline is neither NEEDED nor convenient for New England

20151130-5018

Evelyn Taylor, New Ipswich, NH.

Tennessee Gas Pipeline's Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity for the Northeast Energy Direct Project (NED) is, by the applicant's own definition in section 1.0 INTRODUCTION, "to meet the increased demand in the Northeast United States ("U.S.") for transportation capacity of natural gas."

Please take special note of "transportation capacity", no "use capacity". In March, 2015, Kinder Morgan told the audience at the Mascenic High School in New Ipswich, NH, that New Hampshire was not getting any of this gas. NONE. Kinder Morgan said they were a transportation company. Only after realizing there was no public good or need in this project did they scramble to turn face and try to project a U.S. Northeast regional need, yet again, their statement still indicates transportation capacity. If New Hampshire wasn't to get any of this gas as of March, 2015, what changed so drastically since that meeting that suddenly now presents a serious need for an enormous 30" diameter pipeline of fracked gas? It is my observation and opinion that NOTHING has changed except the applicant's strategy to project an even more urgent public need so they can proceed to tap overseas markets. If the FERC approves this application the FERC must prove such capacity, environmental destruction, and risk and inevitable damage to human health and life-sustaining ecosystems are uncontested essential elements without which the people of the United States cannot live without. The purpose of this comment is to again call upon the FERC to study and assess this project with proper due diligence and integrity as the livelihoods and lives of thousands of people are currently being threatened without proof of just cause for this threatening. The responsibility is now with the FERC to produce the just cause for this threatening if this project is granted approval.

20151130-5022

Evelyn Taylor, New Ipswich, NH.

As of 11/29/2015, Kinder Morgan defines CO-LOCATION on their web site as:

“Co-location is the placement of a new pipeline along existing infrastructure routes including existing underground power or pipelines. This is done to minimize community and environmental impact and can make for a more efficient process overall. One of the primary reasons that led to Tennessee Gas Pipeline decision to adopt the current route is that the route will enable a substantial portion of the proposed new pipeline construction to be located adjacent to, and parallel with, existing utility corridors.”

However, TGP’s Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (A.K.A., Application)says, “Approximately 57 miles of the New Hampshire mainline pipeline facilities will be generally co-located with an existing utility corridor to the extent practicable, feasible, and in compliance with existing law.”

The filing lists 70 total miles though New Hampshire, thus over 81% are expected to be “generally co-located”. I cannot find a definition of “generally co-located”. Does that mean not located along the utility corridor?

As of 11/29/2015 the Kinder Morgan web site says, “Approximately 87% of the 71 miles of the Wright to Dracut Pipeline segment route travels through New Hampshire and is co-located with existing utility lines.”

This suggests approximately 61 miles of the New Hampshire pipeline is co-located with existing utility lines.

So which is it? Will 57 of 70 miles be “generally co-located” or will 61 miles be co-located?

The Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity also says about Massachusetts:

“Approximately 63 miles of this pipeline will be generally co-located with an existing utility corridor to the extent practicable, feasible, and in compliance with existing law, and the remainder of the Massachusetts pipeline will be new pipeline ROW.”

The filing lists 64 miles in Massachusetts, so does “generally co-located” indicate 63 of 64 miles (over 98%) of the Massachusetts pipeline does not follow the existing utility corridor?

What is being put forth here in this Application? Kinder Morgan and TGP have been presenting, and continue to present “co-location” as a benefit. It seems that benefit may be far from being realized in New Hampshire and Massachusetts.

It seems either Kinder Morgan/TGP did not exercise due diligence in the site planning of this pipeline or that the reality was always present that this pipeline would be moved however many times were needed at whatever cost to home owners, businesses or environments.

The FERC should carefully evaluate this type of subtle alteration in the Application to ensure there has been no intent during pre-filing or now to deceive or mislead the public and officials who have been trying to accurately determine the impact, benefits and hazards of this project.

20151130-5024

Evelyn Taylor, New Ipswich, NH.

FERC COMMENT - 11/29/2015

Tennessee Gas Pipeline’s Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity states that high energy costs demonstrate the need for the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project. That is not necessarily so. The greatly elevated rates in 2014 and early 2015 were the precise years Kinder Morgan/TGP were seeking out a need for NED and, in fact, had a hand in the high prices given the use of Tennessee’s system near Dracut, Mass. Is it pure coincidence the TGP pricing point in PA (\$1.733 per MMBtu) was so much less than that in the TGP target area for NED near Dracut(\$9.014 per MMBtu)? Does it seem realistic and reasonable that the region had such a massive deficit never before seen as to justify such extremes? What is especially odd in this equation is that Kinder Morgan told the attendees at an information session at the Mascenic High School in New Ipswich, NH on March 25, 2015, that none of the gas from the NED pipeline would be available to New Hampshire; that the route was one purely as a transmission line to Dracut. There was also no benefit noted for any other New England state, either. In fact, when asked where the gas was going, Kinder

Morgan said they did not know.

Why now does NED hold such great promise to New England? The FERC should back-track Kinder Morgan's motives and activities and demand an explanation of this turn of events. How is it that the necessity of this pipeline changed from not even knowing where the gas was going to now fulfilling an obvious and dire shortage and need for the entire Northeast region of the United States?

20151130-5025

Evelyn Taylor, New Ipswich, NH.

TGP's Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity says that to gain an understanding of the economic impact of the \$5.2 billion NED Project,

Tennessee commissioned economic impact studies in the states affected by the NED Project. The application does not mention the outcome of the New Hampshire study. Was a NH study done? Certainly New Hampshire is affected. What are the results of the New Hampshire study? The FERC needs to request this information to be released and included in the Application.

20151130-5026

Karen Sullivan, New Ipswich, NH.

I read an article by Joe Mahoney titled: EPA: Can local pipeline plans merge?

Here is some of it: "The federal Environmental Protection Agency on Friday (October 16, 2015) urged government regulators to study whether the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline could be combined with other projects, rather than constructing a new system that would have a host of environmental impacts.

The EPA, in a scoping comment on the 412 mile NED pipeline proposed by Tennessee Gas Co., also advised the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission that the gas demand addressed by NED's application could be met by renewable forms of energy such as solar and wind power or be met by other pipeline expansion projects in the region."

While this article referenced New York State it comprised of pipelines heading into New England and ending at Dracut, Mass.

I believe that the pipeline project, along with the compressor station to be situated in New Ipswich, NH is not necessary. It will greatly impact the environment of the southern part of New Hampshire. The surrounding area of the compressor station will be hugely impacted. Flora and fauna, not to mention the human beings in the area, will be hugely impacted and not in a good way. Our health will suffer, our property values will suffer, our rural way of life, our clean water, from our well water to our lakes, ponds and streams will suffer. All the wildlife from the creepy crawly animals to the larger animals will suffer. There is no need for this to happen. There are already three other pipelines that can handle the amount of gas that is going to be pumped through the proposed Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Co/NED pipeline & compressor stations coming through southern New Hampshire.

Just say NO to the Kinder Morgan Application CP16-21. This is an Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project). It is NOT a public convenience nor necessity. There are already three other pipeline companies that can handle the gas that Kinder Morgan wants to bring through southern NH. It is strictly for profit for Kinder Morgan/Tn Gas Pipeline Co/NED.

20151130-5027

Evelyn Taylor, New Ipswich, NH.

FERC COMMENT 11/29/2015

TGP's Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity says natural gas supports renewables by providing clean power when the wind does not blow and the sun does not shine. It also states natural gas is the cleanest fossil fuel available

The NED project will not transmit and deliver just natural gas. It is non-conventional fracked gas that contains and will release many contaminants, toxins and harmful volatile organic compounds including known carcinogens. Fracked gas is not clean, cheap or safe and the continued use of fossil fuels is not a responsible energy alternative. Methane contributes to global warming and studies of fracked gas are suggesting the contaminants in the gas are being released into the buildings where it is burned such as in a home owner's kitchen where contaminants can accumulate to harmful concentrations, particularly in newer homes that are sealed more tightly against weather fluctuations. It is widely realized that the world must get off fossil fuels, not proliferate their use. Other studies have shown that fracked gas is not even a bridge fuel and is even more expensive than traditional fossil fuels. Refer to A bridge to nowhere <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sq2ro95DAzQ&feature=youtu.be>

20151130-5028

Willa Bandler, Walpole, MA.

Now is the time to start building RENEWABLE infrastructure, not to spend more (ratepayer) dollars building more pipelines that will be obsolete before long, but will still create tremendous upheaval and pollution in their construction.

Let the gas companies spend their money fixing leaks in existing pipelines and otherwise improving efficiency. It will still boost their bottom line, while also making the future better for everyone--abutters, but also the entire planet. Climate change is here now--we can't wait around any longer, we have to start changing the way we operate right now.

20151130-5030

Evelyn Taylor, New Ipswich, NH.

FERC COMMENT 11/30/2015

The Kinder Morgan website has the following instructions about Recognizing and Responding to leaks.

Recognizing & Responding To A Pipeline Leak

Although rare, pipeline leaks can be dangerous and require caution and immediate action to protect people, property and the environment.

Signs of a potential pipeline leak include:

- Dead vegetation, liquid on the ground near the pipeline, dirt being blown into the air, fire or a dense white cloud or fog
- Hissing or roaring sound
- Strong petroleum scent or other pungent odor such as sulfur (rotten eggs)

If you suspect a leak or a leak occurs:

- Leave the area immediately in an upwind direction and warn others to stay away
- If near a school, evacuate students and staff from the area immediately as outlined in your emergency response plan
- Do not light a match, start an engine, use a cell phone or turn on/off any electrical appliances
- Once you are a safe distance away from the potential leak use a telephone or cell phone to call 911 and Kinder Morgan
- Do not drive into an area where you suspect a leak, and do not touch or operate pipeline valves

The Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity states that the applicant does not have leak detection equipment. Why is the public put at risk and placed with the burden of detecting leaks? Dangerous toxins or an explosion from leaks can disable or kill a person before they may be able to realize they are being exposed to a leak and thus may not be able to move away, determine which way the wind is blowing or even have egress upwind, warn others, or reach a phone. This comment is to say the burden

of mishaps along a pipeline, especially leaks, belongs to the company responsible for the safe operation of the pipeline. What about children who may be out playing and not recognize signs of a leak? Are they, too, expected to determine they should leave the area in an upwind direction and respond as noted per Kinder Morgan's instructions above? Leak detection equipment is essential to public safety. Leaks have caused many injuries and deaths. It is not a child's responsibility or any other private person's responsibility to monitor pipelines. . I propose that leak detection equipment should be included for the NED project and retro-fitted along all pipeline routes.

20151130-5033

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Katie A Wallace under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 11/27/2015 8:17:18 PM Filed Date: 11/30/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	wallacek412@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I am filing a motion for Intervention status on FERC docket CP16-21-000 based on my residence at 5 Mercury Circle, Andover, MA 01810. I am a private citizen and our property is 2 miles down the road from where the pipeline is proposed to pass. This pipeline is intended to pass through my town of Andover and will pass through protected Article 97 land, including passing under one of our town's drinking sources (The Merrimack River). My interest will be directly effected and I am participating in the pubic interest as a private citizen.

This remaining wording gives credit to Attorney Carolyn Elefant from the Law Offices of Carolyn Elefant as she has provided a sample form motion to intervene.

Pursuant to Commission Rules 385.214(b) and 157.10 (Katie Wallace) moves to intervene in the above captioned proceeding. This intervention is timely filed.

Please enter Katie Wallace below on the official service list for Docket No. CP16-21-000. All pleadings, filings and correspondence in this proceeding shoulder be served on the following: Katie Wallace, 5 Mercury Circle, Andover, MA 01810. Cell phone: (603)818-9528. Email to use for this intervention: wallacek412@gmail.com.

20151130-5037

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Kathy Chapman, ESQ under CP16-21-000. I am a landowner in Mason, NH where both the NED pipeline and the Fitchburg lateral are to traverse.

Submission Date: 11/28/2015 2:15:24 PM Filed Date: 11/30/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	chapman.kathy@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I am petitioning to intervene because I live in Mason, NH, which is slated to have both a portion of the NED pipeline and a portion of the Fitchburg lateral. I own land that is very close to the current proposed route which has not been yet finalized.

20151130-5038

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Charles E Sullivan, JR under CP16-21-000. This motion opposes issuance of the Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity for the reasons above stated under "Documentless Intervention Description."

Submission Date: 11/28/2015 3:40:59 PM Filed Date: 11/30/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	cathyandcharlessullivan@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I oppose the issuance of the Certificate of Convenience and Necessity for several reasons:

1. My family and I live in rural Rensselaer County, New York, about 1200 feet from the proposed pipeline pathway, within the pipeline's so-called "incineration zone." Should an incident occur, my family and our property risk loss.
2. Exercise of eminent domain compensates only the landowner over whose land the pipeline will run. No compensation comes to any member of my family to compensate us for having the risk of loss involuntarily imposed upon us.
3. There is no domestic public need for this project:
 - a. New Yorkers get none of the gas; and MA and ME already have stated that there is no need out to at least 2030 for any additional gas that this project could supply.
 - b. There are other pipeline applications pending before FERC proposing to supply New England with natural gas: this one is superfluous.
 - c. The project sponsor readily admits that it is seeking overseas customers for the gas proposed to be transported via the pipeline, which is proposed to be connected to pipelines running to LNG export terminals in Canada.
4. Issuance of a Certificate for this project will prolong the Nation's dependence on existing fossil-fuel energy sources and hinder mass-scale substitution of alternative energy sources for fossil-fuel energy sources.
5. Because my family lives in a rural area, design, construction, and operation of the pipeline are to lesser standards than those that protect families living in rural areas. This is so despite my paying the same level of taxes as those living in urban areas. Issuance of a Certificate in this matter will therefore allow the applicant to construct and operate its pipeline using standards that cause me to be subject to a second-class level of protection.

20151130-5089

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Ashley Seto under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 11/30/2015 10:29:28 AM Filed Date: 11/30/2015 10:29:28 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	ashley.b.seto@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC)
North East Direct Pipeline Project)

Docket No. CP16-21-000

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO INTERVENE

Pursuant to Rules 212 and 214 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's ("Commission") Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 385.212 and 385.214 (2007), I/we , Ashley and Jimmy Seto , file this motion to intervene in this proceeding.

On November 20, 2015, the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC ("TGP") filed its application under § 7 of the Natural Gas Act, 15 U.S.C. § 717f, and § 157 of FERC's regulations, 18 C.F.R. § 157.1 et seq., for the proposed North East Direct Project (NED), FERC Docket No. CP 16- 21-000

I. COMMUNICATIONS AND SERVICE

All communications, pleadings, and orders with respect to this proceeding should be sent to the following individual:

Ashley and Jimmy Seto
12 Ellsworth Rd
Andover, MA 01810
617-947-3316
Ashley.b.seto@gmail.com

II. INTEREST OF PETITIONER

Construction, operation and maintenance of the Pipeline would adversely impact our family. This proposed pipeline will directly impact our property. This will not only impact the safety of our family but also our property value. The construction of the pipeline will also have a negative impact, not only on our property, but the property in our neighborhood as well. Much of this property has streams, ancient artifacts and stone walls, vernal pools, federal wetlands and conversation lands protected by Article 97 constitutional protection.

Cutting down of the trees on/near our property will impact the privacy that we currently enjoy. There is an office park towards the back of our property which currently is completely hidden by the forest that separates our backyard from the office park. These trees would need to be cut down for the pipeline construction and therefore we would see lights from the office parks which are on 24 hours a day. The trees also serve as a barrier to the 495 highway which is not too far from our neighborhood. Cutting down these trees would greatly increase the highway noise which would negatively impact our family.

Kinder Morgan has stated how this pipeline is necessary to reduce energy costs for New England, especially in the winter months. The Massachusetts Attorney General recently commissioned a study, (Exhibit A), which has proven that this is no need for this pipeline and that New England has capacity to meet all of our energy needs, even during peak season, until at least 2030. Previous studies which were commissioned by Kinder Morgan and the gas companies showed a need for increased capacity, but I would argue that since Kinder Morgan sponsored these studies we should have expected no other result than a conclusion in which they could increase their profits by building a pipeline.

Kinder Morgan has also stated that the pipeline construction will be aligned with current powerline corridors. This is however not the case. The majority of the construction will take place outside of these corridors having a large impact on protect lands and private property such as my own. We don't have a powerline running through our property therefore we should not be directly impacted by it's construction but we are. It is disturbing that a private company stating that it is working for the greater good will be able to take over federal lands, destroy private property and property values and put the safety of so many directly at stake. Given Kinder Morgan's safety record, we will be in fear of the safety of our family and our property

should this pipeline we built. We moved to Andover because it was a safe community with a strong focus on the environment, all of which will be ruined if this pipeline is approved. We urge you to deny Kinder Morgan's request and instead invest in clean, renewable energy projects. We have important information and perspectives to bring to this process, consideration of which will serve the public interest.

III. CONCLUSION

Wherefore, we, Ashley and Jimmy Seto, respectfully requests that the Commission to grant my Motion to Intervene as a party with full rights to participate in all further proceedings.

Respectfully submitted this 30th day of November, 2015.

Ashley and Jimmmy Seto
12 Ellsworth Rd Andover, MA 01810
617-947-3316
ashley.b.seto@gmail.com

20151130-5368

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC) Docket No. CP16-21-000
North East Direct Pipeline Project)

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO INTERVENE

Pursuant to Rules 212 and 214 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's ("Commission") Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 385.212 and 385.214 (2007), I Eric Mantey, file this motion to intervene in this proceeding.

On November 20, 2015, the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC ("TGP") filed its application under § 7 of the Natural Gas Act, 15 U.S.C. § 717f, and § 157 of FERC's regulations, 18 C.F.R. § 157.1 et seq., for the proposed North East Direct Project (NED), FERC Docket No. CP 16- 21-000

I. COMMUNICATIONS AND SERVICE

All communications, pleadings, and orders with respect to this proceeding should be sent to the following individual:

Eric Mantey
40 Bonnie Lane, Tewksbury, MA 01876
1 – (978) – 930 - 4125
eric.mantey@gmail.com

II. INTEREST OF PETITIONER

Construction, operation and maintenance of the Pipeline would adversely impact my family as the proposed pipeline route comes close to my property in a way that has great concern to me. My house as indicated by a circle in picture 1. I tried to list the below in order of precedence!

1. My first concern is safety of our family as I have 2 boys who are 9 and 7 that enjoy playing in the backward and abutting conservation woods. Boys will be boys and now with this pipeline going in its just one more thing to think about when we send them outside!
2. Negative impact of my property value due to this construction. Don't think for one instant my town is going to lower or taxes because of this...That's a pipe dream!
3. Cutting down of trees disturbs me greatly. I purchased this property not more than 3 years ago for the one reason that the location was quiet and had conservation land all around it that is beautiful! It was a bonus to find out all the wild life that lives around the property also. 25+ or more turkeys visit our property and

surrounding area each day along with coyote, fox, deer, possums, skunks, and an occasional fisher cat. With this construction of the pipeline my fear is they will never come back to what our family calls the backyard zoo we have as indicated by a star in picture 1!

4. Wetland destruction as indicated as hexagons in picture 1 may also contribute to the disappearance of all the animals as described in item 3. We did have folks review the area for wildlife but spending 30min surveying will not provide an accurate depiction of what really happens in the area.

5. Blasting portion of the construction phase may bring foundation damage, damage to the town sewer line and gas line hook-up we have going into our home that runs on construction side of our home.

6. There is no clear indication that the pipeline proposed will decrease our current gas bill nor from the reports filed show that capacity is needed in the Northeast?

7. Construction phase where Kendall will need to be dug up as indicated below by a square will redirect all my traffic around in a way that will add an additional 15min to morning commute! Not to mention any other little thing that is needed when leaving the house!

PICTURE 1 *{picture omitted}*

Wherefore, I, give your name, respectfully requests that the Commission to grant my Motion to Intervene as a party with full rights to participate in all further proceedings.

Respectfully submitted this 30 day of November, 2015.

Eric Mantey
40 Bonnie Lane
Tewksbury, MA 01876
978-930-4125
Eric.mantey@gmail.com

20151201-0009

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

Project Docket Number: PF14-22

Date: 11/18/15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Rescinding property access

As the owner of the property located at:
25 Breakneck Road
Hudson, NH 03051

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.

Kan Brace

20151201-0029

November 23, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

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

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

RE: DENYING PROPERTY ACCESS

PROJECT DOCKET CP116-21

FORMERLY DOCKET Docket PF-14-22-000

NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT TRANSMISSION PIPELINE PROJECT

As the owner of the property located at:

15 Dunbarton Drive, Merrimack, NH 03054 or as Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC calls it in their November 20'tter, property with a Tax ID of 2C-96.

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.

Gina Rosati
Gerald Rosati

20151201-0049

Hand written letter, Susan Jones, Pelham, NH 03076: opposing

20151201-0077

Hand draw postcard:

A Family Action Petition: Keep Our Neighborhoods, Farms, Woods, Water, Wildlife and Air Clean and Safe. We say ... "NO Pipelinel". Please say "No" to the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Pipeline" too.

LaFleur Family
572 Gibbon Hwy
Wilton, NH 03086

20151201-0079

Hand written letter, Susan Jones, Pelham, NH 03076: opposing

20151201-5049

Elaine Mroz, Lunenburg, MA.

NED Application Does Not Meet Requirements for FERC Acceptance.

When Kinder Morgan Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company made its voluntary election to use FERC's pre-filing process, it made a commitment under 18 CFR 157.21(d)(10) to file a complete application at the time of filing, as described in 18 CFR 380.12. Kinder Morgan's NED application filed on November 20, 2015 falls inarguably short of this requirement. FERC must hold Kinder Morgan to its commitment by refusing to accept the application as it now stands, or risk both further erosion of the public's confidence in the certificate process, and significant delay of the process through legal avenues.

Examples of where Kinder Morgan falls short, and why it should be held to the process follow:

18 CFR 157.21(f)(9) clearly states a prospective applicant must: "Within 14 days of the end of the scoping comment period, respond to issues raised during scoping."

Kinder Morgan shows no regard for this requirement. The scoping comment period ended on October 16. Yet, the NED application filed on November 20 addresses no comments submitted after October 1. Kinder Morgan indicates it will address these comments by December 21, more than two months after the end of the scoping period. FERC and its representatives repeatedly assured citizens during the process that all comments received during the comment period would be given the same consideration, regardless of the timing and format of submission. At a minimum FERC must delay its acceptance of the application until the comments are addressed to provide the opportunity for citizens to understand Kinder Morgan's responses to comments filed after October 1, and still have 21 days' notice for filing an intervention.

18 CFR 157.21 (b)(2)(ii) clearly states "The application shall contain all the information specified by the Commission staff after reviewing the draft materials filed by the prospective applicant during the pre-filing process..."

On October 8, 2015, the Commission staff presented Kinder Morgan with 35 pages of their own specific comments which "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." Kinder Morgan received similar letters from the FERC staff on February 27, 2015 and on May 15, 2015. Kinder Morgan provided a response matrix to all three of these letters as Attachment B of its November 20 application. Regrettably, Kinder Morgan did not provide answers to requests dating as far back as the February 27 letter. In fact, the matrix Kinder Morgan submitted with their application includes over 60 items that Kinder Morgan admits are yet to be addressed, indicating they will be covered "in a supplemental filing." There is no indication of a projected date for such filings, and no indication of the level of detail which will be presented. Yet, the FERC staff states that this information is necessary to BEGIN a substantive preparation of the draft EIR.

As the pre-filing process is a relatively new approach, it is incumbent on FERC to ensure that early adopters like Kinder Morgan do not abuse and weaken it. The requirements of the pre-filing process should be no surprise to Kinder Morgan. Indeed, Kinder Morgan chose this approach. The FERC staff should not be required to ask for the same information over and over when the requirements are spelled out clearly in the regulations. The public should have a reasonable expectation that Kinder Morgan will comply with the process laid out by FERC in its regulations, or at a minimum, that FERC will ensure its own requests are met.

Likewise, it is incumbent on FERC to ensure that its own power is not weakened by Kinder Morgan's lack of respect for the Commission's function and purpose. Despite Kinder Morgan's failure to present requested information in a timely fashion, and despite the substantial changes Kinder Morgan has made to its project since submitting its request to use the pre-filing process on September 15, 2014, Kinder Morgan continues to request the Commission issue a certificate in the fourth quarter of 2016. By compressing the time available for review, Kinder Morgan appears to be shifting the burden of a thorough environmental review from itself onto FERC, and onto the taxpaying public. Kinder Morgan, not the public, should bear the costs and pressures of its own timetable slippage.

From the start of this process, Kinder Morgan has not shown itself to be a willing partner with FERC in the process. Although the public record is not clear, it appears that Kinder Morgan failed to provide two qualified firms for FERC to consider for conducting the environmental review. This became apparent when Cardno, a firm not listed in the pre-filing, was awarded the contract by FERC. Although Kinder Morgan had spent at least 2 years preparing for the pre-filing, it failed to consider even basic alternatives before it wasted thousands of hours of public review of a route it substantially abandoned two months after pre-filing. Its continuing failure to address questions thoughtfully posed by FERC's staff demonstrates it has little regard for the process, and is attempting to test its limits.

FERC has the authority and the responsibility to protect the public interest in the certificate process. Furthermore, Kinder Morgan's seemingly unchallenged arrogance increases public mistrust of the FERC process. I strongly urge FERC to delay acceptance of the Kinder Morgan NED application until which time Kinder Morgan has fully complied with the federal pre-filing regulations Kinder Morgan has chosen to fol-

low.

Thank you for your serious consideration of my concerns.

Elaine Mroz
978-660-4826
epmroz@gmail.com
December 1, 2015

20151201-5086

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of James k Tucker, III under CP16-21-000.

James K. Tucker is a property owner in Mason, New Hampshire. The Tucker residence stands about 100 feet from the Kinder-Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline (KM/TGP) proposed new pipeline.

Submission Date: 11/30/2015 8:30:26 PM Filed Date: 12/1/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	hosta.man@juno.com	

Basis for Intervening:

II. MOTION TO INTERVENE

James K. Tucker seeks to intervene because the Tucker residence stands 100 feet from the pipeline, and is therefore vulnerable to structural damage during construction, as well as ongoing safety hazards after the project is completed. Further, the Tucker land lies within the right of way corridor for the KM/TGP pipeline, thus exposing the property to condemnation if the certificate is granted.

James K. Tucker opposes the proposed project. If constructed, the KM/TGP pipeline and the proposed Fitchburg lateral will disturb and destroy a swath of land across the north side of Mason, and will bisect the town. Neither of these pipelines will benefit local residents because there is not now nor is there planned to be gas access in rural Mason where the residences are far apart and separated by wetlands, woods, and granite terrain. Further, the gas is being transported through Mason to Dracut, MA, and then possibly for export. Mason and its residents will be forced to absorb the adverse environmental and economic impacts, not to mention the intrusion on individual landowners' property and the reduction in individual property values. Intervention is necessary to enable James K. Tucker to protect his property values and natural resources.

III. COMMENTS

WHEREFORE, for the foregoing reasons, James K. Tucker requests that the Commission GRANT this motion to intervene.

Respectfully submitted,

James K. Tucker
528 Sand Pit Rd.
Mason, NH 03048
603-878-4391
hosta.man@juno.com

DATE OF INTERVENTION: November 30, 2015

20151201-5087

Jacquelyne_Rocan@kindermorgan.com;
curt_moffatt@kindermorgan.com;

shannon_miller@kindermorgan.com;
ben_carranza@kindermorgan.com;
mrp@vnf.com;
Esocha@riseup.net;
Amy.glowacki2@gmail.com;
Lesliecarey123@gmail.com;
colleenmckinney@gmail.com;
Bricardelli@hotmail.com;
clendaniels@juno.com;
Lesliecarey123@gmail.com;
rcurtin@town.lynnfield.ma.us;
rcurtin@town.lynnfield.ma.us;
sueldu@gmail.com;
Chebo33@yahoo.com;
dwightmott@gmail.com;
andersonboatworks@gmail.com;
mark.kalpin@wilmerhale.com;
mark.kalpin@wilmerhale.com;
david.gold@wilmerhale.com;
FERC@LCWD.US;
mleahy@forestsociety.org;
clendaniels@juno.com;
edwarddow2014@gmail.com;
homerdshannon@hotmail.com;
sueldu@gmail.com;
avernon@sau29.org;
glagoy@verizon.net;
mflagoy@verizon.net;
boblidsky@yahoo.com;
wallacek412@gmail.com;
chapman.kathy@gmail.com;
cathyandcharlessullivan@gmail.com;
ashley.b.seto@gmail.com;

20151201-5123

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Daein Ballard under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/1/2015 9:46:01 AM

Filed Date: 12/1/2015 9:46:01 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	ferc@daein.org	

Basis for Intervening:

I'm Property owner directly affected by the project. The project will impact Torreya Taxifolia Trees planted on my property as part of the Torreya Guardians. Additionally, I've been investing other rare forest plants and the project will substantially damage my property's carrying capacity.

20151201-5138

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Stephanie Syre-Hager under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/1/2015 10:31:54 AM

Filed Date: 12/1/2015 10:31:54 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____

Individual syrehag@aol.com

Basis for Intervening:

§ 385.214 Intervention (Rule 214).

(2) Any State Commission, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the U.S. Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, and the Interior, any state fish and wildlife, water quality certification, or water rights agency; or Indian tribe with authority to issue a water quality certification is a party to any proceeding upon filing a notice of intervention in that proceeding, if the notice is filed within the period established under Rule 210(b). If the period for filing notice has expired, each entity identified in this paragraph must comply with the rules for motions to intervene applicable to any person under paragraph (a)(3) of this section including the content requirements of paragraph (b) of this section.

(b) Contents of motion. (1) Any motion to intervene must state, to the extent known, the position taken by the movant and the basis in fact and law for that position.

(2) A motion to intervene must also state the movant's interest in sufficient factual detail to demonstrate that:

(i) The movant has a right to participate which is expressly conferred by statute or by Commission rule, order, or other action;

(ii) The movant has or represents an interest which may be directly affected by the outcome of the proceeding, including any interest as a:

(A) Consumer,

(B) Customer,

(C) Competitor, or

(D) Security holder of a party; or

(iii) The movant's participation is in the public interest.

20151201-5173

Submission Description: Intervention is due to the proposed location of a compressor station. The project would harm my source of food, grown within a few miles of the proposed compressor, and my health would be harmed by atmospheric and drinking water pollution.

Submission Date: 12/1/2015 1:04:37 PM

Filed Date: 12/1/2015 1:04:37 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____

Individual stu@AlpineSolarHeat.com

Basis for Intervening:

Intervention is due to the proposed location of a compressor station. The project would harm my source of food, grown within a few miles of the proposed compressor, and my health would be harmed by atmospheric and drinking water pollution.

The proposed project supports extracting and burning fossil fuel, resulting in climate change. The resultant

severe weather cause difficulty operating a small business and living in a rural community.

20151201-5230

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Thomas R vaillancourt under CP16-21-000.
Submission Date: 12/1/2015 2:17:47 PM Filed Date: 12/1/2015 2:17:47 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	tommyenduro@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

Although the pipeline does not pass through our property it passes within a couple of hundred feet. Construction, operation and maintenance of the pipeline would adversely impact our family. The specific impacts are:

The property to which the pipeline will pass is undeveloped forest. As such streams, ancient artifacts, stone walls, vernal pools, wetlands and conversation lands will be destroyed in the construction.

The pipeline will pass through the towns wellhead protection area which is the source of drinking water for the town. This exposes us and the town to the risk of drinking water contamination from pipeline leaks.

The location of the pipeline will remove forest which currently acts as a buffer between our neighborhood and a very busy intersection and commercial district. This will impact the privacy that we currently enjoy and expose us to 24 hour/7 day light and noise pollution.

And it will create a permanent chemical and explosive hazard.

The impacts already stated will most certainly devalue the property value of our home.

Additional factors in our interest to intervene:

Kinder Morgan stated how this pipeline is necessary to reduce energy costs for New England, especially in the winter months. The Massachusetts Attorney General recently commissioned a study which does not support TGP's claim of necessity.

Kinder Morgan has also stated that the pipeline construction will be aligned with current powerline corridors. This however is not the case. The proposed path does not follow an existing powerline but zig zags through roads, commercial and residential properties, not once collocating with the powerline corridor in our town of Merrimack.

We urge you to deny Kinder Morgan's request and instead invest in clean, renewable energy projects.

20151201-5248

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Terry M Nord under CP16-21-000.
Submission Date: 12/1/2015 2:32:37 PM Filed Date: 12/1/2015 2:32:37 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	tmnferc@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

The Nord Family Trust includes property at 68 Helenwood Drive, Averill Park, NY.

As trustee, I am stating my opposition to the NED pipeline and compressor station proposed for Clark's Chapel Road in the Town of Nassau. The property at 68 Helenwood Drive is within one mile of the pro-

posed compressor station. The property is located on Burden Lake and is enjoyed by my entire family, including five young children. We rely on our well for drinking water.

I believe the emissions from this compressor station could endanger my health and the health of my family. Young children are particularly vulnerable to toxins released. I personally am an asthmatic and would struggle with an increase in particulate matter and the toxins and odors emitted. I also have concerns regarding the blasting for this pipeline. It could impact the quality and output of our well. I am opposed to the potential noise and light pollution from the compressor station and fear the risk of explosion. I am also concerned about the economic consequences. This is a recreational residential area. Property on Burden Lake is now valuable. If a compressor station is placed within 2800 feet from the southern shore of this lake, property values would be drastically reduced. Residents forced to sell to safeguard their health would lose their life's investment. Sadly, families who enjoyed this area would be forced to sell at a loss. The opportunity to own lake front property would then be out of reach.

20151201-5299

Philip Hardcastle, Hudson, NH.

Dear Federal Energy Regulatory Commission:

As a resident of the town of Hudson, NH and living within 1000 feet of the proposed pipeline structure I have the following major concerns:

Incineration Zone - My family and home would be destroyed if there were a catastrophic failure of the pipeline as well as other families and homes within the 1000 feet blast radius.

Property devaluation - Just added a \$100,000 addition to my home.

Potential contamination of my well water. Also the potential contamination of Robinson Pond.

Use of pesticides for pipeline maintenance that could harm Red Tail Hawks that nest in this area as well as many other species of wildlife such as moose, deer, rabbits, skunks, fisher cats, and birds.

Major disruption of current landscape.

Drainage issues due to pipeline construction.

Home foundation and water well structural damage due to blasting.

Possibility that pigging or meter stations could be added and create toxic emissions.

Loss of unrestricted use of land.

Do not ruin our lives, our properties, our conservation lands, our homes, our long-term lifelong investments, our livelihood, our children's futures, and our town.

This project must not proceed when we have plenty of existing infrastructure, new proposals and energy conservation measures to consider and enact.

Sincerely,

Philip and Jodi Hardcastle

20151201-5306

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.

Docket No. CP16-21-000

MOTION TO INTERVENE OF
THE METROPOLITAN DISTRICT

Pursuant to Rules 212 and 214 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (the "Commission") Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 CFR §§ 385.212 and 385.214, Section 15(a) of the Natural Gas Act (15

U.S.C. § 717n), The Metropolitan District (the “MDC”) hereby moves to intervene in the above-captioned proceeding.

I. Background

On or about November 20, 2015, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. (“Tennessee Gas”) filed its Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to Construct Install, Modify, Operate and Maintain Certain Pipeline and Compression Facilities and to Abandon Other Facilities.

II. Motion to Intervene

The MDC is a specially chartered municipal corporation created in 1929 by a Special Act of the Connecticut General Assembly and is headquartered in Hartford, Connecticut. It is the primary provider of potable water and wastewater treatment services to over 440,000 customers located within the Greater Hartford region and beyond, and the MDC is comprised of eight member towns, including Hartford, Windsor, East Hartford, West Hartford, Newington, Wethersfield, Bloomfield and Rocky Hill. In addition, the MDC provides potable water services to other towns that are beyond the geographic boundaries of the MDC.

On a daily basis, the MDC distributes approximately 55 million gallons of potable water to its customers located throughout the greater Hartford region. The primary source of its drinking water are surface water reservoirs owned by the MDC located in the northwest corner of the State. The drinking water is transported, via underground infrastructure, to reservoirs located in West Hartford and Bloomfield, Connecticut, is filtered at these two locations and then delivered to its customers. In connection therewith, the MDC owns approximately 31,000 acres of real property in the State of Connecticut and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Since the MDC is a “water company,” as that term is defined in the Connecticut General Statutes, this property is classified as either Class I, Class II or Class III watershed property, all of which is critically important to sustaining the ability of the MDC to continue to provide clean drinking water to businesses and residences located in the greater Hartford region. Tennessee Gas proposes that approximately 5.70 miles of the 14.80 miles of natural gas transmission line to be constructed in Connecticut, contemplated in the application before the Commission, will be constructed and operated on MDC-owned Class I, Class II or Class III watershed property.

Since 1952, Tennessee Gas has maintained and operated a gas transmission line located in close proximity to the proposed new line. This existing line also is located on watershed property. With respect to the proposed transmission line, the MDC is conducting its own due diligence and will rely, in part, upon information and data that is developed by Tennessee Gas as it performs a site survey on the MDC property over the course of the next several months. As of this date, the MDC policymakers have not established a position either in support of or against the new transmission line; the policymakers will do so after consideration of all pertinent data and information. Nevertheless, it is certain that the MDC’s watershed properties will be impacted in some manner by the construction and operation of the natural gas transmission line proposed by Tennessee Gas.

Accordingly, the MDC has a direct and substantial interest in the above docket and will be directly impacted by the outcome of this proceeding. The MDC cannot be adequately represented by any other party and may be adversely affected or bound without opportunity to present its position unless it is permitted to participate in this matter. Moreover, MDC’s participation in this proceeding is in the public interest. Accordingly, good cause exists to grant the MDC’s Motion to Intervene.

III. Communications

All correspondence and communications related to this proceeding should be directed to the following individuals whose names and addresses should be placed on the official service list maintained by the Secretary for this proceeding:

James Randazzo
Manager – Water Treatment

Brendan M. Fox, Jr.
Assistant District Counsel

The Metropolitan District
1420 Farmington Avenue
West Hartford, CT 06107
jrandazzo@themdc.com

The Metropolitan District
555 Main Street
Hartford, CT 06103
bfox@mdctlaw.com

IV. Conclusion

Wherefore, for the reasons discussed above, the MDC respectfully requests that the Commission grant the MDC's Motion to Intervene as a party in the above-captioned proceeding with all the rights attendant thereto.

Respectfully submitted this 1st day of December, 2015.

THE METROPOLITAN DISTRICT

Brendan M. Fox, Jr.
Assistant District Counsel
Attorney for the Metropolitan District

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this day served the foregoing document upon each person designated on the official service list compiled by the Secretary in this proceeding.

Dated at Hartford, Connecticut, this 1st day of December, 2015.

Brendan M. Fox, Jr.
The Metropolitan District
555 Main Street
Hartford, CT 06103

20151201-5322

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Louise A Delehanty under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/1/2015 4:28:56 PM Filed Date: 12/1/2015 4:28:56 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	lad80cricket@hotmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

Individual

I, Louise A. Delehanty, a resident of Boulder Hills, a 55+ Active Senior Condominium Community in Pelham, New Hampshire, am applying for intervenor status under CP16-21-000, Northeast Energy Direct pipeline project.

All communication, pleadings, and orders pertaining to this intervenor status should be sent to:

Louise A. Delehanty
Boulder Hills
31 Winterberry Road
Pelham, NH 03076

Reasons for Intervention:

The Boulder Hills Community encompasses 24 homes, all abutting the proposed Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline within 1000 feet of the pipeline's placement and dangerously close to construction.

We oppose the clear-cutting of our back yards, of which the trees have Wetland Conservation District status and protection.

Loss of habitat results in death of wildlife, once welcomed for the joy of sightings of deer, New England Cottontail, fox, turkey, and a variety of birds.

We decry the loss of our clean air and pure drinking water due to hazardous emissions and contamination caused by pipeline leaks and accidents.

Should American citizens, especially our Senior residents, be subjected to health issues, loss of homes, and other indignities too numerous to mention in this short space, for corporate greed and profit tied to a pipeline project of “no need and no necessity”?

Finally, all residents, as direct abutters to this pipeline, will have the quality of life diminished as we look to the future.

For these, and many other reasons, I ask to be an intervenor in CP16-21-000.

Thank you.

Louise A. Delehanty
lad80cricket@hotmail.com

20151202-0022

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, DC 26426

November 25, 2015

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

The Honorable Charles Schumer
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Schumer:

Thank you for your October 23, 2015, letter regarding Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.'s (Tennessee Gas) planned Northeast Energy Direct Project (Docket No. PF14-22-000).

On November 20, 2015, Tennessee Gas filed its formal application for the Project. The Commission's review of this application will consider numerous environmental surveys and studies regarding the planned compressor station location. Commission staff will also investigate alternative compressor station locations and may request that Tennessee Gas provide additional information for alternate locations.

Commission staff's review of the Project will be comprehensive and a final environmental impact statement (EIS) will not be issued without the Commission having all of the information necessary to determine the potential impacts associated with constructing and operating the Project. The EIS will consider impacts relating to noise, light pollution, local and regional air quality, and public safety. In addition, the EIS will compare the environmental impacts for Tennessee Gas planned compressor location with alternate locations.

As in any Commission matter, please be assured that the Commission strives to make our review of proposals both accessible and transparent to the public. If I can be of further assistance in this or any other Commission matter, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Norman C. Bay
Chairman

20151202-0023

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, DC 26426

November 25, 2015

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

The Honorable Kirsten Gillibrand
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Gillibrand:

Thank you for your October 23, 2015, letter regarding Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.'s (Tennessee Gas) planned Northeast Energy Direct Project (Docket No. PF14-22-000).

On November 20, 2015, Tennessee Gas filed its formal application for the Project. The Commission's review of this application will consider numerous environmental surveys and studies regarding the planned compressor station location. Commission staff will also investigate alternative compressor station locations and may request that Tennessee Gas provide additional information for alternate locations.

Commission staff's review of the Project will be comprehensive and a final environmental impact statement (EIS) will not be issued without the Commission having all of the information necessary to determine the potential impacts associated with constructing and operating the Project. The EIS will consider impacts relating to noise, light pollution, local and regional air quality, and public safety. In addition, the EIS will compare the environmental impacts for Tennessee Gas planned compressor location with alternate locations.

As in any Commission matter, please be assured that the Commission strives to make our review of proposals both accessible and transparent to the public. If I can be of further assistance in this or any other Commission matter, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Norman C. Bay
Chairman

20151202-0026

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, DC 26426

November 25, 2015

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

The Honorable Stan Rosenberg
President
Massachusetts Senate
State House, Room 332
Boston, MA 02133

Dear Senator Rosenberg:

Thank you for the letter and comments which you brought to our meeting on September 30, 2015, regarding Tennessee Gas' proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project (Docket No. PF14-22-000).

On November 20, 2015, Tennessee Gas filed its application. Commission staff will prepare a draft environmental impact statement (EIS) to meet our obligations under the National Environmental Policy Act. The draft EIS will analyze the environmental impacts and public safety concerns mentioned in your letter and raised in the public meeting you sponsored. The draft EIS will be published and distributed for public comment, and FERC staff will host public comment meetings along the project route during the 45 day comment period. After consideration of the comments received on the draft EIS, a final EIS will be issued that will address any comments received on the draft EIS. The Commission will consider the findings of the final EIS, as well as the public comments received on the need for the project, before making its decision on whether or not to authorize this project.

With regard to how the Commission considers the need for a project, the Commission issued a Statement of

Policy on September 15, 1999 in Docket No. PL99-3- 000. This document provides guidance for evaluating proposals to certificate new construction by establishing criteria for determining whether there is a need for a proposed project and whether the proposed project will serve the public interest. The Certificate Policy Statement explained that in deciding whether to authorize the construction of major new pipeline facilities, the Commission balances the public benefits against the potential adverse consequences. The Commission's goal is to give appropriate consideration to the enhancement of competitive transportation alternatives, the possibility of overbuilding, subsidization by existing customers, the applicant's responsibility for unsubscribed capacity, the avoidance of unnecessary disruptions of the environment, and the unneeded exercise of eminent domain in evaluating new pipeline construction.

In addition, I understand that following our September 30 meeting, Commission staff held discussions with your staff in order to clarify the deadlines applicable to the Commission's scoping process and the comment period relating to the draft EIS, the role and status of cooperating agencies in the environmental review process, and the interaction between the Federal Power Act's eminent domain provisions and the Article 97 of the Massachusetts Constitution.

As in any Commission matter, please be assured that we strive to make our review of proposals both accessible and transparent to the public. If I can be of any further assistance in this or any other Commission matter, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Norman C. Bay
Chairman

20151202-5203

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC) Docket No. CP16-21-000

**MOTION TO INTERVENE OF
NEW YORK STATE ELECTRIC & GAS CORPORATION**

Pursuant to 18 C.F.R. § 385.214(b), New York State Electric & Gas Corporation ("NYSEG"), a gas and electric corporation, duly organized and existing under the Transportation Corporations Law of the State of New York and authorized to do business in the State of New York, represents that it has a direct and substantial interest in the matters before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (the "Commission") in the above-entitled proceeding and in support of this Motion to Intervene respectfully shows as follows:

1. Correspondence or communications with respect to this proceeding should be addressed as follows:

Elizabeth W. Whittle, Esq.

Nixon Peabody LLP

799 Ninth Street, N.W., Suite 500

Washington, DC 20001

202-585-8338

202-585-8080 (fax)

ewhittle@nixonpeabody.com (e-mail)

Linda Dent

Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation

89 East Avenue

Rochester, NY 14649

585-771-4701

585-771-8818 (fax)

Linda_Dent@rge.com (e-mail)

2. NYSEG is a local distribution company regulated by the New York Public Service Commission.

NYSEG is engaged in, among other things, the purchase, sale and distribution of natural gas in its service area. NYSEG currently serves approximately 250,000 customers across a service territory that comprises nearly forty percent of upstate New York. NYSEG is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Iberdrola USA.

3. On November 19, 2015, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company (“Tennessee”) filed a certificate application to construct the Northeast Direct Project, to provide transportation services to shippers in the Northeast.
4. NYSEG is a transportation customer of Tennessee. NYSEG has a direct interest in this proceeding that cannot be represented by any other party.
5. If NYSEG is not permitted to intervene in this proceeding, it will not be adequately represented herein by the existing parties and may be adversely affected and bound by action taken in this proceeding without having had an opportunity to be heard.

WHEREFORE, New York State Electric & Gas Corporation respectfully requests that its Motion to Intervene in this proceeding be granted. In the event that a hearing is held, NYSEG requests an opportunity to appear and participate fully in this proceeding.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth W. Whittle
Attorneys for
New York State Electric & Gas Corporation

Of Counsel:

NIXON PEABODY LLP
799 Ninth Street, N.W.
Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20001
202-585-8338
ewhittle@nixonpeabody.com

Dated: December 2, 2015

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that I have this day served a copy of the foregoing document on all parties listed on the official service list compiled by the Secretary in this proceeding.

DATED this 2nd day of December, 2015.

Elizabeth W. Whittle

20151202-5229

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.

Docket No. CP16-21-000

MOTION TO INTERVENE OF TOWN OF DRACUT

The Town of Dracut (“Dracut”), by and through its Board of Selectmen, hereby moves to intervene in the above-captioned proceeding.

I. Background

On or about November 21, 2015, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. filed its Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to Construct Install, Modify, Operate and Maintain Certain Pipeline and Compression Facilities and to Abandon Other Facilities.

II. Motion to Intervene

The Town of Dracut is a municipal corporation, duly organized under the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, with offices located at 62 Arlington Street, Dracut, Massachusetts 01826. The Board of Se-

lectmen is an elected five person board which is the governing body of the Town of Dracut.

The Town of Dracut is a destination hub for the project in Massachusetts and is “substantially and specifically affected” by this proceeding. Dracut has concerns about the route and size and safety of the project, amongst other concerns. Dracut has a direct and immediate interest in this outcome of this proceeding which cannot be adequately protected by any other party. Dracut is also concerned about the possibility of further eminent domain takings and the environmental impacts related to construction and to the operation of a compression station.

Specifically, Dracut also has concerns about the noise and pollution created by the project and compression station. Furthermore, Dracut is not presently equipped with a high energy infrastructure to handle what is proposed and there are likely safer areas or municipalities or states, other than Dracut, for the hub to be more appropriately located.

Dracut seeks to participate as a full intervenor in this matter and, where appropriate, to file comments, attend conferences, file discovery, and submit briefs.

III. Correspondence

Correspondence and service related to this matter should be directed to the undersigned counsel on behalf of the Town of Dracut.

IV. Conclusion

Wherefore, for the reasons discussed above, Dracut respectfully requests that the Commission grant Dracut’s Motion to Intervene as a party in the above-captioned proceeding with all the rights attendant thereto.

Respectfully submitted this 2nd day of December, 2015.

Respectfully submitted,
FOR DRACUT,
James P. Hall, Esq.
Qua, Hall, Harvey & Walsh
25 Fletcher St
Chelmsford, MA 01824
(978)-869-1072

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this day served the foregoing document upon each person designated on the official service list compiled by the Secretary in this proceeding.

Dated at Chelmsford, Massachusetts, this 2nd day of December, 2015.

James P. Hall, Esq.
Qua, Hall, Harvey & Walsh
25 Fletcher St
Chelmsford, MA 01824
(978)-869-1072

20151203-4002

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
DEPARTMENT of RESOURCES and ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION of PARKS and RECREATION

172 Pembroke Road

Concord, New Hampshire 03302

PHONE: (603) 271-3556 FAX: (603) 271-3553 E-MAIL: nhparks@dred.state.nh.us

WEB: www.nhstateparks.org

December 2, 2015

Eric Tomasi, Environmental Engineer
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, DC 20426

RE: Docket No. CP16-21-000-Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC. (Potential Impacts by the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) proposal to public outdoor recreational properties within the State of New Hampshire encumbered under Section 6(f) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) Act of 1965)

Dear Mr. Tomasi;

Please accept these comments for your information. Based on the NED pipeline route proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC; this office has identified a number of state and municipally owned LWCF Section 6(f) properties that may be directly impacted by this project.

LWCF is a federal assistance program of the National Park Service (NPS) established by the LWCF Act of 1965. The purpose of the program is to provide matching grants to the states for acquisition and/or development of outdoor public recreation lands. In New Hampshire the program is officially administered by the Department of Resources and Economic Development (NHDRED) as designated by the Governor and authorized under the LWCF Act. The LWCF Act permits the state to provide sub-grants to local government agencies as project sponsors.

Per section 6(f)(3) of the LWCF Act, "No property acquired or developed with assistance under this section shall, without the approval of the Secretary (Department of the Interior), be converted to other than public outdoor recreation uses. The Secretary shall approve such conversion only if he finds it to be in accord with the then existing comprehensive statewide outdoor recreation plan and only upon such conditions as he deems necessary to assure the substitution of other recreation properties of at least equal fair market value and of reasonably equivalent usefulness and location." This provision is effective in perpetuity. The program cannot be reimbursed in an attempt to circumvent this provision.

It is our understanding that Kinder Morgan has submitted their application to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for the NED proposal, and that they used the NH GRANIT GIS data set as their resource for identifying conservation land and public properties. You should be aware that the LWCF data within NH GRANIT is not complete, and therefore unreliable in identifying the location of 6(f) properties. The presence of section 6(f) public recreational properties can only be accurately and officially confirmed between the local project sponsor (if applicable), this office, and the NPS-State and Local Assistance Program. However this office is the primary contact point for all LWCF assisted state and local project sites.

Based on the information provided by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC; this office has identified potential impacts to the section 6(f) areas listed below. Amendments to the proposed route may result in an increase or decrease of potential impacts.

<u>PROJECT #</u>	<u>PROJECT NAME</u>	<u>RECREATIONAL AREA</u>	<u>OWNER/SPONSOR</u>
33-00551	State Park Acquisitions II	Rhododendron State Park	State of NH-DRED
33-00613	State Park Land Acquisitions IV	Rhododendron State Park	State of NH-DRED
	> Approximate center of potential impact area: Lat 42°47'49.00"N; Lon 72°12'11.89"W		
	o See Map-1 attached		
33-00501	Mason Railroad Trail	Mason Railroad Trail	Town of Mason
	> Approximate center of potential impact area-(primary): Lat 42°46'47.08"N; Lon 71°45'30.67"W		
	o See Map-2 attached		
	> Approximate center of potential impact area-(lateral): Lat 42°42'53.61 "N; Lon 71°45'15.36"W		

o See Map-3 attached

33-00620 West Rd Recreation Facility I West Rd Fields/Continental Park Town of Londonderry

> Approximate center of potential impact area: Lat 42°50'34.38"N; Lon 71.025°11.64"W

o See Map-4 attached

33-00638 West Rd Recreation Facility II West Rd Fields/Continental Park Town of Londonderry

> Approximate center of potential impact area: Lat 42°50'30.12"N; Lon 71°25'28.62"W

o See Map-4 attached

If you have any questions, please contact Bill Gegas, LWCF Program Specialist, or me at (603) 271-3556, bill.gegas@dred.nh.gov, or eric.feldbaum@dred.nh.gov.

Sincerely

Eric Feldbaum, Community Recreation Specialist/LWCF Alternate State Liaison Officer

cc: Jack Howard, National Park Service

Jeffrey Rose (SLO), NH DRED

Philip Bryce (ASLO), NH DRED-Division of Parks and Recreation

Kevin Smith, Town of Londonderry

Bernard O'Grady, Town of Mason

Attachments

{4 maps omitted, full report with maps can be downloaded at: }

{ <http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/opennat.asp?fileID=14062325> }

20151203-5016

December 2, 2015

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

re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., Docket No. CP 16-21-00

Dear Secretary Bose:

FERC must not accept and notice Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's Application for the NED project until the application is truly complete.

Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Company (KM/TGP) admits in the letter accompanying the November 20th submission that their application is not complete. Page four of the transmittal letter (http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/file_list.asp?accession_num=20151120-5227) indicates there will be supplemental filings in December to:

1. address scoping comments filed with FERC between October 2nd and the close of scoping period on October 16th, and,
2. address responses to Commission staff comments not addressed in the November 20th filing.

These missing comments need more than just a cursory response in a memo. They need to be integrated into the application materials and Resource Reports. For example, my comments, filed on October 7th, suggest several specific alternative analyses not addressed in the Resource Reports filed with the application. FERC assured us at the Scoping Meetings that all comments received during the Scoping period would be addressed by Kinder Morgan in the application and accompanying Resource Reports. The application should not be considered complete until all the that information is included.

Based on the statements made at the Pelham, NH Conservation Commission meeting and reported on the

docket by Kaela Law, Kinder Morgan admits that the application will not be complete until a subsequent April filing:

20151123-5013 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 11/21/2015 12:47:04 PM

Kaela Law, Pelham, NH.

During a conservation commission meeting in Pelham on 11/18/15 Kinder Morgan company reps mentioned that their November 20 filing would NOT be complete and that “a subsequent April filing” would be more complete. Can somebody from F.E.R.C please explain what that particular Kinder Morgan Tennessee Gas Pipeline rep was talking about? Is there going to be a subsequent April filing? We were under the assumption that if and when Kinder Morgan was prepared to file for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity they must do so with a complete project plan. If they are telling us already their November 20 filing is NOT complete, wouldn't the F.E.R.C's decision to deny this application be an easy one? I read an article from the Keene Sentinel in which F.E.R.C spokesperson Tamara Young-Allen said “FERC staff will now go through the filing to make sure it is complete.” - We have Kinder Morgan themselves telling us that it is not.

When KM/TGP requested to use the pre-filing process, they made several commitments.

1. They agreed to respond to issues raised during scoping within 14 days of the end of the scoping period. (18 CFR 157.21 (f)(9)). **We are now at day 47 and they are yet to respond to all the comments.**
2. They agreed that, “*The application shall contain all the information specified by the Commission staff after reviewing the draft materials filed by the prospective applicant during the pre-filing process, including required environmental material in accordance with the provisions of part 380 of this chapter, “Regulations Implementing the National Environmental Policy Act.” (157.21 (b)(2)(ii))* **KM/TGP admits this is not the case as indicated by their comments to the Pelham, NH Conservation Commission and in the number of items they list in the application materials that will be addressed “in a supplemental filing.”**
3. Finally, they acknowledged “*that a complete Environmental Report and complete application are required at the time of filing.*” (157.21 (d)(10)) **As described above, KM/TGP admits that the application is not complete.**

Kinder Morgan has demonstrated repeatedly that they did not take the pre-filing process seriously. Information requests made by the FERC staff in February 2015, which should have been fully addressed in the March Resource Reports, remain unanswered still. Presentations to town boards used pictures of compressor stations several times smaller than the ones proposed in those communities. Alternatives were summarily dismissed without reason.

Kinder Morgan's lax attitude with the FERC process was illustrated as early as last fall when they submitted the November 2014 route information and then did a major revision, identifying the NH alternative as a primary route less than one month later. As indicated by Richard Kinder's public statement in mid-October 2014, Kinder Morgan had known about this change at least more than two weeks before the November Resource Reports were issued. (Richard Kinder's response to Carl Kirst found here :<http://seekingalpha.com/article/2565545-kinder-morgan-energy-partners-kmp-ceo-richkinder-on-q3-2014-results-earnings-call-transcript?page=9&p=qanda&l=last>). A KM/TGP land agent told a Townsend landowner as early as February 2014 that the main pipeline route would be much further north and that only a smaller pipe would be coming through Townsend, making many of us wonder why the original pre-filing route was ever submitted. Throughout the pre-filing process, FERC staff members and consultants said several times that it was hard to hold KM/TGP to account during the pre-filing process because it was a voluntary process. While the use of the pre-filing process may have been voluntary, once KM/TGP chose to use the process they agreed to follow the requirements of that process. FERC must not accept this application until it is complete including “*all the information specified by the Commission staff after reviewing the draft materials filed by the*

prospective applicant during the pre-filing process” as required in 157.21 (b)(2)(ii).

In the transmittal letter and in the press release announcing the filing, KM/TGP requested that a FERC Certificate be issued in 4th Quarter of 2016 so that they meet the “specific contracted needs of the NED project shippers.” KM/TGP wrote those contracts so this is only a KM/TGP target date (one that KM/TGP knows will not be met) and cannot be used as a reason to pressure FERC to speed up the process or issue a certificate prematurely. According to the FERC, it will take six to nine months after they have all the information they need to prepare the Draft EIS. Since KM/TGP is admitting that the application information will not be complete until at least April 2016, they know there is no way they will possibly get a Certificate decision by the end of 2016.

FERC should not “notice the application” until all of the information needed to compete the Draft EIS is submitted. To do anything less makes a mockery of the pre-filing process.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. As a potentially affected landowner I expect FERC to address my concerns.

Most sincerely,

Carolyn Sellars
Townsend, MA
casellers@gmail.com

cc: Senator Warren
Senator Markey
Representative Tsongas
Representative McGovern
Governor Baker
Attorney General Healey
MA Senate President Rosenberg
MA State Rep. Harrington
MA State Sen. Flanagan
Matthew Beaton, MA Secretary of Energy and Environmental Affairs
Townsend Board of Selectmen

20151203-5077

P • L • A • N
PIPE LINE AWARENESS NETWORK
for the NORTH EAST, Inc
www.plan-ne.org

December 3, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street NE, Room 1A
Washington, DC 20216

Re: Docket No. CP16-21, TGP Northeast Energy Direct – Inadequacies of Application; Notice

Dear Secretary Bose:

We write with concerns about inadequacies of the application submitted by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. (the “Company”) in the above-captioned docket. We request that the Commission reject the application as incomplete. We also seek formal clarification for stakeholders regarding timing of motions to intervene, and other matters to be set forth in the Commission’s Notice of Application (if the Company duly submits a complete application for this project).

We incorporate by reference the completeness issues raised by others on the docket, including Elaine Mroz

in a comment filed on December 1, 2015, at Accession Number 20151201-5049, and Carolyn Sellars in a comment docketed today at Accession Number 20151203-5016. We also note that, while the Company has replaced previous “TBDs” with more extensive text, substantive information remains missing. For example, the Minimum Filing Requirements under 18 C.F.R. 380, Appendix A requires the Applicant to “[d]iscuss the need for and **locations where blasting may be necessary** in order to construct the proposed facilities.” Instead, the Application states, “**a complete list of blasting locations can only be accurately determined in the field during the construction process.**” Resource Report 6, 6-31.

If and when the Commission eventually determines that it has received a complete application for this project, we request certain clarifications to be included in the Notice of Application. We note that many stakeholders have already filed motions to intervene. Please clarify in the Notice whether these motions will be rejected as premature; at least three stakeholders have asked this question of three different FERC staffers and have received three different answers. More generally, because so many stakeholders are engaging with the Commission’s process for the first time, we ask that the rights and obligations of stakeholders seeking to intervene be fully addressed in the Notice.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathryn R. Eiseman, President
17 Packard Road
Cummington, MA 01026
eiseman@plan-ne.org

20151203-5129

Don’t Allow Abuse of the Pre-filing Process

The NED pipeline proposed by Tennessee Gas Company/Kinder Morgan is a high impact, high visibility project with a record number of comments logged on the pre-file docket. Now that Kinder Morgan has moved past the pre-filing process and submitted its formal application, FERC must decide whether to accept the application as written. FERC’s decision will have implications on the Commission, not just for this project, but for all other projects which may follow it. This decision must not be taken lightly.

The pre-filing process is about 10 years old. In FERC’s own words it is “...*designed to engage federal and state agencies, tribes, landowners, non-governmental organizations (NGO), and any additional stakeholders to identify and resolve issues at the earliest stages of project development.*”[1] This can allow a more complete review of complex problems in advance of the more adjudicatory application phase. FERC further states, “*If used effectively, the pre-filing process can streamline the review once an application is filed.*”[2]

Unfortunately, Kinder Morgan’s pre-filing has been a bastardization of the process that FERC envisioned in both spirit and substance. The spirit of the process calls for early collaboration and joint problem-solving. Kinder Morgan’s early outreaches were secretive and misleading. Landowners were contacted with no real information given about the project, the impact on their properties, or in some cases even which of the landowner’s parcels was targeted. Local officials received no advance notice of KM’s plans, and KM refused to provide them more detailed information about how their municipalities would be impacted. When severe weather made KM’s Open Houses difficult to attend, KM ignored FERC’s request to reschedule. In at least one case, this prevented FERC officials from attending. At the Open Houses, KM officials completely misrepresented the character of their planned compressor station facilities. These actions surely do not represent the spirit of collaboration that FERC envisioned.

The substance of Kinder Morgan’s pre-filing is arguably a bigger issue. Kinder Morgan targeted a north-east expansion in its business plan for several years. One would presume that they would have thoroughly vetted options before going public with a plan. Remarkably, this was not the case. KM began to present its plan publicly in the spring and summer of 2014. FERC accepted KM’s pre-filing application on October 2, 2014. KM filed voluminous Resource Reports 1 and 10 on November 5, 2014 which were closely examined by FERC, state and local officials and the general public. Less than one month later, Kinder Morgan made

dramatic changes to its proposal. Much of the earlier work had been a waste of time. A completely new set of stakeholders had to become engaged.

Kinder Morgan has clearly used the pre-filing process as a way of planning and vetting their project at taxpayers' expense. This behavior has continued up until the present. Using the pre-filing process means committing to a complete application, yet, the application they filed on November 20, 2015 has many missing pieces of information. Incredibly, it includes a completely new location for at least one compressor station whose abutters have not yet been notified and who did not have the opportunity to engage in the pre-filing process.

Anyone who cares about good government should be leery of accepting this application. FERC's vision of the pre-filing process "...allows for FERC staff and all stakeholders to review and discuss the company's draft resource reports and additional environmental information before the company files an application. ...Unlike the traditional filing process, where FERC staff starts its environmental review after the filing of an application, the pre-filing process involves staff devoting significant resources to the potential project prior to the filing of an application." [3] KM has wasted a lot of FERC's scarce resources as it has developed the project on the fly. Given the large volume of data that is still missing, and given the large number of questions still unanswered, it can be expected that the Commission's staff and consultants will be frustrated with incomplete information as it moves to environmental review. At the same time, they will come under increasing time pressure from KM to complete their work. If FERC accepts this application as written, it's easy to envision that the industry (and some politicians) will blame the regulators for future delays, when the problem is actually KM's failure to do a thorough analysis.

Even more importantly, there is a critical issue of the public trust. How can the public be asked to respect a process if neither the proponent nor the regulator will? What about other companies who make an honest attempt to vet their projects *before* presenting them to FERC? Aren't they penalized by being "late" when they've actually been more complete and professional? If KM is successful in ramming its half-baked project through the system at taxpayers' expense, won't other companies find it useful to sink into the same bad behavior?

The pre-filing process is not perfect. It was patched together to respond to the fast-changing energy world without the type of forethought that now seems necessary. But, this is the process that we must work with in 2015. We must follow it until we can devise a better one. But we must follow it in letter and in spirit.

I strongly urge FERC to NOT accept the NED application until it is complete and compliant with the letter and spirit of its regulations.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Elaine Mroz
epmroz@gmail.com
978-660-4826

Footnotes:

1 Suggested Best Practices for Industry Outreach Programs to Stakeholders FERC Office of Energy Projects July 2015 <http://www.ferc.gov/industries/gas/enviro/guidelines/stakeholder-brochure.pdf>

2 ibid

3 ibid

20151203-5136

**Franklin Regional Council of Governments
Southwest Region Planning Commission
Pioneer Valley Planning Commission**

**Northern Middlesex Council of Governments
Nashua Regional Planning Commission
Berkshire Regional Planning**

December 2, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

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

RE: TGP NED Pipeline Project - Docket number CP16-21-000

Dear Ms. Bose:

Please accept this joint correspondence related to the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) gas pipeline project. Following the brief opportunity to review the Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience & Necessity filed on November 20, 2015 by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, a subsidiary of Kinder Morgan, we have concerns regarding the completeness of the application. Our concerns are based in part on the following:

- The application does not specifically indicate the location of the proposed pipeline route. The information contained on pages 54-55 of the Application describes a ranging width of land in which the pipeline may be located. This ambiguity makes the task of assessing impacts to resources a challenge. **Wouldn't a sufficient application require greater clarity on the location of the proposed pipeline?**
- We have yet to see an adequate demonstration of need for the project. The information provided on page 26 of the Application and in Exhibit I, regarding commitments under precedent agreements, does not indicate need for the project as proposed. **Why are we collectively investing such a significant amount of resources into reviewing a complex proposal at this time, when the project need has yet to be established?**
- Several of the entries provided in *Attachment A: Tennessee's Responses to Scoping Comments* are lacking in detail, incomplete when compared to the concern, and missing the point in many cases. After putting significant time and thought into developing scoping comments, we are disappointed to see such shallow, inadequate responses. **Wouldn't a sufficient application require more complete and detailed responses to scoping comments?**

In addition to the generalized observations above, we are struck by the challenge of FERC making a determination of the sufficiency of the Application in a 10-business day review period. The sheer volume of material submitted would presumably involve a significant amount of time by FERC, agencies such as ours, and others involved in the public review process.

Based on our review of the Application to date, we express significant reservation regarding sufficiency of the Application for the purposes of conducting a thorough and adequate review of the proposal. The comments provided above represent just a few examples to help illustrate this position. We hope you and your staff find this input helpful as you review the Application for sufficiency.

Sincerely,

Linda Dunlavy, Executive Director, Franklin Regional Council of Governments

Beverly Woods, Executive Director, Northern Middlesex Council of Governments

Tim Murphy, Executive Director, Southwest Region Planning Commission

Tim Roache, Executive Director, Nashua Regional Planning Commission

Tim Brennan, Executive Director, Pioneer Valley Planning Commission

Nathaniel Karns, Executive Director, Berkshire Regional Planning

20151203-5192

DOCKET PF14-22-000

I am writing to object to TGP entering my private property to survey and take my property by imminent domain as they have threatened us they would. I am asking you to not grant licenses / approvals from them to enter our properties.

solely upon private wells for their water from two substantial aquifers. These aquifers are not only the sole sources of drinking water for the Town but they ultimately feed the Quabbin Reservoir in Massachusetts. Any damage to our wells or water supplies would do irreparable harm. Rindge is community with substantial bedrock which will require substantial blasting. Rindge has gone to considerable expense to preserve valuable wetlands and watersheds. The pipeline will traverse one of Rindge's most valuable assets, Converse Meadow. The pipeline will also impact areas of wetlands, Goddard Pond and Tarbell Brook. Our review of the TGP filing with FERC suggests that New Hampshire ratepayers might be required to pay a utility bill tariff essentially underwriting the cost of construction of this pipeline. The filings contain no assurance that Rindge will have the benefit of access to gas supplies or lower energy costs or that TGP will provide any financial mitigation for the impacts this pipeline will have on the Town. The Town is deeply concerned about the impacts that construction will have on the community. As stated above, we are a community that relies solely on wells for our water.

20151204-0017

CITY OF PEABODY

24 Lowell Street
Peabody, Massachusetts 01980

P. 978-538-5700
F. 978-538-5980

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
EDWARD A. BETTENCOURT, JR.

December 2, 2015

BY FEDERAL EXPRESS
Tracking No. 837667827221
Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr., Deputy Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, N.E.
Washington, DC 20426

RE: Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LLC
North East Direct Pipeline Project
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
Docket No. CP16-21-000

Dear Ms. Bose:

Pursuant to Rules 212 and 214 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. §385.212 and 385.214 (2007), I am enclosing an original and three copies of a Motion for Leave to Intervene for filing in reference to the above-referenced matter.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Very truly yours,
Edward A. Bettencourt, Jr
Mayor, City of Peabody

Enclosures

cc: Peabody City Council

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO INTERVENE

Pursuant to Rules 212 and 214 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's ("Commission") Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 385.212 and 385.214 (2007), I, Mayor Edward A. Bettencourt, Jr. on behalf of the City of Peabody, Massachusetts, file this motion to intervene in this proceeding.

On November 20, 2015, the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC ("TGP") filed its application under f 7 of the Natural Gas Act, 15 U.S.C. tj 717f, and tj 157 of FERC's regulations, 18 C.F.R. f 157.1 et seq., for the proposed North East Direct Project (NED), FERC Docket No. CP 16- 21-000

I. COMMUNICATIONS AND SERVICE

All communications, pleadings, and orders with respect to this proceeding should be sent to the following individual:

Mayor Edward A. Bettencourt, Jr.
City Hall
24 Lowell Street
Peabody, MA 01960
978-538-5704
edward.bettencourt@peabody-ma.gov

II. INTEREST OF PETITIONER

Construction, operation and maintenance of the Pipeline would adversely impact the City of Peabody insofar that its installation, operation and maintenance is located proximate to and below grade of one of the city's primary recreational assets, the Independence Greenway (IG) bikepath and walkway. The IG abuts residential neighborhoods and the Ipswich River, the watershed providing the source drinking water for not only Peabody, but the greater North Shore of Massachusetts. The Pipeline is a threat to the homeowners and IG users in proximity to its placement, especially those designated by Kinder Morgan to be within its self-described incineration zone; of late Kinder Morgan has experienced gas pipeline failures raising the prospect of a catastrophic critical incident locally. The invasive nature of the pipeline installation puts the IG integrity at risk, an asset of recent development at a great cost to the City of Peabody. Further, such installation compromises the abutting protected wetlands and water quality of the Ipswich river watershed, a source of public drinking water to about 350,000 residents. Further, and in addition to the fear occasioned by abutters and trail users and associated with the high pressure large volume transport of a flammable, the City's landowners are to experience a decrease in their property values.

On behalf of the City of Peabody I have important information that will supplement the above and perspectives to bring to this process, consideration of which will serve the public interest.

III. CONCLUSION

Wherefore, I, Mayor Edward A. Bettencourt, Jr., on behalf of the City of Peabody, Massachusetts respectfully requests that the Commission to grant my Motion for the City of Peabody to Intervene as a party with full rights to participate in all further proceedings.

Respectfully submitted,

Edward A. Bettencourt, Jr.
Mayor, City of Peabody
Peabody City Hall
24 Lowell Street
Peabody, MA 01960
Tel. 978-538-5704

DATED: December 2, 2015

20151204-0018

Statement by Congresswoman Ann McLane Kuster (NH-02) regarding the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline

Delivered to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) on Wednesday, December 2, 2015

As the Representative for New Hampshire's Second District, it is my responsibility to look out for the best interests of my constituents. This is a responsibility that I do not take lightly. Over the past year and a half, I have been engaging in a deliberative process regarding the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline (NED), a natural gas project that proposes to build a 70-mile pipeline that would cut through 17 New Hampshire towns.

As I have assessed the project, I have met and spoken on countless occasions with Kinder Morgan officials, representatives from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC), local business and community leaders, energy policy experts, constituent stakeholders, and residents from affected communities. It is important to me that I hear directly from my constituents, and that is why I chose to visit many of the critical sites along the proposed route of the NED Pipeline. Based on what I have seen, heard and learned about the proposed pipeline, I do not believe this project serves the best interests of the Granite State and its residents.

My extensive research on NED has led me to find ways to leverage the voices of my constituents to impact Kinder Morgan's pre-filing process with FERC. I have signed onto eight letters with the full New Hampshire delegation to extend the comment period, hold additional open houses in the impacted communities, and voice other concerns from our constituents.

Additionally, I have sent several letters of my own to express my concerns about the proposed NED route. Most recently, I led colleagues representing four New England states in signing a letter to FERC requesting a regional assessment of energy projects to analyze regional need and prevent overbuild given other proposed energy infrastructure projects currently under consideration in New England.

This regional assessment has been important to me because New England shares an electricity grid, and we all feel the impact of losing energy sources and adding new ones. Furthermore, the cost of these projects is typically borne by all New England ratepayers.

Throughout this process, I have made it clear that I am in favor of bringing additional clean energy sources to our region while preserving the rural character and safety of our communities. However, it is critical that we are intentional and thoughtful about every project that is proposed and how it impacts our state's future.

NED crosses crucial public water supplies, cuts across rivers, puts at risk the many private wells that are ubiquitous across southern New Hampshire, and impacts pristine conservation lands and state parks. In addition to these concerns, the NED project creates a safety and security burden on small towns along the proposed route - many of which possess limited emergency response resources in the event of an incident with the pipeline or compressor station. Furthermore, Granite Staters understand that the overwhelming majority of gas moved through the pipeline will go to other states.

Recently, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, a subsidiary of Kinder Morgan, filed a "certificate of public convenience and necessity" with FERC that will trigger a year-long environmental review by the agency. As the sole agency in charge of citing natural gas pipelines in the United States, it is the FERC Commissioners who will ultimately decide if the NED project is in the best interest of the public.

As the Federal representative for 15 of the 17 New Hampshire towns located along the route of the NED pipeline, I have concluded that this project does not provide sufficient benefits to New Hampshire families and businesses to justify the disruption and long-term negative impacts to our communities. In the coming weeks, I will be filing my opposition to the project with FERC, and I will urge the agency to deny the issuance of a permit for the NED project.

Throughout the evaluation process, I have aimed to be fair, open and accessible when listening to both

supporters and opponents of the NED project. However, without tangible evidence of substantial economic gains to the communities that are affected, I have not seen enough evidence to justify the potential damage. Given that there are less invasive projects being proposed in New England, I believe that the NED Pipeline, as it is proposed, is the wrong vehicle for bringing meaningful reductions in wholesale electricity costs in New Hampshire.

I am adding my voice to the thousands of citizens who have filed their opposition to the NED Pipeline with FERC. I implore FERC to take into account the potential damage to our water resources, our conservation lands and our environment when making a final decision on this project. I believe that when taking these factors into consideration, FERC should see that the NED project is not in the best interest of New Hampshire families.

20151204-5019

Christine, Dracut, MA.

I oppose the Pipeline because I live less than a 1/2 mile abutting the land that the compressor station will be on. I'm concerned about the contaminated land they want to build on, the noise and air pollution.

20151204-5021

Gina Boisse, Dracut, MA.

My name is Gina Boisse. I live at 190 Methuen Road in Dracut, MA which is part of the Dadak Estates housing development.

I've just been made aware that I am an abutter to the proposed Kinder Morgan Compressor Station location at 970 Broadway Rd., Dracut, MA. I am deeply disturbed that Kinder Morgan neglected to notify our neighborhood as required by 18CFR - 157.21. When Kinder Morgan filed their application they had to be aware that the move in locations just prior to the filing would impact an entirely different group of abutters and others within the half mile radius. Furthermore, they had to have had prior knowledge of the location move at the time they held their public forum at the Four Oaks Country Club, that again - we were not notified of.

Due to this deception, the new abutters, including myself were not given time to address our concerns with FERC, Kinder Morgan, Town officials or State representatives. I ask that you delay approving this project and open a scoping session giving us the same opportunity to obtain vital information pertaining to our health, safety, well-being and economic future that the original abutters were offered.

Sincerely,

Gina Boisse

190 Methuen Road

Dracut, MA 01826

Mobile # 978-390-7977

e-mail: gsartori@comcast.net

20151204-5025

Randy Boisse, Dracut, MA.

My name is Randy Boisse. I live at 190 Methuen Road in Dracut, MA which is part of the Dadak Estates housing development.

I've just been made aware that I am an abutter to the proposed Kinder Morgan Compressor Station location at 970 Broadway Rd., Dracut. I am deeply disturbed that Kinder Morgan neglected to notify our neighborhood as required by 18CFR - 157.21. When Kinder Morgan filed their application they had to be aware that the move in locations just prior to the filing would impact an entirely different group of abutters and others within the half mile radius. Furthermore, they had to have had prior knowledge of the location move at the time they held their public forum at the Four Oaks Country Club, that again - we were not notified of.

Due to this deception, the new abutters, including myself were not given time to address our concerns with FERC, Kinder Morgan, Town officials or State representatives. I ask that you delay approving this project and open a scoping session giving us the same opportunity to obtain vital information pertaining to our health, safety, well-being and economic future that the original abutters were offered.

Sincerely,

Randy Boisse
190 Methuen Road
Dracut, MA 01826
Mobile # 978-390-0803
e-mail: rcboisse@comcast.net

20151204-5026

Stephen St. Arnaud, Dracut, MA.

As a long time resident of the Town of Dracut, MA, I was very concerned to learn that the Northeast Energy Direct project would lead to the development and installation of a compressor station in my rural, farming community. The consequences of allowing this project into our town will likely lead to deteriorated health, environmental impacts, and decreases in property values.

Based on the research that I have done and the presentations that I have seen from other parts of the U.S. where similar projects were completed, the compressor station's scheduled "blow-off" maintenance will potentially introduce many health related issues to the nearby residents of our town and the natural wetlands and wildlife in the very close proximity. As a father to a six year old child and the husband of a woman that may still become pregnant in the coming years, I am deeply afraid of the potential health risks that my family could be exposed to as we live half a mile from proposed compressor site. Additionally, my in-laws whom are both senior citizens and kidney transplant recipients, live within 2 miles of the compressor station site. Given their health conditions, they are also very susceptible to the byproducts that are emitted from the compressor station "blow-offs". The Board of Health in our town unanimously voted against allowing the pipe line project and the building of a compressor station due to health concerns for the residents.

A further concern I have is that the proposed location for this compressor station is within 3 miles of the Campbell Elementary school (grades K-5). This school is attended by over 400 children under the age of 10. As a parent, I don't feel safe for the well-being of these children as the school is down wind from the discharges from the compressor station site.

The Massachusetts Attorney General's office conducted their own study and came to the conclusion that the Northeast Energy Direct project would not benefit the residents of Massachusetts as stated by the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company. The energy needs of the state are currently met at satisfactory level and there is no need to bring this into our state.

I hope that FERC will take the time to hear the voices of the residents of our town and consider the potentially hazardous risks with no benefit that will come from this project.

20151204-5029

Kaela Law, Pelham, NH.

Statements made by Kinder Morgan representatives at the Windham SEC meeting on December 1, 2015, indicating their November 20th filing is incomplete.

"High Consequence Areas have not been determined yet. We've looked at preliminary class locations, but we need to confirm."

When asked questions about the Merrimack Valley Reliability Project as it relates to the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline, specifically how far along has Kinder Morgan come in their discussions with Eversource/National Grid regarding use of the existing powerline easement, and whether their induction of current

studies are accurate measures before the new set of wires is erected on the edge of the Right Of Way and the middle set of wires carries a 345 kilovolt line, and whether their cathodic protection coating system has been designed yet before they are able to run accurate induction of current studies, Representative Jim Hartman had the following to say:

“We have had extensive discussions with the power companies. They have been going on for months and are going to continue. It has been an engineering exchange of data. The design is not complete. We are still gathering information. The process is ongoing. ... Agreements have not been made with Eversource and National Grid for co-location. ... We’re going to be doing our very best to co-locate within that space, but nothing has been agreed upon yet.”

20151204-5050

United States of America
Before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
Docket No. CP 16-21-000

Tennessee Gas PipeLne Company, L,L,C., Application for a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity

Motion to Intervene of the Town of Fitzwilliam, New Hampshire

The Town of Fitzwilliam, New Hampshire, 13 Templeton Turnpike, Fitzwilliam, NH 03447, in accordance with 18 CFR 385.214, respectfully moves to intervene in tte captioned docket.

Standing

Movant, the Town of Fitzwilliam, New Hampshire (Town), a municipaLity as defined by 15 USC 71,7a (3), will be traversed by the Alternauve Route as proposed in the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC, (Com-pany) December 8, 2014, Supplemental Filing-A.doptron 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 irnpacted by the consftuction, operation and maintenance of the pipeline.

Applicant Has Not Satisfied its Natural Gas Act and National Environmental Policy Act Obligations

The Town of Fitzwilliam (Town) objects to the proiect for the reasons that;

1. Applicant cannot satisfy the requirements of 15 USC 717f, the Natural Gas Act OJGA) prerequisite to the issuance of a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity; and,
2. Applicant has failed to satisfy its responsibilities under 42 USC 4331-4335, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) as set forth below:

a. On January 16,2015, the Town requested in comments filed in Docket No, PF 1,4-22- 000 that appli-cant precisely identify the pipeline route; the environmental impacts on the Town; safety concerfis; and, proposed consttucun plans and techniques.

Applicant did not respond.

b. On September 1,,201,5, applicant sent Town a letter requestirrg that Town representatives meet with appJicant representatives to discuss “potential local mitigation opportunities”. On Septembet 24,2015, the Tor,vn, in writrng, accepted the invj.tation to meet. The Town provided applicant with an inventory of the impacts on the Town specifically detailing

those impacts on the pipeline route as known to the Town.

Applicant did not respond.

c. On October 15, 2015, the Town filed its Scoping Cornments in Docket No. pF 14-22- 000 detarhng its concerns about specific Town rmpacts. (The Town Scoping Comments are mcolporated by reference as if fully rewritten herein).The Scoping Comrnents objected to the adequacy of applicant’s July 2014,Dtaft Environmental Report and project Scope Update (Report) with citations to the provisions of NEPA and the applicable regularions.

Applicant did not respond.

Instead of addressing the concerns identified by the Town, applicant provided only generalized information about how it would address issues raised in the many scoping comments filed raising concerns about the project impacts without the specificity necessary to comply with applicant's NEPA obligations. The responses did not satisfy applicant's NEPA responsibilities to the Town and its specific and detailed concerns, repeatedly expressed.

Wherefore, the Town of Fitzwilliam, New Hampshire, requests that it be permitted to intervene in this docket.

Please address filings, communications and correspondence to the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
Arthur B. Cunningham
Attorney for Intervener
PO Box 511,79 Checkerberry Lane
Hopkinton, NH 03229
603-746-2196 (o); 603-219-6991 (C)
gilfavor@comcast.net
Reg. No. 18301
FERC ID # F291489

Certificate

I certify that a copy of this filing was served on applicant by email to Jacquelyn M. Rocan at Jacquelyne_Rocan@kindermorgan.com this 3rd day of December, 2015.

Arthur B. Cunningham

20151204-5088

Rosemary Wessel, Cummington, MA.

Appendix O, dedicated to Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD), has maps and cross sections of where it will happen, doesn't have any description of the process or its potential impacts. Some information is scattered across 29 of the documents filed, but most of them are just mention of using the HDD process, with no description. Buried in Appendix B, page 78-79 are two paragraphs of detail on impacts of HDD in relation to drilling in the town of Amherst, NH:

"Kinder Morgan personnel have indicated that they will use the HDD intersect method at two locations along the proposed pipeline route. FERC requires an additional 50-foot buffer for workspace in areas of drilling near waterbodies, suggesting the aforementioned impacted acreages may be increased. Drilling utilizes a lubricating slurry of bentonite clay and unspecified additives to protect the drill bit, facilitate removal of cuttings, and maintain bore diameters. Depending on the depth to which borings advance, regional groundwater flows could be impacted including the need to breach underlying bedrock formations.

Impacts to surface waters may include increased sediment transport to and elevated turbidity in affected waterways as well as from releases of drilling fluids, which may coat the water body banks and beds with bentonite clay, hydrostatic test discharges, which may erode stream banks and scour stream beds, and spills of hazardous materials contained in fuels and engine lubricants."

Once again, Kinder Morgan has scrambled pertinent information across documents, making us all dig for far flung details on any given subject - this time over 21,000 pages of it.

This is just one of many examples how incomplete the filing for Northeast Energy Direct (CP16-21) is. FERC needs to REJECT THIS APPLICATION as incomplete.

20151204-5094

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Craig W Fifield under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/4/2015 10:16:52 AM Filed Date: 12/4/2015 10:16:52 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____

Individual craigwf@verizon.net

Basis for Intervening:

My Conservation Easement Protected property is on the proposed route of the NED pipeline project. There is no precedent in NH for conservation easement protected land to be taken by eminent domain and I want to do everything I can to prevent Kinder Morgan/TGP from putting Their pipeline through my conservation land.

20151204-5126

Connecticut Department of
ENERGY & ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
79 Elm Street • Hartford, CT 06106-5127 www.ct.gov/deep Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

In the matter of

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC) Project No. CP16-21-000
Northeast Energy Direct Project)
Application for Certificate of Public Convenience And Necessity)

NOTICE OF INTERVENTION

Pursuant to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedures, 18 CFR 385.214, the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection, acting by its Commissioner, hereby gives notice that it is intervening to become a party in the above captioned proceeding. The Department is Connecticut’s energy, environmental protection and conservation agency. Among the Department’s duties and powers, it specifically serves as Connecticut’s fish and wildlife as well as water quality certification agency and thus qualifies under section (a)(2) of Rule 214 to intervene.

The Department designates the following individual for service in the proceeding. Service via email is preferred.

Frederick Riese, Senior Environmental Analyst
Department of Energy & Environmental Protection
Office of Environmental Review
79 Elm Street
Hartford, CT 06106-5127
frederick.riese@ct.gov

Respectfully submitted,
Robert J. Klee, Commissioner
Department of Energy & Environmental Protection

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this day served the foregoing document upon each person designated on the official service list compiled by the Secretary in this proceeding. Dated at Hartford, Connecticut this ~:i11 day

of December, 2015.

Frederick Riese
Senior Environmental Analyst
Department of Energy & Environmental Protection
Office of Environmental Review
79 Elm Street
Hartford, CT 06106-5127

20151204-5149

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

BEFORE THE FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATION COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.

Docket No. CP16-21-000

MOTION TO INTERVENE OF THE LYNNFIELD CENTER WATER DISTRICT

Pursuant to Rules 212 and 214 of the Federal Regulatory Commission's (the "Commission") Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 CFR §§ 385.212 and 385.214, Section 15(a) of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. § 717n), The Lynnfield Center Water District (the "LCWD") hereby moves to intervene in the above-captioned proceeding.

I. Background

On or about November 20, 2015, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. ("Tennessee Gas") filed its Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to Construct, Install, Modify, Operate and Maintain Certain Pipeline and Compression Facilities and to Abandon Other Facilities.

II. Motion to Intervene

The LCWD is a specially chartered municipal corporation created in 1939 by an Act of the Massachusetts General Court and is headquartered in the Town of Lynnfield, MA. It is the primary provider of potable water to the Town of Lynnfield and to customers located within the LCWD District.

The primary source of its drinking water are wells that are pumped and owned by the LCWD and then delivered to its customers. In connection therewith, the LCWD owns approximately 1,000 acres of real property and serves roughly 8,565 residents in the Town of Lynnfield. Since, the LCWD is a "water company," as the term is defined in the Massachusetts General Laws, this property falls under the jurisdiction of The Department of Environmental Protection, which was formed with the intention of protecting water supplies, and has the authority to enforce actions based upon analytical results and other information compiled by its sanctioned representatives and agencies[1]

With respect to the proposed transmission line, the LCWD is conducting its own due diligence and will rely, in part, upon information and data that is developed by Tennessee Gas over the course of the next several months. As of this date, the LCWD policymakers have not established a position either in support of or against the new transmission line; the LCWD Commissioners will do so after careful consideration of all pertinent data and information. Nevertheless, it is certain that the LCWD's watershed properties will be impacted in some manner by the construction and operation of the natural gas transmission line proposed by Tennessee Gas.

Accordingly, the LCWD has a direct and substantial interest in the above docket and will be directly impacted by the outcome of this proceeding. The LCWD cannot be adequately represented by any other party and may be adversely affected or bound without opportunity to present its position unless it is permitted to participate in this matter. Moreover, LCWD's participation in this proceeding is in the public interest. Accordingly, good cause exists to grant the LCWD's Motion to Intervene.

III. Communications

All correspondence and communications related to this proceeding should be directed to the Chairman of the Board of Water Commissioners whose name and address has been placed on the official service list maintained by the Secretary for this proceeding:

John H. Kimball, Jr., Esq.
83 Phillips Road
Lynnfield, MA 01940
(781) 334-3901
FERC@LCWD.US

IV. Conclusion

Wherefore, for the reasons discussed above, the LCWD respectfully requests that the Commission grant the LCWD's Motion to Intervene as a party in the above-captioned proceeding with all the rights attendant thereto.

Respectfully submitted this 4th day of December, 2015.

THE LYNNFIELD CENTER WATER DISTRICT

Christopher T. Casey, Esq.
Attorney for the Lynnfield Center Water District

1 M.G.L. ch.165 §1; 310 CMR 22.01(1)(2)(a)

20151204-5174

Docket No. CP16-21-00:

Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project) of Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC.

MOTION TO INTERVENE OF THE TOWN OF AMHERST, NEW HAMPSHIRE

Pursuant to Rules 212 and 214 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (the "Commission") Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 CFR § 385.212 and § 385.214, the Board of Selectmen of the Town of Amherst ("Town"), New Hampshire, respectfully moves to intervene in the above-captioned proceeding.

I. Background

On March 10, 2015, through a ballot vote at the Annual Town Election the Town of Amherst authorized the Amherst Board of Selectmen to file with the Commission as an intervener to present the claims of Amherst residents and property owners and protect their rights regarding the matter of the proposed Northeast Energy Direct ("NED") project.

On November 20, 2015, the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC ("Tennessee Gas") filed its application for a Certificate Convenience and Necessity for the NED Project, which includes approximately three (3) miles of a natural gas transmission pipeline within the Town.

II. Grounds for Intervention

The proposed pipeline includes a three mile segment in the Town that is expected to directly impact approximately twenty-four (24) individual property owners in the Town, and includes construction in the Town's Wetland and Watershed Protection District, the Aquifer Protection District, and within Wellhead Protection areas associated with the Pennichuck Watershed, the drinking water supply for a significant population in Southern New Hampshire and the Town. Accordingly, the Town has a direct and substantial interest in the above docket, on the behalf of its residents, and will be directly impacted by the outcome of this proceeding

and the Town's interests cannot be adequately represented by any other party. The Town's participation in this proceeding is in the public interest and the Town respectfully requests that the Commission accept this filing and grant its motion to intervene.

III. Communications

All correspondence and communications related to this proceeding should be directed to the following individuals whose names and addresses should be placed on the official service list maintained by the Secretary for this proceeding:

Colleen Mailloux
Community Development Director
Town of Amherst
2 Main Street
PO Box 960
Amherst, NH 03031
cmailloux@amherstnh.gov

Mary Guild
Executive Assistant to the Town Administrator
Town of Amherst
2 Main Street
PO Box 960
Amherst, NH 03031
mguild@amherstnh.gov

20151204-5191

December 4, 2015

Kimberly Boise, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE Room 1A
Washington, DC 20216

Re: Docket Number CP16-21 Northeast Energy Direct—Comments of the Inadequacies of Application

Dear Secretary Bose,

Along with the many other organizations and individuals who have written to you since the November 20th filing of the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, I would like to express my most urgent and grave concerns regarding the NED application. In brief, they include the following:

1. The NED application should only be considered in the broader context and in combination with the other proposals for additional gas pipeline capacity in New England. This should include, but not be limited to: the Kinder Morgan Connecticut Expansion, Spectra's Atlantic Bridge and Access Northeast, Portland Natural Gas Transmission System Continent to Coast (C2C) projects, existing and planned LNG infrastructure, and any other natural gas infrastructure proposal currently before FERC. This recommendation has been communicated to FERC many times, and most recently on November 20th by the 3 New England municipal coalitions who represent 38 communities and over 375,000 residents directly impacted by the NED pipeline. Combining the projects into one consolidated review would promote an open and transparent process and the needs analysis critical to FERC's decision on which projects, if any, may be needed.
2. The case for the need for the NED pipeline has not yet been made. FERC recently received the newest, independent report by the Analysis Group, Inc., and submitted by the Massachusetts Attorney General's office which concludes "that the Study's findings fundamentally call into question any reliability-based need for the NED project. ". Another study, completed in August 2015 by the Boston-based economic consulting firm Energyzt Advisors, LLC and funded by the owners of the Everett LNG terminal, concluded that existing natural gas infrastructure along with the already approved pipeline expansions and renewable energy projects would be adequate to meet New England energy needs for at least the next decade. It further concluded that if NED is built, there is a real risk that New England electricity rate payers will end up subsidizing the use of the pipeline for exporting gas to Canada and beyond. When the United States is expected to be a leader in the global climate change agenda, why would FERC rush to accept an application for a high impact and potentially un-

needed project that commits us to a massive, 100 year fossil fuel infrastructure?

3. The NED application remains woefully incomplete. Even a cursory review of the KM application reveals fundamental inadequacies. The application does not even specifically indicate the location of the proposed pipeline route and compressor stations. Over the last 18 months, the public has witnessed continual and dramatic shifts in the proposed route of the pipeline. How can FERC and state and local agencies reliably assess the numerous impacts of the project when so much about the route remains unclear? For instance, newly impacted residents and abutters to the yet unknown location of at least one new compressor station, haven't even been notified and so couldn't even engage in the FERC pre-filing process. We know that each shift in the pipeline represents significant, new impacts on communities and to individual landowners and, as has been noted by the thousands of scoping comments to FERC, we are also painfully aware that Kinder Morgan has fundamentally failed to interact with the public or elected officials in a transparent or reliable fashion. Having attended and participated in every scoping meeting and the majority of the "KM Open Houses or Community Forums", I have personally witnessed Kinder Morgan's persistent and pervasive misrepresentation of all aspects of the project. With their well-documented and egregious behavior, how can FERC consider accepting an incomplete application that, if approved, will subject the American public to such an untrustworthy, corporate partner?

Based upon the above reservations and the many thoughtful comments and reports already submitted to FERC by the Massachusetts Attorney General, our regional planning agencies, the multi-state municipal gas pipeline coalition, a host of national and regional environmental organizations and well informed individuals, I strongly urge FERC to NOT accept the NED application until it is complete, can be thoroughly reviewed, and is compliant with FERC's own regulations.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Diane K. Hewitt
Groton, MA

20151204-5200

December 4, 2015

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC Docket No. CP16-21-000

MOTION TO INTERVENE

Pursuant to applicable regulations, I, Jon L. Bryan of Mason, NH, ask that you accept my Motion to Intervene in the above matter.

The project seeks pipeline access to my land, and I am therefore directly impacted by Docket CP16-21-000.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jon L. Bryan
154 Morse Road
Mason, NH 03048

20151207-0029

Hand written letter, Alma A. Healey, 6 Tina Avenue, Pelham, NH: opposing

20151207-0049

Hand written card, David & Mary Johnson, 167 Main St, Northfield, MA 01360: opposing

20151207-0055

Hand drawn card, Keane Family, 63 South Shore Dr, Pelham, NH 03076: opposing

20151207-0089

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, DC 20426

December 4, 2015

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

The Honorable Shelia C. Harrington
State Representatives
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
House of Representatives
State House, Boston 02133

Dear Representative Hamngton:

Thank you for your October 19, 2015, letter regarding Tennessee Gas proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project (Docket No. PF14-22-000).

The Commission issued a Statement of Policy on September 15, 1999, in Docket No. PL99-3-000 that provides information about how the Commission considers the impact of new projects on existing pipelines, the possibility of overbuilding, the avoidance of unnecessary disruption of the environment, and the consideration of the enhancement of competitive transportation alternatives. The Commission will use the processes described in the policy statement to evaluate the Northeast Energy Direct Project, which was formally filed with the Commission on November 20, 2015. The Commission's evaluation of the Project will include the preparation of an environmental impact statement (EIS). The EIS will consider, among other things, alternatives to the proposed pipeline route.

With regard to your concerns over pipeline safety and natural gas leaks, the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) has the exclusive statutory authority to promulgate federal safety standards used in the transportation of natural gas. The Commission regulations require that an applicant certify that it will design, install, inspect, test, construct, operate, replace, and maintain the facility for which a Certificate is requested in accordance with DOT federal safety standards and plans for maintenance and inspection.

As in any Commission matter, please be assured that the Commission strives to make our review of proposals both accessible and transparent to the public. If I can be of any further assistance in this or any other Commission matter, please let me know.

Sincerely,
Norman C. Bay
Chairman

20151207-0090

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, DC 20426

December 4, 2015

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

The Honorable Leah Cole
State Representatives

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
House of Representatives
State House, Boston 02133

Dear Representative Cole:

Thank you for your October 19, 2015, letter regarding Tennessee Gas proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project (Docket No. PF14-22-000).

The Commission issued a Statement of Policy on September 15, 1999, in Docket No. PL99-3-000 that provides information about how the Commission considers the impact of new projects on existing pipelines, the possibility of overbuilding, the avoidance of unnecessary disruption of the environment, and the consideration of the enhancement of competitive transportation alternatives. The Commission will use the processes described in the policy statement to evaluate the Northeast Energy Direct Project, which was formally filed with the Commission on November 20, 2015. The Commission's evaluation of the Project will include the preparation of an environmental impact statement (EIS). The EIS will consider, among other things, alternatives to the proposed pipeline route.

With regard to your concerns over pipeline safety and natural gas leaks, the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) has the exclusive statutory authority to promulgate federal safety standards used in the transportation of natural gas. The Commission regulations require that an applicant certify that it will design, install, inspect, test, construct, operate, replace, and maintain the facility for which a Certificate is requested in accordance with DOT federal safety standards and plans for maintenance and inspection.

As in any Commission matter, please be assured that the Commission strives to make our review of proposals both accessible and transparent to the public. If I can be of any further assistance in this or any other Commission matter, please let me know.

Sincerely,
Norman C. Bay
Chairman

20151207-0091

**STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR**

MARGARET WOOD HASSAN
Governor

December 4, 2015

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

RE: Docket No. CP 16-21, Northeast Energy Direct

Dear Chairman Bay:

Having recently met with representatives of a number of host communities for the proposed Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project, I write to reiterate my requests that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) fully consider alternatives for the proposed NED and address the wide range of concerns expressed by those in the path of the project.

I share many of the concerns that communities and individuals have raised, including those reflected in the two attached letters. I ask again that FERC address these concerns and require that the company work to address the environmental, public health and safety issues raised by affected communities. It is my belief that if the company cannot do so, the project should not move forward as currently proposed.

We must strengthen our energy infrastructure to reduce costs for our families and businesses and create jobs, and I believe natural gas will be a part of a strategy to reach a more diverse, clean energy future. But the siting of needed energy transmission projects must always strike a balance between providing benefits, such as reduced energy costs and lower emissions, and potential negative impacts to host communities.

I again encourage FERC to carefully consider whether the potential negative impacts of the project would disproportionately outweigh the benefits, particularly for the New Hampshire residents and communities that would bear the burden of hosting the project.

Thank you for your consideration.

With every good wish,
Margaret Wood Hassan
Governor

cc: Allen Fore, Vice President, Public Affairs, Kinder Morgan
Tad Putney, New Hampshire Municipal Pipeline Coalition
Maryann Harper, New Hampshire PLAN
Robert Dillberger, Mason Conservation Commission
Board of Selectmen, Town of Mason
Board of Selectmen, Town of Londonderry
Board of Selectmen, Town of Sharon
Board of Selectmen, Town of Brookline
Board of Selectmen, Town of Fitzwilliam
Board of Selectmen, Town of Litchfield
Board of Selectmen, Town of Merrimack
Board of Selectmen, Town of Rindge
Board of Selectmen, Town of Temple
Board of Selectmen, Town of Troy
Board of Selectmen, Town of Pelham
Board of Selectmen, Town of Brookline
Board of Selectmen, Town of Richmond
Board of Selectmen, Town of Amherst
Board of Selectmen, Town of Winchester
Board of Selectmen, Town of New Ipswich
Board of Selectmen, Town of Greenville
Board of Selectmen, Town of Milford
Board of Selectmen, Town of Hollis
Board of Selectmen, Town of Hudson
Board of Selectmen, Town of Windham

Enclosures

{copy of August 14, 2015, letter from Governor Hassan to Chairman Bay, see 20150824-0012 above}

{copy of July 16, 2015, letter from Governor Hassan to Chairman Bay, see 20150727-0007 above}

20151207-0092

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, DC 20426

December 4, 2015

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN
The Honorable Bradley Jones
Minority Leader

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
House of Representatives
State House, Boston 02133

Dear Representative Jones:

Thank you for your October 19, 2015, letter regarding Tennessee Gas proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project (Docket No. PF14-22-000).

The Commission issued a Statement of Policy on September 15, 1999, in Docket No. PL99-3-000 that provides information about how the Commission considers the impact of new projects on existing pipelines, the possibility of overbuilding, the avoidance of unnecessary disruption of the environment, and the consideration of the enhancement of competitive transportation alternatives. The Commission will use the processes described in the policy statement to evaluate the Northeast Energy Direct Project, which was formally filed with the Commission on November 20, 2015. The Commission's evaluation of the Project will include the preparation of an environmental impact statement (EIS). The EIS will consider, among other things, alternatives to the proposed pipeline route.

With regard to your concerns over pipeline safety and natural gas leaks, the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) has the exclusive statutory authority to promulgate federal safety standards used in the transportation of natural gas. The Commission regulations require that an applicant certify that it will design, install, inspect, test, construct, operate, replace, and maintain the facility for which a Certificate is requested in accordance with DOT federal safety standards and plans for maintenance and inspection.

As in any Commission matter, please be assured that the Commission strives to make our review of proposals both accessible and transparent to the public. If I can be of any further assistance in this or any other Commission matter, please let me know.

Sincerely,
Norman C. Bay
Chairman

20151207-0093

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, DC 20426

December 4, 2015

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

The Honorable James Lyons
State Representatives
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
House of Representatives
State House, Boston 02133

Dear Representative Lyons:

Thank you for your October 19, 2015, letter regarding Tennessee Gas' proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project (Docket No. PF14-22-000).

The Commission issued a Statement of Policy on September 15, 1999, in Docket No. PL99-3-000 that provides information about how the Commission considers the impact of new projects on existing pipelines, the possibility of overbuilding, the avoidance of unnecessary disruption of the environment, and the consideration of the enhancement of competitive transportation alternatives. The Commission will use the processes described in the policy statement to evaluate the Northeast Energy Direct Project, which was formally filed with the Commission on November 20, 2015. The Commission's evaluation of the Project will include the preparation of an environmental impact statement (EIS). The EIS will consider, among other things, alterna-

tives to the proposed pipeline route.

With regard to your concerns over pipeline safety and natural gas leaks, the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) has the exclusive statutory authority to promulgate federal safety standards used in the transportation of natural gas. The Commission regulations require that an applicant certify that it will design, install, inspect, test, construct, operate, replace, and maintain the facility for which a Certificate is requested in accordance with DOT federal safety standards and plans for maintenance and inspection.

As in any Commission matter, please be assured that the Commission strives to make our review of proposals both accessible and transparent to the public. If I can be of any further assistance in this or any other Commission matter, please let me know.

Sincerely,
Norman C. Bay
Chairman

20151207-0097

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, DC 20426

December 4, 2015

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

The Honorable John B. Larson
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Congressman Larson:

Thank you for your October 16, 2015, letter regarding Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.'s (Tennessee Gas) planned Northeast Energy Direct project (Docket No. PF14-22-000).

On November 20, 2015, Tennessee Gas filed its formal application for the Project. The Commission's review of this application will include the preparation of a draft environmental impact statement (EIS), which will analyze, among other things, impacts to environmentally sensitive areas and drinking water sources. Once the Commission has all the information necessary to determine the potential impacts associated with the Project, the draft EIS will be issued for public comment.

After consideration of the comments received on the draft EIS, a final EIS will be issued. The Commission will consider the findings of the final EIS before making its decision on whether or not to authorize the Project.

As in any Commission matter, please be assured that the Commission strives to make our review of proposals both accessible and transparent to the public. If I can be of any further assistance in this or any other Commission matter, please let me know.

Sincerely,
Norman C. Bay
Chairman

20151207-3018

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.

Docket No. CP16-21-000

Docket No. PF14-22-000

NOTICE OF APPLICATION

(December 7, 2015)

Take notice that on November 20, 2015, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. (Tennessee), 1001 Louisiana Street, Houston, Texas 77002, filed an application pursuant to sections 7(b) and 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act (NGA) and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) seeking authority to (i) construct, install, modify, and operate certain pipeline and compression facilities to be located in Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Connecticut, and (ii) to abandon certain facilities, as part of the Northeast Energy Direct Project (NED Project), as described in more detail below. Tennessee proposes to provide up to 1.3 billion cubic feet per day (Bcf/d) of firm capacity at a cost of approximately \$5.2 billion dollars, all as more fully set forth in the application. The filing is available for review at the Commission in the Public Reference Room or may be viewed on the Commission's website at <http://www.ferc.gov> using the "eLibrary" link. Enter the docket number excluding the last three digits in the docket number field to access the document. There is an "eSubscription" link on the web site that enables subscribers to receive email notification when a document is added to a subscribed docket(s). For assistance, please contact FERC Online Support at FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov or toll free at (866) 208-3676, or for TTY, contact (202) 502-8659.

Specifically, the NED Project includes two components: (1) the Supply Path Component, which is comprised of facilities from Troy, Pennsylvania, to Wright, New York (Supply Path Component), and (2) the Market Path Component, which is comprised of facilities from Wright, New York, to Dracut, Massachusetts (Market Path Component). The Supply Path Component facilities include: (i) approximately 174 miles of pipeline facilities in Pennsylvania and New York of which approximately 41 miles will be looped, (ii) three new compressor stations totaling 153,500 horsepower (hp), (iii) modifications to one existing compressor station, (iv) two new meter stations, and (v) various appurtenant facilities. The Market Path Component facilities include: (i) approximately 188 miles of mainline pipeline facilities in New York, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire, (ii) approximately 58 miles of lateral and pipeline looping, including a total of five delivery laterals in Massachusetts and New Hampshire, one pipeline loop in Connecticut, (iii) six new compressor stations totaling 207,600 hp, (iv) construction of 13 new meter stations, (v) modification of 14 existing meter stations, and (vi) various appurtenant facilities.

Any questions regarding the proposed project should be directed to Jacquelyne M. Rocan, Assistant General Counsel, at Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., 1001 Louisiana Street, Houston, Texas 77002 or at (713) 420-4544 (phone), or (713) 420-1601 (facsimile), or e-mail: Jacquelyne_Rocan@kindermorgan.com, or Shannon M. Miller, Regulatory Affairs, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., 1001 Louisiana Street, Houston, Texas 77002, or at (713) 420-4038 (phone), or (713) 420-1605 (facsimile), or email: shannon_miller@kindermorgan.com

On October 2, 2014, Commission staff granted Tennessee's request to utilize the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Pre-Filing Process and assigned Docket No. PF14-22-000 to staff activities involving the project. Now, as of the filing of this application on November 20, 2015, the NEPA Pre-Filing Process for this project has ended. From this time forward, this proceeding will be conducted in Docket No. CP16-21-000 as noted in the caption of this Notice.

Pursuant to section 157.9 of the Commission's rules, 18 CFR 157.9, within 90 days of this Notice, the Commission staff will issue a Notice of Schedule for Environmental Review. If a Notice of Schedule for Environmental Review is issued, it will indicate, among other milestones, the anticipated date for the Commission staff's issuance of the final environmental impact statement (FEIS) for this proposal. The issuance of a Notice of Schedule for Environmental Review will serve to notify federal and state agencies of the timing for the completion of all necessary reviews, and the subsequent need to complete all federal authorizations within 90 days of the date of issuance of the Commission staff's FEIS.

There are two ways to become involved in the Commission's review of this project. First, any person wishing to obtain legal status by becoming a party to the proceedings for this project should, on or before the comment date stated below file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE, Washington, DC 20426, a motion to intervene in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's

Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.214 or 385.211) and the Regulations under the NGA (18 CFR 157.10). A person obtaining party status will be placed on the service list maintained by the Secretary of the Commission and will receive copies of all documents filed by the applicant and by all other parties. A party must submit 7 copies of filings made in the proceeding with the Commission and must mail a copy to the applicant and to every other party. Only parties to the proceeding can ask for court review of Commission orders in the proceeding.

However, a person does not have to intervene in order to have comments considered. The second way to participate is by filing with the Secretary of the Commission, as soon as possible, an original and two copies of comments in support of or in opposition to this project. The Commission will consider these comments in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but the filing of a comment alone will not serve to make the filer a party to the proceeding. The Commission's rules require that persons filing comments in opposition to the project provide copies of their protests only to the party or parties directly involved in the protest.

Persons who wish to comment only on the environmental review of this project should submit an original and two copies of their comments to the Secretary of the Commission. Environmental commentators will be placed on the Commission's environmental mailing list, will receive copies of the environmental documents, and will be notified of meetings associated with the Commission's environmental review process. Environmental commentators will not be required to serve copies of filed documents on all other parties. However, the non-party commentators will not receive copies of all documents filed by other parties or issued by the Commission (except for the mailing of environmental documents issued by the Commission) and will not have the right to seek court review of the Commission's final order.

The Commission strongly encourages electronic filings of comments, protests and interventions in lieu of paper using the "eFiling" link at <http://www.ferc.gov>. Persons unable to file electronically should submit an original and 5 copies of the protest or intervention to the Federal Energy regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE, Washington, DC 20426.

Comment Date: January 6, 2016

Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr.,
Deputy Secretary.

20151207-5011

Karen Sullivan, New Ipswich, NH.

There is no need for a new gas pipeline coming through southern New Hampshire. This is not just my opinion. Please read the following article by Joe Mahoney published in "The Daily Star".

It would be a miscarriage of justice if FERC approves the Kinder Morgan/TN Gas Pipeline/NED project slated to come through Southern New Hampshire Docket #CP16-21-000.

If this project is approved by FERC, Ferc will be condemning the people that live in New Ipswich & Temple, the two towns that are going to be the most impacted by the compressor station, to a life of noted health impacts related to respiratory, neurological & cardiovascular body system brake downs.

Joe Mahoney | The Daily Star, Oneonta, N.Y.

A new study commissioned by an importer of liquefied natural gas challenges the notion that new natural gas pipelines are needed for the New England market, contending that demand for the product is expected to decline and noting that the region will benefit from a diversification in power generation resources.

The report, issued by Energyzt Advisors LLC and commissioned by France-based GDF Suez, comes at a time when parts of Delaware, Schoharie and Chenango counties have found themselves on the pathways of two controversial projects — the Constitution Pipeline and the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline.

Proponents of both projects have maintained they are needed by energy users in the Northeast and

would help to curb gas price fluctuations during heating-season months.

But the Energyzt report concluded: “Even during extreme winter conditions, new pipeline capacity is not required to meet New England natural gas demand needs given existing infrastructure, current market conditions and policy initiatives.”

In related news, As New England freezes, natural gas stays cheap.

GDF has not been a neutral party on the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission proceedings involving the NED project that would parallel Interstate 88 before heading east into Massachusetts and New Hampshire.

GDF, which operates LNG facilities in Massachusetts, has refused to allow Kinder Morgan surveyors to have access to its land in Northfield and Erving, Mass., the Greenfield Recorder newspaper reported Thursday.

The report also echoed the contentions of local pipeline foes by suggesting some of the gas moved in proposed pipelines would end up being sent to LNG export facilities in the Canadian Maritimes, with New England benefiting from an anticipated increase of Canadian hydroelectric power.

Also this week, among the documents sent to FERC on its review of the NED project was a report by the Southwest Pennsylvania Health Project that summarized potential health impacts from natural gas compressor stations. The NED project would result in two new compressors in the town of Schoharie and one in Franklin.

While no epidemiological studies have been conducted on those living near compressors, the report said, public health surveys have noted health impacts related to respiratory, neurological and cardiovascular body systems.

(c)2015 The Daily Star

20151207-5012

Karen Sullivan, New Ipswich, NH.

I am not the only one who is opposed to this Kinder Morgan/Tn Gas Pipeline Company/NED project. Please take notice of the politicians opposed to this project.

Sanders aligns against proposed natural gas pipeline

Meghan Foley | The Keene Sentinel, N.H.

MANCHESTER — U.S. Sen. Bernie Sanders, I-Vt., is the first presidential candidate to publicly take a position on the proposed Northeast Energy Direct pipeline.

And the Democratic hopeful's opposition to the project has many Northeast Energy Direct pipeline opponents praising him.

In prepared remarks given during the New Hampshire Democratic Party's annual Jefferson-Jackson Dinner Sunday night, Sanders said he's against the proposed natural gas transmission pipeline because “climate change is the greatest environmental challenge of our time.

“And that is why — right here in New Hampshire — I believe the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline that would carry fracked natural gas for 400 miles through 17 communities is a bad idea — and should be opposed,” he said.

The pipeline route is planned to run through southern New Hampshire communities including Fitzwilliam, Richmond, Rindge, Troy and Winchester, and continues to meet strong resistance from residents and local officials in towns along the proposed path. Among their concerns for the pipeline are its potential environmental and health effects, and the federal government possibly taking property by eminent domain for the project.

“God bless the Brooklyn-born Senator from Vermont for taking a position that our very own local elected officials have been too cowardly to do till now,” Richmond resident Seth Reece said this morning

in a Facebook message.

Susan L. Durling, co-founder of the pipeline opposition group Winchester Pipeline Awareness, likewise praised Sanders, saying, “Here’s a politician out there brave enough to say what needs to be said.”

She said in a Facebook message that elected officials need to “start worrying about the planet they will leave their kids and grandchildren, and not about the campaign contributions they get.”

Besides Sanders, Democratic presidential candidates Martin O’Malley and Hillary Clinton gave their pitch for the Oval Office at the Radisson Hotel in Manchester. But neither O’Malley nor Clinton referenced the pipeline in their prepared remarks.

Matt Sheaff, O’Malley’s N.H. deputy state director, said after the former Maryland governor gave his remarks, he met with reporters, one of whom asked about his position on the pipeline.

O’Malley responded that he’d “be inclined to be against it,” Sheaff said.

“We use our eminent domain power for things that serve the public’s interest. And pipelines for fossil fuel extraction generally do not support our public interest,” O’Malley said in response to the question, according to Sheaff. “Lines that actually allow us to bring in clean energy do support our public interest.”

Harrell Kirstein, spokesman for Hillary for New Hampshire, said in a email this morning that Clinton addressed the topic during a town hall meeting in Keene last month.

Clinton said the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission process doesn’t give “enough weight to public opinion in the locations where pipelines are going through,” according to Kirstein.

It also doesn’t pay enough attention to other issues including health and safety, Clinton said, and therefore, she is going to do what she can to make sure the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission has to pay much more attention to local communities, according to Kirstein.

Tennessee Gas Pipeline, a subsidiary of Kinder Morgan, has proposed building the high-pressure pipeline to carry fracked natural gas from shale gas fields in Pennsylvania through upstate New York, parts of northern Massachusetts and into southern New Hampshire before going to a distribution hub in eastern Massachusetts. The route would cross about 70 miles of southern New Hampshire.

The project had been in the pre-filing stages with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for the past year.

On Nov. 20, Tennessee Gas Pipeline officials filed the project’s application with the FERC, putting the federal agency in a position to decide whether the pipeline is approved, which it has the power to do.

Tennessee Gas Pipeline officials are asking the commission to approve the pipeline by the fourth quarter of 2016.

In the filing, company officials described the pipeline as “transformative,” saying the influx of natural gas into the Northeast, specifically New England, would drive down high winter energy costs, and help prevent an energy shortage in the region.

Sanders also cited climate change in why he’s opposed to the Keystone XL pipeline, which would carry oil from the tar sands of Canada to the United States.

President Barack Obama vetoed the project earlier this year.

The four members of the N.H. Congressional Delegation and Gov. Maggie Hassan have sent letters to FERC calling for transparency in the pipeline approval process, but have yet to take positions on the proposed Northeast Energy Direct pipeline.

Karthik Ganapathy, Sanders’ N.H. communications director, said in an email this morning that Sanders has known about the Northeast Energy Direct project for a “long time, and after studying it, decided that its impact on climate change would betray the responsibility we have to future generations.”

In addition to climate change, Ganapathy said, there are “justified concerns” about eminent domain be-

ing abused to seize private property, the route going through historic towns and conservation sites, and, as with all pipelines, the potential for leaks or spills.

“Now that the review process with FERC is officially under way, Senator Sanders wanted to ensure all of that was taken into consideration,” Ganapathy said.

In related news, Keep it in the ground: Bernie Sanders wants to ban new fossil fuel development.

Keep this in mind & do not approve this project FERC. Thank you

20151207-5023

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Garth Fletcher, Mason, NH 03048, under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/7/2015 2:31:43 AM Filed Date: 12/7/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____

Individual garth@jacqcad.com

Basis for Intervening:

Motion to Intervene of Garth Fletcher, Mason, NH 03048 under CP16-21.

I am a long-time (40+ years) resident and landowner in Mason, NH, which TGP’s NED project proposes to trisect with both the main 30” pipeline running West to East and a 12” “lateral” running North to South, the exact pathways still being subject to change. These pipelines would violate conservation lands which my family, and many others, have invested many thousands of hours working to conserve, both as volunteers and as town officials. Some of these lands are subject of “public trusts”, others are municipally owned “LWCF Section 6(f)” properties; violation of such trusts, never before allowed in New Hampshire, would discourage future conservations gifts. The “shallow to bedrock” soils over granite, which characterize much of Mason, would require extensive blasting and put at risk many private wells drilled in bedrock upon which residents depend, there being no municipal water system. The added municipal costs created by the presence of the pipeline, as well as the redistribution of taxation caused by changes in valuation, are likely to raise taxes for many.

20151207-5024

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Mason Pipeline Committee under CP16-21-000. The Mason Pipeline Committee represents property owners in the path of the NED pipeline in the town of Mason, New Hampshire.

Submission Date: 12/6/2015 11:51:49 PM Filed Date: 12/7/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____

Mason Pipeline Committee masonpipelinecommittee@gmail.com

Basis for Intervening:

The Mason Pipeline Committee includes residents of Mason, New Hampshire, and other towns. Members of the Mason Pipeline Committee are affected property owners or possible affected property owners in the path of the proposed NED pipeline. Thus, the Mason Pipeline Committee moves to intervene on behalf of its members.

20151207-5025

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Donald R Johnson under CP16-21-000.
 5 Autumn Street, Windham, N.H. 03087
 Lot 19-B-920

Submission Date: 12/6/2015 3:41:24 PM Filed Date: 12/7/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	oldcats1977@yahoo.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I Donald Johnson 5 Autumn St. Windham N.H. am filing so FERC has it on record that I will suffer tremendous financial loss if the pipeline is allowed to cross my property. I will lose property access and value, will lose trees that have valuable as a wood source for heat and as a protective shield from high voltage electric lines behind but not on my property. I will lose my well that currently provides clean unfiltered, non-conditioned drinking water and all its associated electrical power lines and piping as this Pipeline will cut thru between where my well is located and my house. This is a preliminary listing of the burdens this Pipeline will cause to me directly.

State of New Hampshire
 County of Hillsborough
 Town of Windham
 LL#: NH WD 557.02
 Map/Block/Lot 18-B-920

20151207-5026

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of lena a moffitt under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/6/2015 10:16:55 AM Filed Date: 12/7/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	lena.moffitt@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I am filing as an intervenor against the Northeast Energy Direct line because I am concerned about the impacts of gas on our communities and our climate. Studies are showing that gas is no better for the climate than coal, and may even be worse. These pipelines will lock in demand for a fossil fuel at a time when we must be investing in zero-emitting renewable energy and keeping fossil fuels in the ground.

20151207-5060

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Arlen Gould under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/5/2015 5:03:21 PM Filed Date: 12/7/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	arlungould3@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

Dear FERC,

I am a resident of Amherst, MA. I write to state my opposition to the NED Pipeline project being proposed by Kinder Morgan.

It is not necessary to build such a large-scale project to serve the energy needs of the Northeast. There are many views and opinions on this matter from scientists and energy experts and there is an emerging consensus building that in MA we can meet our needs with efficiency upgrades and alternative energy sources.

Also, this project would not be in line with the climate change goals that our state has adopted. And given that gas is a non-renewable resource how long would this pipeline be in operation? It doesn't seem fair to saddle the residents of this state with the economic burden of this project that is at best a "bridge fuel."

Let MA continue its development of solar, wind, hydro and digester gas (cows) and efficiency upgrades and not have to divert so much money into a project that is so contentious and unwelcome by so much of the state.

Thank you for your consideration of my letter.

May you all be well.

Sincerely and Respectfully,

Arlen Gould
42 Pine Grove
Amherst, MA 01002

20151207-5061

MOTION TO INTERVENE IN CP1621

BY JOHN COOPER AND TAKAKO COOPER

John Cooper and Takako Cooper are residents and owners of 437 Jackson Road (Lot K101), Mason, located in Hillsborough County, New Hampshire. The rightofway proposed in the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's NED project intrudes into this property. If a certificate should be granted, approximately half of this property would be subject to condemnation.

Pursuant to Commission Rules 385.214(b) and 157.10, John Cooper and Takako Cooper move to intervene in the CP1621 proceeding, hereby filing an intervention within the provided time frame.

The Cooper's property and home are directly impacted by the proposed project: condemnation of approximately half of the land, causing irreparable damage to the property, and placing their residence in the incineration/explosion zone created by the proposed pipeline. In addition as the residence is supplied by a drilled well water source, pipeline construction would jeopardize the viability and integrity of the existing well and ground water aquifer. Even after completion of the proposed project, its existence would create ongoing safety, environmental and maintenance hazards.

John Cooper and Takako Cooper are OPPOSED to the proposed project. We are hereby intervening in the CP1621 proceeding for access to Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's filings. Upon inspection of this information additional detailed comments will be provided by John Cooper and Takako Cooper as the application proceeds.

220151207-5100

Katharine Gregg, Mason, NH.
Dear Madam/Sir,

Now the entire New Hampshire congressional delegation and the governor have spoken out against the NED project as it has been presented to you in Kinder Morgan's filing for certificate of need. Each elected official has pointed out that the serious, legitimate concerns of the affected towns have not been adequately

addressed.

No compelling need for additional natural gas has been shown either in New Hampshire or in the Fitchburg area of Massachusetts, to be supplied by a lateral through the town of Mason.

No satisfactory guarantee has been made that well water and wetlands will not be adversely affected. Therefore, there can be no guarantee that property values won't be adversely affected as well.

No satisfactory solution has been put forward to deal with the potential dangers involved in the compressor station in New Ipswich or along the pipeline itself throughout the affected towns.

