

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

BEFORE THE

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

- - - - - x

IN THE MATTER OF: :

WEAVER'S COVE ENERGY, LLC. : Docket No.

: PF08-18-000

- - - - - x

Venus De Milo Restaurant

75 Grand Army of the Republic Highway (Route 6)

Swansea, MA 02777

The above-entitled matter came on for scoping meeting, pursuant to notice, at 7:10 p.m., Rich McGuire, Environmental Project Manager, presiding.

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

2 (7:00 p.m.)

3 MR. MCGUIRE: Good evening and welcome to the
4 public scoping meeting for Weaver's Cove Offshore Berth
5 Project. My name is Rich McGuire. I'm an Environmental
6 Project Manager with the Federal Energy Regulatory
7 Commission ("FERC").

8 As it says in the public notice for this meeting,
9 the Commission is preparing an Environmental Impact
10 Statement or ("EIS") for the proposed Offshore Berth
11 Project.

12 The purpose of this meeting is to give you, the
13 public, an opportunity to comment on the type of
14 environmental issues you think we should address in the EIS.

15 With me tonight is Captain Raymond Perry with the
16 U.S. Coast Guard and Selma Urman who is with the
17 Massachusetts Energy Facility Siting Board.

18 This meeting is being recorded by a court
19 reporter so that we can have an accurate record of tonight's
20 comments.

21 A transcript of this meeting will be placed in
22 the public record so that everyone has access to the
23 information that's discussed here tonight.

24 To ensure that the court reporter produces an
25 accurate record of this meeting, please follow the following

1 ground rules. Number one, if you have any questions or
2 comments, please come forward and speak into the microphone.

3 Number two, introduce yourself, and if
4 appropriate, the agency or group you are representing. We
5 also ask that you spelling of first and last name.

6 Number three, please help the recorder by
7 spelling your name. Number 4, define any acronyms or
8 industry-related jargon. And finally, please talk one at a
9 time.

10 Following the formal segment of tonight's
11 meeting, representatives from Weaver's Cove, will be
12 available outside the room to answer any specific questions
13 you have about their proposed project.

14 Now I'll quickly run through tonight's agenda.
15 In just a couple of minutes, I'll shortly go over the FERC's
16 application process. Then Captain Perry will explain the
17 Coast Guard's oversight and review of its process for this
18 project.

19 Following Captain Perry, Selma Urman will
20 describe the Siting Board's role and its review of the
21 project.

22 I'll then present a brief description of the
23 Offshore Berth Project based on the materials that Weaver's
24 Cove has filed with the Commission to date.

25 Following the project description, we will then

1 hear from those of you who have signed up to speak and make
2 oral comments into the public record.

3 Now I'll go over the FERC approval process. The
4 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission is an independent
5 regulatory agency. The Commission's role is to regulate and
6 oversee energy industries in the economic and environmental
7 interest of the American public.

8 Among other responsibilities, the Commission
9 regulates the interstate transmission of natural gas. The
10 Commission is made up of five members who are appointed by
11 the President and approved by Congress.

12 The Commission staff, which includes myself,
13 prepares technical information to assist these Commissioners
14 in making their decisions.

15 When a company wants to build pipeline facilities
16 to transport and sell natural gas in interstate commerce,
17 the company files an application with the Commission.

18 Weaver's Cove plans to file its application for
19 the Offshore Berth Project with the Commission in November
20 2008. At that time, Weaver's Cove plans to amend its
21 existing FERC authorization issued in July 2005, to include
22 the construction and operation of an offshore berth in Mount
23 Hope Bay and bury liquefied natural gas or ("LNG") transfer
24 pipelines to the Commission authorized Weaver's Cove LNG
25 terminal.

1 Weaver's Cove planned amendment project is
2 referred to as the Offshore Berth Project.

3 The Project will be located in the waters of
4 Mount Hope Bay and include LNG unloading arms, a vapor
5 handling system, and electrical power and control systems.

6 The Offshore Berth would be capable of mooring
7 LNG ships, supporting LNG unloading operations, transporting
8 LNG via the transfer lines to a LNG storage tank at the
9 approved LNG Terminal in Fall River, Massachusetts.

10 If approved, Weaver's Cove anticipates commencing
11 construction at the proposed facilities in September 2010
12 and operation of the facilities is planned to commence in
13 the fall of 2013.

14 Under the National Environmental Policy Act (or
15 NEPA), the Commission is required to perform an
16 environmental analysis of the proposed project's potential
17 affects on the environment.

18 In the case of the Offshore Berth Project, we are
19 doing this analysis in an Environmental Impact Statement, or
20 EIS.

21 Although no formal application has been filed,
22 the Commission's staff has already initiated its NEPA review
23 under the Pre-filing Process.

24 The Offshore Berth Project is in the preliminary
25 planning phase and no precise facility design, pipeline

1 route, and other details have not yet been finalized.

2 The purpose of the pre-filing process is to
3 encourage early involvement of interested stakeholders and
4 the public, and to identify and resolve issues before an
5 application is filed with the Commission.

6 Tonight's scoping meeting is one of the first
7 steps in our process to develop a complete environmental
8 record of Weaver's Cove's proposal. We are here tonight to
9 get your input on the issues you feel need to be analyzed in
10 the EIS.

11 Your comments, along with those of interested
12 groups and agencies, will help us focus our analysis on
13 significant issues. The Commission will make its decision
14 about whether to approve the Offshore Berth Project after
15 considering the Project's environmental impacts, its
16 engineering impacts, and economic aspects.

17 After we receive the formal application from
18 Weaver's Cove, our environmental review team will prepare an
19 Environmental Impact Statement, as I mentioned earlier, to
20 meet the responsibilities under NEPA.

21 The FERC staff will take comments received on the
22 Project during the Pre-Filing Process and address them in a
23 Draft EIS initially.

24 The Draft EIS will describe the proposed Project
25 and alternatives, existing environmental conditions, and

1 potential impacts of the Project.

2 In addition, the Draft EIS will also describe the
3 migration measures, construction procedures, and routing
4 that could be included in the Project to eliminate and
5 reduce impacts.

6 Once the Draft EIS is issued, it will be mailed
7 to the interested stakeholders. Everyone will have 45 days
8 to review and comment on that document, either in written
9 comments submitted to the FERC or verbal comments presented
10 at the public comment meetings that will be held in the
11 vicinity of the proposed Project.

12 The FERC staff will consider all comments on the
13 Draft EIS, prepare written responses those comments, revise
14 the document as needed, and then issue a Final EIS.

15 The EIS will not be a decision document. When
16 the EIS is complete, we will provide the assessment, the
17 staff material on the non-environmental issues which
18 includes rates, cost-of-service, marketing information,
19 accounting, engineering and economic issues. We will
20 provide that to the Commission so that they can make an
21 informed decision about the project.

22 If the Commission does vote to issue a
23 certificate to Weaver's Cove, the Commission's staff will
24 monitor the project through construction and restoration,
25 performing on-site inspections for environmental compliance.

1 If you have additional questions about FERC, I'd
2 encourage you to visit the Commission's homepage on the
3 internet at www.ferc.gov.

4 Now Captain Perry will explain the Coast Guard's
5 oversight of Weaver's Cove's proposed facilities.

6 CAPTAIN PERRY: Thank you and good evening
7 everybody. Thank you for coming and participating in this
8 process, helping us decide what we need to do here.

9 I am Captain Ray Perry and I am the Commanding
10 Officer of the Coast Guard, Sector Southeast New England,
11 Basically my area of responsibility is all of Rhode Island,
12 Cape Cod the Islands, and along the Southern Shore of
13 Massachusetts.

14 My position, a number of you I know have been
15 working on this project for many, many years now. I'm new
16 to it. I've just report in to the perspective of the chain
17 that has worked on this from the Coast Guard. Captain Mary
18 Landry, was the first Coast Guard Captain at the port
19 working on this, now Admiral Landry, and then Captain Roy
20 Nash who got transferred in December. So I have been here
21 since December and have taken on this project.

22 That said, we have some strong continuity in our
23 office. I'd like to introduce, and most of you already know
24 him, Ed LeBlanc, if you'd just raise your hand. Ed LeBlanc
25 is my project officer and he's been working on this project

1 -- the Weaver's Cove project since the beginning.

2 The Coast Guard's role in this process, we really
3 have two roles. First, the Coast Guard is a cooperating
4 agency under the auspices of FERC.

5 In this capacity, I am charge with providing
6 advice to FERC on navigation safety, maritime security, and
7 protection of the environment, particularly as it relates to
8 the prevention of and response to emergencies as defined
9 under U.S. regulations.

10 This advice will be used in the environmental
11 review and will also help FERC prepare the Draft EIS and the
12 Final EIS for the recently proposed LNG transfer pipeline
13 and offshore transfer facility at Mount Hope Bay.

14 Second responsibility is direct -- is a little
15 more direct, and that is the Coast Guard has authority over
16 the safety and security of LNG vessels and the marine
17 transfer area and the LNG facility itself. This is covered
18 under 33 C.F.R. 127.

19 The U.S. Coast Guard is also responsible for
20 matters related to the navigation, safety, vessel
21 engineering, and safety standards and all matters pertaining
22 to the safety of the facilities or equipment located in or
23 adjacent to navigable waters of the United States.

24 We also have authority for LNG facilities
25 security, plan, review, approval, and compliance

1 verification as provided for in 33 C.F.R. Part 105.

2 Prior to the submittal, the Letter of Intent --
3 I'm sorry, prior to the submittal of our findings under
4 this, will be a Letter of Recommendation, the Federal Energy
5 Regulatory Commission, FERC, the U.S. Coast Guard, Weaver's
6 Cove and numerous other state and federal agencies will be
7 participating in an exhaustive analysis covering a wide
8 array of maritime safety and security issues associated with
9 the proposed facility and the transit of LNG tankers to and
10 from the facility.

11 Part of that analysis includes a waterways safety
12 analysis and preliminary waterway safety analysis is done by
13 Weaver's Cove, in this case, the sponsor of the event. They
14 hire somebody to do that, that person has -- the people they
15 hire have to comply with U.S. regulations as being qualified
16 to actually do that preliminary waterway survey and then
17 that will lead to a final waterway survey that will be done.

18 That survey addresses things such as port
19 characterization, characterization of the LNG facility and
20 the LNG tanker route, risk assessments, risk assessments for
21 both safety and security, risk management strategies, and
22 then from all this, conclusions and recommendations will be
23 drawn.

24 We are guided by what we call a Coast Guard
25 Navigation Vessel Inspection Circular, NAVIC 0505. That is

1 not only for the Coast Guard internal guidance, but it's
2 actually for industries guidance and for the public to use
3 and it just outlines what we need to be or should be looking
4 at and of course other things can be looked at also. But it
5 provides the basic guidelines of what we should be looking
6 at through this process.

7 That's basically it. One other thing I would
8 just like to add is that yesterday we had the same type of
9 meeting over in Bristol and again, my responsibility is to
10 look at all the information, all the things that you guys
11 bring up, and to look at that, how it relates to safety,
12 security, and environmental protection.

13 It's a scoping meeting, so you know, if you think
14 of something that could be applicable, we appreciate that
15 thought. It might be something new but if it's something
16 that you've talked to people about, or you've done research
17 on, I would appreciate it if you would also provide who you
18 had talked to associated with that bit of information or
19 where you got that information from. Because, of course, we
20 have to go back, we want to go back and look and talk to
21 those people. Maybe they thought of something that we
22 didn't.

23 And I'll give you some examples. Yesterday some
24 comments were talked about associated with emergency
25 services associated around the security zone, around some of

1 the vessels that we have. Well I would like to know who you
2 are talking to in the emergency services that are providing
3 you that information so that I can learn from that to make
4 sure that we do the right thing. So that's just kind of one
5 example.

6 With that, I would like to start the process.
7 Thank you.

8 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you Captain Perry. Now we'll
9 hear from Selma with the Siting Board who will explain their
10 role in this process.

11 MS. URMAN: Good evening and thank you Mr.
12 McGuire. As Mr. McGuire stated, my name is Selma Urman and
13 I am here on behalf of the Massachusetts Energy Facilities
14 Siting Board which I will refer to as the Siting Board, to
15 hear public comments on Weaver's Cove Pre-filing with the
16 FERC on the company's proposed project.

17 First let me briefly describe the Siting Board
18 and its role in this matter. The Siting Board is an
19 independent board of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts
20 within the Department of Public Utilities.

21 The Siting Board nine members include the
22 Secretary of Energy and Environmental Affairs who serves as
23 its Chairman. The Secretary of Housing and Economic
24 Development, the Commissioner of the Department of
25 Environmental Protection, the Commissioner of the Division

1 of Energy Resources, two Commissioners of the Department of
2 Public Utilities, and three public members appointed by the
3 Governor.

4 One of the principal functions of the Siting
5 Board is to review proposals for construction of new energy
6 facilities in Massachusetts including power plants, electric
7 transmission lines, natural gas pipelines, and natural gas
8 storage tanks.

9 The Siting Board, however, does not have
10 authority to approve to disapprove interstate facilities
11 such as the one proposed by Weaver's Cove.

12 When an interstate company such as Weaver's Cove
13 applies to FERC to construct facilities within
14 Massachusetts, the siting Board is required by its
15 regulations to preserve the rights of interested citizens of
16 the Commonwealth by intervening in the FERC proceeding in
17 any such application.

18 The Siting Board also is required to hold a
19 public informational hearing in the area where the proposed
20 facility will be located. The interstate pipeline company
21 must attend the public hearing.

22 After the conclusion of the public hearing, and
23 additional comment period, the Siting Board files written
24 comments regarding the proposed project with the FERC.

25 The Siting Board's comments are intended to

1 identify difficulties and problems associated with the
2 project as required by the Siting Board's regulations.

3 The Siting Board's comments will be based in part
4 of how the review of any Pre-filing documents filed with the
5 FERC and upon any public comments and questions received by
6 the Siting Board.

7 The Siting Board encourages those attending the
8 hearing tonight to comment on the Weaver's Cove proposal.
9 You are welcome to send written comments to either the FERC
10 or the Siting Board. All comments received by the Siting
11 Board before July 7th will be included in our submission to
12 the FERC for its consideration.

13 If you want to submit written comments, the
14 Siting Board's mailing address appears on the legal notice
15 that was issued for tonight's hearing, and I've placed
16 copies of the notice on the table at the entrance of this
17 room and that concludes my comments. Thank you.

18 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you Ms. Urman. Now I'll
19 provide a brief project overview based on information that
20 Weaver's Cove has filed with FERC to date.

21 Shortly after the Commission approved the
22 Weaver's Cove terminal in Fall River, Massachusetts in July
23 2005, the transportation bill of 2005 that summer, included
24 a stipulation that required the existing Brighton Street
25 bridge stay in place, as many of you know.

1 That stipulation and the existing Brightman
2 Street Bridge prevents LNG vessels that were proposed for
3 the LNG terminal from reaching the terminal side of the
4 approved terminal berth, the terminal side berth.

5 As a result of that, that's what required this
6 Offshore Berth Project to come about. The Weaver's Cove
7 filed for the Pre-filing approval in April, FERC approved
8 the Pre-filing approval and at the end of April, Weaver's
9 Cove filed one of 13 resource reports that are required for
10 FERC review as part of their application that they
11 anticipate filing in November.

12 That resource report included a brief description
13 of the project that was in draft form. They're continuing
14 to change that and adjust that and that will become Resource
15 Report 1 that will be filed in November with a full
16 description of the project.

17 With that information, we sent -- and I'll
18 briefly go over the project overview based on the
19 information they filed with us.

20 The Offshore Berth Project consists primarily of
21 two components. It consists of the Offshore Berth itself,
22 which I no longer at the terminal side but down in Somerset
23 South of Braga Bridge, which is in the circle in the bottom
24 left and corner in the center of that circle. That's
25 essentially where that offshore berth is located.

1 The terminal itself is in the top right hand
2 corner between the offshore berth and the terminal itself is
3 a 4.2 mile pipeline segment that consists of two pipelines.

4 The offshore berth, the components consist of a
5 1,200 feet long jetty, and an essential platform as part of
6 that jetty that's 250 feet by 155 feet and then moorings
7 dolphins and breasting dolphins for the LNG ships when their
8 vessels come to berth at the facility.

9 It also includes three to four unloading arms to
10 unload the LNG off the vessels into the pipeline and a vapor
11 generation system.

12 The ancillary equipment on that facility will
13 include the transfer equipment, the LNG transfer equipment,
14 power substation, emergency generator, uninterrupted power
15 supply, a control room, and operating staff facilities.

16 The offshore berth will also include both passive
17 and active security system and a new 1,100 yard long private
18 vessel channel from the navigation channel to the offshore
19 berth itself.

20 Part of that private vessel channel will be a
21 turning basis as well, right adjacent to the federal
22 channel.

23 The capabilities, the offshore berth will be able
24 to receive LNG ships of 155,000 cubic meters. Those ships
25 are the same that was in the original proposal. They

1 anticipate 50 and 70 ships per year, essentially one ship
2 per week coming to that berth, and that's the same as what
3 was approved by FERC, as far as the volume and size of the
4 ships.

5 The location is one mile southwest of Brightman
6 Point in Somerset, and approximately one mile from the
7 nearest shoreline. That's where their current proposal is
8 for the offshore berth location.

9 As far as the area of impact, the essential
10 platform will be about 1 acre in size and the private
11 channel and the turning basin is what they told us in the
12 resource report, is 40 acres.

13 We are learning that that's going to increase
14 somewhat because the turning basin is going to be of a
15 greater magnitude than what they initially thought.

16 The construction schedule is anticipated that the
17 offshore berth platform itself will take 10 months to
18 construct, and then following that, it will take a year to
19 build the top side facilities, on top of that offshore
20 berth.

21 The LNG transfer lines include two 4.25 mile long
22 cryogenic LNG transfer pipelines and a co-located electrical
23 power cable.

24 The pipelines will consist of a 24-inch diameter
25 pipeline, it will be insulated inside a 38-inch diameter

1 cryogenic steel outer pipeline and that will be covered by
2 three to four inches of concrete.

3 The location of the transfer lines will be --
4 they will be built and buried with approximately five feet
5 below the mud line in the Taunton River in Mount Hope Bay
6 and the pipeline route is on the western side of the Taunton
7 River.

8 The area of impact is undetermined at this point.
9 Again, we're early on in our Pre-filing Process. The
10 company is working on trying to figure that out and the
11 reason for that is there are limitations because of the
12 thickness of the pipe with the insulation and the concrete,
13 the bending radius on that pipe is going to be very minimal
14 and they're trying to figure out how deep the trenches are
15 going to need to be.

16 For the transfer line, the construction period is
17 anticipated that the dredging or the trenching will be a 10-
18 week period based on the anticipated dredging windows that
19 the agencies are likely to impose on the company.

20 And then the pooling of the pipe will occur the
21 following season in September and October.

22 Again this is the location, the same slide I
23 showed you at the beginning, the routing on the western side
24 through the old Brightman Street Bridge.

25 The LNG transfer lines come to the terminal

1 itself and connect to the storage tank, the LNG storage
2 tank. Based on the information that we have there is very
3 minimal changes to the terminal itself that would include
4 minor piping changes to receive the LNG transfer line at the
5 terminal berth.

6 The proposed offshore berth is 4.25 miles
7 downstream in the Mount Hope Bay so what would no longer be
8 proposed is -- the terminal side berth is no longer
9 proposed. So rather than being at the terminal side, it will
10 be replaced and would now be located in Mount Hope Bay.

11 Before we move on to the comments into the
12 record, are there questions project facilities themselves.
13 I'll repeat the questions for the court reporter. Are there
14 any questions about the project? Yes sir.

15 I can repeat it for the court reporter.

16 MR. PASTOVAL: My name is Alex Pastoval. Some of
17 you people know who I am. Most of those people here today
18 don't know me. I was fortunate enough to be the project
19 Manager for the design and construction of the first LNG
20 ship called the Methane Pioneer, so I've been in this
21 business for a little while, since the mid 50s.

22 One of my comments is two-fold, really. I was
23 associated with District gas quite a bit because the joint
24 ownership between Gazocean and Cabot, I was with Gazocean at
25 that time. So I'm quite familiar with District Gas and the

1 problems they've had, which is not too many.

2 I also have been associated with the Sparrows
3 Point project south of Baltimore and the question I have for
4 all of you is, are you going to attempt to make a comparison
5 of safety between District Gas, Sparrows Point, and Weaver's
6 Cove? Because that would be a very interesting comparison
7 to make and make some conclusions from that comparison.
8 Thank you very much.

9 MR. MCGUIRE: The Environmental impact Statement
10 of the original Weaver's Cove project address safety
11 exhaustively and made some of those comparisons but there is
12 no anticipated plan to have a document actually explaining
13 comparison between Sparrows Point, Weaver's Cove, and
14 District Gas.

15 Take a few more questions thought. We will open
16 it up for those of you who have signed up to speak but if
17 you have questions about the project itself that I might be
18 able to answer based on the information we know today. Sir.

19 The proposed lifespan of the pipe is the
20 question. I don't think I have any answer for that
21 question. I mean this is technology that, there are
22 existing transfer lines for LNG. The maximum length of
23 those lines is more in the magnitude of one mile and this is
24 a 4.25 miles so there are questions that we are going to
25 need answers for before we can actually even accept the

1 application and Weaver's Cove is working on that now.

2 Sir. The question was, on the last slide of the
3 terminal side, or the terminal itself, there was some areas
4 that were in green. Those are salt marsh areas at the
5 terminal that the company is trying to avoid as the pipes
6 coming into the terminal. Take a few more questions.

7 SPEAKER: I live in the north end of Fall River
8 that's two miles from this proposed project. Is this the
9 Pre-filing Process that we're in right now?

10 MR. MCGUIRE: Yes, as I mentioned earlier, we are
11 very early on in the process. The Commission approved the
12 Pre-filing Process at the end of April and again they filed
13 one draft Resource Report. Between now and the application
14 filing, which is anticipated in November 2008, they will be
15 filing draft resource reports for comments by the agencies,
16 both FERC, the Coast Guard and the Corp.

17 SPEAKER: So the filing process is an indication
18 right now, is what will happen --

19 MR. MCGUIRE: That will be after November.

20 SPEAKER: And after the formal filing occurs,
21 will there be a period whereby people or the City of Fall
22 River could apply for intervenor status?

23 MR. MCGUIRE: That's correct. Once the
24 application is filed, there will be a formal notice after
25 the application is filed and they will solicit.

1 SPEAKER: The time frame for filing for
2 intervenor status is 30 days?

3 MR. MCGUIRE: Yes.

4 SPEAKER: Okay. My last question is, the city
5 now --

6 MR. MCGUIRE: Hold on just a minute. The
7 question for the court reporter was, the time frame for
8 filing for intervenor status is 30 days.

9 SPEAKER: Thank you. So there will be a 30-day
10 window to apply for the intervenor status and FERC would be
11 the entity that would recognize or grant the intervenor
12 status?

13 MR. MCGUIRE: That's correct.

14 SPEAKER: And anyone like the City, for example,
15 if they did not agree with FERC's decision, they could not
16 appeal unless they had been granted intervenor status?

17 MR. MCGUIRE: That's correct.

18 SPEAKER: Okay, so anyone in the end that does
19 not agree with the decision, they would not be able to
20 appeal in a court of law unless they had been granted
21 intervenor status.

22 MR. MCGUIRE: That's good, that's correct.

23 SPEAKER: Thank you.

24 MR. MCGUIRE: We'll take a few more comments or
25 questions about the project or the process. Sir.

1 Yes. The question was -- more of an expression
2 of concern about not knowing the length of the life of the
3 pipeline and at this point, again we're early on in the
4 process and the company has not filed the extensive and the
5 required minimum filing requirements for the resource
6 reports.

7 Thank you for your comment sir.

8 (Applause.)

9 Take one more comment. Again, the question was,
10 will this be one of a kind, no other pipeline, transfer line
11 is in the country. Not up this way, not up 4.25 miles, no.

