

170 Fish Hatchery Road
Richmond, NH 03470
BarWoodNH@Gmail.com
August 13, 2015

Debra Howard
Executive Director and Secretary
New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission
21 South Fruit Street, Suite 10
Concord, NH 03301

Dear Ms. Howard

On August 9th I sent a letter to FERC expressing my opposition to the NED pipeline proposed by Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas, specifically addressing the pipeline's effect on the marketability of properties in the "incineration zone." On August 12th I sent a letter to FERC expressing my concern about the potential damage to aquifers and private wells that could be caused by the blasting needed to bury a pipe in New Hampshire granite. Attached please find a copy of each of those two letters.

I hope you will consider the points and opinions I expressed to FERC, as well as those points and opinions expressed by other southern New Hampshire residents I have not seen any local support for this proposed pipeline, and the opposition appears to be fervent, unanimous, and well-reasoned. Perhaps residents in towns north of the pipeline route think that their utility rates will go down after the pipeline is operational. Is this your prediction? Is there an expected rate hike for all of us to subsidize Kinder Morgan's construction? Are NH utilities signing up in significant numbers to validate KM's claim that NH needs that much more natural gas? Now? In any case it appears that the towns on the proposed 71 mile pipeline route will face a disproportionate share of the burden resulting from this NED project.

Please do whatever you can to respond to our plight; as private citizens we feel helpless, and we must depend on you to act in the best interests of all New Hampshire residents.

Thank you for any help you can give to those of us at risk.

Yours truly,



Barbara Woodward

170 Fish Hatchery Road
Richmond, NH 03470
BarWoodNH@Gmail.com
August 9, 2015

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

Dear Ms Bose,

I am writing to you to express my opposition to the NED pipeline proposed by Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas, to be buried across a 71 mile swath in southern New Hampshire. In addition to agreeing with the general reasons put forth by those opposed to the pipeline, I wish to highlight an issue specific to me and to those who own property in the designated "incineration zone." While Kinder Morgan may be obliged to negotiate with those whose properties will be physically altered by the pipeline, there apparently is no similar expectation for Kinder Morgan to have any contact with abutting property owners. I conclude Kinder Morgan has no interest in - or sympathy for --- us.

My husband and I have enjoyed our twenty-four years in the rural peace and quiet of Richmond, NH. However, our advancing ages (currently 88 and 83) and escalating health concerns mean that we will be unable to maintain our independence more than another two or three years at best, and we will need to sell our home and move to an area with more services. How will the pool of potential buyers be affected when our home carries the label "incineration zone," and how will the selling price of our property compare to a similar property well distant from a pipeline? In addition to our twelve-acre house lot we own an adjacent eleven-acre undeveloped lot. Who would buy that at any price, knowing that a house built there likely could not be sold for as much as its construction costs? It seems incontrovertible to me that the marketability and value of our home and adjacent lot (both located in the incineration zone) will be negatively affected, and significantly so. Is this fair?

Has FERC done, or have you even seen, any study on real estate transactions specific to incineration-zone properties, comparing them to similar properties not so stigmatized? Shouldn't you? A private company is entitled to earn a profit but that should not be achieved by causing a financial loss to individual citizens. I fervently hope that FERC will not approve KM's application, and if it does, that there will be some recognition of --- and compensation for --- the decreased value of our property.

Please consider our plight.

Yours truly,



Barbara Woodward

170 Fish Hatchery Road
Richmond, NH 03470
August 12, 2015

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

Dear Ms. Bose,

On August 9th I sent a letter to you expressing my opposition to the NED pipeline proposed by Kinder Morgan / Tennessee Gas, specifically addressing the issue of the pipeline's negative effect on the marketability of properties in the "incineration zone." Now I wish to address another issue specific to residents in towns dependent on private wells for their water supply.

The town of Richmond, NH has no public infrastructure to provide water; residents have individual wells and our own well is within 800 feet of the proposed pipeline. Our water is pure and its taste is the envy of our far-flung family. Richmond has an aquifer that lies under the proposed path of the NED pipeline and our property is directly over that aquifer.

New Hampshire as you know is "the Granite State." Richmond itself has several ridges running north and south, and the proposed pipeline runs from west to east across those ridges. The blasting required to enable KM to bury that pipeline in our rocky terrain has many of us very concerned. What is our recourse if our wells are negatively affected, either by contaminants or by loss of volume or pressure? How can we prove that the samples we have lab-tested and analyzed before the blasting begins are in fact from the wells we claim? I have seen that there is a procedure whereby KM signs off on the pre-blast condition of a home's foundation but I have not seen a similar protective procedure for well water.

Thank you for any help you can give to those of us at risk.

Yours truly,



Barbara Woodward