

1 FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

2 U.S. COAST GUARD

3 -----

4

5 Public Meeting on the Broadwater LNG

6 Project

7

8 -----

9

Charles P. Wang Center

10

Stony Brook University

11

Stony Brook, New York

12

13

September 13, 2005

14

7:00 p.m.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

23

1120 "G" STREET, N.W., Suite 500

24

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

25

(202) 347-3700

1 PANEL

2

3 JIM MARTIN, Environmental Project Manager

4 FERC

5

6 CAPTAIN PETER BOYNTON, Coast Guard Captain

7 Port for Long Island Sound

8

9 ALAN BLUME, LCDR

10

11 LT. ANDREA LOGMAN, LCDR

12

13 JOANNE WACHHOLDER, Deputy Project Manager

14 FERC

15

16 BILL STAEGER, Entrix

17 Environmental Contractor

18

19 WAYNE KICKLIGHTER, FERC

20

21 AMY PARSONS, FERC

22

23

24

25

	I N D E X	
	SPEAKER	PAGE NO.
1		
2		
3	Jim Martin	7
4		
5	Capt. Boynton	14
6		
7	Senator LaValle	23
8		
9	Jon Snyder	26
10	(Congressman Bishop's office)	
11		
12	Michael White, Esq.,	30
13	Town of Huntington	
14		
15	Lauren Melton	36
16		
17	Samravit Tadesse	39
18		
19	James Meade	41
20		
21	Claire Kessler	45
22		
23	Davenport Plumer	48
24		
25	Terry Winters	52

I N D E X

1		
2		
3	Councilman Steve Fiore-Rosenfeld	55
4		
5	Kaitlin Boyd	59
6		
7	Joseph Gonzalez	62
8		
9	Edward Romaine, Suffolk County Clerk	64
10		
11	Jim Arnold	67
12		
13	Jennifer Joseph	69
14		
15	Dennis Demetres	72
16		
17	Serena Cohen	74
18		
19	Jenn DuPriest	77
20		
21	Ken Born	80
22		
23	Charles Hersh	83
24		
25	Mark Serotoff	86

1	I N D E X	
2	SPEAKER	PAGE NO.
3	Marge Acosta	91
4		
5	Louisse Kwamboka Nyamweya	95
6		
7	Jeffrey Levinson	99
8		
9	Yunnely Martinez	103
10		
11	Mike Blakeslee	104
12		
13	Doug Van Leuven	108
14		
15	Kyle Rabin	109
16		
17	Bob DeLuca	119
18		
19	Peter Maniscalco	121
20		
21	Dr. Joel Ziev	125
22		
23	Tom Burke	128
24		
25	Eric Bruzairis	130

	I N D E X	
1		
2		
3	Daniel Woulfin	132
4		
5	Cheryl Lynch	133
6		
7	Kay Contino	133
8		
9	Scott Zotto	134
10		
11	Randy Stein	135
12		
13	Don Seubert	135
14		
15	Ernie Fazio	138
16		
17	Mike Padi	141
18		
19	Norris McDonald	142
20		
21	Tony Caserta	145
22		
23	Charlie Ott	148
24		
25	Marie Pensick	148

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 MR. MARTIN: Good evening. Thank you for
3 coming tonight. My name is Jim Martin. I am with
4 the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission or FERC.
5 Seated with me here tonight is the U.S. Coast Guard,
6 Captain of the Port for Long Island Sound, Captain
7 Peter Boynton. He is joined here tonight by LCDR
8 Alan Blume and Lieutenant Logman.

9 Also present from FERC is my branch chief
10 Lonnie Lister and my deputy project manager, Joanne
11 Wacholder. Our environmental contractor, Entrix, is
12 represented by Bill Staeger, seated next to me, and
13 Wayne Kicklighter and Amy Parsons, who are assisting
14 Joanne at the table in the front.

15 We are here tonight to provide some
16 information and to hear your comments on the
17 Broadwater Energy LNG Project.

18 I would like to take a moment to briefly
19 describe the project. Broadwater is proposing to
20 build and operate a liquefied natural gas terminal
21 near the center of Long Island Sound. LNG is
22 natural gas or methane that has been cooled to an
23 extremely cool temperature, -260 degrees. The gas
24 is not stored under pressure and is not explosive in
25 its liquid state.

1 The terminal would be permanently moored
2 approximately nine miles offshore from Long Island
3 and ten miles offshore from Connecticut. The
4 terminal would consist of a Floating Storage and
5 Regasification Unit that would be approximately
6 1,200 feet in length, 200 feet in width, and rising
7 approximately 80 feet above the water line.

8 The FSRU would be designed to accommodate
9 a net storage capacity of approximately 350,000
10 cubic meters of LNG, or the equivalent of 8 billion
11 cubic feet of natural gas. The LNG would be
12 delivered to the FSRU in LNG carriers at the
13 frequency of two to three carriers per week.

14 The FSRU would have a closed-loop
15 vaporization system to vaporize, or regasify, the
16 LNG at a typical rate of 1.0 billion cubic feet per
17 day. The gas would be directed into a send-out
18 pipeline that would extend about 22 miles to an
19 offshore connection with the existing Iroquois
20 pipeline, which provides natural gas to New York and
21 Connecticut markets.

22 Tonight's meeting is a joint meeting
23 hosted by FERC and the U.S. Coast Guard. We have
24 slightly different review processes that this
25 meeting will support, but fundamentally the whole

1 purpose of tonight's meeting is to provide each of
2 you an opportunity to give us your comments and to
3 tell us what the environmental, safety and security
4 issues are that you think we should address in our
5 respective analyses of the Broadwater Project.

6 I will briefly describe the FERC process
7 and then Captain Boynton will discuss the Coast
8 Guard process.

9 The FERC staff's environmental and
10 engineering analysis will result in the generation
11 of an environmental impact statement or EIS. FERC
12 is the lead federal agency tasked with preparing the
13 EIS. We are fortunate to have several cooperating
14 agencies that will help us ensure that all concerns
15 are represented. Cooperating agencies include the
16 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Environmental
17 Protection Agency, the National Marine Fisheries
18 Service, the U.S. Department of Transportation, the
19 New York State Department of State, and our partner
20 agency, the Coast Guard.

21 I would like to take a few moments now to
22 further explain the purpose of tonight's public
23 meeting. First, I would like to clarify that the
24 Broadwater proposal was not conceived by and is not
25 promoted by either FERC or the Coast Guard. FERC

1 reviews applications for the import of natural gas,
2 and Broadwater is in the process of preparing an
3 application to submit to FERC. Once the application
4 is submitted, our obligation is to review that
5 application and prepare an analysis of the
6 environmental impact.

7 Tonight's meeting is not a public hearing.
8 We are not here to debate the proposal or to make
9 any determinations on its fate. We are here to
10 listen to your concerns so that we can consider them
11 in our analysis. Based on the letters we have
12 received, we understand that many people are opposed
13 to the concept of having an offshore natural gas
14 import facility. Others raised concerns about
15 environmental impacts or safety considerations.
16 That is, some objections are general in nature and
17 some objections are based on potential environmental
18 and safety impacts. Both categories are important
19 to FERC, but they are addressed in different ways.
20 General objections to the project would be
21 considered during the Commission's public interest
22 review; whereas, environmental safety impacts are
23 addressed by the FERC staff in our EIS.

24 An EIS is an analysis of impacts to
25 resources and does not analyze specifically public

1 opinions. With that said, we request that your
2 comments tonight focus on the potential effects of
3 the project. Specifically, we are here to ask for
4 your help in identifying potential impacts to both
5 the human and natural environment of Long Island
6 Sound.

7 In our Notice of Intent, issued on August
8 11, we requested your comments and assigned a
9 deadline of October 7th. We will take comments
10 throughout our review of the project, but for us to
11 adequately address your comments, analyze them and
12 research the issues, we ask you to try to get those
13 to us as soon as possible.

14 A speaker's list is located at the back
15 table. We will use that list to identify
16 individuals wishing to provide verbal comments on
17 the Broadwater project.

18 In addition to verbal comments provided
19 tonight, we will also accept your written comments.
20 Many people have already submitted written comments
21 to the FERC docket. If you have comments but don't
22 wish to speak tonight, you may provide written
23 comments on the comment form on that back table or
24 mail them to us at a later date. Be sure to include
25 the project docket number, PF05-4. I think that's

1 on all the forms and notices.

2 The Broadwater project is currently in our
3 Pre-filing Process. That is, an application has not
4 yet been filed with FERC. We consider the
5 Pre-filing process to be, amongst other things, an
6 extension of our scoping process. The scoping
7 process is a learning process. It is where we
8 educate ourselves about the project and the
9 potential impact.

10 During the scoping process we gather
11 information and we agree, using a number of
12 different sources for that information. The four
13 general sources that we are using right now are:

14 Information provided by the applicant.

15 Input from other agencies.

16 Our own fieldwork and research of
17 different issues; and.

18 Information from the public.

19 Once we gather the information during the
20 scoping process, we will analyze it and we will
21 prepare a Draft Environmental Impact Statement, or a
22 Draft EIS, that will be distributed for comments.

23 There are two general ways that you can
24 get a copy of the Draft EIS.

25 First of all, the Notice of Intent that we

1 sent out has an attachment on the back of it that
2 you can fill out and mail back to FERC.

3 Secondly, you can fill in the form on the
4 back table, the "Mailing List," and print your name
5 and address and we will add you to the mailing list.

6 If you don't do one of those two things,
7 we won't be able to send you a copy of the Draft
8 EIS.

9 After the Draft EIS is issued, there is a
10 45-day comment period. During that period we
11 normally will hold another public meeting similar in
12 format to this one. We will probably come back
13 here, to this same facility, if it is available, and
14 ask you to comment on the information provided in
15 the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

16 At the end of the 45-day time period, we
17 begin synthesizing all the information gathered to
18 date and preparing the final EIS. Once we have
19 issued the final EIS, it is forwarded to our
20 Commissioners. Our Commissioners at the Federal
21 Energy Regulatory Commission will use that document,
22 as well as other information, to make a
23 determination of whether or not to grant an
24 authorization for this project.

25 At this time, Captain Boynton will

1 describe the work being performed by the Coast
2 Guard. Following the Coast Guard presentation, we
3 will begin to listen to your comments.

4 CAPT. BOYNTON: Thank you, Jim.

5 My name is Captain Peter Boynton. I am
6 the Coast Guard Captain of the Port of Long Island
7 Sound, and I am responsible for the Coast Guard
8 operations in Connecticut, on Long Island Sound and
9 on the north and south shore of Long Island.

10 I would like to provide some information
11 tonight on the Coast Guard process in reviewing and
12 assessing the Broadwater application and also
13 listening to your comments and concerns.

14 As Jim mentioned, the Coast Guard is
15 neither an advocate nor an opponent to the proposed
16 project. The Coast Guard's role, as a cooperating
17 agency with FERC, is to assess the safety and
18 security of the proposed project. When we assess
19 safety and security in projects like this, or when
20 we manage ongoing operations on the water, such as
21 the movement of existing tankers on Long Island
22 Sound, we do that by managing risk.

23 The Coast Guard does not eliminate risk.
24 When we manage commercial vessel operations in
25 places like Long Island Sound, we manage risk. When

1 we manage risk, we break it down into three
2 components: Threat, vulnerability and consequences.
3 So when we assess safety and when we assess security
4 for the Broadwater proposal, we will do that by
5 looking at all three components of risk, what are
6 the threats to safety and security or the
7 vulnerabilities to safety and security, and what are
8 the potential consequences to any gaps in safety and
9 security? Then we will look at potential mitigating
10 factors in any of those gaps. Then we will assess
11 what resources will be needed to fill those gaps.

12 The Coast Guard has been involved in
13 collecting public input already. That includes
14 having attended a couple dozen open houses, both on
15 Long Island and in Connecticut, to hear the concerns
16 of the public. We are also joining FERC tonight to
17 hold this, the first of four public meetings over
18 the next two weeks, to listen to public concerns.

19 We also have received a number of letters.
20 For the last month or longer, I have been receiving
21 about 160 letters on some days. I have read all of
22 them; I will do my best to continue reading all of
23 them. They have all been entered into the docket as
24 part of the record. Up to this time I have
25 responded to all those letters. I will continue to

1 do that to the extent that I am able.

2 I would like to talk briefly about our
3 safety assessment and our security assessment:
4 First, the safety assessment.

5 We began our safety assessment process by
6 holding what is called a Port and Waterways Safety
7 Assessment, referred to by its acronym PAWSA. Over
8 the last five years or so, the Coast Guard has done
9 ports and waterway safety assessments about three
10 dozen times at various places around the country,
11 not necessarily for LNG projects, but to look at
12 waterway safety in many areas of the country. PAWSA
13 is designed to look at waterway safety over a given
14 body of water, in a general fashion. It is not
15 designed to look specifically at the Broadwater
16 proposal, but we held a PAWSA for Long Island in
17 May. We did that in order to have a baseline look
18 at the safety issues affecting Long Island Sound.

19 We wanted to do this baseline safety
20 assessment with a good cross-section of waterway
21 users. We specifically did not want to do an
22 assessment that only involved the Coast Guard. In
23 order to do that, we invited 30 waterway users to a
24 two-day workshop held in Port Jefferson last May.
25 These included environmental group representatives,

1 commercial vessel operator representatives,
2 recreational boating representatives, commercial
3 fishing representatives, police and fire agencies
4 and other government agencies.

5 We have published the results of that
6 ports and waterway assessment on the Coast Guard
7 website. There's a handout at the door that lists
8 the URL for that website. We encourage you to look
9 at that to get a sense of some of the broad safety
10 issues currently affecting Long Island Sound. Some
11 of those include environmental issues, and by
12 "environmental," I mean things like visibility and
13 lighting. They include congestion in certain areas
14 of the Sound, and they include congestion of mixed
15 use of the Sound: Commercial vessels, recreational
16 vessels, fishing vessels all using the same parts of
17 the waterway, especially in locations like at risk.

18 PAWSA noted the current use of Long Island
19 Sound. For example, we currently receive about 700
20 commercial vessel arrivals from foreign ports all
21 around the world every year. The number changes a
22 bit from year to year, but it's about 700 foreign
23 vessel arrivals a year. In addition, Long Island
24 Sound receives about 1,200 domestic commercial
25 arrivals per year. These are both ships and tug

1 boats with barges. So about 1900 commercial vessels
2 arrive in Long Island Sound and off-load cargo every
3 year.

4 In addition to those 1900 commercial
5 vessels that arrive here, we estimated that there is
6 somewhere between 2,000 to 4,000 commercial vessels
7 that are transit into Long Island Sound, not
8 stopping but using the Sound as sort of I95 on the
9 water. Many of these vessels are headed to and from
10 the Port of New York and New Jersey. They include
11 ships and many tug boats with barges. So if add
12 those numbers together, that's roughly 4,000 to
13 6,000 commercial vessels transiting the Sound every
14 year. This is in addition to tens of thousands
15 recreational boaters and many fishermen.

16 We will take the results of that PAWSA as
17 a baseline and look at impacts that the Broadwater
18 proposal might have on the safety of the Sound. For
19 example, what impact would LNG tankers have on
20 existing congestion? What impact might the tankers
21 have on existing navigation? We will do that with
22 another group of waterways' users, rather than just
23 the Coast Guard.

24 I would like to talk a little about our
25 security assessment. The security assessment that

1 the Coast Guard is doing will differ in important
2 ways from the safety assessment. We have tried to
3 make the safety assessment as open and transparent
4 as we can so that it has maximum visibility to the
5 public and waterway users. It's a different story
6 with security. Because of the nature of security,
7 we are not doing the assessment in a public forum.
8 We are using what is called the area maritime
9 security committee, which I chair for Long Island
10 Sound. There are roughly 40 Coast Guard Captains of
11 port all around country, and each one of them chairs
12 a maritime security committee. Those committees are
13 made up of federal agencies, state and local. They
14 are made up of industries that use the water and, in
15 our case here in Long Island Sound, they include
16 representatives from both Long Island and
17 Connecticut.

18 We have established a subcommittee of the
19 Maritime Security Committee to review security
20 aspects of this project. Because this is security
21 information, this is done at a level called Special
22 Security Information, which is not releasable to the
23 public, but I do want to describe our process. The
24 process is that we look at risk with its
25 three components; what do we anticipate a threat to

1 be? What do we anticipate the vulnerability of both
2 the tankers and the fixed platform in there? And
3 what do we anticipate the consequences might be if
4 an incident occurred?

5 When we do that, we are making use of a
6 new study released in January of this year, a study
7 done by the Sandia National Labs, a component of the
8 Department of Energy. Over the years there have
9 been many LNG studies done that have varied
10 tremendously, in large part because they used
11 different assumptions going into the study. The
12 Coast Guard will be using the results of the Sandia
13 Lab Study, which looks at both risk and consequences
14 of an LNG spill on water due to both an accidental
15 and intentional incident. That study will be used
16 by the Coast Guard officials not only in looking at
17 the applications here in Long Island Sound, but
18 other LNG applications around the country. That
19 study or Sandia Lab report is also available on the
20 web and we have listed the URL to obtain that study
21 on the handout.

22 In many of the letters that I received and
23 many of the comments that I have heard in public
24 meetings I have attended so far, people ask or
25 comment on the security and safety zones that will

1 be used for the tanker or the floating platform.
2 We have not yet completed the safety and security
3 review, so I can't yet tell you how large those
4 security zones might be, but I can tell you that it
5 is likely that there will be security and safety
6 zones for both the tanker and the fixed platform.

7 In the case of the tanker, the Coast Guard
8 typically uses moving security zones, that
9 forward anchor, as it is inbound and outbound. In
10 case of the large moving zones with a typical tanker
11 speed, it takes roughly 15 minutes for that moving
12 zone to pass any given spot. That time will vary,
13 based on the size of the zone and the speed of the
14 tanker. I give that to you as an example.

15 In the case of the fixed moored barge, we
16 anticipate there will always be a safety and
17 security zone. That zone will be fixed in place
18 around the facility. As I said, we have not yet
19 determined the size of that zone.

20 Our next steps are to complete the safety
21 and security assessments. We will not complete
22 those until after we have received the formal
23 application from Broadwater. Once we have completed
24 the safety and security assessments, we will provide
25 those in a report to FERC, and FERC will include

1 those results, to the extent that they are
2 releasable -- and not all the security results will
3 be releasable -- they will provide those in the
4 Draft EIS that they produce, the Draft Environmental
5 Impact Statement.

6 Thank you.

7 MR. MARTIN: Thank you, Captain Boynton.

8 Now we will begin taking your comments.

9 When your name is read, I would like you to come up
10 to the podium. I want you to state your name for
11 the record. All of your comments will be
12 transcribed and included in the records of the
13 project. Those records are available at our
14 website, at WWW.FERC.GOV. At that page, select
15 E-library, and input docket number PF05-4.

