

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

Mount Hope High School Auditorium  
199 Chestnut Street  
Bristol, RI 02809  
Tuesday, June 24, 2008

The above-entitled matter came on for scoping  
meeting, pursuant to notice, at 7:00 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 the Offshore Berth Project. My  
5 name is Rich McGuire and I'm an Environmental Project  
6 Manager with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
7 ("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 project.

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

15 With me tonight is Captain Raymond Perry with the  
16 U.S. Coast Guard. This meeting is being recorded by a court  
17 reporter so that we can have an accurate record of tonight's  
18 comments.

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

22 To ensure that the court reporter produces an  
23 accurate record of tonight's meeting, please follow the  
24 following ground rules. If you have any questions or  
25 comments, please come forward to the speaker and speak into

1 the microphone up here in the front to my right. Introduce  
2 yourself, and if appropriate, the agency or group you are  
3 representing.

4 Please help the reporter with the spelling of  
5 your name as well. Define any acronyms or industry-related  
6 jargon. And finally, please talk one at a time.

7 Following the formal segment of tonight's  
8 meeting, representatives from the company, Weaver's Cove,  
9 will be available in the back of the room to answer specific  
10 questions about its project.

11 Now I'll quickly run through tonight's agenda.  
12 In just a couple of minutes, I'll start out by briefly  
13 explaining the FERC's application process. Then Captain  
14 Perry will explain the Coast Guard's oversight and review  
15 process for this project.

16 Following Captain Perry, I'll present a brief  
17 description of the Offshore Berth Project based on the  
18 materials that Weaver's Cove has filed with the Commission  
19 to date.

20 Following the project description, we will then  
21 hear from those of you who have signed up to speak and make  
22 formal comments on the project.

23 Now I'll go over the FERC approval process. The  
24 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission is an independent  
25 regulatory commission. The Commission's mission is to

1 regulate and oversee energy industries in the economic and  
2 environmental interest of the American public.

3 Among other responsibilities, the Commission  
4 regulates the interstate transmission of natural gas. The  
5 Commission is made up of five members who are appointed by  
6 the President and approved by Congress.

7 The Commission staff, which includes myself,  
8 prepares technical information to assist the Commissioners  
9 in making their decisions.

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

13 Weaver's Cove plans to file its application for  
14 the Offshore Berth Project with the Commission in November  
15 2008, this year. At that time, Weaver's Cove plans to amend  
16 its existing FERC authorization issued in July 2005, to  
17 include the construction and operation of an offshore berth  
18 in Mount Hope Bay as well as bury liquefied natural gas or  
19 ("LNG") transfer pipelines.

20 These will be filed with the Commission for  
21 authorization under the Weaver's Cove LNG terminal.  
22 Weaver's Cove planned amendment is referred to as the  
23 Offshore Berth Project.

24 The Project will be located in the waters of  
25 Mount Hope Bay and include LNG unloading arms, a vapor

1 handling system, electrical power and control systems. The  
2 Offshore Berth would be capable of mooring LNG ships,  
3 supporting LNG unloading operations, and transporting LNG  
4 via the transfer lines to a LNG storage tank at the approved  
5 Weaver's Cove LNG Terminal in Fall River, Massachusetts.

6 If approved, Weaver's Cove anticipates commencing  
7 construction on the proposed facilities in September 2010  
8 and operation of the facilities is planned to commence in  
9 the fall of 2013.

10 Under the National Environmental Policy Act (or  
11 NEPA), the Commission is required to perform an  
12 environmental analysis of the proposed project's potential  
13 effects on the environment. In the case of the Offshore  
14 Berth Project, we are doing this analysis in an  
15 Environmental Impact Statement.

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

19 The Offshore Berth Project is in the preliminary  
20 planning phase and the precise facility design, pipeline  
21 route, and other details have not yet been finalized.

22 The purpose of the Pre-filing Process is to  
23 encourage the early involvement of interested stakeholders  
24 and the public, and to identify and resolve issues before  
25 the application is filed with the FERC.

1           Tonight's scoping meeting is one of the first  
2 steps in our process to develop a complete environmental  
3 record of Weaver's Cove's proposal. We are here tonight to  
4 get your input on issues that you feel need to be analyzed  
5 in the EIS or Environmental Impact Statement.

6           Your comments, along with those of interested  
7 groups and agencies, will help us focus our analysis on  
8 significant impacts. The Commission will make its decision  
9 about whether to approve the Offshore Berth Project after  
10 considering the Project's environmental impacts and the  
11 economic aspects.

12           After we receive a formal application from  
13 Weaver's Cove, our environmental review team will prepare an  
14 Environmental Impact Statement to meet its responsibilities  
15 under NEPA. The FERC staff will take comments received on  
16 the Project during the Pre-Filing Process and address them  
17 in a Draft EIS.

18           The Draft EIS will describe the proposed Project  
19 and alternatives, existing environmental conditions, and the  
20 potential impacts of the Project.

21           In addition, the Draft EIS will also describe  
22 what migration measures, construction procedures, and  
23 routing that could be included in the Project to eliminate  
24 or reduce impacts.

25           Once the Draft EIS is issued, it will be mailed

1 to the interested stakeholders. Everyone will have 45 days  
2 to review and comment on the document, either with written  
3 comments submitted to the FERC or verbal comments presented  
4 at the public comment meetings that will be held in the  
5 vicinity of the proposed Project.

6 The FERC staff will consider all comments on the  
7 Draft EIS, prepare written responses to comments, revise the  
8 document, and then issue the Final EIS.

9 The EIS will not be a decision document. When  
10 the EIS is complete, we will provide the assessment, and the  
11 staff material on the non-environmental issues which  
12 includes rates, cost-of-service, market, accounting,  
13 various engineering and economic issues, and will provide  
14 that to the Commission so that they can make an informed  
15 decision about the project.

16 If the Commission does vote to issue a  
17 certificate to Weaver's Cove, the Commission's staff will  
18 monitor the project through construction and restoration,  
19 performing on-site inspections for environmental compliance.

20 If you have additional questions about FERC, I'd  
21 encourage you to visit the Commission's homepage on the  
22 internet.

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

25 CAPTAIN PERRY: Thank you and good evening

1 everybody. Thank you for coming and participating in this  
2 process.

3 I am Captain Ray Perry. I am the Commander of  
4 the Coast Guard, Sector Southeast New England, which covers  
5 all of Rhode Island, out to Cape Cod and the Islands.

6 People who have held my position beforehand, for  
7 those of you who have been involved with this, and in the  
8 past, was Captain Roy Nash and prior to him was Captain Mary  
9 Landry, now Admiral Landry. They are my predecessors. I  
10 arrived here in December.

11 I'd also just like to introduce two other  
12 people, Mr. Ed LeBlanc here, just raise your hand. Ed works  
13 with me at Sector Southeast New England. He is really my  
14 waterways management division head and has been working  
15 this project for many years and is my expert on the details  
16 of a lot of the things.

17 And then also, Mr. Ron Beck, sitting next to him.  
18 He is up District Staff out of Boston and he has years and  
19 years of experience of working projects such as this.

20 I'd also like to thank the Federal Energy  
21 Regulatory Commission for hosting this today, Rich and your  
22 crew.

23 The Coast Guard's role in this, you've got to  
24 kind of break it down into two, two different areas. The  
25 first, the Coast Guard is what we call a cooperating agency

1 under the auspices of FERC.

2 In this capacity, I'm kind of charge with  
3 providing advice on navigation safety, maritime security,  
4 and protection of the environment, particularly as it  
5 relates to prevention of response to emergencies that's  
6 defined in the U.S. regulations.

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

11 So I'm acting as a support component to FERC but  
12 the Coast Guard, the second part of it too is that the Coast  
13 Guard also has its own regulatory authority dealing with  
14 protection of the waterways and activities on it.

15 We have authority over the safety and security of  
16 the LNG vessels and of the marine transfer area in the LNG  
17 facility. Details on that can be found at 33 C.F.R. 127.

18 We're also responsible for matters related to the  
19 navigation, safety, vessel engineering, and safety standards  
20 in all matters pertaining to the safety of facilities or  
21 equipment located in or adjacent to navigable waters of the  
22 United States.

23 The U.S. Coast Guard also has authority for LNG  
24 facilities security and plan review and approval and  
25 compliance verification and the security aspect of this is

1 covered in 33 C.F.R. Part 105.

2 Prior to the submittal, the representatives of  
3 FERC and the U.S. Coast Guard, Weaver's Cove and numerous  
4 other state and federal agencies. We participate in  
5 extensive analysis covering a wide array of maritime safety  
6 and security issues associated with the proposed facility  
7 and the transit of LNG tankers to and from the facility. Of  
8 course today is a part of that process.

9 We are guided by a -- besides what's in the  
10 regulations -- what we call a Navigation Vessel Inspection  
11 Circular. It's NAVIC 0505 and this guides the Coast Guard  
12 and also all of the participants, the community, industry  
13 and yourself, also you can use this document. And what  
14 needs to be address, as we go through the process of  
15 analyzing safety, security, and environmental protect issues  
16 associated with this.

17 Part of that will include a waterway suitability  
18 assessment and that assessment will include, amongst other  
19 things, a port characterization. It will also provide a  
20 characterization of the LNG facility itself and the LNG  
21 tanker route. Risk assessment associated with safety and a  
22 risk assessment associated with security.

23 Will also address risk management strategies and  
24 the resources needed for safety, security, and response  
25 associated with the transfer of the LNG and storage.

1           The process is, a Letter of Intent is submitted  
2 by the sponsors of the event, in this case Weaver's Cove and  
3 a preliminary waterways suitability assessment is done by  
4 them also.

5           Then we use a NAVIC that I just talked about, and  
6 that will guide us through with opportunities for input  
7 again from the users of the waterway and the community to  
8 provide our input into FERC and then to make our final  
9 assessment also, which comes in the form of a Letter of  
10 Recommendation.

11           So in summary, that's the Coast Guard's role and  
12 responsibilities in this. This is a scoping mission process  
13 today and Weaver's Cove has had a couple of other LOIs in  
14 place and I think many of you are familiar with them.

15           When I look at those, and from a scope associated  
16 with what we're looking at with the most recent LOI, just  
17 from a geographical perspective, the scope is the same.  
18 It's covering pretty much all of Narragansett Bay and going  
19 up into Taunton into the river up to where the Weaver's  
20 Cover facility is at.

21           The big change I think is the fact that we're not  
22 talking about a vessel going all the way up there. The  
23 vessel is only doing a portion of the transit. That will be  
24 up to Mount Hope Bay but the other part of the geographical  
25 area is not there is a new element in there and that is the

1 pipeline that's being proposed.

2 So we will be looking at that. So with that, I  
3 will turn it over to the most important part of that  
4 meeting, that's getting your input. Thank you.

5 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you Captain Perry. Before we  
6 begin to hear from you, I'd like to just go through briefly  
7 a project overview based on materials that the Commission  
8 has received from the company.

9 As I mentioned earlier, the Commission approved  
10 the original Weaver's Cove LNG terminal in July 2005.  
11 Following that approval, shortly after, there was a  
12 transportation bill in 2005 that was issued that kept the  
13 old Brighton Street bridge in place and that became a  
14 navigational issue with getting LNG vessels up to the  
15 terminal side to the LNG terminal berth.

16 In response to that, that's one of the reasons  
17 we're hear tonight for this Offshore Berth Project. And I'd  
18 also point out that Weaver's Cove is required to file 13  
19 resource reports. We approved the Pre-filing Process for  
20 this project at the end of April.

21 At the end of May, they filed the first of those  
22 13 resource reports, Resource Report 1 in draft form.  
23 That's in the public record in the PF docket, PF 0818.  
24 Based on that resource report that the company filed, is how  
25 I'm basing our presentation tonight on that resource report.

1           Essentially there are two parts, main components  
2 of the Offshore Berth Project which will be an amendment to  
3 the approved terminal. That includes that the offshore  
4 berth itself, which is essentially in the center of the  
5 circle that you see here in Mount Hope Bay, that's where the  
6 berth is, and then there is an LNG transfer line, two  
7 transfer lines that go to the terminal berth up to the LNG  
8 terminal site which is in the top right hand corner. I'll  
9 provide that. That slide will come up here shortly.

10           As far as the offshore berth itself, it includes  
11 a jetty of 1,200 feet in length, and includes an essential  
12 platform itself that's measured 250 feet by 125 feet.

13           There are four moorings dolphins planned for that  
14 jetty and three breasting dolphins to support the LNG ships  
15 when they come in to the berth itself.

16           There is also supporting fender panels and  
17 unloading platform. The platform itself includes three to  
18 four sixteen inch diameter unloading arms to unload LNG from  
19 the ships into the pipeline and a vapor generator system  
20 located on the jetty.

21           Additional components of the offshore berth  
22 include ancillary LNG equipment which include the LNG  
23 transfer equipment, power substation, emergency generator,  
24 uninterrupted power supply, a control room, and operating  
25 staff facilities.

1           The offshore berth will also include both  
2 passive and active security system and a new 1,100 yard long  
3 dredge private vessel channel for the LNG ships to get from  
4 the federal channel that's existing, to the offshore berth  
5 itself.

6           The capabilities include -- the capabilities of  
7 the offshore berth terminal will be capable of receiving LNG  
8 vessels that are similar to what we analyzed in May 2005  
9 EIS. Their company does not propose to increase the ship,  
10 the number of ships is still going to be between 50 and 70  
11 LNG ships to the terminal site or to the offshore berth  
12 facility and it will not increase the size of those LNG  
13 ships.

14           So essentially the vessel transit to the offshore  
15 berth is the same as what was proposed in the original  
16 proposal that Weaver's Cove was approved in 2005.

17           The location is one mile southwest of Brightman  
18 Point in Somerset, Massachusetts and approximately one mile  
19 from the nearest shoreline and in the diagram, the aerial  
20 photography that I showed originally, that circle is that  
21 one mile radius.

22           As far as the area of impact for the offshore  
23 berth itself, it's approximately one acre for the essential  
24 platform and combined 40 acre estimate for the turning basin  
25 in that 1,100 yard private channel.

1           As far as the schedule, this is what Weaver's  
2 Cove has presented to FERC at this point. They anticipate  
3 10-month construction time frame for the offshore berth,  
4 jetty platform, and an additional one year time frame for  
5 the jetty top works, for all the facilities that will be on  
6 top of that central to support LNG transit, would be on the  
7 top of that platform, and that's considered an additional  
8 year of construction.

9           As far as the LNG transfer lines, those pipelines  
10 consist of two 4.2 mile long cryogenic LNG transfer  
11 pipelines and a co-located electrical power system.

12           The pipelines will consist of a 24-inch inner  
13 pipeline that will be well insulated inside a 38-inch  
14 diameter cryogenic steel outer pipe to be covered with three  
15 to four inches of protective concrete.

16           The LNG transfer lines will be buried  
17 approximately five feet below the mud line in the Taunton  
18 River in Mount Hope Bay and the pipeline route at this point  
19 is along the western side of the Taunton River and outside  
20 of the federal channel.

21           The area of impact, the actual -- at this point  
22 the company has not given us information on the amount of  
23 impact in the Taunton River along the pipelines, and that's  
24 due to the fact that the pipeline, the minimal bending  
25 radius calculations have not been determined based on the

1 routes.

2 So we don't know at this point exactly how deep  
3 the pipe is going to be. It's going to be a minimum of five  
4 feet from what they've told us, but we don't know exactly  
5 how deep it's going to be because of a federal channel and  
6 because of the bending radius of the pipeline itself,  
7 because of the amount of concrete and the width of the pipe.

