

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  
National Grid LNG, LLC            Docket No. PF15-28-000  
  
Fields Point Liquefaction Project

\* \* \* PUBLIC MEETING \* \* \*  
PROVIDENCE ACADEMY OF INTERNATIONAL  
STUDIES HIGH SCHOOL  
JUANITA SANCHEZ EDUCATION COMPLEX  
182 Thurbers Avenue  
Providence, Rhode Island  
October 8, 2015  
6:36 p.m. - 8:45 p.m.

Kristen M. Edwards  
Court Reporter

1 FEDERAL REGULATORY COMMISSIONS OFFICE OF ENERGY

2 PROJECTS STAFF:

3 Kenneth Warn

4 Dave Swearingen

5 Christina Hoffman

6 Steve Holden

7

8 GUEST SPEAKERS:

9 Peter Nightingale

10 Money McNeil

11 Jan Luby

12 Greg Gerritt

13 Kate Schapiro

14 Ben Boid

15 Stephen Dahl

16 Marti Rosenberg

17 Peter Sugrue

18 Paul Klinkman

19 Liberty Goodwin

20 Karen Palmer

21 Nick Katkevich

22 Gina Rodriguez-Drix

23 Julian Rodriguez-Drix

24 Erin Regunberg

25 Claudia Gorman

1 GUEST SPEAKERS:

2 Servio

3 Lisa Petrie

4 Yudiglenn Sena-Abreu

5 Jesus Holguin

6 Ana Quezada

7 Paul

8 Beth Milham

9 Joshua Miller

10 Juan Pichardo

11 August Guang

12 Vanessa Flores Maldonado

13 Helen MacDonald

14 Steve Roberts

15 Susan Walker

16 Michelle Lacey

17 William Lambek

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25



1           Grid has provided a Spanish translator for  
2           those in attendance who would like to  
3           provide comments in Spanish.

4                     The primary purpose of the meeting  
5           is to provide you an opportunity to provide  
6           environmental comments or concerns to  
7           assist us in identifying the scope of  
8           issues for the environmental analysis we  
9           are preparing for the planned Fields Point  
10          Liquefaction Project.

11                    The FERC or the F-E-R-C is an  
12          independent agency that regulates  
13          interstate transmissions of natural gas,  
14          among other responsibilities. FERC reviews  
15          proposals and authorizes construction of  
16          interstate natural gas pipelines, storage  
17          facilities and liquified natural gas also  
18          known as LNG infrastructure.

19                    As a federal licensing agency, the  
20          FERC has a responsibility under the  
21          National Environmental Policy Act, known as  
22          NEPA, to consider the potential  
23          enviromental impact associated with the  
24          project, which is under consideration.  
25          With regard to National Grid's planned

1 Fields Point Liquefaction Project, the FERC  
2 is the lead federal agency for the NEPA  
3 review in preparation of the environmental  
4 document.

5 The City of Providence and the Rhode  
6 Island Coastal Resources Management Council  
7 have also agreed to participate as  
8 cooperating agencies in preparation for the  
9 environmental document.

10 As I said earlier, the primary  
11 purpose of this meeting tonight is to give  
12 you an opportunity to comment on the  
13 project or on the environmental issues that  
14 we would like to see covered in the  
15 environmental document. It will help us,  
16 the Commission most, if your comments are  
17 specific as possible regarding the  
18 potential environmental impacts of the  
19 project.

20 Time permitting you may also be able  
21 to speak with National Grid  
22 representatives, who are also present here  
23 tonight, after the formal meeting is over.  
24 And I don't see the -- okay, they are to  
25 your right. If you look to your right,

1           they are over there at the table to answer  
2           your questions, specific questions you  
3           might have about their proposal.

4                         However, I must note that our rental  
5           agreement for this facility requires that  
6           all attendees be out of the building by  
7           eleven p.m. at which time the school  
8           representative will lock the building;  
9           therefore, we must formally close this  
10          meeting by no later than 10:30 p.m.

11                        I know we're going to have a lot of  
12          fun here tonight and everyone is going to  
13          want to stay here later, but we have to  
14          abide by the rules of the facility.

15                        Now I want to briefly describe our  
16          environmental review process for you.

17                        To illustrate how this process  
18          works, we've prepared a flowchart. And  
19          representation of that flowchart is to the  
20          right of me here and -- sorry, to the left  
21          as you're looking at me. And for those of  
22          you in the audience who have a copy of the  
23          NOI, Notice of Intent, provided at the  
24          sign-in table or if you received it in the  
25          mail, you might have brought a copy with

1           you, you may want to flip to Appendix 1  
2           illustrating this process flowchart since  
3           you may not be able to read the chart from  
4           where you are seated in the room.

5                         We're currently within the first  
6           topmost two areas colored red on this chart  
7           labeled "Public Input Opportunities" right  
8           there. As indicated by the top yellow box  
9           on the left within this red bubble, the  
10          public opportunities for purposes of  
11          environmental review of National Grid's  
12          proposed liquefaction project began when we  
13          attended National Grid's open house held in  
14          this same room back on August 13th, which  
15          some of you in attendance tonight have also  
16          attended.

17                        As indicated in the third yellow box  
18          from the top of -- on the left of the  
19          chart, and that one would be right here,  
20          National Grid entered in to the FERC  
21          prefiling process on July 2, 2015, which  
22          began our review of the facilities that we  
23          referred to as the Fields Point  
24          Liquefaction Project.

25                        So, the purpose of the prefiling

1 process is to encourage involvement by all  
2 interested stakeholders including -- which  
3 includes you in a manner that allows for  
4 the early identification and resolution of  
5 environmental issues. As of today, no  
6 formal application has been filed with the  
7 FERC; however, the FERC, along with other  
8 federal, state and local agency staffs have  
9 begun review of the project.

10 Now, moving back down to the top red  
11 colored "public input opportunities"  
12 bubble. The yellow box following the open  
13 house, the one in the middle here, shows  
14 that on September 25, 2015 FERC issued a  
15 Notice of Intent or NOI to prepare an  
16 environmental document for this project and  
17 initiated a scoping period.

18 FERC sent copies of this NOI to all  
19 identified stakeholders for the project,  
20 which includes federal, state and local  
21 Providence area officials, other agency  
22 representatives, environmental and  
23 conservation organizations, Native American  
24 tribes, local libraries and newspapers and  
25 property owners within the vicinity of

1 National Grid's proposed project as defined  
2 in the Commission's regulations.

3 As indicated in the NOI, FERC also  
4 mailed Spanish translations of this notice  
5 to local libraries and indicated within the  
6 NOI mailed to the stakeholders in a  
7 footnote translated into Spanish how to  
8 access a Spanish version of the NOI on the  
9 FERC doc. The scoping comment period will  
10 end on October 26, 2015.

11 During our review of the project, we  
12 will assemble information from a variety of  
13 sources and these sources include National  
14 Grid, the public, members of the audience  
15 here tonight, other state, local and  
16 federal agencies and our own independent  
17 analysis and review. We will analyze this  
18 information and prepare an environmental  
19 document that will be distributed to the  
20 public for comment.

21 Currently, the FERC's review process  
22 is at the third and last yellow box within  
23 this red bubble there in which FERC reviews  
24 the scoping comments that all interested  
25 parties may file in the prefiling docket

1           for National Grid's proposal, which is in  
2           docket number P, as in Paul, F, as in  
3           Frank, 15 dash 28 dash triple 0, holds a  
4           scoping meeting, as we are holding tonight,  
5           to take both oral and written comments  
6           which are recorded by a court reporter and  
7           placed into our public record and consults  
8           with interested agencies.

9                         And as I previously mentioned, these  
10           interested agencies so far include the City  
11           of Providence and the Rhode Island Coastal  
12           Resource Management Council once scoping is  
13           finished, our next step will be to begin  
14           analyzing National Grid's proposal and the  
15           issues that have been identified during the  
16           scoping period.

17                        When complete, our analysis of the  
18           potential impacts will be published as  
19           either an environmental assessment known as  
20           an EA or an environmental impact study  
21           known as an EIS and presented to the public  
22           for a 30-day comment period in the case of  
23           an EA or a 45-day comment period in the  
24           case of an EIS. This environmental  
25           document will be mailed to all interested

1 parties.

2 Please note that because of the size  
3 of the mailing list, the mailed version of  
4 the environmental document will be a CD, a  
5 compact disk that you can read on your  
6 computer unless you tell us otherwise. If  
7 you prefer to have a hard copy mailed to  
8 you, you must indicate that choice on the  
9 return mail attached to the NOI. You can  
10 also indicate that on the attendance sheet  
11 tonight at the sign-in table. If you  
12 received the NOI in the mail, you are on  
13 our mailing list and will receive the  
14 environmental document in CD form. If you  
15 are not already on our mailing list, you  
16 can sign up for that at the sign-in table.

17 As I mentioned earlier, the issuance  
18 of the NOI opened up a formal comment  
19 period that will close on October 26th. I  
20 want to emphasize that it does not matter  
21 how you give your comments to us. Whether  
22 submitted via the internet, mailed in or  
23 spoken here tonight, we consider all these  
24 comments equally. All are given equal  
25 weight.

1                   So everyone is free to speak tonight  
2                   who signed up on the list, and we will give  
3                   as many people the opportunity to do that  
4                   within the time constraints that we have.  
5                   But if you'd rather take one of our comment  
6                   sheets and leave written comments here with  
7                   us or submit something later, it's all  
8                   treated equally. It's all equally valid.

9                   We also have a brochure at the  
10                  sign-in table that explains FERC's e-filing  
11                  system if you want to use that if you  
12                  choose to submit written comments following  
13                  the directions in the NOI. It is very  
14                  important that any comments you send either  
15                  electronically or by traditional mail  
16                  includes our docket number for the project  
17                  written clearly on that comment. And that  
18                  project is P, as in Paul, F, as in Frank,  
19                  15 dash 28. If you want to speak tonight,  
20                  you need to make sure you're signed up to  
21                  do so. So please do that now if you  
22                  haven't done so already.

23                  Now I want to explain the roles of  
24                  the FERC Commission and of the FERC  
25                  environmental staff. The five-member

1 Commission is responsible for making a  
2 determination on whether to issue a  
3 Certificate of Public Convenience and  
4 Necessity to the Applicant. In this case,  
5 that is National Grid.

6 The environmental document prepared  
7 by FERC environmental staff, which I am a  
8 part of and Dave is a part of, describes  
9 the project facilities and associated  
10 environmental impacts, alternatives to the  
11 project, mitigation to avoid or reduce  
12 impacts and our conclusions and  
13 recommendations.

14 The environmental document is not a  
15 decision document, and that's very  
16 important to understand. We're preparing  
17 this environmental document to disclose to  
18 the public and to the Commission the  
19 environmental impact of constructing and  
20 operating the proposed project. That's the  
21 primary purpose.

22 When it's completed, the Commission  
23 will consider the information from the  
24 environmental document along with  
25 non-environmental issues, such as

1           engineering, markets and rates and  
2           different parts of the omission, not just  
3           the division where Dave and I work but  
4           elsewhere. We will examine those issues  
5           and collectively will -- the Commission  
6           will make its decision to approve or deny  
7           National Grid's request for certificate.

8                         Now, before I start taking comments  
9           from you, I'll provide a brief overview of  
10          National Grid's proposed project as I  
11          understand it right now based on what  
12          National Grid has filed in the prefiling  
13          docket, and the communications we have had  
14          with National Grid to get a better  
15          understanding of what they'd really like to  
16          do.

17                        So, the people who have a copy of  
18          the NOI may want to flip to the diagram  
19          that shows the same picture to my right.  
20          And if you see that picture, it illustrates  
21          in red where the proposed project boundary  
22          is and it's within National Grid's existing  
23          LNG facility site. And then that area in  
24          green is another area that they would use  
25          to put down materials that would be

1 associated with this.

2 Now, before I go any further, let me  
3 just explain, as simply as I can, what  
4 National Grid, as I understand it  
5 currently, does and what they really want  
6 to do with this project.

7 Currently, National Grid has been  
8 storing LNG at its facility here on  
9 Terminal Road near Allens Avenue in  
10 Providence, Rhode Island since 1974. And  
11 this existing LNG storage facility  
12 currently doesn't have liquefaction  
13 capability and receives this LNG by truck.

14 Now, you may ask, where does it get  
15 this LNG? Well, currently it has customers  
16 and these customers buy this LNG from other  
17 locations that receive it from foreign  
18 sources, other LNG terminals. I believe  
19 the one that provides the most LNG is the  
20 Everett LNG, but National Grid can provide  
21 more information about that.

22 But, in essence, they are trucking  
23 in LNG and this LNG is being drived (sic)  
24 exclusively from foreign sources on the  
25 foreign market, and its customers want to

1 store LNG from -- and then be used when  
2 it's needed most during the heating season.  
3 And National Grid is coming forth with this  
4 proposal, this project, because it would  
5 like to be able to liquefy domestic sources  
6 of gas that it receives via pipeline so  
7 it's able to supplement the existing  
8 supplies that it's receiving from its  
9 customers from this trucking -- trucking  
10 operations with this foreign LNG.

