

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

- - - - -x

NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT : Docket No.

PRE-FILING REVIEW FOR THE ATLANTIC : PF15-12-000

BRIDGE PROJECT :

- - - - -x

Riverfront Community Center

300 Welles Street

Glastonbury, CT 06114

Tuesday, May 12, 2015

The evening scoping meeting, pursuant to notice,
convened at 6:30 p.m., Magdalene Suter, moderator.

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

2 MS. SUTER: All right, good evening. On behalf
3 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission or FERC I would
4 like to thank you all for coming tonight. This is an
5 environmental scoping meeting for the Atlantic Bridge
6 Project proposed by Algonquin Gas Transmission for Algonquin
7 who is a subsidiary of Spectra Energy.

8 Let the record show that the public scoping
9 meeting in Gastonbury, Connecticut began at 6:40 P.M. on May
10 12th, 2015. My name is Maggie Suter and I am the
11 Environmental Project Manager for the Atlantic Bridge
12 Project with the Commission's Office of Energy Projects.

13 With me tonight at the table here is Larry Brown
14 with Natural Resource Group, the environmental consulting
15 firm helping FERC in preparing the environmental assessment
16 for the project.

17 Also at the sign-in table at the front of the
18 room is Andrea Thorton who is also with Natural Resource
19 Group. Just as a notice for before I get into some of the
20 details about who FERC is there is some informational
21 handouts at the front sign-in table, some that will give you
22 more specifics about who FERC is, how the process works. I
23 am going to give you some highlights today at the start of
24 this meeting but there is some more detailed information
25 along with our flow chart that we had a poster board of,

1 that's in the handout as well.

2 So with regard to the Atlantic Bridge Project,
3 the FERC is the lead federal agency for the National
4 Environmental Policy Act or NEPA review and preparation of
5 an environmental assessment. We are currently engaging with
6 other interested agencies to determine their NEPA
7 responsibility and the potential levels of interest in the
8 project and whether any of those agencies may wish to become
9 a cooperating agency in the preparation of the environmental
10 assessment.

11 At this time the EPA has indicated their
12 intention to be a cooperating agency. The primary purpose
13 of tonight's meeting is to give you an opportunity to
14 comment on the project or on the scope of environmental
15 issues that you would like to see covered in the EA for the
16 Atlantic Bridge Project.

17 It would help us the most if your comments are as
18 specific as possible regarding the potential environmental
19 impacts and reasonable alternatives for the proposed
20 project. These issues generally focus on the potential for
21 environmental effects, but may also address construction
22 issues, mitigation and the environmental review process as a
23 whole.

24 In addition the meeting is designed to provide
25 you with an opportunity to meet with Algonquin

1 representatives and get more detailed information about the
2 facility locations and construction plans. They were here
3 at the beginning of the meeting for an hour before we
4 started with maps outside. If you did not have an
5 opportunity to talk with them they will probably be sticking
6 around after the meeting and you can go up and talk with
7 them again if need be.

8 I am going to be giving you a brief overview of
9 the environmental review process, FERC's role in the project
10 and the planned facilities. Then we will hear from those of
11 you planning to speak. If you would like to present
12 comments tonight, please be sure that you have taken a
13 ticket from the sign-in table.

14 To illustrate how the environmental review
15 process works, we have prepared a flow chart and there are
16 copies of that flow chart in the Notice of Intent that was
17 mailed out and we have extra copies at the sign-in table.
18 Currently we are near the beginning of our environmental
19 review process. Algonquin has chosen to utility the FERC
20 pre-filing process.

21 The purpose of pre-filing is to encourage
22 involvement by all interested parties in a manner that
23 allows for the early identification and resolution of
24 issues. As of today no formal application has been filed
25 with FERC however the FERC and other agencies have begun

1 review of the project.

2 This is an important fact to understand. As of
3 today with the pre-filing there is no application for the
4 Commission to consider for a vote on so there is no
5 mechanism to approve or deny Algonquin's plans at this time.
6 On April 27th, 2015 FERC issued a notice of intent to
7 prepare an environmental assessment or EA for the project
8 and initiated a scoping period.

9 The scoping or comment period will end on June
10 11th, 2015. We have extra copies of that NOI available at
11 the sign-in table and it is also available electronically on
12 our website. During our review of the project we will
13 assemble information from a variety of sources including
14 Algonquin, the public, other state, local and federal
15 agencies and our own independent analysis and field work.

16 We will analyze this information and prepare and
17 issue an environmental assessment. Instructions for
18 submitting comments electronically or by mail can be found
19 in the NOI or at the handout at the sign-in table. It is
20 very important that any comments that you send include the
21 internal docket number for this project. That number is
22 PF15-12.

23 Including this number will ensure that the FERC
24 staff evaluating the project gets your comments as soon as
25 possible. Once scoping is finished our next step will begin

1 analyzing the project and the issues that have been
2 identified during the scoping period. This will include an
3 examination of the planned facility locations as well as
4 alternative sites.

5 We will assess the project's effects on water
6 bodies and wetlands, vegetation and wildlife, endangered
7 species, cultural resources, soils, land use, transportation
8 and socio-economics, air quality, noise and safety. I am
9 sure there are probably a few others mixed in there that
10 might fall under those categories so if it is remotely
11 related, it falls under that.

12 When complete our analysis of the potential
13 impacts will be published in an EA with a corresponding
14 comment period so that's another opportunity for you the
15 public to comment on the document and the impacts of the
16 proposed project. This EA will be mailed to our entire
17 mailing list for the project.

18 I will note that because of the size of the
19 mailing list and our efforts to reduce paper where we can
20 the mailed EA that you find in your mailbox will be on a CD.
21 If you prefer to have a hard copy you just need to let us
22 know, at the sign-in table there's a mailing sign-in list
23 with a box that you can check or you can return the return
24 mailer that was in the back of the notice of intent mailed
25 to you and that has an option for you to inform us that you

1 would like a paper copy.

2 To be clear the environmental assessment will be
3 prepared the FERC environmental staff which I am a part of,
4 and we will describe the project facilities and associated
5 environmental impacts, alternatives, mitigation to avoid or
6 reduce impacts and our conclusions and recommendations.
7 However, the EA is not a decision document and does not
8 constitute approval of the project. It merely discloses
9 what the impacts would be if the project were to be
10 constructed and operated.

11 There are up to five Commissioners at FERC who
12 are responsible for making a determination on whether to
13 issue a certificate of public convenience and necessity to
14 Algonquin for the project. The Commissioners will consider
15 the information from the EA along with non-environmental
16 issues such as engineering, markets, and rates in making its
17 decision whether to approve or deny Algonquin's request for
18 a certificate.

19 There is no review of FERC decisions by the
20 President or Congress, maintaining FERC's independence as a
21 regulatory agency and providing for fair and unbiased
22 decisions. For those of you here tonight who are seeking
23 more information about what the Atlantic Bridge Project is,
24 the current project includes about 18.1 miles of pipeline in
25 five pieces throughout New York, Connecticut and

1 Massachusetts.

2 It also includes the addition of compression at
3 two existing compressor stations in Connecticut and one new
4 compressor station in Massachusetts. After the open houses
5 that occurred in March, Algonquin reduced the size of their
6 planned project. The project description that I am
7 providing you tonight represents the current facilities
8 after this reduction in scope.

9 I am informing you of this so that those of you
10 who may have attended in March can understand the
11 differences from what you may have seen before versus what
12 you are seeing now and whether you may have been affected
13 before and maybe you no longer are, so it is for
14 informational purposes.

15 Specifically in this area, the project includes
16 the construction of a 7 mile long new 36 inch diameter
17 pipeline parallel to the existing pipelines in Cromwell,
18 Rocky Hill and Glastonbury, Connecticut. Algonquin plans to
19 add 7,700 horsepower of compression to the existing Oxford
20 compression station in Oxford, Connecticut and 6,100
21 horsepower of compression to the existing Kaplan compressor
22 station in Kaplan, Connecticut.