8 The construction scheduled for the transfer lines  
9 is anticipated to be a ten-week long for dredging and the  
10 dredging window that's anticipated to be required by the  
11 resource agencies, and that will run from November 1st  
12 through January 14th and the pipeline bottom pooling to  
13 occur from September through October the following year,  
14 with a back filling to occur subsequent in November 1st  
15 through January 14th.

16 Again this is the same aerial I showed you  
17 originally and it shows the one mile radius around the  
18 berth, the line cutting through the circle is the Rhode  
19 Island waters. So Rhode Island waters of Mount Hope Bay are  
20 to the left and Massachusetts's is to the right. And then  
21 in the top right hand corner is the approved terminal  
22 itself. Next slide.

23 (Slide.)

24 This is a slide of the existing approval terminal  
25 site so what would be removed here would be the terminal

1 side berth and rather than being at the terminal side, it  
2 will be replaced and would now be located in Mount Hope  
3 Bay. And so that stretch between the offshore berth and the  
4 terminal itself is 4.25 miles.

5 There is some piping adjustments at the terminal  
6 minimal changes to the terminal itself that was approved by  
7 FERC from what we know at this point and then some capacity  
8 -- the boil off capacity will be some minimal changes at  
9 the terminal berth. That's it.

10 Are there questions? Of course this is early on  
11 and we're just beginning to get a handle on the project  
12 facilities themselves. But are there any questions about  
13 the project? Yes sir.

14 SPEAKER OFF MIC.

15 MR. MCGUIRE: Okay, the question was, what is the  
16 burial depth in the federal channel. And I'm going to have  
17 to repeat these questions for the court reporter's benefit.  
18 Is that correct sir? Yes.

19 That is unknown at this point because the bending  
20 radius of this pipe, because of its width, and it's not very  
21 flexible pipe because it's going to be concrete, it's going  
22 to be well-insulated pipe, they're going to have to go quite  
23 a bid deep.

24 I mean the existing channel, federal channel is  
25 dredged originally at 35 feet depth. Now, of course, in the

1 original proposal, from Brightman Bridge north to the  
2 terminal that while federal channel is going to be dredged.  
3 That no longer is proposed in the federal channel, but they  
4 will, as you anticipated, they will have -- the transfer  
5 line will have to cross the federal channel.

6 Because of that bending radius we expect that's  
7 going to be a pretty deep dredge but that will be a question  
8 that Weaver's Cove will have to provide to us during those  
9 Pre-filing Process, between now and when they file their  
10 application.

11 Take another question. Okay, the definition of  
12 mud line was the question. That's the subsurface, the  
13 submarine level below the water. So as soon as they hit the  
14 bottom, that's mud line.

15 Yes ma'am. The question is, are these types of  
16 LNG transfer lines used elsewhere, and if so, where?  
17 Granted this is not technology that has been used very  
18 often, there is a Cove Point LNG project in Maryland in the  
19 Chesapeake Bay, it's called the Cove Point LNG Project that  
20 has a one mile LNG transfer line.

21 It's an offshore berth as well. It's a one mile  
22 like. It's in a tunnel and it's not in the actual  
23 substraight of the Chesapeake Bay. That's one example.

24 There is also a transfer line in the recently  
25 built Freeport LNG Project as well. The technology that's

1 most often used at this point is crude oil but it hasn't  
2 been used extensively with LNG and it's going to be so me  
3 questions that the company is going to have -- we're going  
4 to have questions about that. That will be some of the  
5 questions that the company is going to have to provide us.

6 Exclusion zone around the berth. Good question.  
7 We anticipate that the Coast Guard -- probably is a better  
8 question for Captain Berry, but we anticipate -- the company  
9 anticipate there will be exclusion zone around the berth.

10 It hasn't been determined the actual size of that  
11 exclusion zone and that will be an exclusion zone for when  
12 the ships are at berth and there probably be an exclusion  
13 zone permanent around that berth itself.

14 Captain Perry said when the ships are not there,  
15 there will be a smaller exclusion zone -- is anticipated.  
16 Yes ma'am. How long a ship is there for when they're  
17 unloading?

18 From what we know from the company, they would be  
19 the same as it was in the original proposal, which would be  
20 24 hours to unload the LNG into the pipeline which would go  
21 to the storage tank at the LNG terminal. So 24 hour time  
22 frame. That would include the mooring at the LNG berth and  
23 then unloading the LNG. Ma'am in the back.

24 The question was, is FERC aware that the pipeline  
25 runs along a chiasmic or earthquake zone in the Taunton

1 River? No, that's the first I've heard of that. Their  
2 comment was, once they had an earthquake about 12 years ago.

3

4 Okay, that's something we'll expect and one of  
5 the resource report is on geology and that would be the  
6 information that we would expect from the company, to  
7 include chiasmic conditions. That's one of the  
8 requirements.

9 The length of the Freeport line is not anywhere  
10 close to 4.25. It's under a mile. Yes ma'am. I'm sorry?  
11 Thank you for your comment. The comment was, that seismic  
12 earthquake was in the center of Taunton River and there was  
13 local experience of damage as a result.

14 Yes ma'am. The question is, will the exclusion  
15 zone impact shipping traffic in the area? We do not  
16 anticipate -- it's based on the Coast Guard's exclusion  
17 zones that have been developed in relatively similar type  
18 LNG projects.

19 We don't anticipate, based on the 1,100 yards, as  
20 I explained earlier, it's 1,100 yards is their private  
21 channel to the berth and there will be no impact on the  
22 federal channel itself. We don't anticipate that.

23 CAPTAIN PERRY: Right now the zones are pretty  
24 much for the moving vessels and they are 4,000 yards ahead,  
25 2,000 behind and then 50 off each side -- 1,000 off of each

1 side. But that is the zone that's patrolled. There are  
2 vessels there and you can adjust that based on the  
3 circumstances, if a vessel needs to be standing and de-  
4 vessel or something like that, there are people that will  
5 allow that vessel to go through.

6 So it's an exclusion zone but you also got to  
7 look at it as, I say, controlled zone where vessels can  
8 transit through that upon approval of the people who are  
9 managing the zone, the Coast Guard, and other law  
10 enforcement agencies that are there.

11 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you. We'll take probably two  
12 more questions. We really want to get to the prepared  
13 comments for tonight and just as a reminder, the company is  
14 here tonight. We've asked them to be prepared to answer  
15 specific questions about the project.

16 The answers I'm giving you is based on the  
17 information they provided in Resource Report 1 and they can  
18 give you some additional information outside this room in  
19 the back.

20 So I'll take two more questions. There was a  
21 hand up here. Yes ma'am. The Northeast Gateway Project is  
22 a little different because there is actually transfer lines  
23 -- that's an offshore project so that's a little bit  
24 different than this as far as the area, but it's really  
25 early on and, you know, both FERC and the Coast Guard are

1 just beginning to look at this project and the exclusion  
2 zone have not been determined by the Coast Guard. I mean  
3 that would be part of the process of their evaluation, is  
4 determining the zone.

5 But I think that 500 meter would be the outer  
6 range of what the exclusion zone would be. Question in the  
7 back sir. I'm sorry. No, the question was, that there  
8 would be -- the comment was that there would be 300  
9 deliveries a year. That's -- with the original project that  
10 was approved by FERC, the company anticipated 50 to 70  
11 deliveries, LNG deliveries per year of this size ship, which  
12 is the ship's lengthwise are 950 feet on average and their  
13 capacity of 155,000 cubic meters of capacity.

14 So now, that's 50 to 70, that would be incoming  
15 and then exiting. So the actual transit would be 140 would  
16 be maximum. So if you have additional questions, you can  
17 either ask FERC informally after the meeting, or informally  
18 ask Weaver's Cove.

19 We're going to shift over to the most important  
20 part of tonight, the comments. If you do not want to make  
21 formal comments tonight, you can also send a letter to the  
22 Commission addressing your specific concerns.

23 The public notice for this meeting, which was  
24 issued June 4, 2008, and the comment period ends July 7,  
25 2008. The notice explains how you can mail in comments on

1 page 5.

2 To remain on our mailing list for this project,  
3 you will need to do either one of the following, return the  
4 information request in Appendix A or Appendix 2 of the  
5 Notice, sign the mailing list sheet at the back of this  
6 room, or provide written comments by July 7th.

7 Again, there are some handouts available at the  
8 sign-in table that explain how to send in comments to the  
9 Commission.

10 Now we'll begin to hear from those of you who  
11 signed up to present comments. For the court reporter's  
12 benefit, please come up to the podium, introduce yourself,  
13 and if appropriate, the agency or group that you are  
14 representing.

15 The first speaker tonight is Ronald M. Thomas.  
16 The second speaker is, as soon as Mr. Thomas is finished, is  
17 David Barbosa.

18 MR. THOMAS: Good evening. My name is Ronald  
19 Thomas. Okay, I'm a member of the Coalition for Responsible  
20 Siting of LNG. Okay, I've spent over 40 years in the marine  
21 industry, including LNG tankers, ten of them, which are  
22 presently sailing tonight. Okay, to try sticking strictly  
23 to the environmental end of this thing --

24 MR. MCGUIRE: We're going to have issues with  
25 sound.

1 (Fixing Microphone)

2 MR. THOMAS: Should I start over again?

3 MR. MCGUIRE: Yeah, please.

4 MR. THOMAS: My name is Ronald Thomas. I'm a  
5 member of the Coalition for Responsible Siting of LNG and  
6 I've had over 40 years experience in the marine industry  
7 including building 10 of these LNG tankers as part of my  
8 employment and also as part of middle management.

9 So I know a little bit about what's going on here  
10 but the issue is environment. Okay, what was being proposed  
11 was, only one of the three options which they're proposing.  
12 Now it would make more sense to do the closest one,  
13 therefore less dredging.

14 Okay, we're talking one and a quarter miles less  
15 dredging and if we magnify that out, even if the thing is  
16 only, you know, 10 yards wide, 10 yards deep, we're talking  
17 over 2,000 cubic yards of less dredging.

18 Okay, we've got to stop and look at what we're  
19 doing to this river bottom and how it's impacting the stuff  
20 that's there.

21 Now we're on the verge of calling this river wild  
22 and scenic that's already passing into the Senate, the  
23 Senate is working on it, why we screwing with it? Because  
24 there is no need for it. Okay, we've got offshore, we've  
25 got other technologies, which should be able to alleviate

1 our dependence upon all these fossil fuels.

2 Gas is still considered fossil fuel. It's still  
3 carbon producing, but here in the United States we've gotten  
4 more capabilities than any other country in the world to  
5 open up, look at what all the issues are.

6 They might not be immediately before us, but I'm  
7 sure we can, between solar energy, reintroduce solar power,  
8 okay, we can overcome this shortage and not go out and trade  
9 for these fossil fuels.

10 Mother nature does strange things, including  
11 these storms. While this tank is pulled up alongside this  
12 dock, you know, all of a sudden we get a squall, just like  
13 we had tonight and you stop pumping?

14 Therefore at night it's throwing the entire  
15 schedule off. I mean, we've got to set some type of  
16 parameters. Thank you very much and let's take a look at  
17 the safety issue of the thing also, for the people in  
18 surrounding areas, under the different options. Thank you  
19 very much.

20 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you Mr. Thomas.

21 (Applause.)

22 MR. MCGUIRE: Our next speaker is David Barbosa  
23 and the speaker on deck is Mike Profio.

24 MR. BARBOSA: This is David Barbosa. Do you need  
25 the spelling of my last name? Okay. You know, my first

1 thought when I looked out this evening is, this is like deja  
2 vu.

3 I see many of the same faces that were here  
4 several years ago, and happily see more new faces, all of  
5 who are binding together in universal opposition which  
6 crosses two states to this project and to send a message  
7 loud and clear that this project is not in the best interest  
8 of the citizens of the areas that it affects.

9 I think it was put in perspective when you said  
10 sir, that this is similar to the original EIS, and yes it  
11 is, and to me that is akin to putting perfume on a pig,  
12 because you certainly can not disguise the economic and the  
13 safety issues that this still poses, and I think this poses  
14 more safety issues than the original plan.

15 If I can surmise it, and I will try to be brief,  
16 this will be a major disaster and destruction on two fronts.  
17 First of all, the economic impact that it will have on the  
18 town of Bristol.

19 I am the town council liaison to both the police  
20 and the fire department. I have been for ten years and I  
21 can tell you forthright, that we do not have the manpower,  
22 nor do we have the resources to be able to allow this  
23 company to sustain 140 transports of a ship that is going to  
24 require the closing of the Mt. Hope Bridge.

25 We live on a peninsula. It also affects public

1 safety by shutting off water ways that you can get in and  
2 out of town. We have construction on that bridge and  
3 fortunately so because it's probably one of the better  
4 maintained bridges in the state of Rhode Island, but we know  
5 what it does to traffic on both sides of the bridge.

6 Sometimes it's virtual gridlock and I can only  
7 imagine the impact that this will have doing this 140 times  
8 a year. This will also have, and I'm sure there'll be other  
9 people to elaborate further on this, the impact it's going  
10 to have on fishing and recreational boating.

11 We talk about creating private channels and we're  
12 talking about creating exclusion zones, which right now,  
13 people who live in this area are used to traversing the  
14 waters with their own pleasure craft, and I don't think  
15 that should be taken way for private entity.

16 And I know there will be someone else to also  
17 speak about the impact that the dredging is going to have  
18 from this project. But most importantly, I'm here to  
19 reaffirm the town of Bristol's commitment from the town  
20 Administrator Diane C. Mederos to the other four members of  
21 the town council, to our unanimous opposition to this  
22 project.

23 The town of Bristol was one of the first towns to  
24 step forward and appropriate \$25,000 to hire legal counsel  
25 to oppose the first EIS many years ago and we stand firm in

1 our commitment to doing that again.

2 This is a project that is not in the, once again,  
3 the best interest of the citizens of Rhode Island, as well  
4 as Massachusetts. And I thank you for your time.

5 (Applause.)

6 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for your comment Mr.  
7 Barbosa. The next speaker on deck is Manny and I believe  
8 it's Albes.

9 MR. PROFIO: Good evening. My name is Mike  
10 Profio, I'm a Somerset Resident. I'm a member of the Board  
11 for Coalition for Responsible Siting.

12 MR. MCGUIRE: Please spell your name sir.

13 MR. PROFIO: P-R-O-F-I-O. I'm a Board Member of  
14 the Coalition for Responsible Siting of LNG but I'm really  
15 speaking as a citizen, as a person that grew up in the area.

16

17 I work in sales and I speak every day to many  
18 people throughout the borough, Somerset area, and my  
19 territory comes right down here to East Bay and I venture to  
20 say about 99% of people are against this project. Once in a  
21 while I find somebody that want it for whatever reason, but  
22 it just amazes me that it's even gotten this far as it had.

23 I'm going to give you a little personal history  
24 about myself. In 1975 I joined the Air Force. I was a  
25 security policeman. After a few years in the regular Air

1 Force, I was in the Air National Guard for about seven  
2 years.

3 I had a commander in the Air National Guard, he  
4 was a retired State Trooper, Commander Fitzgerald, and he  
5 would constantly tell his troops -- this was 25 years ago --  
6 the biggest threat to the United States, he used to say, is  
7 terrorism.