11 And in doing so, the customers will  
12 help diversify their portfolios of where  
13 they can get their gas and help meet the  
14 needs of their customers when they need it  
15 most during this peak periods.

16 And another important point I would  
17 like to say that I understand about the  
18 project, the proposed project, is that  
19 National Grid proposes no change to its  
20 existing LNG storage tank, cryogenic piping  
21 or vaporization equipment and the new  
22 liquefaction facility would also require  
23 electrical power. And as far as we  
24 understand about the project would not have  
25 any sources of direct combustion issues.

1                   Now, it may have some future  
2 releases of gas, of methane gas, and  
3 National Grid is in the process of  
4 developing a report as part of the larger  
5 application that it plans to file with the  
6 Commission that estimates and provides  
7 other details regarding these emission  
8 rates.

9                   So, most likely, there will be some  
10 minor levels of methane releases, but we're  
11 still early in the process and still  
12 developing -- still gathering more  
13 information from National Grid and other  
14 sources about the specifics.

15                   And in order to provide that  
16 electrical power that I mentioned, National  
17 Grid would need to construct some  
18 underground electrical cable along Allens  
19 Avenue. This wouldn't be jurisdictional to  
20 what -- to the FERC, but it would still be  
21 required to make -- to enable these  
22 liquefaction facilities.

23                   And, finally, maybe I should get up  
24 here, National Grid also proposes to  
25 construct concurrently with a liquefaction

1 facility, which would be within this red  
2 area on the map to the east of that area, a  
3 containment wall. And according to  
4 National Grid, coordinating the  
5 construction of the liquefaction facility a  
6 containment wall project would minimize the  
7 lengthy overall construction period and  
8 peak construction personnel needs.

9 As I mentioned previously, after our  
10 meeting here is adjourned and time  
11 permitting, representatives from National  
12 Grid will be available, the project maps  
13 will be on hand to answer more specific  
14 questions about the project.

15 So, right now I think that is about  
16 it as far as summarizing what I understand  
17 at this point National Grid is proposing.  
18 So, at this point, I will hand it over to  
19 Dave and give him the opportunity to add a  
20 few comments.

21 MR. SWEARINGEN: Thanks, Ken.

22 Again, my name is Dave Swearingen  
23 and I'm also with the FERC Office of Energy  
24 Projects. And I'm going to just kind of  
25 help run the meeting here. So just set

1           some ground rules here that I'm looking at  
2           the list and the number of people we have  
3           signed up, I think, four minutes per person  
4           is a good starting point.

5                        So, what I will ask you to do is I  
6           will call your name and you can come up.  
7           And for the record to make sure we get  
8           everything on the record correctly that you  
9           spell your name for the court reporter, and  
10          I will have the timer.

11                       This is my cell phone. You probably  
12          haven't seen a cell phone like this in a  
13          long time. It doesn't have any apps. It  
14          doesn't have text. It doesn't even have a  
15          camera. But what it does have is a  
16          stopwatch so I can time each person. I  
17          will give you a 30 second reminder of when  
18          your time is nearing so you can wrap it up.

19                       And after the speaker's list is  
20          called, time permitted, we will stay here  
21          if you want to have additional comments.  
22          So, if you spoke and you didn't finish  
23          everything you wanted to say, you can raise  
24          your hand and come back up to the podium  
25          and finish your thoughts or if, you know,

1           you're not signed up at that time, like I  
2           said, time permitting, we can take people  
3           from the audience to come up.

4                        So, we are here until 10:30 as long  
5           as people want to comment. That's not a  
6           problem. I just ask that we are going to  
7           be professional and courteous. If somebody  
8           gets up here and you disagree with what  
9           they are saying that you -- this is not a  
10          rally to shut people down. It's not  
11          anything to be like that.

12                      So, if you happen to agree with  
13          somebody and you want to clap and  
14          everything, I would just ask that you wait  
15          until they are done and we are shifting  
16          people. If you want to, you know, voice  
17          some approval or something like that, that  
18          is fine but don't disrupt the person while  
19          they are speaking. It's just courtesy that  
20          everybody gets a fair chance to have their  
21          time.

22                      So with that, I will turn it back  
23          over to Ken and he will say a few final  
24          words and then I'll start calling from the  
25          speaker's list.

1 MR. WARN: Thanks, Dave.

2 Now we've got the real important  
3 part of the meeting beginning where we hear  
4 your comments. We will first take comments  
5 from those who signed up on the speaker's  
6 list, which many of you have done which is  
7 at the table at the back of the room.

8 And as I said before, whether you  
9 provide comments verbally or mail them in  
10 or submit them electronically, they will  
11 all be considered by FERC equally.

12 MR. SWEARINGEN: Okay. The first  
13 person we have signed up is Peter  
14 Nightingale and following that is Molly  
15 McNeil. So, Mr. Nightingale, there is a  
16 microphone up there. I'd ask that you use  
17 it so that we get it transcribed properly.  
18 Thank you.

19 MR. NIGHTINGALE: My name is spelled  
20 N-I-G-H-T-I-N-G-A-L-E.

21 In his encyclical, *Laudato Si*, Pope  
22 Francis wrote: The earth, our home is  
23 beginning to look more and more like an  
24 immense pile of filth. EPA recently  
25 created an environmental justice website.

1           Look up the data for Fields Point -- for  
2           the Fields Point area in Providence. You  
3           will find that building a liquefaction  
4           plant in this area is an act of  
5           environmental racism in spreading that  
6           filth.

7                         We know that both shale gas and  
8           conventional natural gas have a larger  
9           greenhouse grass footprint than do coal or  
10          oil for any possible use of natural gas.  
11          As of yesterday, humanity has to reduce  
12          global greenhouse gas emissions by  
13          7 percent per year. Expanding the frack  
14          gas infrastructure is a crime of global  
15          magnitude.

16                        The plan in addition is a violation  
17          of Article 1 Section 17 of the Rhode Island  
18          Constitution, the duty to natural  
19          resources -- excuse me, to provide for the  
20          conservation of air. Let me say this  
21          again. This spells out the duty to provide  
22          for the conservation of air, land and  
23          water, plant, animal, mineral and other  
24          natural resources of the state and to adopt  
25          all means necessary and proper by law to

1 protect the natural environment of the  
2 state and for the people of the state.

3 To you who sit here silently doing  
4 your jobs for this project, I have but one  
5 thing to say. You are complicit in crimes  
6 against humanity and against Mother Earth.

7 MR. SWEARINGEN: Thank you, Mr.  
8 Nightingale. The next person is Money  
9 McNeil and then on deck is Jan Luby.

10 MS. MCNEIL: I just wanted to echo  
11 the statement that --

12 MR. SWEARINGEN: Can you go ahead  
13 and spell your name for the record?

14 MS. MCNEIL: Sure. My name is  
15 spelled M-O-N-E-Y. My last name is spelled  
16 M-C-N-E-I-L. I just wanted to echo the  
17 statement that this is environmental  
18 racism. This is put on the wrong side of  
19 the hurricane barrier which would put  
20 mostly low income communities of color at  
21 risk if something were to happen. Also,  
22 that this will cost 100 million-dollars,  
23 and it looks like we're going to be footing  
24 the bill. And I don't know how that is  
25 possible when most of us are struggling to

1 pay our heating bills anyway, and we're  
2 struggling with shut-offs that are  
3 unlawful.

4 If anyone wants more information  
5 about the kind of detriment for this  
6 project, the Environmental Justice League  
7 is presenting information and they have  
8 tons of pamphlets, brochures and  
9 information on this project and how it's a  
10 detriment to the community, so definitely  
11 their table is over there. You can  
12 definitely sign up and receive more  
13 information.

14 MR. SWEARINGEN: Okay, thank you,  
15 Ms. McNeil. Next is Jan Luby and then on  
16 deck is Greg Gerritt.

17 MS. LUBY: Hi my name is Jan, J-A-N,  
18 Luby, L-U-B-Y. I made note also that no  
19 power plant production or storage  
20 facilities like of this type are proposed  
21 for Barrington, East Greenwich or Lincoln  
22 where wealthy people reside. But the south  
23 end of Providence is fair game and Pascoag  
24 where I live -- I work in Providence but  
25 Pascoag where I live is also fair game.

1                   It's a poor town. We just don't  
2                   have the resources to fight this kind of  
3                   thing. Saying that natural gas creates  
4                   fewer greenhouse gases than coal and is a  
5                   way to move toward a greener energy future  
6                   does not take into account the methane and  
7                   other pollution emitted when gas is  
8                   extracted and piped into power plants and  
9                   other customers.

10                   The EPA's new analysis doubles its  
11                   previous estimates for the amount of  
12                   methane gas that leaks from loose piping  
13                   fittings and is vented from gas wells.  
14                   Calculations for some gas field emissions  
15                   jumped by several hundred percent. Methane  
16                   levels from the hydraulic fracturing of  
17                   shale gas were 9,000 times higher than  
18                   previously reported.

19                   The world estimates that gas  
20                   drilling emissions alone account for at  
21                   least one-fifth of human caused methane in  
22                   the world's atmosphere. And as more  
23                   natural gas is drilled, the EPA expects  
24                   these emissions to increase dramatically.  
25                   Scientists are still trying to understand

1           the effect on the climate. It continues to  
2           be difficult to measure exactly how much  
3           methane is being emitted. But the primary  
4           pollutant from natural gas, methane is far  
5           more potent than other greenhouse gases.

6                     It makes no sense to rush forward  
7           until more studies have been done, and I  
8           think actually enough studies have been  
9           done to tell us that this is not the  
10          direction to take. There are so many  
11          reasons we should not be heading in this  
12          direction. The kind of shale gas drilling  
13          in New York, Pennsylvania, Texas led to  
14          high emissions of greenhouse gases just as  
15          dirty as coal.

16                    So far explosions at natural gas  
17          plants or facilities like this in New  
18          Jersey, Virginia, Connecticut,  
19          Pennsylvania, California have created death  
20          and destruction of property and further  
21          polluted our air. Much of the natural gas  
22          pipeline system is old, deteriorating and  
23          leaking leading to environmental and safety  
24          concerns.

25                    Natural gas pipelines need to be

1 shut down during road construction,  
2 pipeline repair work and emergency  
3 situations or extreme weather events, which  
4 we're getting more and more of with all our  
5 climate change which can lead homeowners  
6 without heat for hours or even days. I  
7 have more here.

8 But, most importantly, natural gas  
9 is not renewable energy and that is where  
10 our focus should be. That is where we need  
11 to be spending our time, energy and money  
12 and in research and development of  
13 renewable energy sources. We need to be  
14 asking ourselves everyday what kind of  
15 planet do we want to leave our children and  
16 their children. Thank you.

17 MR. SWEARINGEN: Thank you Ms. Luby.  
18 Next we have Greg Gerritt and following is  
19 Kate Schapiro.

20 MR. GERRITT: My name is Greg  
21 Gerritt. Greg, G-R-E-G, Gerritt,  
22 G-E-R-R-I-T-T. I live here in Providence,  
23 and I am representing both the Green Party  
24 of Rhode Island and prosperityforRI.com.

25 It is time to stop building out any

1 new gas infrastructure. It is time to stop  
2 building new and improved pipelines,  
3 drilling new wells, building new power  
4 plants. It is time to stop all of it.

5 Climate change is the crisis of our times.

6 It is time to stop building in the  
7 use of ever more fossil fuels and ever more  
8 drilling and ever more methane leaks. If  
9 FERC is serious about climate change, I  
10 kind of doubt that considering that they've  
11 never, never turned down one of these  
12 projects. I mean, a regulatory agency that  
13 does not ever regulate. Obviously not  
14 serious. And they need to be serious about  
15 the climate change. Everybody else in the  
16 world is starting to get serious.

17 It's time FERC actually started to  
18 take climate change into account and say no  
19 to things that will include more drilling.  
20 You also are underestimating the opposition  
21 to the growth of gas infrastructure in  
22 America. All across the county communities  
23 are saying no. They're saying no to  
24 fracking. They're saying no to pipelines.  
25 They're saying no to more power plants.

1           It's time for FERC to start paying  
2           attention to the people instead of being a  
3           captured regulatory agency.

4           Ten years from now if you guys elect  
5           them, they will build these power plants  
6           and pipelines and other facilities and then  
7           they will all go broke, and they will still  
8           be asking us to pay for this stranded  
9           infrastructure that we never wanted and we  
10          all thought was incredibly stupid. As the  
11          climate crisis deepens, we are going to  
12          shut things down.