23 Algonquin also plans minor modifications to the
24 existing Danbury meter and regulating station and to
25 construct a new meter and regulating station, replacing the

1 existing one in Norwich, Connecticut. Please note -- I said
2 that already. After our meeting here Algonquin will be
3 available with project maps if you want to get a closer look
4 at those facilities that I just described to you this
5 evening.

6 So we are now going to begin the important part
7 where we take your comments. If you would rather not speak
8 or don't get to say everything that you wanted to or missed
9 something throughout the process, you may hand us written
10 comments this evening or mail them into the Commission or
11 submit them electronically.

12 There is a form at the sign-in table that you can
13 use to fill out written comments and hand them to any one of
14 the FERC staff here this evening and we will make sure that
15 your comments get put on the record for you.

16 Whether you provide comments verbally tonight or
17 you mail them in or submit them electronically, they will be
18 considered by FERC equally. It doesn't matter how they come
19 in we are going to look into it either which way. All
20 comments will be placed on the public record for this
21 project.

22 So if you haven't noticed tonight, we do have a
23 transcription service here recording tonight's meeting.
24 This is being done so that all comments made tonight and all
25 questions will be transcribed and put into the public record

1 for this project. This helps FERC's staff go back and we
2 would be able to look at all of the issues that you have
3 raised and make sure that we are accurately getting
4 everything down as we research the issues.

5 To help the court reporter produce an accurate
6 record for the meeting and help ensure that we get through
7 everyone who is signed up to speak, we are going to follow
8 just a few ground rules. First when it is your turn to
9 speak, you must come up to the podium here in front of the
10 room and use the microphone.

11 I ask that you not yell or ask a question from
12 the audience as that cannot be accurately recorded for the
13 court reporter you must come to the podium. There are also
14 multiple microphones up there, there is one to project your
15 comments to everyone here in the room, but there is also
16 another one for the court reporter to capture all of your
17 comments so it is important that you face us so that all of
18 the microphones up there can capture your comments.

19 For those of you who wish to speak tonight you
20 received a numbered ticket and we will be going in numbered
21 order. We would like to keep several people prepared to
22 speak. I have some reserved seats up here although I'm not
23 sure that that was necessary because there are some extra
24 ones over here, so just you know when we start with number
25 1, if you are number 2 or number 3 come on down and take a

1 seat towards the front so that you are prepared to speak,
2 you know especially if you are out on the sides you can get
3 to the aisle and be ready to go when your number is called.

4 If you choose not to speak and you took a ticket
5 and you don't wish to or somebody else said your comments,
6 you can either say I support that person's comments or say I
7 would like not to speak and we will go to the next person.
8 We are allowing one ticket per person and you are not
9 allowed to allot your time to another speaker.

10 Because we did numbered tickets I ask that when
11 you come up to the podium please say and spell your name for
12 the court reporter so that they can accurately get it in the
13 record. So we are not going to impose a strict time limit
14 for this evening, I think we only have a little more than
15 what I can count on two hands, number of speakers who have
16 signed up to speak so far so -- but we are asking that folks
17 try to keep their time limit to 10 minutes or less.

18 I have a lighted timer up here that is set for 10
19 minutes, I do not intend to use it however if you feel like
20 you might have a tendency to get lost in your thoughts and
21 go on and on or if you feel like you might go over the 10
22 minute and would like the visual cues because it goes from
23 green to yellow to red to let you know, I am more than happy
24 to set it for you if you like the visual cues. If not we
25 are just going to keep you roughly to 10 minutes and we ask

1 that everyone respect that for everyone here.

2 And lastly, please define any acronyms that you
3 may use. This helps the court reporter accurately get those
4 into the public record. If you forget to do so while you
5 are speaking just handwrite them down and hand them to us at
6 the end so that we can make sure that they get attached to
7 your comments.

8 Most importantly, we want to make sure that
9 everyone has an opportunity to speak this evening and that
10 is respectful. I ask that while a person is speaking please
11 don't interrupt them. I know that you may agree or disagree
12 with the comments that they are saying but folks want to get
13 through their thoughts and it disrupts thoughts when they
14 are in the middle of speaking and you either applaud or
15 disagree, either which way, please wait until their time is
16 up or they are done speaking and then you can voice your
17 support.

18 Let's keep this meeting respectful for everybody
19 here and as long as everyone follows all the wonderful rules
20 that we have laid out and everyone is respectful this
21 evening we will get through all of the list and I will not
22 need to close up early. So with that we are going to start
23 with speaker number 1 and speakers number 2 and 3 and so on
24 -- this is just like when you are at the deli. Come on down
25 and be ready to go.

1 MS. KLEIN: I feel a little short for this but
2 okay. Good evening my name is Martha Klein K-l-e-i-n. I am
3 Communications Chair with the Sierra Club, Connecticut
4 Chapter and a resident and taxpayer of Connecticut. I am
5 going to state a handful of facts before I restrain my
6 comments to just some environmental issues.

7 Number one -- there is no public necessity for
8 Atlantic Bridge and I can prove it. In the winter of 2014
9 it was colder than the winter of 2013. We spent five
10 billion dollars extra than we normally did in 2013 to cover
11 our energy needs for heating costs.

12 The winter of 2014 which was colder, I already
13 said that -- we spent about 2 billion. So our costs for the
14 extra amount of power that we needed to cover the much
15 colder winters, was less in 2014 than 2013, that was without
16 having built an inch of brand new pipeline. We had adequate
17 LNG coming from the shale region, coming here to power our
18 electric plants. There was no lack of shale gas in our
19 region.

20 Another fiction that we have heard very often
21 about shale gas is that using shale gas is going to lower
22 the energy costs. The opposite of that is actually true.
23 So according to a document of the United States Energy
24 Information Agency dated 10/29/14 increased liquid natural
25 gas exports will lead to increased shale gas prices.

1 Why am I mentioning exports? That's not supposed
2 to be FERC's purview. Well the reason that I am mentioning
3 it is because in fact, speaking of the no public necessity
4 for the Atlantic Bridge Project, 56% roughly of the gas that
5 will be coming across our region through the Spectra
6 Pipeline, but also the Kinder Morgan Pipelines that you guys
7 know about, will be going to Canada for export overseas. So
8 I would like to read a very brief quote from the Department
9 of Energy application from PRD Energy that says:

10 "As a result of the existing M&N U.S. Pipeline
11 owned by Spectra, and it's interconnections with other
12 pipeline systems in the eastern U.S. which in turn connect
13 to the larger national pipeline system and proposed
14 enhancements" that's what we are talking about today, "PRD
15 Energy will have the ability to source gas from almost any
16 point in the U.S."

17 And furthermore in the application under the
18 appendix it says "as discussed in the body of the
19 application, Algonquin Gas Transmission together with M&N
20 U.S. commence the open season in relation to the Atlantic
21 Bridge Project, announced the execution of an agreement with
22 Unitil which will be anchor shipper in the project.

23 This project is a proposed expansion of the
24 Algonquin Pipeline system and it allows abundant natural gas
25 supplies to enter through the New England market and the

1 maritime provinces from whence they will be exported --
2 again, not exactly a public necessity.

3 The third issue that we have been told about
4 natural gas is that it is better for the climate. Now I am
5 going to get a little bit into environmental issues and you
6 asked us to restrict our comments to environmental issues, I
7 would like to ask that you. FERC does not look at any
8 environmental effects on the climate and yet it is
9 abundantly proven and I am going to submit two documents to
10 FERC this evening that methane is the second most common
11 anthropogenic greenhouse gas and furthermore it is a vastly
12 more severe greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide.

13 You guys don't regulate either of them and so you
14 don't care and you don't have to, I've read many of the
15 documents that FERC puts out and I have seen what you have
16 said repeatedly, that's not your purview, why would you
17 think about climate change. So I would like to say do you
18 have families? Do you want to live on a planet? Do you
19 want your children, grandchildren, grandnieces and nephews
20 to live on a planet that will heat up by more than 2 degrees
21 Celsius, ending life on the planet as we know it because
22 that is what is going to happen.