These are very real concerns, and we fear that the profit motives of Kinder Morgan and the Tennessee Gas Pipeline will weigh more heavily with you than the rights of New Hampshire—as well as Massachusetts and New York—citizens. We feel that the real strength of our country does not lie in its world trade but in its citizens.

Sincerely,

Katharine Gregg
Mason, NH

20151207-5133

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Timothy K Brewster under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/7/2015 12:24:08 PM Filed Date: 12/7/2015 12:24:08 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	timothykbrewster@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

My property directly abuts the proposed gas line route which will at some point cross under and be near the high tension wires that already occupy that area. My home also is in close proximity to the Concrete plant which does blasting for aggregate. This lateral will not only be close to my home, but it will also be near electrical wires and be subject to constant tremors from the blasting that cracks not only my walls and ceilings but that of many neighbors surrounding the area they are proposing to pass through. Everyone states that the gas line is safe and leaks are very unlikely but they do happen and the results can be catastrophic. I do not feel safe with this gas line passing directly behind my home with the factors that I have stated above.

20151207-5251

Mass Audubon

Protecting the Nature of Massachusetts

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

BEFORE THE

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Northeast Direct Project of
Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC

Docket No. CP16-21-000

MOTION TO INTERVENE OF THE MASSACHUSETTS AUDUBON SOCIETY

Pursuant to Sections 212 and 214 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (“Commission”) promulgated at 18 C.F.R. § 382.212 and § 385.214, the Massachusetts Audubon Society respectfully moves to intervene in the above-captioned proceeding.

Basis and Grounds for Intervention

The Massachusetts Audubon Society is a non-profit organization dedicated to the protection of the nature of Massachusetts for people and wildlife, through conservation, education, and advocacy. The Massachusetts Audubon Society cares for 35,000 acres of conservation land and provides school, camp, and other educational programs for 225,000 children and adults annually. 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.

The Massachusetts Audubon Society, as a landowner, is directly affected by the proposed pipeline project. The proposed project alignment would directly impact land managed and protected by the Massachusetts Audubon Society at the West Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary in Plainfield, Massachusetts. The Wildwood Nature Camp, a residential camp for children owned and managed by the Massachusetts Audubon Society in Rindge, New Hampshire, also lies in the vicinity of one of the proposed project compressor stations, and one property may be impacted by construction and operation of that proposed facility.

The Massachusetts Audubon Society also owns in fee or holds conservation restrictions (deed easements) on other properties throughout the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. If project alignment or associated infrastructure components shift as project plans develop, other Massachusetts Audubon Society properties may be impacted. In addition, the Massachusetts Audubon Society has assisted other private, non-profit land trusts as well as state and municipal conservation agencies on land protection projects. The investments the Massachusetts Audubon Society made both directly and in terms of staff assistance on land conservation and stewardship projects also would be impacted if the intended permanent protection of such lands is altered by the project.

As an impacted landowner, the Massachusetts Audubon Society has a direct and substantial interest in the outcome of this proceeding.

The Massachusetts Audubon Society's participation in this proceeding is in the public interest. The interests of our 100,000-plus members and the many charitable donors who support the organization's work cannot be adequately represented by any other party.

Wherefore, the Massachusetts Audubon Society requests that the Commission accept this filing and grant its motion to intervene.

The Massachusetts Audubon Society designates the following individual for service for the proceeding. Service via email is preferred.

Heidi Ricci, Senior Policy Analyst
Massachusetts Audubon Society
208 South Great Road
Lincoln, MA 01773
781-259-2172
hricci@massaudubon.org

Respectfully submitted,

Gary R. Clayton
President

Dated: December 7, 2015

20151208-3031

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20426

OFFICE OF ENERGY PROJECTS

In Reply Refer To:
OEP/DG2E/Gas Branch 3

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC
Northeast Energy Direct Project
Docket Nos. CP16-21-000, PF14-22-000
§ 375.308(z)

December 8, 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: Environmental Data Request

Mr. Moffat:

Provide the information described in the enclosure to assist in our analysis of the above-referenced certificate application. File your response in accordance with the provisions of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. In particular, 18 CFR 385.2010 (Rule 2010) requires that you serve a copy of the response to each person whose name appears on the official service list for this proceeding.

You should file a complete response within 20 days of the date of this letter. The response must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission at:

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

In addition to the information specifically required in the regulations, staff need the following information to begin preparation of the environmental impact statement for the Northeast Energy Direct Project. If the information cannot be provided in the time frame indicated, explain which items will be delayed and why, and provide a projected filing date. Also, we expect to be requesting other clarifications or information in the future.

Once we have received your responses to this and future data requests and reviewed them for completeness, we will be able to establish a schedule for completing the EIS.

When filing documents and maps, be sure to prepare separate volumes, as outlined on the Commission's website at <http://www.ferc.gov/resources/guides/filing-guide/file-ceii.asp>. Any 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."

File all responses under oath (18 CFR 385.2005) by an authorized Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC representative and include the name, position, and telephone number of the respondent to each item.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (202) 502-8097 Thank you for your cooperation.

Eric J Tomasi
Environmental Project Manager
Office of Energy Projects

cc: Public File, Docket Nos. CP16-21-000, PF14-22-000

All Parties

ENCLOSURE

Environmental Information Request

General Comments

1. At a minimum, Tennessee Gas should respond to the comments contained in the letters identified below received by FERC after the conclusion of the formal scoping period:
 - a. the Massachusetts Attorney General’s Office on October 19, 2015 (letter and Appendix);
 - b. the Mascenic Regional School Board on October 20, 2015;
 - c. the Dracut Board of Selectman on October 20, 2015;
 - d. the Massachusetts Energy Facilities Siting Board on October 19, 2015;
 - e. the Town of Temple, New Hampshire on October 19, 2015;
 - f. the New Hampshire Director of Charitable Trusts on October 19, 2015;
 - g. the Town of Bloomfield, Connecticut on October 19, 2015;
 - h. the Town of Lenox, Massachusetts on October 19, 2015;
 - i. the Nashua Regional Planning Commission on October 20, 2015;
 - j. the Northern Middlesex Council of Government on October 20, 2015;
 - k. the Pelham/Windham Pipeline Awareness Outreach Subcommittee on October 21, 2015;
 - l. the Town of Town of Lynnfield, Board of Health on October 22, 2015;
 - m. the Southwest Region Planning Commission on October 22, 2015;
 - n. the National Park Service on October 23, 2015;
 - o. the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation on October 26, 2015;
 - p. the Town of Merrimack, New Hampshire on October 26, 2015;
 - q. the Audubon Society of New Hampshire filed on October 19, 2015;
 - r. Northeast Energy Solutions filed on October 30, 2015;
 - s. The Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection on November 3, 2015;
 - t. the Town of Amherst, Massachusetts on November 3, 2015;
 - u. the Mason School District on November 10, 2015;
 - v. the Town of Berlin, Massachusetts on November 12, 2015;
 - w. the Town of Dracut Board of Health on November 12, 2015;
 - x. Northeast Energy Solutions on November 12, 2015;
 - y. the City and County of Hartford, Connecticut on November 16, 2015;
 - z. Millers River Watershed Council on November 19, 2015;
 - aa. the Town of Conway, Massachusetts Agricultural Commission on November 20, 2015; and
 - bb. the Berlin Pipeline Study Committee on November 25, 2015.

Resource Report 10 – Alternatives

The application filed on November 20, 2015 did not fully provide adequate data for alternative comparisons. For each of the compressor station (CS) alternatives, provide the information in a table similar to the table below. In addition, provide a USGS topographical map and aerial map for each location.

Compressor Station X Alternative Analysis

	CS X Proposed Site	CS X Alt No. 1	CS X Alt No. 2
Total property size (acres)			
Operational acres			
Land use (type and acres)			
Wetland impacts by type (acres)			
Vegetation impacts by type (acres)			
Length of suction/discharge pipe			

Waterbody impacts			
Number of NSAs within 1/2 mile (including temp. shelters)			
Closest NSA (feet), direction			
Total horsepower of engines/turbines/motors			
Distance to sensitive receptors (school, hospital, nursing home, hospice, etc)			
Distance to park/wildlife areas			
Mines, quarries, and other geological hazards within 1/4 mile			
Environmental Justice: low-income populations, minority populations, or tribal communities in county			
Access road length			
Sidehill excavation required			
Soil stabilization required			
Identified critical habitat			
Contamination – type			
Cultural Resources within 1/4 mile			
Other Sensitive Resources within 1/4 mile (National River Inventory waterbodies, parks, etc)			

1. Consider and fully evaluate utilizing the site alternatives for the Market Path Mid Station 1 compressor station as depicted in the attached images, as well as any other viable site alternatives that Tennessee Gas has developed independently.
2. Consider and fully evaluate utilizing the site alternatives for the proposed Market Path Mid Station 4 and Market Path Tail compressor stations as depicted in the attached images, as well as any other viable site alternatives that Tennessee Gas may develop independently.
3. Prepare additional environmental, engineering, and economic analysis of the Existing Line 200 Alternative combined with the Massachusetts Turnpike Alternative as detailed in the attached images. Provide the information as identified in our May 15, 2015 comments under Resource Report 10 - Alternatives Question No. 11.
4. Consider and fully evaluate utilizing various segments of the Massachusetts Alternative, Massachusetts Route 2 Alternative, and the Article 97 Collocation Alternative in combination to develop the most practical hybrid alternative(s). Also consider that such a configuration may have the additional benefit of reducing the length of a Fitchburg Lateral Extension. Provide the information as identified in our May 15, 2015 comments under Resource Report 10 - Alternatives Question No. 11.
5. The Supply Path Tail Station and Market Path Head Station are both located in Schoharie County, New York, within 10 miles of each other. Explain why the facilities were not located in a single facility to minimize the land use impacts. Provide information on the feasibility of combining the facility into one compressor station complex.
6. Provide alternative site locations for Market Path Mid Station 3 that would move it farther away from the New England National Scenic Trail (NET), and the NET's Richardson-Zlogar Cabin (Cabin) located on NET section 17 in Northfield, Massachusetts. In addition to the alternative analysis identified above, provide a day and nighttime visual impact comparison of the sites for the users of both the NET and the Cabin.
7. Provide an alternative analysis using the existing Line 300 through Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York that would meet Line 200 at or near the existing Tennessee Gas Station 261. Provide the informa-

tion as identified in our May 15, 2015 comments under Resource Report 10 - Alternatives Question No. 11.

8. Consider and fully evaluate utilizing the site alternatives for the proposed Supply Path Mid Station as depicted in the attached images, as well as any other viable site alternatives that Tennessee Gas may develop independently.
9. Provide maps specifically identifying the location of all proposed and all alternative compressor station sites. Ultimately, ensure that for each of the proposed compressor stations, at least one fully viable alternative site is identified.

{Images omitted : }

Image for Alternative Question No. 1

Market Path Mid Station 1 Alternatives

Images for Alternative Question No. 2

Market Path Mid Station 4 Alternative Image 1

Market Path Mid Station 4 Alternative Image 2

Market Path Mid Station 4 Alternative Image 3

Market Path Tail Alternative Image 1

Question 3 Images - NED Turnpike to Line 200 Hybrid Route

Overview Map – Turnpike-Line 200 Hybrid Route Alternative

Turnpike to Line 200 Hybrid Alternative Connection Point near Westfield, Massachusetts

North Oxford Realignment/Modification for the Line 200 Route/Hybrid Route Alternative

Line 200 to Turnpike Alternative Tewksbury Modification 1

Line 200 to Turnpike Alternative Tewksbury Modification 2

Images for Question 8.

Image 8a – Supply Path Mid Station FERC Alt 1

Image 8b – Supply Path Mid Station FERC Alt 2

{Full submission with images can be downloaded at}

{ <http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/opennat.asp?fileID=14066024> }

20151208-5009

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Jennifer Schongar under CP16-21-000. I live in Mason, NH and I am an abutter to the main pipeline.

Submission Date: 12/7/2015 9:16:32 PM

Filed Date: 12/8/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
---------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------

Individual	booniesjen@gmail.com	
------------	----------------------	--

Basis for Intervening:

I live in the town of Mason, NH and I am an abutter on the main route of the pipeline.

20151208-5010

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Gary R Elsworth under CP16-21-000. The proposed Kinder Morgan NED pipeline goes through my property.

Submission Date: 12/7/2015 9:15:53 PM

Filed Date: 12/8/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____
Individual _____ Traderhill101@gmail.com _____

Basis for Intervening:

The Kinder Morgan NED proposed pipeline goes through my property.

20151208-5011

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of John A. Lewicke under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/7/2015 9:03:14 PM Filed Date: 12/8/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____
Individual _____ lewicke@yahoo.com _____

Basis for Intervening:

I am a landowner

20151208-5062

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC

Docket No. CP16-21-000

North East Direct Pipeline Project

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO INTERVENE

Pursuant to Rules 212 and 214 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's ("Commission")

Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 385.212 and 385.214 (2007), I/we, Paul and Kristina Oliveira, file this motion to intervene in this proceeding.

On November 20, 2015, the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC ("TGP") filed its application under § 7 of the Natural Gas Act, 15 U.S.C. § 717f, and § 157 of FERC's regulations, 18 C.F.R. § 157.1 et seq., for the proposed North East Direct Project (NED), FERC Docket No. CP 16- 21-000

I. COMMUNICATIONS AND SERVICE

All communications, pleadings, and orders with respect to this proceeding should be sent to the following individual:

Paul and Kristina Oliveira,
21 Valewood Circle, Tewksbury, MA 01876,
978-640-1782
kholmoliveira@msn.com

II. INTEREST OF PETITIONER

Construction, operation and maintenance of the Pipeline would adversely impact me and my family. This proposed pipeline has a direct impact to our property and our property value. The construction of this pipeline will have a negative impact, not only on our property, but the property in our neighborhood as well. Our neighborhood sits on the Shawsheen river, with many wildlife species calling the river home. There are turtles that make their way to our backyard every spring to lay their eggs, it is their yearly ritual. We have many deer that use the river, as well as the protection of the wooded area directly behind our homes to travel. This pipeline would completely eliminate the trees permanently! These trees that protect our wildlife

also protect our property from Route 93 that runs directly behind our home. They are the only sound and visual barrier we have from the noise and pollution of the busy highway. This will impact the privacy of even enjoying family functions in our backyard. Tennessee Gas, in their

submitted construction drawing would require 142 feet of my back yard to construct this pipeline, as the only access to pipeline route is through our yard from the front due to the highway in the back with untold damage to our driveway and property with heavy equipment. This plan also calls for movement or destruction of structures on our property. This would also have an impact on our inground sprinkler system as well as our septic and leach field that would fail with the weight of heavy equipment. It is also indicated on the Tennessee Gas maps that horizontal drilling under the Shawsheen river would be starting in my backyard. Our property as well as neighbors on both sides has rock ledge in our backyards, which would likely call for blasting, and in turn create possible damage to our home foundations.

As no one else can represent my interests in this matter, I stand to suffer significant damages and irreparable harm from an affirmative outcome in this application; I am filing this motion to intervene.

III. CONCLUSION

Wherefore, we, Paul and Kristina Oliveira, respectfully requests that the Commission to grant my Motion to Intervene as a party with full rights to participate in all further proceedings.

Respectfully submitted this first day of December, 2015.

Paul and Kristina Oliveira
21 Valewood Circle
Tewksbury, MA 01876
978-640-1782
kholmoliveira@msn.com

20151208-5081

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Piedmont Natural Gas Company, Inc. under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/8/2015 11:44:48 AM Filed Date: 12/8/2015 11:44:48 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____

Piedmont Natural Gas Company, Inc. piedmontferc@piedmontng.com

FERCPipeline@piedmontng.com

Basis for Intervening:

Motion to intervene of Piedmont Natural Gas under CP16-21-000. On November 20, 2015, Tennessee Gas Pipeline submitted an Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project). Piedmont is currently a customer of Tennessee Gas Pipeline and will be directly affected by the outcome of this proceeding. Therefore, Piedmont has a valid and substantial interest in this proceeding. Other parties to this proceeding cannot adequately represent this interest, and the participation in this proceeding by Piedmont will not prejudice the rights of any party. Piedmont is an interested party within the meaning of Section 15(a) of the Natural Gas Act, 15 U.S.C. Section 717(n)(a), and its intervention and participation in this proceeding will be in the public interest.

20151208-5104

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Wild & Scenic Westfield River Committee under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/8/2015 1:15:41 PM

Filed Date: 12/8/2015 1:15:41 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____

Wild & Scenic Westfield River Committee WildScenicWestfieldRiver@gmail.com

Basis for Intervening:

Over 78 miles of the Westfield River's three major tributaries and headwater streams are designated as part of the National Wild & Scenic River system. The proposed pipeline project will cross the East Branch of the Westfield River and approximately 20 of its headwater tributaries.

The Westfield River Wild & Scenic Committee is comprised of representatives from 10 communities, non-profit conservation organizations, regional planning commissions, state and federal agencies. The Committee's mission is to preserve, protect and enhance the outstanding natural resources of the Westfield River Watershed in concert with local communities.

The Wild & Scenic Rivers Act (Public Law 90-542) states, in Section 1(b) of the Act:

"It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States that certain selected rivers of the Nation which, with their immediate environments, possess outstandingly remarkable scenic, recreational, geologic, fish and wildlife, historic, cultural, or other similar values, shall be preserved in free-flowing condition, and that they and their immediate environments shall be protected for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations."

The Westfield River and its tributaries support the top representation of fluvial, coldwater fish communities in Massachusetts and one of the best opportunities for river conservation in Southern New England. The Wild & Scenic designation recognizes the river's regionally significant "outstandingly remarkable values", including extraordinary scenic and historic resources, supreme whitewater boating and fishing opportunities, large intact forests, outstanding biodiversity and exemplary natural communities. (National Park Service Wild & Scenic Eligibility Findings, 1993 and 2004).

The Committee has concerns about potential impacts to the National Wild & Scenic River and its headwater tributaries from the pipeline, compressor station and associated infrastructure and work resulting from the proposed project. We seek to have a comprehensive analysis of the pipeline impacts to the "outstandingly remarkable values" for which the river was designated.

20151208-5165

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Emerie Slattery under CP16-21-000. Intervener status

Submission Date: 12/8/2015 3:28:48 PM

Filed Date: 12/8/2015 3:28:48 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____

Individual emeries1@hotmail.com

Basis for Intervening:

"I am an affected property owner - lot number 22-8-23. my property will be impacted, I will lose my home privacy. The current route goes through the outer most corner of my septic leeching field. The leeching field was newly approved and required a variance due to property constrictions, meaning there is no where to move the leeching field to on my property. O. The other side of my property the pipeline will be about 10-15 ft from my well. I have serious concerns of well water contamination. This will require on going

more frequent monitoring if I even get to keep my home.

The current foliage will be lost and my privacy as well. The impact to my property will make my property unsellable or decrease the value substantially. We recently invested in a new forty year roof, new Windows, new and upgraded septic system. New raised stone patio and new stone pool deck. As well as new lawn and sprinkler system a new shed new green house. My yard is lined with foliage and perennials to keep out prying eyes and keep the view to the power lines obscured. Internally we have remodeled our bathroom kitchens floors Pasteur on walls, blue board, New heating system, new electric system, new plumbing, new alarm system, new lighting fixtures, new water tank, new well system. Since moving into our home we have updated, upgraded, remodeled revamp everything. This is not just our house it is our home. We recently took out money from 401k to do some of these projects with the ultimate intent to stay. We have sunk our savings into our home because we enjoyed the proximity to everything yet with privacy and nature surrounding us. We will lose our savings, our home and our sanctuary. As a result of our investment in our home and unexpected changes to our income and a mortgage that is more then our home will be worth due to the pipeline impact we would not have the money for a new down payment or funds to pay relocation costs to move.

20151208-5170

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Scott Slattery under CP16-21-000. Intervener status for property parcel 22-8-23

Submission Date: 12/8/2015 3:36:32 PM

Filed Date: 12/8/2015 3:36:32 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	Sjslatts1@hotmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I am an impacted property owner parcel #22-8-23. This will impact my property and financial well being.

20151208-5171

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of New Jersey Natural Gas Company under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/8/2015 3:38:09 PM

Filed Date: 12/8/2015 3:38:09 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
New Jersey Natural Gas Company	wscharfenberg@njresources.com	dcrudd@njresources.com

Basis for Intervening:

As a transportation customer of Applicant, New Jersey Natural Gas Company is interested in and would be affected by Applicant's filing in the instant proceeding. See 18 C.F.R. § 385.214(b)(2)(ii)(B). New Jersey Natural Gas Company's interests cannot be adequately represented and protected by any other party. Hence, the Commission should grant New Jersey Natural Gas Company permission to intervene in the instant proceeding.

20151208-5173

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of NJR Energy Services Company under CP16-21-000.

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party	Signer (Representative)	Other Contact (Principal)
NJR Energy Services Company	wscharfenberg@njresources.com	gprichman@njresources.com

Basis for Intervening:

As a transportation and storage customer of Applicant, NJR Energy Services Company is interested in and would be affected by Applicant's filing in the instant proceeding. See 18 C.F.R. § 385.214(b)(2)(ii)(B). NJR Energy Services Company's interests cannot be adequately represented and protected by any other party. Hence, the Commission should grant NJR Energy Services Company permission to intervene in the instant proceeding.

20151208-5182

BEFORE THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

KINDER MORGAN CORPORATION

Docket No. CP-16-21 Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project

MOTION TO INTERVENE and FILE COMMENTS

Fred and Barbara Nuffer are private landowners whose residence is within 100 yards of the current proposed NED pipeline route. The Pipeline will cross the Nuffer's property and we anticipate being subject to condemnation if a certificate is granted.

Pursuant to Commission Rules 385.214(b) and 157.10, Fred and Barbara Nuffer move to intervene and file comments in the above captioned proceeding. This intervention has been filed in a timely manner.

I. CONTACT INFORMATION

Please enter Fred and Barbara Nuffer on the official service list for Docket No. CP-16-21. All pleadings, filings and correspondence in this proceeding should be served to the following:

Address: Fred Nuffer	Telephone #: (518)674-2201
171 Radley Road	
Averill Park, NY 12018	e-mail: barbaranuffer@yahoo.com

II. MOTION TO INTERVENE

Fred and Barbara Nuffer seek to intervene to change the proposed route of the NED pipeline. The Nuffers are directly impacted by the proposed pipeline. The Nuffers' residence stands 100 yards from the pipeline, and is therefore vulnerable to structural damage during construction; as well devaluation of property values and ongoing safety hazards after the project is completed. Further, the Nuffers' land lies within the right of way corridor for the NED pipeline, thus exposing the property to condemnation if the certificate is granted.

III. COMMENTS

The water supply for our home comes from a 400 foot deep artesian well. It is a low yield well (approximately 1/2 gallon/minute). The depth of the well, plus the artesian effect, provides ample storage of water within the well casing. The well is artesian because the well head is located below a steep gradient, rising up approximately 300 feet. The proposed pipeline will cut across the steep hill side. Our concern is that the trenching and blasting that will occur during the pipeline construction will alter the artesian effect and negatively impact our low yield well. In addition to our domestic water supply, we also have a springhouse that we use to water our extensive gardens and lawn. The collection area for the spring emanates from the hillside that the pipeline will cross. We have previously sent comments to both FERC and Kinder Morgan

on this issue in registered letters. FERC has acknowledged receipt of this concern. However, Kinder Morgan has refused to sign for the registered letter and it was returned, so they have shown lack of good faith in addressing our concerns. We have requested that the proposed pipeline route be moved 100 to 200 yards further north. This will move the pipeline to a flat area at the top of the hill, rather than a steep side hill. This will avoid the necessary terracing of the steep hillside and hopefully avoid impacting our artesian well or spring.

THEREFORE, for the foregoing reasons, Fred and Barbara Nuffer request that the Commission GRANT this motion to intervene.

Respectfully submitted,
Fred and Barbara Nuffer
171 Radley Rd.
Averill Park, NY 12018
Email: barbaranuffer@yahoo.com

20151209-5013

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Anna Faiello under CP16-21-000. I am a landowner in Mason, NH.

Submission Date: 12/8/2015 10:37:59 PM Filed Date: 12/9/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	afaiello@jacqcad.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I am a landowner in Mason, NH, where there is a proposed large pipeline and a proposed lateral. My land might be in the path of one of the pipelines.

20151209-5014

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Thomas Jaskiewicz under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/9/2015 3:01:13 AM Filed Date: 12/9/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	tom@jaskiewicz.us	
Individual	alison@jaskiewicz.us	

Basis for Intervening:

MOTION TO INTERVENE OF THOMAS JASKIEWICZ and ALISON H. JASKIEWICZ

We (THOMAS JASKIEWICZ and ALISON H. JASKIEWICZ) 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 our property. As a result, a portion of our property is subject to condemnation if a certificate is granted.

Pursuant to Commission Rules 385.214(b) and 157.10, we move to intervene in the above captioned proceeding (docket number CP16-21). This intervention is timely filed.

We are directly impacted by the proposed pipeline. Our 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

our property, causing loss of use of more than half of our land, and would cause irreparable damage to the property. Further, our residence relies on a dug well as its sole water source, and the wetland that supplies water to the well lies within the right-of-way for the NED pipeline. Construction and maintenance activities would jeopardize the integrity and water quality of the well. Additionally, there will be ongoing safety hazards after the project is completed.

We are opposed to the proposed project.

20151209-5024

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Pipeline Project
Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC

Docket No. CP16-21-000

MOTION TO INTERVENE BY DANIEL G. WOLFE, JR. AND MICHELLE M. MARKS

INTRODUCTION:

Daniel G. Wolfe, Jr. and Michelle M. Marks respectfully request to intervene in the application of Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC and with respect to their Project commonly known as the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Pipeline Project, and in accordance with Rule 212 and Rule 214 of FERC's Rules of Practice and Procedures, 18 C.F.R. Sec. 385.212 and 18 C.F.R. Sec. 385.214.

STATEMENT OF INTEREST:

This Project seeks a pipeline approximately % of a mile from our personal residence. Our personal residence is located on a substantial fee of real property owned by us jointly. The real property is located at 42 Rebekah Way, East Greenbush, New York 12061. We are therefore personally directly impacted by this Project.

GROUNDS FOR INTERVENTION:

Our participation in this proceeding is in the public interest and as a consumer. In addition, the proposed pipeline will be approximately % of a mile from our personal residence. The proposed pipeline would directly impact our home, the use thereof, the market value and our ability to refinance and sell our home. As homeowners and owners of real property, our personal interests cannot be adequately represented by any other party. We therefore have a direct and substantial interest in the outcome of this proceeding.

STATEMENT OF POSITION:

Few, if any, residents along New York and in particular this route of the pipeline adjacent to our residence by % of a mile will receive gas service, lower energy prices or permanent jobs from this Project. Yet this area and namely our backyard will bear the majority of the risks and costs, including serious threats to our health and that of our children, established conservation land, water supplies, property values including our property values, and individual rights as private landowners including ourselves.

The State of New York recently banned fracking statewide on the grounds that the health risks outweigh any potential benefits. Yet this same fracked gas would be piped at very high pressure through our community, just % of a mile adjacent to our real property that houses us and our children. Additionally, this pipeline will be in extremely close proximity to electric transmission

wires and numerous bodies of water that act as water supplies to our home and our neighbors' home, and traditional small businesses in the vicinity.

Studies have shown that neither the process of fracking, nor the transport of the resulting gas, which contains hundreds of chemicals the industry refuses to list or fights extremely hard against listing, is safe, sustainable or clean. This is made clear in numerous daily news items (unsolved wastewater problems, earthquakes, explosions, leaks, large-scale spills, pollution, gross decline in property values, lack of oversight,

injury and sickness to humans, and injury, sickness and death to companion animals and livestock etc.) from across the country and around the world, including coverage of five major pipeline incidents in January 2015 alone.

As recently documented by a recent Harvard-led study, the poorly maintained existing gas infrastructure in Boston alone currently leaks” 15 billion cubic feet of natural gas, worth some \$90 million” each year, enough to service 200,000 homes. There is much work to be done inspecting, servicing and maintaining the pipelines already in use in this section of our country before billions of dollars’ worth of larger and more dangerous pipelines are considered including this particular Project.

We understand that the new, high-power compressor stations present their own light, sound, security and environmental concerns, including the regularly scheduled venting of methane (which the EPA reports has 20 times more impact on climate change than carbon dioxide over a 100-year period) into the air called blow down. Coupled with the makeup of our neighborhood (forests, nature, lakes, streams, rivers, wildlife, flora and fauna), this Project will grossly impact the environment in this area.

REQUEST:

For the above stated reasons, we move that the Commission accept this filing and issue an Order granting our Motion to Intervene in any proceedings that may be convened regarding this Project. We wish to be informed regarding progress reports and any and all other filings by the applicant. This includes being added to all official service and mailing lists regarding the aforementioned application.

We designate the following individual for service for the proceeding. Service via email is preferred.

Kimberly A. Steele, Esq.
The Steele Law Firm, P.C.
949 County Route 53
Oswego, New York 13126
Telephone: (315) 216-4721
Email: ksteele@thesteelawfirm.com

Respectfully Submitted this 8th day of December, 2015.

Daniel G. Wolfe, Jr. Michelle M. Marks

Filed By:
Kimberly A. Steele, Esq.
The Steele Law Firm, P.C.
949 County Route 53
Oswego, New York 13126
Telephone: (315) 216-4721
Email: ksteele@thesteelawfirm.com

20151209-5034

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Christopher Belmonte under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/9/2015 11:30:49 AM Filed Date: 12/9/2015 11:30:49 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	montebelmonte@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I am filing as an individual. I live in Turners Falls. I am concerned about our water supply.

If you could please send emails to montebelmonte@gmail.com

Thanks so much.

Signed,

Christopher 'Monte' Belmonte

20151209-5045

David McManus, Milford, NH.

December 9, 2015

Mr. Norman C. Bay, Chairman

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street NE, Room 1A

Washington, DC 20216

Re: Docket No. CP16-21, TGP Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Comments

Dear Chairman Bay,

As a resident of Milford, NH, I have several serious concerns regarding the TGP Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Project, Docket No. CP16-21.

First, to obtain a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity, a company must demonstrate a compelling need for their request because it allows for the seizing of private land for the public good under eminent domain. Unfortunately, TGP has failed, after multiple requests from Senators, Representatives, and Governors, to provide the compelling need being met by the proposed pipeline. After reviewing Attachment A, Tennessee's Responses to Scoping Comments June 30, 2015 through October 1, 2015, and its numerous references, it becomes even clearer that there is no compelling reason to approve this project. It has been my experience that when an organization starts generating thousands of pages of documentation, they have a very weak argument. Examples of compelling needs would be that the Northeast has been subject to rolling electrical blackouts, or that residents have been freezing in their homes do to a lack of natural gas. In fact, there is no compelling need. New England has adopted a mixed fuel strategy to ensure that the energy needs of the region's businesses and residents are met. We are not relying on a single type of fuel. This is a smart strategy that ensures our current and future energy needs are met.

Second, there is a large supply imbalance in the natural gas market as evidenced by the plummeting price of the fuel. Various independent studies including a report done for the Attorney General in Massachusetts, show no need for additional natural gas pipeline capacity to meet the region's needs now or in the foreseeable future. In fact, natural gas storage is at record levels in both the US and Canada according to slide 5 of FERC's 2015-2016 Winter Energy Market Assessment. The commentary on slide 5 states that other fuel stockpiles are also at record levels and can accommodate the deliverability, scarcity, and record price spikes encountered during the 2013-2014 cold weather events. Therefore, I see no compelling reason for the pipeline based on the current FERC documented data.

Third, an EnerKnol Research report from March 2015, stated "Another proposed solution for underutilized new pipeline capacity is to send natural gas to Canadian LNG terminals, such as Canaport LNG in New Brunswick, for export to global markets, as depressed U.S. natural gas prices relative to global markets has led to a reduction in northeast LNG imports. This could occur through the existing Maritimes & Northeast Pipeline, and possibly be supplanted by the Spectra Energy –proposed NED project." This independent report, in addition to many others, further supports the fact that the existing pipelines can support current and future needs of the region. This further calls into question the compelling need for this project.

Fourth, the Northern Pass project or its equivalent through Vermont, will bring a GWH of electric power to the New England electric grid from Hydro Quebec. This additional clean energy will provide significant additional capacity to the electric grid to cover peak demand thereby reducing the need for additional natural gas for electric power generation in the region. The Northern Pass project is also consistent with the strat-

egy of mixed fuel use that is the cornerstone of New England's energy strategy.

Finally, TGP has one of the worst safety records of pipeline companies based on a review of the Federal incident reporting database. Kinder Morgan, TGP's parent company, is under intense financial pressure with just shy of \$50B in debt and liabilities, negative cash flow (Kinder Morgan Q3 2015 10Q) and a collapsing stock price that indicates "in-the-know investors" are unloading the company's stock based on the company's financials and future outlook. Additionally, TGP is seeking approval for five other projects (FERC's Major Pipeline Projects Pending (Onshore) database). I have grave concerns that TGP does not have the financial wherewithal to complete and operate the proposed Northeast Energy Direct pipeline safely thereby putting the public and the environment at risk.

Based on the lack of a compelling need for the project and concerns about the safety of the public and the environment, I respectfully request that the Commission reject TGP's request for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity for the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline project, Docket No. CP16-21.

Respectfully,

David F. McManus
Concerned Resident

20151209-5083

tom sinclair, salem, NH.
December 9 2015

Dear FERC,

I am writing to voice my wholehearted support for the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline proposed for New England. Docket PF14-22.

As a New Hampshire resident I have suffered due to the lack of natural gas availability in my area. Last year my electric utility (Liberty Electric) doubled our electric rates for November thru April due to shortages of natural gas during the winter months. Because of the shortage priority is given to residential users leaving inadequate supplies for electric generating facilities. Because of this Liberty had to purchase more expensive power from outside our area and pass the cost on to consumers. Until additional supplies of natural gas are made available in New England our rates will continue to increase in the winter.

This is essentially a transfer of wealth from the electricity consumer to current natural gas consumers. Those currently with access to gas feel no pain while the electricity consuming public pays for the gas shortage in higher electricity costs.

New Hampshire has some of the highest electricity rates in the nation. These high rates stifle business creation (especially manufacturing) and expansion while burdening those on fixed income with ridiculously high utility bills.

Abundant supplies of natural gas will benefit the areas environment as well as its economy. The gas will be used to reduce the use of coal and fuel oil in electricity generation thereby reducing pollution. The gas will be delivered by pipe as opposed to rail or truck in the case of coal and oil. Clearly pipelines have demonstrated their inherent safety records when compared to rail or road delivery of energy sources.

Those opposed to the NED pipeline will oppose any improvement in energy delivery simply because they oppose everything. Another proposed energy project in New Hampshire is the Northern Pass project which will deliver surplus electrical power from Hydro-Quebec to New England. The same people oppose this project too. How insane is it to oppose the cleanest electricity in the world, hydro power that is currently not being used? The moose and the bears in the New Hampshire woods will readily adapt to the transmission lines without any hardship. Too bad the people are not as flexible.

In summary NED will help our environment, economy and those lower income residents and make the area less vulnerable to energy shortages that sometimes occur due to the harsh New England winter storms. Please approve this pipeline.

20151209-5157

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Leonard M Fudge under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/9/2015 4:50:29 PM

Filed Date: 12/9/2015 4:50:29 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
---------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------

--	--	--

Individual	lenfudge@yahoo.com	
------------	--------------------	--

Basis for Intervening:

My wife and I have been notified that we are abutters to the Northeast Energy Direct gas pipeline project in Pelham, NH.

20151210-5007

ANNA M COREY, Dracut, MA.

Kimberly D. Bose

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First St. NE, Room 1A

Washington, DC 20426

Reference Docket No. CP16-21 Comments from Dracut

Dear Ms. Bose,

My husband and I reside at Dracut at 215 Jones Avenue and have been residents on Jones Avenue for about 40 years. We also own the adjacent property, 225 Jones Avenue where my daughter, a single mother resides with our only grandchild. We are located a mere .4 miles from the proposed 970 Broadway Road Kinder Morgan Compressor Station. The location of this station poses a multiple of problems that will inevitably compromise our health, jeopardize our safety and destroy our life as we know it.

As more and more data comes in, culminated from years of study on the health impacts of living in the vicinity of compressor stations, especially one located so close in proximity to residential neighborhoods, we are seriously concerned for our health. Along with the carcinogens and heavy particular matter being blown into the air during “blowdowns”, we are as deeply concerned about chemical contamination of aquifers. The proposed site was already designated as a contaminated site responsible for the contamination of our wells in the past. The proposed boring on that site of holes 12 inches in diameter with some 100 feet deep very close together raise questions of contaminants migrating into the aquifers that feed the artesian wells we all rely on for potable water. Being so closely located to the compressor station, its daily operations would clearly cause concern for our psychological and neurological health as well. The constant mechanical hum and illumination on site 24 hours a day, 7 days a week depriving us of necessary sleep would destroy all sense of peace and wellbeing that we now enjoy.

Our 11 year old grandson who was born premature already suffers from asthma and multiple respiratory illnesses due to his weak respiratory system. My daughter Danielle, his mother, has increasing demyelination in the brain, indicative of Multiple Sclerosis. She is a single Mom and soul breadwinner who depends on our support in the care and welfare of our grandson. If this station is allowed to be built, we would have no choice but to try to sell the house they live in and move them to an area where they would be free from the devastating effects of the carcinogen gases and heavy particular matter being expelled in the blowdowns that could ultimately cut short or cost them their lives.

I have been diagnosed with hemochromatosis, a liver function ailment that causes me to store unhealthy levels of iron in my blood. While currently under control with bi-yearly treatments, I certainly do not need to add toxic levels of lead. In addition I have been diagnosed with chronic cough and pneumonia on many

occasions resulting with a concern for my own weakening respiratory system.

My husband Mark is now, as this process progresses, getting medical attention through his doctors at Brigham and Woman's Hospital to confirm throat cancer. We will know that answer around the same time you allow or deny Kinder Morgan's application. Obviously the compressor station blowouts could prove fatal to us.

Our property, known as Coreypride Farm is a working farm located on approximately 18 acres. We pride ourselves on breeding and raising stress free, grass fed cattle for consumption, using all natural organic methods as much as possible, free of antibiotics and steroids. Along with the cattle we have one of the largest free range egg producing facilities in town, providing eggs to the general public and local coffee shop as well as pasture raised turkeys. All the animals and poultry are grazing animals subject to the same diseases and illnesses as humans. They would not only be breathing the contaminated air, they would be eating the contaminated particular matter that settles on the grass. The poultry's delicate respiratory and digestive systems could not sustain the contamination at all. No one would buy the meat product knowing it was produced by cattle eating contaminated grasses. The stress from the constant hum and vibration of machinery and light alone could prove devastating especially to the chickens. We would be forced to shut down our farming operation as soon as possible to save the animals. It would be inhumane not to do so.

In shutting down our farm operation we would lose the revenue generated through the sale of our meat and egg products. We would lose our 61A tax status forcing us to pay a considerable increase in real estate taxes without the revenue from the farm to pay them. This in a town where the residents voted in Community Preservation with the intent to preserve and protect our precious farm land. And I know that we are not alone.

Our lives would be devastated. We would lose all that we have worked so hard for and stood for as a family. Our family, dedicated to caring for one another would be separated and forced to find alternative means to support each other. Please, do not allow this happen.

It begs me to ask the question, "How is it possible that a "for profit" company is allowed to cause so much heartbreak and destruction to so many with no recourse?" There is no proven "need" for more gas in New England. Kinder Morgan has been consistently deceptive in notification and disclosure of pertinent information pertaining to the infrastructure of this project. The whole project itself seems to morph and change at Kinder Morgan's will.

Obviously I am not an expert. Not even close. I did however rely on those far more educated than myself in researching the negative impacts this project presents. In putting all the information together, it is obvious that compressor stations, pump stations and meter stations do not belong anywhere near urban or residential communities. Human life should be valued much higher than a stock option.

It is in your power to see that this project is moved to an area where it will not impact so many families, neighborhoods and farms so negatively.

Respectfully submitted,

Anna M Corey

20151210-5012

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Stu Moncrieff under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/9/2015 7:44:40 PM

Filed Date: 12/10/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____

Individual _____ stu.moncrieff@gmail.com

Basis for Intervening:

I am filing to request intervenor status for Docket No. CP16-21-000.

My home is within 400 feet of the originally proposed pipeline route in Merrimack, NH. Although the route has been revised to approximately 2 miles from my home, this alternative route is not set in stone. Should FERC or Kinder Morgan/TGP change the route back to the original location, my land interests and the safety of my family will be significantly affected. My interests, and those of my family, cannot be suitably represented by any other party.

Therefore, I respectfully intervene.

My contact information is as follows:

Stu Moncrieff
2 Fields Farm Rd.
Merrimack, NH 03054
stu.moncrieff@gmail.com

20151210-5041

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC)
North East Direct Pipeline Project)

Docket No. CP16-21-000

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO INTERVENE

Pursuant to Rules 212 and 214 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's ("Commission") Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 385.212 and 385.214 (2007), we, the inhabitants of the Town of Dunstable, MA, file this motion to intervene in this proceeding.

On November 20, 2015, the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC ("TGP") filed its application under § 7 of the Natural Gas Act, 15 U.S.C. § 717f, and § 157 of FERC's regulations, 18 C.F.R. § 157.1 et seq., for the proposed North East Direct Project (NED), FERC Docket No. CP 16- 21-000

I. COMMUNICATIONS AND SERVICE

All communications, pleadings, and orders with respect to this proceeding should be sent to the following individual:

Tracey Hutton, Town Administrator
511 Main Street, Dunstable, MA 01827
978-649-4514 ext. 242
thutton@dunstable-ma.gov

II. INTEREST OF PETITIONER

As the Town Administrator of the Town of Dunstable, Massachusetts, I was authorized by the Board of Selectmen on December 2, 2015, to file this intervention on behalf of the inhabitants of the Town of Dunstable. The Northeast Energy Direct (NED) project, based on plans filed by the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company (TGP), will pass through the Town of Dunstable. Construction, operation and maintenance of the Pipeline would adversely impact the Town of Dunstable in a number of ways.

The Pipeline would increase the risk to public safety from direct disaster that could necessitate costly emergency services and indirect contamination. The Pipeline would also impact the natural resources that are held in high regard by many of the inhabitants of Dunstable, including impacts to the environment and quality of life.

The Town of Dunstable feels that it has important information and perspective to bring to this process, con-

sideration of which will serve the public interest.

III. CONCLUSION

Wherefore, I, give your name, respectfully requests that the Commission to grant my Motion to Intervene as a party with full rights to participate in all further proceedings.

Respectfully submitted this 8th day of December, 2015.

Tracey Hutton, Town Administrator
511 Main Street, Dunstable, MA 01827
978-649-4514 ext. 242
thutton@dunstable-ma.gov

20151210-5042

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Lisa M Senus under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/10/2015 8:56:00 AM Filed Date: 12/10/2015 8:56:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	lisa.senus@gmail.com	leo.senus@gmail.com

Basis for Intervening:

We are seeking to intervene in Docket CP16-21, Northeast Energy Direct, Tennessee Gas Pipeline/Kinder Morgan. We are directly affected property owners as the proposed Fitchburg Lateral traverses our property.

20151210-5047

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Susan Sedlmayr under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/10/2015 9:41:39 AM Filed Date: 12/10/2015 9:41:39 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	Chebo33@aol.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I am extremely upset that this gas pipeline will poison my community with its compressor stations and leaking pipeline. Haven't we learned that fossil fuels are obsolete and there is Clean energy available! A private For Profit company cannot be allowed to cut down our trees, poison our water, kill our wildlife and destroy our farms! AND.... The added gas is not needed. That's why it is going to be exported to Europe. Please listen to our voices Begging you to Not Allow this pipeline to be built!

20151210-5055

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Richard Gumbel under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/10/2015 10:19:31 AM Filed Date: 12/10/2015 10:19:31 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	pipeline.dgumbel@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

This pipeline will cross my land

This pipeline will devalue my property

20151210-5071

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.

Docket No. CP16-21-000

Motion to Intervene

John Herron, JoAnn Herron, Christopher Totman, Susannah Herron, Emmalee Herron and John Herron, Jr. (collectively the “Hawks Farm Interveners”) hereby move to intervene in the above-captioned proceeding. The Hawks Farm Interveners live on Hawks Road in Shelburne, Massachusetts and are directly impacted by the proposed pipeline.

Background

On November 20, 2015, Tennessee Gas Pipeline, L.L.C. (“TGP”) filed its Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to construct, Install, Modify, Operate and Maintain Certain Pipeline and Compression Facilities and to Abandon Other Facilities. On Dec. 7, 2015 the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (“FERC”) gave Notice to stakeholders of TGP’s application.

The Hawks Farm is a farm that traces its beginnings to an ancestor of the Herrons, Zadock Hawks, for his service in the French and Indian War. The King of England granted the Farm to the Herrons’ ancestor.

Zadock’s son, Hilkihah, began clearing the land and built the original homestead in 1783. Octavia Hawks Totman is the eighth generation to live at the Farm. The farm has passed through the generations in an undeveloped, natural state, and has been actively farmed for more than two hundred years, providing the family with their livelihood. Three generations currently farm alongside one another, producing grass fed heritage beef, pastured heritage pork, free range eggs and chicken, hay, maple syrup, firewood and lumber, all sold locally. The Herrons just completed the implementation of a USDA NRCS Environmental Quality Improvement Program grant to improve the pastures by removing invasive species, protecting water quality, improving soil fertility, and increasing grass forage quality and yield. The forests are actively managed for wildlife and include a well-known ‘deer yard’ where deer come from miles around to spend the winter and have done so for well over a hundred years. A significant stand of sugar maple trees in the forest is managed as a sugar bush for producing maple syrup. One area of the farm is designated as a critical habitat area because of rare species that are found there. Hawks Road, which runs through the farm, was part of the original Mohawk Indian Trail. Hawks Cemetery dates to 1796. Historically, this area was known as ‘Wisdom’ and ‘The Old World’ and has been written about in numerous historic and current publications. It has been described as God’s Country. Places like these are extremely rare and deserve to be preserved for their intrinsic value, history, beauty and productivity. This land grows food. It sustains a healthy ecosystem. It brings peace to those who live here and who pass through. The deep family roots, hard work and legacy deserve to be protected. The waterfalls, pastures, fields, forests, brooks, freshwater springs, historic homes and barns deserve to be protected.

The proposed pipeline crosses the Farm and negatively impacts all that the Farm stands for. According to the maps provided by TGP, not only will the pipeline, if approved, cross the Farm land, temporary construction sites will impact the pasture land and the Farm will be subject to condemnation proceedings. The Hawks Farm Interveners actively oppose the TGP application and question whether there is a demonstrable need for the pipeline. The Hawks Farm Interveners are deeply concerned about the negative environmental impacts that will result should FERC grant TGP’s application. The Hawks Farm Interveners join their neighbors and

fellow citizens who have voiced their opposition to this project from its inception. The proposed pipeline is a poor use of resources that is inconsistent with a sustainable future for our children and grandchildren.

Contact Information

All pleadings, filings and correspondence in this proceeding should be directed to undersigned counsel.

Conclusion

Wherefore, for the reasons discussed above, the Clark Interveners request that the FERC grant the instant motion.

Respectfully submitted by,

John Herron, JoAnn Herron, Christopher Totman,
Susannah Herron, Emmalee Herron and John Herron, Jr.
By Their Attorney,

Dated: December 10, 2015

Mark H. Bluver, Esq. BBO# 560330
The Law Office of Mark H. Bluver, L.L.C.
The Arts Block, 2nd Floor
P.O. Box 145
Greenfield, MA 01301
Phone: (413) 376-7506
Fax: (413) 223-1991
mbluver@mbluverlaw.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that this document filed electronically through the PERC online system will be sent electronically to the registered participants as identified on this 10th day of December, 2015.

Mark H. Bluver, Esq.

20151210-5072

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.

Docket No. CPI6-21-000

Motion to Intervene

The Clarkdale Fruit Farm Land Corp. Thomas Clark, Rebecca Clark, Ben Clark and Lori Clark (collectively the “Clark Interveners”) by and through counsel hereby moves to intervene in the above-captioned proceeding.

Background

On November 20, 2015, Tennessee Gas Pipeline, L.L.C. (“TGP”) filed its Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to construct, Install, Modify, Operate and Maintain Certain Pipeline and Compression Facilities and to Abandon Other Facilities. On Dec. 7, 2015 the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (“FERC”) gave Notice to stakeholders of TGP’s application.

The Clarkdale Fruit Farm Land Corporation (“Clarkdale”) is a fourth generation family farm owned and operated by the Clark Interveners. The Farm celebrated its 100th anniversary in 2015. It is comprised of approximately 180 acres of beautiful Franklin County farm land. Clarkdale grows many varieties of apples, peaches, plums, pears, cherries and apricots. Most of the farm income comes from a retail stand right on the farm. This includes sales of their own fruit, and apple and pear cider made on the premises, as well as a

popular pick-your-own apple operation. Clarkdale is a well-known and loved local treasure that is appreciated by thousands of area residents who have been loyal customers for generations. The Farm is subject to an Agricultural Covenant granted by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, acting through the Commissioner of the Department of Agricultural Resources. The purpose of the covenant is:

By obtaining this Agricultural Covenant, it is the intent of the Commonwealth to protect and preserve agricultural lands, encourage sound soil management practices, preserve natural resources, and maintain land in active agricultural use through improving the agricultural economic viability of the Premises. No activity detrimental to the actual or potential agricultural use of the Premises, or detrimental to water conservation, soil conservation, or to good agricultural and/or forestry management practices or which is otherwise wasteful of the natural resources of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts shall be permitted.

The Agricultural Covenant can be found at Book 06193 Page 197 of the Franklin County Registry of Deeds and a copy is enclosed for your convenience.

The covenant expressly prohibits certain uses including, but not limited to, any use which is inconsistent with the statement of purpose quoted above; the covenant prohibits the placing on the Premises of any “temporary” or “permanent” structure not related to agricultural use; the covenant prohibits the placement of “any” structure on the Premises, except for “normal agricultural activities.”

Further, the covenant requires “prior approval” from the Commonwealth for any “excavation, dredging, depositing or removal from the Premises of ... gravel. soil, sand, [or] rock “

The proposed pipeline is inconsistent with the Agricultural Covenant.

Motion To Intervene

The Clark Interveners are directly impacted by the proposed pipeline. The residence and farm buildings are within close proximity of the proposed pipeline and it appears that the proposed route will intersect the north-western section of the Farm. In addition, it appears that temporary construction sites are proposed to intersect and cross Farm parcels. The Clark Interveners submit that their property is vulnerable to structural damage during construction, as well as ongoing safety hazards if the project is approved and completed. The Clark Interveners also submit that portions of their property will be subject to condemnation proceedings if the pipeline is approved and constructed. Further, the Clark Interveners question the need for the pipeline and rely on the findings of the Massachusetts Attorney General’s independent study concerning the need for additional gas pipeline capacity in New England. The Clark Interveners incorporate by reference the arguments and conclusions reached by the Attorney General’s study[1]. In addition, the Clark Interveners have grave concerns that the proposed horizontal drilling near the eastern portion of the Farm will degrade the Farm’s pristine water supply adversely impacting the quality of the Farm’s fruit. Because the Clark Interveners are directly impacted by the proposed pipeline, they collectively request that leave be granted for them to intervene in the proceedings before the FERC. Like the vast majority of the citizens of Franklin County, Massachusetts, the Clark Interveners oppose the proposed pipeline and urge the FERC to deny the TGP application.

Contact Information

All pleadings, filings and correspondence in this proceeding should be directed to undersigned counsel.

Conclusion

Wherefore, for the reasons discussed above, the Clark Interveners request that the PERC grant the instant motion.

Respectfully submitted by,

The Clarkdale Fruit Farm Land Corp. Thomas
Clark, Rebecca Clark, Ben Clark and Lori Clark
By Their Attorney,

Dated: December 10, 2015

Mark H. Bluver, Esq. BBO# 560330
The Law Office of Mark H. Bluver, L.L.C.
The Arts Block, 2nd Floor
P.O. Box 145
Greenfield, MA 01301
Phone: (413) 376-7506
Fax: (413) 223-1991
mbluver@mbluverlaw.com

1 The study is entitled Power System Reliability in New England: Meeting Electric Resource Needs in an Era of Growing Dependence on Natural Gas. The study was prepared for the Attorney General by Analysis Group, Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that this document filed electronically through the FERC online system will be sent electronically to the registered participants as identified on this 10th day of December, 2015.

Mark H. Bluver, Esq.

20151210-5079

Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project of Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company LLC
Docket No. CP16-21-000

MOTION TO INTERVENE

[The links below are to comments that I have previously filed with FERC. The linked documents provide much greater detail on the points being summarized below.]

Basis for Intervening:

As an affected homeowner on the alternate NED pipeline route through Groton, MA and as a citizen of both the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and of the United States, these are some of the concerns that I have regarding the proposed NED pipeline:

- I am concerned about the orgy of misinformation that Kinder Morgan has provided to affected landowners about the pipeline and its negative impacts – and about FERC’s failure to react to this abuse of the public trust.

<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/opennat.asp?fileID=13964751>

- I am concerned that FERC will approve this project and grant Kinder Morgan the ability to take easements across hundreds of private properties. Granting such powers to a private, for-profit company without proving a true need of the American people for the pipeline is simply wrong.

<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/opennat.asp?fileID=13643008>

- If FERC approves this project, I am concerned for the hundreds of property owners who will then be forced to negotiate easements with the pipeline company. Kinder Morgan’s main spokesman, Allen Fore, has repeatedly stated that pipelines don’t affect property values. Given that prejudiced view and facing the threat of an eminent domain taking, what are the chances of landowners receiving a fair offer for the damage to their properties’ value?

<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/opennat.asp?fileID=13697212>

- I am concerned that if FERC approves the pipeline, it will be funded by a tariff on all electric ratepayers (including myself). Why should the public be forced to fund a privately owned pipeline with no guarantee of a return on its investment?

<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/opennat.asp?fileID=13829846>

- I am concerned that Kinder Morgan's true end game here is to send much of the gas carried by its proposed pipeline to Canadian LNG export facilities. This plan is well known, but is not being publicly acknowledged. The result of such an outcome will be that the many negative impacts of this pipeline will be visited upon American citizens so that a private energy company can improve its bottom line by exporting additional natural gas. Whose need is being served?

<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/opennat.asp?fileID=13960807>

- I am concerned that FERC will not consider the upstream and downstream environmental impacts of a new pipeline in its Environmental Impact Statement. I expect that it will consider some of the negative impacts of the construction of the pipeline without giving proper consideration to the many negative impacts of the operation of the pipeline.

<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/opennat.asp?fileID=13927918>

- My overriding concern is that FERC itself appears to be seriously broken and in need of fixing:
 - o FERC is not thoroughly evaluating the negative impacts of such a green-fields pipeline.
 - o FERC is doing a laughably inadequate job of establishing the need for this pipeline.
 - o FERC is not controlling or sanctioning the lies that Kinder Morgan is telling to the public.
 - o FERC is rubber-stamping rather than regulating the pipeline proposals that it evaluates.
 - o In short, FERC is simply not doing its job.

<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/opennat.asp?fileID=13955053>

<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/opennat.asp?fileID=13820762>

Given these many serious concerns, I am very mistrustful of FERC and its processes and of Kinder Morgan and the misinformation that it is supplying to both FERC and to the public.

I therefore intervene.

Contact information:

Nick Miller
670 Longley Road
Groton, MA 01450
ntmiller01450@gmail.com

20151210-5087

BEFORE THE UNITED STATES
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

KinderMorgan
Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline

Docket No, CP 16-21

Motion to Intervene of Stephen & Kathleen Balog in opposition to Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline.

Stephen Balog and Kathleen Balog oppose the construction of the proposed compressor station and pipeline in Northfield, MA on the grounds that it directly threatens our health, safety, and property. We also oppose the documented threat to the wildlife and the environment that exists around the proposed compressor station.

- A. We live approximately 500 yards from the proposed pipeline and the compressor station. We have lived at this residence for 38 years. We are both in our mid 60's and cannot afford to relocate.
- B. Listed below are our concerns from the construction and operation of the NED Project;

1. Health - What are the emissions released from the proposed pipeline and the proposed compressor station (i.e. methane, benzene, toluene, formaldehyde, carbon dioxide, sulfur dioxide, and etc.)? What is the noise level of the compressor during the construction and the operation?
2. Safety – How are we going to be protected from any explosions and leaks from the pipeline and the compressor station?
3. Property – Will there be blasting from the construction of the compressor station? If so, how will this affect our house foundation, artesian well system, and our septic system? How will a 41K horsepower gas operated compressor affect our homeowner’s insurance and the value of our property?
4. Wildlife and Environment – How much acreage of trees and foliage will be destroyed around the proposed path of the pipeline and compressor station? What is the impact of heavy equipment on Gulf Road? Will this heavy equipment restrict travel on Gulf Road?

Contact Information:

Stephen & Kathleen Balog
 27 Orange Road, Northfield, MA, 01360
 1-413-498-2786
 Stephen.balog@hotmail.com

20151210-5090

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
 BEFORE THE
 FEDERAL REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC)	Docket No. CP16-21-000
Northeast Energy Direct Project)	
)	December 10, 2015

MOTION TO INTERVENE OF THE CONNECTICUT FUND FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, INC.

On December 7, 2015, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (“FERC”) issued a Notice of Application for the proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project, FERC Docket Nos. CP16-21-000 and PF14-22-000. As noted in FERC’s Notice of Application, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (“the Applicant”) seeks, among other things to construct an interstate natural gas pipeline and associated facilities of approximately 412 miles in Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Connecticut. In accordance with Rules 212 and 214 of FERC’s Rules of Practice, 18 C.F.R. §§ 385.212 and 385.214, and Section 15 (a) of the Natural Gas Act, 15 U.S.C. § 717n, The Connecticut Fund for the Environment, Inc. (“CFE” or “Intervenor”) respectfully moves the Commission to grant it intervention in the above captioned matter.

I. INTERVENOR

CFE was founded in 1978 to protect and improve the land, air, and water of Connecticut using advocacy and scientific expertise to achieve results that benefit our environment for current and future generations. CFE is a 501(c) (3) not-for-profit corporation, incorporated under the laws of the State of Connecticut, with its principal place of business at 142 Temple Street, New Haven, CT 06510. CFE represents more than 7,000 members in Connecticut and New York. CFE has represented the interests of its membership in legal proceedings before trial and appellate courts and federal and state administrative agencies in various proceedings in which CFE sought to protect the environment and natural resources for its members and the citizens of Connecticut.

CFE has a longstanding interest in ensuring that all Connecticut residents have a safe and clean source of

drinking water. In 2002, CFE helped form the Endangered Lands Coalition (ELC), a statewide network of members dedicated to protecting Connecticut's drinking water through organizing local support and legislative action. By 2006, approximately 170 members and over 80 state and local elected officials had joined the coalition. CFE and ELC have succeeded in permanently protecting approximately 500 acres of electric utility lands, Fairfield County's 800 acre Trout Brook Valley property, 15,500 acres of reservoir lands formerly owned by the Kelda Group, and a 25 acre reservoir in New Milford.

II COMMUNICATION AND CORRESPONDENCE

Service in the proceeding should be made upon, and communications should be directed to:

John M. Looney, Esq.
Connecticut Fund for the Environment
142 Temple Street
Suite 305
New Haven, CT 06510
jlooney@ctenvironment.org
Phone; 860-787-0646
Fax: 860-787-0246

III GROUNDS FOR INTERVENTION

The proposal includes a pipeline loop, a portion of which will be constructed through 5.7 miles of land owned by the Metropolitan District Commission ("MDC") in West Hartford, Connecticut. Several drinking water reservoirs maintained and operated by the MDC are located on this property. These reservoirs provide the major source of public drinking water to over 400,000 people in the greater Hartford, Connecticut area and, as such, they are subject to special public health protections under state law. More than ten municipalities in this area rely on these reservoirs as the sole source for their public drinking water supply. Over 500 members of CFE are customers of MDC and are consumers of the drinking water from these reservoirs on the MDC property.

The MDC lands where the pipeline loop will be constructed are statutorily protected Class I and Class II watershed lands. In accordance with Conn. Gen. Stat. § 25-32(b), no change in use of these protected lands can take place unless the Applicant can demonstrate that such change in use will not have a significant impact upon the present and future purity and adequacy of the public drinking water supply. Pursuant to Conn. Gen. Stat. § 25-32(c), the Applicant has not demonstrated that its proposed activities will not have a significant impact on this critical drinking water supply. In fact, Applicant makes no reference to the fact that the MDC property is statutorily protected watershed land and is the location of a major public drinking water supply in its Environmental Report (ER) submitted with its Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity. Applicant's ER is deficient and does not provide any alternatives analysis for the location of the pipeline in this area.

CFE also questions the adequacy of the Applicant's claim that there is a need for more natural gas in New England and therefore the need to construct additional infrastructure to increase capacity in order to provide it.

Applicant's proposed activities will have a major negative impact on the natural resources in this area and upon the recreational activities that take place on this land, one of the few open space areas for recreation in a primarily urban area. Because the proposed location of the pipeline loop passes through the major source of public drinking water for the Hartford area and because this proposed project will cause environmental damage to the drinking water supply and the other natural resources in this area and the Applicant's inadequate showing of need for additional capacity, CFE opposes this application.

Based upon all of the above, it is in the public interest that CFE be allowed to participate as a party in this proceeding. Therefore, the Commission should grant CFE's motion to intervene in these proceedings.

IV CONCLUSION

For all or the above reasons, CFE respectfully requests that this Motion to Intervene be granted and that CFE be permitted to participate, with full rights as a party, in the above captioned proceeding before FERC.

Respectfully Submitted,

John M. Looney, Esq.
Connecticut Fund for the Environment
142 Temple Street
Suite 305
New Haven, CT 06510

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that I have this day served the foregoing document upon each person designated on the official service list compiled by the Secretary in this proceeding.

Dated at New Haven, Connecticut this 10th day of December, 2015.

John M. Looney, Esq.
Connecticut Fund for the Environment
142 Temple Street
Suite 305
New Haven, CT 06510
jlooney@ctenvironment.org
Phone; 860-787-0646
Fax: 860-787-0246

20151210-5098

{REPLACED BY corrected version, see 20151211-5085 below}

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.

Docket No. CPI6-21-000

Motion to Intervene

James and Diantha Wholey of 425 Bardwells Ferry Road, Shelburne, Massachusetts hereby move to intervene in the above-captioned proceeding. The Wholey Property is directly impacted by the proposed pipeline.

Background

On November 20, 2015, Tennessee Gas Pipeline, L.L.C. (“TGP”) filed its Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to construct Install, Modify, Operate and Maintain Certain Pipeline and Compression Facilities and to Abandon Other Facilities. On Dec. 7, 2015 the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (“FERC”) gave Notice to stakeholders of TGP’s application.

The proposed pipeline crosses the Wholey Farm and adversely impacts the agricultural nature of this old Farm. According to the maps provided by TGP, not only will the pipeline, if approved, cross the Farm land, TGP has proposed that portions of the Farm will be used as staging areas for horizontal drilling under the Deerfield River. The Wholey Farm will be subject to condemnation proceedings and therefore has a direct stake in the case before the Commission. Mr. & Mrs. Wholey oppose the TGP application and question whether there is a demonstrable need for the pipeline. They are deeply concerned about the negative environmental impacts that will result should FERC grant TGP’s application. Mr. & Mrs. Wholey join their neighbors and fellow citizens who have voiced their opposition to this project from its inception. The pro-

posed pipeline is a poor use of resources that is inconsistent with a sustainable future for our children and grandchildren.

Contact Information

All pleadings, filings and correspondence in this proceeding should be directed to undersigned counsel.

Conclusion

Wherefore, for the reasons discussed above, the ~~Clark~~ Interveners request that the FERC grant the instant motion.

Respectfully submitted by,
James Wholey and Diantha Wholey,
By their attorney,

Dated: December 10, 2015

Mark H. Bluver, Esq. BBO# 560330
The Law Office of Mark H. Bluver, L.L.C.
The Arts Block, 2nd Floor
P.O. Box 145
Greenfield, MA 01301
Phone: (413) 376-7506
Fax: (413) 223-1991
mbluver@mbluverlaw.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that this document filed electronically through the FERC online system will be sent electronically to the registered participants as identified on this 10th day of December, 2015.

Mark H. Bluver, Esq.

20151210-5107

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Theresa Grant under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/10/2015 1:38:09 PM Filed Date: 12/10/2015 1:38:09 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____

Individual tgrant527@gmail.com

Basis for Intervening:

Motion to Intervene of Theresa Grant

I am a resident of the town of Prlham, Hillsborough County, New Hampshire. The proposed right of way of the Tennessee Pipeline Company's NED project will run 100 feet from my property.

Persuant to Commission Rules 385.214(b) and 157.10, Theresa Grant moves to intervene in the above proceeding.

20151210-5114

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.) Docket No. CP16-21-000

**MOTION TO INTERVENE
OF THE UGI DISTRIBUTION COMPANIES**

Pursuant to Rule 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. §385.214, the UGI Distribution Companies hereby move to intervene in the above-captioned proceeding. In support of its pleading, the UGI Distribution Companies state the following:

The following persons should be included on the official service list in this proceeding, and all communications concerning this motion should be addressed to the following persons:

Mark C. Morrow, Esquire
UGI Corporation
P.O. Box 858
Valley Forge, PA 19482
E-Mail: morrowm@ugicorp.com

David C. Beasten
Manager Supply, Planning & Procurement
UGI Utilities, Inc.
2525 N. 12th Street
Reading, PA 19612-2677
E-Mail: dbeasten@ugi.com

The UGI Distribution Companies, for the purposes of this filing, are comprised of UGI Utilities, Inc. , UGI Penn Natural Gas, Inc. and UGI Central Penn Gas, Inc.. Each is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The UGI Distribution Companies distribute and sell natural gas to commercial, industrial and residential consumers in Pennsylvania, and a small area in Maryland, and are customers of Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. ("Tennessee") pursuant to certain firm transportation contracts.

On November 20, 2015, Tennessee filed an application pursuant to sections 7(b) and 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act (NGA), and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) regulations thereunder, seeking authority to (i) construct, install, modify, and operate certain pipeline and compression facilities to be located in Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Connecticut, and (ii) to abandon certain facilities, all as part of the Northeast Energy Direct Project.

The UGI Distribution Companies respectfully request permission to intervene in the above proceedings. The UGI Distribution Companies have an interest which will be directly affected by the outcome of this proceeding and which cannot be adequately represented by any other party.

WHEREFORE, the UGI Distribution Companies respectfully request that the Commission grant them intervenor status in these proceedings.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /S/

Mark C. Morrow
Chief Regulatory Counsel
UGI CORPORATION
P.O. Box 858
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 768-3628
e-mail: morrowm@ugicorp.com

COUNSEL FOR THE UGI DISTRIBUTION COMPANIES

Dated: December 10, 2015

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this day served the foregoing document upon each person designated on the official service list compiled by the Secretary in this proceeding.

Dated this 10th day of December 2015.

By: /S/
Mark C. Morrow, Esq.
UGI CORPORATION

20151210-5161

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of David G Rushton under CP16-21-000.
Submission Date: 12/10/2015 4:22:44 PM Filed Date: 12/10/2015 4:22:44 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	daverushton7@yahoo.com	

Basis for Intervening:

Pipeline is expected to pass in close proximity to my home. I am concerned about its effect on my safety and its effect on my property's value.

20151211-5004

Karen Sullivan, New Ipswich, NH.

FERC's own rules state that the public benefits of a pipeline must exceed the costs to society.

The upgrades already in various planning stages to existing pipelines provide alternative gas infrastructure projects that have a smaller impact and costs to landowners, communities and the environment.

Just say NO to the Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company/NED proposal to go through southern New Hampshire.

It is not needed, it is not wanted.

20151211-5085

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.

Docket No. CP16-21-000

Motion to Intervene (Corrected version)

James and Diantha Wholey of 435 Bardwells Ferry Road, Shelburne, Massachusetts hereby move to intervene in the above-captioned proceeding. The Wholey Property is directly impacted by the proposed pipeline.

Background

On November 20, 2015, Tennessee Gas Pipeline, L.L.C. ("TGP") filed its Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to construct, Install, Modify, Operate and Maintain Certain Pipeline and Compression Facilities and to Abandon Other Facilities. On Dec. 7, 2015 the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC") gave Notice to stakeholders of TGP's application.

The proposed pipeline crosses the Wholey Farm and adversely impacts the agricultural nature of this old Farm. According to the maps provided by TGP, not only will the pipeline, if approved, cross the Farm land, TGP has proposed that portions of the Farm will be used as staging areas for horizontal drilling under the Deerfield River. The Wholey Farm will be subject to condemnation proceedings and therefore has a direct stake in the case before the Commission. Mr. & Mrs. Wholey oppose the TGP application and question whether there is a demonstrable need for the pipeline. They are deeply concerned about the negative en-

vironmental impacts that will result should FERC grant TGP's application. Mr. & Mrs. Wholey join their neighbors and fellow citizens who have voiced their opposition to this project from its inception. The proposed pipeline is a poor use of resources that is inconsistent with a sustainable future for our children and grandchildren.

Contact Information

All pleadings, filings and correspondence in this proceeding should be directed to undersigned counsel.

Conclusion

Wherefore, for the reasons discussed above, the Wholey Intervenors request that the FERC grant the instant motion.

Respectfully submitted by,
James Wholey and Diantha Wholey,
By their attorney,

Dated: December 11, 2015

Mark H. Bluver, Esq. BBO# 560330
The Law Office of Mark H. Bluver, L.L.c. The Arts Block, 2nd
Floor
P.O. Box 145
Greenfield, MA 01301
Phone: (413) 376-7506
Fax: (413) 223-1991
mbluver@mbluverlaw.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that this document filed electronically through the FERC online system will be sent electronically to the registered participants as identified on this 11 th day of December, 2015.

Mark H. Bluver, Esq.

20151211-5092

Patrick Daniel, Amherst, NH.

I am not in favor of the Kinder Morgan pipeline being proposed for the State of NH. I live in one of the affected towns and implore the FERC to take into account the potential damage to our water resources, our conservation lands and our environment when making a final decision on this project. This would create a long lasting scar on our beautiful resources. There are alternatives that I feel should be strongly evaluated (existing pipelines, alternative sources) that would have much less impact on our land and properties. This pipeline would do damage and potential great harm for no value to most of the residents impacted by it's construction.

The NED project is not in the best interest of New Hampshire families, period!

Thanks for your time.

20151211-5119

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Donna M Dougherty under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/11/2015 11:24:48 AM Filed Date: 12/11/2015 11:24:48 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____

Individual

donnad@ccfcca.com

Basis for Intervening:

I am a homeowner whose property abuts the proposed pipeline path. I just moved here a year ago with my mother who has alzheimers. I have done my best to follow the documentation for the pipeline. I attended the local FERC meeting. I would like to have a voice in this matter. Thank you

20151211-5155

Karen Sullivan, New Ipswich, NH.

The Tennessee Gas Pipeline company/Kinder Morgan/NED will file an Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience & Necessity with FERC.

I was at the FERC Scoping Meeting held in Nashua, NH on Wednesday, July 29, 2015

I was at the FERC Scoping held in Milford, NH on Thursday July 30, 2015

At the Nashua Scoping meeting there where about 28 elected officials speaking before the FERC members. Not one of these elected officials agreed that the TN Gas Pipeline/Kinder Morgan/NED project was necessary. I do not know how many private individuals spoke. I would guess that only 5 or 6 individuals spoke for the pipeline to be built. These individuals were all union members who wanted union jobs. I am not anti union. I have been a member of my union since 1973. I am pro union. I am anti pipeline.

At the Milford Scoping meeting there were 28 elected officials speaking before the FERC members. Not one elected official spoke in favor of the pipeline. There were 43 private individuals who spoke at the Milford Scoping meeting. Not one of those private individuals was in favor of the pipeline project.

If the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission is not a “Rubber Stamp” for the fossil fuel companies when the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company/Kinder Morgan/NED files an Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience & Necessity I request that FERC DENY this application from the TN Gas Pipeline Co/Kinder Morgan/NED.

This pipeline is NOT for “public convenience”. This pipeline is NOT for “necessity”. This pipeline is strictly for PROFIT by a private company.

There are three other pipelines that can transport this gas from the Marcellas Shale in Pennsylvania to/ through New England.

FERC’s own rules state that the public benefits of a pipeline must exceed the costs to society. The upgrades already in various planning stages to existing pipelines provide alternative gas infrastructure projects that have a smaller impact and costs to landowners, communities and the environment.

I urge FERC to just say no and DENY the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company/Kinder Morgan/NED project slated to come through southern NH with a compressor station planned for New Ipswich, NH (Docket # CP16-21)

20151211-5159

Patty Woodbury, North Reading, MA.

With the increasing energy saving measures in place, this is a NOT needed pipeline. It is being proposed for the purpose of making a wealthy company more lucrative. This pipeline will destroy private properties, conservation lands, water supplies, Native American artifacts and our ecosystem. I stand opposed to this pipeline and really hope that FERC pays attention to the opposition for the NE Energy project.

Thank you .

20151211-5171

I am opposed to the CP16-21 permit filed by Kinder Morgan. This will destroy private properties, wetlands, conservation lands, water drinking supplies, wildlife and Native American artifacts.

With the increasing energy saving measures in place, this pipeline is NOT needed and is solely for the purpose of making a wealthy company more lucrative.

I hope that FERC pays attention to the opposition and sees the senseless motion as such.

Thank you.

Patty Woodbury

Affected landowner, North Reading, MA

20151211-5182

Karen St. Arnaud
81 Dadak Drive
Dracut, MA 01826

12/11/2015

Attention: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Reference: Docket#CP16-21-000

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, N.E.

Washington, DC 20426

Dear Administrative Staff:

I am writing to express my concerns over the proposed Compressor Station and Meter Stations associated with the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline project. I recently learned that Kinder Morgan is proposing the installation of a Compressor Station on a hazardous waste/brownfield site located at 970 Broadway Rd. in Dracut, MA. This location is 0.4 miles from my property. I did not receive an abutter's notification from Kinder Morgan and learned the details of this project through a Pipeline Awareness group in town.

Unfortunately, the proposed Pipeline project is viewed as simply 'a pipeline' and many Dracut residents have not been informed or notified of the dangers and health effects associated with Compressor stations and Meter stations. To help understand the impact a Compressor Station might have on a small densely populated rural community, I researched a town (Minisink) in New York where a compressor station was built and began operating in the spring of 2013. Below is an excerpt of a study completed for that town in 2015. Please note this study was completed roughly one year after the Compressor station became operational.

"In the Minisink study, they found that spikes in air toxins around the compressor coincided with residents' adverse health symptoms. The study involved 35 residents, who were surveyed using a well-tested survey method, including interviews by a physician. SWP-EHP also provided five Speck monitors to measure fine particulate matter in air near residences for the two months, from October 19 to December 17 of 2014. Participants additionally used special canisters to capture air samples during "odor events," periods when the compressor emitted strong odors.

Asthma, nosebleeds, headaches, and rashes were common among the 35 participants in eight families living within one mile of the compressor. Those symptoms are also frequently reported around gas fracking sites, said Brown.

Six of the 12 children studied had nosebleeds, which Brown attributed to elevated blood pressure or irritation of mucous membranes by formaldehyde, a carcinogen found in excess around Compressors in a recent SUNY Albany study."

My son and I have asthma. My parents, who live within a 1.5 mile radius of the proposed Compressor Station site, are immunosuppressed and high risk due to Kidney transplants and chronic upper respiratory issues. My son's school, where 400 children currently attend the Dracut Campbell School, is a mere 3 miles away. This Compressor station should not be located in a densely populated farming community. The "blown downs" are just one of the many ways the air, ground and water may become contaminated.

Our local Board of Health unanimously voted against the Pipeline project due to the health concerns of the residents. The consequences of allowing this project into our town will likely lead to deteriorated health, environmental impacts, and decreases property values.

Families that settle in this town tend to remain here for generations. We would like to continue to keep our family in this town for many generations. Unfortunately, if this Compressor station is built, we will be forced to sell our recently constructed home (three yrs) that we've made significant invests in over the past three years. We will be forced to help my aging parents sell their home of thirty years, watch our close group of neighbors sell their homes and completely disrupt the environment we've worked hard to provide for our son disappear because of an unnecessary 'Pipeline' project. This project will likely have an environmental impact on our community by contaminating our ground/soil, water and air. The local farms would be forced to close and our residents will become ill drinking water from contaminated wells. The proposed Compressor Station site contaminated wells in the area back in the 1980s and several residents became ill. This will likely happen again as we allow drilling or boring into hazardous soil.

I'd ask for you to review the statement made by Massachusetts Attorney General Maura Healey regarding the recent "Power System Reliability in New England: Meeting Electric Resource Needs in an Era of Growing Dependence on Natural Gas" study. She stated "This study demonstrates that we do not need increased gas capacity to meet electric reliability needs, and that electric ratepayers shouldn't foot the bill for additional pipelines." This study clearly states that the state of Massachusetts does not have a 'market need' for this pipeline project.

In conclusion, I'd ask that you please listen to the voice of the people and deny Kinder Morgan's request to build this pipeline, compressor station and meter stations in our town. Our town is currently in debt and cannot afford to support this project with our bare minimum fire and police force. Additionally, the real estate in this town will suffer a huge impact as many residents who started families here will be moving out of town. As you can see, the impact to our town and health is extensive. Please don't force me to leave the town I grew up in and uproot my son from a school and community he loves. Thank you for taking the time to hear my concerns.

Respectfully,

Karen St. Arnaud
81 Dadak Drive
Dracut, MA 01826
Karen.st.arnaud@gmail.com

20151211-5194

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Randy Boisse under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/11/2015 3:05:36 PM Filed Date: 12/11/2015 3:05:36 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	rcboisse@comcast.net	

Basis for Intervening:

FERC
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First St NE
Washington, DC 20426
December 11, 2015

RE: Docket #CP16-21-000

My name Randy Boisse. I live at 190 Methuen Road in Dracut, MA which is part of Dadak Estates.

I've just been made aware that I am an abutter to the proposed Kinder Morgan Compressor Station location at 970 Broadway Rd., Dracut. I am deeply disturbed that Kinder Morgan neglected to notify our neighborhood as required by 18CFR - 157.21. When Kinder Morgan filed their application they had to be aware that the move in location just prior to the filing would impact an entirely different group of abutters and others within the half mile radius. Further, they had to have had prior knowledge of the location move at the time they held their public forum at Four Oaks Country Club, that again – I, nor my neighbors were not notified of.

Due to this deception the new abutters, including myself were not given time to address our concerns with FERC, Kinder Morgan, Town officials or State representatives. I ask that you delay approving this project and open a scoping sessions giving us the same opportunity to obtain vital information pertaining to our health, safety, well-being and economic future that the original abutters were offered.

Sincerely,

Randy Boisse
190 Methuen Road
Dracut, MA 01826
978-390-0803
rcboisse@comcast.net

20151211-5264

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC);

I am writing to express my objection to the Kinder Morgan pipeline running through the backyard of my small town of North Reading, Massachusetts as well as all throughout New England.

The proposed pipeline is not the answer to our energy needs both now and in the future. If energy prices are of a concern we need to be heading in the direction of clean, renewable energy like solar power, wind etc. Gas is not clean. Methane is one of the worst pollutants on this earth. Methane does more damage to our atmosphere than carbon dioxide. Pipelines have also been known to have ruptures and leaks. Where is the leaking gas going? It is going into the ground, into our soil, into drinking water. This cannot be taken lightly. And surprisingly there are currently enough leaks in the existing gas infrastructure to provide another 400 MW of power. 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.

Studies have shown that if our current levels of state energy efficiency programs continue, there is no need for additional gas pipelines even with economic growth taken into consideration. It seems as though there are different motives behind the pipeline and that those who will be affected the most will not see any benefit only destruction of their backyards. The thought that this pipeline will possibly provide gas for export, again at the expense of the citizens this pipeline is effecting is absurd, and KM representatives have repeatedly said that they have no control over who their customers are, so exports are on the table. 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. It will effect the habitat of thousands of wildlife. It will destroy our beautiful earth.

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?

It is with that that I ask you to please consider OBJECTING to the Kinder Morgan pipeline and focus your efforts on the truly clean and renewable sources of energy that our world desperately needs to sustain our

atmosphere.

Andrea Tierno
North Reading Resident

20151214-0010

TOWN OF CONWAY, MASSACHUSETTS
Board of Selectmen
P.O. Box 240, Conway, MA 01341
Town Office: 32 Main St. Town Hall: 5 Academy Hill Rd.
Phone (413) 369-4235 (413) 369-4237 fax
www.townofconway.com

November 30, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street NE, Room IA
Washington, DC 20216

Re: Docket No. PF14-22, TGP Northeast Energy Direct — Setting Deadline for Intervention

Dear Secretary Bose:

We are writing to support a 45-day period for stakeholders to petition to intervene in the event the Commission accepts the NED application. We trust that the Commission will thoroughly review the Company's filing and reject it pursuant to 18 C.F.R. 157.8 if the Commission determines that TGP's application is not in full compliance with, among other things, the Minimum Filing Requirements under 18 C.F.R.380, Appendix A, and we understand that the Commission has ten business days to make this determination.

Under 18 C.F.R. 157.10, the Commission has the discretion to fix the time in which stakeholders may intervene, and the facts warrant longer than 21 days in this case. We note that the proposal for the location of the blow-out valve in the Town of Conway has been changed, and would appreciate time to review this amendment.

With the anticipated filing date, a 21-day time period would end right in the middle of the holiday season. Twenty-one calendar days would include days when municipal offices of impacted communities are closed by law or custom. There is no need to require municipalities and others to operate on a shorter-than-usual time frame during this busy time of year.

Respectfully submitted,

John P. O'Rourke, Chair
Jim Moore
Robert Baker
BOARD OF SELECTMEN

20151214-0012

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

December 4, 2015

Mike Letson
Environmental Project Lead
Tennessee Gas pipeline Co Kinder Morgan
1001 Louisiana Street

Houston TX 77002

RE: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., a Kinder Morgan Company, Northeast Energy Direct Project.
MHC 1RC.56771.FERC Docket 1PF14-22-000rh CPI6-21-000.

Dear Mr. Letson:

The Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC), office of the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), received on December 2, 2015, an item without a cover letter or transmittal sheet, regarding the project referenced above. The item is a CD labelled "Northeast Energy Direct project, Docket No. Cp I 6- -000, Application of Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LL.C., for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity, November 20, 2015."

I am disappointed that the MHC's repeated comments about the format and contents of submittals required by the MHC have not been followed. As the MHC has previously indicated on January 5, 2015 and March 24, 2015, the MHC cannot accept electronic submittals, and the MHC is unable to review materials posted on websites.

The MHC reiterates its previous requests that you please submit information to the MHC in paper format so that the information can be reviewed and retained as records which the MHC is required to keep in paper format. Project plans and drawings submitted to the MHC should be sized no larger than 11"x 17" to accommodate the MHC's record systems.

Additionally, please only submit to the MHC information that is pertinent to the MHC's role as the office of the Massachusetts State Historic Preservation Officer and the State Archaeologist, which is limited to historic and archaeological resources within Massachusetts. Please do not submit information about environmental and operational issues that are not within the purview of the MHC, such as water, wetlands, wildlife, vegetation, socioeconomics, geology, soils, land use, recreation, aesthetics, noise, air quality, hazardous waste, reliability, safety, hazardous waste, marketing and cost data, or aspects of the project in other states.

The MHC looks forward to reviewing and commenting on the information requested.

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

xc:

Secretary Kimtrcrly D. Bose, FERC
Eric Tomaai, FERC
Stuart Fidel, Louis Berger Group

20151214-0022

FERC
Kimberly Bose
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First St NE
Washington, DC 20426
December 4, 2015
RE: Docket 1CP16-21

My name Randy Boisse. I live at 190 Methuen Road in Dracut, MA which is part of Dadak Estates.

I've just been made aware that I am an abutter to the proposed Kinder Morgan Compressor Station location at 970 Broadway Rd., Dracut. I am deeply disturbed that Kinder Morgan neglected to notify our neighborhood as required by 18CFR - 157.21. When Kinder Morgan File their application they had to be aware that the move in locations just prior to the filing would impact an entirely different group of abutters and others within the half mile radius. Further, they had to have had prior knowledge of the location move at the time they held their public forum at Four Oaks Country Club, that again - we were not notified of.

Due to this deception the new abutters including myself were not given time to address our concerns with FERC, Kinder Morgan, Town officials or State representatives. I ask that you delay approving this project and open a scoping sessions giving us the same opportunity to obtain vital information pertaining to our health, safety, well-being and economic future that the original abutters were offered.

Sincerely,

Randy Boisse
190 Methuen Road
Dracut, MA 01826
978-390-0803

20151214-0025

Kimberly Bose, Secretary
FERC
888 First Street, N.E.
Washington, DC 20426

STOP THE NED PIPELINE!!

Protect NH land from Eminent Domain!

I oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) EXPORT pipeline. The pipelines, and compressor station will scar the NH landscape and put our water, wildlife, forests, agricultural lands and rural character at risk. These include health and safety risks from emissions, industrialization, pollution and the devastating effects of fire and explosions. Greed, not need is fueling this project. Say NO to this private company that will TAKE OUR LANDS with NO BENEFIT TO US.

Ted Prizio
8 Farrwood Rd
Windham, NH 03087

20151214-0026

{ same text as 20151214-0025 above, except signed by }

Kay Prizio
8 Farrwood Rd
Windham, NH 03087

20151214-0027

{ same text as 20151214-0025 above, except signed by }

Martha Prizio
PO Box 3
Windham, NH 03087

20151214-0045

Spectra Energy Corporation
34 Morgan Drive

Norwood, MA 02062

Date: December 5th, 2015

Mailed via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access
Spectra Access Northeast

As the owner of the property located at:

42 Depot Street
Sharon, MA 02067

I am denying permission previously granted to the Spectra Energy Corporation, 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.

Kerstin Gallant
Daniel Gallant

Copy to FERC

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

20151214-5002

Leslie J Carey, Averill Park, NY.

On June 26, 2015 I was sitting next to my stream with my nine week old puppy and another dog, enjoying the weather. I then heard a crashing in my woods, and was fearful that a bear or coyote was going to come toward me. It was neither. Instead it was a man in a vest, carrying a machete. I heard, then saw, two small trees come down. I called out to this man. He came toward me. I questioned what he was doing on my property. He stated that he had permission from the landowner to be there. He identified himself as a surveyor for Kinder Morgan. I had no idea what he was talking about, as I had never been informed of this proposed project.

We were standing about 600 feet away from the National Grid Right of Way. I let him know that he was on my property and I had not given permission for him to be there. He argued, and then suggested that maybe I was a renter of the property. In the meantime, I asked him three times to stow his machete away from me and my dogs, and he finally complied on the fourth request.

He showed me a tablet which indicated that my property was highlighted, giving him permission to be there. He flipped his ID toward me upon my request, but he declined to allow me to take a picture of it. There were now two more surveyors coming toward us, and more of my trees were falling down. I asked him if he had cut my trees, and he replied, "just little ones".

I asked him to leave. He asserted again that he had permission to be there, and not only that, he indicated that another 400 feet toward my house was not my property either. I asked him to leave again. He called his land agent, Peter Crave, and got voicemail. I called my husband and told him what was going on. The surveyor then agreed to leave. He gave me a business card with Peter Crave's contact information.

I contacted Peter Crave. He immediately denied that he had given permission for the surveyors to be there. I told him that I was never informed of any pipeline or surveys. He stated that he had informed me by mail. I told him that I never received any information and that he didn't have my permission to survey. I ended the phone call.

He called back with a changed story. He stated that he had "pushed the wrong button, sorry". And then he

wanted to speak to my surveyor, who had recently completed our survey. I declined to allow that. He then said, "ARE YOU REFUSING TO LET ME SPEAK TO YOUR SURVEYOR?" When I confirmed that statement, he said, "Well, maybe I will come up there". I told him he had better not, and terminated the call. I researched this proposed Kinder Morgan project. I found out that as an abutter, I had the right to be informed. I went to my neighbors on both sides, who are also abutters. They had no idea about the proposed pipeline, or any surveying. I realized the violation of my rights and my property, and made a police report on June 28, 2015.

This unethical treatment of landowners is completely unacceptable. If this company cannot be trusted to follow the rules and respect the law, how can they possibly be responsible for caring for our health and safety? You must factor this egregious behavior into any decision about permitting this proposed project. Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas are not trustworthy.

20151214-5006

Karen J. Eno, Pelham, NH.

I am trying to fill out an Intervener for this Pipeline. My concerns are damage to my well water, septic, land, and my families health as well animals being directly affected by this unnecessary track of pipeline. This preserved land was put aside so Not to be disturbed!!!

My stress and anxiety levels are building to an unhealthy level. Please give me more information on how this form for Intervener is done.

Thank you

Karen Eno

20151214-5013

Margaret M Ford, Nassau, NY.

Motion to Intervene on docket CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity

As an abutter to the proposed NED pipeline we have attended presentations, reviewed research, and heard both sides of the story. We do not feel that this project deserves to receive a certificate of PUBLIC convenience and necessity since the public in New York will receive mainly negative outcomes from the pipeline. Our interests in preserving our property value and view, our health and safety, and keeping our acreage animal friendly all contribute to our petition for intervenor status. Perhaps the most important reason for concern is that if you approve plans for the NED and the many other pipelines and petroleum infrastructures in the works, you will have a negative impact on the transition to renewable energy sources. This in the long run will have an effect on us all.

Respectfully submitted on the 12 of December, 2015.

Margaret and James Ford

107 Jordan Lane

Nassau, New York 12123

jordanfarm@aol.com

20151214-5034

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Rosemarie Kelly under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/11/2015 5:02:48 PM

Filed Date: 12/14/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____

Individual rosemarie_kelly@hotmail.com

Basis for Intervening:

Document-less motion to intervene under docket number cp16-21-000

20151214-5038

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Theresa Mayer under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/11/2015 5:14:23 PM Filed Date: 12/14/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	Terimayer19@yahoo.com	

Basis for Intervening:

Intervene on the Pipeline 1 Wentworth Circle Windham NH. Pipeline will be on my property.

20151214-5042

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of William R Crissy, III under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/11/2015 10:29:00 PM Filed Date: 12/14/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	9wentworthhome@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

This pipeline will put my family and home in danger and will threaten my constitutional right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

20151214-5045

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Sean Radcliffe under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/12/2015 1:36:39 PM Filed Date: 12/14/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	sean.radcliffe.purchase@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I live within half mile of the Mid station 4, New Ipswich compressor station, possibly close to 1/4 mile of the compressor station.

45 Mountain View Road,
Temple, NH 03084

I will hear, smell, feel, see and potentially taste (dug well water quality) the effects of the compressor station.

We are concerned about air quality due to 41,000 HP turbines generating exhaust.

We are concerned disturbances to our dug well as it taps into stratified drift aquifer that the compressor station is on top of.

We are concerned with the continuous noise of compressor station, 24-7.

We are concerned with noise and pollution from blowdowns.

We are concerned with light damage to dark skies. We won't be able to see stars.

We are concerned with subsonic vibrations that can subconsciously affect health.

We are concerned about any chemicals or toxins released into the ground that will end up in our stratified drift aquifer.

We are concerned with traffic, noise, air pollution and numerous disturbances during construction.

We are concerned with the property value of our house being extremely close to a compressor station.

We are concerned with the potential closing of the Temple Elementary School because families don't want children to go an elementary school within half mile of the compressor station. Part of the property value and benefit of my residence is being close to an elementary school.

We are concerned with any natural gas infrastructure incidents that would require evacuation from the neighborhood and potential destruction/damage of property and lives.

We are concerned with the industrialization of the neighborhood. The only things that are comfortable living next to 41,000 HP compressor stations is other heavy industry.

We live in the shadow of the proposed compressor station. We will feel its effects.

20151214-5047

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of John Kelly under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/12/2015 3:28:01 PM Filed Date: 12/14/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	johnkkelly@hotmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I am an affected property owner.

Lot # 19B-00506-18388

20151214-5055

Ann Medici R.N.

35 Kenwood Rd.

Dracut, MA 01826

12/12/2015

Attention: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Reference: Docket#CP16-21-000

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

888 First Street, N.E.

Washington, DC 20426

Dear Administrative Staff:

I am writing to express my concerns over the proposed Compressor Station and Meter Stations associated with the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline project. Kinder Morgan 'marketed' this project to our town as 'just a pipeline'. Based on the information available I've learned the pipeline route has been modified several times due to densely populated areas. While reviewing the proposed route and layouts for the NED

project I noticed my home was an abutter for one of the rerouted plans. My neighbors and I were not informed of this plan. Another plan moved the pipeline away from my property so I would not be an abutter. The latest route placed the pipeline within 0.5 miles of my property. Again, my neighbors and I were not notified. The current NED project plan states the Compressor Station proposed location at 970 Broadway Rd. Dracut, MA. At a town selectman meeting on December 8, 2015 the Dracut selectman stated that over 700 residents have not been notified to date.

I have lived in Dracut for the past 30 years and my husband and I have raised our children in this town. My daughter recently built a home on Dadak Dr. in Dracut, MA which is now considered to be within the 'incineration zone' or 'ground zero' based on the currently proposed Compressor Station location. My grandson and daughter have asthma. I am gravely concerned for their health and well-being living within 0.4 miles from the Compressor Station. My grandson also attends the Dracut Campbell School, with a student population of 400, 2.0 miles from the Compressor Station. As a nurse I've researched the possible health effects living near this type of facility. The 'blow downs' that occur have been shown to have negative health effects on those who have respiratory issues, kidney disease or are immunosuppressed. My husband has kidney disease and received a kidney from me 15 years ago. This surgery caused him to become immunosuppressed and I have one kidney. The toxic chemicals released during 'blow down's can travel up to 1.5 miles from the Compressor location. My home is 1.0 mile from the proposed building site. Based on our health and home location, if this Compressor Station is built we will be forced to sell our home. Our daughter will be forced to sell her home as well and we will be forced to start a life in a new town. As a retired couple who is looking forward to spending our retirement in the town we love this is very disturbing news. This could also have devastating effects on our rural farming community. Several farms are prominent in our community and help feed our residents.

It is also important to note that Attorney General Maura Healey stated this is not needed to meet the peak demands in New England.

Please do not approve the NED Project. Approval of this project will force our small town to support a Compressor Station and two Meter Stations with a limited and minimal fire and police department. Dracut is currently in debt and doesn't have the infrastructure to support a project of this magnitude. Kinder Morgan has not clearly communicated to the residents of Dracut from the beginning of this project. We cannot allow a huge project to come into our town, make our residents sick, decrease our home values, place our residents at risk and poison our farmland. This project will simply destroy our town. Thank you for taking the time to read my concerns.

Respectfully,

Ann Medici R.N.

35 Kenwood Rd.

Dracut, MA 01826

Annmedici1949@comcast.net

20151214-5057

Kinder Morgan Continues to Torture the Truth and Abuse the Public

- Part II -

I first wrote about this topic earlier this year, outing Kinder Morgan after it held a series of public information meetings where an image of a small outbuilding at an existing 6,100 HP compressor station was displayed to "give you an idea" of what their compressor stations look like. This despite the fact that at that time they were planning to construct multiple huge 90,000 HP (since revised to 41,000 HP) compressor stations along the pipeline route. This is my earlier comment: <http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/open-nat.asp?fileID=13733932>

Recently there was an opportunity to fact check another slide from that same presentation. The image below is the second slide used in those Kinder Morgan public information meetings. Please note the last bullet item

– no political contributions.

{ graphic omitted, full letter can be downloaded at: }

{ <http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/opennat.asp?fileID=14070152> }

The complete set of slides is available here: <http://static1.squarespace.com/static/50e99f7be4b08880418b9d42/t/54983967e4b07be3105ab7eb/1419262311772/NED+Presentation-+NH.pdf>

And now for the fact-checking: This is the first portion of a recent story from NH Labor News:

Open Democracy Report Shows How Much Kinder Morgan Has Spent Lobbying To Build NED Pipeline

As NED Pipeline Fight Heats Up, Report Finds Kinder Morgan Spent Millions of Dollars on Lobbying and Political Donations Since 2014

MANCHESTER, NH – Texas-based energy giant Kinder Morgan has spent over \$2.5 million in lobbying and campaign donations since 2014, even as it is seeking approval for a controversial new natural gas pipeline from Pennsylvania to New Hampshire and Massachusetts, according to a new analysis of lobbying and campaign finance records by the nonpartisan organization Open Democracy.

The analysis finds that Kinder Morgan Inc. and Kinder Morgan Energy Partners LP began lobbying in New Hampshire and Massachusetts concurrent with the introduction of its Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline proposal in each state. The company spent \$53,500 to lobby New Hampshire state government officials in 2014 and an estimated \$70,780 in 2015, more than any single public interest, non-profit, or labor organization.

The complete story is available here: <http://nhlabornews.com/2015/12/50312/>

My conclusion? This is yet another example of Kinder Morgan’s willingness to torture the truth and abuse the public. And they do this quite openly. How can you tell if they are lying? Their projector is busy displaying images to the public while spokesman Allen Fore narrates!

Now please take a minute to review some of the other bullet points from the slide above – the ones about operating in a safe, ethical and transparent manner and about public safety. Perhaps Kinder Morgan is being every bit as truthful and forthcoming about these items as they are about their political contributions.

And this again begs the question that I posed in my earlier “Torturing the Truth” comment: If this is how Kinder Morgan behaves now, before they have gained FERC’s approval for their project (and 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 landowners, conservation trustees, town government officials and other residents will 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?

What will the future bring? Will FERC continue to stand silently by as Kinder Morgan brazenly lies to the public? Apparently so. What else can we expect from such a spineless “regulatory agency” and such a deceitful private company looking to make a buck regardless of the costs to the public and to the environment?

Nick Miller Groton, MA

20151214-5069

BEFORE THE FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Pipeline Project Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.
Docket No. CP16-21-000

MOTION TO INTERVENE

BY ROBERT J. SIMS, III AND ASHLEY E. SIMS

Pursuant to Rules 214 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 385.214, we, Robert J. Sims, III and Ashley E. Sims file this motion to intervene in this proceeding. We, Robert J. Sims, III and Ashley E. Sims, are residents of the Town of Dracut, Middlesex County, Massachusetts. We live in a community called Farm Gate Estates, where 66 working families reside. The proposed gas pipeline of the Tennessee Pipeline Company's NED project (the "Project") is currently planned to traverse Farm Gate owned property. A metering station is planned to be built on Farm Gate owned property. It is concerning that the planned pipeline in this area is projected to be placed ~400 feet from a quarry (Brox quarry) that undergoes active blasting throughout many months of the year. These blast literally shake the foundation of our homes and has been measured at 2.2 on the Richter scale. The aforementioned gas metering station would be ~0.38 miles from the Brox quarry.

Of most concern is the close proximity to the Joseph A. Campbell Elementary school, where 576 young children reside throughout the day. The Brox quarry is 0.8 miles from the Joseph A. Campbell Elementary school. Placing a gas pipeline next to active demolition within walking distance to an elementary school is a bad idea and doesn't reflect disciplined planning. We are against the Project.

In lieu of terminating the Project, we request that the current gas pipeline route next to the Brox quarry be abandoned.

Respectfully submitted this 14th day of December, 2015.

Robert J. Sims III, Ph.D.
86 Cart Path Road
Dracut, MA 01826
rjsims3@gmail.com

Ashley E. Sims
86 Cart Path Road
Dracut, MA 01826
simsae@gmail.com

20151214-5080

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.
Docket No. CPI6-21-000

**Motion to Intervene
(Corrected version)**

John Herron, JoAnn Herron, Christopher Totman, Susannah Herron, Emmalee Herron and John Herron, Jr. (collectively the "Hawks Farm Interveners") hereby move to intervene in the above-captioned proceeding. The Hawks Farm Interveners live on Hawks Road in Shelburne, Massachusetts and are directly impacted by the proposed pipeline.

Background

On November 20, 2015, Tennessee Gas Pipeline, L.L.C. ("TGP") filed its Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to construct, Install, Modify, Operate and Maintain Certain Pipeline and Compression Facilities and to Abandon Other Facilities. On Dec. 7, 2015 the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC") gave Notice to stakeholders of TGP's application.

The Hawks Farm is a farm that traces its beginnings to an ancestor of the Herrons, Zadock Hawks, for his service in the French and Indian War. The King of England granted the Farm to the Herrons' ancestor. Zadock's son, Hilkieah, began clearing the land and built the original homestead in 1783.

Octavia Hawks Totman is the eighth generation to live at the Farm. The farm has passed through the generations in an undeveloped, natural state, and has been actively farmed for more than two hundred years, providing the family with their livelihood. Three generations currently farm alongside one another, producing grass fed heritage beef, pastured heritage pork, free range eggs and chicken, hay, maple syrup, firewood and lumber, all sold locally. The Herrons just completed the implementation of a USDA NRCS Environmen-

tal Quality Improvement Program grant to improve the pastures by removing invasive species, protecting water quality, improving soil fertility, and increasing grass forage quality and yield. The forests are actively managed for wildlife and include a well-known 'deer yard' where deer come from miles around to spend the winter and have done so for well over a hundred years. A significant stand of sugar maple trees in the forest is managed as a sugar bush for producing maple syrup. One area of the farm is designated as a critical habitat area because of rare species that are found there. Hawks Road, which runs through the farm, was part of the original Mohawk Indian Trail. Hawks Cemetery dates to 1796. Historically, this area was known as 'Wisdom' and 'The Old World' and has been written about in numerous historic and current publications. It has been described as God's Country. Places like these are extremely rare and deserve to be preserved for their intrinsic value, history, beauty and productivity. This land grows food. It sustains a healthy ecosystem. It brings peace to those who live here and who pass through. The deep family roots, hard work and legacy deserve to be protected. The waterfalls, pastures, fields, forests, brooks, freshwater springs, historic homes and barns deserve to be protected.

The proposed pipeline crosses the Farm and negatively impacts all that the Farm stands for. According to the maps provided by TGP, not only will the pipeline, if approved, cross the Farm land, temporary construction sites will impact the pasture land and the Farm will be subject to condemnation proceedings. The Hawks Farm Interveners actively oppose the TGP application and question whether there is a demonstrable need for the pipeline. The Hawks Farm Interveners are deeply concerned about the negative environmental impacts that will result should FERC grant TGP's application. The Hawks Farm Interveners join their neighbors and fellow citizens who have voiced their opposition to this project from its inception. The proposed pipeline is a poor use of resources that is inconsistent with a sustainable future for our children and grandchildren.

Contact Information

All pleadings, filings and correspondence in this proceeding should be directed to undersigned counsel.

Conclusion

Wherefore, for the reasons discussed above, the Hawks Farm Interveners request that the FERC grant the instant motion.

Respectfully submitted by,

John Herron, JoAnn Herron, Christopher Totman, Susannah Herron, Emmalee Herron and John Herron, Jr.
By Their Attorney,

Dated: December 14, 2015

Mark H. Bluver, Esq. BBO# 560330

The Law Office of Mark H. Bluver, L.L.c. The Arts Block, 2nd Floor

P.O. Box 145

Greenfield, MA 01301

Phone: (413) 376-7506

Fax: (413) 223-1991

mbluver@mbluverlaw.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that this document filed electronically through the FERC online system will be sent electronically to the registered participants as identified on this 14th day of December, 2015.

Mark H. Bluver, Esq.

20151214-5128

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.

Docket No. CP16-21-000

AMENDED MOTION TO INTERVENE OF TOWN OF DRACUT

The Town of Dracut (“Dracut”), by and through its Board of Selectmen, hereby moves for leave to intervene in the above-captioned proceeding.

I. Background

On or about November 21, 2015, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. (hereinafter “Applicant”) filed its Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to Construct, Install, Modify, Operate and Maintain Certain Pipeline and Compression Facilities and to Abandon Other Facilities. On or about December 3, 2015, The Town of Dracut filed a “Motion to Intervene.” However, on or about December 7, 2015, Applicant filed its Notice of Application. Of note, in its Notice of Application, Applicant made note that its “Market Path Component” is “comprised of facilities from Wright, New York to Dracut Massachusetts.

II. Motion to Intervene

The Town of Dracut is a municipal corporation, duly organized under the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, with offices located at 62 Arlington Street, Dracut, Massachusetts 01826. The Board of Selectmen is an elected five person board which is the governing body of the Town of Dracut.

As noted by Applicant, the Town of Dracut is a destination hub for the project in Massachusetts and is “substantially and specifically affected” by this proceeding. Dracut has concerns about the route and size and safety of the project, amongst other concerns. Dracut has a direct and immediate interest in this outcome of this proceeding which cannot be adequately protected by any other party. Dracut is also concerned about the possibility of further eminent domain takings and the environmental impacts related to construction and to the operation of a compression station. Specifically, Dracut also has concerns about the noise and pollution created by the project and compression station. Furthermore, Dracut is not presently equipped with a high energy infrastructure to handle what is proposed and there are likely safer areas or municipalities or states, other than Dracut, for the hub to be more appropriately located. Dracut seeks to participate as a full intervenor in this matter and, where appropriate, to file comments, attend conferences, file discovery, and submit briefs.

III. Correspondence

Correspondence and service related to this matter should be directed to the undersigned counsel on behalf of the Town of Dracut.

IV. Conclusion

Wherefore, for the reasons discussed above, Dracut respectfully requests that the Commission grant Dracut’s Motion to Intervene as a party in the above-captioned proceeding with all the rights attendant thereto. Respectfully submitted this 14th day of December, 2015.

Respectfully submitted,
FOR DRACUT,
James P. Hall, Esq. (635343)
Qua, Hall, Harvey & Walsh
25 Fletcher Street
Chelmsford, MA 01824
(978) 250-4255

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this day served the foregoing document upon each person designated on the official service list compiled by the Secretary in this proceeding.

Dated at Chelmsford, Massachusetts, this 14th day of December, 2015.

James P. Hall, Esq.
Qua, Hall, Harvey & Walsh

25 Fletcher Street
Chelmsford, MA 01824
(978) 869-1072

20151214-5195

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Atmos Energy Marketing LLC under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/14/2015 2:54:10 PM Filed Date: 12/14/2015 2:54:10 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Atmos Energy Marketing LLC perryman@atmosenergy.com	mvaferc@mvalaw.com	jeffrey.

Basis for Intervening:

Atmos Energy Marketing LLC (“AEM”) is currently a customer of Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. AEM will be directly affected by the outcome of this proceeding. Other parties to this proceeding cannot adequately represent this interest, and the participation in this proceeding by AEM will not prejudice the rights of any party. AEM is an interested party within the meaning of Section 15(a) of the Natural Gas Act, 15 U.S.C. Section 717(n)(a), and its intervention in this proceeding will be in the public interest.

20151214-5200

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Atmos Energy Corporation under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/14/2015 2:52:55 PM Filed Date: 12/14/2015 2:52:55 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Atmos Energy Corporation	mvaferc@mvalaw.com	Kevin.Frank@atmosenergy.com

Basis for Intervening:

Atmos Energy Corporation (“AEC”) is currently a customer of Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. AEC will be directly affected by the outcome of this proceeding. Other parties to this proceeding cannot adequately represent this interest, and the participation in this proceeding by AEC will not prejudice the rights of any party. AEC is an interested party within the meaning of Section 15(a) of the Natural Gas Act, 15 U.S.C. Section 717(n)(a), and its intervention in this proceeding will be in the public interest.

20151214-5205

Arnold Piacentini

•••

PO Box 454 • Richmond, MA 01254
Tel 413-698-2057 • Email symptrad@nycap.rr.com

December 14, 2015

Ms. Kimberly Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC)
888 First Street NE, Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426

via: Electronic Submission

Re: Kinder Morgan Financial Weakness;

Re FERC Docket Numbers, as follows:
CP14-529 ... KMI/TGP Connecticut Expansion Proposal
CP16-21 ... KMI/TGP Northeast Energy Direct Proposal

Dear Ms. Bose;

There are many considerations for FERC to take into account before issuing a "Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity". I have written about these in my prior filings with FERC.

In this filing I wish to expand on my prior comments with respect to the financial condition of Kinder Morgan (KMI). Last week Moody's issued a warning that KMI's outlook could be downgraded to negative. Following this, on December 8th KMI's board reduce their dividend by 75%. Moody's followed up with a statement that their outlook would remain as stable. S&P followed up with a statement that due to this action, KMI's debt rating would not be altered. Fitch affirmed their current rating.

I believe that the rating agencies are behind the ball on these calls. Barron's over this weekend opined that KMI's stock was still overvalued by about 20%, though it had fallen by -62.7% from the 52-week high of 44.71 on April 24, 2015 to the close last Friday of 16.31.

More to the point, Barron's pointed to the risks of KMI's net debt of \$42.5 billion which stands at a ratio of nearly 6 times annual EBITDA (earnings before interest, taxes, depreciation and amortization). KMI's current liabilities are about 1.3 times their current assets.

When the rating agencies properly analyze the market prospects for KMI and other pipeline companies they will downgrade KMI's rating. KMI would eventually and likely be forced to sell assets. Such sales would be at fire-sale prices, as pipeline-company assets are quickly depreciating in view of the outlook for reduced domestic and foreign demand. KMI would not find a welcome bond market. The junk bond market is currently illiquid and in turmoil with a crowd of investors trying to liquidate in an environment with no buyers. The rating agencies were slow in coming to the realization of what was happening during the sub-prime real estate debacle. I believe that they are behaving similarly in the breach of the pipeline asset bubble that is now upon us.

In conclusion, I believe that KMI does not have the financial strength to properly care for their existing ongoing businesses and to simultaneously execute new projects. Such a situation could translate into reductions of maintenance on existing infrastructure, and incomplete construction of new projects.

I, therefore, have two requests:

- (1) That FERC not issue a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity for the Connecticut Expansion Project, CP14-529.
- (2) That FERC not develop an EIS for the Northeast Energy Direct Project, CP16-21.

That it has become clearly documented that these new projects are not needed is further basis for my requests (1).

Thank you in advance for making sensible decisions and directing KMI to cease further development activities for these two projects.

Signed: Arnold Piacentini, Pro Se
Arnold Piacentini, BS, MS and PhD in ChE

Note (1): The regional study commissioned by the Office of the Massachusetts Attorney General was issued on November 18, 2015 and has concluded that additional gas pipeline capacity would not serve New England's future energy needs. See the following

Regional Electric Reliability Options Study: <http://www.mass.gov/ago/doing-business-in-massachusetts/energy-and-utilities/regional-electric-reliability-options-study.html>

Study Infographic: <http://www.mass.gov/ago/docs/energy-utilities/reros-infographic.pdf>

Joanna B. Tourangeau
Admitted in ME, NH and MA

207.253.0567 Direct
jtourangeau@dwmlaw.com

DrummondWoodsum

ATTORNEYS AT LAW 1965-2015
YEARS OF SERVICE TO OUR CLIENTS AND COMMUNITIES

84 Marginal Way, Suite 600
Portland, ME 04101-2480
207.772.1941 Main
207.772.3627 Fax

December 14, 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.; Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
("Commission") Docket No. CP16-21-00

Dear Secretary Bose:

I have enclosed for filing in regards to the above-referenced proceedings an original and eight copies of Merrimack School District's Motion to Intervene with regard to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's proposed new pipeline.

Thank you for your assistance and please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions.

JBT/as

Enclosures

BEFORE THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC)

Docket No. CP16-21-00

**MERRIMACK SCHOOL DISTRICT
MOTION TO INTERVENE**

The Merrimack School District ("School District") owns and operates the Thorntons Ferry Elementary School ("Elementary School") in Merrimack, New Hampshire. Property owned by the School District is located within the anticipated right of way of the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC ("TNG") proposed new pipeline and is thus subject to condemnation if a certificate is granted pursuant to these proceedings. Further, the Elementary School grounds and buildings which serve to educate young children, including a preschool for 3-4 year olds starting in 2016 as well as the medically fragile are located within 1000-1500 feet of the proposed TNG pipeline.

Pursuant to Rule 214 (18 C.F.R. § 385.214(b)) and 157.10 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's ("Commission") Rules of Practice, the School District, files this Motion to Intervene in the above-captioned proceeding.

I. CONTACT INFORMATION

The School District respectfully requests that the Commission add the following contact information to the official service list for Docket No. CP16-21-00. All pleadings, filings and correspondence in the above captioned proceedings should be served on:

Marjorie Chiafery

Matthew Shevenell

Superintendent of Schools
Merrimack School District
36 McElwain Street
Merrimack, NH 03054
Ph: (603) 424-6200
marge.chialery@merrimack.k2.nh.us

Business Administrator
Merrimack School District
36 McElwain Street
Merrimack, NH 03054
Ph: (603) 424-6200
matthew.shevenell@merrimack.k12.nh.us

II. THE SCHOOL DISTRICT'S MOTION TO INTERVENE

The School District moves to intervene at this time for the purpose of becoming a party pursuant to Rule 214(b)(2)(ii) to Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC's ("TGP") application to the Commission for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity for the Northeast Energy Direct Project ("Certificate"), a natural gas pipeline ("NED Project"). 18 C.F.R. § 385.214(b)(2)(ii). The School District's Motion to Intervene meets each of the intervention criteria of Rule 214(b), 18 C.F.R. § 385.214(b). On November 20, 2015 TGP filed with the Commission its Application for the Certificate for the NED Project.

The NED Project directly and uniquely impacts the School District. A portion of the NED Project known as the New Hampshire Powerline Alternative travels directly across land owned by the School District and part of the Elementary School. This land could be developed as either a fire department to serve the Town of Merrimack and/or as athletic fields to serve the School District's students. The warrant article approving transfer of a portion of this land to the Town of Merrimack for use as a fire station is attached hereto. The proposed route runs within approximately 1200-1500 feet of the Elementary School building and associated playgrounds. A nature trail on School District property and used by the Elementary School children is within approximately 1000 feet of the proposed pipeline route.

The Elementary School itself is a sensitive receptor with a current population of five hundred and seven students in grades K-4. Within this population there is also a group of medically fragile students who are especially sensitive to the impacts associated with the NED Project. In addition, the Merrimack School Board is considering the addition of pre-school to the Thorntons Ferry Elementary School and will review the budget for the addition of a 2016-17 class of 3-4 year olds on January 16, 2016.

The School District opposes the NED Project due to its significant impacts on the Elementary School. Grant of the School District's motion will allow the School District to obtain better information about the many and varied routes proposed by TGP to address the significant impacts to the Elementary School discussed above.

III. Conclusion

The School District respectfully requests that the Commission grant its Motion to Intervene as compliant with Commission Rule 214.

Dated: December 14, 2015

Drummond Woodsum & MacMahon
84 Marginal Way, Ste 600
Portland, Maine 04101-2480
Tel: (207) 772-1941
Fax: (207) 772-3627
Joanna B. Tourangeau, Esq.,
Counsel for the Merrimack School District

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have caused the foregoing document to be served by regular mail upon each person designated on the official service list compiled by the Secretary in this proceeding this day of December, 2015.

Joanna B. Tourangeau, Esq.

20151214-5236

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Karen DiBlasi under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/14/2015 3:49:33 PM Filed Date: 12/14/2015 3:49:33 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	karen.diblas@urs.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I am a homeowner along the path of the Kinder Morgan Northeast Entergy Direct pipeline being proposed to run thru Windham. I am concerned of the property being devalued, construction disruptions and other issues that could be caused from the pipeline being installed so close to my home. This property encompasses 5 Workforce Housing Units and this could cause hardship on all residents in our development.

20151214-5256

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC
North East Direct Project

Docket No. CP16-21-000

**MOTION TO INTERVENE
OF THE ANDOVER VILLAGE IMPROVEMENT SOCIETY**

Pursuant to Rules 212 and 214 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (“Commission”) promulgated at 18 C.F.R. § 385.212 and 385.214 (2007), The Andover Village Improvement Society, files this motion to intervene in this proceeding.

On November 20,2015, the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (“TGP”) filed its application under Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act, for the proposed Project, FERC Docket No. CP 16-21-000.

I. COMMUNICATIONS AND SERVICE

As approved by the Board of Trustees of The Andover Village Improvement Society by a vote at their meeting on November 10, 2015, all communications, pleadings, and orders with respect to this proceeding should be sent to the following individual:

John P. Hess, Vice President
The Andover Village Improvement Society
P. O. Box 5097
Andover, MA 01810
978 470-0806
avisandover20 16@gmail.com
FERC ID #F312891

II. INTEREST OF PETITIONER

Construction, operation and maintenance of the Pipeline would adversely impact The Andover Village Improvement Society (AVIS). AVIS owns or manages approximately 1,100 acres of open space in the Town of Andover, MA in approximately 30 reservations. AVIS is a non-profit land trust dedicated to a) acquiring land and preserving it in its natural state, and b) encouraging public use and quiet enjoyment of the reservations. Founded in 1894, AVIS is one of the oldest conservation organizations in the country.

The proposed pipeline will directly impact land managed by A VIS, the Nat Smith Reservation, with temporary and permanent easements. If the project route or its infrastructure shifts as the project plans develop, additional properties owned by AVIS may be impacted. As an impacted landowner, The Andover Village Improvement Society has a direct interest in the outcome of the proceedings. A VIS has important information and perspectives to bring to this process, consideration of which will serve the public interest.

III. CONCLUSION

Wherefore, I, John P. Hess, on behalf of The Andover Village Improvement Society, respectfully request that the Commission grant my Motion to Intervene as a party with full rights to participate in all further proceedings.

Respectfully submitted this 14th day of December, 2015.

John P. Hess, Vice President
The Andover Village Improvement Society

20151215-5016

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC)

Docket No. CP16-21-000

MOTION TO INTERVENE OF THE TRUSTEES OF RESERVATIONS

Pursuant to Rules 212 and 214 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (“Commission”) Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. §§ 385.212 and 385.214, The Trustees of Reservations (“TTOR”) hereby moves to intervene in the above-captioned proceeding.

1. In support of this motion, TTOR states, as follows: The exact legal name of movant is as set forth in the above, unnumbered paragraph. TTOR works to preserve, for public use and enjoyment, properties of exceptional scenic, historic, and ecological value in Massachusetts. Advocacy and public policy are critical to this work. Collectively, with its members, legislators, other elected and appointed officials, and fellow conservation and preservation organizations, TTOR strives to implement smart and effective public policies that help protect the special places of Massachusetts. TTOR is responsible for nearly 25,000 throughout Massachusetts.
2. The name and mailing address of the person upon whom all communications concerning the proceeding should be served is, as follows:

Vincent DeVito, Partner
Bowditch & Dewey, LLP
300 New Jersey Avenue, NW, Suite 900
Washington, DC 20001
Telephone: 617-757-6518
Fax: 508-929-3019
vdevito@bowditch.com

3. On or about November 20, 2015, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (“TGP”), filed an application pursuant to sections 7(b) and 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act (NGA), and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) regulations thereunder, seeking authority to (i) construct, install, modify, and operate certain pipeline and compression facilities to be located in Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Connecticut, and (ii) to abandon certain facilities, all as part of a proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project (“NED”). The proposed NED is comprised of two components:
 - a. Supply Path Component: Comprised of the proposed facilities from Troy, Pennsylvania to Wright, New York, including approximately 174 miles of pipeline facilities in Pennsylvania and New

York, the proposed construction of three new compressor stations and modifications to one existing compressor station, further construction of two new meter stations, and purported appurtenant facilities.

b. Market Path Component: Comprised of proposed facilities from Wright, New York to Dracut, Massachusetts. These proposed facilities include approximately 188 miles of mainline pipeline facilities in New York, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire, laterals located in Massachusetts and New Hampshire, and Connecticut), proposed construction of six new compressor stations, 13 new meter stations and modification of 14 existing meter stations, and purported appurtenant facilities.

4. During this proceeding, TTOR may seek to verify that TGP can locate the proposed NED within or adjacent to existing rights-of-way; and, further, TTOR may investigate whether appropriate pre-filing and application protocols were followed.
5. TTOR herewith reserves its right to submit comments and other information during this proceeding.
6. TTOR has interests that will be directly affected by the outcome of this proceeding.
7. TTOR's interests cannot be adequately represented or protected by any other party.
8. If TTOR is not permitted to intervene in this proceeding, it is highly likely to be adversely affected and bound by action taken in this proceeding without having had an opportunity to be heard.

WHEREFORE, TTOR respectfully requests that it be permitted to intervene in this proceeding and that it be granted all the rights of a party thereto, including the right to notice of, and to participate in, all hearings and other proceedings.

Respectfully submitted,
On behalf of TTOR:
Vincent DeVito, Partner
Bowditch & Dewey, LLP
300 New Jersey Avenue, NW, Suite 900
Washington, DC 20001
Telephone: 617-757-6518
Fax: 508-929-3019
vdevito@bowditch.com
December 14, 2015

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this day served the foregoing document on all parties listed on the official service list compiled by the Secretary in this proceeding and attached hereto. Dated at Boston, Massachusetts this 14th day of December, 2015.

Vincent DeVito, Partner
Bowditch & Dewey, LLP
300 New Jersey Avenue, NW, Suite 900
Washington, DC 20001
Telephone: 617-757-6518
Fax: 508-929-3019
vdevito@bowditch.com

20151215-5020

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC)

Docket No. CP16-21-000

MOTION TO INTERVENE OF NORTHEAST ENERGY SOLUTIONS, INC.

Pursuant to Rules 212 and 214 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (“Commission”) Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. §§ 385.212 and 385.214, Northeast Energy Solutions, Inc. (“NEES”) hereby moves to intervene in the above-captioned proceeding.

1. In support of this motion, NEES states, as follows: The exact legal name of movant is as set forth in the above, unnumbered paragraph. NEES is a multi-jurisdictional nonprofit corporation comprised of energy, land, environmental, end-user, and related economic interests. Uniquely, NEES, through its founding members, represents over 101,850 individuals in Massachusetts and New York who collectively own or hold conservation restrictions on over 46,211 acres of land in the Massachusetts. NEES also includes municipalities and a state legislator among its members. NEES is an educational resource and advocacy group (before state and federal government officials) that works to ensure that economically viable and environmentally responsible energy projects account for its member’s collective and respective interests. NEES was founded to represent its members in providing energy infrastructure analysis and advocacy regarding the economics of energy projects and transactions in the Northeastern United States.
2. The name and mailing address of the person upon whom all communications concerning the proceeding should be served is, as follows:

Vincent De Vito, Partner
Bowditch & Dewey, LLP
300 New Jersey Avenue, NW, Suite 900
Washington, DC 20001
Telephone: 617-757-6518
Fax: 508-929-3019
vdevito@bowditch.com

3. On or about November 20, 2015, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (“TGP”), filed an application pursuant to sections 7(b) and 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act (NGA), and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) regulations thereunder, seeking authority to (i) construct, install, modify, and operate certain pipeline and compression facilities to be located in Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Connecticut, and (ii) to abandon certain facilities, all as part of a proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project (“NED”). The proposed NED is comprised of two components:
 - a. Supply Path Component: Comprised of the proposed facilities from Troy, Pennsylvania to Wright, New York, including approximately 174 miles of pipeline facilities in Pennsylvania and New York, the proposed construction of three new compressor stations and modifications to one existing compressor station, further construction of two new meter stations, and purported appurtenant facilities.
 - b. Market Path Component: Comprised of proposed facilities from Wright, New York to Dracut, Massachusetts. These proposed facilities include approximately 188 miles of mainline pipeline facilities in New York, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire, laterals located in Massachusetts and New Hampshire, and Connecticut), proposed construction of six new compressor stations, 13 new meter stations and modification of 14 existing meter stations, and purported appurtenant facilities.
4. During this proceeding, NEES may seek to verify that TGP can locate the proposed NED within or adjacent to existing rights-of-way; and, further, NEES may investigate whether appropriate pre-filing and application protocols were followed.
5. NEES herewith reserves its right to submit comments and other information during this proceeding.
6. NEES has direct interests that will be affected by the outcome of this proceeding.

7. NEES' interests cannot be adequately represented or protected by any other party.

8. If NEES is not permitted to intervene in this proceeding, it is highly likely to be adversely affected and bound by action taken in this proceeding without having had an opportunity to be heard.

