

I would like to thank the committee members for their hard work, and Meredith Hatfield for her helpful presentation in Plymouth.

I applaud the broad vision of the energy strategy, and the emphasis on energy conservation as well as renewable energy, which Ms. Hatfield highlighted in her talk. However, I feel that the emphasis is not as evident in a straight reading of the document, and I believe it is in the interests of NH's citizen's to make it very clear that the energy sources discussed in the report are by no means equal in their impact.

Specifically, I think it is essential to employ a simple rating system, or brief summary of positive versus adverse impacts, for each energy source. Relevant impacts would include environmental (in-state and out-of-state, since as we know from REGGI, NH is affected by our larger environment), carbon production, public health, economic (please include *long-term*), and social, along with sustainability/security considerations.

Such an analysis would make it immediately obvious that every dollar invested in conservation would have very different long-term and immediate results for our state compared, for instance, to dollars invested in a gas pipeline, and would allow the public, policymakers, and municipalities to have more informed conversations and decision processes.

Our state and our nation are facing critical decisions regarding energy choices. We cannot afford not to get it right. New Hampshire's Energy Strategy should provide a clear vision as well as specific guidance to help us achieve a sustainable future. By highlighting the relative impacts of each choice, the report could better guide us toward reliable energy sources that will enhance our quality of life, keep our energy dollars in-state, and preserve our independence.

Jennifer Highland
Bridgewater, NH