13          Do not tie all our money up in the  
14          past. We cannot afford this stranded  
15          infrastructure. But if we don't strand it  
16          after you allow it to be built, we'll have  
17          faster climate catastrophes. Take a stand.  
18          No more wasting our money on things we  
19          never wanted and cannot use without  
20          destroying the planet. Thank you.

21                 MR. SWEARINGEN: Thank you,  
22                 Mr. Gerritt. Next we have Kate Schapiro  
23                 and then following is Ben Boid.

24                 MS. SCHAPIRO: K-A-T-E,  
25                 S-C-H-A-P-I-R-O. I don't live near the

1 proposed plant site. I don't live on the  
2 south side, but I care what happens there  
3 because it affects the people who live in  
4 Providence with me and, ultimately, the  
5 burning of that gas will affect the planet  
6 that all of us live on.

7 I don't want them to be at risk of a  
8 breach or a leak or an explosion or even  
9 the normal operation of a plant anymore  
10 than I would want that risk. I don't want  
11 our air or water compromised, their's first  
12 or mine later. I don't want this plant to  
13 be built at all, and I definitely don't  
14 want it in a city where I live.

15 I buy my electricity from National  
16 Grid and I want them to commit to more  
17 renewable, less polluting and dangerous  
18 energy for all of the communities they  
19 profit from. I do not believe that it is  
20 possible to build this plant in a way that  
21 is safe for the people or the other living  
22 things or the water or the air or the soil  
23 nearby. And I would prefer that to see the  
24 company that I must buy my electricity from  
25 to produce it in a safe and sustainable and

1 renewable way. Thank you.

2 MR. SWEARINGEN: Thank you, Ms.  
3 Schapiro. Next is Ben Boid and then on  
4 deck is Stephen Dahl.

5 MR. BOID: It's B-E-N, B-O-I-D. And  
6 I'm pretty much going to reinforce what  
7 everyone has already said. And that is  
8 that we need to be investing in clean,  
9 renewable, sustainable energy sources in  
10 addition to the fact that it is a  
11 well-documented fact that more often than  
12 not any sort of hazardous materials,  
13 facilities are constructed in the low  
14 income or neighborhoods with people of  
15 color and that is unacceptable.

16 We won't see this, like Jan had  
17 said, built in Barrington, built off the  
18 coast of Jamestown. While this is  
19 something that everyone in the state and  
20 the surrounding area needs to use, it's  
21 completely unfair to ask this neighborhood  
22 to shoulder so much of the burden and the  
23 risk to their health when everyone is going  
24 to use it. So we should all share the risk  
25 until we have clean, sustainable energy.

1 Thank you.

2 MR. SWEARINGEN: Thank you, Mr.  
3 Boid. Next we have Stephen Dahl and then  
4 on deck is Marti Rosenberg.

5 MR. DAHL: Hi, I am Stephen Dahl,  
6 S-T-E-P-H-E-N, Dahl, D-A-H-L, of Kingston,  
7 Rhode Island.

8 Weep, weep, weep, weep, thus wrote  
9 Britain's poet William Blake during the  
10 industrial revolution when coal power was  
11 king but it seems that London, England's  
12 National Grid no longer holds Britain's  
13 values. Now we have been tricked into  
14 believing that liquid natural gas,  
15 including three gas plants proposed in  
16 Rhode Island, will provide clean energy for  
17 our children's future. Nothing could be  
18 further from the truth.

19 Again, William Blake in the Chimney  
20 Sweeper scribed: When my mother died, I  
21 was very young and my father sold me while  
22 yet my tongue could scarcely cry weep,  
23 weep, weep, weep. So your chimneys I sweep  
24 and so I sweep children cannot comprehend  
25 that adults could be so evil if children do

1           their part and act with good.

2                         Again, Blake: And so Tom woke and  
3           we rose in the dark and got with our bags  
4           and our brushes to work. Though the  
5           morning was cold, Tom was happy and warm.  
6           So involved in their duty, they need not  
7           fear harm yet experience shows that  
8           innocence will not protect children from  
9           adults who act evil.

10                        Another Chimney Sweep whose mother  
11           is still alive supposedly even more  
12           protected reaches the same dismal fate. A  
13           little black thing among the snow crying  
14           weep, weep in toes of woe where are thy  
15           father and thy mother? Say they are both  
16           gone up to church to pray because I was  
17           happy upon the hurt and smiled among the  
18           winter's snow.

19                        They clothed me in the clothes of  
20           death and taught me to sing the notes of  
21           woe. And because I am happy and dance in  
22           sin, they think that they have done me no  
23           injury and are gone to praise God and his  
24           priest and king who make up a heaven of our  
25           misery.

1                   You National Grid, you, the state,  
2                   its agencies, its regulators and its  
3                   politicians, you wrecked our children's  
4                   health. You are responsible for global  
5                   warming and its continuation which makes  
6                   our planet uninhabitable by your failure to  
7                   replace fossil fuels with wind, water and  
8                   solar energy. You are sending our children  
9                   up the chimney in smoke. For them I weep,  
10                  weep, weep, weep.

11                  MR. SWEARINGEN: Thank you, Mr.  
12                  Dahl. Next we have Marti Rosenberg and  
13                  following Peter -- sorry, I can't read that  
14                  writing so well.

15                  MS. ROSENBERG: Hello. My name is  
16                  Marti Rosenberg, M-A-R-T-I,  
17                  R-O-S-E-N-B-E-R-G, and I live about a mile  
18                  and a half away from the LNG proposal.

19                  So fracking is something that we see  
20                  on the news, and it looks like it happens  
21                  kind of far away. Fracking causes  
22                  earthquakes in Texas and it's, you know,  
23                  people say that water burns in other states  
24                  but this project shows us that the impact  
25                  of fracking is much closer than we think.

1 Natural gas is a reality in neighborhoods  
2 near us. I know that. We know that.

3 We understand that significant  
4 safety risks are there everyday now with  
5 trucks taking this natural gas and moving  
6 it from the highway to the facility and  
7 from the facility to the highway, and  
8 things should be done right now to make  
9 that safer.

10 And National Grid and others may say  
11 let's put it underground to make it safer,  
12 but that's not safe either. There are  
13 risks. There are risks of explosions.  
14 There are risks of hurricanes like Sandy  
15 and like Joaquin, which we just dodged.  
16 And earthquakes, yes, here. There was one  
17 a couple of months ago or weeks ago.

18 These affect neighborhoods like  
19 south Providence first, because the dangers  
20 are already here. And then they affect my  
21 neighborhood and then Warwick and east  
22 Providence can get affected, 14-mile radius  
23 around the project. That is a lot of Rhode  
24 Island.

25 I don't know where you live, but we

1 love Rhode Island and its small size and  
2 everybody probably knows hundreds and  
3 hundreds of people in the 14-mile radius  
4 around this project. So we also have the  
5 health impacts.

6 I do health policy for a living, and  
7 I couldn't not talk about the health  
8 impacts of the natural gas problems that we  
9 have now in south Providence and, frankly,  
10 the highway problems that we have now. And  
11 that affects neighborhoods like south  
12 Providence, which are closer to the highway  
13 than other neighborhoods that have been  
14 mentioned.

15 So what is the answer? You could  
16 say there is no answer to this, because  
17 either it's underground or it's in trucks  
18 and there is no answer. But there is an  
19 answer. The answer is, as folks have been  
20 saying tonight, step back and embrace the  
21 fact that these are dangers that we don't  
22 have to accept.

23 Imagine if we took the 100,000 or  
24 100 million-dollars to be spent on this  
25 project and invested instead in developing

1           and maximizing renewable energy, imagine  
2           that. Imagine if it happened in every  
3           state in the United States where fracking  
4           happens instead of earthquakes and health  
5           risks. Imagine if we made a different  
6           choice, and that the federal government led  
7           the way in helping National Grid and others  
8           make a different choice.

9                       We do not have to continue to choose  
10           one way of natural gas. We can choose  
11           renewable energy. It takes political will.  
12           It takes a backbone. It takes standing up  
13           and saying we do not have to keep our earth  
14           at risk. We have one earth. We have a  
15           very small amount of time to stop the  
16           direction that we are moving in and  
17           preserve our earth for our children, my  
18           children, your children and the children of  
19           south Providence and the West End and other  
20           neighborhoods that need every bit of help  
21           they can get to rise up and maximize their  
22           potential. We can stop this if it's not  
23           too late to start. We have to start now.  
24           We cannot wait, and we can start by  
25           rejecting this proposal. Thank you.

1                   MR. SWEARINGEN: Thank you, Ms.  
2 Rosenberg. Next is Peter Sugrue and John  
3 Glassie.

4                   MR. SUGRUE: Hi, my name is Peter  
5 Sugrue. It's P-E-T-E-R, S-U-G-R-U-E.

6                   And, so, according to the proponents  
7 of this project, the primary projected  
8 benefit is price reliability for liquified  
9 natural gas. Now, there is no mention of  
10 rate reduction. We will clearly see an  
11 initial rate increase for this 100  
12 million-dollar project.

13                   It's hard to see how a raise in rate  
14 reliability significantly helps the energy  
15 consumers of our eye in the short-term if  
16 they are accompanied with rate increases.  
17 And in the long-term, any liquified natural  
18 gas benefit shouldn't matter that much  
19 since Rhode Island is committed to greatly  
20 reducing its reliance of fossil fuels.

21                   Isn't an investment in an industry  
22 that produces 97.7 percent for domestic  
23 energy from shale gas a divestment away  
24 from the commitments we have made to our  
25 regional partners towards renewable energy?

1                   We have to ask ourselves how much  
2                   are these initiatives about ensuring  
3                   consistent prices for consumers and how  
4                   much of our investment is actually about  
5                   ensuring that shale gas continues to be the  
6                   dominant source of energy in our states to  
7                   come?

8                   But perhaps the long-term trajectory  
9                   and the responsibilities of Rhode Island  
10                  isn't only what this meeting is about.  
11                  Perhaps we are here tonight for the  
12                  families in the surrounding neighborhoods  
13                  and the schools and daycare centers and  
14                  surrounding communities, which have already  
15                  been subject to excessive environmental  
16                  degradation and health risks. Communities  
17                  that have every reason to be suspicious of  
18                  more heavy industrialization.

19                 It is they who are being asked to  
20                 take the risks regardless of how small the  
21                 risk may be framed by those asking them  
22                 simply because the public and the local  
23                 citizens may not have access to it or  
24                 expertise and material that explicitly  
25                 pinpoints esoteric areas of technological

1 risks this project poses.

2 It doesn't mean there are various  
3 concerns and are unfounded will sure be  
4 disregarded by distortions, because it is  
5 they who have the bulk of tangible risks  
6 imposed upon them. Why should we ask the  
7 most vulnerable in this state to take on  
8 the majority of the risks for any statewide  
9 benefit, large or small, real or  
10 illusionary?

11 And if it isn't the citizens of the  
12 rest of the state as asking some of the  
13 most vulnerable to accept these risks on  
14 their behalf, why then are the powerful in  
15 this county going to license to impose that  
16 risk upon those least able to resist it?

17 I appeal to the government officials  
18 to enact their primary responsibility the  
19 protection of the American people, which is  
20 secondary to any presupposed empowerment of  
21 any initiative, to forego protection for  
22 the most vulnerable in order to promote  
23 short-term empowerment, empowerment that  
24 may very well be considered to have reached  
25 a point of financial opportunism is an

1 inverse of the priorities of government.

2 It is the obligation of companies  
3 and representatives involved to demonstrate  
4 a lack of risk to the public. Not the  
5 public to demonstrate a predetermined level  
6 of risk inherent in this project. The  
7 community should get to decide the risks  
8 that they are willing to accept. I hope  
9 our officials in the spirit of public  
10 service will protect this community's right  
11 to do just that.

12 MR. SWEARINGEN: Thank you, Mr.  
13 Sugrue. Next we have John Glassie followed  
14 by Paul Klinkman. John -- we will go  
15 straight to Paul Klinkman and following is  
16 Liberty Goodwin.

17 MR. KLINKMAN: Paul Klinkman,  
18 K-L-I-N-K-M-A-N. I am a soler inventor.  
19 Here are two of my patents. They are very  
20 thick. That is how I write them. Thomas  
21 Edison wrote very thick patents. I am  
22 coming after every major use of natural  
23 gas, building heat, cheap solar  
24 electricity, other uses of electricity,  
25 such as daylighting and there are a few

1 more.

2 I realize that if I can hit three  
3 cents per kilowatt per hour for  
4 non-intermittent electricity in ten years  
5 and if the photobiotic industries can get  
6 two and a half cents per kilowatt hour, I  
7 will be sad.

8 However, the natural gas industry  
9 will be flat. It will be financially  
10 ailing. It will be dead. If you want to  
11 see the future of the natural gas industry,  
12 go to the Shale Oil Industry museum in New  
13 Bedford. There it is.