8 I left the military 25 years ago. I went on to a  
9 corporate career. I always had that in the back of my mind  
10 and when 9/11 occurred, his words rang true. This man 25  
11 years earlier had said this, I've watched things happening  
12 in the world and when 9/11 occurred, I was like wow, he  
13 really was right. And honestly, I can't believe, in a post  
14 9/11 world, we're even having a discussion about this  
15 project.

16 How many tankers were band from Boston harbor in  
17 the weeks post 9/11 because of safety and security concerns?  
18 I submit to FERC and the U.S. Coast Guard that in today's  
19 world, presuming it would never be build, and here we are  
20 talking about an ill advised project 50 miles south why,  
21 because Fall River is a blue collar, hard scrabble city and  
22 Hess Weave's Cove does not bank have the resources to stop  
23 them and they think they can bully their way in.

24 I'm citing a quote from the Boston Globe  
25 published July 11, 2006. Title: LNG Plan for Site off

1 Gloucester Gets First OK. The quote says, the company said  
2 in a Stratford Court that recreational and commercial  
3 fishing would be excluded from about 14 square miles during  
4 construction. About 3.9 square miles for the rest of the  
5 project's life because of safety concerns.

6 So if we took that 3.9 square miles, roughly two  
7 miles by two miles, and we look at those diagrams out there  
8 in the hallway, two by two miles does not leave a lot of bay  
9 left for everybody else.

10 At a recent presentation at the Board of  
11 Selectmen Gordon Shearer stated that this new proposal  
12 addresses some of the safety and security concerns from the  
13 local citizens.

14 Later in his presentation he stated, if he could  
15 get the Brightman Street Bridge out of the way, he'll have  
16 his ship come all the way down to the Fall River terminal  
17 even if they've already built the four mile pipeline.

18 I'd like to say -- take this opportunity to say,  
19 thank you Gordon. You really make us feel like you care  
20 about our safety and security, about our family, our  
21 friends, the members of our community when you say on one  
22 end, we're addressing your concerns by putting in a  
23 pipeline, but it wouldn't get that bridge out of the way,  
24 we're going to jam this thing right in there.

25 I was also at an informational meeting about five

1 years ago. This was when Gordon was being very friendly to  
2 us. It was amazing, once he got the first approval, how he  
3 suddenly disappeared, except when he is forced to come back,  
4 to do things like this, trying to get this proposal  
5 approved.

6 But he was being friendly and trying to address  
7 our concerns at a little church in Somerset and at that  
8 meeting he told us that the technology does not exist to  
9 site LNG terminals offshore in the northeast.

10 Now, amazingly before Gordon put a shovel in the  
11 ground, these two new offshore projects off the coast of  
12 Gloucester, it leaves me with the question Mr. Shearer, are  
13 you that misinformed about the possible LNG options? Or  
14 did you choose not to tell use the whole truth?

15 I mean in five years, suddenly they could build  
16 these facilities, wow!

17 (Applause.)

18 An article published in the Gloucester Daily  
19 Times, on August 13, 2007 discussed that one of the  
20 companies building an LNG terminal upper Gloucester is  
21 paying for a new system that will help detect whales and  
22 avoid strikes by massive tankers. I like whales. Anyone  
23 here got a problem with whales?

24 I am happy to see an LNG company that's concerned  
25 about the safety and security of whales. If only Hess

1 Weaver's Cove was as concerned about the 10, 000 people that  
2 live within one mile of their proposed largest, it will be  
3 largest LNG terminal in the United States.

4 Why is it another LNG company cares enough about  
5 the safety and security to build their site ten miles off  
6 shore, to base \$6.5 million for a passive, acoustic bowie  
7 system to protect whales; yet Hess Weaver's Cove insists we  
8 need to jam this project right into the middle of this  
9 populated area.

10 Why does Hess Weaver's Cove care so little about  
11 what the 10, 000 people that live within a mile, never mind  
12 the people starting at the point of Newport coming all the  
13 way down the bay, the people crossing the bridges, they'll  
14 be inconvenienced. It just amazes me that, uh, these guys  
15 just can't take a hint.

16 I want to make my stance perfectly clear. I have  
17 nothing against LNG, I believe it's a great resource. It's a  
18 clean burning alternative to many fuels, however, there are  
19 much more sensible places to bring in large cargo ships and  
20 store in large quantities of LNG. This project will  
21 significantly impact ship and boat traffic from Newport,  
22 Rhode Island to Somerset, Massachusetts. This project will  
23 significantly impact residents' safety and security  
24 throughout the transit from Newport to Somerset, residents  
25 from the berthing area, along the four mile pipeline, and

1 the 10, 000 people living within one mile of the tank.

2 Never mind, now let's just not destroy the  
3 quality of life of the people over here in the Somerset and  
4 Fall River, 10, 000 people in a mile. Let's not care if we  
5 destroy their property value, their living conditions.

6 Now we can take the whole four mile coast of  
7 Somerset, another berthing area. Or why don't I just take  
8 all these people that have a quality of life and maybe a  
9 dream to live near the river, or maybe they worry about  
10 their families when they go to work and want to know  
11 they'll be safe when they get home. Um, the project will  
12 impact marine life, their habitats, and of course there'll  
13 also be dredging impacts.

14 The proposed 1,200 foot jetty. Now I was looking  
15 at the pretty pictures out there, funny, I didn't see the  
16 picture of the jetty. You know, that will impact natural  
17 life and the Mount Hope Bay in general.

18 We've been fighting this insane project for five  
19 years. We will continue to fight it. We do not want this  
20 in our backyard, your backyard, I don't want it in Gordon's  
21 backyard. I don't want it in anyone's backyard.

22 I implore the Federal Energy Resource Commission,  
23 the U.S. Coast Guard, to tell Hess Weaver's Cove, that when  
24 the find a suitable proposal, at least ten miles from any  
25 shoreline, we'll be happy to talk about approving this

1 project.

2 We just had enough. It's just utterly ridiculous  
3 that it even get this far. Thank you.

4 (Applause.)

5 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for your comments.  
6 Representative Gallison will be on deck.

7 MR. ALBES: Hi, my name is Manny Albes and I'm  
8 from Fall River. I live about a quarter mile from the  
9 storage area.

10 MR. MCGUIRE: Will you spell your last name sir.

11 MR. ALBES: A-L-B-E-S. And I live about a  
12 quarter mile from the storage area where the proposed  
13 storage area is going to be, where they're going to build  
14 the tank.

15 I'm in favor of this project. I have no fear of  
16 it. The rest of the world has no fear of it, why should we?  
17 As far as some of the research that I've done, I find China  
18 has signed agreements with Indonesia and all the new --  
19 coming in line to ship LNG to China. That's an emerging  
20 economy that's going to hurt ours. It's already hurting  
21 ours.

22 And I believe that energy is the biggest enemy  
23 that we have. We don't have enough of it and we need this  
24 project. We need this project for the area, we need this  
25 project for the company if we're going to survive as a

1 nation and if we're going to survive as a people.

2 We can't let just other people walk all over us  
3 because someone doesn't want something in their backyard. I  
4 live a quarter mile from it. So that 10,000 people that  
5 people are talking about, exclude one person. It's 9,999  
6 because I want it. Thank you very much.

7 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for your comment.  
8 Representative Gallison. The next speaker will be Don  
9 Church.

10 REPRESENTATIVE GALLISON: Thank you. Good  
11 evening gentleman. Thank you for coming here this evening.  
12 Weaver's Cove have their points and I have various points  
13 that I'll get to in a few minutes, but first of all, let me  
14 -- I'm sorry.

15 First of all, let me just start out by saying  
16 that by the Coast Guard's own definition, offshore would be  
17 something that would be up off demarcation line pursuant to  
18 Newport sea line. This is definitely an inshore project so  
19 it's not offshore whatsoever.

20 And I'm going to follow your handout you had as  
21 far as identifiable environmental issues. I'll try to  
22 follow that as best I can, okay and I'll start out with the  
23 commercial recreational.

24 Certainly, commercial recreation uses in Rhode  
25 Island water will be excluded from the safety and security

1 zone that was published in the federal register seven years  
2 ago, and that safety and security zone was two miles ahead,  
3 one mile astern and a dozen yards on the other wide of the  
4 LNG tanker while it was in transit to and from the proposed  
5 berth and any ship or any recreational vehicle or commercial  
6 vehicle would be a vessel and would be prohibited from  
7 entering into that safety and security zone while the ship  
8 was in transit and while the sip was being offloaded.

9 That would certainly have a negative impact on  
10 the five billion dollar tourism industry in the State of  
11 Rhode Island. And the Newport County Chamber of Commerce,  
12 they conducted a study of what the negative impacts of  
13 tourism industry would be in the State of Rhode Island and  
14 I'm going to submit that in general this evening. And it  
15 clearly stated that recreation and commercial vessels would  
16 be negatively impacted, but more importantly, cruise ships  
17 would not come and they've already stated that they would  
18 not come to the City of Newport, which Newport relies every  
19 heavily on cruise ships during the off season and normally  
20 the come through the City of Fall River.

21 Safety issues. As you notice here on this chart,  
22 and this was prepared by Professor Mark Rickland from the  
23 Roger Williams University. 63,500 people. 63,500 people  
24 lived from the mouth of Narragansett Bay up into the Taunton  
25 River where this facility is proposed.

1                   Clearly, this places these people in imminent  
2 danger. As you noted, which I know, the Government  
3 Accountability Office recently in an article that appeared  
4 in the Providence Journal on March 24, 2008, a study by the  
5 Governmental Accountability Office released last year  
6 concluded that more research was needed on the risks of LNG  
7 and found that an accident or terrorist attack on an LNG  
8 tanker could create a fire so intense, it would burn people  
9 a mile away. 63,500 people would be placed in imminent  
10 harm. I don't think that should be taken very lightly.

11                   Impact on the marine resources. Certainly this  
12 proposal would have a negative impact on marine resources  
13 due to the dredging of Mt. Hope Bay.

14                   The Rhode Island Department of Environmental  
15 Management and Rhode Island Coastal Reassessment Management  
16 Council both have refused dredging permits.

17                   The Rhode Island Department of Environmental  
18 Management has taken testimony from individuals who have  
19 first hand knowledge of the different materials that were  
20 dumped into the Taunton River and have reached into Mount  
21 Hope Bay and set a sediment in the bottom of Mount Hope Bay.

22

23                   Recently, the Rhode Island Department of  
24 Environmental Management and the Army Corp of Engineers  
25 opened what is called the Town Pond Project in the town of

1 Port Smith. That is a natural habitat. That habitat is  
2 obviously for marine life and aquatic life, and what that  
3 habitat would do is be the spawning ground for such species  
4 that have long become almost extinct in our area such as  
5 Winter Flounder.

6 Any dredging will have a serious negative impact  
7 on the Town Pond Project as any of those species after  
8 they've spawned would go out into Mount Hope Bay, any of  
9 this dredging will disturb all of the material that's at the  
10 bottom of Mount Hope Bay and incidentally, Mount Hope Bay  
11 only flushes itself out seven times per year. This has been  
12 documented by studies that were done in conjunction with  
13 problems at the Brightman Point Power Plant which I'll get  
14 to next.

15 Other marine life that is in this particular  
16 area. One of my neighbors who happens to be here tonight,  
17 she frequently kayaks on Mount Hope Bay and especially in  
18 the winter time, and there are seals in this area. In fact,  
19 she just told me tonight that one seal just left recently.  
20 So there are seals in this area which would be definitely  
21 impacted. There are seals that come up through the  
22 Narragansett Bay to get up into Mount Hope Bay.

23 The ship that will be coming in, one of the  
24 closest points is under the Mt. Hope bridge and that's 400  
25 feet. According to Marine Mammal Protection Act, you have

1 to take that into consideration. Not only as the seals  
2 would be coming up under the Mt. Hope bridge, but also as  
3 they are off Spar Island.

4 You need to deny the permit basically also not on  
5 that fact too, that the Marine Mammal Protection Act would  
6 be violated, by locating this facility in there.

7 Traffic studies have been undertaken by the  
8 Aquidnick Island Planning Commission and I'll submit that to  
9 the Commission electronically. It's a 64-page document  
10 which I didn't have time to download and print out for  
11 tonight, but the Aquidnick Island Planning Commission has  
12 concluded that traffic would be halted on the Pell Bridge  
13 for 16 minutes and 37 seconds while a tanker pass below and  
14 it would take up to 25 minutes and 37 seconds for the  
15 traffic to go back to normal on the Pell Bridge.

16 The Aquidnick Island Planning Commission has also  
17 -- their studies also conclude that traffic on the Mt. Hope  
18 Bridge, the bridge would be closed for 33 minutes and 12  
19 seconds to allow the tanker to pass and it would take  
20 traffic 46 minutes and 47 seconds to get back to normal. 46  
21 minutes that you're just disrupting people on the land,  
22 trying to get over the Mt. Hope Bridge.

23 And incidentally, the protocol for Roger Williams  
24 University to transport any student that has been injured,  
25 by ambulance, that has to be transported to Newport

1 Hospital. This means that that particular individual that  
2 was injured on Roger Williams University campus would not be  
3 able to get to Newport Hospital.

4 The regional needs. We hear that Waver's Cove  
5 Energy said that the regional needs are that we need more  
6 LNG and more natural gas in this area. Well I note that  
7 the Northeast Gateway Project is opened, the first LNG  
8 shipment has already taken in for that facility and in  
9 today's Providence Journal, the Algonquin Gas Transmission  
10 LLC has filed an application with FERC for a natural gas  
11 pipeline in this region, which will certainly serve the  
12 region and help the region.

13 I got to tell you something that what I'm totally  
14 angered and enraged about this entire project, and I'm very  
15 incensed by it, is by this proposal is that these people,  
16 Weaver's Cove have the audacity to construct this facility  
17 in our bay, Mount Hope Bay belongs to the people, not to  
18 Weaver's Cove.

19 (Applause.)

20 They want to put a 1,200 foot long berth, a jetty  
21 with 250 foot platform, four mooring dolphins. These are  
22 not little mooring dolphins, these are humongous, along with  
23 three breasting dolphins, fenders in an unloading platform,  
24 along with a pipeline up the Taunton River. Again, this is  
25 our bay.

1           I've been involved in trying to get this bay back  
2 to life. We're fighting the Brightman Point Power Plant for  
3 a number of years. We're almost there. The Environmental  
4 Protection Agency has come around and they've issued a new  
5 permit based upon the water -- what was happening was the  
6 Brightman Point Power Plant was discharging water at high  
7 temperatures. They will only issued the permit if those  
8 temperatures go down.

9           This is going to help the marine life to come  
10 back. But when you introduce this insane, idiotic project  
11 into our bay, it compromises our baby. It compromises  
12 people's ability to use the bay, to go out and fish and use  
13 it for recreational purposes, and use it for commercial  
14 purposes. We don't need it, we don't want it, and I  
15 certainly will never sit idly by and let this project  
16 happen. I will do everything I can possibly do in my power  
17 to make it sure that this is defeated.

18           I also have a piece of legislature I'm going to  
19 submit to you. It was passed by the Rhode Island House of  
20 Representative, sponsored by myself, Representative Rice,  
21 Representative Jackson, Representative Jublinsky,  
22 Representative Mallard, which requires that the Rhode Island  
23 General Assembly and every city in town, in Rhode Island,  
24 along the proposed route of an LNG tanker will have input  
25 and veto power of the emergency response plan that you

1 people require Weaver's Cove to enact.

2 Again, I can not say it more emphatically, I am  
3 never ever going to sit idly by and let you destroy the  
4 people's bay. Thank you.

5 (Applause.)

6 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you Representative Gallison.  
7 Our next commenter is Don Church and commenter on deck will  
8 be Joseph Carvalho.

