

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

IN RE:)
) DOCKET NO.
 ELBA ISLAND/SOUTHERN) CP10-477-000
 LNG COMPANY, LLC,)
 _____)

Notice of NEPA Public Scoping Meeting for the
Proposed Elba Island LNG Truck Loading Project taken
pursuant to notice and by agreement of counsel, under
the Georgia Civil Practice Act, reported by Elise M.
Napier, CCR-2492, at the Savannah Civic Center
Ballroom, 301 West Oglethorpe Avenue, Savannah,
Georgia, on Wednesday, February 2, 2011, commencing
at 7:01 p.m.

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

APPEARANCES

J. RICH MCGUIRE, Chief, Gas Branch 1
Division of Gas - Environmental & Engineering
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
OFFICE OF ENERGY PROJECTS
888 First Street, N.E.
Washington, DC 20426
(202) 502-6177
rich.mcguire@ferc.gov

Terry Turpin, FERC Representative
Karla Bell, FERC Representative
David Hanobic, FERC Representative
PJ Romano, FERC Representative

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

PRESENTERS :

- | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------|
| 1) BENJAMIN JOHNSON | 2) BETH KINSTLER |
| 3) KENT HARRINGTON | 4) PAMELA MILLER |
| 5) BILL DURRENCE | 6) JOHN SNEDEKER |
| 7) PETE SIMON | 8) JACK GACKKNOVS |
| 9) PETER SCHENK | 10) AUDREY PLATT |
| 11) ELLIS COOK | 12) SUSAN COX |
| 13) MARY ELLEN SPRAGE | 14) JOANN LEE |
| 15) CHARLES MOODY | 16) ARTHUR WOLTERS |
| 17) JEFF FELSER | 18) JUDY JENNINGS |
| 19) FRED NADELMAN | 20) JOHN NORTHUP |
| 21) CLETUS BERGEN | 22) REGINA THOMAS |
| 23) NICK FARLEY | 24) ROBERT JONES |
| 25) ROY LANCH | |

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

I N D E X

	Page
Opening Remarks by Mr. McGuire	4
Slide Presentation by Mr. Turpin	18
Certificate of Reporter	130
Disclosure	131
(Reporter's disclosure statement attached to back of transcript.)	

* * * * *

E X H I B I T S

Exhibit	Description	Page
1	Article From Filippo Gavelli, Ph.D., CFEI	122
2	Liquefied Natural Gas Explosion Hazards - Are They Real?	122

1 MR. MCGUIRE: Good evening. And welcome
2 to the public scoping meeting for Southern LNG's
3 Truck Loading Project, Docket CP10-477. Let the
4 record show that this public meeting started at
5 7:01 on February 2nd, 2011. My name is Rich
6 McGuire and I'm an environmental staff member at
7 the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission or FERC
8 and with me tonight is Terry Turpin, who is also
9 on staff at the Commission. At the back we have
10 the assistance of three additional FERC staff
11 members, Dave Hanobic, PJ Romano and Karla Bell.

12 A notice of this meeting was issued on
13 January 7th, 2011 and was mailed to our
14 environmental mailing list, the current list that
15 includes both federal, state and local officials
16 as well as the state powers that have either
17 signed up to be included in our environmental list
18 or have let us know of the meetings or filed
19 comments.

20 As many of you are aware we held an
21 initial public scoping meeting for this project in
22 late September and we've scheduled this additional
23 public scoping meeting at the request of the city
24 of Savannah as well as federal, state and local
25 officials that requested that we reschedule the

1 meeting originally, which we were unable to do,
2 but we scheduled this meeting to provide
3 additional opportunities for the public to comment
4 on this project. The purpose of this tonight's
5 meeting is to give you an additional opportunity
6 to comment on the environmental issues associated
7 with Southern LNG's Truck Loading Project. These
8 could include issues that you believe were not
9 accurately raised at the initial public scoping
10 meeting or issues raised in response to the
11 supplemental information that Southern LNG has
12 provided since the scoping meeting closed in the
13 middle of October. Now, we'll quickly run down
14 through tonight's agenda.

15 First we'll begin the tonight's meeting
16 going through where we're at in the environmental
17 review process at FERC and explain the
18 environmental review process. Following that
19 Terry Turpin will give an overview of the project
20 description based on the information that Southern
21 LNG has provided and has placed in the public
22 record. Following Terry's presentation we'll hear
23 from those of you who have signed up to speak and
24 make formal comments into tonight's public record.

25 Similar to the public meeting in

1 August 4th, 2010 under Section Three of the
2 Natural Gas Act in the docket number that I
3 mentioned, CP10-477, where the prefix CP
4 represents that it's a certificate proceeding.
5 Under the Natural Environmental Policy Act or
6 NEPA, the Commission is required to perform
7 environmental analysis of the proposed projects
8 environmental effects. In the case of Southern
9 LNG's Truck Loading Project we're doing this
10 analysis and environmental assessment.

11 Generally, the environmental assessment
12 will include a project description as well as the
13 associated environmental effects project
14 alternatives as well as mitigation to avoid or
15 reduce environmental impacts and make conclusions
16 and recommendations, those will be staff
17 conclusions and recommendations. The
18 environmental assessment or EA will analyze
19 Southern LNG's proposed truck loading facility
20 that's under our jurisdiction. It will also
21 evaluate LNG truck operation, LAN lines, southeast
22 LNG, a separate company, that's Southeast LNG
23 Distribution Company as an associated action under
24 the Environmental Policy Act.

25 While Southern LNG is required to obtain

1 authorization from the Commission for its truck
2 loading project, Southeast LNG will be required to
3 obtain approvals and meet regulations from state
4 and local agencies. The actual truck loading
5 operation is not under FERC's jurisdiction. The
6 environmental assessment is used to advise the
7 Commission and disclose to the public the
8 environmental impacts associated with construction
9 and operation of the proposed project. The
10 Commission will consider the EA public comments on
11 the project as well as nonenvironmental
12 information for this project in making informed
13 decision on whether or not to approve the project.
14 The EA or environmental assessment will not be a
15 decision document when it is issued. When the EA
16 is complete, we'll provide data as well as staff
17 material on nonenvironmental topics to the
18 commissions so that they can make an informed
19 decision on the project. The Commission does vote
20 to authorize. If the Commission does vote to
21 authorize the project, the Commission staff will
22 monitor construction throughout the project and
23 throughout restoration performing on site
24 inspections for environmental compliance.

25 Tonight's scoping meeting is one of the

1 public opportunities in our process to develop a
2 complete environmental record of Southern LNG's
3 proposal. We're here tonight to get your input on
4 the issues you feel need to be analyzed in the EA.
5 Your comments along with those of interested
6 groups and agencies will help us focus analysis on
7 important or significant environmental issues. If
8 you have additional questions about the
9 Commission, I would encourage you to look on our
10 internet site website at ferc.gov, www.ferc.gov.

11 Now, I'll quickly run through where
12 we're at in the environmental review process. By
13 the way, this graphic, this kind of graphically
14 explains our environmental review process and it's
15 included in the handout that we have at the
16 sign-in table. You might have one in your hands
17 so it's exactly the same thing, it's just broken
18 in to two slides. This first slide explains where
19 we're currently at in our environmental review
20 process. On the left hand column is Southern
21 LNG's actions and the right hand column is the
22 FERC's actions.

23 As I mentioned, Southern LNG filed its
24 formal application with the FERC on August 4th in
25 Docket Number CP10-477. We issued the first

1 public input opportunity is when we begin our
2 scoping, what we call our scoping process where
3 we're trying to solicit what are the issues
4 project and that was the issuance of our notice of
5 intent that was issued September 13th and the
6 public, the formal public scoping period ended in
7 mid October and, of course, we've held meetings,
8 many of you were there in September, and we are
9 here tonight for our second scoping meeting.

10 In addition to these opportunities we
11 also attended -- the company held in late August,
12 August 24th, they had an open house meeting that
13 staff attended as well and then we were in
14 attendance at the city's town hall meeting on
15 October 4th. So where we're at currently as you
16 know, many of you know we did issue some data
17 requests. We've received most of the data that we
18 asked from the company and we're looking at that
19 data now and we're beginning our preparation of
20 our environmental assessment.

21 The next slide is steps to come. This
22 is where these are still actions to come and,
23 again, on the left column is Southern LNG's
24 process, the right column the FERC's process, the
25 actions that we still need to occur. So the next

1 step in our process will be the issuance of a
2 notice of schedule. That will inform the public
3 when we anticipate the EA will be issued and,
4 again, there is still outstanding information that
5 we asked from the company that has not been filed
6 to date, so we'll be issuing one once we obtain
7 all the information we feel we need to go forward
8 with the EA.

9 That EA, the next public opportunity
10 will be when we mail out the EA, the environmental
11 assessment. That will be mailed out to everybody
12 on our mailing list. If you've -- most of you
13 probably know if you're on a mailing list, but if
14 you're unsure, I would encourage you to sign in
15 and give us your address and we'll include you in
16 the mailing list of our environmental assessment.
17 The comment period for that EA will be 30 days, is
18 the typical comment period for environmental
19 assessment. The FERC will respond to comments we
20 receive on the EA and following that would be the
21 Commission order. As soon as that -- as soon as
22 possible time for the Commission order will
23 typically be two months after the EA's issue. So
24 just to give you a kind of a rough idea, that
25 would be the soonest time frame for issuance of

1 the order or when the Commission will actually
2 look at the information in the record, look at the
3 staff information and make a decision on whether
4 to approve the FERC process. The final
5 opportunity after the order is issued would be
6 parties requesting rehearing on the decision. So
7 that basically explains the FERC process.

8 Are there any questions at this time
9 before we move forward in project description?
10 Any questions about the environmental review
11 process at FERC?

12 COMMENTER: I have a question. What
13 outstanding information have you asked for that
14 they haven't given?

15 MR. MCGUIRE: The question is what
16 outstanding information have we requested that has
17 not been given. That would be information
18 associated with Elba Island, the facilities on
19 Elba Island, regarding engineering information on
20 the modelling so, engineering modelling. Yes,
21 sir.

22 COMMENTER: What are the worse case
23 scenarios that have been presented for explosions
24 or bursts or inflammations on -- with Elba Island
25 as well as the trucking of LNG through DeRenne

1 Avenue in Savannah?

2 MR. MCGUIRE: Right. Worse case --

3 COMMENTER: Worst case scenario.

4 MR. MCGUIRE: Right. The question was
5 what are the worse case scenarios of the trucking
6 operations as well as the facility at Elba Island.
7 That's a question that will be addressed in the
8 EA, but that's -- we're not there yet. We're
9 still collecting data. That's a question that's
10 before us and has been raised in the previous
11 meetings as well. So those are questions that
12 we'll be addressing in the EA, we're not at the
13 point of answering. I mean, we're still in the
14 process of answering those questions and looking
15 into that data.

16 Questions about our process is what I'm
17 soliciting just to be clear. Again, you can refer
18 to that graphic diagram that kind of gives you a
19 visual idea of what remains in our process. In
20 the back there is -- we'll take a few more
21 comments. We want to move on but I'll take a few
22 more comments. Yes, ma'am.

23 COMMENTER: Am I correct in
24 understanding that this process only oversees the
25 loading project not the route project?

1 MR. MCGUIRE: The question was that
2 you're asking is our process only addressing the
3 Elba Island facilities and not the trucking
4 operations; correct? Yes. The Elba Island
5 facilities are under our jurisdiction and under
6 the control of the Commission. The trucking
7 operations are nonjurisdictional. There is
8 federal and state agencies that oversee that. We
9 will evaluate that and describe an environmental
10 evaluation of those facilities as much as we can.
11 We're going -- the EA will address trucking
12 operations.

13 COMMENTS: So would the trucking routes
14 come under the highway department of federal and
15 state or is there another department that would
16 oversee those?

17 MR. MCGUIRE: I might defer to Terry.
18 When Terry gets up and makes his presentation --
19 you want to interject now?

20 MR. TURPIN: Let's just do it now.
21 The -- as Rich said, the routing of the truck
22 isn't under the jurisdiction of FERC but there is
23 two agencies under the DOT, Department of
24 Transportation and two departments in there.
25 There is the pipeline hazardous administration

1 that establishes the regulations for how the
2 trucks are built and they have to operate to and
3 the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration.
4 They establish the requirements, licensing of the
5 drivers, training of the drivers, safety records
6 that should be -- have to maintain and they also
7 have Regulation 49 CFR 397 is their record
8 requirements for the routing of the facilities,
9 and by and large, it's those of the federal rules
10 but the jurisdiction, the authority to regulate
11 those routes falls to the state.

12 COMMENTER: Will there be a public input
13 process in their regulations?

14 MR. TURPIN: I do not know. We don't
15 represent those agencies so it's not something
16 that I can really speak on.

17 COMMENTER: Are you speaking of the
18 federal, DOT or state?

19 MR. TURPIN: It's federal DOT 49 CFR
20 397.

21 COMMENTER: So Federal Motor Safety
22 Administration has jurisdiction?

23 MR. TURPIN: Yeah. Let me repeat the
24 question just to clarify. It is, the question was
25 is the -- do I need the Federal Department of

1 the requesting party would have to be an official
2 party in the proceeding and as an intervener and
3 specific information on intervention is included
4 in the notice of intent. We have copies of the
5 notice of intent that explains intervention in the
6 back of the room, so we do have copies of that.
7 The actual time line for intervention has passed;
8 however, if you would like to become an intervener
9 it's not too late. You have to explain and give
10 justification while you're out of time but the
11 Commission has accepted and routinely accepts your
12 intervention if there is justification for that.

13 COMMENTER: Can you please tell us right
14 now who the interveners are today.

15 MR. MCGUIRE: I don't have a full list
16 of the interventions to date. I know that the
17 city is an intervener, I know Ms. Cox is an
18 intervener as well; is that correct?

19 MS. COX: Uh-huh.

20 MR. MCGUIRE: Yes. Those are the two.
21 There is a list of interveners. I think I have
22 that information. I could give you that at the
23 end of the meeting.

24 COMMENTER: Have the hospitals
25 intervened yet?

1 MR. MCGUIRE: I do not believe so, but I
2 have a full list of interventions with me and I
3 could give you that at the end if you would care
4 to look at that list. Okay. We'll move forward.
5 We really want to get to the most important part
6 of this meeting is getting to the comments that
7 you have to place in the record. But we do want
8 to give a brief overview of the proposed truck
9 loading facility and, Terry, I'm going to ask
10 Terry to come forward and give us a presentation
11 on an overview on the truck loading project as
12 based on the information that was filed from the
13 Southern LNG. Terry.

14 MR. TURPIN: So as Rich said, this is
15 going to be a brief overview of the facilities
16 that Southern LNG has proposed to the Commission
17 for approval and these slides were basically based
18 on the material that was already provided to us
19 and we're just sort of characterizing what's on
20 file is that most of this information I think
21 you've probably already seen before but we're
22 going to go like to give this brief overview.

23 The project, of course, is located at
24 the existing Southern LNG's Elba Island, which
25 began operation in '78. It was on standby for a

1 number of years and not in huge operation in the
2 early 2000's and has undergone some expansions.
3 So there is the Island, it's indicative by the
4 star right here. It's approximately on .3 acres
5 so the proposed acreage is a very small portion of
6 the existing facility out there. Specifically,
7 what Elba is proposing or Southern LNG is
8 proposing to install four truck loading bays each
9 with a scale and metering system and a refueling
10 station to load tanker trucks with LNG operated
11 engines. There will be a holding tank of LNG
12 6,000 gallons, which is for just context, it's
13 about eight feet diameter by 20 feet tall, three
14 Southern bays for the containment and a scale
15 house a control room right there.

