

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

BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF:
NORTHEAST (NE) -07 PROJECT
MILLENNIUM PIPELINE LLC
DOCKET NOS. CP98-150-006, et al

Brookfield High School Auditorium
45 Longmeadow Hill Road
Brookfield, Connecticut

Tuesday, July 18, 2006

The above-entitled matter came on for public
meeting, pursuant to notice at 6:08 p.m.

MODERATOR: JENNIFER KERRIGAN

1 MODERATOR KERRIGAN: Okay. Alright. Good
2 evening and welcome to the Shuttle Energy Regulatory
3 Commission's comment meeting for the Draft Supplemental
4 and Environmental Impact Statement or DSEIS for the
5 proposed Northeast '07 project. We also refer to this
6 project as the NE-07 Project. My name is Jennifer
7 Kerrigan and I'm the FERC Environmental Project Manager
8 for this DSEIS. Also here at the table with me tonight
9 are Alex Dankanich from the U.S. Department of
10 Transportation and Chuck Rosenberg from the staff of our
11 consultant, Northern Ecological Associations,
12 Incorporated, or NEA. NEA is assisting us in the
13 preparation of the environmental impact statement for
14 this project.

15 Also assisting with the meeting tonight at
16 the speaker sign-in table are Ellen Armbruster of the
17 FERC staff and Kim Edelman from NEA. Oh, somebody just
18 turned the volume up. The DSEIS was issued by the FERC
19 on June 15th, 2006 and was noticed by the EPA on June
20 16th, 2006. The DSEIS describes the NE-07 project, which
21 is a multi-company natural gas construction project that
22 proposes to provide additional transportation capacity to
23 the northeast U.S.

24 These projects are all under Federal
25 jurisdiction and their permit applications are being

1 reviewed together by the FERC since they are all related
2 projects. They're related projects because the
3 facilities proposed by each company are needed to provide
4 upstream and/or downstream natural gas transportation
5 capacity. Since they are related we're evaluating all of
6 the projects in one environmental document.

7 The NE-07 project includes Millennium
8 Pipeline Company's amended project, the Millennium
9 Pipeline Project Phase I, which is proposed in Docket No.
10 CP98-150 et al and the related applications proposed by
11 Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation in CP98-151 et al.

12 And it also includes and incorporates Columbia's line A-
13 5 replacement project proposed in Docket No. CP0519-000.

14 Other related projects include the Empire
15 Connector Project proposed in Docket No. CP06-5,
16 Algonquin Gas Transmission Systems Ramapo Expansion
17 Project proposed in Docket No. CP06-76-000 and Iroquois
18 Gas Transmission Systems Market Access Project which is
19 an amendment proposed in Docket No. CP02-31-002.

20 Tonight we are providing you with an
21 opportunity to comment on the DSEIS that was
22 prepared for the NE-07 project. Hopefully you have
23 reviewed the document and have some comments about it.
24 We are here to listen to your comments. In the DSEIS we
25 have attempted to address the environmental issues

1 related to the NE-07 project, but this is a big project
2 with a lot of details and issues. For example, you may
3 believe pipeline construction on your property is not
4 accurately described. We want you to point this out so
5 that we can prepare as accurate a final document as
6 possible and we appreciate your comments.

7 All of the comments you present tonight
8 and any written comments you may file with the Commission
9 will be given equal consideration. The final
10 Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, or SSEIS
11 will be part of the information that the Commission will
12 use in examining the applications that are -- that make
13 up the NE-07 project. In addition to environmental
14 issues the Commission will also be considering issues
15 related to gas transportation rates and tariffs,
16 engineering design and the need for the project.

17 The Commission will make its decision
18 about the merits of the NE-07 project sometimes after the
19 final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement is
20 issued. As a reminder, all comments on the draft
21 environmental impact statement should be filed with the
22 Secretary of the Commission by July 31st, 2006.

23 Before I describe how we proceed with the
24 speaker portion of the meeting Mr. Alex Dankanich from
25 the U.S. Department of Transportation would like to make

1 a short presentation. Thank you.

2 MR. ALEX DANKANICH: Thank you Jennifer.
3 Good evening. As Jennifer said, my name is Alex
4 Dankanich. Is the audio okay for everybody in the back?
5 Thank you.

6 VOICE: Bring the mic. closer to your
7 mouth please?

8 MR. DANKANICH: Bring it closer? Okay.
9 Is the audio fine now in the back? Okay. Thank you.
10 Again, my name is Alex Dankanich. I work for the U.S.
11 Department of Transportation, the Office of Pipeline and
12 Hazardous Material Safety Administration, which I'll be
13 referring to as PHMSA. PHMSA is part of the U.S. DOT
14 Department of Transportation. Our programs are driven by
15 our mission to ensure the safe reliable and
16 environmentally sound operation of our nation's pipeline
17 transportation system. The cornerstone of our program is
18 the inspection and enforcement of our pipeline safety
19 regulations by qualified inspectors located in five
20 regional offices throughout the United States.

21 Our regulations include the minimum safety
22 requirements for all pipelines and liquefied natural gas
23 facilities. PHMSA has established pipeline safety
24 regulations for hazardous liquid and natural gas
25 pipelines as well as liquefied natural gas facilities.

1 The regulations are contained in Title 49 of the Code of
2 Federal Regulations, Parts 190 through Part 199, and
3 include requirements for pipeline design, construction,
4 operation, maintenance, personnel qualification,
5 emergency response and employee substance abuse testing.

6 The Pipeline Hazardous Material Safety
7 Administration has regulatory authority over the safe
8 operation and maintenance of pipeline appurtenances such
9 as gas compressor stations. These facilities,
10 compressors, include such devices as automatic shutoff
11 devices, relief valves and gas detection equipment.

12 Prior to commencing operations the
13 facilities operator must establish detailed procedures
14 that specify the normal operating perimeters for all
15 equipment. When a piece of equipment is modified or
16 replaced all procedures must be reviewed and modified if
17 necessary to assure the integrity of the system. All
18 personnel must complete training in operation and
19 maintenance, security and fire fighting. The facility
20 operator must develop and follow a detailed maintenance
21 procedure to ensure the integrity of the various safety
22 systems such as gas detectors, fire detectors,
23 temperature sensors that all automatically activate
24 should an emergency shutdown system occur.

25 The pipeline facility operator must also

1 coordinate with local officials and apprise them of the
2 types of fire control equipment available within the
3 facility. The PHMSA's pipeline regulations require tight
4 security of facilities including controlled access,
5 communication systems and enclosure monitoring and
6 patrolling. During construction OPS, Office of Pipeline
7 Safety, PHMSA, regional staff inspects to ensure that
8 construction complies with the construction requirements
9 of Part 192.

10 In Connecticut PHMSA has partnered with
11 the Gas Pipeline Safety Unit of the Connecticut
12 Department of Public Utility Control. A representative
13 from the Connecticut DPUC is present and will speak about
14 his program this evening. In summary, I believe that
15 through the Federal State partnership diligent attention
16 will be paid to the safety of the proposed facility.
17 Thank you Jennifer.

18 MODERATOR KERRIGAN: Thank you. As you
19 may have noticed, we have a Court Reporter here to record
20 a transcript of this comment meeting. If you wish to
21 obtain copies of the transcript please speak to the Court
22 Reporter after the meeting concludes. And I believe we
23 also have some information out at the sign-up table about
24 getting in touch with her to get a transcript if you want
25 to leave before the meeting ends.

1 Also, if you have written material that
2 you would like to have made part of the public record
3 please give it to the Court Reporter and it will be
4 attached as an exhibit to the transcript. Now for an
5 explanation of how we will proceed with the comment
6 meeting here tonight. We will begin with the elected
7 officials, but I understand that some have been delayed
8 getting here so we may need to work them in when they get
9 here just to let you know that that potentially may
10 happen. The speaker order that we will use was based on
11 the order in which you signed up on the sign-up sheets.
12 And it would be -- when you come up to the microphone to
13 speak it would be helpful if you would state your name
14 and also if you would spell it for the Court Reporter.

15 We don't have a very long speaker list so
16 if you want to speak longer than five minutes you may do
17 so. Right now it looks like we just have maybe 15 or 16
18 speakers, but you know, we would probably appreciate
19 brevity if you can manage that. So with that --

20 VOICE: We need to switch that.

21 MODERATOR KERRIGAN: -- yeah, we need to
22 just make a little switch of the microphones and I will
23 just, like I said, I'll try to speak loudly and clearly
24 so you know who I'm calling on. Thanks. I guess Mr.
25 Blumenthal isn't here yet? No. Okay. Well, you let me

1 know when he -- great. Then Jerry Murphy?