9 MR. CHURCH: Yes, good evening. My name is  
10 Donald Church. My backyard is Mount Hope Bay. I have a  
11 facility in Fall River as a 1,000 yards of waterfront, which  
12 will be looking at this pipeline.

13 I listen to all these comments and I really  
14 wonder who is looking out for the average working man at  
15 Fall River and in the area. It certainly not any of the  
16 speakers that I've heard here to far, with the exception of  
17 one.

18 Quaker Fabrics is slowly going down the drain and  
19 every time there was a little excerpt in the newspaper, they  
20 excited the cost of energy as being one of the reasons  
21 they're going down.

22 Today you've got Swan Fabrics. They're just  
23 laying off one shift and they're laying off people  
24 individually at others. This area needs energy. It needs a  
25 constant supply of it.

1                   My career, I spent 40 years as a state pilot,  
2                   piloting vessels in Rhode Island, Massachusetts,  
3                   Connecticut, and New York. I know the area, I know the  
4                   dangers of shipping.

5                   Today they're still transporting propane ships,  
6                   liquefied propane into Providence. It has very, very much  
7                   the same characteristics as LNG. It's a cryogenic product.  
8                   No one even knows it.

9                   The Coast Guard regulations, I assume, are pretty  
10                  much the same, LNG/propane. There is a very, very large  
11                  propane tank on the dock of Municipal Pier. There is also a  
12                  very large LNG tank on the dock at Municipal Pier. There is  
13                  a very large LNG tanker on Bay Street, Fall River.

14                 For those people who are saying we could stand in  
15                 harm's way of a terrorist attack, none of these people have  
16                 said, let's shut down those tanks because there is a  
17                 possible terrorist attack.

18                 The one in Fall River, if you've got a good arm  
19                 you can hit it from the street with a stone. Why aren't  
20                 they saying shut those tanks down? Secure them? There is a  
21                 possible terrorist attack right there. You've got the City  
22                 Hall in Fall River, all you got to do is drive under it and  
23                 torch up a car, you gonna lose City Hall into 195 if there  
24                 is a possible terrorist attack.

25                 You cannot stop every project because somebody

1 might do something. If you do, you going back to the stone  
2 age.

3 For those folks who are saying pollution, we're  
4 going to ruin Mount Hope Bay, yet the fail to site  
5 Providence Island. We just got through a dredging project  
6 in Providence Island, a very contaminated material, they  
7 done what they call a Cad zone where they could bury  
8 materials that should be disposed of at sea.

9 Army Engineer testimony was when they went down  
10 river from this facility while they were dredging, over 400  
11 feet away they could not detect any sediment. You're not  
12 going to destroy the area by dredging.

13 If it is a fact, prove it. Where is the  
14 detrimental effect from dredging Providence Island? It  
15 doesn't exist. Scare tactics. Terrorism. You're going to  
16 contaminate the bay, you're going to lose the bay. Baloney,  
17 you can't prove it. There is nothing there that you can  
18 show where these things have happened.

19 A propane tanker, as I said is as safe as an LNG  
20 tanker. There is no difference, yet this is something new.  
21 The biggest problem in this area is that word that I just  
22 said, new. The minute you mention the word new, everybody  
23 starts to freak out. They don't want it, they don't  
24 understand it, there is absolutely no rational for what  
25 you're hearing.

1           You've got over one -- you know, the economy in  
2 this area, as I said before, needs energy. You just had one  
3 shoe drop, gasoline, you enjoy paying four bucks a gallon  
4 for gasoline? I hope the folks who have -- or opposing this  
5 project, and not just this project, all marine related  
6 projects, have a lot of money because the next shoe that's  
7 going to drop is going to be heating oil.

8           You're going to be -- projections are you're  
9 going to be paying \$5.50 a gallon for heating oil this  
10 winter. Gasoline and heating oil. You gonna run your  
11 thermostat down to 40 degrees? You either going to live in  
12 Florida or you gonna have some damn good clothing this  
13 winter. Right behind that will be natural gas and  
14 electricity.

15           If the political -- the politicians were really  
16 interested in helping this area, they would have gone out  
17 and recommended, advocated dredging Mount Hope Bay years  
18 ago. They would have also recommended taking down the  
19 Brightman Street Bridge.

20           When I first started piloting, they're going to  
21 take the bridge out. I retired from piloting, the bridge is  
22 still there. It is the greatest impediment to progress in  
23 this area.

24           When they're projecting, you know, the Brightman  
25 Point Power Plant, half of your cost of generating

1 electricity is from coal, half of the cost. Yet no one  
2 wants to dredge the channel but the power companies.

3 We got into this in Providence where we fought  
4 for 20 years to maintain dredging in Providence Island and  
5 it is the same rhetoric, no, no, no, it's going to destroy  
6 the world. We finally get it done after 20 years, we had  
7 absolutely no help from the oil companies, which are the  
8 major importers in Providence.

9 Nobody wanted to go before this type of a hearing  
10 and take the abuse. After the hearings are all over, after  
11 we done dredging, after we got the Cad Cells done, they came  
12 out and they utilized the Cad Cells to dig out their  
13 boroughs so they couldn't utilize the deepened channel. But  
14 they won't come before this board or any of any else that  
15 will not advocate dredging. They ill not take the abuse.

16 The end result of that is, they don't actually  
17 care. This is not from the industry, this is my assumption.  
18 They will provide you with natural gas, they will provide  
19 you with gasoline, they will provide you with electricity,  
20 at whatever the conditions that you generate for them to  
21 live by.

22 You don't want to dredge, you don't want to bring  
23 in natural gas, you gonna pay for it. And I don't really  
24 believe that the area can withstand the upcoming economic  
25 disaster that I think is coming.



1 name are Weaver's Cove and FERC. Every other agency, state,  
2 local, federal, doesn't matter, they always get the  
3 spelling correct except for FERC and Weaver's Cove. No  
4 connection there, I guess.

5 I'm the President of the Coalition of Responsible  
6 Siting of LNG Facilities. I'd like to start with a quote by  
7 a Pulitzer prize winning author Upton Sinclair. "It is  
8 difficult to get a man to understand something when his  
9 salary depends on his not understanding it."

10 (Applause.)

11 Thank you. I will not waste my time nor yours on  
12 addressing the issue before us that was resolved five years  
13 ago but has been kept on life support by the irresponsible  
14 actions of FERC.

15 Although everyone, everyone that is except the  
16 consultants paid by Weaver's Cove and everyone consists of  
17 the United States Environmental Protection Agency, United  
18 States Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife  
19 Services, NOAA Fisheries, Massachusetts Executive Office of  
20 Energy and Environmental Affairs, Massachusetts Department  
21 of Environmental Protection, Massachusetts Office of  
22 Coastal Zone Management, Massachusetts Division of Marine  
23 Fisheries, Massachusetts Division of Fish and Wildlife, and  
24 of all the equivalent Rhode Island state agencies, have all  
25 raised grave concerns about the Hess LNG proposal.

1           FERC has ignored them all and allowed this ill  
2 conceived LNG project to proceed. Ditto for safety and  
3 security concerns as everyone in attendance is well aware.

4           I want to thank the members of the United States  
5 Coast Guard. We are very grateful for them, and those of --  
6 well the Massachusetts Energy Facility Siting Board,  
7 they're not here. They'll be here tomorrow at Venus DeMilo  
8 tomorrow night.

9           So I want to thank the members of the United  
10 States Coast Guard for being here and I ask their  
11 understanding and pardon as I now turn my back on the  
12 hearing table. I refuse to stand here and address the  
13 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission while have absolutely  
14 zero respect for that Agency.

15           These FERC characters, although they surely won't  
16 say it, don't give a river rat's ass about what anyone here  
17 tonight, or later in written testimony has to say unless you  
18 are speaking in favor of the project.

19           Past practice, over five years of mindless  
20 hearings proves me 100% correct in my assessment. Hess LNG  
21 and their lackeys at FERC don't care about you or me so they  
22 obviously don't care about the river and bay environment.

23           Listen to this letter from the FERC to NOAA's  
24 Northeast Regional Office:

25           "We have determined that the Weaver's Cove LNG

1 Project would not have a substantial adverse affect on  
2 managed fisheries."

3 This is from FERC telling the folks in charge of  
4 fish and ocean resources, NOAA, that the Hess LNG Project  
5 will have no adverse affects. The FERC letter continues:

6 "Our conclusion is based on Weaver's Cove  
7 energies modeling results."

8 Isn't that great? And who paid for those results  
9 and what was demanded of the consultants that gathered the  
10 data for those results? What about the environmental  
11 studies and modeling done by state and federal  
12 environmental agencies? Well, that didn't come from  
13 Weaver's Cove so it must be flawed.

14 So what data went into Waver's Cove Energy's  
15 model? Only what Weaver's Cove Energy allowed in. Listen  
16 to what Hess LNG CEO, Gordon Shearer had to say about  
17 modeling. In a letter to Massachusetts Senator Edward  
18 Kennedy, Shearer is attempting to "debunk" his words, not  
19 mine, concerns raised about the dangers of importing and  
20 storing massive amounts of highly volatile energy in  
21 populated areas. In that letter, Shearer states, "we think  
22 we could all agree that scientists can differ on model  
23 results."

24 If scientists can differ on model results, then  
25 how can FERC, unless they're in the bag with Weaver's Cove,

1 state so assuredly "our conclusion is based on Weaver's Cove  
2 Energy modeling results.

3 Folks, they're all in this together. A  
4 despicable cabal of big energy promoters, fast buck LNG  
5 entrepreneurs, and unfortunately, our public servants at  
6 FERC. Hey, how about a little FERC trivia?

7 Who nominated some of the present FERC  
8 Commissioners? Ken Lay, the smartest man in the room. Who  
9 is FERC's project manager for Weaver's Cove and what are his  
10 qualifications? Rich McGuire sitting right behind me and  
11 his qualification for siting 4.4 billion cubic feet of clean  
12 burning gas in your backyard is a degree in parks and  
13 recreation, uh.

14 "I listen to you and I ignore you." What  
15 arrogant twit said that? Where, when, and to whom? Scarlet  
16 Shearer to Fall River City Council Steven Camero at the Hess  
17 LNG Dog and Pony Show last month at the Venus DeMilo  
18 restaurant.

19 And finally, at that same Venus DeMilo event,  
20 when I asked Shearer about past comments, that offshore  
21 siting wasn't possible, he had the audacity to say he had  
22 never said that and called me a liar.

23 FERC employees, my mom always told me one is  
24 known by the people one associates with. Okay folks, listen  
25 to this. Hope I get this right.

1 (Tape playing.)

2 Uh, we know whose voice that is, it's also on  
3 video tape right here, no other than Gordon Shearer, calling  
4 me a liar. So shame on Gordon Shearer, shame on Hess LNG,  
5 shame on Weaver's Cove Energy, but mostly, shame on FERC  
6 for continuing this charade. Thank you.

7 (Applause.)

8 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for your comments. The  
9 next commenter on deck will be representative David  
10 Sullivan.

11 MS. MORRILL: I thought you said Ann Morrill.

12 MR. MCGUIRE: Yes you're right.

13 MS. MORRILL: Okay. Fellow Americans, that  
14 includes FERC, we hope and we know it includes the Coast  
15 Guard.

16 MR. MCGUIRE: If you will give your name and  
17 spell it.

18 MS. MORRILL: Oh, Ann Morrill, MORRILL, from the  
19 Kickemuit River Council. The Kickemuit River Council is an  
20 all volunteer 501(c)(3) organization incorporated in the  
21 state of Rhode Island, formed in 1973, composed of  
22 approximately 350 families on the shores of the salt water  
23 Kickemuit and Warren and Bristol Rhode Island.

24 It's a member of the Rhode Island Rivers Council  
25 and they exist to preserve, protect, and enhance the water

1 quality of the Kickemuit River, one of the four rivers  
2 flowing into Mount Hope Bay, the only Rhode Island River.

3 The Kickemuit River is a conditional salt water  
4 class A river. The Rhode Island Mount Hope Bay is type 2  
5 from Tuisita Point to Haven Rapids Dock and type 1 from the  
6 dock to Mt. Hope Bridge. It is worth protecting.

7 We are firmly against this proposal. Necessary  
8 maintenance dredging and other dredging will poorly affect  
9 the water quality in Mount Hope Bay and then the Kickemuit  
10 River. It will stir up old pollutants in the sediment that  
11 will poorly affect citizen's use of the bay and the four  
12 rivers.

13 This will also be detrimental to sea life. This  
14 proposal is inappropriate in this populated area. This  
15 facility will affect property values and citizen safety and  
16 health.

17 The use of Rhode Island bridges will be affected  
18 for citizens going to work or hospitals. It is very  
19 inappropriate location. It will poorly affect the use of  
20 the bay for boating, fishing, and swimming. It will disrupt  
21 normal bridge and bay activity, public safety is a deep,  
22 valid concern. Major complaints will not be addressed by  
23 this location.

24 The Kickemuit River has previously presented its  
25 concerns to the United States Army Corp of Engineers, the

1 Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management, the  
2 Coast Guard, Rhode Island and Massachusetts Federal Senators  
3 and Representatives, and the Massachusetts Legislature.

4 We've testified at public hearings in this  
5 matter. Dismissal of the dangers of this project by  
6 Weaver's Cove Energy does not affect reality or potential.

7 Our neighbors and friends from Fall River,  
8 Somerset and Swansea should not be put in danger by a  
9 federal agency. It is the agency's function and duty and  
10 reason for being, to protect our citizens and not support  
11 corporate greed when there are other more suitable and safe  
12 alternatives in the region.

13 Safety is the key. The placing of the pipe for  
14 transporting LNG from the facility to Fall River is on an  
15 earthquake fault. This is a gamble, an added danger and  
16 worry.

17 I spoke to FERC about -- I spoke to Waver's Cove  
18 about it and they said they were going to make the pipe so  
19 it would stand at 6.5, I think, earthquake and I said what  
20 about China? That was a 9 point earthquake, right? Anyway,  
21 the added danger and worry that citizens who live through  
22 the last earthquake in Swansea should not have to live with.

23

24 The families of the people in China who lost  
25 their children in the earthquake, would agree. Public safety

1       should be paramount. It is the biggest consideration. No  
2       pipeline is worth the destruction that is possible.

3               We've been told that the Federal Energy  
4       Regulatory Commission, who voted for the first proposal in  
5       Fall River, was headed by Mr. Baker who was a lawyer for  
6       Weaver's Cove law firm. Is that true?

7               MR. MCGUIRE: Yes.

8               MS. MORRILL: Oh, because they was asked at the  
9       public hearing in Bristol and the young man who represented  
10      Weaver's Cove said yes it was true. Anyway, okay.

11              The United States Coast Guard has said it cannot  
12      ensure the safety of shipping LNG to such a terminal. This  
13      proposal is against the Clean Water Act, the Rhode Island  
14      Constitution, the Warren Harbor Management Plan, the Warren  
15      Comprehensive Plan, Bristol and Warren, the Rhode Island  
16      State Senators and Representatives, the Federal Senators,  
17      Rhode Island Federal Senators and Representatives have  
18      helped protected and improved the waters of the Kickemuit  
19      River and Mount Hope Bay for all our citizens.

20              This alternate location amounts to a ploy by  
21      Weaver's Cove Energy to succeed at the expense of the  
22      environment and the public. The Kickemuit River presents  
23      its petition of 704 citizens against any dredging of Mount  
24      Hope Bay to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. Will  
25      they get that petition?

