
From: Lynn Garfield <lynngarfield17@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 25, 2018 9:38 AM
To: PUC - Executive.Director; Kreis, Donald
Subject: DG 17-198 Liberty Utilities Granite Bridge Project

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

Dear Ms. Howland:cc: D. Maurice Kreis, Consumer Advocate donald.kreis@oca.nh.gov



This is a request for information pursuant to Puc 104 and Puc 201.07. Please file this letter as a public comment.

I request unredacted copies of all documents which Liberty Utilities submitted in support of its Granite Bridge petition, as identified in its motion for protective order. For the reasons explained in the opposition to that motion, filed by the Office of Consumer Advocate, I ask that the motion for protective order be denied and unredacted copies be made public immediately.

Liberty Utilities is proposing a capital investment of almost \$312 million for Granite Bridge, which would be passed along to ratepayers during the projected 55-year life span for the pipeline, and 40-year life span for the LNG facility. New Hampshire is a signatory to the [Under2 Memorandum of Understanding](#), under which signatory governments made a commitment to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions towards net-zero by 2050. It should be obvious that it will be impossible for the State to meet that commitment if it approves fossil fuel projects such as Granite Bridge. Moreover, the public must be allowed to scrutinize the details of the proposal in order to evaluate the company's claims if there is to be any confidence that the public interest has been served.

In my community, Liberty Utilities has asked the PUC for permission to extend its gas franchise into Lebanon and Hanover. In that case, DG 16-852, the company also claimed that a large amount of information needed to be withheld from the public. On April 3, 2017, community intervenors Ariel Arwen and Jonathan Chaffee, representing themselves, filed an objection to the company's motion for protective order and argued that the information needed to be made public. They documented instances where redacted information was already in the public record and noted that the public has no way of knowing if the company is misrepresenting known facts. The commission declined to rule on that objection. Now almost 11 months after that objection was filed and more than 5 and a half months since the hearing on that case, the commission has still not ruled on whether Liberty has abused New Hampshire's right-to-know law, RSA 91-A:5. In fact, the commission has established a pattern of taking Liberty's word that their information should be confidential and not ruling on that question ***until after the final order is issued***. Of course, at that point the public has lost all opportunity to affect a decision of vital importance to the community. I ask, therefore, that the commission take this opportunity to establish transparency in its proceedings and release the redacted documents. Frankly, I cannot see how a company's withholding of information from clients/consumers it is claiming to benefit is fair, responsible, or respectful.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Lynn Garfield
Lebanon, NH

cc: D. Maurice Kreis, Consumer Advocate