23 There is a letter here from a bunch of scientists
24 and they sent this letter to the DOE and the EPA and yet
25 you, the FERC agency is approving many more fossil fuel

1 projects even than DOE is. You are responsible for huge
2 amounts of methane that is escaping into our atmosphere now
3 and will be much more so in the future, causing catastrophic
4 climate change and I just want to reiterate a quick quote.
5 "Accurate representation of methane's warming influence on
6 the climate is important because methane's warming influence
7 over the 21st Century makes it the second most important
8 anthropogenic greenhouse gas."

9 Furthermore they discuss in this letter as well
10 as in the article from Cornell, The Bridge To Nowhere
11 Methane Emissions and the Greenhouse Gas Footprint of
12 Natural Gas, that changing from one form of fossil fuel to
13 another, or in the case of Connecticut, quite simply adding
14 more fossil fuel because we haven't shut down any of our
15 plants, we are just adding them, will lead us down the road
16 to climate catastrophe.

17 It is not cleaner. I think it is unconscionable,
18 I think it's wrong, I wonder if it is potentially actionable
19 in the future that FERC is ignoring factual evidence about
20 our climate and causing all of us in America to suffer.

21 Finally I want to make two very quick points.
22 Our friends from the unions don't seem to be as present
23 tonight but we often hear from them about jobs. I hope that
24 FERC is aware that it is demonstrable true that gas jobs are
25 not as good jobs as other jobs. If you would invest a

1 million dollars in energy, you would get about five gas
2 jobs. If you invest a million dollars in energy
3 efficiencies, you might get about 10 or 11 jobs. Investing
4 in wind or solar would produce about 13 and 14 jobs
5 respectively. Gas jobs aren't good jobs.

6 Furthermore, you mentioned the independence of
7 FERC. That's a fiction. Who pays FERC? Industry pays
8 FERC. You are no more independent than the FDA and look at
9 what has happened there? How many patients have died
10 because FDA has approved drugs for which they were given
11 money by industry, that's the exact same model with FERC.

12 It is not safe, it is not responsible and it
13 surely is not protecting the environment, thank you.

14 MS. SUTER: All right, number 2?

15 MR. SCHNEIDER: My name is Dave Schneider, David
16 Schneider from Tolland, Connecticut.

17 MS. SUTER: Spell your name?

18 MR. SCHNEIDER: S-c-h-n-e-i-d-e-r. Okay and I
19 was addressing my comments to the Commissioners. My
20 opposition to the Atlantic Bridge Project indeed to all the
21 natural gas pipeline expansion projects in Connecticut and
22 all the eastern and western states, all of them, is not just
23 because of the environmental threats to the land, water
24 bodies, wildlife habitats and life in spite of the
25 environmental assessments that FERC has looked at or will be

1 looking at.

2 Not just because of the questionability of the
3 reported methane gas emissions into the atmosphere, not just
4 because of the public that because the public is being
5 forced to pay for the construction of these pipelines
6 besides paying for the energy itself, not just because the
7 pipeline projects are linked to the shipment of liquefied
8 methane abroad that will earn high profits for the pipeline
9 companies for whose pipelines we are being forced to pay the
10 construction of.

11 Not just because the public has been misled into
12 believing that the projects are needed because there is a
13 shortage of natural gas. Not just because the state of
14 Connecticut while helping to sell the methane gas shortage
15 idea has been working for a long time in attempting to
16 convert new household customers for this service, they need
17 those customers -- not only because money being spent on
18 these pipeline expansion projects belays our getting off of
19 fossil fuels that are detrimental to the people and the
20 environment, actually I am opposed to all of these natural
21 gas methane gas pipeline expansion projects because they
22 rely on hydraulic fracturing to extract the gas from the
23 ground.

24 The inherent dangers from the numerous chemical
25 compounds, the enormous waste of water that has no hope of

1 mitigation to safety for consumption, the extreme volumes of
2 contaminated water that remains in the ground that is being
3 transported and handled in a manner that causes leakages
4 onto public roadways.

5 The utilization of contaminated water that
6 reportedly are treated and are used to water down projects
7 and I just read the other day also being utilized to water
8 crops in drought-plagued areas. The impoundment of
9 contaminated water in holding areas that have the potential
10 of being future environmental disasters due to leakage or
11 breakage of the impoundment or storage vessel or area, not
12 unlike the spent fuel rods in the nuclear power plants that
13 we don't know how to get rid of, that we don't know how to
14 -- we built a burial ground for them that doesn't work.

15 How do we get rid of the mountains of toxic waste
16 and billions of gallons of toxic water? You, FERC are
17 responsible for more than each individual project. You are
18 responsible for the health, the safety and well-being of all
19 life on this earth.

20 MS. SUTER: Your time is up. Number 3?

21 MS. SCHNEIDER: Okay I am Marge Schneider.
22 S-c-h-n-e-i-d-e-r. I am reaching out to you this night not
23 only as FERC staff but more importantly as intelligent
24 heart-felt individuals who are intent on putting the health
25 and well-being of the people and all living things in our

1 state as the prime focus and necessity of the work you do.

2 I am speaking to you as a mother, as father, as
3 son, as daughter, as sister, as brother of people you so
4 cherish and need to protect. It is the right of all of us,
5 not a privilege to have clean air to breathe and clean water
6 to drink. Firstly may I request a more comprehensive
7 environmental impact statement before any project is
8 permitted to move forward in this state. There is no public
9 necessity for fracked gas. The industry wants more fracked
10 gas as it will bring them an excess of financial gain which
11 is their prime focus and intent.

12 With this financial burden however being carried
13 by the taxpayers, public lands are sacred spaces for people
14 not to be used for carpet power development and greed. Our
15 only need is for clean, non-carbon energy to power our
16 future. All of the intended pipeline expansion projects
17 will not only pollute our environment when they leak, when
18 they are vented, when they explode, but will ultimately
19 delay the clean energy projects which are our sole answer,
20 hope and vital need.

21 Now is the time that we re-evaluate the path to
22 our future and have the integrity and the strength to stand
23 up to what is essential for the well-being of our planet and
24 not make the dollar the Holy Grail and move forward in a
25 dirty path in our ways. Is our goal for a temporary fix for

1 our energy future or will we move forward with a long-term
2 vision that will not destroy, but rather guarantee our
3 survival?

4 MS. SUTER: Okay number 4?

5 MS. SISKIND: Hi, my name is Jennifer Siskind of
6 South Glastonbury. Approving Algonquin's --

7 MS. SUTER: Kindly spell your name.

8 MS. SISKIND: Oh sure, sorry. S (as in Sam) -
9 i-s (as in Sam) k-i-n (as in Nancy) d as in David.

10 Approving Algonquin gas pipeline expansions in segmented
11 projects violates both NEPA and CEQ regulations. The
12 already approved AIM expansion and this proposed Atlantic
13 Bridge Project are geographically, functionally and
14 temporarily connected.

15 The AIM Project was given a more comprehensive
16 environmental impact statement by segmenting Atlantic Bridge
17 into a smaller project and considering for approval only by
18 conducting an environmental assessment, environmental issues
19 may not be properly addressed and the ability for
20 stakeholders and citizens to participate in a formal hearing
21 process after reviewing a draft EIS is being denied.

22 Both for myself and tonight I have heard over and
23 over and over again from stakeholders who came here that
24 this was their first opportunity to see detailed proposed
25 placement of pipes through their own properties. These maps

1 won't be available again to the public until sometime in the
2 beginning of June we are told, giving people limited and
3 handicapped opportunity to research and submit comments
4 before the NEPA deadline of June 11th.

5 The AIM Project includes a small section of pipe
6 downstream from the Cromwell compressor station. Mile zero
7 of the Atlantic Bridge begins in this proximity. The USGS
8 quad map submitted by Spectra to FERC in their latest
9 monthly report dated May 7th show planned removal and
10 relocation of an existing 36 inch receiver that does not
11 exist yet, further evidence of the interdependence of this
12 projects.