WHEREFORE, NEES respectfully requests that it be permitted to intervene in this proceeding and that it be granted all the rights of a party thereto, including the right to notice of, and to participate in, all hearings and other proceedings.

Respectfully submitted,
On behalf of NEES:
Vincent DeVito, Partner
Bowditch & Dewey, LLP
300 New Jersey Avenue, NW, Suite 900
Washington, DC 20001
Telephone: 617-757-6518
Fax: 508-929-3019
vdevito@bowditch.com
December 14, 2015

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this day served the foregoing document on all parties listed on the official service list compiled by the Secretary in this proceeding and attached hereto.

Dated at Boston, Massachusetts this 14th day of December, 2015.

Vincent DeVito, Partner
Bowditch & Dewey, LLP
300 New Jersey Avenue, NW, Suite 900
Washington, DC 20001
Telephone: 617-757-6518
Fax: 508-929-3019
vdevito@bowditch.com

20151215-5022

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of The Robert Batcheller and Suzanne Batcheller Revocable Trust under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/14/2015 7:52:30 PM Filed Date: 12/15/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____

The Robert Batcheller and Suzanne Batcheller Revocable Trust bobatood@comcast.net
katbatcheller@gmail.com

Basis for Intervening:

Robert Batcheller, a Trustee of The Robert Batcheller and Suzanne Batcheller Revocable Trust, is a resident of the Town of Pelham, Hillsborough County, New Hampshire. (Map/Parcel No.: 15-8-215; 217 Windham Road, Pelham, NH.) The proposed right-of-way of the Tennessee Pipeline Company's NED project abuts the Trust's property. As a result, the property will be negatively impacted if a certificate is granted.

Pursuant to Commission Rules 385.214 and 157.10, The Robert and Suzanne Batcheller Revocable Trust moves to intervene in the above captioned proceeding. This intervention is timely filed.

Mr. Batcheller is directly impacted by the proposed pipeline. His Trust's land abuts the right-of-way for the

NED pipeline, thus exposing the property to condemnation if the certificate is granted. The pipeline would cause irreparable damage to the property. Further, his residence will be directly adjacent to the right-of-way, well within the “incineration zone” in the event of an explosion. Further, the residence 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. Other concerns include:

Being within the incineration zone may make it impossible for a potential buyer to obtain homeowner’s insurance. Without insurance, buyers will not be able to obtain a mortgage, rendering the property unsealable—essentially eroding 100% of its value.

Blasting and digging may crack the property’s foundation and plaster, or cause other structural or surface damage.

The pipeline requires a large swath of land to be cleared and kept permanently clear of vegetation. This visual blight will permanently scar the landscape directly adjacent to the property, and negatively impact the property’s value.

Toxic chemicals will be used to prevent vegetation from growing in this cleared path. These chemicals will leach into soil and ground water, potentially rendering the property’s well to be contaminated and unusable.

Mr. Batcheller has spent the past 50+ years developing and nurturing his property by spending countless hours landscaping and cultivating the land. He has planted a vast array of perennials, annuals, shrubs, bushes and trees. Many of these were planted in memoriam of departed loved ones, including his late wife Suzanne. If the pipeline route gets moved onto the property, or if soil, air or water contaminants result in the building or operation of the pipeline, years of work and financial investment will be destroyed.

The Robert Batcheller and Suzanne Batcheller Revocable Trust is OPPOSED to the proposed project. The Trust has no further comments at this time. However, by intervening in this proceeding, The Robert Batcheller and Suzanne Batcheller Revocable Trust will have access to Tennessee Pipeline Company’s filings, which will enable it to provide more detailed comments as the application proceeds.

20151215-5023

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Jennifer J Makris under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/14/2015 8:07:14 PM Filed Date: 12/15/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	jennifer22477@yahoo.com	

Basis for Intervening:

Filing for intervenor status as I am a homeowner that will be directly affected by the construction of this pipeline. I am concerned that my property will be devalued, about construction disruptions (more specifically damage to my home caused by all the blasting that will need to be done to dig the pipeline). I am also concerned about the safety of my family living in the “incineration zone.”

20151215-5026

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Mark R Selby under CP16-21-000.

RE:

Motion to intervene.

I am e-filing a motion to intervene index docket Cp16-21-000 , NED DIRECT PIPELINE for the following reasons. (Formerly PF14-22-000)

As an abutter I will be directly affected by the proposed pipeline.

I rely on well water which has been pristine, and will be contaminated. A pigging station is close by. MY home assessment will be affected, and therefore if I chose to sell, IF STILL POSSIBLE, I will receive much less.

My health will be affected since there is a scheduled blow off valve within 1-2 miles of my home.

Lastly it is impossible to adequately peer review a 22,000 page document by respected peer review professional in a timely manner. Failure to do so is an intrinsic flaw, and therefore the project should not be allowed to proceed.

Respectfully

Mark R. Selby

Submission Date: 12/15/2015 7:43:13 AM Filed Date: 12/15/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	hdwx@crocker.com	

Basis for Intervening:

RE:

Motion to intervene.

I am e-filing a motion to intervene index docket Cp16-21-000 , NED DIRECT PIPELINE for the following reasons. (Formerly PF14-22-000)

As an abutter I will be directly affected by the proposed pipeline.

I rely on well water which has been pristine, and will be contaminated. A pigging station is close by.

My home assessment will be affected, and therefore if I chose to sell, IF STILL POSSIBLE, I will receive much less.

My health will be affected since there is a scheduled blow off valve within 1-2 miles of my home.

Lastly it is impossible to adequately peer review a 22,000 page document by respected peer review professionals in a timely manner. Failure to do so is an intrinsic flaw, and therefore the project should not be allowed to proceed.

Respectfully

Mark R. Selby

20151215-5027

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Loraine J Warner under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/14/2015 10:07:14 PM Filed Date: 12/15/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	warnerloraine@hotmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I hereby request intervener status for the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline project, FERC docket #CP16-21-000. I have been notified by Kinder Morgan that my property, Lot-10-10-19, a.k.a. 112 Frontier Drive, Pelham, NH 03076, is abutting the project. Pipeline construction adjacent to my property would significantly devalue my property. In addition, my property would reside within the incineration

zone and thereby create the real risk of injury or death in the event of pipeline breach or failure. My property is also in close proximity to the proposed compressor station in Dracut posing additional health risks to me and my family due to emissions.

Thank you in advance for granting me intervener status.

Loraine J. Warner
112 Frontier Dr
Pelham, NH 03076
lot-10-10-19

20151215-5029

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Marie E. Ulwick under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/14/2015 6:21:08 PM Filed Date: 12/15/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	ulwickme@comcast.net	

Basis for Intervening:

This pipeline could seriously devalue my property which is within 1000 feet, degrade the quality of my well water, interfere with the peace and serenity of my home and town for the next several years of construction, and in the future, if not maintained properly, could wreak havoc in my area and in the whole region.

For all of this, we cannot even get natural gas in our town - too expensive they say - but we must put up with the negative effects so that Kinder Morgan can get this gas to the ocean to sell to the highest bidder - and then we will pay more for our electricity, if our supplier (currently Liberty Utilities) buys this gas. Also, there appears to be no shortage of natural gas at the current time so why would Kinder Morgan want to go ahead with this large pipeline if not to sell to the world market.

Also, this same right of way is getting an additional electrical line installed with all that goes with it in the construction process. It's just too much to ask of small NH towns.

Most of us have chosen NH for it's more rural atmosphere with open land and pastoral views but the large utility companies want to change that for us with no gain to us at all.

I am hoping for the best but afraid of the worst and hope that FERC can see what we are all afraid of.

Sincerely,

Marie Ulwick, 89 Simpson Road, Pelham, NH 03076 Property Map/Parcel #7-9-136-39
email: ulwickme@comcast.net

20151215-5034

Arnold Piacentini

•••

PO Box 454 • Richmond, MA 01254
Tel 413-698-2057 • Email symptrad@nycap.rr.com

November 25, 2015; December 15, 2015 Revision

Ms. Kimberly Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC)
888 First Street NE, Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426

via: Electronic Submission

Re: Conclusions of my work evaluating fracked gas public policy, applicable to the following FERC docket

numbers, as well as others:

FERC Docket Numbers, as follows:

- CP14-529 ... KMI/TGP CT Expansion Proposal
- CP16-21 ... KMI/TGP NED Proposal
- CP13-499 ... Williams/Cabot Constitution Proposal
- CP14-96 ... Spectra AIM Proposal
- PF15-12 ... Spectra/Northeast Pipeline Atlantic Bridge Proposal
- PF16-1 ... Spectra/Eversource Access Northeast Proposal

Dear Ms. Bose;

Please refer to my October 15, 2015 filing with FERC: http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/file_list.asp?accession_num=20151015-5172. I hereby attach it to make it a part of the record for all of these docket numbers.

My conclusions from the work that I have done so far are as follows:

- The gas model excludes significant costs and personal burdens transferred to society. These are detailed in the above-referenced filing with FERC.
- Burning fracked gas is worse than burning coal or oil from a climate change viewpoint as methane and nitrous oxide releases are vast and not fully accounted for.

Toxicologically, one set of contaminants is replaced by another, and worse with fracked gas we are distributing such contaminants into our water, air, soil and at the burned tip.

- Fracking has failed both financially and technically.
- The worldwide divestment and keep-it-in-the-ground movements are making significant progress. This trend will continue.
- Shale and pipeline, as well as other fossil fuel companies, are becoming financially distressed.
- It is logical to expect that production of oil and gas from fracking will decline at a greater rate than currently forecasted by the EIA.
- The export of liquefied fracked gas does not make sense. The US is a net importer of LNG. Exported liquefied fracked gas is the marginal cost source on the world market. Currently, there is no incentive to export. Should exports occur in the future, this would increase domestic gas prices.
- The intersection of action to address climate change and the profit motive has been reached. Unsubsidized onshore wind and utility-scale PV now cost less than the cost of subsidized fossil fuels. Some of the fossil fuel subsidies would need to be used to get offshore wind off the ground. The potential here is vast.
- Pipeline companies use deceptive and unscrupulous practices.
- FERC does not follow legal requirements and is negligent in their procedures. In its current state FERC is one big conflict of interest.
- FERC by ignoring the big picture is putting our nation's energy security at risk. To put energy security at risk is to put economic security at risk.
- More gas pipeline capacity would not serve New England's needs for reliability enhancement or cost reduction (1).
- Economic activity and job growth can be stimulated significantly more by investing in energy efficiency and renewable energy sources than by a misallocation of capital to gas pipelines.

This would have the added benefits of reducing and stabilizing energy costs and increasing reliability.

- The people want to replace this fracked gas policy with one that expedites investments in energy efficiency and renewable energy sources.

In view of the change in our knowledge of the technical, economic and financial factors, I request that FERC cease issuing "Certificates of Public Convenience and Necessity" and tolling orders for all of the

above-referenced Docket Numbers, as well as others. And, I request that FERC rescind such orders whenever issued.

Thank you for studying the current fundamentals for this policy and for giving serious consideration to my requests.

Signed: Arnold Piacentini, Pro Se

Arnold Piacentini, BS, MS and PhD in ChE

Note (1): The regional study commissioned by the Office of the Massachusetts Attorney General was issued on November 18, 2015 and has concluded that additional gas pipeline capacity would not serve New England's future energy needs. See the following:

Regional Electric Reliability Options Study: <http://www.mass.gov/ago/doing-business-in-massachusetts/energy-and-utilities/regional-electric-reliability-options-study.html>

Study Infographic: <http://www.mass.gov/ago/docs/energy-utilities/reros-infographic.pdf>

Attachment: Comments of Arnold Piacentini on KMI/TGP NED under PF14-22 during Public Scoping Period, including commentary on Background, the Big Energy Picture and Alternatives to Gas and a Request that FERC cease consideration of this proposal.

Arnold Piacentini

•••

PO Box 454 • Richmond, MA 01254

Tel 413-698-2057 • Email symptrad@nycap.rr.com

October 15, 2015

Ms. Kimberly Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC)
888 First Street NE, Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426

via: Electronic Submission

Re: Public Comment Period: Kinder Morgan (KMI)/Tennessee Gas Pipeline (TGP) Northeast Energy Direct (NED) proposal;

FERC Docket Number: PF-22.

Dear Ms. Bose;

My name is Arnold Piacentini from Richmond, MA. I hold three degrees in Chemical Engineering and worked for the petrochemicals industry in several responsible forward-looking technical and commercial positions. I have 6 grandchildren, the 3 oldest of whom are granddaughters of child bearing age. My work is on a pro bono basis and aimed at helping younger and future generations.

In addition, I live in Richmond, MA where 3 TGP pipelines enter MA from New York. There is a gas hub in Richmond where passer-byes occasionally get a whiff of gas.

INTRODUCTION

Please accept and take seriously the following comments and do not be offended by their occasional bluntness. This is a serious problem. Also, please see that this document is widely circulated within FERC.

Before discussing the case against the above-referenced proposal, and indeed all other such infrastructure proposals, I would like to take a step back and to consider some background. FERC has hired hundreds of young people who may not have knowledge of the derivation of law and disastrous public policy that resulted from it. These have in turn created the unprecedented contentious situation between the citizens of our country and the most powerful Federal agency in the U.S. government. Commissioner Cheryl LaFleur acknowledged this 'situation' in her January comments to the Washington press.

A dichotomy has been created between the various States, and regional entities who feel an obligation to

serve ‘their regulator’ FERC and their constituency, the people. A similar dichotomy exists with the people’s representatives, Congress, which has passed some very poorly conceived laws. This dichotomy extends to the White House which has embraced a policy that derives from these poor laws. Citizens from all walks of life, economic strata and geographical areas are in opposition to this public policy and the laws behind it.

Many brave citizens have just completed on September 25th at their personal peril and extreme discomfort a hunger strike of from several to as many as 18 days outside of your offices. They are trying to gain the attention of FERC, the Secretary of Energy, the White House and Congress and many other government entities. Other citizens are chaining themselves to heavy machinery or devising “tree-sits” at great peril to themselves and/or undertaking other nonviolent direct action and in the process are being subjected to arrests and legal proceedings.

In my opinion the objective of these citizens and of the multitudes that write to FERC daily is to demand that FERC cease the issuance of all new permits and revamp its procedures to be in alignment with the real needs of society. I will provide my personal opinions of such driving forces and needs, much of this in the context of the big picture that FERC appears to be ignoring.

HINDSIGHT ... DICK CHENEY’S “ENERGY TASK FORCE”

A thorough discussion of this subject can be found in the literature (1). In retrospect it is clear that while the headline was to develop a National Energy Policy, the result was defined in private by Cheney and other federal agencies in concert with representatives of the fossil fuel industry. Of the 105 recommendations only 7 dealt with renewable energy (RE) sources.

The 2005 Energy Policy Act passed by Congress in essence made the minutes of all of the various closed-door meetings public. The Act contains a plethora of provisions. Most infamous among these are that this bill exempted fluids used in the natural gas extraction process of hydraulic fracturing from protections under the Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act, Safe Drinking Water Act, and CERCLA (2). It created a loophole that exempts companies drilling for natural gas from disclosing the chemicals involved in fracking operations that would normally be required under federal clean water laws — see exemptions for hydraulic fracturing under United States federal law. The loophole is commonly known as the “Halliburton loophole” since former Halliburton CEO Dick Cheney was reportedly instrumental in its passage.

Thus, emanated the birth of high-volume horizontal fracking (HVHF).

Prior to that the Oil & Gas Industry had been exempted in 1988 from the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, known as RCRA, and in 1986 from the Community Right to Know Act. For this industry alone, chemicals such as benzene, toluene and xylenes are NOT hazardous materials!

So, you may ask why belabor these points? The existence of these exemptions is clear evidence that HVHF cannot be done in compliance with these environmental protection laws. It is also clear evidence of a major subsidy given by Congress on behalf of the society that it is supposed to represent to the profits of the fossil fuel industry including fracking and fracking-related industries, including fracked gas pipeline infrastructures.

ARE INHERENTLY CRIMINAL ACTS LESS SO BECAUSE OF THIS BAD LAW?

“Criminal law is the body of law that relates to crime. It regulates social conduct and prescribes whatever is threatening, harmful, or otherwise endangering to the property, health, safety, and moral welfare of people. It includes the punishment of people who violate these laws.” (30)

So, does the existence of a bad law make such acts as denying human and other life clean air, clean water and safe drinking water less criminal, less heinous? In my opinion, no. A bad law does not make an inherently criminal act either civilized or ethical.

The existence of this law and of the other exemptions granted to the Oil & Gas Industry have created the tragic circumstance in which our country finds itself ... citizenry of all ages on behalf of themselves and future generations are pitted against their own government and the elected officials who are supposed to be

serving their needs.

It's time for our government and society to reject the corrupt and twisted principles of one discredited man in cohort with self-interested unprincipled representatives of a dying industry.

I ask that FERC act in a civilized and ethical manner and ignore the existence of this bad law as one of several reasons for not permitting these proposed fracked gas infrastructure projects, including the NED.

ENERGY SECURITY: The facts are in: peak oil is behind us; peak natural gas is behind us; peak economically-recoverable coal is behind us (46); the cost to maintain our aged nuclear power plants is now uneconomic (47); and peak fracked gas is upon us (48).

Many shales have peaked. Recoverable oil from the Monterey shale was downgraded by 96% last year. Most gas shales are estimated by knowledgeable sources to be over rated in their potential. Marcellus is forecast to peak in 2016; all others have already peaked. I believe that the decline in production from gas shales will be much greater than the EIA forecasts.

Such forecasts do not take into account the change in the economic and technical facts of the practice known as high volume horizontal fracking (HVHF). It is via fracking that feedstock for these proposed infrastructures would be produced. Fracking has already spread to every part of our country including New England (NE). The concentration of fracked gas in our gas distribution systems has grown to about 40% nationally, and to about 60% here in New England.

FRACKING HAS FAILED ECONOMICALLY AND TECHNICALLY

A few short years ago MLPs (Master Limited Partnerships) and equity interests in fracking companies were the darling of Wall Street. These MLPs have become toxic; investors are shunning them. Equity interests have endured significant declines in price. The debt for some of the largest fracking companies ranges from 90% to 200% of equity (4).

This occurred before the drop in crude oil prices last fall. For the 4-year period 2010 through 2013, for a universe of 20 shale operators, capital expenditures totaled 226.956 \$B while free cash flow totaled -79.016 \$B. The drop in crude oil prices has of course exacerbated this situation. It will take years, from 7 to 20, for some of the large drillers to pay off their long-term debt using 100% of Net Income.

Technically, about 70% of new shale production is going to offset rapidly declining production from existing wells in all major shales, including the Marcellus. Given the financial condition of the drillers, it is logical to expect a decrease in new well count and, therefore, a decrease in production.

Also, fracking bans are beginning to be put into effect, e.g. by the States of New York and Maryland, and by other communities across the country. Citizenry are demanding that this practice be stopped permanently. See also Reference (43).

The shale bubble is bursting. Capital destruction is underway. Contagion has spread to MLPs for pipeline companies; these, too, are being shunned by investors. KMI announced in 2014 dissolution of their MLP. Once burned, will high net worth investors again be lured by Wall Street to invest in this dying strategy? I think not.

Further, Forbes reported late last month that banks are seeking regulatory relief as their loans to oil and gas interests fall into distressed quality. Noteworthy is that Chesapeake has put their Utica shale interests up for sale.

One last point, late last month it was also reported by the worldwide fossil fuel divestment movement that so far 400 organizations have pledged to divest a total of \$2.6 trillion of fossil fuel investments. This is just the tip of the iceberg.

FERC should pay attention to all of these trends and adjust their policy to their reality.

EDCs show interest in increasing their dependence on fracked gas because they have been told by gas industry lobbyists that it will increase reliability and lower costs. ISO-NE seems likewise concerned with reliability. This metastasis of pipeline infrastructure of which the NED is just one example has emanated from a

supply-push scenario from the Marcellus shale that is now very much in jeopardy.

EDCs, the New England (NE) States' Departments of Energy, ISO-NE and others are looking in the wrong place for reliability. FERC is leading them in the wrong direction.

Further, the claim by industry lobbyists and their parroting aides in various government agencies that more pipeline capacity would lessen the perturbations in price that seem to happen regularly at the height of the winter months has no basis in fact. A similar pattern occurs in Pennsylvania where no reasonable person could claim that there is insufficient pipeline capacity. It would be revealing if the States' Attorney General Offices (AGOs) would do some investigative work on the real cause of these price irregularities. Isn't this also one of FERC's responsibilities?

Kinder Morgan, Spectra Energy, Berkshire Gas, Columbia Gas, Boston Gas and many others with the help of self-serving gas industry lobbyists have tried to spin this into a demand-pull scenario for New England. Nothing could be further from the truth as subsequently discussed.

The other critical issue of the true cost of fracked gas will be subsequently addressed both in the context of costs and personal burdens transferred to society and the consequences of climate disruption.

IN OUR NEW PARADIGM RENEWABLES BEAT SUBSIDIZED FOSSIL FUELS

Many existing gas-fired plants are operating at low capacity levels (45). As energy efficiency (EE) programs and renewables energy (RE) investments are made, domestic energy demand will decrease further. We are now entering a new paradigm where the cost of renewable energy sources from onshore wind and solar PV are lower than (subsidized) fossil fuel sources (3, 44). This is where the New England and other states should focus their efforts. NE will need expansive EE and RE investment programs to replace its coal and nuclear dependence and to thereby reduce its cost of generating electricity. Why isn't FERC driving this?

It would probably be necessary to use some of the subsidies granted to fossil fuels to help get the offshore wind industry off the ground. Potential here is vast.

As touched on subsequently, if these various pipeline projects are built, and the operators are able to economically export liquefied fracked gas, as they dream of doing, the demand may increase just as the supply is diminishing, causing an increase in prices. The last time natural gas prices spiked 10-15 years ago dozens of the gas-fired power plants that had been built during the prior five to ten years were shuttered.

However, the export strategy does not compute. The US is a net importer of LNG. A study done by me has concluded that exported liquefied fracked gas is the marginal cost source on the world market. Why has FERC not analyzed the export strategy? Instead FERC approves unneeded LNG terminals such as Cove Point and dangerous salt cavern projects such as Seneca Lake!

In my opinion FERC and the public policy that is so dependent on fracking and gas overlooks the big picture. In so doing, our government is putting the energy security of our country at risk. To put energy security at risk is to put economic security at risk.

RELIABLE FRACKED GAS MODEL INDESPENSABLE TO SOUND ENERGY POLICY

The Massachusetts Attorney General's Office (AGO) is leading a regional study of needs and alternatives. The key to a reliable study whether it be done by the AGO, FERC or States' departments of energy resources is to use a reliable fracked gas cost model. This would be a gas model that includes what are sometimes euphemistically referred to as "externalities", also called "life cycle costs". I prefer to call them "all of the costs transferred to society". These costs are subsequently discussed qualitatively.

To arrive at a reliable regional long-term strategic plan quantification should be an input. The IMF has provided a study format (31). For the United States in 2015, total fossil fuel subsidies have been calculated in post-tax dollars as \$699.18 B, equivalent to 3.824% of GDP, equivalent to \$2,176.53 per capita. See also reference (38). It's necessary to input accurate comprehensive fracked gas costs into the model used for all studies used to define future energy policy.

It is their life cycle costs that are driving us away from coal and oil. We cannot allow ourselves to ignore

these costs for fracked gas and build gas-fired plants. Otherwise, we will worsen the current situation and create a dire situation for younger and future generations.

Burning fracked gas is worse than burning coal from a greenhouse house gas (GHG) emissions consideration. From a toxicological viewpoint, one set of contaminants replaces another. Worse we are methodically distributing these contaminants into our water, air and soil. What madness! The public policy based on a bad law, the Halliburton loophole, is a tragic failure.

REGIONAL STRATEGIC ENERGY PLAN

The Massachusetts' AGO's study will help define the regional path forward with regard to energy (6) (7). While there has been a dearth of strategic thinking up to now, this study offers the hope of a sane path forward. The Low Demand Study issued in early January has been dismissed as not applicable.

USE EXISTING LNG IMPORT CAPACITY TO BRIDGE TO EE AND RE

My opinions can be succinctly stated, as follows. The LNG import facilities that are integral to the Algonquin system have served well to satisfy peak needs (8, 49), and can continue to do so provided that ISO-NE continues to include this flexibility in their winter reliability program, as was done this past season. Any justified minor debottlenecks should be implemented as a matter of normal business practices.

The region should continue to use this flexibility to implement a longer-term plan that meets the objectives set out in the AGO study outline. The decrease in crude oil prices widens the window of opportunity.

As the next logical step in our energy policy I favor both utility scale and distributed projects in solar and wind, both onshore and offshore. The unique opportunities in large-scale hydro sound interesting. The highly profitable energy efficiency strategy has significant potential to reduce future energy demand, to provide clean, local, reliable jobs and to stimulate the regional economy. Certainly, resiliency and security are integral components to a viable plan.

The lowest cost energy source in the US today is onshore wind. Advances in the manufacture of solar panels are driving costs down rapidly (3); solar PV costs should match those of onshore wind by about the end of 2016. Meanwhile Tesla is reported to be making advances in battery storage technology (3). The future is upon us.

As overall energy demand is reduced by energy efficiency programs and as more energy is generated from renewables, gas supplies from generation would be released for other uses, should some users such as LDCs wish to use them.

There are those who say that renewables will not serve mankind's needs forever (25). This is a valid point. I suggest that we view renewable sources of energy as the bridge towards the next generation of energy. This document is not the venue to discuss innovative technologies; but, there will be alternatives to both fossils and renewables available to us longer term.

CASE AGAINST FRACKED GAS INFRASTRUCTURE

The case against fracked gas and infrastructure including the NED is elementary and comprehensive. It is at the expense of public safety, public health, private and public property, economic livelihood and stable climate. And, we do not need it, and further it represents yet another shift of wealth in the wrong direction. What we do need now is to fix gas leaks and to invest heavily in energy efficiency projects and renewables' sources.

PUBLIC SAFETY

As part of the deregulated environment, corporations are allowed to write their own rules. Recall what this policy brought to us in the BP Gulf of Mexico spill.

The net result of this is that all pipelines are buried just 36 inches deep irrespective of the depth of the extreme frost zone. In rural areas, these companies allow themselves to use the cheapest pipe, i.e. the thinnest pipe, and to space the shut-off valves, used in the event of a breach, as much as 10-12 miles apart. When

there is a breach, it's necessary to vent to the atmosphere more than the equivalent amount of inventory, as it takes time for the valves to be closed. If the release is ignited, the resulting explosion and fire would be spectacular and devastating.

PHMSA, a division of the DOT, compiles self-reported industry data (9). The average for the 9- year and 9- month period ending September 30, 2014 shows a significant incident rate of about 1 per week for gas transmission lines. For all pipelines, gas and liquid, transmission and distribution, the average is 4.5 per week. This rate is significantly higher than the prior ten-year period, as are damages from such incidents. Clearly, the pipeline industry in its current unregulated state is out of control, and DOT seems impotent to influence safety and left only to reporting. See Reference (42).

KINDER MORGAN TRACK RECORD IS POOR

It's worthwhile to remember that the Northeast Energy Direct project is being directed by Kinder Morgan, the parent of Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company. KMI's track record in environmental and regulatory matters has been documented in the press. It is an understatement to describe it as poor. The company has been convicted of felony charges and agreed to settle disputes regarding labor laws. A partial summary of their track record has been documented in reference (5), as follows:

Quote ... Kinder Morgan's safety record is far from stellar, both in our region and elsewhere. Residents of Sandisfield experienced a terrifying incident in 1981 when a boulder dislodged by blasting ruptured an existing pipeline, leading to a major gas leak and evacuation of hundreds of residents. As one Sandisfield resident wrote in the April 2014 Sandisfield Times:

“During blasting... a huge boulder flew into the air and landed on the operating first line, which was ruptured! At 760 PSI, a volcano of natural gas shot into the atmosphere. A crewmember told a reporter that if that gas had ignited, “it would have been like an atomic bomb.”... Families in north Sandisfield, Tolland, and Otis were evacuated. We were told to run for our lives leaving behind everything, including farm animals. Later, probably in the 1990s, TGP approached us to ask permission to install a “cathodic protection unit”... We were told that this measure was necessary because errors in the installation of the initial pipeline caused frost-heaving rocks to rub against the pipe.”

The pipelines proposed by KM will transport fracked gas at 1,450 psi, and therefore ruptures and explosions of these high-pressure pipelines would result in accidents of significantly higher magnitude.

One would be naïve to expect an accident never to happen. However, leaks, ruptures or explosions are all scenarios that happen regularly on similar high-pressure pipelines throughout the country. According to reports from the U.S. Dept. of Transportation's Pipelines and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) compiled on Wikipedia's Kinder Morgan page , throughout the U.S. since 2003, Kinder Morgan and its subsidiaries' pipelines have been responsible for at least 180 spills, evacuations, explosions, fires, and fatalities in 24 states. The details of these events are horrific, and are certainly not scenarios we wish to see reenacted in the Berkshires.

In 2009, Kinder Morgan was cited by the PHMSA for violating safety standards regarding the distance between a natural gas pipeline and a “high consequence area” such as a school or hospital; the pipeline was too close for safe operation in case of a leak.

In 2011, PHMSA cited Kinder Morgan for the following safety violations:

- Failing to maintain update maps showing pipeline locations,
- Failing to test pipeline safety devices,
- Failing to maintain proper firefighting equipment,
- Failing to inspect its pipelines as required, and
- Failing to adequately monitor pipes' corrosion levels.

In 2013, the headline “Wall Street Worries about Kinder Morgan's Safety Record: BC pipeline operator slashes and defers maintenance spending” (referring to KMI operations in British Columbia) was a concern to anyone who lived or worked near a Kinder Morgan pipeline.

The Wall Street Journal asked, “Is Kinder Morgan Scrimping on its Pipelines?” after an investment analyst charged the company with starving its pipelines of routine maintenance spending in order to return more cash to investors.⁷ Deferred maintenance may account for the high number of Kinder Morgan pipeline accidents in the last decade.

Close examination of PHMSA’s incident reports for Kinder Morgan’s onshore gas transmission pipelines shows that faulty infrastructure causes 45% of onshore gas transmission pipeline significant leaks. Failure of the pipe, a cracked weld, and faulty pipeline equipment together account for 28.3% of pipeline leaks, and corrosion of the pipe causes 16.8%.⁸

7 Tom Fowler and Ben Lefebvre, “Is Kinder Morgan Scrimping on its Pipelines?” Wall Street Journal, Sep 27, 2013, <http://blogs.wsj.com/corporate-intelligence/2013/09/27/is-kinder-morgan-scrimping-on-its-pipelines-the-market-shrugs/> “

8 Leak data from http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comm/reports/safety/AllPSIDet_1994_2013_US.html?nocache=1724#_ngtranson

Unquote. In my opinion, KMI is not the kind of company that we want to operate in New England and New York.

PRIVATE AND PUBLIC PROPERTY AND ECONOMIC LIVELIHHOD

Research has shown that, compared to neighborhoods with similar housing and demographic characteristics, neighborhoods within two miles of power plants experienced 3 to 7% decreases in housing values and rents with evidence of larger decreases within one mile and for large capacity plants (45).

The effect on values in proximity to compressor stations are much higher. For example, homeowners living near the Millennium Pipeline Company’s 15,000 horsepower compressor station on Hungry Hill Road in Hancock, New York have seen the value of their homes decline by as much as 50 percent since the industrial facility was constructed in the midst of what used to be a quiet, rural community (50).

The pipeline companies in the process that is set forth for them by FERC seek to receive a certificate of public convenience and necessity. With this and the various State permits, they are given the right of eminent domain. So, private citizens face losing the use of a part of their property. For this, they receive a modest one-time payment. Property values can be wiped out. The stigma effect decreases valuations of neighboring properties.

In a recent court case, a landowner was awarded a total of \$2.1 million for an easement that had been originally valued at \$79,979. The jury revalued the easement to \$282,500 and added an additional \$1,350,410 for diminishment of the remaining property value (51).

In addition, depending on whether they granted the easement they may also have liability. An industry consultant points out that pipelines are not usually mentioned as a hazard in homeowners’ policies. That implies lack of coverage.

And, there may be jeopardy to one’s mortgage. Fine print in some mortgagor paperwork requires a homeowner to inform them should a pipeline enter the picture.

Here in Massachusetts (MA), the proposed Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Energy Direct (NED) project would cross many miles of state conservation land, protected by MA Constitution, Article 97, put aside for future generations to enjoy.

Tourism, the arts, second home ownership and dependent businesses make up an important part of New England’s economy. These activities are threatened by this fracked gas mania. Small scale agriculture, often organic in nature, is attracting many young people as a livelihood. Farmers’ livelihood and our food supply is jeopardized by the specter of a toxic ecosystem and climate disruption.

PUBLIC HEALTH

Incredible decisions by FERC and the pipeline industry impact public health:

- To permit the construction of compressor stations and other pipeline infrastructure in the midst of population centers and, thereby, expose the populace to a constant dosage of radioactive and toxic chemicals.
- To ignore the distribution of these radioactive and toxic chemicals through the burner tip of the kitchen cooker and basement heater.
- To create sacrifice zones at the sources of the shale gas that deny our species and other life the basics of clear air, clean water and safe drinking water is unethical, uncivilized and criminal in nature.

Sacrifice zones are already growing around compressor stations, and, if this policy is left unchecked they will eventually extend over the entire ecosystem. The continuous emissions will become integral to our ecosystem.

Fracking has already spread to every part of our country including MA and NE. The concentration of fracked gas in our gas distribution systems has grown to about 40% nationally, and to about 60% here in New England.

- Compressor stations are sources of many releases of fracked gas either through purposeful releases such as “blowdowns” or accidental releases, such as releases from valves and gaskets weakened by corrosion and thermal stress. The Interstate Natural Gas Association of America lists 21 sources of fugitive gas leaks including metering stations and pigging operations (10).
- Gas turbines drive most of the compressors used; these run at varying degrees of inefficiency; 40% is considered to be a “high” efficiency for the 30,000 HP Titan 250 turbine/compressor systems that are currently favored by the pipeline industry for huge projects such as the Kinder Morgan NED. Smaller compressors have lower efficiency. Low efficiency results in significant quantities of energy being released to the atmosphere that is paid for by the consumer. Other releases include c2 to c4 hydrocarbons and products of combustion such as carbon monoxide, carbon dioxide, formaldehyde, sulfur oxides, and vast amounts of nitrous oxides.
- The proposed NED project as currently envisioned will emit hundreds of tons per year of radioactive and toxic chemicals, emissions that a Kinder Morgan manager called “air” in a Richmond “information” session (37). Nitrous oxide and sulfur oxide both cause adverse respiratory ailments and increased asthma symptoms. Formaldehyde causes eye and nose irritations, and is considered a carcinogen. There are many mechanisms for its formation.

It is the likely cause of nose bleeds experienced by children living near the Minisink compressor station. In a small study of 20 children from 10 families, 6 children were found to be suffering from nose bleeds (11). 7 of the 10 families have now moved, and many other families are trying to do so; these citizens are not being compensated for having their lives turned upside-down. A continuing citizen-lead study is encountering resistance (36).

Citizens living near compressor stations have repeatedly exhibited acute symptoms such as nose bleeds, sore throats, rashes, headaches, dizziness, nausea, depression, drowsiness, irregular heartbeat and the list goes on. Children and the elderly are especially vulnerable, as are people suffering from COPD and other respiratory ailments (24). A friend who lives in proximity to the Southeast Compressor Station in West Chester County has had her health negatively impacted and her life put at risk. Spectra refuses to provide notification of the regular unscheduled blowdowns (39).

Wilma Subra reports that 90% of individuals living and working within 2-3 miles of compressor stations report experiencing odor events and health impacts (12). Wilma is a MacArthur fellow and held positions in the EPA National Advisor Council for two decades.

Also released are residual fracking chemicals (so-called VOCs or volatile organic compounds), which are unburned in the process. These chemicals are known carcinogens such as benzene and naphthalene, neurotoxins such as toluene, ethylbenzene and xylenes, and endocrine disruptors. Dozens of chemicals

have been detected in fracking fluids, in the drilling fields and around compressor stations. Dr. Carpenter and his colleagues have also documented the presence of these chemicals in one of the earliest peer-reviewed studies (13).

Chronic health effects are numerous and dire, if not deadly. 61% of health impacts are associated with chemicals present in the air in excess of Short and Long Term Health Screening Levels as reported by Wilma Subra.

Their synergistic effects with other compounds, resulting in increased toxicity, have neither been studied nor addressed in the regulatory process. For example, ground level ozone, produced by the interaction of nitrous oxide and VOCs, impacts the respiratory system, lung function and cardiovascular system, and reduces crop yields by as much as 30% (14).

There have now been upwards of 600 peer-reviewed studies that document the presence of toxic chemicals and adverse health effects in proximity to the drilling fields. Mutagenic, teratogenic and carcinogenic effects are being documented (35). Remember Love Canal.

Medical professionals in Pennsylvania and Texas have been hit with gag orders.

The fracking companies have hidden behind the exemptions and refused to identify the chemicals they use. In a recent court case, the Department of the Interior was ruled against in their suit to force disclosure (33). The “Frac Act” that would have forced disclosure and other procedures is lying dormant in committee (34). Why the big secret ... EPA, FERC, Congress, Gas Industry, Independent Petroleum Association of America?

Hydrogeologists have opined that fracking technology that uses upwards of 500 chemicals does not make sense. The number of fracking related chemicals is staggering, about 750 according to the Congressional report. Personally, I find it implausible that HVHF constitutes a studied coherent ‘technology’ as has been touted. Imagine the logistics of preparing a cocktail with hundreds of chemicals, and then adjusting it as “produced water” is used instead of fresh.

Further, there is hearsay and speculation that unscrupulous companies may use their exemptions to hide the practice of injecting toxic chemical waste, and, perhaps, are paid to dispose of hazardous materials from other industries. Personally, I find such speculation plausible when I recall various Superfund sites. I live a few miles from the GE PCB Superfund site in Pittsfield, MA. Citizen groups, the EPA, FERC and the States’ departments of environmental conservation and public health need to do vigilant investigative and monitoring work on all of this.

Clearly our water resources are at risk and in many instances have already been poisoned. In my opinion it is also likely that the VOCs emitted by compressor stations contain trace quantities of both naturally occurring and man-made toxic chemicals from HVHF. Trace quantities add up to thousands of tons per year.

Further sources of toxic materials result from use of lubricants and corrosion inhibitors. Corrosion inhibitors are injected to scavenge for hydrogen sulfide. Pigging operations discharge sludge created from this. Such sludge would most likely also contain highly radioactive compounds, as well as heavy metals. Condensate from compressor stations also contains these chemicals. Is handling and disposition of sludge and condensate monitored?

PCBs are present in the Algonquin pipeline system, presumably only from historic use (32). This system is PCB-regulated. Due to the interactions of pipelines in the complex NE transmission and distribution systems, FERC should investigate whether the NED is at risk of contamination.

- Compressor stations are also sources of noise and light pollution. Noise levels often exceed OSHA guides for safety; decibels levels exceeding 90 have been measured at the fence-line. This in combination with 24-7 lighting interferes with routine human living practices. Compressor stations are an obnoxious neighbor and can destroy the quality of life of people in their vicinity.
- Radon is a component of shale gas. Radon concentration in Marcellus shale gas is significantly

higher than in gas from all other shale deposits. The radium content of Marcellus shale measures about 3.5 times higher than the US average. Radon is the progeny of radium.

Radon has a short half-life (about 3.8 days), long enough to be emitted as airborne releases in the transmission and distribution pipeline systems. It is the second leading cause of lung cancer in the U.S. – the first cause for non-smokers (16).

When Radon decays, it decays to and is precipitated as Polonium, a deadly radioactive element with a half-life of about 6 months. When Polonium decays, its progeny is lead. We are well aware of the hazards of lead in the environment. Laws are in effect which regulate lead in gasoline and paint. The final dispositions of these compounds have not been studied.

In addition, radium can form other radioactive compounds that have a long half-life, measured in decades or longer. It is supposed that such radioactive solids accumulate as part of the sludge that is removed in pigging. Their disposition has likewise not been studied. Laws are in effect that regulate releases of radioactive materials to air and the environment. In May a study was published that shows high radioactivity in fracking waste water.

- Given the enormous quantities of fracked gas containing VOCs, products of combustion, and radioactive materials that are released to the atmosphere by compressor station and other operations, it is highly likely that these toxic materials would accumulate in water bodies and ground water. Humans, fish, birds and other wildlife would be endangered. The safeness of drinking water would be jeopardized. The maintenance of organic-type farming is highly problematical. Kinder Morgan has stated that their expectation for the NED is that, ultimately, compressor stations could be 20 miles apart (20)!
- Natural and fracked gas is piped into large population centers where distribution systems may be 60-70 years old (15). Consequently, leaks of methane and all of its contaminants abound. This same fracked gas also exits the burner tips of cooking stoves and heating units in the homes of residents at the receiving end of the pipeline infrastructure. This will increase health care costs and reduce quality of lives, as well as life expectancy.

The States' Departments of Environmental Conservation and Public Health do not test for any emissions including of these compounds, relying on "data" provided by industry operators in their own self-reporting. Industry operators serve their own interests with no regulatory oversight. They just estimate nitrous oxide and a few other emissions based on throughput.

New York State's (NYS) Department of Health (DOH) concluded "Until the science provides sufficient information to determine the level of risk to public health from HVHF to all New Yorkers and whether the risks can be managed, DOH recommends that HVHF should not proceed in NYS." (19)

I believe that this exact statement can be made and position taken relative to the effects of fracked gas pipeline infrastructures. We should cease building them.

Medical professionals have a similar view. The American Medical Association has called for a freeze on issuing infrastructure permits until an official Health Impact Assessment is conducted on the full life cycle of shale gas development. And a Medical Society of the State of New York (MSSNY) Resolution calls for governmental assessment of health and environmental harms and risks from pipelines (39) (40). Concerned Health Professionals of New York and Physicians for Social Responsibility have expressed a similar view in a recent letter to Governor Cuomo (41).

METHANE EMISSIONS ARE VAST AND NOT ACCOUNTED FOR

- The public policy of replacing coal and heating oils with fracked gas was developed with the intent of reducing carbon dioxide emissions and other contaminants. The policy has proved to be a complete and tragic failure. By doing so, we are actually accelerating global climate change because of the vast quantities of methane being released to the atmosphere when fracked gas is extracted, transported, and stored. We are replacing one set of toxic contaminants with another set of toxic contaminants. Burning fracked gas will prove to be more detrimental than burning coal.

- Methane is the main component of natural and fracked gas. Methane is a far more potent contributor to the greenhouse gas (GHG) effect than carbon dioxide on the order of 70-86 times more potent over 25 years, 25-32 times over 100 years, and 5 times over 500 years.
- Methane is leaked throughout the entire process of drilling wells, hydro fracturing, and gathering, processing, transporting, and distributing fracked gas to end uses. The liquefaction and shipment of natural and fracked gas releases further significant quantities, as gas is purposely vented in order to cool the remaining inventory.
- Many fracking wells are poorly constructed and maintained. Almost all wells leak and/or will leak methane from a 'low' level of 3% to a high level of 20+%. Many wells that have been taken out of production in Pennsylvania and also in Colorado are being left uncapped and continue to vent methane into the atmosphere.
- In addition, the vibrations from the drilling and fracking processes loosen the earth around the well-head hole; these fissures provide further routes for methane leakage.
- DPU has commissioned its own exhaustive study of LAUF gas (29) and is well aware of Senator Markey's study of gas leaks in MA (17) and Harvard's in the greater Boston area. Also, consider reference (18), "A Bridge Too Far, The Climate Case against Natural Gas in MA".
- Let us recall that nitrous oxide is a very potent GHG, 298 times carbon dioxide, staying in the atmosphere for 114 years (27).

The gas model has grossly underestimated the contribution to GHG emissions from the wellhead to the burner tip. Leaks abound. The subject of lost and unaccounted for (LAUF) gas could fill several pages. Why have FERC in conjunction with the EPA not adequately addressed this critical issue?

CLIMATE DISRUPTION:

To ignore the realities of climate disruption, caused by the enormous releases of methane and nitrous oxide from this fracked gas mania, especially on younger and future generations is careless, negligent and a potentially fatal act to the species.

To ignore the real and enormous benefits to economic activity and job creation by fixing gas leaks and by investing in energy efficiency and renewable sources is totally inexcusable.

REALITY OF GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE REPORTED

Two reports were issued in 2014 that confirm the reality of global climate change. The World Bank study ranks 136 cities likely to experience damage by flooding. In the top 10 were 5 US cities: Miami is ranked #2, New York #3, New Orleans #4, Tampa #7, and Boston #8. Aggregate world-wide damages from rising sea levels could climb to \$1 trillion per year by 2050. Damages from other manifestations of climate change such as droughts, wild fires, violent storms, etc., are not included in this estimate. Nor has the toll on life, human and otherwise, been described.

The United Nations study concludes that climate change is irreversible.

Just weeks after the largest climate mobilization ever, the People's Climate March in September 2014, the world's two biggest polluters at that time -- the United States and China -- announced their most ambitious climate action yet.

The Clean Power Plan, released in August 2015, by President Obama and EPA Administrator Gina McCarthy mandated steep reductions in GHG emissions from U.S. power plants. A combination of provisions changed from the draft plan issued last year provide an incentive for States to favorably implement renewable energy programs over fracked gas power plants. This plan does not allow new gas-fired power plants, defined as any with a construction start-date after January 8, 2014, to qualify as a means to comply with this new law aimed to address global warming pollution.

It's time for FERC, ISO-NE and the NE States, to integrate the realities and implications of climate disrupt-

tion into their decision making.

FERC

FERC acts with powers taken from the Federal Power Act and the Natural Gas Act. You take from this the power to regulate prices and infrastructure. You are required to comply with NEPA, the National Environmental Protection Act.

FERC'S JURISDICTION IS LEGALLY CHALLENGABLE

The Natural Gas Act does not include fracking and fracked gas. The process of extraction, the resulting product and the environmental effects are quite different and distinguishable from those for conventional natural gas.

Commissioner LaFleur's comment to the Washington Press to the effect that FERC is not the EPA supports my belief. FERC is not empowered to regulate the environment. By proliferating infrastructure FERC IS regulating the environment, albeit in a disastrously negative way.

FERC should recuse itself from further decisions on pipeline infrastructures on this basis alone.

THERE IS NO NEED FOR THE NED

New England has met its needs by using the existing LNG import capacity and can continue to do so (4, 49). Meanwhile energy efficiency and renewables investments are steadily decreasing energy demand. This will release gas pipeline capacity for LDCs.

The new cost paradigm makes onshore wind and solar PV less costly than fracked gas.

The US is a net importer of LNG. Exported liquefied fracked gas is the marginal cost source on the world market.

Investing in gas pipelines now would be a gross misallocation of capital and an insult of the highest order to democracy and to all but the wealthiest citizens who would benefit financially by this further transfer of costs to society.

FERC'S MOST EFFICIENT ACTION WOULD BE TO CANCEL THIS PROJECT NOW

By cancelling the ill-conceived NED proposal now FERC would save FERC, KMI, hundreds of environmental protection and grass roots organizations and thousands of citizen-activists years of time, manpower and funds.

Should FERC continue the dance, it must comply with Court decisions and NEPA.

SEGMENTATION

The June 6, 2014 D.C. Court of Appeals faulted FERC (28) for allowing the use of segmentation by pipeline companies. This is the process by which they purposely progress a big project in so-called "small" increments, sometimes taking the position that the impact is small and, therefore, requires only an EA, an Economic Assessment, rather than an EIS. Sometimes, the pipeline companies ask for an expedited review that would require no environmental study. Kinder Morgan had the audacity to do so on the so-called Connecticut Expansion Project, CP14-529, an illegal segment of their originally proposed Northeast Expansion Project.

Kinder Morgan has recently decreased the size of the NED by eliminating a couple of laterals, reducing the diameter from 36" to 30" and staging their compressor stations. Simultaneously, their Public Relations Manager has warned that the decrease could be temporary. KMI seems to be taking a cue from gas industry lobbyists and consultants that the NED is a "scalable" project. To me this is a code phrase for segmentable. Further, last year their Project Manager stated that the NED could have compressor stations every 20 miles (20).

According to the D.C. Circuit ruling, FERC should require a complete EIS for the potential project scope.

NEPA REQUIRES ALL AND CUMULATIVE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS FROM THE WELL-HEAD TO THE DISTRIBUTION POINTS OVER THE LIFE OF THE PROJECT

Though FERC may not be the EPA, it is subject to NEPA. The EIS should include the following costs that the NED proposal would transfer to society:

- o Total methane, nitrous oxide and other GHGs released to the atmosphere;
 - The impact of this amount on global climate disruption
 - The cost to recover from and remediate this impact
- o Total amount of carcinogens, neurotoxins, endocrine disruptors and all other toxins by identity of chemical compounds;
 - The total costs of the adherent effect on public health in deaths, illnesses, healthcare costs, lost work time and related social costs
- o Total costs of environmental consequences due to losses in economic activity, damages to ecosystems, water sources, farms and food supply
- o Total ecosystem capital used and, therefore, unavailable for future generations
- o Total decreases in real estate values to citizens, communities and the States
- o Total damages to community infrastructure

FERC must also consider the cumulative impacts of related pipeline proposals.

FERC should refer to the foregoing discussions and References (31) and (38) to start the calculation.

FERC PROCEDURES ARE NEGLIGENT

After studying FERC's procedures I have come to the conclusion that FERC along with the industries that it serves have been negligent, and, perhaps, criminally so, in many aspects of how it progresses proposed projects.

There are engineering improvements that could be made to the design of these infrastructures that would reduce the impact on human and other life; these have been totally ignored by FERC and the industry. Your joint optimum has been the lowest direct cost at the greatest expense to society. Change your methods.

FERC must include the No-Build Option in their methodology.

THE ALTERNATIVE IS CLEAN, RENEWABLE ENERGY, THE NEW ECONOMY AND JOB GROWTH

Should there be any doubt that such sweet alternatives exist, I will just summarize this subject here.

- A GIS-based study, geographical information study, assembled by the Frontier Group focused on renewable energy (RE) sources from solar and wind. The objective was to determine the glaring and large sources of renewable energy (21).

The result is stunning. New England can meet its energy needs multiple times over: Maine by a factor of 153 just via Offshore Wind, MA by a factor of 16 via Rooftop PV, Other Solar and Wind and CT by a factor of 1.8 via solar PV and offshore wind. Overall, the NE factor is over 200!

Third party studies not GIS-based including a wind study by ISO-NE conclude that high RE scenarios are achievable. This is with existing technology and at reasonable cost. Needless, to say, barriers exist and trade-offs would be required. The decisions we make now will determine when we get there.

- PERI, the Political and Economic Research Institute at U Mass completed last year a very detailed and in-depth study (22). This resulted in a model for how the US could transition to the NEW Economy to meet 2030 GHG emissions reductions.

The report is over 400 pages long. So, I will again have to cut to the chase.

PERI's Conclusions:

- “Can we control climate change? Yes
- What will it take? Becoming 30% more energy efficient, and using renewables for 22% of our remaining energy need.
- What will it cost? \$200 billion per year (1.2% of current GDP).
- Who Pays? 25% government, 75% individuals and businesses.
- Who benefits? People who live on earth.
- What happens to employment? 2.7 million NET new jobs created.
- Do we have to go back to a horse-and-buggy economy? No.

Changing our behaviors will of course improve environmental outcomes. We can continue to have improved standards of living by using energy more wisely.”

And conversion to an energy efficient and renewables based policy will increase job growth and stimulate the economy!

- o For example, PERI’s model creates 3.1 times as many NET new jobs than investments in fossil fuels.
- o Investing in the new economy creates from 3 to 7 times as many NET new jobs than peak jobs in building pipelines, and these jobs are mostly local; they are clean, ethical and steady.
- o Other metrics from PERI’s work: investments in wind and solar create about twice the number of jobs per unit of investment than fossil fuels and/or pipelines. The metric for transportation and energy efficiency is +/- 4 times as many.

Here is an alternative presentation of some of the same data, a tabulation that has been reproduced from material provided by the Energy Justice Network, <http://www.energyjustice.net/files/md/PGgasplants.pdf> that shows the following:

Natural (i.e. Fracked) Gas = Fewest Jobs

	Jobs per \$1 million Invested	Jobs per \$1 million output
Mass Transit	22.3	11
Biomass	17.4	7.4
Building Retrofits	16.7	7
Solar	13.7	5.4
Wind	13.3	4.6
Smart Grid	12.5	4.3
Coal	6.9	1.9
Oil	5.2	0.8
“Natural” Gas	5.2	0.8

Unions are leading their membership in the wrong direction. They should partner with climate action advocates to lobby for higher capital allocations towards investments in energy efficiency, transportation and renewable energy sources. And, FERC should be driving this.

Should there be any doubt that we are at a turning point in our energy policy, energy, i.e. fossil, stocks have been steadily declining since June 2014. In the past year, as crude prices have fallen more than 55 percent, the nine biggest Western oil companies have shed a combined \$400 billion in market cap as of about mid-August, according to data pulled by FactSet (26). This trend is likely to continue.

IN CONCLUSION

The KMI/TGP NED is not in the public interest:

- **Gas model excludes significant costs and personal burdens transferred to society;**
- **Demand-pull scenario is a mirage;**
- **Supply-push scenario is rapidly disappearing;**
- **Alternatives are available and attractively priced;**
- **Citizens do not want it!**

By ignoring the big picture FERC is putting our country's energy security at risk. To put energy security at risk is to put economic security at risk.

Again, I ask that FERC cancel further consideration of the NED proposal.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Do not hesitate to contact me with any questions, comments or requests for referenced documents.

Sincerely,

Arnold Piacentini, Pro Se

Arnold Piacentini, BS, MS and PhD in Chemical Engineering

References (Copies are available upon request):

- (1) en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Energy_Task_Force
- (2) Kosnik, Renee Lewis MSEL, JD (October 2007). "The Oil and Gas Industry's Exclusions and Exemptions to Major Environmental Statutes" (PDF). Earthworks' Oil and Gas Accountability Project <http://www.ogap.org>.
- (3) <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/finance/economics/11633745/Fossil-industry-faces-a-perfect-political-and-technological-storm.html>
- (4) Emerging Trends: Oil and Gas, Renewable Energy, Deborah Rogers, www.energypolicyforum.org, January 2015, https://www.icloud.com/keynote/AwBWCAESEA46RgfV2sBF7I_2pd9XLwkaKmmNbzZgcBEDAU91IF2UKIRLzylG5IzqDERRKCeNgGBqZ88mFA6DI5kR7gMCUCAQEEIPakO2wyHtXVNMb-V5Q5MobtrtiG4WwStEkb8SRruFQ7#Presentation
- (5) Letter dated December 5, 2014, Arnold Piacentini and Judy Eddy to 1Berkshire Strategic Alliance Inc. et al
- (6) Reply Comments of AGO Re DPU 15-37, July 6, 2015
- (7) Letter dated July 24, 2015, AGO to Arnold Piacentini
- (8) Reply Comments of Suez Gas NA LLC Re DPU 15-37, July 6, 2015
- (9) www.phmsa.dot.gov
- (10) Greenhouse Gas Emission Estimation Guidelines for Natural Gas Transmission and Storage, Interstate Natural Gas Association of America, Section 4.0, Page 52, www.ingaa.org/File.aspx?id=5485
- (11) Pramilla Malick, Co-Chair, Protect Orange County
- (12) "Algonquin Incremental Market Project (AIM Project) Spectra Energy Corp.", report by Wilma Subra
- (13) "Air Concentrations of Volatile Compounds near Oil and Gas Production: a Community Based Exploratory Study", Environmental Health 2014, 13:82, Macey, Carpenter, et al
- (14) "More Than a Pipeline, It's a Toxic Industrial Infrastructure", report by Mina Hamilton, October, 2014
- (15) "Aging Boston Natural Gas Pipeline Infrastructure: Way Too Many Leaks", Clean Technica, by Glenn Meyers, January 6, 2015
- (16) "New Routes for an Old Threat: Kinder Morgan, [Cabot-Williams] and Spectra Gas Pipelines Likely to Transport Marcellus Radon", report by Kathy Kessler, 350MA-Berkshires
- (17) "America Pays for Gas Leaks" "Natural Gas Pipeline Leaks Cost Consumers Billions", A report prepared for Senator Edward J. Markey, August 1, 2013

- (18) “A Bridge Too Far; The Climate Case Against Natural Gas in Massachusetts” report by Better Future Project/350 MA showing the impact of natural gas due to methane leakage, June 2014
- (19) “A Public Health Review of High Volume Hydraulic Fracturing for Shale Gas Development”, NYS DOH, December 2014
- (20) Mark Hamarick, Kinder Morgan NED Project Manager, Milford, NH, January 5, 2015: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=d9guh-nGdTg>
- (21) www.frontiergroup.org
- (22) PERI, Political Economy Research Institute, University of Massachusetts, Amherst
- (23) Kinder Morgan expands its product tanker fleet...www.shalegas.international/2015/08/10/kinder-morgan
- (24) Sign-on letter to Ms. Judith Enck, U.S. EPA Region 2 Administrator, 290 Broadway, NY, NY 10007, June 15, 2015, Re: Algonquin Incremental Market Air Title V Permits Under Review By the U.S. EPA
- (25) Coal on the Ash Heap, “Environmental Illusionists Keep Fanning the Fossil Flames”, The Day Newspaper, Robert Fromer, August 9, 2015
- (26) Power Lunch Interview, www.cnbc.com, August 12, 2015
- (27) <http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/ghgemissions/gases/n2o>
- (28) US Court of Appeals, Delaware Riverkeeper et al vs. FERC, June 6, 201413-1015-1496336
- (29) Report on Lost and Unaccounted for Gas (LAUF) Prepared for MA DPU, ICF International, December 23, 2014
- (30) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Criminal_law
- (31) <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/survey/so/2015/NEW070215A.htm>
- (32) AIM FEIS, www.sape2016.com
- (33) <http://www.cnbc.com/2015/09/30/federal-court-blocks-obama-administrations-fracking-rules-dj.html>; also, Bloomberg - New Federal Fracking Rules Blocked by U.S. Judge in Wyoming <http://bloom.bg/1Rgj2f1>
- (34) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fracturing_Responsibility_and_Awareness_of_Chemicals_Act
- (35) Dr. Sheila Bushkin, MD, MPH, Burden Lake Country Club Presentation, Averill Park, NY, September 30, 2015
- (36) <raverett@frontier.com><http://www.utne.com/environment/gas-compressors-and-nose-bleeds-zm0z15fzsau.aspx?ViewAll=True>
- (37) <https://vimeo.com/101472803/>
- (38) <http://priceofoil.org/fossil-fuel-subsidies/>
- (39) Suzannah Glidden, co-founder www.sape2016.com, Press Conference Re AIM and Indian Point Nuclear Plant, Legislative Office Building, Albany, October 13, 2015
- (40) MSSNY Resolution-2015-#159, Protecting Public Health from Natural Gas Infrastructure, Introduced by Sheila Bushkin-Bedient, MD, MPH and Sandhya Malhotra, MD
- (41) <http://blog.timesunion.com/green/health-groups-ask-gov-cuomo-to-block-gas-pipeline-projects/4682/>
- (42) <http://www.continuityinsights.com/news/2015/01/incidents-reveal-weaknesses-pipeline-management>
- (43) http://www.uppermon.org/news/Other/HV-Marcellus_Risk-Dec08.htm
- (44) Renewables Soon Could Knock the Wind out of Natural Gas, Nathaniel Gronewald, Oct 8, 2015, <http://www.eenews.net/ew/2015/10/08>, Copy on File
- (45) <http://www.energyjustice.net/files/md/PGgasplants.pdf>
- (46) Energy Public Citizen, Coal: the Beginning of the End?, Leslie Gustrom and Zane Selvans, Feb 12, 2015, Pdf on File
- (47) Energy Public Citizen, Killing the Competition: The Nuclear Power Agenda, Dr. Mark Cooper and Tim Judson, March 11, 2015, Pdfs on File
- (48) Drilling Deeper: A Reality Check on U.S. Government Forecasts for a Lasting Tight Oil & Gas

Boom, Richard Heinberg, www.shalebubble.org

(49) http://www.thedailystar.com/news/local_news/study-n-e-doesn-t-need-new-pipelines/article_736e0959-427c-5cdb-995c-8612b87033f0.html

(50) info@catskillcitizens.org

(51) <http://nbharbinger.wordpress.com/2014/03/25/1-6-million-damages-awarded-to-landowner-for-gas-pipeline/>

20151215-5058

Kelly Gass, Windham, NH.

I am an affected property owner, lot number 14-A-757

20151215-5061

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Town of Gill under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/15/2015 9:42:39 AM Filed Date: 12/15/2015 9:42:39 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Town of Gill	gksnedeker@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

The Town of Gill, MA seeks intervenor status because the proposed NED pipeline could possibly negatively impact the town in the following ways: light pollution, noise pollution, air pollution, water and soil pollution, higher energy costs, and emergency response to accidents and disasters. Furthermore, it is questionable that Massachusetts and/or New England needs to increase its supply of natural gas. Also, the Town of Gill is concerned that the pipeline will not bring lower utility rates to homeowners as the NED pipeline will increase the exposure of domestic regional markets to the larger global market demand overseas.

20151215-5107

BEFORE THE UNITED STATES
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.)	Docket No. CP16-21-000
A subsidiary of Kinder Morgan)	
Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline)	

**MOTION TO INTERVENE OF THE TOWN OF SHELBURNE, MASSACHUSETTS
IN OPPOSITION TO NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT PIPELINE**

Pursuant to Rule 214 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission’s (Commission) Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. §385.214, the Town of Shelburne (Shelburne) files this Motion to Intervene in the above-captioned proceeding.

Shelburne opposes the project because approval and the consequent construction of the NED pipeline would amount to the industrialization of a rural area that includes ten historically significant century farms[1] with large tracts of land that have been maintained by the same families for a century or more. Additionally, the impact on the overall environment, economy and quality of life for all Shelburne residents and visitors would be significant. Therefore, the Town seeks party status to protest the proposed pipeline, and fully protect Shelburne’s interests.

I. STATEMENT OF INTEREST

A. Description of the Town of Shelburne

Bounded on the west by the Deerfield River, Shelburne is traversed by the Mohawk Trail, Route 2, the principal route for travel and tourism across the northern tier of Massachusetts. It is situated at the intersection of two Scenic Byways, Routes 2 and 112, and is seven miles west of Interstate 91 and 17 miles south of the Vermont border.

Shelburne is a quintessential New England town. Its compact village center is surrounded by working farms, forested mountains, wild lands, and scenic open space. Loss of manufacturing over the past 60 years has made the natural and built landscape vital economic assets, supporting tourism, outdoor recreation, and the promise of wood-related businesses. Shelburne is dedicated to preserving the purity and simplicity of an earlier day, and its 1,893 residents are proud of their historic buildings and spectacular New England surroundings"[2]

The village of Shelburne Falls, connecting the towns of Buckland and Shelburne, is a living example of a nineteenth century New England mill town. The unspoiled charm of its historic main street and the surrounding rural landscape of hills, farms and forests attracted the filming of two major Hollywood movies in the past five years, "Labor Day" and "The Judge." The Bridge of Flowers, a former trolley bridge across the river that was converted into a linear garden in 1929, attracts visitors from around the world. Visitors are also drawn by a singular geologic feature, over 50 glacial potholes in rocky ledges of the Deerfield River that form a waterfall that powered mills before the river was dammed.

The current alignment of the proposed NED pipeline traverses the southernmost section of town where the principal land use is farming and forestry. The state's BiolMap [3] identifies 1,059 acres of Core Habitat and 1,250 acres of Critical Natural Landscape in the Town, areas of which would be affected by construction and maintenance of the pipeline. While no town property is affected, the pipeline would carve an industrial corridor through three working farms, two residential properties, and forested hillsides within Town limits. The development would directly affect five families and countless residents and visitors who daily and seasonally travel on designated Scenic Roads that would be disrupted by construction traffic.

B. Description of Impacts

Shelburne will be directly impacted and harmed by the proposed project as follows:

1) Economic Impacts. Shelburne's economic health relies on the influx of visitors who come to western Massachusetts throughout the year because of the pristine, scenic and undisturbed natural surroundings—open land, farm fields and orchards, farm stands, forests, and the rural, small-town environment. The construction disturbance of a major gas pipeline will adversely affect essential tourism and recreation related income. Presence of the pipeline will cause harm to individual property owners whose property value will be reduced, and thus result in reduction of the Town's tax revenue.

2) Agriculture & Forestry. Farming and forestry are vital parts of Shelburne's economy and quality of place. Construction and maintenance of the pipeline would threaten both in many ways. They would include: disturbance, compaction and loss of topsoil, mixing topsoil with subsoil, and a decline in general stability in soil structure; loss of crop production and resulting reduction of farm income; contamination of soil/land areas; disturbance of drainage, natural and manmade; loss of timber in the pipeline right of way; introduction of invasive species introduced during of construction; loss of capacity to provide food security; impact of herbicides on existing bee[4] population affecting both existing bee keeping operations and the overall need to maintain pollination by bees': limits on crossing the proposed pipeline with farming and forestry equipment; and limits on farming, forestry and recreational use of the land in the project corridor.

3) Water Resources. The application provides little information on the source of water for pressure-testing of the pipeline and directional drilling, and how the used water containing possible contaminants would be disposed of. Blasting and drilling during construction could cause bedrock fractures that would lead to contamination and redirection of aquifers affecting bedrock wells, farm water supplies, and wetlands.

4) Public Safety. First responders in Shelburne are primarily volunteers who have full-time jobs outside of town. No information is provided on education, equipment and other support that would be provided by TGP to prepare first responders in advance of pipeline accidents. Response by untrained, ill-equipped local personnel would significantly increase the risk to them and residents of the Town in the event of accidents.

5) Open Space and Recreation. Pipeline development would be contrary to the Shelburne Open Space and Recreation Plan[5]. The pipeline would cut through and fragment wildlife corridors and habitats expressly cited for protection by BioMap2. Pipeline construction and ongoing maintenance would disrupt migration patterns by native wildlife. They would also affect current and potential recreation (e.g., hiking, hunting, x-c skiing, snowmobiling) in the proposed pipeline corridor and surrounding areas.

6) Historical, Cultural and Archeological Resources. Historic homes, tree-lined narrow roads, farmlands and forests, and stone walls are central to the small-town, rural quality of Shelburne. Pipeline development is contrary to conserving that quality. Construction traffic would overwhelm designated Scenic Roads that are the only access to the proposed pipeline corridor[6] Right-of-way clearing would damage or even destroy stone walls, cellar holes and archeological sites that reflect Shelburne's long history of land stewardship. At risk, too, are Native American archeological sites that may be uncovered during construction. The pipeline will closely pass by the Herron farmhouse, which is a designated historic structure by the MA Historical Commission.

C. Shelburne's Motion to Intervene Must Be Granted

Shelburne satisfies the standard for intervention under the Commission's regulations. As discussed above, Shelburne is directly impacted by the proposed project, and no other individual or organization can adequately represent Shelburne's unique interest in this proceeding. Further, Shelburne's intervention is in the public interest because the Town is responsible for the protection of the health, safety and welfare of all of its residents. Accordingly, Shelburne respectfully requests that the Commission grant this Motion to Intervene.

II. CONTACT INFORMATION

The following town official should be added to the Official Service List, with all notices and communications in this proceeding addressed to the contact listed below:

Name: Joseph Judd, Selectman/Town Clerk

Address: Town Office, 51 Bridge Street, Shelburne Falls, MA

01370 Phone: 413/625-0301

Email: selectboard@townofshelburne.com

III. PROTEST/COMMENTS

A. TGP's application and its Environmental Reports present incomplete information on the exact location and construction of the pipeline. Details on critical project elements, e.g., frequency and loading of construction traffic, directional drilling under the Deerfield River, and co-location within existing transmission line corridors, are missing, making it difficult if not impossible for property owners and town officials to know and assess the actual project impacts.

B. TGP has not yet made a compelling case that there is a need for additional pipeline capacity to serve Massachusetts' energy needs, or that the need could not be better served by less intrusive, more sustainable and lower cost methods. The NED Pipeline should not be approved by FERC without establishing that it is the most effective means of meeting our intermediate and long-term energy needs as a state, and that it will not result in overbuild or potentially unnecessary infrastructure.

C. Massachusetts residents should not be required to pay for a gas export pipeline through infrastructure cost transfers embedded in long-term gas contracts. FERC must specifically reject the pass-through of infrastructure costs to ratepayers for any pipeline it approves, particularly if such a pipeline is transporting gas for export.

D. Massachusetts Attorney General Maura Healey commissioned a study that has made a compelling case that the NED Pipeline is not needed. We concur and urge FERC to consider the recently completed study in its evaluation of whether the need for this pipeline and public benefit to Massachusetts residents justifies the taking of property and the environmental impacts it will make.

E. The Town of Shelburne supports the proposal that FERC simultaneously review all pipeline proposals now before it collectively, not individually. Such a side-by-side review will show how much additional gas infrastructure, if any, is needed in Massachusetts and the New England region, and which other measures for meeting regional energy needs create the least impacts and environmental damage. When such a review is complete, we believe it will be clear there are even lower impact and more effective methods of meeting our energy needs than building a new pipeline.

F. We believe the most efficient and lowest impact means of meeting our region's energy needs is to invest in energy efficiency. These measures include: building insulation, efficient appliances and industrial processes, residential and commercial solar generation, co-generation and re-use of waste heat. Repairing leaks in the current gas infrastructure must be a priority. By ramping up our investments in energy efficiency and renewable energy resources, any need for additional gas capacity can be met by installing efficiency investments. In summary, it is possible to make our current gas infrastructure more than adequate to transition the region toward a renewable energy future.

G. Given the commitments by nations around the world to reducing fossil fuel use in order to slow human-caused climate change, FERC must adopt a high threshold of need before approving new fossil fuel related energy infrastructure proposals. We believe that when all current pipeline proposals are evaluated simultaneously, and are compared with other methods for meeting regional energy needs, the TGP proposal will be revealed to be a high impact, expensive and unnecessary method for meeting regional energy needs. As such, it must be rejected.

IV. CONCLUSION

Wherefore, in light of the foregoing, the Town of Shelburne respectfully requests that the Commission GRANT this motion to intervene and allow Shelburne to participate in this proceeding with full rights of party status, including the right to request a hearing, cross examine witnesses and seek rehearing and appeal.

Robert Manners, Chairman
Selectboard, Town of Shelburne

footnotes

- 1 A century farm is a farm that has been in operation by the same family for 100 years or longer.
- 2 Shelburne updated its Open Space and Recreation Plan in 2014. A survey sent to every resident asked about their preferences for Shelburne's future. 334 households participated-fully 1/3 of the Town's population. 92% of the respondents wanted Shelburne's small town, rural and agricultural milieu to be conserved, and any proposed development to be consistent with that value.
- 3 BioMap2 is designed to guide strategic biodiversity conservation in Massachusetts over the next decade by focusing land protection and stewardship on the areas that are most critical for ensuring the long-term persistence of rare and other native species and their habitats, exemplary natural communities, and a diversity of ecosystems.
- 4 There are at least five apiaries/bee yards within 2 miles of the proposed pipeline route (the average foraging distance for a bee). Two of these are home to important pollinators used by Apex Orchards, one of Shelburne's most successful orchards.
- 5 The Plan sets three goals: 1) maintain Shelburne's small-town environment characterized by general peace and quiet, clean air and water, safety from crime and vandalism, and its rural character; 2) maintain or improve the quality of its air, drinking water, streams and other surface waters and maintain and improve the quality of farm and forestlands, scenic views, and wildlife habitat through the conservation of locally important natural and open space resources; and 3) maintain and improve the quality and accessibility of all of Shelburne's recreational facilities and programming.
- 6 These roads and the trees and walls that line them cannot be disturbed under Massachusetts General Law, Part 1, Title VII, Chapter 40, Section 15C. Any repair, maintenance, reconstruction, or paving work shall not in-

volve or include the cutting or removal of trees, or the tearing down or destruction of stone walls, or portions thereof, except with the prior written consent of the planning board

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Wherefore on this 15 day of December, 2015, I caused to be served the foregoing Motion to Intervene electronically on all parties on the Commission's electronic service list in this proceeding, in accordance with Commission regulations.

Joseph Judd, Town Clerk

20151215-5137

MERRIMACK VILLAGE DISTRICT

December 15, 2015

VIA E-File and U.S. Mail

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

RE: Motion to Intervene in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.214 or 358.211) and the Regulations under the NGA (18 CRF 157.10)

Dear Secretary Bose:

The Merrimack Village District (MVD) is responsible for providing potable drinking water to 25,000 residents. All of their water resources are derived exclusively from groundwater that is pumped from a series of high-yielding wells sited in three shallow sand and gravel Aquifers. On an annual basis, the MVD provides approximately 800 *million* gallons of high quality, potable water to our customers.

The Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company has proposed siting a high pressure natural gas pipeline route through the Town of Merrimack. The pipeline route currently shown on their interactive website crosses two of the three "Major Aquifers" utilized by the MVD. ***Together, these two aquifers supply 83% of the potable groundwater supplied to the residents of Merrimack.***

A loss of any portion of these potable water supply resources would have devastating and catastrophic consequences to the Town of Merrimack and on the MVD's ability to provide a reliable source of water to its 25,000 customers. Emery & Garrett Groundwater Investigations (EGGI) has been working on behalf of the MVD for the past 20+ years to develop and protect critical groundwater resources that serve the residents and businesses throughout the Town of Merrimack, New Hampshire. EGGI has looked extensively throughout the Town of Merrimack, over the past 20+ years, and have concluded that no other "Major Aquifers" are available that are capable of replacing the overall quantity and quality of groundwater provided by the two Major Aquifers where the gas pipeline is proposed to be constructed.

Our Reasons for Concern include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Portions of the proposed gas pipeline route crosses areas where bedrock is at or near the ground surface; therefore, blasting will be necessary to install portions of the gas pipeline. Groundwater quality concerns with any blasting project are associated with the introduction of blasting chemicals (or their combustion by-products) into the environment. These blasting chemicals can enter the groundwater system and can ultimately create adverse impacts to the underlying bedrock aquifer and adjacent sand and gravel aquifer.
2. Installation of a high pressure gas pipeline also involves significant construction activities including (land clearing) major trenching and excavating, and tasks associated with the assembly of the pipeline and associated infrastructure. Construction activities pose numerous potential threats to the utilization of large community water supply wells. These threats include the frequent handling and storage

of petroleum products that can lead to uncontrolled releases into the environment and result in the contamination of underlying groundwater supplies; and Earth disturbance and excavations that can change (or concentrate) storm water flow in new directions and, as a result, subsequently impair surface water or groundwater quality.

3. Although the normal operation of a natural gas pipeline typically presents limited risk to groundwater quality, there are certain events or occurrences that can pose a significant threat to groundwater resources. Catastrophic pipeline failures are low frequency, high-impact events that have devastating consequences in terms of structural damage and personal injury. A catastrophic leak, explosion, or fire can lead to groundwater contamination due to runoff from fire suppression efforts and/or the mass injection of natural gas into the subsurface.
4. Furthermore, if this proposed pipeline can also be licensed (in the future) to carry liquid hydrocarbons (such as gasoline or crude oil), there is serious concern that a release of these products could result in a significant adverse impact to groundwater quality that renders the groundwater unfit for potable consumption for decades.
5. Finally, the placement of the gas pipeline in its current routing could limit future groundwater development in these Major Aquifers due to the required State setbacks from potential contamination sources.

The MVD finds it unacceptable to route a major petroleum pipeline in such close proximity to its irreplaceable Production Wells, high yield Aquifers, and their associated designated “sensitive groundwater recharge areas. OJ

We formally request Intervener status in accordance with the requirements of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.214 or 358.211) and the Regulations under the NGA (18 CFR 157.10)

Thank you,

Ronald Miner Jr.
Superintendent
Merrimack Village District
2 Greens Pond Rd.
Merrimack, NH 03054

20151215-5141

BEFORE THE UNITED STATES
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LLC)	
A division of Kinder Morgan)	Docket No. CP16-21-000
Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline)	

**MOTION TO INTERVENE OF THE TOWN OF NORTHFIELD
IN REFERENCE TO THE NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT (NED) PIPELINE**

Pursuant to Rule 214 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission’s (Commission) Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. §385.214, The Town of Northfield (hereinafter referred to as “the Town”) files this Motion to Intervene in the above-captioned proceeding. The Town has significant concerns regarding the environmental, safety, and socioeconomic impacts of the NED pipeline project. The resources in the Town that could be directly impacted by the proposed pipeline include: public and private drinking water supplies, permanently protected open space, farmland, rare and endangered species habitats, wetlands, vernal pools, cold-water fisheries, public infrastructure, private homes and businesses, and historic resources. The short and long-term impacts that the proposed project could have in our community are profound. The Town seeks to intervene on the NED Project to monitor the progress of the proceedings and expects to take a position on

the Project once we complete our review of the application filed with FERC.

I. STATEMENT OF INTEREST

A. Description of the Town of Northfield

The Town of Northfield is a small, rural community in Franklin County, Massachusetts consisting of 3,023 residents. If this project is approved the Town will play host to approximately 8.5 miles of pipeline and a 41,000 hp compressor station. The proposed project will directly impact 31 property owners and more than 100 property owners within 0.5 miles of the pipeline.

The proposed pipeline would be located in areas of the Town zoned for residential, agriculture, and forestry and is largely comprised of farmland and forest with sensitive habitat areas and other natural resources.

B. Description of Impacts

The Town of Northfield will be directly impacted and harmed by the proposed project as follows. The proposed pipeline will run through 8.5 miles through the geographic center of the Town. It will cross conservation lands, state forest lands protected by the Massachusetts State Constitution (Article 97), sensitive water protection areas, permanently protected open space, farmland, forestland, rare, threatened and endangered species habitats, wetlands, vernal pools, cold-water fisheries, public infrastructure, private homes and business, and historic resources.

The economic and public health of rural residents is closely tied to the health and viability of the region's natural resource base. Further, the NED pipeline project is proposed to be sited in an Environmental Justice Area in the northern portion of Northfield, and through a National Scenic Trail, which brings tourists to Northfield.

The pipeline is expected to impact air and water quality and may generate noise pollution. The pipeline also has the potential to impact private property including private wells and septic systems within the Town.

Fire protection is provided by an all-volunteer fire department, with forest fire support from the State. While a portion of Northfield is served by hydrants, the areas proposed by the NED plans are not. Most of the roads cited by Tennessee Gas are rural two-lane, in some cases unpaved, and with small bridges which are not suitable for heavy construction equipment or increased traffic.

C. Standard for Intervention

The Town of Northfield's Motion to Intervene must be granted to the Town of Northfield as it satisfies the standard for intervention under FERC's regulations. As discussed above, Northfield is directly impacted by the proposed project, and no other individual or organization can adequately represent Northfield's unique interest in this proceeding. Further, Northfield's intervention is in the public interest because the Town is responsible for the protection of the health and safety of all of its residents. Accordingly, the Town of Northfield respectfully requests that FERC grant this Motion to Intervene.

II. CONTACT INFORMATION

The following should be added to the Official Service List, with all notice and communications in this proceeding addressed to the contacts listed below:

Mr. Brian S. Noble, Town Administrator
Town of Northfield, 69 Main Street, Northfield, MA 01360

III. CONCLUSION

Wherefore, in light of the foregoing, the Town of Northfield respectfully requests that the Commission GRANT this Motion to Intervene and allow the INTERVENOR to participate in this proceeding with full rights of party status, including the right to request a hearing, cross examine witnesses and seek rehearing and appeal.

Submitted by request of the Board of Selectmen,
Brian S. Noble, Town Administrator
Town of Northfield, Massachusetts

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Wherefore on this December 15, 2015, I caused to be served the foregoing Motion to Intervene electronically on all parties on the Commission's electronic service list in this proceeding, in accordance with Commission regulations.

20151215-5307

BEFORE THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline/Kinder Morgan
Northeast Energy Direct
Docket No. CP16-21

Rebecca Meier is a Columbia County resident who fears the route of the Northeast Energy Direct could be changed once again to go near her home in Canaan. As a leader of Stop NY Fracked Gas Pipeline she has been advising people about the pipeline and has a stake in its outcome. As a citizen she has a stake in the future of the planet and the health and safety of its citizens which would be affected by this pipeline.

Pursuant to Commission Rules 385.214(b) and 157.10, Rebecca Meier moves to intervene in the above captioned proceeding. This intervention is timely filed.

I. CONTACT INFORMATION

Please enter Rebecca Meier below on the official service list for Docket No. CP16-21. All pleadings, filings and correspondence in this proceeding should be served on the following:

Rebecca Meier
1409 County Route 5
Canaan, NY 12029
beckyjmeier@gmail.com
518-781-4686

II. MOTION TO INTERVENE

Rebecca Meier seeks to intervene. Rebecca Meier is a leader of Stop NY Fracked Gas Pipeline. Personally she lives near the original route of the pipeline through Columbia County and knows that the route of the pipeline can change and fears there is a chance it could be re-routed again to go through Columbia County. She has been active educating others about the FERC process and how they can influence the progress of the pipeline. As a citizen she is concerned that the building of this pipeline will have negative effects on the earth's climate, on the people living and working near the fracking fields and on the residents living along the proposed pipeline.

Rebecca Meier opposes the proposed project. Continued extraction of fossil fuel is causing climate warming and is endangering life on our planet. Fracking as an extraction process is endangering the health and safety of people living near the fracking fields and workers in the industry. According to Massachusetts Attorney General Maura Healy's report this pipeline is not needed. Continuing to rely on fossil fuel is slowing our transition to renewable energy. If we put our energy and money into creating renewable energy sources we could meet our energy needs with these sources. The destruction of habitat created by the building of the pipeline is significant. The weekly explosions of pipelines across our country are scary. The safety record of Kinder Morgan is not encouraging. Leaks along the pipeline and venting at compression stations release methane and other toxic chemicals into our air, soil and water, making me fearful about the effect this has on the health and safety of residents along the pipeline. I object to the fact that in the FERC regulations people

who live in rural areas are less protected than those in urban areas (allowing thinner pipes, shutoff valves farther away and less inspection). None of this gas will be used by New Yorkers, but New Yorkers will be forced to absorb the adverse environmental and economic impacts, not to mention the intrusion on individual landowners' property. Kinder Morgan has made clear to its stockholders that it expects to export much of this gas, making big profits in so doing. Kinder Morgan has been lobbying to have electric users pay a tariff to help pay for this pipeline. Since this project is clearly not for the common good, I object to Eminent Domain being used for private profit.

WHEREFORE, for the foregoing reasons, Rebecca Meier requests that the Commission GRANT this motion to intervene.

Respectfully submitted,

Rebecca Meier
1409 Route 5
Canaan, NY 12029
518-781-4686
beckyjmeier@gmail.com
December 15, 2015

20151216-0008

United States Senate
Washington, DC 20510
December 10, 2015

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

Dear Chairman Bay.

I write regarding Kinder Morgan's proposed Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline, Docket No. PF14-22-000.

As you know, on September 10, 2015, I joined the New Hampshire congressional delegation in sending a letter to you requesting a substantive response to several specific questions and concerns raised by New Hampshire citizens, including the following'.

- Do you agree that FERC should make the threshold determination for "public need" before siting a proposed pipeline? Has FERC made that threshold determination in the case of Kinder Morgan's proposed NED pipeline? If so, please share with us your detailed analysis regarding the determination.
- Do you agree that in determining the "public need" for a proposed pipeline in a particular region, FERC should evaluate the potential impact of other proposed projects in the region, which may collectively provide unneeded excess capacity? Has it done so for the proposed NED project'?
- Do you agree that FERC should give strong consideration during its "public need" review to a project's economic and environmental impact on communities? Has it done so for the proposed NED project?
- The public comment system is receiving a very high volume of comments. What steps do the Commissioners take to directly review information on "public need" submitted via that system? Does FERC staff review, analyze, and brief Commissioners on those submissions?
- How do stakeholders with information relevant to the determination of "public need" ensure Commissioners will directly review that information?

- Do you agree that the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) should have a role in FERC's determination of whether to permit a proposed pipeline? Has PHMSA provided FERC with safety analysis for the proposed NED project?

Previously, on July 15, 2015, I joined the New Hampshire delegation in writing to the Inspector General for the Department of Energy (DOE), raising concerns with the complexity of FERC's permitting process for new interstate natural gas pipelines and the Commission's consideration of public comments during that process. Specifically, the letter requested an examination of FERC's permitting process and requested answers to the following questions:

- What actions is FERC taking to ensure that it fully complies with its statutory mandate to ensure all interstate natural gas infrastructure projects permitted by the Commission are consistent with public interest?
- Has FERC put in place proper tools and conducted sufficient outreach efforts to ensure that all affected stakeholders have accurate information and instruction on the ways in which they can participate in the interstate natural gas permitting process?
- Does FERC have in place performance measures and controls to provide reasonable assurance that it fully meets its obligations under Executive Order 18604 and other applicable statutes to promote the exchange of information among stakeholders?
- In what way does FERC ensure that the opportunities for public comment currently required in the interstate natural gas permitting process allow for all stakeholders to meaningfully express their concerns about the potential impacts (environmental and otherwise) of a proposed pipeline project?
- In what manner are comments from state and local officials and agencies considered during the permitting process?

The Inspector General responded that it was reviewing FERC's permitting process as part of its audit plan for fiscal year 2016, but did not provide answers to the questions raised by the delegation. On September 24, 2015, the delegation again wrote the DOE Inspector General reiterating the same questions. Once again, the Inspector General declined to answer the questions raised by the delegation.

I also joined the New Hampshire delegation in writing Kinder Morgan asking for a detailed explanation as to why the original route, which ran mainly through Massachusetts, was suddenly shifted to New Hampshire. While Kinder Morgan responded to the delegation's letter, I remain concerned about the shift in the route.

In addition to the questions our delegation has raised as detailed above, my constituents have raised a number of questions and concerns about the proposed pipeline route individually and through their local representatives, and I also believe their concerns should be meaningfully answered and addressed.

These are important questions and New Hampshire residents deserve substantive answers. Unless and until these questions are sufficiently answered and the concerns of local residents are meaningfully addressed, I oppose this project going forward.

Sincerely,

Kelly A. Ayotte
U.S. Senator

CC:

Commissioner Cheryl A. LaFleur, FERC
Commissioner Tony Clark, FERC
Commissioner Colette D. Honorable, FERC

20151216-0021

Kimberly Bose, Secretary
FERC

STOP THE NED PIPELINE!!

Protect NH land from Eminent Domain!

I oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) EXPORT pipeline. The pipelines, and compressor station will scar the NH landscape and put our water, wildlife, forests, agricultural lands and rural character at risk. These include health and safety risks from emissions, industrialization, pollution and the devastating effects of fire and explosions. Greed, not need is fueling this project. Say NO to this private company that will TAKE OUR LANDS with NO BENEFIT TO US.

Ben Pollack
11 Applewodd Dr
Hudson, NH 03051

20151216-0022

{ same text as 20151216-0021 above, except signed by }

Joshua C Blane
10 Mill Road
Durham, NH 03836

20151216-0023

{ same text as 20151216-0021 above, except signed by }

Dylan Carney
3 Cowell Drive
Durham, NH 03836

20151216-0024

{ same text as 20151216-0021 above, except signed by }

Brian Sullivan
17 Florence St
Dover, NH 03820

20151216-0057

{ same text as 20151216-0021 above, except signed by }

no name given

20151216-5010

Norman Boisse
42 Alexander Circle
Methuen, MA 01844
Email: nebois@verizon.net

12/15/15

Attention: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Reference: Docket# CP16-21-000

Dear Administrative Staff:

As a resident of Methuen, closely neighboring Dracut, Massachusetts, I have yet been shown evidence of the need for a new 36 inch gas pipeline with its accompanying 23,000 HP compressor station proposed to be built by Kinder Morgan – Tennessee Gas Corporation pumping what we are told will push 2.2 billion cubic feet of natural gas per day through the Town of Dracut.

Even though I live in Methuen adjacent to Dracut, I am quite concerned that the regularly scheduled blow offs that would occur would place caustic health issues from the dangerous chemicals that would be released. These contaminants get released in the air as well as will find their way to the ground in the surrounding areas, thereby contaminating the soil as well. I have family that resides within 1/10th of a mile of the proposed compressor station. Furthermore, there are many small farms in the area that the local people depend on buying the local produce as it has been felt to be healthier as most of it is organically grown.

Such a compressor station should not be close to any residential or farming areas for health and safety reasons. It is felt the Kinder Morgan is merely trying to look solely at the financial aspects for themselves without any concerns whatsoever for the environmental aspects as well as the health and safety of the areas where they would be building compressor/metering stations. Their selfish motives certainly over the long term to create a pipeline structure that would end up shipping natural gas to the East Coast to be shipped to other countries. Yes, some would be used here in Massachusetts; however there are alternative means of obtaining green energy such as importing hydro power from Quebec, and domestic solar and wind projects. On occasion in other parts of the country gas line and station explosions have occurred and these high pressure pipelines can be disastrous if a calamity occurs. Health issues of individuals living in close proximity of these stations have certainly been known to occur, however with much effort by the pipeline conglomerates to suppress such information.

I am asking that you use your abilities to prevent this pipeline from being run through any residential areas, and especially not allowing compressor/metering stations to be constructed within 5 miles of residential areas.

Looking forward for your support in this matter,

Sincerely,

Norman Boisse

20151216-5071

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Town of Windham, New Hampshire under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/16/2015 10:38:00 AM

Filed Date: 12/16/2015 10:38:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____

Town of Windham, New Hampshire dsullivan@windhamnh.gov

Basis for Intervening:

Motion to intervene for the Town of Windham, NH under docket CP 16-21

20151216-5149

Arnold Piacentini

•••

PO Box 454 • Richmond, MA 01254

Tel 413-698-2057 • Email symptrad@nycap.rr.com

December 16, 2015

Ms. Kimberly Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC)
888 First Street NE, Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426

via: Electronic Submission

MOTION TO INTERVENE IN

FERC Docket: CP16-21 ... Kinder Morgan (KMI)/Tennessee Gas Pipeline (TGP) Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Proposal

Dear Ms. Bose;

I am writing to request Intervener status in the above-referenced docket number.

The bases for my standing are several:

- I live in Richmond, MA where three TGP pipelines enter Massachusetts from Columbia and Albany Counties in New York. There is an existing gas hub in Richmond; passer-byes occasionally get a whiff of gas from the continuous emissions from the regulating station.
- Prior to having been drawn into the opposition to pipeline infrastructure by the announcement of the NED proposal, and of the Connecticut Expansion Project, I was in opposition to the use of extreme extraction processes for fossil fuels. My opposition stemmed from my caring of the environment, public safety and health, climate disruption and the adherent effects on younger and future generations.
- I was born in Massachusetts and mostly educated here. My children were brought up here for much of their lives. I have family, friends and acquaintances over the entire state, in fact over New England, New York and beyond that are and/or would be impacted by this fracked gas mania including the NED proposal. I am a grandfather of six with the three oldest being granddaughters of child-bearing age.
- I hold three degrees in Chemical Engineering, a BS from Tufts University and MS and PhD from Lehigh University. Subsequently, I held several responsible forwarding looking technical and commercial positions in the petrochemical and engineering plastics businesses. In some of these positions environmental conservation and environmental health were within my purview, as was process and manufacturing safety.

During my tenure in the petrochemical industry, the fossil fuel industries operated without most of their current exemptions to environmental laws. I believe that these exemptions were poorly conceived and politically motivated by persons who have since been discredited. In my opinion, these laws should be rescinded and ignored.

- My analysis of the public policy for fracked gas has concluded that it is a failed and very destructive policy and should be discontinued without delay. I have filed these conclusions with FERC. It is available in FERC's eLibrary system at:

http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/file_list.asp?accession_num=20151215-5034

- Subsequent to my corporate involvement, I operated my own financial business. This experience qualifies me for related analyses. My recent analysis on Kinder Morgan's financial condition is available in FERC's eLibrary system at:

http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/file_list.asp?accession_num=20151214-5205

Thank you for granting me Intervener status for the KMI/TGP NED proposal, FERC docket number CP16-21.

Signed: Arnold Piacentini, Pro Se

Arnold Piacentini, BS, MS and PhD in ChE

20151217-0015

Town of Richmond
Board of Selectmen
105 Old Homestead Highway
Richmond, NH 03470
www.richmond.nh.gov
(603) 239-4232

December 7, 2015

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

**Re: Errors in Kinder Morgan's Tennessee Gas' FERC filing re the NED pipeline
CP 16-21 / PF 14-22**

Comment of Richmond NH Board of Selectmen

Dear Ms. Bose,

Checking the Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas filing with FERC, we see a major error in the map that displays the topography and pipeline construction along the initial western part of the route in Richmond, from the Winchester line at MP 4.9 to well into Richmond at MP 5.8, on the map identified as TE SEG 1-007. The map shows the contour profile of the land as a steady slow rise approximating that of a gentle wheelchair ramp -at about 3 or perhaps 5% - with the understanding that the pipeline construction would generally follow this gentle grade. But if you know the land, or look at the contour lines accompanying the contour profile, you see that the land rises and falls over a small mountain in Richmond, Scott Mountain, with elevation extremes in this portion varying from 1160feet to under 800 feet, even according to the contour lines in the very same map filed by Kinder Morgan. Their profile drawing of the grade changes is completely wrong.

This is the same stretch of the proposed route that Kinder Morgan stated (in the FERC filing) that it had been changed at the request of town officials — where we town officials had emphatically requested exactly the opposite — that the original route be preserved.

So the entire filing must be checked for inaccuracies and untruths. Is this a company in which we should entrust our safety

Thank you for your attention,

Board of Selectmen, Town of Richmond NH, unanimously approved
Carol Jameson, Chairman, Richmond Board of Selectman

Cc: Allen Fore, Kinder Morgan

20151217-0021

{ same text as 20151216-0021 above, except signed by }

Alexis Prinz
40 Gables Way
Durham, NH 03824

20151217-0022

{ same text as 20151216-0021 above, except signed by }

Lisa Demaine
63 CampLee Rd
Epping, NH 03042

20151217-0023

Town of Richmond
Board of Selectmen
105 Old Homestead Highway
Richmond, NH 03470
www.richmond.nh.gov
(603) 239-4232

December 6, 2015

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

**Re: Misrepresentation in Tennessee Gas' FERC filing re the NED pipeline
CP 16-21 / PF 14-22**

Comment of Richmond NH Board of Selectmen

Dear Ms. Bose,

Regarding Kinder Morgan's route change through Richmond as filed on November 20, 2015 (see map page TE-SEG 1-007—as compared to the route previously filed with FERC in the pre-filing period - rerouting miles of pipeline closer to residential homes where as before it went through vacant logging land. See map page TE—SEG 1-007. Kinder Morgan states in its November 20, 2015 FERC filing that the changes in the proposed route through Richmond were made to “accommodate town and regulatory agency requests.”

We town officials in Richmond objected to Kinder Morgan's proposed change and asked that this part of the proposed route NOT be changed. The new route goes through a residential and historic area that should not be disturbed. It now parallels very close to the major road out of Richmond if we have to evacuate because of a pipeline accident. It impacts a stream, Brickyard Brook, that was previously minimally touched. In contrast, the original proposed route went through vacant logging land located much farther away from residences. The reroute is a much more invasive proposal.

The representative from Kinder Morgan told town officials that the change in route was at the request of the landowner of the logging parcel that is on the original route, a private deal negotiated between Kinder Morgan and the private landowner without input from town officials. We town officials objected strongly, as did local residents. We objected in letters and phone calls and multiple conversations with agents of Kinder Morgan, and in multiple letters sent to FERC and to our elected officials.

It appalls us that a private land owner can negotiate with a private company to move a pipeline closer to other people's homes -- is this public interest at work?

It appalls us too that a private company would misrepresent the statements of public officials, in a filing with a government agency.

Thank you for your attention,

Board of Selectmen, Town of Richmond NH, unanimously approved
Carol Jameson, Chairman, Richmond Board of Selectman
Kathryn McWhirk, Selectman
Christin Daugherty, Selectman

20151217-0028

*{Letter from J.L. Bradley to President Obama, 9 pages. }
{ small type & poor scan quality result in excessive errors }*

{ download original at <http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/opennat.asp?fileID=14075387> }

20151217-0029

{ small type & poor scan quality result in many errors }

President Barack Obama
The White House
Washington, D.C.

September 14, 2015

Dear President Obama,

I am writing you from Plainfield, Massachusetts in the western part of the state. It is beautiful, serene and pristine. Kinder Morgan has proposed a pipeline through the northern part of the area to carry fracked gas from Pennsylvania to Europe. The source of this gas is estimated to begin to run dry in 2019, less than a year after the proposed completion of the pipeline.

Everything possible is being done with this plan. It will destroy this culturally rich and environmentally sound part of the state, often referred to as the lungs of Massachusetts. The entire area is almost uniform in its support of renewable energy and is united in its opposition to this pipeline. At one of the many meetings we have attended in the last year, we oppose this destruction of our homes, sun, water, clean air, and night skies for the most egregious of reasons, corporate greed. My husband John put our electric bill in August into evidence. I am attaching it. This is a bill for two houses, a plug in car, a hot tub and all the other appliances we have so far. It's hard to read but the total was \$5.95.

We can't afford to, nor do we need to build "the Sacked gas bridge to the Shore" of renewable energy: we need a thing of the present. We may need your help on this one. We are fighting for our lives here and for the life of our planet.

With the deepest respect and gratitude,

Sebem Fisher

208 West St.

West Cummington, MA 01021

20151217-0030

{ small type & poor scan quality result in many errors }

FROM: Stephen Balog

Kate Balog

27 Orange Road

Northfield, MA 01360

DATE: July 24, 2016

RE: Kinder Morgan Proposed Compressor/Pipeline Project in Northfield, Massachusetts

Doc. #PF14-22-000

TO: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Chairperson

Stephan Balog's Comments: My wife and I are very concerned about having to live near such a large proposed gas compressor and gas project. We will live approximately 390 yards from the proposed compressor. There are no means to get a fire on Brush Mountain. Water has to be brought to the mountain in fire truck tankers. We must rely on our voluntary fire department which is about 5 miles from the proposed compressor. The first time we had a major fire on the mountain a house burned to the ground due to the volunteer fire department response and the lack of water.

The mountain road or Gulf Road so the proposed compressor, is not easy to navigate as there are many curves and it is very steep. Gulf Road is not maintained well during the winter months. Therefore, several vehicle accidents occur every year.

The mountain top is a complete ledge and my wife and I are concerned about the dynamiting that will be necessary by Kinder Morgan. We are concerned about our artesian well system and our house foundation. Another concern is, we do not have cell phone access on the mountain should there be an emergency. The mountain is prone to lightning strikes because we are so high up. What does this mean for our safety and evacuation from any emergencies?

My wife has lived on top of Brush Mountain for 63 years. I've lived here forty years. I'm retired and live in our secluded home that we do not want to be forced to move from.

Kate Balog's Commenter I am very putted how Kinder Morgan, who have never lived in ear town nor visited the Mountain, can look on a map and deckle to take away our personal Rves and invade the place of earth that I was born'nd raised on? The only reason Northfield Mountain has been chosen is because it is not highly populated.

The mountain has beautiful trees, historical sites, endangered and protected plants, anlmab and land on your proposed sacrigdal mountain; ag within feet of the proposed compressor. Not only are you destrmiing our Bves, but ag the animals that live on this mountain and the environment. My parents moved to this mountain in 1940and raised myself and 6 siblings here. We chose to also live here and raise our family.

The Earth does not belong to you, Kinder Morgan or anyone else. We have lived on this Mountain longer than you have known it existed. If you have a conscience, you wgl deny Kinder Morgan's proposed request to use Northgeld Mountain and the valley for this project.

My husband and I are hard working, honest and kind people. It is my begef that as humans, we borrow the earth for the short time we are here and need to leave it a better place than'when we first came.

I am assuming that anyone who would allow such an unnecessary, Invasive destruction of our Mountain and Tovrfl, doesn't have our kleals.

If you allow Kinder Morgan to destroy the Mountain, Valley and lives of every living thing in their path, you should ag be ashamed of yourselves. I hope when you Liy your head down on your pglow every night, you think of our beautiful Mountain and the destruction that you had a hand in agowlng.

Perhaps the pl pagne and compressor should be bugt within your gvling space or your chgdren's and grand-chgdreerfs gvng space? You can't really believe this is a beneficial to our Community and the Earth.

We live on a dirt road, with no street ggts; only the stars. At night it Is completely sgent empt for an oc-mional car passing by our house. I request that you come to Northfield, Massachusetts and drive up into the Mountains to see what you are giving your approval te destroy before sealing our fate. I wgl gladly show you the stars at night and let you smell our clean air.

Is this projected gas pllmgne and compressor project rangy what Prssddent Obama had In mimi with his Amerkan Clean Power Plant We would rather Massachusetts investigate wind turbine energy or solar panels for green energy as opposed to a gas compressor.

please help to stop the Kinder Morgan proposed pipegne and compressor project from taking Franklin County's lend and the Mountain in Norihfield.

Sincerely,

Stephen Balog

Kate Balog

C: President Barack Obama

Governor Charlie Baker

Secretary of Energy and Environmental Affairs Matthew Beaton

Attorney General Maura Healy

State Representative Paul Mark

State Senator Stan Rosenberg

U.S. Senator Egzabeth Warren

US. Representative Jim McGovern

Northfield, Massachusetts Selectboard — Town Administrator Brian Noble

20151217-4006

NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION

Division of Environmental Permits & Pollution Prevention

625 Broadway, 4th Floor, Albany, New York 12233-1750

P: (518) 402-9167 I F: (518) 402-9168 I deppermitting@dec.ny.gov

www.dec.ny.gov

December 17, 2015

Mr. Murali Ramamoorthy
Senior Engineer
Kinder Morgan, Inc.
1001 Louisiana Street
Houston, TX 77002

Application 10: 4-9904-00096/00001 - Air State Facility -Supply Path Mid Compressor Station
Application 10: 4-4342-00102/00001 - Air State Facility -Supply Path Tail Compressor Station
Application 10: 4-4350-00051/00001 - Air State Facility -Market Path Head Compressor Station
Application 10: 4-3830-00139/00001 - Air State Facility -Market Path Mid 1 Compressor Station

The New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) Division of Air Resources staff has begun review of the modeling submitted for the four compressor stations (Head, Tail, Mid, Mid1) which are part of the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Project. Below are several preliminary technical comments and questions regarding air modeling for which the DEC is seeking written revision and/or clarification:

1. For longer-term “Annual” impacts, the emergency generators at each NED project site are not exempt from dispersion modeling. AKRF will need to add these generators into their Annual impact modeling analysis. If the emergency generators operate for only 500 hrs/yr, the annual emissions can be scaled accordingly. Emergency generators are exempt from all short-term modeling (ex. t-hr, 8-hr, 24-hr).
2. In the NED permit applications, AKRF evaluated three ambient air temperatures of - 1Q°F, OaF, and 45°F but did not list a high ambient air temperature value, such as 90°F or 100°F. Since the summertime hourly air temperatures in Region 4 are typically over 45°F, we would need to see emissions data for at least one additional high ambient air temperature.
3. To ensure that we are modeling the worst-case scenario, we usually look at the emissions for several load scenarios (100%, 75%, and 50%) at a variety of low, moderate and high ambient air temperatures. In Appendix E, Section 2.2 of the permit applications for the NED projects, AKRF states that the 100% load OaF ambient air scenario was selected for modeling short term impacts and the 100% load 45°F ambient air scenario was selected for modeling annual impacts. To justify that these selections represent the worst-case impacts, AKRF would need to provide additional emissions information for the 75% and 50% load scenarios. AKRF may have already generated a varying-load/ambient-air scenario table to arrive at these conclusions but it was not provided with these reports. (Appendix C contains emissions information for only the 100% load scenario at -10°F, OaF and 45°F.)

DEC staff will continue to review these applications and will provide additional comments as review continues. Such comments would identify any additional information that must be submitted in order for DEC to determine these applications to be complete and prepare draft permits.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me by phone at (518) 486-9955, or by email at stephen.tomasik@dec.ny.gov.

Sincerely,
Stephen Tomasik
Project Manager
Major Projects Management Section
Division of Environmental Permits

xc: M. Letson, Kinder Morgan
Eric Tomasi, FERC
DEC Review Team

methane and leakage of methane. These are the same misrepresentations and omissions posited by Kinder Morgan about natural gas.

In addition to this, I am opposed to contributing in any way to profiting from fracked gas, which poisons other communities' common resources of land, air and water. If VP Dick Cheney had not exempted fracking from clean water regulations by the EPA, they would not be able to carry on their highly destructive, toxic practices. They go bust when the wells are not profitable and then leave the tax-payer to pay for their destruction. This is not profitability. If they can't pay for the destruction they cause, then they are not truly profitable.

I am the mother of a thirteen-year-old daughter. The chemicals found in products that are emitted from fracked gas pipelines are particularly hazardous to the reproductive organs of our children. Endocrine disruptors WILL BE emitted from the valves, the pigging stations and from leaks and all our children will be at risk of endocrine disruption and exposure to carcinogens. I chose to live here and to leave the New York City area (where I lived for 20 years) because my husband and I wanted to get away from the industrial pollution in Jersey City, New Jersey. We wanted to raise our family here because of the clean, beautiful environment and the rich cultural and educational offerings. I am not alone in these choices. I do not want my daughter to grow up down-wind from the fracked gas pipeline and I don't want anyone else's child to either.

I don't think we should be building this pipeline here or anywhere. We should be ending the subsidies to fossil fuel extraction and replacing it with programs to research energy storage improvements, extremely efficient materials and techniques and developing locally-based, renewable energy infrastructure. We certainly should not be forcing ratepayers to PAY (+\$5,000,000,000!) for these toxic and obsolete infrastructure projects. The economics alone are reason enough to nix this NED.

*(multinational corporation with conflicts of interest in the NED Project)

** Shortfalls that occur a handful of days per year could be accommodated with use of existing sites for LNG storage. Significant leakage and poor maintenance has been documented. Addressing leakage would greatly help

20151217-5006

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Alan Archer and Kristie Archer under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/16/2015 9:55:27 PM

Filed Date: 12/17/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	Archerslanding@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

Alan P. Archer, Kristie S. Archer and their 3 children, Camille, 13, Tristan 12 and Evelyn Mae, 10 are residents of the Town of Pelham, in Rockingham County, New Hampshire. The proposed right-of-way of the Tennessee Pipeline Company's NED project runs across the Archers property. They currently own lot number 8-217-7, which is 4.85 acres in size, with 663.27' at the back line running directly under the center of the current power line. As a result, approximately 35% of the Archers' property is subject to condemnation if a certificate is granted.

Pursuant to Commission Rules 385.214(b) and 157.10, Alan P. Archer and Kristie S. Archer move to intervene in the above captioned proceeding. This intervention is timely filed.

The Archers' 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 35% of their land, and would cause irreparable

damage to the property. The open space under the powerlines was surveyed for a proposed Christmas Tree Farm, which falls well within the limited use guidelines of the electric company, but would be impossible to carry out under the proposed pipeline plans. The use of un-determined pesticides that could cause harm to the livestock (free-range chickens) owned by the Archers, as well as the health of the young children would be further cause of concern. This home was purchased knowing that it has been surveyed and zoned for an additional home to be placed to the rear of the property line, adjacent to the now proposed pipeline. If the pipeline is approved any construction would be impossible and all possible income realized by an additional property built on this site would be permanently lost. Further, their residence will be directly adjacent to the right-of-way, well within the “incineration zone” in the event of an explosion. Further, the residence 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. Lastly, the rear of the property under and adjacent to the proposed power line contains valuable free, exposed and semi-exposed stone that holds value to the Archers, and was destined to be used to build stone walls and building materials for home expansion projects.

Mr. and Mrs. Archer are OPPOSED to the proposed project. They have no further comments at this time. However, by intervening in this proceeding, Mr. and Mrs. Archer will have access to Tennessee Pipeline Company’s filings, which will enable them to provide more detailed comments as the application proceeds.

20151217-5034

BEFORE THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

_____)	
Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC)	Docket No. CP16-21-000
_____)	

**MOTION TO INTERVENE OF
The TOWN OF PEPPERELL, MASSACHUSETTS**

Pursuant to Rules 212 and 214 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission’s (the “Commission”) Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 CFR §§ 385.212 and 385.214, Section 15(a) of the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.10), the Town of Pepperell, Massachusetts (the “Town”) hereby moves to intervene in the above-captioned proceeding.

On November 20, 2015, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. (“Tennessee Gas”) filed its Notice of Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to (i) construct, install, modify, and operate certain pipeline and compression facilities to be located in Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Connecticut, and (ii) to abandon certain facilities, as part of the Northeast Energy Direct Project (NED Project).

The Town of Pepperell is a municipal corporation, duly organized under the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and incorporated in 1775, with offices at One Main Street, Pepperell, MA 01463. The Board of Selectmen is an elected three person board which is the governing body of the Town of Pepperell.

On June 30, 2014, the Town at Special Town Meeting passed a Non-binding Resolution to oppose the proposed pipeline. The Resolution was passed by a unanimous vote as the NED Project would “go against our commitments to life, the environment, our economic well-being and our bodily safety.” The Town organized a coalition of municipal pipeline communities known as the Northeast Municipal Pipeline Coalition, which currently includes 15 towns who, as a regional organization, are committed to protecting our residents from the health, safety, financial, and environmental impacts of the NED Project.

The Massachusetts Alternative route, defined in the NED Project Resource Report 10 as the Preferred Route, directly impacts the Town with both the mainline and lateral pipelines. This route continues to be an alternative and would have severe health, safety, and environmental impacts to the residents of the Town. The

current proposed preferred mainline route will run just one town north of Pepperell through New Hampshire and the Townsend lateral is just one town west of Pepperell. Construction, installation, modifications, and operation of the pipeline and compression facilities north and west of the Town may have direct health and environmental impacts on the Town's residents. The Town's aquifer protection zone extends into New Hampshire, our rivers and streams extend beyond town and state boundaries, and the air we breathe can be compromised by the releases of methane gas at the multitude of proposed pipeline infrastructure locations. The taking of properties protected by Article 97 of the Amendments to the Massachusetts Constitution for the construction of the proposed pipeline and related infrastructure will impact land protection efforts in every community statewide. With over 100 conservation properties (most protected by Article 97) potentially impacted by the NED Project, our obligation to protect these open spaces is compromised and interpreted by some as a lack of our commitment to protect what has taken years and countless dollars to protect. Conservation Commission's across the Commonwealth, as well as land protection organizations statewide, protect lands in perpetuity, but the NED Project threatens our ability to guarantee this. Lands left as legacies for future generations, many of which are wildlife corridors, trail systems, greenways, or protection of our aquifers are easily identifiable as locations for the installation of pipelines, for both current and future expansion. As one of 351 communities in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the Town is committed to addressing our energy challenges by investing in energy conservation and clean energy. The Town supports the Commonwealth's goals of meeting the established targets under the Global Warming Solutions Act (GWSA) to reduce total GHG emissions by 25 percent below 1990 levels by 2020 and 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. The NED Project may seriously impact our commitment to reach these goals.

Accordingly, the Town has a direct and substantial interest in the above docket and will be directly impacted by the outcome of this proceeding. The Town cannot adequately be represented by any other party and may be adversely affected or bound without opportunity to present its position unless it is permitted to participate in this matter. Moreover, the Town's participation in this proceeding is in the public interest. Accordingly, good cause exists to grant the Town's Motion to Intervene.

All correspondence and communications related to this proceeding should be directed to the following individual, whose name and address should be placed on the official service list maintained by the Secretary for this proceeding:

Mark Andrews, Town Administrator
Town of Pepperell
One Main Street
Pepperell, MA 01463
978.433.0333 Extension 221
mandrews@town.pepperell.ma.us

Paula Terrasi, Conservation Administrator
Town of Pepperell
One Main Street
Pepperell, MA 01463
978.433.0325
pterrasi@town.pepperell.ma.us

Wherefore, for the reasons discussed above, the Town of Pepperell respectfully requests that the Commission grant the Town's Motion to Intervene as a party in the above-captioned proceeding with all the rights attendant hereto.

Respectfully submitted this 14th day of December 2015.

Mark Andrews, Town Administrator
Stephen C. Themelis, Board of Selectmen Chairman
Michelle R. Gallagher, Board of Selectmen Clerk
Melissa M. Tzanoudakis, Board of Selectmen

20151217-5035

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

MOTION TO INTERVENE AND COMMENTS OF PRIVATE CITIZENS FROM WINDSOR MA. RESIDENTS WHO FORM THE COMPRESSOR AND PIPELINE OPPOSITION OF WINDSOR (CaPOW)

Pursuant to Sections 212 and 214 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (“Commission”) promulgated at 18 C.F.R. § 382.212 and § 385.214, the Windsor Massachusetts residents who form the Compressor and Pipeline Opposition of Windsor respectfully move to intervene and provide comments in the above- captioned proceeding.

Basis and Grounds for Intervention

CaPOW is a grassroots group composed of Windsor Ma. residents who have organized for the sole purpose of fighting this proposed project. A number of its members would be within 1 mile of the proposed compressor station. All would be within 5 miles. Various members of this group rely on a clean environment to: farm organically to homestead, raise organic produce as a livelihood, raise laying hens that free range, and raise dairy goats.

Therefore, CaPOW requests intervenor status because all participants would be directly impacted by this project. Our gardens would no longer be considered organic with the level of emission pollutants in the air and water, and the products from our livestock would no longer be considered safe. Our life styles and livelihoods would be inalterably destroyed. Our property values would be seriously diminished. Our well water put in risk of contamination

Pursuant to Commission Rules 385.214(b) and 157.10, CaPOW moves to intervene and file comments in the above proceeding. This intervention is timely filed. The members of CaPOW file this motion jointly, both as part of CaPOW and individually.(see contact information)

Contact Information

Please enter CaPOW on the official service list for Docket No. CP16-21-000. All pleadings, filings and correspondence in this proceeding should be served on the following;

Jan L. Bradley 841 route 9 Windsor 413-684-3732	frosthollowjan@gmail.com
Marnie and Bob Meyers 152 Hinsdale Rd. 413-684-3463	windalewoods@verizon.net
Holly Higinbotham 300 High Street Hill 684-3724.	higinbo@hotmail.com
Robert Wood 300 High Street Hill 684-3724.	rrwood50@hotmail.com
Susan and Richard Jacobs 565 Worthington Rd 413-684-3191	rmspj1@verizon.net
Michelle Koelle and Sean Lonergan 269 East Windsor Rd. 413-329-	liamdean@verizon.net
Richard and Jean Wagner 105 Windigo Rd 413-684-4435	rnbeaner@aol.com
Valerie Kohn 522 High St. Hill 413-684-1731	valckohn@verizon.net
Audrey Greene 110 Hill Cemetary Rd. 413-684-3424	audrey114_vt@yahoo.com
Dr Richard and Sharon Sutter. 975 East Windsor Road 413-684-4744	richardsutter@verizon.net
Glenn and Mary Roy 1495 East Windsor Rd. 413 684 4889	roys1495@verizon.net
Stu Besnoff 189 North St 413 684 3950	stu@alpinesolarheat.com
Tom and Ellen LeRose 1689 East Windsor Rd. 413 684 3110	ragsboytl@verizon.net

Motion to Intervene

CaPOW seeks to intervene because the individuals comprising this organization are directly impacted by the proposed 41,000 hp compressor station (possibly doubling in size at the option of the developer). We would be impacted by: compressor station emissions, ground water (well water) contamination during construction and from subsequent pollution, structural damage from blasting during construction, loss of livelihood and devaluation in property values; thus diminishing the town’s tax base.

CaPOW opposes this proposed project for the foregoing reasons. CaPOW requests that the Commission GRANT this motion to intervene and comments.

**MOTION TO INTERVENE BY
THE TOWN OF MILFORD, NEW HAMPSHIRE**

Pursuant to Rules 212 and 214 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's ("FERC") Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. §§ 385.212 and 385.214, and as authorized by the Milford, New Hampshire Board of Selectmen by unanimous vote on November 23, 2015, the Town of Milford, New Hampshire ("Milford" or "Town") hereby submits this timely motion to intervene and file comments in the above-captioned proceeding. The Board of Selectmen is an elected five person board that serves as the governing body of the Town of Milford.

I. COMMUNICATIONS AND CORRESPONDENCE

The following individual should be included on the service list for this docket, and all communications should be sent to:

Mark Bender, Town Administrator
Town of Milford
1 Union Square, Milford NH 03055
(603) 249-0601
MilfordPipeline@milford.nh.gov

II. IDENTITY AND INTERESTS OF PETITIONER

1. The above matter concerns an application for the construction of a natural gas transmission pipeline and other facilities ("Project"). Several miles of the pipeline will be located within the Town and within the right of way of public streets and on other property owned by the Town.
2. The Town and its residents will be directly affected by the construction and operation of the pipeline within the municipality. The pipeline is proposed to be installed within public streets that pass through residential and commercial areas. Milford has concerns as to construction-related impacts on the safety and convenience of residents and business, and as to the impacts of the completed pipeline on public health and safety.
3. The impacts of construction and operation of the Project on the Town and its residents may include, but are not necessarily limited to, public safety hazards, traffic and transportation disruptions (with related interruptions of public services), noise generation, air pollution, disruption of wetlands and aquatic ecosystems, public and private wells, building foundations, septic systems, and adverse effects on the Town's scenic, historic, and cultural resources.
4. Milford would like to ensure that the aforementioned local concerns are adequately addressed in the environmental review of the Project. Accordingly, Milford has a substantial interest in these proceedings.

III. CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, the Town of Milford, NH respectfully requests that it be permitted to intervene in this proceeding with full rights to participate in all further proceedings.

Respectfully submitted,
Mark Bender, Town Administrator
Town of Milford
1 Union Square
Milford, NH 03055
(603) 249-0601
MilfordPipeline@milford.nh.gov

Dated: December 17, 2015

20151217-5131

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Rosemary L Wessel under CP16-21-000.
Filing as a homeowner who would be personally and financially impacted in multiple ways by the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline project.

Submission Date: 12/17/2015 1:09:38 PM Filed Date: 12/17/2015 1:09:38 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	wsrw@verizon.net	

Basis for Intervening:

I am a landowner in Cummington, Massachusetts. I invested everything I have into moving to this community in 2002 for many reasons, including accessibility to dark night skies and to assure that I can grow my own organic vegetables and free-range chickens in a clean environment, away from industrial development. In doing so, it was and remains my intent to live the remainder of my life in this community.

Construction of the NED pipeline would mean that I would now be situated:

— 3 miles downwind of the proposed 41,000 horsepower compressor station in Windsor.

This would place my property within the drift zone particulate matter and other toxic pollutants and light pollution in what is now “the darkest corner of New England”. This is the reason an astronomy center exists 1.5 miles from my home and why the Notchview reservation (abutting the compressor station site property) holds astronomy and “stargazing” events among its many other nature-oriented programs, and was the primary factor in my choosing to live here. The effects of living downwind of the compressor would include not only damage to my ability to grow my own food in a clean environment, but risks to the health of me, my family and community from breathing pollutants and particulate matter.

— 2.8 miles from where the pipeline would cross the Westfield River, a designated federal “Wild and Scenic” river.

This river is not only a place I visit regularly in the summer months, but runs through the downtown of the West Cummington and Cummington communities where we live. Wet trenching during construction, pipeline coatings and other possible pollutant leaks affect not only our community, but the entire Hilltowns region, downstream from this crossing. This crossing is part of the headwaters that lead through Worthington, Huntington, Russell, Westfield and West Springfield among other communities on its way to the Connecticut River and is a host to already endangered coldwater fish communities and the predator and raptor species that rely on them as a food source.

— As an independent business person who serves the advertising and marketing needs of businesses who rely on the rural and wild nature of the region to attract tourism and those who participate in a rural and/or organic lifestyle.

— In a region that would feel the economic impacts of:

- reduced property values and the effect this would have on local tax bases, beyond any compensation offered by the pipeline company
- regional health consequences of pollutants associated with the operation of the pipeline
- tariffs proposed to force regional ratepayers to cover the costs of the pipeline
- depressed area economy that relies on the rural character of the region for tourist income
- possible increases in energy costs that could result from export natural gas, forcing local markets to compete on a global scale

— In a financial position where I would receive no compensation from the pipeline company, yet find my

property more difficult to sell if I found living conditions here untenable after the pipeline is built. I, like many in the region, do not have the financial ability to abandon my property or sell at a greatly reduced rate to move elsewhere away from industrial development again. Construction and operation of the NED pipeline would greatly impact my quality of life, and economic wellbeing, and leave me in a position where it would be difficult to re-establish myself somewhere else.

For these reasons, I am interested in and would be affected by Applicant's filing. My interests cannot be adequately represented and protected by any other party. Hence, the Commission should grant me permission to intervene in proceedings for Northeast Energy Direct.

20151217-5132

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.

Docket No. CP16-21-000

**MOTION TO INTERVENE OF
THE TOWN OF ASHBY, MA**

Pursuant to Rules 212 and 214 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (the "Commission") Rules of Practice and Procedure,) 8 CFR §§ 385.212 and 385.214, Section 15(a) of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. § 717n), the Town of Ashby, MA (the "Town") hereby moves to intervene in the above-captioned proceeding.

I. Background

On or about November 20, 2015, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.c. ("Tennessee Gas") filed its Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to Construct Install, Modify, Operate and Maintain Certain Pipeline and Compression Facilities and to Abandon Other Facilities.

II. Motion to Intervene

The Town of Ashby is a municipal corporation, duly organized under the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and incorporated in J 767, with offices at 895 Main St., Ashby, MA OJ 43 J. The Board of Selectmen is an elected three person board which is the governing body of the Town of Ashby.

Construction, operation and maintenance of the Kinder Morgan Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Energy Direct project would adversely impact the Town. We have environmental, public health, and safety concerns on behalf of our citizens.

On May 31st 2014, the Town voted unanimously to oppose the Kinder Morgan Tennessee Gas Pipeline (KM/TGP) Northeast Energy Direct (NED) project at our Annual Town Meeting'. Our resolution, in part, stated the proposed pipeline project would "go against our commitments to life, the environment, our economic well-being and our bodily safety." The Town stands by that statement and seeks to protect our town and its citizens through the process of intervention.

The Town has important information and perspectives to bring to this process, consideration of which will serve the public interest. It is certain that the Town will be impacted in some manner by the construction and operation of the natural gas transmission line proposed by KM/TGP.

Accordingly, the Town has a direct and substantial interest in the above docket and will be directly impacted by the outcome of this proceeding. The Town cannot be adequately represented by any other party and may be adversely affected or bound without opportunity to present its position unless it is permitted to participate in this matter. Moreover, the Town's participation in this proceeding is in the public interest. Accordingly, good cause exists to grant the Town's Motion to Intervene.

III. Communications

All correspondence and communications related to this proceeding should be directed to the following individuals whose names and addresses should be placed on the official service list maintained by the Secretary for this proceeding:

Robert Hanson, Town Administrator
Town of Ashby
895 Main St.
Ashby, MA 01431
978.386.2424 Ext. 25
tadministrator@ashbyma.gov

Cathy Kristofferson, Conservation Commission
Town of Ashby
895 Main St.
Ashby, MA 01431
978.204.3940
conscom@ashbyma.gov

IV. Conclusion

Wherefore, for the reasons discussed above, the Town of Ashby respectfully requests that the Commission grant the Town's Motion to Intervene as a party in the above-captioned proceeding with all the rights attendant thereto.

Respectfully submitted this 17th day of December, 2015.