16 I think there is a picture on the next
17 slide of -- this isn't Elba. This isn't any local
18 facility. It's just a representative picture of a
19 truck loading station and we wanted to put this in
20 here just to kind of give context for the facility
21 being proposed. Most of you probably haven't seen
22 it, so these are two LNG trucks and the loading is
23 going on for these pipes here. So the
24 construction schedule, the Southern LNG intends to
25 operate the -- install the truck facilities and

1 they would be operated by Southern LNG, leased to
2 Southeast LNG for use in their distribution
3 project. They have indicated the plans
4 constructed in two different phases. Phase one is
5 they have requested at the beginning of
6 construction in 2012 with initial operation
7 allowing eight to ten trucks per day and that was
8 on the handout, the agenda there is a green area I
9 have a picture on the next slide, that would be
10 the phase one facility.

11 Phase two we'll put two more additional
12 bays and they've requested construction begin in
13 2016. Operation of both phases would take the
14 tanker operations up to 58 trucks per day, and
15 here is a slide. So these are the green would be
16 the phase one. These would be the phase two truck
17 scales. These are containment basins here and the
18 control house. It's the general layout.

19 And, of course, along with the
20 facilities that we're analyzing that are under the
21 Commission jurisdiction is also the connected
22 actions of the trucks that will depart from the
23 facility. So this is -- these are the routes that
24 have been identified as potential paths of trucks
25 to get from the facility out to the interstate

1 system and all the routes begin, of course, right
2 here. They come down Elba Island Road to this
3 point -- and I'll just kind of run through these
4 for y'all. I'm sure you're more familiar with
5 these than I am, but we'll go through them. This
6 one takes the trucks out President Street, down
7 Truman Parkway, DeRenne Avenue, Lynne's Parkway
8 and out to 16.

9 There is an alternative route to go Elba
10 Island Expressway, route 80 and then Truman,
11 DeRenne and Lynne again. There is a potential
12 route here down President to Bay Street and then
13 out to 16 and there is also an option to come out
14 Truman and when the extension is completed and
15 then Abercorn out to 95 and then the interstate.

16 So that is essentially the quick
17 overview of the facilities that are being proposed
18 and if you have specific questions about the
19 equipment that's being installed, Southern and
20 Southeast are out here and you can ask questions
21 of them. I can answer one or two if you have
22 anything. Yes, sir.

23 COMMENTER: In the associated LNG
24 routes, have they been prioritized as to -- by
25 SLNG, have they been prioritized in their report?

1 MR. TURPIN: So the question is has the
2 routes that I described been prioritized by the
3 applicant in terms of which ones they would like
4 to do and what was I believe what's listed in the
5 application is that the route that the company has
6 indicated they would prefer to take is the one
7 President, Truman, DeRenne, Lynne and out 16. I
8 believe that's correct but that would be listed in
9 the application. Yes, in the back.

10 COMMENTER: FERC is not reviewing these
11 routes?

12 MR. TURPIN: Well, no. Not in our
13 jurisdiction. We are including them in the
14 environmental document as part of the requirements
15 of NEPA as a connected action, but we -- I mean,
16 the Commission actually has no jurisdiction to
17 authorize or deny the use of any of these routes.
18 Yes, sir.

19 COMMENTER: I'll get back to worse case
20 scenarios. We've got schools there.

21 MR. TURPIN: Yeah.

22 COMMENTER: Especially lots of kids
23 running around. I want to know what the plan is
24 in relation to keeping people absolutely safe
25 presuming that there is always the probability of

1 anything causing a gas leak, a gas -- not only a
2 leak but, yeah, an explosion I'll call it. I want
3 to use those words.

4 MR. TURPIN: So the question is, again,
5 what are the worse case scenarios that have been
6 considered or are being considered for things that
7 might happen along the truck route; is that
8 accurate?

9 COMMENTER: Yes.

10 MR. TURPIN: Okay. Maybe I'll have to
11 fall back on what Rich said: That when we are
12 looking at -- we're still trying to address those
13 issues. Right now where we're at, I can tell you
14 that we've kind of been researching the
15 regulations as to jurisdiction and has steps you
16 have to go through. That's our discussion that
17 will be included in the NEPA doctrine, but that's
18 the purpose of our doctrine is to characterize
19 what's out there, what the jurisdictions are and,
20 you know, what the process is for those reviews.
21 Yes, ma'am.

22 COMMENTER: Because you say that FERC
23 really has no jurisdiction over the trucking and
24 carrying of this stuff but that the pipeline
25 handles the hazardous materials and Safety

1 Association and the Federal Motor Carrier Safety
2 Association does. Why don't they come talk to us
3 because you have no jurisdiction and we don't need
4 to talk to you about this part. Why can't they
5 come?

6 MR. TURPIN: Good question. And so the
7 question is why aren't the Federal Motor Carrier
8 Safety Administration having these kinds of
9 meetings. All I can answer to that is they have
10 their own processes to go through so, I mean, it
11 would be good to contact those agencies. We've
12 been contact with them. We did invite them to
13 these meeting tonight but --

14 COMMENTER: You did invite them? You
15 invited them and they did not come? I just want
16 to make sure.

17 MR. TURPIN: Yes.

18 COMMENTER: And how do we go about
19 contacting these people to see why they didn't
20 come?

21 MR. TURPIN: The best thing is you can
22 contact the agency is to go to the web page they
23 will list the contact information. I mean, that's
24 essentially what we did. We went to the
25 headquarters and contacted them.

1 COMMENTER: And I can go to the website
2 by using this?

3 MR. TURPIN: You go to DOT and you type
4 in either of those names, you will find the
5 contacts.

6 COMMENTER: What are the names again?

7 MR. TURPIN: The question was what are
8 the two names of the agencies that have
9 jurisdiction the federal level over truck routing
10 and that is under the department, U.S. Department
11 of Transportation, that is the Pipeline Hazardous
12 Safety Administration and the Federal Motor
13 Carrier Safety Administration. There is also, I
14 mean, I will tell you that under the regulations
15 the routing, those two agencies have established
16 the rules for routing, what has to be done, again,
17 that's in Code of Federal Regulations, Title 49,
18 Part 397. But they do list out in that that these
19 are the rules that have to be followed but the
20 powers to actually regulate the routing fall to
21 the state under those. Yes, ma'am.

22 COMMENTER: In regard to the question
23 about worse case scenario, I think your response
24 was that FERC doesn't know right now that this is
25 part of what you're doing but even where we are

1 now, you don't know. Is this something you're
2 going to know before you make a recommendation
3 about routing?

4 MR. TURPIN: So the question is, again,
5 on the worse case scenario. So will FERC get the
6 information worse case scenarios for -- prior to
7 making a decision. Is that a fair
8 characterization of the question?

9 COMMENTER: Well, yes.

10 MR. TURPIN: Okay. And the answer,
11 again, is our job as staff is to develop the
12 record for the Commission to review and at this
13 point we haven't gotten any of that kind of
14 information. We're still -- see, the part of that
15 for the facilities on the Island under our
16 jurisdiction, that is the information we are
17 seeking that's still outstanding in compliance
18 with the DOT 49 CFR 193 regulations. In terms of
19 the route those fall under other agencies and most
20 likely, you know, our analysis is going to be to
21 characterize the familiar requirements and what's
22 done there, but, again, it's just to inform the
23 Commission as to what the structure is.

24 COMMENTER: Well, my question didn't
25 deal with just routes. I'm talking about Elba

1 itself unloading facility, which as I understand
2 it does come under your jurisdiction.

3 MR. TURPIN: That's right. That's why I
4 said that from the outstanding information that
5 we're still waiting on from the company -- I'm
6 sorry, the question is for worse cases for the
7 island itself, something is being proposed there.
8 That is something that's under evaluation. That
9 is still part of the outstanding information that
10 we've requested that they go to DOT for further
11 information for guidance and that deals with
12 compliance with part 193 regulations that talk
13 about excluding the hazardous for those facilities
14 out there on the island.

15 COMMENTER: If you're still waiting on
16 this outstanding information and we're having to
17 scoping meeting tonight, how can we ask the proper
18 questions if you haven't gotten the outstanding
19 information yet? It seems like we should have the
20 meeting after you have the information because
21 we'll be allowed to question the responses you
22 get. It's been months since the last scoping
23 meeting and you're telling us now that they have
24 not cooperated in giving you the outstanding
25 information.

1 COMMENTER: Excuse me, can you have
2 people use the microphone, please? We can't hear
3 them.

4 MR. TURPIN: Yeah. I'm trying to repeat
5 the question so people can hear them. And we
6 really do need, really need to get to the comment
7 period, section of it. So the question was why
8 we're having the scoping meeting if there is still
9 outstanding information and why not have the
10 scoping meetings after those information has been
11 provided.

12 The way the process is laid out, we
13 attempt to go out and have -- the purpose of these
14 meetings is to receive comments and what people's
15 concerns are. Our goal is to then try to address
16 those concerns. You know, we issue data request
17 of the company and we get their responses, we do
18 our analysis, that then goes into a public
19 document that is still issued for public comment.
20 There is still -- you know, you still can comment
21 on that and those comments can also be addressed
22 before the Commission, by the Commission and their
23 order. That's the way the process is laid out.

24 Now, I would like to characterize that I
25 didn't mean to hint the comment being responsive.

1 We sent them to go to DOT to get these answers and
2 they are still working with DOT. It's not about
3 drum balling. It's another review process there.

4 COMMENTER: Can we move on to the
5 comments?

6 MR. TURPIN: Yeah. That's exactly what
7 I was going to say. That is the intent of this
8 meeting and that's what we're going to do. At
9 this point I'll turn it back over to Rich.

10 MR. MCGUIRE: Thanks, Terry. I don't
11 know if you want to close down the slides.

12 MR. TURPIN: Oh, sure.

13 MR. MCGUIRE: As Terry mentioned, the
14 company both Southern LNG and Southeast LNG does
15 not have a formal presentation tonight but they
16 are present at the meeting. They will be in the
17 back of the room if you have specific questions
18 about the project as Terry mentioned.

19 Now, we'll begin to hear from those of
20 you who have signed up to present formal comments
21 into the record. As I mentioned earlier, a
22 transcript of this meeting will be placed in the
23 public record so that anyone can have access to
24 the information that's discussed here tonight.

25 If you do not want to make formal

1 comments tonight orally, there is still an
2 opportunity to file written comments. We've
3 brought sheets that explain how to file written
4 comments there at the sign-in table and those
5 sheets may be helpful in making it easier for you
6 to file written comments. All comments received
7 whether written or oral will receive equal
8 consideration in our environmental review. In
9 addition, I would point out that all comments that
10 were received in the previous scoping meeting and
11 during the city's town hall meeting are in the
12 public records. Those transcripts are from both
13 of those meetings are in our public record;
14 therefore, there is no need, that doesn't mean
15 that you can't share the same issues that you
16 raised at the previous meetings but there is no
17 need for you to repeat the comments that you said
18 at the first meeting. We have those comments in
19 the transcripts from those meetings; however, if
20 you want to correct any information that's in
21 those transcripts or to clarify anything in the
22 record, you can do that.

23 For the court reporter's benefit, I
24 would ask you that you follow a few simple ground
25 rules when you make your formal comments tonight.

1 Please come to the podium up in front of the
2 meeting room and speak into the microphone, state
3 your name and please spell for the court
4 reporter's benefit, please spell your name, your
5 first and last name and if appropriate, if you're
6 associated with any state agency or
7 government/nongovernmental organization. And then
8 if you would, if you use any acronyms, if you
9 could, define those acronyms. So we'll move at
10 this point to the first commenter.

11 The first commenter tonight is Beth.
12 I'm sorry, we don't have you. Are you an elected
13 official?

14 COMMENTER: No.

15 MR. MCGUIRE: Okay. Well, we have our
16 first commenter as Beth Kinstler, but if you want
17 to --

18 MS. KINSTLER: By all means.

19 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you, ma'am. And
20 your name?

21 MR. JOHNSON: My name is Benjamin
22 Johnson. I'm a consultant for the city of
23 Savannah on this project. I have a series of
24 questions in regards to information being shared
25 and I would also like to, you know, ask as Terry

1 mentioned about the 49 CFR 171. As part of the
2 highway security sensitive materials that the LNG
3 fall under. There is some issues that have come
4 to the forefront for us during our research here
5 that there needs to be a communications plan. To
6 date, we have not received a communications plan
7 as we've asked because I was wondering. I'd also
8 like to know if you received those. If you've
9 received any vehicle security program as part of
10 the trucking and a cargo security program. These
11 are all necessary for the training and for the
12 first responders to be able to respond to an
13 emergency and it's difficult to be able to respond
14 to an emergency if they don't know what they are
15 responding to.

16 The second thing is that there needs to
17 be we were asking for a security inspection of the
18 policies and procedures for that piece, for the
19 trucking and the specifications for the truck and
20 trailer.

21 And my last piece the reported policies
22 and procedures to date we have not received as
23 we've asked for these items in their emergency
24 response plan to be able to coordinate that
25 through any type of emergency response if

1 necessary. We haven't seen any of those things to
2 date. I've also been on your website looking at
3 what has been submitted to you and I have not seen
4 that. And according to your time line my
5 questions, you know, with that information when
6 will that be received? I didn't see that in your
7 time line and where do we go from here.

8 MR. MCGUIRE: I want to try to address
9 your question. Could I ask you, first to spell
10 your name into the record? We don't have you.
11 For some we don't have you listed but if you don't
12 mind spelling it for the court reporter.

13 MR. JOHNSON: B-e-j-a-m-i-n,
14 J-o-h-n-s-o-n.

15 MR. MCGUIRE: Thanks, Mr. Johnson. At
16 this point I should clarify that if based on the
17 outcome of this meeting and the issues that are
18 raised, we may very well ask additional
19 information of the company to give us an update or
20 status so that we have an idea in the record, but
21 I'm not sure we're prepared to answer those
22 questions right now.

23 MR. JOHNSON: Okay.

24 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you. The first
25 commenter? Yes.

1 MS. KINSTLER: My name is Beth Kinstler,
2 that's B-e-t-h, K-i-n as in Nancy, S as in Sam, T
3 as in Tom, l-e-r, and I'm a resident of Savannah
4 with property located in Magnolia Park and Ardsley
5 Park. I'm a member of Keep Savannah Safe and
6 Sound, Preserving Savannah Neighborhoods, I'm a
7 participant of Project DeRenne and I also served
8 as president of both Magnolia Park Neighborhood
9 Association and the Beach Institute Neighborhood
10 Association. One of my interests is architecture
11 and historic preservation so it is with great
12 avidity that I read the report by our Christopher
13 Goodwin & Associates on the significant structures
14 to be found along the proposed routes for the
15 trucking of LNG. Sadly, the report was shot
16 through with erroneous information and glaring
17 consistencies.

18 For example, the Owens-Thomas House and
19 Telfair Academy were listed as, quote, potentially
20 significant. That would be used to Stephen High,
21 the director of the Telfair, and Thomas Allen, the
22 director of the Owens-Thomas House let alone the
23 60,000 plus visitors each year who pay to see
24 both.

25 The Pink House and Savannah Cotton

1 Exchange also fell into the category as did Club
2 One, the place where the Lady Chablis of Midnight
3 in the Garden of Good and Evil received his or her
4 start. I'm sure that she would be hiding her head
5 instead of her candy if she knew.

6 The Davenport House Museum built between
7 1915 and 1820 by Isaiah Davenport is a historic
8 structure. Why are 1519 and 21 East Bay Street
9 not considered significant when they were built
10 during the same time period?

11 Moving much further south, Thunderbolt
12 is listed as, quote, not assessed or not
13 significant yet many of its homes were built
14 during the early 1900s including a home known as
15 The Steamboat House. Thunderbolt interestingly
16 enough was also home to a newspaper written by
17 J. B. Stoner, a virulent racist and misogynist who
18 wrote inflammatory materials against blacks, Jews
19 an other ethnic groups. As distasteful we find
20 his work today, he is part of the historical
21 record, too.