12 We're going to move on to the -- as far as
13 questions, we have quite a few that are -- people who have
14 signed up to make comments. If you have specific questions
15 about the project, I'd encourage you to either ask the
16 company, they will be out, we've asked them to stay after
17 the meeting and ask those outside of the room, or you can ask
18 them at the end of the meeting. Yes, at the end of the
19 meeting, yep.

20 The court reporter just clarified that you don't
21 need to spell your name, unless it's a unique name and it
22 wouldn't be obvious what your last name or first name is.

23 If you do not want to make formal comments
24 tonight, you can also send a letter to the Commission
25 addressing your specific concerns.

1 The public Notice for this meeting was issued
2 June 4, 2008 and the comment period ends July 7. The Notice
3 explains how you can mail in comments on page 5. To remain
4 on our mailing list for this project, you will need to
5 either do one of the following: return the information
6 request in Appendix 2 or the Notice, sign the mailing list
7 sheet at the entrance of this meeting room, or provide
8 written comments by July 7.

9 If I could ask that the side comments stay quiet
10 or if you have side comments, if you could move outside of
11 the room so everybody could hear. I'd appreciate that.

12 Again, there are some handouts available at the
13 sign-in sheet table that explain how to send in written
14 comments to the FERC.

15 Now we'll begin to hear from those of you who
16 have signed up to speak. For the court reporter's benefit,
17 please introduce yourself and if appropriate, the agency or
18 group you're representing. I would remind you that written
19 and oral comments are weighted the same at FERC so if you do
20 not have -- if you're not making formal comments tonight,
21 you can also mail them in.

22 Again, for those of you who attended our Bristol
23 meeting last night, your comments will be in the public
24 record. There is no requirement or need for you to repeat
25 your comments. Of course you're welcome to repeat them, but

1 it wouldn't be necessary. We'll get those with the court
2 reporter and I would also ask, because of the number of
3 commenters we have signed up to speak, if you could limit
4 your comments to five minutes tonight.

5 Well start out by hearing from those of the
6 elected officials. I'll go down the list based on when they
7 signed in and the order they signed in and then we'll go by
8 order of interested parties and stakeholders.

9 The first commenter is Rhode Island
10 Representative, Raymond Gallison.

11 (Applause.)

12 REPRESENTATIVE GALLISON: Good evening. My name
13 is Raymond E. Gallison, Jr., representative of District 69,
14 which is Bristol and Portsmouth, Rhode Island.

15 First of all, I want to thank you for being here
16 tonight and I hope you enjoyed today's lovely weather and
17 happen to go out on the bay, Mount Hope Bay and look at and
18 see the wonderful boats that were out there today. For a
19 weekday, there was a nice number of boats out there.

20 Imagine what that's like on a weekend, imagine
21 how they'll be crippled. Now recreational boating in this
22 are should an LNG tank come up here and should this
23 particular project be built.

24 We have a large number of marinas in the area
25 here, no one would be able to get out if the tank was coming

1 in from Newport all the way up here from Mount Hope Bay.
2 It'll seriously be impacting recreational boating traffic
3 here in the summer months, it would seriously be impacting
4 the commercial traffic in the winter time.

5 In addition to the boating traffic, I just want
6 to make a couple more comments that I didn't make last night
7 and I want to remind you that the channel or the waterway at
8 the mouth of Narragansett Bay is very narrow and a couple
9 years ago we did have a ship that ran aground there and if
10 this had been an LNG tanker, I just don't want to think of
11 what would happen there.

12 The Coast Guard have also had and in your letter
13 of recommendation couple of months ago, you noted that there
14 would be problems from Providence Island all the way up to
15 the Brightman Bridge. Certainly this would include what
16 you're proposing here tonight.

17 I do want to remind you that at one particular
18 point in time, the Mount Hope Bay itself was struck by a
19 tanker, an oil tanker. The bridge was closed and of course
20 creating inconvenience to many people living in both
21 Bristol, Portsmouth, the whole Aquidneck Island and the
22 entire east bay.

23 I don't believe that the Coast Guard could ever
24 secure or provide an adequate safety and security zone for
25 an LNG tanker coming up Narragansett Bay and I'm going to

1 tell you this is based upon couple of factors.

2 First of all, Richard Clark who had done a study
3 here -- did a study by our Attorney General Patrick Lynch,
4 he noted and he brought some experts in, and they noted some
5 of the critical points of approach that are located within
6 this particular area. And I'm going to present to you
7 tonight what are called the critical closest points of
8 approach and these close approaches are buildings and what
9 not that are on land that are within the -- if you took a
10 distance from the middle of the channel to these particular
11 locations.

12 For example, let's just take the closest harbor
13 island naval station in Newport, Coddington Cove in Newport.
14 That's 950 yards away from the central -- middle of the
15 channel. Certainly you wouldn't be able to have a very good
16 safety and security zone.

17 And I want to talk to you also, I'm going to
18 present this to you and I want to tell you a couple of other
19 things. Both of my sons happen to be Assistant Harbor
20 Masters for the Town of Bristol and my oldest son happens to
21 hold the 100-ton Coast Guard approved license. He has his
22 license from the United States Coast Guard.

23 When First Lady Laura Bush came to Roger Williams
24 University a couple years ago to speak at the commencement
25 exercises, he was called in and went out with the Coast

1 Guard for the security for Mrs. Bush. And last year, we had
2 a very serious fire in Portsmouth, Rhode Island on July 3rd,
3 that fire was at the old warehouse site.

4 He was out there with his partner, he called in
5 service that they were there. The Coast Guard came down,
6 the Coast Guard asked him where he want us to be stationed
7 as they set up a safety and security perimeter.

8 Based upon what my son knows, he was born and
9 brought up on Mount Hope Bay, he knows many locations where
10 someone could hide along Mount Hope Bay, Narragansett Bay
11 and cause serious damage to an LNG tanker as it was coming
12 in.

13 In addition to the safety and security zone,
14 within the safety and security zone, if we look at some of
15 the new modern weapons that are out there, if you look at
16 the new incendiary 50 caliber machine gun, it certainly
17 would cause a problem, let alone an RPG, that was pointed
18 out by Richard Clark and his team when they came in, that an
19 RPG shot from any one of the locations along the route could
20 impact a tanker almost instantaneously. It's almost
21 impossible to protect them.

22 But I want to present to you tonight, another
23 article that was compared to the Army Times -- on October
24 27, 2003, and what had happened was, in Iraq, an Abrams A-1
25 tank was totally disabled by what they called something.

1 They don't this day, they don't know what it is.

2 And what happened was this something as they
3 identified, went through the side of the Abrams A-1 tank,
4 was a two inch diameter hole, went right through the side of
5 the Abrams tank, right through the seat of the driver,
6 grazed the flapjack of the other person that was in it and
7 right out the other side.

8 What they don't know today was shot at a tank, an
9 Abrams tank with all its heavy armor, and pierce the tank.
10 Imagine what that would do to an LNG tanker? I shutter to
11 think what it would do. Last night we heard about the
12 energy needs, and I want to also state that there is a vast
13 difference between the current LPG tankers that are being
14 brought in and the proposed tankers that will be brought in
15 for LNG.

16 I don't know how many times larger the LNG tanker
17 is, and the cargo of an LNG tanker, how much more volatile
18 it is than the LPG and how much more devastating. Even the
19 Sandia report that came out -- I guess you people had
20 commissioned, stated that if there was an LNG fire, the
21 devastating effects it would have upon people a mile away.
22 Vastly different than an LPG tanker and the capacity of the
23 LNG tanker is much more than the LPG tanker.

24 The LNG needs for this particular area. As I
25 stated last night, we do have Xcelerant Energy have their

1 facility off Gloucester, Massachusetts and they also have -
2 - right now, and as I stated last night, the Algonquin Gas
3 Company has permission from you people to expand its gas
4 line to accommodate that facility. And I know there are a
5 great number of pipe fitters here in the audience tonight.
6 And if you look at what -- if you people approve that
7 Algonquin Gas, their application, pipe fitters from the
8 towns of Weymouth, Braintree, Holbrook, Randolph, Avon,
9 Stoughton and Canton Sharon, Rehoboth, and Seekonk and
10 Attleborough, Massachusetts would have jobs, along with pipe
11 fitters in Norwich, Preston, Leggett, Northstone and
12 Cromwell, Connecticut, Borough of Rhode Island, and even one
13 up in New Jersey.

14 So this project for the pipeline that's coming,
15 that's proposed by Algonquin would give these people more
16 jobs than this project here in Fall Rivers, so there is no
17 comparison.

18 One of the other things I do want to talk about
19 too is that back in 2005, I happen to be attending a
20 conference in Washington, DC and I happen to meet the
21 Speaker of the House of Representatives from Wyoming and
22 Wyoming is the third largest natural gas producer in the
23 country, American Gas.

24 These tankers are going to be bringing foreign
25 gas. Now the purpose of the Speaker of the House of

1 Representative being there was, he was there to learn
2 international relations because the proposal -- he was there
3 because what they want to do is, they want to take natural
4 gas from Wyoming, build a pipeline into Montana, across
5 Canada, and out the West Coast so they can ship our gas to
6 China. Doesn't make sense to me.

7 Why not use that gas here. If we have the
8 pipeline, bring the pipeline through Montana instead of
9 going left, come right. Create more jobs for people.

10 (Applause.)

11 Now, environmentally, we know that these foreign
12 tankers are going to be coming in into this area, or they're
13 proposed to come into this area and I'm going to do all I
14 can, as you know, to prevent this, but I want to let you
15 know one thing, that the Rhode Island Department of
16 Environmental Management has already raised some serious
17 concerns about tankers from foreign countries coming into
18 this country, into Narragansett Bay right now.

19 Right now there have been some non-indigenous
20 marine organisms that have been found in Narragansett Bay.
21 Bringing more foreign tankers in is only going to increase
22 that problem, it's going to hurt Narragansett Bay and it's
23 going to hurt Mount Hope Bay.

24 Thank you again for your time and I leave these
25 documents with you.

1 (Applause.)

2 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for your comments. Our
3 next commenter is the Chairman for Somerset Selectman Neehan
4 and on deck is Somerset Selectman Lawless.

5 MR. MEEHAN: Good evening my name is Bill Meehan.
6 I am the Chairman of the Somerset Board of Selectmen and
7 joining me this evening are Lorne Lawless, Selectman Patrick
8 O'Neil, Town Council Clem Brown, the Town Administrator
9 Dennis Luttrell.

10 Whereas the proposed project is to be primarily
11 situated in the town of Somerset, we wish to have the town's
12 concerns entered into the record of these proceedings.

13 First, safety issues related to liquid natural
14 gas ship traffic approaching and departing the offshore
15 berth. Offloading the LNG, any cryogenic LNG transfer pipe
16 must be thoroughly examined.

17 Secondly, project impacts on the area residents,
18 quality of life issues including, but not limited to air
19 quality, noise, water quality, and visual resources both
20 during construction and later operation should be examined.

21 Third, project impacts from construction,
22 including, but not limited to dredging on the marine
23 environment and the living resources therein should be
24 examined.

25 Fourth, project impacts to commercial and

1 recreational boaters and fisherman navigating Mount Hope Bay
2 and the Taunton River should be examined.

3 Fifth, feasibility of the proposed project's
4 technology, including, but not limited to the 4.25 mile
5 cryogenic transfer pipe should be examined.

6 Sixth, project site control by the proponent
7 needs to be examined as they do not own or otherwise control
8 the site as required by 18 C.F.R. 157.21(d)(2).

9 The Commonwealth of Massachusetts has not issued
10 a Chapter 91 license for the proposed project's structures.

11 I would like to reserve the balance of my time
12 and that of Selectman O'Neil and Town Administrator Luttrell
13 for use by Selectman Lawless who will give a more detailed
14 presentation on behalf of the Town of Somerset. Thank you
15 very much, I appreciate it.

16 (Applause.)

17 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for your comments.
18 Selectman Lawless.

19 MR. LAWLESS: We just want to set up some
20 displays. My name is Lorne Lawless, Selectman in Somerset.
21 I also come from the oil industry for over 17 years. I
22 actually worked in a refinery. I actually was a supervisor,
23 a hydrogen plant crude unit, Isomax unit Amine plant, sour
24 gas plant, boiler plant. I Worked on a lot of processes.

25 I really appreciate the opportunity tonight. I

1 guess I promise I probably won't use all the time that has
2 been allowed to me, probably about 20 minutes, but I think
3 it's very important for all of us to look at this project
4 and see if it's right, in the right place to site this
5 project.

6 I don't think any of us in the room are against
7 LNG as far as a fuel. It's where do we site it and do we
8 site it safely.

9 Hess Corporation, Weaver's Cove at first, but
10 Hess, said in 2004 that they were going to build this
11 facility.

12 Many elected officials, as you all know, have
13 been against this from Rhode Island to Mass, including Jim
14 McGovern, Bernie Frank, our Governors, our Attorney Generals
15 and many of them are still against this project.

16 Back in October 24, 2007, Captain Nash as the new
17 Captain of the Port knows probably very well, made this
18 statement. It was October 24, 2007, "the U.S. Coast Guard
19 concluded yesterday that it would be too risky to allow
20 liquefied natural gas tankers to travel through Mount Hope
21 Bay and Taunton River to the proposed LNG terminal in Fall
22 River." And this is what he said. You're wondering has the
23 Coast Guard changes its mind.

24 After a careful analysis, I find that the only
25 reasonable conclusion is that the navigation safety risk

1 associated with the vessels of the proposed dimensions and
2 transport frequencies, are highly unacceptable said Roy A.
3 Nash, Coast Guard Captain of the Port of Southeastern New
4 England.

5 So if we look at what he says here, he did not
6 this. In a letter sent yesterday to the project developer
7 at Weaver's Cove Energy, Nash said that the area of most
8 concern, of most concern, is the waterway from Prudence
9 Island to the proposed site in Fall River.

10 The waterway Nash wrote to the company is
11 unsuitable from a navigational safety perspective for this
12 type, size, and frequency of LNG marine traffic associated
13 with your proposal.

14 So if we were to look -- you mind if I come up
15 there?

16 MR. MCGUIRE: You're going to have to speak from
17 there sir for the court reporter.

18 MR. LAWLESS: Okay. If you were to look at the
19 proposal, this is right off the FERC website, and you were
20 going to look at the first berth that we have here, from
21 Prudence Island in, it's 11 miles. In that 11 miles, we're
22 going past Newport, Jamestown, Tiverton we have Middletown
23 in there and into Fall River. We're going along that
24 corridor aware that dredging will have to be involved, where
25 it says it's unsuitable, very unsuitable to do it.

1 So, we look at the platform that they want to put
2 up in 4.25 miles, 4 miles out. It's in 16 feet of water,
3 if you look at the navigation charts, you will see that the
4 turning basin that they have to put in there, so there's
5 going to be quite a bit of dredging that has to take place
6 there.

7 When we look at the comments that have come about
8 coming that 11 miles in, you know many elected officials in
9 Mass, I mean we're charged with safety concern. You know,
10 I'm concerned not just with Somerset, I'm concerned with
11 every area, every aspect from Rhode Island into Somerset
12 Swansea, all the areas are important.

13 U.S. Senator Jack Reid said in a statement, "from
14 a public safety and environmental standpoint, Weaver's Cove
15 Energy Project pose too many risks and would have placed a
16 tremendous burden on local law enforcement and taxpayers."

17 The Coast Guard letter confirms what we have been
18 saying all along, that we hope this will not be overruled,
19 which we know the appeal didn't -- they didn't hold up the
20 appeal, said U.S. Rep Barney Frank, "it is our hope that
21 safety will be allowed to win out over political
22 considerations."

23 When we look at the area, 4.25 miles, my concern
24 is when I looked at it, as you said earlier tonight Rick --
25 is it Rick, did I remember correctly? Sorry I forget your

1 last name. This line has only been provided for one mile
2 and this is your draft environmental study of Weaver's Cove
3 that you put together on this project and in here it talks
4 about cryogenic pipelines.

5 And here is what it says, "LNG can be transported
6 to onshore storage tanks from ships using specially designed
7 cryogenic pipelines. Such facilities enable LNG ships to
8 berth and transfer their LNG cargo to cryogenic pipeline at
9 docking facilities in offshore areas where natural water
10 depths -- natural water depths exceeds 40 feet. This was
11 FERC that said this, 40 feet.

12 We have 16 feet and what I saw in the
13 presentation tonight is saying we only need cover of five
14 feet. So we're not going to have to do any dredging except
15 five feet, we're just going to have to put 5 feet of cover.

16 But right here FERC is saying it has to be 40
17 feet. So I would like to know, you know, what has changed.

18 (Applause.)

19 Then it goes on to say, this is FERC again,
20 "although feasible, a number of technical factors related to
21 transporting LNG in a pipeline, place limits on the
22 practical maximum length of such a pipeline, to about three
23 miles." Three miles, that's what it says. Doesn't say
24 4.25. I suppose when we leave here tonight we'll hear that
25 oh, we have new technology that we can stretch it out

1 another mile and a quarter. Is that what's going to happen?
2 That's probably what we'll hear next.

3 (Applause.)

4 Then right from this report, you know, it shows
5 there is a cryogenic line in Cove Point of one mile. We
6 know that's what you said tonight Rick. So if we go on, it
7 also says this, "therefore, an offshore docking structure
8 and a cryogenic pipeline would have to be located relatively
9 close to a navigational channel," which this is, if you look
10 at the berth, where they want to put it, "which could
11 interfere with other port operators or marine traffic."
12 That's the Coast Guard situation again. Remember we're
13 coming in over 11 miles. "Although considered by FERC, we
14 did not identify a site where the use of this approach
15 appeared practical."

16 That's your words, Rick, I'm not picking on you,
17 but that's the words from the report. But it comes down to,
18 now all of a sudden it becomes practical. And if you notice
19 and you look, you'll see another platform in about two and a
20 half miles on the other side of the channel going into
21 Brightman Point.

22 But when you look at that and we start talking
23 about the Sandia Study and we start look at, they're saying
24 well, a mile radius, to a mile and a quarter, which varies
25 with different scientists, that would take out, if we did

1 get a release there or terrorist attack or whatever, the
2 possibility exist that it would take out Brightman Point, it
3 will take out all Brightman Point and our power station.

4 So if they move that in to comply with two and a
5 half -- that's about two and a half for your three miles,
6 now we're taking out -- that's on their website, the one
7 mile radius -- we are taking out our main power plant on the
8 East Coast. We need to consider that.

9 So now, if we go by what you say Rick, in this, I
10 know it's not you, but, FERC put it together, that it has to
11 be down 40 feet, that channel at 200 feet off the main
12 shipping lane is 16, 17, 18, 19 feet all the way in, we
13 would literally have to go down 40 feet by this report and
14 another feet of cover.

15 So now we're going to have to dredge the Taunton
16 River that we already know has been coming back, it's clean,
17 there has been more stripers this year than ever up into the
18 river, now we have another environmental problem.

19 You know, we say things won't happen, things
20 can't happen, there can't be a disaster, there can't be a
21 catastrophic event. LNG is safe, but since 9/11, things
22 have changed. We probably wouldn't be standing here today
23 if it wasn't for 9/11 because we see what has happened with
24 terrorist attacks and we do know that they have said that
25 they're going to target certain facilities.

1 I'd like to talk a little bit about Jerry Havens
2 who is a Chemical Engineer Professor at the University of
3 Arkansas. He has said that he warned, you know, could be
4 half a mile, up to a mile. Sandia Report, most scientists
5 are in agreement that terrorists could use available weapons
6 to blow a hole in the side of an LNG tanker, causing a rapid
7 spill of three million gallons. They hold about 35 million
8 gallons.

9 He goes on to say, if millions of gallons of LNG
10 has been spilled -- now he's been studying LNG for 30 years
11 and people boo him and say oh, he doesn't know what he is
12 talking about -- 30 years he's been doing this -- LNG and
13 other hazardous materials.

14 If spill on the water, rapidly evaporating fuel
15 was ignited, it would cause a fire bigger, bigger than
16 anyone has ever studied, because we've never studied a
17 release that big, and how can we compare it? We've done
18 10,000 gallon release, which is nothing, try to extrapolate
19 that, it's very difficult to do.

20 A pool fire would be so violent and so large, I
21 think there is a very high probability, almost a certainty
22 in my mind, that it wouldn't stop there, that the ship would
23 be further damaged and you'd have cascading failures and so
24 forth, probably endangering the whole ship.

25 Still he said, the possibility of half mile fire

1 can burn a person a mile away and he says, a two to three
2 mile potential traveling distance for vapor cloud should be
3 a serious enough threat to encourage remote siting.

4 We have remote siting now in Gloucester that's
5 ready to go. The Irving Project and I know that area very
6 well because that's where I work at one time, years ago,
7 Canaport. I talk to the project manager that I know
8 personally. They are going to be up and running December
9 2008, this year. They're almost complete. Different
10 scenario altogether, at low tide in the Bay of Fundy its 180
11 feet deep and they do have a jetty that they're going to use
12 in storms where they can go into, on 1,800 acres, away from
13 populated areas, 1,800 acres. They have bought up houses so
14 to take people out of harm's way.

15 You know, we say things can't happen, but they do
16 happen. They may not happen today or ten years or 30 years
17 from now, but maybe 40 years from now when this plant is
18 getting older, we have a problem. Now your kids, if you
19 live in this area, could be in jeopardy.

20 I want to give you a little scenario that
21 happened in Canada. Maybe some of you are not aware of
22 this. This was in December in 1917. I know it's a long
23 time ago, but things do happen. At 730 a.m. on December the
24 6th, the French ship Mont-Blanc, left her anchors outside
25 the mouth of the arbor to join a convoy gathering in Bedford

1 basin, and if you knew Bedford basis, which I do because I
2 lived there, I lived in Halifax, Nova Scotia, that's where
3 all the convoys left in World War I and World War II.
4 That's where they congregate.

5 She was loaded with 2,300 tons, 2,300 tons of wet
6 and dry citric acid, 200 tons of TNT, 10 tons of gun cotton
7 and 35 tons of Benzol, a highly explosive is. I'm doing
8 this for a point, these things do happen.

9 At the same time, Norwegian vessel Imo, she had
10 ballasts on, that's all she had, set out from the basin to
11 New York to pick up cargo for relief supplies for Belgium.
12 At the entrance of the narrows, the Imo struck the Mont-
13 Blanc on the bow. Although the collision was not severe,
14 fire immediately broke out onboard the Mont-Blanc, captain,
15 pilot, and crew, expected the ship to blow up, immediately
16 launched the life boats and took refuge on the Dartmouth
17 shore -- Halifax and Dartmouth are twin cities.

18 The ship burned for 20 minutes, drifting until it
19 rested against Pier 6 in Richmond District. Just before
20 9:05 a.m. the Mont Blanc exploded. Not one piece of her
21 remained beside the dock where she had finished her voyage.

22 Fragments rained on the surrounding area crashing
23 through buildings with enough force to embed them where they
24 landed. Churches, houses, schools, factories, docks and
25 ships were destroyed in the swap of the blast. Children who

1 had stopped on their way to school, workmen lining the
2 windows, families in their homes, sailors in their ships
3 died instantly. Injuries were frightful. Blindness from
4 the splintering glass adding to the shock and bewilderment.
5 It has a lot of pictures in here

6 MR. MCGUIRE: Selectman, I respectfully ask that
7 you summarize your comments. We have elected officials
8 here.

9 MR. NEEHAM: I'm almost through. My time isn't
10 out, I've been watching.

11 (Applause.)

12 But this is very important because this is what
13 Boston did for these people. This is what Boston, Mass did
14 for these people. Help poured in all over Canada with the
15 continued generosity of Massachusetts, unforgettable.

16 Each Christmas, that's since 1917, the huge tree
17 that glitters in Prudential Plaza in Boston, is a thank you
18 for the gift from the people of Nova Scotia. 1,630 homes
19 were destroyed, 12,000 were injured, 6,000 people were left
20 without shelters. So things do happen.