14 Five years ago the price of oil was  
15 \$100 a barrel, because people thought that  
16 oil would always have an enormous value so  
17 they hoarded it. Lately, the price is \$48  
18 per barrel because rational people expect  
19 the oil industry to go extinct in a few  
20 years, so they are selling out oil while  
21 they still can.

22 You can't sell a building or sell a  
23 bridge that will only be used functionally  
24 for five or ten years. If this LNG  
25 liquefaction plan is built, it cannot

1 possibly be making money for the time  
2 period specified in the permit request.  
3 Either an ever shrinking pool of utility  
4 rate payers will be left holding the bag or  
5 else the utility will go bankrupt, and  
6 lawyers for their bondholders will come  
7 looking for somebody else to blame for this  
8 shortsightedness.

9 I am here to tell those lawyers of  
10 the future that FERC has been warned in a  
11 timely manner about this incorrect time  
12 period in the permit request. And after  
13 that you can read it, I quote, Bloomberg  
14 news, we're seeing the utilization rate.  
15 Fossil fuels wear away. Next I want to  
16 discuss the plant's fireball zone.

17 On October 20, 1944, an LNG  
18 explosion with the power of one-sixth of  
19 Hiroshima atomic bombing leveled one square  
20 mile of Cleveland, Ohio. My wife has  
21 pictures. Due to sheer luck, it only  
22 killed 130 people. The first blast scared  
23 the neighbors. They ran for their lives.  
24 Then the big blast came before school let  
25 out.

1                   I believe that you can't build a  
2                   nightmare within blasting range of someone  
3                   else's property without properly  
4                   pre-compensating them. To do otherwise is  
5                   to deny them the fair use of their property  
6                   due to justified nightmares, and so I ask  
7                   for pre-compensations for all the residents  
8                   in the blast zone.

9                   MR. SWEARINGEN: Thank you, Mr.  
10                  Klinkman. Next we have Liberty Goodwin  
11                  followed by Karen Palmer.

12                 MS. GOODWIN: I am Liberty Goodwin.  
13                 I am speaking both as the director of the  
14                 Toxic Information Project, a nonprofit  
15                 educational organization in Providence, and  
16                 a co-owner of Klinkman Solar Design with my  
17                 husband, Paul Klinkman. And you have  
18                 copies of my testimony, which includes, as  
19                 you saw, the pictures of the devastation  
20                 caused by the Cleveland explosion, which  
21                 was many years ago, but also a list of a  
22                 whole variety of natural gas leaks and  
23                 explosions that have occurred since then,  
24                 in many very recently, but I want to get to  
25                 the bottom line.

1                   And I ask you people from FERC to  
2                   ask yourself these questions. How would  
3                   you feel if you approve this project and a  
4                   devastating accident happened here? Is  
5                   there such a thing as, quote, clean natural  
6                   gas? Would you put your head in a gas  
7                   oven? The adjacent community doesn't want  
8                   to be an ugly, toxic industrial site  
9                   neighbor.

10                  Do the views of local citizens  
11                  matter to those representing our  
12                  government? How will your decision impact  
13                  the trust level to the public, which may be  
14                  of a historic low even now. Then, again,  
15                  do you really trust the assurances of  
16                  safety from large corporate interests given  
17                  history? Why should many of the dollars  
18                  continue to flow into the coughers of  
19                  yesterday's dirty, polluting and dangerous  
20                  technologies when the clean renewable  
21                  technology of the future is rapidly  
22                  developing as you deliberate?

23                  What if you look back years from now  
24                  and realize that the Thomas Edison of the  
25                  21st Century were sitting in this room

1 ignored while you consider continuing the  
2 candlelight era in place of this silly  
3 electric light.

4 My husband, Paul Klinkman, has two  
5 patents and one on the verge of approval  
6 that will one day meet a huge percent of  
7 energy need with new solar tracking, solar  
8 thermal and solar wind, large scale  
9 electrical generation that costs as low as  
10 three cents per kilowatt per hour. Please  
11 don't support outdated, risky, dirty,  
12 outgoing energy technology. Thank you.

13 MR. SWEARINGEN: Thank you, Ms.  
14 Goodwin. Next we have Karen Palmer. And  
15 following Nick, it's Kevin.

16 MS. PALMER: I have to admit that  
17 I'm not 100 percent --

18 MR. SWEARINGEN: Spell your name for  
19 the record, please.

20 MS. PALMER: Oh, I'm sorry. Karen  
21 with a K, K-A-R-E-N, last name Palmer,  
22 P-A-L-M-E-R. I'm sorry to admit that I  
23 have not completely prepared for today. Am  
24 I loud enough?

25 MR. SWEARINGEN: You have to really

1 hold it close.

2 MS. PALMER: I just want to say I  
3 apologize that I'm not as prepared as I  
4 would like to be for this meeting, but I  
5 will share some of the information that I  
6 do know.

7 I do know that when you do fracking  
8 you use 1 to 8 million gallons of water.  
9 At this day and age when water is turning  
10 out to be a premium and a lot of our water  
11 is being contaminated, I sincerely believe  
12 that this is something we need to take into  
13 consideration. There are so many different  
14 laws about what can go into the atmosphere.

15 But overtime, for instance, the  
16 amount of methane that's emitted in the  
17 air, there's a certain quality that's  
18 allowed but it has not been tested or  
19 through all the different facilities that  
20 now exist for either fracking, storage, you  
21 know, each part along the line.

22 So I feel that although there may be  
23 certain standards, they are not being  
24 maintained because they are not being  
25 measured. I feel like, too, I'm a

1           beekeeper. I'm a grandmother. I am in the  
2           medical field. I feel like on the hole the  
3           whole purpose of us is to maintain a  
4           healthy community so that the next  
5           generations to come will, you know, will be  
6           able to sustain a meaningful and healthy  
7           life.

8                         I feel that the use of these gas  
9           compressing stations -- there are too many  
10          variables that present themselves. First  
11          of all, Providence is considered to be --  
12          to have the most amount of toxic elements  
13          in it from the different facilities that  
14          are in the area. The area from where the  
15          gas is being transmitted is from West  
16          Virginia. West Virginia is the second  
17          poorest state of the union.

18                        And because of all of the side  
19          effects from fracking and all that  
20          business, that the people there -- their  
21          health is really suffering. People who  
22          live in the areas where they have done  
23          different fracking throughout -- I am not  
24          sure how many states at this point -- have  
25          experienced neuropathies and all various

1 health problems. It's considered cryogenic  
2 in this day and age where America is 20th  
3 down on successful healthcare, childbirth  
4 and all other things. We do not have a  
5 good health system, especially when we're  
6 being exposed to such toxins.

7 I feel that as a whole that the  
8 whole purpose of FERC is to protect us,  
9 although that is not necessarily the  
10 history of FERC, but I would like to feel  
11 that the people are really being -- the  
12 people's desire for health, people's desire  
13 to slow global warming, the people's desire  
14 to make this a better place should really  
15 be considered.

16 When it comes to global warming, gas  
17 is one of the things that actually is  
18 advancing global warming. We should be  
19 getting away from that and use alternative  
20 fuels like wind and solar. And, so, I feel  
21 like on a whole that this is a lose-lose  
22 situation if this is actually passed. I  
23 feel that it's detrimental not just to the  
24 local community but on the whole because of  
25 what is happening when -- if we have a

1           facility like this, it's encouraging more  
2           fracking. Okay, along those lines -- you  
3           shut me down. I forgot what I was going to  
4           say next.

5                         But in any case, I will submit a  
6           written paper but I am just really gravely  
7           concerned about the future behold to us.  
8           So I feel that if we are going to be  
9           mindful of the generations to come that we  
10          need to take into considerations all of the  
11          bad side effects that fracking will have.  
12          Not just fracking because that is  
13          throughout the country but also through  
14          these consenter stations where they don't  
15          need to share the information of all the  
16          chemicals and toxins that they emit because  
17          it's considered -- I forget the term. But  
18          it's considered secret that their business  
19          can maintain. So I will submit more in  
20          writing.

21                         MR. SWEARINGEN: Thank you, Ms.  
22          Palmer. Next we have Nick Katkevich and  
23          following Gina Rodriguez-Drix.

24                         MR. KATKEVICH: My name is Nick  
25          Katkevich, K-A-T-K-E-V-I-C-H.

1                   So, first, I just have a message for  
2                   FERC that is kind of on a technical basis.  
3                   So the gas that is going to come to this  
4                   liquefaction facility is going to be coming  
5                   through the Spectra Pipeline System. Right  
6                   now there's a one billion-dollar expansion  
7                   to Spectra's pipeline project called the  
8                   AIM project. After that there's an 800  
9                   million-dollar expansion called the  
10                  Atlantic Bridge project, and after that  
11                  there's a 3 billion-dollar project called  
12                  Access Northeast and all of those projects  
13                  are backed by National Grid. And all of  
14                  these projects must be considered one  
15                  project legally; otherwise, it's something  
16                  called "impermissible segmentation."

17                  So this whole process is flawed  
18                  right now. And starting with the Supreme  
19                  Court, it says that FERC has to deal with  
20                  proposals that are for actions of  
21                  accumulative environmental impact upon a  
22                  region pending concurrently before an  
23                  agency must be considered together.

24                  Furthermore, FERC has the authority  
25                  under the National Environmental Policy Act

1           that says that connected actions, which  
2           means that they are closely related, and,  
3           therefore, should be discussed in the same  
4           impact statement and actions are connected  
5           if they are interdependent parts of a large  
6           action and depend on the larger action for  
7           their justification.

8                         So there is three Spectra pipeline  
9           expansions and this project and other  
10          projects that are dependent on the Spectra  
11          pipeline expansions must be considered as  
12          one project, and the impacts must be  
13          measured all together. So this process is  
14          flawed right now, and I know that folks are  
15          preparing lawsuits once the hold is done on  
16          the first Spectra project.

17                        So, I guess, the second piece is  
18          more to the National Grid folks right there  
19          because just like these projects are  
20          connected legally, I think our resistance  
21          is also going to be connected. There has  
22          been fierce resistance in Rhode Island to  
23          the Spectra project. We're the group  
24          called FANG, Fighting Against Natural Gas.  
25          There has been lockdowns, other types of

1           resistance and we're only growing stronger  
2           and fiercer and we're starting to win. And  
3           if you all try to build this project, I  
4           know myself and other folks in our group  
5           are going to do whatever we can in  
6           solidarity with the Environmental Justice  
7           League to stop this project.

8                         So, again, legally and permissible  
9           segmentation these projects aren't  
10          connected and then together our resistance  
11          is going to be connected and we will stop  
12          this thing.

13                        MR. SWEARINGEN: Thank you. Gina  
14          Rodriguez-Drix and then Julian  
15          Rodriguez-Drix.

16                        MS. RODRIGUEZ-DRIX: Hi. My name is  
17          Gina. I am a resident --

18                        MR. SWEARINGEN: Go ahead and spell  
19          it all out.

20                        MS. RODRIGUEZ-DRIX: Oh, I'm sorry.  
21          G-I-N-A, R-O-D-R-I-G-U-E-Z hyphen D-R-I-X.

22                        So my name is Gina. I'm a resident  
23          of Washington Park. I'm a mother of two,  
24          and I am a birth worker and I am deeply,  
25          deeply concerned about this project's

1 effects and disproportionate effects of  
2 women and children and, in particular,  
3 women of color and children of color that  
4 live right here in this neighborhood. This  
5 is unnecessary. It's going to be on us to  
6 pay for it.

7           You're talking about a community  
8 that is constantly getting utilities shut  
9 off that has to make decisions around  
10 whether or not they are going to feed their  
11 children or keep the lights on. And we are  
12 going to have to bear the cost of a  
13 multinational company who has the audacity  
14 to sit in this room and act like they are  
15 doing something to help us. I don't think  
16 so. It's not going to happen. It's not  
17 going to happen.

18           This community is already bearing  
19 the brunt of far too many environmentally  
20 toxic sites, too many. We're dealing with  
21 the UNIVAR facility that's right next door  
22 to this nonsense, which is highly flammable  
23 chemicals and God knows what else.

24           We have institutions that are  
25 storing toxic fumes into the air. We have

1 far too many issues of traffic and air  
2 pollution. We are suffering from asthma  
3 and lead poisoning and toxins in the soil  
4 that are affecting our children. Alvarez  
5 school, yes, is sitting on a toxic site,  
6 exactly. There is no need of this. There  
7 is no need of this.

8 And I'm really, really concerned  
9 with the fact that National Grid thinks we  
10 are stupid, and that we are not paying  
11 attention and that we are not educated to  
12 fight back. And, furthermore, I'm really  
13 concerned that you have the audacity to try  
14 to harass these young people that came up  
15 here. And not for nothing, if it weren't  
16 for those young people sitting at the table  
17 right there, nobody in this room would be  
18 here. Nobody in this room would be here.