22 The report considers Magnolia Park,
23 Kensington Park and Pine Gardens as having, quote,
24 an unknown level of significance. I know that
25 Kensington is applying for national register

1 status and I just spoke to Patricia Jenkins of
2 Pine Gardens, who informed me that even their
3 little neighborhood built for workers in the old
4 shipbuilding industry is going through the
5 national register process. And as a side I just
6 spoke to Don Constance, who is the new president
7 of Magnolia Park, because I had thought that a
8 slightly well known individual lived in Magnolia
9 Park. That would have been their time (inaudible)
10 to serve five terms in the city.

11 Magnolia Park, hard up against the
12 Truman Parkway, was built in the early 1950s and
13 is an iconic mid modern architectural
14 neighborhood. There are a number of custom built
15 homes by locally revered architects such as Henry
16 Levy and John LeBay. Fairway Oaks blanking the
17 other side of the Truman has always been viewed as
18 national register status and contains many homes
19 built by the above named architects as well.

20 In short, there was not a single page in
21 the Art Christopher Goodwin & Associates report
22 that was free of incorrect information,
23 inconsistencies or omissions. Did they even go to
24 the national register historic places and pull up
25 the information on Chatham County? Where was

1 their due diligence.

2 Finally, the report 127 pages was highly
3 repetitive and relied on very outdated local and
4 stated information. For example, Pinch of the
5 Past Antiques and Aurora Stain Glass haven't been
6 on Broughton Street for years and John & Linda's
7 in the Old City Market was shut in the mid90s. Do
8 the principals of this even come here and walk
9 around? For you or for El Paso to put any
10 credence in this report would be making a mockery
11 of the truth. Thank you.

12 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for your
13 comment. The next commenter is Kent Harrington.

14 MR. HARRINGTON: My name is Kent
15 Harrington, K-e-n-t, H-a-r-r-i-n-g-t-o-n. Good
16 evening. I live in Savannah and I'm the cofounder
17 of a grassroots organization, Citizens For a Safe
18 Secure Savannah. We've gotten together because
19 we're concerned about the safety and the security
20 issues raised by the petition from El Paso
21 Corporation otherwise known as Southern LNG to
22 drop unprecedented quantities of liquified natural
23 gas through the center of the city. Reflecting on
24 the information that El Paso has provided since
25 you began your scoping process, it seems to me the

1 company requests is unprecedented in two respects.
2 First, if it's approved, it will essentially gut,
3 eviscerate long standing federal guidelines that
4 say hazardous material trucking should not be
5 routed through highly populated urban areas.
6 That's going to establish a precedence and it's
7 going to make this issue to have extensive
8 implications far beyond the city of Savannah and
9 affect the safety and security considerations in
10 cities and towns across the country.

11 Second, if it's adopted, the petition
12 will essentially ignore literally every terrorism
13 related analysis since September 11 regarding LNG.
14 All of them make the same point. As a potential
15 terrorist tool, LNG facilities and their
16 operations must not be put in vulnerable urban
17 settings where they could become weapons or
18 targets of attack. There is an aspect of El
19 Paso's petition that is not unprecedented and that
20 is the company's disregard for the city's safety
21 and security concerns. The very routes proposed,
22 the preferred routes and the alternatives are
23 evidence of the attitude putting at risks
24 hospitals, putting at risk schools, putting at
25 risk historic sites, not to mention tens of

1 thousands of residents in these areas.

2 In the few written responses to your
3 Commission that have been made public the majority
4 of which have remained either classified or
5 proprietary or covered under what they call
6 infrastructure and remain under requirements and
7 not accessible to the public that's concerned
8 about these issues. El Paso has essentially
9 adopted its own don't ask, don't tell policy. The
10 company's don't trust us. We'll handle safety and
11 security considerations down the road. As
12 regulators I ask you to take note of that
13 statement alongside the company's disregard of the
14 concerns of the city of Savannah and its citizens.

15 From the outset as you know the history
16 very well, and I don't need to repeat it, this
17 proposal was presented in Washington and it was
18 presented to the state government in Atlanta and
19 it was not presented here in any formal way to the
20 city officials before it was revealed that El Paso
21 simultaneously asked for your expedited approval
22 of this petitioning process last fall. The
23 behavior to me is striking. It speaks directly to
24 the credibility of El Paso's promises about what
25 it will do to take care of our considerations down

1 the road and, frankly, it raises a red flag and it
2 should raise a red flag for the Commission about
3 professional standards.

4 Standard practice in developing disaster
5 preparedness plans for emergency compliance call
6 for the closest collaborations between companies
7 and the public sector. If you don't believe me,
8 please read the professional publications from
9 such organizations as the Risk and Insurance
10 Management Institute, from the American Society
11 for Industrial Security, read the Journal of
12 Operational Risk Manager, read the Business
13 Roundtables Publications and others, to name only
14 a few. That collaboration between companies and
15 the public sector calls for more than courtesy
16 calls on city officials and promises. It begins
17 with candor and information sharing and it
18 proceeds to joint work on emergency procedures,
19 the development of communications plans, the
20 evacuation of scenarios, training and equipment
21 needs, exercises after action assessments of those
22 exercises.

23 As we've heard already from Mr. Johnson,
24 the state's consultant, with attempting to deal
25 with this issue of hazardous materials plus

1 including LNG through the city, El Paso has
2 essentially ignored the information from the
3 city's first responders, from Mr. Johnson as well
4 as from concerned citizens. As the evidence
5 accumulates, El Paso's behavior, it seems to me is
6 characteristic of the industry. This isn't my
7 opinion. It's the judgment of the presidential
8 Commission on the deep water horizon disaster.

9 As the chairman of the Commission said,
10 and I quote, when it comes to safety, we face a
11 pervasive problem of a complacent industry that
12 simply doesn't have a culture that reflects what
13 it says. Are these comments -- these were
14 comments about petroleum (inaudible). Are they
15 relevant to the issue on the table today? I think
16 they are, and let me give you an example why.

17 Let me quote from a study by a
18 distinguished panel of terrorism and security
19 experts that were pulled together by Monetta
20 Transportation Institute, a congressionally
21 chartered think tank, that studies transportation
22 policy and their report was done in January of
23 2010. And I'm quoting, they said the following:
24 The terrorists use of truck foreign hazardous
25 materials against public buildings and gatherings

1 is a cause for great concern. We also conclude
2 that while government and industry tend to be
3 dismissive of truck born security threats from
4 flammable liquids. And that's how the Department
5 of Homeland Security classifies LNG, methane,
6 flammable liquids pose security threats that
7 should not be minimized. That was written a year
8 ago.

9 Frankly, we don't find El Paso's
10 dismissal from public safety and security
11 insurance credible nor would the panel of experts
12 that wrote the report from which I just quoted.
13 We don't believe that FERC should either. In a
14 post 9/11 world the uncharted security issues
15 raised by this Patti are troubling. In our
16 research we have found no unclassified analysis or
17 vulnerability of the LNG trucks to terrorist
18 attack nor any public illusions to classified
19 studies or assessments of that subject. We found
20 no trend analysis that addresses the security
21 vulnerability this petition proposes to introduce
22 into the heart of the city. Despite the
23 voluminous analysis of the threats to LNG ships to
24 seaborne transportation of LNG and to land based
25 port facilities, we've discovered no risk studies

1 on LNG trucking including the ability of LNG
2 trucks to vehicles to withstand different
3 scenarios for attack.

4 Now, the Department of Transportation
5 regulatory colleagues highlight these issues in
6 their security planning guidance for carriers, for
7 truckers. And let me quote from that guidance:
8 Quote, there is no moderately secured buffer zone
9 that surrounds the truck while on a route. This
10 is a most challenging security setting, end quote.

11 El Paso proposes to put 58 trucks a day
12 at the end of its development of its new facility
13 on the road creating what arguably are an obvious
14 set of targets. We don't believe that FERC can
15 ignore the security issue, whatever FERC's
16 mandate, or accept El Paso's reassurances in an
17 area where the company and the industry simply
18 don't have expertise. Your role, FERC's role, the
19 Commission's role at the end of the day is
20 critical. No regulatory inquiry would be complete
21 without a full study of the post 9/11 risk
22 environment for hazardous material trucking
23 through cities. It seems to me that this petition
24 calls for just that study. A response that simply
25 says no need the future will be like the past

1 would not only be negligent if an incident, if an
2 attack occurs, it would put the consequences
3 squarely on the shoulders of the regulatory
4 process. Only the federal government has the
5 information and the access, the expertise to
6 perform such a study. No city fire or city police
7 chief and no state level official can make
8 intelligent informed decisions on this
9 unprecedented petition until such risk analysis is
10 done.

11 A federal study of the risk involving
12 urban trucking and LNG must be an interagency
13 effort and it has to examine a broad range of
14 questions only a few. I'll mention now, how
15 vulnerable are LNG trucks? Are the safety
16 features that currently exist on these trucks and
17 carrier security training, training cited by the
18 industry as its contributions to the security of
19 the transportation network, are they even relevant
20 if vehicles face a terrorist assault in the midst
21 of a city? What kinds of attacks and what kinds
22 of countermeasures are possible? It doesn't take
23 a lot of imagination: Explosive devices placed on
24 the truck, car bombs directed at the truck,
25 high-powered weapons all present scenarios that

1 must be understood in order to understand the
2 risks that lies in the property in an urban
3 setting.

4 Are the current federally required
5 security guidelines for transportation of
6 hazardous materials even adequate if LNG trucks
7 are a constant presence on city streets? Most of
8 the security requirements associated with trucking
9 involve recordkeeping. They don't address the
10 real world hazards that the proposed routing of
11 LNG through Savannah would present.

12 As part of considering the
13 nonenvironmental issues that are associated with
14 this petition and as part of your role in
15 forwarding your findings and your concerns, your
16 analysis and your assessments to others of your
17 colleagues in a regulatory community, given the
18 lack of research on these subjects, given the
19 opportunity this petition presents, we don't
20 believe that a responsible decision can be made on
21 this petition unless the study that we're
22 requesting is done. We look to the Commission to
23 set aside assurances from El Paso and to call for
24 research and analysis of this sort before a final
25 decision on this petition is made. Thank you.

1 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you, Mr. Harrington.
2 The next commenter that signed up to speak is
3 Pamela Miller.

4 MS. MILLER: Good evening. My name is
5 Pamela Miller, P-a-m-e-l-a, M-i-l-l-e-r. I'm
6 president of Kensington Park Community
7 Association. The neighborhoods I represent abut
8 DeRenne Avenue and consist of 450 homes. I'm also
9 the cofounder of Citizens For a Safe Secure
10 Savannah. Citizens For a Safe Secure Savannah is
11 grassroots organization focused on the safety and
12 security concerns raised by the petition now
13 before you seeking to truck LNG through the
14 streets of Savannah.

15 We're voicing our concerns this evening
16 over the contemptuous manner in which Southern LNG
17 has handled their responses to the questions
18 raised in FERC's environmental data request. More
19 specifically the lack of concern given the city's
20 leadership and its citizens in answering those
21 questions related to the safety and security
22 issues inherent in trucking hazardous materials
23 through populated areas. El Paso's response
24 through its subsidiaries is witness to this
25 company's disregard of not only the impact of

1 proposed trucking on the city but also of the
2 strained physical status of this jurisdiction, a
3 city that will inevitably pay for the cost of
4 safety and security measures required by SNLG's
5 activities.

6 As to the request to expedite this
7 application we simply ask what's the rush? We
8 asked that FERC slow down the process currently
9 underway in order to allow time to complete among
10 other things an environmental impact statement.
11 An environmental impact statement is needed in
12 order to accurately determine the effects directly
13 and indirectly that trucking 58 tankers per day
14 will have socially and economically on Savannah as
15 well as the cost analysis for all mitigating
16 alternatives. Southern LNG in its motion for lead
17 to answer stated an environmental impact statement
18 was unnecessary. It also misrepresents FERC
19 mandate to use such an environmental assessment to
20 take in account how certain action significantly
21 affect the quality of human environment. An EIS
22 would detail the affected environment, offer
23 alternatives and evaluate the impact on historic
24 and cultural sites as well as social and economic
25 effects.

1 One obvious example is the impact that
2 the petition if granted will have on the DeRenne
3 Project. The DeRenne Project has at its core a
4 plan to reduce traffic, narrow lanes and
5 revitalize the neighborhoods along that avenue.
6 In the response to FERC's data request number 14,
7 which describes the impact LNG will have on
8 Project DeRenne, Southern LNG's response is
9 factually wrong in declaring there was no funding
10 for this project. In fact, the DeRenne Project
11 has \$18 million of SPLOST, which is special
12 purpose local option sales tax, funding and it's
13 preparing to move into the engineering phase
14 approval this month and anticipates beginning the
15 actual implementation as early as this fall. It
16 is clear that Southern LNG's proposed trucking
17 would effectively destroy the goals set for the
18 DeRenne Project, which accounts for countless
19 hours by citizens and city officials, hundreds of
20 thousands of taxpayer dollars and the hopes of
21 Savannah's residents and businesses alike for a
22 better city. What investors would be willing to
23 build a business along a major trucking route for
24 hazardous materials?

25 The city of Savannah in its request to

1 FERC of September 13th, 2010 clearly notes the
2 complacent manner in which El Paso subsidiaries,
3 Southern LNG and Southeast LNG answers data
4 request 18, which questions whether Southern LNG
5 intends to implement any mutual aid agreement, a
6 voluntary response program to assist in handling
7 LNG truck incidents by stating Southeast LNG will
8 provide training for Savannah first responders by
9 SLNG and third parties. That's it; that the
10 planning and preparedness promised will occur at a
11 later date at an unspecified future date is not
12 only irresponsible but unconscionable.

13 Both the fire department and the police
14 department as first responders plays central roles
15 in these functions. Southern LNG's reaction is
16 indicative of its disinterest in supporting the
17 city's role, in particular the training and cost
18 associated with trucking unprecedented quantities
19 of LNG through the heart of the city not to
20 mention the complexity of coordinating emergency
21 management actions such as evacuations in the
22 event of an LNG accident are matters that require
23 careful study, costing, agreement on shared
24 responsibilities and explicit commitment to
25 provide knowledge and resources before any

1 decision on this petition is made. If any
2 requests makes clear the contempt of Southern LNG
3 Corporation for the city leadership as well as
4 Savannah citizens, that particular response stands
5 out.

6 Routing is also an issue. Presently
7 Savannah has no identified hazardous material
8 routing. The city needs time to carefully
9 evaluate not only the routing but alternatives to
10 trucking that mitigate the risks, and that's
11 almost ten years post 9/11. There is no federally
12 mandated electronic reporting on the location of
13 hazardous materials. At best we have your old
14 data on about 40 percent of the HAZMAT cargo on
15 our railways and roadways. So until this city can
16 thoroughly analyze the presence of hazardous cargo
17 on our roads, we simply cannot effectively weigh
18 the impact of 58 more trucks per day. In
19 reviewing the Thomas & Hutton Traffic Impact
20 Analysis done as part of the Southern LNG petition
21 it would appear that the preferred route would be
22 used at Truman Parkway when Phase V of the Parkway
23 opens. This is not a proposal that should be
24 rushed. This alternative as well as other
25 alternatives such as El Paso perhaps building a

1 new pipeline along with reliquefication in a rural
2 area could drastically minimize the safety and
3 security issues. Trucking is cheaper but it puts
4 the burden on the back of our city to pay for
5 security and safety. I also want to clear the
6 mischaracterization made in this morning news
7 editorial. The groups I am affiliated with as do
8 I, do not favor any routes. To the contrary, our
9 very position is that the city and the HAZMAT
10 officials simply don't have enough information at
11 this time to make that determination, which,
12 again, speaks to the need for an environmental
13 impact statement. The Thomas & Hutton Study is
14 one aspect to be considered but the final route
15 should include city leaders, first responders and
16 citizens.