21 I'm going to wrap up my comments. If we were to
22 compare remote siting to putting it in an area, there is
23 another poster up here that shows, right on the site itself,
24 the tank is going to be 240 feet high. They want to run a
25 line through out town, in a densely populated area, 24 inch,

1 up past our high school within 1,000 feet and by the fire
2 and police department.

3 If we were to get a release there, it could be
4 devastating to our town. But if you look at that poster,
5 and you use right in the center of Weaver's Cove, you will
6 see, if you take that one mile and extrapolate it with what
7 the Sandia Report is saying, it could take out our high
8 school and all our coast line and we know the argument is
9 going to be, when you look at this catastrophic release,
10 that TNT isn't quite the same as LNG, no it isn't.

11 It can be more devastating because if we do get a
12 release on the water, the thermal energy that it gives off
13 burns everything in its path. And this is my last comment.
14 If we look at the plant Canaport, we look at they're going
15 to be sending us one billion cubic feet a day starting in
16 December, maybe early in January, but they think December.
17 One billion cubic feet a day, the same thing that this plant
18 wants to send, and they're going to expand it to two billion
19 cubic feet a day.

20 So it's going to be two billion cubic feet a day
21 and it's going to be for us, coming down the northeast
22 pipeline to us, and here is where I see the Irving Group is
23 very, very responsible. Let me tell you why, the pipeline
24 route, we're running this through populated areas but it
25 says here, the new natural gas pipeline will run under grown

1 through the industrial corridor already in place at Rockwood
2 Park, already the site of high tension electrical power
3 lines, and also runs down the international power grid, this
4 was chosen because it presents the least amount of risk to
5 the community or their environment.

6 They looked at this, running an underwater
7 pipeline across the St. John Harbor resented a greater
8 degree of long term risk, greater degree of long term risk
9 and environmental impact to the St John Area. So it was
10 rejected. They rejected it because they knew what the
11 environmental impact would be.

12 We look at here, we could be putting people in
13 jeopardy and can we live with ourselves if we do by not
14 remote siting these plants? We need to really look at this,
15 and you even said in your study, that you look at this, it's
16 not feasible, but of course, as it was brought out earlier
17 tonight by a gentleman, he said the line is not proven, we
18 don't know how long the line will be good for but there are
19 many other aspects that we really need to look at. We are
20 charged with the duty, and you know, coming up through the
21 refinery, I feel for union people because I came up through
22 the union at 10 years, I was five year shop steward in the
23 Atomic Energy Union and I went into management.

24 Yes we all need jobs, we do need jobs. I'm all
25 for jobs, but are we going to put people in jeopardy?

1 That's what I'm worried about. If there is an accident, are
2 we going to be able to live with ourselves?

3 (Applause.)

4 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for your comments. The
5 next commenter is Lisa Lowney who is representing
6 Congressman Barney Frank. The commenter on deck will be
7 Representative David Sullivan.

8 MS. LOWNEY: Good evening everyone. I'm actually
9 here for Congress Barney Frank in conjunction with
10 Congressman James McGovern. They have coordinated a letter
11 together on behalf of this. They say:

12 We are glad to have this opportunity to restate
13 our strong opposition to the wholly inappropriate effort to
14 place a LNG facility in Fall River. As a result of
15 appropriate decisions by Congress, and the Coast Guard, the
16 current LNG proposal is very different from the one
17 originally approved by the FERC. Out of respect for the
18 process and the residents of Fall River, we strongly request
19 that the FERC reopen this matter and conduct a full and
20 thorough review.

21 (Applause.)

22 We have worked closely with the city since we
23 were first confronted with this effort to impose this
24 facility against our will, and we will continue to do
25 everything we can to prevent the federal government from

1 disregarding not just the wishes of the people of Fall
2 River, but public safety and common sense.

3 Building a large LNG facility on the Taunton
4 River, requiring large tankers to sail under heavily
5 traveled bridges defines sensible planning, and Weaver's
6 Cove has finally come to that realization. However, instead
7 of abandoning this ill-advised proposal, they have instead
8 proposed yet another poorly conceived and reckless
9 modification of their plan.

10 Weaver's Cove latest proposal now includes
11 constructing an offshore port in Mount Hope Bay that would
12 allow tankers to unload LNG into a four-mile pipeline
13 towards its proposed facility in Fall River. The new plan
14 would entail LNG tankers docking at the proposed berth, and
15 Weaver's Cove anticipates receiving up to 70 tankers per
16 year at the berth in Mount Hope Bay, which is a heavily
17 traveled body of water. Increasing vessel traffic in this
18 already congested area would be an accident waiting to
19 happen.

20 This new ill-advised plan would also require
21 extensive and damaging dredging of the Taunton River. The
22 proposed pipeline will travel from Mount Hope Bay through
23 the Taunton River. Congress is currently considering
24 legislation to include the Taunton River as part of the
25 Department of Interior's National Wild and Scenic Rivers

1 program. The department of Interior has already determined
2 that dredging associated with the proposed LNG facility is
3 inconsistent with Wild and Scenic designation and that the
4 proposed dredging will not be permitted.

5 A number of leading maritime authorities
6 including the National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration
7 (NOAA) and Massachusetts Division of Marine Fisheries (MDMF)
8 have consistently raised concerns about the scope and extent
9 of dredging associated with this project and placing a
10 pipeline on the river bed further exacerbates the harmful
11 impacts of this project.

12 We believe that the FERC must address these
13 important and vital environmental concerns before it
14 proceeds with any further action related to this project.
15 We therefore strongly urge the Commission to reconsider the
16 Weaver's Cove project in light of these new modifications
17 and determine if the Commission's standards of project
18 safety, security, and the public interest will be met. The
19 FERC cannot continue to ignore the very strong arguments
20 against locating the facility in Fall River, and we call on
21 them to look again at the persuasive evidence that it would
22 be unsafe to site the plant in such a densely populated
23 area. We will continue to do everything we can to oppose
24 this ill-conceived facility.

25 And for those who would like a copy of t his

1 letter, I have put one on the table adjacent to the signing
2 in. Thank you.

3 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for your comments.
4 Representative Sullivan will speak and the next commenter on
5 deck will be Patricia Haddad with the State Representative
6 of Bristol.

7 MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you for an opportunity to
8 testify this evening. I'd like to start off --

9 MR. MCGUIRE: Can you identify yourself.

10 MR. SULLIVAN: Oh yes. I'm Representative David
11 Sullivan. I am a State Representative with the Commonwealth
12 of Massachusetts. I represent the 6th Bristol District. I
13 live in the City of Fall River in the area of where the
14 proposed project is.

15 I really wanted to start off with just some
16 clarification and I know that a previous speaker had also
17 talked about this, but one of the things that have been
18 repeatedly talked about is the unsuitability for navigation
19 and the focus seems to be just exclusively on the old
20 Brightman Street Bridge and the new Brightman Street Bridge
21 that's being constructed.

22 Well the unsuitability of it, according to
23 Captain Nash, what he did, did not stop just there. It goes
24 all the way from Prudence Island all the way down to the
25 terminal site.

1 The reason being is that there are narrow inlets,
2 it's a porous coastline, and we only need to look back a few
3 months ago because when we looked at what happened off the
4 coast of Cape Cod, we have an LNG supertanker. We had an
5 LNG supertanker that lost power and that thing was adrift.

6 There are certain areas within that transit route
7 that Captain Nash was talking about, that if you have an LNG
8 supertanker coming down and lose power, you would be unable
9 to turn that tanker around to get that tanker out. That is
10 a significant problem.

11 These tankers are approximately 950 feet long.
12 What does that mean? Well I can give you a comparison. Many
13 of you have been to the City of Boston, you are familiar
14 with the Hancock Building, right. Well, if you took that
15 ship and stood it up on the stern, it would be taller than
16 the Hancock Building. Think about that.

17 I had the opportunity to go out with the State
18 Police Marine squadron when they go out into Boston Harbor
19 and I got to escort with them and the Coast Guard and the
20 environmental police and it was quite an armada, to bring
21 one of these large, large ships in. And a lot of credit
22 goes to the Coast Guard and to the efforts put in by the
23 State Police and everybody who was involved with it.

24 I can't tell you about the level of security
25 that's going on there because some of it was undercover as

1 well. However, with that intensity of security, I can not
2 begin to imagine could be maintained at a level that's going
3 to continue to be able to be provided to a site where Hess
4 is going to do it as well. The Coast Guard is under
5 restraints with your fleet.

6 There have been articles about the deteriorating
7 fleets and it is not only just the fleet of your ships, but
8 also with your in craft as well. And you certainly do need
9 the tools to be able to do the job.

10 This isn't just issues about terrorism either,
11 although 9/11 has been mentioned. Prior to 9/11 no one
12 would have believed that that would have happened, but it
13 did happen. So things do happen.

14 But we also have to think about other problems.
15 We have to think about human error. Human error is
16 significant. It's a problem that happens. You also have to
17 think about mechanical failure and all you have to do there
18 is go back to Skikda, Algeria, and that was an LNG plant and
19 that exploded and that was due to a faulty barrel.

20 There were 29 lives lost there, it was a remote
21 area, thank God, but I understand too that windows were
22 blown out of houses over four miles away.

23 LNG is a great fuel and I also agree with the
24 previous speaker, I'm not against LNG, I just think that you
25 should site it safely and appropriately. You don't site it

1 in densely populated areas. And when you look at this
2 picture right here, this picture here is a picture of that
3 site and it's not even a mile radius that the studies have
4 come out and in multiple studies, including the two Sandia
5 Reports, the GA Hill Reports, the ADS Reports, they all
6 indicate the at these types of projects should not be build
7 in densely populated areas.

8 And as a matter of fact, it was the Sandia
9 Report, if I'm not mistaken, that broke it down into three
10 zones and Zone 1 was an area where it was highly populated
11 area, the infrastructure, public buildings, and public icons
12 and they said that that was something where these types of
13 facilities should not be built and they specifically sited
14 Zone 1.

15 LNG, which is a liquid to be maintained as a
16 liquid, has to be kept at 260 degrees below zero. The ships
17 are built double hulled, often times it's referred to for
18 safety reasons, but the real reason as I've come to
19 understand it, and I'm sure that this will be reviewed and
20 so I hope, is that you need the double hull in order to keep
21 the insulation in cause really what they are is floating
22 thermos bottles to keep something at 260 degrees below zero
23 because if it rises above that, it's going to start go
24 towards its boiling point and what you're going to see, is
25 you're going to see a transition from a liquid to a gas.

1 Now you might say, well, you know, then what
2 happens, it goes away. But when that happens, one gallon of
3 LNG turns into 600 gallons of gas.

4 If it's not ignited at that point, what happens
5 you get a vapor dispersion cloud, a vapor dispersion cloud
6 as the gas escapes and travels -- in the Sandia Report said
7 that if this is in a urban area the Zone 1 area, an emission
8 source could ignite that cloud, basically igniting a fire
9 storm. But could I do that? My understanding is that even
10 a cell phone spark could do that.

11 The point I'm bringing is that when you look at
12 that picture there, you see a highly populated area. That's
13 where the terminal is going to go. What you can't see in
14 that picture is that there are multiple dead end streets
15 there.

16 There is no reasonable hope for evacuation of
17 those people who live in that area and live on those dead
18 end streets. You would have emergency apparatus coming in,
19 you've got a situation where wooded buildings can be ignited
20 on fire. How are these people going to be getting out? Is
21 this the type of risk that we want to take at this time, in
22 this age, when we really have a lot of unknowns. So much
23 for the public safety incident.

24 I do want to talk about, and I know that this is
25 all about too, the environmental end of it and I do want to

1 talk about some of the things that I've gotten from the
2 reports from the different state agencies and I do want to
3 say that these two hearings that are being held now, I just
4 think they are exercises in futility. I just think that the
5 proposed transit route is unsuitable and it's unfortunate
6 that you continue to put hope and credence into this, which
7 I consider to be a dangerous project just due to the densely
8 populated area.

9 The agencies and the information that I've
10 collected over time, it shows that this proposal could
11 devastate the area water fowl and the plant life of the two
12 bays and the Taunton River. That dredging will have an
13 impact on the ecosystem and it will be a large burden on all
14 aquatic life forms in the river and the bay.

15 The waterway support a vast array of life and
16 they all would be negatively impacted. There exist a
17 delicate balance that allows plant and the animal life to
18 flourish within these waterways and that balance will be
19 destroyed.

20 The impact on benthic invertebrates and other
21 aquatic forest species, the project will also negatively
22 impact commercial and recreational fish species important to
23 the New England fishermen, and that's coming from state
24 agencies related to marine fisheries and so on.

25 What I haven't talked about is that over the

1 years Fall River was a textile town back when in the early
2 years the chemicals used in the process were dumped into the
3 bay, sunk into the sediments. They're talking about
4 chemicals, that the dredging would occur, that would be
5 resuspended with the mercury, cadmium, lead, copper, and
6 other metals, that have toxicity to them.

7 This resuspension and redistribution of heavy
8 metals and other toxins, especially during the change of
9 tides would contaminate areas far and well away from the
10 dredging apparatus.

11 In a previous project of proposal, the Department
12 of Interior stated that the Hess Group had refused to
13 incorporate restrictions to protect downstream anadromous
14 fish and migrations.

15 As currently proposed, the dredging for this
16 project would have unacceptable, adverse impacts to the
17 anadromous fishery resources in the Taunton River without
18 time of year restrictions for both upstream and downstream
19 migrations. We continue to recommend that this application
20 be denied.

21 The many transits being planned for the arrival
22 and departure of the LNG tankers, 950 feet long, will upset
23 the sea floor and destroy fish egg beds. Tourism, and I
24 think this is important, because this talks about jobs,
25 tourism and the recreational industry and other businesses

1 related to the bays and the river, will be impacted.

2 MR. MCGUIRE: Representative, will you summarize
3 your comments please.

4 (Applause.)

5 MR SULLIVAN: Okay, I can do that. Recently,
6 Cindy Hurst, a Lieutenant Commander in the United States
7 Naval Reserves and a political military research analyst
8 with a foreign military studies office said that there are a
9 number of known vulnerabilities within the LNG industry and
10 they lie on the human factor.

11 According to an article she wrote, entitled
12 Liquified Natural Gas Tankers Remain Giant Terror Targets,
13 there are numerous security flaws that exist within the LNG
14 industry.

15 These flaws are, inadequate vetting of crews.
16 Now the Coast Guards does a terrific job. They go on board,
17 they check credentials, but when they're checking
18 credentials, often times are from ships, people who are from
19 third world nations. They really have no way of verifying
20 those people and those credentials. I think that that's a
21 very serious concern. It is inadequate U.S. security
22 measures or facilities shortages of qualified mariners and
23 U.S. officers -- and t his is interesting, no United States
24 flagged LNG vessels, no, they're not U.S. vessels. They're
25 all foreign flagged vessels.

1 MR. MCGUIRE: Representative, if you could
2 summarize.

3 MR. SULLIVAN: I only have one last thing to say
4 here and this -- it's just basically a comment or a quote
5 that came from an LNG expert and basically what he said was,
6 as he was sailing his boat in Boston harbor, an LNG tanker
7 was coming through and we know the intense of security.

8 He said, I was close enough, that with a halfway
9 decent baseball throw, I could have bounced the ball off of
10 it. He was referring to an LNG tanker. That was Mr. Gordon
11 Shearer. Thank you.

12 (Applause.)

13 MR. MCGUIRE: Again, I respectfully ask that you
14 limit your comments to five minutes. We have numerous
15 commenters here tonight who would like to speak and we
16 respect their time. I ask that you limit your comments to
17 five minutes, please.

18 MS. HADDAD: Thank you. Thank you for taking me
19 out of turn, and I will limit my comments to under five
20 minutes. My name is Patricia Haddad, H-A-D-D-A-D. I'm the
21 State Representative for the Town of Somerset, as well as a
22 portion of Swansea most affected by this project.

23 I'm here as you asked to comment, and I'll
24 comment on the areas that you have asked for and skip
25 through a lot of, I'm sure, what people don't want to hear.

1

2

As an elected representative to the Massachusetts General Court, I'm here to strongly advocate on behalf of the residents of my down and those residents of Somerset who reside within my legislative district.

6

The offshore berthing project quite simply is a bad idea and not supported in any way by my district.

7

8

First, I must express my concern relative to the dredging of the area.

9

10

The Taunton River is one of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts old industrial rivers. It runs through a host of communities and by doing so, it's been a primary natural resource and driving industrial force to these same communities over the centuries. Unfortunately, that success may have come at the expense of our environment.

11

12

13

14

15

16

The soil found at the bottom of the Taunton River contains years of waste from the many silver factories, tanneries, ironworks and textile mills which brought to these communities industrial prominence. Dear we uncap these carcinogens by dredging? What public health issues may arise from that dredging? And if we do dredge that river, what environmental impacts it would have on the region?

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

As to the area where the dredging materials are located, they too, will feel the impact far from our Taunton

25

1 River. What happens to the existing fish, or what happens
2 to the people? We know that there -- when you expose people
3 to heavy metals, the result is very serious neurological
4 disorders. You're asking us to endure, what could very well
5 be another epidemic of very, very horrible disease along our
6 river.

7 Secondly I'm concerned about the offshore
8 berthing project's impact on recreational boaters, fishermen
9 and other commercial users of Mount Hope Bay and the Taunton
10 River. Towns of Dayton, Somerset, Swansea as well as the
11 communities of Berkley, Freetown and Fall River, have a
12 great many recreational boaters who use the Taunton River
13 and Mount Hope Bay almost on a year round basis.

14 As we continue to market our area for its natural
15 resources, recreation and quality of life for tourist,
16 pleasure crafts continue to increase their presence on our
17 waterway. Factor into that the City of Fall River's efforts
18 to return small cruise ships to its port and Somerset's
19 small but very expanding marine industries along the
20 shoreline.

21 Thirdly, this proposed project would greatly
22 impact the safety of the thousands of residents who live
23 within the one mile radius of both the suggested terminal
24 site on land, and the offshore berth location in the bay.

25 This platform is within close proximity to a

1 major electric producing power plant. This is a base low
2 power plant, a major contributor to the grid. The site is
3 within two miles of a major interstate highway and bridge,
4 down the bay is located two important bridges, connecting
5 the passages of east and west bay Rhode Island.

6 In this day and age, the site would be considered
7 an all too easy terrorist target. And for those people who
8 would poo poo the idea that anybody, that any terrorist
9 would be interested in the Town of Somerset, if you think
10 that cutting o access to a good portion of our country and
11 taking out the grid, one of the major contributors to the
12 electric grid, would not be interesting to a terrorist, I
13 need you to think again.

14 Finally, an offshore berth would be a visual
15 impediment upon the pristine horizon of Mount Hope Bay.
16 Stand at Brightman Point, Gardener's Neck or the Beach and
17 Ocean Grove and gaze on one of the magnificent sunset.
18 Sailboats dotting the horizon as they traverse from
19 Massachusetts to Rhode Island and back to Massachusetts.
20 It's a site which we all enjoy and really delight in. It
21 would be blighted, blighted by 900 feet of a boat that would
22 just blacken the horizon.

23 In conclusion, I must clearly state that I can
24 not ever endorse, not this latest proposal nor the initial
25 proposal for Weaver's Cove Energy LLC. Clearly the dredging

1 of Mount Hope Bay and the construction of the terminal berth
2 at the coast of Somerset is not in the best interest of the
3 environment, interstate commerce, or the residents of this
4 area and I would urge you to deny this proposal. But I
5 really have to say that I am deeply, deeply disappointed at
6 the latitude that FERC has extended to this company as it
7 continues to try to ram this project down on us. Thank you.

8 (Applause.)

9 MR. MCGUIRE: Our next commenter is City
10 Councilor Cathy Ann Viveiros and the next commenter on deck
11 is Patrick Norton.

12 MS. VIVEIROS: Cathy Ann Viveiros, spelled V as
13 in Victor, I, V as in Victor, E-I-R-O-S. Fall River City
14 Councilor and joining me this evening is also City Councilor
15 Raymond Hague. We both serve on the Fall River City
16 Council's Public Safety Committee and while I concur with
17 much of the comments expressed by the previous speakers, I'm
18 going to direct my comments to two areas that have not yet
19 been touch on, and yet are very close to our concerns
20 regarding public safety.

21 I will start by referencing a document that was
22 developed by the California Energy Commission regarding the
23 liquid natural gas safety. They specifically talk about
24 explosions and fires and provide a very detailed list of
25 incidents that have been relative to LNG facilities. And

1 it's very clear at looking at this that there are a number
2 of what I would call points of failure through the course of
3 a facility and an operation such as this and I won't read
4 them all, but I will say that they talk very specifically
5 about the possibility of ignited vapor that can be very
6 dangerous to us, explosion that can be relative to
7 construction.

8 We haven't really looked at the possibility of
9 things that could happen during the construction process and
10 they talk specifically about natural gas leak so again, in
11 conjunction with the pipeline.

12 They do talk about over pressurization of heat
13 exchanges, which speaks to some of the process that's
14 involved that needs to be looked at, and also again the
15 ignition of the vapor cloud.

16 They talked about problems, serious accidents
17 regarding the discharging arms, which would relate to
18 another point of potential failure regarding the operation
19 and they talk again about main liquid line valves that could
20 fail, loss of power and the problem with piping systems and
21 check valves not operating correctly and they go through a
22 very exhaustive list of the potential problems.

23 To that end, I would expect that the proponent
24 is, in conjunction with the Draft Environmental Impact
25 Statement going to be required to do some risk analysis

1 regarding this project.

2 Specifically, I reference the Sandia Report which
3 was performed by the U.S. Department of Energy, the National
4 Nuclear Security Administration and they make some very
5 specific references regarding the adequacy of modeling.
6 When we try to determine the risk assessment of a project
7 such as this, and they currently say, the current LNG spill
8 and dispersion modeling and analysis techniques have
9 limitation. In addition, variances exist in location's
10 specific conditions that influence dispersion such as
11 terrain, weather conditions, waves, currents, and the
12 presence of obstacles.

13 With all dues respect, we are in New England and
14 we have a saying around here that if you don't like the
15 weather, you need to just wait a moment because it's likely
16 to change.

17 We have some very specific concerns that when we
18 are relying on modeling, and an anticipation of conditions
19 that might be encountered, that there is no reliable way for
20 us to fully determine the risk associated with a project of
21 this nature given its close proximity to very densely
22 populated areas. And a study performed by your own
23 government agency would bear out the fact that it is
24 virtually impossible to provide for all specific
25 circumstances and remove, and at least assure the public

1 that the risk associated with a project like this can be
2 effectively managed and effectively dealt with.

3 The second part of my comments are going to refer
4 to economic development. I know that the Draft
5 Environmental Impact Statement will require an economic
6 analysis to be performed by the proponent. I want to just
7 reference the fact that was mentioned earlier that Fall
8 River and the Taunton River and the communities surround it
9 are looking forward and hoping that our Congressmen will
10 prevail in getting the wild and scenic river designation
11 completed for the Taunton River.

12 And, I will tell you that, the City of Fall River
13 has engaged in a very aggressive effort to complete economic
14 development activities along its waterfront and its
15 shoreline.

16 I would respectfully request that any economic
17 impact report that is done by the proponent also take a look
18 at the adverse economic impacts that could be created by the
19 siting of this facility in that location.

20 It's very difficult for a community such as Fall
21 River and even those in the surrounding areas to go forward
22 with the types of economic development initiatives that it
23 envisions with this kind of a facility located just
24 offshore. And we've already heard about the impacts to the
25 recreational aspects but again, we see it as a severe

1 detriment to the economic development to the City of Fall
2 River and the surrounding areas and we respectfully request
3 that your report take a look at those negative impact so
4 that they can effectively look at the full and total picture
5 regarding that.