13 Atlantic Bridge includes the longest complicated
14 horizontal directional drill to be proposed in Connecticut.
15 The site that will be drilled through on both the Rocky Hill
16 and Glastonbury sides of the Connecticut River includes
17 aquifer protection areas.

18 Accidental spillage of drilling fluids and
19 bentonite clay may compromise both of these areas in
20 addition to a wetlands that is in the same area on the Rocky
21 Hill side. Conducting a more comprehensive environmental
22 impact statement that allows greater review and formal
23 feedback of this process is warranted. The preliminary
24 filings for Atlantic Bridge, lists several endangered
25 species including sturgeon, two types of bats and bog

1 turtle.

2 Glastonbury is also inhabited by the endangered
3 timber rattlesnake, construction timing and tree removal
4 that may require short-term timber piling need to be
5 considerate of mating and foraging seasons between April and
6 October. Rattlesnakes migrate several miles from dens in
7 summer and after hatching and the area designated between
8 mile marker 6 and 7.2 are known foraging habitats and have
9 documented sightings.

10 Thorough evaluation as to whether new nests can
11 be found along the existing pipeline route is also needed,
12 conducted by a recognized rattlesnake authority and repeated
13 up until the point of construction. Cumulative impacts of
14 the build-outs of compressor stations also need
15 consideration. Atlantic Bridge further expands both the
16 Oxford and Chaplin compressors, stations that were already
17 increased in size by the AIM Project.

18 It is common and public knowledge that Spectra
19 also plans to continue expansion with their announced Access
20 Northeast Project and any additional emissions and future
21 build-outs of infrastructure needs to be addressed.

22 Already approved compressor expansions are
23 occurring in non-attainment areas that receive tons of
24 hazardous emissions yearly. Additional expansions to the
25 Oxford and Chaplin stations may further degrade air quality

1 in addition to the Towantic Energy Power Station proposed to
2 be built in Oxford.

3 A health impact assessment and continuous
4 monitoring to study emissions and particulate matter is
5 needed to ensure compressor expansions meet Clean Air Act
6 regulations, thank you.

7 MS. SUTER: Number 5?

8 MR. MANOCCHIO: Yes I am. Nicholas Manocchio.
9 M-a-n-o-c-c-h-i-o, Laborer's International Union of North
10 America. I stand before you tonight representing 7500
11 families in the state of Connecticut that work as a laborer
12 on an on-going basis daily. We in New England are facing a
13 real energy crisis. We as energy consumers are paying the
14 highest cost of energy in the country because of the
15 region's pipeline constraints.

16 The Spectra Energy Atlantic Bridge Transmission
17 Pipeline is the important component addressing this issue.
18 On top of the relief this project will bring to all of the
19 energy consumers in Connecticut and New England, the
20 economic benefits in the region in the form of good-paying
21 construction jobs and other ancillary jobs associated with
22 the pipeline construction.

23 The Atlantic Bridge Project will have a
24 long-lasting positive impact on the men and women who choose
25 construction as their careers and rely on projects like this

1 to feed their families and educate their children in
2 Connecticut. The Atlantic Bridge Project is part of a much
3 larger economic picture that will create hundreds, if not
4 thousands of family supporting construction careers over the
5 next 25 years.

6 We have already begun to train young men and
7 women in the energy construction trades and for these people
8 that have chosen college is not their first choice of
9 employment and have migrated towards the trades, this is an
10 opportunity for them to earn a fair, sustainable living
11 wage, have sustainable health care and be able to provide
12 their family with an existing lifestyle that's comparable to
13 the rest of the demographics in this area.

14 The planned repair, maintenance and expansion of
15 a natural gas distribution network in New England, because
16 of the increased supply of gas will allow some workers to
17 start and finish their careers in the construction energy
18 field. The thousands of labor's union families in
19 Connecticut in the region support the positive economic
20 impact this project will have now and in the future
21 generations.

22 The Laborer's Union recognizes the expertise that
23 Spectra Energy has in the mid-stream industry and our
24 working relationship in history with Spectra on other
25 projects throughout the country allows us to submit our vote

1 of confidence that Spectra will get this important project
2 done with the least environmental and landowner impact
3 possible.

4 We also recognize the needs of the community and
5 the concerns that the community have brought forward to you
6 tonight and just as a reminder that our laborers work and
7 live amongst you all and we are also environmentally
8 concerned about the impact this will have on our community
9 also. We trust that FERC will approve all necessary
10 permits, and environmental impact reviews as thoroughly and
11 expeditiously as possible to move this extremely important
12 project forward.

13 I want to thank you for allowing the laborers to
14 put their position on the record, thank you very much.

15 MS. SUTER: Okay do I have number 6? Come on up.

16 MS. LANK: My name is Karen Lank, L-a-n-k and I
17 am here because I am concerned about methane gas. I am
18 concerned that it heats up the environment 86 times more
19 than oil and it stays in the atmosphere and global warming
20 is a concern.

21 I am here because I am a CL unpaid now Ever
22 Source Energy customer and I do not -- I object to paying a
23 fee for a gas line that I am 100% concerned about my
24 environment and I know without doubt it will have great
25 impact as the speakers before me have demonstrated.

1 I am concerned that putting money into the energy
2 Spectra, the pipeline, that we will not be staying with
3 renewable energies which are very, very important to our
4 environment and that is where our money should be put. And
5 as far as keeping people employed -- the pipeline will only
6 be a temporary, fracking is dangerous, it is costly, they
7 have gone bankrupt. Fracking is just a temporary -- whereas
8 these pipelines will be with us forever and fixing the pipes
9 that are already there seems much more economical and
10 feasible than what has been planned.

11 And putting people to work in renewable energy is
12 what we need to do. We need to put many more to work than
13 the time on the pipeline, thank you.

14 MS. SUTER: Number 7?

15 MS. KURLIND: My name is Marion K-u-r-l-a-n-d.
16 I'll get my glasses -- I am writing -- I am speaking to
17 express my objection to inclusion of the development of the
18 massive new infrastructure of gas lines to be used as a
19 so-called bridge fuel. I include in my objection, a strong
20 opposition to the Algonquin Gas Transmission LLC et al
21 submission of request for approval of pre-filing review for
22 its proposed Atlantic Bridge as well as for all of the
23 pipelines that have been submitted throughout New England.

24 Using gas as a bridge fuel would mean fixing the
25 leaks and integrity of the existing pipelines, not investing

1 in an enormous new project that would behold utility payers
2 for decades to come and then enslave us to fossil fuels.

3 This project is not necessary and is not in the
4 interest of the citizens of Connecticut, New England or the
5 nation. The pipeline would transport huge amounts of
6 fracked gas -- an extremely hazardous poisonous process that
7 destroys water resources, air and land and beautiful healthy
8 inhabited regions of Pennsylvania and beyond.

9 Residues of dozens of endocrine disrupting,
10 cancer-producing and radioactive chemicals used in the
11 process, passes through the interstate pipes and are
12 released at pressure points along the way. The makeup of
13 the gas itself -- methane, is a terrible greenhouse problem
14 and is released in harmful amounts along the interstate
15 pipelines as well.

16 As bad as carbon is for climate change, methane
17 is dozens of times worse. While innovation has taken over
18 our communities, state, region and nation with new and
19 cleaner solutions including solar, wind, energy conservation
20 and energy efficiency, why would our leaders be so eager to
21 listen to fossil fuel propoganda and the people who work for
22 them and spend millions if not billions of our dollars on a
23 dinosaur of a project that would prohibitively enslave us to
24 the damaging infrastructure for fossil fuel.

25 We cannot enrich the fossil fuel corporations at

1 the risk of our citizens, communities, lands, water, air and
2 future. Our leaders must work with the public will for a
3 clean and safe energy future so that our children,
4 grandchildren and future generations can enjoy and sustain
5 life on this planet.