16 You can use the library to get access to
17 everything the Commission does with this project.
18 It's available and it's always filing the
19 information submitted by Broadwater.

20 For your comments, I ask that you try to
21 be as specific as possible with your environment and
22 safety and security concerns. As stated in our
23 notice, the meeting is scheduled to conclude at
24 about 10:00, so we have a good, solid two-and-a-half
25 hours or so. It looks like we have approximately 36

1 to 40 speakers signed up, so that would be around
2 three or four minutes per person. I ask that you
3 make every attempt to try to keep it to that so that
4 we can make sure that everyone that would like to
5 speak has an opportunity to do so.

6 If your comments have been previously
7 stated by another speaker, you may also provide
8 additional time for other speakers by saying you
9 endorse the comments provided by the earlier
10 speaker. Thank you for your consideration.

11 MR. STAEGER: Jim is giving me the
12 opportunity to mispronounce many of your names. I
13 apologize in advance for that. We are going to
14 start off with public speakers. Let's start off
15 with State Senator Ken LaValle.

16 SENATOR LAVALLE: Thank you very much.
17 State Senator Ken LaValle, from the First Senatorial
18 District. I am pleased to speak at tonight's
19 hearing with regard to Broadwater Liquefied Natural
20 Gas, LNG facility which has been proposed for Long
21 Island Sound. It is my understanding that the
22 proposal in the terminal will be sited nine miles
23 off the North Fork and would require a two-mile
24 buffer zone. The buffer would be off limits to all
25 the vessels and would be made a "no fly zone" as

1 well.

2 LNG would require regular deliveries from
3 the foreign ports two to three times weekly. The
4 vessels delivering the gas would require a U.S.
5 Coast Guard escort at a cost of approximately \$8,000
6 per trip.

7 During my tenure I have worked closely
8 with those involved in the Long Island Sound study.
9 Many years and millions of dollars have been
10 invested to improve the quality of the Sound for the
11 habitat and recreational use. Since 1985, 45
12 million in federal tax dollars have been contributed
13 to protect the Long Island Sound and 200 million has
14 been invested through New York State's Clean Water
15 Pond Act. The Long Island Sound is recognized as an
16 estuary of national significance. It makes no sense
17 to install a huge industrial facility owned by a
18 multi-national corporation in this precious public
19 waterway.

20 The 25-mile pipeline required to carry the
21 LNG to the existing pipeline from Connecticut will
22 degrade the already stressed ecosystem of the Sound.
23 LNG is a hazardous, flammable material. Spilled LNG
24 would disburse faster on water than land because
25 water spills provide a very limited time for

1 containment. LNG also vaporizes more quickly on
2 water because the ocean provides an enormous source.

3 Most experts agree that the risks
4 associated with shipping, loading and off loading
5 LNG are much greater than those associated with land
6 based storage facilities. It should also be noted
7 that in North America plans for six proposed
8 terminals have been abandoned because people do not
9 want these terminals anywhere near them.

10 In proposing a facility of this kind in
11 the waters of Eastern Long Island, we must also give
12 great consideration to the increased risk of a
13 terrorist attack. Potential targets that currently
14 exist in this region include the nuclear submarine
15 base in New London, the U.S. Department of
16 Agriculture research facility in Plum Island, and
17 the Millstone Nuclear Power Plant just across the
18 Sound. By air all these sites are located within
19 about five or ten minutes of one another.

20 The proposed LNG site will also negatively
21 impact on tourism. The massive facility would be
22 bright lighted at night and would emit CO2 into the
23 atmosphere. The required exclusion zone would
24 prevent public use of these waters. Currently no
25 marine regasification facility exists to provide a

1 model to be observed and evaluated. Furthermore,
2 Long Island would not benefit from this facility as
3 the LNG regassified at this proposed site would be
4 destined for New York City and Connecticut.

5 I would also like to indicate that I have
6 introduced legislation which provides that the
7 Commissioner of the New York State Office of General
8 Services, in conjunction with the Department of
9 Environmental Conservation and the Department of
10 State will review all leases of underwater lands in
11 the state. In addition, projects that risk
12 endangering the environment would require thorough
13 investigation, with the preparation of an
14 Environmental Impact Statement and hearing. I
15 believe this legislation sponsored by Assemblyman
16 DiNapoli, who is the Chair of the Assembly
17 Environmental Committee, is in the true tradition of
18 our federalist system that we believe would enable
19 us to have full input and protect New York State's
20 interests. Thank you very much.

21 (Applause.)

22 MR. STAEGER: Next is Jon Snyder, from
23 Congressman Tim Bishop's office.

24 MR. SNYDER: I thank you very much. I
25 will be reading some remarks on the Congressman's

1 behalf.

2 I would like to thank FERC, the Department
3 of Homeland Security, and the Coast Guard for
4 holding this meeting tonight. I regret that I am
5 unable to attend in person now that the House is
6 back in session. While I appreciate this hearing, I
7 propose the process that Congress and the
8 administration have created where FERC has the
9 Supervisor to dismiss state, county and local
10 concerns. I urge FERC to remember a piece of
11 school-yard wisdom: Just because you can, doesn't
12 mean you should.

13 I would especially like to thank all the
14 citizens who have taken the time out of their busy
15 schedules to attend tonight. Throughout the past
16 several months citizens have devoted so much of
17 their precious time and energy to stand up against
18 Broadwater. I urge the decision makers on this
19 panel and in Washington to listen to these citizens.
20 These are not professional lobbyists, they're not
21 hired guns brought in from out of state. These are
22 ordinary people who live in the community. They did
23 not come to this process with any preconception and
24 do not stand to gain or lose money from Broadwater,
25 they are simply here to stand up for healthy and

1 safety of the Long Island Sound.

2 I am wholeheartedly against the Broadwater
3 proposal. I believe Long Island needs a more
4 reliable energy supply and I believe there are
5 preferable alternatives. I have chosen a project
6 not by the need to bring more energy for a region,
7 but by whether we can keep our Long Island Sound and
8 industrial park from being exploited or a natural
9 resource to be protected. I do not support
10 industrializing the Long Island Sound.

11 Let me share some of my specific concerns:
12 I am concerned about safety. There are many
13 unanswered questions about a potential explosion on
14 the platform, in terms of its affect on the
15 surrounding community, the impact of thermal
16 radiation, and what efforts would be made to have
17 rescue personnel. There are also questions about
18 all kinds of exclusion zones which would be needed
19 around the platform and whether the Coast Guard has
20 the resources to protect the facility and the
21 tankers.

22 As you know, the Coast Guard is already
23 stretched very thin with its existing Homeland
24 Security and rescue functions. I fear that the
25 Broadwater platform and tankers would not be

1 properly protected for working at the redeployment
2 and take away from existing efforts. And talk about
3 its potential impact on the environment. As you
4 know, more than 20 million people live within 50
5 miles of Long Island Sound, making it one of our
6 nation's most impacted bodies of water.

7 We have seen the impact of water pollution
8 and the effect that it has on marine life, but
9 thanks to a lot of hard work, we have been turning
10 the corner. We have been working reducing pollution
11 in the Sound, and protecting vital space along our
12 shores. What will the impact be of an industrial
13 plant in place in the middle of the Sound, with 80
14 billion cubic feet of natural gas on board? There
15 is concern about air pollution and water pollution;
16 additionally, tankers coming and going at all hours,
17 any residents are concerned about light and noise
18 pollution.

19 I am also concerned that a private company
20 will potentially own a piece of the Long Island
21 Sound, can create a wide exclusion zone just off
22 limits to boaters and fishermen. In my opinion, the
23 Long Island Sound belongs to all of us and I don't
24 think any company should have that right.

25 (Applause.)

1 Finally, perhaps the biggest question we
2 must ask is if this would be a turning point for the
3 Long Island Sound? Once we build one industrial
4 platform and have a Coast Guard presence, what
5 happens inevitably when another company smells an
6 opportunity for private profits from our public
7 waterways? Will the taxpayers of Long Islanders be
8 required to foot the bill for increased Coast Guard
9 security?

10 I understand that FERC and the Coast Guard
11 have a number issues to examine, ranging from the
12 safety and operation of this platform, wherever it
13 fits into our nation's energy policies, but there
14 are other considerations. I urge you to factor in
15 the concerns I have raised and a voice from a
16 community that does not want to industrialize the
17 Sound, that does not want Broadwater.

18 Thank you very much.

19 (Applause.)

20 MR. STAEGER: Michael White, attorney
21 from the Town of Huntington.

22 MR. WHITE: Good evening. My name is
23 Michael White. I am a partner with the law firm of
24 Jaspan, Schlessinger and Hoffman. We represent the
25 Town of Huntington in connection with the

1 application of Broadwater Energy for a liquid
2 natural gas facility in Long Island Sound.

3 Huntington is the western most town in
4 Suffolk County on Long Island Sound. We have been
5 directed by the town to present comments on behalf
6 of town in response to the FERC notice of intent to
7 prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the
8 Broadwater filing. We understand the time
9 constraints will allow only brief verbal comment
10 this evening. You can be assured that we will be
11 submitting detailed written comments to the record
12 on or before the deadline presently set for such
13 comments, October 7, 2005.

14 Our first comment this evening is with
15 respect to process. The Supervisor of the town,
16 Frank Petrone, has sent a letter on behalf of the
17 town to FERC, protesting the fact that there is no
18 public meeting scheduled in Huntington or any
19 location on Long Island west of Stony Brook. I
20 would like to enter Supervisor Patrone's letter into
21 the record here this evening, and I will leave that
22 for you.

23 The Town of Huntington is particularly
24 important in this scoping process as Broadwater
25 contemplates a connection to the Iroquois gas

1 transmission system, which makes land fall in the
2 town and runs through the town, as the contemplated
3 recipient of the gas flow from Broadwater. There
4 are particular risks and impact to the town; there's
5 currently no direct benefit to the town. Like any
6 other development project, the cost to the
7 community, specifically the cost of public services
8 and resources must be identified.

9 You should also be aware that the town has
10 continued concerns about the operation of the
11 Iroquois gas transmission system. Not that long ago
12 Iroquois caused a general public panic in the town
13 with the venting gas which Iroquois reported was
14 unavoidable and routine.

15 The town has another particular
16 involvement to the proposed project, as under the
17 town's Marine Conservation Law, Broadwater will be
18 required to obtain a permit from the town should it
19 choose to connect to and utilize the Iroquois
20 system. Supervisor Petrone has volunteered the Town
21 of Huntington Town Hall as a venue for an additional
22 scoping meeting, to accommodate the public from
23 Huntington and other nearby Long Island sound
24 communities, but to date has received no response.

25 More substantively, the town board of the

1 Town of Huntington unanimously adopted Resolution
2 2004, 431, on June 7 2005, opposing the siting of
3 the Broadwater Project and its related
4 infrastructure in Long Island Sound. I will also
5 leave for the record this evening a certified copy
6 of that resolution.

7 This opposition is based upon the town's
8 continuing commitment to the protection of the Long
9 Island Sound ecosystem, as well as overall concern
10 that the Broadwater Project will have an adverse
11 impact on the environmental stability and economic
12 viability of Long Island Sound. However, as FERC is
13 determined to proceed with the prefiling
14 environmental review of the project and preparation
15 of the Environmental Impact Statement, starting with
16 the scoping process, Huntington will submit detailed
17 written comments on environmental planning,
18 maritime, engineering, and legal issues in
19 conjunction with FERC's identification of the
20 potential impacts of the project. Given the town's
21 request for an additional public scoping meeting, we
22 ask FERC to consider the deadline for all such
23 written comments to be extended accordingly.

24 This evening our comments focus first on
25 demanding the EIS identify and discuss the need for

1 the project in the first instance. Broadwater
2 publications speak of scarcity of natural gas in the
3 northeast and concerns in meeting our energy needs
4 and that Broadwater may joint venture TransCanada's
5 pipeline and that it would build and operate gas
6 pipelines and Shell Gas and Power, an energy that
7 mines, refines and sells petroleum, is saying "We
8 need more natural gas." More over, they have
9 determined by their own criteria, which undoubtedly
10 included emphasis on their own profits, that Long
11 Island Sound is the best place to put their natural
12 gas storage and distribution facility.

13 The EIS independently addressed the need
14 for such a facility in this location against other
15 types of energy facilities, as well as conservation,
16 or even this type of facility in another location.
17 For example, as an alternative location, assuming we
18 actually need such natural gas facility or more
19 natural gas in the first instance, the federal
20 government appears to be looking for a new use for
21 Plum Island. It is difficult to understand how the
22 middle of an estuary of such special significance
23 has been determined or predetermined as the best
24 location for storing, at any given time, eight
25 billion cubic feet of explosive petroleum product,

1 that if released would cause an environmental
2 disaster. The premise is simply a contradiction of
3 millions of dollars of public money spent to study,
4 protect and improve water quality in Long Island
5 Sound, reduce point and non-point discharges to Long
6 Island Sound, and protect and restore the fisheries
7 of Long Island Sound.

8 Therefore, a true independent analysis of
9 alternatives viewing the Broadwater Project in light
10 of the comprehensive conservation and management
11 plan to protect Long Island Sound, and the Long
12 Island Sound agreement which affirms New York's and
13 Connecticut's commitment to Long Island Sound is
14 essential. Furthermore, identifying and assessing
15 the cumulative impacts of the Broadwater Project is
16 imperative. There is no doubt that even with
17 Broadwater energy, the project will have an impact
18 on the environment. The EIS must address the impact
19 of the Broadwater Project if it were the only LNG
20 facility, along with the other existing impacts that
21 already exist for Long Island Sound. A related
22 question is if Long Island Sound has one LNG
23 facility, would that be all or would the acceptance
24 of one facility invite more, and what would be the
25 impact of another ten or more facilities on Long

1 Island Sound?

2 Finally, we request that the analysis of
3 the impact and the resource studies related to the
4 project, such as those which assess habitat, fishery
5 stocks, and water quality be undertaken prior to
6 respective involved resource agencies, such as the
7 United States Environmental Protection Agency, the
8 National Marine Fishery Service, and the New York
9 State Department of Environmental Conversation, not
10 by FERC and certainly not by Broadwater or any of
11 its consultants. It is difficult to accept that
12 FERC, proponent of energy generation facilities,
13 could provide a true independent analysis of the
14 issues in any other way.

15 The town looks forward to its response on
16 its request for an additional public scoping
17 meeting. Thank you.

18 (Applause.)

19 MR. STAEGER: Next speaker, Lauren
20 Melton.

21 MS. MELTON: My name is Lauren Melton and
22 I just have a couple of comments that I would like
23 to make.

24 On the surface the Broadwater plan looks
25 good. The intentions behind it seem ideal, to bring

1 more fuel and cheaper fuel to Long Island and New
2 York as a whole. However, by examining it through
3 cost benefit analysis, the cost greatly outweighs
4 the benefits. This plan will do little to help Long
5 Island economically; it will harm our environment
6 and it will negatively impact individual citizens.

7 On the economic side, Broadwater will not
8 benefit Long Island, after all. Long Island will
9 only receive 18.75 percent of the gas pumped through
10 the pipeline. I do not believe that this will
11 greatly alleviate our fuel burden. Furthermore, it
12 may actually block shipping channels used to require
13 safety zones, thereby hindering area industries.
14 Furthermore, local industries, such as commercial
15 fishing and tourism may be significantly injured by
16 this plan.

17 Environmentally, this plan will have a
18 hugely negative impact. First of all, the 25 mile
19 pipeline will take years to build. Secondly, the
20 FSRU will be anchored into the sound regardless of all
21 the precautions that we have been taking, and will
22 harm local wild life.

23 Long Island Sound is extremely delicate
24 ecosystem, and there are already many species that
25 are endangered. For example, lobsters were already

1 impacted a few years ago by a brown tide and are
2 having trouble recovering as it is. I believe that
3 implementation of this plan will further harm this
4 species as well as many other fish and plant life in
5 the Sound.

6 Secondly, the FSRU location is near
7 several ship and plane wrecks in the Sound, which
8 act as our official reefs. This may displace fish,
9 fish and divers alike.

10 Lastly, great lengths have been taken to
11 implement artificial reefs to observe fish
12 populations and to keep Long Island Sound clean.
13 Too much, in fact, has been done to conserve Long
14 Island's delicate ecosystem. Therefore, I would
15 advise you not to review a plan which will
16 jeopardize all the environmental strides already
17 taken.

18 In terms of individual citizens, there are
19 many groups that will be affected by this plan,
20 including people that live along the Long Island
21 shoreline, recreational fishermen, recreational
22 divers and recreational boaters, just to name a few.
23 I believe that the safety zone that would be put in
24 place enters the building with the pipeline and the
25 placing of FSRU will greatly hinder especially

1 recreational fishermen, divers, and boaters and,
2 therefore, will take away our livelihood that has
3 existed for decades on Long Island and it might
4 create problems for people who live along shore line
5 with the noise pollution and light pollution, as
6 well as possible pollution into the Sound.

7 Natural gas is not going to last forever.
8 What happens then? What happens when the natural
9 gas runs out? If you go through with this plan you
10 may have cheaper fuel for 15 years or 25 years, but
11 you will have an injured economy and a marred
12 environment forever. Thank you.

13 (Applause.)

14 MR. STAEGER: Next speaker.

15 MS. TADESSE: Good evening. My name is
16 Samravit Tadesse. I am here to talk about
17 Broadwater. Proposing a storage facility for
18 natural gas in the middle of Long Island Sound will
19 threaten the Sound. As Senator LaValle said, Long
20 Island was recognized as an estuary of national
21 significance by the Congress in 1987. This insured
22 that the federal government would spend money in
23 order to preserve Long Island Sound. New York and
24 Connecticut have locally spent millions of dollars
25 to that end.

1 Storage of natural gas in Long Island
2 Sound is not a great environmentally sound idea.
3 There is a significant danger to people and wildlife
4 who reside in and around the Sound. Although the
5 proposal offers the floating of a large grounding
6 area for the platform for the Broadwater Project,
7 there will be approximately three square miles to be
8 considered, with no boating, no fishing and no
9 diving zone; yet, there is still a chance of leakage
10 and, I guess, problems from liquid gas -- not liquid
11 gas but the gas being transported by the tankers,
12 and also that are restricting the larger areas of
13 the Sound from other amenities that would affect the
14 economy. Fishermen, global, recreational, and
15 professional, would have little access to the area.
16 That would be completely inaccessible.

17 About 5 to 25 billion dollars is generated
18 from fisheries on Long Island Sound. If that area
19 becomes inaccessible due to safety reasons, the
20 whole fishing industry around that area would be
21 crippled. Possible spills, run offs or even
22 discharges from the pipeline would cause serious
23 damage to the Sound. We know about this. The very
24 presence of dozens of boats in the Sound added to
25 the Long Island industrial structure would

1 definitely be an eyesore for anybody who enjoys the
2 scenic view of the Sound.