6 This is a project that is being put upon us and
7 as a community, we feel that we are going to bare the
8 adverse consequences of this project. Not only to the
9 extent that they are going to interfere with our own
10 development plans and initiatives, but the fact that it is
11 being imposed upon us, is something that we hope would weigh
12 very heavily upon the Commission's consideration. Thank
13 you.

14 (Appause.)

15 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for your comment.

16 MR. NORTON: My name is Patrick Norton, N--O-R-T-
17 O-N and District Representative for Congressman James
18 McGovern and a similar letter, in fact the same letter that
19 Barney Frank in the comments the governors made to FERC.
20 The government is redundant and I won't re-read the letter
21 because I know everybody has heard it once.

22 I did receive a letter from a constituent that
23 I'd like to read. I'd like just to make two quick comments.

24 Weaver's Cove has been playing fuzzy math with
25 this project from day one and I was looking at that slide

1 presentation that said that the berthing facility was one
2 mile away from the shoreline.

3 Now my calculations says it's about three
4 quarters of a mile from shoreline to shoreline where this
5 berthing area is taking place, so I think you, need to redo
6 the map on that particular aspect of the project, one.

7 Secondly, as far as the dredging is concerned
8 that was brought up recently, once the Taunton River is
9 designated a wild and scenic river, there will be no
10 dredging allowed in the Taunton River. So I don't see how
11 the project, from a feasibility standpoint and why we're
12 even going through this whole analysis. If there can't be
13 any dredging done, the project can't move forward period.
14 And secondly, with the Coast Guard recommendations of the
15 channel not being able to be safely traversed, the project
16 can't be moved forward.

17 I am reading a letter from the constituent that
18 was handed to me this afternoon in front of my office. It's
19 by the Reverend James Hoiste, 260 Lake Avenue, Fall River,
20 Massachusetts to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.
21 I ask you to deny any permit for LNG in Narragansett Bay,
22 Mount Hope Bay or the Taunton River. A major concern is
23 that of public safety. The human that reside in the pathway
24 where the tank is, even one mile or so would be a risk.

25 We should be concerned, as part of the

1 environment and protect it from the natures of LNG fire
2 and/or explosion.

3 Although the statistical problem of an accident
4 or terrorist attack may be low for any one trip, over time,
5 as a number of trips mount, catastrophe becomes more and
6 more likely.

7 We are the people who pay the price for
8 inevitable acts of terrorist attack. A burning tanker
9 drifting towards a densely inhabited shore could cause
10 immense damage. LNG facilities need to be offshore and away
11 from inhabitable places. Thank you.

12 (Applause.)

13 MR. MCGUIRE: The final elected official is
14 Representative Steven DeMico.

15 MR. DEMICO: Thank you. I'm Representative Steve
16 DeMico, I represent the 4th Bristol District which include
17 Swansea. Welcome to my district. A few years ago I took my
18 daughter to see a Red Socks game at Yankee Stadium. We got
19 rained out.

20 The next morning I decided to take her to the top
21 of the World Trade Towers. We were on our way when somebody
22 ran out of their home screaming, oh my God, a plane just
23 flew into the World Trade Towers and dragged us in, and we
24 watched it on TV.

25 We rushed down to the river. We rushed down to

1 the river, and what I saw that day, it was something I never
2 wanted to see again. I watched people holding hands,
3 jumping from flaming rooms, tumbling like rag dolls to their
4 death. I watched the building collapsed.

5 Now this new proposal, this new proposal is twice
6 as bad as the first. It provides two targets. You know, if
7 one of those terrorists had flown that plane into the
8 District Heights facility in Everett, there wouldn't be a
9 Boston, Massachusetts today. And there are people who say,
10 well, terrorists aren't interested in Fall River, but you
11 know, there are a lot of complacent people in this country.
12 And they say well, we feel safe because we're not in New
13 York. If a terrorist would strike a smaller city like Fall
14 River to put fear in the heart of every small town in
15 America, every small city, every backwoods, FERC would
16 quake.

17 So to say this isn't New York City, it can't
18 happen here, that's a fantasy. This proposal is twice as
19 bad as the original proposal. You're in two targets now.
20 The ships going to sit in the middle and unload for 24 hours
21 of the 7 times a year.

22 MR. MCGUIRE: 70 times a year.

23 MR. DEMICO: 70 times a year. So that's like
24 confiscating Mount Hope Bay for 70 days, confiscating it
25 from the recreational boaters, confiscating it from the

1 fishermen who have to go buy their -- I just don't think
2 there is any way that we can defend t his proposal.

3 You know, it's gas, it doesn't have to be in a
4 densely populated community. All it has to do is be able to
5 tie into the system. But we see these proposals all the
6 time come out for working class communities that don't have
7 the money or resources to defend themselves.

8 You don't see this proposal from a high income
9 neighborhood or tourist destination where the wealthy
10 vacation. You see it in communities like Fall River and
11 that's a crime.

12 So I would ask respectfully that you reject this
13 proposal. It's bad public policy.

14 Thank you.

15 (Applause.)

16 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for your comment. Are
17 there any elected officials that I missed on our list?
18 Okay, we will proceed with those in order of who signed up
19 to speak from the public and from interested parties.

20 I would ask -- we're getting some feedback from
21 the microphone so I would ask that you don't speak too
22 closely to the microphone due to that feedback. Our first
23 commenter is C.J. Ferry.

24 MR. FERRY: My name is C.J. Ferry, I'm a resident
25 of Fall River, Massachusetts. I'm a registered nurse and a

1 certified public health nurse. I'm licensed in 24 states.
2 I have received several certifications from the Federal
3 Emergency agencies and have been certified also by the
4 Massachusetts system for active registration and the
5 Massachusetts Medical Reserve Board.

6 I want to address three major issues that have
7 been slightly addressed by several of my friends and public
8 officials.

9 The first is environmental. The dredging of the
10 Taunton River will create major health issues for Bald
11 River, Somerset, Swansea, Liberty, Newport, Middletown and
12 God knows how far down river, downstream, and into the bay.

13 With the release of lead, cadmium, and other
14 heavy metals, we will have increased levels of cancer,
15 neurological damage, and death. These create a major public
16 health issues that our medical systems within the area,
17 while being some of the greatest medical facilities in the
18 country, could not handle on such a scale.

19 The recreational use of the river would be
20 restricted but that recreational use would still continue.
21 The aerosolization of these heavy metals and chemicals that
22 would be released by the dredging, would then cause those
23 heavy metals and chemicals to be inhaled and if we look
24 aback to the 70s, when we had lead gasoline, our children
25 suffered lead poisoning, not only from the paint chip, but

1 from the inhalation of automobile exhaust, which contained
2 lead.

3 That lead would be released into the air, being
4 aerosolized by the boats, not only by the recreational
5 boats, but by the fishing vessels as well as these LNG
6 tankers and people along the shoreline would be exposed to
7 those heavy metals and would suffer major health issues.

8 So from a public health standpoint alone, it
9 would be ignorant to allow such a project to go forward.
10 Being FEMA certified in several areas, including manmade and
11 unnatural disasters and natural as well, I know for a fact
12 that the infrastructure within the City of Fall River, the
13 Towns of Somerset and Swansea, and up and down the Taunton
14 River, could not handle a disaster such as that which would
15 be created by an explosion or LNG light leakage.

16 The burns and devastation that would be created
17 within the one mile hot zone, is only the beginning of what
18 we would have.

19 The people that were closest to the devastation
20 would probably be the lucky ones, because they have only a
21 few moments of pain and then they'd be dead. It is the rest
22 of the area that we're concerned with as well because those
23 people would see it coming and know of the years of
24 suffering and reconstructive surgery and necessary medical
25 care that the Commonwealth itself can not afford at this

1 point in time, nor can the insurance systems in the State.

2 There is no system in place currently for
3 funding, or for training the necessary personnel or for even
4 taking care of such a devastation that would be created by
5 an LNG accident.

6 We've heard about fuzzy maps, we've heard pushing
7 this issue. I have to say, right now, that the siting
8 people, Massachusetts Siting, are not doing their job.
9 You're not representing the needs, the wants, and the
10 desires of the people of these communities who are being
11 railroaded at every turn.

12 The fact that FERC as a siting commission, still
13 are entertaining these proposals while cities and towns have
14 to fight, spending necessary funds to prevent such issues
15 from coming forward, is rude, ignorant, and is just plain
16 wrong.

17 Our cities and towns can not afford to be dumped
18 on anymore. Fall River has for years, been dumped on.
19 We're dumped on by the State, we're dumped on by the
20 environmental agencies, and we're dumped on by big business
21 and right now, Weaver's Cove is trying to dump on us as
22 well.

23 We can not have this any more. I'm all for jobs,
24 but more importantly, I'm for the safety and welfare of the
25 community. As a nurse, I don't want to have to live through

1 that which I'm trained to handle. I can handle and work
2 through any disaster, do I want to, no.

3 I receive daily bulletin and daily activation
4 from FEMA on our blood situation in both Maine and in the
5 Midwest and I receive the bulletins regularly. They come
6 right to my BlackBerry, they're so important.

7 That's a ploy. That's a natural disaster. What
8 is FEMA going to do if we have such a disaster created by an
9 LNG tanker leak or explosion? I thank you for your time and
10 I just want to ask that you seriously consider the impact
11 that you will have on these communities. Not only from the
12 standpoint of financially, but environmentally and the
13 public health issue you will create if you do not deny this
14 petition.

15 The people of Fall River are speaking to you
16 today. The only good thing that has ever come out of these
17 hearing and Weaver's Cove Proposal is the fact that the
18 communities have united in a united stance and a united
19 front against being stepped on once again. I thank you for
20 your time.

21 (Applause.)

22 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for your comment. Our next
23 commenter is John Keppel and the commenter on deck is
24 Michael Miozza.

25 MR. KEPPEL: My name is John Keppel, KEPPEL. I'm

1 a resident of the north end of Fall River. When the first
2 series of hearings were held for the Weaver's Cove Proposal,
3 the public in this area held what subsequently prove to be a
4 naive believe that FERC would listen to them. We trusted
5 you. We trusted you as our government, and you let us down.

6 Public safety is identified in the Declaration of
7 Independence as a basic purpose of government, "it's the
8 right of the people to organize the government, as to them
9 shall seem most likely to effect their safety and
10 happiness." Safety and happiness are capitalized. That's
11 the reason this country was formed.

12 Public safety include safe environment. That's
13 the very reason NEPA was written. It belongs as the
14 foremost topic in NEPA's considerations and should not be
15 lost to the myopic application of science, marine biology,
16 or soil contaminants.

17

18 This project does not belong in this area either
19 in its original authorized form or in the present proposal.

20 Let's look at FERC's history with respect to
21 Weaver's Cove. In August 2004, a meeting with the EPA in
22 Boston, EPA told representatives of federal and state
23 legislators, the Mayor's office, concerned citizens, that
24 the ADEIS, Administrative Direct Environmental Impacts
25 Statement had been withheld for five months from NEPA and

1 virtually all citizens constituencies at the request of
2 FERC, giving Weaver's Cove a five month head start in the
3 original project. Only authorization by FERC in August 2004
4 allowed that document to be released.

5 In July 2005, FERC authorized the original
6 proposal, including a land-based LNG tanker at Weaver's Cove
7 with 1,000 foot exclusion zone, to which this proposal is an
8 addition.

9 FERC authorized that siting with a 1,000 foot
10 zone even though the ADS studies said that people can
11 burn 4,600 feet away from an accident on a ship, a ship in
12 the berthing area.

13 FERC authorized that siting with a 1,000 foot
14 zone even though the Sandia Study said people could
15 burn a mile away in 30 seconds if there were an incident.

16 FERC authorized that siting with a 1,000 foot
17 zone even though the Sandia Study said that gas vapor clouds
18 from an incident could ignite over two miles away and burn
19 back to the source. And later they adjusted that for the
20 Cabrio Point Project to 7.2 miles.

21 FERC authorized that siting even though the Coast
22 Guard's NVIC 0505 water suitability assessment wasn't
23 applied to this. If it had been applied, there would be
24 five criteria. Captain, it was not applied, if you do the
25 research, you'll find out. It was dismissed.

1 FERC authorized the siting even though NATO
2 identified LNG tankers in narrow waterways near population
3 centers as potential terrorist targets.

4 These studies are not marketing sensationalism. They are
5 addressing real concerns about LNG, yet FERC dismiss them.

6 The following are near catastrophic accidents
7 since this proposal begin. Two LNG trucks tipped over in
8 Massachusetts alone, Redding and Hopkinton. Interstate
9 highways were closed, people and concerns about evacuation
10 of people as a result of that. We were just lucky and we're
11 talking with this facility, up to 36,000 trucks a year, 100
12 a day.

13 An LNG tanker in Norway lost power and drifted
14 towards the rocks, with nearby residents being evacuated in
15 2004.

16 An LNG tanker lost power off Nantucket this year
17 and was drifting for hours before the Coast Guard got to it.

18 In May 2006, a 600-foot ship in Boston Harbor
19 overshot its berth and sailed into an LNG loading dock.

20 We've been lock there was no LNG tanker there.
21 Nothing in the new Hess proposal changes the dangers
22 associated with LNG in congested populated areas. This new
23 proposal has in-the-bay berthing facility and a cryogenic
24 pipeline under riverbed with a new host of environmental
25 safety issues.

1 There is sufficient reason to require an entirely
2 new application for the tank and the unloading facility.
3 The idea of Weaver's Cove saying they're protecting the
4 public by putting it a mile out is a joke when you've got
5 the tank 1,000 feet from the public.

6 The proposed cryogenic pipeline would be the
7 longest in the world and directly contrary to Weaver's
8 cove's comments in their own FEIS regarding the functional
9 length of cryogenic pipe carrying LNG. It's page 312 of the
10 FEIS, 3-12.

11 How many people in this room, how many of you
12 know that in the Sandia Study, it calls for a mitigation
13 procedure. If there is an LNG leak in a tanker, if there is
14 a breach in the tanker, it could cause a lot of damage to
15 reduce the effects of an even larger vapor cloud igniting
16 that a mitigating procedure is to ignite the LNG, for safety
17 officials to ignite the LNG ourselves. So who is going to
18 make that decision to kill 100 or 1,000 to save 20,000 or
19 50,000?

20 You are our federal and state agencies and we
21 need you to protect us. That's what we're asking you to do
22 and we were failed the first time around and I hope we're
23 not failed this time around.

24 Public safety as identified in the declaration of
25 independence is a part of the environment and it is the

1 paramount issue. The communities along Mount Hope,
2 Narragansett Bays and the Taunton River have a right to
3 expect FERC to represent the public and not corrupt special
4 interests as they have in this process in the past. We ask
5 you to defend this community. Thank you.

6 (Applause.)

7 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for your comment. Mr.
8 Miozza is the next commenter. Following him is Brian
9 Pearson.

10 MR. MIOZZA: Good evening. What I'm emphatically
11 opposed to is this notion that it's smart to build the
12 largest LNG terminal in the U.S. near a residential area.
13 We are opposed to the idea that it's sensible to have large
14 LNG vessels with flammable installation travel nearly 20
15 miles inland, protected by a Coast Guard that is already
16 overstretched, that it's wise to have hundreds of LNG trucks
17 transverse our roads on a daily basis, spewing pollutants,
18 that is proven to dredge 4.25 miles to install twin
19 cryogenic pipelines and disrupt, and possibly forever change
20 the ecology of the Taunton River.

21 Now many of us are aware that FERC has a
22 reputation for dismissing relevant safety, security,
23 environmental, and quality of life concerns when reviewing
24 LNG projects.

25 This was clearly demonstrated in July 2005 when

1 FERC approved this original project. Only one of the three
2 Commissioners, Sudine Kelly had the intestinal fortitude to
3 vote against this project.

4 Now there has been some FERC bashing over the
5 past two nights, but I think the people that are opposed to
6 this project, owe a measure of gratitude and a round of
7 applause to the one Commissioner, Commissioner Kelly who
8 voted against this ill-conceived project.

9 (Applause.)

10 Mr. McGuire, your agency failed the people of
11 Fall River, failed the people of Somerset and failed the
12 people living in the coastal communities of Rhode Island.

13 To approve this offshore berth project or to
14 consider an extension of the Weaver's Cove Project would
15 only mean you have failed the people once again.

16 For a multitude of reasons, I personally think
17 it's a disgrace that you're agency is holding these public
18 hearings. I think the change in this project warranted a
19 restock of the permitting process. Instead of the project
20 making it on the fast track as it most certainly appears to
21 be on.

22 (Applause.)

23 And as Mr. Keppel said just before me, I also
24 agree, if FERC had applied the Coast Guard water suitability
25 assessment to this project back in 2005, and assessment

1 whose significance is so profound, the project would have
2 never seen the light of day and we would not be here
3 tonight.

4 Captain Perry, I ask you to check into that
5 please. Now FERC tells us that LNG is safe. It reminds me
6 of the old line, trust us, we're from the government. When
7 researches information about LNG, we see terms like pool
8 fires and flammable vapor clouds and hot gases and levies,
9 boiling liquid expanding vapor explosions and vapor clouds
10 exclusion zones, and thermal radiation and lower and upper
11 flammable limits, and btu's per cubic feet and second degree
12 burns within 30 seconds, just to name a few.

13 Now it's not the terminology that concerns us,
14 it's the understanding of that terminology and the fact that
15 the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission approve this
16 facility when an agency like the Government Accountability
17 Office, an agency not noted as an alarmist agency, when the
18 GAO released a report stating that 19 of the world's leading
19 LNG experts can not come to a consensus about the
20 consequences of an LNG accident, and can not agree on what
21 represents an acceptable exclusion zone, and when that same
22 credible agency recommends that further research needs to be
23 conducted, that is what concerns us about FERC's approval of
24 this Weaver's Cove Project.

25 Now as a certified safety professional, I am

1 personally outraged, and I think it's absolutely offensive
2 that FERC approve this project without first determining
3 whether an effective emergency evacuation plan could be
4 created.

5 It is troublesome knowing that FERC approve this
6 project, knowing full well that there are no requirement
7 exclusion zones to protect from LNG spills on water.

8 More troubling is that FERC approve this project
9 relying on theoretical models since that's all they have to
10 go on because no LNG tanker has yet to explode and because
11 no LNG tanker has yet to explode, that means that no agency
12 has any relevant experience handling fires at the scale th
13 at the commuter models describe. How outrageous is that?

14 I submit to you Mr. McGuire that after thoroughly
15 researching the Cold Point Maryland LNG Emergency
16 Preparedness Plan, that there is absolutely no way to create
17 an emergency response plan for the Fall River LNG terminal
18 that will not result in loss of life given the many dead end
19 streets, the elderly population that we have down there and
20 the topography.

21 Other than Commissioner Kelly, who got it, I say
22 shame on the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for that
23 despicable decision.

24 Now I can't speak for anyone else in this room,
25 but I absolutely refuse to be a guinea pig for the energy

1 industry. I am not now, nor will I ever be an acceptable
2 risk.

3 Now when you members of the panel leave here
4 tonight, the community is left with the company and its
5 executives. I personally feel that Weaver's Cove has made
6 it extremely difficult to trust them. They've made it
7 extremely difficult to believe in what they say. Let me
8 give you a couple of examples why I feel this way.

9 I find it difficult to trust the company when
10 their CEO tells a Fall River elected official, we listen to
11 you people, then we ignore you. Is that what FERC intends
12 to do.

13 I find it difficult to have confidence in the
14 company when the CEO makes an irresponsible statement like,
15 if a 747 crashed into the LNG terminal, there would only be
16 minimal damage.

17 Personally I lack any confidence that they can
18 responsibly manage an LNG facility. This is why I'm
19 concerned about the Weaver's Cove Project. Ladies and
20 gentlemen, if you're not aware, there is an Executive Order
21 designed to protect citizens against LNG projects like the
22 Weaver's Cove and it was promulgated by President Clinton.

23 It reads in part, Americans deserve a regulatory
24 system that works for them, not against them. A regulatory
25 system that protects and improves the health, safety,

1 environment, and well being.

2 FERC has a golden opportunity to meet the spirit
3 of that Executive Order. Given all the new unbiased studies
4 now released since the original EIS was distributed some
5 time ago, and given the coast Guard's decision that
6 navigation of our waterways is unsafe, I believe that FERC
7 can now unequivocally state that the Weaver's Cove Project
8 is not feasible for this region.

9 And a solution for FERC is real simple -- when
10 creating the new EIS for this project, make Weaver's Cove
11 Energy LLC find an alternate site, a site outside an urban
12 area, much like the Cole Point Maryland LNG facility site.

13 Only with that decision can FERC right the wrong
14 that they have perpetrated on the citizens of Massachusetts
15 and Rhode Island.

16 Now I respectfully ask you, Mr. McGuire, just
17 when enough enough? When is FERC finally going to say this
18 simply cannot continue to go on?

19 In closing, it is my position that if there ever
20 was an LNG project that was never consistent with the
21 public's interest, a project that is currently not
22 consistent with the public's interest, and a project that
23 will never be consistent with the public's interest, I
24 submit to you it's the Weaver's Cove Project. Thank you for
25 listening.

1 (Applause.)

2 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for your comments. Our
3 next commenter is Brian Pearson and the commenter on deck is
4 Manuel Albes.

5 MR. PEARSON: Thank you. My name is Brian
6 Pearson and I'm a citizen of the United States. I'm amazed
7 we're still here tonight. I'm amazed that we're still
8 debating this project.

9 We've had information from LNG experts. We've
10 had information from terrorist experts. We've even had
11 information from the Coast Guard, and this project shouldn't
12 be done. It's not doable.

13 We've had federal reports, the Sandia Report,
14 gleaning the information that's in there, that could take
15 place. That you're telling us we could talk to the company
16 officials after this. I don't want to talk to a company
17 official when a few years ago, that same company official,
18 the CEO of the company told us, if something did happen down
19 at the terminal site, it would be the world's largest roman
20 candle. I don't want to talk to those people.

21 I don't want to talk to those people when they
22 tell the people down in Newport, oh there is not too much of
23 a problem when the ship comes up, I can stand up in my
24 sailboat in Boston and hit the side of the tanker if I give
25 it a good throw, baseball throw.

1 What kind of security is that? This is the CEO
2 of the company talking like this. I don't want to talk to
3 them.

4 Then I hear tonight, we don't know about the
5 pipeline. We don't know how long it could last. The
6 corporation that's making it, they don't have any
7 statistics? Where is that information?

8 You know, it sounds like we're going to be guinea
9 pigs. The terminal site is new technology. The pipeline is
10 new technology. You know, we the people that oppose this
11 project, we do not oppose LNG. We oppose the placing of an
12 extremely dangerous substance near the hard working, law
13 abiding families of Massachusetts and Rhode Island.

14 We do oppose the politically powerful oil and gas
15 industry that has proven over and over that their motto is
16 money over people. We oppose law firms such as Baker Botts
17 who try to find every legal maneuver to shove this project
18 near family homes.

19 We oppose any federal agency that ignores the
20 true leaders of this country, the people.

21 And lastly, we oppose anybody who will step on
22 our unalienably rights, one being the right to safety. Each
23 state and federal official here tonight must remember that
24 our constitution not only protect rights that are written
25 into that document, but it protects the written, unalienable

1 rights that are given to each of us by our Creator. These
2 are rights that no person can take away.

3 By allowing the building of the facility, you not
4 only ignore the people's wishes, but you are trampling on
5 their rights.

6 Captain Nash has said that this project is
7 unsuitable from a navigational perspective. Dr. Jerry
8 Havens, the man who wrote many of the federal LNG
9 regulations is against the project. Richard Clark, a former
10 National Security Advisor for the President is against the
11 project. Dr. James Faye from MIT is against the project.
12 These and many more have come out against the project, but
13 for some strange reason, it still lives.

14 In closing, we all know there are valuable and
15 save alternatives. Stop endangering the people. Say no to
16 this project and site it away from densely populated
17 neighborhoods. In other words, do your duty and obey the
18 constitutional right of every resident along the tank route
19 and the terminal site. Thank you.