6 We can no longer accept the rhetoric we hear from
7 politicians and bureaucrats. We must stand up and protect
8 the future. We the public believe you FERC are at least a
9 major agency that is supposed to not just reduce the impact
10 that these corporations are planning, but stop corporations
11 from destroying us. We need you to stop this direction. We
12 need the employees of FERC to stand up to their leaders and
13 stop and insist on stopping where this agency is going and
14 what this agency is doing.

15 I recently learned that corporations do not have
16 their primary obligation to the stockholders, their primary
17 obligation is to the citizens of the areas that they serve
18 and the state and federal agencies -- it is their job to not
19 incorporate corporations and to not allow them and to take
20 away corporate rights from any agency that is not acting in
21 the public interest, in the public service. This is
22 something in the Constitution.

23 And we have been led to believe that they have to
24 -- that corporations have to be serving their stockholders
25 and I have recently learned that that is just not true and

1 that's it. But also there's a lot of people here tonight
2 but I know dozens if not scores of people who would agree on
3 all of these issues that we need to stop, stop the fracking
4 and we need stop and we need to stop all of these hazardous
5 things because we as communities and individual citizens
6 have been working for the last 5 to 10 years to change our
7 system, our economics and our systems around for clean
8 energy and for energy efficiency and this undermines
9 everything that we have been working at.

10 It undermines everything that all the citizens,
11 the new jobs they are creating, the new businesses that are
12 being created, we need this money to go to the Clean Energy
13 Corporations and I know hundreds of people who would
14 probably be here tonight if they could or if they believed
15 that speaking to FERC can actually make a difference and I
16 hope that they are wrong and we are right.

17 MS. SUTER: Number 8?

18 MS. TWARDY: Hi, I'm Wendy Twardy T-w-a-r-d-y and
19 I echo the sentiments of almost everyone who has spoken
20 before me. It would be impossible for me to articulate my
21 utter disbelief that a project of this nature has reached
22 this point. However, that said I have a very specific
23 question. The drill that would be used to thread the third
24 pipe will be located on our property. I am concerned about
25 the damage that it might cause to our septic, well and

1 foundation.

2 I would like to know what precautions will be
3 taken and assurances that Specter can provide that our
4 property would be protected.

5 MS. SUTER: Number 9?

6 MS. MOECKEL: My name is Cindy Moeckel
7 M-o-e-c-k-e-l. I am distressed that the scope of comments
8 you called for in your earlier comments virtually treats
9 approval as a foregoing conclusion with little or no room
10 for consideration of a larger issue that I am about to
11 discuss.

12 Public convenience -- when you said public
13 convenience is a necessity I took that as the light at the
14 end of this very dark tunnel. Speaking to public necessity
15 I say the chief argument in favor of expansion of the gas
16 pipeline failed to account for the full cost of any further
17 investment in gas. Proponents are taking a short-term path
18 to address a long-term problem. How do we insure or secure
19 energy's future. Gas is a bridge to nowhere at best and
20 more realistically a plank we would be walking to
21 irreversible climate destruction.

22 Any arguments that the proposed pipeline would
23 benefit those of modest means who face high prices for gas
24 are misguided at best, short on full consideration of the
25 facts at least, disappointing and discouraging coming from

1 policymakers and utterly disingenuous when coming from the
2 gas industry.

3 Annual prices for gas delivered to heat homes and
4 offices and to power industry are a tiny portion of the full
5 cost. Recognition of the cost with negative externalities
6 alone should be enough to convince decision-makers that
7 expansion of the pipeline is in no one's best interest other
8 than the short-term bottom line interests of gas companies
9 and investors.

10 Condemning public land and cutting through green
11 space to cut the line is bad public policy on multiple
12 fronts enabling seizure of private land. Using eminent
13 domain is bad public policy. Building the pipeline through
14 fragile ecosystems including water sources and wetlands is
15 bad public policy. Authorizing pumping fracked gas at high
16 pressure through pipelines that can and will fail is bad
17 public policy.

18 Failure to invest in sustainable energy is bad
19 public policy. That is failure to invest. One argument
20 Governor Malloy has promoted is that we must expand the
21 pipeline in order to supply gas to those of limited means.
22 That argument is short-sided and disingenuous at best.
23 Whether today or in the immediate future, most of the gas to
24 be pumped through this pipeline is destined for export to
25 more lucrative European markets and we already have better

1 ways to ensure those of limited means can heat their
2 residences.

3 We have been fiddling for too long, we need to
4 take the long view when we invest. We need to pivot to
5 sustainable distributed generation of power. Any investment
6 we make should be in renewable technologies that harvest the
7 sun, wind and tides that come free to us. None of these
8 involve dangerous polluting hydro-fracking and all the
9 ruinous side effects of capturing methane gas, the burning
10 of which is a significant cause of climate disruption.

11 I have urged Governor Malloy and other promoters
12 of this ruinous idea to reconsider. I urge FERC to deny the
13 permit. Thank you.

14 MS. SUTER: Number 10?

15 MS. KULAS: Hi, I'm Lois Kulas, K-u-l-a-s. I
16 live here in Glastonbury and this is the first opportunity
17 for us to publically discuss this project with any
18 government representatives so I have to start out with some
19 questions. You know my main question coming up is why would
20 the government support the project? Spectra Energy plans to
21 extend their pipeline of fracked gas to reach markets in
22 Canada, Europe and beyond. Why should we allow the further
23 damage of our land, water, and air so the private
24 corporations can reach additional markets beyond their
25 borders?

1 There are good reasons Governor Cuomo banned
2 fracking in New York. Governor Tom Wolfe signed an
3 executive order banning fracking in Pennsylvania state land,
4 European leaders don't allow it. The environmental costs
5 outweigh the benefits. And transmission damages land,
6 water, homes, and yards in its path.

7 Methane gas leaks are more damaging than CO2 gas
8 as a greenhouse gas. And gas explosions harm people and
9 property every year. Why don't we see investment in
10 replacing the current 60 plus year old lines through
11 Glastonbury. Safety of the current gas pipelines could not
12 be guaranteed as they are now. Why would we invest in
13 infrastructure to continue the use of petroleum products
14 instead of investing in clean renewable energy sources?

15 So far these questions have not been answered.
16 So far it looks like we will lose in this deal and Spectra
17 and the gas industry will become rich. I ask that FERC side
18 with the environment and citizens, thanks.

19 MS. SUTER: Number 11?

20 MR. BENT: I'm Gary Bent B (as in Boy) - e-n-t. I
21 live in Mansfield, Connecticut. Besides the increase in
22 global warming, several scientific studies predict will
23 happen from the expansion of using natural gas there are
24 there important environmental impacts from the Atlantic
25 Bridge Projects.

1 The first is the radioactive contamination that
2 is in the pipes themselves. Most of the gas going to the
3 pipeline will come from fracked gas that contains radon and
4 inert radioactive gas. Radon has a short half-life of 3.8
5 days thus in 30 days it has essentially disappeared. The
6 radon decays into Lead 210. Lead 210 has a half-life of 22
7 years and is also radioactive so it will be around for about
8 a hundred years.

9 The radioactive lead is a solid so it forms a
10 scale on the pipe. Even though there may be only a small
11 amount of radon going to the pipe where it decays, the
12 radioactive lead will build up on the inside of the pipe.
13 What precautions will Spectra Energy take for the
14 radioactive pipes they remove to put in the bigger ones?

15 What precautions do they take when they remove
16 the radioactive lead scale that builds up in the pipe? With
17 more gas going through the pipes there will be more
18 radioactive scale inside the pipes.

19 The second is the natural gas that leaks from the
20 pipelines and is vented from compressor stations and
21 metering and regulation stations. Natural gas is 97%
22 methane. The natural gas leakage is high enough that
23 methane produces more global warming per unit energy
24 produced than coal. It is not clean energy. Now I've
25 talked to FERC representatives and I know you all are na ve

1 about the way gas companies operate. They actually
2 deliberately vent natural gas as well as having natural gas
3 leakage. I have been at the compressor station in Chaplin
4 and you can smell the natural gas coming off the roof.

