

April 09. 2015 2:01AM

## **Letter: Pipeline proposal is full of gas**

Winston Porter's op-ed supporting new natural gas pipelines ("Your View: Opposition to new natural gas pipelines is misplaced," April 5) repeated many common gas company talking points, but offered no data or new perspectives.

Here's fresh information: When Congress enacts legislation to cut emissions, New England's reliance on natural gas for electricity will decline. Today, about half of New England's electricity comes from natural gas. Regional Economic Models Inc. studied one national carbon tax proposal, and found that within 20 years of enactment, less than 20 percent of New England's electricity will be from natural gas. REMI's study suggests natural gas will be used for future electricity generation only if carbon capture and storage becomes economically feasible. Natural gas produces too much in carbon emissions to be affordable. REMI found our energy transition will happen quickly: Within five years of enacting a carbon tax, New England's natural gas use will peak. Why build long-term, expensive natural gas pipelines for an obvious short-term need?

Engineers at Stanford have studied each state's energy needs, geography and resources. They calculated that each state can provide all its energy needs by 2030 without natural gas. If we want to, within 15 years we could function without natural gas. Why build a pipeline now?

A Minnesota judge ruled a utility company couldn't build another natural gas power plant because smaller, distributed solar installations filled short-term needs better, was cheaper and freed ratepayers from gas's fluctuating prices.

Porter is right: Building natural gas pipelines is a no-brainer. However, it's time to use our brains.

Rabbi Judy Weiss  
Brookline

[LINK](#)