2 MR. JERRY MURPHY: Can everybody hear me?

3 I'm Jerry Murphy, First Selectman of Brookfield, M-U-R-
4 P-H-Y. First of all, I want to thank some of the other
5 elected officials for being here and also all those who
6 are here. Attorney General Blumenthal we expect shortly
7 and Genie McCarthy the head of the DEP was here to
8 represent the Governor, although I understand there is
9 two accidents on exit nine.

10 VOICE: Speak up please. We can't hear
11 you.

12 MR. MURPHY: And she was to be here. I'm
13 sure she's delayed because of some accidents. Senator
14 Roraback and Representative Scribner are here, and we
15 also have a representative from Nancy Johnson's office.

16 Our objections to this pipeline is pretty
17 much universal to the town of Brookfield. NIMBY, Not In
18 My Backyard is one thing, but NIMBY for safety is another
19 thing. We don't want it in Brookfield for safety
20 reasons. We already host several miles of pipeline,
21 three different lines right next to each other, two
22 Algonquin and one Iroquois. The PIR, the Possible Impact
23 Radius, Iroquois says 624 feet, the Connecticut Siting
24 Council independent expert said, 1,040 feet. And I
25 understand that the FERC holds onto a 1,000 foot radius.

1 What we have here is experts not agreeing. It's not an
2 exact science and to have a school 2,000 feet away I
3 think is unconscionable. The difference between 600 and
4 1,000 is an order of 30, 40 percent and if that is wrong,
5 or the 1,000 is wrong, we're endangering our students.
6 Over 1,000 students at Whisconier School.

7 This is in addition to other items of
8 property values, the aesthetics of the plant and also the
9 fact that this is a volunteer fire department in
10 Brookfield and the danger is of a magnitude that just
11 isn't there. So I would urge that they find another
12 place other than Brookfield, because again, we do our
13 share. It isn't just not in our backyard, we already
14 host a good deal of dangerous pipes. Thank you.

15 MODERATOR KERRIGAN: Thank you. Our next
16 speaker is Jane Park?

17 VOICE: Is it Joni Park?

18 MODERATOR KERRIGAN: Okay. Joni. Joni,
19 sorry.

20 MS. JONI PARK: It's alright. I'm Joni
21 Park and I'm Selectman in Brookfield and I had the
22 privilege of going up to see a compressor station up in
23 Athens, New York. I was very impressed and I was
24 impressed with some of the statistics and some of the
25 information that was given in terms of all of the safety

1 factors that were in place.

2 In looking at that facility it almost
3 broke my heart because that facility sits on an old
4 airport and it's a very large airport. It sits in the
5 middle of that field and I would say within a mile or a
6 mile and a half you don't have any houses, there are very
7 few trees and should anything happen there there would
8 not be the kind of disaster that would happen here. And
9 as Jerry has indicated I think our major concern has to
10 do with the children of this community and you can give
11 us all of the statistics and I believe them, I think you
12 have probably done far more research than any of us have,
13 it's that one thing that just might go wrong that will
14 effect the children at Whisconier. That's why Brookfield
15 is concerned. We really don't want it here for that
16 reason and we ask you to please consider that. Thank
17 you.

18 MODERATOR KERRIGAN: Thank you. Andrew
19 Roraback?

20 MR. ANDREW RORABACK: Good evening. My
21 name is Andrew Roraback, that's R-O-R-A-B-A-C-K, and I'm
22 a State Senator representing the 30th district of
23 Connecticut, which includes Brookfield and 14 other towns
24 in this part of Connecticut. I want to really address my
25 comments more to the audience than to the FERC

1 representatives because in my opinion this -- the people
2 at the table represent our government and you're going to
3 hear a number of elected officials who are going to be
4 trying to tell our government that this is the wrong
5 facility in the wrong place at the wrong time. And what
6 kind of world do we live in when the elected officials
7 can't -- the representatives of the people, we work for
8 you, and we can't convince our government to do the right
9 thing? To me it's a very disheartening fact that we even
10 have to be here tonight begging the government to listen
11 to the people.

12 And so the message that I would send as
13 clearly and as strongly as possible is listen to the
14 elected officials, but more importantly listen to the
15 people of Brookfield and don't site a dangerous facility
16 at the expense of this community for some higher calling
17 because the safety of the children in residence of this
18 community is the highest calling of government and please
19 don't disregard the will of the people or do so at your
20 peril. Thank you.

21 MODERATOR KERRIGAN: Our next speaker is
22 David Scribner.

23 MR. DAVID SCRIBNER: Thank you. My name
24 is David Scribner, S-C-R-I-B-N-E-R, and I am the State
25 Representative in the Legislature representing the town

1 of Brookfield, most importantly it's people. I stand
2 before you tonight amongst my neighbors and friends and
3 fellow elected officials and now only as Brookfield's
4 State Representative, but as a lifetime resident of this
5 community, as a parent, a husband and volunteer in our
6 school system. I have tremendous concern about what is
7 being proposed here and it's potential impact on the
8 people of Brookfield and I implore you to share that
9 concern.

10 I understand this is a regulatory
11 environment and I understand aspects of the process.
12 That is not my concern. My concern is the potential
13 impact on the safety of the lives that I love and
14 represent and that certainly includes very significantly
15 the 1,200 children, faculty and staff members that
16 populate Brookfield's largest public school in far too
17 close proximity to the proposed location of this
18 facility. One needn't look very far to know that despite
19 statements and facts that are analyzed and shared that
20 there are no guarantees no matter how stringent the
21 regulations are adhered to and followed that there is no
22 room for potential disaster and catastrophe that could
23 have devastating impact on neighboring residents, on the
24 people that populate Brookfield's largest public school.
25 With that in mind, I believe that every one of us,

1 whether it be in an elected capacity or an appointed
2 capacity and whether it be in a local, State or Federal
3 level have no stronger obligation than to ensure to the
4 public that we all serve that we will not do anything
5 that has any potential and any risk that would have an
6 effect on providing them the reassurance that they are
7 safe.

8 As others have pointed out, it is not only
9 about the potential, and no one has been able to offer a
10 guarantee, tonight is a small sampling of the many
11 impassioned residents who have done tremendous amounts of
12 research and shared them on other occasions with other
13 officials, their very real concerns about how this too
14 could become a catastrophic situation and no one has yet,
15 and I don't believe has the ability to provide any
16 guarantee that that's not possible here. And so I
17 implore you to listen very carefully to those that are
18 speaking tonight and those that have communicated in
19 other forums that this is not about trying to take away
20 someone's opportunity or entity for a better bottom line.

21 It is not a denial that there's a need and a demand for
22 additional sources of energy. It is all about the people
23 and ensuring their safety. Thank you.

24 MODERATOR KERRIGAN: Thank you. Our next
25 speaker is Philip Sher.

1 MR. PHILIP SHER: Good evening. My name
2 is Philip Sher.

3 MODERATOR KERRIGAN: I think you need to
4 speak closer to the microphone.

5 MR. SHER: I'm sorry.

6 MODERATOR KERRIGAN: Thank you.

7 MR. SHER: Good evening. My name is
8 Philip Sher and I head the Gas Pipeline Safety Unit of
9 the State of Connecticut Department of Public Utility
10 Control. I've been in the Connecticut Pipeline Safety
11 program for over 30 years. I oversee a staff of
12 knowledgeable, highly dedicated engineers and together we
13 have over 58 years' experience in pipeline safety.

14 The DPUC has been involved in pipeline
15 safety since 1911. When the first interstate pipelines
16 were built through Connecticut in the early 1950s the
17 Department was the agency that oversaw the initial
18 construction, testing, and the operation and maintenance
19 of these facilities. With the passage of the Pipeline
20 Safety Act of --

21 VOICES: We can't hear you. We can't hear
22 back here.

23 MR. SHER: -- with the passage of the
24 Pipeline Safety Act of 1968 State safety over
25 jurisdiction of interstate pipelines was transferred to

1 the U.S. Department of Transportation and since then we
2 act as an interstate agent for the Office of Pipeline
3 Safety and are responsible for field inspections and
4 investigation of in Connecticut for OPS. When the
5 Iroquois pipeline was built here in the early 90s we were
6 out there on the job inspecting the pipeline and it's
7 initial construction. And we're the ones on a day to day
8 basis that oversee the operation of the interstate
9 pipeline, including Algonquin and Iroquois.

10 While we have no authority over this
11 current project with respect to establishing the need for
12 the facility nor it's location if it is approved our role
13 will be to address the issues of public safety. Our
14 initial role in this project will be to review the plans
15 developed by Iroquois and Algonquin related to the
16 facilities and ensure they comply with the minimum
17 Federal safety standards. When the actual construction
18 of the pipeline facility occurs my unit will have
19 personnel on the scene to inspect the project as we need
20 to during the construction phase.