1                   MR. MCGUIRE: Can you just clarify. Are you  
2 filing this petition or you want me to submit it into the  
3 record?

4                   MS. MORRILL: I'm filing it and submitting. I  
5 thought if I brought it tonight it would be sent to FERC, is  
6 that true?

7                   MR. MCGUIRE: I can put this into the public  
8 record.

9                   MS. MORRILL: Yes, I would like that.

10                  MR. MCGUIRE: Okay.

11                  MS. MORRILL: We would also send a copy of the  
12 petition and this letter to Selma Herman, Esquire of the  
13 Massachusetts Energy Facility Siting Board, 1 South Station,  
14 Boston, MA. The voices of the people should not be  
15 ignored.

16                  MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you.

17                  MS. MORRILL: You're welcome.

18                  MR. MCGUIRE: After Representative Sullivan,  
19 Reverend Michael Oda.

20                  REPRESENTATIVE SULLIVAN: Thank you very much.  
21 I'm Representative David Sullivan and I represent the Sixth  
22 Bristol District in the State of Massachusetts, Fall River  
23 particular. It's my district where they are attempting to  
24 site this ill-conceived terminal. I know that this is  
25 environmental issued here, but I know with the introduction

1 where some other comments made, I would like to add on to  
2 what was said.

3 I know that Mr. McGuire was talking about the  
4 issue of navigation and the issue of unsuitability of  
5 navigation and one of the things that he pointed out, and  
6 I'm glad it's still sitting there, is the old Brightman  
7 Street Bridge. He is absolutely correct, that is an  
8 obstacle to this project.

9 However, what he didn't tell you is that the  
10 Coast Guards particular findings in determining the  
11 unsuitability for navigational purposes did not just result  
12 from the Brightman Street Bridge. It actually results from  
13 all the way up to Prudence Island and a navigational route  
14 all the way down to Fall River, through Rhode Island waters,  
15 into Massachusetts water down through the Taunton river.

16 Now you might say, what does that exactly mean?  
17 It doesn't take too long ago that we just remember that off  
18 of Cape Cod, that one of the LNG super tankers lost power.  
19 Now the navigation route, 22 miles that's coming down  
20 through Rhode Island waters, and going into Massachusetts  
21 waters, there are very narrow passageways.

22 And one of the things that Captain Nash  
23 identified as being problematic along that route is that if  
24 an LNG super tanker had lost power along that route, they  
25 couldn't turn it around. There are sections of the route

1 down where that tanker would be stuck. And let me tell you  
2 something, for a volume of material which that if it did  
3 catch fire, and you can't put an LNG fire out and I know  
4 that because I sat on the Public Safety Homeland Security  
5 Committee for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts when the  
6 Boston Pilots Association were talking about different high  
7 interest cargos, and the distinction they made about LNG and  
8 other high interest cargos, including jet cargos, jet fuel,  
9 oil, and different things like that, because that's what was  
10 being discussed, they said the difference is, you can't put  
11 an LNG fire out. I think that that's quite significant.

12 So I think it was very important to make sure  
13 that you understand that the unsuitability determined by  
14 Captain Nash was not just based on the Brightman Street  
15 Bridge.

16 It's based on the entire route coming down  
17 through Narragansett Bay by Newport, Narragansett Bay, Mount  
18 Hope Bay and down into the Taunton River. And I thank him  
19 for making that decision because what he did was he listened  
20 to what people were saying and then he took his working  
21 knowledge and made a professional decision. And that's  
22 something that we're concerned about that this maintains and  
23 continues to be not sort of clouded by this new so-called  
24 offshore proposal which is really about 20 miles inshore.

25 I will now get to -- oh, I did want to say that

1 I'm very proud to have stood side-by-side with Rhode Island  
2 officials in this fight. I think it is unique to see two  
3 states come together and stand against something that's  
4 ill-conceived like this.

5 In regards to the environmental concerns, first  
6 of all I want to make it clear that I believe that these two  
7 hearings being held by the Federal Energy Regulatory  
8 Commission, they're act of futility.

9 I'm sure that you are aware that the fact that  
10 the United States Coast Guard is deem the proposed transit  
11 route is unsuitable from navigational safety perspective and  
12 it's unfortunate that FERC continues to give hope and  
13 credence to this ridiculous and dangerous plan.

14 This new so-called offshore idea that the  
15 Weaver's Cove is proposing will devastate the air and water  
16 fowl and the plant life of the two bays in the Taunton  
17 River.

18 Dredging will have a tremendous impact on the  
19 ecosystem. It will place a gigantic burden on all aquatic  
20 life forms in the river and bay. The waterway support a  
21 vast array of life and would be negatively impact by the  
22 dredge spoils, ripped out of the bed of the river.

23 There exist a delicate balance that allows plant  
24 and animal life to flourish within these waterways and the  
25 balance will be destroyed if Weaver's Cove is allowed to

1       move forward with dredging, in addition to the maintenance  
2       dredging that will have to take place every few years, as  
3       long as they stay in operation.

4               Whether it's the old plan or this radical new  
5       plan, it will impact the benthic invertebrates -- do I need  
6       to spell that - okay, benthic invertebrates and other  
7       aquatic foreign species. This project would also negatively  
8       impact commercial and recreational fish species important to  
9       the New England fisherman.

10              Not only man, but ospreys, bald eagles, various  
11       gulls and other sea bird species, marine mammals and  
12       predatory fish will all suffer from the destruction of Mount  
13       Hope Bay and the Taunton River habitat.

14              Nothing has changed as far as the dangers from  
15       mercury, cadmium, lead, copper, and other metals, once  
16       they've been disturbed and placed back in the waterways from  
17       the dredging. Dredging and transportation of the sediment  
18       will cause resuspension and redistribution of heavy metals.

19              Even the Department of the Interior stated, Hess  
20       has refused to incorporate restrictions to protect  
21       downstream anadromous fish immigrations that's currently  
22       proposed. The dredging for this project would have  
23       unacceptable, adverse impacts -- this is the Department of  
24       the Interior -- to the anadromous fishery resources in the  
25       Taunton River without time of year restrictions for both

1 upstream and downstream migration. We continue to recommend  
2 this application be denied.

3 The many transits being planned for the arrival  
4 and departure of LNG tankers will upset the sea floor and  
5 harm commercial fishing industry by destroying the fish egg  
6 beds. Furthermore, it will harm the tourism and  
7 recreational industry from Newport Rhode Island, all the way  
8 to Somerset Massachusetts.

9 There are numerous alternatives to this plan and  
10 these alternatives do not impact tourism, public safety,  
11 fish beds. Why would we continue pushing for a project that  
12 would not only put public safety at risk, but also impact  
13 the livelihood of thousands of residents in Massachusetts  
14 and Rhode Island?

15 The new proposal has introduced new negatives.  
16 Not only will the area have a dangerous LNG terminal, which  
17 by the way, there will be 55 million gallons of LNG in the  
18 tank, if you happen to have a worse case scenario and that  
19 was released, you just take those 55 million gallons,  
20 multiply that by 600, then you have the volume of gas that  
21 would actually be floating through the air or burning.

22 The area has numerous coves and inlets that could  
23 lead to a surprise attack upon the tankers. Now I keep  
24 hearing at times, there is often comments made about, you  
25 know, the issue of terrorism. Sometimes they say, you know,

1 who is going to come here and cause terrorism? Well,  
2 terrorism is a real risk and I think we all know that. But  
3 it isn't just terrorism that we have to be concerned about.

4

5 We also have to be concerned about human error  
6 and mechanical failure. Skikda, Algeria, which was an LNG  
7 terminal in Algeria, did have a serious incident there with  
8 a massive explosion there and that particular place, which  
9 was not in a densely populated area, took many lives.

10 Recently Cindy Hurst, a Lieutenant Commander in  
11 the United States Naval Reserves and a political military  
12 research analyst with foreign military studies office said  
13 that there are a number of known vulnerabilities within the  
14 LNG industry and they lie on the human factor.

15 According to an article she wrote, entitled  
16 Liquefied Natural Gas Tankers Remain Giant Terror Targets,  
17 there are numerous security flaws that exist within the LNG  
18 industry.

19 These flaws are, inadequate vetting of crews  
20 inadequate U.S. security measures for facilities, shortages  
21 of qualified mariners, and U.S. offices. No United States  
22 flagged LNG vessels and the threat of hijacking.

23 Recently in a letter to Weaver's Cove, the Coast  
24 Guard stated that the project is unsuitable from a  
25 navigational safety perspective, as I had previously

1 mentioned.

2 But what was interested about what Captain Roy  
3 Nash said, "therefore no additional public meetings and work  
4 shops with state or local officials to further address  
5 security risks, resource demands, capabilities and  
6 coordination requirements will be held. Moreover, I view  
7 the safety of navigation as paramount.

8 My recommendation is that the waterway is  
9 unsuitable, generating no additional environmental  
10 documentation is required." Except with FERC, I guess.

11 Due to Captain Nash's statement, I can only  
12 regard this hearing as a ploy to try to pump life into an  
13 already dead project. It makes one wonder whom the FERC  
14 actually works for. It is for the citizens of the United  
15 States and their public safety, or for the vast and  
16 politically powerful oil and gas companies.

17 You have to ask the question. I believe the  
18 answer is crystal clear from my perspective. LNG is not a  
19 bad fuel. It is a foreign fuel. We often times talk about  
20 having to get off foreign fuel, but I don't think we can  
21 wean ourselves right away. But every federal study  
22 demonstrates that you don't place these things in densely  
23 populated areas, and that's the bottom line.

24 (Applause.)

25 I want to say one last thing, is that the risks,

1 as I said, coming down through Rhode Island continue to  
2 exist but this is about money folks. This is about money.  
3 And if that terminal is built, in Fall River, the reason is,  
4 is that they will not have to spend a whole lot of money to  
5 build the infrastructure to get to the grid because it's in  
6 close proximity to the Algonquin line and they can get the  
7 money into the grid.

8 It's about money, it's about location, it's not  
9 about the safety of people. Actually they will set aside  
10 the safety of people in order to make a buck.

11 Let's face it, the gas and oil industries profit,  
12 really you haven't been suffering too much. So why should  
13 we be suffering for them? I want to thank you for the  
14 opportunity to address you.

15 (Applause.)

16 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for your comment. The  
17 next commenter after the Reverend is Counselor Lou DiPalma.

18 REVEREND: Captain Perry, Mr. McGuire. Good  
19 evening. I'm wearing a particular hat tonight. I'm one of  
20 the poor chaplain up in Boston Harbor. I'm with New England  
21 Seafarers Mission. We're fairly new. We've only been  
22 doing this up there since 1880.

23 We take care of merchant marine Seafarers. The  
24 fellow who spoke before me, the representative, mentioned  
25 that there are no U.S. flagged LNG ships. There aren't that

1 many U.S. flagged ships. This part of what's unintended  
2 consequences of a piece of protectionist legislation meant  
3 to protect the U.S. maritime industry signed back in 1917 by  
4 President Wilson essentially decimated the American maritime  
5 industry.

6           These ships are foreign flagged but they are  
7 highly inspected by the U.S. Coast Guard, which has a  
8 mandate for safety. The crews on them are highly, highly  
9 trained professionals and they are indeed vetted by their  
10 manning agencies, their foreign crews.

11           What we do at New England Seafarers Mission, and  
12 other maritime missionaries, we do five things. We assist  
13 them to contact home. These men and women on these ships  
14 serve nine to twelve months on a contract. We assist them  
15 to get their wages home to their families.

16           They're working for what we would be considering  
17 short money. An able bodied seaman makes a thousand bucks a  
18 month. But if you're from the Philippines where the per  
19 capita GDP is \$4,000 a year, you are the big man on campus.

20           These are well trained, well disciplined people.  
21 You have officers who are graduates of top maritime  
22 academies. We're church, we do churchy stuff, we do  
23 hospitality. We receive them, we assist them, and we also  
24 do advocacy. It is in that role that I'm here tonight, as  
25 an advocate for Seafarers and for the industrial waterfront.

1

2           Seafarers need to call home. If you've ever been  
3 deployed for a long time, you know how precious that 15, 20,  
4 30 minute phone call is to your spouse, you know how  
5 precious that letter is.

6

7           One of the issues of Seafarers aboard LNG ships  
8 and other ships are that if they are denied the ability to  
9 call home, if they are unable to get to a pay phone, which  
10 is usually how they do it, with prepaid international  
11 calling cards, well you get homesick and it becomes part of  
12 the safety, health and welfare. You get homesick and this  
13 is a problem.

14

15           The shore side tie in up above the bridges would  
16 actually be preferable from a maritime mission's standpoint.  
17 It's not going to happen it looks like, but from t here, we  
18 could get them two phones.

19

20           Up at District Gas in Boston, which is in  
21 Everett, it's up the Mystic River, and we are able to mange  
22 the Tobin Bridge perfectly well.

23

24           Up there, District Gas arranges for the Seafarers  
25 to get on a bus from within the secure facility and they are  
26 bused to shopping malls where they can make their calls.  
27 We, the Chaplains go up on board and provide them with that  
28 opportunity, provide them with the ability to use a cell  
29 phone to call.

1                   We can address these issues best further upstream  
2 but we can also address them down at the remote location  
3 with technology. If there is good EVDO, the Sprint or  
4 Cingular cell phone internet service we are able to hook up  
5 internet phones through that and have four to eight calling  
6 stations. There are other possibilities as well.

7                   As someone who stands on board these LNG ships,  
8 I'll tell you, the safety is great. I have to use this TWIC  
9 card. This is a Department of Homeland Security Card, it's  
10 got my fingerprints on it, but this does not get me in. I  
11 also have to have a Mass Port ID. I get checked out at the  
12 gate, I get checked out on board the ship by the man who's  
13 standing there.

14                  Safety is high. Security is very high. The  
15 Coast Guard has armed water craft guarding the pathway.  
16 There are upstream from this terminal, all sorts of good  
17 marinas and passage is allowed back and forth through the  
18 channel, it all works. Recreational use of the Mystic River  
19 continues when an LNG ship is in and safety is maintained.

20                  Advocating for the industrial waterfront. When  
21 we take a piece of the industrial waterfront out, we put  
22 condominiums up there, shopping, whatever. That space is  
23 lost to real economic productivity for 70 to 100 years and  
24 that is a big blow to the economy. It's a big blow to real  
25 jobs, good jobs, jobs that actually get something done, not



1                   We're looking to have Rhode Island and Mass to be  
2 your test bed for a four and a half mile pipeline. The  
3 question I was going to ask, and I'm glad the lady asked the  
4 question earlier, is this the first time you've done this  
5 type of pipeline? The answer is yes.

6                   As an engineer, I'm a firm believer in facts and  
7 data. Modeling is critical. Theoretical information is  
8 important. When I go and build the real system, and my  
9 background is in military weapons systems and homeland  
10 security systems, it's critical that you build that first  
11 system and then you ratify, compare that first system  
12 against the model and simulation that you had done. Guess  
13 what? The model and simulation you've done, you changed it.  
14 It doesn't mimic anything what the real world looks like.

15                   What you're looking to do here is have Rhode  
16 Island and Massachusetts be your test bed for a 4.25 mile  
17 underground pipe. Take that somewhere else. I recommend it  
18 be done in other places. We should not be the test bed.

19                   I think we need to say no to this project and as  
20 an engineer, one of the models we typically use and I'm  
21 holding up a penny right now, probably that and a dollar I  
22 have in my wallet, since I'm here.