5 I have been to the metering and regulation
6 station and they continually vent natural gas into the
7 atmosphere. They even have an exhaust stack so they can
8 vent it. Other metering regulation stations that will
9 continuously vent, but you go online and then read that they
10 periodically vent natural gas. It's a method of operation
11 of the gas companies.

12 The leaked methane contributes to formaldehyde
13 and ozone production that increases the respiratory diseases
14 and actually leads to death for these diseases. One
15 scientific study has tracked methane emissions in
16 Connecticut and found that 64% of methane emissions come
17 from natural gas transmission and distribution pipelines.
18 More gas being transmitted means increase in methane
19 emissions.

20 The third impact is the stress that increased use
21 of natural gas puts on water supplies, available crop lands
22 and forests. This is a national problem that has been
23 documented. The place will have bigger pipes, larger
24 compressors and the renovation of the metering and
25 regulating stations will bring this stress to Connecticut.

1 Thank you.

2 MS. SUTER: Number 12?

3 MS. BROME: My name is Susan Brome B-r-o-m-e. As
4 a resident of Mansfield, Connecticut I was among hundreds of
5 people who signed a Petition urging our town Council to pass
6 a Resolution expressing to our state legislatures the
7 Council's concern that increased use of fossil fuels as
8 proposed by the Algonquin Pipeline expansion and the
9 pollution caused by escaping methane gas. The Council added
10 its own request for legislatures to urge regulatory
11 authorities to stay for the construction of the pipeline
12 pending additional review.

13 Our reasons for concern include but are not
14 limited to: 1: Release of methane during venting and
15 compression stations at metering and regulation stations or
16 wherever leaks develop along the pipeline. A lot of this is
17 repetitive I'm sorry. Methane while remaining in the
18 atmosphere for a shorter time than carbon dioxide is over 86
19 times more potent as a greenhouse gas than is carbon
20 dioxide.

21 During an open house they hosted in Chaplin,
22 Spectra Energy officials admitted that they do periodic
23 venting and that leaks do occur in the pipeline, but they
24 seemed unconcerned about the health and climate effects on
25 their releases or the leaks.

1 2. Periodic cleaning of the interior of the
2 pipes. Radioactive lead 210, a by-product of the decay of
3 radon is one of the toxic components of the scale that forms
4 inside of the pipes. Spectra Energy tells us they use
5 robotic pigs to clean out the toxic residue in the pipes but
6 they don't tell us how and where they dispose of that
7 residue.

8 3. Surcharges on utility rate-payers bills to
9 cover the costs of pipeline expansions. In addition to
10 requiring money from rate-payers for something they neither
11 want nor need, it appears that part of the "need" for
12 expanded pipelines is to enable natural gas exports to
13 increase greatly.

14 The U.S. Energy Information Administration in an
15 October, 2014 report predicts that increasing exports will
16 result in higher prices for American consumers and vastly
17 increased profits for the gas companies.

18 4. Impact on job creation. According to 350.org
19 more than twice as many permanent jobs would be created by
20 investing one million dollars in either wind or solar power
21 versus one million dollars in natural gas.

22 5. Reasonable alternatives as called for in
23 FERC's Notice of Intent to prepare an environmental
24 assessment. Immediate steps can be taken by government,
25 NGO's, businesses and individuals to increase energy

1 conservation and efficiency without imposing huge financial
2 burdens on any of the players and without contributing
3 further to climate change.

4 At the same time, plans for conversion to
5 renewable power could intensify and financing could be put
6 in place. We could all rest assured that we have been doing
7 what we could have to leave the earth safer for our children
8 and our future generation.

9 In closing I am asking FERC to develop a
10 comprehensive environmental impact statement, EIS, a draft
11 statement emerging from FERC's review of environmental
12 impacts could be studied by the public and by town and state
13 officials who can then provide additional feedback before
14 release of the final EIS and we would hope this approval of
15 Spectra's energy expansion plans thank you.

16 MS. SUTER: Number 13?

17 MR. BROWN: Good evening, my name is Eric Brown
18 and I work as counsel on energy and environmental issues for
19 the Connecticut Business and Industry Association. Before I
20 start I want to thank you first of all for coming to
21 Connecticut and coming to Glastonbury particularly where it
22 is hard to believe that it is almost 40 years ago that I
23 graduated from high school here.

24 I also want to say that while I am a lawyer and a
25 lobbyist which usually that's two strikes against you, when

1 you start speaking in a forum like this, I am also a
2 resident of Connecticut. I'm a father. I taught
3 environmental science for many years. I used to work for
4 the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection on
5 ground water protection issues and worked with the state
6 legislature on passing the Act for Protection Legislation
7 that was referenced earlier.

8 So CBIA has written and spoken extensively about
9 the importance of bring in natural gas to Connecticut and
10 New England for a variety of reasons including economic
11 reasons which I know is not really the purpose of the
12 conversation tonight, but I did want to mention that --
13 throw out a quote from our current EPA administrative Jane
14 McCarthy who when she worked in Connecticut once said she
15 never saw a strong environmental state that didn't also have
16 a strong economy.

17 So I think there's a real nexus. I don't think
18 it's one versus the other and I think we have got a real
19 opportunity here to change Connecticut from a state where
20 businesses look around and say you know I can relocate to
21 pretty much any state in this country and expect to pay less
22 for electricity than I do in Connecticut. I think we need
23 to change that for both our economic and environmental
24 well-being.

25 But we are here tonight primarily to focus on

1 what you stated in the cover page of your public notice to
2 try and help the Commission staff determine what issues need
3 to be evaluated in the environmental assessment and I
4 certainly appreciate the testimony that has been provided
5 tonight and I think there has been a lot of good and
6 thoughtful issues raised, environmental issues raised that I
7 think it would be worth the FERC taking a look at, a factual
8 look at and a data scientific driven look at and I think
9 that would benefit everyone that was involved in these kinds
10 of discussions.

11 The only thing that I want to add is that on page
12 6 of your packet there are a number of bullets that you
13 identify as major environmental issues that you have already
14 identified should be within the scope of your study and what
15 I would like to urge is bullet number 6 talks about air
16 quality and one of the clear benefits of bringing more
17 natural gas to Connecticut is that we are very heavily
18 dependent, not just Connecticut but New England on natural
19 gas powered electric generators.

20 And to the extent that we don't have enough gas
21 to fuel those generators, particularly in the winter, cold
22 winters, Connecticut and other states are forced to rely
23 more on other sources that aren't as environmentally
24 friendly including coal and oil.

25 So I hope that as you look at air quality, you

1 look beyond the construction issues, but also take a look at
2 the potential impact on reducing the need to use coal and
3 oil for electric and heating purposes once we get a greater
4 supply of natural gas.

5 And similarly two bullets down from there you
6 mention traffic and transportation. There's a very
7 admirable effort in this state to expand our ability to fuel
8 cars powered by a variety of renewable sources including
9 natural gas, fuel cells, electric cars and so forth. If we
10 are going to be able to promote these types of technologies,
11 we have got to have the infrastructure in place to support
12 them and certainly in the case of cars powered by natural
13 gas -- I believe I saw one outside in the parking lot as I
14 came in, obviously to have the infrastructure in place to
15 support that kind of technology we have got to have expanded
16 capability for natural gas capacity and distribution in the
17 state.

18 So I just urge you to look at those terms and
19 issues broadly as you evaluate the environmental impact of
20 this project with respect to those issues and that's it,
21 again thank you very much for the opportunity.

22 MR. SUTER: Okay number 14?

23 MR. RUSSELL: Jeff Russell R-u-s-s-e-l-l,
24 Glastonbury. I am glad to hear that so many of my friends
25 and neighbors are so well versed on these issues because

1 many of them have said a lot of things that I would have
2 said and I don't think that I need to repeat them.