21 When the project is finished there will be
22 a pressure test to check everything out and it's our
23 normal procedure to witness those tests to ensure the
24 integrity. And after the facility is placed in service
25 we'll be responsible for ongoing oversight of the

1 operation and maintenance of these facilities as we
2 oversee the rest of the interstate system in Connecticut
3 which constitutes approximately 600 miles of pipeline and
4 two other compression stations totaling about 35,000
5 horsepower. This is in addition to the 7,000 miles of
6 local gas company mains, 390,000 services, for a total of
7 over 12,000 miles of pipe.

8 Our mission is very simple. It's to
9 ensure public safety through a planned and disciplined
10 inspection effort and coordination and cooperation with
11 the Office of Pipeline Safety. This includes ongoing
12 reviews, the operation of maintenance activities,
13 including corrosion control to ensure the safety of the
14 system. Excavation damage prevention programs to
15 minimize damage by people digging and with little pride
16 we think we have the best system in the country.

17 Integrity management programs to ensure
18 the long term integrity of the pipeline, operator
19 qualifications programs to make sure the people working
20 on the pipeline are properly trained and qualified and
21 emergency response planning so that we're ready in case
22 anything ever happens. I'm here to tell you that we will
23 do everything we can consistent with existing laws to
24 make sure the facility is built properly, it is tested
25 properly and it's operation maintained properly.

1 And we feel comfortable that we can handle
2 this job. I understand your feelings and I'm not going
3 to say whether this facility should or should not be
4 built, just to reassure you that if it is we will ensure
5 that it's done properly. Thank you. My name is Philip
6 Sher.

7 VOICE: Would you entertain questions now?

8 MODERATOR KERRIGAN: We -- you can speak
9 informally with people after this proceeding, but I don't
10 -- I'm not sure what --

11 VOICE: I'd like to ask him a question as
12 a professional.

13 MODERATOR KERRIGAN: Well, I think you can
14 speak to him informally afterwards. This is for comment
15 on our draft document. Thank you.

16 MR. SHER: If anybody has any questions
17 I'd be more than willing to answer them at any time.
18 Thank you.

19 VOICE: I'd like it on public record.

20 MODERATOR KERRIGAN: You can speak to them
21 informally afterwards. This is --

22 VOICE: This is not --

23 MODERATOR KERRIGAN: -- the purpose of
24 this meeting is to comment on our draft environmental
25 impact statement. That's the purpose and he said he

1 would speak with you informally.

2 VOICE: -- (Indiscernible, too far from
3 mic.)

4 MODERATOR KERRIGAN: And we do not -- and
5 please do not speak out from the audience. We cannot
6 make a recording of people just speaking out.

7 VOICES: We can't hear you.

8 MODERATOR KERRIGAN: Okay. I'm sorry. I
9 forgot. I've got these microphones here and I keep
10 thinking you can hear me. You can speak with him
11 informally if you have some questions. This is -- the
12 purpose of this meeting is it's a comment meeting on the
13 draft environmental impact statement, okay?

14 VOICE: I guess what my point is, is he
15 spoke as a professional on the subject. I have a
16 question on the subject and I'd like it to be part of the
17 public record.

18 MODERATOR KERRIGAN: And I responded to
19 you. You may speak with him informally. That's not the
20 purpose of this meeting. This meeting is to comment on
21 the draft environmental impact statement, not on his
22 particular role as a professional, okay? Thank you. I
23 appreciate -- and he is willing to talk to you. Okay. I
24 think we can move onto our next speaker. We've got to
25 rearrange the microphone again. Our next speaker is Art

1 Kerley.

2 MR. ART KERLEY: My name is Art Kerley,
3 and I'm a Selectman here in --

4 MODERATOR KERRIGAN: No, you've got to
5 speak into --

6 MR. KERLEY: This one or this one?

7 MODERATOR KERRIGAN: -- that's for the
8 Court Reporter. The little one's for the Court Reporter.
9 That one there.

10 MR. KERLEY: Okay. My name is Art Kerley,
11 K-E-R-L-E-Y, and I'm a Selectman here in Brookfield.

12 VOICES: We can't hear you.

13 MR. KERLEY: Again, Art Kerley, K-E-R-L-E-Y,
14 I'm a Selectman here in Brookfield. I just want to
15 really reinforce reiterate what First Selectman Jerry
16 Murphy said and Selectman Park. I also went to visit the
17 Athens facility and we all agree that Iroquois seems to
18 do a fine job. It was a fine running facility, lots of
19 safety precautions, what have you. But as Selectman Park
20 said, the stark contrast between that environment and the
21 environment here in Brookfield is simply -- it's
22 startling, it's striking.

23 There it's open field, a rural
24 environment, there were no houses around, you know,
25 certainly not any schools around. And again, this is the

1 business of having something risk or verse. It can't be
2 risk free certainly, but when you're trying to some kind
3 of risk or verse activity you don't knowingly put a
4 situation like a school in a setting like this.
5 Certainly if we could turn the sock inside out and if
6 Brookfield or any other town for that matter was
7 considering building a school would we ever consider
8 placing that school within 2,000 feet of a gas
9 compression facility where two pipelines are coming in of
10 unequal pressures and they have to be equalized?

11 Now granted we read all the reports that
12 these are safe facilities by and large, but as
13 Representative Scribner said, there is no guarantee. And
14 why would we want to put a facility like this in such
15 close proximity to school children? Again, I want to
16 thank First Selectman Murphy who's pulled out all the
17 stops to get all the State officials here. He's had the
18 steadfast support of Senator Roraback and Representative
19 Scribner. We want to thank all of them, the Governor,
20 Attorney General, and I think that it's important that
21 FERC listen to them and as someone said to the people of
22 the town of Brookfield, please reconsider your decision
23 and put this someplace else in a rural environment away
24 from children and schools. Thank you.

25 MODERATOR KERRIGAN: Our next speaker is

1 Paul O'Sullivan.

2 MR. PAUL O'SULLIVAN: Good evening. My
3 name is Paul O'Sullivan, O, apostrophe, S-U-L-L-I-V-A-N.

4 I represent Congresswoman Nancy Johnson representing the
5 5th District, which includes the town of Brookfield.
6 Congresswoman Johnson asked me to express her regrets
7 that she can't be here for the hearing tonight, but she
8 does look forward to meeting personally with FERC
9 representatives regarding this project in her office on
10 Thursday down in Washington, D.C. She asked me to read
11 this letter on her behalf.

12 _I am writing once again to express my
13 strong opposition to the proposed location of the
14 Iroquois Gas Transmission System, transfer compressor
15 station and natural gas cooling facilities in Brookfield,
16 Connecticut. The draft Environmental Impact Statement
17 did not adequately address the safety issues posed by
18 myself, local officials and residents. I respectfully
19 urge that FERC reject this plan and encourage Iroquois to
20 find a more suitable location.

21 The proposed site is half a mile away from
22 Whisconier Middle School which hosts 1,000 students daily
23 and is surrounded by more than 400 homes within a two
24 mile radius. Further, the school's playground is 1,900
25 feet from the location in question. As you are aware,

1 last March a natural gas tank ignited at a Colorado
2 compressor station and an employee was injured. 400
3 people from 90 homes within a four mile radius had to be
4 evacuated. In a similar situation it would be extremely
5 difficult to safely evacuate in a timely manner the
6 number of people within that distance of the proposed
7 station's location. The safety of my constituents is my
8 number concern and in my mind as well as those of local
9 officials and residents there will be real danger to
10 families and school children in the event of a rupture
11 and fire at the station.

12 It is unacceptable that FERC failed to
13 seriously consider sites that pose less of a risk to
14 students at school, families in their homes, and the
15 local environment. Such alternatives sites would impose
16 the relatively small cost of building a few miles of
17 transmission line, but would pose no safety or
18 environmental issues. I urge that FERC reject this
19 proposal for an enlarged compressor station and look for
20 alternatives that do not put 1,000 school children and
21 hundreds of neighborhood families at risk while fully
22 complying with all environmental standards. I appreciate
23 your consideration and attention to this matter._ Thank
24 you very much.

25 MODERATOR KERRIGAN: If Attorney General

1 Blumenthal is not here yet we'll go on. That's the last
2 of my list of -- oh, wait. Wait a second.

3 MR. RICHARD BLUMENTHAL: Thank you very
4 much. Thank you to the staff and members of the Federal
5 Energy Regulatory Commission. I have submitted detailed
6 comments on behalf of my office. I want to thank the
7 elected officials who are here tonight, some of my
8 colleagues from Hartford, and of course local officials,
9 Jerry Murphy and others who are representing the
10 community so ably and members of my staff, Assistant
11 Attorney General Robert Snook, who has worked very hard
12 as have others in my office on these comments. And I'm
13 not going to belabor the detailed material that is
14 contained in these comments.