20 (Applause.)

21 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for your comments.

22 MR. ALBES: My name is Manny Albes and I live
23 about a quarter mile away from the project.

24 I would first like to thank the FERC Agency and
25 the Coast Guard for allowing this opportunity for the public

1 input.

2 My comment, on your continued interest in
3 bringing this important issue into the public light
4 scrutiny. There have been too many people, groups and have
5 attempted to distort the fact about important projects, a
6 project that holds numerous potential for the citizens of
7 Fall River and the surrounding region.

8 At this point, I would like to list a few of
9 these potential benefits. LNG will create hundreds of jobs
10 both in construction and businesses to support the project.
11 Fall River has nearly doubled unemployment rate of the State
12 of Massachusetts.

13 Two, LNG will become one of its largest taxpayer
14 at a time when the City desperate needs to expand its
15 dwindling tax base. This is evident in our current budget
16 this year.

17 Three, LNG will provide the City and region a
18 stable supply of clean and safe alternative energy. Four,
19 the LNG project will allow our community the chance to
20 legitimately propose and challenge our largest polluters in
21 the power plant industry to convert to this clean and safe
22 fuel source.

23 With this said, what do the opportunities have to
24 offer in this debate? Hype, exaggeration, and unfounded
25 fears. First, they claim the dredging is unsafe and

1 unwarranted. They are wrong in both cases. The preliminary
2 test in the dredge material clearly show that to the
3 contrary. And our City Council passed a resolution
4 proposing that the Taunton River be dredged for the
5 commercial shipping in 2002. In fact, our waterfront
6 development plan calls for the same action to rebuild our
7 waterfront.

8 Secondly, the opportunity has wrongly created the
9 atmosphere of paranoia regarding LNG project safety. As
10 this panel is well aware of, the only issue of safety with
11 this project has been the transport of tankers between the
12 two bridges and now with the handling of the LNG product.

13 In fact, the bridge issue was created as another
14 official obstruction to the project. We know the original
15 agreement to build the new Brightman Street Bridge included
16 the demolition of the old bridge as the Coast Guard should
17 have in its file.

18 We also have existing LNG facility in this city
19 for the past 30 years. Every day this facility is supplied
20 by trucks that are handling this material safely. Why
21 suddenly the safety issue?

22 It is not an official issue. Despite these
23 obstacles, Weaver's Cove has navigated very openly, safe and
24 alternative approach for this needed project.

25 I would like to conclude with these last few

1 thoughts -- please do not let those who choose fear over
2 progress dictate this project's fate. If we let the idea of
3 terrorism cloud our judgment, then the terrorist won.

4 (Applause.)

5 Please do not let those who choose fear over
6 progress to dictate this project's fate. I fear global
7 warming than any potential safety issue with LNG. Please do
8 not let those who choose fear over economic progress dictate
9 this project's fate.

10 Our City, region and nation need to be able to
11 compete globally. This is the reality of our times. Please
12 think of the people of this City and the region who would
13 benefit from this much needed project. I thank you sir.

14 (Applause.)

15 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for your comment. Our
16 next commenter is Paul Burke and the commenter on deck is
17 Christopher Marcelino.

18 MR. BURKE: Thank you ladies and gentleman. My
19 name is Paul Burke -- B-U-R-K-E. I live at 15 Mattapoisett
20 Avenue in Swansea and I'd like to start with a letter dated
21 5/9/2007 by Captain Nash Section 4(a) and (b).

22 Just quickly it says, the security burden of
23 boarding vessels offshore and escorting them through near
24 shore waters and 25.4 miles of inland waters may involve
25 four hours or more from the time when the vessel begins its

1 transit from the offshore boarding location. Once more,
2 security presence continues for the expected 24 hour
3 offloading period.

4 Upon completion of the escort flotilla will begin
5 moving security zone from the outbound voyage, another four
6 hours or so. Outbound transits depend on conditions being
7 favorable for transit.

8 (b) The limitations of daylight, favorable wind
9 conditions, visibility, tidal lift, avoidance of commuter
10 hour traffic, and external demands on security resources
11 present challenges for scheduling, coordinating security
12 resources.

13 The inability to control several environmental
14 factors appears to preclude accurate forecasting and
15 projecting of relatively well-defined schedule with adequate
16 contingencies to mitigate the uncertainty of the MAMSA
17 security resources.

18 I read t his because I have a question about what
19 the defined term "offshore" is. According to the Coast
20 Guard, offshore means starting off the coast of Rhode
21 Island, 25 miles prior to getting to its location at
22 Weaver's Cove. The offshore terminal that Weaver's Cove is
23 projecting are only four miles from the original
24 destination, that leaves 20 miles of questions of what is
25 "offshore."

1 I don't consider that offshore, what they're
2 saying is offshore terminals in Mount Hope Bay they'd be
3 offshore. I consider them to be onshore and industrial
4 complex in the middle of a residential area.

5 The average number of tankers per week is set at
6 one per week. However, in the high demand, it's been said
7 we could have up to three tankers per week at 24 hour
8 offloading times which precludes 24 hours per day, three
9 days a week.

10 In my personal case, that means 24 hours of not
11 being able to sleep or live because if you look at my
12 address, it's very personal. My house is less than one mile
13 from the offshore berthing. They show in the green zone.
14 It's not on the screen here but the circumference of the
15 green zone that they have in their presentation, the line
16 goes right through my house. But that's taken from the
17 circumference of the middle of the tanker. So we will be
18 within the mile of that berthing facility.

19 One of the questions you have brought up sir, and
20 FERC, is the light and noise level. I find it interesting
21 that the offshore platform that is being used for the last
22 three weeks to do testing disappeared two days ago.

23 I could not sleep at night because the lights on
24 that offshore platform they had four yellow lights, blinking
25 lights, obviously for safety reasons, for the boaters at

1 night. The only way you could sleep was to close the
2 curtains because it was flashing in my bedroom all night
3 long.

4 That isn't even an industrial complex going up
5 there. For 24 hours through the middle of the night there
6 is going to be noise, there is going to be light, there is
7 going to be security vessels running at all times. I'm not
8 sure if the Coast Guard is going to have a helicopter out
9 there all the time, but they're going to have helicopters
10 there during the transit, I'm sure, and all the tugboats
11 that are going to be involved in moving these tankers.

12 So the possibility of affecting me personally and
13 all the people here that are personally affected at the
14 Weaver's Cove in Fall River, all along the shoreline, the
15 Fall River shoreline, is just unacceptable.

16 So I would ask that you decline this based on
17 that and if you would do a mitigation evaluation for the
18 homes in the area to block the light and to stop the noise
19 so that people can sleep during the night and to have a
20 regular life during the day in their own backyards.

21 I know it sounds like nimbyism but, just to
22 remind you that in my backyard, I have one of the largest
23 coal burning power plants in the country. I don't really
24 want to put an industrial LNG facility in my front yard for
25 obvious reasons.

1 Christopher Marcelino. Last name is spelled M as in Mike,
2 A-R-C-E-L-I-N-O. And I myself am a resident of the City of
3 Fall River. Up until about two months ago, until I picked
4 up this informational brochure, that every citizen should
5 know, it tells me right on here. What we should know and
6 the information that's on here.

7 And it isn't about Weaver's Cove, it's by FERC.
8 It says Washington, DC on it and I was amazed at the
9 information that was in here. With that, I had a lot of
10 comments and a lot of concerns and I wrote them down and I'd
11 just like to read them out to you.

12 Natural gas accounts for almost 1/4 of all energy
13 consumed in the United States and it's vital to the economy.
14 While currently not used as widely as oil and coal, natural
15 gas has numerous benefits.

16 It burns cleanly, reduces fewer pollutants, it's
17 easier to transport, and has a variety of uses. 40% natural
18 gas consumption is for industrial activities. 22% is used
19 for residential uses such as heating, cooling and cooking.
20 15% is accounted for by the business sector and 14% is used
21 for electricity generation.

22 Now again, mind you, I'm getting this information
23 from what was in here. The Energy Information
24 Administration forecast natural gas demand will grow more
25 than 38% by 2025. The demand for natural gas is growing

1 relative to the entire energy sector and increase demand
2 will be met through importing natural gas from other
3 country.

4 Acquiring liquefied natural gas from overseas and
5 Alaska will play an increasingly important role in meeting
6 our nation's present and future needs.

7 This will require construction of new LNG import
8 terminals. We all know the crisis that our country and
9 mostly all over the world are going through because of the
10 ridiculous prices we're paying for oil which the U.S. relies
11 on for 40% of its energy. This affects the whole economy
12 and if you don't believe me, just turn on the television and
13 see how the stock market is going.

14 The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission has and
15 is providing a hell of a brochure and as I said to citizens
16 who have questions about LNG. I myself have find this
17 brochure extremely helpful. It has made me feel comfortable
18 and informed of what LNG is and the important role it will
19 play in our country and its choices for energy use.

20 We as citizens of this country have a right to be
21 informed of changes in our country and I also have the right
22 to speak and voice my opinion. But before I can do that, or
23 anyone else, we need to learn to listen and listen to learn.

24 Gather facts from all directions before we judge
25 whether something new is right for us. I myself would not

1 be able to tell you how to fix your vehicle if I haven't
2 learned how to.

3 LNG is a natural gas. The only difference is
4 that it is converting into liquid. It makes practicable to
5 store and transport. We all use natural gas in our homes,
6 at least I know I do. I use it every day to cook my food on
7 the stove, heat my home and warm my water for those nice,
8 comfortable showers and baths that I take after a day of
9 work.

10 I can not believe that we are so concerned with
11 the liquified form of natural gas when we have the vapor
12 right in our homes. I ask all of you one simple question.
13 Should we all FERC come into each of our homes to make sure
14 we are using natural gas correctly? As I've learned,
15 liquified natural gas does not explode, so why the concern?

16 I guess we all should check our neighbor's stove
17 or space heater and make sure it's fully secure and
18 functionable.

19 LNG is safe, if not safer to transport and store
20 than most other fuels. It is not corrosive, carcinogenic or
21 toxic. It doesn't pollute the land or water resources. I
22 ask all you here tonight, especially citizens of Fall River
23 the fate of the hazardous and explosive fuels materials that
24 are being transported by tankers through the heart of our
25 city today.

1 Why are these tankers coming into the City?

2 Because our leaders know the consequence and potential
3 disaster that would occur if one of these tankers exploded
4 underneath the City Hall.

5 Want to talk about security and safety?

6 Remember, there is no protection for these tankers, and I'm
7 speaking about trucks, truck drivers. How do we know that
8 these drivers are fully attentive while transporting these
9 materials throughout the city? We don't. LNG ships are
10 protected by the Coast Guard. Trained crews aboard these
11 ships and other enforcement agencies.

12 I understand the concerns of the citizens but I
13 would rather have LNG transport through our waterways than a
14 tanker driving through the city potentially exploding right
15 in front of our home.

16 I can't understand how we as citizens are more
17 concerned with the waterway rather than the streets we
18 travel, homes we live in and schools our children go to.
19 Obviously this is a great concern and our leaders know that
20 these tankers are dangerous and they fear an explosion on
21 the highway, especially under City Hall.

22 Think of this, 5:00 in the afternoon on any given
23 weekday, where all our family and friends are on these
24 roadways while these tankers are on our highways. We all
25 know that you, you're more likely to die in a car accident

1 than any other form of transportation. Therefore, an
2 accident with a tanker under City Hall or in our city, I'm
3 sure you can use your imagination and figure out what could
4 happen.

5 With more than 50,000 voyages since LNG first
6 transported by sea, no member of the public has been
7 injured, killed as a result of an incident or accident
8 involving an LNG ship. There has never been a major spill
9 in the past 40 years. No member of the public anywhere in
10 the world has been injured or killed as a result of LNG
11 incident or accident.

12 There are five LNG terminals in Tokyo Bay, one of
13 the most crowded harbors in the world. LNG ships have been
14 entering this bay for over 40 years and now number about 400
15 times per year. There has never been an injury, accident --

16 I request and I appreciate and I request the same courtesy
17 that you gave the elected officials.

18 (Applause.)

19 Because I am a citizen and my voice counts here.
20 We forge that we have an LNG facility operating on Bay
21 Street, Fall River for over 30 years. There has never been
22 an incident there. Mind you Weaver's Cove is offering a far
23 more advanced facility that has to withstand earthquakes,
24 hurricanes, even an impact by a Boeing 747.

25 Imagine the plane -- the only thing that would

1 happen, the plane would explode and nothing would happen to
2 the terminal.

3 The U.S. Coast Guard would ensure that the LNG
4 tankers will be inspected before entering the harbor and
5 they will protect it to the port. Have we lost faith in our
6 nation's Military? These men are trained to protect the
7 U.S. waterways and the public.

8 This facility will help the local economy. These
9 benefits will help Fall River and the surrounding areas. It
10 will save us money with reducing our cost of natural gas
11 consumption. Remember that a third of our country's storage
12 tanks are right here in New England. The world's reserve of
13 natural gas is about 67 years of consumption and it's
14 growing faster than it's being consumed and most of it is in
15 North America.

16 These terminals are located throughout the world,
17 Japan, Korea, Taiwan, Belgium, Spain, France, Portugal --
18 and I am Portuguese -- Turkey, India, Great Britain, China,
19 and Mexico. And I happen to turn on the TV the other day
20 and watch the Portuguese news and the European news, and
21 Portugal has found a way to use the natural gas to power
22 their vehicles. What possibilities these could be and it
23 could be available to use in the United States.

24 I ask all of you to do your research with an open
25 mind and to throw away the stinking thinking that we've had

1 in this area for decades. We need to move with the growing
2 times and become self reliant on our own resources.

3 I would like to leave you with this. Think
4 before you speak, listen and inform yourself about this
5 project before you speak through your gut and not through
6 your mind.

7 I support LNG and welcome it into this city, into
8 the City of Fall River. Who knows, this might just be the
9 start we need for a foreign economy in a historical city and
10 I'm glad to say this, that I'm glad to see the
11 Representative Sullivan today and the only reason he is here
12 is because I mentioned he had to leave early yesterday. I'm
13 glad he is here today and I applaud you for it.

14 (Boos and applause.)

15 MR. MCGUIRE: Our next commenter is Joseph
16 Carvalho. The commenter on deck is James McIntyre.

17 MR. CARVALHO: Good evening, my last name is
18 spelled C-A-R-V as in Victor A-L-H-O Joseph Carvalho. I'm
19 the President for the Coalition of Responsible Siting of LNG
20 Facilities and actually the only two -- I mentioned this
21 last night, but the only two entities that have consistently
22 misspelled my last name out of the 20 or 25 other agencies,
23 has been FERC and Weaver's Cove. Every time I get something
24 from FERC and Weaver's Cove my last name is misspelled, and
25 the same misspelling by the way. No conspiracy theory

1 there. Okay

2 Well to start off, I think you should know what
3 you're dealing with when you're dealing with these kinds of
4 companies. First of all the Coalition went up to Boston to
5 make presentation in support of Representative Sullivan's
6 bill, House 2383 back in January of this year. Everyone who
7 spoke, with the same exception of Mr. Garrick from Weaver's
8 Cove spoke in favor of the bill, which was to make some
9 exclusion zones and protect people in this area.

10 And at that time, Mr. Garrick spoke, he quoted
11 the fire chief up in Everett, Chief David Butler and he
12 said, quote, and this is Chief Butler now from the Everett
13 Fire Department speaking, he said, "I have never gone to bed
14 one night worried about the District Gas plant." Well,
15 that's a heavy statement to make, "and that's not as far as
16 I want to go with that," however, because what Mr. Garrick
17 didn't mention was what Chief Butler said right after that,
18 however, he added, "if I was the Fire Chief in Fall River
19 and you ask me do I want an LNG plant, the answer is no,
20 it's ridiculous to put an LNG plant in a neighborhood in the
21 middle of a city." So thanks for leaving that out, Garrick,
22 yeah.

23 (Applause.)

24 How convenient. Then in an informational meeting
25 before members of the Jamestown Town Council, the CEO,

1 Gordon Shearer heretofore referred to as Gordo, was asked
2 how much money has been spent lobbying on behalf of the
3 project. He said, non whatsoever, which is in stark
4 contradiction to a nonpartisan, nonprofit agency in
5 Washington D.C. That covers lobbying and expenses called
6 Public Citizen and you look it up on their website and as of
7 July 22 of 2005, that's nearly three years ago.

8 The papers listed campaign contributions to
9 federal candidates in amounts spent lobbying the federal
10 government by major developers of proposed LNG projects
11 since 2001, guess who is at the top of the list because, of
12 course, it's alphabetical, Amerada Hess, Poten (&) and
13 Partners. Those are the two groups that are backing
14 Weaver's Cove. They spent, up to that point again, July 22
15 of 05, \$2,540,000 lobbying on that particular proposal,
16 right here.

17 So I guess some to that money must have gone to
18 the late Senator Craig Thomas or maybe Senator Imhoff from
19 Oklahoma, you know, he's famous because he doesn't believe
20 in global warming because it ain't in the Bible, and a
21 obscure Congressman from Miami, all three of whom tried to
22 insert language into energy bills or other related bills to
23 take down the venerable and historic Brightman Street
24 Bridge, but they were caught.

25 So I don't know what they did with their part of

1 the \$2,540,000, but it was money not spent well. So that's
2 another thing that we have about this group.

3 Then, and this is really anus, that's my word for
4 it. Gordo came on a local radio talk show, WSAR, and he
5 said that his company would gladly purchase two natural gas
6 powered vehicles, one for the Florida Fire Department and
7 one for the Florida Police Department instead of, and his
8 words, "those filthy, dirty polluting diesel vehicles they
9 currently use."

10 And at first blush you'd think wow. What a
11 magnanimous thing to do, purchase -- no not purchase, give
12 freely one vehicle to the Fire Department and one for the
13 Police Department that runs on clean, natural gas instead of
14 dirty, filthy polluting diesel vehicles, like they use now.

15 However, on closer observation, the Environmental
16 impact Statement that Weaver's Cove themselves admitted to
17 FERC said that their terminal could receive as many as 100
18 LNG tanker trucks, and the speaker just before me saw lots
19 of concerns about tanker trucks going through Fall River.
20 Well, how about as many as 100 a day, yes. They're diesel,
21 filthy, polluting, dirty diesel.

22 What kind of scarlet bastard actually says that
23 to a community? That they're going to give them two free
24 trucks knowing full well that every other day there could be
25 a hundred of those polluting trucks that he refers to that

1 way going through and traversing the streets of our city?
2 That's anus, borders on criminal in my mind on a community
3 that has higher than national average rates of respiratory
4 illnesses, asthma.

5 When I'm at Morton Middle School and I have to
6 have a kid raise his hand because he has to go get his
7 nebulizer because he's got asthma. Do you know how many
8 times that happen a day? And how this joker wants to bring
9 a hundred more diesel trucks into our community? That's
10 anus. That's not even somebody who has a conscience that
11 would do that. Terrible.

12 And last but not least -- I have two things
13 actually -- the World Gas Intelligence Group which is a
14 energy affiliate, not from the coalition, did a study of the
15 40 LNG proposals that were being considered at one time in
16 the United States.

17 A renowned expert on LNG issues, Mr. Ed Kelly of
18 Wood McKenzie Group, which is well known in the field, rated
19 the 40 projects at that time based on 22 different criteria
20 and guess who he found was last? Who ended up 40th out of
21 40 proposals? That's right, Weaver's Cove Energy and that
22 comes from an expert in the field.

23 And lastly, you know, we're all American citizens
24 we're all good patriotic citizens. I'd like to be on the
25 honor system tonight, let's tell the truth as American

1 citizens. If you receive a free meal from Weaver's Cove
2 Energy tonight, please stand up. If you received a free
3 meal from Weaver's Cove please stand up. Thank you for your
4 honesty.

5 Now, conversely, if you have never received any
6 financial gain from the Coalition for Responsible Siting of
7 LNG facilities but rather have given freely of your time,
8 money, resources and your heart and your presence can never,
9 ever, ever be bought at an price, please stand up. Thank
10 you. Thank you.

11 (Applause.)

12 MR. MCGUIRE: Commenter on deck is William Lund.

13 MR. MCINTYRE: My name is James McIntyre. I'm
14 the past president of Widowed Children and have been
15 involved the last 25 years with the health and safety of all
16 the children of the Greater Fall River area.

17 Back in the 1940's, the late 40's, I worked for
18 the company that dredged the area that's in question
19 tonight. That little island that you see just south of the
20 proposed float is Spar Island. At the time when we dredged
21 the river, it was made ten times larger than what it is
22 today.

23 That area where the platform is going to be
24 proposed, sets at the intersection of three major
25 contributory -- waterways besides the Taunton River and

1 Mount Hope Bay. There's the Leed River, the Coles River,
2 and then there is the Kickemuit River, that's going to feed
3 into this and that's why that island is as small as it is
4 today because as I stated previously, it was ten times the
5 size it is today. There is no water there. When you have
6 to dredge that area and go down the depths that these traps,
7 that these ships that are going to be coming in, you're
8 gonna create the largest area that'll need to be re-filled
9 and re-dredged quite often.

10 They'd be better advised to take stocks out and
11 in a dredging company if this thing is allowed to go forward
12 because they'd make more money on the dredging of that
13 river. That portion of the bay that is just south of
14 Dominion Electricity, the electric light company there.

15 At least once a year, the vessels that are coming
16 into the dock there run aground, and I'm sure the Captain
17 can get that from the Castle Hill coastguard station because
18 it's all recorded down there, and when those ships run
19 aground, they have to wait for the next tide to get them out
20 of there.

21 There is no water that's deep enough for any of
22 those vessels that you're proposing to allow to come up
23 here, and once they stop the dredging, and go down to the
24 depth, I believe the channel right now is 36 feet, and
25 they're going to have to go down another 10 to 12 feet,

1 that'll create the largest hole in that area, and that's
2 where the biggest damage is going to be done.

3 That bottom is moving all the time, and the
4 opposite of where the island is right now and where you're
5 proposing to allow a docking facility and a vessel that is
6 900 feet long would need a turning radius of 12 to 1,500
7 feet, so she'd be able to be turned around to be headed back
8 out to sea.

9 Both of those conditions are gonna cause the
10 biggest problem that will ever exist in this bay, and that's
11 what's going to disturb the bottom. On any given day,
12 there's vessels running a ground out there now because there
13 is no water near that Spar Island.

14 As I said to you 40 years ago I worked on a
15 dredging company to dredge the bay, it was a suction dredge,
16 we deposited all of the sill from the bay into that island,
17 you can no longer do that today, they're gonna have to take
18 those. There'd have to be a bucket dredge that'd have to be
19 taken out to sea and deposited, and that's gonna add to the
20 biggest problems, bigger problems than which you can think
21 of now.

22 As I've stated initially, I've spent the last 25
23 years, 20 of them as President of the We Love Children. We
24 have the dirtiest, the filthiest power plant in the
25 Commonwealth of Massachusetts. We have, in the Four River

1 area, the largest dump in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

2 Now you want to put up something that could be
3 the most dangerous thing and as I said to you, the name of
4 the organization, We Love Children, please, please, I
5 implore upon you not to allow this thing to go forward for
6 the sake of the children in this area and the children that
7 could be in this area.

8 Thank you and on behalf of all the children in
9 the area now, and please, please, consider the health
10 effects of the children that are in the area. Thank you
11 very much.

12 (Applause.)

13 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for your comment. Our
14 next commenter is Mr. Lund and following him is Ronald
15 Thomas.

16 MR. LUND: My name is William Lund. I live at
17 Common Fence Point, Portsmouth, Rhode Island. I'm also a
18 trustee for the Common Fence Point Improvement Association
19 who was entrusted to maintain and hold in trust 42 acres of
20 trust land and several miles of beach land at Common Fence
21 Point.

22 Common Fence Point abuts Mount Hope Bay. It is
23 at the northern tip of Aquidneck Island, which is opposite
24 the Brightman Point Power Plant extending out into that bay
25 area.