17 Finally, based on the company's efforts
18 to assure former city manager, Michael Brown, and
19 the city council in October 1999 and again in 2001
20 that no trucking would occur from Elba Island save
21 an occasional truck for maintenance purposes and
22 its action voiding those pledges should be
23 sufficient to produce a demand to stop the
24 petitioning process at this point.

25 Southern LNG in its application to

1 reactivate the truck loading facilities at Elba
2 Island stated that if no issue of substance is
3 raised by any request to be heard, SLNG requests a
4 shortened procedure be used. On behalf of the
5 Kensington Park Community Association and the
6 Citizens For a Safe Secure Savannah, we submit to
7 you that the aforementioned qualify as issues of
8 substance; therefore, the request to reach final
9 approval by February 28th should be denied. Thank
10 you.

11 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you, Ms. Miller.
12 The next commenter is Bill Durrence.

13 MR. DURRENCE: Thank you. My name is
14 Bill, B-i-l-l, Durrence, D-u-r-r-e-n-c-e. I'm a
15 downtown resident, a member of Citizens For a Safe
16 and Secure Savannah, Preserving Savannah's
17 Neighborhoods and Downtown Neighborhood
18 Association. The spring scoping meeting held last
19 September -- I'm sorry, the scoping meeting held
20 last September I spoke to questions (inaudible)
21 contention that Southern LNG through our city
22 poses no risks and their apparent attitude that we
23 should just trust them to do what's right and
24 necessary. My concern was and is not just the
25 security risks but the simple hullo. The PBT

1 disaster shows us, again, that people eventually
2 through any routine can begin to take risks, cut
3 corners to save time and money for just
4 convenience.

5 The explosion in Savannah Sugar shows us
6 the terrible consequences that can come from bad
7 behavior; yet from the September meeting until
8 yesterday, Southern had not met with the local
9 fire chief to discuss any planning preparedness
10 for the community or provided information
11 requested by Savannah City Council. In any human
12 endeavor is it impossible to eliminate error, risk
13 and sometimes maligned intent. For that reason
14 one company seeking financial gain wants to expose
15 residential neighborhoods and other highly
16 populated sensitive areas, schools, hospitals
17 military and governmental facilities, commercial
18 and historic properties to great risk. That
19 company has a responsibility to explain what the
20 worse case scenario might be, what steps they will
21 take to limit the possible problems, what action
22 will be necessary to most effectively deal with
23 problems if they occur and who will be responsible
24 for performing those actions, what liability they
25 will assume for all equivalent and training

1 necessary, what liability both near and long term
2 they will assume for people and property injured
3 in any incident and what financial arrangement
4 they will make to ensure any kind of insolvency if
5 there should be an accident or incident. The
6 answers to these questions must be specific and
7 unambiguous.

8 In addition, the other possibility of a
9 tanker being involved in a routine traffic
10 accident, I'm concerned about security of these
11 trucks. When an LNG tanker ship comes up there
12 with a delivery, a very large security comes
13 around that ship potentially interfering with
14 other board activity, but, apparently, no forms of
15 security measures are required of truck tankers
16 even though it would be a much easier target than
17 a ship.

18 El Paso's request to keep certain
19 documents sent in secret seems to approve that
20 there are serious security concerns with this
21 project. What measures will Southern take to
22 protect us from terrorist attack? Who will the
23 truck drivers work for? Who is liable and what
24 training will they get for those safety and
25 security risks? There is -- you take this much

1 heavy traffic and add it to local streets will
2 cause substantial wear and tear on our
3 infrastructure. What will El Paso do to defray
4 those costs so local taxpayers are not subsidizing
5 their operation?

6 Additionally, the city and Project
7 DeRenne have spent years publically working on
8 Project DeRenne to improve that traffic corridor.
9 Most parties ultimately agreed that lighting and
10 more pavement was not the answer. Beautification
11 and (inaudible) will better serve the residential
12 and commercial. Why did El Paso not participate
13 in that conversation instead of making this
14 petition after the planning was done?

15 The recent filing of historical data had
16 a number of errors including many businesses that
17 no longer exist and it used a one quarter mile
18 radius, yet evacuation rate is from one mile.
19 Shouldn't the data measure the property to that
20 distance and shouldn't it be an accurate before
21 being used in this process. Thank you.

22 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for your
23 comments. The next commenter is John Snedeker.

24 MR. SNEDEKER: John, J-o-h-n, Snedeker,
25 S-n-e-d-e-k-e-r. I'm president of Synergistic

1 Dynamics, a local consulting firm that specializes
2 in the energy industries. I suppose that I should
3 acknowledge up front that my company and I support
4 the application. We note that the opposition
5 claims that, quote, policy clearly restricts
6 transporting LNG through populated areas; however,
7 El Paso has asked for a waiver of this requirement
8 citing, quote, no other option. We believe that
9 trucking LNG under the current circumstances poses
10 a safety and security risk to the city and the
11 county. Let's examine those claims.

12 First, we are unaware of any state,
13 local or national, quote, policy, end quote, that
14 restricts transporting LNG through populated
15 areas. LNG is routinely transported by over 100
16 trucks a day in areas in and around Boston that
17 are far more densely populated than the suburbs of
18 Savannah.

19 Second, the industry is located east of
20 the city of Savannah including Southern LNG have,
21 quote, no other routes, routing option; therefore,
22 gasoline and a variety of chemicals truck through
23 historic district everyday. The ultimate solution
24 to this problem is a second toll bridge across the
25 Savannah River east of the Savannah River. We've

1 been advocating that for over 20 years.

2 The third, this terrorist attack is in
3 opposition. Every new or expanded industrial
4 project since 9/11. There have been no terrorist
5 attacks on any LNG facility anywhere in the world.
6 The Federal Transit Administration, FTA, recently
7 published a study titled Summary Assessment of the
8 Safety, Health, Environmental and Risk, System
9 Risks of Alternative Fuel, cite standards issued
10 by the National Fire Protection Administration
11 concerning the design and instruction of LNG
12 trucks. It reported that, quote, the double wall
13 construction of the LNG tank truck is inherently
14 more robust than the equivalent tanker truck
15 design to transport gasoline and other liquids;
16 therefore, the transport of the LNG is safer from
17 the perspective of fuel spills resulting from a
18 tank rupture during an accident, end of quote.

19 With regard to environmental issues the
20 FTA report said, quote, there are no significant
21 environmental hazards associated with an
22 accidental discharge of LNG, end quote. There
23 have been several incidents of vehicle crashes of
24 trailers carrying LNG including rollovers. In all
25 but one case where only a minor leak occurred the

1 tank stayed intact and retained the LNG. An LNG
2 trailer was subject to intense fire while parked
3 in a Connecticut LNG facility recently. The tank
4 retained its structural integrity and did not lose
5 any product.

6 In September 9th of 2003, a tank truck,
7 an LNG tank truck overturned on the I-93/I-95
8 interchange north of Boston. It was no leakage of
9 LNG from the overturned truck, although the
10 accident tied up traffic during morning rush hour.
11 The incident was widely reported, not so much
12 because of the nature of the cargo, but because of
13 the impact on the traffic flows during the morning
14 rush hour.

15 Last week a gasoline tank truck was
16 involved in an accident on a highway overpass to
17 Florida. The gasoline spilled, caught fire and
18 severely damaged the overpass. It melted the
19 rebars and it will require the entire structure be
20 replaced.

21 The citizens for a Safe Secure Savannah
22 was quoted in this morning news as saying the city
23 is in the dark on these risks. This is just
24 ingenuous giving a massive amount of information
25 data available through the internet and

1 publications such as those cited here, we commend
2 to the attention of the mayor, alderman of
3 Savannah and to the fire chief a book titled,
4 quote, LNG Risk Based Safety: Modeling and
5 Consequence Analysis by John L. Woodward and Robin
6 Pitblado, 374 pages, published in 2010 by John
7 Wiley & Sons. It considers risks on the
8 extraction, transportation and maintenance of LNG.
9 Includes a discussion of case studies and LNG
10 related accidents for the past half century and
11 summarizes findings of the government
12 accountabilities office, survey of 19 LNG experts
13 across North America and Europe. Thank you very
14 much for your attention.

15 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for your
16 comments. Our next commenter is Pete Simon.

17 MR. SIMON: Pete Simon, P-e-t-e,
18 S-i-m-o-n. I'm president of the Fairway of
19 Greenview Neighborhood Association. Our board has
20 been very active for many years with various
21 endeavors to approve not only our immediate
22 neighborhood but our community as a whole.
23 Several of our board members have also served on
24 the Project DeRenne Committee, Preserving Savannah
25 Neighborhood and Citizens For a Safe Secure

1 Savannah. We have worked timelessly of the many
2 years regarding DeRenne Avenue like many citizens
3 of Savannah and are very happy to finally come to
4 consensus on Project DeRenne, one that I feel
5 would not only calm traffic but help beautify our
6 city. We feel that putting 116 trucks a day on
7 DeRenne Avenue would completely demoralize and
8 derail the project and the many years of effort by
9 citizens and officials of Savannah, not to mention
10 the monetary cost associated with it along the
11 way. And, by the way, I note in the report to the
12 F-E-R-C that Fairway Oaks-Greenview is listed as
13 historical on a local and state level. We are, in
14 fact, listed on the national registry of
15 historical places.

16 We don't believe that these trucks
17 should be allowed on the streets of Savannah but
18 at the very least until we as a community have all
19 questions answered regarding safety, security and
20 traffic concerns, we ask the F-E-R-C to suspend
21 application and not move forward.

22 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you Mr. Simon. Our
23 next commenter is Jack Gackknovs.

24 MR. GACKKNOVS: My name is Jack
25 Gackknovs, G-a-c-k-k-n-o-v-s. I am prepared a

1 statement but I heard about the fact that you are
2 not really responsible for the trucking routes but
3 it made me think a little bit of your moral
4 responsibility, though, and would like you to
5 convey that to the Commissioner.

6 It reminds me of a bathkeeper who keeps
7 giving alcohol to the dangerous and already blind
8 person and when that person makes an accident, the
9 bathkeeper says this is not my mistake. I only
10 sell, I only license etc. Now, back to my
11 prepared statement. I understand that it is not
12 your job to judge the merits of the business plan
13 but the truth is that the recently discovered
14 large companies of natural gas preserves in the
15 United States make important LNG as dubious as
16 commercial pension. Permitting -- granting I
17 should say, a dubious commercial pension and their
18 permitting the dangerous dubious commercial
19 venture is quite an error and that becomes our
20 business.

21 There is currently no national economic
22 need or a national energy need that overrides the
23 dangers that transporting of important -- imported
24 LNG poses, the risk of transporting LNG by truck
25 five out of eight, the national benefit, if there

1 was any national benefit to begin with. Since we
2 last spoke during the first public scoping
3 meeting, it has become more probable that the
4 United States will in all likelihood export LNG
5 rather than an import. There may be a need for
6 LNG in the future by not permitting the trucking
7 of LNG now, though, the F-E-R-C as it stands in
8 for the government and all its citizens can send a
9 much needed message to the energy industry
10 regarding the importance of safety, the message
11 that industry has trouble receiving as evidenced
12 recently by the BP in the Gulf, the accident in
13 the coal mines in West Virginia and the explosion
14 of a gas pipeline in California. The message is
15 that we as a nation need a vision and a plan about
16 how to deal safely with LNG, a substance the
17 Homeland Security office clearly recognizes as
18 terrorist start. The message is that the industry
19 to develop technology that are safer than what we
20 have today.

21 The message is also that developing
22 business activity in our community is welcome but
23 not at any price. The message finally is that
24 sheep and green energy is great but the safety of
25 citizens is great. Thank you for your attention.

1 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you. The next
2 commenter is Peter Sneck, I believe. Sorry.

3 MR. SCHENK: Peter Schenk, P e t e r,
4 S-c-h-e-n-k. I'm a vice president at
5 St. Joseph's/Candler Health System and I'm far
6 from an expert on this and I have no knowledge on
7 this subject but I am concerned about the safety
8 of not only of our community but our facilities as
9 well, so I have several questions and some maybe
10 you can answer tonight, maybe you can just add to
11 this list of questions for the review. I
12 understand the trucking company will be separate,
13 a separate company from Southern LNG. That always
14 poses concerns about who is responsible in the
15 event of an accident or a misfortune and I just
16 don't -- I have no idea how this works and whether
17 or not FERC requires minimal limits on financial
18 responsibility for their projects. I know there
19 have been questions tonight about worst case
20 scenarios. Have you in the past reviews of other
21 projects, have you determined what the size of a
22 worse case could be? I mean, have you ever put a
23 dollar amount on that? Could you tell? I'm just
24 wondering.

25 MR. TURPIN: In terms of, as we said,

1 typically, the trucking is under the jurisdiction
2 for the -- on for the facility on --

3 MR. SCHENK: Right.

4 MR. TURPIN: -- the Island that's kind
5 of on shore facilities, the consequence analysis
6 that are done under the regs are just based on
7 heat levels not any economic analysis required in
8 terms of trying to quantify damage that way.

9 MR. SCHENK: Have you ever determined or
10 -- well, maybe the trucking people may tell us
11 this, but have we ever determined how large an
12 explosion could be, how far from that explosion
13 could expand?

14 We're right -- Candler Hospital is right
15 on DeRenne. St. Joseph's is right on Abercorn.
16 The traffic to the sites that you might --

17 COMMENTER: One mile radius.

18 MR. SCHENK: So is Southern LNG
19 responsible to meet minimal financial
20 responsibility related to this project in terms of
21 a loss of some sort? Is that a requirement in the
22 application process?

23 MR. TURPIN: Well, that is one thing we
24 are researching. I mean, the application to FERC
25 is on the Island. There has to be permits gotten

1 from the trucking and from the other agencies and
2 so we are looking into what those requirements are
3 as far as the discussions we've been having in the
4 NEPA document.

5 MR. SCHENK: Okay. So there is
6 really -- there is not a lot you can tell us
7 tonight about the -- you can't tell us anything
8 about the transportation of the project? Do you
9 make a decision before that decision is made as
10 far as how it's going to be transported? Do you
11 make a decision before those agencies weigh in on
12 this as far as, I mean, they could say, no, we
13 don't like the solution to transporting this
14 product, you know.

15 MR. TURPIN: So essentially is the
16 Commission -- when would the Commission's decision
17 be.

18 MR. SCHENK: Yes.

19 MR. TURPIN: Well, again, we're putting
20 together sort of advisory document to the
21 Commission. We'll issue that. That's the only
22 thing that sort of this staff hasn't totally
23 scheduled. The Commission decides when it wants
24 to -- when it thinks something is at a point in
25 time that it can consider it an issue or notice

1 when it's on their schedule. That's all I can
2 tell you. I don't know what their decision will
3 be.

4 MR. SCHENK: I'm concerned about our
5 hospitals and I know Memorial is concerned about
6 it as well about its hospital on the
7 transportation routes. Again, we have no -- we
8 have no idea whether or not it's safe or not safe.
9 We just need to have questions answered. The
10 biggest -- one of the big concerns is, you know,
11 is the carrier -- and I know the carrier is not
12 under the purview but is Southern LNG and/or the
13 carrier, are they responsible then to have minimal
14 limits of insurance and are they going to cover
15 just at the minimal amount that they are required
16 to or are they going to exceed that?

17 I'd like to know. I don't know if it's
18 a requirement for the application process for the
19 transportation side. I know you don't handle
20 that. And I've heard -- again, I'm not an expert
21 on this. I've heard that shipping companies --
22 and I know you're not the expert on this either,
23 but I've heard shipping companies are required at
24 times to have liability coverage or at a maximum
25 exposure rate. And I don't know if that's a

1 requirement under -- for LNG companies or anything
2 like that, but I would like to know if that is the
3 case and if the transporting companies are
4 required to do that as well.

5 We do have concerns. We have concerns
6 about transporting this product and, again, we do
7 not know. We have to have questions answered. So
8 thank you very much.