By:
Robert Hanson, Town Administrator
Town of Ashby
895 Main St.
Ashby, MA 01431
978.386.2424 Ext. 25
tadministrator@ashbyma.gov

20151217-5143

Daniiel R. Jaracz, Methuen, MA.
Regency at Methuen Condominium Trust
2 Sherwood Drive
Methuen, MA 01844

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

OEP/DG2E/Gas Branch 3

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC
Northeast Energy Direct Project
Docket Nos. CP16-21-000, PF14-22-000

§ 375.308(z)

Dear Ms. Bose:

In response to Kinder Morgan's recent application filing for the NED pipeline, FERC on December 8, 2015 directed Kinder Morgan to study three alternatives to the site they have proposed for a compression station in Dracut, MA. One of those alternatives is located at the Brox Industries quarry, which is less than 1,000 yards from our recently-built community of 240 homes.

Because Regency at Methuen, an over-55 active older adult community, was only recently completed, we wonder if the data that FERC used to select this site as an alternative is in fact up to date as to nearby population. There are currently nearly 500 people living in our community.

The residents of Regency at Methuen are deeply concerned about the potential impact of such a facility in

polluted waterways in the US in the 70's. Today, the water quality is dramatically better, but the pollutants of the past are still there in the sediment. We are very concerned that these past problems will come back to haunt us and end up in our drinking water.

The currently proposed path crosses the Merrimack and its tributaries many times, but some of these crossings have a chance to re-suspend some harmful chemicals and heavy metals that could impact our drinking water and the health of the river. For example, the proposed pipeline crosses the Souhegan River in Wilton, NH. According to the New Hampshire 303 d list of impaired waters, this segment of river contains high levels of aluminum, iron, and lead in the sediments.

Another example, the Lynnfield lateral pipeline is proposed to cross the Merrimack River between Dracut and Tewksbury. That particular stretch of the river is listed by Massachusetts as being contaminated with mercury and PCBs. These are just two examples.

From the site where the pipeline would cross from Dracut into Tewksbury it is under 10 miles to the intakes for the public water supplies for Tewksbury, Andover, Methuen, and Lawrence. From the section of the Souhegan River that contains lead and aluminum, there is less than 20 miles of river until Nashua gets its water from the Merrimack.

Second, the other major concern we have is the loss of forested land and the impact of permanently losing this land on water quality. In a study from the US Forest Service, the Merrimack River watershed was rated the most threatened watershed in the country for loss of privately owned forested lands, 4th in the country for threats to water quality, and 7th in the country for loss of habitat for species at risk. The completed project is going to occupy over 1 thousand acres of land that will never have trees on it again. We will lose 3800 acres during construction. The Merrimack watershed cannot afford to lose that land. The American Water Works Association studied 27 water supplies and found that a 10% increase of forested land lead to a 20% drop in treatment costs, and the EPA found that every dollar spent to protect the water reduced treatment costs by \$27.

So, when I say we cannot afford to lose this land, I really mean we can't afford it.

Because of these reasons, the MRWC has some major reservations about this project. We hope that FERC will take these important public health concerns into account, especially if the project goes forward. All parties involved must take the National Environmental Policy Act review process, along with the Clean Water Act, very seriously, or those of us who depend on the Merrimack River for our drinking water will end up paying for it.

20151217-5253

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of SCOTT E. FARNSWORTH under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/17/2015 4:29:30 PM Filed Date: 12/17/2015 4:29:30 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____

Individual SCOTTFARNS123@GMAIL.COM

Basis for Intervening:

I'm a concerned citizen who may be impacted by this natural gas pipeline and compressor station.

20151218-0015

{ same text as 20151216-0021 above, except signed by }

Joan Cannon

36 Oyster River Road

Durham, NH 03824

December 17, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr., Deputy Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company Northeast Energy Direct Project (Docket CP16-21)

Dear Secretary Bose,

We, the members of the Town of Troy Planning Board, would like to express our views on the proposed Northeast Energy Direct (NED) project. The proposed facilities in the Town of Troy consist of approximately 1.59 miles of pipeline, according to records submitted on November 20, 2015. Further, we do not see that the proposed project provides benefits to the Town. As a Town, we have expressed our opinions on the matter at our 2015 annual meeting by voting on and accepting the following warrant articles:

- Warrant Article 33: To see if the town will vote to oppose installation of a natural gas pipeline by Kinder Morgan because the proposal is inconsistent with individual property rights, because if approved, KM would have the power to force private property owners to give up easement under Eminent Domain proceedings for installation of the pipeline.
- Warrant Article 34: To see if the town will vote to oppose installation of a natural gas pipeline by Kinder Morgan because the proposal is inconsistent with protecting the Town's groundwater, residential wells, other bodies of water, local vegetation, wildlife and threatened species.
- Warrant Article 35: To see if the town will vote to oppose installation of a natural gas pipeline by Kinder Morgan because the proposal is inconsistent with preserving the Town's rural character, scenic roads, roadside trees, stone walls, forests, woodlands, wetlands, and open-space areas for recreational purposes.
- Warrant Article 36: To see if the town will vote to oppose installation of a natural gas pipeline by Kinder Morgan because the proposal would adversely affect health and safety by causing construction materials, soil, dust, and potential contaminants to enter the air, wetland areas, and/or groundwater, aquifers, drinking water, along with residential wells and any run-off or seasonal melts.
- Warrant Article 37: To see if the town will vote to oppose installation of a natural gas pipeline by Kinder Morgan because the Town lacks the required equipment or personnel for emergency services to adequately address potential health and safety risks of a pipeline explosion, leak or other installation.
- Warrant Article 38: To see if the town will vote to oppose installation of a natural gas pipeline by Kinder Morgan because the proposal is inconsistent with the Town's goal of keeping the Troy Mills Landfill Superfund site environmentally secure regarding surface water, monitoring wells, wetlands, air and soil.

As an authority on both development and the preservation of natural resources, it is the opinion of the Planning Board that these concerns are just and represent the sentiment of the Town as a whole. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment.

Sincerely,

Mr. Francis Fournier, Chair
Town of Troy Planning Board

Cc: US Congresswoman Ann McLane Kuster
US Senator Kelly Ayotte
US Senator Jeanne Shaheen
Governor Maggie Hassan

County Commissioner Stillman Rogers

Senator Jeanne Shaheen
506 Hart SOB
Washington, DC
20510

Ph: (202) 224-2841
TTY: (202) 224-4049
Fax: (202) 228-3194

Congresswoman Ann McLane Kuster
18 North Main Street, Fourth Floor
Concord, NH 03301
Phone: (603) 226-1002
Fax: (603) 226-1010

Senator Kelly Ayotte
1200 Elm Street, Suite 2
Manchester, NH 03101-2503
Phone: 603-622-7979
Fax: 603-622-0422

Governor Maggie Hassan
Office of the Governor
State House
107 North Main Street
Concord, NH 03301
(603) 271-2121
(603) 271-7680 (fax)

Commissioner Stillman Rogers
Cheshire County Administration
12 Court Street
Keene, NH 03431
Phone: (603) 352-8215
Fax: (603) 355-3000

20151218-5049

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Before the
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

In the Matter of)
Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LLC .)

Docket No. CP16-21-000

**MOTION TO INTERVENE AND COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THE
NEW ENGLAND LOCAL DISTRIBUTION COMPANIES**

The New England Local Distribution Companies (“New England LDCs”) include:

Bay State Gas Company
d/b/a Columbia Gas of Massachusetts
The Berkshire Gas Company
Liberty Utilities (EnergyNorth Natural Gas)
Corp. d/b/a Liberty Utilities
Connecticut Natural Gas Corporation

City of Holyoke, Massachusetts Gas and
Electric Department
Northern Utilities, Inc.
NSTAR Gas Company d/b/a Eversource
The Southern Connecticut Gas Company
Westfield Gas & Electric Department

Fitchburg Gas and Electric Light Company

Yankee Gas Services Company
d/b/a/ Eversource

Pursuant to the provisions of the Natural Gas Act (“NGA”), as amended, 15 U.S.C. §§ 717, et seq. (2006), and to the provisions of Rule 214 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission’s (“Commission”) Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 385.214 (2015), and the December 7, 2015 Notice of Application in the above-referenced docket, the New England LDCs respectfully move jointly and severally to intervene in the above-referenced proceeding. On November 20, 2015, Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LLC (“Tennessee”) filed an application pursuant to Sections 7(b) and (c) of the Natural Gas Act to construct and operate the Northeast Energy Direct Project (the “Project”) which proposes to provide up to 1.3 Bcf/d of firm capacity.[1] Members of the New England LDCs have signed precedent agreements for Project capacity. The New England LDCs support the Project and request prompt approval of the Application.

I. Motion to Intervene

In support of their motion to intervene, the New England LDCs state as follows:

The names and office addresses of movants are:

Bay State Gas Company
d/b/a Columbia Gas of Massachusetts
300 Friberg Parkway
Westboro, MA 01581

Northern Utilities
6 Liberty Lane
West Hampton, NH 03842-1720

The Berkshire Gas Company
115 Cheshire Road
Pittsfield, MA 01201

NSTAR Gas Company d/b/a Eversource
One NSTAR Way, NE 220
Westwood, MA 02090-9230

Connecticut Natural Gas Corporation
77 Hartland Street
East Hartford, CT 06108

The Southern Connecticut Gas Company
855 Main Street
Bridgeport, CT 06604-4918

Liberty Utilities (EnergyNorth Natural Gas)
Corp. d/b/a! Liberty Utilities
15 Buttrick Road
Londonderry, NH 03053

Westfield Gas & Electric Department
100 Elm Street
P.O. Box 990
Westfield, MA 01086

Fitchburg Gas and Electric Light Company
6 Liberty Lane West
Hampton, NH 03842-1720

Yankee Gas Services Company
d/b/a Eversource
107 Selden Street
Berlin, CT 06037

City of Holyoke, Massachusetts Gas and
Electric Department
99 Suffolk Street
Holyoke, MA 01040

Communications and correspondence regarding this motion should be addressed to:

* Debra Ann Palmer, Esq.
Noy S. Davis, Esq.
Schiff Hardin LLP
901 K Street, N.W. Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20001
Email: dpalmer@schiffhardin.com

Email: ndavis@schiffhardin.com

In addition, copies of such correspondence or communication should be sent to the representatives of the respective members of the New England LDCs listed below:

The New England LDCs
"Debra Ann Palmer, Esq.
Noy S. Davis, Esq.
Schiff Hardin LLP
901 K Street, NW, Ste. 700
Washington, DC 20001
Email: dpalmer@schiffhardin.com
Email: ndavis@schiffhardin.com

Fitchburg Gas and Electric Light Company
Northern Utilities, Inc.
*Robert S. Furino
Director - Energy Contracts
Unitil Service Corp.
6 Liberty Lane
West Hampton, NH 03842-1720
Email: furino@unitil.com

Bay State Gas Company
d/b/a Columbia Gas of Massachusetts
*Deepak Raval
FERC Specialist
NiSource Corporate Services Co.
290 W. Nationwide Blvd.
Columbus, OH 43215
Email: draval@nisource.com

City of Holyoke, Massachusetts Gas
and Electric Department
* Timothy Shannon
Superintendent - Gas
City of Holyoke, Massachusetts Gas
and Electric Department
99 Suffolk Street
Holyoke, MA 01040

The Berkshire Gas Company
* Jennifer Boucher
Manager - Regulatory Economics
The Berkshire Gas Company
115 Cheshire Road
Pittsfield, MA 01201

NSTAR Gas Company d/b/a Eversource
*Benjamin Collins
Manager of Gas Supply
One NSTAR Way, NE 220
Westwood, MA 02090-9230
Email: benjamin.collins@eversource.com

Connecticut Natural Gas Corporation
The Southern Connecticut Gas Company
* John Rudiak
Director - Energy Services
77 Hartland Street
East Hartford, CT 06108
Email: jrudiak@ctgcorp.com

Westfield Gas & Electric Department
* Anthony J. Contrino
Energy Supply Manager
100 Elm Street
P.O. Box 990
Westfield, MA 01086
Email: acontrino@wgeld.org

Liberty Utilities (EnergyNorth Natural Gas)
Corp. d/b/Liberty Utilities
*F. Chico DaFonte
Vice President, Energy Procurement
Liberty Utilities
15 Buttrick Road
Londonderry, NH 03053
Email: chico.dafonte@libertyutilities.com

*John W. Welch
Welch & Barba, P.C.
1380 Main Street, Suite 201
Springfield, MA 01103
Email: jwelch@welchbarba.com

Yankee Gas Services Company
d/b/a Eversource
*Andrew S. Katz
Senior Counsel

*Edna Karanian
Director, Gas Supply
Yankee Gas Services Company
d/b/a! Eversource

Northeast Utilities
901 F Street, NW Suite 602
Washington, DC 20004
Email: Andrew.katz@eversource.com

107 Selden Street
Berlin, CT 06037
Email: edna.karanian@eversource.com

* Parties to be designated on the Commission's official service list.

1. The New England LDCs are engaged in the distribution and retail sale of gas to consumers located in the States of Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Rhode Island. Each of these companies is a firm transportation customer of Tennessee, purchasing firm transportation services under certain of Tennessee's rate schedules.
2. Tennessee filed an application to construct and operate the Project on November 20, 2015. This Project proposes construction of pipeline and/or facilities consisting of a Supply Path Component from Troy, Pennsylvania to Wright, New York and a Market Path Component from Wright, New York to Dracut, Massachusetts. As described by Tennessee, the Project proposes to provide up to 1.3 Bcf/d of firm capacity. Members of the New England LDCs have signed precedent agreements for the proposed Project capacity.
3. The New England LDCs are directly affected by this proceeding, and their interest cannot be adequately represented by other parties. The Commission should, therefore, grant this motion to intervene.

II. Comments

Tennessee has clearly demonstrated the need for the proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project. Precedent agreements for most of the project capacity have been executed with shippers, including members of the New England LDCs.² The members of the New England LDCs that have signed precedent agreements need the Project capacity to serve high priority retail load. The New England LDCs, therefore, support the Project and request its prompt approval.

III. Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the New England LDCs respectfully request that the Commission grant this motion to intervene and promptly approve the Application.

Respectfully submitted,

THE NEW ENGLAND LOCAL DISTRIBUTION COMPANIES

By: Debra Ann Palmer

Noy S. Davis

Their Attorneys

SCHIFF HARDIN LLP

901 K Street, N.W. Suite 700

Washington, D.C. 20001

(202) 778-6400

(202) 778-6460 - facsimile

dpalmer@schiffhardin.com

ndavis@schiffhardin.com

December 18, 2016

footnotes

¹ Application of Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to Construct, Install, Modify, Operate and Maintain Certain Pipeline and Compression Facilities and to Abandon Facilities, filed November 20, 2015 in the abovereferenced docket ("Application").

² As of the date of Tennessee's Application, Tennessee had executed precedent agreements for 751,650 Dth per day of Capacity on the Supply Path component and 552,262 Dth per day of capacity on the Market Path Component. Application at p. 77.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this day served the foregoing document upon each person designated on the official service list maintained in this proceeding in accordance with the requirements of Rule 2010 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure.

Dated at Washington, D.C., this 18th day of December 2015.

Noy S. Davis
Schiff Hardin LLP
901 K Street, N.W., Suite
700 Washington, D.C. 20001

Attorneys for
THE NEW ENGLAND LOCAL
DISTRIBUTION COMPANIES

20151218-5101

Submission Description: John Gieschen seeks to intervene. Personally he lives near the proposed route of the pipeline and construction of a compressor station in Rensselaer County and is directly impacted by the proposed pipeline.

Submission Date: 12/18/2015 11:20:20 AM Filed Date: 12/18/2015 11:20:20 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	jgieschen@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

BEFORE THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline/Kinder Morgan

Northeast Energy Direct

Docket No. CP16-21

John Gieschen is a Rensselaer County resident who fears the route of the Northeast Energy Direct and construction of compressor stations on the pipeline will affect and his property due to construction, leaks, explosions, noise and light. Furthermore, the documented environmental impact of compressor stations will affect Mr. Gieschen's personal health and that of his family. As a citizen he has a stake in the future of the planet and the health and safety of its citizens which would be affected by this pipeline.

Pursuant to Commission Rules 385.214(b) and 157.10, John Gieschen moves to intervene in the above captioned proceeding. This intervention is timely filed.

I. CONTACT INFORMATION

Please enter John Gieschen below on the official service list for Docket No. CP16-21. All pleadings, filings and correspondence in this proceeding should be served on the following:

John Gieschen
1202 Burden Lake Road
Averill Park, NY 12018
jgieschen@gmail.com
518-727-4210

II. MOTION TO INTERVENE

John Gieschen seeks to intervene. Personally he lives near the proposed route of the pipeline and construction of a compressor station in Rensselaer County and is directly impacted by the proposed pipeline. Leaks

from the pipeline and venting and blow-downs from the compressor station could affect his air, soil and water. He fears possible health repercussions of such leaks. An explosion would devastate her home and community. The peace and quiet he moved here for will be lost.

John Gieschen opposes the proposed project. Continued extraction of fossil fuel is causing climate warming and is endangering life on our planet. Fracking as an extraction process is endangering the health and safety of people living near the fracking fields and workers in the industry. According to Massachusetts Attorney General Maura Healy's report this pipeline is not needed. Continuing to rely on fossil fuel is slowing our transition to renewable energy. If we put our energy and money into creating renewable energy sources we could meet our energy needs with these sources. The destruction of habitat created by the building of the pipeline is significant. The weekly explosions of pipelines across our country are scary. The safety record of Kinder Morgan is not encouraging. Leaks along the pipeline and venting at compression stations release methane and other toxic chemicals into our air, soil and water, are serious threats to the health and safety of residents along the pipeline. I object to the fact that New Yorkers will be forced to absorb the adverse environmental and economic impacts, not to mention the intrusion on individual landowners' property. Kinder Morgan has made clear to its stockholders that it expects to export much of this gas. Since this project is clearly not for the common good, I object to Eminent Domain being used for private profit.

WHEREFORE, for the foregoing reasons, John Gieschen requests that the Commission GRANT this motion to intervene.

Respectfully submitted,

John Gieschen
1202 Burden Lake Road
Averill Park, NY, 12018
518-727-4210
jgieschen@gmail.com
December 16, 2015

20151218-5155

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Elizabeth M Tatro under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/18/2015 1:58:22 PM Filed Date: 12/18/2015 1:58:22 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	bizzielizzie1.1@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

My name is Elizabeth Tatro (66) and my husband is Robert Tatro (73)- we live at 248 N Main St, Lanesboro MA 01237 - which is in danger of being taken by eminent domain for this project. We are both retired after working our entire lives and now live on Social Security. We do not have any money to pay a defense lawyer. We are incredibly opposed to this pipeline coming through any portion of our property. It is not necessary, as proven by the Attorney General. If it is taken by eminent domain, our lives will be devastated. Our property insurance will be canceled, our mortgage will be recalled and our real estate investment will be lost, as no one will purchase this property because it is within the 1000 ft incineration, or sacrifice, zone. I live in complete terror of an explosion, pollution of our water table, loss of property through eminent domain, loss of our last 25 years of rebuilding our farm, loss of our lifestyle that we live as I could not sleep at night without worrying about an explosion. The monetary compensation would be so minimal we would never recover financially for this kind of loss. The land here consists of hard-pan and is not suitable to buy

this type of pipeline, the ground is like Jello in the spring and when the frost leaves the ground it moves everything. The frost line here last winter was 8 ft, they plan to put the pipeline 3 1/2 ft underground, which is crazy. They think they can drive to the leak and fix it, my horses can't even walk on it - please consider this a practical solution, do not build the pipeline. Our house was built in 1780 and is one of a kind - a truly gorgeous home which cannot ever be replaced, the details inside this home are incredible and should be preserved at all costs. Our trees are beautiful, there is plenty of wildlife, we hunt, fish and raise our own food here, as well as use the fiber, wood, and plants for our hobbies. I, Elizabeth, suffer from PTSD, severe depression and have a Social Security Disability for that - also high blood pressure and cannot take the medication for it. My husband (of 37 years) and I need to be able to live in our beautiful farm, without worrying about someone taking it away, polluting it, or blowing it up. Fracked gas is very toxic and it should not be traveling through a 3 ft pipe with all the pressure, chemicals and pollution it presents. Please look at alternative methods such as Wind and Solar. There will be absolutely no benefit to the Town of Lanesboro residents because we do not have natural gas here - personally, we use propane and wood, which my husband at age 73 cuts, splits, stacks and burns 20 cord for our home. I cannot comprehend why anyone would even consider this fracked gas with all the dangers it presents, unlike the commercials shown on TV, showing how nice gas is - they do not show the dangers. I have been very upset for the past year, since we received the letter from Kinder Morgan asking to survey our property, which we have denied. Even though we have denied them access they keep writing back to get access - which is really annoying. If they can't keep track of their files, how can they take care of a project of this immensity? Please do not overstep what all of the towns in the pathway of this pipeline have unanimously voted against. We do not want this imposition and we do not believe it is in the interest of the rate payers to be paying for this project and any cleanup involved in any accidents, also the expense of traffic control while it is being built. When I see the ads on TV with the beautiful serene cityscape views, it makes me sick - it is my worst nightmare to have to live like that, I love where I am and the pipeline will force me out at a considerable loss. Also, the price of gasoline was just lowered making it harder for Kinder Morgan to get investors. The power companies have way too much power in this country and through a lot of money around - who in the end is paying for it? Our grandchildren and great grandchildren will be paying the most - that is just not right.

20151218-5163

Town of Wilmington

Office of the Town Manager
121 Glen Road
Wilmington, MA 01887-3597
WWW.WILMINGTONMA.GOV

PHONE: (978) 658-3311
FAX: (978) 658-3334
TTY: (978)694-1417

December 17, 2015

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

Submitted via ELECTRONIC FILING

RE: Docket No. CP16-21-000 Northeast Energy Direct Project Notice of Intervention

Dear Secretary Bose:

In accordance with Federal Regulations Title 18, Part 385, Subpart B, Section 385.214 (Rule 214), please accept this letter request as a motion to intervene on the part of the Town of Wilmington, Massachusetts (Town) in the proceedings of Northeast Energy Direct Project (NED), Docket No. CP16-21-000.

Motion to Intervene

The Town of Wilmington hereby moves to intervene in the proceedings of Docket No. CP16- 21-000, Northeast Energy Direct Project (NED).

On October 13, 2015, the Board of Selectmen for the Town voted unanimously to pass a resolution to become an Intervenor to formally participate in the proceedings for the NED. The Board of Selectmen also voted unanimously to adopt a position in opposition to the NED.

The Town has reviewed the Application and Resource Report filings of Kinder Morgan (KM) dated November 20, 2015 regarding the proposed NED. From our review of the documentation, it is evident that the Town will be subject to long term impacts that do not result in any benefit to its residents. It also is unclear whether NED is necessary; specifically, it is unclear whether the construction of NED would result in a condition of overdeveloped pipeline capacity for the New England area (refer to the Office of the Attorney General's study: Power System Reliability in New England, prepared by Analysis Group). Given all of these circumstances, the Town strongly opposes this project and prefers a no-build alternative that would avoid both short-term and long-term impacts to the Town's resources and on-going safety concerns of its residents.

Impact of the Northeast Energy Direct Project on the Movant Community

According to the documents filed by KM on November 20, 2015 relative to the NED, the proposed pipeline and specifically the Lynnfield Lateral (24-inch pipeline segment) would enter Wilmington just prior to station 420+00± and exit at station 536+50. This approximately 2.2 miles of new pipeline would directly and adversely impact 24 properties across Wilmington.

The Town of Wilmington opposes the NED proposal for several reasons. Our chief environmental concern is the direct impact of the proposal on the Zone 2 Aquifer Protection radius for two (2) of the Town's remaining primary drinking water well fields: the Brown's Crossing well field and the Salem Street GP well field. Both of these well fields are shallow, overburdened gravel-packed. Brown's Crossing is the oldest (1927) and most productive of the remaining active well fields in Wilmington. These two well fields currently account for 64% of the remaining local drinking water supply.

The words "remaining local drinking water supply" are used because 5 of Wilmington's original 9 drinking water wells were lost in 2003 as a result of contamination from the Olin Superfund Site, a USEPA national priority list site. That disaster placed significant health and economic stress on the 22,000 citizens of Wilmington. As a result, the Town's drinking water resources are uniquely vulnerable and Wilmington is determined to protect its remaining supply.

As proposed, the total length of NED pipeline located within the Zone 2 Aquifer Protection is approximately 7,750 LF (1.46 miles). The area of disturbance associated with this pipeline through our Zone 2 could result in possible contamination and degradation of our most valued natural resource.

The revised pipeline route also would traverse a parcel owned and operated by Benevento Companies, an aggregate based material supply company and active quarry. The Town is concerned with the proximity of the revised pipeline route to blasting operations at the quarry.

Among our other concerns are construction impacts to regulated wetlands, wetland buffer zones, and river-front area; noise and air quality impacts; and the overall safety of residents in close proximity to the pipeline.

Request for Relief

The environmental conditions in Wilmington relevant to proposed NED project are unique. The interests of its residents therefore cannot adequately be represented by any other prospective party or participant. On behalf of the residents of Wilmington, the Town respectfully requests that the Federal Regulatory Energy Commission grant it leave to intervene in this proceeding.

Service of Papers

Copies of all filings and orders in the above referenced proceedings should be directed to the following individuals. Wilmington requests that they be added to the official FERC service list for the NED project.

Jeffrey M. Hull, Town Manager
Town of Wilmington

121 Glen Road
Wilmington, MA 01887
jhull@wilmingtonma.gov
Paul M. Alunni, PE, Town Engineer
Town of Wilmington
121 Glen Road
Wilmington MA
palunni@wilmingtonma.gov

Sincerely,
Jeffrey M. Hull
Town Manager

Enclosure

cc: Board of Selectmen
Michael J. Woods, Director of Public Works
Valerie Gingrich, Director of Planning and Conservation
Paul M. Alunni, PE, Town Engineer
John C. Foskett, Esq., Town Counsel
Daniel R. Deutsch, Esq.

Town of Wilmington
Office of the Town Manager
121 Glen Road
Wilmington, MA 01887-3597
WWW.WILMINGTONMA.GOV

PHONE: (978) 658-3311
FAX: (978) 658-3334
TTY: (978)694-1417

Resolution of Support and Vote by the Wilmington Board of Selectmen to become an Intervenor in the Tennessee Gas Pipeline for a new natural gas pipeline known as the Northeast Energy Direct

WHEREAS: The Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company has proposed a new natural gas pipeline known as the Northeast Energy Direct Project (“Project”) to be constructed in Pennsylvania, New York, Connecticut, Massachusetts and New Hampshire. In Massachusetts, the Project would include approximately 101 miles of new pipeline, plus additional facilities in this region; and

WHEREAS: We, the Wilmington Board of Selectmen, do hereby strongly oppose the aforementioned pipeline; and

WHEREAS: Once Tennessee Gas files its formal application with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, the Board of Selectmen resolve to become an “Intervenor” which is an official party to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission’s proceeding. Intervenors play a more formal role in the process and are able to file briefs, appear at hearings and be heard by the courts if they choose to appeal the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission’s final ruling.

WHEREAS: As an “Intervenor”, the Board of Selectmen can formally participate in the proceeding by filing a request to intervene within the required twenty-one (21) day window, if it is deemed needed by the Chairman of Board of Selectmen.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Wilmington Board of Selectmen do hereby resolve and vote to become an “Intervenor”, once Tennessee Gas files its formal application with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. Further, the Board of Selectmen resolve to become an “Intervenor” which is an official party to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission’s proceeding, and/or any other actions considered necessary by the Chairman of the Board of Selectmen. Additionally, the Wilmington Board of Selectmen do hereby instruct the Town Manager to stand ready to file a motion to intervene. In witness whereof, we the Wilmington Board of Selectmen do hereby set our hands and affix the Great Seal of the Town of Wilming-

ton, this 13th Day of October, 2015.

Michael L. Champoux, Chairman
Louis Cimaglia, IV
Michael V. McCoy
Michael J. Newhouse
Judith L. O'Connell

20151218-5252

Ken Owen, West Granby, CT.

Building a pipeline to carry fossil fuels through a reservoir area as proposed would be extremely dangerous, putting many thousands of people's drinking water at risk. The people of Connecticut need clean water substantially more than natural gas. Please get your priorities straight.

20151221-0018

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

Project Docket Number: PF14-22

Date: 12/3/15

Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Re: Denying property access:

As the owner of the property located at:

46 Cart Path Rd
Dracut, MA 01826

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

Caren C. Jackson

20151221-0042

Hand written letter, 3 pages, Gina Boisse RN, BSN, 190 Methuen Road, Dracut, MA 01826, opposing.

20151221-0056

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

VIA FEDERAL EXPRESS OVERNIGHT DELIVERY

December 17, 2015

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

D.C. 20426

**RE: Carolyn and Eric Ness, Mega Worcester, Michael and Kelly Paulsen, Holly and Gordon Lovelace. and Woohnan Hill Inc.,
Comments in response to FERC Notice of Intent for the Northeast Energy Direct Project, Docket No. PF14-22-000.**

Dear Ms. Bose:

This letter follows my letter to you dated October 27, 2015. (Copy attached). The issue of whether or not FERC has jurisdiction over the NED pipeline will have to be decided by a federal court. The issue raised in my letter to you of October 27, 2015 was the lack of action by FERC in not forcing NED pipeline proponents to disclose the portion of the transported gas that will be exported to foreign countries.

FERC is aware that Congress deprived FERC of jurisdiction over any issue related to the ‘public interest’ section of the Natural Gas Act:

Federal Power Commission [now FERC] will not pass upon constitutionality of Natural Gas Act, and will not question legislative declaration, contained in 15 USCS) 717(a), that transportation and sale of natural gas in interstate commerce for resale for ultimate public consumption “is affected with public interest” and that federal regulation thereof “is necessary in the public interest.” 15 USCS 4 717(a).

Plaintiffs are challenging that portion of 15 USCS f 717(a) over which Congress deprived FERC of jurisdiction:

Necessity of regulation in public interest.... []t is hereby declared that the business of transporting and selling natural gas for ultimate distribution to the public is affected with a public interest, and that Federal regulation in matters relating to the transportation of natural gas and the sale thereof in interstate and foreign commerce is necessary in the public interest. 15 US.C. P 717(a). (CA. 1 3:15-cv-30131(MAP), Massachusetts Federal District Court, plaintiffs’omplaint at ‘I 58j.

The United States has moved to dismiss Plaintiffs’omplaint based on Article III standing and ripeness. The Court has decided to make a decision on this issue, at this time, rather than on the more complex issue of whether or not FERC violates Plaintiffs’ifth Amendment rights by approving a pipeline for exportation of gas to foreign countries.

Regardless of what the Court decides on the issue of Article III standing the federal courts will have to rule at some point in these proceedings whether or not FERC’s actions in considering and/or eventually approving this pipeline are violations of the Takings Clause of Fifth Amendment of the United States Constitution. Plaintiffs are urging FERC to suspend further consideration of the NED pipeline until after the federal courts have evaluated and decided on the issue of whether or not FERC has jurisdiction to consider or approve pipelines scheduled to carry natural gas for export.

Plaintiffs are putting FERC on notice, through this letter, that if the federal courts find the argument of lack of constitutionality persuasive, FERC would have been negligent in violating Plaintiffs’ifth Amendment rights, by continuing consideration of this pipeline, resulting in severe damages for emotional distress, property values loss, and other tort damages to Plaintiffs and many others. [See James Garcia et al.,v. United States 896 FSupp. 467 (1995);1995 US. Dist. LEXIS 11904’.

Plaintiffs strongly urge FERC to review all the filing in CA. 1 3:15-cv-30131 (MAP), and consider the fact that not only Plaintiffs in this litigation will be entitled to damages under Garcia Id., but all others similarly impacted in Massachusetts, New Hampshire and other states.

Please incorporate this letter and all filings in CA. 1 3:15-cv-30131(MAP) into the record of Northeast Energy Direct Project, Docket No. PF14-22-0(10. I am attaching to this mailing a disc containing the applicable record of C.A. 1 3:15-cv-30131(MAP) to facilitate incorporation of the filings into the record of PF14-22-000.

Sincerely,

Cristobal Bonifaz, Esq.

Cc: All Plaintiffs (w/o enclosures)

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

VIA FEDERAL EXPRESS OVERNIGHT DELIVERY

October 27, 2015

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

RE: Carolyn and Eric Ness, Mega Worcester, Michael and Kelly Paulsen, Holly and Gordon Lovelace, and Woolman Hill Inc., Comments in response to FERC Notice of Intent for the Northeast Energy Direct Project, Docket No. PF14-22-000.

Dear Ms. Bose:

The aforementioned individuals and corporation are directly impacted by the Northeast Energy Direct Project (NED) proposed by Tennessee Gas in Pennsylvania, New York, Connecticut, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts.

Your office issued on June 30, 2015 a request for comments from all parties regarding NED asserting that the EIS will discuss impacts that could occur as a result of the construction and operation of the planned Project under these general headings:

- geology and soils;
- water resources and wetlands;
- vegetation and wildlife;
- cultural resources;
- land use, recreation, and visual resources;
- socioeconomics;
- air quality and noise;
- cumulative impacts; and
- public safety.

You did not invite comments regarding the jurisdiction of FERC to entertain the proposed NED project on the grounds that most of the natural gas to be transported by NED is for export to foreign countries. In fact in all you documents FERC is derelict in not even requiring the NED proponents to specify what they plan to do with the gas since the amount of gas proposed to be transported is far in excess of the amounts that can be used in New England.

The aforementioned Plaintiffs do not believe that the Natural Gas Act grants FERC jurisdiction over the project on the ground that exportation of gas to foreign countries is not "public use" and therefore FERC's assumed jurisdiction over NED is unconstitutional. Given their belief the aforementioned Plaintiffs filed a Complaint in Federal Court in Springfield on July 28, 2015 followed by an Amended Complaint filed on

Augusto 20, 2015. The filing of this case was extensively covered by the local press thus there is no reason for anyone to believe that you were not aware of these filings.

The United States notified Plaintiffs today that it plans to file a Motion to Dismiss the Complaint on the grounds that Plaintiffs proper place to raise these arguments is with FERC. The US does not explain how an agency that is operating on the assumption that it has jurisdiction to operate, can entertain, or has jurisdiction to entertain, a constitutional challenge of the statute on which FERC bases its jurisdiction.

Plaintiffs believe that the argument by the United States that FERC's jurisdiction to entertain a challenge to the constitutionality of a statute, on which it bases its on jurisdiction, is wrong and will so argue in Springfield Federal Court on November 17, 2015.

Plaintiffs here nevertheless are filing their Amended Complaint and Exhibits as Comments with FERC given the view taken by the United States today in this matter.

Sincerely,

Cristobal Bonifaz, Esq.

Cc: All Plaintiffs

Enclosures: First Amended Complaint with Exhibits 1-21

CB/mj

20151221-4006

Description: "*CRISTOBAL BONIFAZ, (LAW OFFICE OF), CD containing comments of individuals re the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Project under PF14-22.*" {Referenced in 20151221-0056 above}

{ Consists of 56 files identified in FERC document list as **20151221-4006(xxxxxxxx).pdf**; only the { (xxxxxxxx).pdf suffix, along with file size and FERC description, is listed below: }

(31098289).pdf 1.00 MB MF-Exhibit-17.PDF

<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078647>

(31098290).pdf 182 KB MF-Exhibit-16.PDF

<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078702>

(31098291).pdf 451 KB MF-Exhibit-19.PDF

<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078649>

(31098292).pdf 3.31 MB MF-Exhibit-20.PDF

<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078650>

(31098293).pdf 2.18 MB MF-Exhibit-21.PDF

<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078651>

(31098294).pdf 328 KB MF-Exhibit-22.PDF

<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078652>

(31098295).pdf 130 KB MF-Exhibit-23.PDF

<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078653>

(31098296).pdf 180 KB MF-EXHIBIT-24A.PDF

<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078654>

(31098297).pdf 128 KB MF-EXHIBIT-24B.PDF

<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078655>
 (31098298).pdf 188 KB MF-EXHIBIT-24C.PDF
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078656>
 (31098299).pdf 186 KB MF-EXHIBIT-24D.PDF
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078657>
 (31098300).pdf 159 KB MF-EXHIBIT-24E .PDF
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078658>
 (31098301).pdf 471 KB MF-EXHIBIT-25.PDF
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078659>
 (31098302).pdf 713 KB MORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF THEIR MOTION FOR SUMMARY
 JUDGMENT.PDF
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078660>
 (31098303).pdf 277 KB e Memorandum in Support of their SJ Motion 27 Pages Long.PDF
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078661>
 (31098304).pdf 277 KB Plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgment.PDF
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078662>
 (31098305).pdf 632 KB onse to Defendant's Motion to Dimiss under Rule 12(b)(1).PDF
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078663>
 (31098306).pdf 319 KB MATERIAL FACTS AS TO WHICH THERE IS NO ISSUE TO BE
 TRIED.PDF
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078664>
 (31098307).pdf 4.45 MB EXHIBIT-A.PDF
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078665>
 (31098308).pdf 188 KB MF-Exhibit-1.PDF
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078666>
 (31098309).pdf 1.22 MB MF-Exhibit-2.PDF
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078667>
 (31098310).pdf 260 KB MF-Exhibit-3.PDF
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078668>
 (31098311).pdf 96.2 KB MF-Exhibit-4.PDF
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078669>
 (31098312).pdf 212 KB MF-Exhibit-5.PDF
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078670>
 (31098313).pdf 1.86 MB ongressional Record S. Res. 83 (Seventieth Congress)1-10.PDF

<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078671>
 (31098314).pdf 1.19 MB 19 Congressional Record S. Res. 83 (Seventieth Congress).PDF
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078672>
 (31098315).pdf 1.79 MB 29 Congressional Record S. Res. 83 (Seventieth Congress).PDF
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078673>
 (31098316).pdf 1.57 MB 0 Congressional Record S. Res. 83 (Seventieth Congress).PDF
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078674>
 (31098317).pdf 1.32 MB 50 Congressional Record S. Res. 83 (Seventieth Congress).PDF
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078675>
 (31098318).pdf 1.67 MB 63 Congressional Record S. Res. 83 (Seventieth Congress).PDF
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078676>
 (31098319).pdf 1.61 MB 75 Congressional Record S. Res. 83 (Seventieth Congress).PDF
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078677>
 (31098320).pdf 1.71 MB 85 Congressional Record S. Res. 83 (Seventieth Congress).PDF
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078678>
 (31098321).pdf 1.57 MB 96 Congressional Record S. Res. 83 (Seventieth Congress).PDF
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078679>
 (31098322).pdf 1.84 MB 10 Congressional Record S. Res. 83 (Seventieth Congress).PDF
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078680>
 (31098323).pdf 1.69 MB 5 Congressional Record S. Res. 83 (Seventieth Congress).PDF
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078681>
 (31098324).pdf 1.85 MB 40 Congressional Record S. Res. 83 (Seventieth Congress).PDF
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078682>
 (31098325).pdf 1.51 MB 52 Congressional Record S. Res. 83 (Seventieth Congress).PDF
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078683>
 (31098326).pdf 1.58 MB 63 Congressional Record S. Res. 83 (Seventieth Congress).PDF
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078684>
 (31098327).pdf 1.78 MB 76 Congressional Record S. Res. 83 (Seventieth Congress).PDF
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078685>
 (31098328).pdf 2.05 MB 91 Congressional Record S. Res. 83 (Seventieth Congress).PDF
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078686>
 (31098329).pdf 1.94 MB 06 Congressional Record S. Res. 83 (Seventieth Congress).PDF
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078687>
 (31098330).pdf 2.40 MB 22 Congressional Record S. Res. 83 (Seventieth Congress).PDF

<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078688>
 (31098331).pdf 1.62 MB 33 Congressional Record S. Res. 83 (Seventieth Congress).PDF
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078689>
 (31098332).pdf 1.93 MB 45 Congressional Record S. Res. 83 (Seventieth Congress).PDF
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078690>
 (31098333).pdf 1.90 MB Congressional Record S. Res. 83 (Seventieth Congress) .PDF
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078691>
 (31098334).pdf 1.89 MB MF-Exhibit-7.PDF
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078692>
 (31098335).pdf 1.95 MB MF-Exhibit-8.PDF
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078693>
 (31098336).pdf 561 KB MF-Exhibit-9.PDF
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078694>
 (31098337).pdf 68.4 KB MF-Exhibit-10A.PDF
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078695>
 (31098338).pdf 88.2 KB MF-Exhibit-10B.PDF
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078696>
 (31098339).pdf 123 KB MF-Exhibit-11.PDF
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078697>
 (31098340).pdf 817 KB MF-Exhibit-12.PDF
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078698>
 (31098341).pdf 199 KB MF-Exhibit-13.PDF
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078699>
 (31098342).pdf 1.24 MB MF-Exhibit-14.PDF
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078700>
 (31098343).pdf 726 KB MF-Exhibit-15.PDF
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078701>
 (31098344).pdf 174 KB MF-Exhibit-18.PDF
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14078648>

20151221-5002

Leslie J Carey, Averill Park, NY.

As the debate continues over Texas-based Kinder Morgan’s proposed 360-mile Palmetto Pipeline that would run from South Carolina to northeast Florida, the company may be hard-pressed to win over converts to the plan when it comes to its own safety record.

According to the U.S. Department of Transportation’s Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administra-

tion, which oversees the industry, Kinder Morgan and its subsidiaries' pipelines have been responsible for at least 180 spills, evacuations, explosions and fires, along with some fatalities, in 24 states from 2003 to 2014. This past April, a Kinder Morgan gas pipeline exploded and burned near Borger, Texas. Fortunately, only one nearby home was evacuated, and there were no injuries or serious damage. But in August, two people did suffer minor injuries when a natural gas pipeline operated by Kinder Morgan ruptured in Falfurrias, Texas.

The year before a pipeline leak occurred in Belton, S.C. — the proposed starting point for the new Palmetto Plantation project — spilling an estimated 370,000 gallons of gasoline on a farmer's land before the leak was detected.

The owners, Eric M. Lewis and Scott Lewis, have filed a lawsuit against Kinder Morgan. According to attorney Gary Poliakoff, who represents the Lewises, their property, which had been listed for sale as commercial property before the accident, has been “permanently damaged and devalued” by the environmental impact of the leak.

Some of the more notable of the company's pipeline accidents over the preceding 10 years include:

- April 2004/Solano County, Calif: An underground Kinder Morgan pipeline ruptured at Suisun Marsh, spilling more than 120,000 gallons of diesel fuel directly into the marsh.

The company failed to notify authorities about the spill for 18 hours, another safety violation for which it was later cited. Kinder Morgan was fined \$5.3 million for the spill, and agreed to enhance spill prevention, response and reporting practices.

The company had 44 spills in 31 months, according to an order issued the following year by the PHMSA, which noted Kinder Morgan's “widespread failure to adequately detect and address the effects of outside force damage and corrosion” along its pipeline system.

- November 2004/Walnut Creek, Calif.: A Kinder Morgan pipeline was struck by a backhoe, causing a gasoline spill that ignited an explosive fireball that incinerated five workers and severely injured four others.

The California Occupational Safety and Health Administration cited Kinder Morgan for failure to accurately mark or map the pipeline location, and the California Fire Marshal fined the company \$500,000 for its role in the “completely preventable” tragedy.

- May 2005/Marshall, Texas: A Kinder Morgan Natural Gas Pipeline of America pipeline exploded, sending a giant fireball into the sky and hurling a 160-foot section of pipe onto the grounds of an electric power generating plant. Two people were hurt and 40 evacuated.

- November 2006/Cheyenne, Wyo.: A subcontractor on Kinder Morgan's Rockies Express (REX) pipeline struck an existing pipeline, causing a rupture and explosion.

Two months after the explosion, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission threatened to shut the project down if REX didn't improve its “poor compliance record” involving construction activity outside the approved work area.

- July 2007/Canada: The Trans Mountain Pipeline, operated by Kinder Morgan Canada, released more than 66,000 gallons of crude oil, with some flowing into an inlet and requiring a \$11 million cleanup.

- September 2008/Pasadena, Texas: One person died and another was injured when a Kinder Morgan pipeline exploded and burned for more than 10 hours. The cause of this “significant event” was corrosion. The Pasadena pipeline experienced at least 18 “significant incidents” from 2004 to 2013.

- July 2009/Sylvarena, Miss.: A pipeline accident involving Boardwalk Pipeline Partners, Southern Natural Gas and Kinder Morgan caused an explosion that killed one person and injured three.

- November 2010/Natchitoches, La.: A Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline failed in a semi-rural area two miles from a country club and just south of a residential subdivision, resulting in the Louisiana state police evacuating 100 homes.

The pipeline failure was near where TGP had a previous failure in 1965, which resulted in multiple fatali-

ties.

- November 2011/Glouster, Ohio: A weld failed on a Kinder Morgan Tennessee Gas Pipeline, and the leak exploded, leaving a blast crater 30 feet across and 15 feet deep. Three homes were destroyed.
- June 2012/Laketon, Texas: A Kinder Morgan Natural Gas Pipeline of America pipe failed and gas ignited, blowing a crater 30 feet in diameter and burning two acres of agricultural land and resulting in other damage.
- June 2013/Washington Parish, La.: A Kinder Morgan Florida Gas Transmission Co. pipeline ruptured and exploded before dawn, jolting residents out of their beds. The blast knocked down trees in an area about 200 yards across, and the fire burned those within another 300 yards. No one was seriously hurt, but 55 homes were evacuated.

Two years ago, an analyst with Hedgeye Risk Management may have come up with the reason Kinder Morgan is having so many pipeline accidents.

Analyst Kevin Kaiser released a report saying Kinder Morgan's "high-level business strategy is to starve its pipelines and related infrastructure of routine maintenance spending in order to maximize distributable cash flow."

The Wall Street Journal asked, "Is Kinder Morgan Scrimping on its Pipelines?" after Kaiser's report in which he claimed the company was deferring routine maintenance spending to return more cash to investors.

20151221-5004

Leslie J Carey, Averill Park, NY.

Like a racer facing a caution flag warning of hazards ahead, America's natural gas pipeline developers are seeing signs that their business plans aren't tracking with the future. Mistakes in this race carry price tags in the billions, and could leave ratepayers (in other words, the public) footing the bill for decades to come.

Two recent developments in particular – a report from the Massachusetts Attorney General's Office and a rate case at the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) – show that the economics for new natural gas pipeline capacity to supply power plants are not as compelling or sustainable as the conventional wisdom would have you believe.

Together, the AG report and the FERC case provide a strong counterpoint to those now rushing to create excessive new pipeline capacity. They suggest that many pipelines will lose customers and money as lower cost alternatives outcompete them, and long before investor expectations are met and their financing is paid off. The question is whether policymakers and pipeline developers will slow down and consider the dangers, or continue to plow ahead.

Financial and Environmental Consequences

In New England, winter gas demand for both heating and power is straining the capacity of pipelines that transport gas from supplies to the south and west, resulting in higher spot prices and electric rates. Although the price spikes of several winters back are diminishing, several of the region's governors want electric customers to pay for more pipelines to ensure there is fuel for electric power plants in winter. This untried approach would commit captive electric ratepayers to 20 year contracts to pay, through their electric bills, for pipelines. Unlike other areas in the country, gas producers, gas utilities and power plant owners are unwilling to sign contracts for pipelines to New England.

In comments filed at the Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities, EDF said the governors' costly plan for investing ratepayer money in pipelines would be problematic, over the long run, for both customers and the environment. Our comments described the high costs of new capacity and questioned whether additional pipelines for electric power generation comply with the Massachusetts Global Warming Solutions Act (GWSA). The Conservation Law Foundation raised similar concerns.

An Attorney General Speaks Out

In November, Massachusetts Attorney General Maura Healey issued a detailed report assessing the governors' questionable plans and validating EDF's concerns, concluding that new pipelines are not needed for electric reliability and that far more cost-effective and environmentally friendly alternatives to pipelines are available. These include investment in energy efficiency and demand response, which reward customers instead of sticking them with a bill, and increased use of liquefied natural gas (LNG), which, as a form of storage, can avoid the need for new pipelines and help renewables by enhancing the flexibility of gas deliveries. The report also warned that excessive investment in pipelines is contrary to climate policy goals and will increase the overall costs to achieve them.

A Glimpse of a Challenging Future

A rate case currently before FERC illustrates that the lower-cost and cleaner alternatives Healey cites will reduce the need for pipelines and market size for natural gas faster than some might think, and offers a glimpse of what the situation throughout the country could look like if those alternatives are ignored in favor of excessive new pipeline capacity.

The Tallgrass Interstate Gas Transmission pipeline system, which extends from Wyoming in the west to Missouri in the east, is struggling to make ends meet. In October, it initiated a proceeding at FERC because its rates aren't covering its costs, resulting in losses of more than \$40 million per year.

Tallgrass's customers are shipping far less gas through its pipelines because the energy system has dramatically changed in the 17 years since FERC last set its rates, and there are cheaper alternatives for obtaining gas supply. In the future, according to Tallgrass, competition will come not just from other pipelines, but also from lower cost and lower emitting renewable energy and energy efficiency which, along with climate policies, will eat into the market share for gas. As Alexander Kirk, a witness for Tallgrass in the FERC rate case explained, "the average [power purchase agreement] price for wind in 2013 and 2014 are below natural gas fuel costs alone," and solar power prices "have fallen significantly in the past 20 years." As deployment of these cost-effective options for cleaner energy expands, he notes that the Department of Energy envisions decreasing natural gas use.

According to Kirk, the bottom line is that "such a large decrease in natural gas use would cause a significant amount of excess pipeline capacity ... and would greatly impact the ability of pipelines to collect their fixed costs."

A Warning to All

Because FERC sets rates to cover costs (plus profit) for pipelines assuming a 35 year or greater useful life, the Tallgrass case and its concerns about a diminishing future market foreshadow a pipeline "death spiral." As fewer customers are asked to cover a larger share of costs, rates increase for those remaining, causing additional customers to leave for lower cost alternatives, again raising rates for the remaining customers and triggering further abandonment until no customers endure.

EDF has argued, and the Massachusetts Attorney General agrees, that new pipelines aren't always a cost-effective tool for electric reliability needs; there are cleaner and lower cost options available, especially considering the 35+ year term over which new pipelines are depreciated and amortized. As these lower cost alternatives take market share, pipeline owners and utility shippers will no doubt try to impose spiraling rate increases on captive retail gas and electricity customers — the very same ratepayers that the Massachusetts Attorney General's report seeks to protect.

Policymakers in New England — and across the country — should heed Healey's warnings and carefully consider the long term economic prospects for new pipelines in comparison to alternatives.

20151221-5007

karen miller, new ipswich, NH.

while watching wmur news, breaking news was released, that the city of keene,nh

was in the middle of a natural gas emergency... liberty utilities experienced a

operational issue, and now homes with natural gas are being asked to call the fire department if they smell gas, and are being warned of a increased risk of carbon monoxide in their homes. natural gas, is not natural!natural gas is not safe! new hampshire does not need new gas infrastructure, we need renewebles that will not contribute to climate change, and will not put our homes and our health at risk! STOP THE PROPOSED NED PIPELINE PROJECT!!!

20151221-5010

Leslie J Carey, Averill Park, NY.

the issue of using eminent domain to place its proposed Palmetto Pipeline in private lands from South Carolina to Florida, Kinder Morgan's pipeline plans have drawn a fierce reaction from many environmental groups concerned with its potential affect on the region's water supply.

Groups like Savannah Riverkeeper, Altamaha Riverkeeper, Ogeechee Riverkeeper, Satilla Riverkeeper, St. Johns Riverkeeper and the Center for a Sustainable Coast question the wisdom of running a pipeline through wetlands and parallel to a river - particularly one that supplies drinking water to more than 1.5 million people.

Railcars and trucks that carry gasoline, diesel, ethanol and other petroleum products may account for more explosive accidents when they occur during transport. But when a pipeline bursts, it is harder to contain than a leaking oil tanker because only a limited amount is contained within a vehicle.

A pipeline can just keep spilling until the operator shuts down the flow, and will usually continue to gush until it's empty.

And, depending where the leaks is, it may be undetectable until an extensive amount of environmental damage has already occurred.

That's what happened last year when a Kinder Morgan pipeline spilled about 370,000 gallons of gasoline on a farmer's land in Belton, S.C. - a leak that went undetected for some time before local residents began reporting a gasoline odor and dead plant life along a road adjacent to the farm.

The property owners, Eric M. Lewis and Scott Lewis, filed suit against Kinder Morgan in November because their property, which had been listed for sale as commercial property before the accident, is now "permanently damaged and devalued" by the environmental impact of the leak.

"Any pipeline that has a leak can potentially cause a huge problem because there's a high volume of product coming through the pipe at usually a very high PSI (pounds per square inch), and this particular line was about 2,800 PSI," said attorney Gary Poliakoff, who is representing the Lewises in the lawsuit.

In this case, Kinder Morgan was notified but were reportedly unaware of any leak, as no leak detection systems had alerted.

"The significance of that in my litigation is that no leak detection of any kind, whatever they had or didn't have, worked," Poliakoff said.

Pipeline spills like this are not uncommon. There are about 280 pipeline spills occur each year in the U.S. that are deemed "significant" by the U.S. Department of Transportation. In the USDOT's methodology, significant means there is a fatality or injury requiring in-patient hospitalization, each caused \$50,000 or more in total costs (measured in 1984 dollars), there are highly volatile liquid releases of more than five barrels or other liquid releases of more than 50 barrels, or there are liquid releases that result in an unintentional fire or explosion.

What's harder to quantify is the dollar amount of a catastrophic pipeline failure on the environment.

According to the U.S. Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA), U.S. pipelines spilled three times as much crude oil compared to trains over an eight-year period - pipeline ruptures dominated by large spills like one that caused 800,000 gallons of Canadian tar sands crude oil to spill in and

around the Kalamazoo River, and another 63,000 gallons that spilled into the Yellowstone River.

The effects of these spills are long lasting on the environment. Three years after the Kalamazoo spill cleanup crews were still working to remove oil from the ground, and residents reported experiencing headaches, breathing problems and nausea - not to mention a negative affect on their local businesses.

With the spill on the Lewis property in South Carolina, cleanup efforts have taken place, but the Lewises believe that around 175,000 gallons of gasoline remain in the soil, groundwater and aquifer – which is now breaking down into hazardous and toxic components.

With the Palmetto Pipeline, any leak of this type would cause major damage to the watersheds of five of Georgia's major rivers, coastal landscapes and swamps. As proposed, the Palmetto Pipeline Project would run underground through 100 miles - transporting seven million gallons of gasoline per day along its 360-mile route.

And, if a leak did occur, the resulting environmental impact would happen fast.

“Any pipeline that has a leak can potentially become a big problem very quickly,” Poliakoff said. “When you have even a very small leak or hole in a high-pressure pipeline, you’re going to have a lot of product escape in a short period of time.”

20151221-5018

Karen Sullivan, New Ipswich, NH.

I live within half mile of the proposed Mid station 4, New Ipswich compressor station. I am in the incineration zone of the proposed New Ipswich compressor station.

155 Old Wilton Road, New Ipswich, NH 03071

I will hear, smell, feel, see and potentially taste (dug well water quality) the effects of the compressor station.

I am concerned about air quality due to 41,000 HP turbines generating exhaust.

I am concerned disturbances to our dug well as it taps into stratified drift aquifer that the compressor station is on top of.

I am concerned with the continuous noise of compressor station, 24-7.

I am concerned with noise and pollution from blowdowns.

I am concerned with light damage to dark skies. We won't be able to see stars.

I am concerned with subsonic vibrations that can subconsciously affect health.

I am concerned about any chemicals or toxins released into the ground that will end up in our stratified drift aquifer.

I am concerned with traffic, noise, air pollution and numerous disturbances during construction.

I am concerned with the property value of our house being extremely close to a compressor station.

I am concerned with any natural gas infrastructure incidents that would require evacuation from the neighborhood and potential destruction/damage of property and lives.

I am concerned with the industrialization of the neighborhood. The only things that are comfortable living next to 41,000 HP compressor stations is other heavy industry.

All who live in the shadow of the proposed compressor station will feel its effects.

Kinder Morgan/TN Gas Pipeline Company/NED have way too many TBD's within the application.

The pipeline is not needed, it is not wanted by the people along the route of the pipeline in southern NH.

Please do the right thing & just say NO to the pipeline project.

Thank you.

- risk to extensive damage from said fires or explosions due to the inability of this small community’s emergency response team to adequately address the situation.
- risk of decreased property value as evidenced in other areas in the state where pipeline proposals have rendered properties “unsellable” by real estate professionals.

I am a landowner in Ashfield, Massachusetts.

The construction of this pipeline would bring economic impacts of:

- reduced property values and the effect this would have on local tax bases, beyond any compensation offered by the pipeline company;
- regional health consequences of pollutants associated with the operation of the pipeline;
- tariffs proposed to force regional ratepayers to cover the costs of the pipeline;
- depressed area economy that relies on the rural character of the region for tourist income;
- possible increases in energy costs that could result from export natural gas, forcing local markets to compete on a global scale.

I am a resident expected to be in the blast radius in the case of pipeline explosion. I am in a financial position where I would receive no compensation from the pipeline company, yet find my property more difficult to sell if I found living conditions here untenable after the pipeline is built. I, like many in the region, do not have the financial ability to abandon my property or sell at a greatly reduced rate to move elsewhere. Construction and operation of the NED pipeline would greatly impact my quality of life, and economic wellbeing, and leave me in a position where it would be difficult to re-establish myself somewhere else.

For these reasons, I am interested in and would be affected by Applicant’s filing. My interests cannot be adequately represented and protected by any other party. Hence, the Commission should grant me permission to intervene in proceedings for Northeast Energy Direct.

20151221-5036

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Robert Markey under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/20/2015 12:53:53 PM Filed Date: 12/21/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	markeyrobert@yahoo.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I am a landowner in Ashfield, Massachusetts within 1/4 mile of the proposed pipeline.

The construction of this pipeline would bring hazards to the people of Ashfield. These hazards could take the form of:

- additional emissions of methane and it’s associated chemical residues from the processes by which it was extracted;
- risk to long-term health impacts from those chemicals - known carcinogens, neurotoxins and endocrine disruptors;
- greatly increased risk of pipeline rupture, fire or explosion due to the high pressure at which the pipelines are planned to run once the expansion is complete;
- risk to extensive damage from said fires or explosions due to the inability of this small community’s emergency response team to adequately address the situation.
- risk of decreased property value as evidenced in other areas in the state where pipeline proposals have rendered properties “unsellable” by real estate professionals.

— removal of permanently protected land from that permanent protection in violation of our state constitution’s Article 97

— increased contribution to climate change and its related hazards of extreme and unpredictable weather events

The construction of this pipeline would bring economic impacts of:

- reduced property values and the effect this would have on local tax bases, beyond any compensation offered by the pipeline company
- regional health consequences of pollutants associated with the operation of the pipeline
- tariffs proposed to force regional ratepayers to cover the costs of the pipeline
- depressed area economy that relies on the rural character of the region for tourist income
- possible increases in energy costs that could result from export natural gas, forcing local markets to compete on a global scale

I am a resident expected to be in the blast radius in the case of pipeline explosion. I am in a financial position where I would receive no compensation from the pipeline company, yet find my property more difficult to sell if I found living conditions here untenable after the pipeline is built. I, like many in the region, do not have the financial ability to abandon my property or sell at a greatly reduced rate to move elsewhere. Construction and operation of the NED pipeline would greatly impact my quality of life, and economic well-being, and leave me in a position where it would be difficult to re-establish myself somewhere else.

For these reasons, I am interested in and would be affected by Applicant’s filing. My interests cannot be adequately represented and protected by any other party. Hence, the Commission should grant me permission to intervene in proceedings for Northeast Energy Direct.

20151221-5038

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC, | Docket No. CP16-21-000
Northeast Energy Direct Project |

MOTION TO INTERVENE OF MASSACHUSETTS ATTORNEY GENERAL MAURA HEALEY

Pursuant to Sections 212 and 214 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (“FERC”) promulgated at 18 C.F.R. § 385.212 and 385.214, respectively, the Office of Massachusetts Attorney General Maura Healey (the “AGO”) hereby respectfully moves to intervene in the above captioned proceeding.

On November 20, 2015, the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. (“Tennessee Gas”) filed an application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity (“CPCN”) for the Northeast Energy Direct interstate gas pipeline project (the “NED Project”) pursuant to sections 7(b) and 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act (NGA). On December 7, 2015, FERC issued a Notice of Application for Tennessee Gas’s CPCN application and set a January 6, 2016 deadline for motions to intervene in this proceeding.

The Market path for the proposed NED Project calls for construction of a 188-mile, 30-inch pipeline designed to deliver up to 1.3 billion cubic feet per day (“Bcf/day”) of natural gas from Wright, New York, to Dracut, Massachusetts. As proposed by Tennessee Gas, 64 miles of the main pipeline would be located in Massachusetts, as would additional miles of lateral delivery pipelines and newly constructed compressor stations.

Statement of Interest and Grounds for Intervention

Attorney General Maura Healey is the chief law enforcement officer for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. The AGO, through its Energy and Environment Bureau, works to protect utility ratepayers and our

environment, and to reduce the threat of climate change for the people and families of the Commonwealth. As the state's Ratepayer Advocate, the Bureau's Energy and Telecommunications Division represents consumers in matters involving the price and delivery of natural gas, electricity, water, and telecommunication services before state and federal regulators. The Bureau's Environmental Protection Division and Environmental Crimes Strike Force enforce the laws that protect our air and water, preserve our lands and open space, require the clean-up of contaminated sites, and govern the use of pesticides and the handling and disposal of hazardous waste. The Bureau's integration of energy and environmental advocacy ensures that our office speaks with one voice in addressing the intertwined ratepayer and environmental protection matters that impact the Commonwealth and our residents.

The AGO is committed to a clean energy future in Massachusetts built around cleaner, renewable energy sources that allow Massachusetts to achieve regional and federal climate goals, as well as to meet the mandates of the Massachusetts Global Warming Solutions Act ["GWSA"], M.G. L. c. 21N §§ 1-9. The AGO also seeks to protect ratepayers by ensuring that when the Commonwealth makes long-term decisions about additional gas capacity investments, it is done on the basis of facts that quantify future natural gas demand, and take into account all cost-effective sources that can be deployed to meet that demand, including energy efficiency, renewables, large scale hydropower, LNG, and natural gas.

The AGO actively participated in pre-filing for the NED Project under docket PF 14- 22-000, including by filing detailed scoping comments dated October 16, 2015. In particular, the AGO's scoping comments questioned New England's need for the natural gas capacity proposed by the NED Project and called on FERC to scrutinize and condition any approval of the NED Project on adherence to the greenhouse gas emission reduction targets and other requirements of the GWSA and on compliance with all substantive and procedural requirements of Article 97 of the Massachusetts Constitution for all Article 97- protected parcels of conservation land impacted by the NED Project.

On November 18, 2015, the AGO filed on the PF 14-22-000 docket for the NED Project its study of New England electric reliability options. Power System Reliability in New England: Meeting Electric Resource Needs in an Era of Growing Dependence on Natural Gas, prepared by Analysis Group, Inc. [the "Study"]. The Study evaluated options to address regional electricity reliability in New England, including natural gas capacity needs, through 2030. Among the Study's findings was that under the status quo, the reliability of New England's power system can and will be maintained over time, including during periods of peak winter demand, without adding any new interstate natural gas pipeline capacity to service the New England region. Upon granting of this motion for intervention, the AGO will be filing the Study in the docket for this proceeding.

If the AGO is not permitted to intervene as a party to this proceeding, its interests will not be adequately represented by other parties and it may be adversely affected and bound by actions, determinations and decisions in this proceeding without opportunity to participate and be heard. The AGO's participation as a party in this proceeding is in the public interest.

SERVICE AND CONTACT INFORMATION

The AGO designates Assistant Attorney General Matthew Ireland for service and all communications in this proceeding and requests that this contact be added to the official FERC service list for this proceeding with the email and other contact information listed below:

Matthew Ireland,
Assistant Attorney General,
Environmental Protection Division
Office of Attorney General Maura Healey
One Ashburton Place
Boston, Massachusetts, 02108
617-727-2200

Email: matthew.ireland@state.ma.us

CONCLUSION

For all the above stated reasons, the AGO respectfully requests that this motion to intervene as a party be granted and that the AGO be afforded all rights attendant thereto, including, without limitation, the right to appear and participate fully in this proceeding.

Respectfully submitted.

Melissa A. Hoffer,
Chief, Energy and Environment Bureau,
Christophe Courchesne,
Chief, Environmental Protection Division,
Matthew Ireland,
Assistant Attorney General, Environmental Protection Division
matthew.ireland@state.ma.us

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this day I have caused to be served electronically a copy of the foregoing Motion to Intervene of Massachusetts Attorney General Maura Healey on all parties listed on the official service list compiled by FERC in this proceeding in accordance with the applicable FERC regulations.

Dated: December 19, 2015

Matthew Ireland,
Assistant Attorney General,
Environmental Protection Division
Office of Attorney General Maura Healey
matthew.ireland@state.ma.us

20151221-5040

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Joseph Edward Branson under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/19/2015 6:03:49 PM Filed Date: 12/21/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	bransonglass@yahoo.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I own two pieces of property in Ashfield, MA. One for my home and one for my business. My business property is within a mile of the proposed pipeline. The pipeline will affect the value of my property plus it threatens the quality of my water and air. I am against this pipeline.

This pipeline not only affects me because of its proximity to my property but it also affects me because it is another step in the continued use of fossil fuel. Burning fossil fuel and especially fracked gas is affecting our climate and any investment and development of more fossil fuel use is a threat to all of us and is just plain short sighted.

For these reasons, I am interested in and would be affected by Applicant's filing. My interests cannot be adequately represented and protected by any other party. Hence, the Commission should grant me permission to intervene in proceedings for Northeast Energy Direct.

20151221-5041

MOTION TO INTERVENE

IN DOCKET # CP16-21

Pursuant to FERC §385.214 (3) (R.214), I hereby move to be granted Intervener status, in compliance with the following subsections:

§(4)(b)(1) – I am a directly affected landowner opposed to the proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project, my land referred to on the TGP plan as LL# MA 213.00, 1 tract, Map/Block/Lot 4-0-48

§(4)(b)(2) - My position is, as a matter of both fact and law, that Kinder Morgan and its subsidiaries have committed and intend to continue to commit consumer fraud by misrepresenting the need and demand for natural gas in the Northeast, and rather are motivated by the opportunity to reap huge profit at the expense of landowners such as myself and utility users throughout Massachusetts. My position is that approval of the proposal would result in profound damage to the environment, economy, sense of community, agriculture, aesthetics, flora, and fauna of this region. My position is that promoting continued reliance on fossil fuels as an energy source represents the greatest single threat to humans and every other species, and indeed to our planet, and that if the same zeal and investment Kinder Morgan proposes for this project was applied to developing improved methods of generating and storing renewable sources of energy, we would be making significant progress in the history of humankind and our planet. My position is that by permitting this dreadful proposal FERC would be violating both the letter and the spirit of the Agreement recently entered into by the United States in the 2015 Paris Climate Conference (COP21.)

Marcine Appel Eisenberg
431 Ashfield Mt. Road
Ashfield, MA 01330-0152
413.628.3325
marcine.appel@gmail.com

20151221-5045

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Colleen Pascu under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/19/2015 11:54:02 AM Filed Date: 12/21/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	colleen.pascu@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I live within half mile of the Mid station 4, New Ipswich compressor station, possibly close to 1/4 mile of the compressor station.

45 Mountain View Road,
Temple, NH 03084

I will hear, smell, feel, see and potentially taste (dug well water quality) the effects of the compressor station.

We are concerned about air quality due to 41,000 HP turbines generating exhaust.

We are concerned disturbances to our dug well as it taps into stratified drift aquifer that the compressor station is on top of.

We are concerned with the continuous noise of compressor station, 24-7.

We are concerned with noise and pollution from blowdowns.

We are concerned with light damage to dark skies. We won't be able to see stars.

We are concerned with subsonic vibrations that can subconsciously affect health.

We are concerned about any chemicals or toxins released into the ground that will end up in our stratified drift aquifer.

We are concerned with traffic, noise, air pollution and numerous disturbances during construction.

We are concerned with the property value of our house being extremely close to a compressor station.

We are concerned with the potential closing of the Temple Elementary School because families don't want children to go an elementary school within half mile of the compressor station. Part of the property value and benefit of my residence is being close to an elementary school.

We are concerned with any natural gas infrastructure incidents that would require evacuation from the neighborhood and potential destruction/damage of property and lives.

We are concerned with the industrialization of the neighborhood. The only things that are comfortable living next to 41,000 HP compressor stations is other heavy industry.

We live in the shadow of the proposed compressor station. We will feel its effects.

20151221-5048

We, James J Jr. and Donna A Maloney, 11 MacArthur Rd North Reading MA. 01864 Parcel ID 0050-0000-0062 Book/Page: 21199/0416 Would like to object to the proposed Kinder Morgan Tennessee Gas Pipeline Lynnfield Lateral portion which could run through North Reading and Our Property. We would like to object to the fact that changes were made to the Lynnfield lateral in the most recent filing (November 20) and there were no open houses held in the eastern Mass. Section of the lateral between Wilmington and the ultimate destination of the lateral in Peabody. The proposed route through North Reading crosses Martins Brook and the Ipswich River also it is too close to one of North Readings Major drinking water wells and drinking water Treatment Plant . There is no need at this time for an additional gas pipeline in this area because the existing gas pipelines in our area are not even used to near capacity. Maura Healy, our State Attorney General has stated her opposition in her comments to FERC that Massachusetts does not need this pipeline. The proposed route is alongside existing electric high power lines which in and of itself is not a good idea. This area will be needed for additional Power Lines in the future and with a pipeline there they will be unable to do so without taking more Private Property. The proposed route in the area where it will cross route 62 (Lowell Rd.) is too close to Beneventos Sand and Gravel Pits where they daily do blasting to make crushed stone The daily blasting will put too much stress on this pipeline and could rupture it at any blast. Kinder Morgan may be in financial trouble, which could stop this project in its construction phase, leaving the Town of North Reading and all us private property owners to clean up their mess or worse the problems caused and liabilities. What happens if the portion of the pipe leaks crossing the Ipswich River, Martins Brook and drinking water wellfields ? It is unfair that We Private Property owners be forced to give or sell portions of our land to a private company whose main objective is profit and who has not proven that this pipeline is even needed for the area communities . Kinder Morgan refuses to say that they will not be selling the gas from this pipeline overseas.

20151221-5049

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Carroll R Durand under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/19/2015 1:10:34 PM Filed Date: 12/21/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____

Individual carrolldurand@hotmail.com

Basis for Intervening:

I live in Ashfield, Massachusetts. I live here because the farm and woodlands are beautiful and protected

from development. I am fully involved in preserving our natural resources and in using, to the largest extent possible, renewable energy sources,

I am totally opposed to the proposed pipeline.

It would terribly impact our life style and the beauty of our lands.

It would poison our pristine lands.

It would place me in danger as I would have to pass over the proposed atrocity several times during my daily routine.

NO PIPELINE!!!

20151221-5052

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of brenda lee olson under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/19/2015 2:30:53 PM Filed Date: 12/21/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	brendaolson45@comcast.net	

Basis for Intervening:

I am directly effected property owner. The proposed line will either go a few feet from my home or more than 25 feet on my neighbors property. This has caused me, my family and neighbors much anxiety. It will decrease our property values if near our homes. Or we loose our family homes to the pipeline construction. Who wants to live near a pipeline with known health and safety hazards with toxins, leaks and explosions etc... I am very concerned about the safety of the local drinking water and the environment. The proposed pipeline will be going through local state owned conservation land (Montague Plains known to be home for endangered species), and a major drinking water source for our community.

20151221-5053

I am a homeowner in Amherst, MA, where I live across the street from the Amethyst Conservation Area and on the Robert Frost Trail. Access to the healing beauty of Nature is an essential part of my daily life. I am a strong proponent of a just transition away from fossil fuels and toward sustainable energy practices and an atmospheric carbon-dioxide concentration of less than 350 parts per million. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts has passed legislation supporting this transition and President Obama, as part of the recent Paris Climate Agreement have taken strides toward these goals. I see the development of this pipeline as a threat to achieving them. I see it as a threat to a way of life that includes the natural beauty of the Connecticut River and its many tributaries, the Berkshire Mountains, apple orchards, maple syrup, and the wildlife that, although threatened, still can be found here.

Specifically, I oppose the proposed pipeline because it would:

- carry fracked gas that would release unacceptable quantities of climate-changing methane in the course of being mined, processed, transported, and stored – resulting in an overall impact to global warming that is worst than coal;
- run counter to my and my community's efforts to advance a swift transition away from fossil fuels;
- support the fracking industry that is destroying water supplies and aquifers, ecosystems, state and national lands, wild habitats and the creatures that depend upon them, and destabilizing the earth's crust leading to increased seismic activity.
- fly in the face of Massachusetts' hard-won gains in leading the nation in the area of energy efficiency and clean, renewable energy development;

- allow for wet trenching and other activities at proposed river crossings that may result in pipeline coatings and other pollutant leaks.
- increase the amount of air borne pollutants which would compromise both human health and the viability of the many thriving and struggling organic farms that are part of our culture here. Amherst has both a summer and a winter Farmer's Market that are an important part of my and our local culture.

In addition to these concerns, I have deep reservations about the responsiveness of the applicant. KinderMorgan/TPG's responsiveness is seriously called into question by their premature and inappropriate application to FERC for expedited review, when such requests have been denied at the state level, and questions asked by Secretary of Energy and Environmental Affairs, Maeve Vallely Bartlett as part of the state process still remain unanswered. Expedited review would cut the public out of their chance for the standard procedures of open houses, scoping meetings and comment periods as required by FERC. It should most certainly not be granted where such unresponsiveness to state and citizen concerns has already been demonstrated.

For these reasons, I am interested in and would be affected by Applicant's filing. My interests cannot be adequately represented and protected by any other party. Hence, the Commission should grant me intervener status.

20151221-5056

MOTION TO INTERVENE IN DOCKET # CP16-21

Pursuant to FERC §385.214 (3) (R.214), I hereby move to be granted Intervener status, in compliance with the following subsections:

§(4)(b)(1) – I am a directly affected landowner opposed to the proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project, my land referred to on the TGP plan as LL# MA 213.00, 1 tract, Map/Block/Lot 4-0-48

§(4)(b)(2) - My position is, as a matter of both fact and law, that Kinder Morgan and its subsidiaries have committed and intend to continue to commit consumer fraud by misrepresenting the need and demand for natural gas in the Northeast, and rather are motivated by the opportunity to reap huge profit at the expense of landowners such as myself and utility users throughout Massachusetts. My position is that approval of the proposal would result in profound damage to the environment, economy, sense of community, agriculture, aesthetics, flora, and fauna of this region. My position is that promoting continued reliance on fossil fuels as an energy source represents the greatest single threat to humans and every other species, and indeed to our planet, and that if the same zeal and investment Kinder Morgan proposes for this project was applied to developing improved methods of generating and storing renewable sources of energy, we would be making significant progress in the history of humankind and our planet. My position is that by permitting this dreadful proposal FERC would be violating both the letter and the spirit of the Agreement recently entered into by the United States in the 2015 Paris Climate Conference (COP21.)

Stewart Eisenberg, Esq.
431 Ashfield Mt. Road
Ashfield, MA 01330-0152
413.628.3325
buz.e@verizon.net

20151221-5060

GOAT MEADOW FARM BED and BREAKFAST
Conway, MA

Who we are:

My husband and I have a small hobby farm in Conway with goats, a minidonkey, a pony, large vegetable garden, frog pond and perennials that we enjoy. We built this beautiful post and beam home ourselves, and run a B&B here to help supplement our retirement. We have 9 children scattered throughout the country (7

of whom are adopted), and we have lived here for 26 years, fortunate to have one set of grandchildren right down the road, who visit often. We are both retired public school teachers, as well as political and educational activists. We have been active members of ConwayPLAN for 2 years now, committed to stopping the installation of the NED pipeline.

How we are impacted:

The proposed route is immediately behind our farm, immediately impacting many of my rural neighbors who own stunning pieces of undeveloped wooded and open parcels. The NED proposal would damage greatly the quality of our lives in rural, quiet Conway. The hours of truck traffic will be disturbing, the pulverizing of our roads. Giant jackhammers working for 10 hours a day will deteriorate our quality of life. Laborers from out-of-state will settle into our area, people with no loyalty to our town. The stories of similar projects are very troubling.

Our small business will suffer tremendously. No one seeking the solace of a rural setting will chose our B&B to relax in. The local hiking paths that we point them to, the biking trails and lazy rivers will be unavailable, and there will be no one here to enjoy them. You might have heard that public school teachers are not well-paid. Our retirement is not that strong either. This additional income is critical to maintaining our style of life.

The co-location of this pipe with the Eversource powerlines concerns us deeply. More than once, we have heard from gas installation engineers, that pipelines should be placed 500-100 ft away from the lines. Sparks, corrosion and leaking terrify us. Yet, Kinder Morgan proceeds irresponsibly with abandon.

Between my grandchildren's home and ours in a proposal for a remote Blowdown Valve. Gas will be released from it in emergency and when pressure needs to be relieved. Gas will be blasted into the air sending particles from the gas and from the fracking process into our clean Conway air. If the wind blows one way, it will land on my grandchildren and the beautiful woods nearby. If it blows the other way, my home, my neighbors, our farms, our river valley and rural downtown will be impacted. Toxins will fall on streambeds and gardens, on pastures and swing sets...for years and years and years.

I have only touched on a very few of our concerns. This pipeline is not wanted, nor is it needed. We are applying for intervenor status to be able to watch closely this unethical and potentially dangerous process unfold. We will watch the lies be written and shared, and we will fight back, by helping you understand the truths. This pipeline is for export and will support only corporate greed. Conway, Massachusetts and New England will have no benefit, only loss... terrible loss. We intend to help stop the NED pipeline, as do 1000's and 1000's of us in MA, NY, NH and CT.

Please, also continue to demand that Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas answer the questions that you requested on them. Thank you.

20151221-5061

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Peter D Wildermuth, JR under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/18/2015 8:11:51 PM Filed Date: 12/21/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
---------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------

Individual	petewildermuth@icloud.com	
------------	---------------------------	--

Basis for Intervening:

As a landowner, electric utility ratepayer / customer with Eversouce Energy I am directly impacted by the proposed Kinder-Morgan / NED pipeline project whose pipeline route would run through my town of Ashfield, MA. I am opposed to the transport of natural gas through my state and the negative impacts to our air, our safety and our health.

I am also opposed to any increase on my electric bill which would support the construction of a pipeline project for the purpose of transporting a fossil fuel.

20151221-5062

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Tiertza-leah Schwartz under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/18/2015 8:22:47 PM Filed Date: 12/21/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____

Individual tschwart@smith.edu

Basis for Intervening:

I live in Ashfield a town that is directly impacted by the pipeline. I am deeply concerned about the health and environmental risks of the pipeline. It is not needed and will cost us too much money. The pipeline will leak toxic gas, pose numerous health risks and decrease our property values. As a first responder and call firefighter speaking personally as an individual I am concerned about the ability of the towns fire and police department to respond in the event of a leak, explosion, fire or other emergency. The majority of the gas will be shipped overseas. There is not need for the pipeline. Our entire way of life is at risk. Our water, air and environment will be polluted.

20151221-5063

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Robert A Armstrong, JR under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/18/2015 8:41:56 PM Filed Date: 12/21/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____

Individual bobaintervenor@gmail.com

Basis for Intervening:

I'm Bob Armstrong of Conway, MA. I bought my small farm in 1980 in beautiful Western Mass, seeking clean water, fresh air, land for my flock of sheep and an unspoiled environment to raise my family. I'm hoping my children will build their own homes on some of this land or that I'll eventually sell it to someone with the same ideals that I hold.

The NED pipeline crosses the road I live on passing through my neighbor's land. The Conway Blow-Off valve is across the street where the pipe crosses the road. I'm assured that periodically, it will blow off excess Fracking Gas into the air right over my home and sheep pastures and then those poisons will settle on my property. This just cannot occur.

I believe this pipeline will lower the value of my property because few people will want to buy beautiful farm land that has been contaminated by Fracking Gas poisons. They will not want to have to listen to the loud roar of the fracking gas as it is released from the blow-off valve. They will not want to live adjacent to a potential pipeline catastrophe.

Over the next several years, I will have to live with the mayhem of the construction with trucks passing by my house, the roads being destroyed by these huge vehicles, the blasting that will have to occur as the pipeline is dug into the solid rock in the hill across from my home. My life should not be subjected to this. The pipeline is unnecessary and being built only to bring this Fracking Gas to our Massachusetts coast to be sold overseas. I object to my home being destroyed for the profits of Kinder Morgan. FERC should not approve this unnecessary project.

20151221-5065

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Stephen M Worth under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/18/2015 8:44:48 PM Filed Date: 12/21/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____

Individual smw@downeastpostandbeam.com

Basis for Intervening:

MOTION TO INTERVENE

In regard to Tennessee Gas Pipeline's Connecticut Expansion proposal

Docket No. CP14-529-000

Stephen M. Worth

Folly Farm

457 Steady Lane

Ashfield, MA 01330

smw@downeastpostandbeam.com

413/628-3221

I strongly object to the construction of the proposed pipeline for a number of reasons. The primary reason for this intervention filing is my objection to expanding the delivery of non-renewable fossil fuels in the form of fracked natural gas that contributes to greenhouse gas and the resulting warming of the planet, a course that is inherently self destructive to our world. Secondary objections are equally strong, namely the reduction of my property values, the negative effect on our watershed, concern for toxic emissions, the impact on conservation easements, the impact on the condition of our local roads, and the reduction in our rural quality of life.

Respectively submitted December 18, 2015

20151221-5066

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Reenie G Clancy under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/18/2015 8:58:31 PM Filed Date: 12/21/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____

Individual reeniegreenie@comcast.net

Basis for Intervening:

As an owner of farmland on the Connecticut River in Sunderland and Deerfield, Massachusetts approximately 15 miles south of where the proposed route of the Northeast Energy Direct Project pipeline. I must convey my concerns. We grow potatoes on this land and use water from the river to irrigate, therefore any possible leaks from the pipeline under the river and emissions downwind from the nearby metering station in Deerfield would seriously damage the quality of water and air which would eventually contaminate the soil. As one of many farmers who rely on the alluvial soils fed by the Connecticut River over the millennia, this could impact the quality of our produce which would result in diminished income.

A larger concern is the addition of more fossil fuel emissions, primarily the methane that is the major component in natural gas, contributing to climate warming, now a global issue affecting the entire planet.

For these reasons I strongly oppose the building of this pipeline on any soil and urge the Federal Energy

Resource Committee to not grant approval to Kinder Morgan and its subsidiary Tennessee Gas Pipeline.

Respectfully

Reenie Clancy

20151221-5077

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene as Carl W Nelke under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/18/2015 6:07:47 PM Filed Date: 12/21/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	cnelke116@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

My property abuts the land on which the power line runs. That is the path of the proposed pipeline. The pipeline will pass within a few hundred feet of my house, water source, and a number of run off streams which cross my driveway. I am seeking intervention status so I may be kept up to date on progress and have concerns over the water supply and integrity of my property addressed.

My well is almost as close to the pipeline as the house. There are several small run off streams going up the hill and crossing the power line property that converge then run under my driveway in a single culvert. I want to make sure the integrity of that system is maintained so I have proper drainage in the event of a heavy rain.

20151221-5093

{ large photograph of powerline, no captions, omitted; referenced in 20151221-5113 below }

20151221-5113

James P. Cutler
421 Beldingville Rd.
Ashfield, MA 01330
jim.cp1621@gmail.com
(413) 625-2097

To the Commissioners of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission,

As an impacted homeowner applying for intervenor status in the permitting process for CP16-21-000 I would like to bring to your attention a number of facts and issues concerning my property that has been included in the proposed route for the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline project.

My parcels as well as parcels to the West of me (also on the proposed route) sit on top of a unique alluvial sand deposit that acts as a large aquifer. This aquifer serves my well among others and would be directly impacted by this pipeline project should you decide to approve it.

This sand deposit is also VERY UNSTABLE! I refer you to the attached image titled "Blowout within 200' of proposed pipeline route". This blowout, according to Mass DEP and Eversource is due to the clear cutting of trees for the existing power line ROW. The proposed pipeline construction path of 100' clearcut will cause further destabilization of the geology resulting in potential pipe failure. You, FERC, are on notice that you have been informed of this situation.

This part of my property has also been placed into permanent conservation easement (Article 97) under Massachusetts General Laws. Article 97 cannot be undone without a 2/3 majority vote. Without that 2/3 majority vote to remove Article 97 from my property TGP CANNOT construct the pipeline.

Kinder Morgan through its subsidiary Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC have not adequately prepared their permit application for this project resulting in 1000's of entries with the acronym "TBD" which means to be decided. This lack of required data renders their submission incomplete and should never have been accepted by FERC. This unprofessional overstep has been noted by this writer and will be pursued through the intervention process.

The property at 421 Beldingville Road is also the location of a 1700's burial site that is in process of being cataloged. Any disturbance could damage this site and the potential historical significance it might play.

I have not given permission to TGP or Kinder Morgan to survey my property. For this reason they do not have access to the necessary information to determine feasibility for this pipeline project.

I also refer you to the image titled "Old Growth Pine & Burial Site within proposed pipeline route". At the base of this old growth tree lies the burial site of my mother Priscilla P. Whipple. This tree and my mother burial site will be desecrated by the pipeline construction process as it lies within the 100' construction zone.

In summary, you, the commissioners at FERC, have accepted an application from TGP to construct a pipeline that is devoid of relevant data, in a proposed area that is inhospitable to this type of construction and that will destroy existing cultural artifacts, a unique and very important aquifer and human burial site.

To say that this is unacceptable is to defile the word.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jim Cutler

20151221-5136

John F Wagner, Averill Park, NY.

I own a parcel of land within one half mile of the proposed NED gas compressor station on Clark's Chapel Rd in the town of Nassau, NY and object to siting the compressor there due to the resulting noise level and air pollution it will produce.

20151221-5179

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Connecticut Industrial Energy Consumers under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/21/2015 12:52:28 PM Filed Date: 12/21/2015 12:52:28 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____

Connecticut Industrial Energy Consumers jking@couchwhite.com adevito@couchwhite.com

Basis for Intervening:

The Connecticut Industrial Energy Consumers ("CIEC") is an ad hoc coalition of commercial and industrial end-users that collectively employs thousands of Connecticut workers at numerous locations throughout the State. As large end-use consumers of electricity in Connecticut, CIEC members pay substantial energy-related costs. CIEC members presently are, or may be in the future, direct customers of the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. and/or the North East Energy Direct Project. The outcome of this proceeding, therefore, may have a significant impact on the rates and charges paid by CIEC members. Accordingly, CIEC has a substantial interest in this matter, and its interests will be directly affected by the outcome of this proceeding. (18 C.F.R. § 385.214(b)(2)(ii)(A).)

Moreover, no other party exclusively represents the interests of large commercial and industrial energy consumers operating facilities throughout Connecticut. Therefore, such interests would not be adequately represented absent CIEC's participation in this proceeding. Accordingly, the participation of CIEC in this

proceeding is in the public interest. (18 C.F.R. § 385.214(b)(2)(iii).)

For the foregoing reasons, CIEC respectfully requests that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission grant this motion to intervene.

20151221-5216

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Jeffrey R Yull under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/21/2015 1:52:44 PM

Filed Date: 12/21/2015 1:52:44 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	jeffyull@verizon.net	

Basis for Intervening:

The construction, operation and maintenance of the NED Pipeline will adversely impact my property, immediate neighbors, as well as the entire community in the following ways:

1. Expose my family to safety risks associated with natural gas, including explosion, pollution, ground contamination, and/or groundwater contamination.
2. Expose my family to potential pollution of drinking water wells, including a well located within a few hundred feet of the proposed route.
3. Reduce property tax revenues by reducing the valuation of private and other property, which could cause an increase in tax rates to make up for the lost revenue.
4. Adversely impact wetlands on my property, do harm to regional habitat and species due to gas leakage, thereby negatively impacting the quality of life.
5. Reduce the amount of open space in Town by utilizing existing open space parcels for the pipeline route.
6. Reduce the value of Town-owned land by siting on or near such land.
7. Cause undue stress upon myself and other property owners thereby affecting the health, well-being, and/or productivity of said owners/residents.
8. The route can be altered to avoid many if not all of the properties currently in the path of the Pipeline, thereby avoiding the use of eminent domain.

20151221-5252

December 21, 2015

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC Docket No. CP16-21-000

MOTION TO INTERVENE

Pursuant to applicable regulations, I, John Wagner of Nassau, NY, ask that you accept my Motion to Intervene in the above matter.

The project seeks to construct a pipeline compressor station within one half mile of land I own in the town of Nassau, thereby directly affecting the environment of the parcel in terms of chemical pollution and noise level.

Thank you for your consideration.

John Wagner

62 Harriman Rd
Averill Park, NY 12018

20151221-5253

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BEFORE THE FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC
North East Direct Pipeline Project

Docket No. CP16-21-000

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO INTERVENE

Pursuant to Rules 212 and 214 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's ("Commission") Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 385.212 and 385.214 (2007), we, Mark and Diann Bouthot, file this motion to intervene in this proceeding.

On November 20, 2015, the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC ("TGP") filed its application under § 7 of the Natural Gas Act, 15 U.S.C. § 717f, and § 157 of FERC's regulations, 18 C.F.R. § 157.1 et seq., for the proposed North East Direct Project (NED), FERC Docket No. CP 16- 21-000

I. COMMUNICATIONS AND SERVICE

All communications, pleadings, and orders with respect to this proceeding should be sent to the following individual:

Mark & Diann Bouthot

65 Dunvegan Road
Tewksbury, MA 01876
(978) 858-0014 bout1525@gmail.com

II. INTEREST OF PETITIONER

Construction, operation and maintenance of the Pipeline would adversely impact me.

As residents of 65 Dunvegan Road in Tewksbury, Massachusetts, we are applying for intervenor status under CP16-21-000, Northeast Energy Direct pipeline project. The Kinder Morgan North East Direct (NED) pipeline application proposes to place a pipeline abutting our property. Construction, operation and maintenance of the Pipeline would adversely impact my family. The property to which the pipeline will pass is undeveloped forest. As such streams, ancient artifacts, stone walls, vernal pools, wetlands and conversation lands will be destroyed in the construction. Additionally, we object because of:

- 1) Loss of privacy during construction and pipeline maintenance.
- 2) We oppose the clear-cutting of our back yards, as it threatens our clean water supply and destroys the natural habitat for the birds and animals that live there. We often see deer, fox, turkeys, skunks, raccoons, and many varieties of birds such as doves, hawks, and owls in the woods surrounding our property.
- 3) Kinder Morgan stated how this pipeline is necessary to reduce energy costs for New England, especially in the winter months. The Massachusetts Attorney General recently commissioned a study which does not support TGP's claim of necessity
- 4) The impacts already stated will most certainly devalue the property value of our home, due to this construction and the presence of the pipeline.

For these, and many other reasons, we request to intervene in CP16-21- 000.

III. CONCLUSION

Wherefore, we, Mark & Diann Bouthot, respectfully request that the Commission to grant our Motion to Intervene as a party with full rights to participate in all further proceedings.

Respectfully submitted this 21st day of December, 2015.

Mark & Diann Bouthot
65 Dunvegan Road
Tewksbury, MA 01876
bout1525@gmail.com

20151221-5254

Joanna B. Tourangeau
Admitted in ME, NH and MA

207.253.0567 Direct
jtourangeau@dwmlaw.com
84 Marginal Way, Suite 600
Portland, ME 04101-2480
207.772.1941 Main
207.772.3627 Fax

DrummondWoodsum

ATTORNEYS AT LAW 1965-2015
YEARS OF SERVICE TO OUR CLIENTS AND COMMUNITIES

December 21, 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.; Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
("Commission") Docket No. CP16-21-00

Dear Secretary Bose:

I have enclosed for filing in regards to the above-referenced proceedings an original and eight copies of the Town of Merrimack Motion to Intervene with regard to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's proposed new pipeline.

Thank you for your assistance and please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,

Joanna B. Tourangeau

JBT/as

Enclosures

BEFORE THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC.)

Docket No. CP16-21-00

**TOWN OF MERRIMACK'S
MOTION TO INTERVENE**

The Town of Merrimack ("Merrimack") is directly and uniquely impacted by the pipeline construction proposed pursuant to the above captioned proceedings. Specifically, as discussed in further detail below, Merrimack owns conservation properties that will experience immediate impacts due to these proceedings including becoming subject to takings. Further, Merrimack facilities such as an elementary school, water supply and fire station will each be endangered should these proceedings result in approval of the current pipeline route through Merrimack. Finally, many businesses and residential neighborhoods inhabited by Merrimack citizens are also threatened by the propose pipeline route through Merrimack.

Pursuant to Rule 214 (18 C.F.R. § 385.214) of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's ("Commission") Rules of Practice, the Town of Merrimack (hereinafter "Merrimack"), files this Motion to Intervene in

the above-captioned proceeding.

MERRIMACK'S INTEREST

I. Merrimack's Motion to Intervene is Supported by its Interests which will be directly affected by the outcome of these Proceedings.

Merrimack moves to intervene at this time for the purpose of becoming a party pursuant to Rule 214(b)(2)(ii) to Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC's ("TGP") application to the Commission for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity for the Northeast Energy Direct Project ("Certificate"), a natural gas pipeline ("NED Project"). 18 C.F.R. § 385.214(b)(2)(ii). Merrimack's Motion to Intervene meets each of the intervention criteria of Rule 214(b), 18 C.F.R. § 385.214(b).

On November 20, 2015 TGP filed with the Commission its Application for the Certificate for the NED Project. The NED Project directly and uniquely impacts Merrimack. A portion of the NED Project known as the New Hampshire Powerline Alternative travels directly through Merrimack, impacting one hundred and fifty three landowners (the majority of whom are Merrimack tax payers) in Merrimack. The proposed route runs within 200-300 feet of several large residential neighborhoods including: Whittier Place, Camp Sargent Acres, Tinker Road, and Thornton Road West. The proposed route also impacts several other neighborhoods including: Cambridge Drive/Wethersfield, Holts Landing, Castleton Ridge, Eric and Greenleaf Streets. Multiple businesses will be impacted by the proposed route including: PC Connection, Dunkin Donuts, Pizza Hut, Home Depot, O'Reilly Auto Parts/VIP Tire and Service Auto Fair — VW, Pennichuck Square retail area with multiple retail businesses, Fidelity, the Merrimack Premium Outlets, Elbit Systems LTC, the All Basics Stove Shop, Meineke Car Care Center, Merrimack Veterinary Hospital, Anheuser-Busch, Innovations Salon and Spa and the Community Hospice House.

The New Hampshire Powerline Alternative also directly impacts Merrimack properties. The routing through Merrimack traverses much of a wetland system and the Naticook Brook Aquifer that serves to provide water for Merrimack's Village District wells and areas slated for expansion of the wellhead protection area, MVD well and water treatment facility planned for near term construction. The New Hampshire Powerline Alternative jeopardizes the entirety of Merrimack's public water supply. The New Hampshire Powerline Alternative also crosses the nearby Pennichuck Water watershed.

In addition to traversing the Merrimack aquifer and wellhead properties which provide the entirety of the municipal water supply, the New Hampshire Powerline Alternative travels within approximately 1200-1500 feet of the elementary school, and immediately adjacent to a site proposed for the new Merrimack fire station as well as the current location of Merrimack South Fire Station. The route also includes impacts to several properties owned directly by or held as conservation lands by Merrimack which contain multiple rare and uncommon species. Certain of these habitats in Merrimack are scored as part of the Highest Ranked Habitat in New Hampshire.

Merrimack actively participated in the pre-filing docket for this matter in order to provide the information necessary to allow TGP to avoid or minimize unacceptable impacts. This participation is essential to protect Merrimack's interests, detailed above, which cannot be adequately protected by any other party or participant in these proceedings. As a municipality with an obligation to protect the public, Merrimack's participation as a party to these proceedings is also in the public interest.

II. Changes to Service List

Should the Commission grant Merrimack's motion to intervene, the names and addresses of the Merrimack's representatives to be placed on the Service List for this proceeding pursuant to 18 C.F.R. § 385.2010 are as follows:

Town of Merrimack, NH
Joanna B. Tourangeau, Esq.
Drummond Woodsum
84 Marginal Way, Ste 600

III. Conclusion

Merrimack respectfully requests that the Commission grant its Motion to Intervene as compliant with Commission Rule 214.

Dated: December 21, 2015

Joanna B. Tourangeau, Esq.,
Counsel for Town of Merrimack

Drummond Woodsum & MacMahon
84 Marginal Way, Ste 600
Portland, Maine 04101-2480
Tel: (207) 772-1941
Fax: (207) 772-3627

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have caused the foregoing document to be served by regular mail upon each person designated on the official service list compiled by the Secretary in this proceeding this 21st day of December, 2015.

Joanna B. Tourangeau, Esq.
Counsel for Town of Merrimack

20151221-5292

BEFORE THE UNITED STATES FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company,
a subsidiary of Kinder Morgan
Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Project

Docket No. CP 16-21-000

MOTION TO INTERVENE OF TOWN OF MONTAGUE IN OPPOSITION TO NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT PIPELINE

Pursuant to Rule 214 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (Commission) Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. §385.214, THE TOWN OF MONTAGUE (MONTAGUE) files this Motion to Intervene in the above-captioned proceeding. MONTAGUE opposes the project because of natural resource, infrastructure and economic impacts and seeks party status to protest the proposed pipeline, and fully protect Montague's interests.

I. STATEMENT OF INTEREST

A. Description of INTERVENOR

Montague is a community of 8,437 people along the Connecticut River in Franklin County, Massachusetts. The proposed NED pipeline's 4.7-mile reach through Montague will bisect the 31-square-mile Town. The pipeline would pass through environmentally sensitive areas, areas protected as open space by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and land that is regulated for public water-supply protection.

B. Description of Impacts

MONTAGUE will be directly impacted and harmed by the proposed project as in the following ways:

Water Resource Impacts: The pipeline bisects the Hannegan Brook Well Zone II Aquifer Recharge Area. This public well supplies water to over 5,000 households in the Turners Falls Water District. The drinking water supply area is regulated in the Montague Zoning Bylaws. Secondly the pipeline crosses two major

rivers in Montague: the Connecticut and the Millers. The Town is concerned about the possible of contamination of public water supplies and waterbodies from the pipeline and from planned horizontal directional drilling.

Economic Impacts: There are approximately 15 homes within 500 feet of the proposed pipeline. The Town is concerned about reduction of home values, difficulties in refinancing, and difficulties in obtaining homeowner's insurance for these properties. There is also a concern about resident rights to pass over the pipeline right-of-way to access privately and publicly owned back lots. Lack of access to some affected lots could have an impact on forestry, recreation, and agriculture in Montague.

Open Space and Recreation Impacts: The Montague Plains are a unique and pristine natural pine-barren ecosystem. The Plains are used extensively for recreation including hunting, hiking, bird watching and cross-country skiing. The proposed route includes approximately one (1) mile of new right-of-way over land held in public trust by Mass Dept of Fish and Wildlife. Thus the Town is concerned about the proposed change of use for one mile of Article 97 protected lands, as well as the impact on hunting, recreational trail use, and habitat.

Public Safety Impacts: Montague's two independent Fire Districts do not have the manpower or equipment to address pipeline accidents. The Montague Plains are a wildfire hazard area. Historically, there have been devastating wildfires on the Montague Plains, where such an occurrence happens naturally. The Montague Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan identified wildfire on the Plains as one of the most significant hazards for Montague -as it would threaten the villages of Lake Pleasant, Millers Falls, and the Airport Industrial Park. A pipeline accident will vastly strain Montague's public safety and emergency response resources.

Construction Impacts: The Town is concerned that heavy equipment during construction will damage town roads. We are also concerned about proximity to high voltage transmission lines and the geological impacts of directional drilling.

Liability Concerns: The Town is concerned about the company's LLC status and thus its ability to cover potential damages. The Commission must consider this issue and explore solutions which may include requiring the parent company to take responsibility for liability or post substantial bond to ensure ability to pay.

C. No Need for the Pipeline

The impacts described are problematic generally, but entirely unacceptable given that TGP has failed to demonstrate a need for the pipeline. In the three years TGP has offered open contract seasons to local gas distribution companies, their interest is only .55 bcf/day. Even after downsizing NED from 2.2 bcf/day capacity to 1.3 bcf/day, these contracts cover less than 40 percent of capacity. A recently-released assessment of New England's electrical needs by the Massachusetts Attorney General's office demonstrated that the electric sector does not need NED or other major new gas pipelines: <http://www.mass.gov/ago/doingbusiness-in-massachusetts/energy-and-utilities/regional-electric-reliability-optionsstudy.html>. Montague requests that FERC adopt this study's findings and recommendations in evaluating the question of domestic need for the NED pipeline.

D. Montague's Motion to Intervene Must Be Granted

MONTAGUE satisfies the standard for intervention under the Commission's regulations. As discussed above, MONTAGUE is directly impacted by the proposed project, and no other individual or organization can adequately represent MONTAGUE's unique interest in this proceeding. Further, MONTAGUE's intervention is in the public interest because the Town is responsible for the protection of the health and safety of all of its residents. Accordingly, MONTAGUE respectfully requests that the Commission grant this Motion to Intervene.

II. PROTEST/COMMENTS

A. Montague does not view the NED Application as complete.

MONTAGUE disagrees with the Commission's acceptance of the Application and the opening of Docket #CP 16-21-000. Our reasons are well-represented in the attached joint letter to FERC that was submitted December 2 by six regional councils of government and planning commissions, including the Franklin Regional Council of Governments. FERC itself issued an Environmental Information Request on December 8, the day after the Notice of Application. (Copy attached.) The request demands TGP supply data in response to lengthy list of comments and inquiries from 28 state, regional, and municipal governing bodies and environmental organizations. FERC staff stated that "at a minimum" TGP must answer these comments--indicating that staff view other information as missing or incomplete as well. It is Montague's position that FERC should have deferred the Notice of Application until staff had received complete responses to the FERC staffs December 8 and October 10 information requests of the Company.

B. TGP/KINDER MORGAN is not financially solid enough to entrust with the NED project.

TGP owner Kinder Morgan's stock price is tumbling; the company just slashed its dividend by 75 percent; its debt is reported by the business press at \$41 billion for a company worth \$37 billion. The company's bond ratings are narrowly skirting junk-bond status. In addition to the proposed NED pipeline, Kinder Morgan has many other projects in development that it proposes to build during overlapping time frames with the NED project, all with 2018 inservice dates. These other projects include a \$5.4-billion expansion of the Trans-Mountain oil pipeline in Canada. Given the Company's balance sheet, it is hard to comprehend the vast investment in so many projects that would not produce income until late 2018 at the earliest. The proposed NED pipeline would be one of the most technically challenging pipelines ever built by TGP, because the geological, hydrologic, and environmental conditions change almost by the yard over the entire route. Even if we had no other objections, Montague cannot have confidence that a company in such difficult financial straits can be trusted to build this complex and demanding pipeline to appropriate standards of safety.

C. The natural-gas market and especially the supply of shale gas is notably unstable.

Frequent press reports cover fracking sites that run dry more quickly than expected; a reduction in drilling due to falling gas prices; regulatory uncertainty as the Federal Clean Power Plan may limit climate-disrupting methane emissions from the industry; and earthquakes caused by fracking that could put an end to the practice if they become severe and widespread. With state and Federal regulatory agencies routinely allowing energy companies to recover "stranded costs" from ratepayers for investments in infrastructure that do not turn out to be profitable, Montague faces a real risk of having an unused pipeline decaying underground, threatening our water supplies, while being paid off by the Town and other Berkshire Gas ratepayers, and possibly Eversource ratepayers as well.

III. CONTACT INFORMATION

The following should be added to the Official Service List, with all notice and communications in this proceeding addressed to the contacts listed below:

Name: Walter Ramsey- Montague Town Planner and Conservation Agent
Address: One Avenue A Turners Falls MA 01376
Phone: 413 863 3200 ext 207
Email: planner@montague-ma.gov

IV. CONCLUSION

Wherefore, in light of the foregoing, MONTAGUE respectfully requests that (the Commission (1) GRANT this motion to intervene and allow INTERVENOR to participate in this proceeding with full rights of party status, including the rights to request a hearing, cross examine witnesses and seek rehearing and appeal.

Respectfully submitted by the Montague Board of Selectmen,
Michael Nelson, Chairman
Richard Kuklewicz
Christopher M. Boutwell

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Wherefore on this [DATE], I caused to be served the foregoing Motion to Intervene electronically on all parties on the Commission's electronic service list in this proceeding, in accordance with Commission regulations.

{ 10 pages of attachments omitted }

Appendix A: Reference Map of Hannegan Brook Water Supply Protection District and residences within 500 feet of proposed pipeline *(better copy provided in a separate file)*

Appendix B: Correspondence from FRCOG, NMCOG, SRPC, NRPC, PVPC, and BRPC to Kimberly Bose dated December 2, 2015

Appendix C: Correspondence to Curtis Moffat Deputy General Counsel and Vice President TGP from Eric J. Tomasi Office of Energy Projects dated December 8, 2015

{ full document and separate map can be downloaded at: }

Document: <http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/opennat.asp?fileID=14078611>

Map: <http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/opennat.asp?fileID=14078612>

20151221-5316

Background of motion to intervene:

Dear FERC members;

We are writing you today to ask that you consider the impacts of approving the NED pipeline and reject the proposed pipeline and compressor station. We are not a rich people and have worked hard for what we have. We have 2 children. We have been living at our current residence since 2009. We are building a log cabin on 5.25 acres and making progress as finances allow. However it could all be for nothing if you allow the NED pipeline to build a compressor station less than 1/2 mile from our home.

We fear for our health and quality of life due to the noise, discharges and well water contamination. Kinder Morgan is not being honest with their maps of people affected. Our home as well as many of our neighbors are not identified on their maps as within the incineration zone. According to google maps we are approximately 2000 feet from the proposed pipeline and compressor station.

They are purposely misrepresenting by publishing misleading and incomplete information. Please Please Please get all the real facts before ruling on this project.

Consider how you would react to a project of this magnitude with incorrect information being disseminated to be allowed to proceed without considering all of the real facts and impacts.

Thank you for your interest

Steven Irwin and Sue Irwin
103 Hogarty Road
Averill Park, NY 12018
518-526-5301
stvnirwin@gmail.com

BEFORE THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline/Kinder Morgan

Northeast Energy Direct

Docket No. CP16-21-000

Steven Irwin and Sue Irwin are Rensselaer County residents who fear the route of the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline and compressor station will forever result in health and safety risks, noise and light pollution and possible well water contamination. As a citizen we feel we have a stake in the future of the planet and the health and safety of its citizens which would be affected by this pipeline.

Our residence stands approximately 2000 feet from Kinder Morgan's proposed new pipeline and compressor station if the project is granted. We believe our residence in Rensselaer County, NY. could be affected by Kinder Morgan's proposed new pipeline and compressor station due to construction, leaks, explosions, noise and light.

Pursuant to Commission Rules 385.214(b) and 157.10, Steven Irwin and Sue Irwin move to intervene in the above captioned proceeding. This intervention is timely filed.

I. CONTACT INFORMATION

Please enter Steven Irwin and Sue Irwin below on the official service list for Docket No. CP16-21-000. All pleadings, filings and correspondence in this proceeding should be served on the following:

Steven Irwin and Sue Irwin

103 Hogarty Road

Averill Park, NY 12018

518-526-5301

stvnirwin@gmail.com

December 20, 2015

II. MOTION TO INTERVENE

Steven Irwin and Sue Irwin seek to intervene. Personally we have been married for 30 years and have 2 children and live near the proposed route of the pipeline and compressor through Rensselaer County in the State of New York and Town of Nassau and knows that the route of the proposed pipeline and proposed compression station can permanently alter our security, health and property value and well water quality. As citizens we are concerned that the building of this pipeline and compressor station will have negative effects on the earth's climate, on the people living and working near the fracking fields and on the residents living along the proposed pipeline.

We feel that we are directly impacted by the proposed pipeline. Our residence stands approximately 2000 feet from the proposed pipeline and compressor station, and is therefore vulnerable to structural damage during construction, as well as ongoing safety hazards after the project is completed. Further, our land lies within the right of way corridor for the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline, thus exposing the property to condemnation if the certificate is granted.) ectly impacted by the proposed pipeline. Leaks from the pipeline and venting and blow-downs from the compressor station could affect her air, soil and water. We fear possible health repercussions of such leaks. An explosion would devastate our home and community. The peace and quiet we moved here for and spent 20 years building our home will be lost.

Steven Irwin and Sue Iriwn oppose the proposed project. Continued extraction of fossil fuel is causing climate warming and is endangering life on our planet. Fracking as an extraction process is endangering the health and safety of people living near the fracking fields and workers in the industry. According to Massachusetts Attorney General Maura Healy's report this pipeline is not needed. Continuing to rely on fossil fuel is slowing our transition to renewable energy. If we put our energy and money into creating renewable energy sources we could meet our energy needs with these sources. The destruction of habitat created by the building of the pipeline is significant. The weekly explosions of pipelines across our country are scary. The safety record of Kinder Morgan is not encouraging. Leaks along the pipeline and venting at compression stations release methane and other toxic chemicals into our air, soil and water, making me fearful about the

effect this has on the health and safety of residents along the pipeline. We object to the fact that in the FERC regulations people who live in rural areas are less protected (allowing thinner pipes, shutoff valves farther away and less inspection. None of this gas will be used by New Yorkers, but New Yorkers will be forced to absorb the adverse environmental and economic impacts, not to mention the intrusion on individual landowners' property. Kinder Morgan has made clear to its stockholders that it expects to export much of this gas, making big profits in so doing. Kinder Morgan has been lobbying to have electric users pay a tariff to help pay for this pipeline. Since this project is clearly not for the common good, I object to Eminent Domain being used for private profit.

WHEREFORE, for the foregoing reasons, Steven Irwin and Sue Irwin request that the Commission GRANT this motion to intervene.

Respectfully submitted,

Steven Irwin and Sue Irwin
103 Hogarty Road
Averill Park, NY 12018
518-526-5301
stvnirwin@gmail.com
December 20, 2015

20151221-5349

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

December 21, 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. CP16-21-000
Northeast Energy Direct Project

Update to Landowner Mailing List

Dear Ms. Bose:

On November 20, 2015, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. ("Tennessee") filed with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("Commission") a certificate application in the above-referenced docket for the Northeast Energy Direct Project ("Project").

Pursuant to Section 157.6(d)(5) of the Commission's regulations, 18 C.F.R. § 157.6(d)(5)(2015), Tennessee notifies the Commission that certain landowner notification letters were returned as undeliverable. Attached to this filing is an updated landowner list that now includes, in highlighted format, corrected addresses for fourteen landowners whose notification mailings were returned to Tennessee as undeliverable. The three tabs on the spreadsheet that contain addresses for which Tennessee received letters back as undeliverable include: (i) Tab 5a_NY WD Affected Landowners (1 returned letter); (ii) Tab 14a_NH FLE Affected Landowners (1 returned letter); and (iii) Market Path Meter Station Tab (12 returned letters). Tennessee requests that the updated landowner list be accorded privileged and confidential treatment, pursuant to Section 388.112 of the Commission's regulations, 18 C.F.R. § 388.112 (2015), and has marked the list with the legend "Privileged and Confidential - Do Not Release". Tennessee notes that it has distributed the required notification material regarding the Project to these landowners at the corrected addresses listed in the spreadsheet. Furthermore, Tennessee notes that it will continue to track and monitor all notification mailings re-

turned as undeliverable, and will plan to file an additional update to the landowner list with the Commission no later than January 15, 2016.

Tennessee also notes that while all affected landowners were included in the landowner list submitted with the November 20, 2015 certificate application, the landowners within 1/2 mile of the site for the Market Head Compressor Station were inadvertently not sent the landowner notification letters after the Commission issued the Notice of Application on December 7, 2015. Tennessee sent the required notification materials to the forty-six landowners affected by this error on December 21, 2015. Tennessee respectfully requests that the Commission waive the landowner notification provisions of Section 157.6(d) to allow for the submission of the notification materials to the forty-six landowners on December 21, 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 a copy of this filing to the Office of Energy Projects.

Respectfully submitted,
TENNESSEE GAS PIPELINE COMPANY, L.L.C.
J. Curtis Moffatt
Deputy General Counsel and Vice President Gas Group Legal

Attachment

cc: Mr. Michael McGehee (Commission Staff)
Mr. Rich McGuire (Commission Staff)
Mr. Eric Tomasi (Commission Staff)
Mr. Wayne Kicklighter (Cardno)
All parties on service list (without attachment)

20151221-5363

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

December 21, 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.

Northeast Energy Direct Project; Docket No. CP16-21-000

Supplemental Filing -- Tennessee's Response to (1) Scoping Comments (October 2 through 16, 2015), and (2) the Commission's Comments on Draft Environmental Report

Dear Ms. Bose:

On November 20, 2015, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. ("Tennessee") filed with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission an application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity ("Application") for the proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project ("Project") in the above-referenced docket. On December 7, 2015, the Commission issued a Notice of Application for the Project.

Tennessee's Response to Scoping Comments

In the Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the Planned Northeast Energy Direct Project, Request for Comments on Environmental Issues, and Notice of Public Scoping Meetings,

issued on June 30, 2015 in Docket No. PF14-22-000, the Commission established a scoping period through August 31, 2015 for the Project. The scoping period for the Project was extended until October 16, 2015 by the Commission in the Notice of Public Scoping Meeting for the Northeast Energy Direct Project, and Extension of Scoping Period, issued September 3, 2015 in Docket No. PF14-22-000. A matrix that included Tennessee's responses to scoping comments was provided as Attachment A to the transmittal letter for the Application. In the transmittal letter, Tennessee noted that the matrix included responses to scoping comments filed with the Commission between June 30, 2015 and October 1, 2015, and that it would file responses to scoping comments filed between October 2, 2015 and October 16, 2015 (the conclusion of the scoping period) with the Commission no later than December 21, 2015.

Included as Attachment A to this filing are Tennessee's responses to scoping comments filed with the Commission between October 2, 2015 and October 16, 2015. Since many of the scoping comments reflect similar issues or themes, Tennessee has provided a combined response to such comments, rather than providing a specific unique response to every scoping comment. For scoping comments that present unique issues, a specific response is provided.

Tennessee's Response to the Commission's Comments on Draft

Tennessee also included with the Application a matrix (filed as Attachment B to the transmittal letter) that addressed comments from Commission Staff, dated (1) February 27, 2015 (draft Resource Reports 1 and 10, filed November 5, 2014 and updated on December 8, 2014); (2) May 15, 2015 (first draft Environmental Report, filed on March 13, 2015) and (3) October 8, 2015 (second draft Environmental Report, filed on July 24, 2015). Tennessee noted in the matrix that certain responses to the Commission Staff comments would be submitted in a supplemental filing to be filed no later than December 21, 2015. Tennessee now submits a matrix responding to the remaining Commission Staff comments as Attachment B to this filing. The matrix includes either the response to the Commission Staff comment or a reference to the location in the Application or Environmental Report where the response to the Commission Staff comment may be found.

In accordance with the Commission's filing requirements, Tennessee is submitting this Application with the Commission's Secretary through the eFiling system. Tennessee is also providing complete copies of this Application to the Office of Energy Projects. Any questions concerning the enclosed Application 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

Enclosures

cc: Mr. Michael McGehee (Commission Staff)
Mr. Rich McGuire (Commission Staff)
Mr. Eric Tomasi (Commission Staff)
Mr. Wayne Kicklighter (Cardno)
Official Service List

{ Enclosures omitted, but can be downloaded at: }

{ Responses to Scoping Comments, October 2-16, 2015, 56 pages, 375 KB }

{ <http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/opennat.asp?fileID=14079023> }

{ Attachment 1: Tax Revenue, 40 pages, 7,596 KB }

{ <http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/opennat.asp?fileID=14079024> }

{ Responses to Comments on Draft Resource Reports, 22 pages, 230 KB }

{ <http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/opennat.asp?fileID=14079025> }

{ Attachment 1: Response to Comment #9, 46 pages, 352 KB }

{ <http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/opennat.asp?fileID=14079026> }

20151222-5005

Roberta Flashman, Ashby, MA.
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. CP16-21-000
Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Ms. Bose:

I would like to comment on the process that is used for approval of Natural Gas Pipelines and their siting. Under section 7 of the Natural Gas Act, the Commission reviews applications for the construction and operation of natural gas pipelines. When reviewing these projects, one would assume/hope that the Commission would conduct independent research to determine whether a project is in the public interest and hence, qualifies for the issuance of a certificate of public convenience and necessity.

As any good manager knows, asking a proponent of a project for justification of the project or monitoring of any portion of the project will result in a less than objective report. A good manager will take that report and the report of other interested parties into consideration for approval of the project, but will conduct (or contract for) independent research about the feasibility and necessity for the project.

The FERC appears not to adhere to these practices. Rather, it assumes that there is a growing demand for natural gas and feels that its role is to continue to respond quickly when companies propose to expand and construct needed pipelines and related facilities. The Commission has directed its staff to participate in efforts to work with the filers of project applications in an effort to allow for the filing of better certificate applications enabling more efficient and expeditious licensing actions by the Commission.

The end result is the licensing of a project and issuance of a certificate of public convenience and necessity to the pipeline company.

In the case of the Tennessee Gas Pipeline's Northeast Energy Direct (NED) project, this appears to be exactly what is taking place despite some rather glaring exceptions to the routine assumptions brought to bear on decisions in the past. These include:

1. The very high installation rate of wind and solar projects in the region;
2. On November 18, 2015, Massachusetts Attorney General Maura Healey announced that a study commissioned by her office has determined that the region is unlikely to face electric reliability issues in the next 15 years and additional energy needs can be met more cheaply and cleanly through energy efficiency and demand response;
3. On December 12, 2015, in Paris, France, representatives of 195 nations reached a landmark accord that will, for the first time, commit nearly every country to lowering planet-warming greenhouse gas emissions to help stave off the most drastic effects of climate change;
4. Individual mandates within the 6 New England States for reduction of heat-trapping emissions which contribute to Global Warming. In Massachusetts, The Global Warming Solutions Act (GWSA), was signed in August of 2008. It created a framework for reducing heat-trapping emissions to levels that scientists believe give us a decent chance of avoiding the worst effects of global warming. It requires reductions

from all sectors of the economy to reach a target of a 25% reduction of Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions by 2020 and an 80% reduction by 2050. Increasing the use of natural gas for electricity generation in the Commonwealth will make those goals unattainable.

5. The FERC's resistance to consideration all of the applications for increase gas pipelines into the region as one large application, with influence and impact upon each other. Instead, each of these projects is being considered in isolation and the resulting volume of gas from these projects far exceeds any and all projections of the region's needs for energy;

6. The prior Massachusetts administration, under Governor Deval Patrick, cited natural gas as a bridge fuel for the region. How long does a temporary bridge stay in place? And, does it make sense to build an infrastructure that has a life expectancy of 50 – 100 years to transport a bridge fuel?

FERC needs to reassess its modus operandi in light of global warming.

FERC needs to reassess its modus operandi in light of the potential for this pipeline to represent no public convenience or necessity to the areas through which it will be built, nor to New England, but rather to the pockets of the corporations proposing its construction with an eye to exporting the gas to Europe and Asia.

FERC needs to reassess its modus operandi in light of increasing evidence that there are viable alternatives to meeting energy needs now, in the near future, and in the decades to follow.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,

Roberta Flashman
339 South Rd.
Ashby, MA 01431

20151222-5015

Dave and Elaine Chichester
368 Newhall Road
Conway, MA 01341
(413) 369-4425

(davechi@comcast.net)

December 21, 2015

To: FERC

Re: Docket # CP16-21

Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline

My wife and I are approaching 80 years of age and have lived in our home for more than 34 years. It sits on the side of a beautiful, scenic hill with a serene and gorgeous view of the surrounding area. We have worked hard and long to achieve this retirement dream.

With the threat of a major construction of the Tennessee Gas Pipeline, we now find ourselves within 950 feet of the proposed route and less than 1/2 mile from the planned entry site of the effort to tunnel up to 400 feet below the Deerfield River. We are advised that, should we want to, we cannot now sell our home for anywhere near its legitimate value. No potential buyer could get a mortgage for the next several years and it's doubtful that anyone could get home insurance. This is an extraordinary financial burden on us and our family.

Further, should the construction be permitted as planned, there will be major disruption and probably damage to our roads, to our restricted and conserved areas, to our wildlife, to our rivers and wetlands and, of course, to the peaceful serenity of this beautiful part of New England.

As past Chair of our town's Board of Health and current involvement in our community's emergency preparedness efforts, we are extremely concerned about the potential damage to our water supply and the long term effect of drilling and blasting on our aquifer resources. There is no public water supply in our town;

therefore, each home is totally dependent upon individual private and deeply drilled wells. Our well, for example is approximately 500 feet deep and clearly at risk to the proposed Pipeline construction. What would we do if our domestic water supply were contaminated? Further, our town's emergency services are in no way prepared for any kind of significant public health event such as this. We have no training, equipment nor resources to deal with pollution, leakage or explosion.

Another consideration is the fact that there is no public utility for gas distribution in our area. We exclusively use propane gas and would have no use for the product being pushed past our doorstep. And, of course, we object strenuously to any attempt to impose taxes or additional charges which would be directed toward paying for the construction of the Pipeline.

Accordingly, we strenuously plead with you to forbid the construction of this Pipeline through our back yards, recognizing the potential damage such a project will have on the very essence of our lifestyle, on our farms, our rivers, forests and fields, our wetlands, our natural resources, and particularly our precious water supply.

Sincerely,

Elaine and David Chichester

20151222-5019

We are writing to you from our home in Plainfield, Massachusetts, now designated as a "sacrifice zone" for Kinder Morgan's pipeline for fracked gas and its Compressor Station in nearby Windsor. In hopes that you will support our opposition to this ill-conceived and environmentally catastrophic plan, we want to offer you some basic facts, easily verified.

The first set of facts relates to unique features of the town Plainfield and in particular of West Mountain and Deer Hill. Plainfield's West Mountain is unique in that it generates and feeds 8 cold water streams that empty into the Westfield River to its west and to the Deerfield River to its north, both of which flow into the Connecticut River. The pipeline as presently planned goes through the heart of this vital watershed. It not only imperils our town but the water supply, fish stocks, birds and all other wildlife and human life that depend on these vast river systems. There is no one in southern New England who would not be negatively affected if not outright endangered by any size pipe line in this area. It must be left undisturbed.

The effects of the planned 41,000 HP compressor station in Windsor would be light pollution, air pollution, water pollution and noise pollution.

Light: As one example of the negative effects of the light pollution that will occur with the security lighting around the proposed station, consider Arunah Hill, an astronomy center on the Windsor side of the town of Cummington, built there because we have the darkest night skies in New England. While the roofline of the proposed compressor station may be less than the 72-foot height of the originally-proposed 80,000 HP station, it is still true that these stations are lit all night long, and that none of us would be able to see the stars from our backyards, much less from the observatory if the proposed compressor station were to be built.

Air: Regular periodic discharge of fracked gas, primarily methane laced with carcinogenic chemicals, will threaten our air. There are over 60 known carcinogens, neurotoxins and endocrine disruptors found in air samples around compressor stations as well as other venting infrastructures of pipelines. People such as we come to this part of Massachusetts to breathe clean air. If this pipeline is built, we will no longer have clean air and the state will lose the area that is known as "the lungs of Massachusetts".

Water: The same discharges threaten our now healthy streams and rivers. As already pointed out West Mountain watershed plays a unique and critical role in the entire ecology of the Pioneer Valley and beyond. The vast majority of people living along the proposed pipeline route have wells. We know that leaks from gas pipelines are not uncommon, and that leaks contaminate aquifers that feed wells. In addition, the blasting that will need to occur during the construction of the proposed pipeline will pose an even more immediate threat to our wells. What protection does Kinder-Morgan's offer to test wells that are located within

200 feet of the proposed pipeline before construction and again after the pipeline is completed offer these people. What remediation are they proposing for contaminated wells? Even if they could and would offer protection, remediation or compensation to owners of these wells, which they don't, what will happen to the owners of the great majority of the wells that draw from the common aquifer but are farther than 200 feet from the pipeline route? This question must be answered. We must also know what KM intends to do in terms of protection of water in aquifers and in streams and rivers throughout the "life time" of this pipeline not just post construction when theoretically the pipe itself will be at its highest integrity.