1 We're very concerned about the environmental
2 impact on the dredging that may occur out there and on the
3 released of the toxins and metals and so on that will affect
4 the beach area and the way of life as it is, affecting
5 swimming, boating, and so on.

6 I think that in the past, the proposal that was
7 submitted, there was some information provided on the cores
8 that were taken for the dredged materials. I would
9 challenge those and ask you to reinvestigate for the new
10 cores, the new areas, to see what is actually in there and
11 what's going to be become waterborne and float in the bay,
12 south of the proposed site.

13 I know my family and I and the local residents
14 all enjoy the swimming in that area but if these pollutants
15 get in, we're not going to be able to enjoy that, we're not
16 going to be able to use that at all.

17 I think previous speakers have talked about the
18 boating traffic. There are thousands of boaters above and
19 below the site. They go through the area from the various
20 rivers, Kickemuit, the Taunton River, Leeds, Cove River,
21 where they have boats stored and boats in Rhode Island that
22 go up into the Falls River area as well.

23 I'd also like to note that I've raced sailboats
24 in that area for a number of years and this location is
25 going into the race course. So hundreds of boaters that are

1 going to be in that area will not have any place to sail.

2 Again, we're still concerned with the public
3 safety and would like to recommend that the proposal not be
4 allowed to go forward and I challenge both Coast Guard and
5 FERC to challenge the documents submitted by Weaver's Cove
6 to investigate further the information that's provided to
7 you. Thank you.

8 (Applause.)

9 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for your comment. Our
10 next commenter is William Lund and the next commenter on
11 deck is -- I'm sorry, Ronald Thomas is our next commenter
12 and the commenter on deck is Marian LeComte.

13 MR. THOMAS: Good evening. I'll try to keep it
14 short. My name is Ronald Thomas, THOMAS. And I'd like to
15 address my concerns. Mostly the piping issue here, which
16 yes, they happen to make marine accidents with LNG and the
17 ones that happen, 60% of the time where there is LNG
18 involved it's been at the loading stations, at the
19 connections where you are going to be tying into this,
20 either the way you're disconnecting, you're going to have
21 some spillage going on there or so on and so forth, okay.

22 But that's beside the point. The piping for
23 these systems here, in the United States, we haven't had
24 that much experience with it, but back in 1998, if you look
25 it up in the New York times, okay,

1 there's an article, I'd say I was aware of it about two
2 months ago, where there was a 36 inch pipeline carrying
3 liquefied natural and went through a valley, over the
4 outskirts between two Russian towns and it just so happens
5 two passenger trains happen to be passing one another.

6 Well, low and behold the pipe was leaking, when
7 the train rolled by it ignited. Over 500 people perished
8 from that accident. A lot of the stuff, you know, remember
9 Chernobyl. I mean at Chernobyl they didn't have a choice,
10 but these things are just starting to come to light now. So
11 it's not unfamiliar for an LNG pipeline to leak. You know,
12 even natural gas pipe is at extreme high pressures. I mean,
13 you know, I'd agree they get more storage by increasing the
14 pressure in the pipelines, okay therefore we can store more.
15 But carrying LNG is a whole new ball game, because you've
16 already got 600 times the volume, from liquid into a gas.

17 Okay now those 500 people died, the majority were
18 children on their way to camp. Okay like the article, the
19 way got it from the New York Times and we've got to stop and
20 look at what we're doing here as far as the people in the
21 area.

22 I mean we're talking, okay, a minimum of 1200
23 people, okay that's living between the storage tank and this
24 other facility, this offshore berthing facility and within
25 these zones, which are considered dangerous.

1 That pipeline going underneath the river also,
2 what's going to happen if something happen where it's going
3 underneath these two bridges? I mean the thing is encased
4 in cement, on a brand new material, which very few people
5 have any experience with and LNG. Yeah, they used it for
6 petroleum products, not on LNG and also the people that's
7 going to be installing this here, all these construction
8 workers, these jobs are going to create, these are extremely
9 high qualified people with qualifications that's going to
10 work on these stuff, okay.

11 There are MT requirements, IT requirements, ATV
12 magnetic testing, radioactive testing has to be done, okay,
13 you've got UT, which will be ultrasonic testing, which has
14 to be done in each joint, any section of pipe going 60 feet
15 long.

16 So we're talking 4.25 miles times two, because
17 there are two pipes, going through and now I'm assuming if
18 you can't get the bend radius you want, now you've got to
19 use fittings to get it down underneath the channel.

20 Now these fittings, they're always small, so now
21 you're going to increase the number of joints. Now when
22 you're these things here there is no way of somebody going
23 inside this pipe to wall the inside of it, so it's a one
24 side joint with a vacuum ring and you putting into the gas
25 through this piping as you're doing so.

1 These are extremely, extremely high qualified
2 people that it takes to do this and he's not going to use
3 local people, local jobs. Those kinds of qualifications
4 aren't around here. We gotta stop and think what we're
5 doing.

6 Okay, we might have a dozen people that are
7 qualified in all of New England, all of New England, and
8 also there testing. Where are you going to get qualified
9 people to test this stuff? The proof in the pudding is
10 Alaskan pipeline. A two year project ending up into a five
11 year project and the majority of the work they have to go
12 back and redo again because the people weren't qualified to
13 do it. I rest my case. Thank you very much.

14 (Applause.)

15 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for your comment. Ms.
16 LeComte. And the next commenter on deck is Robert Rak.

17 MS. LECOMTE: My name is Marian LeComte.

18 LECOMTE. I'm a member of the Coalition of Responsible
19 Siting of LNG Facilities and Co-Chair of the Historic
20 Brightman Street Bridge Committee.

21 As I thought of what I wanted to say to you, I
22 found myself feeling angrier by the minute as I reflected on
23 how things have progressed since FERC handed down its
24 initial decision regarding Weaver's Cove.

25 I thought of all of us who have spent countless

1 hours away from our families, refueled with energy, fighting
2 a proposal that FERC should have rejected from the get go.
3 Respectfully request appealing to the sensibility of the
4 government officials seems to evaporate into thin air and
5 you show no respect to us with your original decision.

6 According to that decision, the safety of the
7 people living and working in this are would not be
8 compromised by the Weaver's Cove facility. I take that to
9 mean that not only do you not see us in any danger from an
10 accident involving a tanker, holding tank or the pipeline,
11 but you also do not see us at increased risk for an act of
12 terrorism.

13 Our President, Vice President, et al never resist
14 an opportunity to remind us that the terrorists are always
15 out there watching and waiting and we must be ever mindful
16 of that. Al-Qaida has repeatedly stated that it intends to
17 target energy facilities in order to cause the greatest
18 damage to our infrastructure and killing and injure the
19 greatest number of Americans.

20 So how, with an enormous stationary target in our
21 backyard and other enormous targets traveling regularly
22 along our waterway, could we possible feel safe from a
23 terrorist attack? And if we are not actually in any danger
24 from terrorists, what does our government keep telling us
25 that we are?

1 Who is telling us the truth? Who are we supposed
2 to believe, the President or you at FERC? And who is truly
3 watching out for us when you bureaucrats play the little
4 game with our lives. This is where our homes, our families,
5 our businesses, our memories, and our tomorrows are. What
6 do you see? Are we easy to dismiss because you see this as
7 a nimby issue? Take a closer look.

8 This project doesn't belong in anybody's
9 backyard. You minimize or overlook our concerns because you
10 relate better to the concerns of Hess LNG? Maybe people in
11 our position can no longer remember what it means to be
12 regular citizens who end up being at the mercy of people in
13 your position.

14 Do you think that if you approve this offshore
15 proposal that we would just go away. Thinking of the
16 offshore proposal, do you think that perhaps that looks and
17 smells like a brand new plan with brand new details should
18 have been treated as a new plan necessitating that Weaver's
19 Cove start the application process from scratch.

20 Now we can be comforted by the flock of tankers
21 regularly offloading LNG a mile from a huge power plant. We
22 can just tell you that the more you and Weaver's Cove
23 arrogantly shove this project down our throats, the more
24 resolute we become. We will not quietly agree to live in
25 fallout of a favorable decision for Weaver's Cove.

1 We are not Hess LNG damn chess pieces and we will
2 not move out of the way just so that this enormously wealthy
3 corporation, claiming to be concerned about us while
4 arrogantly and repeatedly ignores us, to become even
5 wealthier at our expense.

6 Your approval of their project would adversely
7 affect the environment, the economy, and the security of
8 this area. Those at Weaver's Cove can make all the pretty
9 predictions that they want, hundreds of construction jobs,
10 jobs for the community, a list of Fall River and Somerset in
11 the form of property taxes. They can remind us of LNG
12 safety record and leaving us looking like the crazies for
13 feeling unsafe.

14 But how crazy is it to think that just because
15 the industry hasn't had in this country the kind of
16 catastrophic LNG incident that residents are concerned
17 about, the possibility of an accident is nevertheless very
18 real and there is now way that anyone can be 100% certain
19 that a terrorist attack could never occur.

20 As stated previously, Al-Qaida frequently says it
21 would target energy structures for the greatest overall
22 devastation. If you allow this plant to go forward and the
23 unthinkable happens, and thousands of us, maybe some of us
24 whose faces are before you tonight, die or suffer serious
25 injury, will you then put your heads in your hands and weep

1 for us?

2 Would you wish you, really heard us tonight as we
3 asked you to please, with your decision, provide us with the
4 protection that all of us, yourself included, deserve and
5 expect, or will you weep for yourselves knowing that you
6 will forever be remembered as having sat on the Federal
7 Energy Regulatory Commission that in the face of passionate
8 public objection, you approved a project that resulted in
9 human devastation surpassing that of 9/11.

10 Here is your chance to redeem yourselves. We are
11 sounding the alarm. We have been sounding it for years to
12 save ourselves and maybe now, if you are really paying
13 attention, we might even be able to save you. It is in our
14 best interest for you to hear us and take our concerns to
15 heart.

16 We are committed to do whatever it takes,
17 whatever it takes to put an end to this project.

18 To all of you who are here because Weaver's Cove
19 has seduced you with a free dinner and the assurance of
20 future jobs, I strongly urge you to educate yourself about
21 the risks and dangers of LNG. Find out everything you can.

22 Yes we desperately need jobs, but I understand
23 you eagerness to believe what Weaver's Cove executives are
24 telling you. Don't believe them. Don't believe me, educate
25 yourselves. All is not necessarily as it seems.

1 Bottom line is this. We see this project as too
2 risk for populated area. We do not look to Weaver's Cove
3 for truth. We do not believe anything they say. We do not
4 believe that they give a damn about us but we the people
5 should be able to trust you to once and for all do what is
6 fundamentally correct here. Your heads and your hearts know
7 exactly what is. The question is, do you have the guts?

8 (Applause.)

9 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for your comment. Our
10 next commenter is Mr. Rak and following him is Greg Senae.

11 MR. RAK: Well, my name is Robert Rak and that's
12 R-A-K and I come today as a 50 year resident of the City of
13 Fall River and one who has lived, studied, and enjoyed the
14 bay, as we called it, since a young child walking along its
15 shores and fishing with my father.

16 I come here also today, not only as my duty but
17 as my responsibility to the people of this nation and the
18 Clean Water Act who desire to uphold their desire to see
19 this bay restored to the quality it once had.

20 To begin with, we have been presented with
21 something called an offshore berth project. I'd like to say
22 that in all my readings, this does not appear to be
23 something that either the industry or the regulatory bodies
24 consider offshore.

25 This designation is usually associated with deep

1 water ports that are located in federal waters beyond the
2 state seaward boundaries under the Deep Water Port Act.
3 It's usually three miles, or in the case of the Gulf of
4 Mexico, it's three leagues or approximately nine miles off
5 the coast, according to the Submerged Lands Act.

6 The Energy Policy Act of 2005 defines an LNG
7 terminal as including all natural gas facilities located
8 onshore or in stated waters that are used to receive,
9 unload, load, store, transport, gasify, liquefy, or process
10 natural gas that is imported to the United States from a
11 foreign country, and it goes on.

12 Thus, I don't see why this is not considered a
13 major modification to the LNG project as a whole, since by
14 definition it's part of the LNG terminal. But the Natural
15 Gas Act, I guess gives the Federal Energy Regulatory
16 Commission the right to approve an application in whole or
17 in part with such modification and upon such terms that the
18 Commission finds necessary and appropriate.

19 If this were true deep water port, then FERC
20 would not be holding this hearing since deep water port
21 applications fall under the processing of the Maritime
22 Administration and the Coast Guard.

23 The Maritime Administration has described deep
24 water ports, and this why I don't want to see people get
25 confused with a true offshore or deep water port.

1 Deep water ports are offshore facilities
2 providing a safe and efficient means for the delivery of
3 liquefied natural gas. Importation of LNG through deep
4 water ports will help to ensure an adequate supply for the
5 U.S. as well as address safety concerns and relief port
6 congestion. And this was in the 2006 Maritime
7 Administration's annual report, and they even use the
8 Northeast gateway deep water port facility in Massachusetts
9 Bay, which is 13 miles off the coast, as an example.

10 And this water port was later approved in 2007
11 and I believe it received its first shipment May 2008 and
12 three was also a deep water port approved in 2005 before the
13 Weaver's Cove facility was even approved.

14 We were given the impression here that this
15 technology was not a viable alternative to our location. It
16 seems that the Maritime Administration and the Coast Guard
17 seems to think so.

18 My second point deals with who actually has the
19 jurisdiction as to whether or not this berth can be built.
20 This has been a controversial subject not just here, but in
21 other areas.

22 The Energy Policy Act of 2005 amends the Natural
23 Gas Act and does give the Federal Energy Regulatory
24 Commission the exclusive authority to approve or deny an
25 application for siting, construction, expansion, or

1 operation of an LNG facility. It also provides language for
2 the National Gas Act however, which has made this country
3 great, a system of checks and balances.

4 The law states that except as specifically
5 provided in this chapter, nothing in this chapter is
6 intended to affect otherwise applicable law related to any
7 federal agencies, authorities, or responsibilities related
8 to LNG terminals.

9 In addition to this, it also states that except
10 as specifically provided in this Act, nothing in this Act
11 affects the rights of states under the Coastal Zone
12 Management Act, the Clean Air Act, or the Federal Water
13 Pollution Control Act, which we know today as the Clean
14 Water Act.

15 One interpretation of this is that a state agency
16 properly exercising authority under one of these acts, could
17 effectively veto a proposed LNG project.

18 This is not my interpretation, but one that
19 appeared in the International Comparative Legal Guide to Gas
20 Regulation 2001. A practical insight to cross boarder gas
21 regulations and LNG terminal development and access,
22 prepared by the Global Legal Group.

23 This report was written by Clifford Mike Naebe --
24 I'm not sure if I'm pronouncing his name right, and Chad
25 Mills and Mr. Naebe, according to the thing is a former

1 Commissioner of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

2 I thus now turn to section 320 of the Clean Water
3 Act. This section of the Act created the National Estuary
4 Program which was established by Congress in 1987 to improve
5 the quality of estuaries of national importance. It directs
6 EPA to develop plans for obtaining and maintaining water
7 quality in an estuary.

8 This includes protection of the public water
9 supplies and the protection and propagation of a balanced
10 indigenous population of shellfish, fish and wildlife and
11 allows recreational activities in and on the water and
12 requires control of point and non-point sources of pollution
13 to supplement existing controls of pollution.

14 On March 11, 1988, the citizens of the United
15 States, through their elected congressional representatives,
16 identified Narragansett Bay at which Mount Hope Bay is a
17 critical component, one of four urban estuaries that
18 required prompt, coordinated government action to reverse a
19 trend for deteriorating water quality, gradual loss of
20 natural resources, and increase of impact of water quality
21 dependent uses of the estuary, such as shellfish harvesting.

22 The Act required that the states of Rhode Island
23 and Massachusetts, along with the EPA and parties of
24 interest, develop a comprehensive, conservation and
25 management plan within five years of the above mentioned

1 date that recommends priority corrective action, compliance
2 schedule, addressing point, non-point sources of pollution,
3 to restore and maintain the chemical, physical and
4 biological integrity of the estuary, including restoration
5 and maintenance of water quality, a balanced indigenous
6 population of shellfish and fish, and to ensure that the
7 designated uses of the estuary are protected.

8 This also requires that the states, as well as
9 the federal and local agencies, develop plans for the
10 coordinated implementation of the plan.

11 The CCMP, the Comprehensive Conservation
12 Management Plan states that over-fishing, habitat
13 destruction and contamination by toxic pollutants represent
14 ongoing threats to the biological resources of Narragansett
15 Bay.

16 In a congressional report, a congressional
17 research report to Congress called the National Estuary
18 Program, A Collaborative Approach to Restoring Coastal Water
19 Quality, written January 12, 2001, habitat laws is addressed
20 and it states that pollution, land development and dredging
21 operation to construct and maintain navigable waterways can
22 deplete or significant alter habitat.

23 This report goes on to state that the CCMP is
24 subject to EPA approval prior to implementation. The report
25 also describes how the Narragansett Bay estuary should be

1 managed. This is what it says, the majority of federal
2 programs to protect water quality rely on conventional
3 regulatory measures and controls specific sources of
4 pollution uniformly on a national level. However, the
5 National Estuary Programs departs from this traditional
6 strategy to control pollution through incorporating a
7 watershed approach in which all affected parties participate
8 in tailoring solutions to environmental problems for a
9 specific geographic area.

10 This approach can offer state and local
11 government, industry, and citizens the ability to
12 participate in addressing the environmental problems that
13 directly affect their communities and provide increase
14 flexibility in deciding which measures are better suited for
15 their localities.

16 In another section, it states, while a program's
17 collaborative nature provides flexibility, achieving results
18 --

19 MR. MCGUIRE: Sir, if you could please summarize
20 your comments.

21 MR. RAK: Okay, what it goes on to it says, the
22 success of this project depends on the continued
23 participation, commitment, and resources of the stakeholders
24 at each locality. The stakeholders in this locality have
25 donated much time and also they've donated -- not donated by

1 devoted million s of dollars to making Mount Hope Bay and
2 Narragansett Bay as a whole into a cleaner, ecologically
3 balanced body of water and I've been the -- I was the
4 laboratory director at the Waste Water Treatment Plant in
5 Fall River for 11 years, so I know the efforts that have
6 gone in by the City of Fall River.

7 I've also been down in the CSO tunnel under the
8 City so I know the efforts, the millions of dollars that are
9 going into that to create cleaner water and the idea is that
10 with Narragansett Bay to make the body of water in the hopes
11 that some day, perhaps not in our lifetimes, but maybe those
12 of our children can once again enjoy swimming, boating,
13 fishing, shell fishing, and just the sheer enjoyment of
14 looking out on a naturally open body of water.

15 This is the goal of the National Estuary's
16 Program. I'm concerned that this project should be
17 authorized unless it is first made part of the Comprehensive
18 Conservative and Management Plan, as directed by Congress.
19 This is w here the American People have placed their trust
20 in the management of their estuary of national significance.

21 I did not see a section in the National Policy
22 Act or the National Gas Act, which specifically state, as it
23 requires, that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission has
24 authority to act independently of the Comprehensive
25 Conservative and Management Plan prepared and approved for

1 Narragansett Bay.

2 Some may argue that we're now in different times
3 and that we're not aware of the energy crisis. I beg to
4 differ. If I can read just a little brief, it says tonight
5 I want -- this was a televised speech - it says, tonight I
6 want to have an unpleasant talk with you about a problem
7 unprecedented in our history. With the exception of
8 preventing war, this is the greatest challenge our country
9 will face during our lifetime. The energy crisis has not
10 yet overwhelmed us, but it will if we do not act quickly.
11 And it goes on -- simply balance our demand for energy with
12 our rapidly shrinking resources. By acting now we can
13 control our future instead of letting the future control us.

14 This was an excerpt from a televised speech made
15 by President Jimmy Carter April 18, 1977. So we were aware
16 at the time, despite this looming energy crisis, the
17 American people chose to designate Narragansett Bay as
18 estuary of national significance and turn its management
19 over to the people who know it best.

20 As someone with over 30 years of environmental
21 experience, I am concerned about the detrimental effects
22 that this project will have on the bay. Some potential
23 problems include the private dredging operations which will
24 cause a re-suspension of sediment and the potential for re-
25 suspension of the associated pollutants into the bay. These

1 pollutants may then be redistributed by tidal mixing and the
2 potential of bioaccumulation -- which, if you don't know
3 bioaccumulation, even though they are in small quantities in
4 the water, it can rapidly be built up in organisms that feed
5 on a lot of this, particularly in filter feeders and other
6 higher organisms.

7 Past studies have measured elevated
8 concentrations of Mercury in Mount Hope Bay sediments,
9 muscle tissues collected from organisms near Spar Island in
10 Mount Hope Bay were found to be the sixth most contaminated
11 of 72 sites measured in the United States for papa and 8th
12 most contaminated of 145 estuary samples for lead.

13 There is also the loss of habitat due to private
14 dredging operations.

15 MR. MCGUIRE: Mr. Rak, can you finalize your
16 comment.

17 MR. RAK: I'm almost done. There are also the
18 visual losses that such a project would create by having an
19 industrial facility in the middle of the bay and a
20 disruption to recreational boating that the transportation
21 of LNG will produce, as well as the need for traveling
22 around this facility even when no vessel is parked there.

23 Weaver's Cove Energy may own the land in Fall
24 River but I am concerned that this bay is common property to
25 all of this region and that no one company or agency should

1 have the ability to pose its will on a region that does not
2 want it, particular when safer and less intrusive
3 alternatives exist.

4 There is an Indian saying which states that we do
5 not inherit the land from our ancestors, we borrow it from
6 our children.

7 I want to give this bay back to my children in
8 better shape than it is now. If this project moves forward,
9 we will then have to explain to our children and
10 grandchildren why this was allowed to happen. Once this is
11 built, what will be next? The times are now. Please stop
12 this at this point. Thank you very much.

13 (Applause.)

14 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you Mr. Rak. Our next
15 commenter is Fred Senea.

16 (No response.)

17 MR. MCGUIRE: The next commenter is Tim Byrne.
18 B-Y-R-N-E.

19 MR. BYRNE: My name is Tim Byrne. I represent
20 the United Association of Pipefitters that cover the area of
21 Rhode Island, Southeast Mass, Cape Cod and the Islands. We
22 are also part of the New England Pipe Trade Association,
23 together totaling over 12,000 plumbers and pipefitters.

24 United Association spends a little bit more than
25 \$100 million a year training its members in pipe fabrication

1 and different walling techniques. We cover codes of ASME
2 B31(3) and 1104 in our schools in East Providence.

3 We've heard a lot of testimonies tonight both
4 ways and in the interest of time, I'd just like to say that
5 Local 51 supports the construction, the safe construction of
6 this facility and that we will submit written testimony to
7 support our wish that this facility be constructed in the
8 safe manner and also that the pipeline be installed in a
9 safe manner by skilled local craftsmen. Thank you.

10 (Applause.)

11 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you Mr. Byrne. Our next
12 commenter is Michael Oudette and the next commenter on deck
13 is Gordon Carrolton

14 MR. OUDETTE: Good evening. Last night - Michael
15 Oudette. Last night I spoke at Bristol wearing my Port
16 Chaplain's hat. Tonight I'm speaking as a private
17 individual wearing a private individual hat.

18 For those of you who weren't there last night,
19 I'm one of the Port Chaplains up in Boston Harbor and in
20 that role, I get to stand on the decks of LNG ships and on
21 other ships that are at the harbor and been at District Gas
22 many times both before and after the attacks of 9/11. In
23 fact on 9/12, I spent the day exclusively with the crews of
24 ships, crewed predominantly by Muslims. That was
25 interesting.

1 LNG is not going to destroy Mount Hope Bay for
2 recreation. You've got a restriction of area but we have a
3 restriction of area on the Mystic River. We have lot of
4 ships -- boat traffic, small both, private both traffic, up
5 and down, during the course of an LNG offload.