3 We would ask why the Congress declares the
4 Long Island Sound an estuary to preserve in its
5 natural state, but then would allow it become an
6 industrialized site that undermines the current
7 status of the Sound as well as destroying it as a
8 tourist attraction. Maybe you don't have to look at
9 the changes the Broadwater project would have on
10 Long Island; it will add to the pollution overall
11 from the building to the platform, to make the
12 pipeline. It would seriously hinder the quality of
13 life. So we must keep Sound as it was meant to be.
14 Let's keep the Sound naturally. Thank you.

15 (Applause.)

16 MR. STAEGER: The next speaker is James
17 Meade.

18 MR. MEADE: My name is James Meade. I am
19 a retired marine engineer. The focus of my
20 questions this evening are the operational safety of
21 the barge and the tankers, and my questions are
22 primarily directed to the Coast Guard. I do not
23 expect answers this evening, but I would like them
24 to be considered and addressed in the report.

25 The 90 foot yoke which will act as both a

1 mooring and discharge line, the product will be
2 rated for what force winds when both barge and berth
3 are moving together?

4 What Coast Guard endorsements will be
5 required of the barge operators? Will they be
6 tanker men, pumper men, et cetera?

7 Where will they get this training and how
8 will receipt time required for the normal Coast
9 Guard endorsements be handled?

10 Will the Coast Guard require all barge
11 personnel to the standards of training certificate
12 and watch keeping trends?

13 What provisions are being planned when
14 heavy weather forces the suspension of product
15 discharge between the tanker and the barge, and what
16 conditions will cause this knowledge?

17 Should stoppage occur, will the tanker be
18 allowed to anchor in the sound or move to sea?
19 According to the operational plans so far, only one
20 tanker will berth with a barge at a time. Support
21 tugs will assist and defer; will the Coast Guard
22 require that tugs have a fire-fighting capability
23 and that they stand as ready 24/7, while cargo
24 operations are conducted?

25 Will the Coast Guard require that only one

1 tanker at a time be in the waters of the Long Island
2 Sound? Will tankers be permitted to pass each other
3 or anchor while in the waters of Long Island Sound?

4 In the list of basic activities of the
5 barge, the storage capacity of the barge exceeds the
6 amount of LNG that any one tankers could deliver.
7 How would the free surface of the LNG being stored
8 be rendered inert or prohibited from gassing the
9 equipment? There appears to be no refrigeration
10 equipment listed on the barge for this purpose.

11 If nitrogen is used as an inert material,
12 how would the Coast Guard require it to be disposed
13 of after it is mixed with the LNG? Much has been
14 said that a gas balloon that might develop as a
15 result of a spill and a rapid phase transition will
16 have to travel a great distance to find an ignition
17 source. The operation of the barge and the tanker
18 make that the source of ignition.

19 What will the Coast Guard requirement be
20 for an emergency shut down of power on the barge and
21 the tanker? An in the event of an emergency
22 shutdown, how will the Coast Guard require the fire-
23 fighting building be maintained?

24 The safety zone to be considered by the
25 Coast Guard could be as much as five miles,

1 according to previous comments and Broadwater
2 meetings. With the barge in the center and located
3 nine miles from New York and ten miles from
4 Connecticut, would that leave enough room for
5 pleasure craft to commingle without a commercial law
6 on traffic in the Sound and would there be enough
7 depth of water for this other traffic?

8 Now a few questions or comments for FERC:
9 Since it is likely that the Plum Island Research
10 Facility will be shut down, would FERC consider a
11 different type LNG terminal on Plum Island?

12 Also, there is an operating LNG platform
13 in the Gulf of Mexico, 116 miles from shore, I would
14 ask that that be considered in lieu of the barge.
15 As you state in the EIS in its present state, in the
16 Notice of Intent, in the EIS we will also evaluate
17 possible alternatives to the proposed project and
18 make recommendations that would have less or avoid
19 impacts on present conditions. I consider these
20 considerations to be important.

21 Finally, the Iroquois Gas Transmission
22 System, which is not part of TransCanada LLC, enters
23 Suffolk County, Northport, then moves to Commack and
24 ends there. KeySpan is its only customer in these
25 locations. The pipeline remain in the Long Island

1 Sound and ends at New York City's Hunts Point Con Ed
2 Terminal. If KeySpan decides for economic reasons
3 not to purchase BS or TransCanada, the barge will
4 not benefit Suffolk County at all. The
5 TransContinental Gas Line is also a supplier of gas.
6 It is located in Nassau County. Citizens of Suffolk
7 County have no say in how KeySpan purchases gas.
8 Why locate this barge in Long Island Sound where
9 there may be no benefit? Thank you.

10 (Applause.)

11 MR. STAEGER: The next speaker is Claire
12 Kessler.

13 MS. KESSLER: Good evening. My name is
14 Claire Kessler.

15 As a resident of the east end of Long
16 Island, there is presently one coastal evacuation
17 route, Route 27. It is the only major artery on the
18 south fork. The concussion impact if there was an
19 explosion or a disaster would devastate the east
20 end.

21 Long Island is further impacted especially
22 if a disaster occurred during the summer months.
23 That would be between Memorial Day and Labor Day.
24 Ambulance, police and fire units could not
25 expeditiously move through traffic. There does not

1 exist a float evacuation plan for the residents of
2 the towns of South Hampton and the east end. The
3 local energy company, KeySpan, does not express or
4 share the fact that the benefits would not be for
5 the east end of Long Island. Approximately only 15
6 percent would be for Long Island.

7 Move it where the other 85 percent are
8 benefited. We need to look at solar and wind-energy
9 strategies. Still, this does not meet the needs of
10 Long Island.

11 Sometimes, here on Long Island, I
12 experience on the east end an average of six
13 blackouts a year. Sometimes they last for an hour-
14 and-a-half or even longer. This project is for the
15 benefit of big business and selling energy for
16 profit. The environmental impact would be
17 devastating to some of the most beautiful locations
18 in the United States. Long Island funds an enormous
19 amount of money for environmental issues.

20 In January 2004, in Algeria, a steam
21 boiler exploded and it took eight hours to
22 extinguish. The explosions destroyed portions of
23 the plant, 27 deaths, and 56 wounded. To what
24 capacity was this deemed minor?

25 There are questions that must be

1 addressed. Since Long Island Sound is located in a
2 hurricane area, with the aftermath of Katrina, the
3 oil refineries were damaged; how would this vessel
4 withstand a Category 5 hurricane? How is this
5 project beneficial to Suffolk County, and
6 particularly the east end, when it will benefit
7 maybe 15 percent probably totally for Long Island?

8 We on the east end can only go west. East
9 is to the ocean. How is this worth the risk
10 compared to what we have now? The U.S. Maritime
11 Transportation Security Act required all ports to
12 have federally approved security plans with detailed
13 assessments. Has anyone at this time expended or
14 monitored any plans that are expected for the east
15 end? And how or why do you feel this terminal would
16 be secure and any more efficient? Remember,
17 accidental and intentional incidents, even terrorist
18 activity, we even have a miniature airport, which is
19 kind of a danger to Long Island, how will these
20 flights be monitored between arriving and departing?
21 You say there will be a no-fly zone. How effective
22 can the first respondents be prepared on the east
23 end?

24 This project, who pays for it if there is
25 damage? We are still paying for Shoreham. Let's

1 not have the end of the east end.

2 (Applause.)

3 MR. STAEGER: The next speaker is
4 Davenport Plumer.

5 MR. PLUMER: Thank you for the
6 opportunity to speak. I am representing the Long
7 Island Citizens' Action Network. I realize that the
8 comments I am making are directed at the ports and
9 waterway safety assessments. I also realize that
10 that document has to be considered in light of the
11 fact that the Coast Guard, when they took it, was
12 lacking significant information from Broadwater. I
13 commend them on their willingness to go ahead with
14 this and take a stab at what that assessment would
15 look like.

16 Let me address a couple of questions that
17 come up from looking at the safety assessment.

18 The proposed FSRU would have a single
19 mooring tower, allowing the terminal to both
20 levitate on the boat, to ease the docking in the
21 transfer process. What is the size of this 180
22 degree arc around the mooring tower and would all
23 boat traffic be prohibited from this arc, which
24 could be changed over time?

25 We see in the assessment reference to

1 tugs. How many? Will they be required for safety?
2 What is their fire-fighting capability, if any? The
3 supposition is made that the four tugs are
4 necessary. But as the assessment also notes: "Tug
5 escort requirements to be determined." In other
6 words, we seem to be going in two different
7 directions there. Will the tugs be supplied by the
8 home port? If the home port, where? Has the Coast
9 Guard determined the safety issues involved in the
10 possibility of having the tanker without a tug
11 escort?

12 There is also in the assessment the
13 reference to "other support vessels," how many?
14 What type? What home port? What would be the
15 effect of these vessels on traffic safety and
16 fishing in communities bordering the area affected
17 by the terminal?

18 We hear about the Coast Guard escort
19 function. In Boston, that's an \$8,000-a-pop cost;
20 how would that impact on the other important
21 functions that the Coast Guard is obliged to
22 perform? If the FSRU obstructs radar signals, would
23 not the weather vane of the terminal itself create a
24 dangerous ever-changing zone of obstructive signals?

25 Back to tugs, Broadwater says that their

1 tugs have both significant fire-fighting
2 capabilities, yet requirements for the department
3 have not been determined and, therefore, their role
4 in fire fighting remains, at best, unknown. There
5 cannot be principles of making fire safety
6 determinations without a set of facts about the
7 capability of these tugs, if any. LNG's response,
8 they do have these plans, they have not been
9 released. How can the U.S. Coast Guard come to any
10 conclusion about the fire dangers without reviewing
11 these plans, especially in light of the
12 acknowledgment that the fire fighting capability
13 isn't even released?

14 The LNG process features an emergency
15 shut-down system which is designed to minimize
16 spill-offs in designing the discharge operations.
17 What is the average volume of this discharge? And
18 what are the safety implications of a discharge put
19 in twice a week in an already environmentally
20 endangered area.

21 Finally, it comes to a question that the
22 Captain addressed a minute ago, which is the Coast
23 Guard security responsibility. It would be helpful
24 to have additional information on that, particularly
25 since Richard Clark, the national security person

1 whose name you may recall, has done a study of the
2 potential of an attack on a tanker, and that study
3 has been prepared and talks about fairly severe
4 consequences of such an attack. We would like to
5 see that study incorporated into the security
6 considerations. Thank you very much.

7 (Appause.)

8 CAPT. BOYNTON: I would like to offer
9 just a couple of comments regarding your comments.
10 Just to reiterate, as I mentioned, that our PAWSA,
11 Ports and Waterways Safety Assessment was designed
12 to give us a baseline of waterway safety issues
13 across the Sound. It is not the final assessment.
14 I agree that we absolutely need more information on
15 the Broadwater proposal and we are awaiting the
16 formal application to have that additional
17 information, and we will not complete the safety
18 assessment until we have that additional
19 information.

20 Lastly, I have seen the Richard Clark
21 report. I used to work for Richard Clark on the
22 National Security Council. I know him well. We
23 certainly will look at that report.

24 MR. MARTIN: The next speaker will be
25 Terry Winters.

1 MR. WINTERS: My name is Terry Winters.
2 Thank you very much for giving me this opportunity
3 to speak this evening.

4 Many of you in opposing this call FSRU an
5 eyesore that will impact the environment or the
6 marine life of the Sound. I think the FSRU is a
7 safety issue, more important than our homeland
8 security issue for our home front.

9 Since 9/11 our government has undertaken,
10 implemented and directed several significant
11 measures to secure our safety abroad, and more
12 importantly here on the home front against domestic
13 terrorist attacks and the war on terror. Measures
14 such as prepare a response and recovery, but more
15 important preventions have been in the forefront
16 since the commencement of our nation's Homeland
17 Security campaign.

18 Prevention being the initial mitigation
19 measures, they were able to be carried out locally.
20 I am asking why are we placing this so close to our
21 home front? It is secondary threats associated with
22 having an operation such as this so close to our
23 shores that I would like to bring to your attention.

24 Many initiatives originated from various
25 points around the globe; for instance, Algeria,

1 Libya, and all Asia. With eight years straight of
2 LNG, Egypt, Iran and Russia are also entering the
3 market. There will be a shortcut to my
4 presentation, though I did bring to light the many
5 occasions where our public were hosts to a variety
6 of terrorist groups, such as special purpose Islamic
7 groups, Al-Jihad and Al-Qaeda. It cannot be
8 overlooked that potential from domestic and foreign
9 threats to the proposed FSRU exist. In fact, during
10 2004, a variety of falsified cruise ships were
11 floating in the sea, harbor barges, tugs, why not
12 LNG carriers transversing our local waterways? Are
13 we ready locally?

14 Given that the proposed project will
15 impact our environment, political extremist groups,
16 will probably take a stand by heading construction
17 or actual operations. These groups can chain
18 themselves to the FSRU, hang banners, take extreme
19 measures in order to seek the media attention for
20 their cause; are we ready for this and prepared?
21 Stowaways onboard commercial ships, including LNG
22 carriers, are a threat to be considered. The
23 intelligence sources have stated, more than a dozen
24 stowaways entered the U.S. in the '90s on tankers
25 that made LNG deliveries to the Everett LNG Terminal

1 in Boston.

2 In fact, the U.S. government reports that
3 illegal immigrants stowed away on a Nigerian LNG
4 carrier arriving in Boston that may have indirect
5 association with a plot to blow up the Los Angeles
6 Airport? Are we ready for this?

7 Port security in the advent of terrorists
8 are non-existent on Long Island northeast shores.
9 How will our local law enforcement first responders
10 charged with managing these issues manage? Our
11 research has shown that over the past 40 years over
12 80,000 LNG voyages have taken place, covering 100
13 million miles. No major incidents of safety
14 problems have occurred. We never thought that two
15 planes would ever fly into two major buildings
16 either. According to the report that the terminal
17 has associated with a catastrophic incident, it will
18 mainly occur within 1.3 miles and will be short in
19 duration. Sure, an explosion will be short in
20 duration; however, long-term effects in real life
21 will be everlasting. I would hate to be on that
22 boat within the 1.3 miles in that circle when it
23 occurs.

24 We talked about terrorist threats. I
25 would also like to consider natural hazards, storms

1 surges on Long Island Sound is a real threat, and
2 are we prepared for that?

3 In closing, as a North Shore resident and
4 a recreational boater on Long Island Sound, I
5 implore you to deal with the fact that the FSRU in
6 this proposal is dangerous. It seems to me that
7 rather than eliminating potential hazards, one is
8 being placed too close to our home. We feel that we
9 are not prepared and we are scared. Thank you very
10 much.

11 (Applause.)

12 MR. STAEGER: Steve Fiore-Rosenfeld,
13 Councilman, District 1, Town of Brookhaven.

14 COUNCILMAN FIORE-ROSENFELD: Thank you.
15 I hope my comments haven't been repeated 5,000
16 times. They probably will be and I beg the
17 Commission's forgiveness if I repeat things that
18 other speakers said before you me, although what I
19 have to say is relatively short.

20 We stood as a community along the North
21 Shore of Long Island a short number of years ago --
22 actually I have copies if the Commission wants
23 copies of this. We stood as a community along the
24 North Shore of Long Island in practically the same
25 situation, to raise our objections to a nuclear

1 power plant being constructed by LILCO, Long Island
2 Lighting Company in Shoreham. The reason the
3 residents of Long Island and every one of their
4 elected officials, with the potential exceptions of
5 New York State Governor Pataki and the President of
6 the United States, are currently against this
7 proposed LNG facility in our Sound are not so very
8 different from the cogent arguments made back then
9 against Shoreham the Shoreham Nuclear Power Plant.

10 Of prime consideration is the danger in
11 which the citizens of Long Island and our
12 environment could be placed by this project. In the
13 past LILCO told us there was no danger from their
14 nuclear power plant and that evacuation of the
15 residents could be accomplished without any
16 difficulty. Their words and their promises were
17 hollow, and as we all know, the people finally
18 prevailed. Are TransCanada Corporation and Shell
19 now making the same promises? Why should we have
20 any more faith in Broadwater Energy today than we
21 had years ago in LILCO?

22 In addition, this project, a 1,200 foot
23 liquid natural gas terminal sitting in the middle of
24 Long Island Sound, would be a clear target for
25 terrorists, not to mention the gargantuan

1 refrigerated tankers which will be delivering the
2 liquid natural gas in and out of our Sound. What
3 could happen to the terminal or the tankers if Long
4 Island were to be hit with a Category 3 hurricane,
5 Category 4, or Category 5? It was reported that two
6 Shell oil drilling rigs were adrift in the Gulf of
7 Mexico following the onslaught of Hurricane Katrina,
8 and that another broke free of its mooring in Mobile
9 Bay and slammed into a bridge. What headlines would
10 we read if Long Island suffered what the Gulf Coast
11 has experienced with this proposed explosive "gas
12 can" in our Sound?

13 In addition to these most practical
14 considerations, there is the equally important
15 issues, the commercialization and industrialization
16 of Long Island Sound. This nationally recognized
17 estuary is an ecologically important waterway that
18 has received millions of federal and state dollars
19 to clean and restore it. Clearly, it deserves
20 special protection from any possible contamination,
21 not to be subjected to it. To bring such an
22 industrial project into these waters, is to place
23 this environmentally sensitive estuary and its
24 interconnected harbors, such as our Setauket and
25 Port Jefferson Harbors, Conscience Bay and untold

1 others along the northern coastline of our township
2 into harm's way.

3 Finally, this project does not reduce our
4 dependence on the international web of countries and
5 corporations that deal in oil from the Middle East
6 and Long Island, which is the primary reason we are
7 now going to have to pay for a gallon of gasoline,
8 in terms of arms and legs, not just in terms of
9 dollars. We need to stop spending our limited
10 national resources on funding non-renewable energy
11 sources and spend them on researching and funding
12 energy sources that do not impact negatively on our
13 environment and provide us with more energy
14 independence from foreign countries. What is the
15 environmental effect of this proposed LNG project on
16 distracting our region from moving more steadily
17 towards real intergovernmental investments in
18 renewable energy sources such as solar, wind, hydro,
19 geo-thermal and other such true renewable energy
20 sources.

21 What would the effect of this proposed LNG
22 be upon our national allocation of financial
23 resources for Homeland Security versus international
24 military operations required to keep countries which
25 produce oil within our continuing "sphere of

1 influence" as the same countries which produce
2 natural gas and are primarily the same
3 Middle-eastern and Northern African countries which
4 product oil?

5 Broadwater Energy is not even a short-term
6 answer to our region's energy needs. It brings with
7 it growing questions about its necessity,
8 environmental impacts, and public safety. I request
9 that FERC and the Department of Homeland Security,
10 that is the U.S. Coast Guard, to reject this
11 hazardous and inappropriate project. Thank you.