19 I'm sorry, National Grid, public  
20 outreach to the South Side Neighborhood  
21 Association, which doesn't exist to the  
22 Washington Neighborhood Association, again,  
23 which doesn't exist, trying to act like  
24 there's no nonprofits in south Providence  
25 or Board of Directors. I'm sorry, I'm

1 sitting on the board of two. I don't think  
2 so. I don't think so.

3 And, FERC, FERC, your responsibility  
4 is to regulate them. We are going to be  
5 regulating you to make sure that you do  
6 your job. I promise you. And if you have  
7 children, think about that. National Grid  
8 folks, if you have children, think about  
9 your children because I don't know how you  
10 sleep at night. I don't know how you sleep  
11 at night. I don't know how you sleep at  
12 night, and we're going to make sure that  
13 you don't.

14 We know that the chemicals used to  
15 frack gas are endocrine disrupters and are  
16 cancerous. So let's bring that full  
17 circle. We have endocrine disrupters and  
18 cancerous chemicals going into fresh water  
19 to bring out toxic sludge to bring gas to  
20 come here to produce in south Providence,  
21 create more toxins in our community where  
22 we are near the, hello, Women and Infants  
23 Hospital, Hasbrook Children's Hospital,  
24 many clinics, many free clinics, many areas  
25 where people get their prenatal visits and

1           ultrasound care.

2                       This is where we're going to have  
3 another toxic industry? Where does it end  
4 for you people? Where does it end? We are  
5 going to be regulating you, and you are not  
6 going to be able to sleep. It's not  
7 happening in our community. It is not.

8                       MR. SWEARINGEN: Thank you, Ms.  
9 Rodriguez-Drix. Next we have Julian  
10 Rodriguez-Drix and then after that Erin  
11 Regunberg.

12                      MR. RODRIGUEZ-DRIX: My name is  
13 Julian Rodriguez-Drix. That's J-U-L-I-A-N,  
14 last name R-O-D-R-I-G-U-E-Z hyphen D-R-I-X.

15                      I am here as a resident of  
16 Washington Park. I live within one mile of  
17 this facility. I have asthma, and I drive,  
18 bike or bus past this facility almost every  
19 single day. I have got to be honest with  
20 you that I have so much to say, but I am so  
21 tired that I don't have the fire left in me  
22 anymore.

23                      You heard it tonight. You heard  
24 everybody speaking out against this. And I  
25 have been spending late, late nights --

1 I've got a family with two kids, a  
2 full-time job and now it's on us as a  
3 community to try to spend our free time  
4 pouring through pages and pages and pages  
5 of bureaucratic nonsense that is finding  
6 ways to justify a facility that you've  
7 heard everyone here speak out against.

8 I don't have any illusions. I know  
9 that most likely you will approve this, and  
10 we will fight it. But I also know that  
11 because of how this system works because  
12 you don't hear everyday people speaking  
13 about everyday realities. You only hear  
14 bureaucratic nonsense that fits in with the  
15 jargon.

16 I, for better or worse, work at a  
17 state agency. I have an educational  
18 background to be able to pour through these  
19 documents that are produced and make some  
20 kind of sense of it. It is exhausting, so  
21 I don't have the fire in me right now to go  
22 into depths of how I truly feel about this.  
23 But I will try to give you some of the  
24 bureaucratic jargon so that you can  
25 actually expand the scope of your

1 environmental document and actually take  
2 things into account to be looked at.

3 Because I know as it currently is,  
4 most of the things that people are talking  
5 about here today won't be included, and you  
6 will be able to come up with this 100-page  
7 200-page long document that says that this  
8 whole thing is fine, and there is no major  
9 environmental impacts and it has a net  
10 benefit and yadda, yadda, yadda. And I say  
11 that that's bullshit, and I want to say  
12 why.

13 First of all, there is no  
14 justification that this facility is needed.  
15 In the documents that National Grid has  
16 already submitted to FERC, the reasons that  
17 they give that this is needed is that two  
18 companies have said that they need a  
19 diversified supply. Those two companies  
20 are Boston Electric and Narragansett Gas.  
21 I'm sorry, Narragansett Electric and Boston  
22 Gas. Those two companies happen to be  
23 subsidiaries of National Grid.

24 So, basically, we have National Grid  
25 saying that we need this because they say

1           that we need it. And who is going to pay  
2           for it? Of course they are going to pass  
3           it through and make us pay for it. They're  
4           saying that it's going to make the prices  
5           more stable. That's also not true, because  
6           domestic prices of gas are just as subject  
7           to fluctuations as the international market  
8           is.

9                         This will not increase supply. This  
10           will not change anything other than give  
11           them their own supply so they can sell it  
12           to Massachusetts and other sites in Rhode  
13           Island. And who knows, down the line maybe  
14           they are going to want to put an export  
15           facility in here.

16                        2005 one of the few times, rare,  
17           rare times that FERC actually denied an  
18           application was for an LNG import facility  
19           here. It was denied because of safety.  
20           And I don't have any illusions it's not  
21           because anyone at FERC or National Grid  
22           cares about -- you know, they don't care  
23           about the community here. But they cared  
24           about it because they take their trips, go  
25           by Newport.

1                   They would go by the rich, white  
2 parts of Rhode Island and people there got  
3 up in arms over it. The attorney general  
4 got up in arms over there. They  
5 commissioned a report from Richard Clark,  
6 the former White House anti-terrorism  
7 expert who is able to put 100 something  
8 page document together saying how dangerous  
9 it would be and all the potential risks of  
10 explosion from disasters, so that is why it  
11 was turned down.

12                   So National Grid came back to the  
13 drawing table. They got rid of the ship.  
14 Now they are producing it by pipeline, and  
15 they think it's going to go through and  
16 they think no one is going to care about  
17 this neighborhood, but this neighborhood is  
18 going to be organized. We are organized.  
19 We're resilient, and we will fight back.

20                   I want you, FERC, to look at the  
21 cumulative effects of this facility. I  
22 want you to look at the facilities that are  
23 next to here. You have the UNIVAR facility  
24 right next door, which has a 14-mile hazard  
25 radius. That includes 313 schools and over

1 110,000 students who are at risk of a  
2 chemical accident and a disaster. If  
3 anything were to go wrong at this LNG tank  
4 or at the liquefaction facility, that  
5 UNIVAR facility would be impacted.

6 There has never been an accident  
7 with LNG tankers, but there have been  
8 accidents with LNG liquefaction facilities  
9 and LNG tanks like the ones that we have  
10 here already, and the ones that are being  
11 proposed. In 2004 in Algeria there was a  
12 liquefaction explosion which killed 27  
13 people, injured 80 and destroyed an entire  
14 complex. If that were to happen here, it  
15 would trigger the UNIVAR facility next  
16 door, which would have a secondary trigger  
17 with a 14-mile hazard radius.

18 This UNIVAR facility has  
19 trichloroethylene, dichlorofluoromethane,  
20 acetone, ammonia, ethyl-hexylamine, certain  
21 glycol ethyl chlorine, chlorobenzene,  
22 folates, dicudoflalates (sic),  
23 dichloro-ethene, diethylamine,  
24 ethyl-dimethylamine, formaldehyde, formic  
25 acid, freon, hydrochloric acid and more,

1           which is being transported in and out of  
2           our communities by train right past the  
3           zoo, right past 95, right past this LNG,  
4           the proposed facility on trucks right  
5           through our neighborhood streets right on  
6           95.

7                         This is the neighborhood we are  
8           already sitting in. This is a corporate  
9           sacrifice zone, and this is environmental  
10          racism. It is also right next to the  
11          Motiva Oil and Park facility, which serves  
12          fuel for all of southern New England.  
13          That's all of Rhode Island, eastern  
14          Connecticut, Worcester County,  
15          Massachusetts and the south coast of  
16          Massachusetts.

17                        This facility brings the fuel that  
18          the whole region uses but yet it is a toxic  
19          release inventory on the EPA list that  
20          emits the largest pollution source for  
21          these ZIP codes and for most of northern  
22          Rhode Island right in the middle of south  
23          Providence and Washington Park, right by my  
24          house, right by my community, right by  
25          where my friends and my family lives. This

1 facility is also right next door.

2 There was a fire strike that  
3 happened. There was lightening that hit a  
4 Motiva tanker ship in 2006 right next to  
5 the LNG tanker. There was an earthquake  
6 that happened just this summer in August,  
7 which was at the center was in Fields Point  
8 right in the --

9 MR. SWEARINGEN: We have about 10  
10 more people signed up. I would like to  
11 give them a chance. You are kind of off  
12 the scale here.

13 MR. RODRIGUEZ-DRIX: I will submit  
14 the rest in writing.

15 MR. SWEARINGEN: That's all right.  
16 When we get through the 10, you can come  
17 back up. Next we have Erin Regunberg and  
18 then Claudia Gorman.

19 MR. REGUNBERG: Hello. My name is  
20 Erin Regunberg, R-E-G-U-N-B-E-R-G. I am a  
21 state representative from Rhode Island,  
22 House District 4 here in Providence. And I  
23 am here to echo the concerns of all of the  
24 community members we heard tonight who are  
25 already experiencing environmental racism,

1           who already have to fear for their health,  
2           have to fear for their children's health.

3                       There is a constellation of toxic  
4           and dangerous factors that our families  
5           have to deal with, and we don't need  
6           National Grid piling on another concern.  
7           We don't need to be jacking up a few more  
8           percentage points of risks to add on to the  
9           already overwhelming risk factors that our  
10          kids face.

11                      National Grid claims that this  
12          facility can withstand, I think, 500-year  
13          flooding, which, I mean, I personally doubt  
14          they would be speaking that confidently  
15          about that if it were their kids that lived  
16          in the danger zone. But putting that aside  
17          for a moment, just a few days ago in South  
18          Carolina, we had thousand-year flooding.  
19          And it just as easily could have been Rhode  
20          Island or New England that was hit by that  
21          hurricane instead of Rhode Island. And  
22          that was the sixth thousand-year flooding  
23          event we've had in the country this year.

24                      And, by the way, the reason that we  
25          are seeing so many extreme and dangerous

1 weather events is because we are destroying  
2 the planet with carbons. And even though  
3 we know that the science is very clear  
4 about the catastrophic places we are  
5 headed, if we continue plowing ahead with  
6 investments like this, 100 million-dollar  
7 investments in an archaic industry that we  
8 know that is threatening our future. This  
9 proposal is environmental racism and it's  
10 extreme.

11 I know professionally you don't  
12 really have to care about this, but it is  
13 either climate denial-ism or climate  
14 idiocy, take your pick. And it is not  
15 supported by the community very clearly.  
16 So, please, on behalf of the 15,000 Rhode  
17 Islanders, I represent do the right thing,  
18 do the common sense thing, reject this  
19 proposal for all of our citizens. Thank  
20 you.

21 MR. SWEARINGEN: Okay. Thank you,  
22 Representative Regunberg. Next we have  
23 Claudia Gorman and on deck is Steve  
24 Roberts.

25 MS. GORMAN: Claudia Gorman,

1 C-L-A-U-D-I-A, G-O-R-M-A-N. For far too  
2 long, the oil and gas industry and the  
3 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission have  
4 held us over the barrel. With very few  
5 exceptions, the expansion of the industry  
6 has been given the green light from your  
7 agency. Oversight has been a wink and a  
8 nod. Consideration of cumulative impacts  
9 have been cursory and short-sided.  
10 Mitigation is the mantra that would  
11 supposedly alleviate an ordinary citizen's  
12 concerns and/or the impacts to their daily  
13 life.

14 In addition, every approved project  
15 is granted eminent domain and gives the  
16 industry the right to take from us what we  
17 have been led to believe is the American  
18 dream, individual rights and property  
19 ownership. Right now the Northeast is  
20 being bombarded with an overwhelming number  
21 of oil and gas proposals. All are counting  
22 on the shale extraction future. This is  
23 fool hearted.

24 We know the resources are fine eye.  
25 We know that extraction and infrastructure

1           have serious health and climate  
2           consequences. We know it is impacting  
3           residents and communities who have the  
4           least resistance. We know the energy is  
5           guided by profit. The fossil fuel industry  
6           has been too close for comfort in my  
7           family's life for the past six years.

8                         We have been affected by several  
9           100-year floods. We have lost a house to  
10          Hurricane Sandy. We have the threat to  
11          eminent domain to property in the Catskills  
12          for not one but two pipelines.

13                        Here in Rhode Island we have a  
14          massive infrastructure proposal that rides  
15          on the backs of communities and other  
16          space. Transport a dirty, toxic, fracked  
17          fuel leaking methane along the way to parts  
18          unknown. I question National Grid's  
19          contention of a 40 year-old storage  
20          facility conversion to a liquefaction  
21          facility will supply us in Rhode Island  
22          with cheaper and more abundant energy  
23          supply.

24                        This is not the full story. We must  
25          no longer succumb to the powerful presence

1 of the oil and gas industry and ignore  
2 their climate and energy justice impacts.  
3 This is a project that should be denied.