Kinder-Morgan plans to draw water from local reservoirs, streams and rivers such as the Westfield, Deerfield and Connecticut Rivers for hydrostatic testing of the pipeline. Once used, the water would be "discharged to an upland area through a dewatering structure consisting of an energy dissipation device and water filtration structure." In Plainfield alone, hydrostatic testing of the pipe would require many thousands of gallons of water.

While Kinder-Morgan is presently saying that it "does not anticipate the use of any additives within the hydrostatic water," it reserves the right to go back to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission "should it be determined additives are necessary based on the source and composition of the test water." The "additives" they are talking about are chemical biocides that would be returned to the source, contaminated. What would the introduction of these toxic substances do to our now-pristine water table, which ultimately feeds the rivers, lakes and reservoirs in the valley below us? What does this ultimately mean that they would go back to FERC? If this pipeline is ever built KM has to come back to the communities it affects with changes, not just to FERC and not just to announce changes but also plans for mitigation. In the eventuality of biocide use, what are the plans for mitigation?

Pigging, or cleaning of the pipeline, causes discharges of highly contaminated water at the pigging facilities, where pigging launchers and receivers come out of the ground. (See explanatory video at www.no-frackedgasinmass.org for more information.) It's at the pig receiver where effluent from cleaning the pipes is gathered. How safe and contained this gathering is varies widely from one pipeline company to another, even one facility to another; and we presently have no documentation of KM's record on this. They must produce their records that relate to contamination from pigging and their plans for mitigation of this ongoing and severe pollution risk. It is difficult to imagine how this process could ever be environmentally safe. It is up to KM to document that it is. This should be true no matter where they lay their pipe but particularly demanded in this area, one of the few pristine areas of Massachusetts.

Noise: It is quiet out here, beautifully and serenely quiet. Recent citizens' tests of sound levels at the proposed compressor station site in Windsor showed an average ambient level of 15-25 decibels. The ambient noise level of smaller compressor stations is reported at 55 decibels; and when methane is being discharged, the noise levels can go as high as 95 decibels. This is equivalent to the noise level of a jet taking off – one which in this case would be simultaneously dumping toxic gas on its neighbors.

Explosions and Fire: Kinder-Morgan's safety record alone should provide sufficient basis for questioning whether they should be allowed to expand into Massachusetts. In rural areas, they have used the thinnest gauge pipe, class 1. While Kinder-Morgan has recently changed the proposed diameter of the pipeline from 36 inches to 30 inches, it will still be using the thinnest gauge of pipe to carry the highest allowable stress. The depth of the pipeline would be "typically 6-8 ft below the surface", What does "typically" mean. Even at a depth of 6-8 feet, the 30-inch pipeline is vulnerable to rupture from frost heaves, leading to breaks and leakage. Explosive ruptures associated with frost and ice build-up have occurred along other transmission lines (in Pennsylvania, Minnesota and West Virginia). The planned route in western Massachusetts follows power transmission lines, making any leaks that occur all the more susceptible to catastrophic fire events and explosions. Proximity to power lines can also create a higher incidence of pipe corrosion due to AC inductance (the pipe can become essentially a large ground wire, into which current is induced by the power lines above it). KM needs to address this prevailing concern about the siting of this pipeline.

In rural areas, shut off valves can be up to 10 miles apart. At the very least, this would mean that a 10-mile

content of gas would have to burn were there to be a fire. The proposed pipeline has the capacity to carry 1.3 billion cubic feet of fracked gas per day. How would we as individuals, as towns, or as a state ever recover from such an event? Our home is within 100 yards of the pipeline as it is proposed. Many are even closer to it than this. If there were a fire or an explosion on this section of pipe, we would lose our home, solar panels and all. We are in the “incineration zone”. Most of the towns in this region that are affected by the proposed pipeline have volunteer fire departments. The major routes of travel in this region - Route 9, Route 143 and Route 116 and then Route 112 - are all two-lane roads; and these roads are the only evacuation routes for Windsor, Peru, Worthington (143 and 9), Plainfield, Cummington and the village of West Cummington, Conway and Ashfield (116, 112 and 9). And they too would be transected by the pipeline. As you consider what you are reading, remember that, nationwide, gas transmission lines have “significant incidents” at a rate of about 1.3 a week. We need to know KM’s proposal for emergency management, town by town that demonstrates their awareness of evacuation challenges, a major problem in any season but perhaps an insurmountable one in the winter. In the last two years we have had record snow fall and last year a major snow storm every week in February.

Need: By most local estimates other than those made by Iberdola, we in western Massachusetts do not need the 1-2% of the gas that would flow through the proposed pipeline. This much gas is wasted every year through leaks (see above), neglected infra-structure and lack of proper insulation. Recent advances that are bringing down the cost of renewable power generation and storage make it clear that there is no need for such a destructive and wasteful project as KM’s proposed pipeline.

The recent Massachusetts Attorney General’s report on state energy needs concludes that there is no need for additional gas pipeline capacity to provide reliable power to our homes and businesses between now and 2030, even during the heaviest periods of winter usage; rather, it would appear preferable to see our dollars spent on energy efficiency, demand response, and the development of renewable resources.

This area of the Commonwealth is devoted to developing sustainable sources of energy and to the green jobs that come with them. There is a movement in Plainfield to expand solar energy to the entire town. We personally sell our excess solar to the Grid; and our panels were installed by a collective of Greenfield Community College graduates. While it remains to be seen whether it will live up to its expectations, Tesla’s announcement of an imminent release of a high-efficiency home storage battery is one more example of how fast the energy market is changing. Peak-usage demand needs can more readily be addressed by the expansion of existing gas-transmission networks and storage facilities and the energy use by availability model now being widely proposed. Such a model proposes letting consumers know to decrease their demands during certain periods and this works. In light of all this, how could anyone condone the environmental destruction and health risks arising from the construction of KM’s proposed pipeline? Here in western Massachusetts we have an opportunity to become a demonstration zone for the effectiveness of alternative energy solutions and a truly green economy.

Commercial and cultural impact: All local commerce in this part of New England depends on its natural beauty. Our cultural heritage is the pristine environment. Our common culture is one of conserving and protecting this heritage. There is no separating our environment from our livelihoods. They are here, one in the same.

Legalities: At present, many Berkshire Gas and Columbia Gas customers have complained that they are being held hostage to this pipeline because their gas providers state on their bill that there can be no new gas hookups until the KM pipeline is completed. This raises some interesting and important questions. The Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company (TGP) expanded its capacity on the Northampton lateral gas transmission line only three years ago. Even bearing in mind the severity of the past winter, it would seem that this sudden professed need for additional supply shows that Berkshire Gas and Columbia Gas either engage in VERY poor planning in terms of their needs forecasts or appear to be playing up demand in order to paint a picture of dire need to get the pipeline approved. Berkshire Gas is not a local company. It is wholly owned by the international Spanish conglomerate, Iberdola; and two of the import terminals that are slated to buy Marcellus gas (obtained via the proposed pipeline) from the newly-approved Goldboro export terminal are located

in Spain. Were the pipeline to be completed and the export begun, Iberdola would be free to charge for gas at European rates, now three to five times higher than those charged in the US. (The Northeast Energy Direct (NED) project is pulling fracked gas from the Marcellus Shale in Pennsylvania. The gas from this area is projected to run dry in 2019. The pipeline is projected to be completed in 2018.) Given that Berkshire Gas (Iberdola) and Columbia Gas have placed a moratorium on new gas hook ups until this pipeline is completed there may well be anti-trust violations. We strongly suggest that the Attorney General look into this matter.

And there is the question of cost. KM and the other parties involved in this proposed project have been short on specifics as to how it would be paid for and who will ultimately pay for it. Only one thing is certain, one way or another, the cost of construction will come out of the pockets of ratepayers. It always does.

Fracked gas or, as we are calling it, unnatural gas is not sustainable. Gas and pipeline companies have gotten federal, state and local statutes on the books that outlaw the outlawing of fracking. They also cannot be held liable for property destruction, the poisoning of wells or for health effects that arise from them - which recent reports suggest are legion - not only around compressor stations but also near pipelines. New York State has banned fracking, and there is now increasing interest in stopping the construction of more compressor stations that would be part of this NED/KM pipeline.

As for the democracy of all this, our local state legislator whose district includes both Windsor and Northfield reported that 90% of his constituents oppose this pipeline. Further, KM is threatening abutters with eminent domain - as if this pipeline was going to serve compelling local needs. This is blatantly false. In fact, it serves the financial gain of Kinder Morgan and of Iberdola. Since when do we abide eminent domain for the private gain of corporations, particularly of international foreign conglomerates?

As this fight gathers momentum here and in New York State, the Pope has issued a two hundred page encyclical calling on people of all faiths to save the earth. Berkshire Gas (Iberdola) called those opposing this needless and catastrophic pipeline "eco-terrorists". The Pope would not. He would bless our efforts to stop the further destruction of the earth and to do so now, right here in western Massachusetts.

This pipeline cannot be built.

Sincerely,

H. John Fisher and Sebern Fisher
268 West Street
Plainfield, Massachusetts 01070

20151222-5020

Dear FERC,

I am deeply opposed to the natural gas pipeline that Kinder/Morgan is proposing to come through my town of North Reading, Massachusetts. It also is coming right through my private land. I would never have gas in my house because I am very afraid of it and now a large, pressurized pipe may be in my back yard. They have a very poor track record in maintaining their lines and have been fined millions of dollars in the past. The Attorney General Maura Healy has stated that we don't NEED this gas line and have sufficient amounts for at least the next 15 years. Lines already in place are not even being used to capacity and there are an estimated 20,000 leaks in Massachusetts alone which if fixed would save more than enough to see us through the winters. Also methane is the worst gas for the atmosphere and money should be used to further non-fossil fuel energy. The world is choking; why would we possibly add to this?

This proposed pipeline would be coming right through our beautiful woods in town. Through our vernal pools, through Indian artifacts, through our water supply and water shed, the Ipswich River. And with the terrorism this country is now facing we would now have a soft target to be blown up. The whole project is frightening and so unnecessary. Please, you are all we have to protect us.

I also object to the fact that changes were made to the Lynnfield lateral, next door to us, and there were no

open houses held in the eastern Mass. section. Kinder/Morgan continually moves the goal posts and you can't believe anything they say.

Personally I am going to lose my fenced in land where I help rescue dogs. I also will lose my gazebo, pergola, water garden, and two sheds. I will lose my peace of mind and everything it's taken me 30 years to develop. Thank you for your considerations.

Stephen W. Woodbury

20151222-5022

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Richard A Burnham under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/22/2015 4:12:44 AM Filed Date: 12/22/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	dickb234@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

We oppose the Kinder Morgan, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co. "Northeast Energy Direct Project" pipeline corridor through western Massachusetts. We are landowners, at 234 West Street in Plainfield, MA. 01070 (mailing: 234 West St., Cummington, MA 01026).

We have, since December, 2015, been receiving for the first time letters from Tennessee Pipeline Co. and their attorneys, letters requesting permission to survey our land. We do not agree to allow these surveys because we believe that if the pipeline is anywhere near, much less on, our property then we will see a collapse of our entire lives, way of living, the house we built and live in, the ruination of fragile soil structures along with wildlife corridors that we established and have maintained for our 25 years here.

To be specific, please consider our objections to, and opposition to, the pipeline near us for the following reasons:

1. Our land is composed of wet soils and a fragile organic topsoil layer of about 12". Underneath this topsoil one finds that groundwater, seeping from uphill and from natural springs sheet downhill on top of non-organic soils. To bring any kind of heavy machinery, from the likes of a heavy backhoe on upward to bulldozers, on to this land leaves permanent indentation in the land's surface. We have seen such indentations remain in place for well over 15 years after they were made, and they're still there. We expect that any work done on pipelines or surveys will permanently damage our land, our soils, the water sheeting. We oppose such work because the existing land forms are essential to our economic wellbeing because we farm and garden these soils.
2. Our house is built upon independent footings and piers of reinforced concrete. Any disruption of soil structures around the house would redirect current under-soil water flows and impact on foundation stability. Since they are independent footings, this would result in differential settlement of the house that would not be correctable leading to its demise. The proposed construction has the potential to induce vibrations that can unsettle soils around footings and piers. The house was part of my research on lower-income housing that became a book (Housing Ourselves: Creating Affordable Sustainable Shelter by Richard Burnham, published by McGraw-Hill, 1998). The foregoing applies as well to our barn.
3. Vernal pools are present on our property. These pools are part of a berming/ditching land forming done many years ago. While the pool, the berming and water flow induced by the berming cannot be touched without disrupting the entire ecology of the gardened and farmed land.
4. A water curtain drain system surrounds our house, barn, and septic leach field. This curtain intercepts uphill water flows and redirects them below house, leach field, barn and garden. We anticipate that pipeline construction can disrupt the flow of water and the current stable structure of our house, our barn, and the

leach field.

5. We have established and maintained wildlife corridors on our property. We have witnessed bats, bear, moose, deer, wild turkey, porcupine, coyote, and other animals traversing these corridors and we intend to keep them intact. Any pipeline traversing our land would disrupt these wildlife. Additionally, frogs thrive without deformations due to our careful stewardship of the land. We also find small salamanders traversing our land. Endangered bats fly here. Heavy construction nearby due to the pipeline would disrupt the habitat created here.

6. We maintain farm animals here as part of our workaday reality—chickens and sheep and often ducks. The intent is to create a viable relationship between ourselves as gardeners/farmers, the soils, the garden, the meadows and paddocks, and our animals. Our sheep provide us with fleece for weaving, but the farm decisively depends on them for garden manure. And for this very important natural, organic manure we require the use of our land for grazing—every square inch of it. We even extend our grazing fields to adjacent lands owned by family members. Thus any disruption of grazing animals by pipeline construction—the digging up of their lands or having vehicles ruin the landforms forever will negatively impact the viability of our lives, our lifestyle, our means of feeding ourselves.

We thus object to and oppose the construction, insertion, maintenance of a gas line in our property, or nearby out property. While the above has addressed our concerns about our immediate land and our buildings, we wish to also object to pipeline construction and long-term maintenance issues that would negatively impact us. These are blasting of rock (upsetting animals and causing frightened animals to crash through fencing and escape and thus entailing hours spent it finding and returning them), the use of overhead helicopters (same issue), the noxious presence of a nearby compressor station (never ceasing noise, fumes, lights that disrupt the night sky—an issue for animals as well as for us), and the escaping of noxious gases from pressure relief valves here and the pipe would only degrade our environment.

Sincerely submitted,

Richard Burnham (Architect, Ph.D. in Environmental Design and Planning -- Va. Tech)

Ursula Burnham

234 West Street

Plainfield, MA

Mailing address: 234 West Street, Cummington, MA 01026

20151222-5031

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC)
North East Direct Pipeline Project)

Docket No. CP16-21-000

**MOTION FOR LEAVE TO INTERVENE
THE TOWN OF TYNGSBOROUGH, MASSACHUSETTS**

Pursuant to Rules 212 and 214 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission’s (“Commission”) Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 385.212 and 385.214, Section 15(a) of the Natural Gas Act, (18 CFR 157.10), the Town of Tyngsborough, Massachusetts (“Town”) hereby moves to intervene in this proceeding.

On November 20, 2015, the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (“Tennessee”) filed an application pursuant to sections 7(b) and 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act (NGA) and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (“Commission”) seeking authority to (i) construct, install, modify, and operate certain pipeline and compression facilities to be located in Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Connecticut, and (ii) to abandon certain facilities, as part of the Northeast Energy Direct Project (“NED Project”)

The Town of Tyngsborough is a municipal corporation, duly organized under the laws of the Common-

wealth of Massachusetts and incorporated in 1809, with offices at 25 Bryants Lane, Tyngsborough, MA 01879. The Board of Selectmen is an elected five person board which is the governing body of the Town of Tyngsborough.

On October 30, 2015, the Board of Selectmen voted to register the Town as an intervener once a formal application was filed with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. Further, that the Board of Selectmen resolves to become an "Intervener", which serves as an official party to the proceedings of this application. The taking of properties protected by Article 97 of the Amendments to the Massachusetts Constitution for the construction of the proposed pipeline and related infrastructure will impact land protection efforts in every community statewide. With over 100 conservation properties potentially impacted by the NED Project, our obligation to protect these open spaces is compromised and interpreted by some as a lack of our commitment to protect what has taken years and countless dollars to protect. Conservation Commission's across the Commonwealth, as well as land protection organizations statewide, protect lands in perpetuity but the NED Project threatens OUF ability to guarantee this protection.

The Town communicates with the municipal coalition known as the Northeast Municipal Pipeline Coalition, which includes 15 towns, who, as a regional organization, is representing residents in regards to this project. As one of 351 communities in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the Town is committed to addressing our energy challenges by investing in energy conservation and clean energy.

All communications, pleadings, and orders with respect to this proceeding should be sent to the following individual:

Curt Bellavance, Town Administrator
Town of Tyngsborough
25 Bryants Lane
Tyngsborough, MA 01879
978-649-2314
cbellavance@tyngsboroughma.gov

For the reasons discussed above, the Town of Tyngsborough respectfully requests that the Commission grant the Town's motion to Intervene as a party in the above-captioned proceeding with all the rights attendant hereto.

Submitted this 2151 day of December 2015.

By:
Curt T. Bellavance, Town Administrator

20151222-5032

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Allen Young under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/21/2015 5:14:43 PM Filed Date: 12/22/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	ay114@columbia.edu	

Basis for Intervening:

I feel that I would be impacted in an important personal way by this project. I am very much opposed to this project. I live in the Northfield area, and travel frequently on Northfield roads. I feel the compressor station is particularly dangerous with various risks.

Also, I am a professional writer with an emphasis about writing articles about outdoor activities and the natural environment. I feel that the natural environment where the pipeline is to be built will be degraded by

this project, thus affecting the viability of the ecotourism industry in this region. This project will turn this region from “attractive” to “unattractive.”

I purchase electricity from National Grid, and I feel that there is a good possibility that my utility will be buying gas from the pipeline company, and this will cause my electricity rate to go up.

I am concerned about the peace and quiet of our rural community, and I feel the sharp opposition to the pipeline in this region will lead to civil strife -- many people upset and objecting to the construction, and there will be significant cost in security forces, judicial costs, etc., related to the civil strife that will be occurring if Kinder Morgan is allowed to proceed with eminent domain to take people’s property. I have many friends who fear that eminent domain will be used to take their property and this causes great emotional stress to these people and their friends, including me.

Thank you for allowing me to be an intervenor and for paying attention to my concerns.

Allen Young, 75 Butterworth Rd., Orange MA 01364

20151222-5051

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Calpine Energy Services, L.P. under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/22/2015 9:12:42 AM Filed Date: 12/22/2015 9:12:42 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Calpine Energy Services, L.P.	Brian.Fields@calpine.com	Jay.Dibble@Calpine.com
Calpine Energy Services, L.P.		snovosel@calpine.com
Calpine Energy Services, L.P.		Krystin.Worsham@calpine.com
Calpine Energy Services, L.P.		paul.forshay@sutherland.com
Calpine Energy Services, L.P.		meghan.gruebner@sutherland.com

Basis for Intervening:

Calpine Corporation (“Calpine”) is a Delaware corporation engaged, through various subsidiaries, in the development, financing, acquisition, ownership, and operation of independent power production facilities and the wholesale marketing of electricity in the United States and Canada. Through its various subsidiaries, Calpine has a fleet of 83 power plants in operation or under construction, representing nearly 27,000 MW of generating capacity. Through wholesale operations and its retail business, Calpine subsidiaries serve customers in 19 states and Canada. Calpine Energy Services, L.P. (“CES”) is an energy marketer who is charged with arranging natural gas supplies for a portfolio of gas-fired power plants owned and/or operated by affiliates of CES. CES holds firm capacity on the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. (“Tennessee”) system which it relies upon to deliver gas to affiliated power plants in the regions that are served by Tennessee. Because the terms and conditions for natural gas service to CES may be affected by the outcome of this proceeding, CES has a substantial and vital interest in this proceeding. Therefore, CES is an interested party within the meaning of Section 15(a) of the Natural Gas Act, and its intervention and participation will be in the public interest. CES is not now, and will not be, adequately represented by any other party in this proceeding, and may be bound or adversely affected by the Commission’s action herein. CES requests that it be granted intervention with full rights of a party to this proceeding.

20151222-5078

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Julia Blyth and Charles Eiseman under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/22/2015 10:50:31 AM Filed Date: 12/22/2015 10:50:31 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	jablyth@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

We own land and live in Northfield, Massachusetts. We invested almost everything into our home, and chose to live here for several reasons, including our desire to grow organic vegetables and a variety of fruit and nut trees and berry bushes, to raise chickens for meat and eggs, and to operate a small ecological consulting business. The clean air and good water, as well as the rural character of the community were essential in our choice to live here. In the last two years, we have planted 34 fruit and nut trees, and over a dozen berry bushes. These crops take years, some decades to mature, and we planted them with the intent to live here for the remainder of our lives.

Construction of the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline would mean that our home and small farm would be approximately one mile from the proposed compressor station, and in close proximity (less than one-quarter mile) to the proposed pipeline, which would cross the land of our abutters. We are concerned that the pipeline route could change, crossing our property. The close proximity to the proposed compressor station, blowdown valve, and pigging launcher and receiver, all of which would emit a variety of toxins, puts into jeopardy the organic nature of our gardening operations and general good health. The clearing of forest land, and crossing of several small streams in the woods adjacent to our property would alter the landscape, which we use for entomological research. As proposed, any route we take to leave our house would require us to cross the route of the pipeline. Additionally, we frequently hike from our home on the New England National Scenic trail, crossing the town-owned Brush Mountain Conservation Area on our way to the Richardson-Zlogar hikers' cabin. The proximity to the compressor station's noise, lights, and emissions, and crossing the pipeline corridor would degrade our outdoor recreation experience—in fact, the current route would obliterate multiple portions of the trail.

In addition to the impacts to our homestead, we have concerns about national energy policy, of which this pipeline is a part. We are distressed by the implications for global climate change of continuing to expand fossil fuel infrastructure. This project is counterproductive given the transition to renewable energy sources that is needed to meet goals set by our state and federal governments. We are also aware of the more significant damage to communities where this gas is being extracted by hydraulic fracturing. At home, we have invested a significant amount into installing solar panels, which produce more electricity than we use annually; we do not use gas or oil. We have increased insulation, switched to LED lighting, and practice conservation. These factors make us resent the intrusion of this pipeline and compressor station, which our state's Attorney General's office has determined are not necessary for the electricity needs of Massachusetts.

Accordingly, we, Julia Blyth and Charles Eiseman, respectfully request that the Commission grant this Motion to Intervene.

20151222-5111

BEFORE THE UNITED STATES
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

KinderMorgan
Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline

Docket No. CP 16-21

MOTION TO INTERVENE OF Town of Plainfield
in opposition to the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline.

Pursuant to Rule 214 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (Commission) Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. §385.214, the Town of Plainfield files this Motion to Intervene in the above-cap-

tioned proceeding.

OPTION I: As the Executive Governmental Body the Select Board of the Town of Plainfield, a town incorporated by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, files this Motion to Intervene in the above-captioned proceeding. The Town of Plainfield opposes the project because the proposed 5.5 mile route of natural gas pipeline traverses virtually three quarters of Plainfield's 7 mile width bisecting land designated to conservation owned by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the Mass Audubon Society, and individuals; farmland filed under the Agricultural Restriction Preservation Program pursuant to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Constitution Article 97; nine public ways in addition to passing less than one-half mile from Plainfield's recreation area and playground and the Public Safety Complex which houses the Town's emergency vehicles and apparatus and serves as the Fire/EMS headquarters and Emergency Operations Center, and seeks party status to protest the proposed pipeline, and fully protect the Town of Plainfield's interest.

1. STATEMENT OF INTEREST

A. Description of INTERVENOR

The Town of Plainfield, 21.32 square miles, has 613 residents. The 5.5 miles of pipeline (mileposts 21.52-27.07) directly traverses the Town of Plainfield affecting 39 privately owned properties, nine public ways, and those lands listed above. All other areas of Plainfield are located within one and one-half miles of the proposed pipeline.

B. Description of Impacts

The Town of Plainfield will be directly harmed by the pipeline as follows: 39 residential properties will be directly affected by the pipeline in addition to conservation land owned by the Mass Audubon Society, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts as well as privately owned properties. The pipeline is slated to pass through farmland owned by the Robert E. Waryjasz Trust protected under the Agricultural Restriction Program. This farmland has also been designated as a staging area which could potentially contaminate the soil. Additionally, the Town of Plainfield holds a Tax Title Lien on the Waryjasz property for non-payment of taxes.

Notable concerns include: 1. Blasting and trenching have the potential to damage underground aquifers supplying residential wells throughout the Town.

2. Plainfield does not have the financial resources to repair damages to public ways to pre-construction condition. Off-loading and on-loading heavy equipment and construction of access roads will affect several areas.

3. A water source for hydrostatic testing has not been named. Plainfield does not have a water source to meet this demand. Also, of concern are the areas where waters used in hydrostatic testing are to be released.

4. Plainfield has a limited number of volunteer Fire Department/EMS personnel, equipment, and vehicles in the event of an emergency. (Most of these volunteers are not in Town during working hours.)

Pursuant to the Zoning By-Laws of the Town of Plainfield, SECTION IV. GENERAL USE REGULATIONS, 4.2.3 e. "No offensive noise, vibrations, smoke, dust, odors, heat, fumes, lighting or electrical telecommunications shall be detectable off the site."

In the interest of public safety, the Town of Plainfield respectfully requests, should the Northeast Energy Direct Project be approved, "Class 4" pipe, not "Class 1" as proposed, be used throughout the 5.5 miles of pipeline designated to traverse Plainfield.

The Select Board on behalf of the Town of Plainfield reserves the right to bring forth any other matters not readily apparent at this time.

C. The Town of Plainfield's Motion to Intervene Must Be Granted

The Town of Plainfield satisfies the standard for intervention under the Commission's regulations. As described above, the Town of Plainfield is directly impacted by the proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project, and no other individual or organization can adequately represent the Town of Plainfield's unique interest in

this proceeding. Further, the Town of Plainfield's intervention is in the public interest because the Town of Plainfield by its Select Board is responsible for the protection of the health and safety of all its residents. Accordingly, the Town of Plainfield respectfully requests that the Commission grant this Motion to Intervene.

II. CONTACT INFORMATION

The following individuals should be added to the Official Service List, with all notice and communications in this proceeding addressed to the contacts listed below:

Name: Paula J. King, Admin. Sec.

Phillip S. Lococo, Judith Feeley, Dennis Mimitz, Plainfield Select Board

Address: 304 Main Street, Plainfield, MA 01070

Phone: (413) 634-5420

Email: plainfieldmaacct@yahoo.com

IV. CONCLUSION

Wherefore, in light of the foregoing, the Town of Plainfield BBCA respectfully requests that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (1) GRANT this motion to intervene and allow the Town of Plainfield to participate in this proceeding with full rights of party status, including the right to request a hearing, cross examine witnesses and seek rehearing and appeal.

Respectfully submitted,

Paula J. King, Administrative Secretary,

For:

Phillip S. Lococo

Judith Feeley

Dennis W. Mimitz

Plainfield Select Board

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Wherefore on this December 22, 2015, I caused to be served the foregoing Motion to Intervene electronically on all parties on the Commission's electronic service list in this proceeding, in accordance with Commission regulations.

Paula J. King

Plainfield Administrative Secretary

20151222-5113

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of elaine a REardon under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/22/2015 12:09:40 PM Filed Date: 12/22/2015 12:09:40 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	ear@crocker.com	

Basis for Intervening:

RE: The Northeast Energy Direct Project:

I live in Warwick MA], and want to intervene in this proceeding to oppose the NED pipeline. I have an interest which may be directly affected by the outcome of the proceeding because my air quality, water quality, natural light and darkness will be impacted. Many certified rare and endangered species share this land with me.

I also live in the within 2 miles of the proposed pipeline / and the proposed compressor station so I would be at physical risk, not to ut my life above those animals and water sources that share this area. I am very concerned about the aquifer that serves me and my nieghbors being impacted. Our water is pristine, as is our forest. Should water that is so clean be put at risk?

In addition, I am concerned about long term health risks, home values (as I'd not be able to live here any longer). My next objection is to expanding the delivery of non-renewable fossil fuels in the form of fracked natural gas as this contributes to greenhouse gas and the resulting warming of the planet. Any of us that hope to leave the world a place that our children and grandchidren may live our a normal lifespan will surely have those hopes dashed by these proeedings.

Elaine Reardon
25 Quarry Rd
Warwick MA 01378

20151222-5121

Submission Description: Erving Board of Health Air Quality, Ground Water contamination, Noise issues or any other pipline related health concern of Erving residents. I also am the Chair of the Erving Historical Commission up hold Secion 106. Protect the Native landscape.Please.

Submission Date: 12/22/2015 11:32:37 AM Filed Date: 12/22/2015 11:32:37 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	cydscott@yahoo.com	

Basis for Intervening:

Docket No. CP 16-21-000 NED Motion to Intervine Bruce W.Scott IN OPPOSITION TO NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT PIPELINE Pursuant to Rule 214 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (Commission) Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. §385.214, files this Motion to Intervene in the above-captioned proceeding. As Boarh of Health Chair, on June 2, 2015, the Erving Board of Health voted unanimously to hold an open meeting regarding immediate health concerns and long term health impacts to the residents of Erving, regarding the proposed High Pressure gas line and Compressor Station Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co. plan to operate within Erving and close proximity lands in Northfield MA. Kinder Morgans Attorneys stated "Erving BOH has no authority to regulate the project" In regards to Air Quality, Ground Water contamination, Noise issues or any other health concern of Erving residents. For this issue first, I would like to Intervene as a citizen only. I also am the Chair of the Erving Historical Commission. We would like to invoke : Section 106 NAPA to help local officials retain control over the sacred landscapes determined to be with in a 18 mile circumference around the ceremonial hill."Turner's Falls Airport location. Erving dwells well within that mapping profile. Under the duties of the commission Erving has located many sites of significance some in the path way of this project. For this reason as well I ask to Intervene as a citizen only.

20151222-5124

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of John Boccalini under CP16-21-000.

As editor of Richmond's only local newsletter in the public interest , Rep. of the Selectmen of the Town of Richmond to the New Hampshire Municipa and Cheshire County Pipeline Coalitions

Submission Date: 12/22/2015 12:27:00 PM Filed Date: 12/22/2015 12:27:00 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	richpipe119@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

Docket No. CP 16-21-000

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., Application for a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity Motion to Intervene

John Boccalini, 180 Fay Martin Rd. Richmond, NH 03470, in accordance with 18 CFR 385.214, respectfully moves to intervene in the captioned docket.

Standing

As editor of Richmond's only local newsletter, Representative of the Selectmen of the Town of Richmond to the New Hampshire Municipal Pipeline Coalition and Cheshire County Pipeline Coalition and Representative of the Richmond Action Group, I am responsible to keep town officials as well as the public aware of the activities related to the applications, dialogs and results of said applications of Docket NO CO 16-21-000

Please address filings, communications and correspondence to the undersigned at Richpipe119@gmail.com

Respectfully submitted,

John C. Boccalini

20151222-5127

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Laura J lynch under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/22/2015 12:35:09 PM Filed Date: 12/22/2015 12:35:09 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	laurankensplace@hotmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I will hear, smell, feel, see and potentially taste (dug well water quality) the effects of the compressor station.

I am concerned that my already serious COPD will be exacerbated because of the toxic emissions coming from the Compressor station within 1 mile from my home.

I am concerned about air quality due to 41,000 HP turbines generating exhaust.

I am concerned with the continuous noise of compressor station, 24-7.

I am concerned with noise and pollution from blowdowns.

I am concerned with light damage to dark skies. We won't be able to see stars.

I am concerned with subsonic vibrations that can subconsciously affect health.

I am concerned about any chemicals or toxins released into the ground that will end up in our stratified drift aquifer.

I am concerned with traffic, noise, air pollution and numerous disturbances during construction.

I am concerned with the property value of our house being extremely close to a compressor station.

I am concerned with the safety of my animals from the emissions coming from the compressor station.

I am concerned with any natural gas infrastructure incidents that would require evacuation from the neighborhood and potential destruction/damage of property and lives.

I am concerned with the industrialization of the neighborhood. The only things that are comfortable living next to 41,000 HP compressor stations is

We live in the shadow of the proposed compressor station. We will feel its effects. other heavy industry.

20151222-5133

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC)
North East Direct Pipeline Project)

Docket No. CP16-21-000

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO INTERVENE

Pursuant to Rules 212 and 214 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's ("Commission") Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 385.212 and 385.214 (2007), We, the Conservation Commission for the Town of Tewksbury, Massachusetts, (Hereinafter referred to as the "Tewksbury Conservation Commission"), file this motion to intervene in this proceeding.

On November 20, 2015, the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC ("TGP") filed its application under § 7 of the Natural Gas Act, 15 U.S.C. § 717f, and § 157 of FERC's regulations, 18 C.F.R. § 157.1 et seq., for the proposed North East Direct Project (NED), FERC Docket No. CP 16- 21-000

I. COMMUNICATIONS AND SERVICE

All communications, pleadings, and orders with respect to this proceeding should be sent to the following individual:

Kyle Boyd
Town Planner/ Conservation Agenet
Tewksbury Conservation Commission
Town Hall
1009 Main Street
Tewksbury, MA 01876
978-640-9370 x 236
kboyd@tewksbury-ma.gov

II. INTEREST OF PETITIONER

Construction, operation and maintenance of the Pipeline would adversely impact the Tewksbury Conservation Commission (TCC). The stated purpose of the TCC is to promote and develop the natural resources and to protect the watershed resources of the Town. Our Legal authority specifically includes the power and responsibility to administer and manage the existing conservation land of the Town of Tewksbury, to own conservation land and to acquire additional conservation land. We are also charged with Administration of the Tewksbury Wetlands Protection By Law (TWPBL) and the Massachusetts Wetland Protection Act (MWPA), and with the responsibility to regulate and control activities that fall under the both the TWPBL and the local administration of the MWPA,

The Town of Tewksbury sits in the watersheds of four rivers, all of which play a vital role in providing clean drinking water , both private and public . The Town of Tewksbury and the Tewksbury Conservation Commission own over 1,000 Acres of open space and Article 97 conservation lands, throughout the Town of Tewksbury for the purposes of protecting wetlands and wildlife habitats , protecting the precious watersheds and the aquifers they replenish, protecting public and private drinking water supplies and to otherwise promote the health, safety and welfare of the general public.

The proposed Lynnfield lateral, Segment N, will specifically directly impact, with temporary and permanent clear cut easements land owned and/or managed by us and held by us under the protection of Article 97.

One such parcel is all of a certified wildlife Habitat, a NHESP Priority Habitat of Rare Species (PH 523), and contains at least 2 certified vernal pools. It consists of approximately 18 forested acres protected under Article 97 and is shown as parcel MA LL 77.00 on the map for Segment N, sheet TE_SEG N-006. In addition, The Lynnfield Lateral will also impact the Shawsheen River, also under our jurisdiction and which is shown on Sheet TE_SEG N-008. This River and its 200 foot river front buffer is certified NHESP Priority Habitat of Rare species (PH 1459, PH 352, PH 349), Protected Riverine habitat, and is under our jurisdiction, as are the many named streams, swamps and other wetlands that exist directly in the proposed path and which, to date, have not be identified on the maps and plans filed in connection with the December, 2015 application.

In addition, the newly introduced alternate hybrid Wright to Dracut route via Tewksbury, which was proposed by FERC in a letter to Mr. Moffat, dated December 8 , 2015, will directly impact other lands we own or otherwise have jurisdiction over, including, but not limited to, the Concord River, the Farwood Forest, the Melvin Rogers Park, the McNeil Walsh Open Space, The Great Swamp, and tens of named perennial streams that feed these areas and nourish the watersheds and aquifers all of which directly lie in the newly suggested path and most of which are also protected under Article 97, and most of which are NHESP protected rare species and riverine Habitats.

If the project route shifts or its infrastructure changes, there may be other parcels under our ownership or jurisdiction which will be impacted.

The Tewksbury Conservation Commission has a direct interest in the outcome of the proceedings which no one else can represent. We have important information and perspectives to bring to this process, consideration of which will serve the public interest.

III. CONCLUSION

Wherefore, we, The Tewksbury Conservation Commission, respectfully request that FERC grant this Motion to Intervene as a party with full rights to participate in all further proceedings.

Respectfully submitted this 18th day of December, 2015.

TEWKSBURY CONSERVATION COMMISSION

By: Kyle Boyd

Title: Town Planner /Conservation Agent
Tewksbury Conservation Commission
Town Hall
1009 Main Street
Tewksbury, MA 01876
Telephone: 978-640-4371
Email:kboyd@tewksbury-ma.gov

20151222-5148

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Christopher D Cyr under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/22/2015 1:23:45 PM Filed Date: 12/22/2015 1:23:45 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	cyr3@verizon.net	

Basis for Intervening:

This is related to the compressor station being suggested for Brox farm and along the Methuen / Dracut border, which is a heavy residential area.

I am aghast that this would be put in such a residential area.

The station will be within a mile (as the crow flies) of my house - never mind within less than that of a large over 50 community.

204 Wheeler St

Methuen MA 01844

I will hear, smell, feel, see and potentially taste the effects of the compressor station. Many of us moved to this area due to the relative quiet nature of the neighborhood area.

We are concerned about air quality due to the system - but even more importantly when the system has to shut down or go into a safety mode where poisonous gasses are released into the air.

We are concerned with the continuous noise of compressor station, 24-7.

We are concerned with noise as well as the air-pollution from blowdowns.

We are concerned with light damage to dark skies.

We are concerned with subsonic vibrations that can subconsciously affect health.

We are concerned about any chemicals or toxins released into the ground that will end up in our stratified drift aquifer as well as its proximity to the Merrimack River and the drinking water that comes from it as well as the recreational use of the area.

We are concerned with traffic, noise, air pollution and numerous disturbances during construction.

We are concerned with the property value of our house being extremely close to a compressor station.

We are concerned with any natural gas infrastructure incidents that would require evacuation from the neighborhood and potential destruction/damage of property and lives.

We are concerned with the industrialization of the neighborhood. The only things that are comfortable living next to 41,000 HP compressor stations is other heavy industry.

We live in the shadow of the proposed compressor station. We will feel its effects and its damage on our environment, our health and our lives.

20151222-5149

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Nashua River Watershed Association under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/22/2015 1:49:28 PM

Filed Date: 12/22/2015 1:49:28 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____

Nashua River Watershed Association alf@nashuariverwatershed.org

Basis for Intervening:

The Nashua River Watershed Association (NRWA) is an environmental nonprofit founded in 1969 when citizen activists called for the cleanup of the river and promoted the passage of the Clean Water Act. The NRWA founders adopted a watershed approach, and recognized the inextricable link between water quality and land protection. Our mission is to work for a healthy ecosystem with clean water and open spaces for human and wildlife communities, where people work together to sustain mutual economic and environmental well-being. Today, the NRWA's professional staff work from a River Resource Center in Groton, Massachusetts. The Association serves as an educator, steward, advocate, and technical provider for 32 communities in central MA and southern NH including the following towns directly affected by the proposed NED project: Brookline, Greenville, Mason, Milford, and New Ipswich New Hampshire and Lunenburg and Townsend Massachusetts. Should the alignment of the project shift – for example, back to the original

proposed route through northcentral MA – other towns in the NRWA service area may be impacted as well. If the proposed NED project is deemed necessary, the NRWA’s primary concern is the negative impacts it would have to critically sensitive environmental areas, especially when there are alternative routes that could use existing rights of way with far less irreversible impact. Negative impacts are anticipated to both groundwater and surface water. An increase in suspended solids in the surface water due to erosion will result in a reduction of the rivers’ water-bearing capacity, reducing oxygen availability and in turn impacting aquatic plant and animal species, especially the reduction of macroinvertebrate diversity and native brook trout habitat.

The NRWA was the primary facilitator of year-long process to achieve the state-designation of the “Squannassit Area of Critical Environmental Concern” (ACEC) in the Commonwealth. Much of the Fitchburg Lateral in Massachusetts will bisect the Squannassit ACEC – which has 23 state-listed rare species -- and in so doing detrimentally affect the large conserved forest tracts and exceptional biodiversity that define this area.

As the principal non-profit conservation organization devoted to conservation, management, and public education associated with the Nashua River and watershed, the NRWA has a Cooperative Agreement with the United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service to convene, facilitate, and coordinate the Nashua Wild and Scenic River Study. Sections of the Nashua, Squannacook, and Nissitissit Rivers were designated for study as a potential National Wild and Scenic River in December of 2014. The proposed NED project’s pipeline and the Fitchburg Lateral are planned to cross several conservation lands, wetlands and waterbodies -- including Mitchell, Spaulding, Gould Mill, Mason, Locke, Pearl Hill, Walker, and Willard Brooks – and will thus have potential impacts on these headwater tributaries of the Squannacook and Nissitissit Rivers. Outstandingly Remarkable Values, by which a river section is deemed eligible for Wild and Scenic designation or not, could be compromised by the pipeline before the Study Committee has the opportunity to fully enumerate the baseline natural resource values: scenic, recreational, geologic, fish & wildlife, historic, and cultural.

The NRWA requests that the Commission accept this filing and grant its motion to intervene.

The NRWA designates the following individual for service for the proceedings (service via email is preferred):

Al Futterman, Land Programs Director
Nashua River Watershed Association
592 Main Street
Groton, MA 01450
978/ 448-0299
alf@NashuaRiverWatershed.org

The request has been submitted by:

Elizabeth Ainsley Campbell
NRWA Executive Director

20151222-5194

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of clark j rhoades under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/22/2015 2:29:29 PM Filed Date: 12/22/2015 2:29:29 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	cjrsailor@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

Current FERC Time: 2:24:54 PM Eastern

20151222-5311

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Jan A Griska under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/22/2015 4:49:45 PM Filed Date: 12/22/2015 4:49:45 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	tincan19619@myfairpoint.net	

Basis for Intervening:

My wife and I are residents of Rindge, N.H. we are directly impacted by the NED project. NED's ROW as currently planned, will take 25% of my property (1/2 acre), we have a two acre lot. Rindge uses two acre zoning here because the town doesn't have a municipal water supply or a sewage treatment system.

Our private well is in our back yard near to proposed NED ROW, our septic system is in our front yard for obvious reasons. With the taking of the half acre we have no room for a system failure. Damaging our artesian well will make our home uninhabitable and unsalable, for that matter.

We won't have access to the gas brought to Dracut, MA. The logistics of bring gas to our door, doesn't make it economically feasible. We don't even have high speed internet and reliable cell phone service. What gas distributor is going to run a pipeline to my home? It doesn't make economic sense.

KM/TGP doesn't have a contract with a power generating utility in New Hampshire, but if they do, I will have to help pay for a pipeline the we don't want.

Studying the volume of gas provided by NED verses the need projected and the direction change of the gas going North out of Dracut, MA. can only mean that NED is planning to supply exporters with natural gas. Supply and demand will govern the price of natural gas in the future and it won't be cheap once we start shipping it overseas.

Being abutters on the NED ROW puts us in the blast zone. A gas leak/fire/explosion will destroy the four homes on my road. Given we are home (we are retired) we will be dead. Given NED crosses all of our main roads, I doubt a practical evacuation plan can be created.

As a member of the Rindge Conservation Commission, and an active wetland citizen scientist, I can say with a clear conscience, that all KM/TGP have done concerning the environment in Rindge is lip service. They have in fact placed survey ROW markers in a productive Vernal Pool. The Vernal Pool is registered with the Harris Center, Hancock, N.H.

Thank you,

Jan and Marilyn Griska

20151223-0006

Joanna B. Tourangeau
Admitted in ME, NH and MA

207.253.0567 Direct
jtourangeau@dwmlaw.com
84 Marginal Way, Suite 600
Portland, ME 04101-2480
207.772.1941 Main
207.772.3627 Fax

Drummond Woodsum

ATTORNEYS AT LAW 1965-2015
YEARS OF SERVICE TO OUR CLIENTS AND COMMUNITIES

December 14, 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.;Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
("Commission") Docket No. CP16-21-00

Dear Secretary Bose:

I have enclosed for filing in regards to the above-referenced proceedings an original and eight copies of Merrimack School District's Motion to Intervene with regard to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's proposed new pipeline.

Thank you for your assistance and please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,

Joanna B. Tourangeau

JBT/as

Enclosures

BEFORE THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC)

Docket No. CP16-21-00

**MERRIMACK SCHOOL DISTRICT
MOTION TO INTERVENE**

The Merrimack School District ("School District") owns and operates the Thomtons Ferry Elementary School ("Elementary School") in Merrimack, New Hampshire. Property owned by the School District is located within the anticipated right of way of the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC ("TNG") proposed new pipeline and is thus subject to condemnation if a certificate is granted pursuant to these proceedings. Further, the Elementary School grounds and buildings which serve to educate young children, including a preschool for 3-4 year olds starting in 2016 as well as the medically fragile are located within 1000-1500feet of the proposed TNG pipeline.

Pursuant to Rule 214 (18 C.F.R.5 385.214(b)) and 157.10of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's ("Commission") Rules of Practice, the School District, files this Motion to Intervene in the above-captioned proceeding.

I. CONTACT INFORMATION

The School District respectfully requests that the Commission add the following contact information to the official service list for Docket No. CP16-21-00. All pleadings, filings and correspondence in the above captioned proceedings should be served on:

Marjorie Chiafery
Superintendent of Schools
Merrimack School District
36 McElwain Street
Merrimack, NH 03054
Ph: (603) 424-6200
marae.chiaferv@merrimack.k12.nh.us

Matthew Shevenell
Business Administrator
Merrimack School District
36 McElwain Street
Merrimack, NH 03054
Ph: (603) 424-6200
matthew.shevenell@merrimack.k12.nh.us

II. THE SCHOOL DISTRICT'S MOTION TO INTERVENE

The School District moves to intervene at this time for the purpose of becoming a party pursuant to Rule 214(b)(2)(ii) to Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC's ("TGP") application to the Commission for a

Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity for the Northeast Energy Direct Project (“Certificate”), a natural gas pipeline (“NED Project”). 18 C.F.R.tj 385.214(b)(2)(ii). The School District’s Motion to Intervene meets each of the intervention criteria of Rule 214(b), 18 C.F.R.tj 385.214(b). On November 20, 2015 TGP filed with the Commission its Application for the Certificate for the NED Project.

The NED Project directly and uniquely impacts the School District. A portion of the NED Project known as the New Hampshire Powerline Alternative travels directly across land owned by the School District and part of the Elementary School. This land could be developed as either a fire department to serve the Town of Merrimack and/or as athletic fields to serve the School District’s students. The warrant article approving transfer of a portion of this land to the Town of Merrimack for use as a fire station is attached hereto. The proposed route runs within approximately 1200-1500 feet of the Elementary School building and associated playgrounds. A nature trail on School District property and used by the Elementary School children is within approximately 1000 feet of the proposed pipeline route.

The Elementary School itself is a sensitive receptor with a current population of five hundred and seven students in grades K-4. Within this population there is also a group of medically fragile students who are especially sensitive to the impacts associated with the NED project. In addition, the Merrimack School Board is considering the addition of pre-school to the Thomtons Ferry Elementary School and will review the budget for the addition of a 2016-17 class of 3-4 year olds on January 16, 2016.

The School District opposes the NED Project due to its significant impacts on the Elementary School. Grant of the School District’s motion will allow the School District to obtain better information about the many and varied routes proposed by TGP to address the significant impacts to the Elementary School discussed above.

III. Conclusion

The School District respectfully requests that the Commission grant its Motion to Intervene as compliant with Commission Rule 214.

Dated: December 14, 2015

Joanna B.Tourangeau, Esq.,
Counsel for the Merrimack School District

Drummond Woodsum & MacMahon
84 Marginal Way, Ste 600
Portland, Maine 04101-2480
Tel: (207) 772-1941
Fax: (207) 772-3627

20151223-0009

TOWN of BROOKLINE Massachusetts

BOARD OF SELECTMEN
NEIL A. WISHINSKY, Chairman
NANCY A. DALY
BENJAMIN J. FRANCO
NANCY S. HELLER
BERNARD W. GREENE
MELVIN A. KLECKNER
Town Administrator

December 8, 2015

333 WASHINGTON STREET
BROOKLINE, MASSACHUSETTS 02445
(617) 720-2200
FAX: (617) 700-2000
www.brookiineMA.oov

Representative Frank Smizik
State House — Room 274
Boston, MA 02133

Dear Representative Smizik:

I am transmitting herewith a Resolution adopted by the Town of Brookline Special Town Meeting of November 17, 2015:

Resolution concerning Natural Gas Pipelines.

This Resolution calls for the Town to implore Federal and Massachusetts agencies to deny permits for the Northeast Direct natural gas pipeline proposal and the Access Northeast natural gas pipeline proposal

Thank you for your attention and action on this important matter.

Sincerely yours,

Melvin A. Kleckner
Town Administrator

Cc: President Barack Obama
Governor Charles Baker
Attorney General Maura Healey
Secretary of Energy and Environmental Affairs Matthew Beaton
Commissioners of Public Utilities:
 Angela O'Connor
 Jolette Westbrook
 Robert Hayden
Secretary of Public Utilities Mark Marini
Energy Board of Director Andrew Greene
Senator Cynthia Creem
Representative Edward Coppinger
Representative Jeffrey Sanchez
Representative Michael Moran
Secretary of Energy Ernest Moniz
Federal Energy Regulatory Commissioners:
 Norman Bay
 Tony Clark
 Colette Honorable
 Cheryl LaFleur
 Philip Moeller
Secretary of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Kimberly Bose
Senator Edward Markey
Senator Elizabeth Warren
U.S. Representative Joseph Kennedy, III

November 17, 2015 Special Town Meeting

ARTICLE 17

SEVENTEENTH ARTICLE

Submitted by: Craig Bolon, TMM8

To see if the town will adopt the following resolution or will take any other action with respect thereto:

Whereas the Northeast Direct pipeline proposal from Tennessee Gas Pipeline, a division of Kinder Morgan, presents unacceptable financial and environmental risks to Massachusetts, and

Whereas the Access Northeast pipeline proposal from Algonquin Gas Pipeline, a division of Spectra Energy, presents unacceptable financial and environmental risks to Massachusetts, and

Whereas investments in the Access Northeast project proposed by Eversource and National Grid encounter gross conflicts of interest and present unacceptable demands on Massachusetts utility customers,

Now, therefore, be it resolved:

The Town of Brookline calls on federal and Massachusetts agencies to deny permits for the Northeast Direct natural gas pipeline proposal and the Access Northeast natural gas pipeline proposal and calls on federal and Massachusetts agencies to reject investments in the Access Northeast project proposed by Eversource and National Grid and to deny their consideration for setting electricity rates, and

The Brookline town meeting asks the Brookline town administration to send copies of this resolution with the explanation of the article and federal docket numbers as available to Governor Charles Baker, to Attorney General Maura Healey, to Secretary of Energy and Environmental Affairs Matthew Beaton, to Commissioners of Public Utilities Angela O'onnor, Jolette Westbrook and Robert I-layden, to Secretary of the Department of Public Utilities Mark Marini, to Energy Facilities Siting Board Director Andrew Greene, to state Senator Cynthia Creem, to state Representatives Edward Coppinger, Michael Moran, Jeffrey Sanchez and Frank Smizik, to President Barack Obama, to Secretary of Energy Ernest Moniz, to Federal Energy Regulatory Commissioners Norman Bay, Tony Clark, Colette Honorable, Cheryl LaFleur and Philip Moeller, to Secretary of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Kimberly Bose, to U.S. Senators Edward Markey and Elizabeth Warren and to U.S. Representative Joseph Kennedy, III.

PETITIONER S ARTICLE DESCRIPTION

The November 18, 2014, Brookline town meeting was asked for a resolution against a gas pipeline proposed across northern Massachusetts. However, the resolution adopted did not ask state and federal agencies to deny pipeline permits and could not have anticipated financial participation in a pipeline project by regional electricity distributors. The spirit of the 2014 resolution has only gained merit with adverse developments since an article was drafted in summer, 2014.

There were four gas pipeline projects being proposed through Massachusetts. They have not only potentials for environmental damage but also potentials to inflict deep and lasting financial harm on the state. This spring, Maura Healey, elected as Massachusetts attorney general in fall, 2014, urged caution on the state's Department of Public Utilities. Her office has underway a comprehensive study of energy options, to be completed by October, 2015. Gas pipeline issues are explored and documented in a local news article:

Craig Bolon, New England gas pipelines: need versus greed

Brookline Beacon, August 29, 2015

<http://brooklinebeacon.com/2015/08/29/new-england-gas-pipelines-need-versus-greed/>

The two largest New England pipeline projects are Northeast Direct, proposed by the Tennessee Gas Pipeline division of Kinder Morgan, and Access Northeast, proposed by the Algonquin Gas Pipeline division of Spectra Energy. Two smaller proposals also come from Algonquin. Both parent companies are located in Houston, TX. Final applications to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) are expected for the big proposals in October, 2015. Docket numbers will become available and submission of comments will become timely.

Northeast Direct would be a new pipeline on virgin territory with capacity up to 2.2 billion cubic feet per day (Bcf/d), routed across northern Massachusetts and southern New Hampshire. Access Northeast would be pipeline expansions with capacity up to 1.0 Bcf/d, mostly along the existing rights of way for the 1953 Algonquin pipeline across Connecticut, Rhode Island and eastern Massachusetts.

The combined proposals would double pipeline capacity into New England. There is no conceivable need for such an enormous flow of gas. Although loudly denied by both companies, their likely intents are to connect to pipelines extending into Canada and to send U.S. production there for export as liquefied natural gas. One terminal in Canada already has permits to export 0.8 Bcf/d, and another has applied for permits to export 0.75 Bcf/d. There is no reliable source for such large amounts of natural gas in eastern Canada.

An obvious result of such a scheme would be to couple marketing of U.S. natural gas in New England with international marketing and to jack up New England prices. However, that is not enough for the pipeline promoters. They also want New England utility customers to pay for their pipelines, although most of the

proposed new capacity could not reasonably serve New England customers.

Since last year's warrant article, the two largest New England electricity distributors, Eversource (formerly NStar) and National Grid, have proposed to invest in 60 percent of the Access Northeast project. In particular, they have asked Massachusetts to include pipeline costs as factors in electricity rates.

Involvement in a long-distance gas pipeline is outside the charters of Eversource and National Grid. They are electricity distributors, not long-distance pipeline operators. They would encounter gross conflicts of interest, selling wholesale gas delivery to generating plants from which they buy wholesale electricity.

Massachusetts Assistant Attorney General Christina Belew of the Energy and Telecommunications Division called the proposed projects "an inefficient expense...units added would be minimally utilized." The Brookline town meeting should object to both the Access Northeast proposal and the Northeast Direct proposal—the latter called out in a warrant article in fall, 2014—and should object to financial participation by Massachusetts electricity distributors.

SELECTMEN'S RECOMMENDATION

Article 17 is a petitioned resolution that calls for the Town to implore federal and Massachusetts agencies to deny permits for the Northeast Direct natural gas pipeline proposal and the Access Northeast natural gas pipeline proposal. This article is a followup from Article 19 from the November, 2014 Special Town Meeting which called for the Town to oppose the Northeast Energy Direct Project of the Tennessee Gas Pipeline and all similar projects that may be later proposed. That resolution did not speak to the denial of permits or financial considerations which the current resolution seeks to address.

The Board of Selectmen supports this article. While it is a complicated issue the Board agreed that building these pipelines to support consumption outside of New England, but at New England ratepayer expense is not something we can support. This seems to be a good deal for the gas companies and a bad deal for the consumers from both a financial and economic perspective. We need to reduce our dependence on fossil fuels and continue to increase the use of renewable energy sources.

The Board voted 4-0-1 FAVORABLE ACTION on the following resolution:

VOTED: that the Town adopt the following resolution or take any other action with respect thereto:

Whereas the Northeast Direct pipeline proposal from Tennessee Gas Pipeline, a division of Kinder Morgan, presents unacceptable financial and environmental risks to Massachusetts, and

Whereas the Access Northeast pipeline proposal from Algonquin Gas Pipeline, a division of Spectra Energy, presents unacceptable financial and environmental risks to Massachusetts, and

Whereas investments in the Access Northeast project proposed by Eversource and National Grid encounter gross conflicts of interest and present unacceptable demands on Massachusetts utility customers,

Now, therefore, be it resolved:

The Town of Brookline calls on federal and Massachusetts agencies to deny permits for the Northeast Direct natural gas pipeline proposal and the Access Northeast natural gas pipeline proposal and calls on federal and Massachusetts agencies to reject investments in the Access Northeast project proposed by Eversource and National Grid and to deny their consideration for setting electricity rates, and

The Brookline town meeting asks the Brookline town administration to send copies of this resolution with the explanation of the article and federal docket numbers as available to Governor Charles Baker, to Attorney General Maura Healey, to Secretary of Energy and Environmental Affairs Matthew Beaton, to Commissioners of Public Utilities Angela O'Connor, Jolette Westbrook and Robert Hayden, to Secretary of the Department of Public Utilities Mark Marini, to Energy Facilities Siting Board Director Andrew Greene, to state Senator Cynthia Creem, to state Representatives Edward Coppinger, Michael Moran, Jeffrey Sanchez and Frank Smizik, to President Barack Obama, to Secretary of Energy Ernest Moniz, to Federal Energy Regulatory Commissioners Norman Bay, Tony Clark, Colette Honorable, Cheryl LaFleur and Philip Moeller, to Secretary of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Kimberly Bose, to U.S. Senators Edward Markey

and Elizabeth Warren and to U.S. Representative Joseph Kennedy, III.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Favorable Action Abstention

Daly Wishinsky

Franco

Heller

Greene

ADVISORY COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION

A report and recommendation by the Advisory Committee will be provided in the Supplemental Mailing.
XXX

20151223-0023

{ duplicate copy of 20151223-0009 above }

20151223-3015

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, DC 20426

OFFICE OF ENERGY PROJECTS

In Reply Refer To:

OEP/DPC/CB-2

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.

Northeast Energy Direct Project

Docket Nos. CP16-21-000, PF14-22-000

Section 375.308(x)(3)

December 23, 2015

Mr. J. Curtis Moffat

Deputy General Counsel and Vice President

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.

1001 Louisiana Street

Houston, TX 77002

Re: Accounting Data Request

Dear Mr. Moffat:

Provide the information described in the enclosure to assist in our analysis of the above-referenced certificate application. File your response in accordance with the provisions of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. In particular, 18 CFR 385.2010 (Rule 2010) requires that you serve a copy of the response to each person whose name appears on the official service list for this proceeding.

You should file a complete response within 20 days of the date of this letter. The response must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission at:

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

If the information cannot be provided in the time frame indicated, explain which items will be delayed and why, and provide a projected filing date. **You should be aware that the information described in the**

enclosure is necessary for us to continue reviewing these filings.

File all responses under oath (18 CFR 385.2005) by an authorized Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. representative and include the name, position, and telephone number of the respondent to each item.

In addition, please send a courtesy copy to Olubukola Pope at Olubukola.pope@ferc.gov.

Sincerely,
Olubukola Pope
Project Manager
Certificate Branch 2
Office of Energy Projects

cc: Public File, Docket Nos. CP16-21-000, PF14-22-000

All Parties

ENCLOSURE

**Northeast Energy Direct Project (Project)
Docket Nos. CP16-21-000, PF14-22-000**

Accounting:

1. In Exhibit K, Tennessee estimates the capitalized AFUDC as \$189,786,000 for the Supply Path of the Northeast Energy Direct project, and \$341,430,000 for the Market Path. Please provide the following in Microsoft Excel. Also, the worksheets and/or files should retain all notes, plus any formulas supporting the calculation:

- a. The worksheet computations on a monthly basis to support the amount of AFUDC. Identify the debt/equity AFUDC amounts.
- b. The computation and methodology to support the debt/equity cost rates used to derive the AFUDC rate.

20151223-5003

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of William F Louisignau under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/22/2015 6:38:04 PM Filed Date: 12/23/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	louisignaususan@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I live in Northfield, MA and want to intervene in th is proceeding to oppose the NED pipeline. I have an interest which will be directly affected by the outcome of the proceeding because I am a landowner that will be significantly impacted by the pipeline route and the location of the compressor station. I am about 1.2 miles as the crow flies from the compressor station. We have a well that could be impacted as it is down 'stream' from the station. Mill brook runs by our house. I am an electric ratepayer and understand that there will be an increase on my bill relating to NED cost recovery. I enjoy my several acres and have had horse as well as other amenities that are a part of living in a small New England town.

We are very concerned as we know this will impact the value of our property. My wife has a real estate business and stigma has already attached to this town and is a factor in the value of the houses in Northfield. Obviously the closer you are to the compressor station the more of an impact on value. We do not see the benefit to us at all, with us meaning people in our state and our immediate area. We do know there are health risks

as well.

20151223-5004

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Brenda J Davis under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/22/2015 6:35:28 PM Filed Date: 12/23/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	brenda.davis.mba@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I own property in Northfield, MA and want to intervene in this proceeding to oppose the NED pipeline. I have an interest which may be directly affected by the outcome of the proceeding because:

I am a member of an impacted community who has concerns about various impacts to the local economy/environment/aesthetics/health.

I am an electric ratepayer who if KM secures my electric utility as a project customer, expects to see an increase on my bill relating to NED cost recovery.

I enjoy the out of doors and do not want any state or town public parks or forests, which have been set aside for the people and wildlife, to be impacted by any activities of this commercial project.

I am a property owner who lives within a mile of the blast radius so my property will be at physical risk of damage due to basting vibrations.

I am a property owner whose source of drinking water is less than 0.5 miles from a blast radius so my drinking water supply is risk of contamination due to construction and/or operation of the pipeline.

20151223-5005

MOTION TO INTERVENE: DOCKET #CP16-21

I have lived in Ashfield, Massachusetts, for twenty-seven years. I am filing this motion to intervene in the proceeding as a directly impacted landowner and abutter and also as a concerned member of my community and those along the proposed Northeast Energy Direc (NED) pipeline, the construction of which I remain strongly opposed to for the following considerations:

The proposed pipeline would half-encircle my 2.21-acre wooded property [MA (4) 279.00, Map/Block/Lot 4-0-7], within 200-250 feet of my house, shed, and well, crossing my driveway to align with the high-tension wires on the property abutting mine on the NW property line.

A high-pressure gas transmission pipeline on the property in the event of a pipeline leak would create the risk of fire and personal injury and the contamination of well water. The hazards associated with a high-pressure gas pipeline on the property would violate the provisions of my homeowner insurance and mortgage, putting me at risk of foreclosure. The presence of the proposed pipeline would permanently decrease property value (and hence property tax necessary to the community) and prevent sale because of the difficulty of obtaining insurance and mortgage.

The extensive drilling and blasting necessary to lay the pipeline through ledge and waterways in the region would impact the water table in ways as yet unknowable and together with possible pipeline leaks would threaten widespread contamination of the water supply. The woodlands along the proposed route would be decimated and the wide path of the pipeline subject to chemical spraying from aircraft to deny growth of anything forever.

The question of the necessity for the pipeline for energy reliability here in Massachusetts has been answered by the recent report Power System Reliability, requested by the Commonwealth's Attorney General: State

Attorney General Maura Healey, releasing her study on the need for the Northeast Energy Direct project, asserted that “we do not need increased gas capacity to meet electric reliability needs, and electric ratepayers shouldn’t foot the bill for additional pipelines.” [12/06/15].

Earlier studies and reports including ISO Net Energy for Load Report [5/8/15] support the findings of the AGO’s study for Massachusetts as does the national study released by the DOE, Natural Gas Infrastructure Implications of Increased Demand from Electrical Power Sector [2/15] which cited as key summary findings: “Diverse sources of natural gas supply and demand will reduce the need for additional interstate natural gas pipeline infrastructure. Higher utilization of existing interstate natural gas pipeline infrastructure will reduce the need for new pipelines.

There is no public need in New England for additional interstate transmission gas pipelines for our energy needs, but there is great financial incentive for Kinder Morgan/TGP to build the NED pipeline to convey fractured gas from the Marcellus Shale to ports for export in the Northeast and Canada for their own profit at the expense of ratepayers.

The proposed pipeline is the least viable option to meet the short-term and/or long-term energy needs of Massachusetts and the greater Northeast. The proposed pipeline would have a greater negative environmental impact than all other energy alternatives available in the region. In the name of public convenience and necessity, Kinder Morgan/TGP and selected local utility companies and energy suppliers have distorted, misrepresented, and inflated local energy requirements to justify destruction of the natural environment that sustains us and seizure of protected and private property for shared corporate profit. The claim that insufficient or lack of interstate infrastructure limits the supply of natural gas for energy needs of homeowners and businesses throughout the Northeast must be examined closely in light of independent studies that persuasively demonstrate otherwise.

What we do need to ensure energy requirements in the Northeast is a vigorous and timely commitment to developing sources of clean energy and storage technology for renewables, as well as programs to increase energy efficiency and conservation. In the meantime, we need to implement immediate programs (and we are) to initiate effective electric utility management for peak periods and upgrade repair, maintain, and expand existing gas supply pipelines.

Finally, I respectfully ask how a certificate of (questioned/debated) Public Convenience and Necessity for Kinder Morgan/TGP’s corporate profit derived from the Northeast Direct Energy pipeline justifies or equals the imposition of extensive risk factors so numerous and potentially dangerous to the health and welfare of the community, risks that imperil, as well, natural eco-systems, including wildlife, watersheds, vernal pools, aquifers, protected and conserved lands, our way of rural agricultural life, and the local, national, and international goals of developing alternative energy resources to counteract global climate change?

Thank you for your consideration, not only of my motion to intervene, but of the myriad issues and questions the NED pipeline proposal and application for Public Convenience and Necessity raises—but does not fully answer.

Submitted 12/22/15 by

Marion E. Wheeler
Ashfield, MA 01330-0479
413.628.4634
marionwh@juno.com

20151223-5007

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Shirley Keech under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/22/2015 6:16:07 PM

Filed Date: 12/23/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Leigh Youngblood under CP16-21-000.
Submission Date: 12/22/2015 7:50:49 PM Filed Date: 12/23/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	leighyoungblood@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO INTERVENE

Pursuant to Rules 212 and 214 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission’s (“Commission”) Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 385.212 and 385.214 (2007), I, Leigh Youngblood, file this motion to intervene in this proceeding.

On November 20, 2015, the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (“TGP”) filed its application under § 7 of the Natural Gas Act, 15 U.S.C. § 717f, and § 157 of FERC’s regulations, 18 C.F.R. § 157.1 et seq., for the proposed North East Direct Project (NED), FERC Docket No. CP 16- 21-000

I. COMMUNICATIONS AND SERVICE

All communications, pleadings, and orders with respect to this proceeding should be sent to:

Leigh Youngblood
155 Royalston Road
Warwick, MA 01378
978 544-2694

II. INTEREST OF PETITIONER

Construction, operation, and maintenance of the Pipeline would adversely impact me. I am a landowner in the Massachusetts towns of Warwick and Greenfield. I reside in Warwick. My husband also owns two businesses and properties in Northfield, MA, where a compressor station is proposed.

My position is that reasonable alternatives to meet regional energy needs are available that are less destructive to me as a landowner, my community, the environment, and to the integrity of the Massachusetts Constitution, which provides unique protections to public conservation land, which constitute more than 20% of the distance of the pipeline route in Massachusetts.

This project does not pass the cost/benefit test required by NEPA and FERC regulations. When originally proposed the “benefit” of the pipeline was 2.3Bcuft. The NED Application submitted on November 20, 2015 requests approval for .7Bcuft, scalable at the Applicant’s purview, to 1.3Bcuft. The result of these changes is that for approximately equal costs to landowners, communities, and the environment, only one-third of the originally proposed “benefit” will accrue.

As a resident of a town the NED will pass through, my daily quality of life (has already been and) will be affected by the threat of, construction, and presence of overbuilt fossil fuel infrastructure across a relatively intact and quintessential New England landscape. My rural town has a population of 700 people. I travel throughout the region to get to work, buy groceries, visit friends, participate in community events, and enjoy local amenities as an individual and with visiting family and friends.

At the two properties I own I am collectively a customer of Berkshire Gas, Eversource, and National Grid. My home is powered by a 7.8Kw photovoltaic system and heated in part by wood and oil. I am aware that the NED project would not comply with the Global Warming Solutions Act, a law passed to lower greenhouse gasses, which are a severe threat to the health, safety, and quality of life of my three sons and two grandchildren.

As a long-term resident, person employed in the land conservation sector, and energy customer, I have infor-

mation to contribute to the public review process and to an outcome that is in the interest of public health, safety, and welfare.

III. CONCLUSION

I respectfully request that the Commission grant my Motion to Intervene as a party with full rights to participate in all further proceedings.

Respectfully submitted this 22nd day of December, 2015.

Leigh Youngblood
155 Royalston Road
978544-2694

Warwick, MA 01378
leighyoungblood@gmail.com

20151223-5020

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Mary K King under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/22/2015 7:08:18 PM Filed Date: 12/23/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	mary.mking9@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I am a resident of Northfield MA where a compressor is proposed to be built. I enjoy the outdoors and do not want any state, town, or conserved parks or forests to be impacted by the activities of this commercial NED pipeline.

I donate to local land conservation trusts and the purpose of my donations would be violated if the NED is built through western Massachusetts.

I fear that our local water supplies will be damaged by the toxins that can result in the air and in the water from a pipeline "incident", and from the blow downs of toxic emissions along the pipeline route and at the compressor.

20151223-5021

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Judy L Wolter under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/22/2015 7:16:25 PM Filed Date: 12/23/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	judywolter@yahoo.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I live on Gulf Road in Northfield within the 2 mile radius of the proposed compressor station and closer to parts of the proposed pipeline. My house was built in 1826 and is on the Massachusetts Registry of Historic Houses. I have extensive flower, medicinal herb, berry, and vegetable gardens, as well as fruit and nut trees, all of which are organically grown. I raise much of my own food, and I also sell or trade berries, jams, and vegetables locally and supply an herbal pharmacy. I oppose the construction of the pipeline and compressor station.

I am applying to be an intervenor because I am aware of the alarming health effects on people living within two miles of compressor stations, the concern for the health of my food and other plant products, the purity of my well, and the market value of my property. I am nearly 67 years old and would be particularly affect-

ed, and would have to move away were it built, and would not be able to recover my financial and personal labor investment. I have attended numerous meetings of Kinder Morgan and related organizations, and have been struck by the lack of transparency and accountability, giving me deep distrust of the intentions, methods, and processes so far.

I hope that FERC will grant me intervenor status so that I can be kept informed and have the opportunity to raise my concerns to a responsible party.

20151223-5022

United States of America
Before the
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC
Northeast Energy Direct Project

Docket No. CP16-21-000

**MOTION TO INTERVENE
OF NORTH QUABBIN PIPELINE ACTION (NQPA)**

Pursuant to Rules 212 and 214 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) promulgated at 18 C.F.R §385.212 and 385.214 (2007), North Quabbin Pipeline Action (NQPA), files this motion to intervene in this proceeding.

On November 20, 2015 the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (“TGP”) filed its application under Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act, for the proposed project, FERC Docket No. CP16-21-000.

Interest of Party:

North Quabbin Pipeline Action is a group of concerned citizens in the North Quabbin region (No. Central) of Massachusetts who have come together to build awareness, organize opposition, and engage in collective activities opposing the proposed Northeast Energy Direct (NED) natural gas pipeline. Many of our members are directly impacted by the current route of the pipeline. Others were impacted by the past proposed route.

Concerns and possible impacts

Public Lands in Conservation: Many properties in our region are under conservation restrictions. The NED pipeline is a questionable activity on conserved land.

Wetlands: In the North Quabbin region hundreds of wetlands will be impacted by this project. Many land-owners rely on wells for their drinking water. Wetlands are an integral part of clean drinking water. Furthermore, we are in the Millers River Watershed which could be affected by drilling under the Millers River.

Climate Change: The Legislature in Massachusetts passed the Global Warming Solutions Act which has set goals to lower Massachusetts carbon footprint by 25% in 2020. This proposed pipeline takes us in the exactly opposite direction locking us into a fossil fuel infrastructure for next fifty years.

No Need for the Pipeline: According a recent report commissioned by MA Attorney General Maura Healey, there is no need for a large pipeline project in Massachusetts to supply its energy needs.

Communications:

North Quabbin Pipeline Action Group
Contact person: Maureen Blasco
67 Norcross Rd.
Royalston, MA 01368
(978)-249-5138

Conclusion:

North Quabbin Pipeline Action (NQPA) respectfully requests that the Commission grant our Motion to Intervene as a party with full rights to participate in all further proceedings.

20151223-5027

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC) Docket No. CP16-21-000
North East Direct Pipeline Project)

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO INTERVENE

Pursuant to Rules 212 and 214 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission’s (“Commission”) Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 385.212 and 385.214 (2007), we, the Town of North Reading, file this motion to intervene in this proceeding.

On November 20, 2015, the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (“TGP”) filed its application under § 7 of the Natural Gas Act, 15 U.S.C. § 717f, and § 157 of FERC’s regulations, 18 C.F.R. § 157.1 et seq., for the proposed North East Direct Project (NED), FERC Docket No. CP 16- 21-000

I. COMMUNICATIONS AND SERVICE

All communications, pleadings, and orders with respect to this proceeding should be sent to the following individual, whose name, address, and email should be placed on the official service list maintained by the Secretary:

Town Administrator Michael P. Gilleberto
Town Hall
235 North Street
North Reading, MA 01864
978-664-6010
mgilleberto@northreadingma.gov

II. INTEREST OF PETITIONER

Based on plans filed by TGP, the NED project will pass through the Town of North Reading in a route of over 3 miles, crossing at least 40 unique parcels of land. Construction, operation and maintenance of the Pipeline would adversely impact the Town of North Reading in the following ways:

1. Expose the Town to public safety risks associated with natural gas, including explosion, pollution, ground contamination, and/or groundwater contamination.
2. Expose the Town to potential pollution of drinking water wells, including a well located within a few hundred feet of the proposed route.
3. Potentially reducing property tax revenues by reducing the valuation of private and other property, which could cause an increase in tax rates to make up for the lost revenue.
4. Adversely impact wetlands, do harm to regional habitat and species due to gas leakage, thereby negatively impacting the quality of life.
5. Reduce the amount of open space in Town by utilizing existing open space parcels for the pipeline route.
6. Reduce the value of Town-owned land by siting on or near such land.
7. Cause undue stress upon property owners and residents in Town, potentially affecting the health, well-being, and/or productivity of said owners/residents.

Accordingly, the Town of North Reading has a direct and substantial interest in the above proceeding, as the Town will be directly impacted by the proposed project. The Town may be adversely affected or bound by a decision in this proceeding, and no other party can adequately represent the Town's unique interests. Further, the Town of North Reading's intervention is in the public interest, because the Town is responsible for the protection of the health and safety of all of its residents.

III. CONCLUSION

Wherefore, I, Michael P. Gilleberto, Town Administrator for the Town of North Reading, respectfully request that the Commission to grant the Town of North Reading's Motion to Intervene as a party with full rights to participate in all further proceedings.

Respectfully submitted this 22nd day of December, 2015.

Town Administrator Michael P. Gilleberto
Town Hall
235 North Street
North Reading, MA 01864
978-664-6010
mgilleberto@northreadingma.gov

20151223-5052

TOWN OF GILL
MASSACHUSETTS
www.gillmass.org

BEFORE THE UNITED STATES
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LLC)
A division of Kinder Morgan) Docket No. CP16-21-000
Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline)

**AMENDED MOTION TO INTERVENE OF THE TOWN OF GILL
IN REFERENCE TO THE NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT (NED) PIPELINE**

Pursuant to Rule 214 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (Commission) Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. §385.214, the Town of Gill (hereinafter referred to as "the Town") files this Motion to Intervene in the above-captioned proceeding. The Town has significant concerns regarding the environmental, safety, and socioeconomic impacts of the NED pipeline project. The short and long-term impacts that the proposed project could have in our community are profound. The Town seeks to intervene on the NED Project to monitor the progress of the proceedings and expects to take a position against the Project.

I. STATEMENT OF INTEREST

A. Description of the Town of Gill

The Town of Gill is a small, rural community in Franklin County, Massachusetts consisting of 1500 residents. If this project is approved the Town of Gill will border three towns that will play host to the pipeline including Montague, Erving and Northfield. The proposed pipeline would be located in these neighboring towns in areas that are zoned for residential, agriculture, and forestry and is largely comprised of farmland and forest with sensitive habitat areas and other natural resources. As the benefits of open space and farmland are community assets and not just property of any one town or landowner, the Town of Gill's residents have a vested interest and concern in the direct impacts in these neighboring towns, as well as the direct impacts on the Town of Gill.

B. Description of Impacts

Because of Gill's close proximity to the Town of Northfield, the most apparent impact of the proposed pipeline will be as follows. The proposed pipeline will run through 8.5 miles through the geographic center of the Town of Northfield, less than a mile from the Town of Gill's border. It will cross conservation lands, state forest lands protected by the Massachusetts State Constitution (Article 97), sensitive water protection areas, permanently protected open space, farmland, forestland, rare, threatened and endangered species habitats, wetlands, vernal pools, cold-water fisheries, public infrastructure, private homes and business, and historic resources. Due to the proximity, any negative impacts on the Town of Northfield will have direct environmental, health, economic, and community impacts on the Town of Gill.

The economic and public health of rural residents is closely tied to the health and viability of the region's natural resource base. Furthermore, the proposed compressor station in Northfield is expected to generate light and noise pollution that will directly impact residents of Gill.

C. Standard for Intervention

The Town of Gill's Motion to Intervene must be granted to the Town of Gill as it satisfies the standard for intervention under FERC's regulations. As discussed above, Gill is directly impacted by the proposed project, and no other individual or organization can adequately represent Gill's unique interest in this proceeding. Further, Gill's intervention is in the public interest because the Town is responsible for the protection of the health and safety of all of its residents. Accordingly, the Town of Gill respectfully requests that FERC grant this Motion to Intervene.

II. CONTACT INFORMATION

The following should be added to the Official Service List, with all notice and communications in this proceeding addressed to the contacts listed below:

Mr. Gregory M. Snedeker, Chair, Board of Selectmen
Town of Gill, 325 Main Road, Gill, MA 01354

III. CONCLUSION

Wherefore, in light of the foregoing, the Town of Gill respectfully requests that the Commission GRANT this Motion to Intervene and allow the INTERVENOR to participate in this proceeding with full rights of party status, including the right to request a hearing, cross examine witnesses and seek rehearing and appeal. Submitted by request of the Board of Selectmen,

Gregory M. Snedeker, Chair, Board of Selectmen
Town of Gill, Massachusetts

Telephone 413-863-9347

325 Main Road, Gill MA 01354

Fax 413-863-7775

This institution is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Wherefore on this December 15, 2015, I caused to be served the foregoing Motion to Intervene electronically on all parties on the Commission's electronic service list in this proceeding, in accordance with Commission regulations.

20151223-5057

Mark & Diann Bouthot
65 Dunvegan Road Tewksbury, MA 01876

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC

Northeast Energy Direct Project (NED Project)

Docket #CPI6-21-000

1615 Suffield Street

Date: December 23,2015

Re: Denying/Rescinding property access

As the owners of the property located at **65 Dunvegan Road, Tewksbury, Massachusetts**, we are **denying permission** and/or **rescinding permission** previously granted to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), its representatives, contractors, subcontractors, or associates to enter our property 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.

Mark A. Bouthot Diann M. Bouthot

cc: Tewksbury Police Department
Tewksbury Planning Board
FERC.GOV website

20151223-5060

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Patricia J Stanko under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/23/2015 10:24:21 AM Filed Date: 12/23/2015 10:24:21 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	pjstanko96@yahoo.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I am a resident of the town of Royalston, MA one of the original towns sited for this pipeline. As a result, I educated myself about this issue and have many concerns.

I am concerned about the use of public conservation lands designated for the route of the pipeline. I am concerned about the Massachusetts Global Warming Solutions Act which attempts to lower Massachusetts carbon emissions by 2020. Putting long term fossil fuel infrastructure in violates this idea. I am concerned about emissions from the proposed compressor stations. The Massachusetts Attorney General, Maura Healey, had commissioned a study which found no need for this pipeline to supply our future energy needs.

20151223-5065

Submission Description: (doc-less) Notice of Intervention of the Connecticut Public Utilities Regulatory Authority

Submission Date: 12/23/2015 10:23:05 AM Filed Date: 12/23/2015 10:23:05 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Connecticut Public Utilities Regulatory Authority		Clare.Kindall@ct.gov
Connecticut Public Utilities Regulatory Authority		lsg@dwgp.com
Connecticut Public Utilities Regulatory Authority		klm@dwgp.com

Basis for Intervening:

The Connecticut Public Utilities Regulatory Authority (the "Connecticut PURA") hereby provides notice of

intervention in this proceeding. The Connecticut PURA is a state authority created within the Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection to regulate electric companies within the State. The Connecticut PURA, like the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, must balance the interests of utilities providing electricity services with those of ratepayers, who should be charged not more than reasonable and fair rates for services. The Connecticut PURA is also charged with ensuring that there are adequate and reliable gas and electricity supplies available to serve Connecticut customers. The Connecticut PURA is authorized by the General Statutes of Connecticut § 16-6a to participate in proceedings before federal agencies and courts on matters affecting utility services rendered or to be rendered in Connecticut. As the State of Connecticut's utility regulator, the Connecticut PURA has a direct and substantial interest in this proceeding, as the application by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC in Docket No. CP16-21 includes facilities to be constructed in Connecticut, and a portion of the costs proposed would be borne by Connecticut ratepayers.

THE CONNECTICUT PUBLIC UTILITIES REGULATORY AUTHORITY

Clare E. Kindall

AAG Department Head, Energy

Attorney General's Office

Ten Franklin Square

New Britain, CT 06051

Phone: 860-827-2683

Fax: 860-827-2893

Clare.Kindall@ct.gov

Lisa S. Gast

Kathleen L. Mazure

Duncan, Weinberg, Genzer & Pembroke, P.C.

1615 M Street, NW, Suite 800

Washington, DC 20036

Phone: 202-467-6370

Fax: 202-467-6379

lsg@dwgp.com

klm@dwgp.com

20151223-5083

BEFORE THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC)

Docket No. CP16-21-000

Northeast Energy Direct Project)

**MOTION TO INTERVENE OF
KATHRYN REGINA EISEMAN**

I hereby move, pursuant to 18 C.F.R. § 385.214(b), to intervene in the above-captioned proceeding. I seek to intervene in opposition to the Northeast Energy Direct Project (the "Project" or the "NED Project") proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (the "Company"), a subsidiary of Kinder Morgan, Inc. ("Kinder Morgan"). Communications concerning this proceeding should be served upon me as follows:

Kathryn R. Eiseman

17 Packard Road

Cummington, MA 01026

(413) 320-0747

katyeiseman@gmail.com

My interests “which may be directly affected by the outcome of the proceeding” pursuant to 18 C.F.R. § 214(b)(2)(ii) include:

- My interest as an electric ratepayer, inasmuch as the Company seeks to secure my electric utility as a Project shipper, which, in turn, would seek to recover costs associated with the Project from ratepayers. As explained in depth by others on this docket (and on the pre-filing docket PF14-22), Kinder Morgan is essentially telling the Commission that New England needs a blow torch to light a candle. The massive overbuild embodied in this proposal is very likely to lead to higher energy costs for New England’s ratepayers – either because the excess capacity contracted for by our utilities would go unused, or because capacity would be used for markets overseas, driving up domestic energy prices.
- My interest as a resident of the Westfield River Watershed, living just downstream from where the Company proposes to cross the federally designated Wild & Scenic Westfield River with its pipeline. In addition to living in the watershed, my family swims and plays in the river near the Windsor town line. I am concerned about the impact that the construction and operation of the pipeline, and the compressor station proposed for Windsor, could have on ecological and human health in our watershed.
- My interest as a taxpayer, neighbor and visitor to protected public land in Massachusetts. My land abuts the Deer Hill State Reservation, and I am very concerned about the threat this Project poses to all public land protected by Article 97 of the Articles of Amendment to the Massachusetts Constitution.
- My interest as a land trust supporter, visitor and neighbor to the Massachusetts Audubon Society’s West Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary in Plainfield, MA and The Trustees of Reservations’ Notchview Reservation in Windsor, MA.

All visits to our treasured wild areas are now bittersweet. I live in the western part of Cummington, Massachusetts, with a portion of my property located in Plainfield, Massachusetts. My property line is approximately a mile from the proposed pipeline path through the West Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary. The entrance to the wildlife sanctuary is just up my street, and I would need to cross over the pipeline any time I wanted to spend time there (or go to Plainfield or Windsor for any reason). At this wildlife sanctuary this autumn, my two children – both in pre-school – marveled at their first sight of a beaver, at the pond near the entrance from our road. From my reading of the maps filed with the Company’s application, the center line of the proposed pipeline would transect an adjacent pond, with no readily available information as to how devastation to this ecosystem would be prevented.

Also this fall, we have started to see bald eagles in Cummington and Plainfield. Whether they are nesting in the Project area remains an open question; a separate question is whether the Company and its agents can be trusted to adhere to the requirements of the federal Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act. The public record indicates that Kinder Morgan’s modus operandi is to do whatever it takes to get pipelines approved and installed as quickly as possible, cut corners on construction and maintenance, and simply pay the fines later. Kinder Morgan continues to show disregard and disrespect for the people and natural resources of our region. The purported benefits of this 400-mile, 360,000-horsepower monstrosity are not worth the risks and the impacts to our communities. Far less harmful and disruptive means of meeting our energy needs should be pursued. I have been studying this proposal since it first became public, and I can bring valuable information and perspective to this proceeding.

WHEREFORE, for the foregoing reasons, I respectfully request that my motion to intervene be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathryn R. Eiseman

December 23, 2015

20151223-5086

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of John D Angleman under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/23/2015 11:52:10 AM Filed Date: 12/23/2015 11:52:10 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____

Individual smiworld@verizon.net

Basis for Intervening:

RE: FERC Docket # CP16-21

I am a directly impacted landowner.

John D. Angleman

225 Smith Road

PO Box 292

Ashfield, MA 01330

Phone 413-628-3219

Email: smiworld@verizon.net

THIS IS TO REQUEST THAT FERC DENY THE KINDER MORGAN NED PIPELINE – (in 1987-88 a pipeline along this route was previously considered and denied by FERC under the Ansbacher Doctrine - see Docket # CP87-451). The building of such a pipeline is even less compelling today.

I live in Ashfield, Massachusetts.

I am a property owner directly affected by the proposed Kinder Morgan NED pipeline. The pipeline will be sited within 50 to 75 feet of the main door to my home.

The pipeline will totally devalue my property and render it uninhabitable

My home is a candidate eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places under Chapter 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

My home at 225 Smith Road (the only State designated Scenic Road in Ashfield) is over 200 years old and is registered in the MACRIS data base of Historic Massachusetts homes with the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Historical Commission. It also has extensive historic provenance as documented in the Ashfield Town records of the Ashfield Historical Society. Research and discovery will corroborate the historical significance of my property including area adjacent to my home which is suspect as a burial ground for victims of a yellow fever epidemic experienced during settlement of Ashfield.

Devaluation of my property will be in part, but not totally, the result of:

- extensive blasting – the entire area is solid rock ledge – horizontal drilling is not possible.
- removal of over 200 trees (500 cords of wood; over 13000 feet of linear lumber; many 300 year old maple trees)
- destruction of drinking well water supply – deep water artesian well within 75 feet of pipeline
- destruction of in-ground septic system within 75 feet of proposed pipeline
- destruction of underground propane feeds and 1000 gal. tank
- removal of underground 400AMP electric service to home
- removal of underground 16 line phone service to home
- removal of distribution electric transformer
- destruction of drive to home making access impossible
- destruction of historic stone walls

- violation and contamination of wetlands (during construction alone not to mention gas contaminants) providing drinking water to Ashfield Town Wells and Ashfield Lake for Ashfield citizens
- destruction of wetlands themselves and vernal pool
- disruption of the unique ecosystem under power lines (where no pesticide spraying is currently permitted) as documented by \$ 2 Million study by the Audubon Society and the University of Vermont
- destruction of road frontage along the only State designated Scenic Road in Ashfield – will no longer be able to subdivide property consistent with historic guidelines.
- violation of the Massachusetts Historic Trails corridor
- introduction of pesticides (currently prohibited under agreement with Northeast and Eversource electric utilities) on property aquifer feeding the Town of Ashfield and Ashfield Lake
- termination of overhead 14000 volt electric distribution lines currently servicing the residents of Smith Road – these lines run perpendicular to the proposed pipeline route and they have fallen numerous times spontaneously and under adverse weather conditions – Northeast Utilities and Eversource have advised that these lines could trigger an explosive event – last incident April 2015.
- displacement and killing (during construction and subsequent use of pesticides) of unique and endangered plants and wildlife on the property including but not limited to:

Zebra Clubtail (*Stylurus scudderi*), Jefferson Salamander (*Ambystoma jeffersonianum*), Spring Salamander (*Gyrinophilus prophyriticus*), Longnose Sucker (*Catostomus catosomus*), Wood Turtle (*Glyptemys insculpta*), Smooth Green Snake (*Opheodrys vernalis*), American Bittern (*Botaurus lentiginosus*), Dwarf Mistletoe (*Arceuthobium pusillum*), Dwarf Scouring-rush (*Equisetum scirpoides*), Bristly Black Currant (*Ribes lacustre*) and vulnerable communities of Acidic Graminoid Fen; Rich, Mesic forest Community; Spruce Fir Swamp.

Mitigation of damages is not an option for this property. I have officially served Tennessee Gas with a no trespass notice and am currently denying surveying on my property.

Accountability for all losses and attendant consequences will be pursued.

Wherefore, I, John D. Angleman, respectfully request that the Commission grant my Motion to Intervene as a party with full rights to participate in all further proceedings.

Submitted this 22nd day of December, 2015

John D. Angleman
 225 Smith Road
 PO Box 292
 Ashfield, MA 01330
 Phone: 413-628-3219
 Email: smiworld@verizon.net

20151223-5118

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Town of Lunenburg under CP16-21-000.
 Submission Date: 12/23/2015 12:44:00 PM Filed Date: 12/23/2015 12:44:00 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Town of Lunenburg	klafleur@lunenburgonline.com	

Basis for Intervening:

Motion to Intervene submitted by the Town of Lunenburg, MA

Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Town of Lanesborough

Newton Memorial Town Hall
Post Office Box 1492
83 North Main Street
Lanesborough, MA 01237
Tel. (413) 442-1167
FAX (413) 443-5811
www.lanesborough-ma.gov

BEFORE THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Company, LLC

Docket No. CP16-21-000

Northeast Energy Direct

MOTION TO INTERVENE OF THE TOWN OF LANESBOROUGH

The Town of Lanesborough is a municipality incorporated under the laws of Massachusetts. Five miles of the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline will cross properties located within the municipal limits of the Town of Lanesborough, including one town owned property.

Pursuant to Commission Rules 385.214(b) and 157.10, the Town of Lanesborough moves to intervene in the above captioned proceeding. This intervention is timely filed.

I. CONTACT INFORMATION

Please enter the Town of Lanesborough below on the official service list for Docket No. CP 16- 21-000. All pleadings, filings and correspondence in this proceeding should be served on the following:

Town of Lanesborough
83 North Main Street
Lanesborough, MA 01237

II. MOTION TO INTERVENE

The Town of Lanesborough and its residents are directly impacted by the proposed pipeline. The pipeline will cross five miles of property within the town, impacting up to 19 residential homeowners and business owners. The pipeline will likely result in a devaluation of residential property and will likely limit the businesses ability to expand, thus diminishing the Town's tax base. Further, the pipeline, as currently proposed, will cut through a portion of the Town-owned land/watershed/etc., which will necessitate removal of trees, etc. and the possible taking of Town land.

The Town of Lanesborough requires additional information with respect to the proposed pipeline. If constructed, the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline will have environmental and economic impacts, not to mention impacts to individual landowners' property.

Intervention is necessary to enable the Town of Lanesborough to protect its park and natural resources and to defend its taxpaying residents and businesses and their property from encroachment by Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline. The Town of Lanesborough seeks to intervene to monitor this proceeding and address potential effects to land, wetlands, riverfront and waterfront, rare and endangered species, transportation, and homes in close proximity to the proposed pipeline.

Further, the Berkshire Regional Planning Commission has also been acting on behalf of the Town of Lanesborough, Massachusetts, and the various municipalities and districts in Rensselaer County, New York and Berkshire County, Massachusetts through which the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline is proposed to or could pass through or impact to protect their common public interests.

The Berkshire Regional Planning Commission filed scoping comments with FERC on October 15,2015 (accession no. 201510155279; docket no. PF14-22-000) which comments are incorporated herein by reference.

The Berkshire Regional Planning Commission continues to coordinate the dissemination of information to the County of Rensselaer, New York and the various municipalities in Rensselaer County, New York and Berkshire County, Massachusetts. This motion should be regarded as also made in support of the intervention motion made by the Berkshire Regional Planning Commission.

WHEREFORE, for the foregoing reasons, the Town of Lanesborough requests that the Commission GRANT this motion to intervene.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul Sieloff, Town Manager

Town of Lanesborough

83 North Main Street

Lanesborough, MA 01237

413-442-1167

Town.Secretary@Lanesborough-ma.gov

12/23/15

20151223-5132

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of James D. Roche under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/23/2015 12:47:04 PM Filed Date: 12/23/2015 12:47:04 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	jroche@mass.rr.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I am a land owner in central MA with in proximity (500 feet to 6 miles depending on the proposed routes currently on record) to the proposed NED LNG pipeline. I am also a contributor to various conservation groups.

The use of public domain laws are expressly for the interest of the majority. In MA there are numerous public domain pathways that are accepted and provide convenient, direct routes for utilities etc. , these should be considered first for the NED route.

I'm concerned the NED proposal doesn't qualify for new public domain approval because of the vague misleading information provided by the company. When pressed, the company allows that a large portion of the pipeline capacity will be sent to over seas markets. Clearly this is not in the best interest of the majority public. I am also concerned about the solvency of Kinder Morgan and it pipeline affiliate. I have misgivings that the utility and tax payers of MA will be left holding "the bag".

Our conservation lands are set aside for the protection of wildlife and enjoyment by its citizens. The NED pipeline proposal stands to negatively impact our rivers, forest and wetlands, and negatively impact our property values.

In MA there are over 25000 documented LNG pipeline leaks to our infrastructure, these leaks should be fixed before any consideration is given to new, invasive pipeline routes.

20151223-5144

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Dennis Gauvin under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/23/2015 1:09:18 PM Filed Date: 12/23/2015 1:09:18 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	dgauvin61@comcast.net	

Basis for Intervening:

I am concerned about a number of issues regarding the NED pipeline through NH.

1. I am concerned about the effects of air pollution on human and animal health from the compressor station which will be located 1 mile from my home as well as near many other residents and farms
2. I am concerned about the noise and light pollution from the compressor station and its effects on our small rural community
3. I am concerned with the use of eminent domain for a project that has not demonstrated there is a need above and beyond the existing alternatives which are already in place and would negate the need for this massive new pipeline
4. I am concerned that in light of the recent Paris agreements, efforts should be focused on limiting new infrastructure on old energy sources and increasing efforts toward alternatives
5. I am concerned with the existing leaks which should be repaired, the lack of promoting energy efficiency, the need for increased credits for solar and wind power – all of which should be considered rather than a massive new project
6. I am concerned the cost of the project will be passed on to us as ratepayers

20151223-5157

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Kenneth E Lynch under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/23/2015 2:00:38 PM Filed Date: 12/23/2015 2:00:38 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	ltandk12000@yahoo.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I am concerned that I will hear, smell, feel, see and potentially taste (dug well water quality) the effects of the proposed compressor station.

I am concerned that my and my wife's already serious COPD will be made much worse because of the toxic emissions coming from the Compressor station within approximately 1/2 mile from my home.

I am concerned about the abundance of many other airborne toxins due to 41,000 HP turbines generating noxious exhausts.

I am concerned with the perpetual noise of compressor station, 24/7

I am concerned with extreme noise and the amount of poisonous and "proprietary" pollutants from blow-downs.

I am concerned with the light that will penetrate our dark skies. We will no longer be able to see the stars at night.

I am concerned with subsonic vibrations that can subconsciously affect both our mental and physical health.

I am concerned about any chemicals or toxins released into the ground that will end up in our stratified drift aquifer.

I am concerned that my well water and spring-fed pond will become permanently contaminated.

I am concerned for the entire town of Greenville as the proposed compressor station's locale will destroy

their reservoir.

I am concerned for the hundreds of children that are located less than 1/4 mile from the proposed compressor station ingesting poisons from pollutants emitted into their air and settling in their playgrounds and homes.

I am concerned that the elementary school children are consuming water from the Greenville reservoir which will become seriously contaminated.

I am concerned with traffic, noise, air pollution and numerous disturbances during construction.

I am concerned with the degradation of the property value of our home, being extremely close to a compressor station.

I am concerned with the safety of my animals from the emissions coming from the compressor station.

I am concerned with any natural gas infrastructure incidents that would require evacuation from the neighborhood and potential destruction/damage of property and lives.

I am concerned with the industrialization of the pristine neighborhood we live for.

We live in the shadow of the proposed compressor station. We will feel it's extremely damaging environmental and health effects.

I am concerned that this proposed N.E.D. pipeline will bring other heavy industries to the immediate area, degrading the quality of life to the entire tier of Southern New Hampshire as a whole.

20151223-5170

OFFICE OF THE RENSSELAER COUNTY ATTORNEY
NED PATTISON GOVERNMENT CENTER
1600 SEVENTH AVENUE
TROY, NEW YORK 12180
(518) 270-2950
Fax - (518) 270-2954
Service by facsimile is not authorized

Kathleen M. Jimino, County Executive

Stephen A. Pechenik, County Attorney

Kelly A. Cramer, Deputy County Attorney

Justin A. Law, Assistant County Attorney

Bryan J. Goldberger, Special Counsel

Peter R. Kehoe, Special Counsel

BEFORE THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Company, LLC

Docket No. CP16-21-000

Northeast Energy Direct

MOTION TO INTERVENE OF THE COUNTY OF RENSSELAER, NEW YORK

The County of Rensselaer, New York is a municipality incorporated under the laws of New York. Twenty-three and 25/100 (23,25) +/- miles of the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline will cross properties located within the municipal limits of the County of Rensselaer, New York that includes many parcels of real property that receive potable water supplies from artesian wells, spring boxes and drilled wells. In addition, the applicant, Tennessee Gas Company, LLC, proposes to place a compressor station within the boundaries of our County, thereby significantly impacting the serene environment of the community through pollution that includes noise, lighting, traffic, and the release of gasses and chemicals into the surrounding atmosphere during normal operations and especially "blow downs". The construction of the pipeline and compressor station will also negatively impact County highways.

Pursuant to Commission Rules 385.214(b) and 157.10, the County of Rensselaer, New York moves to intervene in the above captioned proceeding. This intervention is timely filed.

I. CONTACT INFORMATION

Please enter the County of Rensselaer, New York below on the official service list for Docket No. CP16-21-000. All pleadings, filings and correspondence in this proceeding should be served on the following:

County of Rensselaer, New York
Attn.: Stephen A. Pechenik, County Attorney
Ned Pattison County Government Center
1600 Seventh Avenue
Troy, New York 12180
Fax: (518) 270-2950
E-mail: spechenik@rensco.com

II. MOTION TO INTERVENE

The County of Rensselaer, New York and its residents are directly impacted by the proposed pipeline. As aforesaid, the pipeline will cross approximately 23.25 miles of real property within the County, impacting 467 residential homeowners, 12 farms, 10 community service providers, 12 business owners, 1 industrial site, 10 public service providers 2 recreational owners and two parks/land conservation organizations. There are several major aquifers from which potable water supplies are obtained that the proposed route will transverse. The pipeline will result in a devaluation of residential property and will limit the businesses ability to expand, thus diminishing the tax base of our County. Further, as stated above, and as more thoroughly discussed in the scoping comments submitted by Rensselaer County on October 15,2015 (accession no. 201510155123; docket no. PFI4-22-000) which comments are incorporated herein by reference, many other issues need to be addressed by the applicant before this project should be authorized by FERC. Further, the Berkshire Regional Planning Commission has also been acting on behalf of the County of Rensselaer, New York and the various municipalities and districts in Rensselaer County, New York and Berkshire County, Massachusetts through which the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline is proposed to or could pass through or impact, to protect their common public interests.

The Berkshire Regional Planning Commission filed scoping comments with FERC on October 15,2015 (accession no. 201510155279; docket no. PF14-22-000), which comments are incorporated herein by reference and made part hereof. The Berkshire Regional Planning Commission continues to coordinate the dissemination of information to the County of Rensselaer, New York and the various towns in New York and Massachusetts. This motion should be regarded as also made in support of the intervention motion made by the Berkshire Regional Planning Commission.

The County of Rensselaer, New York opposes the proposed pipeline. If constructed, the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline will have adverse environmental and economic impacts, not to mention the intrusion on individual landowners' property.

Intervention is necessary to enable the County of Rensselaer, New York to protect its citizens and residents, natural resources, roadways, and to defend its taxpaying residents and businesses and their property from encroachment by Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline. The County of Rensselaer, New York seeks to intervene to monitor this proceeding and address potential effects to land, wetlands, riverfront and waterfront, rare and endangered species, transportation, and homes in close proximity to the proposed pipeline.

If the County of Rensselaer, New York is not permitted to intervene as a party to this proceeding, its interests will not be adequately represented by other parties and it may be adversely affected and bound by actions, determinations and decisions in this proceeding without opportunity to participate and be heard. The County's participation as a party in this proceeding is in the public interest.

WHEREFORE, for the foregoing reasons, the County of Rensselaer, New York requests that the Commission GRANT this motion to intervene.

Dated: December 23,2015.

Respectfully submitted,

II. INTEREST OF PETITIONER

Construction, operation and maintenance of the Pipeline would directly and adversely impact us. Our home is located on the Lynnfield Lateral and is identified as Lot MA LL 82.00 and is shown on Map filed 11- 20- 15 Named Segment N, Lynnfield Lateral Sheet TE-SEG _ N -006 and on Construction Drawing LA -SEG _ RES-O 13

Our concerns about the pipeline are as follows:

The proximity to the pipeline to our home - According to the map submitted to FERC, the proposed pipeline runs through the center of my back yard. The construction will occur within 45 feet of our home within an area that I use nearly every day. I take pride in my yard and enjoy entertaining and playing sports in the backyard, which also includes sitting around a fire pit with friends and family. Our family would never enjoy any of that anymore knowing that such an enormous gas line was underfoot. The quality of life, safety and security of our family would be directly impacted and irreversibly altered. Our peace of mind, and use and enjoyment of the home we are so proud of will be diminished in a way that money cannot compensate us for. In addition, the mere thought of having a gas line run through my yard causes me great anxiety now, and it's not even there. I can't imagine going to bed every night for the rest of my life without thinking about the existence of a gas pipeline in the back yard. (See Attachment 1)

The information about the adverse impact on health and safety is abundant and is out in the public domain. It is easy to find and impossible to ignore. We bought our home in the neighborhood we chose because it was safely away from such health risks and other dangers.

Clear cutting - My backyard and the abutting land are pristine forested wetlands buffering a major stream and two Certified rare species habitats. Not only is Kinder Morgan requesting to clear cut a permanent 50 foot wide easement area around the pipeline, the newest maps show temporary work areas and additional temporary work areas, extending out to 175 feet. All of that clear cutting is on my property. This will result in the removal of hundreds of mature shade trees which never grow back to their current state. (See Attachment 1)

The depreciation of my property value - we have lived in this house since it was built over 22 years ago. We, like the other homeowners here, purchased houses on our street because we own the land behind our houses as well, which typically means it cannot be built upon. With the way that developers build on every available bit of land nowadays, it's comforting to know that we own a forested section of land in the back of our property that cannot be built upon. That is a very desirable feature to our house and property, important to both to us and our neighbors. We have never thought about moving from the only house that our family has even known. However, having a pipeline on the property would certainly scare us away. The existence of a pipeline running through the backyard would almost certainly make this property unsaleable anywhere close to market rate.

The existence of a pipeline as proposed completely changes the living environment, of going from having a nice wooded lot with a stream running through it to a clear cut industrial gash through the entire neighborhood. This is an unrepairable blight for all of eternity, and a show stopper for many a real estate buyer.

Damage to existing wetlands, water table and French Drain system - Having lived in this neighborhood since it was built, I am keenly aware of the delicacy of the water table. In the past, heavy rain and rapid snow melt have resulted in the small perennial stream (on our and our next door neighbor's property) that the pipeline would run through, rising as much as six feet in height and 50 feet across, and overflowing Pinnacle Street. In observance of this fact, when our houses on Dunvegan Road were built, a French drain system was put into place by the builders which runs under our foundations as well as into low areas on the properties to keep our basements dry. This pipeline is proposed to run exactly where the French Drain system runs. There is no argument that a disruption by the pipeline will cause permanent disruption to the water table and associated streams in this area. It would create serious flooding issues in the short term as well as long term future of surrounding homes and properties.

Our overall objection to the process is as follows- We have written once before and stated objection and

concern about the pipeline, during the pre-filing period. Since that time, we have followed the evolution. We can't help but get the feeling that our original thoughts that Kinder Morgan was acting disingenuously, are more substantiated each day. Our concerns go back to last year, when my neighbors and I started receiving correspondence by mail and phone to allow surveying of our property for a pipeline. At that time, not even the Town Manager or Selectmen had been contacted. I was shocked when I saw the proposed pipeline route through backyards and farms and wetlands, near schools, etc. This sent the message that there was little thought given to the initial maps. If Kinder Morgan is such a leader of building pipelines, as they claim, I would have thought that they would know how not to go about it.

Now that Kinder Morgan has officially applied for approval, the same maps have been submitted with their application. The map of the pipeline through our yards is extremely detailed but surveys have not been conducted. My neighbors and I have not allowed surveys to take place because our questions and concerns have not been addressed at open houses or by written correspondence.

As the months have passed, my original perception of the situation has only become clearer. Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co. are simply going through the motions of appearing concerned and hope that FERC will rubber stamp their proposal based on all their purported "research."

The need for gas - We agree with many others including the Massachusetts Attorney General's office, who claims that there is not suitable need for addition gas in the region to support this enormous project.

In addition, a recent article in the Boston Globe reported that there were 20,000 known gas leaks in Boston alone which have cost ratepayers over \$1 Billion.

<http://www.bostonglobe.com/metro/2015/08/20/new-law-casts-light-state-natural-gasleaks/qJJPCjRZITc5aiOJeHNOqO/story.html>

It seems rather obvious to me that repairing these leaks would be a win-win for all and should take priority over new construction.

We feel that Kinder Morgan's platform that the pipeline is needed only applies to their needs, and of Tennessee Gas' to generate income by building and leasing out lines for use by others. They use the fact that they have commitments from gas distributors to buy the gas to substantiate their claim, but when challenged in regards to how the distributors plan to use the gas, they state that they are not involved at that level.

We have also followed the correspondence posted under the docket number. The objection to this pipeline is overwhelming from Cities, Towns, elected officials, conservation groups and regular people like the folks in my neighborhood who have nothing to gain and everything to lose if the pipeline is approved.

Like many others, we feel that this is nothing but a capitalistic attempt to steal property from regular people in the disguise of working for the "greater good"

Alternate locations - In conclusion, from the untrained eyes of homeowners to the wellresearched objectors, the question of rerouting along existing easements continues to be asked. If one were to walk through the neighborhood, they would see that there are already Kinder Morgan pipelines not too far from the proposed gas line. They appear to run in the same general direction but these are run along the power line easement. Why isn't this and other existing easements and routes being considered as an option? FERC has also now asked for a response to similar questions and has provided alternate locations as well. I am hopeful that Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Gas Pipeline provide FERC with logical answers to their initial line of questions. Homeowners and abutters did not come away from the open houses with much assurance that routes were going to be open for discussion.

III. CONCLUSION

Wherefore, Thomas Kinchla and Gail M. (Cyr) Kinchla, respectfully request that the Commission grant our Motion to Intervene as a party with full rights to participate in all further proceedings.

Respectfully submitted this 23rd day of December, 2015.

Thomas Kinchla

26 Dunvegan Road
Tewksbury, MA 01876
978-640-9144
t-g.kinchla@comcast.net

{ map omitted }

20151223-5187

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Kathleen S Gauvin under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/23/2015 2:50:20 PM Filed Date: 12/23/2015 2:50:20 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	kgauvin61@comcast.net	

Basis for Intervening:

I have numerous concerns about the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline project:

I live in the town of New Ipswich where the pipeline and the compressor station will be built. I live just about a mile from the compressor station.

I am concerned about the toxic emissions that will be in the air we breathe.

I am concerned about the potential contamination of our aquifers.

I am concerned about the contamination private wells as we do not have a public water system.

I am concerned about the pollution of our soil.

I am concerned that the light and noise pollution will ruin the rural nature of our community.

I am concerned that this pipeline project is ravaging through rural communities and ruining their natural beauty.

I am concerned that in light of Kinder Morgan's financial standing that this pipeline project will be built at lightning speed for a quick completion date. I am concerned about the lack of quality in construction.

I am concerned that eminent domain will be used to take public and private lands.

Most of all, I am concerned that there has not been a proven NEED for this project.

20151224-5001

Leslie J Carey, Averill Park, NY.

A fast-growing web of interstate pipelines to service the fracked-shale-gas industry is creeping across the nation, capturing communities in its destructive grip. At the center of the web is the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC), an agency that is imbued with extraordinary power to impact lives and approve environmental damage that will span generations.

Once FERC approves a fracked-gas pipeline, it anoints the pipeline company with the power of eminent domain, allowing the pipeline industry to take control of private property, public parks, preserved forests, and preserved lands. Once approved by FERC, pipelines are also exempted from state and local laws for protecting communities' health, safety, and environment that apply to every other industry, which means the impact of their damaging footprint is far greater than many expect. The construction and operation of pipelines inflict significant harms on the communities they cut through, including reducing crop yields on farms, polluting air and water, bringing down forests, undermining local business, and forcing families to live next to the constant threat of pipeline accidents and explosions.

FERC's extraordinary level of power over the lives of the public and our environment requires unbiased and

careful reviews of pipeline projects to ensure they are actually serving a public need. The builders' responsibilities should include avoiding unnecessary harm, dealing fairly with impacted communities and property owners, and fully complying with laws that do apply.

So far, this hasn't been the case.

According to Delaware Riverkeeper Network research, FERC has only ever denied one proposed natural-gas pipeline (one that was not submitted by energy companies). There's not a single other federal agency that has an approval rate this close to 100 percent. Also, meetings where pipelines are approved allow for no public comment.

In addition, our research shows that FERC has never issued a civil penalty for violations related to construction activity for any pipeline project. And yet, we know for a fact from reviewing agency records and our own monitoring that violations during construction border on the routine.

All of these pipelines are for a fracked-gas energy source that experts on all sides of the issue say will first begin to decline around 2020 and be in serious decline by the year 2040.

It's time that the public asks for an independent examination of FERC to identify necessary reforms. We need senators who serve on the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources to request such a review from the Government Accountability Office (GAO)—senators such as Bernie Sanders (D-Vt.) and Elizabeth Warren (D-Mass.).

There's no defense for harming lives and the environment for purely private industrial interests.

20151224-5002

Leslie J Carey, Averill Park, NY.

During the first week of November, hundreds of people from around the country flocked to a little-known federal agency on First Street in Washington, DC. Each with their own story of tainted water and air, health problems, fear for their lives and communities, and concern for the climate, they followed a path to the source of their troubles: the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC).

Maggie Henry, a farmer from Ohio, pointed the finger at FERC for approving a natural gas pipeline on the farm her family has worked for 100 years. "I'm here all week, because [FERC is] rubberstamping these permits without taking anything into account," said Henry. "There is a 40" transmission line that is 30 feet outside my front door. In March, we had a 4.0 earthquake. I was two miles from that epicenter. My drywall is cracked, the integrity of my basement wall is gone. It leaks like a sieve in the rain."

Among its responsibilities, FERC reviews applications for interstate natural gas pipelines, liquefied natural gas (LNG) terminals and other gas infrastructure. If natural gas is leaking into Maggie Henry's basement (and all gas pipelines leak), she's right to be afraid—it could explode. Accidents involving gas pipelines are not rare. According to federal agency PHMSA, there have been 552 incidents so far in 2014, resulting in 15 fatalities and 90 injuries. And there are lots more pipelines on the way.

More Infrastructure, More Fracking

In only the last two months, FERC approved two LNG export terminals—Cove Point LNG on the Chesapeake Bay and Corpus Christi LNG on the Gulf Coast; the Constitution Pipeline, 124 miles of new pipeline in Pennsylvania, Delaware and New York; and a storage facility for liquefied petroleum gas in a salt cavern on Seneca Lake in upstate New York. Even on the last day of protests, as activists blocked the driveway to FERC's parking garage with arms locked together and encased in PVC pipe, FERC announced that a proposed LNG export terminal on the Oregon coast would have few environmental impacts, paving the way for its final permit.

All of these major projects, even with mitigation, are problematic for health, safety and environmental reasons. The Cove Point terminal, for example, is located in the middle of a highly populated area, where the risks of highly volatile LNG are compounded by squeezing a power plant and liquefaction train into a small site. The geological instability of the salt caverns at Seneca Lake threatens the water supply of 100,000

people. The Constitution Pipeline cuts through forests, farmlands, and wetlands. And all of this new and improved infrastructure makes it possible to transport more gas obtained by fracking.

Questionable Need

“I’m angry at FERC because I’ve seen Cove Point. I have friends who live in Seneca Lake,” said protestor Sean Glenn. “These are real people dealing with these pipelines, export terminals they’re approving and they’re not thinking of the people in the communities. Cove Point is not even for American jobs or Energy Communities. None of it makes sense. It’s endangering communities and lives.”

Many people question whether these gas infrastructure projects are even necessary. “FERC just fast-tracked the pre-filing for the Tennessee Gas Pipeline that’s slated to go to Massachusetts, a project that’s not needed and would put 2.2 billion cubic feet of gas per day through the state,” said protestor Dineen O’Rourke.

In Whose Interest?

FERC concludes that the projects it approves are necessary, but the question is, necessary for whom?

The Natural Gas Act confers authority on FERC to determine whether a project is “required by the present or future public convenience or necessity.” Along with its broad discretionary powers, FERC must also be “a guardian of the public interest,” as one court interpreted its role. If you define “public interest”—in a common sense way—as the health and well-being of citizens and their environment, and “public convenience and necessity” as projects which citizens require to serve their own energy needs (taking into consideration the drastic consequences of burning fossil fuels), then indeed, FERC’s actions make no sense.

It makes much more sense, however, when you understand how FERC defines “public necessity” and “public interest.” A company proposing a project demonstrates need if it has signed agreements for the gas it will process, store or transport. Cove Point LNG is in the public interest from the perspective of the Department of Energy and FERC because its operator, Dominion Resources, has signed contracts with Indian and Japanese gas companies. Because the gas is contracted, the facility is in Americans’ interest, even though the export terminal will serve Asian markets, not domestic ones. (Jobs and benefits to the U.S. economy are also considered. The Department of Energy, however, determined that exporting natural gas could cause domestic prices to double by 2040.)

Line Up the Customers

If a company has customers for its project, it has essentially proven need.

In reviewing the application of a compressor station in Myersville, Maryland, FERC determined that it was necessary because, according to a sworn statement from a Dominion Transmission official, it has contracts with two local market providers. Dominion did not even produce the actual contracts, yet determination of need was based on the agreements.

Some of Myersville’s residents challenged FERC’s decision, but in May, a US District Court ruled against them. Their lawyer, Carolyn Elefant, sees a larger problem. “I think one of the biggest concerns is that the court’s decision, if taken to a logical extreme, says that, just because an applicant says that there’s a need for a facility, they can build anything anywhere, and there’s no check on that,” she said after oral arguments in the appeal of Myersville’s case.

Deceptive Practices

Ultimately, contracts aren’t binding. In a couple of years, Dominion could cancel the contracts for the Myersville compressor in favor of more lucrative offers. Myersville residents claim that Dominion Transmission has been deceptive about the purpose of the compressor station. Once Cove Point LNG is up and running, they say, the compressor will be used to help transport gas there.

“It’s going to be unusual for gas to reach Cove Point, but it makes no difference if some of the gas ends up at Cove Point, because 100% of the capacity of the compressor station is committed now,” Dominion Transmission’s counsel argued to the US Court of Appeals. On the contrary, it makes quite a bit of difference to Dominion whether gas goes through Cove Point and on to Asian markets, where it will garner many

times the profit that it would in the US. And it matters to Myersville, because it means that Dominion lied about the purpose of the compressor, which may emit as much as 23.5 tons of nitrous oxide per year into the air they breathe.

FERC colludes with companies like Dominion to craft proposals in a way that will best help them avoid hard scrutiny. The agency is often called a “rubberstamp,” but it might be better seen as a partner of or collaborator with the industry it is supposed to regulate.

Mission: Promote Natural Gas

“FERC is not doing the job they were designed to do, which is regulate the fossil fuel industry and keep it from its worst excesses,” said protestor Ellen Garfield from Baltimore. “They’re not even trying to keep it from any excesses. They should do their damn job.”

FERC ought to be curbing industry excess and safeguarding the public. Still, it is largely doing the job it was created to do. According to its Strategic Plan 2014-2018, the agency’s primary objective is to “foster economic and environmental benefits for the nation through approval of natural gas and hydropower projects.” The underlying assumption is that extracting natural gas will lead to economic and environmental benefits, when the reality is that extracting, transporting and burning natural gas is destructive to human health, the environment and climate.

In an age when we should be transitioning away from production of natural gas, not ramping it up, FERC facilitates the gas industry’s mad quest. Protestors called on FERC “to make decisions based on the well-being of current and future generations and the protection of our shared natural resources.” But FERC will need a complete overhaul before it can say, “The public’s interest is better served by natural gas staying in the ground.”

Fed Up

“A lot of people have been working through the system and submitted comments, letting [FERC] know that families need clean air and clean water,” said protestor Laura Cubisch. “These are more important than money. It really boils down to one thing only, and that’s greed.”

Earlier this month, dozens were arrested blockading FERC in Washington, DC. There were coordinated actions at Seneca Lake and Cove Point to block construction which also resulted in several arrests. People adversely affected by fracking and gas infrastructure projects have called out FERC for masquerading as guardian of the public interest. They will no longer play by FERC’s rules or tolerate greed disguised as public need.

20151224-5010

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Carole R Groman under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/23/2015 5:55:27 PM Filed Date: 12/24/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____

Individual carole.r.groman@gmail.com

Basis for Intervening:

I live in Ashfield, MA, and want to intervene in this proceeding to oppose the NED pipeline. I have an interest which may be directly affected by the outcome of the proceeding because:

I am an electric ratepayer who, if KM secures my electric utility as a project customer, expects to see an increase on my bill relating to NED.

I am a member of an impacted community concerns about various impacts to local economy/environment/aesthetics/health.

20151224-5054

Karen Sullivan, New Ipswich, NH.

I have the wood frog (Rana Sylvatica) on my property that is within 1/2 mile of the proposed compressor station. This frog is protected in some areas of the US. Its numbers are said to be in decline here in New Hampshire due to habitat loss. The wood frog is vernal pool dependent. With the construction of the pipeline and the placement of the compressor station over our aqua-filter we are going to bring about the demise of the wood frog.

This is totally UNACCEPTABLE to me.

I am also worried about bringing on the demise of my self and my family members.

FERC, please just say NO to the Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company/NED project/Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project).

It is not necessary, it is not needed, it is not wanted.

Thank you

20151228-0014

Hand written card, V. Hastings, 30 North Lane, Northfield, MA 01360: FERC needs to require complete baselines on air, water, sound before anything begins.

20151228-0016

Kimberly Bose, Secretary
FERC
888 First Street, N.E.
Washington, DC 20426

STOP THE NED PIPELINE!!

Protect NH land from Eminent Domain!

I oppose the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct (NED) EXPORT pipeline. The pipelines, and compressor station will scar the NH landscape and put our water, wildlife, forests, agricultural lands and rural character at risk. These include health and safety risks from emissions, industrialization, pollution and the devastating effects of fire and explosions. Greed, not need is fueling this project. Say NO to this private company that will TAKE OUR LANDS with NO BENEFIT TO US.

David Claypool
13 David Drive
Pelham, NH 03076

20151228-0017

Hand written card, H. Hastings, 30 Nort Lane, Northfield, MA 01860: opposing.

20151228-0019

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

In the Matter of)
Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.)
Northeast Energy Direct Project)

Docket No. CP16-21-000

MOTION TO INTERVENE

Pursuant to Rules 212 and 214 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's ("FERC") Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 385.212 and 385.214, the Green Farm Village Cluster Association of New Ipswich, New Hampshire hereby submits this timely motion to intervene and file comments in the above-captioned proceeding.

I. COMMUNICATIONS AND CORRESPONDENCE

The following individual(s) should be included on the service list for this docket, and all communications should be sent to

Carolyn Cormier, President
101 Green Farm Road
New Ipswich, NH 0307
603-801-0607
carolynncormier@gmail.com

II. IDENTITY AND INTERESTS OF PETITIONER

1. The above matter concerns an application for the construction of a natural gas transmission pipeline and other facilities ("Project"). Several portions of the pipeline will be located within the Green Farm Village Cluster Association and within the right of way of public streets in the association and on common land owned by the Association.
2. The Association and its residents will be directly affected by the construction and operation of the pipeline. The pipeline is proposed to be installed within common land owned by the Green Farm Village Cluster Association (New Ipswich tax lot 10-6). Green Farm Village Cluster Association has concerns as to construction-related impacts on the safety and convenience of residents, and as to the impacts of the completed pipeline on resident health and safety.
3. The impacts of construction and operation of the project on the Association and its residents may include, but are not necessarily limited to, public safety hazards, traffic and transportation disruptions (with related interruptions of public services), noise generation, air pollution, disruption of wetlands and aquatic ecosystems, and adverse effects on the Association's scenic, and cultural resources.
4. The Project specifically contemplates building a compressor station within one half mile of the Green Farm Village Cluster Association which would negatively affect the quality of life for all nearby residents. In addition to producing toxic emissions and atmospheric pollution, we are concerned about the well documented noise impacts and disruption to the rural tranquility our residents enjoy.
5. Green Farm Village Cluster Association would like to ensure that the aforementioned local concerns are adequately addressed in the environmental review of the Project.

Accordingly, Green Farm Village Cluster Association has a substantial interest in these proceedings.

III. CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, the Green Farm Village Cluster Association respectfully requests that it be permitted to intervene in this proceeding with full rights to participate in all further proceedings.