12 (Applause.)

13 MR. STAEGER: Our next speaker is --

14 MS. BOYD: Hi, my name is Kaitlin Boyd.

15 As I sat on the top deck of the ferry, the
16 Port Jeff Ferry, last weekend, I stared at my
17 surroundings, and for miles all I could see was the
18 beautiful, peaceful water of the Long Island Sound.
19 As I traveled to Port Jeff with the rising sun
20 shining on my face, I could not help but soak up the
21 sea around me.

22 The Long Island Sound is enjoyed by many
23 people. As I stat there that spectacular morning,
24 it was easy to see how the Sound brings so many
25 people joy; not only is it a dazzling site to see,

1 but it is home to tons of wildlife and also provides
2 daily recreation to millions of people in
3 Connecticut and Long Island. If this Broadwater
4 project is allowed to commence, the beautiful sites
5 of Long Island Sound will be changed forever.

6 The first obvious way the Sound will be
7 changed is that there will be a massive structure
8 built that will be visible for miles. Civilian
9 boats come and go every day now; numerous ferries
10 make their way back and forth, but these boats are
11 not permanent. At night they all dock in their
12 harbors. Broadwater marine shape vessels would
13 never leave. They would continuously haunt us day
14 in and day out, plaguing the skyline. Not only will
15 the structure be permanent, but the huge tankers
16 will be docked there quite frequently, making it a
17 site to point out. If this project is put into
18 action, the view of Long Island Sound will be
19 tainted by the unwanted addition.

20 Secondly, Long Island Sound is a natural
21 environment that many creatures rely on to
22 subsistence. The plan for this project is to add an
23 exorbitant amount of unnatural apparatus. The
24 ecosystems that exist within the Sound are fragile
25 and making a significant change to the ecosystems

1 would be detrimental to their existence. This
2 project could mean death for a copious amount of
3 creatures that call the Sound home.

4 Additionally, the risk of water pollution
5 is a real possibility. No matter how safe the
6 project claims to be, accidents do happen. We don't
7 want any, "Oops, I'm sorry, in our Long Island
8 Sound. The Broadwater Project is too much of an
9 environmental risk to even be considered.

10 Lastly, Long Island Sound is a
11 recreational tool for millions of people in our
12 area. Some of us use that water every day of our
13 lives. It is the water that all of our North Shore
14 beaches. It is where we water ski or we fish, and
15 where we relax. By adding a potential environmental
16 hazard to the water, it could ruin the water
17 recreation of millions of people. The pattern of
18 the plan is to limit the space for water recreation.
19 The area where the project will be built will be
20 restricted; in essence, limiting the bulk of the
21 freedom of water on Long Island Sound.

22 In conclusion, once a project this
23 callosal has begun, it will be difficult to stop.
24 That is why this project must be blocked at the
25 preliminary stage. It appears that the planners of

1 this project are more concerned about energy than
2 actual people. In blocking this project for Long
3 Island Sound's visible beauty, wildlife and
4 recreational use will be saved from
5 industrialization. Ultimately, Broadwater will ruin
6 our water.

7 (Appause.)

8 MR. STAEGER: The next speaker is Joseph
9 Gonzalez.

10 MR. GONZALEZ: My name is Joseph Gonzalez.
11 Although I do support our federal government's
12 effort to use different sources of energy,
13 especially in light of the issues gas and oil
14 provides, this proposal, based on the information
15 provided by the opponents, as well as the usual
16 parties' respective agencies, raised a couple of
17 concerns for me, the first being the safety or more
18 so, the marketing of safety.

19 I look upon this initiative with great
20 stress and disdain, and I think it is a bit naive
21 and disingenuous to simply say to us there is no
22 danger of a national catastrophe. I have quote here
23 from the California Energy Commission, and I know
24 that doesn't carry a lot of local relevance, but
25 considering that they're LNG's projects, FERC, I

1 think, should welcome them: "LNG weighs less than
2 half the weight of the water so it will float if
3 spilled on water."

4 Now I don't know if that was meant to
5 distract or point to physical properties or if it
6 was meant to evade its support of inert properties
7 if it were to come into contact with water, and
8 nowhere on that page was there any reference to the
9 rapid phase transition if a large amount of LNG was
10 spilled into a body of water. The California Energy
11 Commission is, in theory, a neutral agency, but the
12 comments seem a bit condescending and if California
13 is being sold a bill of goods, what about the same
14 thing happening to Long Island?

15 My second concern is in terms of
16 liability. All vessel owners are protected from
17 liability by the implementation of the Vessel Owners
18 Liability Act, which is titled 46(a) of the United
19 States Code, Chapter 8, Section 1(a)1, which
20 basically states, and I'm paraphrasing: The owner's
21 liability is limited to the value of the vessel and
22 the value of the cargo contents remaining after a
23 calamity occurs. So, if I interpret that correctly,
24 the word "calamity," the less liability the owner is
25 responsible for, but in terms of a catastrophe

1 involving a LNG vessel, I think it would be pretty
2 catastrophic.

3 Liability is normally based on negligence,
4 but assuming there's no negligence, the other part
5 would be to demonstrate that LNG is an over
6 hazardous project, but on their website, LNG is a
7 clear, odorless, non-toxic and non porous liquid.
8 So is Elmer's Glue.

9 Now, if I read this correctly, it looks
10 look government has basically removed the ability to
11 seek human remedy from the owners. So not only do
12 we not want it, now we have to pay for it if
13 something goes wrong. That can't be acceptable. I
14 mean, any company who wishes to exploit the Long
15 Island Sound should be warned, "If you break it, you
16 buy it." Thank you.

17 (Applause.)

18 MR. STAEGER: The next speaker is Edward
19 Romaine.

20 MR. ROMAINE: Good evening and thank you
21 for the opportunity to appear. I'm Edward Romaine.
22 I'm the County Clerk for Suffolk County for the last
23 16 years.

24 Broadwater facility is something that is
25 concerning and troublesome to a lot people in

1 Suffolk County because of the nature that it poses,
2 the risks that it takes in Long Island Sound,
3 located nine miles off the coast of Wading River and
4 11 miles from the Connecticut coastline and,
5 obviously, is going to be a big deal for Long Island
6 Sound. It's the first floating LNG facility that
7 will be built in this nation, and it would stretch,
8 the facility itself, over 1,200 feet. It lies 100
9 feet from the surface of the water.

10 Numerous environmental safety concerns
11 have been identified, leading many to the conclusion
12 that this facility would be a step in the wrong
13 direction. Long Island's energy needs are better
14 answered through renewable technologies that do not
15 impose serious risks and detrimental effects for our
16 Long Island Sound estuary system. The mooring
17 platform to hold this floating facility would cover
18 over 7,000 square feet of sea floor, disturbing a
19 multitude of organic and inorganic material.

20 The connecting pipeline right from the
21 facility to the existing Iroquois facility would
22 provide almost 25 miles to be ditched into Long
23 Island Sound, further disturbing sediments and
24 living creatures. The resulting release of one
25 sediment into the water could further hurt decapods

1 already affecting the Sound and may cause additional
2 degradation in the overall quality of the water.

3 This project will allow the multi national
4 corporations to assume control of several square
5 miles of a local public resource, which in my
6 opinion would set, at best, a dangerous precedent.
7 It would change the Long Island Sound from an
8 estuary of national significance to commercial real
9 estate to the highest bidder, further
10 industrializing Long Island Sound.

11 The safety zone, which is yet to be
12 defined, raises even greater questions concerning
13 the accessibility of commercial or recreational
14 fishing, lobstering, boating and other activities.
15 Because the LNG infrastructures are highly visible,
16 they could be easily identified. They could be
17 vulnerable to terrorist attack and require constant
18 and costly security. Who is going to bear the cost
19 for this facility?

20 I could go on. When I saw that yellow pad
21 I have sympathy for you, because I have been in your
22 spot, and I know we are saying the same thing over
23 and over again; it's a simple message: We live
24 here. We look out on the Sound. We love the beauty
25 of this Island. We love the beauty of the

1 waterways. We fear for the safety of this Island.
2 We see this Island changing. We watch this Sound
3 being industrialized. We watch more tankers
4 treading, and then we see something that's going to
5 be permanently moored here, something that poses a
6 risk to us, something that is going to change our
7 way of life.

8 I don't know, I don't believe it's going
9 to give us energy independence, and a lot of the
10 people testifying here are students from my
11 administrative law course. One thing that we teach,
12 which FERC understands better than anyone, there is
13 always a trade off. We set goals, but there is
14 always a trade off. I understand we need energy,
15 but I also understand we need to respect the place
16 where I live.

17 I also understand what it means and how
18 this will dramatically change Long Island forever,
19 and the danger that it poses to people that live
20 here. I am sure you will weigh all of this. Thank
21 you for your attention.

22 (Applause.)

23 MR. STAEGER: The next speaker will be
24 Jim Arnold.

25 MR. ARNOLD: My name is James Arnold. I

1 come here not really representing anybody else but
2 myself. As a long-time resident of the North Shore,
3 I'm an avid sailer. I go jet skiing. I see the
4 problems with boating safety. I have gotten tickets
5 from the Coast Guard. I now know what I can and
6 cannot do because I live here. The basic problem I
7 have is with all the other ships, the international
8 ships, to be more specific.

9 Mr. Meade brought up some interesting
10 comments I was going to go through, I'm not, other
11 than major points. One of the Major points I saw is
12 that we have no standard for installation. There is
13 no guidelines or anything else. I would like to see
14 something where there is a U.S. standard before this
15 happens. Also who will be checking these vessels?
16 Is the Coast Guard going to do it where? Are they
17 going to first see it offshore or in the Sound?

18 Personally, I don't think this project
19 will go through. However, looking at alternative
20 sites for Plum Island, they do need something else
21 to do it. I would see that as a much more viable
22 way of getting natural gas resources. I have gas
23 heat in my house, it's a lot cheaper. It doesn't
24 smell as bad as oil. I'm pointing that out there.
25 So anything you guys choose, I hope it's in the best

1 interests of actual people who live in Long Island
2 and not for Shell Gas or TransCanada or anyone else.
3 Thank you.

4 MR. STAEGER: The next speaker is
5 Jennifer Joseph.

6 MS. JOSEPH: My name is Jennifer Joseph
7 and I'm a Stony Brook student and a Long Island
8 resident.

9 One of the more obvious concerns of Long
10 Island residents is the industrialization of Long
11 Island Sound. If Broadwater is approved, I hope it
12 will become more difficult to obtain further
13 development, and I wonder if we should be preparing
14 a snowball effect, considering that major political
15 officials appear to have little to say in the matter
16 and this facility has the power to set a precedent
17 for future applicants.

18 With regard to the current events, I am
19 certain that many people are highly concerned about
20 obtaining the most complete information possible
21 about any course regarding this scenario. I hope to
22 see a reference to the Environmental Impact
23 Statement. I am wondering how soon an estimate will
24 be available as to the size and the safety zone
25 surrounding the facility, and if the size of the

1 zone will take into consideration what can happen in
2 the worst case scenario.

3 Although the current information among the
4 Broadwater sites details development and operations,
5 certain environmental standards be observed, what
6 type of environmental oversight will be in place
7 during these activities and what guarantees do
8 people of the area have that this oversight is
9 reliable? I've known more than one person in my
10 life on Long Island with an inspection sticker on
11 the car that said they had passed an emissions test,
12 but that doesn't mean they did.

13 Also, with regards to the environmental
14 oversight of the project, details about LNG carriers
15 docking at the facility two to three times per week,
16 I would like to ask: Would these carriers be
17 subject to the environmental standards that the
18 Broadwater site be made to comply with, but I am
19 sure they won't. We can expect environmentally
20 destructive water traffic to and from the facility,
21 with the corporation undertaking this joint venture.
22 You have to consider that setting environmental
23 standards for carriers docking at the facility, that
24 such standards are logistically impossible to
25 uphold?

1 The final concern that I would like to
2 express, some people touched on it before -- for
3 those who haven't gotten it, it's the rapid phase
4 transition. With cold liquid natural gas, you have
5 much warmer water. Target tanks burst into a high
6 energy explosion. In consideration of the facts
7 involved in the Broadwater liquid natural gas
8 facility, would the risks in conditions like this be
9 significantly higher, and how would safety
10 procedures address this issue?

11 I am not an expert on rapid phase
12 transition bursts. I only know what I have heard,
13 but I will tell you that I have heard that the sound
14 is terrifying. As much as the Federal Energy
15 Regulatory Commission decided this facility is not
16 an experimental design because its components are in
17 separate use in other facilities, the combination
18 the technology creates a higher risk in a fragile
19 environment on which so many people depend. I urge
20 FERC and the other agencies involved to give the
21 honor of being the U.S.'s first off-shore LNG to
22 somebody else.

23 (Applause.)

24 MR. STAEGGER: Dennis Demetres. If you
25 could pronounce your name?

1 MR. DEMETRES: My name is Dennis Demetres.

2 I just have a couple of points:

3 Marine life, the harmful consequences,
4 possible detrimental effect on the community at the
5 bottom of the sea floor to shellfish and other
6 bottom dwellers. Dredging, et cetera, can cause
7 further degradation of the water quality within this
8 proposed site. It will be felt by the Long Island
9 habitat. It affects fish and migratory birds.
10 Mortality rates will increase as birds will be
11 flying into this one-foot platform. There will be
12 potential damage to all LNG facilities and possible
13 loss of life.

14 Since 1944 there have been approximately
15 31 serious tanker facilities; in 2004, as someone
16 else has stated, there was a fire at the LNG
17 facility in Algeria which killed 27 workers,
18 destroyed the entire plant and damaged marine life.
19 It was caused by a gas leak which resulted in a gas
20 vaporizing, the gas was actually drawn into a boiler
21 room and then exploded.

22 Going on to terrorism. The Congressional
23 Research Service Report which Congress did in 2004
24 stated: In light of the terror attacks 9/11,
25 Congress is concerned about the security of existing

1 LNG infrastructure, and for security, the major
2 increase in LNG imports into the U.S. Tankers may
3 exist and be physically active in a variety of ways:
4 To destroy their cargo or commandeer the use of
5 weapons against coastal targets.

6 If a fire were to occur, there could be 30
7 hot fires extending about two miles around the
8 facility; now how would that affect either
9 commercial vessels or recreation vehicles that are
10 within that two-mile radius?

11 The industrial use of the Long Island
12 Sound is just bad public policy. Long Island Sound
13 is recognized by the federal government as an
14 estuary of national significance, as many people
15 have stated. Connecticut, New York and the federal
16 government have entered into a partnership agreement
17 to provide funding to implement programs to clean up
18 the Sound and to restore it. The project would
19 allow international corporations to assume control
20 of several square miles of the public resource
21 safety zone, which is far too great for Long Island
22 Sound, for Long Islanders like myself who love the
23 sea; that you have to deal with.

24 I just feel all this money spent on LNG
25 finance sources should be spent on renewable

1 resources, because eventually gas is going to run
2 out, and where is that LNG facility going to go?
3 Thank you for hearing me.

4 MR. STAEGER: Next is Serena Cohen.

5 MS. COHEN: My name is Serina Cohen. I
6 am going to tell you how I feel about the liquid
7 natural gas project.

8 Domestic inception of natural gas is at a
9 higher rate, and making up the difference between
10 importing natural gas via a gas pipeline through
11 continental ships carrying liquid natural gas from
12 far away sources. Broadwater Joint Venture,
13 TransCanada and Shell, propose to make up the
14 difference by transporting natural gas to the high
15 demand areas in New York and Connecticut. The
16 proposed savings should be 30 percent increase in
17 natural gas supply. Although this is very much
18 needed, the bad consequences definitely outweigh the
19 good.

20 Safety requirements require a zone
21 exclusion around the liquid natural gas plant. This
22 will affect a number of activities, such as fishing.
23 What if any message will be in place if that occurs?

24 The boundaries are not yet known for Islip
25 Airport what will prevent overhead problems? The

1 Sandia Report of residents located within
2 two-and-a-half miles will bear the greatest risk if
3 a terrorist attack or malfunction causes a fire or
4 vapor to occur. Although the demand of liquid
5 natural gas project is nine miles from shore, how do
6 residents know if they are really safe? What about
7 wildlife, including fish? What would happen to the
8 revenue from the 5.5 million dollar fishing
9 industry?

10 The liquid natural gas carriers approach
11 the plant with regular shipping rules. One of the
12 closest approaches will be only one mile from shore,
13 Fisher Island. If a spill or attack were to occur
14 on one of the ships, then their people would be in
15 great danger. What security measures are talking
16 place to ensure the safety of these vessels and the
17 people it affects?

18 Liquid natural gas project is located in
19 the deep waters of the Long Island Sound and the
20 terminal will connect to the existing Iroquois
21 pipeline already in the region. When the Iroquois
22 pipeline was built, it destroyed the endangered
23 population of shellfish, and to this day that
24 population has not recovered. What will happen if a
25 new pipeline is used for the Long Island Sound's

1 very sensitive wildlife? The consequences of
2 thermal radiation, water pollution, air pollution,
3 light pollution and noise pollution are all a threat
4 to the human way of life and the wildlife and Long
5 Island's health and quality of life, people.

6 Section 101(c) of Natural Environmental
7 Policy Act states that the Congress recognizes that
8 each person has the right to enjoy a healthful
9 environment, and has the responsibility to
10 contribute to the preservation and enhancement of
11 the environment. Therefore, if the water and air
12 are polluted, then the wildlife have no chance of
13 surviving. This is a violation of the Natural
14 Environmental Policy Act.

15 In 2004, in Algeria, a similar natural gas
16 plant experienced an unknown gas leak that resulted
17 in the 27 people's deaths. What is being set in
18 place to ensure that an accident of this or greater
19 magnitude is not experienced in the Long Island
20 Sound?

21 As a concluding statement, I would like to
22 say that the bad consequences definitely outweigh
23 the good. Liquid natural gas, I pass.

24 (Applause.)

25 MR. STAEGER: Next would be Jenn

1 DuPriest.

2 MS. DuPRIEST: The proposed Broadwater
3 project will negatively impact the environmental and
4 economic energy of the region, as has been stated
5 all evening. At present, there are obviously five
6 liquid natural gas facilities in North America. No
7 facility of this type exists so close to the
8 shoreline. As a result, we have no benchmarks to
9 show they will not have adverse affects on the
10 ecosystems.

11 This ecosystem, which for nearly two
12 decades has been the center of a variety of
13 restoration and preservation programs by Long Island
14 and Connecticut agencies, as well as state and
15 federal governments, would be compromised with the
16 installation of this facility. We would essentially
17 become day pay for this project. Allowing a
18 corporation like Broadwater to build this facility
19 would take the Long Island Sound out of public hands
20 and place it into corporate ones.