15 We have noted what we consider to be very
16 serious deficiencies and flaws in this environmental
17 impact statement, the draft SEIS that we think failed in
18 a number of respects to consider not only the adverse
19 impact of this project but the alternatives, as it has an
20 obligation to, the alternatives that are easily and
21 readily available. Alternative sites and alternatives
22 configurations. This site for all the reasons that you
23 know and you have heard again reiterated tonight is very,
24 very seriously flawed if only because it is near, so near
25 to this town's only middle school that serves every day

1 some 1,000 staff and children, if only because it is in a
2 residential area that would be blighted and scared. We
3 believe that the visual and aesthetic impacts need to be
4 considered as well as the environmental effects. And of
5 course the public safety and security concerns that are
6 raised so intimately by this project.

7 But then there are alternatives and FERC
8 has an obligation to consider them. The law requires
9 that we cited the law, the hard look that the law
10 requires in our view mandates that those alternative
11 sites be considered and of course alternative
12 configurations. Why can't the towers be reduced in size?

13 Why can't the scope and scale of this project be
14 reconsidered? We believe that not only the impact of
15 features of this project taken singly and separately
16 should defeat it, but also regarded cumulatively if this
17 project is considered in terms of cumulative impact it
18 also should be doomed.

19 So very respectfully I would suggest that
20 there are very severe defects in this environmental
21 impact statement insofar as it fails to consider the
22 immediate adverse impacts to environment as well as
23 safety and also fails to consider as seriously and in
24 depth as it must the alternatives that are available. I
25 want to thank you for giving me this opportunity to be

1 with you. Again, I rely on the detailed comments that
2 we've submitted and they will be received by the FERC
3 through mail -- overnight mail that we have sent today as
4 well as the copies that we've submitted to this group
5 today. Thank you very, very much on behalf of the State
6 of Connecticut. Thank you.

7 MODERATOR KERRIGAN: Thank you. Okay.
8 Our next speaker will be Nina Jacobs.

9 MS. NINA JACOBS: I want to know if people
10 can hear me before I try to start my --

11 VOICE: Pull it down.

12 MODERATOR KERRIGAN: Yeah. You need the
13 mic. pretty close to your mouth.

14 MS. JACOBS: -- pull it down? Is that --
15 can you hear me. Okay. I won't move. I had my daughter
16 with me tonight. She's 11-years-old, she attends
17 Whisconier. I'm Nina Jacobs. She's not allowed in the
18 building because of the asbestos abatement. She worked
19 really hard on her speech. She rehearsed it and I have
20 it and I'd like to read it for her since she couldn't be
21 here. So this is Emily Jacobs, my daughter, she's aged
22 11.

23 _I'm going into sixth grade at Whisconier
24 Middle School. I have three more years there. I think
25 what Iroquois is trying to do is really, really wrong. It

1 upsets me that Iroquois doesn't care if they take a
2 chance with my life or all my friends' lives or all the
3 teachers that I really care about just so they can start
4 making tons of money.

5 If this really was a safe thing to do why
6 all the meetings and why has Iroquois been trying for
7 months and months to convince everyone that it would be
8 safe? I think it has all gotten way too complicated. It
9 really is not rocket science even though Iroquois
10 probably wants the parents to think it is.

11 I've heard about the possible risks and
12 dangers and to me, the decision is so obvious, a no-
13 brainer. I may be only 11 but even I know that no one
14 should build anything near a school that is not totally
15 safe. And this compressor station is definitely not
16 safe. Too many kids could get hurt or even die.

17 I think since Iroquois and FERC don't
18 really know for sure just how hurt we could get they
19 should not build the compressor station near Whisconier
20 School. I love Brookfield. I want to feel safe while
21 I'm growing up here. Please do the right thing. Thank
22 you._

23 And now my comments. Once again, I'm here
24 to voice my family's extreme opposition to Iroquois'
25 irresponsible, greed-driven proposal to build a gas

1 compressor station right behind Whisconier Middle School,
2 which absolutely would endanger the lives of Brookfield's
3 1,100 plus middle school children, 200 staff and teachers
4 and many residents. Attendance here tonight is not an
5 indication of the town's concern. Some of our elected
6 officials are busy running their campaigns and many
7 residents have already given their public comments. And
8 I do want to thank the elected officials for being here
9 in the summer.

10 It's no coincidence that we're here in
11 mid-July, the peak of summer vacation. Nothing that
12 Iroquois has done even to the tiniest detail has been
13 coincidental, especially timing. In fact this meeting
14 was -- it was told to the news press that it started at
15 8:00 o'clock. We caught that and we fixed it. They are
16 always calculating the path of least resistance. People
17 are on vacation, they should be, I don't know why this is
18 being done now. But -- so some of us are in town and
19 here again jumping through exhausting emotional hoops
20 voicing our very serious concern for safety. And why?
21 So far Iroquois and FERC have chosen to ignore public
22 opinion.

23 We continue to watch with sickening
24 amazement Iroquois going through this authorization
25 process, month after month, with slick, polished,

1 attorney-based, evasive, misleading, salesman-type
2 answers to our very critical questions regarding the
3 dangers that would absolutely face our school children,
4 teachers and residents.

5 Since the last meeting FERC has
6 recommended the High Meadow site pushing ahead for the
7 greater good as they like to call it. We all know that
8 money is at the root of this proposed plan. FERC, the
9 Siting Committee and Iroquois all knew that the greater
10 good could and should be served without threatening the
11 lives of 1,128 children this year at Whisconier, 200
12 teachers and staff and hundreds of residents.

13 If I'm correct it is the President and
14 Congress that have given FERC the authority to allow
15 companies like Iroquois to build what and where they need
16 to in order to deliver energy. I can't imagine that they
17 ever intended for FERC to abuse that power by putting
18 countless generations of school children at such
19 indisputable risk out of convenience and greed. That's
20 at least 1,100 counts of child endangerment and
21 negligence. It is abuse of power. But so far FERC is
22 choosing to consciously ignore that.

23 No one disagrees that energy needs to be
24 transported but it must be done safely. Safety should
25 always be a priority. Iroquois could consider

1 alternative sites. As for wetlands, we all know our
2 children are infinitely more important than frogs and
3 salamanders.

4 FERC issued a draft Environmental Impact
5 Statement on June 9th. In it they say, quote, _The
6 proposed Brookfield compressor station is not expected to
7 adversely affect the school._ Not expected to? After
8 all this time and money spent on experts your finding is
9 that you don't expect adverse effects to the school?
10 Well, NASA didn't expect the space shuttle to blow up
11 years ago, but it did. Astronauts choose to take risks,
12 our children would be forced to. It's a matter of how
13 and when a disaster will strike. The fact is FERC, along
14 with Iroquois, know they cannot unconditionally guarantee
15 with 100 percent certainty that there would never be a
16 tragic, devastating accident. They've admitted it but
17 again they are consciously and consistently choosing to
18 ignore the facts.

19 FERC found a safety expert that says an
20 explosion would not affect the school. Given time any of
21 us could find experts that would challenge his opinion.
22 No one knows for sure, it's a guess. That's exactly why
23 we should err on the side of caution. Our children are
24 not guinea pigs and should not after calculated and
25 callused greedy planning by Iroquois be put to the test.

1 Iroquois' business is not risk free.
2 Explosions do occur. The recent explosion in Colorado is
3 proof of that. There is new data showing that accidents
4 are not only on the rise, they are more common at
5 unmanned sites, as Brookfield's would be. FERC and
6 Iroquois know this also.

7 Iroquois' safety record is littered with
8 countless safety and environmental violations and huge
9 fines. Iroquois holds the record for the second largest
10 fine ever charged a pipeline company by the EPA in
11 history. Executives have been jailed and rehired. Their
12 culture has not changed. FERC is well aware of this and
13 still is recommending that this dangerous facility with
14 all it's risks be built right behind our town's middle
15 school. I want to ask FERC, the Siting committee and
16 Iroquois, whose best interest do you have in mind? It is
17 clearly not Brookfield's school children.

18 FERC and Iroquois have known from day one
19 that there is no possible safe evacuation plan for
20 Whisconier Middle School. This emergency response plan
21 no one's ever said a thing about it, it doesn't exist. I
22 want you to visualize for a minute what would really
23 happen if a very serious gas leak or devastating accident
24 were to occur. It is a horrific scenario. First of all
25 Iroquois states that no cell phones or even vehicles are

1 to be used during a gas leak. We all know there is only
2 one access road leading to the site. Brookfield's very
3 small town volunteer fire department could not maneuver
4 in and out of ground zero. No town could for that
5 matter.