Respectfully submitted,

Carolyn Cormier
President
Green Farm Village Cluster Association
101 Green Farm Road
New Ipswich, NH 03071
(603) 801-0607
carolynncormier@gmail.com

Dated: December 18, 2015

20151228-0022

P.O. Box 908
Northfield, MA 01360
November 29, 2015

James L Messenger
GORDON & REES
745 Atlantic Avenue, 4th Floor
Boston, MA 02111

Via Certified Main, Return Receipt Requested

REGARDING: Northeast Energy Direct Project, Docket No. CP16-21
DENIAL OF PROPERTY ACCESS, FOURTH NOTICE

Mr. Messenger, et al,

As the owner of the properties located at 955 Northfield Road in Warwick and Old Warwick Road in Northfield in Franklin County, Massachusetts, **I am again hereby denying permission** to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company LLC (a Delaware limited liability company and a Kinder Morgan company), its agents, assigns, affiliates, employees, contractors, sub-contractors, and/or associates to enter any of my lands 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.**

Sincerely,

Mary Neville Wall
EXODUS ACRES

CC: Northfield Selectboard
Warwick Selectboard
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
MA Attorney General
MA Department of Public Utilities
Local, State and Federal Representatives

20151228-0023

Norman Boisse
42 Alexander Circle
Methuen, MA 01844
Email: nebois@verizon.net

12/14/15

Attention: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Reference: Docket1 CP16-21-000

Dear Administrative Staff:

As a resident of Methuen, closely neighboring Dracut, Massachusetts, I have yet been shown evidence of the need for a new 36 inch gas pipeline with its accompanying 23,000 HP compressor station proposed to be built by Kinder Morgan — Tennessee Gas Corporation pumping what we are told will push 2.2 billion cubic feet of natural gas per day through the Town of Dracut.

Even though I live in Methuen adjacent to Dracut, I am quite concerned that the regularly scheduled blow offs that would occur would place caustic health issues from the dangerous chemicals that would be released. These contaminants get released in the air as well as will find there way to the ground in the sur-

rounding areas, thereby contaminating the soil as well. There are many small farms in the area that the local people depend on buying the local produce as it has been felt to be healthier as most of it is organically grown.

Such a compressor station should not be close to any residential or farming areas for health and safety reasons. It is felt the Kinder Morgan is merely trying to look solely at the financial aspects for themselves without any concerns whatsoever for the environmental aspects as well as the health and safety of the areas where they would be building compressor/metering stations. Their selfish motives certainly over the long term to create a pipeline structure that would end up shipping natural gas to the East Coast to be shipped to other countries. Yes, some would be used here in Massachusetts; however there are alternative means of obtaining green energy such as importing hydro power from Quebec, and domestic solar and wind projects. On occasion in other parts of the country gas line and station explosions have occurred and these high pressure pipelines can be disastrous if a calamity occurs. Health issues of individuals living in close proximity of these stations have certainly been known to occur, however with much effort by the pipeline conglomerates to suppress such information.

You are requested to use your abilities to prevent this pipeline from being run through any residential areas in Massachusetts, and especially not allowing compressor/metering stations to be constructed within 5 miles of residential areas.

Looking forward for your support in this matter,

Sincerely,

Norman Boisse

20151228-0024

PO Box 908
Northfield MA 01360
December 20, 2015

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

RE: Docket 1 CP 16-21-000
Northeast Energy Direct Project
Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LLC

Dear Secretary Bose,

As a United States citizen, resident of Warwick, Massachusetts and a homesteading land-owner of affected property in Warwick and Northfield, I write to you to express my serious concerns with the "Northeast Energy Direct" pipeline project proposed by Kinder Morgan and its subsidiary, Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LLC. Based on FERC's mandate to identify need in order to grant a "certificate of public convenience and necessity", I urge FERC to deny a license to Kinder Morgan. This pipeline will neither be "convenient" nor is it a "necessity" for the people living in Massachusetts, New Hampshire and New York where the line is proposed to run. It is also clear that this pipeline is not needed for the region as a whole and that simple alternatives will satisfy peak demand scenarios which occur a few days a year, such as utilizing existing liquefied natural gas infrastructure, upgrading existing leaking (and corroding) pipelines, installation and greater dependency on renewables, and promotion of efficiency standards in homes and businesses. Rather than installing a new, over-sized, dangerous, obtrusive and unwanted pipeline through an area that is valued for its ecological, aesthetic and rural virtues, I also urge you to listen to the people, encourage the adjustment of regional pricing and supply policies which created inflated natural gas pricing last year, and also adjust your own policies, if needed, in the face of today's energy innovations, alternatives and the impact methane-pro-

ducing pipelines have on global warming, which has undeniably been accelerated through human consumption of fossil fuels, including natural gas.

FERC's Statement of Policy IDocket no. PL399-3-000) states that issuance of a Certificate "should be designed to foster competitive markets, protect captive customers and avoid unnecessary environmental and community impacts while serving increasing demand for natural gas". I urge FERC to deny a license to Kinder Morgan for its Northeast Energy Direct pipeline. If the Commission claims any question of need or impact at this time, perhaps it is time for FERC's policies to be reviewed and updated through a public and transparent process, before any future Certificates are issued.

Thank you for your review and consideration,

Mary Neville Wall

Cc: State, Federal, and Local Representatives

20151228-0027

December 16, 2015

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

Docket Number: CP16-21-000

Dear Secretary Bose,

My name is Jean Theberge. I am a life-long resident of Methuen Massachusetts and administrator of Methuen Pipeline Awareness. I am writing today to express my concerns with the proposed alternate Dracut compressor station locations at or near Brox quarry in Dracut, Ma. an active quarry. These proposed alternate compressor station locations will negatively affect the residents of and west Methuen and east Dracut.

The proposed 30" Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Pipeline terminates in Dracut Ma. with a massive, automated, unmanned 23,000+ horsepower compressor station facility that compresses the natural gas into higher pressures to move the gas through the system. Compressor stations pose significant environmental impacts from venting "blowdowns." Blowdowns can occur many times a year. Blowdowns are loud reaching high decibel levels and can last for hours releasing large quantities of methane and a host of other chemicals and toxins into the atmosphere. The 24/7 humming sound of regular compressor station operation can be heard by residents as far as a mile away.

The proposed alternative compressor station site is an extremely short distance from neighborhoods in Methuen and Dracut. The Regency is an over 55, 300+ home development on Wheeler street in Methuen in very close proximity to this alternative site as are Methuen residents on route 110 and Dracut residents on Wheeler Street and Rinzee Avenue. The Campbell Elementary School in Dracut and the Methuen National Guard Armory are within a half mile radius.

The surrounding environment is highly impacted by compressor station emissions released into the atmosphere. Conservation land, habitats and wetlands will be impacted. The proposed alternative site is extremely close to the Merrimack River, upstream from the drinking water intake for Methuen and surrounding communities. According to the 2012 Massachusetts BioMap of Methuen, this area of west Methuen/and east Dracut is labeled a Core Habitat described as areas "necessary to promote the long-term persistence of rare species," and the Merrimack River is labeled a Critical Natural landscape a "large natural landscape blocks that are minimally impacted by development." American bald eagles are frequently viewed and bald eagle nest(s) are visible and have been photographed.

The pipeline project presents numerous, disturbing concerns. No definitive proof exists to support the assertion that the northeast is facing or will face a natural gas shortage or that a significant increase in natural gas supply brought about by a new pipeline will result in lower prices. Peak demand shortages can be

met through other alternative. The recently released study by Massachusetts attorney general Maura Healy questions need for the project. Options exist that better serve the needs of the northeast; fixing existing infrastructure, upgrading existing lines to accommodate increased capacity, repairing leaks and examining appropriately sized pipeline projects.

We the people do not need a pipeline that greatly exceeds the energy needs of the region as the pipeline company postures for export overseas. This project does not fit FERC's definition of serving "public convenience and necessity." Export for profit of a private corporation does not suit public purpose.

I respectfully request FERC review the significant local impacts that this pipeline and compressor stations could have on the safety of Methuen residents, private and public property and the environment. Please help keep our Community safe- PLEASE DO NOT APPROVE THIS PROJECT!

Regards,

Jean Theberge
Methuen Pipeline Awareness
5 Armory Street
Methuen, MA 01844

20151228-0046

Typed FERC Comment form:

Federal Energy Regulation Commission
888 St. N.E. Room 14
Washington DC 2046

To Whom It May Concern

RE: Phyllis M Jaques as a Intervenor at the FERC Hearing

I am informing you of the official letter I submitted to The Town of Northfield Select Board on July 21, 2015. I would like to state in the year 2014 that I was misled and I did not give my permission to have my 4.6 acres of land surveyed on 355 South Mountain Rd., Northfield MA 01360. I was approached by a young man whom stated he was surveying for the Northfield town. It was many months later I found out differently when it became public knowledge regarding the installation of the Tennessee Gas Pipeline on Four Mile Brick Rd. approximately 1200 ft. from home; my artesian water well, my garden and the clean air that I breathe.

During the summer of 2014 I helped obtained the 200 signatures needed for "Stop The Pipeline" and this was before I knew of the location of the pipeline and how severely it would affect my health; my sleep; my well water; my vegetable garden and clean air that I breathe.

On July 21, 2015 I wrote a letter to The Town Of Northfield Select Board how I was misled to believe that TGP/KM assessor was an assessor from the Town of Northfield. The Northfield Select Board notified KM/TGP and forwarded my complaint of denying them entrance or surveying my land.

I am a 80 yr. young widow living on a low social security income and struggling with a life altering illness. Now financially self serving TGP will cause me to lose my home insurance.

I won't be able to pay the astronomical insurance increase or worse the cancellation of my policy because of the vagueness as to whom would be responsible for the liability of the pipeline and compression station. At present there is no policy large enough to cover these costs; it will put me at a great financial disadvantage if I try to sell my much loved 35 yr old home as the buyer might not be able to get a loan from the bank for what they will consider the depreciation is. What buyer would live in a town that would in time attract terrorists and with our understaffed, underpaid police force be held accountable for the town's safety?.

How would our small under staff and ill equipped volunteer fire department safely handle explosions, forest fires, gas leaks, Methane and other dangerous chemical releases? By the way there are no water hydrants

on South Mountain Rd, or Four Mile Brook Road or any of our mountain roads, another safety hazard?. Who pays for the upkeep of repairing our roads from the heavy destructive truck loads during the two year installation and after? In five years when their pipeline rusts and leaks dangerous chemicals and fumes and our gracious historic town has serious life threatening health diseases and be in financial ruin will TGP/KM ignores its responsibility of repairs as they have done to so many US states that have been struggling with huge legal expenses trying to get GTP/KM to repair their rusty and explosives leaks. By its past record It' apparent GTP/KM feels it's easier to build new pipelines than easily repair old ones. STOP THE PIPELINE

The pipeline is for the one percent KM/TGP financial profit only with no consideration for humans or wild-life, or Global Warming. Solar Energy will create jobs, cleaner air and lower ocean temperatures.

I have in the past and I am currently again refusing Tennessee Gas Company, LLC (a Kinder Morgan Company), it's representatives, contractors, sub-contractors, or associates to enter my land to perform surveys, or for any other purpose. Any physical unauthorized person or action will be treated as trespassing.

Phyllis M. Jaques
355 S. Mountain Rd
Northfield, MA 01360

December 14,2015

20151228-0050

Town of Troy

16 Central Square - PO Box 249 - Troy, New Hampshire 03465

December 17, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr., Deputy Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Energy Direct Project (Docket CP16-21)

Dear Secretary Bose,

We, the members of the Town of Troy Planning Board, would like to express our views on the proposed Northeast Energy Direct (NED) project. The proposed facilities in the Town of Troy consist of approximately 1.59 miles of pipeline, according to records submitted on November 20, 2015. Further, we do not see that the proposed project provides benefits to the Town. As a Town, we have expressed our opinions on the matter at our 2015 annual meeting by voting on and accepting the following warrant articles:

- Warrant Article 33: To see if the town will vote to oppose installation of a natural gas pipeline by Kinder Morgan because the proposal is inconsistent with individual property rights, because if approved, KM would have the power to force private property owners to give up easement under Eminent Domain proceedings for installation of the pipeline.
- Warrant Article 34: To see if the town will vote to oppose installation of a natural gas pipeline by Kinder Morgan because the proposal is inconsistent with protecting the Town's groundwater, residential wells, other bodies of water, local vegetation, wildlife and threatened species.
- Warrant Article 35: To see if the town will vote to oppose installation of a natural gas pipeline by Kinder Morgan because the proposal is inconsistent with preserving the Town's rural character, scenic roads, roadside trees, stone walls, forests, woodlands, wetlands, and open-space areas for recreational purposes.
- Warrant Article 36: To see if the town will vote to oppose installation of a natural gas pipeline by Kinder Morgan because the proposal would adversely affect health and safety by causing construction materials, soil, dust, and potential contaminants to enter the air, wetland areas, and/or groundwater, aquifers, drinking water, along with residential wells and any run-off or seasonal melts.

- Warrant Article 37: To see if the town will vote to oppose installation of a natural gas pipeline by Kinder Morgan because the Town lacks the required equipment or personnel for emergency services to adequately address potential health and safety risks of a pipeline explosion, leak or other installation.
- Warrant Article 38: To see if the town will vote to oppose installation of a natural gas pipeline by Kinder Morgan because the proposal is inconsistent with the Town’s goal of keeping the Troy Mills Landfill Superfund site environmentally secure regarding surface water, monitoring wells, wetlands, air and soil.

As an authority on both development and the preservation of natural resource, it is the opinion of the Planning Board that these concerns are just and represent the sentiment of the Town as a whole. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment.

Sincerely,

Mr. Francis Fournier, Chair
Town of Troy Planning Board

Cc: US Congresswoman Ann McLane Kuster
US Senator Kelly Ayotte
US Senator Jeanne Shaheen
Governor Maggie Hassan
County Commissioner Stillman Rogers

20151228-5014

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Miriam Kurland under CP16-21-000. I am submitting this intervention to ask FERC to stop the proposed Kinder Morgan pipeline expansions project in Massachusetts.

Submission Date: 12/25/2015 12:07:09 PM Filed Date: 12/28/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	mimbck@yahoo.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I am deeply concerned about the huge investment into fossil fuels by the expansion of the so called ‘natural gas’ pipeline which will be transporting fracked gas from Pennsylvania throughout the Northeast, including beautiful and precious lands in Western Massachusetts, much of which will be exported. My children and grandchildren live in Western Massachusetts and are making every effort possible to reduce their use of fossil fuels, increase efficiency and conservation and invest in clean energy. They and I do not want our utility payments to support the toxic and environmentally hazardous expansion of fossil fuels. My husband and I recently retired and are planning to move to Western Massachusetts in order to be in closer proximity to our children and grandchildren. We will not purchase a property that is within five to ten miles of the proposed pipeline and this is greatly influencing our choices of properties, as we are looking to purchase a home between where our children’s families reside. Massachusetts communities and small businesses have been taking huge steps to reduce the dependence on fossil fuels, developing small and local businesses that are employing an eager and ever expanding labor pool of young people to who are enthusiastically developing an economy and social network to better the world and all life on it. This expansion is already trying to take away their dreams and their hard working efforts,as they see the large corporate interests taking over the government that they know should be responsive to the people instead of big money. This fossil fuel expansion project is corrupting our government and destructive to the lives of all of us and our future generations. Please take the bold steps necessary and stand up for what’s right.... listen to the wisdom of the people and stop this horrific project.

Lisa Derby Oden
6 Upper Pratt Pond Road
New Ipswich, NH 03071

I am a landowner in New Ipswich, NH. Since 1993 I invested everything I have into building my home and developing a horse property in this community for many reasons, including accessibility to dark night skies and to assure that I can have horses, dogs, cats and any other animals of my choosing in a clean environment, away from industrial development. It has been my intent to live the remainder of my life in this community.

Construction of the NED pipeline would mean that I would now be situated within 4 to 5 miles downwind of the proposed 41,000 horsepower compressor station in New Ipswich. This would place my property within the drift zone particulate matter and other toxic pollutants. The effects of living downwind of the compressor would include risks to my health, as well as the health of my animals and community from breathing pollutants and particulate matter.

I am further concerned with:

- subsonic vibrations that can subconsciously affect health for people and animals.
- any chemicals or toxins released into the ground that will end up in our stratified drift aquifer.
- traffic, noise, air pollution and numerous disturbances during construction.
- natural gas infrastructure incidents that would require evacuation from the neighborhood and potential destruction/damage of property and lives.
- industrialization of the neighborhood. The only things that are comfortable living next to 41,000 HP compressor stations is other heavy industry.

Our region would feel the economic impacts of:

- reduced property values and the effect this would have on local tax bases, beyond any compensation offered by the pipeline company
- regional health consequences of pollutants associated with the operation of the pipeline
- tariffs proposed to force regional ratepayers to cover the costs of the pipeline
- area economy that relies on the rural character of the region for tourist income, as well as food products grown locally and purchased locally because the buyer knows where the food is coming from and that it is safe to eat
- possible increases in energy costs that could result from export natural gas, forcing local markets to compete on a global scale
- financial position where I would receive no compensation from the pipeline company, yet find my property more difficult to sell if I found living conditions here untenable after the pipeline is built. I, like many in the region, do not have the financial ability to abandon my property or sell at a greatly reduced rate to move elsewhere away from industrial development again. Construction and operation of the NED pipeline would greatly impact my quality of life, and economic wellbeing, and leave me in a position where it would be difficult to re-establish myself somewhere else.

For these reasons, I am interested in and would be affected by Applicant's filing. My interests cannot be adequately represented and protected by any other party. Hence, the Commission should grant me permission to intervene in proceedings for Northeast Energy Direct.

Sincerely,

Lisa Derby Oden

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

In the Matter of)
Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.)
Northeast Energy Direct Project)

Docket No. CP16-21-000

MOTION TO INTERVENE

Pursuant to Rules 212 and 214 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission’s (“FERC”) Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. §§ 385.212 and 385.214, the Town of New Ipswich, New Hampshire (“Town”) hereby submits this timely motion to intervene and file comments in the above-captioned proceeding.

I. COMMUNICATIONS AND CORRESPONDENCE

The following individual(s) should be included on the service list for this docket, and all communications should be sent to:

Board of Selectmen
661 Turnpike Road
New Ipswich, NH 03071
603/878-2772
administrator@townofnewipswich.org

II. IDENTITY AND INTERESTS OF PETITIONER

1. The above matter concerns an application for the construction of a natural gas transmission pipeline and other facilities (“Project”). Several miles of the pipeline and a large compressor station will be located within the Town and within the right of way of public streets and on other property owned by the Town.
2. The Town and its residents will be directly affected by the construction and operation of the pipeline within the municipality. The pipeline is proposed to be installed within public streets that pass through commercial and residential areas. New Ipswich has concerns as to construction-related impacts on the safety and convenience of residents and business, and as to the impacts of the completed pipeline on public health and safety.
3. The impacts of construction and operation of the Project on the Town and its residents may include, but are not necessarily limited to, public safety hazards, traffic and transportation disruptions (with related interruptions of public services), noise generation, air pollution, disruption of wetlands and aquatic ecosystems, and adverse effects on the Town’s scenic, historic, and cultural resources.
4. The Project specifically contemplates building a compressor station within the Town which would affect the quality of life for all nearby residents. In addition to producing toxic emissions and atmospheric pollution, the Town is concerned with the compressor station noise and light impacts, emergency response requirements, and disruption to the rural tranquility our residents enjoy.
5. New Ipswich would like to ensure that the aforementioned local concerns are adequately addressed in the environmental review of the Project. Accordingly, New Ipswich has a substantial interest in these proceedings.

III. CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, the Town of New Ipswich respectfully requests that it be permitted to intervene in this proceeding with full rights to participate in all further proceedings.

Respectfully submitted,

BOARD OF SELECTMEN
George H. Lawrence, Chairman

Rebecca M. Doyle
David S. Lage
December 28, 2015

20151228-5048

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Marilyn Learner under CP16-21-000.
Submission Date: 12/28/2015 9:42:58 AM Filed Date: 12/28/2015 9:42:58 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	Mzlearner@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I live in Hollis NH, and want to intervene in this proceeding to oppose the NED pipeline. I have interests which may be directly affected by the outcome of the proceeding.

As proposed, the pipeline route enters my town and sites a new utility corridor next to one already within its borders. If the project route shifts or its infrastructure changes, there may be other privately or publicly owned parcels in my town which could be impacted.

I am a NH resident who may be charged with paying for the pipeline with a tariff charge added to my electric rates.

The aquifer which provides my well water could be degraded by construction and operation of the pipeline. The quality of air that I breathe could be degraded by toxic emissions from planned and unplanned compressor station blow downs and/or valve and/or metering station leaks.

The soils on nearby farms and my garden which grow produce I eat could be compromised by toxic emissions from planned and unplanned compressor station blown downs and/or valve and/or metering station leaks.

The financial ramifications of known and unanticipated consequences of the construction and operation of this pipeline and related appurtenances could increase my local and state tax obligations.

I am opposed to the construction of new infrastructure which promotes further dependence on fossil fuels. I, like all other citizens, will experience the consequences of climate warming which could be accelerated by the methane this project will release into the atmosphere. I believe this pipeline is NOT in the public interest, and I oppose it.

Sent from my iPhone

20151228-5056

BEFORE THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC)	Docket No. CP16-21-000
Northeast Energy Direct Project)	

**MOTION TO INTERVENE AND PROTEST OF THE
PIPE LINE AWARENESS NETWORK FOR THE NORTHEAST, INC.**

The Pipe Line Awareness Network for the Northeast, Inc. (“PLAN”) hereby (1) moves to intervene pursuant to Rule 214 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (“Commission”) Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 385.214, and 18 C.F.R. § 157.10 of the Natural Gas Act regulations, and (2) protests the proposed project as well as the Commission’s acceptance of an incomplete application.

The name and address of the person upon whom all communications concerning this proceeding should be served are as follows:

Kathryn R. Eiseman, President
Pipe Line Awareness Network for the Northeast, Inc.
17 Packard Road
Cummington, MA 01026
(413) 320-0747
eiseman@plan-ne.org

The Proposed Project

On November 20, 2015, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (“TGP” or the “Company”) filed with the Commission an Application (the “Application”) pursuant to sections 7(b) and 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act and the Commission’s regulations thereunder, seeking authority to (i) construct, install, modify, and operate certain pipeline and compression facilities to be located in Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Connecticut, and (ii) to abandon certain facilities, as part of the Northeast Energy Direct Project (“NED” or the “Project”). **This Project is proposed to add over 400 miles of pipeline in five states; nine new compressor stations with over 360,000 horsepower (hp) in four states; 1.3 billion cubic feet per day (Bcf/d) of firm capacity, though it appears that market participants have subscribed for substantially less than half of the capacity; all at a cost now estimated at \$5.2 billion to be charged to TGP’s shippers, and ultimately, their ratepayers (to the extent capacity is contracted for by regulated utilities).**

The two proposed components of the NED project are as follows: (1) the Supply Path component, comprised of facilities from Troy, Pennsylvania, to Wright, New York (the “Supply Path”), and (2) the Market Path component, which is comprised of facilities from Wright, New York, to Dracut, Massachusetts (the “Market Path”).

As of the date of the filing of the Application, the board of directors of TGP’s parent, Kinder Morgan, Inc., had not authorized capital for or otherwise approved the Supply Path.¹ Proposed Supply Path facilities include: (i) approximately 174 miles of pipeline facilities in Pennsylvania and New York of which approximately 41 miles would be looped, (ii) three new compressor stations totaling 153,500 horsepower (hp), (iii) modifications to one existing compressor station, (iv) two new meter stations, and (v) various appurtenant facilities.

Proposed Market Path facilities include: (i) approximately 188 miles of mainline pipeline facilities in New York, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire, (ii) approximately 58 miles of lateral and pipeline looping, including a total of five delivery laterals in Massachusetts and New Hampshire, and one pipeline loop in Connecticut, (iii) six new compressor stations totaling 207,600 hp, (iv) construction of 13 new meter stations, (v) modification of 14 existing meter stations, and (vi) various appurtenant facilities.

Improper Acceptance of the Application and Deadline for Intervention

On December 7, 2015, the Commission accepted TGP’s application and set a January 6th, 2016 deadline for motions to intervene. However, the following day, the Commission issued an information request, noting, among other things, that the Company “did not fully provide adequate data for alternative comparisons” in its Application,² as required by the Minimum Filing Requirements (“Minimum Filing Requirements”) under 18 C.F.R. 380, Appendix A and 18 C.F.R. 380.12(l)(2)(ii). This, and other violations of the Minimum Filing Requirements previously noted on this docket, should have barred the Commission from accepting the Application. As such, this proceeding should properly be terminated, and the intervention deadline should be voided. To the extent that this proceeding remains ongoing, PLAN hereby moves to intervene, as further set forth below.

The Movant

PLAN is a broad-based coalition of organizations, municipalities, businesses, citizen groups, legislators, ratepayers and concerned citizens working to prevent the overbuild of natural gas infrastructure in the Northeast. PLAN seeks to prevent the negative economic and environmental impacts associated with overbuild, and to promote lower-impact energy solutions. PLAN is incorporated as a non-profit under Massachusetts law. As an organization, PLAN has an interest in upholding and advancing state laws, policies and goals pertaining to energy decisions and land conservation, many of which may be directly affected by the outcome of this proceeding. As a diverse coalition, PLAN and its members have other specific interests implicated by this proceeding, including those detailed below.

Consumer interests: PLAN's members include commercial and residential ratepayers of the four Massachusetts and New Hampshire local distribution companies ("LDCs") that have received preliminary state approval of that precedent agreements that would make these LDCs shippers on the NED Market Path. (These state regulatory approvals are the subject of ongoing judicial appeals by PLAN and others.) PLAN's members also include ratepayers of electrical distribution companies that TGP seeks as additional project shippers. Tariff adjustments for the regulated shippers would ultimately be reflected in the utility bills of PLAN members. Thus, PLAN and its members, as ratepayers, have a consumer interest in this Project.

In addition, ratepayers and potential ratepayers of the Berkshire Gas Company ("Berkshire") have been subjected to a moratorium on any new or expanded gas service in this LDC's eastern division (served by TGP's Northampton lateral), which Berkshire claims (on its customers' bills) will be in place until the NED pipeline "is permitted and built". Bay State Gas Company (d/b/a Columbia Gas of Massachusetts) has also imposed a moratorium with respect to additional service off of the Northampton lateral. On information and belief, Berkshire is foregoing opportunities to resolve the moratorium with more expeditious supply options and system modifications, thus holding its customers and potential customers hostage to the investment interests of its parent company, UIL Holdings Corporation, which has an ownership interest in the NED project.

Landowner interests: PLAN's members include municipalities, businesses, land trusts, and individual landowners in Massachusetts, New Hampshire and New York whose property would be directly impacted by the Project. PLAN's members also include landowners whose property would be impacted by alternate routes set forth in Resource Report 10. In addition to direct and immediate property impacts to PLAN members from construction and operations, many PLAN members own land adjacent to the proposed route and are concerned about potential and foreseeable health, safety and environmental impacts related to the siting of the pipeline, compressor stations, and other appurtenant Project facilities.

Conservation interests: In addition to land trusts and private and public owners of conservation land, PLAN's members include donors to land trusts and supporters of land conservation throughout the region. PLAN, and its members, are concerned about the direct impacts to conservation land along the NED route, as well as the threat posed by the project to future conservation efforts. As stated in a scoping comment filed by the Massachusetts Energy Facilities Siting Board relating to publicly-owned conservation land, "The disposition of Article 97 lands for pipeline easements, or other commercial or industrial uses, could certainly send a detrimental message to donors and benefactors of future conservation lands." PLAN is also concerned about the violation of the public trust posed by the siting of this infrastructure in public or private land intended to be protected in perpetuity.

Drinking water supplies: PLAN and its members have an interest in protecting the public and private drinking water supplies of the region. Among many foreseeable impacts, many of these water supplies could be impacted by blasting, horizontal drilling, and the simple installation of the pipeline. As set forth in scoping comments submitted by PLAN to the Commission via Massachusetts Senate President Stanley Rosenberg (and not adequately responded to in the Company's "Responses to Scoping Comments"), PLAN is concerned that, particularly given the hydrogeology of this region, a new pipeline corridor could act as a conduit for groundwater contamination between aquifers, river basins, and other water sources that would

normally be isolated from one another.

Other Socioeconomic and Environmental Interests: PLAN and its members, as the residents, businesses, communities, and organizations that would be directly impacted by this project, have numerous other environmental and socioeconomic concerns, many of which have been set forth in PLAN's scoping comments relating to socioeconomic impacts, noise and air quality, and precedent agreements entered into based on unrealistic demand forecasts of the LDCs and inadequate alternative analyses at the state level.

Preventing Overbuild

Fundamentally, PLAN opposes the NED project as an extreme overbuild of gas infrastructure. Less than half of the capacity on the Market Path is subscribed – indeed, after more than two years of intense efforts by TGP, the Company has added an inconsequential amount of subscribed capacity to the approximately .5 bcf/day in “firm commitments” they had secured by July of 2013.³ The capacity that has been contracted for is being challenged in court as excessive and imprudent.

To fulfill the organization's mission, PLAN seeks both a programmatic environmental impact statement (“EIS”) of all proposed natural gas expansion projects throughout the Northeast and a consolidated review for non-environmental issues. A programmatic EIS would allow for the adequate consideration of the cumulative impacts of these projects, pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act, and eliminate concerns about improper segmentation. See *Del. Riverkeeper Network v. FERC*, 753 F.3d 1304, 1319 (D.C. Cir. 2014) (finding FERC's environmental assessment deficient in failing to include “any meaningful analysis of cumulative impacts”, and reaffirming that such an analysis must identify cumulative impacts of proposed and reasonably foreseeable actions that are expected to have impacts in the same area or be triggered by the proposed action).⁴

A comprehensive review of the proposals in the region to address non-environmental issues would allow the Commission to evaluate the impact of each project and multiple projects to the pipeline systems in the region and to minimize potential redundancies, excess capacity and stranded costs that could ultimately put ratepayers at risk. Also, in the event that offshore Canadian production is curtailed or halted due to a glut of Marcellus gas flooding the region, the result will be a reduction in supply diversity. Moreover, the anticipated export of Marcellus gas overseas is widely predicted to drive up domestic prices for gas, ultimately increasing energy costs for residential, commercial, and industrial ratepayers,⁵ including PLAN members.

For the reasons set forth above, PLAN has “an interest which may be directly affected by the outcome of the proceeding” pursuant to 18 C.F.R. § 214(b)(2)(ii) and its “participation is in the public interest” pursuant to 18 C.F.R. § 214(b)(2)(iii). PLAN is in a unique position to represent its interests and the interrelated interests of its members and their constituents.

Request for Formal Hearing

Pursuant to 18 C.F.R. § 157.10(a)(1), PLAN respectfully requests a formal hearing on the Application, including the environmental impacts of and public need for the Project.

WHEREFORE, for the foregoing reasons, PLAN respectfully requests that its motion to intervene and further relief sought herein be granted, and that it be granted the right to participate in all hearings in this proceeding.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathryn R. Eiseman, President

17 Packard Road

Cummington, MA 01026

eiseman@plan-ne.org

(413) 320-0747

December 28, 2015

footnotes

- 1 See Kinder Morgan, Inc. press release dated November 20, 2015 (http://www.kindermorgan.com/content/docs/NED_FERC_Cert.pdf).
- 2 The Company persists in presenting (and rejecting) alternatives designed for NED's full proposed 1.3 Bcf/d capacity. Yet as of the Application filing, only about .55 Bcf/d had been contracted for on the Market Path. Alternatives along the existing 200 line, together with modifications to existing laterals, could be designed incrementally to accommodate the actual subscribed capacity on the Market Path, reducing impacts that would be associated with a 200 line alternative. PLAN reiterates its request for an analysis of alternatives that focus on targeted expansion along the 200 line, particularly take-up and relay. This approach would de-bottleneck any constraints in the system that may be needed to fulfill approved capacity contracts, while preventing the overbuild embodied in the current NED proposal.
- 3 See "Plans to expand natural gas pipeline in New England bring opportunities," Maureen D. Smith, New Hampshire Business Review, July 12, 2013 (<http://www.nhbr.com/July-12-2013/Natural-gas-pipeline-plans-bring-opportunities/>).
- 4 The NED application states: "The proposed interconnection with the Joint Facilities, together with the anticipated reversal of the primary flow direction of the Joint Facilities and Maritimes & Northeast Pipeline, will potentially enable the Project to access more markets in the region, including those in New Hampshire and Maine, the Atlantic Canada region, as well as markets on Algonquin Gas Transmission's ('AGT') pipeline system through its HubLine Pipeline." NED Application, Resource Report 1, at 1-13 to 1-14.
- 5 See generally, "Why Manufacturers Oppose Unfettered LNG Exports", Paul N. Cicio, President, Industrial Energy Consumers of America, Pipeline & Gas Journal, August 2014, Vol. 241, No. 8 (<http://pipelineandgasjournal.com/why-manufacturers-oppose-unfettered-lng-exports>).

20151228-5081

Karen Miller
161 Ashburnham Road
New Ipswich, NH 03071

I am a landowner in New Ipswich, NH. Since 1995 I invested everything I have into purchasing my farm and developing a horse property in this community for many reasons, including accessibility to dark night skies and to assure that I can have horses, dogs, cats and any other animals of my choosing in a clean environment, away from industrial development. I have practiced organic gardening to produce food for myself and family, as well as for grazing our animals. It has been my intent to live the remainder of my life in this community.

Construction of the NED pipeline would mean that I would now be situated within 4 to 5 miles downwind of the proposed 41,000 horsepower compressor station in New Ipswich. This would place my property within the drift zone particulate matter and other toxic pollutants. The effects of living downwind of the compressor would include risks to my health, as well as the health of my animals and community from breathing pollutants and particulate matter, and potentially cause cancer.

I am further concerned with:

- subsonic vibrations that can subconsciously affect the emotional well-being of people and animals.
- any chemicals, toxins and carcinogens released into the ground that will end up in our stratified drift aquifer.
- traffic, noise, air pollution and numerous disturbances during construction.
- natural gas infrastructure incidents that would require evacuation from the neighborhood and potential destruction/damage of property and lives.
- industrialization of the neighborhood. The only things that are comfortable living next to 41,000 HP compressor stations is other heavy industry.

In a region that would feel the economic impacts of:

- reduced property values and the effect this would have on local tax bases, beyond any compensation offered by the pipeline company
- regional health consequences of pollutants associated with the operation of the pipeline

- tariffs proposed to force regional ratepayers to cover the costs of the pipeline
- area economy that relies on the rural character of the region for tourist income as well as food products grown locally
- possible increases in energy costs that could result from export natural gas, forcing local markets to compete on a global scale
- financial position where I would receive no compensation from the pipeline company, yet find my property more difficult to sell if I found living conditions here untenable after the pipeline is built. I, like many in the region, do not have the financial ability to abandon my property or sell at a greatly reduced rate to move elsewhere away from industrial development again. Construction and operation of the NED pipeline would greatly impact my quality of life, and economic wellbeing, and leave me in a position where it would be difficult to re-establish myself somewhere else.

For these reasons, I am interested in and would be affected by Applicant's filing. My interests cannot be adequately represented and protected by any other party. Hence, the Commission should grant me permission to intervene in proceedings for Northeast Energy Direct.

Sincerely,

Karen Miller

20151228-5088

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Julia Steed Mawson under CP16-21-000.
 Submission Date: 12/28/2015 11:19:42 AM Filed Date: 12/28/2015 11:19:42 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party	Signer (Representative)	Other Contact (Principal)
Individual	islandwork999@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

Motion to Intervene of Julia Steed Mawson

Julia Steed Mawson is a resident in the town of Pelham NH, in the county of Hillsborough County, New Hampshire. The proposed Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company Northeast Energy Direct (NED) project, if approved would run across my property located off Birch Lane (Mawson Living Trust). Further, the pipeline would be less than 1,000 feet from Little Island Pond where I reside and approximately 1.5 miles from the proposed compressor station in Dracut MA.

My property off Birch Lane would be directly impacted by the proposed pipeline. My land lies within the proposed right of way for the NED pipeline, thus exposing the property to condemnation if the certificate is granted. The pipeline would traverse the property of Birch Lane, causing loss of more than 40% of the forested land and would cause irreparable damage to the soils, trees and bedrock on the property. Further, my actual residence at 17 South Shore Drive located on Little Island Pond would be impacted since the pipeline construction could impact the water quality of the lake. Additionally, there would be ongoing safety and health hazards after the project is completed.

I oppose this pipeline proposal.

20151228-5089

Jim Markham
 Plainfield, MA
 emandjim3@verizon.net
 December 28, 2015

To Whom It May Concern:

I am a landowner in the town of Plainfield, adjacent to the proposed NED pipeline route and downwind from the proposed Windsor compressor station. I am also a utility rate payer in the state of Massachusetts. I am opposed to the building of this pipeline and am filing a motion to intervene in the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline, docket #CP16-21-000.

The primary reason for my objection to this pipeline is the detrimental effect greenhouse gasses from fossil fuel burning are having on the global climate. For the wellbeing of all living things, humans need to rapidly phase out fossil fuel use in favor of renewable energy sources combined with improved conservation and efficiency. We must not invest massive new infrastructure dollars on fossil fuel technologies, especially natural gas technologies which cannot be shown to be less damaging to the atmosphere than coal.

My other objections to this pipeline are more personal, but no less strong. As a landowner adjacent to this industrial facility, my property value will inevitably decline. As a ratepayer, it is likely my rates will go up as New England begins to compete with export prices in Europe, and ratepayers are saddled with the bill for the project. The health and wellbeing of my family are at risk from toxic emissions into the air, soil and water. Our small organic farm which we have nurtured for over a decade is threatened by routine toxic emissions from the proposed compressor station, and possible pipeline leaks. The quality of our well water is at risk from the blasting inherent in trenching, and possible pipeline leakage. The condition and safety of our roads will decline due to the heavy construction traffic. The quality of rural life which has encouraged many to settle here and many more to visit is imperiled by this massive industrial project. This pipeline, if built, will damage the tourist economy on which the region depends, leading to a loss of jobs, not the increase Kinder Morgan assures us we will see. The proposed pipeline route passes through numerous ecologically sensitive and preserved lands which should not be disturbed, especially since Massachusetts attorney general Maura Healy has found that New England DOES NOT NEED the gas this pipeline would provide.

I hope these objections are sufficient for FERC to accept my motion to receive Intervenor status .

Sincerely,

Jim Markham

20151228-5090

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of William F Goode under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/28/2015 11:24:43 AM Filed Date: 12/28/2015 11:24:43 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	dlgoode@comcast.net	

Basis for Intervening:

Dear FERC,

These are our concerns with the Pipeline.

Construction, operation and maintenance of the pipeline would adversely impact our family. This proposed pipeline will directly impact our property. This will not only impact the safety of our family but also our property value. The construction of the pipeline will also have a negative impact, not only on our property, but the property in our neighborhood as well. Cutting down the trees on/near our property will impact the privacy that we currently enjoy.

Kinder Morgan has stated how this pipeline is necessary to reduce energy costs of New England, especially in winter months. The Massachusetts Attorney General recently commissioned a study which has proven that there is no need for this pipeline and that New England has capacity to meet all of our energy needs,

even during peak season until at least 2030.

Kinder Morgan has also stated that the pipeline construction will be aligned with current power line corridors. This is however not the case. The majority of the construction will take place outside of these corridors having a large impact on protected lands and private property such as my own. We don't have a power line running through our property therefore we we should not be directly impacted by its construction, but we are. It is disturbing that private company stating that it is working for the greater good will be able to take over federal lands, destroy private property and property values and put the safety of so many directly at stake.

We urge you to deny Kinder Morgans request and instead invest in clean, renewable energy projects. We have important information and perspectives to bring to this process, consideration of which will serve the public interest.

Therefore, we, William & Donna Goode respectfully request that the Commission give to grant our motion to Intervene as a party with full rights to participate in all further proceedings.

Respectfully submitted: December 28,2015

William & Donna Goode
46 Dunvegan Rd
Tewksbury, MA 01876
dlgoode@comcast.net

20151228-5101

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Judy S Phillips under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/28/2015 12:10:17 PM Filed Date: 12/28/2015 12:10:17 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	judy-dharma@crocker.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I am a resident of Northfield MA and I wish to intervene in this proceeding to oppose the NED pipeline. I have an interest which may be directly affected by the outcome of the proceeding because of the proximity of the pipeline and the compressor station to my home. In many documented cases, the existence of a natural gas pipeline has had adverse effects on air and water quality in the vicinity of the pipeline. In addition, I am an electric ratepayer who, if KM secures my electric utility as a project customer, expects to see an increase on my bill relating to NED. Please accept my application for status as an intervenor in the NED project.

20151228-5113

December 28, 2015

From: Bennett Markens
597 Bellus Road, PO Box 4009 Ashfield, MA 01330
Ashfield tax map 5, lot 66

Re: Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Energy Direct Project, Docket #CP16-21-000.

I am writing in opposition to the proposed pipeline.

I am an affected landowner and KM/TGP intends to route its pipe on my land. I respectfully request to be granted status as an intervenor.

I have attached three documents.

The map was supplied to me by KM/TGP and looks to be a google-type map showing the trees and color clearly. My 11.5 acres can be identified as follows starting on the left. My land ends just to the left of the bottom red line. At the top, my land ends at the dotted blue line - the Bear River. To the right, at the white line, which is Beldingville Road, and at the bottom just below the part you can see is Bellus Road.

The blue line was supplied to me by KM/TGP as their plan for the pipe. I drew the red lines (with my finger on an ipad = which explains why they are jagged) to approximate the 75 feet on either side that I have been told is required for the temporary easement during construction.

You can see my home just below the redline and to the left of the 87.4 marker. As you can clearly see, this pipe comes about 100 feet from my home. As I'm sure you know, the incineration zone is 1500 feet.

My well is about halfway between the house and the 87.4 marker.

Just look at how much of the woodlands they want to destroy. I guess close to 70% of all our mature trees. At an informational meeting (disinformational really) with a KM employee, he said the trees would grow back. I said, "Seriously? Not in my lifetime." He just smiled at me.

The second document is from a Massachusetts certified arborist describing my land and its unique features. While I 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 land-owners, 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 denied.

As an affected landowner, I oppose this project and respectfully request intervener status on project.

Sincerely Bennett Markens Ashfield, MA

{ map omitted }

Certified Arborist
Certified Horticulturist
Jim Mc.Sweeney, M.C.A. M.C.H.

Hilltown Tree & Garden LLC

As a certified arborist, horticulturist and faculty member of the New England Wildflower Society I have had the opportunity to work on many interesting and special pieces of property in the Hilltowns of MA. But few, in my almost 2 decades of landscape management of hundreds of property, compare to the property of Ben & Jen Markens of Ashfield.

The following is a list of a few of the notable features that makes this property truly unique.

- 1) Heirloom apple tree orchard. Some of the trees probably date back to the 19th century & are still productive thanks to the care they have received.
- 2) The property is part of the watershed for the Bear River. Management of its trees and soil have been a constant focus of the Markens.
- 3) Native plant diversity. To name a few that are found on the property: jack-in-the-pulpit, trillium, asters, joe pye, black cohosh, dogwood, black walnut, etc ... This diversity is likely due to the rich soil on the property, an aberration in the Hilltowns.
- 4) Historic stonewalls.
- 5) An ongoing invasive species management program to keep and improve the lands biodiversity.

None of the above characteristics, on there own, make this property exceptionally unique as many property in this area have stonewalls or are in a watershed. But taken cumulatively they make for a truly unique piece of property.

Jim McSweeney M.C.A, M.C.H.
President
Hilltown Tree & Garden LLC
Cell (413) 559-1905
www.HilltownTreeandGarden.com
<https://www.facebook.com/HilltownTreeAndGarden>
<http://hilltowntreeandgarden.bjogspot.com/>
P.O. Box 248, Chesterfield, MA 01012 . 413.559.1905

20151228-5121

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Virginia M Notter under CP16-21-000.

I do not know what this means and have been unable to get an answer?

Submission Date: 12/28/2015 12:53:24 PM Filed Date: 12/28/2015 12:53:24 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	vnotter@juno.com	

Basis for Intervening:

Should the NED project be approved then a huge compressor shall be installed in New Ipswich, NH; a rural town with some 5,000 plus residents. As a result of the pollution from the compressor station the air quality shall likely be reduced. I am concerned that this will negatively affect my health.

My risk of heart attack and stroke is elevated. The reduction in air quality will likely further increase my chance of heart attack and stroke. My quality of life and longevity will likely be adversely affected as a result of the pollution from the compressor station.

I am concerned that the installation of and pollution from this project may affect my 110' deep well.

I am concerned that there will be too much loss of habitat for the local raptors and other wildlife.

I am concerned with traffic, noise, air pollution and numerous disturbances during construction.

I am concerned with any natural gas infrastructure incidents that would require evacuation from the neighborhood and potential destruction/damage of property and my life.

I am concerned with the property value of my house being close to the pipeline.

I am concerned that the huge compressor station that is proposed to be built in New Ipswich, NH may become a terrorist target in either a physical or cyberspace capacity.

20151228-5126

BEFORE THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC)	Docket No. CP16-21-000
Northeast Energy Direct Project)	

**MOTION TO INTERVENE OF
WILLIAM L. HARPER
and
MARYANN B. HARPER**

We hereby move, pursuant to 18 C.F.R. § 38S.214(b), to intervene in the above-captioned proceeding. We seek to intervene in opposition to the Northeast Energy Direct Project (theProject” or the “NED Project”) proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (theCompany”], a subsidiary of Kinder Morgan, Inc. (“Kinder Morgan”).

Communications concerning this proceeding should be served upon us as follows:

William L. & Maryann B. Harper
154 Sunridge Road
Rindge, NH 03461
(603) 899.6027
maryannharper3@gmail.com

Our interests “which may be directly affected by the outcome of the proceeding” pursuant to 18 C.F.R. § 214(b) (2) (ii) include the following:

We own five separate parcels of land located on Sunridge Road in Rindge, NH. The route as shown in the March and July 2015 filings indicated that one of our parcels would be crossed by a permanent easement for the NED project and three others would be impacted by the temporary construction corridor.

The November 2015 filing indicated the route had been slightly shifted to the other side of the National Grid Easement but still within 400+ feet of four our parcels, one of which is developed with a residence that includes a private well and septic system.

Another of the parcels is the location of the structural remains of the historic Thomas & Towne Mill which has been documented and cared for and which includes massive stone walls and foundation remains that should remain intact and not be disturbed. Little Meadow Brook (a year-round stream) enters and traverses this parcel and the mill foundation from a large high value wetlands. Should this project be approved these wetlands, which encompasses a substantial area under both the Eversource and National Grid easements would be negatively impacted.

The November 2015 filing indicates that the private road that all of our parcels are located on is designated as a “construction access road.” This road is private and limited to residents and guests. All maintenance costs are borne by the residents whose property has frontage on the road and our share is 5/18 of those costs. This road was not built to withstand heavy industrial construction traffic and would be severely damaged. Its narrow cartway would present a safety hazard to the residents if utilized by heavy industrial traffic as an access road during the six months construction phase estimated by the Company.

Our concerns encompass both the construction phase where our lives and our properties will be severely impacted and the operation phase where our properties will be at risk, less marketable and devalued due to their location within the impact blast radius for this pipeline as calculated from its proposed diameter and pressure as filed by the Company.

Our interests include the impact that the NED Project will have on our lives, lands, residence, and historic structures as well as the road we are obligated to maintain. Our interests also include concerns that the excessive costs, including potential stranded costs, of this project will be passed on to us as electric ratepayers should the Company secure our electric utility as a Project shipper which in turn would seek to recover associated costs from its ratepayers.

We, as well as our neighbors in the Sunridge Community, chose to make a substantial investment here because we value the peace and quiet of country living as well as access to clean air and water over other conveniences and necessities deemed desirable and found in more densely populated areas. Our community is part of a larger parcel of land that has been protected by deeded covenants. Abutting this and located on

the far side of the National Grid easement is another large parcel that is protected by a conservation easement through the Monadnock Conservancy. The

NED project's proposed route will traverse, disrupt and destroy forests, wetlands, habitat and wildlife in its path. These lands have been protected for future generations to enjoy and to preserve a greenway wildlife corridor that is desperately needed for many of the larger mammals that are being forced from their habitats due to the loss of forests and other wild spaces. The construction of the NED Project is in direct opposition to these goals.

We strenuously object to the approval of the NED project for the above reasons and because we believe the determination of "need" is based on flawed information and projections using outdated methodology that does not take into account what constitutes a responsible energy plan for our country and our planet. We believe we have a substantial interest in the outcome of these proceedings and are filing this motion in a timely manner.

WHEREFORE, we respectfully request that our motion to intervene be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

William L. Harper Maryann B. Harper

20151228-5198

BEFORE THE UNITED STATES
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, a subsidiary of Kinder Morgan
Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Project(NED)

Docket No. CP 16-21-000

**MOTION TO INTERVENE OF RONAL R. COLER
IN OPPOSITION TO NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT PIPELINE**

Pursuant to Rule 214 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (Commission) Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. §385.214, I file this Motion to Intervene in the above-captioned proceeding. I oppose the project because of natural resource, infrastructure and economic impacts and seek party status to protest the proposed pipeline, and fully protect my personal interests and those of my grandchildren.

I. STATEMENT OF INTEREST

A. Description of INTERVENOR

I live in Ashfield, Massachusetts approximately one mile north of the proposed pipeline route. I have lived in this town most of my life and in this specific location for the past 20 years. The pipeline would pass through environmentally sensitive areas, residential neighborhoods, and aquifer recharge areas associated with public drinking water. Initiated by a family decision made 20 years ago, my family made a conscious decision to be proactive with respect to the oncoming impact of global warming and live off-the-grid. This decision was made at considerable expense with sacrifice backed by tangible conservation efforts. This proposed pipeline along with its transport of irresponsibly extracted hydro-fracked gas from the Marcellus Shale deposits of Pennsylvania is an affront to all that I believe in.

B. Description of Impacts

I will be impacted and harmed by the proposed project in the following ways:

Water Resource Impacts: My deep drilled well produces water at the marginal recharge rate of less than two gallons per minute. I live on Ridge Hill which is the same geologic formation that the proposed route intends to cross. The entire hill is comprised of ledge outcropping and any attempts to bury a pipeline will certainly include destructive construction methods (blasting and/or hydraulic hammers) that will impact my meager supply. Currently, my neighbor located to the south of me has an obnoxiously high concentration of

sulfur in her water supply while mine is totally free of such and is of high quality. I have also tested for the presence of various radioactive traces and am pleased to know that I have one of the finest quality drinking wells in the area. I must know that this project will not interfere with my basic right to continue to enjoy this same quality of drinking water in an unencumbered fashion. Solving a prospective harmed water supply with bottled water or transported water is completely unacceptable to me.

Carbon and Water Footprint: As you can see by the attached article that was published for the town's 250th anniversary and associated history project, my family measures our personal impact on the Earth's frail ecosystem. We shop locally for the food that we eat. We quantify our carbon and water footprint on a regular basis and have demonstrated a sustained reduction of both by nearly 75% of the average American household. To have the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Project deliver a fossil fuel product that was extracted in such secretly destructive and poisonous manner is a vulgar show of complete disregard for the Earth and its inhabitants. As a member of the human species who chooses to make a difference today in how we treat the Earth, I am utterly and completely offended by FERC's nonchalant and continued approval of fossil fuel exploitation. The proposed NED development will cost rate payers billions of dollars and projects decades of continued extraction, transport, and use of fossil fuel. Like the tar sands of northern Alberta, its development flies in the face of agreements made at the 2015 Paris Climate Conference (COP21.) and this country's efforts to curb its destructive fossil fuel energy portfolio.

Article 97 of the Articles of Amendment to the Massachusetts Constitution: As a taxpayer in the State of Massachusetts, I trust (and demand) that all private and public land (APR or otherwise designated) that falls beneath the protection of said Article, be dealt with in accordance with the protocols established by said Constitution. Any change of use whether temporary or permanent must be voted upon by "Lands and easements taken or acquired for such purposes shall not be used for other purposes or otherwise disposed of except by laws enacted by a two thirds vote, taken by yeas and nays, of each branch of the general court." Per the Massachusetts Constitution, I have a constitutional right to a clean environment and therefore any attempt to thwart such would be considered a breach of public trust.

Liability Concerns: With their poor fiscal status I am concerned about the company's LLC status and its ability to cover potential damages. The Commission must consider this issue and explore solutions which may include requiring the parent company to take responsibility for liability or post substantial bond to ensure its ability to pay for damages.

C. No Need for the Pipeline

The impacts described are problematic generally, but entirely unacceptable given that TGP has failed to demonstrate a need for the pipeline. In the three years TGP has offered open contract seasons to local gas distribution companies, their interest is only .55 bcf/day. Even after downsizing NED from 2.2 bcf/day capacity to 1.3 bcf/day, these contracts cover less than 40 percent of capacity. A recently-released assessment of New England's electrical needs by the Massachusetts Attorney General's office demonstrated that the electric sector does not need NED or other major new gas pipelines: <http://www.mass.gov/ago/doing-business-in-massachusetts/energy-and-utilities/regional-electric-reliability-options-study.html>. I request that FERC adopt this study's findings and recommendations in evaluating the question of domestic need for the NED pipeline.

II. CONTACT INFORMATION

The following should be added to the Official Service List, with all notice and communications in this proceeding addressed to the contacts listed below:

Name: Ron Coler
Address: 168 Bailey Rd., Shelburne Falls, MA 01370
Phone: 413 834 2465 Email: roncoler@hotmail.com

{ 6 page essay "Living off Grid" by Ron Coler, January 12, 2012, omitted, can be downloaded at: }

20151228-5202

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC)
North East Direct Pipeline Project)

Docket No. CP16-21-000

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO INTERVENE

Pursuant to Rules 212 and 214 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's ("Commission") Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 385.212 and 385.214 (2007), I/we, Janice Kurkoski, file this motion to intervene in this proceeding.

On November 20, 2015, the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC ("TGP") filed its application under § 7 of the Natural Gas Act, 15 U.S.C. § 717f, and § 157 of FERC's regulations, 18 C.F.R. § 157.1 et seq., for the proposed North East Direct Project (NED), FERC Docket No. CP 16- 21-000

I. COMMUNICATIONS AND SERVICE

All communications, pleadings, and orders with respect to this proceeding should be sent to the following individual:

Janice Kurkoski
881 Wendell Rd.
Warwick, MA 01378
978-544-3419
janicedauphinais@gmail.com

II. INTEREST OF PETITIONER

My husband and I live in the small town of Warwick MA, through which a portion of the proposed NED pipeline will pass. Construction, operation and maintenance of the Pipeline would adversely impact me.

There is no special zoning in our town – no commercial or industrial enterprises exist, and the land base is roughly 51% State or town forest. Therefore we citizens pay a higher property tax rate than neighboring towns that do have commercial and/or industrial zones. Should our property values drop due to this new pipeline (some folks might revel in this), the town will struggle even further to maintain it's roads, schools, municipal buildings, and meet it's operating expenses.

Our small but dedicated Volunteer Fire Department is ill-equipped to handle an emergency involving natural gas, and the cost to better equip them would mean that other budgets would suffer.

Warwick is also an officially recognized "Right-to-Farm" community, with several small farms in operation as organic growers of animals, fruits and vegetables. One dairy farm has been in business for generations. Our town welcomes new farmers. With a compressor station proposed within about a mile of our western border, I would ask how do farmers and gardeners (myself included) continue to raise organic products and "naturally raised" animals in the windfall of a compressor station, a "pigging" launcher and receiver, and a blow-down valve – all with fully known harmful emissions?

More important to me than my town's budget issues is the environmental effect of our continued commitment to the extraction and burning of fossil fuels, all the while subsidizing the processes on the backs of us ratepayers and taxpayers. When 97% of climate scientists agree that global warming does exist and is in fact due largely to human activities, primarily the burning of fossil fuels, then it affects me at the gut level when a project like this one comes along, committing us all to the continued use of "natural" gas for years to come. If I must focus my objections to only the "building, operation, and maintenance" of the pipeline and

not the contents, then I would still argue that these things do affect me – the carbon footprint of the entire physical project is tremendous: including but not limited to the eradication of forests, farms, and wetlands, the unintentional and intentional leaks of natural gas (primarily methane) and other contaminants during daily operations, and the constant defoliation that will need to occur to keep the pipeline path clear of “nuisance” vegetation – all of this will affect me personally.

We are already failing to meet the goals of the Massachusetts Global Warming Solutions Act of 2008. The NED pipeline will put us further away from reaching those goals.

The pipeline will affect many public lands with conservation restrictions, the procurement of which I have personally contributed to in the past – in particular a parcel in Warwick that is within earshot of the proposed compressor station. Article 97 of the Massachusetts Constitution protects this parcel, along with many other parcels (about 20% of the entire proposed route in Mass.) from unnatural alterations and contaminations.

My work over the last twelve years has been primarily in the energy efficiency and renewable energy fields. The building of this pipeline would negate much of what I have worked for, which is basically a more responsible use of energy. Beyond a doubt, the projections for need for this project have been overstated, there being many more cost effective alternatives to a 5+ billion dollar new fossil fuel infrastructure.

I have a great deal of experience both at home and in my dealings with local and regional Energy Committees, especially as it applies to the building sector. I have a hands-on approach - measurement and verification are the tools I use to gauge the success or failure of the projects I have been involved in. I feel I can contribute to this review process and to an outcome that is clearly in the interest of the public good for generations to come.

III. CONCLUSION

Wherefore, I, Janice Kurkoski, request with all due respect that the Commission grant my Motion to Intervene as a party with full rights to participate in all further proceedings.

Respectfully submitted this 28th day of December, 2015.

Janice Kurkoski
881 Wendell Rd.
Warwick, MA 01378
978-544-3419
janicedauphinais@gmail.com

20151228-5243

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Gina Rosati under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/28/2015 4:24:53 PM Filed Date: 12/28/2015 4:24:53 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	jgj3@msn.com	

Basis for Intervening:

December 28, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr., Deputy Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, N.E.
Washington, DC 20426

RE: Motion to Intervene

Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LCC - Northeast Energy Direct – Docket #CP16-21-000

Dear Ms. Bose and Mr. Davis,

This letter will serve as my intent to file for individual intervenor status in opposition to the Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (KM/TGP) Northeast Energy Direct (NED) transmission gas pipeline (Docket #CP16-21-000).

One of the many routes KM/TGP has proposed to trench the NED pipeline through Merrimack, NH, takes it directly through a thirty foot deep peat bog that sits less than 400 feet behind my home. While the pipeline itself would not be directly on my property, there is a green line identified on the map that travels directly through my property, as well as through both of my neighbors' properties and common land that is owned collectively by our neighborhood, Castleton Ridge.

As a direct abutter, I am concerned about the environment, safety, wildlife, quality of air and town water and property value. I respectfully ask that you grant me individual intervenor status. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Gina Rosati
15 Dunbarton Drive
Merrimack, NH 03054
Jgj3@msn.com

20151228-5266

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

December 28, 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.
Northeast Energy Direct Project; Docket No. CP16-21-000
Response to Environmental Information Request No. 1

Dear Ms. Bose:

On November 20, 2015, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. (“Tennessee”) filed with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission an application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity (“Application”) for the proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project (“Project”) in the above-referenced docket.

On December 8, 2015, the Commission issued Environmental Information Request No. 1 to Tennessee in the above-referenced docket. Included with this filing as Attachment A are Tennessee’s responses to 26 of the 28 comment letters identified in Question 1 of the Commission’s Information Request. These responses are marked to correspond to the letter designation that the Commission assigned to each scoping comment letter in the request.

Tennessee has been unable to locate the scoping comment letters from the Dracut Board of Selectman, dated October 20, 2015 (Request 1.c.) and from the Town of Lynnfield, Board of Health, dated October 22, 2015 (Request 1.l) in the pre-filing docket for the Project (Docket No. PF14-22-000). Tennessee has requested guidance from the Commission staff regarding the location of these two scoping comment letters. Since Tennessee has not been able to locate those two scoping comment letters, responses to the comments in those letters are not included in Attachment A. Tennessee will respond to these two scoping comment letters

upon receiving guidance from the Commission.

Tennessee has not included responses to Questions 2 through 9 from the Commission's Environmental Information Request relating to Resource Report 10, Alternatives. Tennessee will submit responses Questions 2 through 9 no later than December 31, 2015.

In accordance with the Commission's filing requirements, Tennessee is submitting this filing with the Commission's Secretary through the eFiling system. Copies of this filing are being served on all parties on the official service list for the above-referenced docket. Any questions concerning this 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. Michael McGehee (Commission Staff)

Mr. Rich McGuire (Commission Staff)

Mr. Eric Tomasi (Commission Staff)

Mr. Wayne Kicklighter (Cardno)

Official Service List

{ Attachment A: Responses, omitted; 549 pages, 548 KB. original can be downloaded at: }

{ <http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/opennat.asp?fileID=14083266> }

{ Attachment B: Affidavits of Responders, omitted: 19 pages, 4,232 KB; original can be downloaded at: }

{ <http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/opennat.asp?fileID=14083267> }

20151229-5000

Evelyn Taylor, New Ipswich, NH.

I received a letter dated 12/9/2015 from Tennessee Gas on 12/18 saying my property may be subject to an easement for the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Project. I feel this letter is pure harassment, untimely and unprofessional. I want to know why I am getting a letter at this stage of the Project as notice of temporary or permanent easements and eminent domain without Tennessee being able to state whether I am affected or not. The letter indicates if an easement it applies a representative of Tennessee will contact me "in the near future". What does that mean? There is no definition of Tennessee's interpretation of "near future" and will I be notified if I am not affected? How can I possibly respond now to concerns of loss of property at this late time? It is my opinion that if Tennessee does not yet know the construction impacts of this project that their filing to the FERC is deficient whereby they have not demonstrated sufficient professional expertise to proceed. I have been told repeatedly that I was not on the list of impacted properties and thus I was not able to voice concerns or address such impacts during the comment periods. Surely a company claiming to be the largest in the industry with over 84,000 miles of pipeline experience should be able to precisely identify construction needs, particularly given a record of mishaps, violations and general operating routines that have caused numerous injuries and death. One has only to drive the narrow winding roads in New Ipswich surrounding the proposed large compressor site and along the pipeline route to conclude these roads cannot readily sustain or support construction nor allow access for an effective emergency response to a disaster situation such as an explosion and fire. I have submitted comments to the FERC and others stating my concerns of how a disaster like that in San Bruno, CA in 2010 could be managed in New Ipswich or other small towns along this route. The roads cannot accept dozens upon dozens of fire trucks and other emergency response vehicles that were available in San Bruno. The San Bruno event was also fought with air support

which I have read is the only truly effective way to approach an explosion and fire from large high-compression gas pipeline incidents. If Tennessee has no vision of these conditions and remains incapable of identifying whether additional nearby properties such as mine are affected or not, it is my opinion that they are totally incapable of this build and will be putting thousands, if not millions of lives at risk along the entire route through PA, NY, NH and MA. It is also my opinion that this sudden revelation by Tennessee is a deliberately planned effort to deceive and conceal the true total impact and cost of this project upon people, private properties, local and state properties, conservation and protected lands, drinking water supplies and the environment. I find it difficult to believe that a company that claims over 84,000 miles of pipeline and the greatest expertise in the industry failed to recognize the impacts of this construction, thus I form my opinion that this is deliberate concealment as a tactic to gain approval against an impact assessment that may be greatly flawed and underestimated. I call for an immediate moratorium and total shut down of this Project until a thorough investigation is conducted of both Tennessee and the FERC as to why such gaps and oversights exist. I also call for a full external audit of the proposed finances and impacts of the Project as it seems evident to me we do not yet have a proper determination supporting need or benefit. This letter also states that Tennessee will engage in good faith negotiations and will offer fair market value for the easement. I believe good faith and fair market value are impossible to achieve because good faith would have notified me sooner and fair market value of our properties no longer exists by virtue of being in the path of harm from the hazards of pipelines and compressor stations. I believe the timing of the assessment of "fair market value" is also intentionally delayed to save money for Tennessee and Kinder Morgan. These assessments are better made by comparing to properties in similar towns that are totally removed from the impacts of construction and operations as we were before Kinder Morgan and Tennessee funded secretive intrusions into our neighborhoods and onto our private lands long before giving us public notice of their presence and intent to construct this pipeline. This process is another obscene violation of civil and human rights for which the United States should be ashamed. Our forefathers violated the Native American's homelands and held human beings prisoners of slavery and here we are still allowing innocent people to be removed from their homes or held hostage in harm's way as victims of yet another group of bullying profit seekers who believe they can take whatever they want whenever they want it.

20151229-5006

Leslie J Carey, Averill Park, NY.

On Thursday the Texas oil company Kinder Morgan will meet with the National Energy Board to pitch their Trans Mountain tar sands pipeline proposal. Harper's second favorite pipeline company and Harper's tainted energy regulator will try to find a way to build their dangerous, unwanted tar sands pipeline. Piping tar sands 1,150 kilometers from Alberta to Vancouver is a bad idea for public safety and the environment. The NEB members must realize that they are far from ready to independently or thoroughly evaluate the safety this proposed project.

The first question they must ask, just who is Kinder Morgan and what is their record? We can help answer this important question with a quick Kinder Morgan cheatsheet:

Kinder Morgan has a dismal safety record: Kinder Morgan's existing Trans Mountain pipeline has spilled 78 times since it started operating in 1961. That's a spill every 8 months for 54 years. In the United States the company has an even worse record -- including \$10 million fines for criminal negligence resulting in worker death, \$300,000 fines for negligence, at least 45 occupational health and safety violations since 2006, and more than 180 spills, accidents, fires, evacuations, explosions and fatalities since 2003.

Kinder Morgan isn't up for the job: Kinder Morgan says it has a reliable and trustworthy plan for dealing with oil spills in the cold seawater of Burrard Inlet. But every study concludes the same thing: bitumen sinks in water, and cleaning it up would require technology and oversight that doesn't exist yet. The US National Academy of Sciences delivered their review to Congress on December 8, noting that current pipeline proposals and emergency response plans like the one that Kinder Morgan is rushing forward are based on conventional crude, without an adequate understanding of the dangerous and unconventional properties of

diluted tar sands.

Kinder Morgan has NO support from Indigenous nations: In B.C. much of the route the proposed twinned pipeline would cross is on unceded First Nation land. This includes the lands of the Squamish, Tsleil-Watough and Musqueam Nations whose traditional lands and waters encompass the Salish sea and what is now known as Burrard Inlet; along with those of the Sto:lo nation in the Fraser Valley. None of these nations support the Kinder Morgan project.

It's the Climate, Stupid: Last Saturday Canada joined 194 other nations in signing the Paris Agreement on climate change, pledging to try and limit global warming to 1.5 degrees Celsius. That legally-binding agreement will require Canada to make deep cuts to its current CO2 emissions, meaning a lot more tar sands is going to need to stay in the ground. If we're serious about climate change—and we just signed a legal international document saying we are—then Kinder Morgan's expansion simply cannot happen. Wall Street has already gotten the message, just last week Kinder Morgan slashed its shareholder dividend as investors realized the company was grossly overvalued.

The NEB review process for this pipeline is a farce. Already the NEB removed oral hearings, greatly limited the participants, and had to stop and restart the process once it was revealed that a Kinder Morgan contractor had joined the NEB and was going to be approving an economic analysis he wrote himself. Meanwhile, thanks to reduced oversight and lax regulatory authority put in place by the Harper Government, it will be even more difficult to force Kinder Morgan to do what they say they will if the project is approved.

The NEB has made a serious error in judgement allowing Kinder Morgan to continue a rushed and shoddy decision making process that still shows the Harper Government's fingerprints. And Kinder Morgan has proven itself to be a dirty and dangerous kind of oil company. So for the safety of the BC coast, and the cities, towns and tribes along the proposed pipeline route, we will

20151229-5007

Leslie J Carey, Averill Park, NY.

Local residents and an area school district are voicing concerns about air quality from chemicals that could be emitted from a compressor station associated with the proposed Northeast Energy Direct natural gas pipeline.

The town of New Ipswich is slated to be home to a 41,000-horsepower compressor station for the pipeline, which would be the largest compressor station on the East Coast. Compressor stations help transport natural gas and keep it properly pressurized.

The Kinder Morgan company, through its subsidiary Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co. LLC, is proposing the pipeline to run from Pennsylvania to New York, including a section through southern New Hampshire and a number of local towns.

Reports by a Pennsylvania environmental health project and an analysis by a Boston-based pediatrician say that people living near natural gas pipeline infrastructure, including compressor stations, could be at increased risk of health problems.

Groups that have studied the possible health effects compressor stations can have on humans say that public health needs to take more of a priority in the development of natural gas infrastructure. At the same time, they say, more studies need to be done about the potential link between a person's health and exposure to natural gas infrastructure.

The findings of those recent studies, seeking to link air quality to health problems that people living near compressor stations are experiencing, are among the latest tools New Hampshire pipeline opponents are using to make their case about why the project shouldn't go forward.

They are also seeking to share the footage of a recent presentation given by pediatrician Dr. Curtis L. Nordgaard analyzing the health risk of a compressor station in New Ipswich. Nordgaard said preliminary reports suggest compressor stations can negatively affect human health.

Tennessee Gas Pipeline says it's complying with all the federal, state and local regulations and standards on air quality.

ConVal board speaks out

People, especially children, living near natural gas pipeline infrastructure may be at increased risks of cancer, nosebleeds, asthma, throat irritation, severe headaches, heart problems and other conditions, according to a March study by the Southwest Pennsylvania Environmental Health Project and sources cited in the journal *New Solutions*. The Pennsylvania project also concluded that babies are at risk for being born prematurely or with low birth weights, which can negatively affect future health.

The nonprofit environmental health project was established in 2011 to help people living in Washington County, Penn., who believed natural gas drilling activities were linked to declines in their health.

A February report from the environmental health project also questions the emissions levels allowed by state and federal agencies for natural gas facilities, and the effectiveness of the equipment in place to manage those emissions.

"Compressor construction and operational phases are generally projected to produce emissions below (EPA-established standards)," according to the report. "The problem posed by estimating tons of contaminants emitted per year is that over the course of a year emissions will vary, often greatly."

The New Ipswich compressor station is proposed to be about a quarter of a mile from Temple Elementary School.

This proximity caused the ConVal Regional School Board to submit a letter to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission in September, taking a stance against the project. The school district covers Antrim, Bennington, Dublin, Frankestown, Greenfield, Hancock, Peterborough, Sharon and Temple.

The board said emissions from the compressor station could affect the health of students and staff, both inside and outside the school building. Board members also cited a lack of means to evacuate the school in a timely way, and a lack of local police, fire and ambulance resources if there were an emergency at the station.

Tennessee Gas Pipeline officials filed the project's application last month with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, which has the power to approve or reject the pipeline. Company officials have asked the commission to approve the project by the fourth quarter of 2016.

Compliance and complaints

Tennessee Gas Pipeline (TGP) officials said in a statement Friday that before building and operating the New Ipswich compressor station, they'll be required to have an air quality permit from the N.H. Department of Environmental Services. The same is true for building compressor stations in other states, according to the statement.

"During the permitting process, TGP must show that proposed facilities will comply with all applicable federal, state and local air pollution regulations and standards. TGP must also demonstrate to the agency satisfaction that such facilities won't cause an adverse impact to human health or the environment," the statement said.

In addition, company officials must demonstrate the proposed compressor station will not adversely affect air quality downwind of the facility, according to the statement.

However, some levels of toxic chemicals are expected to be emitted.

According to the Northeast Energy Direct project's FERC filing, those emissions per year are expected to be 49.62 tons of nitrogen dioxide, 39.72 tons of carbon dioxide, 9.23 tons of particulate matter, 8.53 tons of volatile organic compounds, 4.66 tons of sulfur dioxide and 0.64 tons of formaldehyde. All are within acceptable limits for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to issue a permit, according to the filing.

On Dec. 2, Nordgaard, the Boston pediatrician, presented some of his research on compressor stations to Gov. Maggie Hassan during a meeting with the N.H. Municipal Pipeline Coalition.

The coalition is a group of 15 southern New Hampshire towns either along or near the pipeline's proposed path that have come together to fight the project. Members are Amherst, Brookline, Fitzwilliam, Greenville, Litchfield

20151229-5010

Evelyn Taylor, New Ipswich, NH.

Due to the 3-1/2 day shutdown of the systems at the FERC from Dec 24 until Monday, Dec 28 lost on our behalf to file comments and file for Intervener status, I am requesting an extension to make make up those days and any others that may be lost during the upcoming New Year's Day holiday.

It is totally unfair to have blocked us from proceedings. It is my belief that this NED pipeline has drastic and life-threatening impacts to those who live near proposed compressor stations as I do as studies are showing over and over again that the greatest health hazard posed by unconventional fracked gas pipelines is through air pollution with compressor stations being a major contributor to that pollution.

This comment is to request an extension be granted to our comment and Intervener filing deadline. The FERC needs to do its job with integrity and good intentions and with a concern for the welfare of those expected to be harmed by this pipeline. People's lives matter.

20151229-5012

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Kathryn Hecker under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/29/2015 1:18:20 AM Filed Date: 12/29/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	pennylanepriims@aol.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I live in New Ipswich, NH and I am within 3 miles of the proposed compressor station. I am very concerned that the air quality in my town will be filled with chemicals and the water table will be affected by the blasting necessary to build a pipeline. We will certainly not benefit from the fracked gas that will pass through our town crossing wetlands and private properties. Private citizens should never have to worry about their property being taken by eminent domain, especially if it is not for the public good, but instead for corporate gain. Please consider a route change, or better yet, no pipeline at all! Renewables is the way to proceed for the sake of clean air, a stable earth, and our children's futures.

20151229-5015

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Laura Martin under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/28/2015 8:15:25 PM Filed Date: 12/29/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	mrtnllmar47@aol.com	

Basis for Intervening:

Docket # CP16-21

I live in Florence, Massachusetts (a suburb of Northampton, MA), and want to intervene in this proceeding to oppose the NED pipeline. I have interests which may be directly affected by the outcome of the proceed-

ing. These include:

I am an electric ratepayer who, if Kinder Morgan secures my electric utility as a project customer, expects to see an increase on my bill relating to NED and may include stranded costs of overbuilt infrastructure rather than more appropriate measures to meet realistic growth forecasts of the gas company.

I am a resident whose watershed (Connecticut Watershed - <http://www.mass.gov/eea/docs/eea/water/watersheds-map.pdf>) is crossed by the proposed route and could have my drinking water supply impacted by construction and/or operation.

I am opposed to the pipeline going through APR protected land under Massachusetts Constitution Article 97 of the Amendments to the Massachusetts Constitution which protects public lands in perpetuity. Kinder Morgan (KM) is trying to remove these permanent protections to install their high-pressure shale gas pipelines. The lands being targeted include State Forests, State Parks, Wildlife Management Areas, municipal conservation properties, public water supply protection areas, and conservation restriction and agricultural preservation restriction protected lands. Tennessee Gas Pipeline (TGP), a subsidiary of KM has requested a waiver of this protection.

This requires a 2/3 vote of Massachusetts house and senate) and in their application TGP assumes that the waiver will be granted.

Wet trenching during construction, pipeline coatings and other possible pollutant leaks affect towns and cities downstream from this crossing because this crossing is part of the headwaters that lead through Worthington, Huntington, Russell, Westfield and West Springfield among other communities on its way to the Connecticut River, which runs through Northampton.

For these reasons, I am interested in and would be affected by Applicant's filing. My interests cannot be adequately represented and protected by any other party. Hence, the Commission should grant me permission to intervene in proceedings for Northeast Energy Direct.

Thank you,

Laura Martin

20151229-5016

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Christine M Jerome under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/28/2015 8:27:51 PM Filed Date: 12/29/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____

Individual seej431@netzero.com

Basis for Intervening:

I live in Ashfield, Massachusetts, and want to intervene in this proceeding to oppose the NED pipeline. I have an interest which may be directly affected by the outcome of the proceeding because I am an electric ratepayer who, if KM secures my electric utility as a project customer, expects to see an increase on my bill relating to NED. Further, I am a member of an impacted community with concerns about various impacts to my local economy, environment, aesthetics, and public health. In addition, I am a donor to the Franklin Land Trust and the purpose of m donation would be violated by this project.

20151229-5017

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Mary Raven under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/28/2015 8:32:12 PM Filed Date: 12/29/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____

Individual marybeth.raven@gmail.com

Basis for Intervening:

Basis for intervening:

I am a resident of Merrimack, NH. My community and my daily life will be impacted in many ways, including the following:

1. I travel on the section of Rt. 101a that the pipeline will parallel. I do this on a daily basis for shopping, to go to church, and to commute to work. This will be a huge inconvenience during construction, and a potential danger after construction.
2. My alternative route to work and shopping is Continental Boulevard in Merrimack. The pipeline will also parallel this part of Continental Boulevard, again posing both an inconvenience during construction and a danger after construction.
3. My church, St. John Neumann Roman Catholic Church, is very near to where the pipeline will cross Rt. 201a. In fact, much of the parking lot and parts of the church are in the 1,000 ft. "incineration zone." While I am fairly certain that I will go to Heaven if I am in church and the pipeline explodes, I'd still rather not die that way.
4. I am also an electric rate payer and I understand that I might have to pay a tariff on my electric bill to partially fund the construction of the pipeline.

20151229-5019

To Whom it may concern:

I am filing as an intervener for the pipeline project. I am a home owner in North Reading MA whose land will be directly affected by the proposed pipeline. I personally do not believe this pipeline project is needed and believe the negatives do not out way the positives in any way shape or form. The beautiful landscape, the wild life that calls this habitat home will all be destroyed. It will be dangerous for our drinking water. It will be unsafe for my children to play outside in their backyard. I am hoping that myself along with others will be able to come together to stop this mistake in its track before our landscape is destroyed forever.

Please consider the already existing yet under utilized pipelines that are not even at half of their capacity. Why destroy even more area? Why not use what we have. Or better yet, lets look into actual sustainable energy sources one that will not produce harmful by products nor destroy the environment in the construction process. I urge you to consider other avenues to the energy needs of the state and country, ones that create less problems especially for the citizens of all of these affected communities both directly in the path of this monster pipeline as well as those who will be affected indirectly through the air we breath, the water we drink.

Thank you,

Mario Tierno

20151229-5020

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Lee M Lemoine under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/28/2015 9:28:38 PM Filed Date: 12/29/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____

Individual llemoine@gmail.com

Basis for Intervening:

I live in Mason, New Hampshire , and want to intervene in this proceeding to oppose the NED pipeline. I have an interest which may be directly affected by the outcome of the proceeding because of the following reasons:

- 1) I am a resident whose source of drinking water is crossed by the proposed route so my drinking water supply is at risk of the construction and/or operation of the pipeline, compressor station, or other facilities.
- 2) I am a member of an impacted community who has concerns about various impacts to the local environment/aesthetics of the rural character of Mason.
- 3) I am an Eversource electric ratepayer who, if KM secures my electric utility as a project customer, expects to see an increase on my bill relating to NED cost recovery.
- 4) I enjoy the out of doors and do not want any state or town public parks or forests, which have been set aside for the people and wildlife, to be impacted by any activities of this commercial project.

20151229-5021

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC)	Docket No. CP16-21-000
North East Direct Pipeline Project)	

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO INTERVENE

Pursuant to Rules 212 and 214 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission’s (“Commission”) Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 385.212 and 385.214 (2007), we David & Beth Chase, file this motion to intervene in this proceeding.

On November 20, 2015, the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (“TGP”) filed its application under § 7 of the Natural Gas Act, 15 U.S.C. § 717f, and § 157 of FERC’s regulations, 18 C.F.R. § 157.1 et seq., for the proposed North East Direct Project (NED), FERC Docket No. CP 16- 21-000

I. COMMUNICATIONS AND SERVICE

All communications, pleadings, and orders with respect to this proceeding should be sent to the following individual:

David & Beth Chase
10 Dunvegan Road, Tewksbury MA
(978) 758-3083 (978) 618-4075 (978) 455-6930
dchasedesign@yahoo.com

II. INTEREST OF PETITIONER

Construction, operation and maintenance of the Pipeline would adversely impact me.

Our lot number is noted as MA LL 80.01 or 10 Dunvegan Road (corner lot of Dunvegan and Pinnacle Street in N. Tewksbury, MA)

The pipeline will adversely affect our home, neighbors, community and the environment. Major concerns involve (but not limited to):

- 1. **Safety** – Living in this quiet neighborhood for the past 8-1/2 years, we have never had to worry about safety, our family’s or public safety. However, with the proposed addition of a pipeline and major access point near our street, we now have major concerns, including but not limited to:

- a. Before and after construction with a proposed major access point for construction vehicles and maintenance, located at the end of our road, Dunvegan Road, which is a small cul-de-sac road. There are small children living on Dunvegan Road (in our home and elsewhere), currently a quiet street with minimal traffic activity. Construction and maintenance vehicles entering and exiting would pose an added risk to an otherwise quiet/safe neighborhood. (See #6 below).
 - b. Impact on cleanliness of groundwater, associated health concerns and Clean Water Act. Spills, despite being accidental, would directly affect the quality of groundwater in the area. Other significant spills over the last decade that occurred in the vicinity of residential areas have had detrimental and sometimes drastic impacts on those homes or neighborhoods. Also, please see # 4 below.
 - c. General safety concerns with pipelines including fracking and leaking of pipes, incineration, threat of pipeline explosion, known/ unknown and unforeseen air-borne containments and chemicals, and potential ledge and use of dynamite to clear it. Especially with the large number of kids in the area.
2. **Utility of Outdoor Space** – We purchased our property with a focus on privacy (minimal direct neighbors shielded primarily by significant trees), knowing that we were adjacent to wetlands controlled by the conservation commission with the idea that no one could build, and enjoyment of nature and outdoor space. If this pipeline goes through, we will no longer be able to use outdoor space on our property in a manner consistent with how it is currently used, particularly due to noise pollution, loss of privacy, loss of habitat (ducks, hawks, beavers, musk-rats, deer), significant loss of trees, increase water run-offs, flooding, as well as land disturbances. Cutting down such a vast corridor of the dense, tall existing trees will displace and perhaps even eradicate some habitats.
 3. **Noise Pollution / Screening** – Our home is fairly close to Interstate 93. Cutting down such a vast number of the dense, tall existing trees, in such a wide corridor will eliminate a large portion of noise screening, thus making noise from the highway much more audible. This will also lower property value.
 4. **Devaluation of property value** – The addition of a pipeline would significantly impact property values in the neighborhood, including ours at 10 Dunvegan Road (see #1 and #2 above) as well as an implied impact to the market of potential buyers after disclosure of pipeline on property, additional easements, etc. This is evident with the house currently for sale at 70 Dunvegan Road. Also, please note we already have one easement with the Town. Adding another easement would be detrimental. Also, see noise screening above (#3).
 5. **Stormwater quality / quality control and property flooding** – Cutting down the thick and dense wooded area, in the corridor width proposed, near Dunvegan Road will most likely increase stormwater runoff, suspended solid, debris and quality of water. Where existing trees once reached the sky, filtered out debris and suspended solids and absorbed stormwater, will now be cut down thus taking away their ability to filter and absorb stormwater, etc. Also and probably most importantly, our house at 10 Dunvegan is at the lowest elevation along our road, where said debris and suspended soils will rest, along with water, causing flooding, property and house damage (flooded finished basement). We occasionally have some flooding during very heavy and extensive rain storms and with the increase stormwater will certainly flood out basement on a regular basement, potentially causing mold and other health concerns. This also affects how we use our outdoor space (i.e. flooded yard).
 6. If access is granted, the pipeline company will have an open-ended, uncontrolled invitation for potential future added lines and as a result, future disturbances to our home, street and neighborhood. Also the threat or fear of increase pipe size, which has already increased from 20” to 24” diameter.
 7. **Liability and trespassing** – There will be increased liability with potentially leaks, fracking and combustion of the pipeline to our property, neighbors, residents, and general public, particularly with the soft soils of wetlands. There is a potential liability of the general public and children playing on

and around the pipeline, the easement and their demarked poles. Trespassing is a concern with the open easement and people falsely portraying an official Tennessee Pipeline worker. Also, there is a proposed access point at the end of the Dunvegan (see #1a), which could serve as an access point for the general public to enter and for youthful exuberance (parties, bonfires, riding of ATV, etc.), which is also a concerns for liability if one was injured during such an activity. Some of these activities occur on the existing utility corridor mentioned above (1/4 mile south of Dunvegan). It should be noted that this area/easement could also be easily accessible at Pinnacle Street.

8. Environmental Impacts:

a. **Destruction of wetlands** and natural stream (SPI-679) pictured below. The current proposed run has the pipeline going center and straight thought the natural brook, which is called Meadow Brook. Increased liability is evident with soft soil stability of the wetlands. Restoration of natural wetlands to its original condition and its habitat will take decades, if at all. View of wetlands (WPI-2789) and Meadow Brook off of Pinnacle Street. 10 Dunvegan is on the right.

{ photo omitted }

b. **Destruction of neighboring Endangered Species** found under Article 97 of Commonwealth Constitution (see MA LL 76.00, MA LL 77.00 and Map 92 Lot 33 to the Tewksbury Conservation Commission) owned or recently owned by Andover and Tewksbury Conservation Commission. Also known as the land/parcel behind the end or cult-de-sac of Bonnie Lane in Tewksbury, MA. This area, Town residents of Tewksbury, MA recently voted to put a conservation restriction on this parcel due to the findings of a Wildlife Habitat Study of Rare Species that found two vernal pools on the property. Pipeline construction of this area will destroy rare species habitat and vernal pools.

9. Other significant considerations and concerns include:

- a. There is a need for consideration of alternate routes, **particularly use of nearby, existing utility corridor just a 1/4 mile south of Dunvegan Road**. FERC and Tennessee Pipeline should be reviewing alternatives, with a goal of impacting residential areas as minimally as possible. Using existing utility corridors, as Tennessee Pipeline has advocated, should be strongly considered. This has obviously been ignored given the existing nearby utility corridor. Also, just moving the pipeline north and/or south should lessen the area of disturbance and the number of Parcels affected.
- b. The Massachusetts Attorney General's filed a report stating there is no need for additional pipeline and alternatives like energy efficiency, reduced gas emissions, etc. should be considered instead

I have important information and perspectives to bring to this process, consideration of which will serve the public interest. Please consider our Motion to Intervene.

III. CONCLUSION

Wherefore, we, David & Beth Chase, respectfully requests that the Commission to grant my Motion to Intervene as a party with full rights to participate in all further proceedings.

Respectfully submitted this 27th day of December, 2015.

David & Beth Chase
10 Dunvegan Road, Tewksbury MA
(H) 978- 455-6930
(C) 978-758-3083 or 978-618-4075
dchasedesign@yahoo.com

20151229-5022

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Greg Pugliese under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/28/2015 10:44:51 PM Filed Date: 12/29/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	gmpugliese@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

Resident of Mason, NH, which would be negatively affected by this project.

20151229-5024

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Karen J. Eno under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/28/2015 6:53:39 PM Filed Date: 12/29/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	octkasa@aol.com	

Basis for Intervening:

Homeowner Intervention on grounds of pipeline impacts

20151229-5025

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Karen J. Eno under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/28/2015 6:56:28 PM Filed Date: 12/29/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	octkasa@aol.com	

Basis for Intervening:

126 Frontier Dr
Pelham, NH 03076
Octkasa@aol.com

20151229-5028

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC) Docket No. CP16-21-000
North East Direct Pipeline Project)

MOTION TO INTERVENE

In accordance with Rules of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's ("Commission") Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 385.214 and 385.211, I, Edward F. Kleinke III file this Motion to Intervene in this proceeding on behalf of Rose Watkins.

On November 20, 2015, the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC filed an Application for a Certificate of

Public Convenience and Necessity (“Application”) with the Commission to (a) to construct, install, modify, operate and maintain certain pipeline and compression facilities to be located in Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, New Hampshire and Connecticut and (2) to abandon certain facilities, as described in the “Application”.

I. COMMUNICATIONS AND SERVICE

All communications, pleadings, and orders with respect to this proceeding should be sent to the following individual:

Rose Watkins
95 Brookhaven Lane
Glenmont, NY 12077

II. INTEREST OF PETITIONER

Of concern is the proposed alignment for a new 36” pipeline through the middle of farmland owned by petitioner. It is understood that the present agricultural use of the land would impacted less than the future developed use of Mixed Economic Development, for which the property is zoned.

In either case, a strip of land 100 ft. wide (50ft. permanent easement + staging area ranging in width from $\pm 50'$ to $\pm 100'$) by $\pm 2,000$ ft in length would transect the property. While the acreage involved may seem small with respect to the larger property, the impact on future development is significant.

According to a Kinder Morgan publication entitled Developer Handbook, with a revision date of July 2013, there are significant restrictions with respect to agriculture and non agriculture development on and around pipelines and their associated easements.

These range from deep plowing to road and utility crossings. Such restrictions not only limit development potential for the property, but reduce the property’s value and add significant development costs due to the easement’s proposed location across the middle of the property.

It is requested that two (2) alternative alignments for the new 36” segment pipeline be considered as part of studies for this project. Both alternative alignments would place the proposed pipeline along perimeter areas of the property and would place the proposed pipeline out of the primary development area.

As such, I would request that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) require alternate routes be studied as part of the Northeast Energy Direct Project, with specific attention made to the subject property identified herein.

I should note that there currently exist gas pipelines crossing the subject property to which the proposed 36” segment pipeline is to connect. In addition to the requested additional alternate route studies on the subject property, I would request that FERC require an analysis of this existing pipeline/easement configuration for inclusion of the proposed new 36’ segment pipeline.

III. CONCLUSION

I request with all due respect that the Commission grant my Motion to Intervene on behalf of Rose Watkins as a party with full rights to participate in all further proceedings.

I appreciate your consideration of these requests. If you have questions or need additional information, please feel free to call or email me. Thank you.

Respectfully,

Edward F. Kleinke III
306 Delaware Avenue
Delmar, NY 12054
info@kleinkeassociates.com
518-439-7790
EFK:rf

cc. Rose Watkins

20151229-5037

I am one of the owners' of the farm (Deed # 6312-12). I am opposed to the Northeast direct pipeline project because the pipeline will prevent me from growing Christmas trees on the land used by the pipeline as I am presently doing, destroy a portion of the maple sugar bush, disrupt four land drainage tile lines, disrupt a spring waterline supplying water from a spring at the base of Mill Hill to the farmhouse and damage or destroy a historic hand dug water well that used to be a water source for the farmhouse.

If the pipeline has to be built on this farm, I would want to see the pipeline placed on or to the south of the northern border of Western Mass Electric Co. right of way on this farm. This change of location of the proposed pipeline would preserve the fifty+ year old maple trees of the sugar bush and maple trees along the stream south of Bellus Rd., avoid four land tiles that are in the proposed pipeline site and avoid the historic hand dug water well.

The temporary work space #288 must not extend west of the boundary between this farm and WEMCO land on the north side of Bellus RD. as marked by a stone wall so as to not destroy the maple trees on that part of the farm. The waterline from the spring to the farmhouse must not be disturbed and must be kept in a functional condition. Also the pipe must be at a sufficient depth along its entire length on this farm so as to allow passage of heavy farm machinery and forestry machinery anywhere over the pipeline.

20151229-5038

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Robin Babin under CP16-21-000.

Filing in opposition to the proposed Pipeline and accompanying compressor station to be located in my town of New Ipswich, NH

Submission Date: 12/28/2015 7:26:35 PM Filed Date: 12/29/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	m.muse10@comcast.net	

Basis for Intervening:

I strongly oppose the proposed pipeline for a number of reasons. As homeowner in New Ipswich, my concerns are heightened by the thought of a 41,000 horsepower compressor station being built in my town. As if having our rich lands, clean water and air polluted by toxic emissions from this station isn't enough, I am incensed at the thought of a lower-than-usual-quality pipeline running through the town I have called home for 37 years.

I am an avid gardener who is deeply concerned about toxic emissions from the proposed compressor station permanently contaminating the soil where I raise organic produce. I am also a person living with asthma. Clean air is a must to my good health. Should toxic emissions force me to consider relocating, how does one sell a home whose value has plummeted due to the pipeline/compressor station in town? Will Kinder Morgan compensate me a fair, pre-pipeline value for my home? I am not in a position to lose what I have invested in this place I call home, a place that I love.

Further concerns are that our small, rural emergency response teams; fire, police and EMS are woefully understaffed and underequipped as it is. We are in no way prepared to deal with any kind of mishap either along the (lower-than-usual-quality) pipeline nor (God forbid) the compressor station itself. New Ipswich scrapes by as it is, utilizing older model fire trucks and depending on volunteer workers. Properly protecting ourselves from a project as large and dangerous as the pipeline with the added curse of a compressor station would break the town as it stands today. We do not have the funds to purchase and staff necessary safety

equipment. Plummeting property values due to the pipeline will further, negatively, impact the towns buying power for these necessary things. Who then is going to guarantee and stand by our safety and the safety of our air, water and soil? Surely not Kinder Morgan!

I am finding it difficult to comprehend that in order to cover the costs of building the pipeline, monies will be coming out of the pockets of ratepayers through proposed tariffs. Why should we the people who do not want this atrocity to be built in the first place, an atrocity from which we the people shall gain nothing be bled from financially for its construction? It has been shown again and again that this gas is not for us, we the people of New Hampshire. It is for export!

I have become more and more fearful upon hearing lie after lie from Kinder Morgan and NED. Their errors, omissions and outright misstatements of facts thus far have left me with no confidence in the assurances they make in their filing to protect the environment and safety of our town and my immediate surroundings. One such lie is their calling fracked gas “natural gas”. Fracked gas is NOT “natural gas”. The Nazi’s gave prisoners in their concentration camps bars of soapstone, telling them it was ‘soap’ before leading them into what they told them were “showers”. I feel as if history is repeating itself in the lies that we are being fed by KM and NED. We the people are being held their prisoners. I hope our fate is not the same.

Respectfully Submitted by Robin Babin, New Ipswich, NH

20151229-5042

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Beth A Markens under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/28/2015 7:54:01 PM Filed Date: 12/29/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	bethashleym9786@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I am a Family Nurse Practitioner living in Western Massachusetts. I oppose the proposed TNG pipeline for several reasons. I worry about the increase in air and water pollution. The known chemicals involved in the transportation are known respiratory irritants and the gas itself is carcinogenic. The pipeline is also due to cross through several aquifers and small wells. I am opposed to the proposition to go through conservation land and to overturn Massachusetts’ Article 97.

On a personal note, the pipeline is due to cross my parents’ property on the land they’ve worked 30 years to own. The pipeline would cross within 30 yards of their bedroom. These pipelines have a known history of leaks and explosions, and I do not want my family in danger.

20151229-5062

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Nancy M Forest under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/28/2015 5:46:06 PM Filed Date: 12/29/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	nancy.forest@comcast.net	

Basis for Intervening:

I am a landowner directly impacted by the pipeline route.

I am a resident whose source of drinking water is crossed by the proposed route so my drinking water sup-

ply is at risk of the construction and/or operation of the pipeline.

I enjoy the out of doors and do not want any state or town public parks or forests, which have been set aside for the people and the wildlife, to be impacted by any activities of this commercial project.

20151229-5063

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Mark CD Caron under CP16-21-000. There is a grounding matt being stalled on or near my property. My property value and safety will suffer because of this grounding matt and pipeline. I am in the blast zone of the pipe.

Submission Date: 12/28/2015 5:54:40 PM Filed Date: 12/29/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	bencaron@hughes.net	

Basis for Intervening:

(doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Mark C.D. Caron under CP16-21-000. Intervener status for property parcel owned near Segment H around area 240.00 and 245.00 This is the area where the Pipeline is slated to bore under the Deerfield river at Bardwell's Ferry Road.

20151229-5074

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Jeanne A Dietsch under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/28/2015 5:10:36 PM Filed Date: 12/29/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	jeanne.a.dietsch@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I am a resident of the Monadnock region who expects to run for the office of Senate in the 9th District of NH, which includes Troy, Fitzwilliam, Richmond, Sharon and Temple, NH. Residents of these towns fervently fear and resent the moving of this pipeline into NH across their properties. As their future Senator, I wish to speak on their behalf to report on the shaky fiscal situation of Kinder Morgan, as presented in their own annual Form 10-K filing to the SEC, where they discuss risks, beginning on p 29. These risks include the possibility that they will not be able to service their debt, the possibility that demand for fossil fuels may decrease as a result of climate change repercussions, the possibility that regulations may constrain their supply of natural gas and various other risks that could result in stranded assets and/or an inability for Kinder Morgan to meet their commitments made to people whose properties would be degraded.

In addition, I believe that the consequence of this pipeline will be to reduce the availability of alternative energy sources and increase the alternative energy prices due to lower demand that will hinder technological improvements in solar technology for NH climates, that would otherwise develop without the pipeline.

Please accept my application to intervene.

20151229-5075

Lisa Derby Oden, New Ipswich, NH.

I am requesting an extension to the January 6, 2016 deadline for filing for Intervention. FERC was closed from Dec 24, 2015 until 9AM on Dec 28, 2015. I tried repeatedly to access the submittal system during that

time to file to be an Intervenor. As a resident of the town where the compressor station is to be sited, I live with this situation 24/7 and have no vacation and no time off from it. When I try to use some of my time off from work to request to intervene, I am thwarted by holiday hours? That is unacceptable.

20151229-5077

Janet I. Clark, Ashfield, MA.

This is an unnecessary taking of private land for private gain. This pipeline route also challenges to our State constitution which empowers our decisions about conserved lands. Do you realize the determination of New Englanders? If it comes to it, there will be thousands of people chained to trees and standing in front of bulldozers. As they are taken to jail, there will be thousands to take their place.

20151229-5078

United States of America
Before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC
Northeast Energy Direct Project

Docket No. CP16-21-000

**MOTION TO INTERVENE
OF RICHMOND, NH PIPELINE ACTION GROUP (RAG)**

Pursuant to Rules 212 and 214 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) promulgated at 18 C.F.R §385.212 and 385.214 (2007), Richmond, NH Pipeline Action Group), files this motion to intervene in this proceeding. On November 20, 2015 the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (“TGP”) filed its application under Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act, for the proposed project, FERC Docket No. CP16-21-000.

Interest of Party:

RAG is a group of concerned citizens in the Southwest Corner New Hampshire who have come together to build awareness, organize opposition, and have engage in collective activities opposing the proposed Northeast Energy Direct (NED) natural gas pipeline. Many of our members are directly impacted by the current route of the pipeline. Others were impacted by the past proposed route.

Concerns and possible impacts

- Public Lands in Conservation: Properties impacted in our region are under conservation restrictions. The NED pipeline is a questionable activity on conserved land.
- Wetlands: Wetlands will be impacted by this project. All of Richmond residents rely on wells for their drinking water. Wetlands are an integral part of clean drinking water..
- No Benefit: There will be no positive benefit to the town resulting from the construction of this pipeline
- Health Risk: Contrary to be carrying aatural gas this pipeline will transport an unknown product (Fracked Gas) which contains a mixture of methane and known and unknown chemicals.

Communications:

Richmond Pipeline Action Group
Contact person: John Boccalini
180 Fay Martin Road
Richmond, NH
richpipe119@gmail.com

20151229-5083

Re: Docket No: CP16-21

12/24/2015

Ms. Kimberly Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC)
888 First Street NE, Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426

Dear Ms. Bose,

Having read the application for the Tennessee Gas Pipeline (TGP) Northeast Direct Project (NED, CP16-21), I have some questions.

According to the FERC, in Docket No. RP12-514-002, et al.

7. The Staff held a technical conference on April 10, 2013. Tennessee's responses to the data request indicated that Tennessee would only implement the new proposal in an extended maintenance or force majeure situation, and that it had not restricted secondary in-the-path service at all in the four years preceding its response. Supplemental data submitted by Tennessee showed that approximately 32 electric generators receive service from Tennessee, including at least 13 in New England. The supplemental data also show that over 99 percent of Tennessee's deliveries to the points serving those generators were made pursuant to firm transportation contracts. The data further show that approximately 56 percent of deliveries serving New England electric generators were made using firm contracts held by someone other than the generator, indicating that New England generators rely significantly on purchasing natural gas at their downstream delivery points from other shippers holding firm transportation contracts on Tennessee. Similarly, about 61 percent of deliveries to non-New England generators were also made using firm contracts held by someone other than the generator.

What changed so drastically between 2013 and 2015 such that:

"Adding the NED Project capacity to transport incremental natural gas supplies will ease natural gas capacity constraints and is expected to provide significant benefits to energy consumers in the region in the form of lower natural gas and electricity prices ."(Application for the NED pg 2, Nov 20, 2015)

From the application for the NED, pg 65

"In 2012, natural gas accounted for a record-high 52 percent of New England's electricity generation, almost exclusively displacing higher-priced and higher emission coal- and oil-fired generation, which fell to a combined record-low of about 3.4 percent. However, that trend has reversed in recent years as demand has exceeded available firm capacity, resulting in increased natural gas pipeline constraints, decreased competitive spot supplies, and extraordinarily high utilization of existing pipeline infrastructure by LDC s and other firm contract holders. In 2013, natural gas-fired generation fell to 46 percent, while generation from coal and oil increased to nearly 7 percent. In 2014, natural gas generated only 43 percent of the region's electricity, while coal and oil combined to account for over 6 percent again, despite lower overall demand." (emphasis added)

Let's do the math.

In 2012 electricity in New England was produced using $52\% + 3.4\% = 55.4\%$ fossil fuels.

In 2013 electricity in New England was produced using $46\% + 7\% = 53\%$ fossil fuels.

In 2014 electricity in New England was produced using $43\% + 6\% = 49\%$ fossil fuels.

It seems the region is using less total fossil fuels with each passing year (as a percentage) for electricity production, and since secondary in the path receipt points are available to those with long haul Firm Transportation contracts on the current TGP 200 and 300 lines through the Shale plays, there should already have been a reduction in cost realized by electric rate payers and heating customers. Has there been? If not, why?

What is the projected increase/decrease in electricity generation/use over the upcoming 5 to 10 years, and how much of the increase is expected to be new gas fired electric generation as opposed to hydro, wind, solar, oil and coal?

Is it responsible to rely so heavily on one type of fuel for electric generation? What is the proportion of natural gas electric generation compared to total electricity generation which could or would be realized if

the NED is built?

TGP is not the only pipeline which supplies gas to New England. How much of the Algonquin Incremental Market Project (AIM) capacity will be used to supply electric generators?

How much of the replacement contract capacity used to justify the AIM project will be available and on which pipelines will the capacity be available when the AIM project is put in to service?

If the LDC s in New England have been reducing the cost for their heating customers by using “mitigation” in the form of supplying natural gas to electric generators when they have excess, what impact will the NED have on the LDC s’ ability to mitigate their costs, and will their possible inability to mitigate costs lead to an increase in expense for the captive heating end user?

Where exactly does TGP claim the constraints are on their system, and why, if there are constraints, have they entered into negotiated transportation contracts with some current shippers?

There is reserved capacity available on the current TGP system for this project to reduce its size. Since there is already reserved capacity to reduce the size of the project, why would the public or the FERC entertain the notion of a project which is sized far in excess of the amount for which there are contracts?

The most intriguing aspect of the proposal is that there seems to be no guarantee that the supply component and the market component have been “scaled” together. It is entirely possible that the supply component capacity could be fully contracted and sent elsewhere on other pipelines, while the market component remains at its currently contracted size. In the event that there is then a desire to contract for the available capacity on the market path, the supply path would be unavailable, necessitating new infrastructure to bring gas to Wright NY.

In evaluating TGP’s application, I would ask the FERC to consider these questions. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Susan Baxter

Attached are briefs from the current Ct PURA investigation into capacity contracts for the NED and other proposed expansions.

***{Brief of Connecticut Natural Gas Corporation and the Southern Connecticut Gas Company, omitted }
{ 16 pages, 85 KB, Word file, can be downloaded at: }***

{ <http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/opennat.asp?fileID=14083277> }

***{Brief of The Yankee Gas Service Company d/b/a Eversource Energy, omitted }
{ 11 pages, 56 KB, Word file, can be downloaded at: }***

{ <http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/opennat.asp?fileID=14083278> }

***{ Brief of CT Public Utilities Regulatory Authority : Brief Of The Office Of Consumer Counsel, omitted }
{ 19 pages, 10,455 KB, PDF of scan, can be downloaded at: }***

{ <http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/opennat.asp?fileID=14083279> }

***{ CT Dept of Energy & Envir. Protection, Bureau of Energy and Technology Policy brief, omitted }
{ 21 pages, 418 KB, PDF file, can be downloaded at: }***

{ <http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/opennat.asp?fileID=14083280> }

20151229-5085

Kathleen and Stephen Setzer
195 William G. Dr.
Tewksbury, MA 01876
978-851-0503 (home)
kathiesetzer@gmail.com

My husband and I are direct abutters to the Lynnfield lateral pipeline proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC

There are many ways that we will be affected by the pipeline expansion.

First is the destruction of the old growth pines that are in our back yard, one of the attributes that drew us to purchasing this property. It gave us the privacy we were looking for in an urban environment. This wooded area has afforded us the pleasure of being able to enjoy the wildlife that visit. One of them, not on the endangered list, is the local turkey population. They use these old growth pines to roost. This proposed pipeline will take away the protection that these trees give to the local turkey population.

We have had many a laugh as we watch them clumsily fly up into the pines at sunset to roost. In the morning we have dubbed them Turkey Bombs as the ungracefully fall to earth to resume their foraging. No amount of restoration by Tennessee Gas can bring back the size of these trees and what they afford our backyard environment.

This pipeline will devalue our property and destroy the character of our neighborhood. It will be a liability to us and potentially raise our insurance rates.

It poses a risk squeezing this pipeline between homes and puts everyone in danger as we are within the blast zone should an accident occur. It has happened with other pipelines.

We request that the Commission grant our motion to intervene as a party with full rights to participate in all further proceedings.

Respectfully submitted this 26th day of December 2015

Kathleen and Stephen Setzer

20151229-5090

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Michele DeJohn under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/29/2015 9:10:15 AM Filed Date: 12/29/2015 9:10:15 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	Mdejohn76@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

Filing intervene status as a direct abuter with concerns for my family's safety and health.

20151229-5094

Rheo J Bouchard, NEW IPSWICH, NH.

MY HOME IS 700 FEET AWAY FROM THE PROPOSED PIPELINE ROUTE AND CURRENTLY HAVE MAJOR CONCERN WITH DRILLED WELL BEING IMPACTED BY BLASTING OF GRANITE ACROSS THE AQUIFER THAT IS KNOWN TO FEED MY WELL.

20151229-5095

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Ryan Smith under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/29/2015 10:10:30 AM Filed Date: 12/29/2015 10:10:30 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	rmsmith33@hotmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I hereby move, pursuant to 18 C.F.R. § 385.214(b), to intervene in the above-captioned proceeding. I seek to intervene in opposition to the Northeast Energy Direct Project (the “Project” or the “NED Project”) proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (the “Company”), a subsidiary of Kinder Morgan, Inc. (“Kinder Morgan”). Communications concerning this proceeding should be served upon me as follows:

Ryan Smith
176 Charles Bancroft Hwy
Litchfield, NH 03052
rmsmith33@hotmail.com

My interest as an electric ratepayer, insomuch as the Company seeks to secure my electric utility as a Project shipper, which, in turn, would seek to recover costs associated with the Project from ratepayers. As explained in depth by others on this docket (and on the pre-filing docket PF14-22), Kinder Morgan is essentially telling the Commission that New England needs a blow torch to light a candle. The massive overbuild embodied in this proposal is very likely to lead to higher energy costs for New England’s ratepayers – either because the excess capacity contracted for by our utilities would go unused, or because capacity would be used for markets overseas, driving up domestic energy prices

My interest as a resident of Litchfield, NH, living directly adjacent to where the Company proposes to cross the Merrimack River and wetlands with its pipeline. In addition to living by conservation wetlands, I am concerned about the impact that the construction and operation of the pipeline, and the ball valve station proposed for Litchfield, could have on ecological and human health in our town.

My interest as a taxpayer, neighbor and visitor to protected public land in Litchfield, New Hampshire. I built a new home a year ago on historical family property next to the proposed pipeline route. My family was completely unaware about any potential pipeline being built. The thought of our (domestic well) drinking water potentially being contaminated from this type of pipeline and its byproducts, along with the inherent risk of living in an explosive area is absolutely devastating. We have been lifelong residents in this farm town and are now raising our own young children here.

WHEREFORE, for the foregoing reasons, I respectfully request that my motion to intervene be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Ryan Smith

20151229-5097

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Rheo J Bouchard under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/29/2015 10:07:21 AM Filed Date: 12/29/2015 10:07:21 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	rheo.bouchard@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

MY HOME IS WITHIN 700 FEET OF THE PROPOSED PIPELINE ROUTE.

MY HOME IS WITHIN 3K FEET OF THE PROPOSED COMPRESSOR STATION IN NEW IPSWICH.
MY HOME ASSOCIATIONS COMMON LAND WILL HAVE APPROX 3K FEET OF LAND TAKEN
FOR EASEMENT.

I AM AN AFFECTED LAND OWNER.

20151229-5102

Ada Peters, Dracut, MA.

Hi,

When I learned of the proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project I immediately became distressed over it. How many major accidents do we have to have before the people who run this country, and the rest of the world, understand that we are killing the planet and, thereby, ourselves.

I live in Dracut, Massachusetts, a nice little country town that drew me here because of the trees, nature, quiet, and friendly atmosphere. This pipeline will destroy this community, and it has already begun. I know of people who have health issues who are putting their homes up for sale. The stress level is high with concern over the negative impact this project will have on the environment and residents of our town, the state, and the country. It's never a question of "if" an accident happens; it's always a question of "when" the accident happens. We know that nothing is perfect and nothing lasts forever. And these pipelines are so vulnerable.

Please, can't we spend money on clean energy? We know it works. Why do we always have to gravitate to things that are destructive to us and the planet?

This pipeline will change my life here in Dracut. It will no longer be a place that I will be comfortable in. There will always be the unease of a leak or explosion and the overall environmental impact of this project.

Please, stop the pipeline.

Sincerely,

Ada Peters

20151229-5113

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Samantha Smith under PF14-22-000.

Submission Date: 12/29/2015 10:57:45 AM Filed Date: 12/29/2015 10:57:45 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:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	samantha_f_smith@aol.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I seek to intervene in opposition to the Northeast Energy Direct Project (the "Project" or the "NED Project") proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (the "Company"), a subsidiary of Kinder Morgan, Inc. ("Kinder Morgan"). Communications concerning this proceeding should be served upon me as follows:

Samantha Smith
176 Charles Bancroft Hwy
Litchfield, NH 03052
samantha_f_smith@aol.com

My interest as an electric ratepayer, insomuch as the Company seeks to secure my electric utility as a Project shipper, which, in turn, would seek to recover costs associated with the Project from ratepayers. As explained in depth by others on this docket (and on the pre-filing docket PF14-22), Kinder Morgan is essentially telling the Commission that New England needs a blow torch to light a candle. The massive overbuild

embodied in this proposal is very likely to lead to higher energy costs for New England's ratepayers – either because the excess capacity contracted for by our utilities would go unused, or because capacity would be used for markets overseas, driving up domestic energy prices

My interest as a resident of Litchfield, NH, living directly adjacent to where the Company proposes to cross the Merrimack River and wetlands with its pipeline. In addition to living by conservation wetlands, I am concerned about the impact that the construction and operation of the pipeline, and the ball valve station proposed for Litchfield, could have on ecological and human health in our town.

My interest as a taxpayer, neighbor and visitor to protected public land in Litchfield, New Hampshire. I built a new home a year ago on historical family property next to the proposed pipeline route. My family was completely unaware about any potential pipeline being built. The thought of our (domestic well) drinking water potentially being contaminated from this type of pipeline and its byproducts, along with the inherent risk of living in an explosive area is absolutely devastating. We have been lifelong residents in this farm town and are now raising our own young children here.

WHEREFORE, for the foregoing reasons, I respectfully request that my motion to intervene be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Samantha Smith

20151229-5132

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Cecilia M Mancini under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/29/2015 11:25:30 AM Filed Date: 12/29/2015 11:25:30 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	cecmancini2@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I live in Dracut, MA and want to intervene in this proceeding to oppose the NED pipeline. I have an interest which may be directly affected by the outcome of the proceeding because my husband, Robert and I are landowners directly impacted by the pipeline route, proposed metering station and compressor station. There is currently a Tennessee Gas Pipeline that runs through my property, less than 50 feet from my house that may or may not become part of the project. It is my understanding that the pipeline is not scheduled to go through my property, although the exact route keeps changing.

I have received threatening letters from Kinder Morgan's attorneys saying that we allow them to survey or else they make seek an order from the Dept. of Utilities to access our property. I feel this is intimidation and anti-American.

My property lies within a half mile of the proposed metering station and less than 18 miles from the proposed compressor station.

I am very concerned that our property may be taken for a project that will have no direct energy benefit to me or anyone in Dracut. I do not feel that my property and neighborhood's air, water and noise quality should be allowed to be taken by an out of state company who's main objective is export and profits.

I am very concerned about the air quality, water quality, and noise pollution that is bound to occur from this project. It appears to me that industry standards have been made up by the industry and are minimal at best, and oversight is almost non-existent.

I am concerned that the whole quality of life in Dracut is going to be compromised. There is a substantial amount of farmland and conservation land in this area that will be destroyed forever.

I am also very concerned about the financial capacity of Kinder Morgan to stay in business. The Wall

Street Journal recently reported that their stock has just missed junk status and that they are substantially more leveraged than other companies. This makes me very concerned that they can maintain what they've got, let alone add this very large high pressure pipeline, that calls for even better maintenance.

20151229-5138

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of James A VanNatta under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/29/2015 11:33:57 AM Filed Date: 12/29/2015 11:33:57 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	jimvann@comcast.net	

Basis for Intervening:

I live in Northfield MA and want to intervene in this proceeding to oppose the NED pipeline. I have an interest which may be directly affected by the proceeding because the property of my primary residence is directly next to the proposed pipeline route.

I am strongly concerned that I will suffer a loss of property value with the pipe in close proximity.

I have strong concerns for the possible effects of the trenching and blasting on the quality of my well water.

I have strong objection to the taking and spoiling of both public and private land for the financial benefit of a corporation.

I have strong objections to money being invested in fossil fuel infrastructure rather than renewable sources of power development.

Thank you for your consideration of my Motion to Intervene in the NED Pipeline Application.

20151229-5144

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Paul Premo under CP16-21-000 as a Townsend resident/home owner located on the original Kinder Morgan proposed route.

Submission Date: 12/29/2015 11:51:58 AM Filed Date: 12/29/2015 11:51:58 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	elvpaul@lycos.com	

Basis for Intervening:

As a land owner in Townsend on the original Kinder Morgan main gas route I want to make it clear that I do not approve of putting a gas main and/or a compressor station this close to any homes on my street. The proposal puts this main less than 150ft from my home. The blast radius for such a pipe rupturing is 900ft.. It would incinerate my entire neighborhood for a pipeline that is not necessary. No benefit would be seen here by any Townsend resident only risk to our natural resources, safety and health. This solution is driven by greed with no consideration for citizens. I have seen some of the maps that were used to file this by Kinder Morgan. They were from the 80s when no homes were in the area. A deliberate way of not showing what is actually here in these areas at present day. Why such a dishonest approach is a question that needs to be answered. This isn't right. Please do not allow this to proceed.

20151229-5145

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Robert Abbatiello under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/29/2015 11:41:26 AM

Filed Date: 12/29/2015 11:41:26 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____

Individual raclearpoint@gmail.com

Basis for Intervening:

I own property and a business along pipeline. I have been informed that a staging area is to be placed on the adjacent property to mine (102 Main Street Ashfield MA) which would be a financial burden to both my property and my Salon business. It would devalue my property and cause noise and construction pollution. I also live along the pipeline 243 Watson spruce corner road Ashfield ma 01330. The pipeline would devalue my home and endanger my family. This pipeline is an unnecessary burden on the commonwealth for corporate profit, it will have devastating consequences for tens of thousands of people, this is not an eminent domain issue, it is a corporate greed issue. Stop the pipeline.

20151229-5148

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of John Rioux under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/29/2015 12:12:24 PM

Filed Date: 12/29/2015 12:12:24 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____

Individual conwaypipeline2@gmail.com

Basis for Intervening:

My wife and I live on an 8-acre farm in Conway, just 1/4 mile down wind from the proposed pipeline route and Blowdown valve. It is a post and beam house with high vaulted ceilings and a stunning 2-story window to look out to our gardens. My wife and I built it. We are public school teachers who can sheetrock, lay tile, do plumbing and electrical work. This beautiful home is the nest egg that will secure us in our aging future.

I am 80 and had triple bypass surgery last winter. We can no longer stay in a home as large as this, and had planned to downsize in the next 2 years. IF this pipeline happens (and we are doing all we know how to do to prevent it from happening) our home will be almost impossible to sell. If we were to sell it, its value will be greatly decreased.

How do we secure our future? How do we secure the future of our special needs son? The profit that we should have realized, from going from a large house to a small one, will be gobbled up by Kinder Morgan.

Kinder Morgan is stealing our future, for their corporate gain. People move for countless reasons, out of necessity and choice. New England does not need this gas. We have other solutions. This process is unethical and unnecessary.

I deserve to be an intervenor, to closely observe and provide input during this unnecessary and misguided process.

20151229-5155

I strongly object to the construction of the proposed pipeline for a number of reasons, and find the planned route incomprehensible, there being in my mind a much more suitable route along the Massachusetts turnpike.

The proposed pipeline route will not only disturb, but will cause much destruction of sensitive wetland areas, a federally designated Wild and Scenic River, The Westfield River, and will also pass through, or under

numerous pristine wildlife areas, sanctuaries and conservation lands.

The primary reason for my intervention filing is my objection to the detrimental impact on areas I visit nearly daily: fishing on the Westfield River (a federally designated Wild & Scenic River...which states that rivers under this designation, "...Shall be preserved in free-flowing condition...and protected for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations..."), [construction will cause much down-stream pollution of the river-way, loss of habitat for endangered coldwater fish communities and the predator and raptor species that rely on them as a food source]; walking along the Trustees of Reservations path along the Gorge on the Westfield River in Chesterfield, [I can already imagine floating dead fish]; swimming and picnicking there in the summer, [polluted river, silt, changes to watershed, fish, plants]; skiing at Notchview (another Trustees property) in the winter or hiking there in the summer, [building eyesores, noise, light pollution]; tracking wildlife, bear, moose, coyote, fox, beaver, otter, bird life, and other wildlife, including increasing sightings of Bald-headed Eagles among others on the Middle, East and West Branches of the Westfield River, [the area will be greatly changed by the impact of a construction, pollution]; hiking on Savoy Mountain; walking along the Windsor Jamb, and scrambling down the gorge area there, [again noise pollution, changes in waterways, fish and other wildlife habitat and passage]; paddling quietly in my kayak along waterways in the area including lands that are proposed to be a part of the expansion of the Silvio O. Conte National Fish & Wildlife Refuge, a national organization that promotes conservation of fish, wildlife and plants, [all of the above].

It appears that the proposed pipeline will work in total conflict to other government affiliated organizations that work to create, sustain, and improve wild and scenic areas in Western Massachusetts for the enjoyment of all. Why then would a grossly over-built pipeline be considered for this area, when there is a perfectly usable pipeline already in place, mostly following the Massachusetts Turnpike, that with some improvement would handle the perceived needs stated by Kinder Morgan, and particularly at a period in global development when governments throughout the world are putting emphasis on renewable resources, and not finite fracking oils and gases.

My secondary reasons impact the general quality of my life and other residents in our Western Massachusetts hilltowns. Perhaps the foremost reasons are increased heavy trucking traffic which will impact road conditions and strain already tight town budgets for repairs. Increased traffic along narrow, winding, icy in winter roads is followed closely by light and noise pollution, toxic emissions during construction and general on-going damage to the environment, waterways, sensitive wetland areas, wildlife, fish, plant life, the list could go on for pages. Other reasons include health consequences from pollutants associated with pipeline construction and on-going pipeline operation.

Other reasons are simply failure to comprehend our rural way of life and the total destruction of those values by which we live, with little or no regard for residents' wishes. This pipeline (which will bring little or no benefit to Western Massachusetts residents), perhaps even increased energy costs, and which I understand residents will be forced to help fund, will destroy our well-being, our property values, will reduce property values, reduce the tax base, reduce interest as a tourist destination, one of our major sources of revenue, and will thereby create more stress on an already economically strained area, and our way of life. It is untenable.

20151229-5156

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Stephen A Matthews under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/29/2015 12:25:07 PM Filed Date: 12/29/2015 12:25:07 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____

Individual samonthehill@gmail.com

Basis for Intervening:

I work a short distance downwind of the proposed compressor station proposed for New Ipswich, NH.

The tons of noxious chemicals that are predicted (by Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas to be put out into the air by this facility will, to a large extent, be carried by the wind over my workplace.

I have had several heart operations and would be considered one of the “at risk” people when the particulate matter ejected by this facility are carried over the company where I work which has no AC system in my building to filter incoming air.

20151229-5164

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Diane K Hewitt under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/29/2015 12:55:23 PM Filed Date: 12/29/2015 12:55:23 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	diane.hewitt@gmail.com	diane.hewitt@gmail.com

Basis for Intervening:

Diane and Richard Hewitt of Groton, MA respectfully request to become interveners in the Northeast Energy Direct Project for the following, compelling reasons:

1. In the original route, the NED project was expected to trespass across our land and land we have expressly put into conservation and is now held by the Groton Conservation Trust. Like so many landowners who are eager to preserve land for the public good, the NED pipeline would violate the purpose of our collective donations if the project is allowed to take easements over land that was meant to be protected in perpetuity.
2. Just prior to the rerouting of the pipeline in southern New Hampshire, our children purchased their first home in New Ipswich, NH. The proposed and alternative siting of the 41,000 horse power compressor station is located within a mile or so from their home and puts their health and safety at serious risk. Most importantly, they are expecting their first child this spring, and the health impacts of compressor stations on young children are especially serious and well documented. I would urge FERC to study the growing body of research related to this issue, including the Southwestern PA. Environmental and Health Study (2014). Additionally, because even the threat of the pipeline has seriously eroded housing prices in New Ipswich, it is impossible for our children to recoup their largest and only financial investment. This project will bring irreparable harm to our extended family.
3. With the proposed taking of over 85 parcels of land protected by Article 97 of the MA state constitution, The NED pipeline blatantly disregards the will of the people and our elected officials. It sets a dangerous precedent and is an unconscionable violation of the trust we place in our governance system.

For these reasons, we believe that the NED pipeline adversely affects our lives, the lives of our children and surrounding communities. We respectfully request to become interveners in the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline project.

Thank you.

Diane and Richard Hewitt
Groton, MA

20151229-5170

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Lisa A Smith under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/29/2015 1:02:34 PM Filed Date: 12/29/2015 1:02:34 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	ladiperr@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

As a resident of Dracut, I am deeply concerned for the health and financial well-being of our town as impacted by the proposed pipeline and compressor station. Our home is located in close proximity to the proposed compressor station, and I am concerned about water and air quality, noise pollution and the impact both the construction and operation of this compressor station will have on our quality of life and the value of our home and those of our neighbors. As a business owner in town operating a dance studio, my clientele is comprised wholly of children living in and around the area of the proposed pipeline and compressor station. Already there are homes in our neighborhood going up for sale, and I am concerned about the financial impact to my business as concerned families move out of town. I am opposed to this project.

20151229-5174

Virginia M Notter, New Ipswich, NH.

29Dec2015

To Whom it may concern,

I am writing to find out if it would be possible for the FERC to extend the Intervenor deadline for docket Number CP16-21. eFiling on the ferc.gov website was unavailable from mid-day 24Dec2015 until the morning of 28Dec2015 and I would assume eFiling for the new years holiday will also not be available. That is a full week plus of days that the site has been unavailable for eFiling.

These weekend days are most often the best time for folks that work Monday through Friday to take the time to e-File. Many of us tried to access the ferc.gov website to e-File and found that the site was unavailable during the Christmas break. Will the FERC please consider extending the Intervenor deadline?

Please advise.

Thank you & kind regards,

Virginia Notter
New Ipswich, NH

20151229-5175

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Holly B Koski under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/29/2015 1:27:56 PM Filed Date: 12/29/2015 1:27:56 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	hollybk63@myfairpoint.net	

Basis for Intervening:

I live in Rindge, New Hampshire, and want to Intervene in this proceeding to oppose the NED pipeline. I have interests which may be directly affected by the outcome of the proceeding.