23                   As an engineer, we look at facts and we look at  
24 data so it's in God we trust, everyone else bring your data  
25 with regards to the model there is not enough data here to

1 support this project so I encourage you not to support it.

2 (Applause.)

3 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for your comments. After  
4 Eric Husher speaks, the next commenter is Steve Stoute.

5 MR. HUSHER: Good evening. My name is Eric  
6 Husher, that's H-U-S-H-E-R. I just want to look at a few of  
7 these things. I've heard some of these things mentioned  
8 before but I'm going to go ahead and say them again. I'd  
9 like to look at this issue under three different  
10 categories, both legal, environmental, and economic.

11 Captain Perry, I understand there are federal  
12 definitions of what constitutes "offshore." Is that  
13 correct?

14 CAPTAIN PERRY: Yes.

15 MR. HUSHER: And that this does not constitute  
16 offshore, does it?

17 CAPTAIN PERRY: No.

18 MR. HUSHER: This is actually inshore. That's  
19 number one. Number 2. Back in 2005, former FERC Chairman  
20 Pat Wood stated that only seven to nine new LNG terminals  
21 would be needed in the entire U.S. along with expansions  
22 and peak shaving facilities.

23 There are now, including Broad Water, Long Island  
24 Sound, 31 projects already in service, under construction,  
25 or affirmative by FERC. The vast excess, surplus of LNG

1 import capacity.

2 I also noted, just taking a look on the internet,  
3 there is a lot of problems going on in the gas industry, LNG  
4 industry now with supply of LNG. There is a lot of places  
5 for the supply to come in, but there just isn't that much  
6 supply to come in.

7 Several LNG terminals in the northeast, including  
8 Maine and up in Nova Scotia, Barrhead LNG in Point Topper,  
9 Nova Scotia, they shelve these projects, not because they  
10 couldn't get permitting or because the local people didn't  
11 like it or they didn't have a place for the gas to go, but  
12 they could not get the gas to come in in the first place  
13 because it simply was not available in the international  
14 market line.

15 Now you noted that a lot of people mentioned the  
16 project up in Gloucester, offshore, which is 13 miles  
17 offshore, not 13 miles off the bay, 13 miles at sea, okay.  
18 That facility actually opened in December of last year but  
19 they weren't able to get their first shipment of LNG until  
20 April of this year.

21 Now it's interesting to talk about, you know, 50  
22 to 70 ships coming up the bay here to go to the proposed  
23 Weaver's Cove facility, but I'm wondering does Weaver Cove  
24 actually have any kind of contracts online for this gas to  
25 come in there in the first place?

1           If that's the case and they don't, I don't see  
2 what this facility is going to benefit either this area, New  
3 England, or the United States, or the United States economy  
4 or the region's economy either.

5           As far as environmental issues, we've talked  
6 about this, the dredging. Dredging, whether they're  
7 dredging a shipping channel or they're dredging to put in  
8 this pipeline, is actually about the same amount of dredging  
9 when you come down to the end of the road. What you do with  
10 all this material?

11           I know what Providence say, they had to dig a  
12 special case on the base of the bottom of the harbor to put  
13 all the materials because they couldn't dump it offshore.  
14 Maybe that could be done, maybe it could be done someplace  
15 but is it going to happen in Massachusetts or is it going to  
16 happen in Rhode Island?

17           Now this project, I know this offshore facility,  
18 both offshore facility should say, is within Massachusetts  
19 boundaries. Is there any kind of regulations that are  
20 associated with this kind of material coming out of  
21 Massachusetts waters and they being dumped into Rhode Island  
22 waters? Well that now require some coordination. Or are  
23 they going to take it further up the Taunton River and dump  
24 it up there somewhere?

25           I'd like to see that kind of stuff addressed and

1 I haven't seen anything like that addressed.

2 Finally, with the new terminals that have come  
3 online, I know the one in Gloucester has the capacity to  
4 provide 20% of all of New England's, all of the Northeast  
5 LNG requirements, now they have another one going up in  
6 Canada. You have two up in Canada, another one down in  
7 Gloucester, then there is Everett and Boston too.

8 I don't see what the necessity is for yet another  
9 facility at this time, especially when it's not going to co  
10 me online until, I think it's when they say, 2013? Now  
11 these facilities are already online and they're already  
12 providing gas. They're already providing gas they can find.

13

14 They're having it shipped from Algeria to  
15 Trinidad to God knows where to try to find the LNG to get it  
16 in. Maybe that has something to do with the proposals that  
17 the President's come out with lately about releasing the  
18 Continental Shelf now for offshore drilling as well. Maybe  
19 that's what they're looking at, but with the current  
20 supplies that are out there, I'm not so sure that Weaver's  
21 Cover is going to be able to keep itself supplied enough to  
22 make any difference.

23 Finally, this issue has come up again and again,  
24 and again. Weaver's Cove has come back with this change and  
25 that change and this is the latest change, when really there

1 is only one change that's going to satisfy everybody, from  
2 an environmental aspect, from a economic aspect, from a  
3 military aspect, as well as the Coast Guard, Navy. Ask to  
4 put the thing truly offshore, like off the end of Sechuana  
5 Point about ten miles.

6 (Applause.)

7 I don't know how many of you know this or not,  
8 but there is a right of way and a LNG pipeline now that goes  
9 from Paul River, all the way down to the end of Sechuana  
10 Point. Now, since that pipeline is already t here, if you  
11 build your fancy facility offshore and 13 miles offshore,  
12 you already have a place to hook it up to. You don't need  
13 to go to Weaver's Cove or even go through Fall River at all.  
14 Then all the facilities could be done way out of range of  
15 any kind of explosive activity, well out of range of  
16 terrorism and I think it would be to everyone's benefit if  
17 that kind of a program was presented. I think they'd get a  
18 lot more support.

19 I'm not against LNG, I'm not against energy for  
20 New England, I don't think anybody is. I think that's why  
21 we're seeing these new facilities coming online already.  
22 But one more, at this point, it seems to be more a case of  
23 greed, maybe personal greed. I don't know what's going on  
24 as far as that goes.

25 I can tell you one thing though, that it seems to

1 me that Mr. Hess might want to consider hiring some new  
2 engineers and maybe some new lawyers too because I think  
3 these guys are all getting paid, they're getting paid again  
4 and again and again, every time they got to come up with a  
5 new plan, they have to get paid again.

6 Now, seems to me if they failed one time, okay,  
7 well, oh well, that happens. Go back and do it better next  
8 time. But they aren't doing it better. They keep coming  
9 back and each time it's worse than the last.

10 (Applause.)

11 Now this guy with his own money, he's digging  
12 himself deeper and deeper, he's not getting anywhere near to  
13 getting this project through. We ought to know, at least we  
14 all hope, there is going to be a significant change in  
15 Washington shortly and when that happens, there's going to  
16 be some changes at FERC, there's going to be some changes at  
17 the EPA too and if he think these things that have been, you  
18 know, washed over the last few go arounds is going to happen  
19 again, I submit that that's not going to happen again and  
20 that's a good thought to think about. Thank you very much.

21 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for your comment. Our  
22 next commenter is Steve Stoke, Bristol Park Shores. The  
23 next commenter is Terrence Tierney, attorney general Patrick  
24 Lynch and the commenter on deck is Karen Crowmell.

25 MR. TIERNEY: Good evening, my name is Terrence

1 Tierney, T-I-E-R-N-E-Y. I'm a Special Assistant Attorney  
2 General and I'm representing Attorney General Patrick Lynch  
3 tonight.

4 We first like to thank FERC for convening this  
5 scoping session here in Rhode Island and for its recognition  
6 of the potential adverse environmental impacts to our state,  
7 resulting from the proposed in-bay berth project being  
8 considered.

9 And I say in-bay because this is not truly an  
10 offshore project as other people have pointed out, this is  
11 not miles offshore like those in Gloucester, this is  
12 literally right in our bay. And so I suggest people should  
13 start referring to this as the in-bay project, not the  
14 offshore proposal.

15 Now we intend to submit formal written comments  
16 to FERC prior to the deadline of July 7th, but would like to  
17 take this opportunity to present just some of our concerns  
18 about the intended scope of the Environmental Impact  
19 Statement.

20 Initially, we would like to note that the  
21 proposed amendment to the project does not avoid the  
22 environmental harms and public safety risks that are  
23 associated with the original Weaver's Cove proposal. In  
24 fact, in many such risks have doubled.

25 For example, instead of a single land-based

1 location, needing to be protected and secure 24/7, we're  
2 looking at two potential terrorist target sites now,  
3 including a well lit platform several stories high, located  
4 right in the middle of our Mount Hope Bay.

5 Now we therefore ask that your analysis include  
6 all environmental impacts that are associated with safety  
7 and security exclusion zones around the offloading central  
8 platform where activity such as fishing and boating will be  
9 excluded for the first time in recorded history.

10 We also ask that FERC specifically analyze the  
11 environmental impacts from a deliberate attack by a  
12 terrorist group on the proposed unloading platform at a time  
13 when a delivery vessel would be offloading LNG. And  
14 specifically we're looking for an analysis of a hijacked  
15 jumbo jet being crashed into both the structure and the  
16 vessel, similar to the attacks that have occurred in our  
17 country at the Pentagon and the World Trade Center.

18 The Environmental Impact Statement should also  
19 analyze the massive obstruction to free and open navigation  
20 in Mount Hope Bay which will be resulting from the proposed  
21 location of a 30,000 square foot platform in an estuary of  
22 national significance.

23 As you know, FERC policies require that Weaver's  
24 Cove must be able to demonstrate control of the site of the  
25 proposed facilities before proceeding with permitting.

1                   We therefore hope and expect that the  
2           Environmental Impact Statement that you prepare, will  
3           discuss the need to obtain permission from the owners of the  
4           submerged lands, which Weaver's Cove intends to simply  
5           dredge away and then occupy for decades.

6                   The public safety concerns which need to be  
7           addressed in the EIS include the inherent dangers associated  
8           with the two and a quarter mile long LNG pipelines now being  
9           proposed.

10                  As you know, this represent new and unproven  
11           technology which has never been used anywhere in the world  
12           for this type of underwater application.

13                  Similarly, please thoroughly analyze the  
14           structural integrity of the proposed pipeline and platform  
15           in the event of an earthquake. We also ask that you closely  
16           consider the many noise and visual impacts the area  
17           residents associated with both the construction and the  
18           operation of the in-bay facilities, including all lighting  
19           and warning signal aspects of the project.

20                  The EIS you prepare must also consider the many  
21           impacts to Rhode Island from the proposed dredging and  
22           disposal of at least three million cubic yards of submerged  
23           land.

24                  Plans to haul this material by barge through  
25           Mount Hope Bay and Narragansett Bay to an offshore disposal

1 site will severely disrupt the 60,000 recreational boaters  
2 who use this area and present public safety issues which  
3 are in addition to those associated with the LNG delivery  
4 vessels.

5 With respect to those dredging impacts, we  
6 implore you to not simply rest on the EIS that was prepared  
7 years ago for the original project. We believe the amount  
8 of material to be dredged was underestimated in that FEIS  
9 and of course the disposal location has now changed and  
10 this location will severely impact Rhode Island due to  
11 interruptions from barge traffic.

12 As you may know, Weaver's Cove has refused Rhode  
13 Island's reasonable request for information about its  
14 planned dredging activities but FERC is in the position to  
15 insist that such relevant information be made available to  
16 the public on a timely basis, as it becomes available.

17 The new EIS also needs to better analyze the many  
18 adverse socioeconomic impacts related to LNG delivery,  
19 including bridge closures and the intended traffic delays  
20 which, frankly were largely ignored in the last FEIS  
21 through assumptions made by the FERC, which were  
22 unwarranted.

23 Rhode Island is very concerned with the impacts  
24 to our wildlife and marine resources including the permanent  
25 loss of shell fish habitat.



1           For the purposes of the Environmental Impact  
2 Statement you are preparing, I want to touch on four areas  
3 of concern: dredging, access, economic impact, and security.

4           Dredging the bay would be an environmental  
5 disaster. There is no other way to describe the potential  
6 impact to the life that exist in and round the bay.

7           Decades of manufacturing has left poisonous  
8 sediments on the floor of the bay which will be churned up  
9 by the dredging necessary to run a four mile pipe up the bay  
10 and up the river.

11           In addition to the immediate impact on the fish  
12 and wildlife that would be poisoned by the toxic sludge,  
13 what about the long term consequences of releasing who knows  
14 what into the waters of the bay? Would we find out that IQ  
15 levels of children born to woman who swim in the area are 30  
16 points lower than they should be?

17           Will those of us who eat native shellfish get  
18 cancer at a rate 25 times that of our friends who don't eat  
19 shellfish? The bottom line is that we don't know what the  
20 consequences are but we do know that stirring up 130 plus  
21 years of manufacturing poisons is a really bad idea any way  
22 you look at it.

23           Chances are that if you live in this area you  
24 enjoy the water. As I look around the room, I see sailors  
25 and fishermen, swimmers and boaters. For many of us, the

1 day the boat goes in is as significant as the birthday or  
2 anniversary. It's marked on the calendar and it is a day to  
3 look forward to.

4 If this berthing facility is sited in the middle  
5 of Mount Hope Bay, what will it mean for the hundreds of  
6 thousands of people from Rhode Island and Massachusetts who  
7 enjoy these waters every, year? The security perimeter for  
8 LNG transport will be large, so both traffic will be halted  
9 from Jamestown to Fall River every time an LNG delivery is  
10 made.

11 Suddenly our waterways will be closed with no  
12 notice given and no end time in sight. This will cripple  
13 commercial fisherman who already have limited time on the  
14 water due to weather and other governmental regulations, and  
15 ruining the quality of life for the rest of us who enjoy the  
16 water on a regular basis.

17 The area between Bristol and Newport is  
18 considered the sailing hub of the U.S. In addition to the  
19 commercial fishermen, many Rhode Islanders are employed in  
20 the marine trades, from boat building to sail making, to  
21 designing racing yachts. The industry is one of the few  
22 bright lights in the Rhode Island economy.

23 The LNG facility and the unpredictability it  
24 brings with it will have a devastating effect on this  
25 industry. Not only will major sailing events choose to go

1 elsewhere, but boat builders and brokers will leave, not  
2 wanting their businesses to be subject to the vagaries of  
3 the LNG tanker schedule.

4 We also depend heavily on tourism here and we  
5 already know that the cruise industry, which has started to  
6 make stops in Newport and Bristol and various areas, won't  
7 risk being stuck in port because of an LNG ship. They'll  
8 just go elsewhere, taking their tourist dollars with them.

9 Frankly, I have a hard time getting my arms  
10 around the LNG security issues. Hess tells us how safe LNG  
11 transport is and how unlikely it is there will be an  
12 accident, but then very quickly points out how far away from  
13 land the facility is.

14 The GAO says, and I quote, "a terrorist attack on  
15 an LNG tanker arriving at a terminal could ignite an  
16 explosion and fire so fierce, that people a mile away will  
17 be burned."

18 And in April, President Bush threatened to veto  
19 an \$8.4 billion Coast Guard budget bill because it forced  
20 the Coast Guard to provide security at LNG facilities. The  
21 White House protest it saying, it will divert finite Coast  
22 Guard assets from other high priority missions and provide  
23 an unwarranted and unnecessary subsidy for the LNG owners.