6 It's not going to destroy fishing. As a
7 recreation al fisher, I know that when I can find more
8 structure, I find more fish. And then in areas where there
9 is restricted fishing where you can't go fish, they breed.
10 It's going to be a feeder area for the rest of that part of
11 the bay.

12 If anything, the dredging can be a remediation or
13 a fix for poison silt. It worked that way up in Boston on
14 the Harbor Maintenance Project. In fact, I believe there is
15 a study paper on the Coast Guard's website where there is a
16 bit of a regret that they weren't able to dredge all of
17 Massachusetts Bay.

18 When you dredge with a closed bucket and then you
19 put the silt up onto a barge and you titrate off the water,
20 you end up with all the crud stuck there, you mix it with
21 cement and in Boston, we dug holes all cad cells contained
22 aquatic little places, within there got topped off with
23 clean sand from Cape Cod and it's considered contained. You
24 can actually clean up your bay doing that.

25 I'd like to thank Representative Sullivan for

1 reminding us that LNG is indeed very cool stuff. It is not
2 capable of dissolving oxygen. It is not capable of
3 dissolving oxygen. It can not ignite unless it's in a
4 gaseous form and the percentage of oxygen is somewhere
5 between 5 to 15% anything less than 5% oxygen, not enough
6 oxygen to combust. Anything more than much, much, about
7 15%, not enough methane to combust.

8 It also has a 1,200 degree Fahrenheit flash
9 point. Gasoline on the other hand is only 600 degrees and
10 dried pine starts churning, I think about 258/270.

11 It's very hard to change the status quo. My
12 vocation in ministry is about social change. I understand
13 its very hard to change the status quo and your role is to
14 measure prudence against the need for change and we have all
15 been reminded about the need, the deep need for change in
16 our national energy planning and policy these past few
17 months, not just in our fuel costs, but how these fuel costs
18 and energy costs have impacted everything, everything else.
19 Especially food.

20 Energy security is really what we're talking
21 about here and energy security is ever more evidently to the
22 common person, part of our national security. And so my
23 thoughts and prayers are with you as you weigh the prudence
24 of all these things.

25 I do ask FERC and the Coast Guard to do what you

1 do. To sift out the unhelpful information from the helpful
2 information and to discern well what is going to be best.

3 My belief is that siting this LNG facility here
4 is going to be very, very good for our nation, our region
5 and I do believe good for the local economy. In the
6 interest of full disclosure, I did eat dinner over next
7 door, it was really, really good. However, there were no
8 drinks, no dancing, and I don't roll over that easy.

9 Alright, so FERC please, give this good
10 consideration. Coast Guard please do consider the safety of
11 us all.

12 (Applause.)

13 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for your comment. Our
14 next commenter is Gordon Carrolton and the commenter on deck
15 is Robert Flannigan.

16 MR. CARROLTON: I have a few, kind of action
17 notes. I don't need to make a speech. I have a list of
18 things that I kind of want to see addressed by the
19 Commission and the Coast Guard and I would say there two
20 different sections. There are things for FERC and things
21 for the Coast Guard.

22 The Coast Guard's I know primarily revolve around
23 the boater issues and safety issue and then some of the
24 other items for FERC, I would say probably revolve around
25 the actual pipeline and the facility and those types of

1 things.

2 So one of the things we had yesterday at the
3 meeting in Bristol was something that came up about
4 earthquakes and I think it was mentioned by someone by FERC,
5 I think it was FERC, that we are in an earthquake zone here
6 and the pipeline will be able to sustain a 6.5 I think is
7 what was said yesterday. I'm curious to know why it was
8 just a 6.5.

9 This area is known to have earthquakes back into
10 the 1600s that some of which, I guess some of the theories
11 are that they've been as high as 8.5

12 It was also stated by FERC yesterday the pipeline
13 is the first of its kind. What long term testing will be
14 done on this type of pipeline, its casings, the fittings and
15 the concrete shell will not to ensure it will not degrade
16 over time?

17 This question is actually directed to the Coast
18 Guard. I'd be interested to see a detailed review of all
19 commercial and recreational boating accidents in the
20 Narragansett Bay, Mount Hope Bay, the Taunton River, the
21 Coles River, the Lees River and the Kickemuit River.
22 Ideally this review would cover significant incidents that
23 have taken place during the past 30 or 40 years.

24 Over this time there have been numerous incidents
25 on these Bays of water, some of those involve multiple

1 fatalities and large vessel groundings. Some of these
2 incidents have actually taken place at secured facilities
3 such as Naval Station, Newport.

4 Another question for the Coast Guard would be
5 that if a steel, aluminum or fiber glass vessel in a 30 to
6 50 foot range was laden with fuel and explosives and it were
7 to mistakenly or intentionally crash into the tanker, worse
8 case, what would that situation look like?

9 I've personally know of someone who have put a 44
10 foot boat upon Spar Island and some of these incidents may
11 not be reported to the Coast Guard, some of them may have
12 just been addressed by local police and local fire
13 responders and local maritime community people. So you may
14 have to do a little digging to get some of the details if
15 the Coast Guard wasn't involved.

16 Another question about the navigation is how long
17 would it take to actually get this facility placed onto the
18 GPS and chart map systems. A lot of people from this are
19 rely on that.

20 And this is actually a question for the Coast
21 Guard. If there was ever an attempt for someone to do harm
22 at this facility, what would be done with a vessel
23 approaching the facility at a fast rate of speed? Would
24 that vessel actually be fired upon? Because I would have
25 concern that some people in this are don't understand the

1 magnitude of what we're talking about here tonight and might
2 not think anything of having a cigarette boat race up the
3 river, which happens all the time and people coming from
4 other areas that don't understand what this facility is.

5 I would hate to see a recreational boater be
6 fired upon over something like this, although I do
7 understand it's a very secure facility and there would be
8 concerns about situations happening. So my assumption is
9 that at some point you probably have to do something like
10 that.

11 And my other question is, have you done that at
12 other facilities? Have you actually fired upon vessels?

13 Then this is more directed at FERC and the siting
14 of the facility. I'm interesting to know what kind of
15 modeling is going to be done on the viability of this
16 facility and how that would be affected by hurricane
17 situation, similar to the one in 1938 or more importantly, a
18 fast moving category 5 storm that's a direct hit at
19 Narragansett Bay. I know that we have some experience with
20 this going back to the 38 hurricane and the damage that took
21 place in this area was significant.

22 I don't know whether this pipeline would be able
23 to support that type of a scenario. I don't know what the
24 plan would be. I don't know what type of damage would
25 happen in a situation like that and I think those are

1 questions that I think everyone needs answered. That's
2 pretty much it. Thank you for the time.

3 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you Mr. Carrolton. Our next
4 commenter is Robert Flanagan.

5 MR. FLANAGAN: Thank you. My name is Robert
6 Flanagan and I'm here with my brother George Flanagan and my
7 brother lives at 700 Shore Drive, pretty much just outside
8 his window is where these tankers will be pulling in and I
9 briefly looked at the information that was handed out with
10 these studies and I think that the information, particularly
11 the amount of dredging, I believe it said 40 acres, is that
12 possibly correct?

13 MR. MCGUIRE: That's what's intended.

14 MR. FLANAGAN: I'm sure that's a mistake. I
15 don't believe there is any possibility that that is accurate
16 based on the size of the tanker. Excuse me, I just got
17 somewhat distracted. I'm sure that that number has to be
18 incorrect.

19 And the other thing too is the engineering study
20 on that pipeline. I really don't understand how that could
21 work that way. I mean, I looked at it briefly and I'm not
22 an engineer in that area, but I just don't understand it and
23 I think more information should have been presented,
24 particularly things like venting. Like how would you keep
25 the gas cool enough from point A to point B?

1 It may well be possible, but does it require
2 additional venting stations? I mean what is really required
3 there? Now another thing that I don't really understand is,
4 over 20 years, say 25 years of the lifespan of this thing,
5 two things are going to happen. The population of this area
6 is going to increase and the quality of the pipeline, or its
7 ability over time will deteriorate.

8 And that means the risk to the people that are
9 anywhere near the tankers or tankers coming in or the
10 pipeline will be increased over time. Now will that
11 increase and both security by Coast Guard or the ability to
12 secure the pipeline and the tankers is even in question.

13 I mean, are these costs really being considered
14 and does the Coast Guard have that potential? I thought the
15 Coast Guard was actually trying to decrease risk in the
16 future, not increase. I don't understand this whole trim.

17 It's not as if anybody here is against LNG or any
18 kind of liquefied gas or the plumbers and pipefitters or
19 anybody else that supports this thing, it's the siting of
20 the location. It's just not a common sense answer to the
21 problem at hand and I think it needs to be considered over
22 the 20 year life cycle of this entire project.

23 Anytime anything goes wrong around the road, like
24 say one of the tankers in another explodes or causes some
25 kind of problem in Japan and right now we probably have

1 about 10% of the total trips that will be taken over the,
2 let's say 20 years, well what will happen is, additional
3 security will come in and really clamp down on the local
4 area. We don't even know what that is yet. For instance,
5 more restrictions on how close people can be to the river,
6 maybe even moving people out of houses to move them back off
7 the river.

8 Any accident in the world will affect the local
9 environment and I think that that needs to be considered
10 too. Thank you very much.

11 (Applause.)

12 MR. MCGUIRE: Our next commenter is from the
13 carpenter's Local 1305 and I'm having a very hard time
14 reading the actual spelling of the name, I apologize.

15 MR. RHEAUME: My name is Ron Rheaume. I'm a
16 representative --

17 MR. MCGUIRE: Could you spell your last name sir,
18 please.

19 MR. RHEAUME: R-H-E-A-U-M-E.

20 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you.

21 MR. RHEAUME: I'm here tonight to comment on
22 behalf of the construction trades people of the area. I've
23 been paying attention to Weaver's Cove projects since its
24 inception. I've seen not only the project by others that
25 have been proposed, meet some opposition from small group of

1 organized people who say the Weaver's Cove facility is not
2 right for Fall River. I don't agree.

3 People have said Weaver's Cove's only incentive
4 to be here is profit and that there is a total disregard for
5 the safety of the people of Fall River. Again, I disagree.
6 I believe Weaver's Cove looked at the Fall River site and
7 saw the highly skilled labor work force and perfect location
8 for the main gas lines of the Eastern United States a deep
9 port, a site that pretty much leaves nothing else to be
10 built on because of the previous contamination and the fuel
11 oil facility that operated there for decades.

12 Since 2004, Weaver's Cove has been answering
13 questions and looking for ways to address the concerns of
14 the skeptics. Our politicians have been in a win/win
15 situation knowing they have no say in the final decision.
16 If the plan for LNG is rejected they look like heroes and if
17 it is approved, they can say that FERC allowed it and we did
18 all we could.

19 The troubling part to me is, of the whole thing,
20 is the loss of jobs, very good paying jobs which would be
21 created by the construction of a \$500 million facility.

22 The \$3 million in the tax revenue the city loses,
23 the upgrade of fire and safety apparatus, not to mention the
24 training Weaver's Cove is willing to provide to fire and
25 emergency responders in case of an accident.

1 The Mass LNG Facility Siting Board hasn't said
2 much. They know the Northeast needs the energy, the power
3 plant across the river could have used the gas to fire its
4 facility, but instead chose coal probably because of the
5 uncertainty of the Weaver's Cove Project.

6 The concerns of barges and ships navigating up
7 the river and under and three bridges are now addressed with
8 the offshore, offloading berth. I feel the safety concerns
9 of the plant minimal. With the safety record of LNG in the
10 United States and the strict regulatory process of numerous
11 agencies involved, the chances of something going array are
12 minimal.

13 The fact that Weaver's Cove came to the building
14 trades from the beginning tells me they want nothing but a
15 first class facility here in Fall River. The city's plan
16 for a 300 acre biotech park I believe would only be enhanced
17 by Weaver's Cove. Companies will come if a competitive
18 energy supply is available.

19 Weaver's Cove could be the light at the end of a
20 long dark tunnel, called the South Coast. Thank you.

21 (Applause.)

22 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for your comment. Our
23 next commenter is Alex and it looks like its Pastaben.

24 (No response.)

25 MR. MCGUIRE: Our next commenter is Lillian

1 Goldsmith and the commenter on deck is -- looks like Pam
2 Cooney? Tom Cooney.

3 MS. GOLDSMITH: I'm Lillian Goldsmith, a resident
4 of Somerset and a member of the Coalition. Most of what I
5 wanted to say has already been said so I will be brief.

6 One thing I hadn't mentioned, yes, I understand
7 the need for jobs for these people, very much so,
8 particularly in the economic environment today. But people
9 in Fall River are going to have a lot of increases in their
10 expenses. Hess is very smart. They make the money.

11 I don't know how they ever swung this they make
12 the profits but the towns that they are in pay the security
13 expenses, which means about a million and a half dollars of
14 increase taxes for Fall River plus increased insurances.

15 In the economic environment, who wants to come in
16 to help us develop our waterfront and our industry if the
17 first thing they're going to see is this huge, the biggest
18 tank that has been constructed yet, on the smallest site?
19 The tank is supposed to be as tall as the Braga Bridge, it's
20 not a very pretty environment.

21 Health wise, we have, as someone already
22 mentioned, two power plants. We have Mt. Trashmore. What
23 else do they want to put down in this area? I've lost a lot
24 of friends already and this is here for a reason. How much
25 more do any of us have to accept?

1 Democracy was always something to be very
2 treasured to me. It's so important to our government that
3 we are in Iraq, hopefully bringing it to the Iraqis at the
4 cost to us of 4,000 beautiful young lives, thousands and
5 thousands of our young people who have been wounded, many
6 very seriously, and don't know if they'll ever be themselves
7 again, plus the billions of dollars that have been spent.

8 They mislocated \$9 billion someplace and can't
9 even find it. I mean, it's a little ridiculous but, it's
10 that important that democracy be farmed out to the rest of
11 the world. But I have one question. If democracy is so
12 important that we're paying this bill for other people to
13 have it, why are we losing ours? We don't have a right to
14 say what can go on in our community. Thank you very much.

15 (Applause.)

16 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you Ms. Goldsmith.

17 MR. COONEY: Good evening. My name is Thomas
18 Cooney and I'm a carpenter from Local 275.

19 MR. MCGUIRE: Please spell your last name please.

20 MR. COONEY: C-O-O-N-E-Y.

21 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you.

22 MR. COONEY: And I'm a carpenter from Local 275
23 which is in Newton, Mass, which represents about 13 cities
24 and towns around it and I'm here in support of Weaver's Cove
25 and not only as my role as a carpenter, as it will bring

1 jobs, but also as, you know, a concerned citizen that will
2 help protect local jobs for local people and the amount of
3 benefits that I think that it would bring to the city and
4 the economy and just itself, the local businesses with
5 having 400 jobs over the next three years.

6 The economy is real bad today and people losing
7 their homes. I worked up in Newton and I've often work down
8 here in jobs down here and people have to travel miles and
9 miles, and with the way gas is today, I think it would boost
10 the economy with other types of industries coming into the
11 city.

12 So I think FERC and Hess have done their homework
13 and they're not going to put -- they're not out there to put
14 the residents in danger and I think they've done their
15 homework and they're going to do it as safe as humanly
16 possible and that's why this is just the beginning of the
17 hearings.

18 There will be plenty more testing done on the
19 testing and the dredging and the pipeline. You know, the
20 plant in Everett, there's never been an accident in 60 years
21 with LNG tankers and I think it's a perfectly safe product
22 and I think we need the LNG in Massachusetts.

23 I always thought LNG was always a good source of
24 energy. I worked 32 years ago building the tankers over in
25 Quincy shipyards that was transporting it, and that was a

1 boost for that city over there and I think this could just
2 bring to her types of businesses to the city also. Thank
3 you very much.

4 (Applause.)

5 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for your comment. Our
6 next commenter is Jean Paulamue.

7 (No response.)

8 MR. MCGUIRE: Peter Hallock.

9 MR. HALLOCK: My name is Peter Hollack, that's H-
10 A-L-L-O-C-K. I live on Seaview Avenue in Swansea,
11 Massachusetts and I've lived there, living on the shores of
12 Mount Hope Bay for the last 40 years. I've had the good
13 fortune to be able to be able to boating, sailing, fishing,
14 enjoying this bay and I know a great deal about Mount Hope
15 Bay, particularly in the area where you're planning to put
16 the proposed LNG facility.

17 I'll be brief. I've got three points I want to
18 make. First is on the dredge spoils. I've been involved in
19 Save The Bay. I used to be their Vice President and
20 Treasurer and when they wanted to dredge the channel here
21 before, they very seriously considered using Spar Island,
22 it's location for dredge spoils, which is the worse possible
23 location they could do.

24 I think one thing, if I could get across to you,
25 is pay attention to where those dredge spoils go.

1 Environmentally, they should be taken offshore and if you
2 try and shortcut it, you're shortcutting the people in this
3 area.

4 Secondly, the depth of the bay. Most of the bay
5 from Spar Island up through all rivers and all the way up to
6 where they propose it, except in the channels, are very
7 shallow. It's maybe 16, 15, 14 feet, Coles River it might
8 be 13 feet, but it's shallow and one of the questions that I
9 would encourage you to look into with the exception of the
10 channels is where else have you had a facility with a
11 floating distribution unit in waters this shallow. That's
12 really shallow water that you're putting this in. This
13 isn't some nice 60 footer or 80 foot depth, you're in a very
14 shallow area.

15 We get waves that are very different than you do
16 in deep water. So I would ask if anybody knows anywhere
17 that they have had any facility like this, that is in that
18 shallow of water and if they haven't, you'd better consider
19 a developmental project and you better have some pretty hard
20 evidence that you can put it in this shallow area.

21 And I agree with the gentleman before, having g
22 20 or 50 acres that you've got to make for turnaround
23 doesn't even begin to approach what you're going to wind up
24 needing for safety factor.

25 Third is - and it may sound like a strange thing

1 but bringing this whole operation into Mount Hope Bay, I
2 don't know whether you consider what it will do to the
3 devaluation of property here. There are a lot of shore
4 front property owners who are going to suffer. They're
5 houses are going to be worth much less because this is going
6 to make it a very unattractive spot to be.

7 So I would encourage you to please consider not
8 having this facility here. It might be fine somewhere else.
9 If you put it anywhere, make sure you put it offshore and
10 offshore means offshore, not some advertising guy's idea
11 that this would help sell it. So I would encourage you to
12 take into consideration the things I have brought up. It's
13 going to destroy this bay and I just hate to see it done.
14 Thank you.

15 (Applause.)

16 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for your comment. Our
17 next commenter is John Greenlis.

18 (No response.)

19 MR. MCGUIRE: Chuck Russell. The commenter on
20 deck is Roger Hood.

21 MR. RUSSELL: I'm Chuck Russell. First comment
22 only largely environmental. I'd like to see, I think the
23 secondary source sustained --

24 VOICES: Can't hear you.

25 MR. RUSEELL: You can't hear me? That's a first,

1 I'm telling you. That tanker, they lost a boiler t here
2 last year and they made a big deal out of it. If you get a
3 secondary source of steam you know, in on the dock, it takes
4 what's a pretty big problem and makes an aggregation of it
5 rather than a problem. You know, floating boiler or
6 something where you could just plug it in.

7 People have been talking about the dredging. If
8 you can dredge New Bedford Harbor, which has got to be way
9 worse than this, you know, I don't see any reason you
10 couldn't dredge here and with more LNG, you might get rid of
11 the coal at Brayton Point, which will do us an awful lot of
12 good in air quality. And that's pretty much it. Thank you.

13 (Applause.)

14 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for your comment.

15 MR. HOOD: The size of the site in Mt. Hope Bay
16 will not only be a menace to navigation but will require a
17 super large area to handle the dockage of these huge tankers
18 and the mechanisms involved to pump the LNG to the
19 underwater pipes to the Shell oil dock.

20 There will have to be a safety zone around the
21 site and this would block off a significant portion of Mt.
22 Hope Bay. What happens to all shipping, especially coal
23 barges being brought up the bay to come into national grid
24 and Dominion when the unloading is in progress?

25 What happens to this site if the Old Brightman

1 Street Bridge comes down and Weaver's Cove decides to bring
2 these huge tankers to the Shell oil dock and discards the
3 idea of using the Mount Hope Bay site? We all know that
4 when their job of forcing this monstrosity into the public
5 is completed the powers that be will disappear and let the
6 towns and cities figure out for themselves what the
7 problems will be.

8 Mr. Shearer's comment that boating in the bay
9 would go on as usual is a misstatement. All activity on the
10 bay would be prohibited until each tanker has finished
11 unloading and it has not been stated as to how long it takes
12 to do this.

13 The designing with the safety to the public in
14 mind on this whole project is best protected by the U.S.
15 Coast Guard who warns that it won't work -- FERC, take note
16 and vote this project down as another unacceptable,
17 complicated, unsafe venture by Weaver's Cove!

18 The proposed tank on the Shell dock is so high
19 that the pressure created by the height could easily burst
20 the underwater pipeline after a time and could create a
21 problem in filling the tank trucks.

22 It would appear that the consequences to the
23 designed of the whole Weaver's Cove site is flawed and
24 should be looked into more carefully by every agency
25 involved.

1 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for your comment. Steve
2 Mellow, next commenter. No.

3 (No response.)

4 MR. MCGUIRE: Cecile Scofield. Is she here?
5 Wendy --

6 MS. SCOFIELD: Hi, good evening. My name is
7 Cecile Scofield. I did speak last night at Mount Hope High
8 School and I was representing myself as a taxpayer. This
9 evening I am representing my non profit organization,
10 Citizens for Environmental Justice of Greater Fall River
11 Incorporated and I am the President.

12 I just left the room for a couple a minutes
13 because I was hoping there would still be some members of
14 the Carpenter's Union here to hear what I have to say
15 because I think it's important.

16 First of all, I'll talk a little bit about the
17 proposed dredge channel. The proposed dredge channel would
18 impact hundreds of acres of river bottom including acres of
19 shallow habitats specifically identified as spawning beds
20 for winter flounder, deepening its area from its natural
21 existing depth, changes the habitat and represents a
22 permanent impact on fish habitat.

23 Dredging increases the presence of dirt particles
24 suspended in the water, creating a blanket of silt on the
25 downstream riverbed so that native plants and animals cannot

1 survive. In the case of the Taunton River Dredging, these
2 particles will most likely be contaminated with harmful
3 chemicals.

4 Weaver's Cove has not addressed the cumulative
5 impacts from the project on Mount Hope Bay. Considering the
6 impacts from the Brayton Point power station on winter
7 flounder, or the fragile eco system. The proposed LNG
8 project is inconsistent with Massachusetts and Rhode Island
9 CZMA.

10 I would be remiss if I failed to talk about the
11 proposed site for the LNG tank located on the back of the
12 Taunton River and Fall River, Massachusetts. Citizens for
13 Environmental Justice of Greater Fall River Incorporate was
14 awarded a \$10,000 technical assistance grant by the
15 Massachusetts Department of Environment Protection. The
16 funds are being used to support public educational programs
17 on environmental issues.

18 CJ's mission is to ensure that environmental
19 regulatory requirements are met prior to the development of
20 brown fields or other environmentally contaminated sites in
21 the Greater Fall River area. We came into being to promote
22 environmental awareness in the effort to change local,
23 national, and global communities perception of environmental
24 issues in order to give a more positive and mainstream
25 significance to environmental concerns.

1 CJ's first project is Weaver's Cove proposed LNG
2 terminal in Fall River, Massachusetts. And I do have a long
3 wealth of information about that site but obviously not
4 going to share all of that with you tonight but I think I
5 did pick some highlights.

6 The Weaver's Cove site operated as an oil storage
7 facility and/or refinery from 1920 until 1995 where
8 petroleum products, such as gasoline, kerosene, diesel, home
9 heating oil and waste oil were stored. It was also the
10 location of former dredging and filling activities.

