Mass Audubon Opposes Natural Gas Pipelines

Mass Audubon opposes three natural gas pipeline projects that have implications for our wildlife sanctuaries, the properties of our conservation partners, lands we have assisted in protecting, state forests and parks, the Commonwealth’s energy policy, and the Massachusetts Constitution’s “Environmental Bill of Rights” (Article 97).

Today, we are working in the courts, at the legislature, and before the Baker Administration in opposition to:

1. **Northeast Energy Direct.** This project has been suspended as of April 2016. Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co. had proposed a large new pipeline system that would run from NY through MA and NH delivering 1.2 billion cubic feet/day (bcf/d) of fracked gas from the Pennsylvania Marcellus Shales. In Massachusetts alone, over 100 miles of new pipeline would cross more than 100 parcels of protected lands, including Mass Audubon’s West Mountain Wildlife Sanctuary in Plainfield.

2. **Connecticut Expansion.** The Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co. is also proposing a four-mile expansion of existing pipelines in southwestern Massachusetts, with the gas dedicated to serving CT customers. This project would cross lands that Mass Audubon assisted the Department of Conservation and Recreation in protecting in 2007 at Otis State Forest in Sandisfield.

3. **Access Northeast.** Spectra Energy/Algonquin Gas Transmission is partnering with Eversource and National Grid to expand 125 miles of Algonquin’s pipeline system. This project would serve gas-fired electric power plants. It includes 26 miles of proposed new pipeline in Norfolk County including construction through Mass Audubon’s 100-year-old Moose Hill Wildlife Sanctuary in Sharon. Other areas affected include Blackstone watershed communities along the 27 mile lateral from Medway to West Boylston. The project also includes another lateral and large new LNG storage facilities in Acushnet.

Mass Audubon does not support these proposed pipeline projects because they:

- **Are not necessary to satisfy the energy needs of the Commonwealth.** Massachusetts is a national leader in energy conservation and efficiency along with the development and production of clean, renewable energy. The Commonwealth’s green energy industries provide more than 28,000 jobs and contribute $10 billion annually to the state economy. Studies show that there are more cost effective, environmentally sound ways to meet the region’s electric reliability needs.
• **Are an incursion into and across state and private conservation lands in violation of Article 97 of the Massachusetts Constitution.**
  More than one hundred parcels of “permanently protected” conservation lands will be adversely impacted by the pipeline projects. These lands are protected by Article 97 of the state constitution and/or are held in public trust by private organizations. These valuable natural areas represent decades of investments by the Commonwealth and the land trust community and provide clean air and water, fish and wildlife habitat, opportunities for recreation and tourism, and a high quality of life that must not be sacrificed.

• **Are a major and long-term investment in fossil fuel use.**
  This is counter to a major objective of *The Massachusetts Green Communities Act* (2008) to establish a vibrant and expanding Renewable Portfolio Standard of clean renewable energy sources such as wind, solar and hydro.

• **Are a step backward in reducing greenhouse gas emissions (GHG.)**
  *The Massachusetts Global Warming Solutions Act* (2008) requires the Commonwealth to reduce GHGs 25 percent by 2020 and 80 percent by 2050, based on 1990 levels. The long-term investment in fossil fuel infrastructure is detrimental to achieving those goals.

• **Are not necessarily going to provide significant energy for domestic use.**
  The pipeline projects would provide a means for fossil fuel companies to export gas to other states and overseas. Rather than saving ratepayers money, the projects can drive up costs resulting in ratepayers contributing significantly to the costs of pipeline construction. A bill proposed for the legislature would do just that – require Mass electric ratepayers to finance new pipeline construction projects. Investments in local energy conservation and efficiency efforts along with, clean renewable energy development are a far better solution to meet our energy needs.
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