21 The Mooring platform that is expected to
22 cover over 7,000 square feet of the sea floor and
23 will require 25 miles of ditching from Northport to
24 Main River, will allow the fine sediments and
25 organic materials into the exposed area, which is a

1 detrimental effect on the already affected shellfish
2 community and other bottom dwellers in the
3 surrounding areas.

4 The reason, Islander East Pipeline was
5 denied by Connecticut was for similar reasons. Why
6 should this be any different? There is also a
7 concern that air emissions from the delivery tankers
8 and the facility itself will also affect the bird
9 migration patterns, thus throwing out the balance of
10 nature, not just in the Long Island sound, but in
11 areas where these birds migrated to.

12 First with shellfish, the Long Island
13 Sound is due for a number of federally threatened
14 and endangered species. Any act that would change
15 their habitat would be counter productive to the
16 stewardship program which has been adopted by both
17 New York and Connecticut. Millions of dollars have
18 been spent federally and by the state to protect the
19 waters. Programs such as wetland restoration,
20 habitat restoration, and water preservation have
21 been implemented and have been successful over the
22 past few decades. The proposed LNG facility would
23 be counter productive to all of these programs, and
24 new variables will be introduced.

25 The EPA estimates, as it has been said,

1 that the Long Island Sound generates 5 million
2 dollars per year, most of this revenue coming from
3 the fishing industry. All taxpayers' money and
4 federal and state spending on the stewardship
5 program will be wasted in the event of a spill or an
6 explosion. The amount of money that would be
7 required to clean up such a mess would far exceed
8 any budget restoration monies. In fact, the 2004
9 explosion, the estimated cost to replace the
10 facility is 800 million dollars.

11 Also, the area where the tankers would
12 travel would be right in the heart of where our
13 fishing industry continues to flourish. The local
14 economy is highly dependent on them.

15 Biological and chemical concerns:
16 Emissions from the tankers into the water and into
17 the air most certainly will change the chemical and
18 biological makeup of the environment. One vapor
19 cloud which can cause the LNG to spill, is not
20 immediately ignited if you're some distance from the
21 spill, but we all know how windy Long Island is. It
22 can very easily reach the mainland, coming into any
23 number of conditions.

24 When the Shoreham Power Plan was proposed,
25 there was immediate concern for Long Islanders'

1 proper evacuation route in the event of a nuclear
2 accident, that all Long Island communities have a
3 safe and sure fire way to get off the Island. The
4 same concerns hold true for the Broadwater Project.
5 There is still no proper evacuation if you live on
6 the North Shore, and the threat of an accident is a
7 very real possibility.

8 As stated, since 1944 there have been
9 approximately 31 serious accidents in LNG's transfer
10 vehicles. As Senator Clinton says, when she came
11 out formally against Broadwater, like Shoreham,
12 Broadwater doesn't make sense for Long Island.

13 (Applause.)

14 MR. STAEGER: Thank you all for making
15 your statements brief. We will probably make our
16 deadline and be out of here by 10:00. Next is Ken
17 Born.

18 MR. BORN: Good evening. I have one
19 comment with regards to the environmental impact in
20 preparation for the Broadwater Project, and that is
21 the EIS preparation process should take full
22 advantage of the local and state staff experts and
23 administrators. The process should not be conducted
24 in vacuum and should not be conducted solely at the
25 federal level. There is a lot qualified

1 professionals who are more than eager to be involved
2 in the environmental impact process, and I hope that
3 you take advantage of that.

4 My main concern at this point with any
5 process, without the Environmental Impact Statement
6 to review, is to what level or responsibility has
7 Shell oil, Shell Oil and Gas have exhibited in
8 industrial practices across the world? As you know,
9 Shell Oil is one of the key components of the
10 Broadwater project. Unfortunately they have been
11 proven in recent years, among other practices, to
12 exploit workers. Shell Oil has been involved in
13 anti-union activities and plays a leading role in
14 the oil industry, to derecognize trade unions across
15 the world. They import fuel from oppressed regimes.
16 Shell deals with Nigeria's military dictatorship
17 through a joint venture with that government. Shell
18 has admitting to supplying guns to the Nigerian
19 government.

20 Shell has an affinity for environmentally
21 destructive industrial practices. In the March 1999
22 report produced by the Council of Economic
23 Priorities, ranked Shell the 10th environmentally
24 discounted of 15 companies. That's not exactly a
25 company fact. The United Nations report in 1997

1 stated: "We have deep concerns about wide-spread
2 environmental damage on account of oil exploration
3 and other operation practices of the Shell Oil
4 Company.

5 Shell continues to hold on to an
6 industrial infrastructure that is hazardous to
7 people and the environment. Their operations leach
8 carcinogenic chemicals and other harmful toxins into
9 neighborhoods. This neglect causes contamination
10 that poisons the environment and damages people's
11 health. They endanger survival of the species and
12 negotiate with local government substandard
13 environmental controls. Shell has not proven that
14 as a corporate presence it is a responsible presence
15 in any area where it does business. In the last
16 year alone, issues of complaints and environmental
17 and social injustice at the hands of this
18 transnational corporation have been reported in
19 South Africa, Brazil, Russia, Ireland, the
20 Philippines, The Netherlands, and right here in the
21 U.S., in Texas and Louisiana. You need to think
22 about where this gas is coming from, who is
23 providing it, along side the appropriate
24 environmental impact.

25 Please ensure that Long Island is not

1 added to the list of communities that have gotten
2 shafted from Shell Oil and their exploitative energy
3 schemes. Please report for EIS no action
4 alternative. Thank yu.

5 (Applause.)

6 MR. STAEGER: The next speaker is Charles
7 Hersh.

8 MR. HERSH: Hi, there, can you hear me?
9 I think you guys need a change of pace. I am for
10 the Broadwater Project. I think it will actually
11 improve the environment rather than making it worse.

12 You know, one of the things they are
13 worried about is the Sound; the worse problem with
14 the Sound is the nitrate injections. I would like
15 to say you guys are getting crack because you have
16 nothing to do with it. That's from sewerage and
17 fertilizer; that has nothing to do with the
18 Broadwater Project. Actually, I'd better start
19 reading this. We are here with expensive oil causes
20 while discoveries of huge reserves of gas hydrates
21 world wide abounds. That's world wide. Therefore,
22 it makes sense to shift from an oil economy to a
23 methane economy, especially with the present and
24 future damage to the Gulf refineries, causing
25 further fuel shortages. It just makes sense.

1 Natural gas is a cleaner burning fuel that
2 supplies more energy for the same amount of CO2
3 production. Furthermore, it can be easily used in
4 gas turbines, further increasing the efficiency
5 while lessening CO2 production even more.
6 Unfortunately, the environmentalists are frightening
7 the public with misinformation. For example, since
8 natural gas is lighter than air, a resultant fire
9 wall would be rising and it would be 100 feet above
10 land by the time it actually reaches land.
11 Broadwater is no threat to the residents on land, on
12 either side of the Sound.

13 This means that all the hazards are
14 entirely within the Sound itself. Furthermore,
15 there is no pollution problem since liquid natural
16 gas quickly evaporates and enters our atmosphere.
17 There is no oil slick. Well, having the natural gas
18 in the atmosphere is probably greenhouse gas, but
19 actually we prefer the fire ball to form, that way
20 we get carbon dioxide rather than natural gas. But
21 as far as being hazardous to the public, no.

22 It is sorely needed. Rather than causing
23 environmental damage, it actually helps the
24 environment by providing sufficient energy with
25 minimum greenhouse gas emissions or other pollution.

1 What I would like is for FERC and the U.S. Coast
2 Guard to carefully weigh the proposal's benefits
3 along with any problems. They should assess if any
4 problems to the project can be mitigated so that the
5 project can be operated safely. Small problems
6 should only require adjustments of procedures and
7 because that's vital to Connecticut and New York
8 energy needs, I find that the environmentalists
9 opposing project are seriously misguided and are
10 hurting the environment.

11 One thing they fail to realize is that
12 most people care about the environment, but are
13 unwilling to give up their standard of living. The
14 Broadwater Project is a very practical project that
15 serves the needs of the people with very minimum
16 damage to the environment. Our environmentalists
17 need to stop their beer mongering. You know, the
18 choice really is between oil and natural gas.
19 Frankly, natural gas is less polluting than oil, so
20 really, I want you to try to figure out how this
21 project could get going without things like maybe
22 with the tankers, make them check their employee
23 records to make sure they don't have alcoholics, or
24 people with sleep apnea or problems with piloting
25 the ships. That's a consideration and, you know,

1 you have to keep folks away. People on the Sound
2 really do drink and drive on the Sound.

3 Maybe there should be some consideration
4 of a Category 2 hurricane. I think that's possible.
5 These are the considerations, but overall this
6 project is good for the environment because you have
7 to take into account the energy needs of the people
8 of Long Island, New York and Connecticut, all who
9 would benefit from this natural gas, and having the
10 ships market it is far more economical. You realize
11 that the oil -- they usually discover oil, and they
12 usually have natural gas too. After they do, they
13 just burn it because there is no market. These
14 tanker ships are allowing it to be marketed; that
15 saves the environment further.

16 I am for the project and I think it's the
17 best thing that could happen, but you just have to
18 make it safe. Thank you very much.

19 MR. STAEGER: Thank you for your
20 comments.

21 Next is Mark Serotoff.

22 MR. SEROTTOFF: Good evening.

23 For the record, my name is Mark Serotoff.
24 I'm Coordinator of the Sandia Energy Alliance of
25 Long Island and a licensed ship captain, master, 25

1 ton rating.

2 The Broadwater Energy proposal presents
3 numerous, serious risks with a few, if any,
4 benefits. Broadwater claims that by increasing the
5 available supply of natural gas, the cost of fuel
6 may be lower. This contradicts phone conversations
7 I had with people at Iroquois and KeySpan. They
8 assured me there is, quote, "no issue" with gas
9 sources and supplies, as much gas as is needed.

10 Further more, another source, Islander
11 East Pipeline is one permit away from an approval
12 and consensus is that it will be built. What risks
13 accompany the Broadwater proposal? Number one,
14 large difficult-to-maneuver vessels will be
15 traversing Long Island Sound numerous times during
16 the week, at all hours and all conditions. The sea
17 lanes used already have conventional and high speed
18 ferries carrying vessels and passengers. Fishing
19 boats and pleasure boats of all sizes and conditions
20 piloted by captains ranging from highly skilled to
21 teenagers to inebriated weekend sailers. These
22 pleasure boats usually don't have radar,
23 communications or other electronic ways. These
24 conditions set the stage for accidents.

25 The conditions of limited visibility over

1 our seas, an inexperienced boater may wander in the
2 path of an LNG vessel or break down or simply get
3 lost. The LNG vessel can't turn or stop easily and
4 there could be a collision. This could lead to
5 damage, steering more propulsion of the tanker.

6 Number two, a tanker and/or facility could
7 be a target for private aircraft by controlled
8 flight into a target. This was done at the World
9 Trade Center. There are many airports on both sides
10 of the Sound. Also, the tanker or facility can be
11 rammed by a private vessel, like a coal. These
12 represent serious risks that cannot be justified by
13 possibly lowering fuel costs. Can the Coast Guard
14 assure security?

15 Number three, these tankers have to
16 navigate through a constriction in the Sound to
17 race, which in addition to a safety zone around the
18 tanker could leave minimum maneuvering room and no
19 margin for error or mechanical failure on the part
20 of an LNG vessel or other vessel. Again, this could
21 happen at all times of the year and all hours and
22 all sea states and all conditions. How can the
23 Coast Guard address this issue?

24 Number four, potentially catastrophic
25 events could arise from a serious accident involving

1 these facilities, such as vapor cloud fires, with
2 possible asphyxiation of personnel, skin burns and
3 cryogenic effects.

4 Number five, global warming. LNG uniquely
5 increases the emission of carbon dioxide, which is
6 the primary cause of global warming into the
7 atmosphere. Global warming has been shown to cause
8 polarized melting. This raises the sea level, which
9 is being felt on both sides of the Sound.

10 Number six, approval of this project could
11 set the precedent for the further industrialization
12 of the Sound, raising new safety and environmental
13 and quality-of-life issues. Can these be adequately
14 addressed by the Coast Guard?

15 Number seven, the sustainable energy
16 alliance of Long Island promotes renewable energy,
17 conservation and rebuilding old power plants into
18 state-of-the-art power plants. This project will
19 increase reliance on burning fossil fuel which goes
20 against the New York State renewable energy
21 portfolio standard that requires New York to utilize
22 renewable energy to meet 25 percent of our
23 electricity needs by 2013. The 700-plus million
24 dollar investment would be much better spent
25 repowering the Northport Power Station, for example,

1 the second largest polluter in the region and the
2 largest affordable fired plant in the east coast.
3 A repower plant can at least double and generate
4 capacity while reducing pollution over 90 percent.

5 Number eight, there are hidden costs as
6 has been mentioned, because protecting each tanker
7 could be 80,000 or more.

8 Broadwater estimates that two to three
9 tankers per week will travel on the Long Island
10 Sound and off-load their fuel to the proposed
11 facility. The cost of protecting these tankers
12 entering the Sound could reach over 12-and-a-half
13 million a year; who will pay for this?

14 Finally, the responsibility of securing a
15 facility and vessels will be the Coast Guard's. Its
16 budget is already stretched razor thin. In fact, I
17 used to get the weekly local Notice to Mariners
18 mailed to me; due to budget restraints, the Coast
19 Guard had to cut back on paper expenses, so it was
20 no longer easily mailed. Where are the ships and
21 personnel going to come from? How will the
22 budget-strapped Coast Guard pay for this? It is
23 scrounging for excess Navy cast-off vessels right
24 now.

25 The monumentally negative and numerous

1 risks, with few if any benefits, mitigate against
2 the approval of the Broadwater energy project.

3 Thank you.

4 (Applause.)

5 MR. STAEGER: Marge Acosta.

6 MS. ACOSTA: Good evening. My name is
7 Marge Acosta. I'm a member of the Long Island
8 Citizens' Action Network.

9 I am opposed to the Broadwater proposal on
10 many levels. What I will discuss tonight are my
11 safety concerns, which I hope you with the Coast
12 Guard will take seriously, for you have the power
13 and responsibility to stop this disastrous proposal
14 and protect the people in your care.

15 Unfortunately we have seen in the past few
16 weeks how causally and callously the federal
17 government ignores the real threats, the impending
18 disasters to the country. In order to steamroll
19 through its nearsighted energy program, this
20 administration attempts to create a Pollyana aura of
21 minimal threats, false assurances, and economic
22 blues, but we will not stand idly by while our Long
23 Island Sound is threatened and our people are
24 endangered so another oil company can profit.

25 All of the propaganda, and even the Coast

1 Guard's false report, are written with false
2 assurances that minimize dangers that must be
3 addressed. One of the biggest myths the LNG
4 industry has perpetuated is that there has not been
5 a major LNG accident on American soil since 1944.
6 However, Lockheed Martin, in its 1998 risk
7 assessment report prepared for the Department of
8 Energy, clearly demonstrates that the 1973 Staten
9 Island accident killing 40 workers, was in fact due
10 to LNG.

11 In several places, Broadwater's proposal
12 and your report spruce up the fire-fighting
13 capabilities of the proposed LNG facility, tankers
14 and tugboats. Capability to fight what? We are
15 told in every reputable safety report that a boat
16 fire, which can extend two-thirds of a mile, cannot
17 be extinguished. Even the Coast Guard has told you
18 to evacuate, and your report indicates that the
19 nearest useful fire-fighting equipment to fight even
20 a lesser petroleum fire, is in New York Harbor,
21 which is over 50 miles away.

22 Your report does not address safer
23 products, but Broadwater does. In the DVD it
24 distributes, it says vapor clouds just dissipate and
25 they fade at night, they simply burn back to the

1 source. "Simply burn back to the source"? James
2 Fay, the MIT expert on LNG tells us there is a real
3 possibility these clouds travel several miles, and
4 if they ignite, they flash back to the source at the
5 speed of about one mile per second, with the same
6 heat intensity as a pool fire. Unignited vapor
7 clouds also pose a danger of death by asphyxiation.
8 Vapor clouds are so dangerous that Sandia, in its
9 risk mitigation measures, suggests that we ignite a
10 vapor cloud before it leaves the LNG site. That
11 seems incredulous.

12 There are many risks that Broadwater and
13 the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission have
14 reported, from the cascading instructional storage
15 tanks due to cryogenic effects, to enduring
16 radiation well below the five kilowatts per square
17 meter standard that FERC has set; that this would
18 significantly set these estimated danger zones.
19 Most of all, FERC and Broadwater pose the greatest
20 risks of all, terrorist attacks. FERC does not
21 allow consideration of a worst case scenario. Yet
22 all we have to consider is the plane flying into the
23 facility as the tanker unloads, like not one but two
24 planes flying into the World Trade Center. Another
25 idea that we were told was not credible, yet it

1 happened and so might this.

2 If not one or two but all of the tanks
3 were compromised, 33 million gallons of LNG along
4 with the facility, what effect would that have on
5 boaters in the coastal community, on wave formation,
6 on the Iroquois pipeline and on the entire economy
7 of Long Island to New York? I don't want to hear it
8 is not credible. I want to hear the impact it would
9 have and what you could do about it. Thank you.

10 MR. STAEGER: Next, Louise Kwamboka
11 Nyamweya.

12 CAPT. BOYNTON: Can I ask you to hold for
13 minute, I want to make a comment on the last
14 speaker.

15 I think the Coast Guard report you were
16 referring to was the Ports and Waterways Safety
17 Assessment or PAWSA that we did in May and posted on
18 the website this summer. I would just like to offer
19 that that is a baseline study of waterway safety
20 issues across the Sound. It is not the Coast
21 Guard's recommendation regarding safety for this
22 proposal. It's just a starting point. And an
23 example of why we have that report, and you are
24 absolutely correct, that the report notes that there
25 is no major fire-fighting capability for Long Island

1 Sound at present. That has to be brought from New
2 York City. That's really, the point of that
3 baseline is to identify gaps like that. We will be
4 identifying additional gaps as we proceed with
5 safety assessment. That's the whole point, to
6 identify gaps so that we have an idea of what the
7 risks are and what would be required in order to
8 mitigate those risks.

9 Thank you.

10 MS. NYAMWEYA: My name is Louise Kwanboka
11 Nyamweya, and I want to say something about the
12 project and my concern for the fisheries and
13 wildlife. And we know this has been shown in many
14 forms that have been mentioned, but I wanted to do
15 -- I don't want to repeat what has been said, but I
16 have some environmental concerns that have been
17 spoken about.

18 My second concern is the safety and
19 security of the natural gas. As I understand it, it
20 is a quickly spreading, long distance and can result
21 in fire beyond the domestic fire-fighting
22 experience, a gaseous form. I can also -- it can
23 also cause fire to everything in its path.
24 According to one of the articles I was reading,
25 every tanker, and it's happening at the site

1 proposed, will naturally be carrying, I think, three
2 million gallons of LNG. That's higher than the 155
3 Hiroshima bomb. The security of the plant wasn't
4 happening. It is likely it would be carried two
5 miles by the Coast Guard. What about wildlife when
6 the tanker is heading to the landing zone? Is there
7 going to be radiation? How do we prevent a
8 catastrophe like that? What is going to happen?