4 MR. SWEARINGEN: Thank you, Ms.  
5 Gorman. Next we have Steve Roberts  
6 followed by Lisa Petrie.

7 SPEAKER: Steve had to take a phone  
8 call. He is not on right now.

9 MR. SWEARINGEN: So you are?

10 SPEAKER: Servio.

11 MR. SWEARINGEN: Servio, if you can  
12 go ahead and spell it for the record.

13 SPEAKER: S-E-R-V-I-O. So I would  
14 like to echo some points that already have  
15 been made and to emphasize that this is a  
16 project that will inscribe environmental  
17 racism even deeper into a neighborhood that  
18 is already, you know, suffering from  
19 concentrated poverty, deplorable living  
20 conditions.

21 And, also, this is one of the  
22 neighborhoods that are the poorest in Rhode  
23 Island all together. And we are also  
24 people who have suffered shut-offs at, you  
25 know, at the hands of National Grid.

1                   And, so, what this means is people  
2                   who want to just live right after coming  
3                   from work to take care of their children,  
4                   to take care of their families are being  
5                   forced to go into a house without any  
6                   energy. And this is the same company that  
7                   wants to build an LNG facility whose  
8                   environmental impacts are going to be  
9                   focused straight up in their neighborhoods.

10                  It is just yet another dangerous and  
11                  toxic facility on top of all the other  
12                  polluted facilities in the area. Our  
13                  communities of color suffer from high rates  
14                  of asthma and other environmental-related  
15                  health issues. The waterfront in south  
16                  side is filled with toxic industry while  
17                  richer, white people on the east side, Fox  
18                  Point, east Providence or Cranston or  
19                  Pawtucket Village get nice waterfronts with  
20                  parks, boating and walking areas.

21                  If anything goes wrong with the  
22                  facility, this facility has the potential  
23                  to be extremely dangerous and the people  
24                  who would be most hurt by it are people of  
25                  color who are already dealing with

1 concentrated poverty, as I have already  
2 mentioned, crippling schools, substandard  
3 housing conditions and health problems.

4 I would like to focus a little bit  
5 more on the schools, right. So this is  
6 going to be in an area, which multiple  
7 schools, day care centers and the hospitals  
8 is being built on, right. So I am not  
9 quite sure how much National Grid is taking  
10 into consideration that this is going to  
11 impact directly workers, low-wage workers,  
12 caring workers, workers who are in caring  
13 and labor, meaning taking care of people,  
14 right.

15 How can you really take care of  
16 people who are being exposed to toxins and  
17 other forms of pollution? And mind you,  
18 these are people, patients, students,  
19 workers who have been dispossessed from  
20 their power to actually withstand this  
21 imposed project, right.

22 So these are the people who are too  
23 busy to be here, right, and this is what  
24 National Grid is taking advantage of. And  
25 to be quite honest, I feel that this is

1           what you guys are taking advantage of as  
2           well. There are no signs out here on this  
3           building to indicate that something is  
4           going on here other than like what, 8 by 11  
5           paper, and you have four police outside  
6           turning people away if they come in with  
7           signs. I don't really believe that you are  
8           here to actually listen to us.

9                         This is simply just a performance  
10           for you, and it's simply a performance for  
11           National Grid and simply a performance for  
12           these politicians. This is simply a  
13           performance.

14                        So it just says, my comments have  
15           said, my neighbors have said, my coworkers  
16           have said, we are going to resist this  
17           tooth and nail. If you all don't  
18           disapprove it, then we will make sure that  
19           it doesn't happen.

20                        MR. SWEARINGEN: Okay, thank you  
21           Servio. Did we miss Mr. Roberts? Did he  
22           leave?

23                        SPEAKER: He's busy.

24                        MR. SWEARINGEN: We can roll you  
25           into the end if you want to come up later.

1 Lisa Petrie followed by Monica Zuertes.

2 MS. PETRIE: I have a feeling I am  
3 going to run out of time so I will try to  
4 speak quickly.

5 MR. SWEARINGEN: I won't turn the  
6 clock on until you spell your name.

7 MS. PETRIE: L-I-S-A, and my last  
8 name is P-E-T-R-I-E. One of the purposes  
9 of this meeting is to determine what this  
10 environmental impact statement needs to  
11 cover. And in addition to all the  
12 excellent points others have already made,  
13 I think it's essential that the  
14 environmental impact statement assess the  
15 greenhouse gas impacts of emissions from  
16 this facility and also from the increase in  
17 fracking in the Marcellus shale that the  
18 project will cause.

19 In its previous assessments, FERC  
20 used wildly outdated estimates of the  
21 potency of methane. The intergovernmental  
22 panel on climate change recently found that  
23 methane was 34 times as potent as carbon  
24 dioxide over 100-year period. Not 20 times  
25 as potent, 25 times as potent as FERC

1 believes. And, more importantly, it's 86  
2 times as potent over a 20-year period and  
3 more than 100 times as potent over a  
4 10-year period.

5           And these shorter time frames are  
6 critical to look at because, as Robert  
7 Howarth and his colleagues at Cornell  
8 University have pointed out, if we don't  
9 control methane now, we will go over the  
10 climate cliff in the next 15 to 35 years.  
11 And if that happens, it doesn't matter what  
12 happens 100 years from now because we all  
13 will be dead or at best our civilization  
14 will be destroyed, and we will all be  
15 living in a new dark age.

16           Today I got an e-mail from the Moms  
17 Clean Air Force, which is an action group  
18 that is concerned about air pollution and  
19 climate change saying that the single most  
20 important thing we can do to fight global  
21 warming is to cut methane emissions from  
22 fracking.

23           As others have pointed out, we need  
24 to stop investing in all fossil fuels  
25 immediately and begin massive investments

1 in conservation and renewable energy  
2 sources, such as solar and wind. So-called  
3 natural gas -- and, by the way, what is  
4 natural about it? It's natural in the same  
5 sense that coal and oil are natural.

6 It's naturally occurring deep  
7 underground, but there is nothing natural  
8 about fracking, pumping millions of gallons  
9 of water laced with toxic chemicals into  
10 the ground and then bringing all that water  
11 up and having no responsible way to dispose  
12 of it and contaminating peoples' water  
13 supplies, et cetera.

14 Clean the energy -- so natural,  
15 quote, unquote, natural gas is not a bridge  
16 for our clean energy future. The only  
17 bridge to our clean energy future is clean  
18 energy and energy saving investments, such  
19 as public transportation, insulation,  
20 generation of electricity and heat, buying  
21 less and sharing more, et cetera. Those  
22 are the bridge to our clean energy's  
23 future, and those are the only paths to  
24 energy independence and energy security.  
25 And cheap natural gas is slowing the growth

1           for renewable energy, not just replacing  
2           coal and oil but also crowding out solar  
3           and wind.

4                        Back in 2011, the International  
5           Energy Agency warned that any new fossil  
6           fuel infrastructure we build now will lock  
7           us into decades more of dependence of  
8           fossil fuels. And that lock, in effect,  
9           will be the single most important factor  
10          placing us at risk for runaway catastrophic  
11          global warming.

12                       We've heard a lot of scepticism  
13          about FERC here tonight and with good  
14          reason. Time and again, FERC has rubber  
15          stamped frack gas projects over the  
16          objection of the people who will be  
17          impacted in a fragrant disregard for  
18          serious risks to the health and safety of  
19          surrounding communities and the testimony  
20          of expert -- of independent experts.

21                       For instance, they recently approved  
22          the pipeline that Nick spoke about  
23          recently, a project of expanding a pipeline  
24          by Spectra Energy. And right now they are  
25          considering a request for rehearing from a

1 coalition of grassroots groups, including  
2 ours and a number of other groups in the  
3 room, groups throughout the roots of the  
4 AIM pipeline expansion.

5 While they consider that request and  
6 supposedly reconsider their approval of  
7 this project, meanwhile, we are barred from  
8 taking the legal action but the pipeline  
9 company has been given the green light to  
10 begin construction on the project.

11 MR. SWEARINGEN: We do have some  
12 people on the rest of the list. But if you  
13 want to come back up, that will fine.

14 MS. PETRIE: I'll submit written  
15 testimony too, thanks.

16 MR. SWEARINGEN: Thank you. Next we  
17 have Monica Zuertes followed by Yudi.  
18 Monica Zuertes? Okay, then we'll go to  
19 Yudiglenn followed by Jesus.

20 MS. SENA-ABREU: My name is  
21 Yudiglenn, Y-U-D-I-G-L-E-N-N, Sena, S-E-N-A  
22 hyphen A-B-R-E-U. Now that you know my  
23 name you don't know my story. I am a  
24 female. Obviously I am a female of color.  
25 I am a student, and I am a victim of

1           enviromental racism. This is yet another  
2           dangerous and toxic facility on top of all  
3           the other polluted facilities in the area.  
4           I went to Delsesto Middle School and it was  
5           on a polluted facility, and so is Alvarez  
6           high school. And these places are being --  
7           are in communities of color suffering from  
8           high rates of asthma and other  
9           environmental-related health issues.

10                   I also live in the south side, and  
11           the south side is filled with toxic  
12           industries while the richer, white people  
13           on the east side, Fox Point, east  
14           Providence, Cranston or Pawtucket Village  
15           get nice waterfronts with parks, boating  
16           and walking areas and I have never seen  
17           that in my community.

18                   This facility has the potential to  
19           be extremely dangerous, and we all know  
20           that from experience. And the people who  
21           would be most hurt by it are people like  
22           me, people of color who are already dealing  
23           with concentrated poverty, crumbling  
24           schools and substandard housing conditions  
25           and health problems. We need to stop this

1 now. Thank you.

2 MR. SWEARINGEN: Thank you. Next we  
3 have Jesus followed by Ana Quezada.

4 MR. HOLGUIN: Hello. Hi, you guys.  
5 My name is Jesus Holguin. That's  
6 J-E-S-U-S, H-O-L-G-U-I-N. I work for the  
7 Environmental Justice League of Rhode  
8 Island. I am their youth leadership, my  
9 right there. So I want to talk to you guys  
10 about why we are opposed to this facility  
11 being built.

12 I graduated from this high school,  
13 which is within the one mile radius of the  
14 hazardous waste. I have lived in this  
15 neighborhood most of my life. I've lived  
16 and worked in this neighborhood most of my  
17 life, not to mention three of my younger  
18 siblings, including myself, have asthma.

19 I am here today to tell you that  
20 before we start looking at this expansion  
21 we have to look at -- before we start  
22 looking at this expansion that's going to  
23 come out of the pockets of this community,  
24 we have to look at the things that are  
25 already affecting this community.

1                   This community is already facing a  
2                   lot of problems with high rates of asthma  
3                   because of the chemical facilities that are  
4                   already here. We have Motiva. We have  
5                   I-95 that cuts right across this whole  
6                   neighborhood, and that's already a lot of  
7                   bad air quality and to add something onto  
8                   that is just like roadkill.

9                   This facility is not going to  
10                  benefit us in any way. Something that  
11                  would benefit us is just transition away  
12                  from fossil fuels. If 100 million-dollars  
13                  of our own money is being invested into  
14                  energy, it should be invested in community  
15                  or renewable energy.

16                  We want jobs within our own  
17                  communities in south Providence that are  
18                  life-sustaining and support healthy  
19                  communities, not toxic risk. We demand  
20                  climate justice, which means racial  
21                  justice, economic justice and no new  
22                  investments in fossil fuels.

23                  With that said, we have a petition  
24                  that we let out just like a week ago and  
25                  we've already gotten 400 signatures and

1 we're going to continue to keep getting  
2 those signatures. And, yes, we are not  
3 going to let this be built in our  
4 community. Thank you.

5 MR. SWEARINGEN: Thank you, Mr.  
6 Holguin. Next we have Ana Quezada followed  
7 by Daniel Flores.

8 MS. QUEZADA: Good evening. My name  
9 is Ana Quezada, A-N-A, Q-U-E-Z-A-D-A. And  
10 I am here tonight, and I have more  
11 questions than answers. I am very  
12 surprised to look around this room and  
13 don't see anybody from the community. And  
14 I want to ask you, what did you guys do to  
15 let the people in the community know about  
16 this meeting and to know what is going on  
17 about in this building? Because I don't  
18 see anybody from this -- yes, but very  
19 little. That is what I mean.

20 But my question to you is, too, I am  
21 very surprised to hear all this going on  
22 when we have our senator in the White House  
23 who is part of the committee of  
24 environmental in Washington. How he is  
25 going to be allowed and given 100

1 million-dollars to this company to create  
2 this plant over here in this neighborhood  
3 when he is part of our -- he represents us  
4 in Washington.

5 Then I want everybody here tonight  
6 to call general White House Jack Reed and  
7 see what they are doing about this. What  
8 are they going to do? They are going to  
9 allow this company create this plant over  
10 here.