24 And on June 3rd, the Coast Guard of Massachusetts  
25 established a 500 meter security zone around the Northeast

1 Gateway facility, effective closing that one in the middle  
2 of July.

3           So where does this leave us? I agree that tax  
4 dollars shouldn't be spent guarding private property. But  
5 if this facility is created in our backyard, who is going to  
6 provide security? Can the Coast Guard protect us? What  
7 will it entail? Will it be enough or too much?

8           The passage under Mt. Hope Bridge is narrow.  
9 Will students at Roger Williams have to stay in their dorms  
10 when a ship passes by? Will residents at the Water's Edge  
11 have to evacuate? We do know that if the security  
12 parameter is similar to the Northeast Gateways, both the  
13 Pell and Mt. Hope Bridges will need to be closed for  
14 deliveries, causing horrific traffic jams and inconvenience  
15 for residents and tourists alike.

16           The most offensive part of this proposal and the  
17 process in general, is that it's unnecessary. We don't need  
18 the facility and it will be a white elephant shortly after  
19 construction.

20           While I appreciate the concerns of those who are  
21 worried about rising energy prices, our natural gas needs  
22 will be met by truly offshore LNG facilities. The Xcel  
23 facility in Gloucester has just had its first delivery in  
24 May and will be able to handle 20% of New England's gas  
25 needs at that facility alone.



1 principles of our democracy, the democracy upon which our  
2 great nation was founded.

3 In January 2006, FERC rejected, for safety  
4 reasons, a proposal submitted by Keyspan LNG to convert an  
5 existing LNG storage facility into an import terminal that  
6 would have provided gas to the Northeast United States while  
7 you simultaneously affirmed your July 2005 decision to  
8 approve the construction and operation of a new importing  
9 terminal proposed by Weaver's Cove Energy in Fall River,  
10 Massachusetts.

11 FERC Chairman, Joseph Kelliher, stated that while  
12 both of the projects were needed, FERC was approving only  
13 one -- the Weaver's Cove Project. It is interesting to note  
14 that one of the reasons given for the denial of the Keyspan  
15 proposal was the fact that the thermal radiation and  
16 flammable vapor exclusion zones would have extended offsite  
17 onto adjacent properties.

18 In approving the Waver's Cove Project in Fall  
19 River, were you not aware that the proposed LNG site sits in  
20 the middle of densely populated area? Well perhaps you  
21 didn't have a map or maybe want to take the time to look at  
22 one.

23 If FERC's primary role in reviewing LNG import  
24 facility authorizations is to ensure safety, then FERC's  
25 approval of the Weaver's Cove Project is mind-boggling. The

1 City of Fall River, Massachusetts, alone has spent over \$1  
2 million in legal fees to fight the ill-conceived Weaver's  
3 Cove Project.

4 How much more money will you steal from our  
5 city's coffers -- money that we desperately need to buy  
6 books for our school children, to repair our infrastructure,  
7 to provide important programs for our senior citizens and  
8 youth, and to develop our downtown and waterfront. FERC has  
9 raped our city of its treasure, and you're still doing it as  
10 we speak.

11 Federal agencies with environmental  
12 responsibilities and expertise have questioned the adequacy  
13 of your NEPA process and have urged the adoption of  
14 substantially more protective environmental conditions,  
15 including the prohibition of all dredging activities in the  
16 Taunton River and Mount Hope Bay from January 15 through  
17 October 31 each year.

18 In an appeal of FERC's approval of the Weaver's  
19 Cove LNG Project, Rhode Island cities and towns filed an  
20 amicus brief, which explained that the towns had not  
21 intervened sooner because their position was entirely  
22 consistent with the opposition that had been so strongly  
23 expressed by their elected representatives.

24 Weren't you even curious to know what they wanted  
25 to say?

1           The federal Environmental Impact Statement for  
2           the Weaver's Cove Project failed to analyze the impacts of  
3           security zones on recreational boaters, commercial  
4           fishermen, ferries, tour boats, charters, sailing regattas  
5           and cruise ships.

6           A study completed by the Aquidnick Island  
7           Planning Commission and submitted to the Commission for  
8           inclusion in the amicus brief by the Attorney General of  
9           Rhode Island titled "LNG Tanker Impacts to Marine  
10          Navigation," August 2005 report, emphasized the criticality  
11          of these waterways to the economic survival of the coastal  
12          communities, leaving no doubt that the mere introduction of  
13          LNG traffic, even postulating, erroneously, the ability to  
14          prevent accidents or intentional attacks, necessarily would  
15          impose irreparable economic prejudice.

16          What would be threatened is what the report  
17          characterized as "one of Rhode Island's primary economic  
18          assets," the total annual value of which is estimated at \$2  
19          billion. The brief went on to state, "we urge the  
20          Commission to review that report with care. It leaves no  
21          doubt that the introduction of LNG traffic into these waters  
22          would destroy what truly is a unique national resource, not  
23          to mention the economic lynchpin of the region.

24          The amicus brief filed by the town of Jamestown,  
25          Rhode Island, stated, "...it is apparent that the

1 Commission, in approving the project, did not fully  
2 comprehend the consequences such a decision would have on  
3 island life in rural Jamestown."

4 Much of Jamestown's population is well within the  
5 zone of incineration danger identified in the environmental  
6 impact study. Moreover, the town's area of greatest  
7 population density, "the village," is directly adjacent to  
8 the LNG tanker route.

9 As such, this area not only falls within the  
10 radiation burn zone, but the buildings and structures may  
11 well ignore should a combustible vapor cloud form or a "pool  
12 of fire" occurs. The consequences in the event of an  
13 accident or terrorist attack are cataclysmic.

14 FERC systemically refused to permit a probing  
15 analysis of by refusing to even read these amicus briefs by  
16 finding a legal loophole - the towns had not filed for  
17 intervenor status.

18 As noted in a request for a rehearing of FERC's  
19 approval, "the deliberate avoidance of information relevant  
20 to a required public interest determination is always  
21 intolerable; where the core public interest concerns are the  
22 implications of a proposal for public security, health and  
23 well-being, the avoidance is unconscionable."

24 "The majority declined to even look at, let alone  
25 to consider, the only sworn testimony available to it,

1 testimony that is addressed to the very issues the primacy  
2 of which the order acknowledges."

3 Some of the facts you failed to consider in your  
4 approval of Weaver's Cove's LNG application included:

5 1. The terminal and tankers would  
6 present terrorists with precisely the type of targets or  
7 opportunity they desire;

8 2. Intentional attacks are not  
9 preventable;

10 3. An accident or intentional attack  
11 could place tens of thousands of lives at imminent peril;

12 4. Evacuation would be infeasible and  
13 emergency response capacity totally inadequate; and

14 5. Largely because of these  
15 unavoidable consequences, the mere presence of the facility  
16 and the tankers could destroy the economic lifeblood of the  
17 area and render unachievable the plans developed by Fall  
18 River for the restoration of economic vitality.

19 In violation of the Natural Gas Act and its  
20 obligations for reasoned decision-making, you arbitrarily  
21 and capriciously -- and not in accordance with the law --  
22 found that approval of the Weaver's Cove application would  
23 not be "inconsistent with the public interest."

24 In addition, in your order, you impermissibly  
25 denied the City of Fall River's request for full evidentiary

1       hearings on numerous disputed material issues of fact,  
2       including the threat of terrorists attacks; adequacy of  
3       security plans; vulnerability of tanker traffic; accidents;  
4       extent of environmental damage associated with the  
5       construction of the channel, including the substantial  
6       dredging that would be required within Mount Hope Bay and  
7       the Taunton River; and the extent of adverse impacts that  
8       would be imposed on minority and low-income populations, and  
9       finally, you have frustrated the expression of Congressional  
10      intent that, wherever possible, LNG facilities be located in  
11      remote areas away from populated centers.

12                 ...And now here we are. You are once again  
13      asking the citizens of Southeastern Massachusetts and Rhode  
14      Island to put not only our future, but our very lives, in  
15      your hands. We are asked to come here before you once  
16      again, to express our opinions and to participate in the  
17      decision-making process of yet another ill-conceived LNG  
18      project.

19                 This entire exercise, to me, I'm sorry is a  
20      farce. I am tired of making speeches. I am tired of  
21      writing letters to a governmental agency that processes  
22      paper, but you fail to address my concerns.

23                 Might I take this moment to remind you of your  
24      mission - your mandate - to balance competing environmental,  
25      economic, and social concerns to maintain a reliable and



1           Our organization is in favor of both the original  
2 proposal and the pipe in pipe proposal being discussed here  
3 tonight. It is our understanding that Weaver's Cove Energy  
4 has developed the pipe in pipe proposal as a result of  
5 objections to the LNG tankers traversing the Taunton River.

6           In our opinion, the original project has been  
7 studied and modeled more extensively than any other LNG  
8 project in the past. Further, you correctly approved the  
9 Weaver's Cove facility approximately two years ago, based on  
10 factual information and data.

11           The pipe in pipe proposal if possible to achieve,  
12 hopefully will allay some of the perceived concerns about  
13 this project. As you know, New England needs new and  
14 additional energy infrastructure, as well as a second  
15 storage facility to meet its growing needs.

16           Please do not allow a small minority of nimbi  
17 zealots to skew the Commissions determination on this  
18 project. Don't we want to enjoy energy piece of mind? We  
19 need the storage, we need the supply to be there. We need  
20 to make this a reality.

21           In sum, the Weaver's Cove Energy Project can be  
22 built and operate safely and securely and will be an  
23 enormous economic stimulus to the area. Please approve this  
24 project as quickly as possible. Thank you.

25           MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for your comment. Our

1 next commenter is Representative Bruce J. Long. On deck is  
2 Joanne Devoe.

3 REPRESENTATIVE LONG: Good evening, my name is  
4 Representative Bruce J. Long. I live in Middletown and I  
5 represent the Island of Connecticut that would be Jamestown  
6 and Middletown in the General Assembly, District 74.

7 Ma'am, of course we want energy, whoever you are,  
8 of course we do. What kind of question is that? It's a  
9 redundant, ridiculous question.

10 I think Mr. Carvalho says it correctly and you  
11 know, the people in the orange shirts -- I've been coming to  
12 these meetings for over five years and they have, and you  
13 know, Weaver's Cove keep coming back and they're hoping to  
14 wear us down.

15 When I drove in here, I'm thinking the first time  
16 I came here I had to park so far away that it was a good  
17 exercise walking over here, not tonight. See the people  
18 have to win this fight every single time. We can't lose  
19 once. The developers, with plenty of money, our money, they  
20 sell energy and we buy it, they only have to win once, and  
21 those are odds that I don't like.

22 And you know, my hats off to Attorney General  
23 Patrick Lynch and Attorney Tierney. Great job, great  
24 presentation, great facts, you do much better job of putting  
25 your homework together than I do.

1                   This has been absolutely amazing. In Rhode  
2                   Island where the political parties enjoy fighting, on this  
3                   issue, there has been unanimity and it's not an in my  
4                   backyard situation, it's clearly thought out that this  
5                   proposal, these proposals, and to be honest with you,  
6                   talking with my colleagues, I had my money on you guys  
7                   approving the Keyspan project. I thought that was the  
8                   easier one. That one went down.

9                   I mean, it was clear that the powers to be in  
10                  Washington were going to approve one of them, not both, and  
11                  it was a race, it was a financial race to get to the gate  
12                  first, because there is a lot of money to be made here.

13                 I'm a Republican, and I'll tell you, I'm looking  
14                 forward to the upcoming elections and a chance of  
15                 administration. I'm not looking for a change in political  
16                 parties, because I support John McCain, but I'm looking for  
17                 a change in administration. I'm looking for a President  
18                 that has an environmental conscience, a president that  
19                 isn't a bottom line financial where is the money. I'm  
20                 disappointed in the last eight years of this administration  
21                 and I'm embarrassed for my party.

22                 But I'm not embarrassed for the collaboration of  
23                 the elected officials and appointed officials in Rhode  
24                 Island and the collaboration between the two states that are  
25                 looking for what's best for the people of the two states.

1                   It's clear that responsible siting of this type  
2 of facility, because I like natural gas. It's clean. It  
3 works well and environmentalists have been saying, let's go  
4 with natural gas for years. But this isn't the way to do  
5 it. You know, enough has been said about the cost to our  
6 environment because of the dredging, the security issue,  
7 clearly there is a security issue, and you know, if you take  
8 the 22 miles up Narragansett Bay, you'll find that the  
9 district that I represent has the most narrow channel  
10 between the land masses. That would be between Jamestown  
11 and the City of Newport.

12                   It's a risk and I agree with one of the  
13 presenters suggesting that this should be an entirely new  
14 petition for the whole project and I'm not accepting, okay,  
15 FERC in 2005 approved or authorized the construction of the  
16 facility and this is an amendment. I think we have learned  
17 an awful lot about this project and it really should -- and  
18 I don't say this -- I know how it works. We try to delay.  
19 When we can't beat the developers, we try to delay the  
20 project until the developers go away. Developers aren't  
21 going away. That's very clear.

22                   So I think we need a good analysis and I'm tired  
23 of counting on the Coast Guard and thank you Coast Guard and  
24 you're the third Captain of the Port to deal with this issue  
25 since it first came around and I don't know you, but I

1 trust that you, like your predecessors, will analyze this  
2 and make the best decision for our safety.

3 I don't get that same feeling with FERC. I just  
4 don't, and I don't know you Mr. McGuire, I don't know any of  
5 the gentlemen who serve on that board, but I don't get a  
6 good feeling.

7 So I stand here, as I have at every single  
8 meeting for the last five years. And my wife said, well  
9 where you going tonight? Oh, it's an LNG meeting. Oh, they  
10 killed that thing. No they didn't. They're coming back  
11 with an amendment.

12 It reminds me of what we did in the final week of  
13 our session in the House -- lots of amendments. And when  
14 something died, it seem to come back about 20 minutes later  
15 or an hour later. Well, you know what, I can live with  
16 some of the mistakes that we might make in the General  
17 Assembly, but this is a mistake that's much too costly to  
18 the people of Southeastern Mass and Rhode Island.

19 So I ask you FERC to deny the authorization of  
20 the amendment and let's work with real offshore. And when  
21 this first started, I think there were three facilities in  
22 the United states operating. I don't know how many there  
23 are now, but it's a lot more than three.

24 So thank you for the time to get up here and  
25 speak my peace and please, you know, don't just accept

1 Weaver's Cove analysis and do a review on it. That got me a  
2 little nervous before and somebody mentioned about an  
3 earthquake.

4 Well, Weaver's Cove has a geology company and  
5 they're going to do analysis and then we'll review it. I  
6 really want to see our federal government, our federal tax  
7 dollars go into true independent analysis of all of the  
8 issues of the report. Thank you.

9 (Applause.)

10 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for your comment. Our  
11 next commenter is Joanne DeVoe. Ms. DeVoe. The final  
12 commenter signed up to speak is Christopher Marcelino. Okay  
13 that's the last speaker signed up. If you have comments  
14 that you'd like to put in the public record, you still have  
15 time to do so. You have to come up to the table -- yes --  
16 come up on deck. Yes you're on.

17 MR. MARCELINO: My name is Christopher Marcelino.  
18 Last name is M-A-R-C-E-L-I-N-O. I'd like to thank the Coast  
19 Guard Captain for being here, also FERC and also everyone  
20 else here.

21 I'm a retired police officer in the City of Fall  
22 River and I've seen most of the same faces at the City Hall,  
23 at the Chambers and the questions and the concerns have been  
24 the same since Weaver's Cove started the first proposal.

25 We speak about safety and security and I want to

1 ask the people, and actually I wasn't going to speak today,  
2 but just by all the speakers today, I took some handwritten  
3 notes here because I'm going to speak tomorrow at the Venus  
4 where I'll be very prepared to speak.