9 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for your
10 comments and questions. Our next speaker is
11 Audrey Platt.

12 MS. PLATT: I'm Audrey Platt,
13 A-u-d-r-e-y, P-l-a-t-t, and I'm just a citizen and
14 very, very concerned as is my family who all live
15 here about what this trucking could mean and the
16 risks we feel are enormous around I'm so grateful
17 to all those who have spoken tonight. They know
18 so much and they have covered so much territory
19 proving that we know very little except that
20 Southern LNG trucking will bring major new risks,
21 I believe, to my city; that Southern LNG has not
22 committed safety personnel or funding to deal with
23 any accident. What is the company's commitment to
24 disaster remediation including funding, which
25 could be huge if there were an accident?

1 In addition, no information has been
2 provided to the public about Southern's security
3 plans to protect against terrorist targeting.
4 There are just way too many unknown areas here for
5 our safety and we rely on FERC since we don't have
6 the Department of Transportation here to provide
7 these, and I hope an EIS that will go more
8 diligently into these things.

9 In closing I'd like to quote from
10 Savannah Morning News this morning just another
11 possibility, quote, why not pipe natural gas to a
12 depot outside Savannah where the fuel can be
13 rechilled to liquid form. Concern about trucking
14 would vanish as would the need for FERC hearings.
15 I don't know that Southern has considered this
16 because I know it's more expensive than trucks but
17 it's certainly safer. Thank you.

18 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for your
19 comments. Our next commenter is Ellis cook.

20 MR. COOK: My name is Ellis Cook,
21 E-l-l-i-s, C-o-o-k. Just a little history on the
22 Elba Island tank on the form. I think you said it
23 came online in 1978 and I guess it was in service
24 for maybe two or three years and then it was
25 decommissioned for a number of years and it just

1 sat dormant until the early 2000s when Southern
2 LNG decided to restart the facility. I happened
3 to be on the city council at the time that it came
4 before council and during the council meeting, I
5 called for public hearings about the restart of
6 this facility. To my amazement or to my
7 knowledge, no public hearing was ever held on the
8 restart of this facility and the reason I was told
9 by Mayor Floyd Adams and by our city manager,
10 Michael Brown, was that they had a verbal
11 commitment from Southern LNG that they would never
12 transport LNG by truck through the streets of
13 Savannah. What I want to know is why they went
14 back on that promise and why should we trust
15 anything that they tell us now. Thank you.

16 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for your
17 comment. Our next commenter is Susan Cox.

18 MS. COX: You can just -- S-u-s-a-n,
19 C-o-x. Glad y'all have a scoping meeting again
20 and once again, here we are, lots of questions,
21 few answers. I'm sorry Mr. Snedeker left because
22 we had a question for him. Where does he live?

23 COMMENTER: Amen.

24 COMMENTER: Amen.

25 MS. COX: How would he feel if this was

1 coming near his residence or where his children
2 went to school or where his doctor's office is
3 that he goes to or he has a family member in the
4 hospital or any other locations around here,
5 businesses.

6 The question I have first is for the
7 people in the audience. How many here live or
8 work within one mile of any of the proposed
9 routes? If you'd just raise your hand just for a
10 visual. Thank you.

11 Potentially, you would all have to be
12 evacuated in the event of any type of accident
13 involving a truck carrying LNG. Doesn't matter,
14 trucks has been damaged, if there has been an
15 accident, you'll be evacuated. That alone would
16 be disastrous along Truman Parkway, DeRenne,
17 President Street, Bay Street, any one of the
18 selected routes. None of them are desirable.

19 I am a member of Preserving Savannah
20 neighborhoods and Citizens For a Safe Savannah. I
21 have served on the Fairway Association Board for
22 the last 16 years and their representative on the
23 Project DeRenne Advisory Committee. Our residents
24 as well as all the neighborhoods along or near
25 DeRenne have advocated for many years a plan for

1 DeRenne Avenue to preserve and protect the
2 surrounding neighborhoods. The Project DeRenne
3 Advisory Committee along with the Private DeRenne
4 Steering Committee, city staff and consultants
5 devised a plan to reduce the traffic congestion as
6 well as protecting neighborhoods. As a
7 neighborhood representative I was most concerned
8 with preserving neighborhoods and while this plan
9 is not perfect it achieves that goal.

10 The new access will alleviate traffic on
11 DeRenne. The new configuration of the roads and
12 proper place will keep that neighborhood contained
13 and solidify boundaries. These are goals we had
14 hoped to meet and did. Then comes August 22, 2010
15 an article telling us about proposed El
16 Paso/Southern LNG application to begin trucking
17 liquified natural gas on over 100 trucks per day
18 along DeRenne, 58 in, 58 out. Their first choice
19 for the truck route was DeRenne Avenue, the very
20 road on which this community has spent years
21 studying. Why would anyone ever recommend
22 trucking flammable material along a road adjacent
23 or near two of our three hospitals, Hunter Army
24 Airfield, numerous homes, businesses, schools and
25 school district facilities, doctor offices

1 synagogues, businesses everywhere.

2 Until December 31st I was a school board
3 member representing constituents who live along
4 most of DeRenne and know that this community and
5 more essentially parents of the students do not
6 want those trucks traveling next to our school
7 buses and schools. 58 trucks in and 58 truck out
8 everyday. Someone said it's no more hazardous
9 than a truck going down DeRenne to fill the gas
10 pumps, so I called one of the gas companies and
11 asked how often do their trucks come in and out to
12 fill up trucks for a gas station specifically
13 Colonial Oil on DeRenne. I was told that their
14 trucks come in around four or five times a week
15 and usually come until late at night or very early
16 in the morning so as to avoid the traffic and
17 inconveniencing the customers. So I don't think
18 you can fairly compare less than one truck per day
19 to 58 trucks in and out each and every day.

20 I could talk about the economics, the
21 lack of a current market for LNG, a glut of
22 domestic natural gas, the lack of any financial
23 benefit on the city of Savannah and its residents,
24 but I'll state the real concern: No matter the
25 level of emergency preparedness, no matter whose

1 funds the emergency preparedness, taxpayers, rest
2 assured, will do it one way or another. No matter
3 what safety plans El Paso puts in place, 58 trucks
4 carrying LNG poses too great a risk for a highly
5 populated residential and commercial area. Adding
6 those trucks alone increases the risk of accidents
7 simply by adding the trucks.

8 DeRenne is not currently a preferred
9 truck route. Making it one completely changes the
10 risk assessment to our area. Our neighborhoods,
11 families, coworkers and anyone along the route
12 will be at greater risk by allowing the trucks on
13 DeRenne.

14 Lastly, in 2009 Freeport LNG requested a
15 truck unloading facility. Per the FERC response
16 dated 3/25/10 -- this is kind of critical because
17 it's about trucking it. The LNG truck unloading
18 facility shall only be -- this is quote, from
19 y'all's response, FERC's first response, first
20 response, LNG truck unloading facility shall only
21 be used to replace the amount LNG loss due to boil
22 off while the oil/gas liquefactions facility are
23 not operational, e.g. during maintenance overhauls
24 and shall be limited to not only 66 gallons per
25 day, approximately six trucks per day. This is in

1 the response of FERC. Daily trucking summaries
2 shall be included in the city annual operation
3 reports to the Commission.

4 Number two, Freeport LNG shall conduct
5 ERP, which I guess is some kind of emergency
6 response plan, review meetings with Freeport fire
7 department management and other first responders
8 to address the ERP issues identified during the
9 Commission's November 18th, 2009 onsite review.
10 Freeport LNG shall consider conducting tabletop
11 exercises and mock drills in the local community.

12 Number three, and this is the real
13 kicker, at least two weeks prior to each use of
14 the truck unloading facility when the oil off gas
15 liquefactions facilities are not operational,
16 Freeport LNG shall provide notice to the elected
17 officials and first responders in the town of
18 Montana, which is where Freeport LNG facility is,
19 and shall familiarize the on scene incident
20 commander with the location of evacuation zones,
21 assembly areas and the main pick up points. All
22 that -- this is for six trucks every once in a
23 while. Two weeks notice to the first responders
24 and elected officials. Now, I mean, y'all's phone
25 would have to be on speed dial. Jeff, your phone

1 would be ringing off the hook because there is
2 always going to be a truck on the road.

3 Savannah residents are supposed to
4 accept 58 trucks coming in and 58 trucks fully
5 loaded each and every day? And this is not last
6 comment, but it's really a request to the -- and I
7 appreciate the council members who are here. I
8 don't know of any Chatham County Commission
9 members are here but I certainly live in the
10 county as well, the Savannah county as well, but
11 since we keep hitting this roadblock about
12 trucking, that trucking is not under FERC's
13 purview although it sure is included in the
14 application, I'm going to request that city
15 council -- well, I'm begging that y'all contact
16 the Federal Motor Safety Administration and GDOT
17 and request a public meeting so that we can have
18 this same discussion with them since they somehow
19 are insulated from this process. It's really
20 unfair to the citizens to continue to hear that
21 FERC is only dealing with the unloading facility
22 on Elba Island and the trucking is not in your
23 purview when trucks -- I'm concerned about Elba
24 Island because they are neighbors and residents
25 that live near there, but do you really increase

1 the risk dramatically, exponentially between
2 putting that liquified natural gas on 58 trucks
3 coming in and out Savannah everyday and we have
4 nobody -- has come to any of these meetings as any
5 part of that decisionmaking process. So I beg the
6 city of Savannah let the officials please request
7 a meeting with them, public meeting with them, so
8 that they, too, can hear our concerns. Thank you.

9 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you, Ms. Cox. The
10 next commenter is Marion Sprig, Mary Ellen Sprage.

11 MS. SPRAGE: Marry Ellen Sprage,
12 M-a-r-y, E-l-l-e-n, Sprage, S-p-r-a-g-e, alderman
13 for district, city of Savannah. First of all,
14 DeRenne runs right through my district and
15 includes the hospital that Mr. Schenk was just
16 talking about and the neighborhoods he was
17 concerned about. This has been going on since
18 August but not until today did Southern LNG meet
19 with our fire chief. They offered one thing:
20 Training only. We need to work with them on
21 routing, on time of day, on security issues, on
22 bonding, on assurance, on emergency response and
23 yet it was only today. They are in short bad
24 neighbors. They have not been forthcoming with
25 information. They have been slow to meet with

1 local officials. I completely support the
2 Citizens For a Safe and Secure Savannah that you
3 have currently been hearing.

4 Mr. Schenk was talking about what is all
5 this about, the fellow from Candler. Let me tell
6 you what it's all about: This is from the
7 emergency response guy. This is refrigerated
8 liquids. They are extremely flammable, will be
9 easily ignited by heat, sparks or flames, will
10 perform explosive mixtures with air. Vapors with
11 liquified gas are initially heavier in the air and
12 spread along the ground. Vapors may travel to
13 source of ignition and flash back. Cylinders
14 exposed to fire may bend and leave flammable gas.
15 The pressure relieves and containers may explode
16 when heated. Ruptured cylinders may rocket.
17 Help. Vapors may cause dizziness or asphyxiation
18 without warning. Some may be irritating if
19 inhaled at high concentrations. Contact with gas
20 or liquified gas may cause burns, severe injury
21 and/or frost bumps by these irritating and toxic
22 gases.

23 If there is an isolated spill, you have
24 to leave within 330 feet in all directions; if
25 it's a large dose, one half mile; if there is a

1 fire, one mile. This comes from the emergency
2 response guide as used throughout the United
3 States and was provided by our local fire chief.

4 I also looked at material, as
5 Mr. Snedeker formally talked about some of the
6 accidents that have happened. One of the
7 accidents which there was a natural gas fire was
8 recently in February 14th, 2005 in Finley, Nevada.
9 According -- and I read directly from the report
10 from that, according to the narrative on the rear
11 of the tank where the valves were located was a
12 leak of approximately one to two gallons per
13 minute of liquified natural gas to be immediately
14 formed a natural gas vapor cloud as it contacted
15 the external atmosphere. Initially, the Lion
16 County Fire Department commanded, according to the
17 DOT ERG book, evacuation distance of 350 feet from
18 leaking tanker. The driver of the truck reported
19 a small initial leak and became larger. Following
20 steps taken to lead the pressure of the tank, an
21 unknown ignition -- an unknown ignition, didn't
22 even know what caused the fire started the fire.
23 After ten unsuccessful attempts to extinguish the
24 fire, all fire units were moved approximately one
25 half mile away from the fire and all surrounding

1 businesses were closed. Interstate 80 was also
2 closed as more fire units dispatched to the
3 sustaining area. The (Inaudible) fire units were
4 moved several times and final staging taking place
5 approximately one -- I don't think -- that is one
6 mile from the scene. The fire burned without
7 suppression efforts for approximately
8 three-and-a-half hours.

9 What I'm saying to you here is this is
10 dangerous. This is very dangerous. The people of
11 Savannah know it is dangerous, Southern LNG has
12 not -- please deny this request. Thank you.

13 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you, Ms. Sprage.
14 Our next commenter is Joanne Wee.

15 MS. LEE: JoAnn Lee. That's, J-o
16 capital A-n-n, L-e-e, and I'm a resident of
17 Kensington Park and as an earlier speaker said,
18 what we've learned today is that we know nothing
19 or we know very little. Unfortunately, Southern
20 LNG has been very insulated, not forthcoming and
21 I -- it is in my nature and I think it is in
22 several people's nature that if someone is
23 withholding information, they must be trying to
24 hide something and so I feel very nervous. I
25 think many citizens of Savannah feel very nervous

1 about trucking, transporting liquid natural gas
2 through any part of Savannah.

3 I think historically liquid natural gas
4 has been transported only through rural or
5 unpopulated areas and as Mr. Allen said earlier
6 that at one point there was a promise that they
7 would never transport it through the city and it's
8 bewildering and suspicious that they now change
9 their minds. So I feel that many questions have
10 to be answered and I hope you will. I know that
11 you have repeatedly said that transportation is
12 not under your purview, but I also think you said
13 you consider these issues when writing, drafting
14 your environmental assessment and so I hope you
15 will seriously consider the concerns that have
16 been voiced by many people.

17 And I just do want to reiterate that
18 that the citizens of Savannah have spent many
19 hours, years, probably goes back ten years, but
20 they have been discussing how to manage traffic on
21 DeRenne and it comes about every ten years, you
22 know, how do we manage this traffic and it was a
23 year-long project. It was already mentioned
24 that's just wrapped up recently called Project
25 DeRenne and the goals as was mentioned earlier was

1 to try to focus on traffic abatement not traffic
2 enhancement and it sounds like that's what they
3 want to do is enhance our traffic. So we did
4 reach our goals, that is to devise a plan that
5 would calm traffic and that would -- that would
6 improve the beautification of the city and now it
7 seems like this is going to be washed out because
8 if, that is, you do propose, you do approve this
9 proposal and then if they are allowed to truck
10 through DeRenne, then that will destroy the
11 private DeRenne plan. But I agree I think that
12 any type of transportation through any part of
13 Savannah should not be allowed, so please do not
14 play with fire at the expense of the lives of the
15 citizens of Savannah. So please do not approve
16 this proposal. Thank you.

17 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you, Ms. Lee. Our
18 next commenter is Charles Moody.

19 MR. MOODY: My name is Charles Moody.
20 It's spelled C-h-a-r-l-e-s, M-o-o-d-y. At the
21 last meeting that I was here, the federal experts
22 from Washington said that anything could go wrong
23 would go wrong, so what does that tell me? That
24 the worse scenario is that these tanker trucks
25 could go super nova, they could explode. So now

1 we know that. Now, we know that there is good LNG
2 and that there is evil LNG. The good LNG and when
3 you pipe the gas on the other side of the city and
4 to the other locations, that's good LNG. Evil LNG
5 is trucking it because they know that they will
6 explode. Thank you.

7 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you, Mr. Moody. Our
8 next commenter is Arthur Wolters.

