Shaiken, Benjamin

From: celt hobbes <celt.hobbes@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2015 10:47 AM
To: ETTestimony
Subject: HB1078

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Energy and Technology Committee

There are sections of RHB1078 that are outrageous at best and contradictory at the very least. I'll highlight sections below. But the short version is this; to make rate payers pay for expanded pipeline that we don't need and will only make more profits for fracked gas companies is the reason politicians have a lower approval rating than head lice. The majority of people won't know about this until it's too late and the majority of Connecticut residents don't even know this bill exists! (not to mention no time to get to the LOB to testify against it)

Secondly, one of the major tenets of energy decisions is taking into consideration our promised reduction in greenhouse gas emissions on an agreed upon timeline. How can more fracking, which expanded pipeline capacity is really for, help us to our goal of less greenhouse gas emissions?? Especially considering fracked gas (methane) is 86 times more potent as a greenhouse gas than CO2 over the first twenty years.

We can only include that either: you haven't been educated in ALL aspects of energy matters or ....this is to appease campaign contributors, in which case we don't have a democracy; we have an auction. Please don't get defensive. That will just prove we have a legitimate point.

Sec. 4. (NEW) (*Effective July 1, 2015*) (a) The Commissioner of Energy and Environmental Protection, in consultation with the procurement manager identified in subsection (l) of section 16-2 of the general statutes, the Office of Consumer Counsel, the Attorney General and the joint standing committee of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to energy and technology may, in coordination with other states in the region of the regional independent system operator, as defined in section 16-1 of the general statutes, or on the commissioner's own, solicit proposals for long-term contracts, in one solicitation or multiple solicitations, from providers of (1) natural gas pipeline capacity constructed on or after January 1, 2016, Un-needed and more than 50% will be for export through Canadian terminals because Asia and Europe pay more for the fracked gas.(2) liquefied natural gas, (3) Class I renewable energy sources, as defined in section 16-1 of the general statutes, (4) passive and active demand response resources, including, but not limited to, load management and efficiency measures, or (5) distributed generation, including, but not limited to, combined heat and power.

(b) The Commissioner of Energy and Environmental Protection shall evaluate the following factors when reviewing proposals pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, including, but not limited to, (1) economic benefits to the state, (2) fuel diversity, (3) whether benefits of the proposal outweigh the costs of the proposal, (Are ALL costs included in the evaluation? History has shown they have not.) (4) the delivered price of such sources, (5) whether the proposal is consistent with the requirements to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in accordance with section 22a-200a of the general statutes,(Fracked gas [methane] is 86 times more potent as a greenhouse gas than CO2 so expanding pipeline capacity for more fracking IS NOT consistent with our greenhouse gas reduction requirements) and (6) whether the proposal is aligned with the policy goals outlined in the Comprehensive Energy

Strategy, pursuant to section 16a-3d of the general statutes, including, but not limited to, environmental impacts. ("environmental impacts" include, but are not limited to, fracking waste, groundwater contamination, air pollution, public health threats, climate change impacts)

(c) If the commissioner finds proposals pursuant to subsection (a) of this section to be in the best interests of ratepayers, (Seriously?? Paying for pipeline we don't need in the interest of ratepayers??? Even in our most recent coldest winter, the current pipelines were only 65% full. So building more pipelines or expanding the ones we already have to export more fracked gas, increase fracking in the US and make the gas company more profits IS NOT in the best interest of the ratepayers!) the commissioner may select proposals from generating facilities or demand response resources to meet up to the state's proportional share of the regional energy load of natural gas capacity.

(d) Any agreement reached by the commissioner and a generating facility owner or demand response resource owner shall be subject to review and approval by the Public Utilities Regulatory Authority. The Commissioner of Energy and Environmental Protection may file an application with the authority for the review and approval of the agreement. The authority shall issue a decision not later than sixty days after such filing. If the authority does not issue a decision within sixty days after receiving said application, or within ninety days if the Commissioner of Energy and Environmental Protection consents, the application shall be deemed approved. The net costs of any such agreement shall be recovered through a fully reconciling component of electric rates for all customers of electric distribution companies. Such costs shall include reasonable costs incurred by electric distribution companies pursuant to this section.

Sec. 5. (NEW) (*Effective July 1, 2015*) In any rate application filed with the Public Utilities Regulatory Authority on or after July 1, 2015, by any electric distribution company, the electric distribution company may seek cost recovery for the costs of purchasing new natural gas capacity either through procuring contracts for new pipeline capacity (not when it's already proven to be unnessecary and meant to make more profit for gas companies to export fracked gas.) or otherwise, as directed by the Commissioner of Energy and Environmental Protection pursuant to section 4 of this act.

John D. Calandrelli
Enfield CT