6 Several months out of the year deep snow
7 banks line our roads making passing more hazardous or
8 impossible. The two small roads near the school would be
9 extremely gridlocked, emergency vehicles could not get
10 through. Hundreds upon hundreds of cars of panicked
11 parents would be everywhere while they desperately try to
12 find their children. 1,100 plus young children along
13 with 200 teachers and staff would be fleeing the school,
14 which is the only possible way for them to evacuate.
15 It's not like a fire drill where they all assemble on the
16 soccer field. There would be extreme chaos, panic and
17 fear. They'd be running every which way to get away from
18 the disaster through many people's yards, possibly
19 through deep snow, trying to get far enough away. Who
20 knows whose house they may end up in. Girls 11 to 14
21 years of age are the most abducted. That's a dangerous
22 situation in itself. In this day and age it's a very
23 real concern. It's a realistic scenario that wreaks of
24 1,128 plus counts of child endangerment and careless
25 negligence.

1 Again, there is no possible safe
2 evacuation plan. When the explosion of three pipelines
3 and a compressor station occurred in Perry, Florida the
4 evacuation radius was two miles. It is disturbing and
5 frankly despicable to know that FERC and Iroquois know
6 this and they have intentionally chosen to ignore it and
7 push ahead, eagerly and aggressively, out of greed and
8 convenience for the High Meadow site.

9 Connecticut's Governor, Congresswoman,
10 Senators along with many other elected officials have
11 voiced their very strong opposition to the High Meadow
12 site because of the threat it poses to Brookfield's
13 school children. FERC has heard them and so far has
14 consciously chosen to ignore their urgent requests to not
15 build on the High Meadow site.

16 We're also concerned about the school
17 children's psychological health. They are old enough to
18 know what's going on. They would know that at any time
19 on any day -- any given day as they look out a sunny
20 window or winter snowfall there could be a horrific
21 instant disaster that could change their lives forever.
22 They have fire drills in case of fire. They would have
23 to be informed on which way and how far to run for their
24 lives when an explosion occurs. By the way, which way
25 would they all run? There are no words to express how

1 wrong and unconscionable Iroquois' plan is. It is
2 riddled with negligence.

3 As for Iroquois' high tech, state-of-the-
4 art safety precautions they're meaningless to us because
5 as long as there is even a remote chance of a
6 catastrophic event they would be taking a gamble with our
7 children's lives. A gamble that shows no regard for
8 human life, especially our young children. It is without
9 conscious that FERC and Iroquois are pushing to get this
10 proposal approved.

11 We live in a very dangerous world today.
12 Early in this process it occurred to me that this could
13 be a possible terrorist target. I recently looked up the
14 word terrorist and it said it is someone who knowingly
15 instills fear in others by threatening violence for their
16 own personal or political gain. Our school children and
17 loved ones are being threatened and the thought of an
18 explosion is terrifying and we are no where near Lebanon.

19 The words school children and explosion
20 should never be words we are forced to say in the same
21 sentence. Again, FERC is saying they don't expect there
22 to be any adverse affects to the school. Unless there is
23 zero risk there should be zero tolerance for any company,
24 Federal or otherwise, that would put our school children
25 in harm's way.

1 A lot of time has already gone into this
2 High Meadow site plan, but it is not too late to stop.
3 If this site gets FERC's stamp of approval the only
4 possible explanation we can conclude is that the Federal
5 Energy Regulatory Commission and Iroquois are filled with
6 pay offs, greed, self-serving ulterior motives and
7 corruption. FERC please prove us wrong._ Thank you.

8 MODERATOR KERRIGAN: Our next speaker is
9 Michelle McBride.

10 MS. MICHELLE McBRIDE: I decline because
11 Ms. Jacobs said just about everything that I could.

12 MODERATOR KERRIGAN: Okay. Thank you.
13 Then our next speaker will be Greg George.

14 MR. GREG GEORGE: Can everyone hear me?
15 Can everyone hear me? Better? Better?

16 MODERATOR KERRIGAN: You need to be real
17 close.

18 MR. GEORGE: My name's Greg George, G-E-O-
19 R-G-E, that's the last name. Should have, would have,
20 could have embarrasses a great deal of people. FEMA
21 relied on the Army Corps of Engineers with the levees,
22 FERC is relying on the arc of danger formula for their
23 decision to hold the wool over their eyes and ignore
24 Whisconier Middle School.

25 Wetland protection is more important than

1 fifth to eighth graders, but back then under the Clinton-
2 Gore wetlands was more important than terrorism. He who
3 hesitates is lost. Iroquois hesitated because they say
4 the markets and the time changed and they had to adjust
5 for their needs. Well, in that time the Brookfield
6 landscape changed too. Yet FERC still holds the wool
7 over their eyes.

8 Homes and communities have sprung up that
9 are even closer than Whisconier Middle School. This
10 buries your reasoning about the alternative site location
11 table 3.2.4.6-1, page 3-42. You'll need to revisit it
12 because your reasons are now invalid. What is your
13 recourse? Iroquois was corrupt and you still allow this
14 to happen. The gentleman who spoke about looking at the
15 pipelines before I think that when Iroquois put in the
16 line they were extremely negligent. So I'm kind of
17 curious at what kind of testing and quality assurance
18 that company is doing for us.

19 KeySpan, who is part of this partnership
20 as well, according to the Post April 17th, 2006 still
21 owes 852,000 in fines. More recently, March 5th, natural
22 gas tank ignites in rural Colorado, 400 people from 90
23 homes within a four mile radius had to be evacuated.
24 Firefighters could not reach the blaze for hours. And
25 I'd like to focus on hours. So that arc of danger

1 increases with the fact that they can't reach the site,
2 so if you say it's 1,000 feet, imagine two hours time.
3 That increases even farther and farther. So I think you
4 need to rethink your math. You need to go home and you
5 need to rethink this whole project.

6 Fire Chief Phil Tiffany is quoted as
7 saying, within a one half mile radius of the school it
8 would severely harm the structure of the school. There
9 could have been potential casualties. I would hesitate
10 to even allow homes within 2,000 feet. This is him
11 saying this. It would complicate evacuating the school
12 and the kids -- put kids on buses and worry about the
13 lives of the teachers. He needed no formula, he lived
14 it. So I think you need to rethink your thoughts because
15 they are invalid at this point in time.

16 2-18, gas coolers 20 to 25 feet in height.
17 I think Iroquois says 50, so you might need to revisit
18 that. 2-27, FERC third party, party project manager, I'd
19 like to know who that project manager is. 2-28, web site
20 is going to post daily and weekly inspection reports. Is
21 there a web site? Where is it? Do we have access to it?
22 Can we see it? 2-49, permanent water supply and onsite
23 sanitary waste disposal is required and local officials
24 are going to have to approve each step of that way.

25 2-52, maintenance activities include

1 regular scheduled gas lead surveys. Have any been done?
2 Have you checked on it? Who is responsible for
3 monitoring this? I don't hear any comments from the
4 board up here and I don't expect to be seeing -- or
5 hearing any of their comments.

6 As important Scoda (phonetic) 4-250
7 there's a major flaw in the software and there's a major
8 discussion going on. So I think you need to revisit the
9 software that this company is using. You need to do your
10 homework. Whisconier Middle School kids do and it's only
11 fair that you do the same and you need to revisit the
12 decision and go somewhere else.

13 MODERATOR KERRIGAN: Thank you. Our next
14 speaker is Dick Vlaha.

15 MR. DICK VLAHA: Let me see if I can get
16 this straight. Can you hear me?

17 VOICE: Yes.

18 MR. VLAHA: You know, there's not much
19 more to say than everybody's said here tonight. One of
20 the things I would like to do is to complement FERC, the
21 Environmental Protection and the Army Corps of Engineers
22 for following a very strict checklist of the safety that
23 needs to be done to install one of these gas pipelines.

24 Having said that however, I said -- I'm
25 going to say that that system to me is flawed because

1 there is nothing, nothing that I have seen that has a
2 risk analysis like NASA that takes into account the
3 effect that it has on human life. I understand
4 environmental protection. I understand safety, but it
5 has to and if it does not it is totally flawed. If it
6 does not take into consideration a risk analysis on human
7 life. If that was in your checklist there would be no
8 doubt in my mind or anybody here that you would pick an
9 alternative site other than High Meadow.