9 MR. WOLTERS: My name is Arthur Wolters
10 A-r-t-h-u-r, W-o-l-t-e-r-s. I've been a commenter
11 to the first FERC comment with a comment in
12 support of LNG and I have been the author of an
13 article in the Savannah Morning News, which
14 receives the title, thanks to Tommy Martin of
15 Don't Be Scared of LNG, although my initial title
16 that I submitted to the paper was LNG Shipping One
17 Truck At a Time. I guess I'm speaking to try to
18 overcome the inflammatory rhetoric and
19 inflammatory in both senses of the word: To
20 exaggerate the danger of LNG itself, which is
21 playing with liquified natural gas, and the
22 inflammatory scare tactics employed by so many
23 people, which truly scare people like Ms. Lee and
24 others. We can't say we do not know about natural
25 gas. It is the oldest method of energy used today

1 other than coal and it was first discovered in
2 Pennsylvania 190 years ago and the worse thing
3 that people can say about it is it burns hot.
4 Well, that's why we use it. We can't heat our
5 houses, run our industries with something that
6 doesn't burn hot.

7 The most famous statistic quoted by the
8 consultants hired by Savannah city council was
9 this oft quoted statement that the danger extends
10 a mile. Where does the mile come from? Where did
11 the number come from? Well, the commonly used
12 number for all liquid hydrocarbons, it's not a
13 specific number derived for liquified natural gas
14 or propane or gasoline or jet fuel. It's just a
15 routine number that if you have a big spill of
16 liquified petroleum, it's better to get from it if
17 it's burning or even if it's not burning for that
18 matter. But it's not a specific fault of LNG evil
19 or otherwise.

20 The essence of my article in the
21 Savannah Morning News was to say that LNG is one
22 of the lesser hazardous hydrocarbons and you might
23 say, well, what could be worse? Well, the propane
24 that's in your back yard grill is worse. In the
25 first place, its molecular weight is three times

1 as high, which mean its vapor is three times
2 heavier, which means it flows along the ground and
3 does not disperse even after it warms up. The
4 propane in your back yard grill it boils at minus
5 42 degrees centigrade, which is about minus 42
6 degrees Fahrenheit, also. And on a winter day the
7 pressure in your propane tank is about four
8 atmospheres or 60 pounds per square inch, but on a
9 hot summer day the tank on your back deck goes to
10 325 pounds of pressure and you don't think a thing
11 of it. For us liquified natural gas we shipped at
12 atmospheric pressure because it's shipped cold.
13 So LNG is not unprecedented as one of the
14 presenters said. It is a 190-year-old material
15 and cooling it into a liquid does not change it
16 into evil.

17 Some of the people that wrote letters to
18 the editor mentioned many things that are shipped
19 as liquid. One of them is oxygen and they listed
20 that along with things that burn. Well, oxygen
21 does not burn. Oxygen is the stuff that does the
22 burning and really it is a very hazardous
23 material. So but it doesn't burn in the sense of
24 light a match to it but if you put a match to it,
25 the match will disappear very quickly because

1 liquid oxygen vapor rises to gaseous oxygen and
2 that is five times more concentrated than air is
3 with oxygen, so it will burn things more than five
4 times faster than air will.

5 I was surprised to see Candler Hospital
6 be an intervener in this process because at the
7 northwest corner of their hospital lab a tank of
8 liquid oxygen right next to two unloading stations
9 for liquid hydrogen, and what happens to a car
10 that drives into a cloud of liquid oxygen? It
11 burns up along with everybody in the car. So
12 let's recognize that the world is full of things
13 we have to handle carefully and unlike many of the
14 people here, I believe the history of El Paso
15 natural gas is that they have handled LNG
16 carefully.

17 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you Mr. Wolters.
18 Our next commenter is from the city council, Jeff
19 Felser.

20 MR. FELSER: J-e-f-f, F-e-l-s-e-r.
21 Alderman at large, post to Savannah City Council.
22 It's hard to follow up someone who has just
23 compared an LNG truck to a back yard grill. The
24 comparison is a little ludicrous, but I just want
25 to start from the beginning and thank you,

1 Mr. McGuire, thank you to Mr. Turpin and your
2 staff for coming again. Many of us were here on
3 September 29th, many of us are here again and it's
4 obvious tonight that we need to be here again and
5 I want to address the why. But first I also want
6 to thank you Fire Chief Middleton. I want to
7 concur with the comments made by Benjamin Johnson,
8 our consultant for the city of Savannah. I agree
9 with the mayor and the entire council that voted
10 nine to nothing with regards to questioning and
11 being an intervener in this process and I also
12 want to thank our interim acting city manager,
13 Rochelle Small Toney, who followed the mayor in
14 council's policy and direction by becoming an
15 intervener and I must say that it typifies the way
16 we should act together and if we do act together
17 when we know we are facing real harm. And let me
18 tell you why. Elba Island does come under your
19 jurisdiction. To come here tonight and to state
20 that you are still waiting and seeking information
21 from this company that months and months have
22 passed on the engineering modeling and that you
23 haven't gotten probably accident and security
24 modeling to go with that, that is your
25 jurisdiction. That in and of itself is reason to

1 deny any expedited process; that in and of itself
2 is to ensure that there is an additional scoping
3 meeting after you get that information so that we
4 can ask the responsible questions we need to ask.
5 We can't ask questions tonight upon information
6 you haven't even received yet. It's ludicrous.

7 There has been no reason for a shortened
8 procedure. In fact, there has been tremendous
9 reason for an environmental impact statement must
10 be done, must be done. To do so otherwise would
11 be to ignore that this is a very rich coastal
12 community environmentally, combined with the
13 historic and urban setting and, yes, a port that
14 has natural security interests and Elba Island is
15 a perfect opportunity as well as the intersection
16 of Abercorn and DeRenne for terroristic activity.
17 It is a very fine balancing act and why on earth
18 in going into such a fine balancing act would you
19 engage in a shortened procedure? All the more
20 reason to follow the procedure to its logical
21 conclusion and not grant any shortened or
22 expedited procedure. That in and of itself is a
23 smell test. There is a reason for that. Why
24 would they want to shorten it?

25 All but two speakers have spoken against

1 this activity of trucking but I am also advocating
2 that you have every reason under your jurisdiction
3 with regard to Elba Island and the engineering and
4 the security risks to deny the expedited
5 procedure. I completely agree with my colleague,
6 Mary Ellen Sprage and all her comments that she
7 has made as well as fully support statements from
8 Secure Savannah as well as all of the neighborhood
9 presidents who have come here again, spent their
10 time and energy and effort and research. They are
11 incredible. Their statements speak for
12 themselves.

13 To Mr. Wolters, the one mile is
14 established in the emergency response guide.
15 Nobody made that up. It comes from federal
16 documents. The Nevada accident that my colleague,
17 Mary Ellen Sprage, spoke about we, spoke about in
18 September and it is a perfect example of where
19 they cited the one mile radius of evacuation. Can
20 you imagine evacuating at Abercorn and DeRenne?
21 All the schools, two of the major hospitals of the
22 city as well as it is the perfect intersection for
23 a terrorist to take out two of the local
24 synagogues including the synagogue and the day
25 school where many Orthodox Jewish people attend.

1 What an incentive you would be providing for
2 someone to come against this city in many ways:
3 To endanger our ports, endanger our people and all
4 of our citizens.

5 It has already been explained that
6 Hunter Army Airfield is within this radius. There
7 are many, many schools, which I haven't mentioned
8 or too numerous to mention. Historic
9 neighborhoods, just the evacuation alone, we don't
10 have the resources for and it's very obvious that
11 they would cause tremendous chaos and the
12 difference between the back yard grill and the LNG
13 is simply look at the difference. The only
14 solution that has been cited for LNG is let it
15 burn. Can we afford that? I can't even begin to
16 get into the questions about insurance but we
17 can't afford to let something burn. You are
18 talking about people's lives literally and their
19 pursuit of the happiness here in the city of
20 Savannah. It's unthinkable and it should not
21 even -- their proposal is deficient. It is just
22 factually and environmentally deficient.

23 I'd like to summarize by saying, you
24 know, there a lot things that local elected
25 officials are called upon to do but public safety

1 is number one. Public safety is our number one
2 priority and we are as unified as can be that we
3 will protect to the best of our ability the
4 citizens of Savannah as well as join in with the
5 county in protecting our citizens.

6 But FERC should also be aware that we
7 have unfilled positions in our Savannah fire and
8 emergency. We have faced a budget crunch just as
9 well as every other city throughout the country
10 and we have had to hold back on hiring. So not
11 only have our Savannah's first responders not been
12 educated but we don't have the resources to even
13 initially combat even the smallest of an accident.
14 There has been no credible independent risk
15 assessment of the hazardous material. The city
16 under the leadership of the mayor and the council
17 has taken it upon themselves to do a HAZMAT study
18 and we have found out that we are up against far
19 more than we can handle if there were a tremendous
20 accident. At this point in time we don't need to
21 add to that burden. It will eventually fall on
22 some taxpayer whether it's a citizen of Savannah,
23 the state of Georgia or the federal government,
24 somebody is going to have to pay and it wouldn't
25 be Southern LNG because they are going to contract

1 this work out to a trucker and that's how they are
2 going to insulate themselves from all of this.

3 The company's tone has been
4 irresponsible. The way we were first told about
5 what they proposed was not only irresponsible but
6 begs the question why. Why wouldn't you come to
7 us in the beginning? Why would you ask for an
8 expedited process? Why would you be against an
9 environmental impact study? What are they hiding?
10 What is it they don't want you, perk, to know?
11 And Chief Middleton has done his very best but
12 still lacks the details on accident modeling and
13 emergency response training requirements.

14 Savannah Morning News said it's
15 troubling. It's far more than troubling. It
16 borders on just an irresponsible disregard to life
17 in our community on the part of LNG and I pray
18 that FERC doesn't take that same attitude that you
19 will at the very least deny an expedited request,
20 allow our intervener status to have another
21 scoping meeting after you've gotten the material
22 that you have not gotten because we need time to
23 see it. We need time to study it and then after
24 that, please, for God's sake, deny this request.
25 It's all about the money. They just don't want to

1 pipe it. They just want to save money and change
2 it for lives and put people at risk. That's not
3 acceptable.

4 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for your
5 comments. Our next commenter is Judy Jennings.

6 MS. JENNINGS: Thank you. I'm Judy
7 Jennings, J-u-d-y, J-e-n-n-i-n-g-s, and I have
8 been an environmental activist for about 25 years
9 so I guess I could speak for several engineers,
10 but I've read these comments through the Coastal
11 Syria Club so I speak for them tonight. One of
12 the things I'm going to start out by saying is
13 that some things has been said about El Paso
14 tonight, but I want to make sure everybody
15 understands that El Paso no longer owns Southern
16 LNG. Wouldn't it be great if everybody in the
17 room could shelter their assets, their homes,
18 their residences, their hospitals, their schools.
19 The greatest is to shelter our assets the way El
20 Paso did. On November the 15th -- I've read a lot
21 of their material and I was -- you know, my inbox
22 was just flooded with these little words about how
23 El Paso had sold lock, stock and barrel Southern
24 LNG, El Paso Elba Express at an additional 15
25 percent interest in Southern Natural Gas and they

1 sold it to a Delaware limited partnership called,
2 let's see, El Paso Pipeline Partners and this is
3 basically money shuffling because El Paso
4 currently owns 52 percent limited partnership
5 interest and a two percent general partnership
6 interest in the partnership. So they are still in
7 the mix but they were able to do what a lot of us
8 could not do with our homes and assets and
9 resources that are in the way. So that was a real
10 cool trip I thought. I wish I could do it, but I
11 can't.

12 So I want to talk -- I want to go to
13 this document that you have on your website. It's
14 the 39 questions that were asked and largely El
15 Paso answered; however, if you don't mind, I might
16 say that of the 39 questions that were asked when
17 I printed it on my computer, questions 5, 6, 13,
18 14, 15, 20, 25, 26, 27, 28, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37
19 and 38 did not print because they are proprietary
20 or in some way what you call CEII, confidential
21 energy infrastructure information. I really would
22 appreciate it if y'all would release that data
23 because it's hard for me to stand here and talk to
24 you. I counted it up and that's 17 out of 39, so
25 it's real hard to maybe talk to you on cogent way

1 when 17 out of 39 questions are not available to
2 me. Not -- I mean, nothing of their answers. But
3 a little of it is, so one of the very -- let's
4 see, it was request number 13, it says based on
5 section -- I'm sorry, I'm boring and I don't have
6 prepared remarks and so this is going to be boring
7 for you, but if you'll just bear with me because
8 I'm talking foreign. Sections three, dash, two
9 point two, paragraph C of the Georgia Department
10 of Public Safety Transportation Rule Book, trucks
11 of LNG would be required to comply with Title 49
12 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 397,
13 Subpart C: So I'm thinking, let's see what El
14 Paso (inaudible) let's see what it says here.
15 Southeast LNG proposed route complies with Title
16 49 Code of Federal Regulations, Subpart C. This
17 subpart provides -- but let me go on and say to
18 you, they say Subpart C but they don't put Subpart
19 C they go, you know, A comply with nonhazardous
20 material routing designations of a state and Part
21 B, operate the facility over routes which do not
22 go through or near heavily populated areas, places
23 or routes where tunnels, narrow streets or alleys
24 except for the motor vehicle determines that there
25 is no practical alternative or, two, a reasonable

1 deviation, if necessary, to reach terminals,
2 points of loading and unloading facilities -- of
3 facilities for food, fuel, fuel, repairs, rest or
4 a safe haven. Now, that's all in Part B.

5 And so what they do here is cite, okay,
6 we're in the book. We're the -- let me see, I
7 printed that off today, there in the accept
8 category, so with a rule it's for the exception
9 but they never did address paragraph C, which says
10 operating convenience is not a basis for
11 determining whether it's practical to operate a
12 motor vehicle in accordance with paragraph B of
13 this section. So I honestly don't understand how
14 looking at this motor carrier responsibility for
15 routing Title 49 of CFR, Title 49 in any way gives
16 El Paso the right to do business with trucking out
17 of Elba Island. It's simply not in the law. It's
18 against the Code of Federal -- it's against
19 federal law. I don't understand it. I mean,
20 there are people in country that think they should
21 be able to set up shop and sell illegal drugs but
22 it is against the law and I think trucking out
23 of -- I think it's an inconvenient place. I'm
24 sorry they stuck it in out there in the middle of
25 river but they did and I don't think they deserve

1 to get to do business just because they want to.

2 In fact, I'm a little appalled at some
3 of the safety reference I've heard tonight because
4 people quoting them know very well that they told
5 you and they reminded you that the facility came
6 in, was operated for two years and then didn't
7 come back up until 2000 and it has not rammmed up
8 to full capacity even now. So, you know, it would
9 be -- you know, I have a bachelor of science in
10 biology is like letting me say, well, I've never
11 killed anybody in a surgery room. I haven't been
12 there so, I mean, my track record is almost nil
13 and so much so they haven't been doing it. It's a
14 real drag that goes on about their track record.

15 But I think I could make the case what
16 we're here tonight is to talk to you about
17 comments on the environmental assessment and I
18 want to say right off the bat there hasn't been an
19 activist that comes under -- I haven't seen any
20 (inaudible) not to just make the point of a
21 (inaudible.) You've already got virtually a
22 written record somewhere. We don't see it yet.
23 Unless there is an EA guide is validate finding
24 the most significant impact, so I think as I
25 looked up NEPA requirements today for

1 environmental impact statement, which you've heard
2 mentioned several times, it a much more lengthy
3 document. It does not presuppose an outcome. It
4 actually asks a question is this a good idea and
5 can we avoid and minimize or mitigate for it. So
6 as I looked through it, I want to talk to you
7 about the significance, context and intensity of
8 doing an EIS and I think that when we talk about
9 significance we're mostly talking about impacts
10 that should be discussed on any social, economic
11 or environmental impact that is uncertain. And I
12 think you've heard a lot of things here tonight
13 that is uncertain. And so when we talk about
14 significance, we would be asking who cares and how
15 much do they care and what is the agency
16 experience in dealing with similar situations.
17 And except for those guys in Boston, I don't think
18 we have a lot of experience in dealing with this.