5 Safety and security is your big question. Where  
6 were your facts? What safety and security are you worried  
7 about?

8 I myself wasn't allowed to be part of this  
9 because I was a police officer and now I'm a citizen now and  
10 I have a voice to speak like everyone else here and I'm  
11 going to tell you that in a month's time, actually it was a  
12 month when I was at the Venus the last time, and so I was  
13 going to say that you, did make the paper as your acting was  
14 at the Venus, screaming at the Venus. You made the paper  
15 and I applaud you for that one.

16 Safety and security of this. I'm going to tell  
17 you something. The safety and security has all been planned  
18 out, if you read the material, which I did for about a  
19 month.

20 We forget about the terminal that's at Bay  
21 Street. Has anyone remember that one? I worked car nine  
22 for a long time and I sat right near that terminal and it's  
23 about 30, more than 30 years old. Has anything happened to  
24 that terminal? It's owned by the Forward gas company.

25 We speak about another one that's up in Detham

1 and the pipeline coming down. Well guess what, more piping,  
2 and if you all look at your gas bill, more piping, more  
3 cubic feet that has to reach your house, the more money you  
4 going to pay. And I'm sick and tired of paying. I'm sick  
5 and tire of paying.

6 I'm a single father, a single father with a  
7 retirement and barely making it on \$1,800 a month and I'm  
8 very concerned. I'm very, very concerned about the energy  
9 and where we're getting it.

10 I couldn't believe that someone said today that  
11 there is other sources, and you are right. I heard someone  
12 say nuclear source, nuclear? A nuclear source and I said to  
13 myself, how can we fathom an idea of having a nuclear  
14 source? Doesn't the United States and the united Nations  
15 fight all over the world about nuclear weapons and nuclear  
16 facilities?

17 The Mount Hope Bay I heard today, no one was  
18 worried about that before when it was just going to Fall  
19 River, now we're worried about it going to Mount Hope Bay.

20 You speak about the dredging. A few years ago,  
21 and I'm not that old, but I have a great memory, the  
22 Battleship Massachusetts was tugged from its site, where it  
23 was, and it sits in the ground, and I'm not sure how far  
24 down, but they pulled that out of there with tugboats and  
25 no one was concerned about that, I did some painting for

1 that, right. No one was concerned about, about stirring all  
2 the material that was down there, in the industry no one was  
3 concerned about that.

4 You speak about a plane in 9/11. Well from the  
5 reading that I did, that those tanks are structured that a  
6 747 Boeing could hit it and nothing would penetrate that  
7 tank, nothing. The plane itself would explode.

8 You know what, if Mr. Sullivan was still here,  
9 which he is not, and that's how much he cares about the  
10 citizens of Fall River, he's not here, he said his peace and  
11 he left. And I was always told, learn to listen, listen to  
12 learn. And that's what I did here. I let my ride leave  
13 because I wanted to say my peace.

14 I can't believe what he had said tonight and I  
15 just want to touch on that. He spoke about the bridges. He  
16 speak about Brightman Street Bride. You know how many  
17 people go over that bridge every day and it's one of the  
18 worse bridges in the state and in the country, one of the  
19 worse. No one worries about that?

20 You guys weren't worried about Mt. Hope bridge  
21 when the battleship had to go underneath it to get to, I  
22 believe Boston, somewhere up there to get painted. Had to  
23 go up that way too. No one was concerned about that.

24 And we forget about Bay Street, a 30 year old  
25 terminal that's there. It's not structured right, it's

1       there. It's 30 years old. Hey, I'm 30 years old and I'm  
2       feeling, nooks and crannies and I'm hurting. My joints  
3       aren't well operating.

4               The new terminal, it's a new terminal, it's a new  
5       structure and my understanding because I remember doing a  
6       detail sitting at the City Hall, listening to all of this  
7       stuff. They're trying to do something to alleviate the  
8       problem from before, from bringing it right up to the  
9       citizens of Fall River.

10              Mr. Sullivan forgets one thing, what about the  
11       City Hall? What about the City Hall in Fall River that  
12       millions of cars go by, millions of cars go by, and 195,  
13       where I have to go underneath? Where I have to go into that  
14       building, where the tankers, we have tankers now that go  
15       into the City of Fall River.

16              So if we're all worried about the ocean but what  
17       about coming through my city in the streets of my city to  
18       get us energy? Anybody here worried about that from Mount  
19       Hope Bay? Is anyone worried about that? I don't think so.

20

21              I am because that is the worse. There is  
22       potential hijacking in that way of a truck, potential truck  
23       that has no security. There is no security for those  
24       truckers, none of them. They drive by themselves in the  
25       city and if you don't believe me, sit on the corner of

1 Milligan Boulevard and turn Columbia Street to Robin and  
2 you'll see about 15 to 20 of those a day. Sit there.

3 We are blue collar people. We work hard. Quaker  
4 Fabrics is gone, they've gone to other places. Jones  
5 Fabrics is gone, they've gone to other places.

6 The hard working citizens of Fall River, you know  
7 what, they haven't read the material and they're not as  
8 educated as some of the younger people are, but it is my  
9 sole duty to educate them about this project and it is my  
10 sole duty to educate them that this is safe. They've done  
11 their homework. What else are they going to do. It doesn't  
12 matter what they do, it seems like it's not going to make  
13 you, happy. You're going to find anything and everything to  
14 change it. And like I said, I wasn't going to speak today,  
15 but I couldn't understand some of the stuff that you're  
16 talking about.

17 LNG is liquefied, I read. It does nothing, it  
18 doesn't burn. Jet fuel is worse. Jet fuel is worse.  
19 Propane tanks. No one is worried about that. I'm sure  
20 worried about that. I'm sure worried about -- you heard the  
21 gentleman who is a trucker and he said that he delivers  
22 that through the city. That concern me, and it still  
23 concerns me. I want to stop that from coming in.

24 Number two, LNG coming in here, we have another  
25 competitors so we don't have to get locked in to just four

1 other gas company and paying these outrageous fees.

2 No one here remembers that, no one here  
3 understands that but if anyone here, I have the respect and  
4 the utmost respect for every speaker here. If you can give  
5 me concrete evidence of our research, I will gladly take a  
6 look at it, but none of you have. None of you. None of you  
7 today have. You've said safety, security, bridges.

8 You know something, if someone needs to go to the  
9 hospital I believe we have helicopters and a dire emergency,  
10 right, that get you med-flighted in that case? Correct? We  
11 do it at Charlton Memorial -- we do it at Charlton  
12 Memorial.

13 You know, Mr. Sullivan, I couldn't believe that  
14 he left and that just goes to show you the leadership that  
15 you have in this district because if he cared about you,  
16 he'd be here and to listen to every citizen because every  
17 citizen has a right to speak. He is not here now, he said  
18 his peace and he is gone.

19 I don't care if I have to stay here until  
20 midnight, but I wanted to listen to each and every one of  
21 you and give you the same amount of respect that I want in  
22 return.

23 He spoke about the bridge, the Brightman Street  
24 Bridge, he spoke about the Bay, reducing the Bay. He  
25 hasn't done a thing for Fall River. They've been planning

1 to do something at the waterfront for so long and nothing  
2 has been there. Brayton Point is there. You can't go  
3 swimming in Somerset. I wouldn't put my kid in that beach  
4 right now. You guys aren't worried about that stuff. That  
5 tankers, they're just like oil tankers. They look just the  
6 same. They're double insulated, if you read about it, and I  
7 don't have may material and I wish I did, and tomorrow I'll  
8 be more prepared. Believe me when I tell you, I will be  
9 more prepared and I would love to speak with anyone here who  
10 has a comment of concern to speak to me.

11 I am for this plan as a citizen. I am for this  
12 plan because it's going to bring a decent amount of jobs to  
13 the City of Fall River. They're willing to. LNG from what  
14 I understand is willing to give fire apparatus, training,  
15 they're willing to put security there. You just don't want  
16 to listen. You do not want to listen.

17 I listened here for over four hours today and  
18 I've got a list of I don't know of how many speakers, but I  
19 can tell you this, each one of you had the same concern. No  
20 concrete evidence, no difference. And I'd like the same.  
21 You want the same evidence from them, I'd also like the same  
22 evidence from your coalition, all of you in the orange  
23 shirts, bring me your information so I can take a look and  
24 to see what side I'm going to play a part of. Thank you for  
25 your time.

1 (Applause.)

2 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for your comment. My  
3 apologies, John Torgan.

4 MR. TORGAN: Thank you. My name is John Torgan  
5 with the environmental organization, Save The Bay. I will  
6 submit these in writing so I'll summarize my comments for  
7 the record tonight.

8 MR. MCGUIRE: Okay.

9 MR. TORGAN: In order to provide adequate scoping  
10 for this EIS, the applicant must undertake comprehensive  
11 analysis of potential environmental abuse impacts, not  
12 limited to the recent proposed project change.

13 It is the applicant's burden to demonstrate that  
14 the project will not have severe negative impacts on the  
15 surrounding environment and that's a burden that we feel the  
16 applicant has not demonstrated in previous iterations of  
17 the project. The scoping, I'm going to just list the ten  
18 major areas that we feel the scoping for this EIS needs to  
19 encompass.

20 The first is fish habitat characterization and  
21 modeling. Mount Hope Bay shallows are designated as  
22 Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) by the National Marine Fishery  
23 Service. There are at least 29 native fish species that  
24 depend on the area, the project site at some stage of their  
25 life cycle.

1                   We know these waters are historically important  
2 spawning and nursery areas for locally depressed populations  
3 of winter flounder, tautog and a range of other species,  
4 including Elwas, Blue Back Herring, Rainbow Smelt, American  
5 Eel.

6                   This characterization should include all of Mount  
7 Hope Bay and the lower Taunton River to adequately assess  
8 those impacts.

9                   Second, shellfish habitat characterization. The  
10 proposed area of impact is an important shellfish habitat,  
11 particularly for clawhogs, soft shell clams and oysters.

12                   This characterization should also include Mount  
13 Hope Bay and the lower Taunton. Deep dredge channel has the  
14 potential to cause hypoxia, at least during the summer  
15 months, at least six months out of the year and may  
16 interfere with the migration of lobsters. So we believe  
17 this should be studied and adequately assessed.

18                   Third, dredging and dredge sediment disposal  
19 modeling. The footprint area to be dredged for the project  
20 needs to be analyzed for the above species of concern.  
21 Sediments need to be characterized for full range of  
22 priority pollutants as identified by EPA.

23                   Since the applicant propose to dispose of these  
24 sediments in federal waters off the coast of Rhode Island,  
25 they must meet the standards of 103 of the Ocean Dumping

1 Act, 404 of the Clean Water Act, and the dredging must  
2 meet the standards of the Rhode Island Coastal Research  
3 Management Council as Mass CZM Regulations.

4 Appropriate permits must be duly applied for and  
5 received by each state, as well as the Army Corp of  
6 Engineers, the United States Coast Guard. Modeling should  
7 be conducted to ensure that the turbidity plume will not  
8 violate state water quality standards.

9 Also, modeling should be performed to ensure that  
10 the new deepened channel will not cause or exacerbate  
11 hypoxia as has been observed and documented in the federally  
12 authorized channel in Mount Hope Bay.

13 Dredging will need to observe windows or temporal  
14 restrictions to protect winter flounder and other species of  
15 concern.

16 Fourth, usage analysis. This would include  
17 navigation safety, navigation impacts. This area of Mount  
18 Hope Bay is extensively used for recreational and other  
19 commercial activities, including fishing, swimming, sailing,  
20 kayaking, shipping, scuba diving and many other activities.

21 Due to the security regime required around LNG  
22 shipping and berthing operations, it's likely that this  
23 project would severely impact these activities and become a  
24 dominant, if not exclusive use of the area.

25 The applicant must be required to document

1 existing and planned future uses of the project site and  
2 demonstrate that the project will not unreasonably interfere  
3 with the public trust in Mount Hope Bay, the Taunton River,  
4 east passage of Narragansett Bay, nor the surrounding  
5 communities, including Fall River, Newport, Middletown,  
6 Portsmouth, Bristol, Tiverton, and Warren, Rhode Island.

7 Fifth, Marine Mammal Protection Act  
8 considerations. Mount Hope Bay, and specifically Spar  
9 Island are important winter habitat for seals. Harbor  
10 seals, possibly Harp and Hooded seals use Spar Island,  
11 that's the island just south of the proposed berthing area,  
12 for haul out and forage in the vicinity of the proposed  
13 project site.

14 The applicant must demonstrate that the  
15 construction and operation of the offshore berth do not  
16 disturb or displace these animals. In accordance with the  
17 Marine Mammal Protection Act, analysis should include  
18 expected lighting and noise associated with the facility,  
19 as well as loss of forging and hollowed habitat.

20 Sixth, migratory birds. Mount Hope Bay and the  
21 lower Taunton are an important flyway for a broad range of  
22 federally protected migratory water birds. Over 154 species  
23 of birds, including bald eagle, are known to use the area,  
24 including 114 that breed in the Taunton Rive Watershed.

25 The project must include a characterization of

1 the avian use of this corridor and estimate the potential  
2 impacts of the project's construction and operations,  
3 including lighting and noise.

4 Seven, hydrological impact modeling. This  
5 project has the potential to change flow and flushing  
6 patterns in the bay by creating a new deep dredge channel.  
7 In addition to the standard dredging impact analyses, the  
8 applicant must demonstrate that the project will not  
9 fundamental change tidal flow and currents in Mount Hope  
10 Bay.

11 Eight, cultural and archeological impacts.  
12 Applicant must assess the presence of important historic and  
13 archeological sites of the project's footprint area. This  
14 includes southbound profile, historic research on  
15 shipwrecks and Native American sites within the project  
16 area.

17 Number nine, the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. As  
18 the project will affect the Taunton River and this river is  
19 pending designation in Congress as a national wild and  
20 scenic river, the project is subject to review and  
21 consultation from the National Park Service.

22 Tenth, Endangered Species Act. As there are  
23 several threatened and endangered species within the  
24 proposed project area, and analysis of affected species must  
25 be performed in consultation with the United States Fish and

1 Wildlife Service.

2 Save the Bay is Southeastern New England largest  
3 nonprofit environmental organization. We have more than  
4 20,000 members and supporters throughout the region and we  
5 object strenuously to the proposed project revision on the  
6 grounds that we feel it would permanently and irreversibly  
7 destroy critical fish and wildlife habitat and have  
8 unacceptable impacts to the public usage of the waterway,  
9 including Narragansett Bay's east passage and the water from  
10 Mount Hope Bay.

11 So we urge you to consider all these comments and  
12 I will submit this in writing for the record. Thank you for  
13 this opportunity to speak.

14 (Applause.)

15 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for your comment. As  
16 just a reminder, the comment period does end July 7. Filing  
17 written comments has the same weight as speaking them into  
18 the record tonight, so I would encourage you to file any  
19 comments that weren't addressed tonight, you file those and  
20 place those into the record.

21 The formal part of this meeting will conclude. I  
22 would encourage you to stay and look more closely at the  
23 maps and other information that Weaver's Cove has brought  
24 with them tonight. Their representatives will be available  
25 to assist you with these maps and answer any specific

1 questions you may have about their proposal.

2 On behalf of the Federal Energy Regulatory  
3 Commission, I want to thank you for coming here tonight and  
4 expressing your concerns.

5 WHEREUPON THE MEETING CONCLUDED AT  
6 10:00 P.M.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25