10 MODERATOR KERRIGAN: Thank you. Our next
11 speaker will be Bruno Ricci.

12 MR. BRUNO RICCI: Hi. My name is Bruno
13 Ricci, R-I-C-C-I. First of all, I'd like to thank all of
14 the elected official who are here tonight, especially for
15 coming on a day like this. I know many of my neighbors
16 are not here because of a vacation and with the weather I
17 guess.

18 The draft supplement -- the Draft
19 Supplemental Environment Impact Statement concludes that
20 the construction proposed of the compressor station is
21 not expected to have an adverse effect to Whisconier
22 Middle School. I would like to ask Iroquois, FERC, and
23 the DOT if a catastrophic incident were to occur at the
24 proposed compressor station is school evacuation and
25 children at the playing field exposed to heat flux

1 adverse effects?

2 When you look at past incidents that
3 occurred at similar compressor stations as the one
4 proposed in Brookfield evacuation radius is measured in
5 miles. Therefore the school, about 600 yards from the
6 site, would have to be evaluated. The proposed eight
7 acre compressor station would become an active component
8 connected to three pipelines. The potential magnitude of
9 a catastrophic incident is greatly increased. If the
10 station and the three pipelines were to explode the
11 effect would be devastating for our town.

12 Such similar incidents has occurred as Ms.
13 Jacobs pointed out in Perry, Florida on August 18th, 1998
14 DOT I.D. report 1998-0102, in this incident a similar
15 compressor station of the type that Iroquois is proposing
16 connected to three pipelines exploded. Four firefighters
17 were injured. Several residents and vehicles were
18 destroyed. The evacuation radius was two miles. If such
19 incident were to occur at the proposed Brookfield site a
20 two mile radius would include Whisconier Middle School
21 with the 1,200 children and about 3,500 homes, business,
22 handicapped housing in the town of Brookfield, Newtown
23 and Bethel.

24 I have written letters to FERC with more
25 details on this and it's on file. I checked it. In my

1 opinion Iroquois, FERC and DOT have not addressed the
2 high consequences area where Whisconier Middle School is
3 located adequately. They simply use a formula provided
4 by DOT -- the DOT to populate the potentially impact
5 radius, PIR, the radius calculated in this formula does
6 not define survivability. In other words, if you are
7 outside this area you can't for sure say, I'm going to
8 live.

9 When applied to a real incident such as
10 the one that occurred in Carlsberg, New Mexico where six
11 unfortunate victims were found 145 feet further out than
12 the radius. I have emailed to DOT. I have got a
13 response back say that it was referred to some committee,
14 never heard again how you calculate the human impact, not
15 the fancy curve and the radius. And I mailed them again,
16 never heard. I phoned them and they said they would not
17 get involved. Yet every document we have from Iroquois
18 or FERC says DOT regulates the safety.

19 We fear that in the event of a major
20 incident at the site the school would not be able to
21 evacuate. To date I have not seen any evaluation plans
22 or evacuation radius if such a catastrophic incident were
23 to occur at the proposed site. In a public awareness
24 message from Iroquois Pipeline, it was published in the
25 Danbury News Times on August 28th, 2005, in this message

1 Iroquois is telling us that if you become aware of any
2 sense of potential gas emergency such as smell, noise,
3 etcetera, we have to evaluate without using car, bus or
4 not even using the phone. The question is, how would you
5 evaluate the Whisconier Middle School?

6 In a normal situation the compressor could
7 vent -- go through a venting sequence discharging gas and
8 if the wind blows uphill to the Whisconier Middle School
9 anybody present there if they smell gas is to initiate an
10 evaluation. During this process we have asked for worst
11 case analysis and evaluation plan to be done paying
12 special attention to the middle school. In 2002 the town
13 hired a consultant. He concluded that the playing field
14 abutting the proposed site would be exposed to heat flux
15 should a catastrophic incident occur at the site.
16 Iroquois in their worst case analysis concludes that the
17 playing field would be exposed to a sunny day in the
18 topics. To date no evaluation plan is available. I
19 respectfully ask the government's representatives
20 responsible for the safety of our children to address
21 these issues.

22 Alternate sites are still available.
23 There's one on Vail Road in Brookfield and another one on
24 Hanover Road in Newtown. I would respectfully ask you to
25 reconsider. Thank you.

1 MODERATOR KERRIGAN: Our next speaker is
2 Kerry Swift.

3 MS. KERRY SWIFT: I'm Kerry Swift. This
4 one? Can you hear me? Good. Okay. Kerry Swift, K-E-R-
5 R-Y, the last name is Swift, S-W-I-F-T. And I didn't
6 really prepare anything to speak about tonight, but I'm -
7 - a prepared speech, but I do have some information that
8 I'd like to address and I'd like to first say I live
9 about a mile -- a little over a mile because we don't get
10 the mailings and I'd invite you people to come to my
11 house and tell me how I and my neighbors are going to
12 evacuate. We have a lot of houses with long driveways,
13 you know, interior lots, and to try to walk out of there
14 especially with my children at Whisconier I'm going to
15 walk away and leave my children? I'm going to have to
16 walk back up to Whisconier to try to get them? I don't
17 know how you're going to have an evaluation plan.

18 And as Bruno was saying, we haven't seen
19 one. I haven't gotten any mailings. I'm a little over a
20 mile away and I would have to evaluate and I can't even
21 imagine. Plus there's elderly people, you know, grandma,
22 hurry up, walk faster. My neighbor has an elderly mother
23 that comes to stay with her quite often. I can't even
24 imagine how she would get her there in a lot down a slope
25 how she would get her mother walking up the hill and get

1 them out of that area. And remember, we can't use a cell
2 phone. There's nothing -- we can't use a car. How would
3 we get out? And I don't think you can build this there
4 until you can answer that question.

5 I would also like to speak about the
6 regulatory agencies that are supposed to be overseeing
7 this. We keep hearing these great claims of wonderful
8 safety. How the State, the DOT is going to oversee this
9 and the EPA. Well, I'll tell you, as parents in this
10 town we have been dealing with the EPA for six years over
11 asbestos issues and the State government and we have --
12 Bruno's experience with the DOT is about what we've
13 gotten. There are weak laws and we get gobbly-gook
14 nonsense responses and I am not impressed that the EPA is
15 going to be watching over this. That makes me absolutely
16 terrified. And if you come to my house for the
17 evaluation I can show you a few boxes of nonsense letters
18 that we have too.

19 I'd also like to speak about since this is
20 an environmental impact hearing, about some of the health
21 impacts for children and elderly especially. This
22 station, I have the air report and I have some marked
23 pages that I marked, I'm not going read this. This was -
24 - Iroquois was kind enough to provide this. This is
25 their report that they have to do to test the stacks.

1 And I will tell you I will go up there and do air tests
2 myself if this gets built there. I don't believe this to
3 begin with.

4 But this is their report of what this
5 station is emitting and what this station is emitting by
6 their own admission, I have it here, is particulate
7 matter. And I have some information here on particulate
8 matter. And this is from the New Jersey Clean Air
9 Council, the 2004 Annual Public Hearing Report. I'm just
10 going to read you a few sections -- pointed sections of
11 it.

12 This is about the health effects from
13 particulate matter, which is any matter in the air under
14 10 microns. These health effects include premature
15 mortality, so there's death. Emphysema, COPD and asthma.
16 Since Emphysema is a disease of the lower airways fine
17 particles have an impact. For Bronchitis it may be 2.5
18 to 10. That's the micron, that's the size of the
19 particulate, which this station by it's own admission is
20 emitting.

21 Epidemiology has been moving towards
22 cardiac effects. We did the first study with mice
23 wearing implanted cardiac monitors. We used a normal
24 mouse and a genetically altered mouse which is prone to
25 develop cardiac aortic plaque spontaneously. These --

1 this represents a model for the human cardiac patient.
2 We found significant changes of heart rate in the mouse
3 model that varied on a daily basis with concentrations 10
4 times the ambient air. And remember, we're going to be
5 right next to this station if we are in the middle
6 school.

7 Over a five month period we saw a 10
8 percent shift in the heart rate that accumulated with
9 continuing exposure. So it got worse and worse and
10 worse. Both acute and chronic effects can come from the
11 particles in the ambient air in a susceptible model,
12 which would be those elderly people like my neighbor's
13 mother who are going to be living right near the station.

14 I'm sure there's people even living closer that are
15 elderly and I'm sure there's heart patients around there.

16 The most recent analysis of the ACS cohort
17 showed one cancer in excess of cardiovascular mortality
18 on an annual basis. That's beyond the people that died
19 from their heart giving out, they also got cancer, some
20 other people. And a second paper on the same 16 year
21 follow up documented more specific cardiac association,
22 okay? And that's for probably our elderly that live near
23 there.