11 I live in Rhode Island for 24 years  
12 here in Providence. This is my  
13 neighborhood. And somebody here said  
14 tonight we don't have the money to go  
15 against a big company like Narragansett  
16 Electric. We don't have the money, but we  
17 have people like Gina. And we had a young  
18 man like Servio to come here and talk about  
19 these issues.

20 We are not going to allow this to  
21 happen in this neighborhood. Then I want  
22 to let you know that this community can get  
23 together, and we are going to make sure  
24 that this don't happen. And, please, I  
25 advise everybody call the white house, call

1 state, call representatives. What they are  
2 doing about this matter? It's not just us.  
3 They are the people that represent us, and  
4 those are the people who given back the  
5 money to do this plan. Thank you.

6 MR. SWEARINGEN: Thank you, Ms.  
7 Quezada. Next we have Danielle Flores  
8 followed by Susan Heally.

9 SPEAKER: (Speaking in Spanish)

10 MR. SWEARINGEN: I think we do have  
11 a translator, because this will not help  
12 us.

13 SPEAKER: This is for the community,  
14 not for you.

15 MR. SWEARINGEN: It's your four  
16 minutes. If you want this to be on the  
17 record, you need to have the translator.

18 SPEAKER: Translate for the record.

19 SPEAKER: Just keep going.

20 MR. SWEARINGEN: Go ahead.

21 SPEAKER: (Speaking in Spanish)

22 MR. SWEARINGEN: Next we have Susan  
23 Heally followed by Paul. Ms. Heally? We  
24 will move on to Paul.

25 SPEAKER: Hello. Paul, P-A-U-L.

1 Using the promise of jobs to get a plant  
2 built in an area where unemployment is an  
3 issue is unfair. These jobs that will be  
4 created during the project will be reserved  
5 for union employees, most of which do not  
6 live in this neighborhood.

7 These jobs will be gone after the  
8 completion of the project and the five  
9 permanent jobs they will be highly  
10 specialized, and it is unlikely that  
11 community members will have a stake in the  
12 highering process. Even if community  
13 members are chosen for these five  
14 positions, that will not solve unemployment  
15 in this neighborhood. Instead, this plant  
16 will continue to profit the corporation  
17 that has little investments in the  
18 community. Thank you.

19 MR. SWEARINGEN: Thank you, Paul.  
20 Next we have Beth Milham followed by  
21 Senator Josh Miller.

22 MS. MILHAM: My name is Beth Milham,  
23 B-E-T-H, M-I-L-H-A-M. I will be very  
24 brief. I just want to add a little bit of  
25 prospective. I read in the newspaper just

1 a day or two ago that National Grid plans  
2 to petition the Public Utilities Commission  
3 to put a surcharge on ratepayers who are --  
4 have solar panels and thus increase the  
5 cost to people who are doing the  
6 responsible thing about the energy future.

7 Here they are investing 100  
8 million-dollars in an energy source of  
9 past. And what are they doing for the  
10 energy sources of the future? I think  
11 that's a question that is fair for  
12 everybody to ask. Thank you.

13 MR. SWEARINGEN: Thank you, Ms.  
14 Milham. We have Senator Josh Miller  
15 followed by Senator Juan Pichardo.

16 MR. MILLER: Joshua Miller,  
17 J-O-S-H-U-A, M-I-L-L-E-R. My district, I  
18 represent part of Providence and part of  
19 Cranston. I live less than two miles from  
20 the facility. My district starts across  
21 the street and goes south on Terminal Road.  
22 Many of my constituents' concerns have  
23 already been addressed very well by them.

24 I want to address another concern  
25 that, I think, National Grid and FERC to

1 look at as a way to improve conditions in  
2 Providence, whether or not this plant is  
3 built, and that is the LNG traffic by truck  
4 as it is currently routed through  
5 neighborhoods past where people live and  
6 work.

7 If you were trying to access 95  
8 South, which many of the trucks do, I think  
9 the truck traffic currently in the current  
10 facility is about 30 a day for LNG. And  
11 then there is also the collateral gasoline,  
12 oil and other chemicals that come in and  
13 out of the same area.

14 And, so, an improvement to  
15 accommodate current LNG traffic by truck  
16 and future LNG traffic by truck, if this is  
17 permitted, can be an improvement for the  
18 whole community. Currently if you have to  
19 access 95 South, you go down Allens Avenue,  
20 upper Earnest Street, across 95 on a bridge  
21 that was seriously damaged because of a  
22 truck traffic on Eddy Street to a couple of  
23 blocks away from here on Eddy Street and  
24 then down Thurbers onto 95 South.

25 This is the -- I believe, there must

1 be a concern and a consideration for is  
2 this the safest way for truck transport to  
3 go through these neighborhoods. So I hope  
4 there is an exploration on safer routes  
5 that have less of an impact to these  
6 neighborhoods, not only for the LNG that  
7 goes through those neighborhoods currently  
8 and in the future but also gasoline fuel,  
9 oil and the collateral diesel pollutions  
10 that causes they go on this route that not  
11 direct but indirect to gain access to the  
12 highway. Thank you.

13 MR. SWEARINGEN: Thank you, Senator  
14 Miller. Next we have Senator Juan Pichardo  
15 followed by August Guang.

16 MR. PICHARDO: Thank you very much.  
17 My name is Juan Pichardo, resident of  
18 Providence, also a state senator in  
19 District 2, which covers the Elmwood  
20 Reservoir triangle in the west end.

21 At onetime about 10 years ago, I  
22 was a representative of this community  
23 where you're sitting at, which is District  
24 6, which is the Washington Park, south  
25 Providence and Elmwood area. I am here

1           today to ditto the comments from my  
2           colleague and the neighboring city but also  
3           neighboring senator, Senator Josh Miller  
4           but also would like to add that if Senator  
5           Metzwood would be here -- he couldn't be  
6           here with us. He represents this area --  
7           would also be commenting and also opposed  
8           to this LNG or this facility being built  
9           and the waterfront is so close to hospitals  
10          and so close to the neighborhood.

11                         About 10 years ago, I opposed the  
12          LNG proposal and I oppose the recent  
13          proposal and I oppose it for also the same  
14          reasons as you probably have read or maybe  
15          have not, because you are gathering  
16          information to include to provide it to the  
17          Commission. I hope that the writeup has  
18          been written proposal be included in the  
19          record, the writeup that has been put in  
20          place by the Providence Journal that  
21          illustrates that in the vicinity of where  
22          the proposal is being or the LNG facility  
23          is being proposed has many distributors  
24          that are depot for oil, for toxic chemicals  
25          that impact the quality of air, that

1 impacts the quality of life here in the  
2 City of Providence and the neighboring  
3 city, which is Cranston.

4 MR. SWEARINGEN: I'm sorry. If I  
5 could, I don't know that anybody has  
6 submitted that journal article on the  
7 record. Do you happen to have the date of  
8 the -- what date that came out?

9 MR. PICHARDO: I don't have the  
10 date, but I will submit it along with my  
11 written comments.

12 MR. SWEARINGEN: Okay. I just want  
13 to make sure we get it, because you  
14 referred to it.

15 MR. PICHARDO: I will actually take  
16 the lead on it in terms of joining my  
17 colleagues, Senator Miller and Senator  
18 Metzwood and other legislators from  
19 Providence, along with the house members,  
20 to submit a packet of information that is  
21 important that has been highlighted through  
22 the Providence Journal and also through, as  
23 you probably heard already from the  
24 different speakers, from the Environmental  
25 League of Justice, also articles that have

1           been also highlighted in the RI Future  
2           website. That is also online. As you know  
3           that many people get their information now  
4           digitally.

5                     Unfortunately, a lot of things  
6           change. Some things have not changed in  
7           this community. There is very -- if you  
8           know the demographics, it's low income  
9           community. In fact, there is no newspaper  
10          in the area. A lot of people don't read  
11          the Providence Journal. A lot of people  
12          don't have access to computers.

13                    So, therefore, the lack of  
14          information getting out to the community is  
15          also a significant part that, I believe,  
16          that National Grid should have done a  
17          better job in circulating information and  
18          not relying on others.

19                    It's an investment just as they are  
20          investing in proposing a facility there  
21          that they should have taken more steps to  
22          get that information out, because they are  
23          right in our backyard. They are in the  
24          district and Elmwood Avenue, Elmwood  
25          neighborhood on Melrose Street. So with

1           that said, yes, they could have sent it out  
2           with our bills just to get information if  
3           they really wanted to have more  
4           information.

5                        I hope that beyond this when this  
6           gets not approved that we continue to have  
7           a better relationship with National Grid.

8                        Lastly, I wanted to say that just as  
9           of last year the quality of air in the  
10          neighborhood has not improved as much as we  
11          wanted it to because of all these things  
12          that are within one mile, two miles,  
13          whether it's the buses, whether it's also  
14          in the port, all the gas and oil tankers  
15          that are there, we all know that it's a  
16          hazard to our health but it's also a hazard  
17          to all the homes that are around this area,  
18          including to the hospital.

19                       That is the number one hospital in  
20          Rhode Island, which is Rhode Island  
21          Hospital. That complex there has a  
22          children's hospital, the only children's  
23          hospital in the State of Rhode Island.

24                       To add more of these type of  
25          facilities in the area hurts the quality of

1           life, hurts the safety of our community,  
2           hurts all the members in the district and  
3           the people that I represent, not just only  
4           my district, but also through the City of  
5           Providence and State of Rhode Island.

6                         With that said, I will submit also  
7           some comments along with my colleagues in  
8           the senate that each of us represent within  
9           our district 30,000 people each. There are  
10          seven of us in the City of Providence  
11          and -- how many in the house -- about 15,  
12          15 representatives. And the  
13          representatives and I will take the lead to  
14          make sure you get the articles but  
15          information and also our opposition to this  
16          project. Thank you very much.

17                        MR. SWEARINGEN: Thank you, Senator  
18          Pichardo. Next we have August Guang and  
19          then Vanessa Flores Maldonado.

20                        MS. GUANG: Hi, my name is August  
21          Guang. August like the month, G-U-A-N-G.

22                        So what I have to say is in passing  
23          there was a land Rhode Island Act. Rhode  
24          Island made a forward thinking and much  
25          needed commitment to reduce greenhouse gas

1 emissions and improve the state's  
2 resilience against climate impacts.  
3 Expanding liquified natural gas is a step  
4 in the wrong direction. Not only will this  
5 project support fracking and increase the  
6 state's dependence on fossil fuels, it will  
7 also bring an environmental hazard to a  
8 community already negatively impacted by a  
9 chemical storage facility and an existing  
10 LNG storage tank.

11 The fracking process is toxic to the  
12 community where natural gas is being  
13 extracted. In addition, the infrastructure  
14 from beginning to end is by -- is this what  
15 the Ocean State wants to support? We will  
16 be looking at health and environmental  
17 damage at great cost to not only Rhode  
18 Island but people who live in the state  
19 coerced by the gas and oil industry to  
20 squeeze out every last drop primarily for  
21 their profit.

22 Do not let National Grid build their  
23 LNG facility. If you all really want it  
24 that badly, build it in your own  
25 neighborhood but you won't. So what does

1           that mean? It means that the FERC doesn't  
2           care about black folks, doesn't care about  
3           brown folks, doesn't care about indigenous  
4           folks, doesn't care about people of color.  
5           Thank you.

6                       MR. SWEARINGEN: Thank you. Next  
7           Vanessa Flores Maldonado followed by Helen  
8           MacDonald.

9                       MS. MALDONADO: My name is Vanessa  
10          Flores-Maldonado. Vanessa is spelled with  
11          one N, two S's. So I am looking at the  
12          National Grid website about this proposal,  
13          and on there it has four reasons why the  
14          Fields Point location is ideal for the  
15          facility. Talks about it's already used  
16          for storage. It has existing  
17          infrastructure. There is sufficient space,  
18          and it provides quick and major access to  
19          the highways.

20                      What is neglected to say there that  
21          there are dangerous facilities in that area  
22          as well. This area is the center of  
23          operation for some of the most polluted  
24          industries in the city and state. In  
25          February, the MEPA inspection revealed that

1 the dust in the wind seal contained 50  
2 times, 50, five, zero times the legal limit  
3 for lead concentration.

4 And, so, I am telling you that this  
5 is a horrible, horrible idea. Because not  
6 only are you polluting the environment, but  
7 also you need to think about the people who  
8 are being affected by this. There is a  
9 school within a two-mile radius, George  
10 Alvarez, and that is built on a polluted  
11 site.

12 So what you are telling me about  
13 this proposal is that you don't care about  
14 our kids. You don't care about kids of  
15 color. You don't care about the  
16 environment and really it's all about the  
17 money, so no to this proposal. Thank you.