3 A couple of points -- it's been mentioned that
4 methane is a much more powerful greenhouse gas than carbon
5 dioxide, even though it has a shorter lifespan. What has
6 not been mentioned is that when methane decays in the
7 atmosphere it decays to water vapor and carbon dioxide, both
8 of which are powerful greenhouse gases.

9 The idea that increasing our use of natural gas
10 is in any way shape or form environmentally responsible,
11 from all of the information that I see is insane. These
12 resources will be much better spent as others have pointed
13 out on making our energy use more efficient, expanding our
14 reliance on renewable energy sources and on distributed
15 generation.

16 We have already seen a very badly covered up
17 disaster caused by the fact that hydraulic fracturing has
18 been exempted from the Clean Water Act and the Clean Air Act
19 -- people who can set their tap water on fire because of
20 natural gas exploitation. When I look at the total effect
21 globally of our expansion of gas production and I do not for
22 a moment believe there is any kind of shortage of natural
23 gas. I am firmly convinced there's a glut, but if I look
24 globally at the effect this has I have to look in the
25 direction of the whole reason for expanding U.S. natural gas

1 production has been more about impoverishing the Russian
2 Federation than doing anything good for we the people of the
3 United States.

4 We have pushed U.S. produced gas onto the markets
5 to the point where we have pushed the Russian people -- we
6 have impoverished a large section of the Russian people and
7 pushed their government to become more and more reactionary.
8 Quite frankly I would like to see Vladimir Putin be a lot
9 less of a pale imitation of Adolf Hitler.

10 The idea that this expansion of this pipeline
11 will in any way, shape or form benefit we the people of
12 Connecticut or of the Northeast makes no economic sense to
13 me. When I ran for Senate under the Green Party in 2010, I
14 was privileged to learn a great deal about economics from a
15 man named Warren Mosler, and when I look at the real
16 economic effects of this, nothing adds up except the
17 possibility of bringing this gas to ports where it can be
18 exported, that does we the people of this state no good
19 whatsoever.

20 And for the corporations to ask we the people to
21 pay for this is unconscionable. There will be no economic
22 benefit in the long term for the residents of New York, New
23 Jersey, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New
24 Hampshire, Maine, from the expansion of this pipeline.
25 There will be environmental damage.

1 And the more I look at this, the more it appears
2 to be to be another case of government of the people, by the
3 corporations for the profits. Thank you.

4 MS. SUTER: Number 15?

5 MS. SCHADE: My name is Duffy Schade,
6 S-c-h-a-d-e, I am also from Glastonbury and so much of what
7 I have fought and believed was very well expressed already
8 today so I'm not going to go into that. I just in addition
9 to that would like to express my concern about the impact
10 the expansion would have on the agricultural people, the
11 farmers of our town, particularly and I'm sure that's true
12 in other towns.

13 This is taking more land from them, it will --
14 particularly the orchards, I know one in Glastonbury where
15 the orchard would be disturbed during that time, that maybe
16 they would lose the time to prepare their crops for the next
17 years, the growing season of the summer and the harvest
18 season which pays for it all and that it would be very hard
19 replacing the trees, those that make crops that will bear
20 and pay for itself the following year.

21 I am also very concerned about the wildlife that
22 would be affected by the construction and I would second to
23 the others who have said that a much more extensive
24 environmental impact study needs to be made for that.

25 With the realization of problems called by

1 infraction, it's my dream I guess that that will soon be --
2 there will be less natural gas, but through this pipeline
3 will become obsolete and tall of this damage that's has been
4 done to the landscape will be a scar forever. It won't
5 probably be something that I will see in my lifetime but it
6 will and truly substantial, thank you.

7 MS. SUTER: Number 16?

8 MS. BOSCO: My name is Sunny Bosco B-o-s-c-o.
9 Can I adjust this for those of us who aren't so tall? I
10 live in Moodus, I'm an editor, a writer, I sit behind a
11 computer for 12 hours a day and don't interact with people
12 much and I certainly don't ever speak in public so I'm
13 terrified right now and I think the fact that I am up here
14 anyway is a reflection of how important this is and how
15 scared people are.

16 I think it's interesting that the name of this
17 Center is Riverfront that speaks to the value that we put on
18 water. We like looking at it, we like swimming in it, we
19 like turning our tap on and having safe, clean water to
20 drink and trusting that the government is going to ensure
21 that that is safe, clean water for us to drink and to cook
22 with and to give to our kids but what happens if we can't do
23 that? What happens if that goes away?

24 The river is too polluted to enjoy if it is too
25 toxic to let our kids swim in if we can't turn on the tap

1 and trust that the water is safe. All of that will happen
2 if you allow this project to go forward for all of the
3 reasons everyone else has stated. Pipelines leak at a
4 minimum of 4%, probably more. They have to be periodically
5 flushed with water and that water has to go somewhere.

6 This is being sold by the folks who
7 were paid to speak here as clean energy, as job creating
8 energy. It's not those things. It may create jobs during
9 the construction phase but after that it will not be a job
10 creator and it is certainly not clean or good energy. This
11 project will poison our rivers, it will poison our land and
12 it will poison our kids. It's a lie that it will create
13 jobs, it's a lie that it will lower costs, it's a lie that
14 we need it -- the gas companies need it.

15 This project sacrifices public health for
16 corporate profits and we are all terrified that you will
17 fail to protect us here. Please act in the public interest
18 and vote against it, thank you.

19 MS. SUTER: So that was the last speaker who took
20 a ticket to speak but before I respond to a few of the
21 comments that were made this evening and conclude the
22 meeting I would like to open it up. If there is anybody who
23 perhaps after hearing tonight or after sitting here has
24 mulled it over and you have a comment that you would like to
25 make, if you have not already come up is there anybody

1 interested in presenting any comments?

2 Okay -- so before I conclude I just
3 want to touch on two topics that I heard a couple of times
4 that I want to give you a little bit of information because
5 they are process related -- the first was preparing an
6 environmental assessment versus an environmental impact
7 statement and wanting us to do that the more rigorous the
8 EIS. So I want to clarify for you as of today or right now
9 we are planning an environmental assessment.

10 NEPA allows you or allows an agency to first
11 prepare an environmental assessment to determine what the
12 impacts of a project are and then if you determine that an
13 EIS is needed it can then switch or transition or perform
14 afterwards, an EIS. So the option is still on the table
15 that an EIS may be needed. We need to identify all of the
16 scope of issues between all of our meetings this week in the
17 scoping period and what issues need to be addressed and then
18 we need to start evaluating the project and what the impacts
19 of the project would be and so that will help determine
20 whether we believe an EIS is needed.

21 So as of today it is in the EA because we don't
22 have a lot of information about the project and we are just
23 starting to understand the scope of issues being raised and
24 if we were to transition we would notify the public that we
25 would be preparing an EIS instead.

1 The second that I wanted to address was just
2 about the newness of information, the availability of maps
3 being provided today and being on the public record in early
4 June, but the close of the comment period may be coming
5 sooner than that or soon after.

6 NEPA requires us to have a public scoping period
7 so we have to set a start date and an end date but anybody
8 who has worked with the Commission before understands that
9 we have a very liberal policy with accepting comments. If
10 you have something that comes to mind after the close of the
11 comment period, we encourage you to submit those comments on
12 the records because we will continue to look at those.

13 The main advantage to submitting your comments
14 during the comment period is that we have a couple of steps
15 involved that will help start to address those issues or
16 identify those issues earlier. The first is that within 14
17 days of the close of the comment period Algonquin is
18 required to submit a response to comments on the public
19 record -- so that's your first chance at seeing things.

20 If you submit comments after the close of the
21 comment period they obviously won't be considered during
22 that time period. The other is that submitting comments
23 during the comment period helps us to identify the issues
24 and refine the project, look at alternatives, such that when
25 Algonquin does submit an application if they do so, those

1 issues can be addressed in that application.