11 In 2000, the site was used to stage heavy
12 equipment and construction materials. As early as 1975,
13 petroleum products were noted on the Taunton River. In 1983
14 site investigation activities found oil floating on the
15 water table.

16 In November of 1989, the Massachusetts Department
17 of Environmental Protection consider the site to be a
18 disposal site. It is a disposal site ladies and gentlemen.
19 And assigned release tracking number 40749.

20 In 1990, the DEP assigned another release
21 tracking number, 40930 for the release of gasoline,
22 including led, petroleum based oil and waste oil. In 2000,
23 site investigation activities identified elevated levels of
24 heavy metals arsenic and beryllium in the site soil.

25 A ground water and light aqueous space liquid

1 recover system has been operating at the site since 1989.
2 As of 2004, 1,150,000 gallons of petroleum products were
3 recovered from the subsurface. The clean up of the site is
4 being performed by Shell Oil, U.S. in accordance with the
5 regulations contained in the Massachusetts contingency plan
6 310 CMR 40 and Shell must ensure that human health, the
7 environment and public safety are protected at all times
8 during the clean up process. And of course they're very
9 concerned about that because they're the original polluter.

10 In an article titled Shell Questions Weaver's
11 Cove's Terminal Assertions, which I found in LNG Daily,
12 Volume 1 #87 in the Friday, October 22, 2004 edition, S hell
13 is quoted as saying, Weaver's Cove design for the terminal
14 and environment calls for an enormous amount of material,
15 whether dredge sediment or clean fill, to be placed on the
16 site and for extensive construction in areas of particular
17 importance to the ongoing remediation of the site.
18 Specifically the proposed construction would require
19 shutting down and removing components of the existing
20 remediation system, creating a risk that the light non-
21 aqueous phase liquid plume and groundwater will flow into
22 the adjacent Taunton River and that risk would persist
23 whether or not dredge sediments are ultimately disposed off
24 offshore, the company said.

25 The comments by Shell Oil Products U.S. to the

1 Fall River Conservation Commission to Weaver's Cove Energy
2 Notice of Intent, Shell stated, Shell is not opposed to the
3 construction of LNG facilities, however, Shell has
4 significant concerns regarding both the effect of Weaver's
5 Cove energy's proposed activities associated with the
6 project on Shell's ongoing response actions and the
7 activities potential to degrade the site.

8 Shell is concerned that the proposed activities
9 fail to adequately address two of the interest of the
10 wetlands protection act under MGL Chapter 131 Section 40.
11 The interests are the protection of groundwater and
12 protection of surface water.

13 Furthermore, Weaver's Cove Energy has filed to
14 adequately address substantially equivalent economic
15 alternatives that could pose less risk to the environment.

16 The comments continue, in particular Shell is
17 concerned about its ability to recover existing light non-
18 aqueous phase liquid napl and the Weaver's Cove Energy's
19 ability to prevent migration of napl to areas covered under
20 MGL 131 Chapter 40.

21 These concerns result from Weaver's Cove Energy's
22 failure to address directly and satisfactorily the potential
23 environmental concerns arising from its proposed activities.
24 The specific goals of Shell's remediation plan are to
25 prevent the napl from migrating into the Taunton River and

1 to reduce the thickness of the napl by removing subsurface
2 petroleum products to less than a half an inch. I
3 understand the oil is probably 12 feet in some of the areas
4 across that site and there is a lot of crap that I would
5 want to be exposed to or have my family or neighbors or
6 friends exposed to or the workers who are going to be
7 working on that site.

8 I'm just hoping and praying that Weaver's Cove
9 has been honest with these people so that they know what
10 kind of crap they're going to be getting involved with if
11 they start working on that property.

12 The report goes on to state, numerous flaws in
13 Weaver's Cove Energy's risk assessment. I am confident that
14 as part of your due diligence FERC study this report in
15 great detail although in hindsight I cannot help but ask, if
16 you did, then how the heck did you ever approve this
17 proposal in the first place. Thank you.

18 (Applause.)

19 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for your comment. Our
20 next commenter is Wendy and it looks like its Malenfaut?
21 She left. Cecille Montplaisir. The commenter on deck is
22 Dave Spencer.

23 MR. MONTPLAISIR: My name is Cecille Montplaisir.
24 M-O-N-T-P-L-A-I-S-I-R. I represent myself. I don't have a
25 prepared speech but I have a few comments I'd like to point

1 out. Weaver's Cove has mentioned in many of their articles
2 that by bringing LNG that the prices of the gas would
3 decrease, which apparently will not decrease, it will
4 increase because the ships coming in are sitting out in the
5 ocean waiting to see where they can get the better price and
6 many of them are diverted to the far east where they get a
7 better price.

8 And also, I have another article from the
9 Canadian gas association and they claim that North American
10 natural gas market remains well supplied and this was
11 published on May 22, 2008.

12 It says this recent upward pressure on natural
13 gas prices, additional supplies, particularly from
14 unconventional sources expanded LNG import capabilities and
15 increasing investment in Natural gas storage will keep the
16 market in balance over longer terms. Concluded a new April
17 release today by the Canadian Gas Association. North
18 America continues to have ample supply of natural gas which
19 expected declines in some conventional resources, a supply
20 being offset by stronger than expected performance by other
21 conventional supplies, CGA, which is the Canadian Gas
22 Association entitled Natural Gas Markets, Price and Supply
23 Update.

24 And also, I was wondering what the market would
25 be for Weaver's Cove. The area they will service because

1 I'm sure they've had open season and they have their areas
2 where they will supply their products, which is most likely
3 would be New England and with the Northeast LNG facility
4 that we have up in Boston Harbor, they're supplying 20% of
5 the supply that New England needs. So I was wondering how
6 much supply that they would need and how much supply is
7 actually needed in New England.

8 And I was wondering also what the quality of gas
9 will be, where it will be converted as the natural gas that
10 comes off -- the LNG that comes off the ship is different
11 than what a homeowner uses and where it would be converted
12 so that it will be adaptable for home use. Because there
13 has been quite a bit of discrepancy in this. And also, what
14 part will Homeland Security play with the pipeline because
15 their proposal to Congress is forcing the Department of
16 Homeland Security to look more closely at pipeline security.

17 Another article I have is the Department of
18 Interior wants to impose tough new regulations on offshore
19 rights of way pipelines, now regulated by the Department of
20 Transportation and this was just published in May 2008 in
21 the Pipeline and Gas Journal.

22 And we also have a lot of natural gas finds in
23 the areas. South in Quebec, there is a huge find they're
24 going to be exploring and I'm sure that some of this could
25 be imported into the United States, as well in Pennsylvania,

1 there is supposed to be a lot of gas in the hills down there
2 that they're exploring right now, and some of this can be
3 transported to New England just as well as any other parts
4 of the country, as well as the Rockies mountain where they
5 are doing a lot of exploring in that area.

6 And I also want to mention that many years ago
7 there was an article about coal deposits in Somerset and the
8 town in Somerset did not want to excavate the coal deposits,
9 which is generally in the area, somewhere -- I don't know
10 exactly where, in New England, probably at the Bragga Bridge
11 and I'm wondering if any of those coal deposits veins extend
12 into the Taunton River and if they did, if they would be
13 that area where the pipeline would be going where they would
14 be excavating and what that would cause, imminent from this
15 excavation and if the vein did extent into the Taunton
16 River.

17 Also it was mentioned there would be employment
18 created from the building of the plant and the facility, but
19 this is only temporary and compared to when you think of the
20 life of the plant itself, which could be 50 years and it
21 would be minimal employment at those time comparison to the
22 time of the construction where there is a lot more
23 employment.

24 So they'd be like say, 45 years that there would
25 be limited employment compared to what the employment would

1 be during the construction.

2 And I was wondering, will the pipeline be pigged
3 just like they pig the normal pipelines where the ship will
4 be docking to a facility. And I also saw an article where -
5 - I believe its Norway or Denmark, where the LNG facilities
6 vent. Over there is a plant that goes up and put that sot
7 from that plant there was a lot more cancer in the area. So
8 that should be checked out also, see if that would be
9 adaptable to that.

10 And I'd also want to state that last year the oil
11 companies have made a profit of \$1.7 trillion dollars and it
12 leads you to believe, how much did the gas companies make as
13 a profit and I believe that we should be using -- the United
14 States should be self reliant and use its own -- a lot of
15 its own resources, which they have and have not done much
16 about exploring them. And if we do, we would eliminate a
17 lot of the imports and rely on our own facilities.

18 In this way, as I heard on one of the programs
19 on radio, there is a new website, Setting America Free and I
20 think this would be great if by setting America free we
21 develop our own resources and I believe they are going to be
22 presenting a bill sometime this week or next week in
23 Congress which will be trying to set America free by
24 proclaiming or asking that a new law be passed that the only
25 cars to be built in the United states will be flex cars so

1 they can use methanol, ethanol or gasoline. And you can
2 check their website and they probably have that information
3 on there.

4 So we could do the same thing with gas by using
5 our own stuff and our own material and thereby helping all
6 of America. This was my comments.

7 (Applause.)

8 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you very much ma'am. Next
9 commenter is Dave Spencer and the commenter on deck is
10 Elizabeth Bullard.

11 MR. SPENCER: Good evening, I'm Dave Spencer.
12 I'm a retired registered professional engineer in mechanical
13 engineering, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Washington State.
14 Expert on power plants particularly boilers, coal fired, gas
15 fired, oil fired.

16 I'll guarantee everybody that Brayton Point never
17 fired gas, never wants to fire gas. It's technically
18 impossible to fire gas and in addition, it is economically
19 very highly penalized when plants have to use gas, it costs
20 far more than coal or heavy oil, and most of the combined
21 cycle plants built in the United States that were going to
22 fire gas ten years ago are sitting there idle because they
23 can't afford to fire gas.

24 So the idea that we're going to get some gas in
25 here and rejuvenate the nation is pathetically wrong. There

1 are a few other things that were brought up that was just
2 incorrect. One is, any liquid is not combustible or
3 naturally liquefied natural gas, petroleum, gasoline,
4 kerosene, doesn't burn, but when it vaporizes, it does burn
5 and if the Coast Guard can confirm kerosene is not
6 considered particularly combustible and they use to have on
7 boats, pressurized kerosene stoves.

8 Then they found out that by these pressure stoves
9 would atomize the kerosene and it became very dangerous and
10 nobody uses it anymore. I would also like to say that there
11 were several other things that ere very misleadingly spoke
12 of. However one that was very accurate was the welding of
13 high nickel alloy pipe.

14 Now minus 260 degrees F, you use a very high
15 nickel LOA and you use a nickel rod and it's very hard to
16 control the weld pipe. It takes really good welding. I
17 agree with the person who spoke, t here might be 12 people
18 in New England that can do it and certainly have the
19 biometric inspection techniques to determine its okay.

20 So that I back up. It's feasible to do, it's
21 very difficult to do. I had some other issues and I can't
22 quite remember what they were -- well there were two things
23 here.

24 One of them is, I wish that the moderators would
25 really limit the people's time to five minutes because

1 everybody has left and some of those people that need to
2 hear the danger of natural gas in a volatile state -- oh
3 there is a good feature, they say between 5 and 15% is
4 combustible.

5 Natural gas versus air. Well the same for
6 gasoline, it's what they call flammability limits and
7 gasoline doesn't burn at too rich or too lean a mix. It's
8 standard procedure.

9 Also, I've been involved in many, many explosions
10 and fires at power plants and I have been a principal
11 investigator or some of them and I'll tell you, there is no
12 fuel, when it becomes volatile that's anything near safe.
13 And I sure don't want to be standing next to a tank of
14 liquified natural gas when a 747 flies into it. Naturally
15 as a liquid it's all safe, but it's going to vaporize and
16 all it takes is a very small spark at the right mix, the
17 right flammability limit and you're going to get one hell of
18 an explosion and fire.

19 Flames as you know are propagated about 90 feet a
20 second, so from that exit to the other wall, it takes about
21 one second. So there is no way you will get out of the way
22 of have anything to do with it.

23 And, or course, I guess I would like to say that
24 I wrote the safety procedures back in the mid 80s for the
25 Fall River Gas Company. It was situated on the shore. They

1 closed it down a few years later, which was a good idea, not
2 because the procedures wouldn't be that great, but people
3 don't like to follow procedures.

4 People in the military do because they'll be
5 highly penalized. But generally in a plant, people get kind
6 of familiar with what they're doing, they don't check the
7 temperature or pressure, they open a valve, they close a
8 valve. They've done it many times and that's when you get
9 into trouble. Its human carelessness is the major cause
10 backed up by some mechanical failures at times.

11 So thank you very much and I hope when we address
12 the Board later, we'll actually get limited. I suggest the
13 big clock for five minutes, cut them off.

14 (Applause.)

15 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for your comment. The
16 next commenter is Elizabeth Bullard. Commenter on deck is
17 Thomas Lowney.

18 MS. BULLARD: My name is Elizabeth Bullard. I'm
19 the Vice President of Friends of LNG and I speak for Jerry
20 Reposo, the President as well as the entire membership of
21 the Friends of LNG.

22 Our organization is in favor of both the original
23 proposal and the pipe in pipe proposal being discussed here
24 tonight. It is our understanding that Weaver's Cove Energy
25 has developed the pipe in pipe proposal as a result of

1 objections to the LNG tankers traversing the Taunton River.

2 In our opinion, the original project has been
3 studied and modeled more extensively than any other LNG
4 project in the past. Further, you correctly approved the
5 Weaver's Cove facility approximately two years ago, based on
6 factual information and data.

7 The pipe in pipe proposal if possible to achieve,
8 hopefully will allay some of the perceived concerns about
9 this project. As you know, New England needs new and
10 additional energy infrastructure, as well as a second
11 storage facility to meet its growing needs.

12 Please do not allow a small minority of nimbi
13 zealots to skew the Commissions determination on this
14 project. Don't we want to enjoy energy piece of mind? We
15 need the storage, we need the supply to be there. We need
16 to make this a reality.

17 In sum, the Weaver's Cove Energy Project can be
18 built and operate safely and securely and will be an
19 enormous economic stimulus to the area. Please approve this
20 project as quickly as possible. Thank you.

21 (Applause.)

22 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for your comment. Thomas
23 Lowney.

24 MR. LOWNEY: My name is Thomas Lowney, that's L-
25 O-W-N-E-Y. I'm here on my behalf and fellow citizens in

1 Fall River that I've talked to extensively on this project
2 being that its dear to my heart. Also talking from a little
3 bit of experience, and seeing what goes on with maritime
4 areas.

5 I notice a lot of things on this river, being I
6 only live half a mile from it on Mount Hope Avenue. Having
7 the terminal there has brought up a lot of questions, a lot
8 of incidents that have happened in the area pertaining with
9 shipping and LNG. If you could answer these question that
10 would be great, or get back to me on them I'd appreciate it.
11 Sorry about that, I'll try to be a little louder here.

12 The question I have is the Coast Guard has
13 allowed Weaver's Cove to provide a waterway analysis and
14 that seems to be a private analysis, correct? Does the
15 Coast Guard have analysis being done on their own on this
16 project to coincide with this, to confirm it or will they do
17 a separate one on its own? The waterway analysis.

18 CAPTAIN JERRY: Yes, the analysis is done by
19 individuals who are guided by regulations so they'd have to
20 follow these regulations.

21 MR. LOWNEY: Yes, I understand that, but does the
22 Coast Guard follow up with a follow up or a set of standards
23 that it adheres and checks on that?

24 CAPTAIN PERRY: The analysis, we then go through
25 the analysis bringing other experts to validate that that

1 has been done and as for requiring any additional work done
2 if needed.

3 MR. LOWNEY: Thank you on that question. The
4 other question I have is, I noticed your platform out there
5 and you have your dimensions and so forth but I noticed one
6 thing it didn't have is any mention of lighting protection.

7 Providence just recently had an LNG lighting
8 strike. Thank God there was no gas problem, leakage or the
9 tanker, I believe was just pumped clean. So it had a small
10 fire, it was contained, and stopped. That's a prime
11 example, that's something that could happen here in a
12 moment's flash -- excuse the pun and as I said, chemicals
13 are volatile and they perform. You have a leak out on that
14 platform it's a wide dispersal area. You may not notice it
15 at first, lighting strike in that are, could be a dangerous
16 thing.

17 The pipeline you mentioned is four miles long,
18 4.25 requiring dredging for the two pipelines, you said five
19 feet of sediment on top of it or three to four feet of
20 concrete and a 38-inch pipe. Now if that extends through
21 the whole circumference of the pipe, you're talking about a
22 15 foot channel for each pipe, 30 feet wide, 15 feet deep
23 under. Then you have to take into effect, also tunneling
24 under two channels.

25 The channel going under Brayton Point for their

1 tanker to go in and, unload coal, as well as the Montack
2 Electric channel, which I believe those are what, 36 feet
3 deep. So you're talking almost 50/55 feet deep of dredging,
4 30 feet wide at some points. So that's essentially almost a
5 channel of its own and I don't think that's going to be able
6 to cut it if the protective Water Act goes through.

7 The other thing I was wondering about was danger
8 of barge traffic as well being that barge is a shallow water
9 and everything else that comes in this area, which has been
10 a problem in the past with shipping, if some of these barges
11 should get loose and drift into the tanker or the terminal,
12 could pose a problem, since barges can go into shallow
13 water, even though the channel is restricted or God forbid
14 say anything would happen with the coal carriers coming in
15 here. They also have shallow tracks on the way out. If
16 there should be any problems, which they have soft grounded
17 in the past in this area, didn't see anything going along
18 with that.

19 I've seen enough of the coal carriers come out of
20 Brayton Point ground out softly over the years. The other
21 problem I perceive that FERC should consider is that the
22 distribution via diesel truck, hundred deliveries a day from
23 that site. Your main passage coming out of three is Route
24 24, 24 and 79. The entrance coming from the terminal is a
25 high speed merge. I do this on a vehicle, I used to do it

1 on a daily basis. People don't think around here when they
2 drive.

3 An LNG tanker is the perfect target for an idiot
4 behind the wheel. He will not see it, he can swerve in,
5 Toyota can go over nicely under an LNG truck, caught up and
6 have a nice spill. A highway correction would have to be
7 done to take the high speed lane out of the problem.

8 A hundred times a day, every day, 365 days,
9 statistic tells you you're going to have that idiot come
10 sooner than you think. Please consider that.

11 Also, going on the opposite direction, 195,
12 crossing over the Bragga Bridge, as well as going underneath
13 the City Hall. Congestion, traffic tie-ups, we already have
14 a problem with construction at City Hall and so forth. That
15 again, that should be considered as part of a disaster or an
16 accident plan.

17 The other things, unannounced scheduling of LNG.
18 Is there a Coast Guard plan for the LNG arrivals also going
19 to have an effect on commercial, not just private and
20 recreational?

21 But for us that's trying to get its industrial
22 act back together as a small bar company thriving to come in
23 here, trying to work around it and it's going to be needing
24 to know when they can bring in commercial work. Will that
25 affect that. It should be something to consider.

1 I hear a lot of people talk recreational, but
2 from the industrial side of Fall River, that is going to
3 have a drastic effect on it as well.

4 The other question I had, since Weaver's Cove is
5 completed analysis pertaining to the berth and dredging,
6 will the public have the opportunity to comment after all
7 that analysis is in on a set plan? Will that be available?
8 Because once you've agreed on design specs and come out with
9 the plan, not just a proposal, will there be an opportunity
10 for the public to speak on those and have their questions
11 answered? Because right now you're in a proposal stage, you
12 don't have specifics.

13 Once that is agreed upon and the plan is
14 approved, saying it is, I don't think it will be, but if it
15 is, will there be another opportunity for the public to have
16 questions answered on that facility?

17 MR. MCGUIRE: Just to clarify, this is Weaver's
18 Cove project, the company's proposal and we will, as I
19 mentioned earlier, we will issue a Draft EIS for public
20 comment, addressing their proposal.

21 MR. LONEY: Okay, thank you. And that basically
22 covers my concerns. Personally on record, I am opposed to
23 the LNG not say LNG itself, but the tank. It provides too
24 many problems, too many houses, confined area and I live
25 here. I wouldn't mind if I was living out somewhere in

1 Texas where it was 10 miles away, my nearest neighbor was
2 200 yards, but as many people staying in a congested city
3 area geographically and topographically we're in a confined
4 valley area, fall River.

5 If anything should happen, God forbid, either
6 accidental or terrorist, the blast effect is contained in
7 this area and can be doubled. Other studies have showed it.
8 I'm not going to quote specifically those but the
9 researching people already provided it. My opinion, it's
10 not a wise thing. Thank you for your time, have a good
11 night.

12 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for your comment.

13 Applause.

14 MR. MCGUIRE: The final speaker that's signed up
15 to speak is City Councilor Steven Camara. He is still here?

16 MR. CAMARA: Good morning. My name is Steven
17 Camara, that's CAMARA. I'm a member of the Fall River City
18 Council and I've been an elected officer holder for 19
19 years. Never in my entire tenure as an elected office
20 holder have I seen such unanimity in opposition to the
21 proposed Weaver's Cove Project.

22 For those who had stated there was a small group
23 of activists, this City Council that is now sitting and
24 previous City Councils that have voted on this have always
25 voted unanimously in opposition to any and all aspects of

1 the Weaver's Cove Project.

2 There would be many more hundreds of people here
3 if Fall River were a community where people are working two
4 and three jobs to support their families and their children
5 and elders with the exception of those that are here still,
6 but there are so many elders who are living in either
7 assisted living or nursing homes or just unable to be here.
8 And so for all of them, I speak and ask you to do the right
9 thing in opposing any continuation of this farce.

10 It truly is absurd that with any common sense, no
11 one would ever consider putting either a storage facility of
12 this type or an offloading offshore, as its called berth in
13 such a densely populated area.

14 Assuredly, the fact that Fall River is a
15 community of working people who are struggling financially,
16 this project would not go forward in a community other than
17 a community of our type.

18 Nonetheless, with unanimous opposition from the
19 entire elected body of the City of Fall River, as well as
20 the town of Somerset, most boards of selectmen and the
21 towns that are along Mount Hope Bay and the Taunton River,
22 if not all that have voted on this, our entire Congressional
23 Delegation, our Senators Kerry and Kennedy, the Senators
24 from Rhode Island and the Congressional representation of
25 this District as well as nearby Rhode Island, the Governors

1 of both Massachusetts and Rhode Island, the attorney
2 Generals of both Massachusetts and Rhode Island, all are in
3 synced in opposing this project.

4 My entire lifetime, shell fishing has not been
5 allowed to occur in Mount Hope Bay. It is only recently
6 that that ban is about to be lifted. To think that just --
7 and it seems almost silly to talk about fish and shellfish,
8 but the destruction of that source of commerce for so many
9 and source of food for so many, would be destroyed for the
10 foreseeable future if this dredging project were allowed to
11 move forward.

12 So for those reasons, and for so many more, this
13 project will not go forward. We are in synced. The cit of
14 Fall River, despite of its great difficulties as
15 appropriated another half million dollars to continue to
16 fight this project legally, we will do all that we can to
17 make sure this project does not go forward and we ask you to
18 be good public servants.

19 We commend its Coast Guard for its past action
20 and we ask the Coast Guard to continue to guard our coast by
21 stopping this project and letting Weaver's Cove and let this
22 nightmare end for the people of Fall River and surrounding
23 areas. Thank you.

24 (Applause.)

25 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for your comment. It's

1 been a long night. We do appreciate your comments tonight.
2 The formal part of this meeting is concluded. I would
3 encourage you to continue to follow this project through the
4 PF08-18 public docket at the FERC.

5 On behalf of the Federal Energy Regulatory
6 Commission, my colleagues here in front from the Coast Guard
7 and the Siting Board, I want to thank you for coming here
8 tonight and expressing your concerns. Good night.

9 (Applause.)

10 (WHEREUPON THE MEETING CONCLUDED AT 11:45 P.M.)

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25