18 MR. SWEARINGEN: Thank you, Ms.  
19 Flores-Maldonado. Next we have Helen  
20 MacDonald followed by Jenny.

21 MS. MACDONALD: Hi. I'm Helen  
22 MacDonald, H-E-L-E-N. In 2005 a proposed  
23 LNG import facility was rejected because of  
24 high risk for disaster. While the main  
25 focus in opposition to that proposal was

1 the large tanker ships that would have  
2 delivered LNG, there has never yet been a  
3 disaster from an LNG tanker ship. But  
4 there has been disasters involving the  
5 exact kind of LNG facilities that National  
6 Grid is proposing now.

7 In 2004 in Algeria, a liquefaction  
8 facility producing LNG exploded killing 27  
9 people and injuring 74. In 2014 in  
10 Washington State, an LNG storage tank like  
11 the one that's already there in Fields  
12 Point ruptured and injured five workers  
13 causing an evacuation within a two-mile  
14 radius. Both the Algeria and Washington  
15 incidents were in remote areas. If an LNG  
16 accident happened in a densely populated  
17 urban area like Providence, it would be  
18 disastrous.

19 Now, we all know National Grid is  
20 clearly a corporation concerned with the  
21 monetary value of various resources but  
22 it's clearly apathetic to the value of  
23 human lives, especially lives of color.  
24 This proposed LNG facility is a racist,  
25 classless disregard of the lives of people

1 with color.

2 MR. SWEARINGEN: Thank you, Ms.  
3 MacDonald. Next we have Jenny followed by  
4 Susan Walker. You're obviously not Jenny.  
5 Susan Walker and then Steve Roberts are the  
6 last two people that we have signed up.

7 MR. ROBERTS: I'm Steve Roberts.  
8 Regular Steve with just -- drop the N.  
9 Before I want to first speak, I want to  
10 thank everybody who signed and shared the  
11 petition. 400 signatures in five or six  
12 days is awesome. Thank you, National Grid,  
13 for the lovely job they did at community  
14 outreach.

15 I come up here to say we should look  
16 at conservation in making Providence more  
17 energy efficient before looking at  
18 increasing the supply of natural gas. Is  
19 there research on how making older houses  
20 and housing complexes more energy efficient  
21 will save us?

22 The majority of homes in Rhode  
23 Island were built before 1960. The state's  
24 rental units make up a disproportion share  
25 of this older housing as nearly 70 percent

1 of them were constructed before 1960. In  
2 fact, the late 1960 housing comprised a  
3 greater share of the rental market in Rhode  
4 Island than in any state in the country.  
5 Rhode Island tenants are uniquely  
6 vulnerable to the problems that arise from  
7 older housing and the quote, unquote, need  
8 for more natural gas that displaces them  
9 further is one of those ways they are  
10 running from.

11 The EPA estimates that air sealing  
12 and insulating alone can result in a  
13 12 percent reduction of total energy costs  
14 and, also, it will create jobs for the  
15 folks in this community. This calculation  
16 is based on homes built between 1970 and  
17 1990, meaning that making these  
18 improvements to the older homes likely use  
19 even greater savings.

20 Unfortunately, in the rental housing  
21 market, landlords have less incentive to  
22 invest in energy efficiency because they  
23 typically do not pay energy cost  
24 themselves. Instead, most tenants pay  
25 their own utility bills. Perhaps our

1           surprisingly analyses of energy uses  
2           indicate that more energy efficiency  
3           improvements have been made to owner  
4           occupied homes than to rental units. This  
5           disparity between the efficiency of owner  
6           occupied homes and rental housing is  
7           particularly significant for older  
8           structures.

9                         This is also reflected in the first  
10           attempt to our community outreach by  
11           National Grid where they reached out to  
12           homeowners and not renters. Literature  
13           also we need to -- these are questions we  
14           need to ask ourselves. Do we have research  
15           on what areas of Providence use the most  
16           natural gas or what entities in the city  
17           use the most natural gas and how can we  
18           target them and strategically plan for them  
19           to reduce their energy use?

20                        The capital solution is to create  
21           more, more, more. But as we see, we are  
22           going down a slope where that is not  
23           possible. It's impossible to create  
24           incident -- it's impossible to have  
25           infinite production on a planet with finer

1 resources. We need to take the use of what  
2 we have and make it work more efficiently  
3 for us. Thank you.

4 MR. SWEARINGEN: Thank you, Mr.  
5 Roberts. Susan Walker.

6 MS. WALKER: Hello, Susan Walker,  
7 S-U-S-A-N, W-A-L-K-E-R. I'm speaking as a  
8 concerned citizen of Pawtucket, Rhode  
9 Island. I am also a master student at  
10 Brown School of Public Health.

11 I want to talk about volatile  
12 organic compounds. They are the things in  
13 the air that smell terrible and lead to bad  
14 lung outcomes, increased asthma rates and  
15 aggravates emphysema, things like that.  
16 You smell them. I got lost. I took a  
17 wrong turn. I went down to Fields Point,  
18 and it smelled horrible.

19 And the reason why we don't have as  
20 much hard evidence linking them to bad  
21 respiratory outcomes as we should is  
22 because when they do things like make  
23 fracking facilities and compressor stations  
24 and LNG facilities where those volatile  
25 organic compounds are out in the air, there

1 is no baseline data in all of the studies  
2 to show what the asthma rate, emphysema  
3 rates and birth defect rates and stillborn  
4 rates are before these plants move in. So  
5 that's a weak point in all of the existing  
6 studies.

7 But I am a concerned Rhode Islander  
8 and about to launch a career in public  
9 health and to data collection methods. So  
10 I would be sure there would be baseline  
11 data before this project begins and before  
12 the compressor station expansion up in -- I  
13 told Gina the last time we chatted about  
14 the compressor station expansion.

15 What also concerns me from a public  
16 health perspective is why we already have  
17 fracking chemicals stored in that area. Is  
18 that true? Do I -- there is already -- I  
19 believe that is true. So why in the world  
20 do you want to store fracking chemicals on  
21 the waterfront? It seems extraordinarily  
22 risky.

23 First of all, we don't know what is  
24 in there. What they are supposed to do is  
25 go under the water under high pressure and

1 break apart the ground with the sand in it  
2 and stuff like that. But there is a lot --  
3 they mix a lot of chemicals into those that  
4 break apart the earth and break apart the  
5 bedrock and they, like, disintegrate the  
6 ground from the -- why -- it seems highly  
7 risky to have that kind of stuff stored  
8 right on the ocean, so that concerns me.

9 And then also -- so we are concerned  
10 about respiratory health with this facility  
11 being built here, and asthma already  
12 impacts minorities at a higher rate than  
13 non-minorities. And that is definitely  
14 shown to be the case down in south  
15 Providence, a higher incident of asthma  
16 everywhere.

17 So, you know, that's already a  
18 burden that this population has, so  
19 anything that would add to that burden I  
20 think is unconscionable. So those are the  
21 public health perspective points I wanted  
22 to bring up. Thank you for listening.

23 MR. SWEARINGEN: Thank you, Ms.  
24 Walker. That is the end of the sign-up  
25 sheet. What I would like to do is if there

1 is anybody who got to four minutes and ran  
2 out of time is there anybody who would like  
3 to come up and finish a thought? We will  
4 handle that, and then we can move into just  
5 calling people from the audience who wish  
6 to say something. Is there anybody who  
7 needed to finish a thought?

8 Okay. We will have these two people  
9 come up first, and we will just open it up  
10 to whoever wants to go after that. You are  
11 going to have to remind us of your name and  
12 everything so we can connect the thoughts.

13 MS. PALMER: My name is Karen  
14 Palmer. Karen with a K. And, actually, I  
15 have relatives down in Florida and they are  
16 building a pipeline or proposing to build a  
17 pipeline down in Florida across the farm  
18 where my husband's family lives.

19 One of the people who testified at  
20 one of the hearings down there about the  
21 pipeline actually worked for Monsanto  
22 Shale, and he was an engineer for the  
23 project. And one of the things he says  
24 that -- he talks about experts and he says,  
25 "I have no faith in experts because experts

1           lie. I lie to my job because that's just  
2           the name of the game." You have  
3           two-thousand page report put together by  
4           mindless people who absolutely have no  
5           responsibility who will build a -- bear no  
6           responsibility to this. And this is  
7           regarding the trail but he says nobody will  
8           build a -- bear any personal  
9           responsibility.

10                         And what about FERC? FERC is the  
11           same thing. If something goes wrong, not  
12           our problem. I am sure you will all have  
13           geologists who will come out and say, well,  
14           we studied the situation. Nothing we did  
15           invented this. This was just a naturally  
16           occurring event. They are talking about an  
17           explosion.

18                         If you lose your home or you lose  
19           your property, well, if you're old, you  
20           will be dead before it's settled. If  
21           you're young, you will be old before it's  
22           settled. Experts and attorneys will have a  
23           field day. The companies don't care. It's  
24           just greed and arrogance.

25                         Again, the aquifer (sic) in this

1 area -- and he talks about this specific  
2 area in Florida. I guess the point being  
3 is that, I think, the whole drive behind  
4 all of this has to do with greed and it  
5 does not have the best interest of the  
6 people at heart.

7 I think that people who promote this  
8 actually are willing to sacrifice peoples'  
9 lives, their livelihood, their well-being  
10 and I feel like this is not in the best  
11 interest of the people of the United  
12 States. I would like to have the voices of  
13 the Americans heard and not the voice of  
14 the corporations.

15 MR. SWEARINGEN: Thank you. You  
16 wanted to finish a thought. Again, I think  
17 you wanted to speak. You will be next.

18 MS. PETRIE: Lisa Petrie, and I'm  
19 from Fossil Free Rhode Island. I was  
20 talking about the FERC's disregard for the  
21 will of the communities that are impacted  
22 by these projects and the testimony of  
23 independent experts, as well as the impacts  
24 on peoples' safety and health, as well as  
25 the greenhouse gas impacts on the entire

1 world.

2 People have testified and filed  
3 letters and legal petitions again and again  
4 and FERC has turned a deaf ear. In the  
5 face of all this stonewalling, some folks  
6 have got so desperate that they stationed  
7 an 18-day hunger strike, as you're probably  
8 aware, outside of FERC headquarters in  
9 Washington, DC.

10 And at the same time, hundreds of  
11 people around the country fasted in  
12 solidarity for shorter periods. Those  
13 folks I want to give a shout out to them.  
14 They consumed only water for 18 days, and  
15 they were sustained only by their passion  
16 to protect our world and our children from  
17 FERC's recklessness.

18 Please prove us wrong. Please for  
19 once show that you care about the impacts  
20 of the projects you oversee, and that you  
21 have the courage to stand up to the  
22 industry that you're supposed to regulate.  
23 Thank you.

24 MR. SWEARINGEN: Thank you, Ms.  
25 Petrie.

1 MS. LACEY: Hello. My name is  
2 Michelle Lacey, L-A-C-E-Y. I am a  
3 community member of directly -- literally I  
4 walked here. It took me two minutes.  
5 First I would like to say to National Grid,  
6 this is a quorum. You could have notified  
7 us any way that this meeting was taking  
8 place.

9 I am the health care professional in  
10 this neighborhood, and I just want to go on  
11 the record to say that I have notified  
12 every community leader around here that I'm  
13 affiliated with, and this is not going to  
14 happen. We will fight you tooth and nail.

15 The next thing I'd like to say to  
16 the Justice League, I want to thank you. I  
17 want to thank you for sending that  
18 community message to us. I'm sorry if I'm  
19 the only person that could attend out of my  
20 group, but we will support you. I've  
21 already been in contact with the ones that  
22 are not here tonight, and we will be behind  
23 you 100 percent.

24 I, myself, will walk door-to-door.  
25 My family owns six houses two blocks from

1 here. We are taxpayer citizens. This is  
2 not going to happen here. It's just not.  
3 Thank you.

4 MR. SWEARINGEN: Thank you, Ms.  
5 Lacey. Is there anybody else who wishes to  
6 speak? Yes, come on up.

7 MR. LAMBEK: Good evening. My name  
8 is Will Lambek, L-A-M-B-E-K. I heard a lot  
9 of excellent testimony this evening from  
10 folks who are in opposition to the plan. I  
11 don't want to be redundant. I have very  
12 little to add. I just wanted to add my  
13 voice to the chorus of the Providence  
14 residents, Rhode Island residents who are  
15 opposed to this project and we hope that  
16 you will listen to the voice of the people.  
17 Thank you very much.

18 MR. SWEARINGEN: Thank you,  
19 Mr. Lambek. Anybody else? Okay. I don't  
20 see anymore hands. With that the public  
21 portion of the meeting will close the  
22 transcript -- the official transcript for  
23 this meeting will be available from the  
24 FERC website in a few weeks. And if you  
25 want something sooner than that, you can

1 talk to the court reporter.

2 Let the record show that the  
3 Providence Rhode Island meeting ended at  
4 8:45 p.m. on October 8, 2015. Thank you.

5

6 (Meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.)

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25