I am a NH resident who may be charged with paying for this pipeline with a tariff charge being added to my electric rates.

My home is about 3/4 of a mile from the current proposed pipeline "Co-Location" and the entrance to my Private Road is less than 1500 feet from this proposed pipeline. Evacuation from my road may be impossible if the pipeline was to explode. My daily travels cross over the proposed pipeline route, so I will be at physical risk.

Our well water could be affected by the construction (blasting) and operation of the pipeline. We do not currently have a Town water supply- my well is my only source of water for my home.

I am concerned about the traffic, noise, air pollution and other disturbances that will affect my quality of life before, during and after the construction of NED.

I have a disease that I have been living with for the past 37 years. My mobility and my breathing are already compromised, the additional pollution and toxins that I will be exposed to if this proposed pipeline were to be installed would directly worsen my condition.

The housing market has declined since we built our home in 2007 and I can not afford to have my property value decline further because of the proximity of this proposed pipeline.

This proposed NED pipeline will be destructive to the various wildlife that relies on the many parcels of conservation land, wetlands and ponds in order to survive if this pipeline were to be installed.

For these reasons I am requesting that the Commission grant permission for me to intervene in the proceedings for Northeast Energy Direct.

20151229-5176

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Deborah A. Pomerleau under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/29/2015 1:31:07 PM Filed Date: 12/29/2015 1:31:07 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	pdhahw@aol.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I am filing as an intervenor. I grew up in Mason, NH, graduated from UNH, now live in Londonderry and work in Manchester. This proposed pipeline will cause great harm to southern NH. Items effected that effect me: wells, rivers, ponds, streams, wetlands, air quality, property values, everyone's physical and mental health, endangered species, non-endangered species, all farms, all schools from preschools to high schools to colleges, tourism industry, police and fire departments and a way of life that is unique in our country. There will be noise pollution, air pollution, water pollution, and long term unknown pollution that cannot be predicted. I live in Londonderry 3/10th of a mile from the proposed pipeline route. My beautiful home town of Mason, where my father is buried, is at risk of damage, Greenville NH, where I had my first job, and New Ipswich NH where I went to middle and high school is at risk. This breaks my heart. I know first hand how the ground in NH can be unique. Every year is so different. Too much rain, and wetlands grow. Too little rain, and wetlands shrink. Kinder Morgan has proposed to put this pipe right through these wetlands. The ground will shift and change a lot and KM has not shown how they will protect the pipe from damage. KM proposes to blast their way through granite. This is just not realistic. Any person knows this. I know it and I am not a geologist. I worry about what an explosion will do to southern NH, and where I live and work. As I have always been a bird watcher, I worry about birds too. I worry about the loss of the beautiful night sky, because of light pollution. I worry about the long term effect of the delicate balance of property values and the corresponding property taxes that are needed for our state. The impact on tourism industry will reduce revenue for small business owners as well as the state. This pipeline is not in anyone's best interest. I have been personally shocked by the possibility of this pipeline in our state, and it just can not be allowed to happen.

20151229-5187

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Joseph Kayan under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/29/2015 1:43:44 PM Filed Date: 12/29/2015 1:43:44 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	jckayan@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I have a multitude of compelling reasons to oppose this project.

I live in Northfield, MA and the pipeline and proposed compressor station are well less than a mile from my home. This is an overwhelming concern as I will be personally confronted with the environmental degradation to my rural landscape, our wildlife habitats, our air quality, possible pollution of our aquifers and the noise and light pollution that will accompany the building, operation and maintenance of this unwanted and unneeded project. The industrialization of this area, the disregard for many public and private parcels of conservation lands, and the assured necessity of taking property by eminent domain are, to me, morally repugnant. Our protected lands should be valued and defended for what they are - a gift of hope and sanity for the community of man and nature forever. That a collusion between our (not so) democratic government and our profit thirsty corporations can override the considerable efforts of many to protect these areas is WRONG.

If built, I fear the remote but plausible occurrence of a major "incident" that could destroy the property and even lives of me, my family and my neighbors.

That this project is another costly endeavor to keep non renewable fossil fuels as the major energy supplier, wreaking havoc on our world is also woefully myopic. Conservation, repairs and upgrades to existing pipelines, better management and preparations for peak demand usages and utilization of storage tanks to meet that demand are all better solutions than constructing this massive project.

Just because Kinder Morgan has spent considerable time and resources planning and promoting this boondoggle pipeline is not a sufficient reason to grant its existence.

Please respectfully consider my thoughts and views in your decisions.

20151229-5193

Stephen A Matthews, New Ipswich, NH.

To Whom it may concern,

I am writing to inquire if FERC will extend the Intervenor registration deadline for docket Number CP16-21.

eFiling on the ferc.gov website was unavailable from mid-day 24 Dec 2015 until the morning of 28 Dec 2015 and I fear eFiling for the new years holiday will also not be available. That is a full week plus of days that the site has been unavailable for eFiling.

Weekends are the best time for people that work Monday through Friday to make the time to e-File.

Many people tried to access the ferc.gov website to e-File and found that the site was unavailable during the Christmas break. Will the FERC please consider extending the Intervenor deadline to compensate for the loss of opportunity to participate in the process for this docket?

Please advise.

Thank you & kind regards,

S.A. Matthews

New Ipswich, NH

20151229-5194

karen miller, new ipswich, NH.

i write requesting the deadline of jan 6, 2016 for intervenor filing be extended

to make up for the “holiday shut-down” of the FERC website dec. 24-dec. 28, 2015. those of us in communities fighting to stop the NED/ Tennessee gas pipeline, proposed out of GREED, NOT NEED, by kinder morgan, did not get a “holiday shut-down” from the 24/7 nightmare this proposed project inflicts!

fracked gas is not “natural”! fracked gas is a hazard to our health! it causes cancer! fracked gas is a hazard to our environment, and contributes to climate change! stop the proposed NED pipeline project, protect our health!

protect our climate!

20151229-5218

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

In the Matter of)
Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.)
Northeast Energy Direct Project)

Docket No. CP16-21-000

MOTION TO INTERVENE

Pursuant to Rules 212 and 214 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission’s (“FERC”) Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. §§ 385.212 and 385.214, the Green Farm Village Cluster Association of New Ipswich, New Hampshire hereby submits this timely motion to intervene and file comments in the above-captioned proceeding.

I. COMMUNICATIONS AND CORRESPONDENCE

The following individual(s) should be included on the service list for this docket, and all communications should be sent to:

Carolyn Cormier, President
101 Green Farm Road
New Ipswich, NH 03071
603-801-0607
carolynncormier@gmail.com

II. IDENTITY AND INTERESTS OF PETITIONER

1. The above matter concerns an application for the construction of a natural gas transmission pipeline and other facilities (“Project”). Several portions of the pipeline will be located within the Green Farm Village Cluster Association and within the right of way of public streets in the association and on common land owned by the Association.
2. The Association and its residents will be directly affected by the construction and operation of the pipeline. The pipeline is proposed to be installed within common land owned by the Green Farm Village Cluster Association (New Ipswich tax lot 10-6). Green Farm Village Cluster Association has concerns as to construction-related impacts on the safety and convenience of residents, and as to the impacts of the completed pipeline on resident health and safety.
3. The impacts of construction and operation of the Project on the Association and its residents may include, but are not necessarily limited to, public safety hazards, traffic and transportation disruptions (with related interruptions of public services), noise generation, air pollution, disruption of wetlands and aquatic ecosystems, and adverse effects on the Association’s scenic, and cultural resources.

4. The Project specifically contemplates building a compressor station within one half mile of the Green Farm Village Cluster Association which would negatively affect the quality of life for all nearby residents. In addition to producing toxic emissions and atmospheric pollution, we are concerned about the well documented noise impacts and disruption to the rural tranquility our residents enjoy.
5. Green Farm Village Cluster Association would like to ensure that the aforementioned local concerns are adequately addressed in the environmental review of the Project. Accordingly, Green Farm Village Cluster Association has a substantial interest in these proceedings.

III. CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, the Green Farm Village Cluster Association respectfully requests that it be permitted to intervene in this proceeding with full rights to participate in all further proceedings.

Respectfully submitted,

Carolyn Cormier
 President
 Green Farm Village Cluster Association
 101 Green Farm Road
 New Ipswich, NH 03071
 (603) 801-0607 carolynncormier@gmail.com

Dated: December 18,2015

20151229-5220

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Carolyn Cormier under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/29/2015 2:25:19 PM Filed Date: 12/29/2015 2:25:19 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	carolynncormier@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

As a resident of 101 Green Farm Road, I request to intervene in TN Gas Pipeline’s project: CP16-21-000. This project will take from our common land and install a dangerous compressor station less than 1 mile from our family home. The negative health impacts (as documented by pediatric doctors and research from Minisink, NY) serve as evidence of the possible negative impacts that this project will have on our family’s air and water quality. In addition, we face potential health risks living so close to the proposed New Ipswich compressor station. Because of the potential loss of land and increased health hazards, I feel as though I have a right to intervene in this project. Thank you for your time and consideration.

20151229-5221

Gina Goff, Sharon, NH.

I live nearby the proposed gas pipeline, and not far from the proposed compressor station. It’s my belief that the project, if approved, will impact my health (due to blown downs/releases of toxic fumes into the air), my safety (due to potential fires and explosions) and the value of my home and property. Furthermore, I have concerns about evacuation in the event of a major accident and the capability of the (mostly) volunteer first responders to help.

It is also a key issue that the majority of gas in the proposed pipeline is destined for export overseas...while it may create a few temporary jobs during the construction period, this proposed pipeline and the gas it transports will not benefit the local economy nor lower local energy rates.

As a country, we need to place our emphasis on new, clean energy technologies like solar...not on projects such as NED.

20151229-5229

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Lynn A Sullivan under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/29/2015 2:42:11 PM Filed Date: 12/29/2015 2:42:11 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	IntervenerLAS@yahoo.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I live in New Ipswich, NH and wish to intervene to oppose the NED pipeline. I have an interest because I am a landowner, concerned citizen, wife, mothe and grandmother living just over the half mile mark of the largest compressor station slated to be built.

The pipeline and compressor station drastically risks our health and quality of life both short and long term. The impacts of fracked gas pipelines and compressor stations have been documented and shared by many States informing us of the devastation created during construction and then the after math.

New Hampshire must be spared from short term energy solutions that will leave generations to come with no water, no farms, significant health issues and paying for the residual effects of NED executives' short mindedness.

I am concerned for our water supply, farms, wildlife, conservation land, our health and our way of life in rural NH.

Sincerely,

Lynn Sullivan

20151229-5238

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Kristina Dean under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/29/2015 2:49:57 PM Filed Date: 12/29/2015 2:49:57 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	kristina.dean@thlspecialists.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I would be and already have been affected by the Applicant's filing. I bought my dream home less than 3 years ago when there was not even an inkling of a gas pipeline barreling through my neighborhood. Had I known this was going to happen I would not have purchased my home here in Milford, NH. The pipeline would be less than 100 steps away from my home and that is an extremely terrifying thought. Not only would we have to live with the extensive amount of construction for an undetermined period of time but also if something goes wrong with the pipeline my family and I would be incinerated in seconds. This is not the lifestyle I dreamed of for my family. I also tried selling my home this past September to get away from this mess and I had 1 showing because people were not interested in purchasing a home so close to a gas pipeline. This has already made it impossible for me to sell my home and destroyed my property value and it isn't even in yet. I am asking FERC to deny this application as it is not necessary to come through Milford. Thank you for your consideration.

MOTION TO INTERVENE OF THE TOWN OF SCHODACK, NEW YORK

The Town of Schodack, New York is a municipality incorporated under the laws of New York. Eleven and 153/1000 (11.153) +/- miles of the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline will cross properties located within the municipal limits of the Town of Schodack, New York, that includes many parcels of real property that receive potable water supplies from artesian wells, spring boxes and drilled wells. In addition, the applicant, Tennessee Gas Company, LLC, proposed to place a compressor station within the Town of Nassau, New York close to the Town of Schodack, New York, thereby significantly impacting the serene environment of the community through pollution that includes noise, lightning, traffic, and the release of gasses and chemicals into the surrounding atmosphere during normal operations and especially “blow downs”. The construction of the pipeline and compressor station will also negatively impact State, County and Town Roads located within the Town of Schodack.

Pursuant to Commission Rules 385.214(b) and 157.10, the Town of Schodack, New York moves to intervene in the above captioned proceeding. This intervention is timely filed.

I. CONTACT INFORMATION

Please enter the Town of Schodack, New York below on the official service list for Docket No. CP16-21-000. All pleading, filings and correspondence in the proceeding should be served on the following:

Town of Schodack, New York
Attn.: Dennis Dowds, Town Supervisor
265 Schuurman Road
Castleton, New York 12033
Fax: (518) 477-9594
E-mail: dennis.dowds@schodack.org

II. MOTION TO INTERVENE

The Town of Schodack, New York and its residents are directly impacted by the proposed pipeline. As aforesaid, the pipeline will cross approximately 11.153 miles of real property within the Town of Schodack impacting 243 residential homeowners, 12 agricultural, 5 community service providers, 8 business owners, 1 industrial site, 8 public service providers, and 77 open/vacant spaces. There are several major aquifers from which potable water supplies are obtained that the proposed route will traverse. The pipeline will result in a devaluation of residential property and will limit the businesses ability to expand, thus diminishing the tax base of our Town. Further, the Berkshire Regional Planning Commission has also been acting on behalf of the Town of Schodack, New York, County of Rensselaer, New York and the various municipalities and districts in Rensselaer County, New York and Berkshire County, Massachusetts through which the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline is proposed to or could pass through or impact, to protect their common public interests.

The Berkshire Regional Planning Commission filed scoping comments with FERC on October 15, 2015 (accession no. 201510155279; docket no. PF14-22-000) which comments are incorporated herein by reference and made part hereof. The Berkshire Regional Planning Commission continues to coordinate the dissemination of information to the Town of Schodack, New York and the various towns in New York and Massachusetts. This motion should be regarded as also made in support of the intervention motion made by the Berkshire Regional Planning Commission.

The Town of Schodack, New York opposes the proposed pipeline. If constructed the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline will have adverse environmental and economic impacts, not to mention the intrusion on individual landowners' property.

Intervention is necessary to enable the Town of Schodack, New York to protect its citizens and residents, natural resources, roadways, and to defend its taxpaying residents and businesses and their property from encroachment by Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline. The Town of Schodack, New York seeks to intervene to monitor this proceeding and address potential effects to land, wetlands, riverfront and waterfront, rare and

endangered species, transportation, and homes in close proximity to the proposed pipeline.

If the Town of Schodack, New York is not permitted to intervene as a party to this proceeding, its interests will not be adequately represented by other parties and it may be adversely affected and bound by actions, determinations and decisions in this proceeding without opportunity to participate and be heard. The Town's participation as a party in the proceeding is in the public interest.

WHEREFORE, for the foregoing reasons, the Town of Schodack, New York requests that the Commission GRANT this motion to intervene.

Dated: December 29, 2015

Respectfully submitted,
Dennis Dowds, Supervisor
Town of Schodack
265 Schuurman Road
Castleton, New York 12033
Tel. No.: (518) 477-7918
E-Mail: dennis.dowds@schodack.org

CERTIFICATION OF SERVICE

Wherefore on December 29, 2015, I caused to be served the foregoing Motion to intervene electronically on all parties on the Commission's electronic service list in this proceeding, in accordance with Commission regulations.

Dennis Dowds, Supervisor
Town of Schodack
dennis.dowds@schodack.org

20151229-5263

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Monica J. Leverett under CP16-21-000.
Submission Date: 12/29/2015 3:29:44 PM Filed Date: 12/29/2015 3:29:44 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	mjakuc@smith.edu	

Basis for Intervening:

I am an electric ratepayer who, if Kinder Morgan secures my electric utility as a project customer, expects to see an increase on my bill relating to NED cost recovery.

I enjoy the out of doors and do not want any state or town public parks or forests, which have been set aside for the people and wildlife, to be impacted by any activities of this commercial project.

I am a donor to Massachusetts Audubon Society (West Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary) and The Trustees of Reservations (Notchview Reservation), and the purpose of my donation would be violated if this project is allowed to take easements over land that is meant to be protected forever.

Bald eagles have been seen in Cummington and Plainfield. If they are nesting in the project area, Kinder Morgan must adhere to the requirements of the federal Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act. I don't trust them to do that, based on their past record.

20151229-5272

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Jonathan Mark Haber under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/29/2015 3:50:33 PM

Filed Date: 12/29/2015 3:50:33 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	noflyby@yahoo.com	

Basis for Intervening:

Such a project as proposed by “NED” would simply destroy our communities around where I have lived for the last forty years, and invested in a home I built (from trees on the land) for the last thirty years. My property value, now situated bordering 3 state forests, with Moss Brook running through, is only 4 miles from the proposed compressor station It would cut property values in half. The main reason someone would want to live here is based on natural smells, sounds, and clean water. The TGP proposal threatens what is good about where I live, and the connection with our community and environment.

I produced 3 video programs on this project broadcast by Greenfield Community Television and other area stations, and on youtube. Please watch if possible:

“Moss Brook and TGP - No Fracking Way!”

15 June, 2014 - Youtube 0:28:00

http://youtu.be/BB8K_wm4Erg

GCTV

<http://vp.telvue.com/preview?id=T00887&video=200023>

“Beyond Moss Brook - No Fracking Way!”

15 March, 2015 - Youtube - 0:37:30 + 20:30

<https://youtu.be/jeYUSaswcbw>

GCTV

<http://vp.telvue.com/preview?id=T00887&video=230207>

Beyond Moss Brook - Save Pulpit Falls!

02 June, 2015 - Youtube 0:07:58

<https://youtu.be/YDFtgsxD3UQ>

I also publish Flyby News, an Online Journal, (FlybyNews.com) which among other topics has provided resource and perspectives on: Energy Pollution’s Impact On Our Environment - <https://flybynews.wordpress.com/2011/05/11/energy-pollutions-impact-on-our-environment/>

A clear and present danger exists from too much carbon saturation in our atmosphere that is causing weather extremes and climate change. Why would FERC want ton continue such a devastating investment? The costs for generating electricity is similar by using gas or solar energy. One method causes sickness and devastation, the other harms our world much less, and our community, and these forests should not be harmed in such a manner for the transport of a limited dirty fuel. Our lives and well being is at stake. I will intervene until this project is no longer such a threat.. We have alternatives for generating power.. and one way you will have the peoples’ support, the other way, the old way, we will stand up to such a threat for it tramples on our human rights and that in our US Constitution.

President Eisenhower in his farewell address warned that

..In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist. We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes. We should take nothing for granted. Only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of the huge industrial and military machinery of defense with our peaceful methods and goals, so that security and liberty may prosper together. ““

The people have a right to demand our rights to care for our environment. The government should represent such interests, but have gotten side-track by corruption, money and greed, fear and power. Since the Oil Companies knew the harm from their fuels for the last 30 or more years, isn't it time to stop such an assault on humankind and nature? We have the opportunity to support clean distributed energy technologies, and have the duty to stop such new infrastructure projects by technologies doing us much harm. Please take a stand for everyone's sake in the long run.. Life is too precious to trample upon.

20151229-5275

BEFORE THE UNITED STATES
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company LLC,)
a subsidiary of Kinder Morgan)
Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline)

Docket No. CP16-21-000

**MOTION TO INTERVENE OF
The Board of Selectmen, Town of Conway, Massachusetts
IN OPPOSITION TO THE
NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT PIPELINE**

Pursuant to Rule 214 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (Commission) Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. §385.214, the Board of Selectmen for the Town of Conway, Massachusetts (hereafter referred to as the Town of Conway or Conway) files this Motion to Intervene in the above-captioned proceeding. The Town of Conway opposes the project for many reasons including the immediate and long-term deleterious effects on the public ways, residential properties, public health, environmental integrity, and natural resources of the Town of Conway. Citizens voted at the May 2014 Town Meeting, to oppose the construction of the NED pipeline. Conway seeks party status to protest the proposed pipeline and fully protect Conway's interests.

I. STATEMENT OF INTEREST

A. Description of the Town of Conway

The Town of Conway (37.8 square miles) lies in the foothills of the Berkshires just west of the Connecticut River Valley, a region rich in agriculture, arts & culture. It is the first "hill town" northbound on State Route 116, one of only seven roads designated a Scenic Byway by the Commonwealth. In a poll taken in 2005, cited in the Town's Master Plan of 2013, the townspeople spoke forcefully in favor of pursuing two goals related to the Town's rural nature: 1) preserve Conway's rural character, and 2) safeguard the Town's natural resources, plants, and wildlife. Conway, Massachusetts and its approximately 1,900 residents (represented by the Board of Selectmen) are directly affected by the proposed pipeline project as the proposed route bisects the town, entering from the west, at the border with Ashfield and, after 3.41 miles, would travel under the Deerfield River into Shelburne to the east. If built, it will pass through and along highly sensitive ecosystems, wetland resource areas, vernal pools, cold river fisheries, areas of critical habitat for rare species, protected forests, prime farmland, and permanently protected open space.

B. Description of Impacts

The Town of Conway is directly and indirectly impacted and seeks to intervene to oppose the proposed NED pipeline.

Our concerns about the proposed NED project include: the impact to the environment, the flora, fauna, soils and water, the impact on the quality and flow of subterranean water, noise pollution, the impact on public health, the impact to town public ways, the integrity of the proposed pipeline given the proximity to existing power lines, the impact on cultural resources, agricultural resources, and other natural resources in town.

The pipeline is proposed to cross three public ways: South Shirkshire Road, Shelburne Falls Road (a rural major collector), and Bardwells Ferry Road. The proposed pipeline will cross over a dozen privately owned parcels and result in a devaluation of these properties, thus diminishing the Town's tax base. Impacted land includes parcels that are designated as permanently protected and parcels used for recreation. The proposed Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) operation is located in close proximity to the South River State Forest which, according to the NED application, will negatively impact the forest to an unspecified degree.

In addition to 3.41 miles of 30" pipe, the proposal includes a Mainline Valve (MLV) and "blow off" valve now sited along scenic Shelburne Falls Road, a rural major collector connecting two designated scenic byways. Three private residences are located within 500' of the proposed MLV. Residents have expressed concern over the impact of the proposed pipeline project, during both the construction and operation phases, on the quality of their lives, their health, and the viability of their farms and businesses, including those related to recreation and tourism.

All properties in the Town of Conway have private wells and septic systems. The specific geology of the proposed route across Conway is a grave concern with respect to proposed drilling and blasting as part of the proposed NED project given the geology of the region and the risk to the integrity of the underlying aquifer. This is a particular concern where the HDD operation is proposed to drill through geologic formations characterized by historic faults and fractures.

In July 2012, Conway was designated a Green Community by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, satisfying five criteria demonstrating the Town's commitment to energy efficiency and renewable energy and receiving a state grant. The Green Communities program of Massachusetts' Department of Energy Resources "strives to help all 351 Massachusetts cities and towns find clean energy solutions that reduce long-term energy costs and strengthen local economies. The division provides technical assistance and financial support for municipal initiatives to improve energy efficiency and increase the use of renewable energy in public buildings, facilities and schools." Aiding in the transport of a natural gas, which contributes to global warming, is contrary to ideals we hold, and work we have been doing, as a Green Community.

Finally, questions persist regarding the need for the NED pipeline as is evidenced by the recent report from the Massachusetts Attorney General's office. The capacity for the proposed pipeline has not changed and remains under-committed. There is no direct benefit to the residents of the Town of Conway from the proposed project, though the adverse environmental and economic impacts are clear. The sponsors of this project, while claiming a major need for the pipeline, have admitted that they not yet been able to fully subscribe the projected supply.

Intervention is necessary to enable the Town to protect its park and natural resources and defend its tax-paying residents, businesses, and associated properties from encroachment by the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company LLC, a subsidiary of Kinder Morgan Inc.

C. The Town of Conway's Motion to Intervene Satisfies Regulatory Standards

This petition should be granted because the Town of Conway satisfies the standard for intervention under the Commission's regulations. As discussed above, Conway is directly impacted by the proposed project, and no other individual or organization can adequately represent Conway's unique interest in this proceeding. Further, Conway's intervention is in the public interest because the Town is responsible for the protection of the health and safety of all of its residents. Accordingly, Conway respectfully requests that the Commission grant this Motion to Intervene.

II. CONTACT INFORMATION

The following should be added to the Official Service List, with all notice and communications in this proceeding addressed to the contacts listed below:

Name: John P. O'Rourke, Chair, Board of Selectmen

Address: c/o Town of Conway, P.O. Box 240, Conway, MA 01341

Phone: 413-369-4235 ext. 3

III. PROTEST/COMMENTS

A number of comments from the Town of Conway were submitted independently, with the filings of Massachusetts Senate President Rosenberg, and in testimony to the Massachusetts Facilities Siting Board. The Town and some of its agencies submitted comments previously to the FERC in this matter detailing specific concerns and points of opposition to the proposed NED pipeline. The Pipeline Task Force submitted comments on July 29, 2015 at the FERC scoping hearing in Greenfield, MA; the Conservation Commission submitted comments on July 30, 2015; the Planning Board submitted comments on August 27, 2015; the Board of Selectmen resubmitted the comments of the Pipeline Task Force dated September 22, 2015 to clarify that those comments were on behalf of the Town as a whole; and the Agriculture Commission submitted comments on November 20, 2015.

We have begun the process of reviewing the application filed by the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC a subsidiary of Kinder Morgan on November 20, 2015. At this time we are still trying to determine if the application was responsive to our concerns. A preliminary review suggests that the application is incomplete and that details necessary to assess the environmental impact of the proposal are missing. Deficiencies noted include incomplete information related to the proposed 4,530 foot HDD component of the proposed project. Information on a cathode system is similarly incomplete and fail to explain the appearance of a permanent easement and temporary workspace outside of the proposed right of way (ROW).

IV. CONCLUSION

Wherefore, in light of the foregoing, the Town of Conway, Massachusetts respectfully requests that the Commission GRANT this motion to intervene and allow the Town of Conway to participate in this proceeding with full rights of party status, including the right to request a hearing, cross examine witnesses and seek rehearing and appeal.

Respectfully submitted,

John P. O'Rourke
Chair, Board of Selectmen
c/o Town of Conway
32 Main Street
P.O. Box 240
Conway, MA 01341
413-369-4235, ext. 3
selectboard@townofconway.com

20151229-5303

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Susan C.S. Cristini under CP16-21-000.
Submission Date: 12/29/2015 4:13:53 PM Filed Date: 12/29/2015 4:13:53 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party	Signer (Representative)	Other Contact (Principal)
Individual	Supr_Coach@hotmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I have many concerns about the affect of the pipeline and compressor station on the quality of life in New Ipswich.

Specifically:

Environmental/health impacts --

- 1) The increase in light and noise pollution;
- 2) The possible negative affects on wildlife, designated wetlands, conservation land, ground water, and air quality;
- 3) The possible negative affect to the health of children in close proximity to the compressor site, as well as to anyone with respiratory issues;
- 4) The possibility of leaks in the pipeline and possible explosions which could cause massive destruction of the forests;

Personal impacts --

- 1) The taking of private property by a for profit business;
- 2) The possibility that those who wish to move out of town can not find buyers for their homes even when the property values decrease;
- 3) The possibility of a diminishing tax base and the need for more and better trained first responders, both of which would contribute to increased taxes (I am on a fixed income).

I moved to New Ipswich 10 years ago because of its beauty and the relative peacefulness of the area. Now, both appear threatened by this pipeline and compressor station. I can not afford to move again. Even if I could, I would probably take a loss, that's if I could find a buyer.

Thank-you for taking my concerns into account when making your final decision.

20151229-5314

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Maureen A Flannery under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/29/2015 4:26:41 PM Filed Date: 12/29/2015 4:26:41 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party	Signer (Representative)	Other Contact (Principal)
Individual	maureen@flannery.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I am filing as a private citizen intervenor in this project because of my residence in western Massachusetts and my desire to preserve the landscape that I appreciate exploring for my children and grandchildren to enjoy. I do not own land adjacent to the proposed pipeline route but do serve on the board of Woolman Hill Quaker Retreat Center in Deerfield, which would be adversely impacted by the pipeline. I advocate for measures that decrease use of fossil fuels and increase availability of sustainable forms of energy.

20151229-5317

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Docket No. CP16-21-000

Motion to Intervene

Opposed to Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline

December 28, 2015

Dear FERC Administrative Staff,

My family moved to Massachusetts 20 years ago from Texas. We fell in love with a colonial home in east Dracut. We bought our house when Dracut was requiring that all new homes be built on at least one acre. The power lines running beside our home were promised to us as conservation land and our neighbors would be deer, turkey, and moose. With this station being near our home, we fear losing our peaceful relationship with the wildlife and Dracut's pristine conservation and farm land we have worked so hard to

protect.

Leaving behind the life of the big city, we began to raise chickens, grow most of our own vegetables, and compost our garbage. This is the lifestyle that is supposed to provide us with a long and healthy life. Now I am just half a mile away from the proposed Kinder Morgan compressor plant. I am afraid the carcinogens emitted will prevent me from raising healthy chickens and from growing edible vegetables free of contaminants. Not only will I have to stop growing my own food, but I will not feel safe buying any food grown or raised anywhere in our town or neighboring towns.

Our house is on well water. If the pipeline cracks or breaks, it will contaminate our well water with somewhere around 150 chemicals. I don't know if I will be able to taste the contamination, or if I will be drinking unflavored poison.

Our 3 daughters attended Dracut High School and all received scholarships, bachelors degrees, and doctorates. Our family has thrived here and we owe this to our healthy environment. Now, our girls are married and have started families of their own in neighboring towns. I babysit my grandchildren at my house - my house sits directly in the prevailing northeasterly winds of toxic pollution from the Kinder Morgan compressor plant. The compressor station has us most concerned about the health of our grandchildren. The contamination from carcinogenic chemicals has been proven to cause leukemia in children. My whole street is full of young children.

When I am in my garden, I listen to the birds. I read that the compressor makes a constant sound. I will lose my peaceful existence. I am concerned that the noise pollution will aggravate my nerves beyond tolerance. Then there is the Incineration Zone and the "Blow Down" when this compressor station turns into a bomb. This is the scariest part of the whole disaster. Even though I am slightly out of the Incineration Zone, I am pretty sure that the forest will not stop burning where the zone stops. It has the potential of taking down all of the trees in east Dracut, for they are all connected. The loud sound, the blaring sirens, the fear of explosion, the huge dump of hazardous, undetermined chemicals that will spew into the air is terrifying me. How can such a facility even be allowed to exist ???

My husband is getting ready to retire. Our house is paid for and we look forward to growing old in our beloved Dracut. We are older now and have planned on living in our home for the rest of our lives. Our house is a great portion of our wealth and having to sell it at a loss when our property values dive would deplete our ability to remain independent. House values will drop - not just for houses in the incendiary zone, but for all of Dracut. We will be the "town with the compressor station", not the "farm town" any more. All home values will drop, including the towns that surround us.

The power lines, which were conservation land, are now a pathway of potential destruction of our well water, our forest, our wetlands. The wildlife that dwell there will most certainly never return in my lifetime. The things that Dracut planned to protect 20 years ago, the way of life that Dracut wanted for their community, will no longer exist.

Our family has the lowest electricity use in our neighborhood, and we are strongly committed to being energy efficient. Further use of fossil fuels heavily pollutes the air and causes global warming, respiratory illnesses, and cancer. I am not comfortable having this in our town where we have worked so hard to protect our open areas and farms. This undermines everything we have worked to protect and will ruin our town's beauty and charm.

The world is shutting down on fossil fuels. Everyone is stopping the fracking. Why are we going here??? I am deeply saddened that the Dracut lifestyle that was sold to us 20 years ago is being raped for private profit. It hurts all of us. Please, please stop this. We fear for our lives.

Submitted by

Barbara Varnum

6 Trinity Way, Dracut, MA 01826

kbvarnum@gmail.com

20151230-5000

Susan Cristini, New Ipswich, NH.
29Dec2015

To Whom it may concern,

I am writing to ask you to extend the deadline for eFiling as an intervenor for docket Number CP16-21-000 on the ferc.gov website because the website was unavailable from mid-day 24Dec2015 until the morning of 28Dec2015. I am assuming eFiling will be similarly affected by the new years holiday. This results in a full week plus of days that the site will have been unavailable for eFiling.

These weekend days are most often the best time for folks who work Monday through Friday to e-File. Many tried to access the ferc.gov website to e-File only to find the site unavailable during the Christmas break. Will the FERC please consider extending the Intervenor deadline for this docket?

Please advise.

Thank-you in advance for your prompt attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Susan C. S. Cristini,
Resident of New Ipswich, NH

20151230-5002

Leslie J Carey, Averill Park, NY.

The week of Christmas was the warmest on record by far for a vast stretch of the eastern United States from Texas to Maine. In Philadelphia, every single day this month has been warmer than normal—if that word even retains meaning during a month like this.

While this month's extreme weather is primarily due to an atmosphere supercharged by the record-breaking El Niño, it's also an example of the kind of unnerving meteorological event that's becoming more likely as climate change plays an increasingly large role in daily weather. The New York Times called it "a fitting end to the warmest year on record." Together, El Niño and climate change have combined for a year unlike any other in human history—a harbinger of an altered planet.

Over the past several days, an alarming string of tornadoes has left dozens dead across the South. At least 68 tornadoes were reported in 15 states from California to the Carolinas from Dec. 21 to Monday, the longest streak on record of December days with a tornado. December tornadoes are twice as common during El Niño years, but this weekend's atmosphere over the South was something different entirely: By some measures, it was the most moisture-laden ever seen during the winter months.

One tornado in northern Mississippi on Wednesday was so strong it ripped the carpet off the floor after destroying a home. A series of tornadoes also struck Northern Texas the day after Christmas, many at night, creating horrific devastation. The worst one seems to have occurred in Garland, Texas; it was the deadliest tornado in the Dallas area—for any month—in nearly 90 years. Meteorologist Bob Henson notes that 2015 is the first year since 1875, when records began, that there have been more tornado-related deaths in December than in the entire rest of the year combined.

The Texas tornadoes were part of a much larger storm system that at one point encompassed about half the country. The same storm system also brought heavy rains to the Midwest that threaten one of the biggest floods in history on the Mississippi River south of St. Louis, surpassing even the legendary 1993 flood. Road closures due to high water blanketed Missouri, and water levels will continue to rise for several days as record floodwaters from Oklahoma make their way toward the Gulf of Mexico.

That's absolutely terrifying and incredibly rare.

On its western and northern fringes, the storm brought snow, the worst of which struck New Mexico. There, Gov. Susana Martinez activated the state's National Guard and said the historic snowstorm had created a "dire situation." In fact, at the exact same time that tornadoes were bearing down on Dallas, a record-setting blizzard was burying cars under snowdrifts 10 feet deep on the western side of Texas. Snow fell as far south as northern Mexico. The system also helped bring record-breaking freezing weather to southern California, a fierce ice storm to Chicago and Michigan, and the first significant New England snowfall of the season—just two days after temperatures climbed into the 70s as far north as Vermont. The Wall Street Journal called the juxtaposition of weather extremes "freakish."

El Niño has driven the show when it comes to this year's extreme weather, and there are signs its influence on the atmosphere will only grow over the coming weeks and months. In the United Kingdom, recent record rains have caused flooding that's prompted a political firestorm as the country struggles with the aftermath. In South America, the worst flooding in 50 years has hit parts of Paraguay, Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay. Meanwhile, drought and famine threaten Ethiopia, and Australia has suffered a record-setting heat wave. Earlier this year, a prolonged drought in Indonesia sparked a nightmare of forest fires that blanketed the region in smoke. Taken together, the fires, floods, heat waves, tornadoes, and blizzards are surely strange, even unsettling—but the scariest weather of the year is still on the way.

As it departs North America this week, the storm will rapidly intensify over the northern reaches of the Gulf Stream and draw tremendous amounts of warm air northward from Spain and the Mediterranean Sea toward the Arctic. As the storm approaches Iceland, it will have strengthened to the equivalent of some of the strongest hurricanes ever recorded in terms of atmospheric pressure. Intensely high pressure over western Russia, perhaps boosted by melting sea ice, will aid in setting up the tropics-to-pole atmospheric superhighway.

Unlike other recent episodes of extreme weather around the planet, this storm is probably not related to El Niño, which has limited influence in Europe. The storm will be strengthening over the exact spot that North Atlantic temperatures have been cooling over recent years, an effect that scientists have linked to a slowdown of the basin's circulation triggered in part by melting sea ice—the same scenario that was highly dramatized in the movie *The Day After Tomorrow*. This year, there's been a notable increase in the sharp contrast between this cold patch and record warm ocean temperatures in the tropical Atlantic, an effect that leads to stronger ocean storms—like this one.

The remarkable storm will briefly boost temperatures in the Arctic basin to nearly 10 degrees Fahrenheit warmer than normal—and the North Pole itself will be pushed above the freezing point, with temperatures perhaps as warm as 40 degrees. That's absolutely terrifying and incredibly rare. Keep in mind: It's late December and dark 24 hours a day at the North Pole right now. The typical average high temperature this time of year at the North Pole is about minus 15 to minus 20 degrees. To create temperatures warm enough to melt ice to exist in the dead of winter—some 50 or 60 degrees warmer than normal—is unthinkable.

For some perspective, I contacted a team of climate scientists at the University of Washington who maintain a fleet of weather monitoring equipment near the North Pole. James Morison, the principal investigator of the North Pole Environmental Observatory, said he's "never heard of" temperatures above freezing in the wintertime there. Looking closer at the weather data, it appears this event is in fact unprecedented during the time period from late December through late April.

On Wednesday, the North Pole will be warmer than Western Texas, Southern California, and parts of the Sahara. This, more than any other extreme weather event in a remarkable year for the climate, feels like something new. This midwinter melt at the North Pole is a preview of what's to come later this century—in fact, the temperature anomalies match almost exactly with what is predicted. The long-feared worst-case climate change scenario, which, thankfully was made less likely by the Paris agreement earlier this month, projects an ice-free Arctic within decades. Storms like this week's are exactly the type of events that do the dirty work of ushering in that world. In the meantime, we're running on the knife's edge as a civilization, dodging warning signs and hoping for a planetary miracle.

20151230-5004

Julia Steed Mawson, Pelham, NH.

To our FERC Commissioners,

I am writing to respectfully request that the period for allowing individuals or groups to file a Motion to Intervene be extended beyond the January 6th, 2015 date. I understand that as of the Nov 20th Kinder Morgan filing, there are now over 700 new abutters (and at least twice that in the impact zone).

I met several families from Dracut MA last night that due to a nother route alteration, have just found out that they are now within 1/2 mile of the 22,000 hp compressor station now slated to be located on an existing haz mat site. They have never been notified by Kinder Morgan - with the exception of one letter that arrived a few days ago addressed to the developer of the subdivision who has no further connection to that project.

They are stunned to say the least and they don't even know how to get onto this site to make comments or ask questions.

This story is not unique - and is similar whether one is in MA, NH, NY or Penn. I am deeply disturbed that these families and so many others will have no opportunity to participate in FERC Scoping Meetings or have no time to learn about the incredible complexities of this massive project and the tangle of the office of FERC.

As an abutter who first learned about this on January 15th, 2015 when someone knocked on my door asking permission to survey, I know what it feels like. I myself was a victim of shoddy notification since my Kinder Morgan letter of December 5, 2014 never reached me since it was address to me ... Pelham, NH. (I am not sure anyone has been able to receive mail addressed that way since probably the turn of the century.) Shoddy work? Deliberate obfuscation? A simple mistake? It has left me wondering for months now.

But the main point is that as a result, I lost over a month of precious time trying to jump on the learning curve - and it is a steep one that has taken me and others months to learn. Needless to say, I empathise with these new abutters and I must therefore ask that more time be given for them to comment, become an intervenor and to participate in FERC scoping sessions.

To not give adequate notice for a project as complex as this is not just.

Again, please extend the time for allowing these new people to learn, participate and comment.

Julia Steed Mawson

17 South Shore Dr.

Pelham, NH 03076

20151230-5009

BEFORE THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline/Kinder Morgan

Northeast Energy Direct

Docket No. CP16-21

Stop NY Fracked Gas Pipeline (SNYFGP) is an all-volunteer group of concerned citizens who oppose Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's Northeast Energy Direct (NED) project. Its current activities include increasing public awareness about this project and its many risks, educating members of the impacted communities about their rights at public forums, and communicating with local, state and federal officials. In addition to our activities in Rensselaer County, SNYFGP is also a member of the three-state Stop NED Coalition, which combines the efforts of more than two dozen like-minded organizations along the pipeline's proposed route from Wright, NY to Dracut, MA.

Pursuant to Commission Rules 385.214(b) and 157.10, Stop NY Fracked Gas Pipeline moves to intervene in

the above captioned proceeding. This intervention is timely filed.

I. CONTACT INFORMATION

Please enter Stop NY Fracked Gas Pipeline below on the official service list for Docket No. CP16-21. All pleadings, filings and correspondence in this proceeding should be served on the following:

Stop NY Fracked Gas Pipeline
1409 County Route 5
Canaan, NY 12029
info@stopnypipeline.org
518-781-4686

II. MOTION TO INTERVENE

SNYFGP opposes NED for the following reasons:

- The stated “need” for this project is highly questionable. According to Massachusetts Attorney General Maura Healy’s report this pipeline is not needed.
- Continued extraction of fossil fuel is causing climate warming and is endangering life on our planet. Fracking as an extraction process is endangering the health and safety of people living near the fracking fields and workers in the industry. Continuing to rely on fossil fuel is slowing our transition to renewable energy.
- It is likely the majority of the fracked gas that would flow through this pipeline will be exported to Canada and overseas, potentially via Kinder Morgan’s own companies such as American Petroleum Tankers and State Class Tankers, which would negatively impact energy prices for the domestic customers who would be subsidizing the cost and construction of the pipeline through tariffs, property taxes and loss of their private land.
- Few, if any, residents along the New York route of the pipeline will receive gas service, lower energy prices or receive permanent jobs from this project, but all will bear the majority of the risks and costs, including serious threats to their health, established conservation land, water supplies, property values and individual rights as private landowners.
- We do not support the use of public land or hundreds of acres of private property taken by force through Eminent Domain by a for-profit company, nor do we believe families, farms, churches and schools should be placed in what the industry itself terms “incineration zones.”
- New York recently banned fracking statewide on the grounds that the health risks outweigh any potential benefits, yet this same fracked gas would be piped at very high pressure (1460 psi) through our communities, in close proximity to electric transmission wires and beneath numerous bodies of water if NED is approved.
- Neither the process of fracking, nor the transport of the resulting gas, which contains hundreds of chemicals the industry refuses to list, is safe, sustainable or clean. This is made clear in numerous daily news items (unsolved wastewater problems, earthquakes, explosions, leaks, large-scale spills, pollution, lack of oversight, etc.) from across the country and around the world, including coverage of five major pipeline incidents in January 2015 alone.
- As documented by a recent Harvard-led study, the poorly maintained existing gas infrastructure in Boston alone currently leaks “15 billion cubic feet of natural gas, worth some \$90 million” each year, enough to service 200,000 homes. There is much work to be done inspecting, servicing and maintaining the pipelines already in the ground before billions of dollars worth of larger and more dangerous pipelines are considered.
- In addition to the many long-term risks of the pipeline itself, the new, high-power compressor stations it would require present their own well-documented light, sound, security and environmental concerns, including the regularly scheduled venting of methane (which the EPA reports has 20 times more impact on climate change than carbon dioxide over a 100-year period) during blow downs.

- The true cost of expanding the region's antiquated pipeline infrastructure (tax and utility-payer burdens, air and water quality, public safety, climate change impact, continued reliance on fossil fuels, etc.) is incalculable, and many safer options with long-term benefits for local workers, energy customers and alternative energy development are available now.

WHEREFORE, for the foregoing reasons, Stop NY Fracked Gas Pipeline requests that the Commission GRANT this motion to intervene.

Respectfully submitted,

Stop NY Fracked Gas Pipeline
 1409 Route 5
 Canaan, NY 12029
 518-781-4686
 info@stopnypipeline.org
 December 16, 2015

20151230-5010

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of John S Leoutsacos under CP16-21-000.
 Submission Date: 12/29/2015 10:41:43 PM Filed Date: 12/30/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	jleoutsacos@myfairpoint.net	

Basis for Intervening:

I am requesting intervenor status opposing the Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline/Northeast Energy Direct (NED) project docket #CP16-21.

I am a homeowner who will be directly and irreparably affected by the construction of this proposed pipeline and the location of MID compressor station #4. My home at 79 Mountainview Dr., Temple, NH is within a half mile and possibly as close as a quarter-mile of the proposed MID compressor station #4 in New Ipswich, New Hampshire.

I am concerned about my dug well water source. The proposed compressor station, with its toxic emissions, could contaminate my well.

I am concerned that too much habitat will be lost for the local raptors, risking their migratory flight.

I have several concerns about the proposed 41,000 hp turbine compressor station:

- Toxic and carcinogenic emissions will be emitted posing potentially severe health hazards.
- The 24/7 continuous noise that the proposed compressor station would emit will forever damage the quaint and charming character of my New Hampshire town.
- I am very concerned about the noise and known toxic pollutants that are released during BLOW OFFS (BLOW DOWNS).
- Due to possible light pollution of our incredible night sky, those of us living so close to the proposed compressor station may not be able to see the stars from home again.
- I have concerns about the adverse effects on human health caused by subsonic vibrations as reported in studies.

I am concerned about the traffic, pollution, damage to our rural roads and untold multiple disturbances during the construction of this proposed project.

I'm concerned that living so close to a compressor station would adversely affect my property value.

I am concerned that being so close to the proposed compressor station would put the children and staff of the Temple Elementary School in harm's way.

I am concerned about the possibility of a high pressure, natural gas infrastructure incident that would require rapid evacuation from nearby neighborhoods. The potential for devastation and destruction to property and the possible loss of life could be catastrophic.

Kinder Morgan/TGP is rushing to build this pipeline, insisting that NH "needs it." Intelligent, educated citizens, including Massachusetts Attorney General, Maura Healy absolutely disagree. Ms. Healy has already supplied an extensively researched report to FERC with this reasoning.

I am very concerned that if this project is approved, New Ipswich, Temple and Greenville, New Hampshire could become the next Minisink, New York .

20151230-5014

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Margaret M Viglione under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/29/2015 9:05:30 PM Filed Date: 12/30/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	pegviglione@comcast.net	

Basis for Intervening:

I reside in Greenville, NH so the proposed NED pipeline would run through my town. The sole source of drinking water for Greenville is within approximately 1 mile of the New Ipswich compressor station and I have grave concerns regarding drinking water contamination. I also have grave concerns about the emission of toxic fumes from planned blow downs and potential leaks as I live about 1/2 - 1 mile from the proposed compressor station site. I am very concerned about the damage to aquifers, rivers, wetlands, forests, ecosystems, farmland/gardens, and residential properties, both during construction and operation. I feel the levels of air, noise and light pollution will irreparably damage our rural way of life. I have additional concerns that our local, volunteer emergency responders are untrained, unequipped and unprepared for any pipeline emergency event. I also have grave doubts that Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas has the financial stability to build, operate and maintain this project safely and responsibly. Studies have clearly shown that this gas is NOT NEEDED in New Hampshire, is intended for export to provide huge profits for a private corporation and is NOT in the public interest. Therefore I unequivocally OPPOSE this pipeline project.

20151230-5029

I live in Wellesley, MA and I want to intervene in this proceeding to oppose the NED pipeline. I have an interest which may be directly affected by the outcome of the proceeding because my daily commute crosses over the proposed pipeline route, so I will be at physical risk. I am also concerned about multiple negative impacts on my local economy and environment, including unchecked natural gas leaks and potential impact on my drinking water supply. I am also a donor to land conservation organization and the purpose of my donation would be violated.

20151230-5043

Alice and Kenneth J Bury, Trustees

7 Patricia Lane

Amherst, NH 03031

Email: apkjb1117@aol.com (Alice), kenjbury@comcast.net (Ken)

Phone: 603-672-0687 (H), 603-320-0622 (Alice's Cell), 603-930-7163 (Ken's Cell)

I. Background

We are owners of the property at 7 Patricia Lane, Amherst, NH 03031. This approximately 1 acre plot including our primary residence was identified by Kinder Morgan to be partial used for a temporary and then permanent easement for the proposed NEDirect Natural Gas pipeline. Not only would the proposed route directly impact our property but it would also cross Patricia Lane at its only point of egress isolating us should an emergency condition develop.

We are seniors with a limited amount of financial resources. One of our major financial reserves is the investment we have in this house and land. While we have been told that having a pipeline in our back yard would not ultimately impact the value of our investment, from this time until the area is re-grown and settled will be years. We do not have years to wait until and if we do get the value back in our investment.

As residents of the state of New Hampshire and the USA we question the need for this extra energy resource. NH does not need and for the most part will not use this gas. Massachusetts is in most need and is expected to use most of this gas and as such the pipeline should be located there. It is also true that the original and current route will take it through one of the largest aquifer's in NH.

Also it has become apparent that the gas flowing through this pipeline will be sent out of the country to Canada where as well as being used by them it maybe liquefied and sent to Europe. While we are not against this use we do think that Kinder Morgan should not be given eminent domain rights to what will ultimately improve their bottom line. Eminent domain is for the common good not to reward a private corporation.

II. Motion to Intervene

We have been told that the original proposed route has been changed to move it off and further away from our property. We also understand that this could be changed back to the original route. Also even though the location has been moved it still leaves us within what is called "incineration zone" within 1,000 ft of the pipeline.

For these reasons we want to apply for intervener status on this project if it is continued.

Kenneth J. Bury, Trustee

Alice Bury, Trustee

20151230-5046

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Deanna Scarfe under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/30/2015 8:12:28 AM Filed Date: 12/30/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	deannascarfe@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I am a stakeholder in this matter. I will be affected by the outcome of this proceeding. I own property and live in the Westfield River Watershed which will be affected by the pipeline. My family and I also used protected public lands such as the Trustees of Reservations Notchview Property. The Notchview property is used by the Bill Koch Cross-Country Ski League which develops recreational and competitive cross-country skiers. This property will be affected by the pipeline.

I am also a taxpayer and electric ratepayer. I want my resources to be used for developing less harmful and less disruptive ways of meeting energy needs. I also believe that this pipeline will produce a monetary benefit for a *company* at the detriment to the *people* and the environment.

Please do not prioritize a *company* over *people*. Please do not approve the pipeline.

BEFORE THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC
A division of Kinder Morgan Energy Partners
Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline

Docket No. CP 16-21

**MOTION TO INTERVENE OF
THE FOUR MILE BROOK WATERSHED ADVISORY COMMITTEE
NORTHFIELD, MA**

Kinder Morgan/TGP filed their formal application for Northeast Energy Direct (NED) on November 20, 2015. Docket No. CP16-21 for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity, pursuant to the Natural Gas Act, 15 U.S.C. § 717f, and 18 C.F.R. §§ 157.1 et seq.. In its Application, TGP requests authorization to construct, modify and expand natural gas infrastructure through western Massachusetts.

The Four Mile Brook Watershed Advisory Committee is an official town board of residents who advise the Northfield, Massachusetts selectboard in how to balance town, landowner, and environmental concerns about Four Mile Brook Road and Four Mile Brook, a Massachusetts Division of Fisheries and Wildlife designated cold water fishery.

Both Four Mile Brook and Four Mile Brook Road are affected by the NED pipeline expansion. The brook would be crossed at least once, and approximately a quarter of the pipeline's 8.5 mile route within Northfield is within the brook's watershed.

Further, Four Mile Brook Road has been proposed by Kinder Morgan as a transportation route for equipment and materials used to build the pipeline. Both the road and watershed would be greatly impacted (literally) by heavy truck traffic for which it was not designed, and there is a substantial increase in public safety risk with the increase in traffic.

I. CONTACT INFORMATION

Please enter the Four Mile Brook Watershed Advisory Committee on the official service list for Docket No. CP 16-21. All pleadings, filings and correspondence in this proceeding should be served on the following:

Lisa McLoughlin
364 Four Mile Brook Rd.
Northfield, MA 01360
Intervenor2@hemlockhouse.net

II. INTEREST OF PETITIONER

As an official town board of residents who live and/or own property along Four Mile Brook and Four Mile Brook Road, we have a myriad of concerns regarding the environment and safety of our neighborhood and the environmental integrity of Four Mile Brook and its watershed which includes our drinking well water. The incursion of the pipeline into the brook's watershed, the direct crossing of the brook and its tributaries by the pipeline, and the construction process of the pipeline create many problems for us as residents and land owners.

So far, we are concerned about the following aspects of this project, and we expect to take a position on the project once we complete our review of the application filed with FERC and subsequent documents filed:

1. Very high potential to negatively impact to water quality in the watershed of Four Mile Brook. That, in turn, would affect the aquatic habitat of the brook itself, as well as our wells and drinking water.
2. Increased potential for erosion due to changes in drainage patterns caused by construction and by the pipeline itself, causing degradation of the aquatic habitat of the brook due to sediment deposit.

3. Fragmentation of the forest, which would affect animal patterns of movement and migration, and increase the likelihood of the establishment of invasive plants
4. Possibility of blasting for construction causing structural damage to our houses.
5. Increase of traffic on our road which is at times a single lane with severely restricted sight distance, and therefore dangerous. This dirt road is in most of its length one lane with severely limited site distances. In 2010 it was the subject of a Franklin Regional Council of Governments grant for reducing roadway impacts on the watershed. An increase in traffic also brings an increase in littering, a perennial problem already along our rural road.
6. Construction noise including drilling, chain sawing, blasting, drones, surveillance helicopters, truck traffic, and heavy equipment which would destroy our peaceful enjoyment and use of our properties, and would affect animal populations.
7. Increased neighborhood noise after construction due to loss of tree cover, increase in traffic for monitoring personnel, drones, and/or helicopters, and maintenance along the right of way including chainsaws and other vegetation management.
8. Reduced air quality due to the compressor station emissions and increased vehicular traffic including heavy equipment during and after construction.
9. Degradation of our local scenery and view sheds including loss of tree cover and possibly enhanced roadway infrastructure designed to accommodate large vehicles. We are currently exploring scenic designation for the road, and any changes to it would make that designation less possible.
10. Likely destruction of historic and cultural resources along the pipeline route, and fragmentation of our cultural landscape which goes back thousands of years.
11. Degradation of the environmental quality and monetary value of our property in the vicinity of the pipeline during and after construction.
12. Our neighborhood is within the evacuation zone for emergencies at Northfield Mountain Pump Station, and the compounding safety hazard of this facility on any pipeline disaster (or vice versa) has not been studied, putting all residents of this zone at greater risk.

For the reasons set forth above, the Four Mile Brook Watershed Advisory Committee has “an interest which may be directly affected by the outcome of the proceeding” pursuant to 18 C.F.R. § 214(b)(2)(ii) and its “participation is in the public interest” pursuant to 18 C.F.R. § 214(b)(2)(iii).

III. CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, for the foregoing reasons, the Four Mile Brook Watershed Advisory Committee respectfully requests that its motion to intervene be allowed.

Lisa McLoughlin
364 Four Mile Brook Rd.
Northfield, MA 01360
Intervenor2@hemlockhouse.net
413-475-0650

20151230-5048

BEFORE THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC
A division of Kinder Morgan Energy Partners
Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline

Docket No. CP 16-21

MOTION TO INTERVENE OF

Warren Ondras and Lisa McLoughlin

We own a home at 364 Four Mile Brook Rd., Northfield, MA, and with Gail Ondras, own an adjacent parcel (with the same address), 76 acres of mature hemlock forest. We oppose this project due to the following concerns:

- Both our parcels, including our homestead, are within a half mile of the proposed pipeline route.
- Four Mile Brook which would be crossed by the pipeline, runs through both our properties.
- Kinder Morgan has proposed to use our road (Four Mile Brook Rd.) to access the pipeline route and compressor station parcels. This is an un-engineered, one lane dirt track and not suitable for heavy truck traffic. It would endanger us to run trucks on this road, and possibly make the road impassable when trucks are on it, as there is only one lane for most of it.
- We would be listening to the construction noises of the pipeline and compressor station for a year or more including blasting and heavy equipment. I know construction noises in these areas would reach my house because new electrical pylons were installed along the same route last year, and I heard that construction. This interferes with our work: we both work from home.
- My right to the peaceful enjoyment of my property would be impaired not just during the construction process but after it by the compressor station. As we live on a hilltop, we would also hear and see the light pollution from the proposed compressor station. This would interfere with the practice of my religion which requires dark night skies and natural sounds.
- Our property value would be affected by the pipeline's proximity and by the introduction of noise from the construction and then from compressor station.
- We live within the evacuation zone for emergencies at Northfield Mountain Pump Station, and the compounding safety hazard of this facility on any pipeline disaster (or vice versa) has not been studied, putting all residents of this zone at greater risk.

WHEREFORE, because we will be personally affected by this project, we respectfully request that pursuant to rule 214(b)(2)(ii) we be granted intervenor status.

CONTACT INFORMATION

Warren Ondras
364 Four Mile Brook Rd.
Northfield, MA 01360
warren@hemlockhouse.net

20151230-5050

Re: Request for Intevenor Status – CP 16-21
Dt: December 29, 2015
Fm: Steve Roberto
177 Gulf Road
Northfield, MA 01360
To: FERC – Ref doc CP 16-21

I live in Northfield, Massachusetts, and want to intervene in this proceeding to oppose the NED pipeline proposal. My family has an interest, many, which may be directly affected by the outcome of the proceeding because of the following concerns:

- I am an electric rate payer who, if KM secure my electric utility as a project customer, we expect an increase on our monthly electric bills relating to the NED proposal, not a decrease in utility pricing boosted by the KM marketing effort.
- I am a directly impacted land owner with site – specific concerns listed below.

- I am a resident whose watershed is crossed significantly by the proposed route & could have an impact to my drinking water (well) supply impacted in volume & quality by construction & operation of the pipeline & proposed compressor station & electric substation operations. I also have two ground spring fed open ponds fed from above recharge filtering. The water quality of both existing is & has been excellent.
- My family has a farm directly downhill & down wind from the proposed pipeline & proposed compressor station. The distance apart has not been shared by KM, but is approximately 1500 lf.
- We are very concerned for our health with the proposed 41,000 hp frak NG engine industrial complex sited in an agricultural zoned, rural district. The complex would be sited atop a pristine water recharge slope with high quality water & healthy open running brooks. Our water will very likely be ruined.
- We are very concerned about the planned methane blowdown discharges & the related cancer causing & health issues with such releases including heart attack, stroke & respiratory affects by close proximity to these events. Part of our concern are local wind patterns thru the year with frequent inversions annually.
- We are concerned for road damage, erosion of brooks & construction impacts from digging, tree clear cuts & blasting. Our local roads & drainage is fragile & easily damaged. The truck traffic & idling exhaust of equipment will produce annoyances that are grave. The operation noise of the proposed compressor station is unacceptable. Our average natural noise level is 30-35 db. The compressor stations may not hold their required 55 db average. An average noise is alarming & would frequently break 100 db thru the year.
- The Air quality of running frak NG engines at the compressor station 24/7 is disturbing & not in the public convenience or good.
- The economic impacts of both a pipeline & additionally a huge compressor station are staggering & directly impact the radius land owners assessed & actual property values. Greatly diminished are the quiet, the night sky & peace & tranquility that local residents moved to Northfield to experience. That will be destroyed.
- The impact to wildlife is likely significant. Our area is host to hunting, fishing, camping & hiking by thousands of visitors & residents. The wide corridor resulting from the proposal along with the electric high line corridor opens a disproportionately extensive clearing for invasive species & wildlife movement thru the area.

In summary, I am opposed to the NED proposal. It is an unnecessary proposal based on the private corporate interests (KM) & profit at the expense of forested land, much in conservation holdings, impacting local residents along & near the proposal path. It is very Eco Unfriendly. It does little to nothing to advance our climate change goals & mission. The very basic evaluation of need is currently being challenged by an unbiased research study released & submitted to your group from the Mass. Attorney General office, Ms. M. Healy. The summary & thrust of that study state clearly the overreaching saturation of such a pipeline into the Northeast. We feel confident that the damage to our community, our home, our environment, is priority over alternative routes you proposed KM address. It appears the public good & convenience is substantially more the profit of frak gas shipment to the coast, processed into LNG for shipment to European markets.

While their interests are the focus many suffer the damage for that luxury. Please critically assess alternatives if that is the only way. It would be far better to stop the project so that renewal energy, energy efficiency & existing energy sources are better managed within New England.

Thank You.

Steve Roberto

20151230-5052

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Heather C Gray under CP16-21-000. Objecting to pipeline.

Submission Date: 12/29/2015 7:28:07 PM Filed Date: 12/30/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	heathergray63@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I live in Ashfield, MA. This is one of the towns that the proposed pipeline would go through. As such, the pipeline affects me, my neighbors, my town, and our water supply. With the high incidence of leaks, explosions, accidents, etc., should this pipeline be built it's only a matter of time before something happens and contaminates our drinking water.

I oppose the pipeline project; it should not be built. It's environmentally dangerous, unneeded, and I don't want to have to pay for it (taxes, whatever). We're getting solar installed at our house, as are over 100 households in our area, so we are REDUCING our need for their last-century, old-fashioned fuel.

I object to the delivery of non-renewable fossil fuels in the form of fracked natural gas that contributes to greenhouse gas and the resulting warming of the planet, a course that is inherently self destructive to our world. I object to the negative effect the pipeline will have on our watershed. I'm concerned about toxic emissions -- Boston has enough of that from all the leaking pipes there; we don't want that here, poisoning people and animals. The pipeline construction will the impact the land, eroding and destroying it in many places, because some of the land is extremely fragile and needs the trees to keep it stable.

This is a thoroughly bad idea, contrived by greedy corporations, and is completely unnecessary. Time and more than time to plan and move forward on clean energies, to improve the world instead of destroying it.

20151230-5055

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Robert J McArthur under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/29/2015 6:02:45 PM Filed Date: 12/30/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	boyntonad@hotmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I am a home owner in the Green Farm Village Cluster Association and the pipeline would abut our property. My home is less than 1/4 of a mile from the proposed pipeline location and the compressor station would be less than a 1/2 mile from my house. I will be 70 yrs old in May and my wife will be 68 and we moved to New Ipswich , NH to get away from noise and pollution and things that would harm us. We moved here to enjoy the peaceful country life for our senior years. Now we hear about the pipeline and it upsets our plans for our remaining years. What we have worked all these years spoiled by the pipeline. Now the value of our house will go down and if we could find a buyer I don't know if we would get enough to relocate to get away from the pipeline.

20151230-5061

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Thomas DeVito under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/29/2015 6:28:23 PM

Filed Date: 12/30/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	liont@aol.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I am a landowner directly impacted by the pipeline route.

20151230-5064

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC
North East Direct Pipeline Project

Docket No. CP16-21-000

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO INTERVENE

Pursuant to Rules 212 and 214 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's ("Commission") Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 385.212 and 385.214 (2007), I/we, Paul and Kristina Oliveira, file this motion to intervene in this proceeding.

On November 20, 2015, the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC ("TGP") filed its application under § 7 of the Natural Gas Act, 15 U.S.C. § 717f, and § 157 of FERC's regulations, 18 C.F.R. § 157.1 et seq., for the proposed North East Direct Project (NED), FERC Docket No. CP 16- 21-000

I. COMMUNICATIONS AND SERVICE

All communications, pleadings, and orders with respect to this proceeding should be sent to the following individual:

Salvatore and Maryann Frisella
39 Valewood Circle
Tewksbury, Ma. 01876
mfezzuoglio@hotmail.com

II. INTEREST OF PETITIONER

Construction, operation and maintenance of the Pipeline would adversely impact me and my family. This proposed pipeline has a direct impact to our property and our property value. The construction of this pipeline will have a negative impact, not only on our property, but the property in our neighborhood as well. Our neighborhood sits on the Shawsheen river, with many wildlife species calling the river home. There are turtles that make their way to our backyard every spring to lay their eggs, it is their yearly ritual. We have many deer that use the river, as well as the protection of the wooded area directly behind our homes to travel. This pipeline would completely eliminate the trees permanently! These trees that protect our wildlife also protect our property from Route 93 and buffers the noise level that runs directly behind our home. They are the only sound and visual barrier we have from the noise and pollution of the busy highway. This will impact the privacy of even enjoying family functions in our backyard.

Tennessee Gas, in their submitted construction drawing would require 105 feet of my back yard to construct this pipeline, as the only access to pipeline route is through our yard from the front due to the highway in the back with untold damage to our driveway and property with heavy equipment. This plan also calls for movement or destruction of structures on our property. This would also have an impact on our inground sprinkler system as well as our septic and leach field that would fail with the weight of heavy equipment. It is also

indicated on the Tennessee Gas maps that horizontal drilling under the Shawsheen river would be starting in my backyard. Our property as well as neighbors on both sides has rock ledge in our backyards, which would likely call for blasting, and in turn create possible damage to our home foundations.

As no one else can represent my interests in this matter, I stand to suffer significant damages and irreparable harm from an affirmative outcome in this application; I am filing this motion to intervene.

III. CONCLUSION

Wherefore, we, Salvatore and Maryann Frisella, respectfully requests that the Commission to grant my Motion to Intervene as a party with full rights to participate in all further proceedings.

Respectfully submitted this 29th day of December, 2015.

Salvatore and Maryann Frisella
39 Valewood Circle
Tewksbury, Ma. 01876
978-828-1222
mfezzuoglio@hotmail.com

20151230-5065

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Claire A Townend under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/29/2015 8:21:18 PM Filed Date: 12/30/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	catsleworks@hotmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

In regards to Docket #CP16-21-000, the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company,LLC and the Northeast Energy Direct Project.

I hereby seek intervention to this proposed pipeline. My interests may be directly affected by the outcome of the proceedings if found in favor of building this proposed pipeline. I presently live at 123 Crane Rd in Windsor, MA within 2 miles of the proposed compressor station. I grow my own organic fruits and vegetables which can be endangered by "blowoff" chemicals that are known to be released from fracked gas compressor stations as well as fracked gas wells. Several of these, such as benzene and formaldehyde, are known carcinogens. I built my house in the country to escape the pollutants of city living and now they are to be stationed here.

I believe this pipeline will not lower electricity costs of the residents of Massachusetts but indeed, force prices even higher as most of this fuel is to be sold overseas at higher prices which will drive our prices higher.

The noise, smells, lights 24/7, and dangerous chemical pollutants associated with compressor stations are all things I oppose.They are all in opposition to nature and all that we cherish living in a small community.

Kinder Morgan continues to show disregard and disrespect for the public and natural resources of our region. There are far less harmful and disruptive means of meeting our energy needs. Were the Paris climate change talks in vain? We have an obligation as Americans to do the right thing for our country, for our world, for our planet.

I respectfully request that my motion for intervention be granted.

Respectfully submitted,
Claire Townend

123 Crane Rd.
Windsor, MA 01270-9615
Catsleworks@hotmail.com
Submitted December 29th, 2015.

20151230-5069

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of H John Fisher under CP16-21-000.
Submission Date: 12/29/2015 8:51:32 PM Filed Date: 12/30/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	Hjohnfshr@aol.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I am writing to request intervener status. I am a trustee of the Fisher Plainfield Irrevocable Real Estate Trust, which holds in trust a property located at 268-270 West Street in Plainfield, Massachusetts. My wife and I maintain our primary residence at this property, which abuts the path of the proposed Kinder Morgan NED natural gas pipeline.

We have a direct and personal interest in these proceedings as the pipeline would have a substantial negative effect on the value of this property – both short-term and long-term – as well as significant negative effect on our quality of life and that of our neighbors.

Beyond this, the construction of such a pipeline would not only be significantly harmful and disruptive to a rural area such as this – manifested in the numerous to-be-determined and circumlocutions still found in Kinder Morgan’s most recent filing – it would also provide the ongoing potential for catastrophic threat to an ecosystem which serves as the primary watershed for an area that extends from the borders of three adjacent states to the Connecticut River and beyond.

Finally, there is no true need for this pipeline. It has become increasingly clear that whatever energy needs this region might have would be better served over the short term by the upgrade and/or expansion of existing infrastructures – expanding storage capacity, upgrading present rights of way, and moving to reduce losses in existing gas distribution systems. Rather than providing a long-term solution to our energy needs, the NED pipeline would be little more than a patch – a costly and destructive patch – to what is fast becoming an outmoded system. Rather than being a bridge to the future, it would only serve as an exit ramp to the past.

20151230-5072

BEFORE THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC)	Docket No. CP16-21-000
Northeast Energy Direct Project)	

**MOTION TO INTERVENE OF
ROBERT MICHAEL MEAGHER**

I hereby move, pursuant to 18 C.F.R. § 385.214(b), to intervene in the above-captioned proceeding. I seek to intervene in opposition to the Northeast Energy Direct Project (the “Project” or the “NED Project”) proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (the “Company”), a subsidiary of Kinder Morgan, Inc. (“Kinder Morgan”). Communications concerning this proceeding should be served upon me as follows:

Robert M. Meagher

30 Knotwood Drive
Greenfield, NH 03047
(603) 759-1202
meagher@alum.mit.edu

My interests “which may be directly affected by the outcome of the proceeding” pursuant to 18 C.F.R. § 214(b)(2)(ii) include:

- My interest as an electric ratepayer, insomuch as the Company seeks to secure my electric utility as a Project shipper, which, in turn, would seek to recover costs associated with the Project from ratepayers. As explained in depth by others on this docket (and on the pre-filing docket PF14-22), Kinder Morgan is essentially telling the Commission that New England needs a blow torch to light a candle. The massive overbuild embodied in this proposal is very likely to lead to higher energy costs for New England’s ratepayers – either because the excess capacity contracted for by our utilities would go unused, or because capacity would be used for markets overseas, driving up domestic energy prices.
- My interest as a resident of the Monadnock Region of New Hampshire, living within 15 miles of the proposed New Ipswich compressor station. I am concerned about the impact that the construction and operation of the pipeline, and the compressor station proposed for New Ipswich, could have on ecological and human health in my area.
- My interest as a taxpayer, neighbor and visitor to protected public land in New Hampshire. I am very concerned about the threat this Project poses to all public land protected by various covenants of land preservation in New Hampshire and the Monadnock Region.
- My interest as a land trust supporter, visitor and neighbor to lands protected by the Monadnock Conservancy in southern New Hampshire.

Kinder Morgan continues to show disregard and disrespect for the people and natural resources of our region. The purported benefits of this 400-mile, 360,000-horsepower monstrosity are not worth the risks and the impacts to our communities. Far less harmful and disruptive means of meeting our energy needs should be pursued. I have been studying this proposal since it first became public, and I can bring valuable information and perspective to this proceeding.

WHEREFORE, for the foregoing reasons, I respectfully request that my motion to intervene be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert M. Meagher

December 30, 2015

20151230-5091

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of John A Maggs under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/30/2015 9:07:45 AM Filed Date: 12/30/2015 9:07:45 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	jmaggs@jmaggs.com	

Basis for Intervening:

My wife and I have been residents of Conway for more than thirty years. The proposed pipeline will have many negative consequences for our community. These include noise, the desecration of preserved areas, the lowering of property values, and potential health hazards. I feel strongly that there is nothing to be gained through this project other than the profits realized by the business interests that are behind it.

20151230-5093

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Janet Maggs under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/30/2015 9:08:31 AM

Filed Date: 12/30/2015 9:08:31 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____

Individual jan@jmaggs.com

Basis for Intervening:

I, Janet Maggs, along with my husband, have been Conway residents for over 30 years. I am very concerned about the destructive changes that the proposed NED pipeline will bring to Franklin County, and to Conway and Ashfield in particular. The proposed blowdown valve on Shelburne Falls Road will cause damage to our local natural farms, and farmers' livelihood, and reduce home values for many people. The damage to our roads, and to the water and air quality will be devastating.

20151230-5101

Valley Medical Group

Ruth A. Potee, MD
 Family Practice
 329 Conway Street
 Greenfield, MA 01301
 Telephone: 4137746301
 Fax: 8666440871
 www.vmgma.com

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

December 29, 2015

Re: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC Docket No. CP1621000
 Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Secretary Bose:

I am filing to intervene against the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline project. I write as a local physician caring for nearly 2000 patients living in towns that abut the expanse of this pipeline through Berkshire and Franklin counties in rural western Massachusetts. This patient panel includes infants, children, the very elderly, and individuals at high risk of respiratory illness and cancer due to higher than average tobacco use disorder.

Every September, I send out messages to my patients with asthma and COPD to remind them to take their inhaled corticosteroids daily as the particulate matter in the air is likely to rise in the coming months. This is the nature of living in a rural and poor area where wood is burned to heat homes and businesses. This relatively small burden of air particulate matter makes a large difference in the health of my patients, especially the children in my practice.

The installation of an extremely large air compressor station in my hometown of Northfield will have a large impact on the health of our community. Compressor stations are well known to release multiple pollutants including carbon monoxide, nitrogen and sulfur oxides, volatile organic compounds, and particulate matter. The nitrogen oxide emissions predicted at a much smaller compressor station are expected to increase the rates of new diagnosis of childhood asthma by 7% and the rates of hospitalizations for strokes, heart attacks

and COPD by more than 7%. Within 2 miles of this compressor station live hundreds of children, the local elementary school, and the Northfield's athletic fields and playgrounds.

Of equal concern are the cancer causing volatile organic compounds of benzene and formaldehyde. At other active compressor station sites, benzene and formaldehyde are found at levels from 100 times to 1000 times the levels considered the threshold at which rates of leukemia start to increase. Of particular concern in Northfield is our glacially mediated topography which ensures that water particulates (fog) and chemical particulates (emissions from the natural gas compressor station) are held close to the most populated areas for prolonged periods of time. In this inversion impact area along the Connecticut River sits a large private school, the entire business district, a senior housing complex, the fourtown regional high school, and the majority of the population of the town.

As disturbing, this pipeline construction will impact the mental health of our community, causing stress, anxiety, insomnia, depression, and will likely increase the rates of addiction and suicide. Although this is not as easily measured as the rates of hospitalizations for strokes and heart attacks, it remains a major public health risk that disproportionately impacts poor regions. Franklin and Berkshire counties are the poorest in Massachusetts with the fewest health resources. Tracking pipeline through hundreds of private properties and building neverbeforeimagined megacompressor stations will lead to a massive devaluation of properties and homes. For most residents of these two counties, their home is their only investment. It represents the tuition for their child's education and their savings account at retirement. The impact of this pipeline in our region would be similar to a massive factory closing or a devastating natural disaster. Like a large traumatic event, it would be felt for a generation or more. Typical for most commercial enterprises focused on their bottom line, KinderMorgan and the Northeast Energy Direct project drives environmental injustice by constructing through a region that is poor, rural, and underresourced.

I urge you to reject this application for a carbonbased pipeline tracking through New England. All of our efforts must be spent actualizing renewable sources of energy and reducing our energy consumption on a daily basis.

Sincerely,

Ruth A. Potee, MD, ABAM
Chair, Department of Medicine
Baystate Franklin Medical Center
Medical Director
Pioneer Valley School District
Medical Director
Franklin County House of Corrections

20151230-5103

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Bernadette Cassidy under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/30/2015 9:52:59 AM Filed Date: 12/30/2015 9:52:59 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	bcacassidy@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

My home, a part of the Green Farm Village Cluster Association, is adjacent to the area where the proposed gas pipeline will be installed. TN Gas/Kinder Morgan also intends to put in access roads on Green Farm common land, of which I am an owner. The pipeline, access roads and the nearby compressor station will not only impact my quality of life but it will do irreparable damage to the surrounding land. The long terms

following some old outdated information, as they themselves have mentioned by that statement. This line in my town will never have a lateral for home heating, and even if one were possible the payback is not there. Keep in mind that over 70% of all homes in this area heat with oil and the conversion dollar factor in itself would have a 25 years payback to break even, this figure being based on the past five year average of oil and gas pricing, and the change over cost of burners. As with the Paris climate talks it's time to move away from more fossil fuels, fix the old ones we have that leak, make them more efficient and eliminate leaking methane gases. // Thanks

20151230-5117

Motion to Intervene

12/30/2015

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co., LLC
Northeast Energy Direct Project
Docket No. CP16-21-000

Contact Information:

Paul & Carey Sullivan
3 Autumn Street
Windham, NH. 03087
603-882-4984
socrda@gmail.com

My wife and I are abutters to the proposed Tennessee Gas pipeline at 3 Autumn St., Windham NH. Segment J, Mile Post 34.80. At this time Tennessee Gas proposes to seek a permanent easement on our property.

Our concerns include:

-Damage to Wetland and Watershed areas

It should be noted that this neighborhood is included in the Stratified Drift Aquifer [1] and also part of the Upper Beaver Brook Merrimac River Watershed [2]. Referencing the Tennessee Gas maps of 1/12/15 [3] at mile marker 34.8 an 'unnamed stream' links a series of ponds and drains into Beaver Brook at mile marker 34.9. No 'wetlands' are delineated on the TGP map. But a simple review of town tax maps shows a Wetland & Watershed Protection District (WWPD) [4] along the western edge of Autumn St. including most of lot 19-B-919.

-Construction in the WWPD would violate town ordinances [5] written for the protection of private wells and natural habitat.

The potential risks include: contamination from pipeline construction, (including compounds used for field-coating welds before installation of pipe), potential contamination of the watershed from herbicide use, disturbance of soil in the ROW, staging areas and temporary construction access points will seriously increase the risk of invasive plant species

The nature of the watershed, which includes glacially deposited sand and gravel are highly susceptible to contamination. "Wells located in an unconfined aquifer are considered to have a high vulnerability to potential contamination due to the absence of hydro geologic barriers (i.e. clay) that can prevent contamination migration into the aquifer from the surface." [6]

-The aesthetics of the environmental damage.

When this neighborhood was developed 35 years ago, the power line ROW had already been established. The builder preserved the natural buffer of trees to the ROW as the development took shape. Now comes TGP, who will remove the natural buffer and opening a vista comparable to a lunar landscape...no trees, no brush no buffer, just an unimpeded view of the electric ROW.

It's not just the abutter effected by this, but residents across the street, who once had a view of majestic

trees will now have unimpeded views of the power lines and towers.

More importantly, as of this date, Tennessee Gas cannot point to a spot on the ground and tell my neighbors...this is where the pipe will be placed!

Segment J uses construction technique ROW-CONFIG_05 and _06 [7], which could cause a clearing of either 45' or 85' from the centerline of the pipe. This is bad enough, but the fact is, we don't even know where the pipe will actually be placed to start with.

In its Environmental Construction Plan for NH, Tennessee Gas is '...proposing that the pipeline will be installed generally five feet outside the existing power line easement boundary.'"[8] But a few paragraphs later the proposal comes with a loophole...."adjustments may result in the centerline of the pipeline to be located within an existing power line easement, less than five feet from the existing power line boundary, or further than five feet from the existing power line boundary." [9]

In other words, we are giving Tennessee Gas the option, to put it wherever it wants. You are asking for comments and analysis on a moving target.

-Land value and resale issues

Numerous parties have raised the issue of impacted property values and ability to sell impacted properties. TGP asserts, "The analysis completed for the study indicates that proximity to a pipeline does not have a measurable, systematic impact on land use or residential property values. [10]" Further that "transaction data that was studied does not support that residential properties that are in close proximity to a pipeline (even as close as 25 feet), sell more slowly or for lower prices than similar houses in the same development that are located greater distances from the pipeline." [11] Others have dismissed the cited studies as outdated, industry sponsored and statistically inaccurate. I can only offer, from real world experience that attempting to sell my house in this neighborhood is impossible! Our house has been on the market since July. We have had many showings and the common refrain is "love the house...but this pipeline proposal (?)" ...". Realtors are reluctant to show houses in the neighborhood due to the unknown liability. This proposal does and will impact our property values and our ability to sell. It's common sense...not industry studies!

Carey and I, vehemently oppose this proposal, and find explanations and analyses riddled with double speak, misrepresentations and outright lies.

Paul & Carey Sullivan

footnotes

- 1 Rockingham Planning Commission Map 12/15/09
- 2 Rockingham Planning Commission Map 3/22/06
- 3 Appendix A
- 4 Appendix B
- 5 Town of Windham NH, Zoning Ordinance and Land Use Regulations (amended March 10, 2015) re: 601.1.1 "Prevent the development of structures, or other land use within the WWPD that would contribute to surface and groundwater contamination or reduce surface and groundwater supplies."
- 6 Source Water Assessment and Protection (SWAP) Report, MA DEP
- 7 Appendix #3
- 8 TGP, Environmental Report NED Project Appendix M, M-4 July 2015
- 9 TGP, Environmental Report NED Project Appendix M, M-4 July 2015
- 10 Response to Commission's December 8, 2015 Environmental Information Request No. 1 of Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. under CP16-21
- 11 Response to Commission's December 8, 2015 Environmental Information Request No. 1 of Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. under CP16-21

{ appendices A ... C (map, deed, illustrations) omitted, original (7.1 MB) can be downloaded at: }

{ <http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/opennat.asp?fileID=14085142> }

20151230-5121

FERC intervention for NED kinder morgan in ma. 12/15

I am deeply concerned about the huge investment into fossil fuels by the expansion of the so called 'natural gas' pipeline which will be transporting fracked gas from Pennsylvania throughout the Northeast, including beautiful and precious lands in Western Massachusetts, much of which will be exported. My children and grandchildren live in Western Massachusetts and are making every effort possible to reduce their use of fossil fuels, increase efficiency and conservation and invest in clean energy. They and I do not want our utility payments to support the toxic and environmentally hazardous expansion of fossil fuels. My husband and I recently retired and are planning to move to Western Massachusetts in order to be in closer proximity to our children and grandchildren. We will not purchase a property that is within five to ten miles of the proposed pipeline and this is greatly influencing our choices of properties, as we are looking to purchase a home between where our children's families reside. Massachusetts communities and small businesses have been taking huge steps to reduce the dependence on fossil fuels, developing small and local businesses that are employing an eager and ever expanding labor pool of young people who are enthusiastically developing an economy and social network to better the world and all life on it. This expansion is already trying to take away their dreams and their hard working efforts, as they see the large corporate interests taking over the government that they know should be responsive to the people instead of big money. This fossil fuel expansion project is corrupting our government and destructive to the lives of all of us and our future generations. Please take the bold steps necessary and stand up for what's right.... listen to the wisdom of the people and stop this horrific project.

20151230-5128

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Joe Young under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/30/2015 11:09:14 AM Filed Date: 12/30/2015 11:09:14 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	madtanker@verizon.net	

Basis for Intervening:

I am writing this document on behalf of myself and speak for no one else or any other organizations.

I am an avid lover of the outdoors here in all of New England. I hike, climb, fish, geocache all year round and in the winter add snowshoeing to the above mentioned activities.

I also have helped to construct and maintain many hiking trails that this pipeline will be infringing upon if its allowed to be constructed. Not only will it ruin and stop access to available hiking trails and lands, it will also impede on many area where wild life will be compromised. We are just starting to see major rebirth of the American Bald Eagle out here in our area. This bird was on the endangered species list not to long ago. We have rivers out here in MA that have gone from being severely polluted to Class A and B rivers today. Many areas that the proposed pipeline will go through are protected lands. Some are by the federal government, some by the state, and some by the home owners.

The other big thing to look at from this area in MA is the fact that we are a poor area and depend on tourism and people coming to our area to help generate local business. The pipeline will take away our ability to attract people to come hike, fish, and enjoy our natural beauty of the woods.

This pipeline is not within the best interest of the people that is will effect. Accidents happen as we all know and leaks, spillage, and damage to the area effected by the pipeline is sure to happen. Also not to mention the pollution factor such as noise pollution from compressor stations along the proposed pipeline.

Thank you,

Joe Young
Orange, MA 01364

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Amanda L Nash under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/30/2015 11:06:27 AM

Filed Date: 12/30/2015 11:06:27 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
---------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------

Individual	noteaparty@gmail.com	
------------	----------------------	--

Basis for Intervening:

Motion to Intervene of Amanda Nash for the North East Direct Pipeline Project

I am a real estate investor, that is my livelihood. I originally came to Conway, MA, to do a renovation project. During the renovation, my partner and I discovered that we loved the area and decided to stay. So although I now consider myself a long-term resident, because real estate is the basis of my income, it is also important to me that my home retains its value. So I am filing as an intervenor both as a committed resident of Franklin County and also as a real estate professional.

The reason we chose to stay here is because of the beauty of the area and the health benefits of living in such a clean area where residents have a commitment to good health through natural means. We buy 90% of our food from local farms. We are customers of the Natural Roots farm, which I suspect you have heard many times is a wonderful organic (not certified, but we know!) farm in Conway that is extremely well-loved by the locals, and now is being threatened with a proposed pipeline blow-off valve that would very likely ruin the quality of their crops. We have our own well and our water quality is amazing (we actually have too much water; there is a spring in our basement, the management of which was a major aspect of our renovation project). I am an enthusiastic lake and river swimmer and am extremely concerned that the construction and operation of the pipeline will compromise our water quality.

But it isn't just about me. Take my story and multiply it by tens of thousands. Franklin County does not just supply healthy farmed food for its residents but for probably tens of thousands of other people, in Massachusetts and nationally. And our water supply is not just for us but for tens of thousands of other Massachusetts residents. The parklands and rivers that we enjoy are visited by tens of thousands of travelers seeking peace, fun, and good health. We have closely researched Kinder-Morgan's safety record and it is not good. Explosions, leaks, shoddy materials, poor drilling practices, and outrageously inadequate emergency planning and accident mitigation are rife in their history.

Our home is where the Conway School of Landscape Design began. It is an 1850 farmhouse that has historic value architecturally, for its age, and for its history as a renowned school. Our barn is perched on the South River (another major aspect of our renovation project – we had to mitigate erosion of the embankment, which required a long and complicated permitting process and much physical effort), a beautiful, clean river. We have invested over a hundred thousand dollars in our renovation project. Now we hear that the property values in this area have already dropped due to the prospect of the pipeline. Real estate along the route and nearby is not selling. People are applying for property tax abatements. We hear stories, particularly from Northfield where the compressor station has been sited, of banks refusing to lend and insurance companies deeming properties “uninsurable.” Although my property is a few miles from the pipeline route, these issues trickle down. Shortly after we arrived here we considered buying some additional property (we have a half acre; we were looking for more land), but all the properties we liked were too close to the pipeline route. Our real estate agent, when pressed, told us that nothing was selling for that reason. How are our schools and roads and emergency services going to be maintained if the property taxes are reduced? Obviously, tax rates will rise, and eventually people's property will be “under water,” with no available buyers.

The people in this area have a demonstrated commitment to renewable energy. Massachusetts has done an outstanding job of replacing fossil fuels with solar. This is how we want our state to operate. The death of

the fracking industry is already written on the wall – what will we do with a giant pipeline then? Who will maintain it?

We are all too aware that this pipeline is not for New England’s public good – this has been confirmed by our attorney general’s study! – but for the profit of the corporations that have proposed the project. We know that our gas prices will not go down, especially after this fuel is shipped overseas where it will command higher prices; and we know that we will have to foot the bill for the infrastructure. Use of eminent domain to take private land and public land that is legally protected, is perpetrating a fraud. Permitting this pipeline would be unconscionable, and will clearly indicate that your “Federal” agency serves only the oil and gas industry. Please stop this project before we are forced to enter into a protracted and extremely expensive legal battle. It is the purported mission of FERC to serve the public interest. As a member of the public, I insist on having the opportunity to participate in the discussion of what is in our interest.

20151230-5132

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene in opposition to NED pipeline of Judith S Eiseman under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/30/2015 10:58:34 AM Filed Date: 12/30/2015 10:58:34 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	judyeiseman@comcast.net	

Basis for Intervening:

Northeast Energy Direct Project

Docket No. CP16-21-000

MOTION TO INTERVENE OF JUDITH SCHAFER EISEMAN

I seek to intervene in opposition to the Northeast Energy Direct Project proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC, a subsidiary of Kinder Morgan, Inc.

My interests “which may be directly affected by the outcome of the proceeding” pursuant to 18 C.F.R. § 214(b)(2)(ii) include:

- My interest as a citizen of the Commonwealth allied with hundreds of others seeking to uphold Article 97 of the state’s Constitution as well as the strong environmental laws and regulations the state has enacted and which Kinder Morgan has indicated at public hearings it will abide by.
- My interest as a consumer and an electric ratepayer concerned that I will have to pay for the misadventure of a business seeking profits rather than common sense approaches in the face of global catastrophe represented by the continued over use of fossil fuels.
- My interest as an advocate for increased incentives for alternative energy and conservation of resources. Now that the results of the overuse of fossil fuels is clear to all rational beings, continuing to rely unnecessarily upon them threatens the ecosystems upon which all life depends. This pipeline represents a threat to immediate surroundings and to those who live or recreate in the vicinity as well as an increased threat to the quality of habitat for rare and endangered species.
- My interest as an environmental advocate and conservationist with 40 years of experience devoted to helping to ensure Massachusetts continues as a healthy place to live. As a current Board member and past Chairman of The Kestrel Land Trust, the Swift River Valley Historical Society, the Massachusetts Association of Conservation Commissions and as a member of the Massachusetts River Alliance as well as an employee, board member and leader of other organizations seeking to protect air, land, and water resources from degradation, no other group or individual can provide the perspective I have concerning the impacts this project will have on my life’s work.

tioned proceeding.

I. Background

On November 20, 2015, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. (the “Company”) filed its application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity to construct, install, modify, operate and maintain certain pipeline and compression facilities and to abandon other facilities (the “Project”). The Company’s application shows an alternative route for the proposed pipeline (“the Massachusetts Turnpike Alternative”), which goes through Stockbridge. On December 8, 2015, the Commission requested additional information from the Company on various alternative routes, including the Massachusetts Turnpike Alternative.

II. Grounds for Intervention

1. This matter concerns an application for the construction of a natural gas transmission pipeline and other facilities. An alternative to the current pipeline route, the Massachusetts Turnpike Alternative, would involve the siting of a portion of the pipeline within the Town.
2. In its December 8, 2015, information request, the Commission requested additional information regarding the Massachusetts Turnpike Alternative and the possibility of siting the natural gas pipeline along that route, a portion of which is located in Stockbridge.
3. If the Massachusetts Turnpike Alternative is selected, Stockbridge and its residents will be directly affected by the construction and operation of the pipeline within its boundaries.
4. The potential impacts of the construction and operation of the Project on Stockbridge and its residents include, but are not limited to, public safety hazards, traffic and transportation disruptions, noise generation, air pollution, disruption of environmental resources, and numerous effects on historical and cultural resources.
5. Stockbridge is responsible for the protection of both its natural environment and the health of its residents. Accordingly, it has a significant interest in the outcome of this proceeding and seeks to ensure that both Stockbridge’s and its residents’ interests are adequately addressed in the environmental review of the Project.
6. Because of Stockbridge’s expertise and familiarity with the alternative pipeline location, its participation in this proceeding will significantly benefit the Commission.
7. Stockbridge will zealously represent the interests of its residents. Thus, its participation in this proceeding is in the public interest.
8. No disruption to this proceeding will result from granting the Town intervener status.
9. Existing parties will not be prejudiced by, nor will they sustain any additional burden by Stockbridge’s becoming a party to this proceeding.

III. Communications

The persons to whom communications regarding this Petition should be addressed and upon whom service of all pleadings or other documents in this proceeding should be made are:

J. Raymond Miyares
Town Counsel
40 Grove Street
Suite 190
Wellesley, MA 02482
Phone: 617-489-1600
Email: ray@miyares-harrington.com

Jorja Ann P. Mardsen
Town Administrator
50 Main Street
P.O. Box 417
Stockbridge, MA 02189
Phone: 413-298-4170 ext. 100
Email: Jorja.marsden@townofstockbridge.com

IV. Conclusion

WHEREFORE, the Town of Stockbridge respectfully requests that the Commission grant the Town intervention as a full party in the captioned proceeding.

Respectfully submitted,
TOWN OF STOCKBRIDGE

By its Attorneys

J. Raymond Miyares (BBO #350120)

Ivria Glass Fried (BBO #688177)

Miyares and Harrington, LLP

40 Grove Street, Suite 190

Wellesley, MA 02482

ray@miyares-harrington.com

ifried@miyares-harrington.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on December 30, 2015, I have this day filed the foregoing document electronically and served the foregoing document upon each person designated on the official Service List compiled in this proceeding by the Secretary to the Commission in the particular manner specified therein.

Respectfully submitted,

J. Raymond Miyares

Miyares and Harrington, LLP

40 Grove Street, Suite 190

Wellesley, MA 02482

ray@miyares-harrington.com

20151230-5139

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Christina Miller under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/30/2015 11:53:00 AM Filed Date: 12/30/2015 11:53:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____

Individual kcmiller4@comcast.net

Basis for Intervening:

Kevin J Miller

Christina R Miller

4 Birch Lane

Pelham, NH 03076

T#603-635-3683

December 30, 2015

As notified affected Landowners, we are filing this motion to intervene on the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline proposal that was filed with FERC by Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Pipeline.

We do not agree that this pipeline is needed and it most definitely is not wanted. The construction and location of this pipeline puts our property at risk for degradation of our water, soil, and air, could possibly lower our property value or increase our Homeowners Insurance premium, and reduce our quality of life.

This is not a Public Project. This is a private company proposing construction that will affect our land for

their sole benefit and profit. It will not provide NG to our Town or our property. It will not decrease our electricity costs. We will get nothing but negative effects from this proposed pipeline with no offsetting benefits. We did not work hard and save to purchase this property and make renovations to increase its value only to have a private company come and destroy our surrounding and devalue our property.

Best regards,

Kevin J. & Christina R. Miller

20151230-5146

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Tyler R Schenck under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/30/2015 12:16:00 PM Filed Date: 12/30/2015 12:16:00 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	tylerschenck@ymail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

Tyler R. Schenck
652 Wendell Road
Shutesbury, MA 01072
tylerschenck@ymail.com
413-336-4817

I hereby seek to intervene in opposition to the Northeast Energy Direct Project proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC, a subsidiary of Kinder Morgan, Inc.

My interests include:

As a father of two young children, I am concerned with the toxicity of the material flowing through the pipeline, released by compressor stations and the eminent leakage of pollutants.

My interest is also as a taxpayer, neighbor and visitor to protected public land in Massachusetts. I want to insure that the beautiful abundant land in Western Massachusetts is left for present and future generations to come. I do not support Kinder Morgan's plan to destroy our land, safety and way of life.

We are an area that uses individual wells (approximately 2.8 million people in New England). Any rupture to a buried pipeline could cause significant damage to the drinking water supply. Neither Federal nor State governments regulate well water safety.

Kinder Morgan's massive overbuild is very likely to lead to higher energy costs for New England's ratepayers – either because the excess capacity contracted for by our utilities would go unused, or because capacity would be used for markets overseas; driving up domestic energy prices.

My interest is also as an area resident where the company proposes to cross federal and state designated wildlife areas, scenic rivers and watersheds with its pipeline. My family enjoys the outdoor life of our rural New England area. We swim, hike, farm, study and play in the very areas that would be affected.

I am concerned of the negative effects that the construction of the pipeline could create on the environment and human health in our area. We are an area with large wetlands which would be affected trenching and run off from construction.

I am appalled by the potential abuse of federal eminent domain laws which would force land owners to have their land taken from them.

Respectively submitted December 30, 2015

Signed,

20151230-5159

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Edward Stockman under CP16-21-000.
Submission Date: 12/30/2015 11:33:58 AM Filed Date: 12/30/2015 11:33:58 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	edstockman@verizon.net	

Basis for Intervening:

As a certified, professional wetland scientist and biologist, I have spent most of my scientific career (25 years) working on wetland issues. I am a resident of Plainfield, MA (32 years), a former member of the Plainfield Conservation Commission (15 years) and its chair for eleven years. Presently, I am a special advisor to the Commission, and as such I am a concerned stakeholder. Several other Plainfield stakeholders have asked me to intervene on their behalf.

Massachusetts has a long and proud history of protecting wetlands for the benefits they provide to humans and wildlife. These benefits need to be upheld.

Work within wetland resource areas needs to be held to the highest standards and monitored by professionals who have assessed the values and functions of the wetlands to be impacted during pipeline construction. Qualified wetland professional with a full understanding of topography, wetland vegetation (hydrophytes), hydric soils, wetland hydrology and wetland ecological relationships, as well as, applied engineering design to mitigate all construction impacts are required.

Identification and delineation of all wetland resources must be conducted prior to the assessment process. Several wetlands within the proposed NED pipeline right-of-way through Plainfield were not identified and consequently are not delineated on the most recent project plans. This oversight must be remedied and a comprehensive assessment of each wetland undertaken.

I am filing this motion to intervene because I am presently opposed to the NED project (CP16-21) as proposed. The Kinder Morgan application does not address many important aspects of wetland protection and mitigation. The protection of wetlands and the benefits they provide are not only important to me and my neighbors in Plainfield but also to the citizens of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Submitted by: Edward Stockman, M.S., P.W.S. Biologist/Professional Wetland Scientist

20151230-5176

I live in Rindge NH and want to intervene in this proceeding to oppose the NED pipeline. I have interests which may be directly affected by the outcome of the proceeding.

As proposed, the pipeline route enters my town and sites a new utility corridor next to one already within its borders. If the project route shifts or its infrastructure changes, there may be other privately or publicly owned parcels in my town which could be impacted.

I am a NH resident who may be charged with paying for the pipeline with a tariff charge added to my electric rates.

My Town of Rindge relies completely on wells for its water supply. The drilling and blasting that the pipeline construction will require will adversely affect these wells.

As a member of the Rindge Conservation Commission, I am seriously concerned with the damage the pipeline will cause to conservation lands and other forested and watershed areas. This pipeline will cross a number of conservation lands that were donated to the town and other conservation agencies because the

donors believed they would be forever protected from this or any type of commercial use/development. It is unconscionable that FERC will allow these lands to be taken for commercial use and used for a pipeline.

One of the conservation lands that will be adversely affected was purchased by the Town of Rindge with voter approval. The intent of the purchase of this land and its aquifer was to protect it for a water supply for the town in the future. The NED pipeline will cross this area and can cause serious damage to the aquifer.

The financial ramifications of known and unanticipated consequences of the construction and operation of this pipeline and related appurtenances could increase my local and state tax obligations.

I am opposed to the construction of new infrastructure which promotes further dependence on fossil fuels. I, like all other citizens, will experience the consequences of climate warming which could be accelerated by the methane this project will release into the atmosphere. I believe this pipeline is NOT in the public interest, and I oppose it.

Albert C. Lefebvre
Rindge NH 03461

20151230-5177

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Andrea G Doremus under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/30/2015 12:19:39 PM Filed Date: 12/30/2015 12:19:39 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____

Individual adoremus@rcn.com

Basis for Intervening:

"I seek intervenor status in opposition to this project to the extent of what is known about it. I particular, my interest is as a Massachusetts electric rate-payer in the manner by which the company seeks to secure my electric utility as a project shipper. This, in turn, would cause an effort by them to recover costs associated with the project from Massachusetts ratepayers. I do NOT believe that this use of rate-payer funds is fiscally wise or constructive."

20151230-5180

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Carol Hammond under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/30/2015 12:28:06 PM Filed Date: 12/30/2015 12:28:06 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____

Individual cbh13@hotmail.com

Basis for Intervening:

I oppose the pipeline project; it should not be built. It's an environmentally dangerous project.

I object to the delivery of non-renewable fossil fuels in the form of fracked natural gas that contributes to greenhouse gas and the resulting warming of the planet, a course that is inherently self destructive to our world. I object to the negative effect the pipeline will have on our watershed. I'm concerned about toxic emissions -- Boston has enough of that from all the leaking pipes there; we don't want that here, poisoning people and animals. The pipeline construction will the impact the land, eroding and destroying it in many places, because some of the land is extremely fragile and needs the trees to keep it stable.

The NED is contrived by greedy corporations, and is completely unnecessary. I'm filing for intervention be-

cause I care about the planet and my Granchildren's future. It saddens me that Kinder Morgan has no regard for the air we breath and the water we drink and the landscapes that surround us.

20151230-5190

December 28, 2015

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

David and Jennifer Pychewicz
24 Crestwood Dr.
North Reading, MA 01864

RE: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.
FERC Document CP16-21-000

Motion to Intervene

To the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission,

We are landowners who would be directly impacted by the Northeast Energy Direct Project by Kinder Morgan. The proposed pipeline would be cutting through our property. We oppose this project as we are concerned about the negative impact it will have with lowered property value and safety issues. We are also concerned about future use of our property due to the pipeline and its buffer zones.

Thank you for your consideration,

David and Jennifer Pychewicz

20151230-5192

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Elizabeth Stowe under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/30/2015 12:57:08 PM Filed Date: 12/30/2015 12:57:08 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	estowe@gmx.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I moved to Conway in March 2015 because I discovered a wonderful home here. As a town resident, a Massachusetts resident, and a US citizen, I am filing a motion to intervene concerning the proposed NED pipeline. As a Conway resident, I am concerned about the blowdown valve which is planned for Shelburne Falls Road. The toxic materials such a valve would emit would cause significant environmental damage. As a Massachusetts resident, I know that the pipeline is unnecessary for energy needs in the commonwealth. Furthermore, I am opposed to the added taxes needed to pay for the pipeline and the disruption to the ecosystem that the construction and running of the pipeline would cause. As a US citizen, I am against the overdevelopment of fossil resources, especially where they are intended for shipment beyond US borders.

20151230-5198

To whom it may concern,

We respectfully request to be added to the list of Interveners in opposition to the proposed NED pipeline expansion project.

Kinder Morgan wishes to expand the right of way that bisects our property located at 884/872 Stone Rd, Windsor CT 06095. This will significantly limit the land use/value of said property.

Robert M. Bologna Debra A. Bologna
933 Stone Rd
Windsor CT 06095

20151230-5202

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Michelle Bedard under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/30/2015 1:08:25 PM Filed Date: 12/30/2015 1:08:25 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	michjbthemh@comcast.net	

Basis for Intervening:

BEFORE THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC) Docket No. CP16-21-000 Northeast Energy Direct Project

MOTION TO INTERVENE OF Michelle Bedard

I hereby move, pursuant to 18 C.F.R. § 385.214(b), to intervene in the above-captioned proceeding. I seek to intervene in opposition to the Northeast Energy Direct Project (the “Project” or the “NED Project”) proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (the “Company”), a subsidiary of Kinder Morgan, Inc. (“Kinder Morgan”). Communications concerning this proceeding should be served upon me as follows:

Michelle Bedard 10 Bedard Ave Pelham, New Hampshire 03076 michjbthemh@comcast.net My interests “which may be directly affected by the outcome of the proceeding” pursuant to 18 C.F.R. § 214(b)(2)(ii) include:

My interest as an electric ratepayer, insomuch as the Company seeks to secure my electric utility as a Project shipper, which, in turn, would seek to recover costs associated with the Project from ratepayers. As explained in depth by others on this docket (and on the pre-filing docket PF14-22), Kinder Morgan is essentially telling the Commission that New England needs a blow torch to light a candle. The massive overbuild embodied in this proposal is very likely to lead to higher energy costs for New England’s ratepayers – either because the excess capacity contracted for by our utilities would go unused, or because capacity would be used for markets overseas, driving up domestic energy prices.

My interest as a taxpayer, neighbor and visitor to protected public land in New Hampshire. I am very concerned about the threat this Project poses to all public land protected by Article 97 of the Articles of Amendment to the Massachusetts Constitution.

My interest as a land trust supporter, visitor and neighbor to the Massachusetts Audubon Society’s West Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary in Plainfield, MA and The Trustees of Reservations’ Notchview Reservation in Windsor, MA.

WHEREFORE, for the foregoing reasons, I respectfully request that my motion to intervene be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Michelle Bedard

20151230-5232

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Yibin Xiang under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/30/2015 1:42:12 PM Filed Date: 12/30/2015 1:42:12 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
---------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------

Individual yxiang@yahoo.com

Basis for Intervening:

I am an impacted as the property owner of parcel of the project CP16-21 on the Dracut Assessor's Map. This will impact my property and financial well being. I am against this proposed project.

Yibin Xiang and Sheena Gu

20151230-5237

United States of America
Before the
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC
Northeast Energy Direct Project

Docket No. CP16-21-000

**MOTION TO INTERVENE
OF NORTH QUABBIN ENERGY (NQE)**

Pursuant to Rules 212 and 214 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) promulgated at 18 C.F.R §385.212 and 385.214 (2007), North Quabbin Energy (NQE), files this motion to intervene in this proceeding.

On November 20, 2015 the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC ("TGP") filed its application under Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act, for the proposed project, FERC Docket No. CP16-21-000.

Interest of Party:

North Quabbin Energy is an informal network of citizens in north-central Massachusetts that supports and facilitates communication with people and town energy committees to share ideas and projects concerned with issues relating to energy use. Through this network of people and direct communication we work to educate ourselves and our neighbors about the true social and environmental costs of our current energy consumption patterns, both locally and globally. We also work to find ways of changing our individual and collective habits of energy use through conservation, use of renewable fuels, and support for local and regional enterprises that reduce our dependence on fossil fuels. North Quabbin Energy opposes the Northeast Energy Direct Project.

Concerns and possible impacts

Climate Change and Massachusetts Programs to Cut Carbon Emissions: Massachusetts has made a commitment through the Global Warming Solutions Act (GWSA) to cut greenhouse gas emissions by 25% below 1990 emissions by 2020. Building new gas pipeline infrastructure in the state does not help the state meet these goals and puts Massachusetts in the situation to use more fracked gas for electricity generation. The region already produces electricity using 44% from natural gas. If the state continues the use of more fossil fuels, produces more electricity from gas, and has less diversification in producing electricity for the region, then this moves us in the wrong direction in terms of cutting carbon emissions.

Large Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Is Not Needed: In the ISO-New England 2014 Regional System Plan (Nov. 2014), ISO-New England forecast that the demand for electricity showed "slow growth in both summer and winter peak demand times with an annual usage rise of 1%" (2014 Regional System Plan, ISO-New England, Nov., 2014, p. 4. <http://www.iso-ne.com/system-planning/system-plans-studies/rsp>). The recent study released by MA Attorney General Maura Healey also concludes that there is no deficiency for the production of electricity, even at peak times, and that no new large pipeline structure such as that proposed by the Tennessee Gas-Northeast Energy Direct project is needed (Power System Reliability in New England: Meeting Electric Resource Needs in an Era of Growing Dependence on Natural Gas- Fall, 2015). Building a large new gas transmission pipeline across Massachusetts and Southern New Hampshire is not needed.

Conservation land in North Quabbin Region: Crossing public and private conservation land in the region could have a negative impact on the recreational and economic uses of forests and lands in this region, and more particularly, on the sanctity and future vulnerability of protected conservation lands.

Use of fossil hydrocarbons for energy generation: The era of fossil energy generation has, of necessity, been drawing to a close for years, as understanding of the speed and global consequences of climate change has grown, and it is our position that major new investment in this sector is now obsolete.

Energy Conservation and Efficiency: Massachusetts has ranked #1 in the country in energy efficiency for the past four years. According to a recent study released by the MA Attorney General (Power System Reliability in New England: Meeting Electric Resource Needs in an Era of Growing Dependence on Natural Gas), Massachusetts can continue to cut energy usage through more energy conservation and efficiency programs. In several towns in the region North Quabbin Energy members have built inserts (inexpensive interior storms) for public buildings, helped move MA Green Communities forward in several towns and held programs for residents on energy conservation, efficiency and renewable alternatives. North Quabbin Energy, a regional citizens' group with participants from the towns of Athol, New Salem, Orange, Petersham, Royalston, Warwick and Wendell and contacts in other towns including Erving, Northfield, and Montague affected by the proposed path of the pipeline, is in a unique position to speak to issues regarding energy conservation and efficiency. Thus we believe our motion to intervene in this proceeding should be accepted.

Communications:

North Quabbin Energy
www.northquabbinenergy.org/wordpress
Contact person: Patricia Larson
173 Athol Road
Orange, MA 01364
E-Mail: plarson24@hotmail.com
Phone: 978-575-1226

Conclusion:

North Quabbin Energy respectfully requests that the Commission grant our Motion to Intervene as a party with full rights to participate in all further proceedings.

20151230-5238

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc. and Orange and Rockland Utilities, Inc. under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/30/2015 1:50:34 PM Filed Date: 12/30/2015 1:50:34 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____

Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc. and Orange and Rockland Utilities, Inc. savagep@coned.com
butlers@coned.com

Basis for Intervening:

Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc. and Orange and Rockland Utilities, Inc. are firm customers whose interests may be impacted by the outcome of this case.

20151230-5245

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Trude Witham under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/30/2015 2:22:12 PM Filed Date: 12/30/2015 2:22:12 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____
Individual trudew@comcast.net

Basis for Intervening:

I live in Townsend, Massachusetts, and want to intervene in this proceeding to oppose the NED pipeline. I have an interest which may be directly affected by the outcome of the proceeding because the proposed route of the pipeline would go through the town's water supply aquifer and the pipeline and compressor station may be located 1/2 mile from my house; thus, I am concerned about the health and safety effects of the pipeline. I enjoy the outdoors and do not want any state or town public parks or forests, which have been set aside for the people and wildlife, to be impacted by any activities of this commercial project.

20151230-5260

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Wenjun Chen under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/30/2015 2:09:54 PM Filed Date: 12/30/2015 2:09:54 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____
Individual wenjunchen88@gmail.com

Basis for Intervening:

I am impacted as a person live in the property of 63 Regency Drive, Dracut, MA. This will impact my person health due to the air pollution and noise generated by the Pipeline project.

I am also impacted as a property owner. This will impact my property value as well as resale of the property.

Thanks,

Wenjun Chen

63 Regency Drive, Dracut, MA 01826

20151230-5272

Randy Boisse, Dract, MA.

Just recently, as of December 21, 2015; the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company told FERC that they neglected to notify (46) of the affected landowners that are within 1/2 mile of the proposed Dracut, MA compressor station site. The Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company requested that FERC waive the landowner notification provisions of Section 157.6(d) since Tennessee supposedly sent out belated letters to the (46) impacted landowners on December 21, 2015.

This waiver request is not right, and is unconstitutional. The FERC deadline to intervene is January 6, 2016. This does not allow sufficient time for the impacted landowners to ask questions, to reach out to Town officials and State Representatives, and to file an intervention request.

Please deny Tennessee's request to waive the landowner notification provisions of Section 157.6(d), and please extend the intervention January 6, 2016 deadline by a few months so that those impacted by this project will have time to digest the information, ask questions, and to reach out to local and state representatives.

Sincerely,

Randy Boisse

190 Methuen Road

Dracut, MA 01826

20151230-5273

{duplicate copy of 20151230-5272 above}

20151230-5274

{duplicate copy of 20151230-5272 above}

20151230-5305

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Judtih Williams under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/30/2015 3:18:05 PM Filed Date: 12/30/2015 3:18:05 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____

Individual _____ judithbryanwilliams@verizon.net

Basis for Intervening:

I am commenting as an intervenor because of many reasons. I am a property owner in Plainfield whose property will be directly affected by the pipeline. Eighteen years ago, after always wanting to put land into conservation, my husband and I bought 400 acres of undeveloped land that we put under conservation restrictions so that it would remain in its natural state and never be developed. Our motivation was to preserve a corridor of land between 2000+ acres of MA Audubon property and thousands of acres of Mohawk State Forest Property. Our property is situated between these two previously mentioned properties and provides habitat for moose, deer, beaver, mink, otter, raccoon, fisher, song birds, waterfowl, and numerous other species. In addition I have certified 2 vernal pools on my property. This property is relatively free of invasive plant species which allows native wildflowers, shrubs, and trees to flourish. It is well known that any interruption to conservation property will allow native species to invade. The thought of the pipeline going through this property is devastating. I have committed my life to teaching about the natural environment and am presently an adjunct professor at Berkshire Community College where one of the courses that I teach is Conservation of Natural Resources. It seems an abomination that this conservation land will be desecrated by construction of a pipeline.

20151230-5312

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Leslie Charles under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/30/2015 3:35:55 PM Filed Date: 12/30/2015 3:35:55 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____

Individual _____ Lesliecharles@hotmail.com

Basis for Intervening:

My interest as a resident of the Westfield River Watershed, living just downstream from where the Company proposes to cross the federally designated Wild & Scenic Westfield River with its pipeline. In addition to living in the watershed, my family swims and plays in the river near the Windsor town line. I am concerned about the impact that the construction and operation of the pipeline, and the compressor station proposed for Windsor, could have on ecological and human health in our watershed.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC
North East Direct Pipeline Project

Docket No. CP16-21-000

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO INTERVENE

Pursuant to Rules 212 and 214 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's ("Commission") Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 385.212 and 385.214 (2007), I/we, Salvatore and Maryann Frisella, file this motion to intervene in this proceeding.

On November 20, 2015, the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC ("TGP") filed its application under § 7 of the Natural Gas Act, 15 U.S.C. § 717f, and § 157 of FERC's regulations, 18 C.F.R. § 157.1 et seq., for the proposed North East Direct Project (NED), FERC Docket No. CP 16- 21-000

I. COMMUNICATIONS AND SERVICE

All communications, pleadings, and orders with respect to this proceeding should be sent to the following individual:

Salvatore and Maryann Frisella
39 Valewood Circle
Tewksbury, Ma. 01876
mfezzuoglio@hotmail.com

II. INTEREST OF PETITIONER

Construction, operation and maintenance of the Pipeline would adversely impact me and my family. This proposed pipeline has a direct impact to our property and our property value. The construction of this pipeline will have a negative impact, not only on our property, but the property in our neighborhood as well. Our neighborhood sits on the Shawsheen river, with many wildlife species calling the river home. There are turtles that make their way to our backyard every spring to lay their eggs, it is their yearly ritual. We have many deer that use the river, as well as the protection of the wooded area directly behind our homes to travel. This pipeline would completely eliminate the trees permanently! These trees that protect our wildlife also protect our property from Route 93 and buffers the noise level that runs directly behind our home. They are the only sound and visual barrier we have from the noise and pollution of the busy highway. This will impact the privacy of even enjoying family functions in our backyard.

Tennessee Gas, in their submitted construction drawing would require 105 feet of my back yard to construct this pipeline, as the only access to pipeline route is through our yard from the front due to the highway in the back with untold damage to our driveway and property with heavy equipment. This plan also calls for movement or destruction of structures on our property. This would also have an impact on our inground sprinkler system as well as our septic and leach field that would fail with the weight of heavy equipment. It is also indicated on the Tennessee Gas maps that horizontal drilling under the Shawsheen river would be starting in my backyard. Our property as well as neighbors on both sides has rock ledge in our backyards, which would likely call for blasting, and in turn create possible damage to our home foundations.

As no one else can represent my interests in this matter, I stand to suffer significant damages and irreparable harm from an affirmative outcome in this application; I am filing this motion to intervene.

III. CONCLUSION

Wherefore, we, Salvatore and Maryann Frisella, respectfully requests that the Commission to grant my Motion to Intervene as a party with full rights to participate in all further proceedings.

Respectfully submitted this 29th day of December, 2015.

Salvatore and Maryann Frisella
39 Valewood Circle
Tewksbury, Ma. 01876
978-828-1222
mfezzuoglio@hotmail.com

20151230-5318

Thomas Medici
35 Kenwood Rd
Dracut, MA 01826

12/30/2015

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

Dear Kimberly D. Bose:

My name is Thomas Medici and I've lived in Dracut for over 40 years. I have watched our small town grow and raised two wonderful children here. You can imagine how happy I was to learn one of my daughters wanted to build their dream home down the street from me. I consider myself very lucky to have my daughter and grandson so close. It is especially nice having family close by as I am a kidney transplant recipient, double hip transplant recipient, and had incurred several other life threatening surgeries over my lifetime.

I've recently learned about a Compressor Station being proposed on Broadway Rd. in Dracut, MA roughly one mile from my current home and less than a quarter mile from my daughters newly built home. My daughter's neighborhood is full of young families who have worked very hard to afford their dream homes. My neighborhood also includes newly built homes and existing homes that are now being purchased by my daughter's generation. It is heartwarming to think the second generation decided to stay in our small town to raise their families.

Firstly, I'd like to detail how this Compressor Station will affect our town. Dracut is a rural farming community with many local farms following organic farming methods. Four of these farms are within a half mile radius of this proposed Compressor Station. The environmental impact on these farms and our community will be extensive. Several studies have documented that these stations pollute the groundwater, soil and air within a ten mile radius.

Our small town's economy, which doesn't include any large retail chains, will be gravely impacted as farms begin to close due to the contaminated groundwater and soil. Many residents in Dracut rely on wells to provide fresh drinking water in their homes. These wells will likely be impacted due to heavy drilling and other activities associated with the NED project.

The proposed location of the Compressor Station has already been identified as a 'Brownfield Site'. This site poisoned wells and affected groundwater back in the 1980s. It has been documented that this site contains petroleum and many other unidentified chemicals and toxins. Disturbing the ground at an already contaminated location to place another hazardous building on that site does not seem to make sense for our town or any town in the Merrimack Valley area.

Secondly, I'd like to detail how this Compressor Station will affect my family. As I mentioned above, I am a kidney transplant recipient. This surgery has caused me to have a compromised immune system. I will be directly affected by the toxic emissions vented from the Compressor Station during 'Blown Down' events. The NED project has requested 75 'Blown Downs' per unit per year. These 'Blown Downs' have been shown to cause rashes, frequent nose bleeds and respiratory distress to residents within a ten mile radius but

is more potent the closer the individual is to the Compressor Station. As I mentioned above, my daughter, son-in-law, and grandson are within a quarter mile of this Compressor Station. Please note, my daughter and grandson have asthma. This will have a significant impact on our families overall health. Due to the health effects of this Station and the impact it will likely have on our town my daughter will be forced to sell her dream home (several of her neighbors have already put their homes up for sale) and I, after living in my home for 30 years, will need to move. My daughter was also not notified by Kinder Morgan at any point in this project. She has contacted Kinder Morgan on several occasion and they have not returned her calls.

At the age of 68 years old I cannot imagine the thought of losing everything I have worked so hard to achieve. My wife and I are retired and are on a fixed income. Please consider the impact the Northeast Energy Direct project will have on our town and families like mine. I am opposed to the NED project and you should be too.

Respectfully Submitted,

Thomas Medici

20151230-5335

RE: Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Pipeline,
Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LLC, a division of Kinder Morgan

Docket # CP16-21-000

MOTION TO INTERVENE of Mary Neville Wall to OPPOSE the NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT PIPELINE

As a United States citizen, a resident of Warwick, Massachusetts and a homesteading land-owner of directly impacted property in Warwick and Northfield, I am filing this Motion to Intervene in this proceeding to oppose the NED pipeline due to the project's significant impacts on the environment, health, safety, and its socioeconomic consequences to myself directly as well as the region.

My interests "which may be directly affected by the outcome of the proceeding" include, but are not limited to:

- My home, garage, barn, wells, 9.45kW solar plant, livestock, organic orchards, gardens, and arena are all firmly within the "blast radius" aka the "incineration zone". This will impact my property and financial well-being.
- My foundations, wells, cistern, pond, and numerous springs may be adversely affected or directly destroyed by the substantive drilling and pervasive blasting through miles of interconnected and steep slope bedrock.
- My health and the health of my family, farm and community may be at risk due to noise, frequencies, vibration, as well as damaging particulate materials and ground contaminants. Note that the public record indicates that Kinder Morgan's modus operandi is to do whatever it takes to get pipelines approved and installed as quickly as possible, cut corners on construction and maintenance, and simply pay the fines later.
- My interest as a taxpayer, neighbor, frequent horseback rider and hiker on affected protected public land in Massachusetts and New Hampshire. I am very concerned about the threat this project poses to all public land protected by Article 97 of the Articles of Amendment to the Massachusetts Constitution.
- My interest as a land trust supporter, frequent visitor and neighbor to the Warwick, Northfield, and Mount Grace State Forests, as well as Mt. Grace Land Trust and Pulpit Falls conservation properties. As a donor to land conservation organization, the purpose of my donation would be violated.
- My interest as an electric ratepayer. As explained in depth by others on this and PF14-22 dockets, the massive overbuild embodied in this proposal will very likely lead to higher energy costs for ratepayers and an increase on my bill relating to NED – either because the excess capacity contracted for by our utilities would go unused, or because capacity would be used for export, driving up domestic

energy prices.

- My interest in our area wildlife, established ecosystems, the value of our forests to combat climate change and the sanctity of protecting our clean water resources. Kinder Morgan continues to show disregard and disrespect for the people and natural resources of our region. Far less harmful and disruptive means of meeting our energy needs should be pursued.
- My interest in and concerns regarding the 41,000HP compressor station proposed for Northfield. The growing documentation which identifies numerous detrimental consequences such a compressor station would impose on our environment, health, and the safety of the region should not be ignored.
- My interest in FERC's ability to approve Eminent domain to advance corporate agendas and private industrial profits. This is an extremely personal issue for me as I may be the third generation to be a victim of Eminent Domain in my family. Now the NED Pipeline threatens me with Eminent Domain for private profit. If corporations are people and all people are created equal under the law... will FERC require Kinder Morgan to provide a fair market value, legal costs, moving expenses as well as compensation for pain, suffering and losses?

In conclusion, I, Mary Neville Wall, satisfy the standard for intervention under FERC's regulations and request that the Commission GRANT this Motion to Intervene and allow the INTERVENOR to participate in this proceeding with full rights of party status, including the right to request a hearing, cross examine witnesses, and seek rehearing and appeal.

20151230-5342

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Abby Foster under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/30/2015 3:51:24 PM Filed Date: 12/30/2015 3:51:24 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	mhairi_foster@yahoo.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I am a resident of West Townsend, MA and I want to intervene in this proceeding to oppose the NED pipeline. I have an interest which may be directly affected by the outcome of the proceeding because, and the proposed pipeline would have an effect on the health and safety of my family. We also live in close proximity to state conservation lands that would be directly affected by the route of the pipeline, causing undue damage to natural ecosystems. Having a pipeline go through our town would increase the possibility of costly and hazardous accidents, affecting the culture of our town. I fully OPPOSE the proposed pipeline.

20151230-5344

December 30, 2015

To: The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC)

From: Dennis Manitsas & Sondra Lisson

4 Scotland Heights

North Reading, MA 01864

Re: Motion to Intervene – Docket CP-16-21-000

Dear M/Mr.

We oppose the Northeast Energy Direct Project (NED) for the following reasons.

1. We do not believe that the proposed project is in the interests of our community.
2. The project as defined represents a potentially significant safety threat to our property and the commu-

nity at-large.

3. The project as defined represents a potentially significant environmental hazard to our community.

4. On a personal level the presence of a gas pipeline on our property in addition to the already present New England Electric power lines represents an undue burden to us and other North Reading homeowner's who are similarly affected.

We urge our local, state and federal elected officials along with all appropriate regulatory bodies to consider these factors and to oppose the NED project.

Respectfully Yours,

Dennis Manitsas & Sondra Lisson

20151230-5351

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

December 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.
Northeast Energy Direct Project; Docket No. CP16-21-000
Response to Environmental Information Request No. 1

Dear Ms. Bose:

On November 20, 2015, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. ("Tennessee") filed with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission an application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity ("Application") for the proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project ("Project") in the above-referenced docket.

On December 8, 2015, the Commission issued Environmental Information Request No. 1 to Tennessee in the above-referenced docket. On December 28, 2015, Tennessee submitted responses to Question 1, and noted that responses to the remaining Questions 2 through 9 related to Resource Report 10 (Alternatives) would be filed no later than December 31, 2015. Enclosed with this filing are Tennessee's responses to Questions 2 through 9 of the December 8, 2015 Environmental Information Request, including attachments.

In accordance with the Commission's filing requirements, Tennessee is submitting this filing with the Commission's Secretary through the eFiling system. Copies of this filing are being served on all parties on the official service list for the above-referenced docket. Any questions concerning this filing should be addressed to Ms. Jacquelyne Rocan at (713) 420-4544 or to Ms. Shannon Miller at (713) 420-4038.