9 My third concern is less: Although they
10 speak of energy prices that will be eased a little,
11 how do we answer the critics who say that this is
12 for benefit of the current administration? The
13 people say economically this is a suggestion of the
14 Bush administration. How do you answer that given
15 the arguments of the administration? Most contracts
16 have been given to friends of this administration.
17 Gee, how come we don't consider the worst case
18 scenario? Are we for energy more than the
19 humanitarian nature of this project? Thanks.

20 MR. STAEGER: Next?

21 MR. LaGARRY: My name is Nathaniel
22 LaGarry. Thank you for giving me this opportunity
23 to be here today.

24 I have come to the conclusion that the
25 Broadwater project is a mismanaged project that will

1 give us energy problems. It's not simply because
2 there will be a tanker on Long Island, but because
3 Broadwater engenders energy concerns. Although it
4 must be acknowledged that the increased demand for
5 energy must be met, to begin a program we should
6 realize that you increase the risk for foreign fuel,
7 and such concerns you might speak about. But the
8 question of energy dependency is a major national
9 concern.

10 The future health and prosperity of this
11 nation is at stake, and to finally create and
12 develop an efficient, renewable energy source that
13 would rely upon domestic energy resources would not
14 happen for many years to come. This is urgent. The
15 sustainable development of the project should be a
16 long-term goal.

17 The benefits of renewable energy are
18 enormous. There are certain scientists who study
19 natural gas, reducing gas used by improving energy
20 efficiency and developing a renewable energy
21 sources, such as solar, wind, geothermal and
22 bionergy that will be faster, cheaper, cleaner, and
23 more secure, and they're relying primarily on
24 developing new gas lines.

25 Furthermore, a recent study by Neiberg and

1 counsel (ph.) for an energy-efficient economy
2 represent future reductions in gas through
3 efficiency measures. But will the increased
4 renewable energy significantly impact natural gas
5 prices and availability while saving somewhere
6 around 75 million dollars on that natural gas over
7 the next five years?

8 Funding of such renewable energy
9 development should take primary development rather
10 than sources controlled by foreign nations. Besides
11 decreasing our dependence, this will allow us to
12 develop our own renewable energy sources, to develop
13 renewable sources.

14 This will increase energy efficiency which
15 will have a positive effect on the environment. It
16 would stimulate job creation probably with the
17 development and construction phases, with the main
18 improvement phases as well.

19 My other concerns were environmental and
20 aesthetic concerns. For the sake of brevity and to
21 prevent repetition, I will end by saying that the
22 potential for an accident or terrorist activity
23 cannot be ignored. So a terminal in Long Island
24 Sound is inappropriate, and to the extent that it
25 could violate our waters, you cannot ignore the

1 danger that is created by its presence. Thank you.

2 (Applause.)

3 MR. STAEGER: Next is Jeffrey Levinson.

4 MR. LEVINSON: Good evening. My name is
5 Jeffrey Levinson. I am a ecologist and my specialty
6 is the relationship of organisms and seabed. I
7 would like to focus on three ecological issues that
8 are troubling to me relating to this project. I
9 think these need to be assessed carefully. They are
10 bottom disturbance, first; second, encouragement of
11 invasive species, and finally the toxic substances
12 that will be associated with this very large
13 facility.

14 First, the problem of bottom disturbance.
15 Very briefly, many organisms act as ecological
16 engineers. Their furrowing activities increase
17 oxygen in the sediment and also increase the
18 degradation of organic matter, and it is now being
19 used, furrowing, as a world weapon throughout Europe
20 and the United States. It has been done for
21 decades here in the United States, it is spreading
22 now throughout the world.

23 The disturbances caused by anchoring,
24 stabilization and also the pipeline produced with
25 this project and other projects, are going to

1 reverse a very positive trend we have had in Long
2 Island Sound for the last 25 years. We know from a
3 lot of research that dredging and disposal of
4 dredging spoils degrades the bottom and shuts down
5 these processes in furrowing and oxygenation and
6 organic matter degradation. We don't want to do
7 this. We've made so much progress. Long Island
8 Sound is on the rocks. Most of the part benefitting
9 from resources are nearly gone here. We are
10 beginning to turn the corner and this is a terrible,
11 terrible reversal of fortune that Long Island Sound
12 would have by doing this.

13 Second, the invasive species: Balanced
14 water from tankers and disturbance mined in a very
15 unfortunate way to facilitate the introduction of
16 invasive species. San Francisco Bay is a very good
17 example. There are no native species left virtually
18 in San Francisco Bay. It is a highly disturbed
19 ecosystem and it's disturbed by the effect of
20 invasive species.

21 The water in Long Island Sound already has
22 tremendous impact from invasive species. Our two
23 most common crabs are invasive species. We now have
24 a whole species of sea squirts. It sounds very
25 harmless, but they are coating the intertidal zone,

1 the shallow subtidal zone and last year the whole
2 bottom of the Eastern Long Island Sound. Bringing
3 in disturbance is known very well to facilitate this
4 invasion. This has to be assessed.

5 We do not have very good method of
6 protecting balanced water impacts on our coastline
7 and research is only beginning to be done right now
8 in Chesapeake Bay to understand these impacts. We
9 have no real way to deal with balanced water. In
10 theory we do, but in practice nothing really is
11 happening very effective, and we have a tremendous
12 invasion of species throughout out coastline around
13 and United States, and for that matter around the
14 world. It's very well known, and many, many
15 invasive species have come in.

16 The Long Island Sound is no exception and
17 it would be terrible to flip it into an alternative
18 state that come from all the basis of species the
19 way San Francisco Bay is.

20 Finally, and I don't know how important
21 this is, I am just asking the question: What about
22 anti-fouling paints for this large floating project?
23 We know there is going to be an interaction with the
24 Department of Homeland Security. What grade of
25 toxic substance is going to be used? Are you going

1 to use the paint that is on my boat right now or are
2 you going to use the Trimule Tin (ph), which is
3 military gray, which is highly toxic? I am very
4 worried that very horrible toxic substances ae going
5 to be used, and I would like to see that addressed.
6 I am very worried that that is going to be a major
7 release of toxic material, particularly metals, into
8 Long Island Sound, and that is going to affect all
9 of our projects; our marine sanctuary that we are
10 creating, and also maritime projects. I think this
11 is very troubling indeed.

12 For 30 seconds outside of my area of
13 expertise, I believe we all know that a man named
14 Haram shot a cannon across the Hudson River from
15 Cold Spring, New York storm and it struck King
16 Mountain. He did that around 1860, I believe. It's
17 so easy to fire something today. Today's power gun
18 that won the civil war, is going toward the missile.
19 I am very worried that as a resident, that this
20 might happen. You could have 15 people who could do
21 this off the shore.

22 Finally, I personally and my wife would
23 like to float in a boat and I would like to see our
24 children float in a boat late at night, bathe in the
25 glow of the after glow of evening and not see the

1 awful light of this terrible project. Thank you.

2 (Applause.)

3 MR. STAEGER: Yunnely Martinez.

4 MR. MARTINEZ: Good evening. My name is
5 Yunnely Martinez.

6 I share many of the concerns that have
7 been stated tonight. However, I have a couple of
8 concerns that I would like to address as well.

9 I am aware of the proposal of the
10 Broadwater Project and I also understand that there
11 is strong backlash in spite of the benefits that it
12 will contribute to the Long Island Sound in New York
13 and Connecticut. However, from a resident's point
14 of view, there are several concerns that I do not
15 see solutions for.

16 My first concern is that we as human
17 beings, we do not really change. And this project
18 will force us to change our lives dramatically.
19 Another concern that I would like to indicate is
20 that from the looks from it, Broadwater will
21 decrease the property values of Long Island
22 properties. Long Island properties vary but it will
23 decrease the individual property value around the
24 shore.

25 Another concern that I have is that it has

1 taken into account compensation for individuals that
2 do live around the shore right now and their
3 tranquility will be disturbed. Like I said before,
4 many of my views have been said tonight, so I will
5 not keep addressing them. I am sure you have heard
6 all of them and but in concluding, I would like to
7 say that the good water is a natural water. You
8 have more waters and let's rethink because Long
9 Islanders have a lot to lose and very little to
10 gain.

11 Thank you very much for your time. Have a
12 great night.

13 (Applause.)

14 MR. STAEGER: Mike Blakeslee.

15 MR. BLAKESLEE: I am a U.S. Coast Guard
16 licensed chief engineer. I have worked with natural
17 gas vessels for over 20 years. Over my 20 years as
18 the ship engineer, I have been responsible for all
19 aspects of a safe and secure handling of LNG.
20 During this period a Fleet of eight LNG that I work
21 in connection with, had an impeccable safety record.
22 In fact, over 40 years, the world wild commercial
23 LNG commercial operation, there has never been a
24 serious incident resulting in loss of cargo.

25 Transportation of LNG has an excellent

1 safety and environmental record when compared to the
2 safety and environmental records of ships and barges
3 that carry liquid petroleum, such as gasoline, luke
4 warm diesel fuel, and heavy bunker C. For all
5 intents and purposes, I consider Broadwater's
6 regassification plant to be a stationery ship. The
7 Manning requirements will be very similar, that is
8 the monitoring of the LNG will be on a professional
9 basis. The only difference between an LNG ship and
10 a regasification plant is that a ship has a
11 propulsion system that allows it to move from Point
12 A to B.

13 On board LNG vessels there is machinery
14 and equipment associated with peak international gas
15 in the liquid state. For the Broadwater
16 regasification plant, there is also marine-type
17 machinery and equipment that will be used to change
18 the liquid back into natural gas, equipment similar
19 to that found on an LNG ship. It is my
20 understanding that the proposed Broadwater FSRU
21 would be constructed using proven technology,
22 designed to hold the FSRU, even during the most
23 severe conditions that will be experienced in the
24 Sound.

25 As I have stated, liquefied natural gas is

1 safe to transport. It's stored, provided that there
2 are qualified people cast with this oversight. Over
3 the years people have asked me whether I felt safe
4 sailing aboard an LNG carrier. My answer is that I
5 often felt safer working on board an LNG ship,
6 traveling across the seas from terminal to terminal,
7 than I did or when I do my riding in a car on any
8 American highway. I hope FERC will consider my
9 comments, from the safety and security of LNG
10 Transportation operations, as it considers the
11 Broadwater application techniques. Thank you.

12 (Applause.)

13 MR. STAEGER: Next is Doug Van Leuven.

14 MR. VAN LEUVEN: My name is Doug Van
15 Leuven. I am a U.S. Coast Guard certified chief
16 engineer, a cargo engineer for LNG operations.

17 I support the use of Broadwater's
18 regasification plant because I believe it would be
19 safer than nuclear power plants and environmentally
20 better than coal burning facilities. Natural gas is
21 a more efficient energy source as well. Each LNG
22 vessel carries sufficient natural gas to power a
23 major city of 75,000 for a year. I support the
24 Broadwater Terminal water project because LNG
25 transportation has been proven to be safe.

1 I began my career in the late 1980's on
2 LNG ships. I have over 18 years of experience
3 transporting LNG from liquefaction terminals to
4 gasification terminals world wide. I sailed for an
5 energy transport corporation for 15 years
6 transporting LNG from Indonesia to Japan. I spent
7 another four years transporting LNG to the United
8 States, Europe, and Asia. During our tours of duty,
9 usually six months a year, the wives and children of
10 the shipboard officers frequently traveled with us
11 during portions of the tour. We believed them to be
12 safer aboard an LNG tanker than walking the streets
13 back home, so as long as the people handling and
14 transporting the natural gas have a record of the
15 training and qualifications.

16 Broadwater's regasification and storage
17 facility is in essence just like an LNG ship, except
18 for some minor points. Instead of the facility
19 being a ship moving from port to port, it's a
20 stationary, water-borne structure like a ship at
21 anchor. The facility would still receive and store
22 the LNG, but with capability to convert the LNG back
23 into a gas before it is sent to the New York and
24 Connecticut markets by the existing Iroquois
25 pipeline which crosses existing Long Island Sound,

1 from Milford, Connecticut to Northport, New York.
2 Like a ship, the Broadwater regasification plant
3 would have LNG on board.

4 The plant would have to be manned by
5 professional workers on a watch-type rotation, day
6 in and day out, just like ship. The equipment and
7 machinery onboard the regasification facility would
8 either be the same type or identical to the marine
9 equipment and machinery on board ship. Broadwater
10 regasification and storage facility as well as
11 transportation of LNG by the facility can be
12 achieved in a safe manner, provided that qualified
13 personnel operate the facility. There are hundreds
14 of active officers in the American Merchant Marine
15 who, like me, have decades of experience in the safe
16 and reliable transportation of LNG. I believe I can
17 speak not only for myself but for my shipmates in
18 LNG transportation who would welcome the opportunity
19 to serve their country by working to guarantee safe
20 delivery and storage of the LNG Broadwater terminal
21 port project.

22 I hope the FERC will consider my comments
23 on the safety and security of LNG transportation
24 operations as it concerns the Broadwater
25 application. Thank you.

1 MR. STAEGER: Thank you. The next
2 speaker is Kyle Rabin.

3 MR. RABIN: Good evening. I am a member
4 of Friends of the Bay, part of the Retirement
5 Watchdog Group seriously protecting the Oyster
6 Bay/Cold Spring Harbor estuary. I appreciate the
7 opportunity to provide comments on Broadwater's
8 proposal to site a liquefied natural gas terminal in
9 the heart of Long Island Sound.

10 Friends of the bay have a number of
11 concerns regarding the Broadwater LNG proposal. If
12 the federal review process is thorough and credible,
13 it will reach the following common sense
14 conclusions:

15 Number 1, that the Broadwater terminal and
16 related pipeline and tankers, over the short and
17 long-term environmental lists of unknown magnitude
18 to the Sound, an estuary of national significance,
19 that is already under considerable stress.

20 Number 2, the Broadwater project in its
21 entirety will create a precedent and setting brought
22 in by a special zone that will have negative,
23 economic, recreational, and environmental impacts
24 that would forever change the Sound.

25 Number 3, the Broadwater Project will

1 compromise our region's energy security by creating
2 false dependency upon the facility.

3 Number 4, the project will cause the
4 region to become more exposed to natural gas price
5 volatility, keeping us more dependent on natural gas
6 availability.

7 Number 5, the Broadwater Project will
8 increase our nation's reliance on hard fossil fuel
9 in parts of the world that are vulnerable to
10 instability, thereby reducing the region's economic
11 and energy security.

12 Number 6, the project will be an economic
13 burden on the region. The site will need 70 million
14 dollars in the region during the lifespan of the
15 terminal's operation. That's with the price of
16 natural gas at \$6, which is really what it means to
17 you. We know it's going to go up.

18 Number 7, the project will provide
19 terrorists with a prime target that will potentially
20 disrupt the New York City Metropolitan economy and
21 threaten public health. The tankers will pass
22 dangerously close to populated area in the entrance
23 to the Sound.

24 You will notice in these seven points you
25 will find the criteria that the Coast Guard used

1 regarding threat, vulnerable, and the consequences.
2 I would like to go into a little more detail on each
3 of these points.

4 The first point, regarding Broadwater
5 terminal and related pipeline and its dangerous
6 impact on the environment, I would like to start out
7 by saying that the Long Island Sound is just one of
8 almost 28 estuaries of national significance under
9 the federal government's national estuary program.
10 The "estuary of national significance" designation
11 should increase the threshold of deviation as
12 compared to projects located in areas that are not
13 covered under such designation.

14 Please keep in mind, throughout the
15 process, the Sound's sensitive ecology leads to
16 damage that is slow to repair. We have a lot to
17 learn and understand about the delicate ecological
18 balance in the Sound and what we can do to better
19 protect it. We must err on the side of protecting
20 the Sound rather than the profits shared by Shell
21 and TransCanada.

22 I strongly urge the federal government to
23 work closely with the New York State Department of
24 State in carefully considering these coastal
25 policies. The EIS must carefully evaluate the water

1 quality, impacts associated with construction, such
2 as trenching the pipeline and then covering it.
3 From the Iroquois experience we have learned that to
4 place a pipeline in a trench requires using a dredge
5 to take down 8 feet, piling the material somewhere
6 else, usually along side the trench. In order to
7 have a 20 to 25 foot wide trench, it is necessary to
8 expose the sides out about 75 feet in total.
9 Therefore, a 25 mile trench will have an impact area
10 of 25 miles by 18 feet, by 75 feet wide, not
11 including the anchors.

12 Of course we need to bring the ships in
13 once a day. The second time we place the pipe and
14 then the third time we bury the pipe. Each movement
15 of material will disburse some of the sediment into
16 the water column, and there is always the
17 possibility of a smoke event before the excavated
18 materials are placed back into the excavated area,
19 and some storm could spread material all around.

20 Other impacts include the fact that once
21 the shallow area near shore is destroyed, it never
22 comes back. The anchor starts about 8 feet deep, so
23 you will have dead zones.

24 Post construction, what will be the
25 environmental impact associated with two or three

1 tankers leaving the Sound on weekly basis? You
2 heard this earlier so I won't add too much to this,
3 but the issue of invasive species is very
4 significant and must be closely studied.

5 Finally, Broadwater's reach sets the
6 abatements of the western part of the Sound due to
7 the fact that it will pave the way for other
8 industrial projects that may be sited closer, such
9 as Oyster Bay and Hempstead Harbor. This is just
10 one example of the ripple effect that the Broadwater
11 Project will have.

12 The second point I want to discuss is
13 regarding the precedent-setting nature of the
14 Broadwater facility. Aspects of the proposal are
15 relatively untested. As we know, newer technology
16 has a higher rate of failure. I realize that some
17 aspects of the Broadwater facility have been used
18 before, but there are certain components of it that
19 are not in fact tested, and this will make the Sound
20 a guinea pig for this experiment. While the
21 facility will not take a large amount of space in
22 the Sound, it will require a buffer or more
23 appropriately an exclusion zone, excluding boaters
24 or users within that radius. That radius would
25 represent the geographic area available.

1 Also, the EIS needs to assess the impacts
2 associated with other industrial projects that
3 Broadwater, if approved, will surely open door for.
4 The federal review must not only examine
5 Broadwater's environmental and social impacts, but
6 examine it to include its precedent-setting effects.
7 The fact that the Broadwater Project will pave the
8 way for other industrial projects, may be other LNG
9 terminals. The review must seriously consider the
10 possibility that the Sound could become an epicenter
11 for energy projects, including other LNG facilities.
12 As the LNG's reported pipelines have paved the way
13 for Broadwater, what will Broadwater bring with it
14 and where will we draw the line?