19 You want to make sure that you covered
20 all the environmental and social impacts, indirect
21 ones and cumulative ones, and very importantly you
22 want full disclosure on impacts of human
23 environment. These were all coming from NEPA
24 statements. And this I think is one of the most
25 important things because we had Mr. Harrington

1 talk rather extensively about the Homeland
2 Security aspect of this and EIS has usually a
3 large contingent of an interdisciplinary team and
4 usually an EA you're looking at an
5 interdisciplinary approach and if we have to
6 answer the question of Homeland Security, right
7 there you have about like 40 agencies and you have
8 good agencies coordination built into it.

9 Also you want regular objective analysis
10 of all alternatives and impacts, full public
11 involvement and full interagency coordination. I
12 think we've addressed some of that. Other reasons
13 you need to do the EIS, it looks at the benefits
14 and adverse impact, it looks at balancing those
15 two, it looks at the degree to which the proposed
16 action affects public health or safety, it looks
17 at the unique characteristics of the geographic
18 area. It's particularly important in a highly
19 controversial situation. It looks at the degree
20 to which possible affects from a human environment
21 or highly uncertain or involves NEPA unknown
22 risks. These things are right up our alley here.
23 The degree to which the action may have had a
24 precedent for future actions with significant
25 events are represented a decision in principal

1 about a future consideration. This is us.
2 Whether the action is related to other actions
3 with individually insignificant cumulative
4 significant impact, so I could go on about that
5 but I hope you guys will look that up and realize
6 that quality EA is certainly an improvement over
7 an expedited decision. I don't think that it
8 would comply with your obligation under the
9 National Environmental Policy Act.

10 However, since I was able to get the
11 computer to print me some of these questions that
12 were asked, I'll talk to you about -- I talked to
13 you about one, that was question number 13 is
14 about the routing and, absolutely, if you guys
15 will go back and read that Code 49 CFR 397 point
16 67, if you can explain to me how they can truck
17 out of Elba Island without breaking that law, I'd
18 really, really love to see it.

19 Bug going on, this is request number 18
20 and it says discuss whether Southern LNG intends
21 to implement any mutual aid agreement, a voluntary
22 response program to assist in responding to LNG
23 trucks incidents. And, you know, I actually read
24 that whole EA. I've gone (inaudible) so I've read
25 all of this, too. Maybe so I was just a little

1 loopy when I read this, but this statement
2 actually says Southeast LNG will provide a 24/7
3 phone number for technical assistance. That's
4 really going to make me feel good, by the way.
5 It's designed to offer field support at the scene,
6 to assess and resolve the incident and we've heard
7 it mentioned training for the Savannah first
8 responders by Southeast, LNG and third parties.
9 So I'm looking forward to the phone number and all
10 that good training.

11 Number 17 says provide a description of
12 emergency response procedures that will be
13 implemented and be adapted in the LNG trucking
14 accident. This says emergency response procedures
15 are set forth and its emergency response plan on
16 file with FERC. Any emergency would be treated in
17 accordance with its current procedure. Really, I
18 hope they are going to work on that because I
19 think we really -- this is unbelievably serious,
20 so having asked that you not proceed with any sort
21 of expedited decision and check the EA, which is
22 roughly your events of the findings. You know
23 that. So assuming that you're going to have EIS
24 I'd like to ask you to include certain things in
25 that and one would be, of course, a full scope of

1 the project, absolutely the full scope from the
2 empty trucks coming into Savannah along the route,
3 pulling up, loading and various conditions. We
4 don't even know the first book you put out didn't
5 even say that they couldn't be -- that they might
6 come with LNG, so don't eliminate that, so the
7 full scope of the project.

8 Okay. We've talked about risk analysis.
9 We need to talk about that in a couple ways. One
10 for which is I need to see a risk analysis of
11 every possible thing that could go wrong with that
12 truck and every possible thing -- and one thing
13 that drives me crazy is people who talk in the
14 community, well, it's not the worst thing out
15 there and then it's better (inaudible), so I think
16 that you do need to take it into consideration
17 what else those trucks might be interacting with.
18 Of course, I said that to an expert in LNG and he
19 says, Judy, it's going to blow up. I mean, it's
20 just really talking about cumulative impacts and
21 interactions is just, you know, it's kind of like
22 do you want to drown with a foot of water over
23 your head or two feet of water over your head.
24 But I'm still asking you to look at that.

25 So the other kind of risk analysis is

1 the kind of risk that every individual along the
2 route would face on a daily basis and that
3 includes a variety of risks, so I would like for
4 you to see that from a mechanical point of view, a
5 human scoping point of view, also an absolute. I
6 don't even know what to ask for here, but I think
7 generically when I say a security analysis, you
8 know what I mean. If you're doing a full
9 environmental impact statement and you have full
10 interagency coordination including the agencies
11 within Homeland Security and others that would be
12 required. You could easily do that.

13 Another thing since they are using our
14 streets some of which are federal, I think that --
15 and whether or not they are federal, regional or
16 global; however, I think we need to see enough
17 of -- a business plan from Southern LNG so that it
18 can be put into an economics analysis so that we
19 can see whether or not their use of our assets
20 pate for by tax dollars is worth it. I mean, on a
21 benefit cost ratio are the benefits greater than
22 the cost to the people who have paid for the
23 facilities the trucks would be using and that
24 would be just about any time after they leave Elba
25 Island Road. So as you can see, I speak

1 extemporaneously and so I'll probably follow up
2 with some written comments, but I would
3 appreciate -- I will ask you this: What is the
4 possibility of my getting those other 17 questions
5 and their answers? And there is a lot of other
6 information on the website that's locked under
7 CEII as well. Any opportunity?

8 MR. TURPIN: Well, there is a defining
9 process for information that's filed as
10 confidential, you submit a request to the
11 Commission. For it CEII information, it's a CEII
12 request. If you go to FERC.gov and you look under
13 legal documents, it's under CEII and it goes
14 through what you have to do to file the request
15 and basically you submit it to there is a
16 coordinator in our office of external affairs,
17 they receive it, the Commission then looks at the
18 request and determine is the information something
19 that should be released and can be released and
20 make a decision.

21 MS. JENNINGS: So I have to check it on
22 every question mark I have?

23 MR. TURPIN: Well, you put it in simply
24 just one of the requests that lists all the
25 documents you want.

1 MS. JENNINGS: Okay.

2 MR. TURPIN: And the best thing to do to
3 target that is, as you said, you must get it in a
4 data request and that if you just list the
5 question number from the library that you want to
6 specifically target, then you do one for all of
7 them.

8 MS. JENNINGS: Okay. Well, I appreciate
9 your attention. Thank you.

10 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you, Ms. Jennings.
11 Our next commenter is Fred Nadelman.

12 MR. NADELMAN: I am a citizen of
13 Savannah living in Gordonston. I've been living
14 in Gordonston since '78.

15 MR. MCGUIRE: Can you spell your name,
16 sir, please.

17 MR. NADELMAN: Capital N as in nation,
18 a-d as in Delmonte, e-l as in elephant, M as in
19 Mary, a-n as in Ann of Cleaves.

20 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you.

21 MR. NADELMAN: Benjamin Disraeli could
22 be paraphrased by saying to Mr. Wolters noble
23 bellow I will add my small voice against LNG. I'm
24 sure as he said that I can use gas from LNG to
25 cook on my stove as I do with my present gas, what

1 I will not do is shave with a blow torch from LNG,
2 which is what he's asking us to do and anything
3 that can happen, will happen.

4 As I quoted the last time I was here, I
5 do believe in Murphy's Law. Those trucks going
6 through Savannah are no damn good. We should keep
7 LNG off those trucks and we should keep it out of
8 Savannah and eventually get it out of Elba Island
9 and into the ocean safely on a ship way out in the
10 ocean away from people, away from hospitals, away
11 from schools, away from houses of worship and away
12 from historic places in Savannah.

13 Of course, if you put your finger over
14 liquid natural gas for a second or five seconds,
15 nothing will happen. Keep it there and you could
16 do real damage just as you can suffocate from
17 leaking gas in your own home. Even the whole
18 neighborhood can suffer from it, but it's more
19 likely to catch fire and burn everybody up within
20 a mile radius and it attaches fire to other
21 factories and other gas tanks, other fuel tanks,
22 all of Savannah.

23 We've already had one burning of
24 Savannah in 1995 with a power explosion. Much of
25 East Savannah was covered with fumes, people went

1 to the Memorial and they are still suffering the
2 effects. Pine gardens had to be evacuated,
3 Gordonston, where I live, had to be evacuated.
4 These aren't small potatoes, folks, and 1995 was
5 not so long ago nor was the Savannah Sugar
6 Refinery explosion subsequent to that so long ago.

7 Until the 21st century, we've had a
8 liquid natural gas explosion or inflammation, call
9 it what you may. I don't know what the heck the
10 difference could be -- destroy much of a city in
11 Eastern Algeria. This was a state-of-the-art
12 plant and then in Chong Ching, China, where I went
13 as a tourist, there was another explosion, again,
14 in this decade of the 21st century. People had to
15 be evacuated, people went to the hospital, so
16 don't tell me that I'm just getting another form
17 of gas for my stove. This is a real hazard that
18 we've got to keep out of Savannah and we've got to
19 decide to do it now.

20 As the California politician said, I'm
21 mad as hell and I won't take it anymore. We don't
22 need liquid natural gas by the southern --
23 produced by the southern company or any other
24 company.

25 In 1943 during World War II there was an

1 explosion or an inflammation in Detroit. This was
2 liquid natural gas, folks. We have had serious
3 accidents in the United States and we still store
4 it in essentially the same way. Don't tell me
5 it's any less dangerous on a truck than stored in
6 a tank. Wheels can blow a tire just as a tank can
7 be the victim of a terror attack or simple, dumb,
8 malfeasance or a simple accident right on the site
9 by a negligent employee. The consequences are
10 just too great.

11 I'm not going to sound -- I don't mean
12 to sound like John Brown and say the whole U.S. is
13 going to run with blood as it did subsequent to
14 his death, but Savannah is definitely in danger if
15 we let this damn thing go through. Keep it out of
16 Savannah forever. We don't need liquid natural
17 gas. There are other forms of fuel we could use.
18 We could use solar power. We can use any form of
19 energy, any other form of energy as long as it's
20 clean. Liquid natural gas can be piped. It
21 doesn't have to be trucked and it doesn't have to
22 be stored in Savannah or moved in Savannah. There
23 are too many deadly consequences.

24 I said I'd be short, be brief and be
25 gone but I think we've heard too much that borders

1 on absurdity here tonight and we need -- and we
2 need to tell Southern LNG we don't want you right
3 in our back yard. There is a worse case scenario
4 we haven't heard it and Southern LNG is not
5 enthusiastic about giving it to us. As Mr. Felser
6 said, the issue is money, dough, whatever, euros
7 whatever you want to call it, and this is selfish.
8 The welfare of Savannians are more important.
9 They are far more important than what a few
10 millionaires can make. We only get a few more
11 stevedores at the dock. We'll be getting plenty
12 of people in the hospital if we have a bad
13 inflammation, a bad conflagration. Thank you very
14 much.

15 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for your
16 comments. Our next commenter is John Northup.

17 MR. NORTHUP: First name John, J-o-h-n,
18 last name Northup, N-o-r-t-h-u-p. I'd like to
19 first thank Mr. McGuire and Mr. Turpin for coming.
20 I also for particularly for explaining to all of
21 us that FERC is a federal commission, correct me
22 if I'm wrong, with members appointed by the
23 president and that FERC has the power to issue any
24 federal permit. I really have two more pieces of
25 information that I would like to have. The first

1 is that I'm still unclear, and I'm a newspaper
2 reader, I try to pay attention, but I'm still
3 unclear as to why Southern Liquid Natural Gas is
4 doing this. I don't think we really understand
5 that. The second thing I want to know is I want
6 to know a little bit more about the accident
7 potential. A lot of people talk about that I
8 think that needs to be much more fully understood
9 and explored.

10 As far as question number one to
11 elaborate a little bit about this, I'll be brief,
12 it will appear that there has been conspiracy of
13 silence as to exactly why Southern Liquid Natural
14 Gas wants to put these trucks through our city.
15 We need to unravel this conspiracy of silence from
16 the company and find out exactly why Southern
17 Liquid Natural Gas is so insistent on doing this
18 to us particularly as they pointed out in the
19 paper this morning, most people think that natural
20 gas is something that goes through a pipeline.
21 There is an alternative and if they want to use
22 trucks instead of a pipeline, the public including
23 the federal government needs to understand exactly
24 why they are so insistent on doing this.

25 As far as the accidents are concerned,

1 if you read some of the things that are coming out
2 from the company, they point out that they think
3 that liquid natural gas has an excellent safety
4 record and the implication is that accidents won't
5 happen because they just won't happen, so I'd like
6 to dramatize this event, and if every person here
7 who has ever been involved in any way in an
8 automobile or truck accident will be sure to keep
9 your hands in your lap or by your sides, then I'll
10 ask if there is any individual here who has never
11 ever personally been involved in an auto accident
12 or a truck accident to please raise your hands.
13 Only three, four in the entire area. That tells
14 you that automobile and truck accidents not only
15 happen but they are common when they happen
16 everyday in streets of Savannah, Georgia.

17 Now, Mr. Charles Watson, a scientist,
18 has studied what would happen if we have one of
19 these accidents and he has indicated that the fire
20 from an LNG accident could go as high as 5,000
21 degrees. To put that in perspective, a table
22 glass burns at 2,800. He's indicated also that a
23 truck if it were involved in an accident as we
24 know from Nevada, that the damage could go on 700
25 feet or more. And on those proposed routes it's

1 quite clear that the hospitals are within this
2 radius and an accident could theoretically burn up
3 the hospital with one of us in it or more
4 importantly the schools are within this radius and
5 a catastrophic accident could incinerate a school
6 with our children and our future within it.

7 So back to the two questions. First
8 thing is there seems to be an alternative in my
9 mind to putting the natural gas and trucks in the
10 first place and I'm not all together clear why it
11 is that we have to have these trucks and I think
12 the conspiracy of silence clearly needs to be
13 broken.

14 Second thing is we need to understand
15 more about the accidents. As time as gone on as
16 Mr. Snedeker quite well pointed out, we're having
17 a few accidents and he's trying to say that the
18 accidents are minimal accidents; Mary Ellen Sprage
19 points out that sometimes they are not minimal
20 accidents and one of those accidents happen near
21 our schools or synagogues or churches or
22 hospitals, it would be a disaster of unthinkable
23 magnitude. Many people here feel that this risk
24 is unnecessary and unacceptable but even if we
25 have to have another scoping trial, I really

1 appreciate your being here because I don't think
2 you have to be here, you're doing this on your own
3 violation. Another scoping trial to explore
4 particularly this subject of the accidents would
5 be a very good thing as well. Thank you very
6 much.

7 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you, Mr. Northup.
8 We have three more commenters who are signed up to
9 speak and our next commenter is Clete Bergen.

10 MR. BERGEN: My name is Cletus Bergen,
11 C-l-e-t-u-s, B-e-r-g-e-n. I prefer to be called
12 Clete, C-l-e-t-e. Cletus is a hard name to live
13 with. Somehow I've managed. Actually, I kind of
14 like the name now. I'm born and raised here in
15 Savannah and I happen to love this city. I care
16 deeply about it. And I've been involved with John
17 Northup and several other speakers here over the
18 last 20 years on environmental issues, air, smell
19 from the pulp mills, water issues and this issue.
20 And this morning in the paper editorial in the top
21 left page talked about how there needs to be a
22 balance between emotional aspects of this issue
23 and the logical aspects and there is an inference
24 that there have been a lot of inflammatory remarks
25 and maybe we aren't thinking this thing through.