2 You know, by all means you can submit afterwards,
3 they just may not be adjusted at that time and we will have
4 to look at them afterwards, in which case responses to those
5 comments that come in later -- you won't really see any
6 information about that until we issue the environmental
7 document.

8 So that sort of covers I think two of the more
9 process related questions that I had, we will take one or
10 two -- I know you have to come up to the mic though so we
11 can capture your comments, I know -- I know but we have to
12 get it for the record. And just say your name one more
13 time.

14 MR. BENT: You said that, okay Spectra Energy has
15 to submit within 14 days after the comment period ends is
16 that what you said?

17 MS. SUTER: Correct.

18 MR. BENT: So that's the June 11th day when you
19 said comment period ended?

20 MS. SUTER: Correct.

21 MR. BENT: Okay will we -- if we are on your
22 mailing list will we get those replies?

23 MS. SUTER: Okay so that's a very good question
24 so -- and you saw at the sign-in table there is something
25 called e-subscriptions so there are filed publicly on our

1 public record and that's -- you can access all of that
2 electronically but if you want to see copies of that you
3 would need to register with our e-subscription service
4 because those comments do not get mailed out to the entire
5 mailing list, they get submitted and filed with FERC and you
6 can access that information through our website and you can
7 sign up for something called e-subscription and that allows
8 you to get a notice every time anything is filed on the
9 docket and you can click on a link and then you can see
10 whatever was filed, whether it was by Algonquin, by FERC or
11 by anybody, you can e-subscribe and there is information on
12 how to do that at the sign-in table.

13 MR. BENT: Okay I have been to the FERC website
14 and if I put in the number for the pre-filing I get nothing.
15 So how do you get to the Spectra Energy stuff on the FERC
16 website?

17 MS. SUTER: So you use the e-subscription.

18 MR. BENT: PF15-12?

19 MS. SUTER: Under e-library.

20 MR. BENT: No up in the search term?

21 MS. SUTER: So I promise you and I can say this
22 all now, but if you look at the I think it is in the Notice
23 of Intent there are instructions on how to access that
24 information, how to go through our website and navigate
25 that, which links to click on and to get you there.

1 MR. BENT: Thank you.

2 MS. SUTER: And what was your name for the record
3 again so that he can get it?

4 MR. BENT: Gary Bent, B (as in boy) -e-n-t.

5 MS. SUTER: Thank you. Follow-up questions?

6 MS. MOECKEL: Cindy Moeckel M-o-e-c-k-e-l. Was
7 your answer to Gary -- I want to know how is it I am not a
8 very proficient user, how is it that one goes in to put in a
9 comment on this process -- a comment on Algonquin's
10 proposal?

11 MS. SUTER: Okay so there are several methods to
12 do that. You can mail in comments to us and on the Notice
13 of Intent or at the -- do I have the brochure up here, I
14 don't -- there was a brochure in the back or a handout, it's
15 all in the back and it tells you how you can mail them in or
16 if you want to do it electronically, all the methods to do
17 it.

18 MS. MOECKEL: Thank you.

19 MS. SISKIND: Hi, Jennifer Siskind,
20 S-i-s-k-i-n-d. Mr. Bent commented on the radioactive
21 material that gets cleaned out the pipes periodically. The
22 FERC documents that were filed on May 7th, the monthly
23 report that was filed by Spectra at mile 7.2 it mentions
24 relocating the 36 receiver that doesn't exist yet at mile
25 zero is going to be re-located to mile 7.2 which is right

1 across the street from Thompson Street at the end of the
2 pipeline and a question about whether this receiver will be
3 a permanent pigging station receiver because that would be
4 an area where all this radioactive material gets cleaned out
5 and we are wondering what the impact that will be on the
6 Meshomasic State Forest and on property owners who live in
7 that area as well?

8 And the other three permanent locations of the
9 pigging stations would also be appreciated before the June
10 11th deadline as well so that there is an opportunity to
11 comment about those, thank you.

12 MS. SUTER: And you know, I don't know the
13 answers to all of those questions as of today but we are
14 anticipating that when we receive the full set of resource
15 reports, you know, there are drafts of what their
16 application would look like, we will get a lot more details
17 about that information.

18 MS. SISKIND: Understood and you know just all
19 the more reason why an environmental impact statement is
20 needed instead of just an environmental assessment because
21 the public should be allowed the opportunity to read a draft
22 EIS and then be able to formally comment in a public
23 hearing.

24 And just one other comment to make in reading the
25 reports that Spectra has filed on the FERC website, they

1 talk about notifications and I would like to comment that
2 the open house that they held before this event -- the
3 notification that appeared in the local newspaper was posted
4 a week after the open house occurred so I question what kind
5 of public notice was adequately given by Spectra?

6 It also repeatedly comments that governments,
7 stakeholders are being contacted and have been duly
8 informed. I talked to people at the Community Development
9 Office today, I have talked to engineers at the town and
10 they are informing me that they have received very little
11 information from Spectra, thank you.

12 MS. KURLIND: I just wanted to make a comment and
13 I hope that FERC will realize that we are just ordinary
14 citizens and we don't have lawyers and publicity experts to
15 defend our comments which Spectra Agency does and when they
16 review all of our comments, they are going to put all the
17 probably millions of dollars to work to try to change your
18 mind about what you are hearing tonight and I just hope that
19 you realize that we are doing it from our hearts and from
20 the research that we have done and we are not doing it for
21 publicity sake or for any personal gain except for a better
22 world.

23 MS. SUTER: Can you just restate your name for
24 the record.

25 MS. KURLIND: Marion Kurlind.

1 MR. SRINIVASAN: I'm Prasad Srinivasan.

2 MS. SUTER: Can you spell?

3 MR. SRINIVASAN: Of course I can.

4 MS. SUTER: You need to for the record anyway.

5 MR. SRINIVASAN: I expected that -- I expected
6 that. S (as in Sam) -r-i-n-i-v (as in Victor)-a-s-a-n. And
7 on behalf of -- I'm the State Representative here from
8 Glastonbury, the 31st District and on behalf of all of my
9 constituents who live in town who are going to be impacted
10 by this, obviously as you can understand we have a lot of
11 concerns.

12 Yes we did have a couple of open houses, you know
13 but this format -- I want to thank you first for coming out
14 here this evening, because this is a different set up than
15 what you have had in the past. And I think our concerns of
16 all of us here who are going to be impacted. I'm not sure
17 if I am or not but regardless of that, our town is impacted
18 along with other towns.

19 We have concerns which to us are very legitimate
20 and obviously for you, you may have a reason you may have a
21 rationale that we do not need to be concerned, that we don't
22 need to be worried about those impacts. But I think it
23 behooves you to make it clear to us that our concerns are
24 all addressed (a) in a timely manner and (b) in a manner
25 that satisfies us and we feel comfortable in this project as

1 it moves forward.

2 And I'm hoping that as we move forward I know
3 about the deadlines coming up and we have enough of these
4 opportunities where it would be on a face-to-face like
5 tonight or this evening or by email or other sources that we
6 can keep in touch and communicate with all of us in town who
7 are impacted by that and that is critical for us.

8 I think information needs to be shared and
9 somebody talked about how difficult it was to go on to that
10 side and glean the information that is needed. Remember we
11 don't do this day in and day out so for us it is not as easy
12 as it might be for you, so some kind of a system where we
13 can communicate and communicate in an effective way is very
14 important to all of us here in town, thank you for giving me
15 this opportunity today I appreciate that, thank you.

16 MS. SUTER: Okay so with that I am going to close
17 the formal part of this meeting. FERC staff and I think
18 Algonquin might still be out in the hallway but FERC staff
19 is certainly here to continue talking with you and answering
20 any additional questions you may have.

21 On behalf of the Federal Energy Regulatory
22 Commission I would like to thank you all for coming tonight.
23 Let the record show that the Atlantic Bridge scoping meeting
24 in Glastonbury, Connecticut concluded at 8:05 p.m.
25 (Whereupon at 8:05 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.)