Respectfully submitted,

TENNESSEE GAS PIPELINE COMPANY, L.L.C.

By: /s/ J. Curtis Moffatt
J. Curtis Moffatt

Deputy General Counsel and Vice President Gas Group Legal

Enclosure

cc: Mr. Michael McGehee (Commission Staff); Mr. Rich McGuire (Commission Staff); Mr. Eric Tomasi (Commission Staff)
Mr. Wayne Kicklighter (Cardno)

Enclosure files:

NED_Dec 8Data RequestResponses_Alternatives(final).PDF 120 KB
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14086526>

AttachmentA_FERC CS AlternativeTable (Dec 30)(final).PDF 219 KB
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14086527>

Attachment B_NED_CS_LOCATION_MAPBOOK 20151229.PDF 23.1 MB
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14086528>

- Supply Head Station Alternatives (Segment C): 1-5
- Supply Mid Station Alternatives (Segment D): 6-11
- Supply Tail Station Alternatives (Segment E): 12-13
- Market Head Station Alternatives (Segment F): 14-15
- Market Mid Station 1 Alternatives (Segment F): 16-26
- Market Mid Station 2 Alternatives (Segment F): 27-29
- Market Mid Station 3 Alternatives (Segment H): 30-33
- Market Mid Station 4 Alternatives (Segment J): 34-45
- Market Tail Station Alternatives (Segment K): 46-51

AttachmentB__ALT_CS_LOCATION_QUAD_MAPBOOK.PDF 7.41 MB
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14086529>

- Susquehanna County, PA: 1
- Delaware & Otsego Counties, NY 2
- Delaware County, NY 3
- Schoharie County, NY 4-5
- Rensselaer County, NY 6-8
- Berkshire County, MA 9
- Franklin County, MA 10
- Middlesex County, MA 11
- Hillsborough County, NH 12
- Middlesex County, MA 13

Attachment C_NED Data Response_Figures.PDF 6.66 MB
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14086530>

NED_Affidavits (Dec 30).PDF 259 KB
<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14086531>

20151230-5356

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Rebecca Wandrei under CP16-21-000.
Submission Date: 12/30/2015 4:13:14 PM Filed Date: 12/30/2015 4:13:14 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party	Signer (Representative)	Other Contact (Principal)
Individual	bwandrei@hotmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

We are very concerned about the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline project (Docket# CP16-21-000) because it will be located in an area abutting our property line. We are even more concerned about the 41,000 HP compressor station planned for our town (Windsor, MA) just over 2 miles away from our home. We are concerned about air quality due to the 41,000 HP turbines generating methane exhaust.

We are concerned about disturbances to our well water as it is very close to the blasting zone for the pipeline.

We are concerned with the continuous noise expected of the compressor station, 24-7.

We are concerned with noise and air pollution from compressor station blowdowns.

We are concerned with subsonic vibrations that can subconsciously affect health.

We are concerned about any chemicals or toxins released into the ground that will end up in our well water.

We are concerned with traffic, noise, air pollution and numerous disturbances during construction.

We are concerned with our property value decreasing being so close to a 41,000 HP compressor station.

We are concerned with natural gas infrastructure incidents that would require evacuation from the neighborhood and potential destruction/damage of property and lives.

We are concerned that our “volunteer” fire department will not be adequate in fighting a natural gas incident that will come from this pipeline or compressor station.

We are concerned with the industrialization of our extremely rural town.

We have a 9 year old son and are very concerned for his health and well being due to ill effects that will come about from living so close to this pipeline & compressor station.

20151230-5360

My family and I live far too close to the potential “impact zone” for the pipeline. I am concerned about the following aspects of this project: 1) blowdown noise and gas emissions from the proposed Dracut compressor station on Broadway Road; 2) the impacts that construction would have on property values in Dracut and the residential tax base which supports our school funding; 3) the proximity of the proposed pipeline to the active Brox Industries quarry; 4) the potential contamination of wells due to the proposed construction of the Market Path tail compressor station on 2 contaminated sites (see MA DEP Release Tracking Numbers 3-0000307 and 3-0001070), including wells that support farming and help preserve the rural character of Dracut.”

20151230-5363

Norman S. Walker
P. O. Box 130
Ashfield, MA
01330

December 30, 2015

Re: Docket No. CP16-21
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co. - NED Project

Motion to Intervene

As a landowner directly affected by the proposed pipeline, I hereby move to intervene in the above-captioned proceeding.

I strongly object to the planned route of this pipeline for the following reasons:

1. The company plan places it 45 feet from my home at 411 Hawley Road in Ashfield, MA (see photos attached). This home is a 180-year-old house painstakingly restored, modernized and landscaped with orchard, gardens and rare plants. This is unnecessarily close for a sparsely settled neighborhood (only three other houses within a half-mile radius).
2. The pipeline will traverse the steep hill upon which the house stands at a level immediately above it, exposing it unnecessarily to seepage from leaks or ruptures.
3. Dynamiting of granite ridges to bury the pipeline will likely affect adjacent springs that supply the house's water. It will also likely affect a nearby spring (200 yards north of the line) that supplies relatives as well as the Town of Ashfield Water District reservoir.

I oppose construction of the pipeline altogether because it will seriously reduce the value of my property, and because it will subject me to passthrough costs for electric rate payers even though I will have no benefit from those costs.

In addition I oppose construction for general reasons, to wit:

1. Federal policy is to downgrade the use of fossil fuels, as per the recent international agreement in Paris on preservation of the environment and control of global warming emissions.
2. State policy is to shift development of energy supplies to renewables.
3. According to the Attorney General of Massachusetts this pipeline is not needed. Gas supply requirements should be evaluated on a long-term, not an immediate or transitory basis.
4. Hundreds of acres of watershed for the Town of Ashfield reservoir drain entirely over the pipeline route on my land. This is potentially damaging to the Town in the event of improper maintenance of the line.
5. Promises of Tennessee Gas/Kinder Morgan cannot be accepted at face value due to financial weakness and other aspects.

Finally, I urge that this project not be reviewed on a stand-alone basis but only in conjunction with other projects for adding gas supply to New England, if needed.

I hereby request the granting of the right to intervene.

Respectfully submitted,
Norman S. Walker

Contact information:

Norman S. Walker
411 Hawley Road – P. O. Box 130
Ashfield, MA 01330
Tel: 413-638-3387
Email: walkerns@verizon.net

20151230-5367

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Charlie Wang under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/30/2015 4:29:40 PM Filed Date: 12/30/2015 4:29:40 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	charliewang978@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I am an impacted as the property owner of 63 Regency Drive, Dracut, MA 01826 on the Dracut Assessor's

Map. This will impact my property and financial well being.

I am a resident whose source of drinking water is crossed by the proposed route so my drinking water supply is at risk of the construction and/or operation of the pipeline, compressor station, or other facilities.

I enjoy the out of doors and do not want any state or town public parks or forests, which have been set aside for the people and wildlife, to be impacted by any activities of this commercial project.

20151230-5369

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Amy J Grube under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/30/2015 4:42:49 PM

Filed Date: 12/30/2015 4:42:49 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	ajgrube@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

December 30, 2015

Amy Grube

6 Field Rd.

Windham, NH 03087

Docket number: CP16-21-000

To Whom it May Concern:

I am a home owner in the town of Windham, NH, and have been identified by Kinder Morgan as an abutter to the Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline project in New Hampshire. I am requesting a motion to intervene in this proceeding to oppose the project. I have many interests which will likely be directly affected by the outcome of the proceeding.

I am not convinced that the benefits are enough to substantiate the financial, economic or environmental risks that could impact the local community and New Hampshire. The proximity of my home to the proposed pipeline location as an abutter also poses a number of dangers to me and my family.

Potential personal concerns:

- Health and safety risks from blasting and construction, as well as ongoing operation and maintenance hazards
- Physical vulnerability of my home and well
- Water quality degradation
- Devaluation of property as an abutter
- Loss of privacy - trespassers, drones, surveyors, etc.
- Increase to my electric bill relating to the NED project

Potential community concerns:

- Herbicide usage to control unwanted vegetation in and around pipelines
- Tariff on electric rates to pay for the project
- Future financial burden for landowners who accept a one-time easement payment
- Future tax burden to the community for appropriate emergency response facilities
- Contamination from leaks
- Meter station toxic chemical emissions

I respectfully request that my motion to intervene be granted.

Regards,
Amy Grube

20151230-5370

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Richard Kinnas under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/30/2015 4:47:00 PM Filed Date: 12/30/2015 4:47:00 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	rk01201@hotmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I am an impacted landowner, parcel MA WD 74. This will impact my property, my financial well-being and my physical well-being.

20151230-5396

December 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.
Northeast Energy Direct Project; Docket No. CP16-21-000
Response to Environmental Information Request No. 1

Dear Ms. Bose:

It is completely laughable to imagine anyone believing the claims of Kinder Morgan Tennessee Gas Pipeline (KM/TGP) in their 12/28/2015 Response to Environmental Information Request No. 1 filing that "Tennessee has, to the maximum extent practicable and feasible, routed the Project to avoid Article 97 lands.[1]" They made that claim twice in their Responses to both the Massachusetts Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs' (EEA) Comment a-4 and to the EEA's Energy Facilities Site Board's Comment d-7. How can this claim be true when KM/TGP continues to target additional Article 97 land beyond the actual pipeline route for their so-called temporary work spaces?

A perfect example of this contradictory behavior is their selection of the Waryjasz property in Plainfield for contractor yard NED-G-0703. The property is not only protected by Article 97 of the Amendments to the Massachusetts Constitution, but is also a farm protected by the Massachusetts Department of Agricultural Resources' Agricultural Preservation Restriction (APR) permanent easement program, and is designated as PH 574 Priority Habitat of Rare Species by the Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program (NHESP) of the Massachusetts Department of Fish and Wildlife[2]. Is this really a wise and environmentally friendly choice for an active construction site and storage area of pipeline components, heavy equipment vehicles, welding and other construction equipment, solvents and other toxic products, all known to compact soil, leak and spill?

Properties protected by APRs are required to have prime agricultural soils making them the least suited for soil compaction by heavy construction equipment. A property designated Priority Habitat of Rare Species really does have rare species present also making it not suitable for a construction site. Did KM/TGP

really try “to the maximum extent practicable and feasible“ in avoiding Article 97 lands when they chose the Waryjasz property for their contractor pipeyard? Or is this property’s selection just another purposeful targeting of protected land?

Kinder Morgan’s wanton disrespect of conservation land is well documented by their own filings. There are 6 pages of entries in Resource Report 8’s Enrolled Lands Crossed by the Project Pipeline Facilities Table 8.3-5 listing over 400 acres of permanently protected land impacted. Does this table include all of the additional lands now proposed to be permanently impacted as temporary construction work spaces? FERC and their environmental contractor Cardno must not allow this continued assault on permanently protected land. And you must not accept as final KM/TGP’s non-answer responses to valid questions and concerns.

Respectfully,

Cathy Kristofferson

CC: Governor Charlie Baker

EoEEA Secretary Matthew Beaton

MDAR Commissioner John Lebeaux

DFG Commissioner George Peterson, Jr.

footnotes

1 <http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=14083266>

2 <https://elibrary.ferc.gov/IDMWS/common/OpenNat.asp?fileID=13939531>

{ table & 2 maps omitted, full document can be downloaded at: }

<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/opennat.asp?fileID=14087297>

20151231-5002

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Bruce C Townend under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/30/2015 7:30:14 PM Filed Date: 12/31/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	brucetownend@verizon.net	

Basis for Intervening:

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Room IA East

888 First Street, N.E.

Washington, D.C. 20426

Re: Docket No. CP16-21-000: Petition for Intervention of the Northeast Energy Direct Project

Dear Secretary Bose:

Enclosed is the petition for my intervention in the above referenced proceeding, submitted by electronic filing. Thank you for your consideration.

In regards to Docket #CP16-21-000, the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company,LLC and the Northeast Energy Direct Project.

I hereby seek intervention to this proposed pipeline. My interests may be directly affected by the outcome of the proceedings if found in favor of building this proposed pipeline. I presently live at 123 Crane Rd in

Windsor, MA within 2 miles of the proposed compressor station. I grow my own organic fruits and vegetables which can be endangered by “blowoff” chemicals that are known to be released from fracked gas compressor stations as well as fracked gas wells. Several of these, such as benzene and formaldehyde, are known carcinogens. I built my house in the country to escape the pollutants of city living and now they are to be stationed here. I am an avid Nordic skier, cyclist and hiker at Notchview Reservation and the roads in our community and I believe this compressor station will be a huge deterrent to myself and others who enjoy the natural surroundings that our town offers.

I believe this pipeline will not lower electricity costs of the residents of Massachusetts but indeed, force prices even higher as most of this fuel is to be sold overseas at higher prices which will drive our prices higher. With the study done by MA Attorney General Healy, our need for more fracked gas is not necessary to the future needs of Massachusetts residents.

The noise, smells, lights 24/7, and dangerous chemical pollutants associated with compressor stations are all things I oppose. They are all in opposition to nature and all that we cherish living in a small community.

Kinder Morgan continues to show disregard and disrespect for the public and natural resources of our region. There are far less harmful and disruptive means of meeting our energy needs. Were the Paris climate change talks in vain? We have an obligation as Americans to do the right thing for our country, for our world, for our planet.

I respectfully request that my motion for intervention be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Bruce Townend
123 Crane Rd
Windsor, MA 01270
brucetownend@verizon.net

20151231-5003

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Anne Goodwin under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/30/2015 7:47:44 PM Filed Date: 12/31/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	annegoodwin@comcast.net	

Basis for Intervening:

I am filing as a ratepayer. I do not wish to pay for fossil fuel infrastructure which will bring environmental degradation and adverse health effects into my state, and which will increase my rates without bringing any benefits.

20151231-5004

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Mark A. Godin under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/30/2015 7:56:27 PM Filed Date: 12/31/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	mgodnr75@aol.com	

Basis for Intervening:

Motion to intervene of Mark and Brenda Godin, residents of Pelham NH Hillsboro County. We request to be intervenors because we have great concerns regarding the effects that this NED pipeline may have on the water and air quality of our Town. We live on Little Island Pond which is less than 1000 feet from the proposed path of the pipeline. This lake is important to us because it is home to a breeding pair of Loons. This threatened species has successfully reintroduced itself within the last ten years after an absence of over 40 years due to the effects of DDT. Maintaining good water clarity is essential for Loon feeding and their survival. We are also concerned that the proposed path of the NED pipeline crosses our aquifer and therefore could threaten our sole water supply. Also the proposed compressor station in nearby Dracut Ma. causes us concern because of the possibilities of contamination of both air and water. Finally as ratepayers we are concerned that the enormous cost of this project will be passed on to us. We oppose this pipeline.

20151231-5010

BEFORE THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC
Northeast Energy Direct Project

Docket No. CP16-21-000
12/30/2015

**MOTION TO INTERVENE OF
Robert A. Chesebrough**

I hereby move, pursuant to 18 C.F.R. § 385.214(b), to intervene in the above-captioned proceeding. I seek to intervene in opposition to the Northeast Energy Direct Project (the “Project” or the “NED Project”) proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (the “Company”), a subsidiary of Kinder Morgan, Inc. (“Kinder Morgan”). Communications concerning this proceeding should be served upon me as follows:

Robert A. Chesebrough
27 Fletcher Lane
Hollis, NH 03049
(603) 320-3575
robert.chesebrough@gmail.com

My interests “which may be directly affected by the outcome of the proceeding” pursuant to 18 C.F.R. 214(b)(2)(ii) include:

1. I am a landowner and resident of Hollis, NH. I was notified by the Company that my property would be affected by the construction and operation of the Nashua Lateral of the NED project. A later change of preferred route of the project then temporarily decreased the risk to my property as the Nashua Lateral may no longer be required. More recently another NED project route change has moved the 30” pipeline back into the town of Hollis and within 1 mile of my property.
2. Recent FERC requests have brought further emphasis on alternate routes through Massachusetts including the Massachusetts Turnpike and Massachusetts Route 2 alternative. Maps of alternate routes released as recently as December 2015 identify a new South Merrimack Lateral through Hollis which could endanger my property. Additionally minor shifts in the preferred route of the pipeline through Hollis could also directly endanger my property.
3. The water supply for my property comes from a dug well fed by a Hollis aquifer. The construction and operation of the NED project would cross this aquifer. Disruption or degradation of this aquifer would cause changes in flow, increased sediment, and contamination by known and unknown toxins. These changes would endanger my primary drinking water and primary supply of water to my fruit and vegetable crops. Sediment and contaminants would also place my well pump, pressure tank, forced hot water furnace, hot water heater, washing machine, ice maker, faucets, shower heads, plumbing, and irrigation system at risk.
4. I am a customer of NH. This state is my home, my recreation area, and my tranquil escape. Construc-

tion and operation of the NED project would devalue the visual landscape, water quality, and air quality of this area which violates the core reasons I chose NH as my primary residence. The NED project would cause increased air pollution, light pollution, and noise pollution from proposed and future industrial compressor stations, meter stations, and mainline valves. Scheduled and unscheduled pressure releases or “blowdowns” from the massive NED project’s infrastructure are not common of quiet rural NH.

5. I am a NH utility ratepayer. An electricity tariff has been proposed to subsidize new pipeline construction. This tariff would subject me to the estimated \$5 billion cost of the NED project. The Massachusetts Attorney General’s November 2015 study proves quite clearly that there are more financially responsible ways to meet winter reliability concerns. I applaud her efforts and support her choices for my ratepayer dollars.
6. I am a taxpayer in Hollis. Construction and operation of the NED project through Hollis would require investments in town infrastructure for which I would be held financially responsible. Taxpayer revenue has already been allocated for Project related legal fees and studies. These monetary requirements would increase if rural Hollis must host the industrial NED project.
7. I am a member of the public in this application for public need and necessity. Liberty Utilities is the only NH subscriber for the NED project. This contract represents 8% of the 1.3bcf/d NED project capacity and Liberty’s filings also state that nearly half of this capacity would replace existing supply and therefore is unnecessary. Consequently 0.065bcf/d is the public need for NH. This minimal need could be obtained through far less expensive and less destructive means therefore the NED project is not a necessity.

WHEREFORE, for the foregoing reasons, I respectfully request that my motion to intervene be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert A. Chesebrough

20151231-5011

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Saralinda Lobrose under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/30/2015 9:17:29 PM

Filed Date: 12/31/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
---------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------

Individual	lobrose1@gmail.com	
------------	--------------------	--

Basis for Intervening:

BEFORE THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

_____)	Docket No. CP16-21-000
-------	---	------------------------

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC)	
-------------------------------------	---	--

Northeast Energy Direct Project)	
---------------------------------	---	--

_____)	
-------	---	--

MOTION TO INTERVENE OF

Saralinda Lobrose

I hereby move, pursuant to 18 C.F.R. § 385.214(b), to intervene in the above-captioned proceeding. I seek to intervene in opposition to the Northeast Energy Direct Project (the “Project” or the “NED Project”) proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (the “Company”), a subsidiary of Kinder Morgan, Inc.

(“Kinder Morgan”). Communications concerning this proceeding should be served upon me as follows:

Saralinda Lobrose
122 East Main St.
Plainfield, MA 01070
413-634-5513
Lobrose1@gmail.com

My interests “which may be directly affected by the outcome of the proceeding” pursuant to 18 C.F.R. § 214(b)(2)(ii) include:

- My interest as an electric ratepayer, insomuch as the Company seeks to secure my electric utility as a Project shipper, which, in turn, would seek to recover costs associated with the Project from ratepayers. As explained in depth by others on this docket (and on the pre-filing docket PF14-22), Kinder Morgan is essentially telling the Commission that New England needs a blow torch to light a candle. The massive overbuild embodied in this proposal is very likely to lead to higher energy costs for New England’s ratepayers – either because the excess capacity contracted for by our utilities would go unused, or because capacity would be used for markets overseas, driving up domestic energy prices.
- My interest as a resident of the Westfield River Watershed and the farmlands of the Berkshire foothills. I live just next store to the site where Kinder Morgan has proposed storing pipes and building materials. The site is beautiful useful farmland. Here we are in a “Right to Farm” community facing the possibility of having the farmland taken over by pipes, explosives and other materials. This would be a complete violation of our neighborhood and a health risk for my family and neighbors!
- My interest as a taxpayer, neighbor and visitor to protected public land in Massachusetts. Much of our area is State Forest and protected land and this pipeline project would put this wilderness at great risk.
- My interest as a land trust supporter, visitor and neighbor to the Massachusetts Audubon Society’s West Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary in Plainfield, MA and The Trustees of Reservations’ Notchview Reservation in Windsor, MA.

I live in Plainfield, MA with my grown children and husband. My elderly mother also lives with us after leaving her home in upstate NY because of the threat of drilling there and in neighboring PA. My granddaughter lives in Winchester, NH. Our properties are within a mile or less of the proposed pipeline path. It seems that no matter where my family goes, we are haunted by the impending destruction, devastation, and health risks associated with the horrendous business of hydrofracking. Kinder Morgan has a horrific safety record and I am very concerned about the risk for all of us, but especially for the youngest, such as my granddaughter.

Kinder Morgan continues to show disregard and disrespect for the people and natural resources of our region. The purported benefits of this 400-mile, 360,000-horsepower monstrosity are not worth the risks and the impacts to our communities. Far less harmful and disruptive means of meeting our energy needs should be pursued. This project is not good for anyone except for Kinder Morgan. It is certainly not in the best interest of the public!

WHEREFORE, for the foregoing reasons, I respectfully request that my motion to intervene be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Saralinda Lobrose

20151231-5013

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Keith P Babbitt to oppose the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/30/2015 10:02:29 PM

Filed Date: 12/31/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

20151231-5018

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Richard Kres under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/30/2015 6:40:27 PM Filed Date: 12/31/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____

Individual richietennis20@yahoo.com

Basis for Intervening:

motion to intervene of Richard L. Kres and Kathleen M. Kres

Richard L. Kres and Kathleen M. Kres are residents of the town of Pelham, Hillsborough County, New Hampshire. The proposed right of way of the Kinder Morgan/ Tennessee Pipeline Company's NED Project runs across the Kres property. As a result, approximately 20 percent of the kres property is subject to condemnation if a certificate is granted.

Pursuant to Commission rules 385.214 (b) and 157.10, Richard L. Kres and Kathleen M. Kres move to intervene in the above captioned proceeding. This intervention is timely filed.

The Kres' 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 20 percent of their land, and would cause irreparable damage to the property. Further, tjheoir residence will be directly adjacent to the right of way well within the incineration zone in the event of an explosion. Further, the residence relies on a drilled well as its sole water source, which is of great concern because the pipleline would cross Pelham's aquifer. Construction activities would jeopardize the integrity of the well. Additionally there will be ongoing safety hazards after the project is completed. In addition the Kres' have great concern regarding the proposed compressor station proposed for Dracut, Massachusetts. This facility is less than a mile from New Hampshire's border and emissions could pollute the air in Pelham as well as in Dracut and therefore cause health concerns.

20151231-5021

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Aliyah Sarro-Schwartz under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/30/2015 10:40:24 PM Filed Date: 12/31/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____

Individual aliyahss@stanford.edu

Basis for Intervening:

I live in a community that will be directly impacted negatively by this pipeline. My health, safety, and welfare will all be impacted by this project. Property values will decrease, and our community will become less desirable. This is an unacceptable price for my community, and many other communities, to pay so that others can have energy prices that will supposedly be a little bit lower.

20151231-5022

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Caren Jackson under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/30/2015 5:17:28 PM Filed Date: 12/31/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____
Individual _____ Carenjackson@msn.com _____

Basis for Intervening:

I am a landowner in the town of Dracut. My family moved here six years ago and it felt like we hit the lottery. We could not be happier living in this home with our neighbor's that quickly became family. Our children play freely with lots of open space and fields.

Construction of the metering station and compression station worry me for many reasons along with my neighbor's. The metering station is planned to be located in our backyard. My property is downwind from the compression station. The compression station will emit various harmful chemicals causing health issues from headache to God forbid cancer- how could anyone think this is a good idea when innocent lives could be put in harms way. We have two farms right in our neighborhood, we belong to the CSA, what would this do to the farmers? What would this do the crops-? It's not good.

I don't want to move but I certainly don't want to risk the lives of my young boys or myself or husband.

There is financial aspect to this as well. We could certainly not sell our house given the possible construction of such a harmful scenario so we would lose money, money that we can't afford to lose. As mentioned this was our dream home and it took everything to make this dream come true.

Construction and operation from the pipeline would greatly (negatively) impact the quality of my life and my financial well-being.

20151231-5023

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Northeast Direct Project of
Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC

Docket No. CP16-21-000

MOTION TO INTERVENE AND COMMENTS OF WINDSOR MA. RESIDENT

Pursuant to Sections 212 and 214 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("Commission") promulgated at 18 C.F.R. § 382.212 and § 385.214, I, Valerie C. Kohn respectfully move to intervene and provide comments in the above-captioned proceeding.

Basis and Grounds for Intervention

I have been a resident of Windsor, MA (site of the proposed Kinder Morgan compressor station) for the past 39 years. I am a well-informed citizen and I am outraged that despite all the facts, Kinder Morgan may be allowed to go ahead with their proposed pipeline. Our Attorney General, Maura Healey, has made it known, after an extensive study, that the gas is not needed in New England. It is simply for Kinder Morgan's profit. I am also aware that the health of our community is in jeopardy: radon, formaldehyde, hydrogen sulfide, and benzene, among other carcinogens will be released into the air and ground at the compression station site. I have a son with asthma whose lung function is already at risk. Studies have been done since 2011 that prove that all these health concerns are legitimate. I saw the statistics during a presentation by two concerned medical doctors. Compression stations make people sick! My ground water, in addition to the air, will be affected such that my well may be contaminated. I am within the 5 mile radius of the proposed compression station, so my home will also be affected by the blasting; I know that at another site, (Wellsboro, PA) windows rattled in homes that were six miles from the blasting. Our property values in Windsor would be seriously diminished as well. But it is the health of the people, animals, and land that disturbs me the most. We are a "green community," and, as in the recent Paris Climate Conference, recognize the need to protect our land for future generations.

Pursuant to Commission Rules 385.214(b) and 157.10, I move to intervene and file comments in the above proceeding. This intervention is timely filed.

Contact Information

Please enter me on the official service list for Docket No. CP16-21-000. All pleadings, filings and correspondence in this proceeding should be served on the following;

Valerie Kohn, 522 High St. Hill, Windsor, MA 413-684-1731 valckohn@verizon.net

Motion to Intervene

I, Valerie Kohn, seek to intervene because I am directly impacted by the proposed 41,000 hp compressor station (possibly doubling in size at the option of the developer). I would be impacted by: compressor station emissions, ground water (well water) contamination during construction and from subsequent pollution, structural damage from blasting during construction, loss of livelihood and devaluation in property values; thus diminishing the town's tax base.

I oppose this proposed project for the foregoing reasons. I request that the Commission GRANT this motion to intervene and comments.

Respectfully submitted,

Valerie C. Kohn, FERC ID#F314542

20151231-5026

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Andrew Friedman under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/30/2015 5:19:32 PM Filed Date: 12/31/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	morrisfri@aol.com	

Basis for Intervening:

BEFORE THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC)
Northeast Energy Direct Project)
_____))

MOTION TO INTERVENE OF
Andrew Friedman

I hereby move, pursuant to 18 C.F.R. § 385.214(b), to intervene in the above-captioned proceeding. I seek to intervene in opposition to the Northeast Energy Direct Project (the "Project" or the "NED Project") proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (the "Company"), a subsidiary of Kinder Morgan, Inc. ("Kinder Morgan"). Communications concerning this proceeding should be served upon me as follows:

Andrew Friedman
45 Roosevelt St.
Hadley MA 01035
413-549-0060
Morrisfri@aol.com

My interests “which may be directly affected by the outcome of the proceeding” pursuant to 18 C.F.R. § 214(b)(2)(ii) include:

- My interest as an electric ratepayer, inasmuch as the Company seeks to secure my electric utility as a Project shipper, which, in turn, would seek to recover costs associated with the Project from ratepayers. As explained in depth by others on this docket (and on the pre-filing docket PF14-22), Kinder Morgan is essentially telling the Commission that New England needs a blow torch to light a candle. The massive overbuild embodied in this proposal is very likely to lead to higher energy costs for New England’s ratepayers – either because the excess capacity contracted for by our utilities would go unused, or because capacity would be used for markets overseas, driving up domestic energy prices.
- My interest as a taxpayer, neighbor and visitor to protected public land in Massachusetts. I am very concerned about the threat this Project poses to all public land protected by Article 97 of the Articles of Amendment to the Massachusetts Constitution.
- My interest as a land trust supporter, visitor and neighbor to the Massachusetts Audubon Society’s West Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary in Plainfield, MA and The Trustees of Reservations’ Notchview Reservation in Windsor, MA.

WHEREFORE, for the foregoing reasons, I respectfully request that my motion to intervene be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew Friedman

December 30, 2015

20151231-5027

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Elizabeth Reilly under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/31/2015 12:04:56 AM Filed Date: 12/31/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	libby4235994@yahoo.com	

Basis for Intervening:

Elizabeth and Scott Reilly as individuals and d/b/a Reilly’s Farm, are requesting to be official interveners to docket # CP16-21-000, known as the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline by Kinder Morgan.

We have a personal and business interest in the proposed NED pipeline, due to its current proposed compressor station in Nassau, NY on Clarks Chapel Road. This compressor station is located adjacent to our 100 acre organic farm (149 Clarks Chapel Road Nassau, NY). The farm is currently listed as a historic structure that is adjacent to the current proposed compressor station on the November 20th application, it is listed as the Marvin home and Farm. The land being purchased for this industrial site extends to my side of the road and abuts my property. The property has yet to be subdivided to portray the land Kinder Morgan will have as stated on their maps for the station’s site.

The farm dates back to the late 1700’s and still contains numerous outbuilding. The physical farmhouse will be 1,500 feet from the physical compressor station building as proposed on the maps generated by Kinder Morgan. We produce grass fed beef, pastured pigs and chickens, eggs, hay, maple syrup, organic vegetables and honey from our hives on the property (check out reillysfarm.com for more info on the farm). In the winter months we sell Christmas Trees which brings in appx. 4,000 people, who come here for the historic ambiance and beautiful views. We also host field trips for the local schools.

The proposed compressor station for Clarks Chapel Road will start only 400ft from the road, it will be in clear view for all the local neighbors to see and hear from their back yards, including my Cut your own

Christmas tree field and house. My business will not exist if this compressor station goes in, we rely on an organic surrounding as well as ambiance for both the animals and Christmas tree sales. Who would buy meat from a farm located next to a toxic compressor station? I would not, I would no longer be able to produce my own meat like we currently do.

I am mostly concerned about the grave health effects this will have on my two small growing children, as well as the other numerous family's living in close proximity to this site. We eat organically, I use essential oils for cleaning and produce our own soaps and other household products. We live in the country away from Industrial, commercial, and any major road ways for the tranquility and for the cleaner living it provides for our family. We suffer from a documented gene mutation that does not allow us to process toxins like the average person, and that is the main reason why we have taken such great measures to insure our living environment contains a minimal amount of pollutants.

This entire project is unnecessary and should not be approved. Residents along the entire pipeline have so much to lose. We have a lot in jeopardy with the NED pipeline personally and financially, we have invested thousands of dollars into the property and the improvements, which will all be worth rock bottom. This would be a major economic setback for our family and the other close neighbors. Then throw in the loss of business the farm would face.

Thank You for your Time,
Elizabeth and Scott Reilly
149 Clarks Chapel Road
Nassau, NY 12123
Reillysfarm.com
www.reillysfarm@aol.com

20151231-5028

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Gail E DuFresne under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/31/2015 3:16:57 AM Filed Date: 12/31/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	Gpainterspet@aol.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I live in Rindge, NH and want to intervene in this proceeding to oppose the NED Pipeline. I have an interest which would be directly affected by the outcome of the proceeding because: I am a resident (and abutter) whose watershed is crossed by the proposed route and could have my drinking water supply impacted by construction and or/ operation. I am a member of an impacted community with concerns about various impacts to local economy/ environment/ aesthetics/ health, our drinking water and wells being affected. Another concern I have: I am a ratepayer (electric) Utilities will seek to charge ratepayers for the cost of capacity contracted for on NED. Consumers may also suffer increased cost of gas due to exporting to foreign markets.

20151231-5030

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Catherine P Casiello under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/30/2015 5:46:21 PM Filed Date: 12/31/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

I am concerned with the industrialization of the neighborhood.

I am concerned with the destruction of my rural area. The contamination of vernal pools, brooks, streams, rivers and lakes.

I am concerned with the disruption and destruction of wild life.

I am concerned with the destruction of the forest, other plants, fresh air, clean water and the rural way of life in New Ipswich, NH.

I will live in the shadow of the proposed compressor station. I will feel its effects. I will suffer its effects as it destroys my health.

20151231-5044

BEFORE THE UNITED STATES
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company,
a subsidiary of Kinder Morgan
Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Project

Docket No. CP 16-21-000

**MOTION TO INTERVENE OF
THE TOWN OF HINSDALE, MASSACHUSETTS**

Pursuant to Rule 214 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (FERC) Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. §385.214, the Town of Hinsdale, Massachusetts, files this Motion to Intervene in the above-captioned proceeding. Further, the Town of Hinsdale also joins in the Motion to Intervene filed by the Berkshire Regional Planning Commission (BRPC), which has also been acting on behalf of the County of Rensselaer, New York and the various municipalities and districts in Rensselaer County, New York and Berkshire County, Massachusetts through which the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline is proposed to or could pass through or impact to protect their common public interests. The BRPC filed scoping comments with FERC on October 15, 2015 (accession no. 201510155279; docket no. PF14-22-000), which comments are incorporated herein by reference. The BRPC continues to coordinate the dissemination of information to the County of Rensselaer, New York and the various municipalities in Rensselaer County, New York and Berkshire County, Massachusetts. This motion should be regarded as also made in support of the intervention motion made by the BRPC.

The Town of Hinsdale, Massachusetts, does not take a position on the proposed project at this time, and seeks to intervene to monitor the progress of the proceeding. Berkshire County, Massachusetts, eight directly impacted constituent communities and three additional potentially impacted constituent communities, as well as Rensselaer County, New York, and its three directly impacted towns have all taken formal votes opposing construction of the pipeline in their jurisdictions.

I. STATEMENT OF INTEREST

A. Description of PROJECT/REGIONAL CONTEXT

Berkshire County contains 946 square miles and has a population of 128,715 people (2014). The proposed Northeast Energy Direct (NED) pipeline crosses seven towns in Berkshire County and impacts the City of Pittsfield's primary drinking water supply reservoir and associated watersheds. The seven towns directly impacted are Hancock, Lanesborough, Cheshire, Dalton, Hinsdale, Peru, and Windsor and collectively they have a population of 17,410 people (2013). The City of Pittsfield water supply system serves 62,000 customers located in the City of Pittsfield and the Towns of Dalton, Lanesborough, and Lenox. The Lanesborough Village Fire and Water District Zone 1 aquifer, primary well and storage tank is also directly impacted and serves an additional 850 customers. The Dalton Fire District receives its primary drinking water supply from the City of Pittsfield but its back-up water supply reservoirs and associated watersheds are directly im-

ected by the proposed pipeline. A compressor station is proposed in the Town of Windsor and would also impact portions of the Towns of Hinsdale and Peru. The Town of Windsor is one of the most rural towns in Massachusetts and has some of the lowest ambient noise levels in the state.

Rensselaer County contains 665 square miles and has a population of over 159,000 people (2010). The proposed NED pipeline cross three towns in Rensselaer County. The three towns directly impacted are Scho-dack, Nassau, and Stephentown and collectively have a total population of 20,486 (2010). The three town's population relies on well water from the Schodack and Valatiekill Aquifers which are directly impacted by the proposed pipeline. A compressor station is proposed in the Town of Nassau which is a rural residential community containing no industrial uses.

B. Description of INTERVENOR

The Town of Hinsdale, Massachusetts, joins in this request and asks that it be granted separate intervenor status as well. While it is a member of and participates in the regional working group, it has specific issues and concerns which it must protect. The town is both directly and indirectly impacted by the currently preferred route. The Town of Hinsdale is a general purpose unit of local government chartered by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts (1804). The currently proposed preferred pipeline route crosses nearly three (3) miles of Hinsdale, directly impacting at least three (3) local roads, several private rural residences, municipal watershed lands being managed for preservation, and multiple large parcels of forestland (including privately-owned and publically-owned parcels) that provide valuable habitat to local wildlife and outdoor recreational opportunities to Hinsdale residents and visitors. Of particular concern are potential impacts that construction and maintenance of the NED pipeline would have on the Hinsdale Flats Area of Critical Environmental Concern (Figure 1: Hinsdale Flats Area of Critical Environmental Concern Map), which encompasses 14,000 acres of ecologically sensitive land and waters. Hinsdale is served by an all-volunteer fire department and EMS service and relies upon surrounding communities for incidents involving mutual aid.

If the Town of Hinsdale is not permitted to intervene as a party to this proceeding, its interests will not be adequately represented by other parties and it may be bound by actions, determinations and decisions in this proceeding without opportunity to participate and be heard. Hinsdale's participation as a party in this proceeding is in the public interest.

C. Description of Potential Local Impacts

Hinsdale, Massachusetts, has the potential to be directly and indirectly impacted and harmed by the proposed project as follows.

- 1) Construction of the pipeline and transportation of significant amounts of heavy equipment and supplies for construction of the pipeline and related infrastructure will impact aging and fragile local infrastructure and the regional transportation network. Specific areas of concern are all roads, bridges, and culverts used for transport; maintenance of public access, including for public safety during construction. Additionally, although the currently proposed pipeline route does not pose a potential risk to the Town of Hinsdale municipal reservoir and associated watershed, Hinsdale shares concerns expressed by the Town of Dalton and City of Pittsfield regarding potential impacts on water supply infrastructure (water mains, water distribution systems, and a primary aqueduct feeding Pittsfield's Cleveland Brook Reservoir) on lands and waters located within the Town of Hinsdale.
- 2) Provision of public safety services involving construction and operations of the pipeline and related facilities.
- 3) The large number of streams, lakes and ponds, wetlands impacted by the NED pipeline.
- 4) The NED pipeline impacts multiple waterbodies (Cleveland Brook Reservoir), perennial and intermittent streams, forestlands, and key natural areas, including the Hinsdale Flats Area of Critical Environmental Concern (which spans Dalton, Hinsdale and Peru), Massachusetts Core Habitat (spanning the communities of Hancock, Lanesborough, Cheshire, Dalton, Hinsdale, Peru, and Windsor), and Massachusetts Critical Natural Landscapes & Landscape Blocks (spanning the communities of Han-

cock, Lanesborough, Cheshire, Dalton, Hinsdale, Peru, and Windsor).

- 5) Socio-economic impacts regarding loss of agricultural lands, heritage and recreational tourism (including impacts to the Appalachian National Scenic Trail in an earlier version of the proposed route); commercial forestry; impact on lodging during primary tourist season; impacts on local businesses; municipal liability exposure; potential impact on a major interstate electric transmission line; impact on community quality of life, local property values, and local tax base, and; impacts of construction, and operations on private property owners throughout the length of the pipeline.

D. The Town of Hinsdale's Motion to Intervene Must Be Granted

Hinsdale satisfies the standard for intervention under applicable federal law and regulations. As discussed above, the jurisdiction served by the Town of Hinsdale is directly impacted by the proposed project, and no other individual or organization can adequately represent Hinsdale's unique interest in this proceeding, particularly as there is not county government serving Berkshire County. Further, Hinsdale's intervention is in the public interest because the town is responsible for the protection of the interests of all of its residents and property owners/renters and its areas of responsibility include all impacts indicated previously, as well as others which may arise during the proceedings. Berkshire County has suffered from population loss and declining incomes for the preceding forty years and increasingly relies on a natural resource and tourist based economy which will be threatened by the NED project. Accordingly, Hinsdale respectfully requests that FERC grant this Motion to Intervene.

II. CONTACT INFORMATION

The following officials should be added to the Official Service List, with all notice/communications in this proceeding addressed to the contacts listed below:

Name: Ryan J. Aylesworth, Town Administrator

Address: Town of Hinsdale, 39 South Street, Hinsdale, MA 01235

Phone: 413-464-6534

Email: raylesworth.hinsdalema@gmail.com

Name: John Genzabella, Chair, Select Board Member

Address: Town of Hinsdale, 39 South Street, Hinsdale, MA 01235

Phone: 413-655-2245

Email: hinsdalema.selectman@verizon.net

Name: Laurel Scialabba, Select Board Member & Pipeline Working Group Rep.

Address: Town of Hinsdale, 39 South Street, Hinsdale, MA 01235

Phone: 413-358-8478

Email: rbslas@verizon.net

III. PROTEST/COMMENTS

In addition to seeking intervention and expressing its explicit support for the petition to intervene filed by the BRPC, the Town of Hinsdale expresses its concern that the project as proposed, if adequate accommodation and mitigation of impacts is not agreed to through community benefit agreements with TGP or in the FERC certificate that the Rensselaer and Berkshire municipalities, fire & water districts, and the individual property owners will be severely negatively impacted and will not be adequately compensated for or protected from those impacts. Many of the municipalities and water districts involved in our regional working group, covering portions of both Massachusetts and New York, have conducted formal votes in opposition to the project. Furthermore, all communities in the regional working group possess significant concerns that the pipeline will have severe negative impacts on their communities and ability to provide vital public services, especially including adequate drinkable public water. We have significant concerns over impacts on public safety and the ability of our first responders, almost all of whom are volunteers, to respond on a continual basis to potential public safety impacts. The impact of transport of significant amounts of heavy

equipment and materials for construction on very fragile public roads is of considerable concern and neither the Town of Hinsdale nor the Massachusetts Department of Transportation (DOT) have the financial resources to repair damage to the roadway infrastructure. Finally, although the particular matter of compressor station siting does not presently directly concern the Town of Hinsdale, the impact of one of the proposed compressor stations (Windsor) has the potential to indirectly negatively impact the quality of life that residents of Hinsdale cherish and which makes the community a desirable place to live.

IV. CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, the Town of Hinsdale, Massachusetts, respectfully requests that FERC grant this motion to intervene and allow the town to participate as an INTERVENOR in this proceeding with full rights of party status, including the right to request a hearing, cross examine witnesses, and seek rehearing and appeal.

Respectfully submitted,

Ryan J. Aylesworth
Town Administrator

{ 2 maps omitted; full document can be downloaded at: }

<http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/opennat.asp?fileID=14086631>

20151231-5045

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BEFORE THE FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

In the Matter of)	Docket No. CP16-21-000
Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.)	
Northeast Energy Direct Project)	

MOTION TO INTERVENE AND PROTEST

Pursuant to Rules 212 and 214 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's ("Commission") Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. §§ 385.212 and 385.214, the Town of Brookline, New Hampshire ("Brookline" or the "Town") hereby submits this timely motion to intervene and file comments in the above-captioned proceeding. The Town opposes the construction of a natural gas transmission pipeline and other facilities known as the Northeast Energy Direct project ("Project") due to the adverse impacts that will be sustained by the Town, and therefore seeks party status to protest the proposed pipeline, and fully protect the Town's interests.

I. IDENTITY AND INTERESTS OF PETITIONER

1. The Town is committed to enhancing and protecting the quality of life of all its residents, workers, and businesses, and is gravely concerned for those who live, work, and recreate near the proposed pipeline route. There are substantial and real environmental, economic, and health threats to the Town arising from the construction and operation of the pipeline within the municipality. It is unacceptable that we may be coerced into the industrialization of our landscape and the degradation of our scenic, historic, and cultural resources-for a Project not even intended to benefit us.
2. The proposed pipeline will run through 2.73 miles of the Town and within the right of way of public streets and on other property owned by the Town. It will cross conservation lands, forestland, wildlife corridors, wetlands, vernal pools, public infrastructure, private homes and private wells. The proposed location of the pipeline is intrusive, and threatens to disrupt the rural tranquility our residents enjoy by completely eliminating one well used hiking and expert mountain biking trail and bisecting five other well established nature trails with a high pressure pipeline. Additionally, construction will impede roadways and cause traffic and transportation disruptions along with related interruptions of public services

along Ruonala Road, and Route 13.

3. There are also approximately eight homes within 500 feet of the proposed pipeline, and these residents are deeply worried about the reduction in value of their homes, and the difficulties they may encounter in refinancing and in obtaining homeowner's insurance for their properties. Faced also with the looming threat of the forcible taking of their property to facilitate the construction of the Project, these citizens are uniquely harmed by the Project and the Town is obligated to defend them from encroachment by the pipeline. Moreover, the Project threatens public safety by placing fire and explosion hazards in close proximity to residential areas, and subjects the Town and its residents to an ongoing fear of such catastrophic incidents. The Town's emergency response systems will also be burdened by any pipeline failure given our almost full reliance on "on call/volunteer" firefighters and ambulance personnel. Brookline currently has only one full-time member for its fire department.
4. Brookline is responsible for the protection of both its natural environment and the health and welfare of its residents, and would like to ensure that the aforementioned local concerns are adequately addressed in the environmental review of the Project. Accordingly, Brookline has a substantial interest in the outcome of this proceeding. Moreover, given the Town's expertise and familiarity with the locale of the proposed pipeline and the proposed alternative site locations, its participation in the above-captioned proceeding will significantly benefit the Commission.

II. COMMUNICATIONS AND CORRESPONDENCE

The following individual should be included on the service list for this docket, and all communications should be sent to:

Mr. Tad Putney
P.O. Box 360
Brookline, NH 03033
(603) 673-8855 x213
tputney@brookline.nh.us

III. CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, the Town of Brookline respectfully requests that it be permitted to intervene in this proceeding with full rights to participate in all further proceedings.

Respectfully submitted

Tad Putney
P.O. Box 360
Brookline, NH 03033
(603) 673-8855 x213
tputney@brookline.nh.us

Dated: December 30, 2015

20151231-5047

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Doug Arotzky under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/30/2015 6:45:30 PM Filed Date: 12/31/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	difficult4evr@yahoo.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I live within half mile of the Mid station 4, New Ipswich compressor station.

I will hear, smell, feel, see and potentially taste (well water quality) the effects of the compressor station.
I am concerned about air quality due to 41,000 HP turbines generating exhaust.
I am concerned disturbances to our well water as it taps into stratified drift aquifer that the compressor station is on top of.
I am concerned with the continuous noise of the compressor station, 24-7.
I am concerned with noise and pollution from blowdowns.
I am concerned with light damage to dark skies. I will not be able to see stars, moon, planets and space station.
I am concerned about any chemicals or toxins released into the ground that will end up in the stratified drift aquifer.
I am concerned with traffic, noise, air pollution and numerous disturbances during construction.
I am concerned with the property value of my house and my ten acres being extremely close to a compressor station and pipeline.
I am concerned with any natural gas infrastructure incidents that would require evacuation from the neighborhood and potential destruction/damage of property and lives.
I am concerned with the industrialization of the neighborhood.
I am concerned with the destruction of my rural area. The contamination of vernal pools, brooks, streams, rivers and lakes.
I am concerned with the disruption and destruction of wild life.
I am concerned with the destruction of the forest, other plants, fresh air, clean water and the rural way of life in New Ipswich, NH.
I will live in the shadow of the proposed compressor station. I will feel its effects. I will suffer its effects as it destroys my health.

20151231-5048

carolyn bosch, dracut, MA.

We live in close proximity to the proposed gas pipeline on Blacksmith Rd in Dracut. Until recently, we were in the direct blast zone. Whether we are in the direct path of the pipeline or just 2 miles away, the impact to the local environment is still unacceptable. Long term effects of gas emissions from blowdowns, gas leaks into the soil and ground water contamination are not known and the risk of those unknowns are placed solely on the residents of Dracut and the surrounding towns. The energy needs of New England are being met yet Kinder Morgan continues to propose this pipeline. The obvious goal is not to benefit New England, but to line the pockets of Kinder Morgan when they sell our natural resources overseas for profit. Ferc, please stop this proposal.

20151231-5052

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of James M Dee under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/30/2015 6:33:00 PM Filed Date: 12/31/2015 8:30:00 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____

Individual JMDelectric1@Hotmail.com

Basis for Intervening:

I live in Pepperell, MA., and want to intervene in this proceeding to oppose the NED pipeline. I have an in-

terest which may be directly affected by the outcome of the proceeding because: I am a landowner directly impacted by the pipeline through my property which includes wetlands. I am a landowner who would have my property seized by eminent domain.

I am a resident who lives in the blast radius, so I would be at physical risk. I am a resident whose source of drinking water is crossed by the proposed route so my drinking water supply is at risk of the construction and/or operation of the pipeline.

20151231-5055

BEFORE THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC)
Northeast Energy Direct Project)

Docket No. CP16-21-000

**MOTION TO INTERVENE OF
Kent C. M. Varnum**

I hereby move, pursuant to 18 C.F.R. § 385.214(b), to intervene in the above-captioned proceeding. I seek to intervene in opposition to the Northeast Energy Direct Project (the “Project” or the “NED Project”) proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (the “Company”), a subsidiary of Kinder Morgan, Inc. (“Kinder Morgan”). Communications concerning this proceeding should be served upon me as follows:

Kent Varnum
6 Trinity Way
Dracut, MA 01826
(978) 835-3899
kvarnum@comcast.net

My interests “which may be directly affected by the outcome of the proceeding” pursuant to 18 C.F.R. § 214(b)(2)(ii) include:

- I am a landowner directly impacted by the pipeline route / compressor station.
- I am a resident who lives approximately 1/2 of a mile from the proposed compressor station and my commute crosses over the proposed pipeline route and I will be at physical risk.
- I am a resident whose source of drinking water is crossed by the proposed route so my drinking water supply is at risk of the construction and/or operation of the pipeline, compressor station, or other facilities.
- I am a member of an impacted community who has concerns about various impacts to the local economy/environment/aesthetics/health (specifics below).
- I am an electric ratepayer who, if KM secures my electric utility as a project customer, expects to see an increase on my bill relating to NED cost recovery.
- I enjoy the out of doors and do not want any state or town public parks or forests, which have been set aside for the people and wildlife, to be impacted by any activities of this commercial project.

I live in Dracut Massachusetts, and want to intervene in this proceeding to oppose the NED pipeline.

I am very concerned with the KM TGP NED expansion project and the threat it poses to the health and welfare of my community, myself, my wife, my children and my grandchildren. The risks associated with the projects are not well understood and far outweigh the benefits.

I moved from El Paso, Texas to Dracut to provide a better life for my family in rural Massachusetts. In El Paso, our quality of life was severely degraded by major pollution problems from the unrestrained fossil fueled factories less than 3 miles away, across the border in Juarez, Mexico. My family and I suffered the impact of the pollution and it was frustrating and heartbreaking to see our water and air ruined by companies over which we had no influence.

Today, I am deeply concerned that Dracut and the other affected towns in Massachusetts and New Hampshire will suffer the same fate as El Paso. Dangerous, unwanted industrial equipment (Compressor Stations) will be constructed and operated close to our homes, degrading our quality of life and threatening our health and the health of our loved ones.

My concerns are listed below:

1. Pipeline System Performance Metrics, Data and Risk: There is insufficient consistent, standardized, and verifiable data on the environmental safety of these systems available in the public domain to accurately determine the risk to Public Health and the Environment. This issue has been identified in many open sources including the Government Accounting Office (GAO-13-168). Without data, any risk-based decision must tend toward a conservative decision - in this case to protect the public. In this industry, Risk discussions frequently balance improved consumer price and service against the possibility of outages and/or incidents (e.g. the cost/frustration of the outages or replacing the damaged equipment). The long-term impact to the public is not addressed in these assessments, but it must be. A project of this magnitude and risk cannot be allowed to proceed until we can thoroughly assess its overall risk to the public and the environment.
2. Project Need: In Docket CP16-21-000, KM TGP asserts that the need for the new pipeline and compressor stations is driven by the fact that “Multiple studies have concluded that there is a critical need in the northeast US for additional pipeline capacity to lower energy costs, reduce volatility of natural gas and electric prices, and foster more reliable natural gas and electric service to New England consumers.” There is no compelling need that is identified that is related to the health and safety of the public. It is not clear what the basis of electric service reliability shortfall is. In Massachusetts and New Hampshire, we have had very challenging winter and summer seasons and the only cause of power outages was weather damage to power lines and substations. The docket actually states that one of the negative effects of the “critical need” in the Northeast is that the grid suppliers seek alternative sources of energy, which is actually aligned with National Anti-Fracking initiatives. Reducing the price of electricity and enabling the continued use of Fracking in the US does not in any way justify compromising Public Health and Safety. This Pipeline Project is not needed.
3. Water Pollution: CP16-21-000 States that Construction, Operation and Maintenance of the project will be conducted in accordance with all applicable water pollution prevention federal, state, and local permit requirements. The CP16-21-000 further states that KM TGP will provide a draft plan to FERC for review and comment. In the review of these documents, the reviewers must consider the risk associated with all chemicals that can seep into the groundwater and pose a public health risk. The CP16-21-000 consistently addresses contamination limits for chemicals that have established limit values but the existence and identification of all other chemicals used in the pipeline and compressor station operation are not addressed. Specifically, KM TGP representatives have referred to “Proprietary” chemical mixtures used in moving their product through the pipeline that are separated out, transferred and stored in separate tanks and disposed of by 3rd party contractors. Assessing the risk of a spill of these chemicals cannot be done without the knowledge of what the chemicals are. FERC should have Non-Disclosure Agreements that provide access to the complete list of chemicals to be used at these sites and must do a thorough assessment of what impact they could have on the local groundwater. My drinking water comes from a private well, and my neighbors and I are not on any town plans to be connected to town water. I cannot live in my house if my water is poisoned.
4. Noise Pollution: CP16-21-000 states that “For new compressor stations, the FERC requires that the noise level can be no greater than 55 decibels on a day/night average sound level (“dBA Ldn”) at the closest noise sensitive area (“NSA”)”. My concern is that the specified levels are average values. The actual CP16-21-00016 submission gives blowdown durations on the order of “a few” to “3.5 minutes”. These durations do not agree with documentation and witness accounts in open sources which report that blowdowns may last up to 4 Hours. Event duration ranges from 3.5 minutes to 4 hours in an ambient environment of 35 dBA implies blowdown noise levels on the order of 100 dBA (jet taking off at 2000 feet) to

80 dBa (busy traffic intersection). Further, in CP16-21-000, KM TGP indicates that they have submitted an air quality estimate based on 78 blowdown events per year. This averages out to one every 4.7 days. Witness statements and YouTube videos graphically illustrate the severity and the magnitude of these events and support the contention of many who live by these compressor stations that these blowdowns have significantly degraded their quality of life. My family and I will lose our quality of life with these kinds of explosions.

5. Air Pollution: In the CP16-21-000 proposal, KM TGP relies implicitly on the USEPA to govern their air quality activities stating that “The USEPA has promulgated NAAQS to protect human health and welfare. The NAAQS include primary standards which are designed to protect human health, including the health of sensitive subpopulations such as children, the elderly, and those with chronic respiratory problems. The NAAQS also include secondary standards designed to protect public welfare, including economic interests, visibility, vegetation, animal species, and other concerns not related to human health.

The NAAQS currently apply to the following criteria pollutants:

- Sulfur dioxide
- Particulate matter with a nominal aerodynamic diameter of 10 microns or less
- Particulate matter with a nominal aerodynamic diameter of 2.5 microns or less
- Nitrogen dioxide
- Carbon monoxide
- Ozone
- Lead.”

Unfortunately, open sources have a wealth of resources that have identified far more contaminants that can be found in blowdown emissions. These include:

- 1,1,2-Trichloro-1,2
- 2-trifluoroethane
- 1,2-dichlorobenzene
- 2-butanone
- benzene
- carbon tetrachloride
- chloromethane
- dichlorodifluoromethane
- ethylbenzene
- methane
- methylene chloride
- tetrachloroethylene
- toluene
- trichloroethylene
- trichlorofluoromethane

The National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), used as a benchmark for air quality, were not created to assess the air quality and safety in a small area with widely varying emissions such as blowdown events. NAAQS addresses regional air quality concerns but doesn't adequately assess risk to human health for residents living in close proximity to polluting sources such as natural gas compressor sites, where emissions can be highly variable.

As previously mentioned, it has been noted that current protocols used for assessing compliance with ambient air standards do not adequately determine the intensity, frequency, or durations of the actual human exposures to the mixtures of toxic materials released regularly at natural gas sites, including compressor stations. The periodic 24-hour average measures can underestimate actual exposures by an order of magnitude, and reference standards are set in a form that inaccurately determines health risk because they do not fully consider the potential synergistic combinations of toxic air emissions.

It follows then that estimates of yearly totals of contaminants released by a compressor station do not allow for an assessment of the physiological impact of those emissions on individuals.

NAAQS reflects what, over a region, over time, is deemed safe population-wide. This is very different than what is safe within 1200 feet of this compressor station. As already stated, averaging over a year can wash out important higher spikes in emissions (thus exposures) that may occur at various points throughout the year. These high spikes can put residents at risk for illnesses caused by air toxins.

The fact that general standards exist for a subset of chemicals does not change the reality of the situation - that the public will be exposed to a wide range of chemicals (not all of which are known at this time - see the ground water pollution "proprietary chemicals" discussion above) at high concentrations and the impacts of these types of exposures are not understood. Standards or not, My family and I will be breathing contaminants that will make us sick.

6. Physical Security: KM TGP states in the CP16-21-000 submission that they have detailed physical security plans to prevent terrorist attacks and that these plans are controlled. While this is understandable, it is not clear if these plans will be reviewed by an independent qualified organization to verify the adequacy of these plans. We cannot rely on a single entity or their representatives to certify we are safe against a terror attack that could level my house.
7. Emergency Decision Protocols: CP16-21-000 indicates that the pipeline will be controlled remotely by a control center in Texas. As a part of this design, KM TGP states that they will be using Remote Controlled Valves to improve response time in the case of an emergency. There is no indication that the design contains any Automatic Valves. Industry seems to prefer Remote Valves to Automatic Valves because, although Automatic Valves provide immediate action (by closing a pipeline flow if certain anomalous conditions are met), Industry prefers to add human intervention and evaluation at the expense of a variable time delay. Since remote valves are the design selection and the critical decision to shut off a pipeline in the presence of a possible pipeline incident is in the hands of the operators in the control center, the public needs to be provided with emergency protocols, documents, and training that the control center is required to follow in the event of an emergency. Some companies appear to favor a more safety-conservative approach to pipeline operation than others, and the philosophy behind emergency decisions related to shutting down possibly ruptured pipelines must be shared with the necessary stakeholders (local residents). The use of Remote Controlled Valves will delay the decision to shut down a pipeline in the event of a rupture and increase the threat of explosion.

In Summary, the KM TGP project should not be allowed to proceed. Conducting an honest assessment of the true need, risks, and the likelihood that all of the mitigating activities will actually provide the promised mitigations clearly show that the risks are greater than the rewards. We are balancing Lives and Livelihoods against convenience and profits. Please do not let this project go forward.

WHEREFORE, for the foregoing reasons, I respectfully request that my motion to intervene be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Kent C. M. Varnum

December 30, 2015

20151231-5078

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Delta X Carney under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/31/2015 9:59:18 AM Filed Date: 12/31/2015 9:59:18 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	delta0406@hotmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I live in Ashfield, MA. The proposed pipe line will dissect my town in half. The most current map available has the construction of the pipe line going periously close to our town water wells. These wells are part of the aquafer for several towns. This is farming country and many people have private wells. I am concerned about what would happen to all of these people, dairy farms and a multitude of organic farms, should there be a leak in this pipe line.

I am concerned about the reports coming out of states west of here that talk about the radioactive materials in the lines.

I am concerned about what chemicals that are used in obtaining the gas that may still be present in the gas and the lines.

The AG office of my state has done a study of the need for more gas. The study concluded that the gas was not needed.

The proposed route brings gas threw town after town that have never used gas and have no plans to use in the future. Unlike electricity that we all use.

Mass has been using many plans to reduce the use of energy. We have winterzing plans for people of limited income, solarizing plans, etc.

In 2014, Commomwealth Magazine published an article about the use of gas for my state. They used the Gas industries own figures in their report. A little over 800 billion units of gas was used. At the same time the total capacity of all current gas lines was 1700 billion units. I have used the generic term of units because TGP often uses a multidue of terms for measuring the gas. This report agrees with the AGs study. The gas is not needed.

I am concered about gas companies puting a tarrif on the electic bills that would pay them back for the construction. Just in my little town of 1800 people, we have over 700 people who are over 65. Many are retired and are on a fixed income. Adding the un-needed cost would mean leaving a home that has been lived in for many generations.

I have a friend that was selling her home. She had people who put a down payment and came to the closing ready to buy, check in hand. When they were told about a proposed gas line coming threw the property they backed out. No one will buy her property now. So her property has gone from several houndred thousand to zero.

This is not anything that I want nor does my town as we have voted no.

Please consider that just because a large corporation says that it wants to do something, does not mean that it is the right thing to do.

Even our President has said to leave the fossel fuels in the ground.

to their bills would mean having to give up homes that have been lived in for many generations.

20151231-5079

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Kym Craven under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/31/2015 9:55:18 AM Filed Date: 12/31/2015 9:55:18 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	kymcraven@aol.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I live in Townsend Massachusetts and want to intervene in this proceeding to oppose the NED pipeline.

I have an interest which may be directly affected by the outcome of the proceeding. I am a shareholder directly impacted by the pipeline route. The pipeline will destroy a family property that includes farmland and the site of a family business. In addition, I own two homes that will be adversely affected by blasting and the destruction of forestland.

The pipeline route crosses an aquifer recharge area which affects drinking water for our town. In addition, the pipeline disrupts land that was specifically set aside for conservation.

The pipeline takes land and homes for which people have worked. Eminent domain is supposed to benefit people, not destroy land, homes, business, conservation land, water, and community livability.

I respectfully request that FERC decline this application and focus effort on solar energy so that we begin to mitigate damage already done by fracking and extraction of fuel.

The need for this pipeline and the gas is overestimated. Collectively we need to focus efforts on better energy sources that are renewable and not destructive.

Respectfully,

Kym Craven

22 West Meadow Road, West Townsend MA 01474

87 Lunenburg Road, West Townsend MA 01474

486 Main Street, West Townsend MA 01474

20151231-5081

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Norman Flye, JR under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/31/2015 9:28:45 AM Filed Date: 12/31/2015 9:28:45 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	flye.norman@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

Motion to Intervene by Norman Flye, Jr. concerning CP16-21-000 - Tennessee Gas Northeast Energy Direct Project

I am a homeowner in Orange, MA, and I make contributions to Mount Grace Land Conservation Trust. I am concerned about protecting land for farming, forests, and the Millers River Watershed. Taking public lands out of Article 97 protection must not happen.

I understand that it is good for business, but we need to deal with climate change now. I am in favor of using less energy and opposed to the Tennessee Gas Northeast Energy Direct Project.

For these reasons I would be affected by the Applicant's filing. I, Norman Flye, Jr., respectfully request that the Commission grant my motion to intervene. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Norman Flye, Jr.

Athol Road

Orange, MA 01364

flye.norman@gmail.com

20151231-5116

Henry and Madelyn Collins
131 Whitetail Run
Averill Park, NY 12018

We are landowners in Nassau, NY. We moved here in December 1989 because we wanted to live in a quiet and unpolluted environment. Most of our land is wooded and we were attracted to it so that we would have a small piece of wild property that we could protect.

Our property is located slightly more than one mile downwind from the proposed 41,000 horsepower compressor station to be located on Clark's Chapel Road. Therefore, our property is located within the drift zone of particulate matter and other pollutants that will emanate from the compressor station.

We are interested in, and would be affected by, the Applicant's filing for at least the following reasons:

- We believe our property value would be substantially negatively affected should the compressor station be built. We are aware of two properties located further from the proposed compressor station where potential sales were impacted by the possibility of the station being built.

We heard first of a property where the buyers reportedly did not appear at the closing because they'd learned of the proposed compressor station. I (Madelyn) spoke directly to someone who had gone to contract on a home a few miles from the proposed site who was attempting to terminate the purchase contract for the property because she did not wish to live even a few miles from a compressor station.

For these reasons, we believe we cannot sell our home without taking a loss on its pre-pipeline proposal value, and we are quite sure that should the pipeline/compressor station be built, our home and property could be sold only at a significantly reduced price.

Furthermore, please see information regarding home prices in Minisink, NY after the (much smaller) compressor station was built there.

- Reduced property values in our town would also affect the local tax base, which is already small. According to our town supervisor, we would not make back the money we need from any taxes Kinder Morgan might pay. Our town tax base would also be negatively impacted from the loss of business income from organic farms and recreational activities that would be impacted by an industrial complex coming into a rural/recreational/residential area.

- We have organic gardens – both vegetable and flower gardens (that were cultivated specifically to feed wildlife...bees, butterflies, birds, small animals). The toxins released from the compressor station will render these non-organic, and potentially toxic to us, our pets, and the wild animals that live on or visit our property.

- Living downwind from the compressor station, should it be built, will lead to a situation where our health will be impacted by the air and water toxins released by the compressor station (and also potentially released by pipeline leaks).

- We are also concerned about subsonic vibrations that can affect our health, as well as traffic, noise, air pollution, and other disturbances during construction, and potential infrastructure incidents that our volunteer fire departments are unequipped to deal with, and the potential devastation to our town and community should there be such an incident.

- We are in our 60s, close to retirement age. We cannot afford to "walk away" from an unsellable property and we are getting to the age where our health will be more impacted by toxins.

Our interests cannot be adequately represented or protected by any other party or parties. Therefore, the Commission should grant us permission to intervene in proceeding for the Northeast Energy Direct.

Sincerely,

Henry C. Collins
Madelyn S. Collins

20151231-5130

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Christine Roy under CP16-21-000.

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	croy06@comcast.net	

Basis for Intervening:

December 31, 2015

To the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission:

We live in Townsend, MA and want to intervene in this proceeding to oppose the NED pipeline. We have an interest which may be directly affected by the outcome of the proceeding because:

- We are directly impacted landowners of the original preferred route which still stands on record as the alternate option.
- We are in the path of a proposed project by an energy company that seeks to disrupt our neighborhood by installing a 36-inch natural gas pipeline within a couple hundred feet of our home.
- And with this pipeline, a compressor station (4 Titan 250 turbines, for a total of 120,000 horsepower) proposed to be sited in Townsend, MA may be sited directly behind our property and the Pheasant Ridge residential development.
- We are directly affected by this pipeline's potential consequences including risk of gas leak-related explosion, chemical contamination 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.
- We are facing the anxiety of living next to a natural gas transmission pipeline with noise and air pollution from a compressor station and the possibility of additional infrastructure build-outs.
- As homeowners, we are alarmed that an industrial land use of such scope and intensity could even be considered 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 station(s) and the impact this project will have on the quality of life, our health and safety.
- We live in an area of critical environmental concern (ACEC) and are concerned of the adverse impact this gas infrastructure development will have on this area.
- We need to protect the sensitive conservation land, protected rivers, state and town forests, areas of environmental concern, wetlands and farmlands which this pipeline will cross.
- We are concerned that we are being forced to defend our property rights from an energy company so they can implement a business plan.
- We believe this natural gas is destined for export and this project is not in the public's best interest.
- And we are an electric ratepayer who, if KM secures our electric utility as a project customer, expects to see an increase on our bill relating to NED.

Thank you for your consideration,

Raymond and Christine Roy
Townsend, MA 01469
Parcel 17-24-16

20151231-5134

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Brice Hereford under CP16-21-000.
Submission Date: 12/31/2015 11:11:05 AM Filed Date: 12/31/2015 11:11:05 AM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	bricehereford@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

Good day, My name is Brice Hereford and I live in the town of Conway, Massachusetts and as a land and homeowner in this town I request to be an Intervenor. This is very pristine wilderness for the most part and any projects such as the proposed Kinder Morgan Pipeline threatens the land, the water and wildlife as well as our own peace of mind. The proposed Blowdown Valve proposed for Conway is very disturbing from a noise, pollution and safety perspective. I respectfully request to be an Intervenor to monitor the progress of this project. It has yet to be shown that there is a need for this pipeline to supply the resident of Massachusetts with gas. It does appear that it is intended to be used as a pipeline to bring the gas to the coast to be exported, meanwhile extorting the rate payers of Massachusetts to pay for its construction.

20151231-5136

Approximately one-half mile of the route of the proposed pipeline is on land that my wife and I own. The pipeline would place my home in the blast zone, endanger Carr’s Creek and several of its tributaries as it crosses them on my land, destroy portions of my woods, disrupt my network of trails, reduce the value of my land, and scar the landscape. It would increase the emission of greenhouse gases—both carbon dioxide from combustion and methane from leakage in drilling and distribution—by promoting further development and use of natural gas. This would exacerbate the problems from climate change.

I request a full, cumulative environmental analysis of this proposed pipeline project.

My interest cannot be adequately represented by any other party to this proceeding.

Timothy M. Camann

20151231-5156

BEFORE THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC)	Docket No. CP16-21-000
Northeast Energy Direct Project)	

**MOTION TO INTERVENE OF
VINCENT E. PREMUS**

I hereby move, pursuant to 18 C.F.R. § 385.214(b), to intervene in the above-captioned proceeding. I seek to intervene in opposition to the Northeast Energy Direct Project (the “Project” or the “NED Project”) proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (the “Company”), a subsidiary of Kinder Morgan, Inc. (“Kinder Morgan”). Communications concerning this proceeding should be served upon me as follows:

Vincent E. Premus
43 Elm Street
Pepperell, MA 01463
(978) 433-0079
vince.premus@gmail.com

My interests “which may be directly affected by the outcome of the proceeding” pursuant to 18 C.F.R. § 214(b)(2)(ii) include:

- My interests as an electricity ratepayer, whereas there has been a pattern of behavior on the part of ISO New England, and other energy policy makers, which clearly signals an intent to promote an over-reliance on natural gas infrastructure development. I believe that by doing so, they have placed the region at risk. Natural gas now accounts for about half of the electricity produced in the region. This imbalance exposes the region’s electricity consumers to more risk, not less, and leaves us vulnerable to future price volatility, especially as the company’s export plans will force domestic gas consumers to compete for resources on the global market. If anything, there is now a vital need to reduce development of new natural gas infrastructure and accelerate the development of distributed, renewable resources to counter balance the region’s over-reliance on gas fueled generation.
- My interests as a citizen of the United States of America, inasmuch as the case for need of the Kinder Morgan pipeline has not been demonstrated to the degree sufficient to justify the imposition of eminent domain on homeowners and land trusts. Witness that in November, 2014, ICF International published a study commissioned by ISO New England that examined near-term, interruptible gas supply available to serve electric generation over the next several years.[1] Their analysis projected the region’s median annual winter gas supply deficit through the year 2020 to be 10.7 MMDth, or 10.7 Bcf—1% of the region’s annual natural gas consumption of 889 Bcf, according to the U. S. Energy Information Administration. This projected deficit is roughly equivalent to the amount of natural-gas lost to leaks annually in the state of Massachusetts alone, as documented in a 2013 study published by Shanna Cleveland, formerly of the Conservation Law Foundation.[2] I assert that findings such as these demonstrate that the proposed pipeline is only a matter of convenience to businesses interested in the export of natural gas to global markets, rather than a matter of need to consumers interested in securing New England’s electricity supply for years to come. It is certainly no justification for the employment of eminent domain against New Hampshire and Massachusetts homeowners.
- My interests as a citizen of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, inasmuch as the threat this proposed project represents to the region’s watershed, natural wildlife habitat, and protected open spaces. The construction and operation of this proposed pipeline will impose significant risk of contamination to the region’s air and water supply. The operation of compressor stations throughout the proposed path will introduce hazardous contaminants into the environment, and raise background noise levels to such an extent as to make the surrounding areas unlivable by any reasonable standard.

Throughout this proceeding, Kinder Morgan and its agents have routinely misled the region’s ratepayers and landowners, masking their intent to export natural gas to global markets under the guise of securing the region’s electricity supply. The purported benefits of this 400-mile, 360,000-horsepower, massive overbuild of natural gas transmission infrastructure are not worth the risks and the impacts to our communities. Far less harmful and disruptive means of meeting our energy needs can and should be pursued, including the expansion of energy efficiency and demand response programs, recovery of gas lost to leaks, and development of commercially available battery storage technology.

I have been studying this proposal since it first became public, having published widely on the subject in regional news media, testified before multiple FERC scoping sessions, and conducted homeowner meetings with neighbors and citizens. I have also led a delegation of ratepayers that has met personally with Gordon Van Welie, President and CEO of ISO New England to discuss our concerns with this proposal, and the future of the region’s power infrastructure. I believe I can bring valuable information and perspective to this proceeding.

WHEREFORE, for the foregoing reasons, I respectfully request that my motion to intervene be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Vincent E. Premus

December 23, 2015

footnotes

1 “Assessment of New England’s Natural Gas Pipeline Capacity to Satisfy Short and Near-Term Electric Generation Needs: Phase II,” submitted to ISO New England Inc., November 20, 2014, available at http://www.iso-ne.com/static-assets/documents/2014/11/final_icf_phii_gas_study_report_with_appendices_112014.pdf(last accessed October 13, 2015).

2 S. Cleveland, “Into Thin Air: Time to Replace and Repair Leaking Natural Gas Pipelines,” August 1, 2013.

20151231-5157

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC
Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Project

Docket No. CP16-21-000

MOTION TO INTERVENE OF TOWN OF ANDOVER

Pursuant to Rules 212 and 214 of the Federal Regulatory Commission’s rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 CFR§ 385.212 and §385.214 (2007), the Town of Andover by and through its Board of Selectmen files this motion to intervene in this proceeding. This intervention is timely filed.

On November 20,2015, The Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC filed its application under §7 of the Natural Gas Act, 15 u.s.c. § 717f and §157 of FERC’s regulations, 18 CFR§ 157.1 et seq., for the proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project (NED Project), FERCDocket No. CP16-21-000.

I. COMMUNICATIONS AND SERVICE

All communications, pleadings, filings, correspondence and orders with respect to this proceeding should be served on the following:

Mr. Andrew Flanagan
Town Manager
Town of Andover
36 Bartlet Street
Andover, MA 01810
aflanagan@andoverma.gov
(978) 623-8227

II. INTEREST OF PETITIONER

The Town of Andover is a municipal corporation, duly organized under the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. The Board of selectmen is an elected five person board which is the governing body of the Town of Andover. The Town of Andover is located within Essex County.

residential homeowners, reducing the value of their property and jeopardizing their long term assets.

Furthermore, the pipeline is proposed to traverse several Article 97 parcels (conservation and recreation lands protected under Article 97 of the Massachusetts Constitution). These properties were put into conservation and taken off the state tax rolls of the Town to create a community asset and preserve the land for future generations; and has significant environmental, cultural and recreational value to the Town of Andover.

The Town of Andover seeks to intervene to monitor the proceedings and address potential affects to land, wetlands, riverfront and waterfront, rare and endangered species, transportation and homes and businesses in close proximity to the proposed pipeline and its easements. Filing as an intervener will allow the Town of Andover recourse to seek to avoid, minimize, or properly compensate for the community and environmental impacts which may reasonably be expected from a project of this nature.

III. CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, for the foregoing reasons, the Town of Andover respectfully requests that the Commission GRANT the Town of Andover's Motion to Intervene, as a party with full rights to participate in all further proceedings.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew Flanagan
Town Manager
Town of Andover
36 Bartlet Street
Andover, MA 01810
aflanagan@andoverma.gov
(978) 623-8227

DATED: December 8, 2015

20151231-5192

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Erin Jaworski under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/31/2015 12:02:30 PM Filed Date: 12/31/2015 12:02:30 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	erinjaworski@hotmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

My name is Erin Jaworski, I live with my husband and three small children in Northfield Massachusetts. I am a fourth generation resident of this town. My parents and my grandmother all reside in Northfield. I believe that the proposed NED pipeline and compressor station is a threat to the quality of life in the town of Northfield. I am concerned that blasting and potential pipeline leaks would threaten and pollute our aquifers and waterways. My drinking water comes from the municipal well, which is fed by aquifers that would be crossed by the pipeline. I work as a rowing coach and spend hours in boats on the Connecticut River. If a pipeline leak or drilling accident occurred under the river that resulting pollution could be catastrophic not only for countless wildlife that depend on the river but for the people who rely on the river for their jobs and recreation.

I am also concerned about the venting of particulate pollutants by the proposed compressor station. Clean air is a necessity and a right and I am very concerned that the proposed compressor station would add toxins to our air. I am also not convinced there is a need for this pipeline. Massachusetts is a leader in green energy, let's keep it that way. Please approve my application to be an intervenor in these proceedings. Thank you.

20151231-5195

BEFORE THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC

Docket No. CP16-21-000

Northeast Energy Direct Project

12/31/2015

MOTION TO INTERVENE OF Eric Lawrence of Dracut, MA

I hereby move, pursuant to 18 C.F.R. § 385.214(b), to intervene in the above-captioned proceeding. I seek to intervene in opposition to the Northeast Energy Direct Project (the "Project" or the "NED Project") proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (the "Company"), a subsidiary of Kinder Morgan, Inc.

("Kinder Morgan").

Reasons for Intervention

I am a resident of Dracut with two small boys. First off I have yet to be show any evidence of the need for gas that would justify the pipeline. In fact, this November the Massachusetts AG Maura Healey released a study stating an additional gas line was not needed. As Maura Healey mentioned "This study demonstrates that we do not need increased gas capacity to meet electric reliability needs"

Secondly, and of great concern is the compressor station which will be build an estimated 1400 feet from my house and neighborhood. A neighborhood which as roughly 17 kids between the ages of 2 through 10. This compressor station was recently moved to this location without any warning or notification. Our residence and many others including one of the three fire stations in Dracut are in the incineration zone. All residents will be subject to the health hazards associated with the station as well. These include, chronic sore throats, headaches, nosebleeds and an elevated risk of certain cancers.

Thirdly is the pollution, both environmental and noise. This includes contaminated land and water. Land that the farmers in the area depend on for their livelihood.

This pipeline will negatively affect our health, well-being, lifestyle and will diminish our property values.

I oppose this proposed project for the foregoing reasons. I request that the Commission GRANT this motion to intervene and comments.

Respectfully submitted,

Eric Lawrence

20151231-5199

{Photo, attributed to Norman S Walker, showing pipeline route next to a house, no caption}

20151231-5249

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LLC }
A division of Kinder Morgan } Docket No. CP16-21-000
Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline }

MOTION TO INTERVENE OF THE TOWN OF TEWKSBURY, MASSACHUSETTS

Pursuant to Rules 212 and 214 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission’s (Commission) Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. §385.212, and 18 C.F.R. §385.214, the Town of Tewksbury, Middlesex County Massachusetts, (hereinafter referred to as “the Town” or as “Tewksbury”) files this Motion to Intervene in the above-captioned proceeding.

On November 20, 2015, the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (“TGP”) filed its application under § 7 of the Natural Gas Act, 15 U.S.C. § 717f, and § 157 of FERC’s regulations, 18 C.F.R. § 157.1 et seq., for the proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project (NED), FERC Docket No. CPI6-21-000. According to the maps and plans filed with said Application, Segment N, the Lynnfield Lateral, will directly impact the Town of Tewksbury, Massachusetts, by being installed and buried under the Tewksbury-Andover Border for the Town’s entire length. It will traverse 4.2 Miles through Tewksbury, impacting 75 property owners.

On November ,2015, the Tewksbury Board of Selectmen voted to intervene and authorized the Manger to do so on the Town’s behalf because the Town’s Inhabitants and their selectmen have significant concerns regarding the environmental, safety, and socioeconomic impacts of the NED pipeline project. The resources in the Town that could be directly impacted by the proposed pipeline include: public and private drinking water supplies, permanently protected open space, farmland, rare and endangered species habitats, wetlands,

vernal pools, public infrastructure, private homes and businesses, and historic resources. The Sh011 and long-term impacts that the proposed project could have in our community are profound. The Town seeks to intervene on the NED Project to monitor the progress of the proceedings and expects to take a position on the Project once we complete our review of the application filed with FERC.

I. STATEMENT OF INTEREST

A. Description of the Town of Tewksbnry

The Tewksbury is a small, rural community in Middlesex County, Massachusetts consisting of 30,613 residents. It is bordered on the North by the Merrimack River, a major drinking water supply, and on the South by the Shawsheen River, which contributes to the drinking water supply.

Tewksbury is unique in that it sits in four watersheds- Merrimack, Shawsheen, Ipswich and Concord Rivers. This position gives Tewksbury a vital role in protecting drinking water and the resources which rely on healthy ground water and healthy water tables. In addition, Tewksbury was incorporated in 1734 from a section of Billerica, which in turn, had been incorporated in 1655 from land abutting Andover. The lands in Tewksbury are rich in early colonial American, pre-civil war, civil war and Industrial American history. The historical and geological and archeological importance of this Town has also been recognized. (See the open space Master Plan dated 2009)

B. Description of Impacts

The Town of Tewksbury has numerous interests which will be directly impacted and harmed by the outcome of the proceedings:

1) Environmental:

The proposed pipeline will deprive the inhabitants of the natural and environmental resources they came here to enjoy. The line and its easements, as proposed, will run along and through a very important pond called Ames Pond, created by a Civil War general, then through the wooded and forested back yards along the northern border which the Town shares with the Town of Andover. It will cross Town owned Article 97 conservation land, as well as sensitive Town zoned ground water protection areas and a state recognized zone II well head protection area. The Town and its inhabitants depend on these resource areas to rejuvenate its/their aquifers. The Path, as proposed, is predominantly through densely populated high consequence subdivisions consisting of single family homes with wooded and forested 1-2 acre lots. There are many property owners along this path who rely on well water, have in ground pools, and depend on septic systems. The Path, as proposed, will adversely impact permanently protected Article 97 conservation land, as well as a forested and wetland rich Wildlife corridor which runs from the Shawsheen to the Merrimack. The areas through the backyards are previously undisturbed wetlands because State and local law prohibits their disturbance. Many of these areas exist in the back yards of the privately owned lots.

It will also pass through other open space, other mature forests, wetlands, vernal pools, public infrastructure, private homes and business, and historic resources. The Town owned parcel, through which the Segment N path specifically is proposed to pass, consists of 18 acres and is identified as Lot MA LL 77.00 on the map for Segment N, sheet TE_SEG N-006. It is recognized by NHESP as an NHESP rare species protected habitat, as well as a Biomap 2 core habitat. It has also been recognized as a certified wildlife habitat. The lot owned by Tewksbury abuts conservation land in Andover which is also rare species and core habitat. Together, between the two towns, the abutting conservation parcels form a valuable 100 acre contiguous conservation and wildlife habitat. The Segment N lateral under the Applicant's proposal will bisect and fragment that vital Article 97 habitat.

2) Economic:

The economic and public health of residents is closely tied to the health and viability of the region's natural resource base. In Tewksbury, residents have worked very hard to document, prioritize, and preserve the existing natural resource base. Because of their hard work, the Town has a number of parcels of Article 97

land which are at risk of being impacted. For example on one parcel, identified as MA LL 77.00 on Sheet TE_SEG N-006 for Segment N, there are two of our certified vernal pools behind Blight Street which were identified and certified by residents and further designated by the state as a 'Priority Habitat' by Natural Heritage. The pipeline is proposed directly between these two vernal pools and could irreversibly impact these habitats and damage an area that is very important to residents of the Town. The pipeline is expected to impact air and water quality and may generate noise pollution. The pipeline also has the potential to impact private property including private wells and septic systems within the Town.

In addition, the project as proposed will adversely impact the real estate tax base and will result in a re-allocation of the burden of the real estate tax revenue required by the Town to operate. The proposal seeks to create a new temporary and permanent clear cut utility right of way, varying from 50- 175 feet wide, through a primarily residential section of Town where no utility right of way exists. It will bisect and change the character of neighborhoods, make them less desirable and potentially more dangerous places to live, and thereby adversely impact the fair market values of the single and multi family family homes and condominium developments located there. It will also reduce the value of town owned land by bisecting it or being sited near it.

3) Historical and Cultural:

Tewksbury has a long rich history, going back to the 1600's. It was originally part of Andover, then became Billerica, then became incorporated in its own right in 1734. Prior to the settlements of the 1600s, it was inhabited by various Indian tribes who lived, hunted and fished the Merrimack and Shawsheen Rivers. It abuts the Lowell Historic National and State Parks. Specifically, also, the area where the line is proposed was one where the boundary line with Andover was moved as recently as 1904. The early land owners in that location were the same persons who helped industrialize Lowell. There are many historic New England Field Stone walls, and other historic and cultural assets in the area in the direct path where the line is proposed to run, all of which are recognized by the Commonwealth as having significant historic and cultural value.

4) Public Health and Safety:

i) General: A primary obligation of a Town via its Boards and Departments is to protect the health, safety and welfare of its inhabitants. The Town's obligation will be impacted as follows:

Impact radius: The proposed path of Segment N is through a densely populated area, also known as a High Consequence Area. Not only does it pass through single family, multi family and condominium subdivisions as explained above, it also passes within a few hundred feet or less of a Hotel, an apartment complex, and several Office Parks. In the event of an emergency, these areas are accessible by very few roads, all of which evolved from old and narrow cart paths from the 1600's. It would be impossible for First responders to get to any area along the proposed path in a timely fashion, especially in the winter months. It is the towns understanding that for a pipeline of this size under this pressure, Impact radius for thermal impact is at least 1,000 feet, or a half a mile.

Tewksbury lacks the equipment, training and funding to effectively respond to a rupture of a line of this size, especially if an explosion throws burning debris beyond the initial impact radius, causing fires in a larger geographic area.

ii) Air Quality - Tewksbury is bounded with Dracut by the Merrimack River. Many Tewksbury homeowners are within 1 mile of the proposed location for the Dracut compressor and are at the health risk of being subjected to the noise, methane and toxic venting that results from the operation of a compressor of the size proposed for Dracut. They are also at risk of having their property values diminished because their valuable view across the river might become one of a compressor station. There is also a venting main line valve at about Mile 8 on Segment N which creates a risk that Homeowners will be exposed to the toxic exhaust from regular venting of that valve.

iii) Water Quality - At this time, Tewksbury derives its drinking water from the Merrimack River. It also has many residents who still rely on well water. It also has the ability to fall back on well water as a public supply if it needs to. It sits in the water shed of four rivers, including the Merrimack, as well as in the water-

shed of the Shawsheen River, which contributes to the Merrimack drinking supply. The proposed path runs through these four watersheds. It will result in the elimination of thousands of mature trees which serve to shade, filter and help rejuvenate and protect our watersheds, well heads and aquifers. It creates a risk to our drinking water supplies. There are a number of homes on the proposed lateral who will be impacted because their own private drinking wells are right in the direct path.

5) FERC's Alternate Hybrid Wright NY to Dracut MA route-

Tewksbury will also be directly and adversely impacted by the Wright to Dracut Hybrid Route proposed by FERC in its letter to Mr. Moffat dated December 8, 2015. This proposal would make Tewksbury part of the 'Market Path' and would result in the construction of a 30" 1460 psi pipeline through other Article 97 lands the Town owns, including, but not limited to the Farwood Forest, the Melvin Rogers Park, the McNeil Walsh Open Space, the Great Swamp, and various streams, watersheds and aquifers which are in the direct path. It will also impact residential subdivisions in addition to those impacted by the Lynnfield Lateral. If the above alternate is adopted, Tewksbury will be subjected to a 30" 1460 PSI line bisecting Tewksbury on its way to Dracut after entering Tewksbury through one boundary, and a 24" 1460 PSI "lateral line" running along the opposite boundary on its way to Lynnfield.

If the project route shifts or its infrastructure changes, there may be other parcels under our ownership and jurisdiction which may be impacted.

6) Rate Payer Status

Tewksbury is a rate payer.

II. TEWKSBURY MEETS THE STANDARD FOR INTERVENTION

The Town of Tewksbury's Motion to Intervene must be granted to the Town of Tewksbury as it satisfies the standard for intervention under FERC's regulations. As discussed above, Tewksbury is directly impacted by the proposed project and is also a rate payer. No other individual or organization can adequately represent Tewksbury's unique interest in this proceeding. Tewksbury's intervention is in the public interest because the Town is responsible for the protection of the health, safety and welfare of all of its residents. Accordingly, the Town of Tewksbury respectfully requests that FERC grant this Motion to Intervene.

III. CONTACT INFORMATION

The following should be added to the Official Service List, with all notice and communications in this proceeding addressed to the contacts listed below:

Richard A. Montuori,
Town Manager
1009 Main Street,
Tewksbury, MA 01876
Telephone:
Email:

IV. CONCLUSION

Wherefore, in light of the foregoing, the Town of Tewksbury respectfully requests that the Commission GRANT this Motion to Intervene and to participate in this proceeding with full rights of party status, including the right to request a hearing, cross examine witnesses and seek rehearing and appeal.

Submitted by request of the Board of Selectmen,

Richard A. Montuori
Town Manager
Tewksbury, Massachusetts

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Wherefore on this December 31, 2015, I caused to be served the foregoing Motion to Intervene electroni-

cally on all parties on the Commission's electronic service list in this proceeding, in accordance with Commission regulations.

Richard A. Montuori
Town Manager
Tewksbury, Massachusetts

20151231-5250

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Tadea Klein under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/31/2015 1:37:56 PM Filed Date: 12/31/2015 1:37:56 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	TadeaKlein@yahoo.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I am an organic gardener living in Ashfield, MA. I am deeply opposed to the proposed Kinder-Morgan pipeline due to the destructive environmental effects that it will have on our Commonwealth.

20151231-5251

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Cherylann Pierce under CP16-21-000. I oppose this NED project as not needed nor necessary.

Submission Date: 12/31/2015 1:35:00 PM Filed Date: 12/31/2015 1:35:00 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	cherylannbp56@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

As a citizen of the town of Londonderry through which the NED is proposed to "Co-Locate" with overhead transmission lines of Eversource; I have not seen any reasonable explanation of "need and necessity". Currently the Granite Ridge gas powered electricity generator sells excess electricity produced to Massachusetts on a daily basis.

During several telephone conversations with Eversource Representatives I have been reassured repeatedly that it is not in the best interest, nor is being negotiated with Kinder-Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline to Co-Locate any electric transmission line project with any gas pipeline project.

I also take great exception with Kinder-Morgan's recent appeal to FERC to accept the current docket precedent given that all abutters to the proposed compression station in Dracut, MA (which has been re-located within Dracut) have not been notified by registered mail nor any other manner that they own property which abuts said currently proposed compressor station.

20151231-5265

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Lawrence A Panfil under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/31/2015 2:08:32 PM Filed Date: 12/31/2015 2:08:32 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	lapanfil@yahoo.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I seek to intervene in opposition to the Northeast Energy Direct Project (the “Project” or the “NED Project”) proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC (the “Company”), a subsidiary of Kinder Morgan, Inc. (“Kinder Morgan”). Communications concerning this proceeding should be served upon me as follows:

Lawrence Panfil
17 Cart Path Road
Dracut, MA 01826
(617) 688-8618
lapanfil@yahoo.com

Our neighborhood (Farm Gate Estates in Dracut, MA) has a little over 60 houses – mostly made up of young families, with small children. I have two young children of my own – one son who suffers from epilepsy. Recently our neighborhood has been titled the “epicenter”, even the “terminus” of where the newly proposed NED Kinder Morgan pipeline would end and connect.

My land abuts and includes the easement for the Haverhill Lateral, which Tennessee Gas plans on updating from a 10 inch pipeline to a 20 inch pipeline and connecting further up my road to a new 30” pipeline with a metering station at the connection.

Should this pipeline receive Federal approval our happy community will be invaded by Tennessee Gas, adding multiple acres of pipeline, a loud 21,000 HP compressor station, and two continuously lit, chemical producing metering stations with valves that emit toxic fumes, literally in some of our back yards. A much-loved quiet neighborhood community, with local farms to get food and fresh country air to breathe, would be forever changed.

The newly proposed compressor station location is just a little over a mile from my house. I have concerns about constant noise and what this would do to our air quality. Just a little over a mile away, my house is directly DOWNWIND from the proposed compressor station site. Our neighborhood, and Campbell Elementary School specifically, are in direct line of being affected. Even Dracut’s commissioner of the board of health expressed great concern for this location and for our families’ health if this goes through.

On top of all of this, we have Brox Industries about a mile from us. They do weekly quarry blasting, that shakes our houses and cracks our foundations. Recent surveyors working for Kinder Morgan didn’t even know of any local blasting. I have concerns of what quarry blasting could this do to a high-pressure pipeline running VERY close to the quarry.

Beyond our health and safety, I am concerned with my property directly. I don’t want to lose property value of our house because we are so close to a compressor station AND surrounded by Pipelines. Nor do I want to lose land and trees in my yard due to construction of the Haverhill lateral.

For these reasons, I am interested in and would be affected by Applicant’s filing. My interests cannot be adequately represented and protected by any other party. Hence, the Commission should grant me permission to intervene in proceedings for Northeast Energy Direct.

Respectfully submitted,

Lawrence Panfil

20151231-5266

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Joseph A Waseleski under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/31/2015 2:08:12 PM Filed Date: 12/31/2015 2:08:12 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____
Individual Sundawner@hotmail.com

Basis for Intervening:

I am home owner whose well is next to the pipeline route land has been in family for generations and like to keep it that way

20151231-5273

I live in Dracut, MA and want to intervene in this proceeding to oppose the NED pipeline. I have an interest which may be directly affected by the outcome of the proceeding.

Construction of the NED pipeline would mean that I would now be situated less than a mile downwind of the proposed 23,000 horsepower compressor station in Dracut. The effects of living downwind of the compressor would pose irreversible risks to the health my family and the community.

In addition, the proposed pipeline and compressor station, would cause detrimental impact to the surrounding area including:

- reduced property values (and the effect this would have on local tax bases, beyond any compensation offered by the pipeline company)
- regional health and environmental consequences caused by pollutants associated with the operation of the pipeline
- tariffs proposed to force taxpayers to cover the costs of the pipeline
- possible increases in energy costs that could result from exporting natural gas, forcing local markets to compete on a global scale
- Stranded costs of overbuilt infrastructure rather than more appropriate measures to meet realistic growth forecasts

I, like many in the area, do not have the financial ability to abandon my property or sell at a greatly reduced rate to move elsewhere away from this proposed industrial development. Construction and operation of the NED pipeline would greatly impact my quality of life, and economic wellbeing, and leave me in a position where it would be difficult to re-establish myself somewhere else.

For these reasons, I am interested in and would be affected by Applicant's filing. My interests cannot be adequately represented and protected by any other party. Hence, the Commission should grant me permission to intervene in proceedings for Northeast Energy Direct.

Thank you,

Kristine Baptiste
8 Brentwood Drive
Dracut, MA 01826

20151231-5288

December 31, 2015

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing as a thirty-year resident and homeowner together with my husband, John, and as property owner who will be greatly affected if this proposed gas pipeline is brought to fruition. The proposed thirty-inch pipe will run across the back of our property and would be quite visible from our home. I imagine that it won't be buried because of all the ledge which is present. Aesthetics aside, the threat to my family and this neighborhood could be catastrophic in the event of a leak. Property values would also suffer greatly. I understand that it is probably the least expensive route for the gas company because of the power line path it would follow but it is not the safest or the most desirable for the residents of North Reading and specifically,

the Chestnut Village neighborhood.

Please reconsider the path of this pipeline for the safety of all residents and not for the size of your collective bank accounts.

Carole A. Mason
20 Crestwood Drive
North Reading, MA 01864
carole_mason@verizon.net
978-495-2371

20151231-5304

BEFORE THE UNITED STATES
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LLC)

A division of Kinder Morgan)

Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline)

Docket No. CP16-21-000

**MOTION TO INTERVENE OF THE ASHFIELD HISTORICAL COMMISSION
IN REFERENCE TO THE NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT (NED) PIPELINE**

Pursuant to Rule 214 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (Commission) Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. §385.214, The Ashfield Historical Commission files this Motion to Intervene in the above-captioned proceeding. The AHC has concerns about the impact of Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's proposed Northeast Direct Project on cultural resources in the Town of Ashfield. The impacts that the proposed NED project could have on our community are profound.

Statement of Interest

1. The Ashfield Historical Commission was established in 1984 under the Constitution of the Commonwealth of MA Chapter 40A-Section 8d and charged with the preservation, protection and development of the historical or archeological assets of Ashfield. In addition to the AHC, the Ashfield Historical Society preserves the cultural heritage of the town as a museum and a repository of archives. AHS is maintained by local historians who work with researchers.
2. The AHC received a 10/19/2015 letter from the Louis Berger Group, a company selected by TGP to conduct research and discovery of cultural resources along the corridor of the pipeline. The letter from a Louis Berger cultural resources consultant informed the commission of the upcoming application to FERC for the proposed TGP pipeline through Ashfield. The letter did NOT ask the AHC for information about cultural resources in the town of Ashfield.
3. The Nov. 2015 TGP application to FERC for the NED pipeline includes within its Environmental Report "Resource Report 4: Cultural Resources." In that report pages 4-96 to 4-99 pertain to Ashfield historical properties affected by the pipeline. In addition on pages 4-108 - 4-109 is another listing of "Newly Identified Sites." The report acknowledges that the list is incomplete and that SOI-qualified Architectural Historians "are conducting field reconnaissance...." Research is said to be "on-going." TGP research and discovery of Ashfield's historical assets so far is restricted to the Massachusetts Historical Commission's MACRIS data base—a data base assembled in 1986 which contains errors and is incomplete. It is clear that TGP has not done due diligence in conducting research and discovery about properties by consulting with the literature and experts at the AHS and the AHC and with property owners most directly affected by the pipeline.

Concerns

1. Of concern to the AHC are at least 4 historical Ashfield properties, in close proximity to the proposed pipeline, that qualify for the National Register of Historic Places under Section 106 of the National Historic

Preservation Act. These properties are MACRIS NUMBER - ASF 195 (Norman Walker), 199 (John Angelman), 102 (Phyllis Kirkpatrick) and 98 (Peter Corens). These historic, timber-framed, late-18th, early-19th century Capes enrich the life of the community and signify the deep history of the settlement of America. Icons like these are valued by townspeople and draw visitors, prospective property owners and businesses to Ashfield. Along with the pastoral landscape of hills and valleys, they create a sense of character and depth. Blasting through bedrock in close proximity to these properties could damage the foundations and framing of these buildings seriously. The water supplies of these homes come from springs that would be affected by blasting. There are other historic buildings, of concern, within a half-mile of the proposed pipeline. When will the SOI-qualified Architectural Historians complete their research and discovery of Ashfield's historical assets in a search that moves beyond the limitations of the MACRIS website?

2. Of concern to the AHC is the high visibility of the proposed NED pipeline from the heart of town, an area called the Ashfield Plain Historic District—listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The beauty of the District is valued by Ashfield residents and draws visitors, prospective property owners and businesses to Ashfield. The proposed pipeline would follow the high tension line, now barely visible, on the south flank of a hilltop that is clearly visible from town. Widening the cut to the north of the existing utility line along the flank of the hill will create a visual scar much more noticeable than what exists. How does TGP plan to mitigate the affect of the proposed pipeline on this view from town?

The proposed NED pipeline route will have a negative impact on MA 112, designated a MA Scenic Byway in 2009 under the National Scenic Byways Program. In particular Segment 17 — extending from Smith Road to Bug Hill Road — was highlighted: a long, sweeping view with “outstanding scenic value...predominantly characterized by a magnificent and picturesque farmland setting and historic farmhouses.” Of note is the existing power line stretching across the middle ground. Widening its path will accentuate significantly the scar that already exists. What does TGP plan to do, in regard to the view in Segment 17 of MA Scenic Byway, to mitigate the visual affect of significantly widening the current power line corridor to accommodate the proposed pipeline?

3. Of concern to the AHC is the location of a pipeline in the Northeast section of town, where the earliest settlers put down roots. This history is well-documented. The most current and historically accurate account can be found in Mark Williams's *The Brittle Thread of Life: Backcountry People Make a Place for Themselves in Early America* (Yale U. Press, 2009). The AHS houses more resources for the research and discovery of sites in this part of town by the cultural resources consultant from The Louis Berger Group.

Ashfield, first known as Weymouth Canada and then Huntstown Plantation, was a Proprietor town granted the Province of Massachusetts Bay in 1735 to the soldiers from Weymouth for their “hardships and sufferings” during the French and Indian War. The original First Division Lots are located in the northeast section of Town, extending southerly to “the Plain,” through which the pipeline is proposed to pass. Of particular significance lot #1 was drawn by freed slave Heber Honestman who was one of the first settlers in Huntstown/Ashfield. The proposed NED route will affect seriously this historic site and others in this part of town. When will the SOI-qualified Architectural Historians conduct research and discovery of this part of town to determine how to avoid historic sites, in consultation with the AHC and the AHS?

Standard for Intervention

The proposed NED pipeline would cause significant alterations, if not irreversible damage, to the historic character of Ashfield. The Ashfield Historical Commission's motion to intervene is in the public interest because the AHC is responsible for the preservation, protection and development of the cultural assets of the town of Ashfield.

WHEREFORE, for the foregoing reasons, the Ashfield Historical Commission respectfully requests that its motion to intervene be granted, and that it be granted the right to participate in all hearings in this proceeding.

All notices and communications in this proceeding addressed to:

Ashfield Historical Commission, Town of Ashfield, 412 Main St., Ashfield, MA 01330

Approved by and submitted by request of the Ashfield Historical Commission,

Joanna S. Hall, member of the Ashfield Historical Commission.

20151231-5314

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Edward J Ciramella under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/31/2015 2:34:44 PM Filed Date: 12/31/2015 2:34:44 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	eciramella@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

To whom it may concern -

I live in Dracut and want to intervene in this proceeding to oppose the NED pipeline. I have an interest which may be directly affected by the outcome of the proceeding because I am a resident expected to be in the “blast radius”/my daily commute crosses over the proposed pipeline route, so I will be at physical risk.

I chose to move to Dracut over a decade ago because I appreciated the country aspect of this town yet it’s proximity to all major highways (my wife and I work in Cambridge).

The new proposed station in Dracut is roughly 1400’ from my house.

I have two options - continue to press on and see to it this never happens, or, move and abandon this town.

Seeing this proposed pipe and compressor station continuing to move forward is aggravating.

I am an avid mountain biker and am revolted that this town would ruin the woods around me like this.

Please stop this!

20151231-5319

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Hayley E. Wood under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/31/2015 2:33:38 PM Filed Date: 12/31/2015 2:33:38 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	helizwood@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I am an employee at Double Edge Theatre in Ashfield, Massachusetts, where I report to work every day. Double Edge theatre resides on 105 acres of farmland on Route 116, grows a significant amount of organic produce on its land, and aspires to both grow more food and decrease its energy footprint in the coming years--active plans are afoot to achieve both goals. I am opposed to the NED pipeline for several reasons: (1) the environmental and public health effects of toxic emissions in our air and water, (2) the fact that communities from which the fracked gas comes have been devastated by that activity, (3) the exportation of fracked gas is a profit-motivated development that does nothing to decrease our country’s overall dependence on fossil fuels that are having a devastating affect on the globe and contributing to climate change and increased incidence of natural disasters, and (4) the socio economic consequences to our neighbors are dire, particularly the farms, and as a now-thriving member of the tourist industry, our own survival as a scenic destination is threatened by the pipeline.

BEFORE THE UNITED STATES
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co., LLC)
Northeast Energy Direct Project)

Docket No. CP16-21-000

**MOTION TO INTERVENE OF JOHN SCHUSTER AND MARTHA RULLMAN
IN OPPOSITION TO NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT PIPELINE**

Pursuant to Rule 214 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (Commission) Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. §385.214, John Schuster and Martha Rullman file this Motion to Intervene in the above-captioned proceeding. We oppose the project because it directly threatens our property, our health, and the environment. Therefore we seek party status in order to protest the proposed Northeast Energy Direct project and to fully protect our interests.

I. STATEMENT OF INTEREST

A. Description of INTERVENOR

John Schuster and Martha Rullman, husband and wife, are residents of the Town of Northfield. We are stakeholders in this proceeding because our home is less than a mile from the proposed pipeline route and Market Path Mid Station 3 compressor station. We live at the base of a steep, forested stream valley and the Millers Brook flows through our property and right beside our home. The pipeline route runs along the crest of the Upper Bald Hills, and the proposed compressor station site is located approximately 800 feet in elevation above our home, at the top of the Millers Brook watershed. Our concerns include the impacts downhill and downstream from blasting, deforestation and trenching activities in the Millers Brook watershed, including the threat of flooding from increased runoff due to land clearing, landslides, and erosion on the steep slopes above us, stream degradation, contamination of our drinking water, and damage to the environment, our health and our property. So even though the pipeline route does not cross our property, we will be directly impacted in numerous ways by the construction and ongoing operation of the proposed pipeline and compressor station uphill and upstream of our home.

The Millers Brook is classified as a cold water fishery and is an important natural resource to the Town. The entire Millers Brook watershed is within a Water Protection District. The Brook and all of its tributaries are listed in BioMap2 as Critical Natural Landscape and Core Habitat supporting Species of Conservation Concern. The Town of Northfield's 2013 Open Space Plan designates this habitat High Priority for Conservation.

B. Description of Impacts

John Schuster and Martha Rullman will be directly impacted and harmed by the proposed project as follows.

1. **The threat of flooding:** After living directly beside the Millers Brook for twenty five years, we know from experience how vulnerable it is to logging, storm water runoff, and land clearing uphill and upstream of us. There is a serious threat of flash flooding due to the increased volume of runoff that will result from all the logging and excavating associated with construction of the pipeline, and especially the compressor station. Note that the area from Pratt Hollow Road down to Maple Street along the Millers Brook is federally designated as a flood zone.
2. **Degradation of steam habitat, alteration of hydrology:** Because of the steeply sloping terrain, deforestation and the disturbance and removal of the soil will cause erosion, siltation and degradation of stream habitat. During the summer of 2014 logging on a parcel of land that abuts the proposed compressor station site directly impacted us, not only because of erosion from the access roads and skid trails, but because of the increased volume of runoff. This resulted in the State Forester intervening to address the problems. The impacts associated with construction of the proposed pipeline

and compressor station will be at a scale beyond anything we have witnessed in the past. Increased erosion will result in increased mud and siltation, and degraded water quality and stream habitat. Our concern is that the Millers Brook will be irreparably damaged by the effects of logging, blasting and excavating in the headwaters of the Brook and its tributaries. This damage will directly impact us in a number of ways and will threaten our property.

3. **A threat to our drinking water:** Our spring-fed shallow well is located next to the Millers Brook and is vulnerable to surface water intrusion during periods of high water. The construction and operation of the proposed compressor station poses a threat to our drinking water supply because of contaminants entering the surface and groundwater. It also poses a threat to the entire public water supply in the town, as both of the two public water supply districts would be impacted by the proposed pipeline and compressor station. Our water is a precious resource, and this project jeopardizes our water supply and our health.
4. **Toxic air emissions:** The proposed compressor station site is near the crest of a mountain at one of the highest elevations in Northfield. We are concerned about emissions of methane and other toxic gasses flowing down into the stream valley during periods of atmospheric inversions which can trap and cause these emissions to settle downhill. We are quite familiar with air inversions, which occur frequently in Pratt Hollow. We both have medical issues, and based on the data from health studies that is available, we would not be able to remain in our home if the compressor station is built where it is being proposed, a little less than a mile uphill and upstream of us.
5. **A decline in the value of the stream habitat and our home:** The Millers Brook is a rushing mountain stream which runs along 2 sides of our house. While we consider it the most valuable aspect of our home and property, this pristine waterway would be imperiled by the impacts of the large scale land clearing and contamination of the stream.

C. JOHN SCHUSTER AND MARTHA RULLMAN's Motion to Intervene Must Be Granted

JOHN SCHUSTER AND MARTHA RULLMAN satisfy the standard for intervention under the Commission's regulations. As discussed above, JOHN SCHUSTER AND MARTHA RULLMAN are directly impacted by the proposed project, and no other individual or organization can adequately represent JOHN SCHUSTER AND MARTHA RULLMAN's unique interest in this proceeding. Accordingly, John Schuster and Martha Rullman respectfully request that the Commission grant this Motion to Intervene.

II. CONTACT INFORMATION

The following individuals should be added to the Official Service List, with all notice and communications in this proceeding addressed to the contacts listed below:

Name: John Schuster
Address: PO Box 21, 29 Pratt Hollow Rd., Northfield, MA 01360
Phone: 413-498-2157
Email: jschuster@hughes.net

Name: Martha Rullman
Address: same as above
Phone: same as above
Email: mrullman@hughes.net

III. PROTEST/COMMENTS

The proposed compressor station is sited at the top of a sensitive and vulnerable watershed, surrounded by core and critical plant and animal habitat and conservation land. The siting of this industrial complex at the top of Gulf Road poses a danger to those living downhill and downstream. Gulf Road is a steep and treacherous mountain road that winds through a ravine in which flows a tributary of the Millers Brook which runs beside the road before joining the main branch of the Brook approximately 1/8 mile upstream of our home.

This tributary is very vulnerable to storm water runoff from Gulf Road. The map of the compressor station shows the planned access road to the compressor station complex running perpendicular to Gulf Road and sloping right down into this tributary. A large volume of runoff from the site will be quickly carried downstream, through our property (less than 20 feet from our back door) and past our home to other properties in town.

Additionally, further back from the road at the compressor station site, the other tributaries of the Millers Brook will also be seriously impacted by the blasting, earth removal and levelling, and deforestation. Subsequent application of herbicides and pollutants associated with the operation of the compressor station will negatively impact surface and groundwater. We have lived here for twenty five years and have seen problems associated with activities uphill and upstream of us, but they have been relatively short lived and temporary in nature up until now. However, we have no doubt that the results of the building this large compressor station complex at the headwaters of this watershed will have catastrophic results, both to our safety and well-being and to the integrity of this cold water fishery. - 7 -

We are also especially concerned about the fact that the Slope Stability Map prepared by the Massachusetts Geological Survey identifies the soils on the steep slopes along Gulf Road just downhill of the proposed compressor station as highly unstable, placing it at high risk for landslides. (There is an area just upstream of us where a landslide occurred in the past, so this is not something that should be dismissed). The area in the whole town of Northfield with the most highly unstable slopes is on the downhill (west) side of the compressor station, as can be clearly seen on TGP's Market Path Mid Station 3 Site Plan and on the Slope Stability Map. Gulf Road will be a principal access point for pipeline construction, and the permanent access road to the proposed compressor station is planned for an area with steep slopes that drain into Millers Brook. The access road will have to cross the Brook and during construction will have to support a great deal of heavy traffic. TGP's map identifies the proposed access road as "Permanently Disturbed" plus an area of "Temporary Work Space" that extends downstream along the Brook. There is a great risk of erosion in this area, yet it is not included in TGP's list of Areas of Severe Erosion Potential Crossed by the Project Pipeline Facilities in Massachusetts (see Table 5.19-2, page L-87 in TGP's Environmental Construction Plan for Massachusetts. This Table identifies only one location in all of Franklin County. See also Table 5.19-4, page L-93 pertaining to Access Roads).

It should also be noted that the site of the proposed access road is located in an area identified as High Priority for Conservation by the Town of Northfield's 2013 Open Space and Recreation Plan.

IV. CONCLUSION

Wherefore, in light of the foregoing, the John Schuster and Martha Rullman BBCA respectfully requests that (the Commission (1) GRANT this motion to intervene and allow INTERVENOR to participate in this proceeding with full rights of party status, including the right to request a hearing, cross examine witnesses and seek rehearing and appeal.

Respectfully submitted,

John Schuster and Martha Rullman

20151231-5335

BEFORE THE UNITED STATES
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.)
A subsidiary of Kinder Morgan)
Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline)

Docket No. CP16-21-000

**MOTION TO INTERVENE OF THE TOWN OF LYNNFIELD
IN OPPOSITION TO NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT PIPELINE**

Pursuant to Rules 212 and 214 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (the “Commission”), 18 C.F.R. §385.212 and 385.214, Section 15(a) of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.c. § 717n), the Town of Lynnfield, Massachusetts (the “Town”) files this Motion to Intervene in the above-captioned proceeding.

The Town opposes the project because of the impacts to health, public safety, wells that supply drinking water to the Town, interference with conservation land, close proximity to residential homes and obtrusive noise. The Town seeks party status to protest the proposed pipeline and in order to protect fully the interests of the people of the Town.

I. BACKGROUND

On or about November 20, 2015, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.c. filed its Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to Construct, Install, Modify, Operate and Maintain Certain Pipeline and Compression Facilities and to Abandon Other Facilities.

II. MOTION TO INTERVENE

A. Description of the Town of Lynnfield

The Town is a municipal corporation, duly organized under the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and incorporated in 1814, with offices at 55 Summer Street, Lynnfield, MA 01940. The Board of Selectmen is an elected three-person board which is the governing body of the Town.

B. Description of Impacts

The Town will be directly harmed by the proposed project as follows:

The proposed pipeline will run through several miles of the Town, including sensitive water protection areas, conservation areas and in close proximity to residential homes.

The Town is very concerned about the impacts to groundwater flow, supply and quality, as well as air quality and noise.

The proposed “Lynnfield Lateral” will be routed through land owned by the Lynnfield Center Water District, which provides public drinking water to approximately one-half of the Town’s residents. The land in question is a critical, undeveloped watershed protection area surrounding many of the said water district’s wells. Construction, installation and operation of the right of way on this property, including on-going pipeline maintenance, could do significant harm to the watershed. In addition, maintenance of the right-of-way, including possible application of herbicides and pesticides, could also have negative impacts on the Town’s public drinking water.

In addition, a portion of the proposed pipeline will utilize an existing electrical right of way in the Town. The proposed route would take the pipeline through approximately 30 residential properties, disrupting the land and the lives of lives of the owners and their families, and reducing their property values. Installation of the proposed pipeline would unfairly lower the quality of life of these residents while offering them no countervailing benefit.

Finally, all communities in the Commonwealth will be adversely impacted when the goals of the Massachusetts Global Warming Solutions Act are not met due to increased emissions from this proposed project’s infrastructure and from the consumption of additional natural gas facilitated by the project. The New England Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative goals will be similarly thwarted. All of the Commonwealth’s electricity rate-payers could be harmed by the so-called “cost recovery” mechanisms put in place to facilitate this project.

C. The Town's Motion to Intervene Should Be Granted

The Town meets the standard for intervention under the Commission's regulations. As discussed above, it is directly affected by the proposed project, and no other individual or organization can adequately represent the Town's unique interest in this proceeding. Further, intervention is in the public interest because the Town is responsible for the protection of the health and safety of all of its residents. Accordingly, the Town of Lynnfield respectfully requests that the Commission grant this Motion to Intervene.

II. CONTACT INFORMATION

The following individual should be added to the Official Service List, with all notice and communications in this proceeding addressed to the contacts listed below:

Mr. James Boudreau
Town Administrator
Town of Lynnfield
55 Summer Street
Lynnfield, MA 01360

III. CONCLUSION

Wherefore, in light of the foregoing, the Town of Lynnfield respectfully requests that the Commission GRANT this motion to intervene and allow the Town to participate in this proceeding with full rights of party status, including the right to request a hearing, cross-examine witnesses and seek rehearing and appeal if appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,

James Boudreau, Town Administrator
Town of Lynnfield
55 Summer Street
Lynnfield, Massachusetts 01940
(781) 334-9410
jboudreau@town.lynnfield.ma.us

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Wherefore on this December 31, 2015, I caused to be served the foregoing Motion to Intervene electronically on all parties on the Commission's electronic service list in this proceeding, in accordance with Commission regulations.

James Boudreau, Town Administrator

20151231-5354

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Shelley Fitzgerald under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/31/2015 4:13:20 PM Filed Date: 12/31/2015 4:13:20 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party	Signer (Representative)	Other Contact (Principal)
Individual	shelley.fitzgerald26@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

I am a parent of two children who will attend the Joseph A. Campbell Elementary school located on Methuen Street in Dracut, MA. The path for the Kinder Morgan proposed pipeline has come very close to this school and it is certainly subject to modifications, including those proposed by FERC, that would again put my child's school within the potential "impact zone" for the pipeline. Furthermore, I am concerned

about the following aspects of this project: 1) blowdown noise and gas emissions from the proposed Dracut compressor station on Broadway Road; 2) the impacts that construction would have on property values in Dracut and the residential tax base which supports our school funding; 3) the proximity of the proposed pipeline to the active Brox Industries quarry; 4) the potential contamination of wells due to the proposed construction of the Market Path tail compressor station on 2 contaminated sites (see MA DEP Release Tracking Numbers 3-0000307 and 3-0001070), including wells that support farming and help preserve the rural character of Dracut

20151231-5356

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Elizabeth Pichette under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/31/2015 4:19:14 PM Filed Date: 12/31/2015 4:19:14 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____

Individual briceh@verizon.net

Basis for Intervening:

As a citizen of Conway where the proposed pipeline will be located, I am very concerned about the impact on the environment, the potential for accidents for which we do not have safety, fire and health personnel to cover such an event, the impact on the value of our properties, the quality of life of this town and its pristine beauty. A compressing station would carry grave risks to life and property of this town. Also the fact that we are expected to pay for this pipeline through our utility bills adds insult to injury for which we would not see any benefit. Wild and unpopulated land offers a far greater benefit to the health of this state than any commercial enterprise that benefits only a few shareholders in a select corporation.

20151231-5359

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of Deborah D Maia under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/31/2015 4:11:43 PM Filed Date: 12/31/2015 4:11:43 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

Filing Party _____ Signer (Representative) _____ Other Contact (Principal) _____

Individual innana99@gmail.com

Basis for Intervening:

My name is Deborah Maia and I am a Conway homeowner . . . living on Shelburne Falls Road, about 1000 feet from the proposed Northeast Energy Direct pipeline. I am 63, a practicing physical therapist and steward of the 12 wooded acres and wildflower meadow that I call home. Being a steward involves taking care of the land by protecting it's resources . . . wildlife, soil, water, natural beauty . . . allowing nature to thrive. This proposed pipeline will put in constant threat of destruction my little area of nature refuge and my home . . . as well as many surrounding homes and land under conservation, family farms and community supported agriculture in Massachusetts. By attending meetings and hearings and the scoping process . . . and listening to both sides . . . the fear of living so close to this pipeline and the damage it will do to this protected farmland and rural area is palpable. In addition, the blowdown valve is also planned for Conway . . . another hazard for the town.

Massachusetts does not need this pipeline. We can lead in renewable energy, if given the chance. Energy conservation, solar, wind . . . we do not need this pipeline. Let all towns be subsidized to create sustainable energy sources for it's residents. Creativity has already begun locally and is spreading out to cover the whole

state. With local, state and federal support. . . serious energy conservation . . . retrofitting all buildings . . . solar and wind farms, we can create jobs, weaken climate change and become energy independent. I would welcome a solar or wind farm as my neighbor.

I am asking FERC to be bold and strong and forthright in representing the needs of the people of Massachusetts. This pipeline poses an immense threat to the health and well being of Massachusetts and contributes greatly to Climate Change. Support Massachusetts in becoming a leading sustainable energy state. Please lean away from fossil fuels and focus on renewables for consumer energy.

20151231-5364

BEFORE THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC
A division of Kinder Morgan Energy Partners
Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline

Docket No. CP 16-21

**MOTION TO INTERVENE OF
THE NOLUMBEKA PROJECT, INC.**

The Nolumbeka Project Inc. (“Nolumbeka”) is a 501(c)(3) Nonprofit corporation with a Native and non-Native volunteer board, whose mission is to preserve, protect, and educate the public about Native American cultural resources in what is now called New England and the Northeastern United States. The Native American cultural resources of our area are greatly impacted by the proposed Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline with 242 acres of land being reserved for a compressor station, and approximately 135 miles of proposed pipeline in Massachusetts and New Hampshire. We know of multiple Native American cultural antiquities and sacred sites on these properties that are at risk of destruction should the project go forward. We also consider the entire affected area part of a larger sacred ceremonial landscape that would become fragmented and degraded were construction to go forward.

Pursuant to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 CFR § 385.214(b), the Nolumbeka Project moves to intervene in the above captioned proceeding in the public’s interest. This intervention is timely filed.

I. CONTACT INFORMATION

Please enter the Nolumbeka Project, Inc. on the official service list for Docket No. CP 16-21. All pleadings, filings and correspondence in this proceeding should be served on the following:

Howard Clark
Nolumbeka Project, Inc.
88 Columbus Ave.
Greenfield, MA 01301
Intervenor3@hemlockhouse.net

II. INTEREST OF PETITIONER

Kinder Morgan/TGP filed their formal application for Northeast Energy Direct (NED) on November 20, 2015. Docket No. CP16-21 for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity, pursuant to the Natural Gas Act, 15 U.S.C. § 717f, and 18 C.F.R. §§ 157.1 et seq.. In its Application, TGP requests authorization to construct, modify and expand natural gas infrastructure through western Massachusetts and New Hampshire.

Nolumbeka and its board members have been working to preserve Native American cultural sites in the Northeast, and educate the public about the Native American presence here in the middle Connecticut River Valley for over 46 years. We achieve this goal through historical archival research, field research, and public

outreach.

Through an expertise built up over the past five decades, Nolumbeka and its board members have identified over 100 definitive and prospective Native American ceremonial stone landscape features on more than two dozen properties that will be affected by the NED project either directly or as part of the larger ceremonial stone landscape. Our historical and field research, as well as that of the Massachusetts Historical Commission and the University of Massachusetts, confirms the pipeline would run through some of the most intact, richest and least explored areas of prehistoric cultural resources in the Northeast.

Article 97 is an amendment to the Massachusetts state constitution adopted in 1972 which is intended to permanently protect land from development. Article 97 has been essential to us in preserving Native American cultural resources in our area. We currently share with US Fish and Wildlife Service an Article 97-protected conservation easement on an ancient Native American cultural village site at the Great Falls in Turners Falls, Massachusetts, and there are many other lands in our area whose preservation depends upon Article 97. Our site, and these others, are intended to be permanently protected. We cannot support the taking or use of Article 97-protected lands proposed by this project. We expect to finalize our position on the project as a whole once we complete our comprehensive review of the application and subsequent documents filed with FERC.

As a non-profit, the public supports us with donations to protect and preserve Native American cultural resources. The Nolumbeka Project has long-standing expertise and history with and deep interest in the protection and preservation of a) specific sites within the ceremonial sacred stone landscape district some of which now stands directly in the pathway of this project, as well as b) the surrounding ceremonial landscape as a whole.

For the reasons set forth above, the Nolumbeka Project has “an interest which may be directly affected by the outcome of the proceeding” pursuant to 18 C.F.R. § 214(b)(2)(ii) and its “participation is in the public interest” pursuant to 18 C.F.R. § 214(b)(2)(iii).

III. CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, for the foregoing reasons, the Nolumbeka Project Inc. respectfully requests that its motion to intervene be allowed.

Howard Clark, Senior Anthropologist and Historical Researcher
Nolumbeka Project Inc.
88 Columbus Ave.
Greenfield, MA 01301
Intervenor3@hemlockhouse.net
413-475-0650

20151231-5365

Submission Description: (doc-less) Motion to Intervene of David M Pease under CP16-21-000.

Submission Date: 12/31/2015 4:45:02 PM Filed Date: 12/31/2015 4:45:02 PM

Dockets

CP16-21-000 Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (NED Project)

Filing Party/Contacts:

<u>Filing Party</u>	<u>Signer (Representative)</u>	<u>Other Contact (Principal)</u>
Individual	dmpease42@gmail.com	

Basis for Intervening:

My interest as an electric ratepayer, inasmuch as the Company seeks to secure my electric utility as a Project shipper, which, in turn, would seek to recover costs associated with the Project from ratepayers.

The massive overbuild embodied in this proposal is very likely to lead to higher energy costs for New England’s ratepayers – either because the excess capacity contracted for by our utilities would go unused, or

because capacity would be used for markets overseas, driving up domestic energy prices.

{ Intentionally blank page }

{ Intentionally blank page }