24 Three short-term effects -- and this is
25 from another speaker at the same symposium and he's

1 speaking more of children. Three short-term effects from
2 air pollution are asthma, heart attacks and COPD. With
3 children it's important to look at three hour exposures
4 because it is a significant amount of the air that a
5 children (sic) breaths in the day. And we know they're
6 in school for six hours. There is a severe asthma
7 problem in Connecticut. So here we are in New Jersey and
8 they're talking about how terrible our asthma problem is
9 in Connecticut. It says, although safety standards are
10 built into the Federal Clean Air Act standards it is
11 difficult to protect people against short term health
12 impacts. And I'll tell you, I have a son who has
13 terrible asthma and what are we going to do? I'm going
14 to tell him, I'm sorry. FERC said we could put this near
15 you and your asthma you're going to get worse and suffer
16 more. We'll give you a few more inhalers. I don't
17 understand how FERC can say this is okay.

18 And this is now more of what they say.
19 Particles are toxic because they absorb water and gasses
20 forming an acid gas, which is carried deep into the lungs
21 damaging tissue. Two very important studies occurred in
22 the last four years. The Peter's study showed that PM
23 2.5, remember that's the size, 2.5 microns, was
24 associated with mild cardial infractions in Jamaica
25 Plains two hours after an increase in particulate matter,

1 so more in the air, the heart attack rate went up. The
2 second study by Dr. Gent tracked severe asthmatics in New
3 Haven, Hartford and Springfield, Massachusetts. They
4 found that 35 percent of those studied had increased
5 wheezing one hour after 50 parts per million of ozone and
6 47 percent had increased chest tightness. At no time
7 during the study was the standard exceeded.

8 So Iroquois has been telling us that it's
9 okay, we're going to be emitting these particles from
10 these basically turbine engines that we're putting in
11 your neighborhood and right next to the school, but don't
12 worry. We're not exceeding the EPA standard. Well, here
13 are the health effects when that -- when you don't exceed
14 the standard, which are pretty bad.

15 With particulate matter we have an asthma
16 epidemic at the end of the 20th century. Discovering
17 this epidemic 25 years into it suggests that we're not
18 doing a good job. Asthma is now a major disease in our
19 schools. Although EPA has revised the standard they are
20 not placing enough emphasis on short-term health effects
21 and there are plausible health risks from short-term
22 exposure. So these are our children who are going to be
23 sitting in the classroom with this particulate matter
24 being pumped over to them in their classrooms and that's
25 going to be a lot of their day and a lot of their

1 exposure and those short-term risks if you're having an
2 asthma attack and wheezing you certainly can't learn and
3 never mind what the effect is going to be on your health.

4 And it goes on. This is the last part
5 that I'm going to read to you. Six ways to reduce
6 pollution for school children includes identifying
7 sources, restricting emissions, reducing idling engines,
8 increasing make up air during the clean period and
9 preventing stagnation of the air in schools. And here we
10 have all these ways to do this and putting this station
11 next to our school violates five of them.

12 So I just -- I can't see how we can do
13 this and, you know, I just hope that FERC will listen to
14 us tonight and not do this project next to our school.
15 Thank you.

16 MODERATOR KERRIGAN: Alright. Our next
17 speaker is Wenen Chen (phonetic).

18 VOICE: (Indiscernible, too far from mic.)

19 MODERATOR KERRIGAN: Okay. Thank you.
20 Okay. Then our next speaker will be Bill Derone.

21 MR. BILL PERRONE: Can everyone hear me?

22 VOICE: Yes.

23 MR. PERRONE: My name is Bill Perrone, P-
24 E-R-R-O-N-E. My comments I agree with what everyone said
25 here, our officials, everything. It's what should be

1 talked about. My issue is what the bottom line is. You
2 know, we've talked about the safety issues and it's all
3 been minimum requirements. Minimum requirements. When
4 you're talking about school children I think you should
5 go maximum. That's more important than just skating by
6 the rules, okay?

7 And as far as I want to talk about what
8 the impact is when something does happen. You want to
9 talk about bottom line? You want to talk about making
10 money? How much are you going to pay for the first
11 person that gets hurt? A truck leaving the station
12 getting into an accident and blowing the house off it's
13 foundation and the people inside not surviving, how much
14 are you willing to pay? How much are you willing to pay
15 to train our first responders in this town? Our police,
16 our fire, our school, every year those people have to be
17 retrained because you get new people every year. How
18 much are you willing to pay?

19 How much are you willing to make our roads
20 safe for your trucks? We can't keep up with our roads
21 now. How much are you willing to pay? And how much are
22 you willing to pay for the first life lost for your first
23 mistake? Thank you.

24 MODERATOR KERRIGAN: Thank you. Our next
25 speaker is John Haggarity.

1 MR. JOHN HAGGARITY: Is this okay? I
2 would like to renew my strong opposition to this project.

3 This project is being placed in a dangerous location. A
4 lot has changed since this original proposal was approved
5 many years ago. I don't believe the original project
6 would have been approved given the number of new homes
7 and roads that surround this project. Saying that this
8 application is a simple expansion of an already approved
9 project stretches my concept of fairness and
10 thoroughness.

11 We've listened to a lot of scenarios about
12 what would happen if there was an explosion at this site.

13 The chaos at the school would be enormous. What I
14 haven't heard is what would happen with a simple small
15 gas leak or simply a warning alarm going off. Once it
16 became known in this community every parent would run to
17 pick up their child. There would be 2,000 cars
18 descending on Whisconier School at the intersection of
19 West Whisconier Road and Route 25.

20 That number of cars would create such a
21 traffic situation that both roads would be blocked. Cars
22 would be parked to the side as parents walked to get
23 their children out of harm's way. As this was going on
24 school buses would be arriving hopefully to take away
25 these children greatly aggravating the situation. The

1 situation at the school would be a nightmare.

2 While all this was going on emergency
3 vehicles would be trying to get to High Meadow Lane. If
4 you know anything about Brookfield you realize that the
5 Fire Department and Police Departments would have to pass
6 by this school or that intersection of Route 25 to get to
7 the High Meadow Lane project. This is a dangerous
8 scenario with emergency personnel not being able to get
9 there.

10 This project makes sense for only one
11 group of people and that is Iroquois. Tell Iroquois to
12 spend the money to expand the pipeline so that they don't
13 have to place this facility near our homes and near our
14 schools. Thank you.

15 MODERATOR KERRIGAN: Our next speaker is
16 Lucy Lapointe.

17 MS. LUCY LAPOINTE: Lucy Lapointe. I
18 spoke -- I spoke at our last meeting and I asked for
19 names. Names of the FERC members who are recommending
20 the High Meadow site. Why do I want names? I truly
21 believe in my heart that FERC and Iroquois working
22 together as a team already know that this is a done deal.

23 I further believe that this FERC and Iroquois team are
24 insulting the residents of this town and the dedicated
25 public officials by allowing us to voice our legitimate

1 concerns knowing that this is already a done deal.

2 With this dynamic duo in mind I go back to
3 my original question of names. I want to know who and
4 how I can contact them when a catastrophe occurs any
5 child or many children become the victim of this FERC and
6 Iroquois team. Thank you.

7 MODERATOR KERRIGAN: Okay. The last
8 speaker that I have on my list is Mike Maze.

9 MR. MIKE MAZE: Hi and thank you for the
10 opportunity to speak tonight. First I'd like to express
11 my opposition to this project. I'm located across the
12 street from the school and I feel I'd be effected should
13 there be a catastrophic failure. At one of the very
14 first meetings, and at that point it was an informational
15 meeting that we met at Whisconier School, I asked for a
16 failure analysis, worst case in case there was a
17 catastrophic failure at that compressor station. I
18 wasn't satisfied with the answer we got that it would be
19 like getting a little bit of a sunburn.

20 What I was looking for was actual
21 thermodynamic sheets that show the temperature ranges 500
22 feet out, 1,000 feet out and etcetera. We didn't get
23 that. And I think that that's the least that Iroquois
24 could provide along with a lot of other information that
25 they've held out with so far.

1 One of the points that hasn't come up
2 tonight is the fact that if that compressor station did
3 have a catastrophic failure it's not one pipeline,
4 there's two pipelines across there so it wouldn't be one
5 pipeline blowing up like some of the other failures that
6 we've talked about tonight, it would be a case where you
7 could have two pipelines blowing up. So you'd have pipe
8 fed from both of those lines and you'd have a tremendous
9 catastrophic failure.

10 To take it a step further Iroquois has
11 talked about putting larger pipes in in the future and
12 they have a lot of space there and they've talked about
13 the potential for putting additional compressor stations
14 in in the future. I think that number one, there
15 shouldn't be one compressor station there, but if there
16 is they're just going to keep going. They're going to
17 keep trying to add on further and further and further.