15 The third point regarding Broadwater's
16 Project, it will be compromising our region's energy
17 security by creating a false dependency on it.
18 According to Broadwater, the facility could supply a
19 very significant percentage, one-third to one-
20 quarter of the New York City metropolitan region's
21 demand for natural gas, but that shouldn't be
22 construed to mean that there is an urgent need for
23 Broadwater energy. On the contrary, there are
24 numerous alternatives, if the federal review will
25 consider them.

1 This may be seen by some policy makers as
2 a quick fix, but we must resist this confusion. We
3 need to put our noses to the proverbial grindstone
4 to develop an energy plan for the region, a plan
5 that doesn't put all our eggs in one basket. If we
6 don't take this challenge seriously, we will be
7 stuck with a facility that could cripple us. If the
8 Broadwater terminal became unable to supply the
9 smallest portion of our energy due to a malfunction,
10 terrorist attack or other disruption, energy prices
11 would be expected to spike dramatically.

12 We have seen the results of the
13 MidAtlantic region's dependence on natural gas type
14 of off-shore drills in the Gulf of Mexico and also
15 our dependence on foreign oil; why do you want to
16 expose this region to the negative impacts that are
17 associated and so reliant on one facility based
18 primarily on foreign fuel? The EIS should move
19 carefully to evaluate the benefit of having a
20 regional energy plan based on smaller energy
21 projects with more emphasis on demand-side
22 management, energy conservation, and energy
23 efficiency.

24 The EIS should also consider strong the
25 possibility that the Broadwater Project could

1 represent a road block to efforts to develop a
2 regional renewable energy structure. The federal
3 review must consider that the Broadwater project may
4 very well be in part of the problem rather than the
5 solution to our current energy predicament. If
6 approved, the Broadwater facility will determine
7 energy policy for the next three decades.

8 Finally, we need more information as to
9 what the need is and what markets the gas will be
10 serving. Some have said that the gas will be
11 primarily funneled to New Jersey. On the manner of
12 making policy, in number 27 appears a policy
13 statement that states, among other things, that the
14 decision on the siting and construction of major
15 energy facilities in the coastal area will be based
16 on public energy needs.

17 The fourth point I would like to address
18 with regards to the project's exposing our region to
19 natural gas price volatility. On this matter, I
20 just want to hit on two key points:

21 First, the review of Broadwater must look
22 at the inter-dependence of gas supply and demand,
23 prices of oil and gas, and investigate how this
24 forecast might be affected by the recent
25 unprecedented raise in prices and futures. We

1 believe this is an important perspective on the
2 issue. It calls into question the current validity
3 of the studies that have been used to justify new
4 energy terminals, and also has some bearing on the
5 viability of alternatives such as energy efficiency.

6 The presumption underlying the LNG
7 infrastructure in the United States is that it
8 represents a funded, low protocol source of supply
9 for the U.S. However, with the increasing
10 competition from Europe and Asia, it is not all that
11 clear that the cost of LNG is going to remain
12 attractive. On the contrary, the recent reliance on
13 foreign sources you see in oil will affect the gas
14 market and the electricity market domestically.

15 I am going to jump ahead here to my sixth
16 point regarding the economic burden that this
17 facility places on the region. It will insight 70
18 million, at least 70 million from the regional
19 economy. That's based on a \$6.00 price. But there
20 are also the hidden costs. There's the cost of
21 implementing the appropriate security, emergency
22 planning of the project that will be prohibitive.
23 The hidden costs alone could make this project
24 uneconomic. In this vain the project will generate
25 new, unnecessary financial burdens on citizens,

1 straining already limited Coast Guard resources.
2 The federal review must comprehensively evaluate all
3 the hidden costs. Please, I ask you, leave no stone
4 unturned in your evaluation of the hidden costs for
5 this facility.

6 Who stands to benefit? Shell and
7 TransCanada make out like bandits.

8 The seventh point I want to discuss
9 regards the project itself, the tankers, the fact
10 that they pose an obvious target to terrorists. In
11 fact, they're a sitting duck. It's an accident
12 waiting to happen.

13 MR. STAEGER: We appreciate your passion,
14 but you have gone beyond your time.

15 VOICE: Enough is enough. We'll be here
16 all night.

17 MR. RABIN: I believe a lot of what has
18 been said here tonight is common sense. And if
19 common sense were to prevail, the federal review of
20 Broadwater's proposal would not have any chance of
21 being approved by the government agencies. Thank
22 you.

23 (Applause.)

24 VOICE: If I can say so, sir, we should
25 keep these people to three minutes. I don't need

1 three minutes to say what I have to say.

2 MR. STAEGER: Bob DeLuca.

3 MR. DELUCA: Good evening. My name is Bob
4 DeLuca and I serve as President of the Group for the
5 South Fork. My organization represents the
6 conservation and planning interests of some 2,500
7 member-households, businesses and individuals
8 residing primarily in the towns of Southampton, East
9 Hampton and Shelter Island. I'm here on behalf of
10 this group to express our opposition to Broadwater
11 Project.

12 I am going to submit all of my comments in
13 writing to you. I believe there are two things that
14 I just want you to think about:

15 On the 21st of November 2002, the
16 Department of Homeland Security put out a press
17 release that basically said Al-Qaeda was interested
18 in flying cargo planes using liquid natural gas
19 tankers and other hazardous materials and chemicals.
20 I think about that with respect to large liquid
21 natural gas tankers coming into our waters, and
22 somebody getting ahold of that tanker and aiming it
23 into the gulf nuclear power plant. I keep trying to
24 picture about what we would do to stop a vessel that
25 takes five miles to stop, even if it is being

1 escorted by a bunch of Coast Guard boats, because I
2 don't think you'd want to shoot it. I don't think
3 you'd want to fire anything at it. And I don't know
4 what happens if the captain decides to aim this
5 thing at a nuclear reactor. So I would hope that
6 the target safety assessments, somebody takes the
7 time to figure out if something happens, exactly
8 what the consequences could be and how well the
9 Coast Guard is equipped to deal with those
10 consequences, even if they can't blow that ship up,
11 somebody on the plane that could get it to fire a
12 missile, I'm sure, and it's probably not as hard to
13 do as people think it is. Just take a look at that.

14 The final point is this: I believe there
15 are some three dozen applications for FERC at the
16 present time, at least, similar types of
17 applications for the natural gas facilities ail
18 around the country, and you get the same concerns,
19 in virtually every community that people are
20 concerned about. And yet it seems they are going to
21 be viewed in isolation. I guess my point is, part
22 of the national government policy actually asks you
23 to look at the issues in a comprehensive, cumulative
24 fashion, and I would encourage you to look at the
25 piece in a programmatic way, largely because if the

1 goal of FERC is to provide national energy policy
2 that is not disjointed, you shouldn't look at each
3 of these projects in isolation from all the other
4 projects. I would rather think that even if it ends
5 up in Long Island Sound or someplace else, that the
6 ultimate decisions of where a liquid natural gas
7 facility would go has more to do with national
8 security, national leads, than it does with which
9 applicant is in the door first. Basically there's a
10 tremendous amount of venture capital in this right
11 now. The first five or ten applications that get
12 through are going to get through whether or not they
13 make the best sense for the country.

14 So I ask you to look at that and I'd ask
15 that the Environmental Impact Statement evaluate why
16 the whole fuel assessment for programming purposes
17 is being done and also to look at the assessment of
18 each individual project in one larger framework.
19 With that I will leave with you my written comments
20 and I thank you very much for your time.

21 (Applause.)

22 MR. STAEGER: Next Peter Maniscalco.

23 MR. MANISCALCO: I will be brief. I am
24 Peter Maniscalco.

25 When I was two years old my parents

1 brought me to Long Island Sound. I am familiar
2 since August of 1941 with Long Island Sound. For
3 four years I was a fishermen and got to know the
4 waters here very intimately. Over the last seven
5 years I've taught at Southampton College, in the
6 environmental studies' program.

7 There are a couple of concerns that --
8 before I say what I want to say, I am disturbed by
9 the Federal Energy Bill. It's disturbing that FERC
10 can override state and local governments and no
11 matter what we say here, this may be some type of
12 situation where what we think is actually
13 meaningless. I just want everyone in the audience
14 to remember that the Benito Mussolini's definition
15 of fascism was the marriage between corporations and
16 government. I think we have to decide for ourselves
17 whether our country is beginning to take steps in a
18 fascist form of government. That is one of my
19 concerns.

20 The second thing: I can't come to this
21 university, I find it deeply disturbing that Dean
22 David Conover of the Marine Science program here at
23 this college, made the following statement in Albany
24 on February 15, 2005: While the Broadwater Project
25 is large and has an estimated life span of 30 years,

1 we believe that the direct environmental impact from
2 the project will be relatively minor.

3 Apparently Dean Conover has gone from
4 being scientist to a psychic, and maybe we will see
5 him on TV one of these days as he moves from his
6 position here at the university. I find it deeply
7 disturbing that a leading scientist of this
8 institution made that comment without looking at any
9 Environmental Impact Statement.

10 Now what I want to say is -- do you know
11 who John Meur was?

12 MR. MARTIN: Yes.

13 MR. MANISCALCO: John Muir, Walt Whitman,
14 Ralph Waldo Emerson, if they were alive today, they
15 would come here to say to us that Long Island Sound
16 has tremendous spiritual value. They were spiritual
17 environmentalists. They saw something in nature
18 that our culture is becoming bereft of. They saw
19 that nature had an essential element to it that was
20 essential for our sustaining our creativity, for
21 sustaining our life, for sustaining our beautiful
22 view of what life is, and now that that is getting
23 lost, we need to remember that.

24 They would tell us that Long Island Sound
25 is as holy as any church, as sacred as any

1 synagogue, as spiritual as any mosque, and as
2 beautiful as any temple. And I wonder why we can't
3 see that. I believe that to be true for myself as I
4 have my own spiritual experiences directly with Long
5 Island Sound. I know that is true, and I teach that
6 to my children, and I teach that to my
7 grandchildren. If we are to allow -- if this were a
8 hearing about putting this facility inside a church,
9 how would you gentlemen feel if I said to you,
10 "Let's put this LNG in a church, in a synagogue or
11 in a mosque"? Would you tell me I was crazy? I
12 think you would. Why do we see this project as being
13 crazy? It's a violation of the spiritual integrity
14 of Long Island Sound.

15 I would like to ask Mr. Martin, that there
16 be a spiritual analysis, that someone look at Long
17 Island Sound for its spiritual qualities and that
18 the people who would do this would be indigenous
19 people so that they could teach all of us. Once
20 again, what it is of value in these beautiful
21 spaces. As my good friend, Adrian Esposito always
22 says, "The Long Island Sound is our Adirondack.
23 It's time that we remember that. We value that. We
24 love that. We respected that. We would say "no" to
25 an industrial project in a holy place.

1 (Applause.)

2 MR. STAEGER: Next speaker is Dr. Joel
3 Ziev.

4 DR. ZIEV: Good evening. That's a hard
5 act to follow. I am going to get very factual and
6 summarize some very short comments I have. I will
7 not be addressing the science of project. I
8 understand that it is relatively simple, the
9 regasification, and I look forward to receiving the
10 EIS and having an opportunity to review that.

11 I do want to comment though on the role of
12 the Coast Guard in this project. I am deeply
13 concerned that the assets which are currently
14 available to Long Island Sound, which have already
15 been significantly depleted for the routine use of
16 safety, of helping mariners, of doing the things
17 that the Coast Guard has been known to do so very,
18 very well have been reduced and who will increase --
19 will there be additional resources put to this
20 project to handle the safety and security measures
21 related to Broadwater, or will the current assets be
22 reallocated for this purpose, further reducing the
23 safety and the security that we have on Long Island
24 Sound with the presence of the Coast Guard? I am
25 very, very concerned about that.

1 I am also looking at Long Island Sound,
2 how can we allow a significant part of the public
3 trust land to be taken over by a private venture?
4 This recently happened in New London where a local
5 entity took over some property for local, private
6 economic development, and the court system has
7 supported that move, but this was done by local
8 political entities, elected officials in the local
9 community, not by a broader base. In this case, we
10 have removed all local control in making decisions
11 about our own properties, taken it away and moved it
12 simply to the federal level without local input. I
13 am concerned that we are moving it further and
14 further away and that we are unable to really handle
15 and really manage our own land. It's as if you have
16 children and you don't want to accept the answer
17 from them, therefore, you don't ask them the
18 question. You know, "Will you do this?" You know
19 it's going to be "no," so you say, "Let's do this
20 anyway," without asking.

21 On a very personal note, being very, very
22 brief here, I sail in Long Island Sound. I have
23 been doing this for a long time. I meet tug boats
24 with barges being towed repeatedly. I am in their
25 way and I know damn well they can't stop and I am in

1 trouble, and it takes me, in a small sail boat, a
2 long time to get out of the way of these boats. I
3 see myself sailing Long Island Sound and one of
4 these vessels are coming in, and I know they are not
5 scheduled and probably will not be for security
6 reasons, how do I know they're there? How will I
7 get out of the way of this humongous boat, the
8 security zone around it? I know that there will be
9 nuclear subs coming in and they have a security zone
10 and I know it's a challenge, but this is much larger
11 than that, this is huge. If you go by me in the
12 wrong way, you break my wind. I don't have any
13 propulsion to get out of the way.

14 What are we going to do with small boats
15 without propulsion who are going to be in the way of
16 these vessels coming to both the security zone or
17 just the safety of this huge vessel that won't be
18 able to stop in a short distance?

19 I am just going to stop there. I know
20 there's a lot of other people, a lot of issues here.
21 We would look to have more opportunity to look at
22 the EIS, I look forward to that, and I thank you for
23 the opportunity for letting me speak. I hope I have
24 been brief enough.

25 MR. STAEGGER: Tom Burke.

1 MR. BURKE: Good evening. Thank you for
2 the opportunity to speak. My name is Tom Burke and
3 I represent the North Fork Environmental Council
4 located in Myotatic, New York, where I serve as the
5 Council's legislative liaison to the Town of
6 Riverhead. I have a short statement I would like to
7 enter into the record.

8 The 1,500 members of Long Island's North
9 Fork and Retirement Council are unconditionally
10 opposed to the development, construction, and
11 operation Broadwater and its site in Eastern Long
12 Island Sound. We oppose Broadwater for reasons:
13 It's adverse impact on the environment. Its adverse
14 impact on the lives and safety of the people who
15 live along the Sound. The use of LNG with all its
16 attendant problems, especially in terms of global
17 warming as a short-term fix to this region and this
18 nation's energy problems. Finally, the unknown
19 nature of the project and its risks, the sponsors'
20 position of "trust us." Frankly, with history as
21 our guide, our members don't trust these sponsors.
22 There has been some erosion, I think, recently of
23 trust in some federal agencies based on the
24 occurrences of the last few weeks. So trust is in
25 short supply these days.

1 The details of our doubts and our concerns
2 have been well described and well documented by most
3 of the other speakers here. I see no need to go
4 through that again. I would like to comment on one
5 aspect of the proposal though.

6 Proponents of this project will advocate
7 that the issue of local control and the impact on
8 local natural resources and local residents who will
9 be most directly affected are trumped by the greater
10 good for the greater number people. Indeed, local
11 control for these projects has been taken out of the
12 hands of the state and local government by an Act of
13 Congress. Again, though, if history is our teacher,
14 recent actions by Congress in the name of good
15 government have done anything but bring good
16 government, good policy, or good results to the
17 citizens of this state, this region or this country.

18 I think we only have to look at the
19 Medicare drug bill, the recent energy bill, the
20 bankruptcy format, no child left behind, or
21 transportation bill to see proof of outside
22 influences and the influence of special interest and
23 lobbies has done anything but bring good government,
24 good policy or good results, and has subverted the
25 ability of citizens to manage their local affairs

1 and local government.

2 Sadly, our objections to the politics
3 underpinning the approval process for this project
4 are not valid reasons for its denial, but they
5 shouldn't be forgotten. We should remember them and
6 deal with them at the right time and the right place
7 -- that's on Election Day in the voting booth.
8 There are quite clearly, however, solid policies,
9 scientific and safety reasons that our membership
10 rejects this proposal. We, therefore urge the
11 rejection of Broadwater as bad policy, bad for the
12 environment and bad for the people who live and work
13 around Long Island Sound.

14 Thank you.

15 (Applause.)

16 MR. STAEGER: Thank you. The next
17 speaker is Eric Bruzairis.

18 MR. BRUZAIRIS: Good evening. My name is
19 Eric Bruzairis with the Long Island/New York Public
20 Interest Group, NYPIRG, a good government,
21 environmental, and consumer advocacy group, state
22 wide.

23 I would like to thank the Coast Guard for
24 holding this hearing and giving the public an
25 opportunity to speak. I will be brief. You have

1 heard everything that I would have said. In terms
2 of opposing this project, I would like to make one
3 or two other comments quickly. One is, you have
4 heard the voices of Long Islanders tonight. These
5 are people whose lives will be affected, and I know
6 you take that with great seriousness.

7 This is a decision that will be made
8 partly from Washington, but when you do make that
9 decision, understand that there are local concerns,
10 there are local people that will be affected.

11 In terms of safety issues, in terms of not
12 only the facility itself, the transportation of the
13 energy over the Sound through the North Fork, take
14 into consideration the affects on first responders,
15 something you hadn't heard. People who will go just
16 because they are asked, and we need to look out for
17 them, we do, because they are in our charge.

18 With that I conclude. Thank you.

19 MR. STAEGER: Can you repeat the name of
20 your organization, I'm not sure she picked that up.

21 MR. BRUZIARIS: Eric Bruziaris, NYPIRG,
22 New York Public Interest Research Group.

23 MR. STAEGER: Thank you.

24 (Applause.)

25 MR. STAEGER: The next person's last name

1 is Woulfin, and I'm sorry I can't read it.

2 MR. WOULFIN: My name is Daniel Woulfin,
3 and I am a Long Islander. My parents, my
4 grandparents, my cousins, we all have grown up on
5 Long Island; we all use the Sound. Also I work here
6 at Stony Brook as a teaching assistant in the
7 Department of History. Many of my students are Long
8 Islanders. My point is that this is my home and
9 Long Island Sound has always been a public natural
10 resource. Broadwater would end that with no benefit
11 to Long Island.

12 The Sound would cease to be an estuary of
13 national importance that would be usable for all
14 Long Islanders. Broadwater would basically
15 privatize Long Island Sound. We will not be able to
16 use the Sound in a safety zone. We will not be
17 allowed in. The liquid natural gas facility would
18 serve as an eyesore on the Sound, limiting the
19 number of Long Islanders who could use the Sound and
20 would be a potential danger to our environment.

21 Broadwater serves no one here on Long
22 Island; not myself, my family, not my friends, my
23 colleagues or my students. As a third generation
24 Long Islander I implore you to deny this
25 application. We don't want it.