1 The emotional side of this thing is very
2 simple. It's a picture of a fire here, and you've
3 seen it before, and this fire, the picture you
4 can't see it in the record but it's a fireman
5 looking at a natural gas fire in California
6 recently and it's a very bad picture and it
7 happened in San Bernandino. That's the emotional
8 side and Fred Nadelman talked about Algeria. The
9 other side is a picture of a burnt out building
10 with nothing but structure standing. That's
11 emotional side of what happens when natural gas
12 can explode.

13 The logical side of the argument is what
14 is LNG. Well, we all know and we've tried to
15 educate this community that it's nothing but
16 natural gas chilled down to minus 260 degrees at
17 which point it becomes a liquid and very easy to
18 transport and so we're transporting it in the
19 Middle East and from South America to our ports
20 here in the East Coast of America because it's
21 cheap to transport it that way. And we get it
22 back here and we heat it back up to above minus
23 260 and when that happens, it automatically
24 becomes a gas and for the next 100 degrees it will
25 hover on the ground and it will be at least 160

1 degrees, minus 160 degrees, it starts rising so
2 you have potential for it to go into the pipes
3 with that first 100 degrees and starts rising
4 thereafter and when it rises, finds a spark and it
5 will ignite. And we talked about pool fires.
6 Mary Ellen Sprage talked about it very well, and
7 what we know about pool fires today is we can't
8 put one of them out and here is a fireman standing
9 watching a big fire of natural gas, they couldn't
10 put it out. The emotional side, but I'm talking
11 about the logical scientific side now. So we know
12 this and it's a greater concern to us citizens.

13 I think we've had 18 speakers now and
14 two opposed it so far but we are concerned from a
15 logical aspect. Now, today I understand that our
16 city fathers, Mr. Felser and city alderman, I
17 think, I'm not sure, but I understand they may
18 have met with LNG people. They met with their
19 consultants trying to get educated with this issue
20 and I think at one point today, but I'm not sure,
21 El Paso perhaps agreed to provide some training to
22 our first responders and I think that they might
23 have, I'm not sure, offered to provide some
24 equipment for our first responders. I'd like to
25 know more about what, if anything, happened today.

1 But I do know that since October they have been
2 asked many, many questions and we've heard them
3 over and over tonight. Questions like what is the
4 communication plan between Elba Island and the
5 city of first responders and the city fathers?
6 What is the communication plan? Questions like
7 what is the vehicle security program? I'm not
8 exactly sure what that is, but I think that's been
9 asked of them. What is the cargo security plan of
10 our program? What is a high alert level protocol?
11 These are terms I'm not familiar with but I
12 understand this is what's been asked of them.
13 What is the reporting policy and procedure program
14 and they have been asked about training. They
15 have been asked about equipment and they have been
16 asked about an emergency response plan. I think
17 only two of those questions have been answered or
18 may be addressed today. They are going to give us
19 some equipment maybe to our first responders and
20 they are going to give us some training.

21 But from what we know from our past
22 experience you can't put out a pool fire and we've
23 heard over and over tonight that the radius is one
24 mile, back away one mile or maybe a half a mile
25 and our studies of this issue we've learned that

1 the program lab that does the testing for the
2 government, in one of their experiments found go
3 to the Pacific Ocean that an LNG vapor cloud
4 travels seven miles, at least we found that in
5 literature.

6 Now, I'm really concerned. Well,
7 another point that I'm concerned about, you know,
8 in recent news we've learned that here in the U.S.
9 we found major, major natural gas deposits in New
10 York and Pennsylvania and Texas and Montana and
11 North Dakota and it's through this new fracking
12 process and right now it's providing roughly 20
13 percent of our needs and it's predicted that in
14 2010 it will provide up to 40 percent of our needs
15 and by 2030 maybe 60 percent of our needs. This
16 is a relation study. Is there a needs assessment
17 process in your work process? I know the
18 hospitals we had the St. Joseph Candler physician
19 here talking about his concerns on how hospitals
20 have to go through all kinds of assessment
21 programs before you can get a hospital built. Is
22 that part of your process? We have a lot of
23 natural gas right here in our country. Why are we
24 shipping it from the Middle East in unstable areas
25 like South America and areas of South America when

1 we have it right here and exposing us to potential
2 danger.

3 Now, I am concerned about the fact that
4 El Paso has apparently ignored many requests for
5 information and perhaps today maybe address two,
6 equipment and training, I don't know that for a
7 fact but maybe they did, but Peter Schenk from
8 St. Joe/Candler asked about liability issues.
9 Well, I'm a lawyer and I'm a tort lawyer. Most of
10 my work is plaintiffs oriented and I do cases
11 against trucks and we're concerned about trucks at
12 Elba Island will they take on this gas or this
13 liquid. And from my experience as a tort lawyer I
14 know that trucks are required to have a minimum of
15 \$1 million insurance. I think in some cases they
16 go as low as \$750,000, but they are required to
17 have at least a minimum and I talked to my
18 insurance friends that deal with these trucks and
19 lot of times they suggest, well, just buy the
20 minimum policy because tort lawyers, you know,
21 they will reach for, you know, the easiest route
22 to grab. They will settle for the \$1 million.

23 And then we heard Judy Jennings talking
24 about the fact that the shell game that the
25 corporations are playing right now that's and old

1 game but we've got to know whose responsible.
2 That's a tough thing for a lawyer to fair all that
3 out. But I don't know how much liability
4 insurance they have got. Who is going to be
5 responsible if something happens? And I know when
6 a truck leaves the facility over at Elba Island, I
7 think Elba Island would be the deep pocket, but
8 that truck may only have a million dollar coverage
9 policy required by the DOT and if we have a major
10 catastrophe, it's not going to be anywhere near
11 what it's going to cost to cover it. And then,
12 too, you need to think about the fact that if it
13 is a terrorist like Mr. Felser was concerned
14 about, most terrorists are excluded from insurance
15 policies, those are facts, so who is going to be
16 responsible?

17 Now, you guys here today I'm thankful
18 that you're here and for God sakes, I hope that
19 when some of those questions get answered, we'll
20 have another chance for the public to respond and
21 a chance for our city fathers to wrestle this
22 problem and our city mothers, but I'm really
23 concerned who in the world is going to be
24 responsible. Thank you.

25 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for your

1 comments. Our next commenter is Regina Thomas.

2 MS. THOMAS: Regina Thomas, R-e-g-i-n-a,
3 T-h-o-m-a-s. I do want to tell you how much we
4 appreciate you being here. I know your patience
5 and sitting here listening and listening and not
6 cutting them off, that is to be commended. People
7 are scared when they don't know what's going on.
8 I'm a stakeholder and I'm a lifelong resident of
9 Savannah. I live in the Live Oak neighborhood,
10 which is about a quarter of a mile from the Truman
11 Parkway, maybe a little less than eight miles from
12 Elba Island.

13 A lot of things has been said that I
14 would like to say. I'm not to be redundant and
15 bare everything that's been said that I wanted to
16 say, but I can tell you that when we had had an
17 explosion on President Street not from Elba
18 Island, the fire burned for a long time. Many
19 people were evacuated. Where I live if the fire
20 had continued to burn we would have had to be
21 evacuated. No one thought that that fire would
22 happen. No one thought that Savannah Sugar would
23 explode as well. There were many lives lost; many
24 families disrupted. And Oxnard it was about
25 70,000 people that was effected by that explosion

1 with LNG in 1944, and since then Ohio. It
2 devastated Ohio. Someone asked about the cost
3 analysis and I guess you can go to 1944 and Ohio
4 and Oxnard and see how much it cost them when they
5 had those catastrophic accidents there.

6 Savannah is just not equipped to hold
7 that many trucks in and out at that tonnage. We
8 have lumps and bumps. We have potholes, tank
9 holes, open holes, cracks and crevices and when
10 you think about trucks of that size in and out all
11 day, wear and tear, Savannah is the only entity
12 that will have liability. The profit and benefits
13 will go someplace else. It will not be here in
14 Savannah. Granted, bringing trucks in will not
15 generate revenue for the residents of Savannah,
16 quite the opposite.

17 It is sad to say that this process has
18 been rushed. It's sad to say that all the
19 partners are not at the table. It's sad that you
20 being FERC with the federal government don't have
21 all the answers, and sitting here tonight
22 listening to all 21 speakers before myself, we
23 don't know too much more than we knew when we
24 came. We can't rush this. We do not want to rush
25 this and people talk about unintended consequences

1 and worse case scenarios. It can happen because
2 it's happened before. I can say to you that if
3 this permit is allowed and if there is an accident
4 at all that's going to cause a life of just one
5 life, there is no amount of insurance coverage
6 that can replace a life but I can say if this
7 happens and someone dies as a result of it, the
8 blood will definitely be on your hands. Thank you
9 so much.

10 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for your
11 comments. Our final speaker signed up to speak is
12 Thomas Taylor. Is Thomas Taylor still here?

13 COMMENTER: He left.

14 MR. MCGUIRE: At this time is there
15 anyone who did not officially sign up to speak
16 that would like to come to the podium before we
17 close? Sir, if you do come up, please state your
18 name and spell it out. The gentleman in the back
19 first.

20 MR. FARLEY: My name is Nick Farley,
21 N-i-c-k, F-a-r-l-e-y. You may gather I'm not a
22 native Savannian but I got here as fast as I
23 could. I have as much to say as a lot of you here
24 as I think many of you were born here. I'm a lost
25 mariner from many years ago, been in business with

1 a big chemical company, competitive, in fact, with
2 my (inaudible) here, who, by the way, is a master
3 in chemical engineering from NYT. I'm sure he
4 knows what he's talking about in terms of a
5 technical aspect of what we've got here. Now,
6 this is something I wanted to address because I
7 think it's very important. I read this article in
8 the Savannah News and I picked up a lot from it of
9 information I don't know. Graham Symes doesn't
10 put me into mechanical engineering or chemical
11 engineering or any other thing. He mentioned in
12 that article something written by a man called
13 Dr. Filippo Gavelli and I brought the report here.
14 He's written in good understandable logic and he
15 references all the accidents that most of us have
16 talked about in Algeria, in Cleveland and all the
17 other ones. He tells why he thinks --

18 MR. MCGUIRE: If you would speak into
19 the mike, sir.

20 MR. FARLEY: I'm addressing the people
21 here. His credentials are impeccable. I've never
22 heard of this man before but I see he's a Ph.D.,
23 mechanical engineering from the University of
24 Maryland, a BS in nuclear engineering from cum
25 laude' from Italy, his resume is about five pages

1 long, he's a fire investigation I certification
2 accredited by the California State Fire Marshal,
3 licensed professional certified fire exposure
4 investigator and so on and so on. I would urge
5 you, if you have not read this to please read it
6 because I think you'll pick up some very clear
7 understanding of what he was trying to say and
8 what he did say on any claim. It's a very
9 important thing to try to understand exactly the
10 as best you can from a layman point of view what
11 the chemical components are and the risks factors
12 and everything else that comes with it. As an old
13 man, I'm a little familiar with risk factors and
14 you have to assess it and sometimes very quickly
15 and sometimes they are inconsequential but
16 sometimes they are very serious and safety of the
17 people is the number one priority and I don't
18 think any of us would argue with that. So we just
19 have to find the right way to make it work and
20 that's what I've got. I'll leave this with
21 somebody so you can put it on the document.

22 MR. MCGUIRE: Yes. We can leave it with
23 the court reporter so it can be included in the
24 transcripts. Thank you, sir. Next commenter.

25 MR. JONES: My name is Robert Jones,

1 R-o-b-er-t, J-o-n-e-s. My comment is more of a
2 question. I should preface by saying to you
3 gentlemen that long ago I learned that the mind
4 can stand and absorb no more than a sponge can
5 stand, so at this hour of the day I trust your
6 minds are still open to absorb. I've attended the
7 meetings, I've read the newspaper. The very basic
8 question keeps coming to my mind, one that our
9 most astute mayor pointed out many, many months
10 ago whether DeRenne Avenue or whatever group,
11 there simply is no safe way to truck this product
12 from Elba Island to the city. Now, we're hearing
13 in part maybe in place that has a rule. I just a
14 bit here can you imagine you gentlemen would not
15 know but those in the audience certainly would,
16 particularly those who go South Abercorn 5:00,
17 6:00 in the evening. Can you imagine one of those
18 trucks caught up on Abercorn Street went out south
19 Abercorn. Maybe that a good thing because the
20 state would have to call out the Georgia National
21 Guard to open the highway up, the rest of us can
22 get behind and get on out quicker than we can now.
23 The point I'm making is, again, as Mayor Johnson
24 pointed out, it appears that there is simply no
25 safe way to truck this product from Elba Island

1 through the city. As harsh as this may sound,
2 fundamentally is, if LNG Company continues to
3 insist on trucking their product, maybe they
4 should move their tanks.

5 At the meeting at the Garden Hilton
6 Abercorn many months ago late in the evening this
7 gentlemen like guy standing by waiting very
8 patiently to take his turn and he raised a couple
9 of very good points, one being the burden upon the
10 highway system. That's not my point. I take
11 nothing away from that. My point is what he
12 raised about given the opposition I don't think
13 people are necessarily against the product. What
14 people are opposed to is the product being
15 transported through our city and it wouldn't take
16 but once such a disaster and would be a hard
17 lessened learned and particularly the sugar
18 refinery, I think, and we read in the paper that
19 said he didn't know that sugar dust would explode.
20 So to the extent of this, certainly prevention
21 should be considered as a factor. Why put a
22 community at such a risk when of this gentlemen at
23 the Garden Hilton raised the question why not
24 locate the loading dock west of the city in some
25 unpopulated area, pipe in the gas from Elba Island

1 happy to see so many citizens, so many folks that
2 really care about our community here. Our
3 politicians that are elected and those who would
4 be elected have a vested interest in being here
5 and I think they are going to do a good job in
6 trying to staunch this jibber and all with a
7 runaway truck highly loaded with explosives that
8 may endanger all of us. I remember when I was ten
9 years old my ankle was driving a pickup truck in
10 Montezuma, Georgia and he was aged and he really
11 shouldn't be driving and he drove his pickup truck
12 on the highway and just coming over the top of the
13 berm was a tractor-trailer rig loaded with fuel.
14 That was just regular gas but it ignited two
15 vehicles on either side and he was consumed and so
16 was everyone that was in the vehicles all around
17 there. As a ten year old I remember seeing the
18 highway two days later and it was totally
19 disintegrated and the asphalt was not there. It
20 was just sand. That was just regular fuel that
21 you buy at a gas station.

22 My wife works at Memorial Hospital in
23 the neonatal intensive care unit. She goes there
24 everyday and the way she gets there is from our
25 home, she drives to DeRenne Avenue and goes in the

1 back way by Jenkins High School and she's going
2 over that little bridge within a few hundred yards
3 of where you're talking about putting massive
4 amounts of highly flammable material through our
5 city for a profit. This is bizarre. It's insane.
6 The bureaucracy has gotten to the point that we're
7 here, citizens of this community, spending our
8 time to listen and to -- and God bless you for
9 being here, but you bureaucrats, and you are that,
10 and I appreciate your task but you just aren't
11 equipped to respond to the needs of this community
12 and the things that people want to hear because
13 you don't have the information. If this proceeds
14 any further without further hearings and no
15 responsibility, everyone is going to pay, not just
16 the citizens of United, but God forbid this be
17 allowed to happen.

18 I don't think our politicians current
19 and those that would be sitting in the next
20 administration is going to allow this to happen
21 because I think there is going to be enough
22 citizens and the Mayor that this never happens.
23 With that I'll close. Thank you.

24 MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for your
25 comments. Well, we sincerely appreciate your