18 Another concern that I had came from that
19 very first meeting. I spoke to a member of FERC who
20 happens to be here tonight and one of the questions I
21 asked her was that had FERC ever denied an application
22 for a compressor station and if so, how many? The answer
23 I got was to the best of her knowledge FERC had never
24 denied an application for a compressor station. And I
25 think that in itself tells the residents of Brookfield

1 what we're in for, what we can expect and that we're
2 speaking to deaf ears and I'm really disappointed in our
3 government for that.

4 The final aspect of this whole thing is
5 the fact that as people have talked about tonight there
6 is no way to evacuate that school should there be a
7 catastrophic failure and no one to date has been able to
8 tell us that there is definitely no chance of a
9 catastrophic failure. So with all that taken into mind I
10 hope FERC reconsiders and maybe makes this a precedent
11 and makes it the first compressor station to be rejected.

12 They had indicated to me that maybe some other
13 applications had been withdrawn before they had a chance
14 to reject them in fairness to FERC. I personally had
15 hoped that we wouldn't be here today, that Iroquois would
16 have previously withdrawn this application and chosen a
17 different site.

18 It's amazing to me, I have an engineering
19 background and a business background so I understand both
20 sides of it, but it's amazing to me that the residents of
21 Brookfield, the politicians, the Attorney General, the
22 Governor, everyone is speaking in opposition of this
23 thing. We all understand the dangers and the
24 catastrophic emergency that could occur here, and yet the
25 professionals, the people from FERC, and the people from

1 Iroquois all think it's a great thing and it makes you
2 really question some of the reasoning that's going on
3 here. Thank you.

4 MODERATOR KERRIGAN: As I said, that was
5 the last name that was on my sign-up list, but if there's
6 anybody else that would like to take the opportunity to
7 say a few words go ahead, we can -- we have some time and
8 so if you feel like doing that feel free to do so. Just
9 state your name and all.

10 MR. JUDD EVERHART: Right. My name is
11 Judd Everhart, I represent Governor Rell. I won't make
12 any kind of significant speech. I just wanted to get the
13 Governor's recent letters about the draft recommendation
14 on record here tonight and so I'll just submit them to
15 the clerk. Her opposition to this site is fairly well
16 documented. Thank you.

17 MODERATOR KERRIGAN: Thank you. Go ahead.

18 MR. MURPHY: Jerry Murphy. I just want to
19 thank all those who spoke and thanks for being here and
20 just urge --

21 VOICE: One more.

22 VOICE: I'd like to speak if I can.

23 MODERATOR KERRIGAN: Well, I'm not ending
24 -- I'm the one that ends the meeting, so he can speak.
25 Don't worry about it.

1 MR. MURPHY: -- no, no. I just want to
2 thank everybody for being here and just urge FERC to
3 listen to what you heard tonight.

4 MODERATOR KERRIGAN: Okay.

5 MR. JAMES FISHER: James Fisher, F-I-S-H-
6 E-R. I'd like to remind FERC and everybody here who's
7 not been in town for a while a little bit about Iroquois.
8 I'm going to read some old newspapers articles I have.
9 Newtown woman indicted. Pipeline crimes alleged. The
10 indictments handed up in the U.S. District Court bring to
11 seven the number of people accused of spoiling hundreds
12 of streams, rivers, wetlands in New York during the
13 construction of the 370 mile natural gas pipeline which
14 critics claim was rushed in order to complete the project
15 on time.

16 Specifically the 27 page indictment
17 alleges that the defendants helped cause environmental
18 damage to over 100 streams and wetlands by building the
19 pipeline in wrong places, failing to install required
20 erosion devices and by failing to clean up after
21 construction. This was in the Danbury News Times October
22 18th, 1996.

23 This is from May 25th, 1996, also in the
24 News Times. Iroquois will pay 2,000,000 to State.
25 That's just the State of Connecticut. The announcement

1 came as New York authorities announced Thursday that
2 Iroquois will pay the Federal government 18,000,000 and
3 New York 4,000,000, the largest environmental settlement
4 since the Exxon -- since Exxon paid 1,000,000,000 for
5 penalties and cleanup after the 1989 Exxon Valdez Alaskan
6 oil spill. The \$22,000,000 settlement comes after the
7 investigation to the construction of a 370 mile pipeline
8 which runs from Canada to Long Island Sound found
9 thousands of environmental and safety violations in the
10 1991 construction of the line.

11 I've listened to the people here from FERC
12 tell me, we're going to do this, you know, we've got the
13 greatest shut off valves, this, that, and the other
14 thing. Well, I know what they tell me and I know what
15 they did. So after you tell me that the gas lines are
16 the safest to their ability and that we're only going to
17 get a sunburn after a couple of feet -- after the
18 explosion I'd like to read another story.

19 This is from February 10th, 1997, also
20 from the Danbury News Times. Natural gas line pipeline
21 exploded yesterday sending a fireball up into the night
22 sky the second such explosion this weekend. How nice.
23 Let's go watch the fireballs burn up over Brookfield.
24 The explosion happened in a rural area north of Kalama,
25 35 miles north of the Oregon border and the glow could be

1 seen 30 miles away said Kathy Bachelor of the Cowlitz
2 County Emergency Management Department. Let's see. You
3 can see the glow 30 miles away, I guess we're not talking
4 something I'm cooking marshmallows on here. 30 miles
5 away. I wonder how far people had to be evacuated?

6 We hear there's a fireball going straight
7 up in the air said dispatcher Tracy Eaton of the
8 Sheriff's Department. Now the woods are catching on
9 fire. Hey, good. Bring more marshmallows. The whole
10 town could have a good old bon fire. There was no
11 immediate reports of injuries. Thank God.

12 On Saturday night a natural gas pipeline
13 explosion set a towering flame into the sky at the
14 opposite end of the state, near the Canadian border. Is
15 FERC -- is this the same pipelines you all approved back
16 then? I'm just curious. I mean, you know, you're here
17 to protect us just like you were the people in Oregon.

18 A 26 inch pipeline ruptured shaking the
19 homes near Everson, five miles south of the Canadian
20 border, and flaming gas roared 300 feet into the air.
21 That sounds like a pretty big fire to me from a natural
22 gas pipeline that FERC probably approved and some other
23 gas company, somebody at Iroquois said, well don't worry.

24 We're going to use the best equipment possible and it's
25 safe. There are no homes in the area and no one was

1 injured. Well, thank God there was no homes in the area
2 or any schools.

3 The blast came from a high pressure
4 pipeline in a sparsely populated area just outside of
5 Everson said John Nipwhich, a spokesman for the -- oh,
6 I'm sorry, Northwest Pipeline is the company that had the
7 dubious record with this explosion who owns the pipeline.
8 We don't know the cause and we may not for some time he
9 said. The fire was visible for up to 40 miles away in
10 British Columbia and the explosion could be heard 12
11 miles to the southwest in Belinhan. I was in my living
12 room with my cat when we heard the boom, Belinhan
13 resident Mary Alex told King TV of Seattle. We thought
14 it was Mount Baker blowing up.

15 This doesn't sound like a little accident.
16 This sounds like a major catastrophe. What would the
17 results be if that happened in Brookfield? Of course the
18 paper has told us in the past, could it happen here?
19 Here's the pipeline explosion. This is March 5th, 2006
20 at Fort Lupton in Colorado. I'm sure FERC is familiar
21 with that. They probably approved that compression
22 station too.

23 Here's another article, this is from the
24 New York Post, Tuesday, August 22nd, 2000. Death toll
25 hits 11 in New Mexico gas blast. I'm sure FERC approved

1 this gas pipeline too and it was safe. But this happened
2 to kill 11 people when it blew up. So you tell us the
3 pipeline is safe. I don't believe you. I have a vested
4 interest in this. My child goes to that school. My
5 daughter is going to be going there in two years. My
6 friends and family have many, many children that go to
7 the school, teachers that teach there, and people that
8 live around the area.

9 FERC tells us it's okay. You've approved
10 many of these gas pipelines. It's very disheartening to
11 hear you've never turned one down. So I guess I have no
12 qualms sitting here and saying, FERC, you're not doing
13 your job. I'm not going to get any brownie points with
14 FERC, I'm not going to apply for a job with you all or
15 with Iroquois, but I'm telling you, you're failing
16 miserably and you're putting my child and everybody
17 else's child in this room and everybody who's living in
18 this town at danger and I want to know how you can sleep
19 with yourself at night.

20 MODERATOR KERRIGAN: Would anybody else
21 like to speak? If not, then we will conclude this
22 meeting. Thank you all for coming and we appreciate your
23 comments.

24 (Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at
25 7:44 p.m.)