1 (Applause.)

2 MR. STAEGER: Cheryl Lynch.

3 MS. LYNCH: Thank you for hearing me
4 today. My name is Cheryl Lynch. I am on the Board
5 of Directors of NYPIRG, New York Public Interest
6 Research Group. I am also an eighth generation Long
7 Islander and I was on a boat on the Sound when I was
8 seven days old. This will be horrible for all those
9 who live, work and play on Long Island, the
10 environment, our economy and the public use of the
11 Long Island Sound. Thank you.

12 (Applause.)

13 MR. STAEGER: Kate Contino, next.

14 MS. CONTINO: Kay Contino. I am not a
15 Long Islander; I am a transplant from upstate New
16 York, but I have called Long Island home for over a
17 year now, and I continue to live and work in the
18 community. I would like to see nothing more than
19 the beauty of the Sound to be preserved and
20 Broadwater's proposal would stop that dead in its
21 tracks. It's up to you, Commissioners of FERC, to
22 make sure that that doesn't happen.

23 I don't want to be redundant. We are all
24 tired. My points have been reiterated for the past
25 three hours. Take what has been said under serious

1 consideration and do what is right for Long Island
2 and stop this proposal.

3 (Applause.)

4 MR. STAEGER: Scott Zotto, next.

5 MR. ZOTTO: Good evening. My name is
6 Scott Zotto, and I am a Long Island resident, born
7 and raised 26 years enjoying this beautiful Island.
8 I really endorse the comments of most of the people
9 that have been speaking, especially Kate that just
10 spoke.

11 So I just want thank you very much for
12 bringing us all together. I am a Long Islander and
13 a budding environmental advocate. I voice my
14 opposition to the Broadwater proposal. It has been
15 said over and over tonight that this LNG facility
16 poses great risks to the marine environment and it
17 intrudes on Long Island residents with the 100 or so
18 platform member crew it requires and the personnel
19 that have to attempt to contain an unfortunate
20 accident. There is a reason everyone has been
21 saying this, to me, to you, to everyone.

22 Pool fires, vapor clouds and creating an
23 obvious terror target scares me. A fire capable of
24 melting steel, that scares me. Asphyxiation, that
25 scares me. I won't mention that this proposal moves

1 us further and further away from utilizing renewable
2 energy sources. I will mention that again: This
3 proposal moves us further and further away from
4 utilizing renewable energy sources.

5 My name is Scott Zotto, again, and I am
6 opposed to the Long Island Broadwater proposal.
7 Thank you very much.

8 (Applause.)

9 MR. STAEGER: Randy Stein.

10 MR. STEIN: My name is Randy Stein. I am
11 a lifetime Long Island resident. The safety
12 concerns about LNG have been enumerated numerous
13 times, so I will just briefly say that, as a Long
14 Island resident, the potential or safety risks that
15 will be caused by energy spills, pool fires, and
16 vapor clouds, and the irrigation that could affect
17 Long Island residents not just near the LNG but
18 throughout the Island, scares me greatly. I feel
19 that LNG is not in the best interest of Long Island
20 residents.

21 (Applause.)

22 MR. STAEGER: Don Seubert.

23 I would like to thank you all for making
24 those two short statements. We have six remaining.

25 MR. SEUBERT: Good evening. I don't know

1 if I can make it shorter, but I will try.

2 My name is Don Seubert, and I am a Long
3 Island lifer, too. I am representing the Medford
4 Taxpayers and Civic Association in Medford and I
5 just want to tell you these comments:

6 Long Islanders recognize the great
7 protections, security and environmental oversight
8 that our U.S. Coast Guard provides. However, we
9 realize the enormous stress Long Island, New York
10 City, and Connecticut place on our service men.
11 Long Island Sound is itself at risk. Millions of
12 dollars to salvage our Long Island estuary has been
13 spent, and much more needs to be expended.

14 We need to save the ecology of our Sound
15 not place it in additional danger. Natural,
16 invasive, environmental, accidental, over
17 development, recreational abuses on knowing
18 thoughtless actions place daily our Sound at risk.
19 We need no additional man-made created risk to the
20 people's Sound. The crown jewel for millions of
21 residents whose waters are their livelihood, beauty,
22 recreation, get-away from the 2005 rat race, is too
23 important to risk. If, indeed, our area is to
24 remain vital, Long Island Sound is no energy crisis
25 solution, but Broadwater could be the incubator for

1 a crisis.

2 Recent events tell us we have so little
3 ability to react to a disaster. Our armed forces
4 lack improvement and are spread too thin. Threats
5 of base closings, stress dangers, dwindling
6 personnel, it takes only common sense to realize the
7 possible catastrophic dangers to our environment and
8 well being. Too few Coast Guard personnel should
9 not be manning videotape, escorting ships, fly
10 helicopters overhead at taxpayers' expense to lessen
11 an unneeded and unwanted public risk. Even the
12 reimbursed efforts in energy from our Coast Guard
13 ought not to serve as paid protection for private,
14 foreign, and domestic conditions.

15 With U.S. deployment concerns, how can we
16 be assured that the necessary emergency brigade and
17 necessary expertise will be available 365 days a
18 year? Energy conglomerates, multi-billion dollar
19 protected cargo serves only to maintain our
20 addiction to fossil fuel and its possible dire
21 environmental consequences. Brookhaven Town,
22 Suffolk lakes which were once swimmable are no
23 longer. Indeed, our Long Island beaches or Long
24 Island Sound beaches are all closed to fishing and
25 swimming. Our clams, scallop, oyster, lobster,

1 fishing beds continually fight extinction. It would
2 be unconscionable not to address each and every
3 risk.

4 Minus 270 degrees is to me an uncharted
5 death. I would hate to view a photograph of DNA at
6 270 degrees. What mutations to marine life might
7 result? Species partially escaping such frigid
8 temperatures and those that succumb become the new
9 environment only to offer us a souther Sound. The
10 risks are not worth it. Our Coast Guard needs to
11 return to their most admirable goal and truly
12 protect our citizens and waters to ensure our marine
13 life's future. Neither our U.S. Coast Guard nor our
14 environment should ever be at risk. Oh, Lake
15 Pontchartrain is a little less than half the size of
16 Long Island Sound. We all know how well we are
17 doing in New Orleans. Thank you very much.

18 (Applause.)

19 MR. STAEGER: Ernie Fazio.

20 MR. FAZIO: Good evening. My name is
21 Ernie Fazio. I am Chairman of the Long Island Mid
22 Suffolk Business Section. We are an organization
23 that promotes the building of major infrastructure,
24 where we decide it is to the benefit of the
25 community and where it is environmentally better

1 than what we are doing. Our board of directors have
2 not made a decision on whether Broadwater is a good
3 idea or a bad idea, but I did make some
4 observations.

5 As far as the danger of the vessels in the
6 Sound, we have oil shipments that come on that
7 harbor all the time, on the Sound all the time, and
8 they represent a spill liability that's far in
9 excess of anything that could happen with liquid
10 natural gas. Gasoline tankers as well, very, very
11 dangerous, as compared to the LNG.

12 The oil that we use in our homes, which
13 would we would like to phase out, because that is a
14 clear and present danger to our health and we do not
15 want to have -- we would like to see more natural
16 gas used on Long Island for the heating of our homes
17 and buildings. So these are all the positives for
18 the Broadwater situation.

19 As far as sources, some people say that
20 the same sources provide oil as gas and therefore
21 they are vulnerable in the international market. I
22 somehow agree with that. That does seem to be a
23 problem, but it is not exactly the same sources.
24 There are places that we would be getting natural
25 gas from where we would not be getting any oil from,

1 and it would be new sources.

2 So as far as the danger of the natural
3 gas, I did a project years ago with some vendors I
4 was involved with, and we needed to test a hydrogen
5 tank as to how it would react to an accident and
6 subsequent ignition. We made that comparison to
7 gasoline and we found that the gasoline was
8 infinitely much more dangerous because it laid low
9 to the ground and absolutely consumed the vehicles
10 that we were testing, whereas the hydrogen gas being
11 lighter than air burned from the top and left the
12 vehicles actually intact.

13 I assume that the situation would be
14 similar with the gas that was now released and
15 gasified, but I really don't know for sure. I am
16 not a scientist, I am somebody who just gets
17 involved with that kind of technology from time to
18 time as a layman with a science background. Again,
19 I don't qualify as a scientist.

20 What other points did I want to make here?
21 Oh, they want to repower all the generators on Long
22 Island. I had gotten the Chairman of KeySpan to say
23 that that will be done. When we have enough cables
24 to produce enough electricity so that we can close
25 down these oil plants during the summertime when

1 demand is high, we will be able to do that. So this
2 will be contributing to the source of natural gas
3 that we will need to power those plants and to
4 supplant the use of oil on Long Island.

5 I think for all these points, we have to
6 take into consideration that all of the things these
7 people have said here are rather valid observations
8 and criticisms of the plan. On the other hand, I
9 think that we should keep the argument open and
10 consider all the things that I have said. Thank
11 you, all.

12 MR. STAEGER: Thank you. Next will be
13 Mike Padi.

14 DR. PADI: Mike Padi. I'm an educator,
15 social studies teacher. There are going to be many
16 papers that ask the students to write, both in the
17 high school and middle school and college level
18 class that implicate the social, political,
19 economical and environmental, but most historical.

20 As a former County Director of Emergency
21 Preparedness, I am well aware of the mitigating
22 circumstances or preparing for, responding to,
23 recovering from man-made and natural disasters,
24 catastrophes, but we have to look at the hidden
25 agenda here. The hidden agenda is politics, and

1 it's politics as usual. Follow the money, money and
2 profit. If you were to look at the national
3 headlines in association with the disasters. We
4 look at it yesterday, we look at it the day before,
5 we look at it today, what are the headlines going to
6 say tomorrow when there are multiple incidents that
7 could take place in this Sound, in case of an
8 accident? We look at the broad picture, long term
9 not short term.

10 So I ask each and every one of you to look
11 at the hidden agenda, because politics being what it
12 is, we have short-term memory, but there will be a
13 long-term significant impact on Long Island Sound.

14 Thank you.

15 MR. STAEGER: Next.

16 MR. McDONALD: My name is Norris
17 McDonald, President of the African American
18 Environments Association. Our New York coast is
19 located in The Bronx and I am here this evening to
20 express my concern about the "NIMBYism."

21 First of all, you cannot NIMBY everywhere
22 all the time and expect to have electricity
23 everywhere all the time. That's one big concern.

24 My second concern is the need for process
25 and the possible abuse of the need for process.

1 There have been published reports that a
2 congressional task force instead of legal lawsuits
3 have at least twice have prevented system
4 improvements to protect New Orleans from a
5 hurricane, the Sierra Club and other environmental
6 groups in 1996 sued the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
7 and stopped the project around New Orleans. So I
8 have concerns about the misuse of any process.

9 I love teaching this. I've taught a
10 course, but let me get right to the specifics of the
11 issues here this evening.

12 Overall, we support the Broadwater
13 Project, first of all. Overall, the Broadwater
14 Project will be environmentally benign and will have
15 little or no impact. The largest threat to Long
16 Island Sound is pollution run off, and I will leave
17 that until I have more on that.

18 Some of the other issues, jogging the
19 soil. The disturbance of the sediment due to the
20 installation of the FSRU, the mooring and submarine
21 pipeline will be minimal. The FSRU mooring tower
22 will have a small footprint, about the size of a
23 basketball. The disturbance will be temporary, the
24 ecology in the Sound will return to its natural
25 state. The state-of-the-art cables, technologies

1 and techniques will minimize the impact.

2 Water resources: Water falling into the
3 immediate area of the FSRU will not be threatened by
4 water discharges. There will be little to those
5 discharges run off as spills. Clearly, massive
6 discharges run off the land base are a major concern
7 to the water quality in the Sound. The water
8 resources that Broadwater posits will not have a
9 negative impact on the aquatic resources, the
10 wetlands or lands. The body of the Sound will not
11 be impacted in any way by the project.

12 The project will not cause soil erosion.
13 And there will be little habitat destruction. The
14 laying of the pipeline will have a temporary effect
15 on very few organisms and will have no effect after
16 the natural body itself is restored.

17 Threaten to endangered species: The
18 project does not pose a threat to endangered
19 species, me included.

20 LNG is an excellent fuel for electricity
21 generation. We need a mix of energy sources for
22 electricity. It appears that the only real obstacle
23 is its application to Long Island Sound, which is
24 "Not in My Backyard." You can barely see it from
25 the shore. Of course their sensitivities should not

1 be belittled or minimized. Part of the reason that
2 most of the industrialization goes into minority
3 neighborhoods is the power of others to keep it out
4 of their backyards.

5 There should be some sensitivity to the
6 fact that many Americans are sacrificed for
7 industrialized activity while others barely see the
8 residue of a benign project solely because people
9 can afford to keep it out of their backyards.

10 Thank you.

11 MR. STAEGER: Tony Caserta.

12 MR. CASERTA: My name is Tony Caserta. I
13 am a native Long Islander. I am 67 years old. I
14 have seen this place change from cabbage patches to
15 where we are now, a sprawling suburban place to
16 live.

17 I have a couple of things to say: First
18 of all, one of our biggest concerns for our energy
19 is our lights, gasoline for our cars, our heat. We
20 are all dependent on oil. Right now, our oil supply
21 is primarily coming from places like Venezuela,
22 Nigeria, and Saudi Arabia. You look at this list
23 and you say: Gee, Nigeria, they have a permanent
24 Civil War going on there; in Saudi Arabia they have
25 a new king yet to be tested as to whether he is a

1 threat or not; and in Venezuela we know he is doing
2 a number on us. He's selling oil to the Bolivians,
3 to Castro and who knows who else at \$40 a barrel and
4 we are paying him 60. So we have a questionable
5 supply for our oil.

6 Most of our electrical power plants on
7 Long Island are based on oil. As an old aerial
8 space engineer -- I spent 35 years at Grumman -- I
9 know that it is good to have a back-up, an
10 alternative. I see Broadwater as a possible back-
11 up, and I think we should keep it alive, as one of
12 the other gentleman said, and really take a hard
13 look at it.

14 We have heard some excellent, excellent
15 critiques tonight, concerns of people. The concerns
16 are very valid, but I know that today modern
17 technology can solve a lot of problems. Many years
18 ago, when they started the moon program, it looked
19 like we would never get up there, too far away.
20 They gave a thousand reasons why we couldn't do it.
21 To me, this is a challenge. We have to find an
22 alternate energy source for Long Island; Natural gas
23 is a significant possibility, and to just brush it
24 aside is a mistake.

25 I know that we have windows we are looking

1 at and sure let's have them. But there is a limit
2 to how many energy they can provide. One area we
3 have not looked at is wave power. That's another
4 source of energy that we could use here on Long
5 Island and we have not really looked at it.

6 There's coal, but there's problems with
7 the coal. It's dirty. I remember cleaning out the
8 buckets at night with the coal burners in Brooklyn
9 when I was kid, it was a problem. It's a messy fuel
10 to work with.

11 Natural gas has always been the clean
12 fuel. It has a very explosive quality to it. What
13 I like about the proposal that these people have
14 made is that, first of all, we are putting the
15 storage tank out in the middle of the Sound, nine
16 miles from the nearest person. Basically, I
17 remember the tanks that used to be along side the
18 Expressway in Queens, and I used to say, "What's
19 going to happen to the neighborhood?" Well, being
20 in the Sound is a heck of a lot better neighborhood
21 for it to be in than being in the middle of Queens,
22 Brooklyn, Nassau or wherever. So I think that
23 should brought into the equation.

24 The main thing that needs to be done is
25 you need to get some good engineers to take a look

1 at all these options and look at all these concerns,
2 and one by one address them and come up with good
3 answers. That's basically story. I just hope you
4 keep it open. I hope you take a really hard look at
5 it and I hope it solves some problems.

6 I have a written statement to submit.
7 Thank you.

8 MR. STAEGER: That was our last
9 registered speaker. We have six or seven minutes,
10 if anybody would like to speak very briefly.

11 MR. OTT: My name is Charlie Ott. I just
12 represent myself. I was looking last week at the
13 television and looking at something down in the Gulf
14 Coast, and I was watching this off-shore driller
15 sitting up against a bridge. The first thing that
16 came to my mind was Broadwater. A hurricane, it
17 slips its moorings, and it goes adrift, probably up
18 in Connecticut where my son lives, and it blows up.
19 It's as bad as that. That's the way I saw it.
20 Thank you.

21 MR. MARTIN: Is there anyone else who
22 would like to add their comments?

23 MS. PENSICK: My name is Marie Pensick,
24 and I am the Acting Chair of the Long Island
25 Sailboat Group.

1 We are opposed to the Broadwater Project.
2 We have brought this issue to the Atlantic Chapter,
3 which is all over New York State, and they are
4 backing us up in the opposition. I won't go into
5 all the details, everybody has mentioned all the
6 environmental problems that could possibly result.
7 We don't know, we are a pilot program, and I guess
8 the rest of the world will learn by our mistakes
9 when and if they happen.

10 One of my feelings is that we don't need a
11 project that is going to last 30 years into the
12 future and, according a Broadwater, become a bridge
13 to true alternative and non-polluting energy. Those
14 technologies exist today; they should be implemented
15 today. Global warming is happening today, as we see
16 in New Orleans. The ice caps are melting.
17 Scientists by the thousands are telling us that this
18 is reality, this is not fiction, and to have a
19 continued dependence on fossil fuels for the next 30
20 years is totally ludicrous.

21 I have solar on my home. It costs me \$70
22 a year to run my electric utilities, and that's
23 where we should be putting our efforts, not in a
24 ridiculous project that's going to continue for the
25 next 30 years from fossil.

1 When is the last time you ever heard of a
2 solar panel exploding? When was the last time you
3 heard of a wind turbine losing its base and flying
4 off and killing someone? I don't think you can
5 answer those questions.

6 (Appause.)

7 MR. MARTIN: Thank you. We can squeeze
8 one more in if someone else has a comment?

9 (No response.)

10 MR. MARTIN: Okay. Thank you very much.
11 You have all been very polite. I appreciate your
12 cooperation in keeping things organized and on
13 schedule. Certainly we'll take into consideration
14 everything we have heard. There will be a copy of
15 the transcript generated and it should be available
16 on our web page in about 10 days.

17 So thank you very much. Good night.

18 (Time noted: 10:25 p.m.)

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

I, Margaret Eustace, a Shorthand Reporter and notary public, within and for the State of New York, do hereby certify:

That I reported the above proceedings on September 13, 2005, in Stony Brook, New York, and that to the best of my ability, this transcript is an accurate transcription of what transpired at that time and place.

I further certify that I am not related to any of the parties to this action by blood or marriage, and that I am in no way interested in the outcome of this matter.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this day of , 2005.

Margaret Eustace
Shorthand Reporter