



January 17, 2017

54 Portsmouth Street  
Concord, NH 03301  
Tel. 603.224.9945  
Fax 603.228.0423  
info@forestsociety.org  
www.forestsociety.org

The Honorable Richard Barry, Chairman  
Committee on Science, Technology and Energy  
Legislative Office Building, Room 304  
33 North State St  
Concord, NH 03302

Dear Chairman Barry:

Thank you for this opportunity to present these comments in opposition to HB 199. As currently organized in RSA 362-F, New Hampshire's Renewable Portfolio Standard is designed to stimulate investments in renewable energy generation in New England and New Hampshire. We believe amending the statute as HB 199 proposes would enable hydro power from Canada to become eligible to participate in Renewable Energy Credit markets created by RSA 362-F. Before allowing this to occur, we would ask the Committee to consider the adverse impacts of such a change in state policy.

First, New Hampshire would now be opening the door to direct ratepayer subsidy of Canadian hydro. This was never the intention of the Renewable Energy Act when passed in 2007. Second, by its sheer size Canadian hydro would severely undercut, and possibly eliminate, the entire market for smaller scale renewable energy projects that the original law was designed to stimulate.

As one example, current law provides over \$186 million annually in direct economic benefits to the State through renewable energy credit sales by wood to energy plants, according to an analysis done by the NH Timberland Owners Association. These plants support over 500 jobs throughout the state in forestry, power plant operation and clean energy technology. The plants provide needed diversity in regional energy generation. All these economic benefits stay here in New Hampshire.

If enacted, HB 199 would starve home grown renewable energy investment and shift these investment dollars to Quebec. Hydro-Quebec, the Quebec's publicly owned electric utility, is now partnering with Eversource to build a transmission line in New Hampshire which both partners claimed six years ago would not require any subsidy to make the electricity shipped over the line competitively priced in New England. If market forces have changed to now require such a subsidy, why should it come from New Hampshire ratepayers and why should it come at the expense of a growing domestic market for renewable energy generation?

Instead, we would ask the Committee to focus on steps which will support the intended beneficiaries of the Renewable Energy Act are renewable energy projects located in New Hampshire and across New England. We urge you to ITL HB 199. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Matt Leahy, Public Policy Manager  
Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests.